

CONTRIBUTED.

How to Dispose of Anonymous Letters.

ANONYMOUS writing is permissible in newspapers, simply because it is not anonymous. The publisher is responsible. He or the editor knows who the author of every communication or letter is, and without that knowledge neither communication nor letter would be published. But even in such a case, the fact that he does not intend to back his opinions with his own name should exercise a potent restraining influence on the writer. He should write more moderately, and with more regard to the rights and feelings of others than if he intended to sign his name to his epistle.

But what shall we say of the men or women who actually write anonymous letters to either their friends or their enemies? We shall simply say nothing concerning them. There are some subjects and some people that should always be ignored. Never attempt to dispute the crown of the causeway with sweep or baker's boy. But how shall we dispose of anonymous letters? Oh! that is easily answered. If before reading, you notice that the only signature is "friend," "student," "graduate,"—for honorable names can be assumed—or some such word, burn the thing promptly. If you have been betrayed into reading the odious thing, burn and forget. There is a difficulty here, it is true. Some people cannot forget easily. The poison having been distilled, works. What is the remedy? Remember that justice demands that you should hereafter think more highly than ever you thought before of the person or persons whom the anonymous letter has slandered. Never refer to the fact that you have received an anonymous letter. Never suspect any one of having written such a composition. And never be betrayed by any provocation into writing anonymously.

Dancing.

DEDICATED TO NON-DANCING STUDENTS.

THERE is a peculiar quality of human nature, which is called by various names but which is a prevailing characteristic of the genus man (male and female) the world over. This is "the old Adam," called by some persons in private (for remember this expression is not to be tolerated) "cussedness," and by the same persons in public perversity.

This it was that first caused me to come out as an advocate of dancing. None of my relations dance, but then they were not outspoken opponents of dancing and consequently I took no thought on the subject.

Some years ago, however, I was reading a work on Popular Amusements and noticed that the writer in dealing with chess, not only ran down the game (of which I was then an ardent admirer and poor player), but consigned the players thereof to places rather inferior if anything to those generally considered to be the natural resting

place of the most successful practical examples of the doctrine of total depravity.

All of the above mentioned quality of which I was the fortunate possessor immediately developed to its fullest extent and it will perhaps be understood why I combated every statement he made when he commenced to discuss the subject of dancing, of which he was of course the strong opponent. As I was at this time on that neutral ground where the feelings of a boy commenced to be supplanted by the unnameable attributes and aspirations of more advanced youth, and as I now for the first time commenced to mingle in what is called Society, in which it was possible for a close observer to find pure women and noble men who did not think that Dancing held an A 1 place in the catalogue of unpardonable sins, my predilections in favor of dancing were greatly strengthened, and from thenceforth whenever the subject was mentioned in my presence, I dropped remarks of sufficient force to show that I must be ranked among its advocates.

It is purely a spirit of justice that has caused me to state the above facts, for I did not think it fair to any reader that they should think that I was actuated by the spirit of impartiality which might be attributed to me when I announce the fact that I do not care for dancing (though this may be because I am a poor dancer); I must admit that I am prejudiced, being afflicted with the prejudice of combativeness.

One's opinion of dancing must depend a good deal on the stand point, e.g., those whose stand point is a light fantastic toe generally consider that dancing is perfectly orthodox. It is on account of my peculiar standpoint that I consider it beneficial. This standpoint is social enjoyment. Suppose reader you have been invited to spend a social evening at a friend's house and from the general get up of the invitation have reason correctly to suppose that you are by no means alone in receiving that invitation. Suppose also that you know enough about the hostess to know that the morality of the company will be all that can be hoped for in these days. Suppose also that you don't dance (I think the ordinary imagination ought to be able to suppose all this). Then if you have only a limited acquaintance with the rest of the guests what are your chances for a pleasant evening. In the first place your (agreeable) acquaintanceship is not likely to be increased; and it's ten to one if you can say more than a few words to the most agreeable of those with whom you are already acquainted. You will likely devote your evening to some stupid games of whist or chess or sister games (for these games are stupid when live fun is going on round about you). The brightest recollection of the evening will be the supper unless perhaps—if you are fortunate—the journey home. The next morning there will be a general cut of the classes, and the probabilities are that having tried to take all your enjoyment out of the supper, the supper will try to take all its enjoyment out of you and there will be one of those internal dissensions which all history declares to be so much worse than any foreign war