

INCIDENTALLY, IT seems, there is an impression afloat that the State University should withdraw from the Oratorical Association. There are many reasons why this should be done. Very few state universities are represented in the Interstate Association, which is controlled almost entirely by small denominational schools. With all due respect to these, we know too well how different their standards of oratory are from ours. Their training is entirely different from what we are accustomed. From the first prep to the senior their students are required to take "rhetoricals." They are trained to write orations, and to deliver anything from a doggerel in dactyls to Wendel Phillips sublimest oration. Our orators usually never try to write an oration until they get the contest fever, and then they usually produce essays or eulogies. On this account, if for no other reason, we can never hope to win an interstate contest. Beside this, there is the perpetual bitter hatred these schools with which we now compete have for all state universities. It is so here, and in every other state. These colleges control the association, and we may rest assured they will never let a state institution walk away with a plumb if they can possibly help it. This year the presidency of the association comes to Nebraska, and already some deluded mortals are speculating upon which one of our candidates will be elected. It will be a miracle if we even get scent of it. The denominational colleges will combine against us at the mere mention of State University. We are playing in a losing game. We furnish the money to run a few impoverished belligerents who will knife us at the word. Speed the day when we learn wisdom from Wisconsin, and withdraw from an organization in which we can never hope to be more than a tool of our most bitter enemies.

Final arrangements have been completed for beginning the construction of the American University. The project will involve \$5,000,000.

OUR ESTEEMED contemporary published, as a "Charter Day" number, a university supplement to *Vanity Fair*. In that supplement it ruthlessly invades the hallowed sanctity of the chamber of the dead, and publishes a representation, a sort of composite photograph, so to speak, of the HESPERIAN board, wrapped in their winding sheet with their arms folded peacefully on their breast, as, with great toe crossed cunningly over middle toe, they await the call of the Great Trumpeteer. It is all very funny no doubt; its classic wit and delicate humor is patent to the most hurried reader, but is it true? We hope not. THE HESPERIAN has enough faith in the ennobling effects of a higher education to believe that a college paper may be edited by ladies and gentlemen, may be run on those principles of refinement and culture befitting a literary publication, and still be appreciated by the readers. We do not mean to be personal, but at the same time, we do not believe that the Charter Day supplement to *Vanity Fair* represents the manhood and womanhood of this university; we do not believe that its "jokes" and "sketches" are a fair example of what four years of the university curriculum will do toward turning out men and women of true learning, refinement and culture; we do not believe that a college paper need be littered with malice and mud and innuendo to insure its life and popularity; and for these reasons we do not believe that the *Supplement*, with its ill-tempered and ungentle personalities is fitted to act as the spokesman of the students of this University in pronouncing us dead. But the serious question arises: Can we as a nation expect to put down sensationalism and its attendant evils in our daily press, when we see, in the very home of the best and highest culture, ethics and morality, a "newspaper" published and supported that is run on the principles of the *Police Gazette*, *New York World* and *Puck* and *Judge*, with all of their malice and none of their wit and humor? Do the "reading public" of the University demand such literature? Do