

finally they have beheld the results of their continuous setting, they should receive the sympathy of all their fellow frats, in this their hour of affliction. We are not fighting the fraternity. We are fighting the ring that corrupts our University politics. When the fight was on they had not hatched out, and now when they have, we fight their Tammany methods and not their fraternal brotherhood.

The writer of "The History of a Crime" was the "rankest of the barbs," was she? Her article was a "senseless tirade," and was written because the writer was a sorehead? The Nebraskan twists and squirms in order to beg the question. The girl who wrote the "history," not the girl who "was chosen," has reason to be proud of her article. Its arguments have not been "phased" a particle by all the misrepresentation of the Nebraskan. If the Johnston faction wants to know the history of the "history" let them come around to the writer and learn it. What the HESPERIAN prints it stands by. It makes no difference who writes, as long as what they write is the truth.

If "three fourths of the people present at the meeting of the local oratorical association favored Johnston for delegate," it is strange that they could not find three men who would support him when it came to the state convention. If those in opposition were a "mere handful whom the students have never seen fit to invest with any power," it is strange that in three hours they could have even as much influence (this being all the Nebraskan will admit) in gaining signers to petitions, as did the Johnston faction, who started Sunday, the day previous. If the Nebraskan states Fisher had been a candidate for three weeks, we retaliate by saying that Johnston had been the same as candidate for nearly a year. Inveterate politicians have their eyes on the future. If W. M. Johnston had so little opposition, why could he meet the Crete delegation at the depot with only

members of a prospective fraternity? If his power ramified in every direction, why could he not influence the Crete delegation when the opposition allowed his side to have an interview? Why could not his four men and Mains, when down at Crete, influence the Crete delegation, as against the arguments of the "coalition"? Things do be strange. Then to cap all we have the word of a member of this delegation which acted so honorably, that they did not regret their vote which was apparently thrown away. This from the Crete delegation which Johnston had so often befriended.

Consider the action of Doane and then believe if you will that Cotner changed her mind for nothing. We verily believe that the Johnston faction must have used a Y. M. C. A. racket of their own brand, and of a special flavor on their denominational friends. Their deals show, however, that they did not have any Puritan in their firm. The manner in which they pooled issues was clearly set fourth in our last issue. It has not been denied and so stands.

Graham returned of his own accord. When he made known his action, he was told that it would be inexpedient to run him for vice-president as the Johnston faction had promised to do. As this did not change his determination to vote for the right side, he was offered the vice-presidency. We have proofs that this is true. If the Nebraskan denies it, the whole thing resolves itself into a simple question of veracity.

Then, why did we not call a meeting of the association and instruct our delegation? We would ask why the records of the association which were in the hands of Adam McMullen, who was secretary and treasurer last year, were not handed over to the officers elected for '94? The constitution is supposed to offer a few hints as to the manner in which affairs are conducted in the association, and it is not reasonable to expect that people are to act in the dark. In the article in the Nebraskan, reference is