

ALUMNI.

EDITOR HESPERIAN—When I received your invitation to write "copy" I was somewhat at a loss for a proper subject. The question of debates versus oratorical contests seems to be settled by recognizing the utility of both. Brain versus Brawn seems more appropriate during the base-ball and foot-ball seasons. Threeyears military "flimflams" versus common sense seems to be quietly acquiesced in by the prep of the present generation. But there is one question which after a lull of a few years is again breaking out with some of its old time fervor—the question of Barbarism versus Greek. Here is a question as old as the rock-ribbed hills of the quaternary and bids fair to be as everlasting. While this fraternity question is not a new one, the present phase of it is a new one. Weary, perhaps, of the warfare of extermination there is a new school of sophists springing up who, by penetration keener, and insight clearer, have just discovered that the fraternities are the very best friends of the open literary society.

These sophists would have us believe that the Greek of the present is a great improvement on the Greek of the past, and that they are all really good fellows. Mr. Editor, an Englishman may be just as good a fellow as an American, but if Englishmen assume the right to land upon American soil and retain a form of government that tends to destroy ours, or in any way to weaken or undermine its influence, we should turn all the engines of war upon them that this great country can muster. But the Greeks do more—they, backed by their faithful allies, the aforesaid sophists—demand that we not only welcome them to our fellowship but that we change the most vital provision in the constitution in order that they may take peaceful possession of our strongholds.

No sir, "the war must go on." It must go on until democracy becomes triumphant everywhere. The anti-fraternity amendment will stand so long as there are five loyal barbarians in each society. They tell us

that this kind of doctrine is "unchristian," "narrow." They theorize about the "Universal brotherhood of man," and a society organized according to the gospel of St. John. What magnificent souls! Haven't we heard that voice before? "The voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hand is the hand of Esan," just as of old.

The fox said to the hen on the roost, "Come down and let us be sociable, I am really the best friend you have, let us enjoy God's sunshine together." But the hen was well satisfied with her exalted position. *She knew the character of the brute.*

There is one way and but one that these fraternity amendments may be repealed—by supposed barbarians. It has stood and will stand like a stone wall against the most persistent attacks of its avowed enemies. If they are struck down it must be done by a Bratus who in the name and in the guise of democracy would destroy democracy.

The doors of the open literary society swing open to all classes who will pledge loyalty and support to its principles. It takes in the poor as well as the rich, the prep as well as the senior, the male as well as the female, the cultured as well as the uncultured, the black as well as the white. It holds no session behind closed doors; it puts no premium on foppishness. Its meetings—business and social are open to the world. Is not this platform broad enough for our "universal brotherhood" friends?

If those beneficent, whole-souled, broad-gauged reformers are so anxious to go about the world doing good, why do they not invite students who admit they need the society and whom in after years the society will need? There are several hundred students who would join willingly perhaps if there were room. Students too, who do not owe a higher allegiance to another organization.

In short, why try the experiment that in the past has led to but one result—failure, invariable and irreparable. If the fraternities wish to enjoy the benefits of the open literary societies why do they not organize