

## THE HESPERIAN

Issued Weekly by the HESPERIAN ASSOCIATION of the University of Nebraska.

### TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

One copy, per college year (in advance) \$1.00  
One copy, one semester .50

### ADVERTISING RATES ON APPLICATION

#### ALUMNI AND EX-STUDENTS.

Special endeavor will be made to make THE HESPERIAN interesting to former students. Please send us your subscriptions. Subscriptions on our books will be continued until ordered stopped.

Address all communications to THE HESPERIAN, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.

The Kansas Nebraska debate takes place at Lawrence Kansas, next Friday evening. Reports from Lawrence say the Kansas representatives are strong men. So are Baker, Green and Dennison. They are hard at work preparing for the decisive contest. The debate promises to be the hardest contested of any debate since the organization of the Kansas-Nebraska association.

It begins to look as if Nebraska would not be represented in the inter-state oratorical contest. The state association has paid Mr. Roper but \$30 of the prize money. It is bankrupt and cannot pay his expenses to Columbia, Mo. where the contest is to be held. Mr. Roper, who is working his way through school feels that he cannot afford to pay his own expenses. Here the matter stands. If Mr. Roper does not participate in the contest, to be held at Columbia next week, it throws Nebraska out of the inter-state association. Can not something be done? Do we wish to be unrepresented in this contest? Are we willing to be dropped from the inter-state association? If we are to do something it must be done at once as Mr. Roper must leave next Tuesday in order to get to Columbia in time for the contest.

This is not the day of book worms, but there are a few around the university whose recluse manner and worn faces tell of a life given almost wholly to their books. It is not ours to discourage a careful, studious life, but we do believe that many carry this to an extreme, and thus become simply repositories instead of active, living factories for ideas. There is too much of the cramming in process, instead of the leading out. We must come in touch with our fellow students and get the practical side—the living vibrating, animating side of our college life, if we are to make the world better for being in it. Some people go at their studies as though all the preparation for life they ever expected to get was between book covers. Let us be studious—very studious, but only a part of our material for life's study is printed on paper. Our fellow students want our interest, our sympathy and our thought; let us come in touch with them.

### *The War at Crete.*

The raging floods did not prevent the representatives of the U. B. D. C. from meeting the sturdy Cretans last Saturday evening.

The program was given in the Congregational church. W. H. Rhodes, of the U. B. D. C. presided and called the house to order at 8:30. Mr. Lee of the P. K. D. kept time. The question debated was "That the present division of labor tends rather to hinder than to help individual development."

E. W. Ellis, of the P. K. D. society opened the debate for the affirmative. He defined the question carefully and outlined the argument for their side. He asserted that this system suppresses the mind; makes the laborer more dependent and causes a lack of interest in self improvement. G. F. Warren opened the argument for the negative in behalf of the U. B. D. C. He showed that a distribution of functions was the plan of animal life, and essential to social development. He made a strong point in rebuttal by showing that national prosperity was possible only when the individual citizens were improving. C. J. Bahr, the next speaker on the affirmative conceded most of the propositions made by the negative. He dwelt upon the evils of specialization as being conducive to a one-sided development. N. R. Ewart followed for the negative and hurled a witty shot which was looking for more individual development on the part of the affirmative. He showed that the system of labor had not materially changed in the last fifteen years and that the negative had failed to limit the question.

A. Houston, then proceeded to argue for the affirmative that this system destroys the home by employing the mothers and children in shops. He asserted that laborers were becoming mechanics and by taking away individual interest they were losing all pride in the furnished product. F. G. Hawxby followed on the negative and insisted that the present system was the natural method of developing those resources most essential to man's happiness. He compared the home of a weaver, before the time of machinery, with the advantages of the laborer of today. By a comparison of statistics from the report of the commissioner of labor, he showed that the greatest industrial, intellectual and social development had taken place in manufacturing cities.

W. H. Hotze quoted good authorities to show that the present system tends to degenerate the individual. He insisted that national and individual development were not co incident and that increased wages could not replace the injuries of the factory system, which prevents the laborer from applying him-self. O. W. Meier closed for the negative. He showed clearly the perfection of our system, and how completely the individual was developed through a differentiation of functions. He quoted living authorities and showed how persistently his opponents refused to limit the question. Mr. Ellis made a forcible close for the affirmative.