

have been said of its slumber even a few years ago is no longer true. In its days of slumber a naval commission reported: "A polar expedition is useless to determine the earth's axis; go to Annapolis rather. It should be called the pivot city. It is the center of the universe, for while all the world around it revolves it remains stationary." An account so recent and yet even now historical!

It would seem that in the element of smoke this rare old town was born, flourished, died and revived. The "noxious weed" was the source of its early wealth, the juices of Maryland's soil and the toil of Africa's children disappeared in clouds of tobacco smoke which returned to her in showers of gold. When England's oppression drove the townspeople to a vindication of their manhood the smoke of the "Peggy Stewart" attested their love of liberty; and but recently the revived Annapolis showed its abhorrence

of drunkenness by publicly burning in the market-place the contents of a groggery, the fumes of the alcohol mingling with the smoke of this vestal flame of temperance. Let us close the old volumes and enjoy in cogitation a pipe of Maryland tobacco.



COAT-OF-ARMS, ANNAPOLIS.

COLLEGE HAZING.

THE precise origin of college hazing, like the origin of many of the feudal customs of which it is a great-grandchild, is somewhat obscure. Undoubtedly, however, it sprang from those social distinctions which, as tares, were brought to the New World along with the seeds of political and religious liberty. In our colonial period, the graduated pyramid of social distinctions stood in the midst of every community: the ignorant served the educated class; the commercial, the professional; the poor, the rich; the younger brother, the elder; all with a sharpness of division between the servant and the served that is now seldom observed.

The social regimen of the colonial colleges was the copy of the social regimen of the community. Students were seated in recitation hall and chapel according to the social rank of their families; and the struggle for a high seat was more ardent than the present strife for high scholastic rank. The laws of the colleges—borrowed, to a certain extent, from the fagging and other laws of the English schools—assigned a subordinate social position to Freshmen, and made them a kind of feudal villain to the barons of the upper classes. As early as 1760, at Yale, it was enacted: "It being the duty of the Seniors to teach Freshmen the laws, usages,

and customs of the college, to this end they are empowered to order the whole Freshman class, or any particular member of it, to appear, in order to be instructed and reformed, at such time and place as they shall appoint; when and where every Freshman shall attend, answer all proper questions, and behave decently." "The Freshmen are forbidden to wear their hats in the college-yard until May vacation; and whenever a Freshman either speaks to a superior or is spoken to by one, he shall keep his hat off until he is bidden to put it on." "A Freshman shall not play with any members of an upper class without being asked." "Freshmen are obliged to perform all reasonable errands for any superior." "Freshmen shall not run in the college-yard, nor up and down stairs, nor call to any one through a college window." Similar restrictions binding the Freshmen are found among the "Ancient Laws and Liberties" of Harvard: "No Freshman shall wear his hat in the college-yard, unless it rains, hails, or snows; provided he be on foot, and have not both hands full." "Freshmen are to consider all the other classes as their Seniors." "No Freshman shall speak to a Senior with his hat on, or have it on in a Senior's chamber, or in his own if a Senior be there." "All

Freshmen (except those employed by the immediate government of the college) shall be obliged to go on any errand (except such as shall be judged improper by some one in the government of the college) for any of his Seniors, graduates, or under-graduates, at any time except in studying hours, or after nine o'clock in the evening." "When any person knocks at a Freshman's door, except in studying time, he shall immediately open the door, without inquiring who is there."

But these social distinctions of the colleges were leveled, along with the gradual leveling of the social distinctions of the community. Within the walls of the colleges, too, rebellions were constantly breaking out against the aristocratic *régime*. The late Professor Levi Hedge (father of Frederic Henry Hedge), when a Freshman at Harvard, a little less than a hundred years ago, threatened to knock down a Senior who demanded the removal of his hat, unless the Senior also removed his. The case was appealed to President Willard, who upheld young Hedge. This decision struck the death-blow to the "hat law" at Cambridge. The growth of the antipathy, therefore, both within and without the colleges, to such petty rules and distinctions, occasioned, in the first quarter of the present century, their overthrow. But the principles which underlay them to a certain degree were perpetuated by the tricks and annoyances which, in their stead, were imposed upon Freshmen. Instead of the Seniors' lecture to the Freshmen, as practiced at Yale, came the Sophomores' "smoking out"; instead of the running of errands came the obligation, now in force at many colleges, to entertain upper classmen at the college eating-saloon; and instead of the duty of uncovering in a superior's presence was substituted the unwritten law, obeyed in nearly every college, that a Freshman shall not wear a silk hat.

The methods of hazing as at present practiced are numerous and diverse. The Freshman is taken from his bed at midnight, bathed by Sophomoric hands at the nozzle of the college pump, and, blindfolded, made to run, with his escorts, three or four miles to and fro on the campus. If his room is furnished with care, he endures the risk of finding, as he returns from an evening call, his furniture piled up in the center of the floor, his pictures smashed and his knickknacks rifled. If he manifests an unusual degree of fondness for any attractions of person or of dress he may possess, he may think himself fortunate if the Soph-

omore's razor does not shear him of his strength. Of an evening, a party of a dozen Sophomores call upon him, fill his room with the smoke of their cigars, demand a speech and a song; compel him to play "leap-frog" with his chum, test his expertness in "clog-dancing," toss him in a blanket, put him to bed, and, after an hour's interview, bid him "good-night," promising to call again as soon as possible. By these, and occasionally by severer afflictions does he pay the penalty of his Freshmanhood.

