

“IF a boy is not a man at twenty, the probabilities are that he never will be a man.” It makes no difference who wrote the above sentence. The question is, is it true? It is a plain statement and worthy of careful consideration, even, if in some cases, it should prove a little discouraging. That there are exceptions it would be foolish to deny; that it is generally true we will not try to prove, but the most of the time we believe it, and the rest of the time we feel sure. Anyway it would be no harm for a fellow to *try* to be a man by the time he is twenty, although some seem to think it would be kind of foolish and wicked. It would be no harm for him to commence to try when he is only fourteen or fifteen, or as soon as he comes to the Academy. If he cannot be a man without a cigar he had better save up his pennies and buy one as soon as he can. If he cannot be a man without swearing and cards and rum, without bombast, conceit and florida water, without love of the truth, honesty, good sense and a kind heart, without indifference to the future, disrespect to himself, disregard to the right of others and bullragging the weaker; if he cannot be a man without scorning at all that is good and true, without striving after purity of heart, without yielding to every lust, without the companionship of the vile, without despising father and mother, without struggling to be like the best man that ever walked the earth and living not for himself, then the sooner he commences the better.

IF it is possible to feel the loss of anything without ever really having it in possession, we believe the experience has been ours. We purchased a large, interesting looking work last year, written originally by a philosopher, John Stuart Mill, and since mutilated by an American author, whose chief recommendation, so far as we can discover, is an apparently inexhaustible amount of presumption. The work is one on political economy, and we looked forward to an interesting course of study in a branch of science as universally needed as it was with us unsatisfactory. We were disappointed if not disgusted, not however with the subject the principles taught, the doctrines set forth, (so far as we anticipated them) nor in the manner in which the work was handled by the professors who had charge of the departments, for they made the most of every minute and opportunity, and

to a degree highly appreciated by those who had the benefit of their lectures, but in the pitifully short time which is allotted to the study of its principles, and the unsystematic division of even the portion that is given. One, lone, solitary hour per week running through one college year, or, counting out the loss for accidents, holidays, omissions, periods for examination, we have left probably twenty-five hours out of four years, devoted to one of the most important subjects in the whole range of English studies. The matter is too bad to be ridiculous. A subject of this kind has to be an unusually interesting one to hold the attention during a week's intermission, and when this happens not once but is continued, it is almost impossible to pursue it advantageously. The connection is lost; interest flags if it ever was generated at all, and the whole matter assumes the proportions of a solemn farce enacted weekly and with the same old company to play and no audience to appreciate. To cap the climax, however, just as a fair start has been made, and some of the leading questions loom up out of the fog of doubt and chaos, clear and well defined, thus impelling you to greater exertions for closer and more thorough examination, down go the sails, out runs the anchor and we are anchored hard and fast in the mud flats of June. The voyage is over; our cargo of political economy, it is safe to say, will hardly pay the freight.

Mill is one authority, yet only a mere smattering of even his work is mastered. Smith, Cairns, Malthus, besides a host of other eminent English writers, to say nothing of French and American authors, are wholly out of the question.

That a knowledge of the principles of political economy is most important is, perhaps, scarcely worth remarking; some of the grandest disasters in the affairs of nations of which we read in history, within a comparatively recent period, at least have had their origin in the grossly erroneous views which they cherished of the foundations of wealth, commerce and industry. It is a subject with which the *people* should be familiar. Mere ignorance causes them to rail at what they are pleased to call “theorists;” with many indeed, anything that savors of theory is deemed worthy of immediate and unqualified condemnation. This they justify on the same ground that they “stand by the faith of their fathers;” just what the faith is is known only and exclusively to themselves. To the