

a gossiping frivolous sheet, that aims at nothing better than to give back a dim reflection of the surface of things. We require more individuality than a looking-glass, (Bacon notwithstanding), if we wish to penetrate the surface.

But it is not only in the retailing of college gossip, that worship of the particular becomes the most debasing idolatry. Articles of the truly newspaper style, whether copied from, or occasioned by publications, either on this side or that side of the world, should never find a place within the columns of the JOURNAL. For it might be possible (if afflicted with *strabismus* for instance) to circumnavigate the globe, nor ever see the shining of a single universal truth.

The JOURNAL should afford opportunity for the expression of college opinion. It should tempt students of literary taste to exercise their talents, and it should be the means of training these to a higher perfection. How is this to be done? First of all the JOURNAL must appeal to the Alumni. They must contribute of their intellectual wealth if the JOURNAL is to occupy its true position. According to the proportion of subscribers alone (and our subscribers are also our contributors) the Alumni are to the students as five to two. Of our subscribers then, all over the country, from California to Turkey in Asia, we urgently request some practical recognition of this principle. Moreover such efforts of outsiders, who are occupying, many of them, distinguished positions in the world, must re-act favorably upon the literary energy of the undergraduates. A student of real ability does not desire to measure himself except with the best.

At the same time we should not entirely neglect the necessities of some; and we should still retain a little, just a little of the gossip-froth. But let us remember that as with the waves of the sea, (unless we are broken on the shore), it is only the deepest and the broadest which has a right to carry any foam.

•BY THE WAY•

A university is worthy the support of an intelligent people just so far as it gives its students broader and truer views of the true nature of men and things. The mere scattered threads of knowledge of particular subjects may be obtained, with a little variation of the present status of our high schools, from other sources in a very much more economical way. The ever recurring outbreaks of the Russian students against the intolerable despotism of the Czar is a comforting proof to every well-wisher of mankind that the universities of Russia are performing the functions which form their sole *raison d'être* satisfactorily. We are aware that a far different reason for these outbreaks has been lately assigned; but, without taking the trouble to compare the triviality of the assigned cause with the mortal seriousness of the effect, we simply say that we believe the writer to be wrong.

Just as the outbreaks in question are a guarantee that the universities in Russia are giving the youths who throng their walls true thoughts on liberty and the rights of man, so, from the utterances of our students, men will pronounce judgment upon the success or failure of our universities; and, not only will the voices of the present, but, far more important the less fallible voices of the future, condemn or acquit. The men of the present,—from interest, enthusiasm, passion, or too close participation in the affairs in question, may be distorted in view or biased in judgment; but the men that shall arise,—their ears unconfused by the clang of strife, their eyesight unimpeded by the clouds of battle, their pulses unstimulated,—shall pronounce, with philosophic calm, a judgment which the world will not hastily lay aside.

This being so, it is fit and proper that we should doff our hats to this principle, both in the mapping out of our work, and in its execution. If we do so, there will be less, far less, moral cowardice manifested in the lives of our students. We will reach down to the bottom of things so as to grasp the principle of truth which lies below them; and, having gained this, we will stand by it in sunshine and in storm, in the minority or in the majority, when men frown and when they smile. So will we get a right view of the scope and nature of the mission we were created to perform; and having a definite goal before us, our footsteps will lose much of their tortuosity, and our actions speak to men with an emphasis utterly lacking in the corks calling themselves men, bobbing about us on the sea of life.

The execution of Riel, with its attendant circumstances, again calls up the subject of capital punishment,—its fitness and unfitness, its justice or injustice. Setting aside altogether the personal question of Riel's merits or demerits, capital punishment in and of itself, is, like the toll gate, only on a larger scale, a mere relic of a bygone and barbaric age. As a question of morals, it is iniquitous; as a metaphysical problem, it is unphilosophic. Its abolition is a mere question of time. Everything comes to him who knows how to wait for it. The right of man to self-preservation is a true principle. It is grounded on justice and the eternal fitness of things. The right of man to protect himself by removing from his society a person whose influence is pernicious, is unquestionable; but his right to cut such a person off from *life*, or from the only life with which we have an intimate, sensible acquaintance, is not only questionable, but, as a matter of fact, is no right at all,—unless we are ready to confess that might alone is right. The society from which we shut off the criminal in imprisoning him, we have ourselves formed—brought into existence; as far as we are concerned, *created*. The life from which men cut off the man who has been executed, they have *not* created; and, until they can give evidence of having made this world, their right to cut any man off from it, whatever his crimes, amounts exactly to—nothing at all. If it is wrong for