

to the end to devote her life and substance to the spread of the kindergarten and its underlying ideas. In recent years there has arisen a great deal of opposition against Miss Blow's Froebelian ideas, similar in scope to the opposition against William T. Harris's Hegelian conception of the common school curriculum. But it would be short-sighted even for the most vigorous opponent of these ideas to deny the great service which Miss Blow and William T. Harris rendered in their day to the cause of national education.

FOR some weeks past Governor Brumbaugh of Pennsylvania has been pretending to think of himself as a presidential candidate. It was not even very much of a pretense, and it was even less convincing than the efforts of a number of "favorite sons" in other commonwealths. Under cover of the Brumbaugh boom, however, a desperate fight was being waged by the Governor's contractor-boss allies, the Vare brothers aided by Mayor Smith, to wrest the control of the state organization from Penrose, McNichol, Oliver, *et al.* In this way Governor Brumbaugh's activities became very odious to the party gangsters of the second part, and apparently they had decided to "Sulzerize" him. First blood has been won by the Governor, who beat his opponents to the newspaper offices with the details of the sordid story. It concerns a check for one thousand dollars sent to Brumbaugh during the campaign for the governorship by his former friend, David B. Oliver, brother of the Pittsburgh senator. This check the Governor says he regarded as a personal gift. He deposited it to his private account and used it for his own purposes after the election. It was not included in any statement of his campaign expenses filed according to law with the Secretary of the Commonwealth.

PENNSYLVANIA is staid and sober, but even in that state the spectacle of Penrose and Oliver in the role of public avengers of political immorality will provoke Homeric laughter. Why were these senatorial sleuths silent so long? Why did they postpone "squealing on the Governor" until they needed to coerce him? Naturally and quite justly Dr. Brumbaugh's friends are shrieking "Black-mail!" at the top of their lungs. But all their clamor will scarcely avail to down the fact that by his own confession the Governor committed the colossal blunder of appearing to misapply and conceal a campaign contribution. Of such stuff as Brumbaugh's presidential candidates are no longer made. In the court of public opinion, therefore, the only possible verdict is guilty, applying equally to the Brumbaugh-Vare-Smith clan and the Penrose-McNichol-Oliver gang.

Through Thick and Thin

BETWEEN campaigns political partisanship in the United States was blinder and more vehement twenty-five years ago than it is to-day. Opposition newspapers were slower to praise things that the administration said or did. Administration newspapers did not so often criticize the administration adversely. Since few editors felt free to say upon all occasions what they happened really to think, few got the habit of thinking outside the beaten partisan way. Political writing was mostly advocacy. Political writers were counsel for the defense or the prosecution. Fear of being quoted in approval of the enemy or in opposition to one's own side was a stronger and commoner motive than it is nowadays between campaigns.

Once a campaign is on, however, nearly all political writers and spectators lose whatever impulse they may have had to say what they think. After the conventions have adjourned nearly everybody refuses to admit in public that the candidate whose defeat he desires has a good point or two. Most of us shrink from representing the man whom we want our readers and hearers to vote for as a finite being, having a mixed character and a mind that can do some kinds of work less well than other kinds. Most of us are afflicted with a stone age unwillingness to tell our hearers and readers what we know that all of them know except the very stupidest, namely, that when an American citizen is making up his mind about two candidates for President he is shut up to a choice between two fallible human beings, neither of whom is as great a man as Julius Caesar or Napoleon or Bismarck. To this bad habit of indiscriminate praise, and not a sudden mental breakdown, one must attribute such absurdities as the New York *World's* discovery, made about four years ago, that Mr. Wilson was the greatest living master of the English language. This was like saying that Colonel Roosevelt is as original a faunal naturalist as Charles Darwin, or that Mr. Root thinks as profoundly about politics as Burke.

In the coming campaign THE NEW REPUBLIC will no doubt prefer one candidate, plus the part of his platform that means anything, to the other combination of platform and candidate. We shall make this preference and the reasons for it as plain as we can. But we shall not say, unless we happen also to believe, that the candidate whose election we desire unites all the merits of Pericles, Lincoln, Attila and William Penn. It is possible to vote for a man even if you do not think he can give an all-wise Providence a stroke a hole. It is not possible to read, in Mr. Thayer's life of John Hay, his summary of President Roosevelt's conversation with Dr. Holleben without admitting that President Roosevelt then

acted with characteristic decisiveness in foreign affairs. But it is possible to admire this quality without affirming that it is always found in combination with an equal aptitude for dealing with the labor problem.

