

for an Annual at \$1, admitting the good work of both? Is it morally right to give 50 cents to the Athletic association, and morally wrong to give 50 cents for a class representation in an Annual? We want to be enlightened. Where shall we draw the line? The theory calls for the abandonment of athletics, oratory, societies, fraternities, NEBRASKAN and everything else but text books and tablets.

Of course, the actual work of preparation and publication falls on a few, but they can stand it for what they get out of it. The editorial work does not amount to any more than the aggregate work of a similar nature put on college papers, and the same is true of the management. The bulk of the work last year came on four students, but they are all on deck this year and expect to graduate; of course it was warm work last spring, but none of them got a written notice to discontinue any class work on account of incompetency.

As to the personalities, we think the Chancellor takes an extreme view. We do not believe that last year's Annual had any more "bitter" personalities in it than did the college papers for that year. We believe further, that almost without exception, everybody mentioned in the "sparks" was a little bit proud to have his name in the book instead of mortified at an imaginary insult. We do not believe that Nebraska raises men mean enough to make capital of such things against the University, and if there be any we don't want their sons here anyway.

We think, in conclusion, that '94 will do well to reconsider its rather hasty action in this matter. We do not think they have offered a single worthy excuse for breaking what '93 hoped last year to establish as a tradition. By making the publication of the Annual a matter of tradition and a matter of course, we will but fall into line with our sister colleges from the largest to many of the most insignificant—a thing we usually have good sense enough to do promptly.

A statement sent to the NEBRASKAN throws

the cause upon increased school work from change of courses and the breaking of no tradition; '94's increased work from change of courses is only a trifle more than '93's, which is practically nothing. As to broken tradition we believe '94 will do far more harm if it nips this promising branch of student enterprise in the bud, than if it simply discontinued for one year a long established custom. '94 ought to consider the University as well as herself in this matter.

The banqueting season for the foot-ball players has approached, and generous faculties all over the land are showing their appreciation of the boys efforts in various ways, and especially by giving them banquets. What reward do the members of our team receive for their ten weeks hard labor for the triumph of the University? No banquet indeed, but instead some have received those cream notices from the Chancellor's office, to discontinue work in certain classes because of deficiency. Is this the right way to treat our team? Is it fair to drop one of them from class without a fair show? If at the end of the term these players cannot pass their examinations, then they should be dropped, but not before. It is true that all who have attempted work upon athletics, oratory and journalism have been hampered in their work as much as possible by superior powers, and allowed no credit for their efforts. Yet it does not seem right that one step more should be taken and men on the foot-ball team unceremoniously dropped because their work at this time was not up to the mark. We trust that the faculty will not allow any of the foot-ball players to lose their standing in class without fair show.

Another season of foot-ball has passed away, as the first chilly blasts of a northern wind sweep the campus. Now for oratory. With over 900 students in school, some good oratorical talent can surely be secured. While the University has always been first in foot-ball and base ball in the state, our