

most unenviable duty. Each member should be prepared then to perform whatever he may be able for his society and let him be assured that however much good he may do for his society that he himself will receive the most benefit from the work.

RATHER strange what ideas some people have. They join a fraternity because they intend to attend school elsewhere and the fact that they belong to a fraternity will insure them a standing in society that would not be attained otherwise. It seems to us that this is absurd. A fraternity may be composed of good men in one institution and of very undesirable ones in another. If a person is wise he will select new friends when he has a chance to see and know them rather than allow some one else to choose as his associates people whom he has never known. We prefer to select our friends after we have had an opportunity to test them rather than to be bound to any aggregation simply because they happen to wear a particular frat pin. That man must indeed have small confidence in his own ability who must rely upon a fraternity badge to bring him into "good society."

WE admire consistency. We also have great respect for the man who when finding himself mistaken has the courage fearlessly to acknowledge his mistake and the manhood to attempt to make amends. But we are unable to repress contempt for the person who when he finds that he has been in error, tries to shift all the blame from his own shoulders to those of another. Such has been the action of one of the city papers with respect to the charges of plagiarism against Mr. Ferguson. The paper to which we refer was the first to proclaim the news that Mr. Ferguson's oration was not original and the alleged proofs of the charge were not published as we believe solely because the paper did not possess them. But when the facts were brought forward by another paper, the journal referred to was not slow to use them. A few days later this great moral educator, with a high conception of Truth and Justice proceeded to brand as cowards those who struck at a man when by his absence he was unable to defend himself and seemed to insinuate that it was in no way responsible for the attack. Now leaving aside all questions as to manliness of attacking a man when it was impossible for him to defend himself, would it not be more honorable, more dignified, and more just, if this great moral newspaper had frankly admitted that it had been in error rather than to attempt to throw the whole burden of the blame upon another paper that is perhaps less open than itself to the charge of injustice?

THE faculty of other institutions seem to take more interest in oratory than do our faculty. One professor of rhetoric came from a far off state with the orator who represented that state. It is only fair to suppose that the professor did not come merely as a spectator but to render all the assistance in his power to that orator. We may be pardoned for asking how much the professor of rhetoric and oratory in this institution trained in delivery our representatives to the last two state contests. If oratory is a thing to be discouraged for what reason have we a professor of oratory? Why support such a department? But if oratory is a thing to be encouraged, why is it that our representatives at the state contests have not received the proper amount of training? Every defeat lowers the institution in the opinion of the people. We do not intend to blame any member of the faculty. They all have plenty to do, but we do wish to remind every one of the necessity for training our orators and also of the fact that so far as we know no special pains have yet been taken in drilling our orator for the state contests. As a consequence of this we have been defeated in several contests.

NOW that the inter-state contest is over we may be allowed to pass judgment upon the manner in which the Wesleyans treated Gates college after the state contest. We should have done so before but we did not wish to take any action that would tend to diminish the support which we, as the representative of Nebraska State University owed to our orator at the inter-state contest. As is well-known the orator from Gates was unable to speak at the state contest but his manuscript was marked first. The Wesleyan man won first honors, according to the constitution. Legally he was entitled to his honors and could not be deprived of them. But there is a difference between what is legal and what is right and we would naturally expect a Christian institution to pursue a course in accordance with right. But it did not. Instead of acting in a spirit of nobleness and generosity the Wesleyans acted in a very selfish and unchristain manner. Gates was given no opportunity to compete for a prize that we believe she would have won. We do not pretend to be a religious institution. We do not harp upon the advantages to be derived from attending a Christian school, but we do wish to remark that our students are capable of showing a fairer and more Christian spirit than are those of the institution situated in the eastern part of this city. We do not desire any honors unless we win them fairly. Perhaps you may say that the Wesleyan is not responsible for the action of her orator. True she is not responsible for all of his actions but if any student or the U. of N. treated an unfortunate