To such treatment Freshmen submit with varying degrees of willingness and unwillingness. To some it seems an essential part of college life, and the failure to receive a respectable hazing would be a sad disappointment. Others submit to it as a necessary evil, the endurance of which is the best escape from its pains. Yet others kick against the Sophomoric pricks, which occasionally yield, but frequently pierce the deeper for the opposition. Sometimes a Freshman defends himself from these annoyances at the point of his revolver, and the few hazing encounters in which Sophomores have been shot at serve to make them afraid of the weapon with a Freshman's finger on the trigger. But if he can be seized unarmed, he pays most dearly for his bravery.

The extent to which hazing prevails is very general, and the degree of its pervasiveness in the different colleges is most diverse. Into the Western colleges, as a class, the practice has never been introduced with that thoroughness with which it is pursued in many colleges of the East. But the University of Michigan, with a few other institutions, are to a slight degree afflicted with the evil. A recent number of the journal published by the students of that university, remarks of an attempt at hazing: "No one was severely hurt, but a few injured faces and evidences of flying missiles bear witness that we have not wholly escaped from the mania which has wrought such unfortunate results among other students." But the large number of the Western colleges are entirely free from the disgrace. In many of the Eastern colleges, also, the intensity of the evil has steadily decreased within the last decade. Yale was formerly as thoroughly afflicted with it as any college, but for the last two years only a few Freshmen have been hazed, and they by the homœopathic method. At Harvard the evil was wiped out six years ago by the co-operation of the faculty and

the students. At Amherst, too, a similar condition prevails, and the usual good order of the college is in no way more marked than in the cordiality of the relations of the two lower classes. The case is substantially the same at Williams. But at Bowdoin, Bates, Princeton and many other colleges the evil still lingers with a considerable degree of vitality. The notorious case of hazing at Princeton in February last was in its final stages most novel and remarkable. It has, I believe, never before happened in the Sophomore-Freshman wars that both sides, armed to the teeth, fired, as has been said—though perhaps not with literal truth—"repeated volleys into each other, at short range."

The causes of hazing as it now prevails are few, but deeply rooted. The first is custom. Indirectly, hazing is, as has been indicated, the continuation of the early social distinctions of the community and the college; but directly, the hazing of one year is the mother of the hazing of the next. Every Freshman who is hazed can heal his injured honor only by hazing. So custom perpetuates the evil through successive classes. A second cause is that principle of human nature which tempts one to impose upon inexperience, immaturity and greenness. The manners and customs of the college world are unique. In it the Freshman is a foreigner of only a few days' naturalization. His ignorance, therefore, offers to the Sophomore, a citizen of long standing, a delightful opportunity for merriment. A third source of the evil is found in the high development which the love of fun attains among college men of the lower classes. The Sophomore unites the carelessness of boyhood with the enjoyments of manhood, without a consciousness of manhood's responsibilities. Than hazing a Freshman he finds no richer mine of delight.

In order to abolish hazing it is first necessary to create a college sentiment which opposes it. The means of creating this sentiment are as numerous as those by which any change in either public or college opinion is promoted. The exertion of stronger moral and religious influences, a more intimate association of professors and students, and a stricter demand for high scholarship, indicate, in general, the best methods.

A more rigid execution of the college laws regarding the offense would also tend to abolish hazing. These laws are in their letter sufficiently severe; either expulsion or

suspension is the penalty usually affixed to their infraction. But in their actual execution, college authorities are proverbially remiss. The student, when *in medias res* of his offense, feels assured that, if detected, the influence of his friends and his own promises of good behavior will return him to college. A case has lately come to my notice in which a Sophomore was expelled for aiding in tying a Freshman to the bell-knob of a house of a lady with whom the Freshman was acquainted. The sufferer was naked. He could not move to release himself without ringing the bell. For this outrageous offense the culprit was expelled, but by the influence of his family and family friends the penalty was revoked. To banish hazing the governing boards must enforce the laws with unconditional severity.

There is, however, a milder method which, properly applied, will usually prove more effective and is easier of execution. It is the method that Harvard College adopted in the autumn of 1872. At the opening of that college year the Faculty proposed an agreement for the Sophomore and Freshmen classes that they would abstain from indulging in all those annoyances usually included in the term hazing. So far as can be learned, every member of the two classes, over three hundred in number, signed it. This simple process ended hazing at Cambridge. The Sophomores of 1872-73 did not haze, and the Sophomores of the next year, bound by the agreement and not having been hazed, had no injured honor to vindicate, and the succeeding Freshmen were not molested.

With the opening of the present college year, Yale, too, passed a law which has proved remarkably effective in crushing the anti-Freshman proclivities of the Sophomores. Any student, the law states, who is guilty of hazing shall withdraw from his own class, and enter that immediately below. Already, I am informed, two or three Sophomores, in consequence of breaking it, have been compelled to enter the Freshman class. The method is an excellent one. It strikes at the root of the evil by emphasizing the *disgrace* inherent in it. But either this method or the procedure employed by the Cambridge college can, I believe, be used, if applied with discretion, by every college in the United States; and it would undoubtedly serve to wipe out the annually recurring shame.