

one of their own? Why did they not keep alive the one they already had organized? When their own offspring lay dying from neglect and non-attendance it was their boast that they did their literary work in the chapter houses. They did not need the old style literary. Their literary programs were far superior to ours. Was that purely mythical—manufactured to deceive candidates "to be taken in?" Then sir, they have not a single plausible argument today that they brought forward ten years ago to prove the advantages of fraternities over open literary societies. They were dealing in prophecy then. They are confronted with facts today. They come cringing to us now in the hypocritical garb of religion and brotherhood, praying to be taken back into the organization which they for fifteen long years sought to destroy. Oh, yes, we can forgive them, certainly, but if we should have a finger cut off by a buzz saw we would be fools to thrust the whole hand in.

If these anti-fraternity amendments should ever be repealed I wish these predictions to be recalled: First, the so-called barbarians, who are now advocating this step and prating about their loyalty, will take a Greek degree before they take a University degree. Second, the future historians of literary societies of the University will begin with the repeal of these amendments to write their "Decline and Fall."

Mr. Editor, I cannot close this already long letter without congratulating the barbarian element in the University that THE HESPERIAN has again donned its war paint and is after the enemies of democracy and open literary societies in the University. It is a question that experience has demonstrated needs handling without gloves. Apathy, silence, indifference, are the hot-bed of fraternityism. It was these conditions that made possible that disgraceful manifesto during the joint program of the societies last June, when a frat egotist in the guise of a barbarian, denounced in blatant tones a barbarian who dared to express his honest convictions upon this question. Free, open and thorough discussion is the sole safeguard of the open literary societies of the University as well as of democracy in the republic.

C. M. SKILES.

#### The Nebraska Literary Magazine.

I am told that friends and scrap-books of contributors to the *Nebraska Literary Magazine* are already supplied with suitable clippings. What is wanted now, my informant says, is something censorious, and not an addition to the list of grateful and comforting notices. But censure in this instance must surely be exhibited homœopathically. There is no occasion for heroic measures.

For the writers it produces, writers like Octave Thanet, Mr. Garland, Mr. Howells, Eugene Field and James Whitcomb Riley, the poverty of the midland in periodicals is phenomenal. We have almost nothing with high ideals except the *Dial*, and this is limited in scope. Consequently, any attempt toward occupying the field is sure to be welcomed and should be. One cannot predict the future of the modest beginnings made in different places. One thing is certain, there is room here. If the new monthlies and quarterlies we now inspect with curiosity are none of them to abide, at least they will do the pioneering.

One of the boldest of these ventures is the English Club's quarterly. It is not a careless experiment of good times, but the circumstances of its origin and continuance have been such that anything short of success would have been fatal. The want and the ability to supply it are sufficiently shown in the shifting of talk from mere survival to standards. But even survival will sometime depend on standards.

Of course all agree that an effort and a vigorous one should be made toward improvement. There are no advocates of inferiority in the abstract. In particular instances there always are. Not many editors have the courage to decline an article by the man of "wide reputation within narrow limits." There are great men who can not write, and some men who are not great but are thought so share the same characteristic. The *North American Review* in its decadence will demonstrate this to the doubting. Names will sell a number or two but