

any one, in the face of existing facts, can be so bigoted as to think that no one can oppose fraternities from principle, and because he believes them evil, is beyond our comprehension. Of course it is much easier to try to throw discredit on the motives behind an attack, than to meet that attack squarely, and manfully. We have noticed a general tendency in fraternity men to avoid any argument on the fraternity question. One prominent Greek informed us that "it wouldn't do to show forth the beauties of a fraternity publicly, because everyone would want to join and we can't take in everybody." When an organization gets so lovely and holy, that it will not do to have its loveliness generally known, it is about time for it to be translated to a higher sphere. So far as we have been able to discover, this cry of "sorehead" is simply another such flimsy excuse to get out of answering arguments which strike too close for comfort. Our attention has just been called to this practice of crying down opponents rather than proving statements false, by a squib in the *University Review* directed personally against us. We care nothing for the opinion of the *Review*, especially since it is founded on utter ignorance. The article quoted from THE HESPERIAN, ascribed to the editor-and-chief, was in our exchange department. The exchange editor derived the information on which the item was based, by residence in Kansas, and acquaintance with the persons of whom he spoke. The *Review* is decidedly rash in branding the exchange editor as a liar. We—the editor-in-chief—have no personal acquaintance with the situation at Lawrence further than that obtained from the various papers coming from that institution during the last four or five years. Judging from these, we should say our exchange editor has not even exaggerated the ill results from the numerous fraternities at Lawrence, much less lied outright as is charged. Talking about making statements on partial knowledge, on how much "personal acquaintance" do you base your statement that "the best students of the Nebraska University are in the fraternities," Mr. *Review* man? In order to make a comparison, acquaintance with both sides should be had. You detest "a fraternity or an anti-fraternity crank," and don't understand "why an allwise Providence permits either to live." Allow us to remark that we have tenfold more respect for an out-and-out fraternity man than for a weak-brained fence-straddler such as the *Review* man seems to regard as the ideal man. A "crank," ordinarily, is simply a man who has opinions of his own, and, furthermore, the manhood to express them fearlessly.

Dr. Garten, eye, ear, nose and throat specialist. Glasses fitted. 1115 O street, Lincoln, Neb.

## LITERARY.

The *Quarterly Review* has an article on Cavour that is particularly commendable. The work of the great writer of Italy, his relations to the new formed nation, his motives and his successes are clearly and entertainingly discussed.

\*\*\*

And now the *Cosmopolitan* comes forth with an illustrated article on the "Opening of Oklahoma." The pictures are especially of interest. Everyone has heard enough of the great scramble for real estate; now some of it can be seen.

\*\*\*

The December *Harper's* will contain an essay on fraternity by the editor of the "Easy Chair." Then there may be an opportunity for readers of THE HESPERIAN to see the distinction, clearly pointed out, between fraternity and fraternities.

\*\*\*

The *New England Magazine* for November, besides a large number of other entertaining topics, contains an excellent article on Francis Parkman. The noted historian's history is traced briefly, while several very good engravings lend interest to the sketch.

\*\*\*

The November *Magazine of Western History* contains an article on Manitou Springs, Colorado. The style of the article is not particularly admirable, perhaps, but the place described is one of the most beautiful on the American continent, and cannot fail to be of interest to all who have seen the place, and to a great many who have not.

\*\*\*

Time, which is said to heal all wounds and to cool all loves, has, no doubt, gone by at a sufficiently rapid pace to enable those who read the "Romance of Dollard" with pleasure to bear with a word or two against the story. Those that were not pleased with Mrs. Catherwood's tale have lost enough of their dislike of it to be cool-headed in judging it. Not that any excuse is needed for a statement of the faults or virtues of the story, far from it. Dealing as it does with one of the most heroic of New France's many heroic deeds, "The Romance of Dollard" becomes public property, and judgment of it a right. The readers of THE HESPERIAN are familiar enough with the story to render more than the merest outline, unnecessary.

\*\*\*

The story opens at Quebec in the year 1660. The "Gibraltar of America" is a hundred years old. Montreal is younger and of less importance, but already beginning to make those advances which have placed her where she is today, at the head of Canada. The opening chapter of the story is devoted to the description of a "marriage market" in Quebec. A ship load of 150 maids, some young, some old, has just arrived from France. They are destined to become the wives of the settlers and of the "couriers of the woods." As in Virginia the home government took this means of rendering permanent the still precarious settlements in the New World. The *coureur du bois*, though of inestimable benefit to New France, had lived his day, and now what was needed was a sober, diligent, industrious farmer class. To this end the royal government of France offered to every man who would marry, a wife, a certain amount of live stock and farm produce. There can be no better commentary on the character of the English and French settlers in America. The Virginians, longing for something like home life, were will-