

manhood and womanhood which dominates our thinking.

In the period we are pleased to call the age of chivalry a different state of society ruled the outlook of men, and in order to protect the interests and welfare of the race, a certain attitude of mind was necessary. Hence the men who stood for the "best," took a protecting and artificial view of their relation to women and tilted the natural and equal idea of sex into a dangerous angle. On one hand they professed to worship woman as a deity, which she was not, and on the other hand they looked upon her as a mere plaything and decidedly inferior, which again she was not.

This attitude of mind forced woman into the position so well described by Mary Walstoncraft in her "Vindication of the Rights of Woman," and gave a coloring to the whole social fabric from which we are only now beginning to free ourselves.

Should man hold any chivalry to woman which is built up on a theory that they are sensitive hot-house plants above the sphere of human activity. I say decidedly not. Should they hold any chivalry which implies a feeling of superiority and gives them an inner contempt. Again I say no. This is why that form of hypocrisy which goes under the name of modern chivalry is wrong and pernicious. The type to which I refer is well exemplified by the attitude of mind shown by not stamping because women were present. The stamping may be an annoyance to students, but I maintain that the difference of sex should never in a matter of this kind be brought into the discussion. The average woman (any more than the average man) does not think out these questions. Certain attitudes of mind are classed as gentlemanly and others not and since many of these attitudes which go by the name gentlemanly are slightly veiled insults to the common-sense of man and the dignity of woman women should unite to express true womanliness and to discourage those conventional lies which place her many times in a false and contemptible relation to her brothers in the common human development.

I close with a few lines from Walt Whitman, the purest, sanest and most wholesome man whom I have ever met in literature:

"Her shape arises,

She, less guarded than ever, yet more guarded than ever;

* * * * *

She knows the thoughts as she passes—nothing is concealed from her;

She is not the less considerate or friendly therefore,

She is the best beloved—it is without exception—she has no reason to fear and she does not fear;

* * * * *

She too is a law of nature—there is no law stronger than she is."



About the only man we ever heard of that wasn't spoiled by being lionized, was a Jew named Daniel.—Ex.

THE LIT

The other day Professor Wrong referred to a story told of the efforts of the pro and anti-slavery parties to secure control of the new settlements in the Western United States during the fifties. At one immigration post the Southerners were in control, and they tied up a cow in a prominent position. If a newcomer made any remarks about the "kyow" he was at once kicked across the border as a hated abolitionist from New England. In retaliation, the Northerners, where they were supreme, put a bear on exhibition, and who ever referred to the animal as a "bar" was lucky if he escaped tar and feathers. Now, apropos of certain things that are happening in regard to Literary Society affairs, we would suggest that, during the next few weeks, the fact that a man says "kyow" or "bar" be not the sole criterion of his worth, and the worth of his ideas.

In plain words, we advise every man in University College to be a strong party man, but also to be an intelligent one. Remember that one side is not always necessarily right and the other wrong. Always have an opinion of your own on subjects of importance, and be prepared to express it, either in your party meetings or in the meetings of the Lit. And do not hesitate to speak because you are afraid that your idea will be thought foolish: as Carlyle would say, it probably is, but then the same authority tells us that we are all "mostly fools."

In this intelligent and independent discussion the meeting of the Society on Friday night took high rank. The attendance left much to be desired, but the debates, especially that on the question of Student Control of Discipline, were admirable.

The scheme proposed was amended in some details. Clause Five now places under the jurisdiction of the Board "offences against the good order or fair name of the University College, and interference with the personal liberty of any student." It was resolved to submit the proposal to a vote of the men of the College. The members present declared themselves in favor of the principle of student control by a vote of 40 to 21.

The recommendations of the Executive nominating a Constitution Committee, and appointing February 8th as a Star night, under the Cambridge system, and February 9th as a Hockey night were adopted.

W. A. Cameron, representative to the I.C.D.U., reported that Mr. Hugh Kerr had donated a magnificent trophy for competition in the Union. It was resolved to send him a letter of thanks.

Mr. Dunham was appointed our representative to the McMaster banquet.

The resignation of Mr. J. C. Fisher, Secretary of Committee, was announced.

Mr. Saywell, '10, gave a vocal solo that was much appreciated.

The Vice-President announced that Mr. Eric Armour, President of the Society, was in the General Hospital recovering from a dangerous illness. The Society expressed its best wishes for his speedy return to health, and resolved to send a bouquet of flowers as an expression of its sympathy.

Xavier.