



SOPHOMORE SOCIETIES.

A Suggestion from the Faculty About New Members—The Situation.

On Saturday of last week, May 19, the petition of the members of the Senior Class of Yale College, not members of Sophomore societies, praying the Faculty for the abolition of these societies, which had been withdrawn, pending the work of the Conference Committee, was returned to the Faculty. This was in accordance with the vote of the petitioners when they authorized their Committee to confer with the Committee of the Sophomore societies and at the same time to withdraw temporarily the petition. Besides this petition, a special one to the same end was presented, signed by about a score of Yale graduates, studying in Johns Hopkins University. On Monday of this week, another petition to the same end, signed by approximately one hundred members of the Class of Ninety-Nine, also praying for the abolition of the Sophomore societies, was presented.

After a long session, in which the liveliest interest in the Society problem was shown, the Faculty, at a special meeting at noon, Monday, May 21, passed the following:

"Voted, That the interests of the University demand that the taking in of new members by the Sophomore societies be postponed until further notice."

MEANING OF THE VOTE.

This vote of the Faculty shows two points in the attitude of that body.

First, the Faculty seems determined that the societies shall not pass to a new set of men the responsibility for the settlement of problems brought directly before the present members several months ago, and concerning which the conference of the committees during the last three months has prevented any solution of the matter by the Faculty.

Second, the vote of the Faculty expresses the very strong desire of that body that the societies themselves settle this matter and not force the Faculty to pass over the line of non-interference in such matters, traditional in Yale government.

EVENTS LEADING TO THIS ACTION.

The attitude of the societies towards the Conference Committee report was intimated in a general way in the last issue of the WEEKLY. The matter has become so distinctly one of public concern and the facts have been so freely circulated that it is possible and proper to restate them with more definiteness now. The Sophomore Society of Eta Phi adopted the Conference Committee report immediately on its presentation.

The Society of He Boule, after a very careful consideration, voted the report down by a large majority. The ground taken was, that the pyramidal system, called for by the report, (which as the WEEKLY's readers will remember, proposed to transpose the fraternities and the societies at present in Sophomore year and slightly increase the latter in size) could not accomplish the end sought for, namely, the recognition of those men who came to College unknown and who did not develop their strength early in their course. It was held that the failure to make a fraternity in Sophomore year would cut off even the present chance of later recogni-

tion. The members of the Society went into the matter with the utmost thoroughness and conscientiousness and voted as they did, only because they considered that the course suggested by the Committee was not the best one for Yale. It is proper to record this fact with some definiteness, because many papers hereabouts have been filled with a great many lies of a grossly abusive nature. The sentiment was freely expressed by the members of this Society, in coming to this conclusion, that they would rather go out of existence than to submit to such a change in their organization, which would materially weaken it and which, in their opinion, would do Yale more harm than good.

The Society of Kappa Psi, the youngest of the three Sophomore Societies, tabled the matter, but it is known that the sentiment there has been as strong as in He Boule against the proposed change.

REASONS FOR SOCIETIES' ATTITUDE.

The action above recorded was chronicled in the last WEEKLY, as a disappointing surprise to the Yale public. This was rather a mild way to put it. Very conservative men held that the overthrow of the report was an act which in any other relation in life would generally be regarded as bad faith. To apply this view to the present situation, however, is to overlook certain points, to which people who have kept their heads and who appreciate the high character of the men who are in these societies have given proper weight.

These societies had begun themselves to try to change the present order before the present agitation broke out. They had looked upon the conference with the committee from the petitioners as merely a means to enable them to get at some plan of reform which would meet the situation. The report of the Conference Committee was treated exactly as the report of their own committee would have been treated, if it had been equally unsatisfactory. They did not appreciate the difference between the two, growing out of the public nature of this problem and the responsibility upon the societies, first, and the Faculty next, if the societies failed to meet the situation by definite action and not by further mere negation.

THE PUBLIC VIEW OF THE MATTER.

The Faculty, graduates and students of Yale, outside of those directly interested, have considered the present agitation as the culmination of a long period of growing dissatisfaction, and have said that now was the time to meet and settle the question. All desired that the Faculty should not act, so long as it appeared that the societies would act. The appointment of the Conference Committee and its long sessions, extending over approximately three months, have been considered as a guarantee of willingness on both sides to agree with one another if they could. During all this time, plan after plan has been proposed on both sides, and it has been supposed that with the nature of those different plans the societies which had sent their committees into the conference were familiar. As a matter of fact, it is said that the societies were not acquainted with the different propositions, owing to a rule in the Conference Committee that their deliberation should be kept absolutely secret until some decision was reached. This, of course, has proved a most unfortunate rule and has left the disagreeing societies in a false position.

For, as the different propositions came from one side or the other, they

were all modified, always on the argument from one side or the other, that the proposition must be thus and so changed if it were to pass the respective bodies represented. This, of course, leaking out from time to time, increased the confidence of the public, that when the Conference really agreed the end would be at hand.

ATTITUDE OF THE PETITIONERS.

The petitioners accepted the report of their Committee, not because they thought it ideal, as no one did, but because they were told it was the best thing that could be secured. Since it accomplished one main object of the whole agitation, namely, taking out the smaller society from the early part of the course, it was considered much more worth accepting than rejecting.