A few readers will dislike our attitude toward the candidate whose election we hope for. Some of them will accuse us of giving our case away, being disloyal, blowing hot and cold, firing at our own officers, fouling our own nest. Such are the standard forms likely to be taken by their resentment at seeing in print the opinion that getting nominated never enables a candidate to shed all his human weaknesses. Such misunderstandings are unavoidable. But there will be compensations. Many readers will take kindly to the experiment of talking as freely and candidly in print as thousands of Americans talk privately to one another. These readers may even wonder why such a sensible and obvious course should still at this late day be more or less an innovation.

Behind the Agitations

OPPONENTS of greater preparedness recently exhibited the model of a dinosaur with this threatening legend upon it, "All armor-plate—no brains. Now extinct." To this a wag replied with a picture of a man bearing the label, "Genus Homo, invented the best offensive weapons. Owns the earth." And so the discussion wallows deeper and deeper into confusion. There is no longer any body of facts which both sides agree upon. Each faction has its admirals, its generals, its "experts," its editors, its clergymen, its politicians, its government reports ready to support its particular case. The congressional hearings proved to each person whatever he wished them to prove. If one side has its General Wood, the other has its General Miles, and so far as the plain man can find out the net moral is that the generals disagree. At this moment the country simply does not know whom to believe. There is no authoritative statement of the efficiency and strength of our existing forces, and every estimate made is discredited as just so much partisanship.

It ought not to be impossible to ascertain pretty exactly so concrete a thing as the military equipment of a nation. We have learned to measure infinitely subtler things than that. Yet here we are after more than a year of agitation more hopelessly divided than ever on the basic and essential facts. Now when men tangle themselves up this way, it generally means that the will to believe has dominated them. Their capacity for seeing the truth is ruined

by their hot desire to prove a case. Their minds reject whatever conflicts with their policy. Investigation ceases to be a way of reaching conclusions, and becomes a method of supporting conclusions. Their decision is made not on an analysis of evidence, but on some obscure half-recognized impulse which is then rationalized, made respectable, and furbished with an array of those facts which happen to support it.

This conflict of underlying wills to believe is what has set the armament question at sixes and sevens. Thus, those who are for preparedness are making their popular appeal on the theory that the territory of the United States is about to be invaded by the Germans and the Japanese. See for example "The Battle Cry of Peace," any magazine serial on the conquest of America, or the names of the armament societies—National Security League: the method is that of the famous play "An Englishman's Home," which had so great an effect in scaring the British public. Had it been a really prophetic play, had it shown the need of sending millions of Englishmen to Flanders or Gallipoli or Saloniki, it would have been flat—the agitators didn't dare to tell the people the exact truth. So with us. No doubt most of the propagandists sincerely believe in the theory of invasion, but the really informed students of the question have a totally different picture in their minds. When they speak about the defense of America, they mean the defense of American rights at sea, of American interests in China, of American policies about Latin America. They do not imagine that we are to be invaded in order to take away our gold, or put a ransom on our cities. They know that if we are committed to a first class war it will be because we have quarrelled with some great Power about some American right or ambition in some territory not within the boundaries of the United States. The invasion, if it happens, would be the outcome of that sort of quarrel. But in order to secure increased armament the agitation is concentrated on the possibility of invasion, not on the desirability or justice of a conflict in Latin America or China. That is why Michigan votes for Henry Ford. Michigan doesn't think it will be invaded.

We are not trying to justify Michigan, but merely to get at the deeper prejudices which confuse the preparedness discussion. So among the pacifists there exists a revulsion which the defense leagues seem to ignore, and because they ignore it their propaganda is frustrated. What the pacifist sees is not a table of figures showing the military weakness of America. He sees a world in ruins, brought to its ruin by the very same kind of talk and calculation now being used so glibly by the advocates of pre-