

HESPERIAN STUDENT.

Issued semi-monthly by the HESPERIAN STUDENT
Publishing Association of the University of Nebraska

BOARD OF EDITORS:

Managing Editor, A. G. Warner.

EDITORS-IN-CHIEF, : : : :	{ C. S. ALLEN.
LITERARY, : : : :	{ J. H. HOLMES.
LOCAL, : : : :	E. J. ROBINSON.
DRIFT, : : : :	WILL O. JONES.
ASSOCIATE, : : : :	C. G. McMILLAN.
MEDICAL, : : : :	ANNA SAUNDERB.
BUSINESS MANAGER, : : : :	S. B. LETSON.
	W. C. KNIGHT

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:

One copy, per college year,	\$1.00
One copy, one half year,50
Single copy,10

RATES OF ADVERTISING:

One column, one insertion,	\$3.00
Two squares, one insertion,75
One square, one insertion40

All communications should be addressed to the HESPERIAN STUDENT, State University, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Editorial Notes,

JOSEPH COOK is having a serious time setting the religious world aright. Whether he will succeed or not is somewhat doubtful. The worst of it is that there are some people who will not believe that Joseph knows everything. Whether he does or not we do not pretend to say; but at least he thinks he does.

ONE of our modern critics says in one of his reviews, "that it is necessary to see before you attempt to oversee." This is an excellent idea, and one that many critics heretofore have not discovered. Very frequently they seize upon a subject and without a comprehensive idea of what was intended, proceed to discuss it. It is much the same as if a smith should make an axe and an other man criticize it as a hoe. To be a successful critic requires very clear insight and perception, without this it is like shooting at random and expecting to hit a mark.

JUDGE TOURGEE says that to nominate Blaine for the presidency would be to defeat the Republican party. For while Blaine is powerful in conventions, and has a large following among politicians, yet he has nothing to bring him into sympathy with the nation at large. He is a cold, crafty political trickster, supremely selfish, possessed of no qualities that would endear him to the people. During the war, when every true man should have lent his aid

to help his country, he was busy coining money for himself. His political record in Maine is not as clean as it might be, there is strong evidence that he resorted to bribery several times in his campaigning. He certainly is not a man fitted for the presidency, he has not the interests of his country purely at heart, he simply wants to elevate James G. Blaine.

Many reformers and philanthropists seem to carry out their purpose as a hobby, rather than from any high moral principle. They are just as selfish and narrow as money-makers, and other professional worldly men, they do not differ in principle from these they only take a different field of action. It may seem somewhat strange that one spending his life in a philanthropical work could have a selfish motive, but when we see a man giving no evidence in his daily life that he is in accord with the spirit of the work, we then conclude he must have some other motive. Such men are of little use, they can produce no real, lasting good. As Emerson says "the sentiment from which it sprang determines the dignity of any deed, and the question ever is not what you have done, or forborne, but at whose command you have done or forborne."

MANY people seem to associate ugliness and awkwardness with goodness, and to consider that good looks and a smooth courteous bearing are a sign of depravity. The reasons are not exactly logical, but spring for the most part from prejudice. A house neatly finished and painted is none the less serviceable for this fact, and is far more agreeable to the sight. So with man, those who pay attention to their appearance are more pleasant to meet. The man who neglects this, is incomplete, for the finish is a part of the structure. It is of no use to say that this is of no importance. Webster once said that a great deal was due to "dress and address." We are too apt to look at all matters with a certain bias, a half view, and to flatter ourselves that the things outside of these are of no consequence.

THE author of "Bread Winners" is attracting considerable attention. It is claimed that he is unfair towards the working men. Perhaps he is, there is room for complaint on both sides, capital and labor, but we can not look for any perfectly satisfactory adjustment between them until the millenium comes. At present it is a game of "grab," labor siezes all it can get, and capital follows suit. One, as a whole, is as unprincipled as the other. No system of political economy can render perfect results under such a state of affairs. It sounds very nice to talk about trades-unions, and of themselves in principle they are