The societies, on the other hand, which disapproved the act, looked at it simply as one of a number of possible ways to work out their own particular responsibility for changing the social system, and said that it was not best and therefore they would not have it. What they failed to realize was the necessity of at once putting forward something better, for which it was supposed that these long months of consideration had prepared them. That they did not do so, has seemed to many who have given them full credit for their motives, to illustrate the fact that their secrecy and their exclusion as members of their society from the rest of the student body make it impossible for them to appreciate public sentiment.

The action of the Faculty above referred to is taken with the idea evidently of giving them still another chance to bring forward such a reform as they think will meet the requirements of the situation. It is thought that the additional time will be used very industriously by the members of these societies to find this better way or else that the consideration which they will now give to the situation will enable them to see that the Conference report is the best way out.

At the Faculty meeting the point was raised whether, in consideration of the fact that it had accepted the report, Eta Phi ought not to be allowed to take in their new members this month. The final vote of the Faculty shows the opinion that the matter would be left in better condition for future treatment if all the societies deferred their elections.

The vote of the Faculty is purposely framed as a suggestion.

Dr. Gallaudet to Leave Yale.

It was announced last week that Dr. Edson F. Gallaudet, Yale '93, would leave his position of Instructor in Physics in the College at the close of the present academic year, to take a position in the Engineering Department of William Cramp & Sons' Ship and Engine Building Company in Philadelphia. Dr. Gallaudet has been teaching physics at Yale for the last three years, and since Mr. Robert J. Cook went abroad has been Coach of the Yale Crew. He was stroke of his Freshman Eight and of the winning Yale Crews of 1892 and 1893.

The Yale Crew.

The Yale Crew will go to New London June 7. The Crew rowed four miles on time last Thursday in about 22 minutes, which was considered fairly good considering the lack of distance trials this Spring.

JUNIOR ELECTIONS.

Names of Those of 1902 Taken by the Fraternities.

The Junior Fraternities announced their elections on the night of Tuesday of this week, May 22, with the usual calcium light formalities and robed processions and songs. The list of those receiving elections follow:

PSI UPSILON.

Courtlandt Dixon Barnes, New York City; Dixon Boardman, New York City; Newton Case Brainard, Hartford, Conn.; Graham Brush, New York City; Julian Winsor Burdick, Albany, N. Y.; James Rogers Deering, New York City; Alton Farrel, Ansonia, Conn.; Alfred Ludlow Ferguson, Stamford, Conn.; Robert Hale Ives Goddard, Jr., Providence, R. I.; Henry William Hamlin, Canandaigua, N. Y.; Henry Stewart Hooker, Washington, D. C.; Herman Warren Knox, New York City; George Lear, 2d, Doylestown, Pa.; Benjamin Robbins Curtis Low, Brooklyn, N. Y.; George Walter Lindenberg, Columbus, O.; Arthur Crosby Ludington, New York City; Norman Howell Mason, Chicago, Ill.; Payson McLane Merrill, New York City; Henry Pendleton Rogers, Jr., New York City; Frank Huestis Sincerbeaux, Moravia, N. Y.; Edwin Allen Stebbins, Rochester, N. Y.; Henry Budington Stoddard, Bridgeport, Conn.; Samuel Harold Stone, Syracuse, N. Y.; Joseph Rockwell Swan, Jr., Utica, N. Y.; Reginald Claypool Vanderbilt, New York City.

DELTA KAPPA EPSILON.

Ellis Adams, Summit, New Jersey; John de Koven Alsop, Middletown, Conn.; Charles Harold Collins, Brooklyn, New York; Charles Cyprian Strong Cushing, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.; John Raymond Hall, Dansville, N. Y.; John Babinger Hart, Cincinnati, Ohio; Charles Sterns Hopkins, Bangor, Me.; Walter Martin Kremrentz, Newark, N. J.; Harry Langden Laws, Cincinnati, Ohio; George Gould Lincoln, Washington, D. C.; George Woodward Noyes, Cincinnati, Ohio; Laurance Blanchard Rand, Lawrence, New York; Dorrance Reynolds, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Walter Farley Roberts, Utica, New York; Bronson Case Rumsey, 3d, Buffalo, New York; Henry Stoddard Sherman, Cleveland, Ohio; Edward Levi Skinner, Westfield, New York; Keith Spalding, New York City; William Romer Teller, Kingston, New York; Mason Trowbridge, Chicago, Ill.; Thomas Nugent Troxell, West Pittston, Pa.; Henry Frank Wells, New York City; Homer Augustus Wessel, Jr., Cincinnati, Ohio; Percy Gardiner White, Gardiner, Me.; Bartlett Golden Yung, Hartford, Conn.

ALPHA DELTA PHI.

Gardner Abbott, Cleveland, O.; Laurance Baldwin Beckwith, Toledo, O.; John Booth Burrall, Waterbury, Conn.; George Boone Carpenter, Chicago, Ill.; Simeon Baldwin Chittenden, Brooklyn, N. Y.; William Edwards Day, Indianapolis, Ind.; Frank Manson Eastman, Boise, Idaho; Edward Easton, Jr., Albany, N. Y.; Edward Lyttleton Fox, New York; John Stephen Garvan, Hartford, Conn.; James Lester Goodwin, Hartford, Conn.; Charles Gould, Albany, New York; Raymond Gano Guernsey, Poughkeepsie, New York; Floyd Welman Jefferson, Louis-