

will finally crumble to pieces, as all institutions that are founded on a false principle. But in the mean time do we want such a blot and stain upon our government to remain until that time? But if anything is done it must be done immediately.

One of the editors in an article in the *STUDENT* estimates Carlyle as "two-fifths genius and three-fifths sheer fudge." All we can say is, if he is "three-fifths sheer fudge" let us pray for more like him. If fudge consists in a hatred of all shams, an earnest love of truth, let us have more fudge. Carlyle was one of the pioneers who brought about the great revolution which has swept over the world, which has renovated literature, religion and the life of man. Before his advent literature was but little better than an imatory art, religion consisted principally of outward ceremonies, and the aim of man was to seem rather than to be. He commenced a fierce attack and shouted the "everlasting no." He pictured in bold colors the evils of the day, abuse and insults were rained upon him, but he kept steadily on. He directed his blows against sham and appearance wherever he met them, and insisted on the necessity of being true. His efforts have not been in vain, the truth and force of his philosophy has been recognized; literature has been revived, religion has ceased to be a form, and has become a living reality, "the eyes of man," as Julian Hawthorne says, "have been turned within," and he recognizes the fact that the highest aim is to be, not to seem. Carlyle is one of the great factors that accomplished the change. If fudge can do this, then fudge is what the world wants.

THE *STUDENT* has no objection to fraternities as fraternities; any thing which tends to bring the students into closer relations meets our hearty approval. But there is a question as to whether fraternities accomplish this end in the sense of bringing the greatest good to the greatest number—whether the formation of a clique will not destroy more friendship than it creates. Friendship brought about in this way has no regard to mental compatability, nor in fact to anything but the sense of companionship in a few exclusive particulars, extravagance being too often the main one. It is doubtful whether a friendship founded upon a feeling that unnecessary drafts have been drawn upon the future or upon relatives will be lasting, or tend toward good results. No faithful student can afford more than one evening in each week to social enjoyment. The question then arises—is the chapter more beneficial than the society? At the former the enjoyment consists in conversation which, the members being exclusively masculine, is more than likely to degrade rather than elevate. The interest must be eked out with banquets

and other expensive affairs which the individuals would never think of in their private capacities. The expense is no small matter to most students. On the other hand the society need cost very little, and its work is the art of expressing in the most forcible manner what we have already learned. In fact those who have gone through a University course usually say that the society is worth one study throughout the four years. There is, it is true, a third course open, which, being the worst, is the one that will generally be followed—that of belonging to both. This necessitates a neglect of the work we are here to accomplish. We do not mean one may not attend both the society and the chapter and still stand well in his class; but we do mean that he cannot do this and do the best that is possible for him in his University work.

THE *State Democrat* seems to take an unwarranted degree of interest in the University. No misdemeanor or offence escapes its vigilant eye, and when there are none of these, it has a habit of manufacturing them out of whole cloth. The late articles on Charter Day are examples. We might expect such things from a back-woods country paper, which, for lack of any thing else, is filled with slanders and lies, but for a paper which pretends to be a state paper to stoop as low as this is infinitely disgusting. The *Democrat* adds apologetically that the first article was only intended as a joke to get up a little excitement. If the *Democrat* has so little brains in its staff that it has to have recourse to such stuff as this for a joke, we advise it to emigrate to Custer County (where it properly belongs) and become the County paper, where it will have the patronage of cow-boys who, possibly, can appreciate such jokes. The *Democrat* has always done all it could to injure the University. Last year, when an entertainment was given by the students on Charter Day, which was approved by the faculty, the *Democrat* suddenly became very moral, and actually discovered some things that shocked it. Such cases of moral discrimination are very rare. The *Democrat* characterized the performance as "disgraceful" and unfit to be repeated before decent people. This was absolutely false, as there was nothing in it that would shock the moral sensibilities of the most refined person. The ambition of the *Democrat* seems to be to blacken and ruin the reputation of the University all it can. A laudable ambition certainly. It is a pity that the *Democrat* could not reserve the high degree of morality it sometimes attains to, for daily use, but doubtless it is of such an ethereal character that it vanishes as soon as it reaches the air. But at least we would like to have the *Democrat* confine itself to facts. If it only tells these, we will not complain.