

and rain. The rotary motion causes a rarefaction of air which, in the center of the storm being increased by the condensation of moisture, sometimes becomes almost a vacuum. The pressure from above then begins and pushes the center of the cloud downward, thus causing the funnel shaped cloud which is an invariable attendant of the tornado.

On the outside of these storms the air is almost always comparatively calm and, in case of the larger storms, which are properly called cyclones, the wind generally blows away from the storm center as well as towards it, owing to the increased density of air caused by the outpouring of warmer air at the top of the chimney of heated air, if we may again use the illustration of the stove

The Professor then related some of the terrible effects of these storms. A very common thing is for the roof of a building to be destroyed or some part, as the side, forced out, caused by the expansive pressure of the air inside. Sometimes buildings in the direct path of the storm are almost uninjured and in one case the roof was lifted from a house and a cow standing in the yard near by was lifted unhurt into the house. In a tornado which created great destruction near Rock Island in 1844 not only were the fences demolished, but the rails themselves were broken to pieces. Wagon wheels were torn from wagons and the spokes drawn bodily from the hub. A large log which some workmen had tried in vain to split was, by the storm split into four pieces. In another case not only were trees torn up, but small pieces of wood were driven into them. These terrible illustrations were not, the Professor thought, from electricity as is so often claimed, but from the violent movement of the air. Air moving 100 miles per hour exerts a pressure of fifty pounds per square foot. If the velocity is increased to 300 miles per hour the pressure becomes nine times as great as before, and the rotary motion of the tornado is computed to be fully 300 miles per hour.

In concluding it was remarked that observations taken showed Nebraska to be comparatively free from these terrible visitations

A contemporary regrets that some great authors have failed to "put themselves into their works." In a certain sense the objection may be well taken, for too many in their imitations of others or from a false idea of what is proper and desirable fail to write naturally; but when one undertakes to lament that Shakespeare did not stamp his individuality on his works he assumes more than most readers will admit. It is spoken of as the crowning glory of Shakespeare that he was able to so thoroughly sympathize with and enter into other men's thought. It is this which made him a great depicter of character and we could not wish him otherwise. No man with a nature of the strongly, narrowly intense stamp could have been a Shakespeare.

Certain things not mentioned in the college curriculum should be cultivated and studied as assiduously by every student as though they were compelled to take them as regular studies. These are reading, writing and speaking well. Certainly they are the indirect objects of much college work, but too many fail to perceive their value and pass through one, two, or three years of school life without any special effort to attain excellence in them. It should be urged, and urged again upon every student that in nothing can he err more than in thinking it unnecessary to cultivate a proficiency in these three things. It is a fundamental principle of advanced teaching that the ability to procure is more valuable than possession itself. He who can read rapidly and intelligently need not long be poorly read, nor will he. And such a one will never

cease to be a reader, while he who has read only under compulsion will cease as soon as that compulsion is removed. If so much may be said of the ability to read, an equal amount might be said concerning style in writing or ability in speaking and writing. The ability to clothe the thoughts in apt phrase is no small part of an education. As there exist unwritten constitutions, so there are also unwritten curriculums.

John Ruskin is great, but like some others equally great is terribly egotistic. This is illustrated in his criticisms on some seven authors whose works he threw out of a list presented to him for inspection. Of Grote's History of Greece he says "There is probably no commercial establishment between Charing Cross and the bank, whose head clerk could not write a better one, if he had the vanity to waste his time on it;" of Charles Kingsley, "His sentiment is false and his tragedy frightful. The story of 'Hypatia' is the most ghastly in christian tradition, and should forever have been left in silence." Darwin he rejects because it is every man's duty to know what he is, and not to think of the embryo he was, nor the skeleton he shall be. Because, also, Darwin has a mortal fascination for all vainly curious and idly speculative persons, and has collected, in the train of him, every impudent imbecility in Europe, like a dim comet wagging its useless tail of phosphorescent nothing across the steadfast stars." Gibbon he rejects because "none but the malignant study the Decline and Fall of either state or organism. Dissolution and putrescence are alike common and unclean in all things. For the rest, Gibbon's is the worst English that was ever written by an educated Englishman." Voltaire's work "is, in comparison with good literature, what nitric acid is to wine, and sulphuretted hydrogen is to air." Seldom have we seen a criticism more evidently arising from prejudice or expressed with less regard to the good that might be said. It may do for Mr. Ruskin to criticise so unguardedly and sweepingly because Mr. Ruskin is a man who is, in some measure, great, but if one of less renown had undertaken to write such opinions he would have been a laughing stock. There is a fresh personality about Ruskin's criticism, yet we think it only just to concede something to the value of the opinions of others, and this he does not do.

Our friend from Suspension Bridge appears concerned because the *Cornell Sun* has clipped from a western exchange something that reflects on the Jesuits. The *Index* devotes something over two columns to quotation, personal allusion and an attempt at consideration of the charges made. THE HESPERIAN did not see the article in question for the simple reason that, knowing such topics to be generally treated from a standpoint of religious prejudice rather than from any desire to reach the truth, we pay them small attention. The *Index* scarcely meets the charges fairly or successfully. It uses words from a partizan standpoint and evidently with a partizan meaning. The western journal before mentioned charged that in a certain Catholic college in California no book on philosophy other than Tongeorgi was allowed within the walls and that the students were forbidden to read anything not sanctioned by the church. The *Index* does not presume to deny the statements, but rather seeks to justify such a course. It remarks that, in philosophical studies, the course above mentioned is the surest step to success. But what is success in philosophical study? We grant that one may reach a preconceived conclusion much more certainly by reading only those books which are in harmony with that conclusion; but, unless we can be infallibly assured that the preconceived conclusion is the whole truth and nothing but the truth, such a course