

COMMUNICATIONS.

The Editors are not responsible for the opinions of correspondents.
No notice will be taken of unsigned contributions.

HAZING.

To the Editors of THE VARSITY.

SIRS,—Forgive me for prolonging this discussion, but I wish to add a few words to what has been already said on hazing, and to answer the flimsy arguments advanced by "Ubique" in its support.

His article is like a drum, it speaks great things, but behind the parchment is nothing but wind and emptiness.

Firstly, he states that it is manly to assault your fellow man, using, at the same time, obscene and blasphemous language toward him, and also extorting it from him, and to listen to such language without blushing. Is this manly? Dryden tells us that manliness is dignity, nobleness and bravery.

He then says, "Having proved to my satisfaction the advantage to the hazed:" observe that he uses the first person singular.

My answer to his argument, "have we not known many of the most offensively cheeky of the breed so altered in a single night, that next morning they have been deemed worthy to be the bosom friends of their correctors," is, in his own style, "feathered bipeds of similar plumage live gregariously."

I agree with him that man must have relaxation.

"A little nonsense now and then"
"Is relished by the wisest men."

But let it be honourable nonsense.

I can scarcely understand "Ubique's" ideas of "worthy men," for worthy men are manly, and his apparent idea of manliness needs no further criticism.

He seems to think it curious that the devil is older than the mufti, are they associated so closely in his mind, is his rusty blade ready to avenge the wrongs of that hazy personage? If so, who's safe?

J. H. CHEWETT.

To the Editors of THE VARSITY.

SIRS,—As the subject of hazing is being discussed in the columns of your valuable paper, permit me also to express my opinion about it and to endeavour to submit a few points for the consideration of your readers.

From the pleasing fact that no one has publicly taken up the cudgels in defense of the practice, and, from what can be learned as to the general sentiments of undergraduates about it, one is quite safe in saying that a large majority of the students are opposed to this ancient rite and conceive that its usefulness, if it ever had any, is gone and that now it is high time for it to doubly die and

"Go down
To the vile dust from whence it sprung,
Unwept, unhonoured, and unsung."

With an ideal hazing, from which all objectionable concomitants are separated, one might perhaps have little fault to find; but such hazing exist only in the imagination, and never, either in the history of our own college or in any of the American colleges have they been free from those repulsive features which go so far to lower the whole moral tone of the student body and exert a sinister and baneful influence over all legitimate college institutions. Those who, though opposed to hazing as at present conducted, yet think it can be reformed and made respectable, are advocating a scheme which is altogether *en p' air*. The actual facts seem to be, however we may account for them, that men will say and do things in these nocturnal mysteries which they would never dream of saying and doing at times when calm and no amount of reformation will eradicate it. In this connection I am credibly informed that even at a theological hall a student who took part in a hazing afterwards apologized for the language he had used on the occasion. The only feasible and effective way of getting rid of these evil tendencies, obviously, is to abolish that which gives occasion to their rise; and this what all the college authorities in the United States are trying to do; this, too, is what the authorities of our college have again and again urged. Surely we may draw some inferences as to the character of the practice from their action. Socrates claimed to fit his disciples to be good citizens and honorable men; and a modern college can have no higher aim than that. One of the chief lessons undergraduates should learn is that

of the "rule of law," submission to legally constituted authority. How then can indulgence in a practice which is essentially unlawful, a gross interference with personal liberty, help to make a man a law-abiding citizen? Would any man continue to act in after-life as he does at college when participating in a hazing? I trow not. The strong arm of the law would speedily arrest his progress and show him that he could not go on his way rejoicing according to his own sweet will. Why, therefore, should indulgence in a spirit of unlawfulness be permitted at college?

Again, I ask my athletic friends whether or not it is British fair play for half a dozen or more to attack one man? Most certainly it is not. Yet, what but a most lamentable want of fair play is it for a crowd under cover of darkness to maltreat and use physical force upon *one* trembling gentleman of the first year, whose nerves are all unstrung, and whose heart leaps into his mouth from dread of the unknown terrors of the immediate future? Verily, gentlemen, if you reflect upon this aspect of the case, you will scorn to be parties to an act so unfair. Great too, forsooth, is the valour, and doughty are the deeds of those who administer sundry cuffs and kicks to freshmen in the corridors! O shades of all ye valiant heroes of old! To think that members of a great University, at the close of the nineteenth century of the Christian era, would stoop to such conduct! Allow me to suggest a more excellent way of dealing with freshmen who may really be offensive. "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more good and true men, and continue thy admonishing; and if he shall neglect to hear thee, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." Let him severely alone.

Just a word as to the supposed benefit effected by hazing. If a student of refined sensibilities becomes a victim, his very soul revolts at the treatment he receives, and, perhaps, permanent injury is done him; he could not take any pleasure in his own debasement. A student of a more callous nature will become still more callous, and will sullenly bide his time, "Nursing his wrath to keep it warm," waiting till the glad occasion comes when he can mercifully wreak his vengeance on a weaker victim of the next first year. We read that Napoleon III., when chagrined and annoyed in any interview with a foreign ambassador, always preserved his courteous bearing till the Minister withdrew, and then vented his spleen and fury upon his servants and subordinates. But University College students ought not to be guilty of such despicable conduct. In a word, the benefit of hazing to subjects and participants is *nil*, the injury incalculable.

How, finally, can this evil thing be put away from among us? I think it can be done through the instrumentality of first year men themselves. Gentlemen of the first year, when freshmen, you are, without exception, opposed to hazing. Be consistent in your profession; continue your opposition even when you have attained to the dignity of sophomores. If you are true to yourselves and your best interests, if you remain firm in your earliest conviction throughout your college course, the "consummation devoutly to be wished" will be effected, and hazing, this "relic of barbarism," as our own grand "old man eloquent" phrases it, will soon be only a subject of archaeological investigation, and lexicographers of the future will have to ransack dusty newspapers of the past to determine its meaning.

H. J. CODY.

AN OPEN LETTER TO HAZERS.

To the Editors of THE VARSITY.

SIRS,—You will, I am sure, pardon the liberty I have thus taken in publicly addressing you, and will not, I trust, too severely censure me if I seem to meddle somewhat with your own private affairs concerning a certain habit you have of interfering with the inclinations and rights of others. You will not, I am sure, tell me to mind my own affairs, and that you will mind yours and the first year's—which, if slightly negligent at other times, you certainly do at the annual hazing with a zeal and vigour quite embarrassing. When you frankly tell me that we differ on this point, and, as is perfectly right we should, have each our own opinion, do you, in a similar spirit of toleration, haze only from among those of the first year in favour of the custom? Whether, in this case, does your zeal outrun your liberality; or do you fear lest the custom, wise and beneficial though it be, might, by such a course, come to an abrupt end through excess of practitioners and a paucity of patients? Will you not explain why, in resenting our spoken remonstrances, you yet propagate by force your own opinions?

But do you really think, you who haze, that modesty is ever taught by force, forbearance learnt from violence? Do you think that justice is ever got where judge, jury, witnesses, and accuser, are one and the same person? Who made you to judge your fellow students? Or are you self-appointed, and have you forgotten, or do you not need, the "Judge not, that ye be not judged?"