

The striking down of Sadi Carnot, President of the French Republic, by the dagger of a cowardly assassin, on Sunday last, has sent a shock of horror, mingled with something like dismay, through the civilized world. When we read of the way in which the footsteps of the Czar of Russia are dogged by would-be assassins, so that he dare not stir abroad until the most elaborate precautions have been taken, and he is at every step encircled, so to speak, with concentric cordons of armed men, we find no difficulty in accounting for the fact. Irrespective of any traits, agreeable or the opposite, in his own character, he stands to hundreds of thousands of his subjects as the representative and head of a system of the cruellest despotism. But in the case of the murdered President of France, it seems impossible to assign any motive for the dastardly deed that we can conceive of as having weight with sane men. Personally he was remarkable among the prominent men of the period in France for worth and dignity of character. In character he seems to have been upright and amiable to a degree which had won for him a singularly widespread esteem and confidence among his volatile fellow-countrymen. In a word, it does not appear that there could have existed any sufficient motive, either political or personal, to enable us to account for the murder on ordinary principles. We have to fall back upon the explanation, which explains nothing but merely states a strange and unaccountable fact, that the assassination was the deed of an Anarchist!

The Anarchist may, for want of a better comparison, be regarded as the Thug of Western civilization. Yet in many respects the comparison fails. The Thug murders mostly for the sake of plunder; the Anarchist kills without any such motive. The Thug spares certain classes and seldom lays his hand upon women; the Anarchist, though he may to-day select a prominent victim, will to-morrow throw his bomb with reckless indifference into the mixed crowd in the theatre or on the street. The Thug takes precautions to insure his own safety; the Anarchist glories in self-immolation. By virtue of his dreary philosophy, or social despair, or whatever may be the controlling impulse, he is transformed, for the time being at least, into a savage beast, utterly reckless of consequences, and seeming often to court rather than to fear the death which almost surely dogs his footsteps as he goes forth to commit the crime for which he has probably been set apart by some mysterious tribunal. It is this peculiarity which puts the Anarchists beyond the pale of all the means of repression by which any other comparatively small criminal organization could be speedily crushed out of existence. Perhaps the strangest of all the strange features of Anarchism is its utter hopelessness. It is beyond the power of imagination to

conceive of any end capable of being consciously sought by a sane mind, which its votaries can set before themselves and their adherents. As the poor wretch Santo must have realized when the sternest efforts of the police and mounted guards hardly sufficed to save him from being torn in pieces by the infuriated crowd, the overthrow of organized society, which is their ostensible goal, could only mean their own more sudden and ruthless destruction. With all its mysterious terrors, however, it is impossible that Anarchism can ever accomplish more than a few desultory outrages. Every fresh atrocity, such as this murder most foul, will but hasten the end. Civilized nations will speedily take concerted action for the outlawry and extermination of a body whose deeds cut them off from all claims upon human sympathy or pity and compel their classification with those wild beasts, whose extermination is found necessary for the safety of society.

A MISDIRECTED ALARM.

Even in the comparatively young and undeveloped Province of Manitoba, some of the wise are taking up their parable, and deploring the misdirected ambition which leads so many young men to pursue an arts course in the University, with a view, it is assumed, to some of the learned professions, instead of preparing themselves for agricultural and other manual pursuits. Lieut.-Governor Schultz seems even to have implied in a recent address that something should be done by the University authorities to bring about a different result. The *Winnipeg Free Press* very sensibly replies that until farm life can be made more agreeable and its pecuniary returns more satisfactory in comparison with those of other pursuits, young men will continue to forsake the farm. "No institution of learning," says the *Free Press*, "not even an agricultural college, is likely to convert young men to a belief in the advisability of choosing farm life, while every one of its professors is living in a style and earning a salary that is princely in comparison with what he could realize in the pursuit of agriculture."

This is certainly a practical view of the matter. It assumes that the mercenary, or if that word is too harsh, the business motive is the ruling one in drawing young men to college. It takes no account of any possibility that some of the young men may love learning for its own sake. Yet are we not warranted in believing that at least a respectable minority of the members of every university class have entered college mainly for the sake of the education itself, and the enlarged horizon that they believe will be opened up by four or five years of earnest study, while giving scarcely a thought to the bearing of the work upon their future material prospects? Of one thing we are sure. If every university in the Dominion does not contain a considerable percentage

of students who are pursuing its course under such impulses without calculating or even conscious reference to its relations to the bread-and-butter problem, students who would not falter for a moment in their resolve were it clearly revealed to them that they should have in all the future to earn their bread in the sweat of their faces—we have fallen upon degenerate days. The average student of to-day must be of quite a different species from most of the dozen or two of good fellows whom memory recalls as the college intimates of other days. We still have a very vivid recollection of the contempt aroused in the student mind, in those days, by the frank declaration of one young man who, when urged to enter for a degree, declared that if he could be convinced that a college course would enable him to earn, after its completion, an income so much larger than he could otherwise make as to repay principal and interest on the sum necessary to carry him through, he would take the course, not otherwise. "If that is your way of looking at it, do not waste your time in study," was the feeling, if not the expression, of those who felt or fancied themselves actuated by higher ambitions.

We know that one is in danger of exposing himself to ridicule, or of being set down as visionary, if he attempts to put the question on too lofty grounds in these ultra-practical days. The view that found favour a quarter or half-century ago, and which had much to do with the founding of many of the institutions which are now doing a large work for higher education—the view that the largest possible mental development is the birthright of every individual, that culture and learning should be sought for their own sakes, as conditions of the highest manhood (and womanhood), seems to be becoming outgrown in these days. One of the results is the constantly growing tendency to specialization in our college and university courses. Another result is the tendency in some quarters to deprecate the ambition which is, it is feared, leading to the over-education of the young men of the day. Indeed, it would seem that certain practical philanthropists are so impressed with the danger to society likely to arise from this source that they are almost ready to inaugurate a movement for the forcible restriction of the numbers of arts students in the universities.

Even should we admit the existence of the danger, we should still distrust the remedy. Who shall determine, and by what authority, who of our boys shall and who shall not, be permitted to acquire a liberal education? Judging from the outcry which is being heard from so many quarters touching the depravity which is leading so many young men to forsake the farms and other rural pursuits and seek their fortunes in the cities, one might infer that not only the colleges but the professions and other better-paid pursuits should be closed against the country youths and reserved for the sole