

# THE VARSITY

*A Weekly Journal of Literature, University Thought and Events.*

VOL. XI.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, FEBRUARY 23, 1892.

No. 17.

## Editorial Comments.



WHEN we have said that VARSITY has not the least sympathy with the bellicose letter published last week over the suggestive signature of "Old Roman" we have intimated our position on the subject in general.

An explanation as to why the communication was suffered to appear in our columns will probably not be unacceptable, if, at least, we may draw an inference from the unprecedented and unanimous outbreak of indignation against its misguided author. You will have perceived that the letter is capable of two decidedly distinct interpretations. If regarded in one way, it assumed the form of a bold and uncompromising, but incompetent and opprobrious, expression of opinions held by a no means inconsiderable portion of the student body, who still think that the ladies should have a separate institution. If regarded in the other way, it assumed the form of a cowardly, contemptible scrawl, in which the writer's ignorance and degraded nature is exposed by foundationless insinuations which we cannot find language strong enough to adequately condemn.

Now, our readers may be sure that it was as the first of these two that it was given space among our lines, and we think we are safe in saying that to a well-regulated and well-balanced mind this interpretation is the most natural. According to this, "Old Roman" expressed in an overdrawn and falsely-colored representation what seemed to him the natural and baneful results of co-education, and did not intend so much to have a hit at imaginary or trifling improprieties as to strike a blow at what he considered their natural cause. This explanation, we maintain, is rendered more probable by the fact that to a calm and impartial critic the article displayed more literary style and broader knowledge than could possibly exist in a man whose nature falls so far below the lowest of our misogynists who is so "raw from the prime" as to handle a pen to such a disgraceful purpose as the other interpretation implies. It is therefore to be hoped that our fellow-students will, for the fair fame of our Alma Mater, accept the interpretation we have pointed out.

Accordingly being such an article as our theory of facts would make it, the letter represented numerous members of the student body, and as such our way was not clear for its rejection. It is to be remembered that if you start muzzling a journal which is supposed to be representative, you are in great danger of permitting it to degenerate into a mediocrity, innocuous, it is true, but painfully inane. If a considerable body of students be not allowed to promulgate their views, that body is suffering an injustice. Again, when a man comes to the editor to whom he is personally opposed, and says that his communication embodies the views of a large number of students, that, unless

you are guilty of rank partiality and unfair discrimination, resulting from pecuniary, personal or political considerations, you are bound to give it publication, he carries with him a weight by no means inconsiderable.

From these and other facts you will easily grasp the point that the man in the editorial chair is not one who "feeds on the roses and lies on the lilies of life." We tried conscientiously to do our duty, and trust we did not fail. We believed that if the article met with the first interpretation, the one occurring first to elevated minds, such as we thought our undergraduates possessed, there could no harm result from its appearance. Moreover, we considered that by especially noting that it did not meet with the editorial sanction we were placing ourselves beyond the reproach of being responsible for the publication of anything improper.

Our own views and the views of the majority of the student body are that co-education, if properly understood and put into practice, will do more to produce an ideal class of students than by any other system. We rejoice that "knowledge is no more a fountain sealed," and hope that "all may drink deep until the habits of the slave, the sins of emptiness, gossip, spite and slander die." We believe that the full realization of the value of college training, the training so much prated about, that comes, not from books alone, will come with the time when "two plummets shall drop for one to sound the abyss of science and the secrets of the mind." We hold that woman, "twice as magnetic to sweet influences of earth and heaven," cannot fail to have such an influence, refining but developing, polishing but strengthening, our rougher selves, until we may be brought nearer Matthew Arnold's ideal of "sweetness and light," the necessary aim, we earnestly believe, for every one who is worthily called a student.

Our opinions outlined above are most adequately and exquisitely expressed in the lines found near the close of Tennyson's "Princess." We have not space to quote them, but trust our readers will turn them up for reference. They begin:—

"'Blame not thyself too much,' I said; 'nor blame  
Too much the sons of men and barbarous laws.'

"The woman's cause is man's; they rise or sink  
Together, dwarfed or God-like, bond or free.

"Yet in the long years liker must they grow;  
The man be more of woman, she of man.

"Then springs the crowning race of human kind.  
May these things be."

The University of Chicago recently purchased 280,000 volumes and 120,000 dissertations in all languages.

Mrs. Stanford has given the University sculptures to the value of \$25,000. The carving was done by George Brontas, the Athenian sculptor. Statues of Achilles and Paris are among them.