

# THE + HESPERIAN.

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA.

VOL. XXVI

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, DECEMBER 24, 1896

No 18

## *The Hesperian.*

The scrap precipitated by the proposed changes in the HESPERIAN constitution now seems to be in a fair way of settlement. The main features of the new plan have met little if any opposition. They were submitted to such men as Prof. Caldwell and Will Owen Jones and approved by them. They certainly go a long way toward correcting certain disadvantages under which the paper has labored. But although the main outline of the plan proved acceptable, one or two details met no little opposition. And this opposition took the position that the provisions of the old constitution had not been complied with and consequently the new constitution entire—good features and bad—was illegally adopted.

It was argued that the proposed amendments were not "posted" and therefore could not be adopted. It is true that the amendments had not been posted in the usual manner, i. e. they had not been stuck up on the bulletin board. But they had in effect been posted because the main features had been published as widely at least as they would have been had the amendments been tacked up in the hall. When the question came up in the meeting Friday the chairman explained that the officers of the Association had no copy of the old constitution and had not learned its exact provisions in time to comply with them if the meeting were to be held before the Holidays. He held that since the general features of the plan had been published the constitution had been complied with. Now who is to decide such a question, except the meeting call-

ed to act upon the proposed amendments? It would seem that a majority of such a meeting must be competent to pass on such a question. And if the meeting is unanimously of this opinion—as was the meeting last Friday—that the constitution has been complied with, what more can be asked? The opposition itself acted on this view when it submitted this same question to the meeting last Monday and was defeated. Nor can anyone charge that the officers were guilty of sharp practice in hurrying the matter through. The plan was submitted to some twenty representative society members and made public through them. It came up at a meeting Friday, was discussed in detail and laid over until Saturday. Meantime the societies met and discussed it and one of them passed resolutions instructing its members how to vote. If all did not know the details the fault was their own. They knew that important changes were pending and they knew the time and place of meeting.

But there are two provisions in the new constitution whose legality is more doubtful. They had not been published till Friday. They were inserted by the committee informally appointed to draft the constitution. And these aroused the most opposition, more on account of their nature than because of the manner in which they were proposed. All concerned are ready to admit that a bad blunder was made in forcing these through and those most intimately concerned stand ready to do what they can to correct the wrong. At the request of these the new managing editor will call a meeting on Jan. 5, at which the question of the legality of the whole procedure will be considered and the objectionable clause will probably be modified or withdrawn.