

corn-fed steers. The cattle graze during the winter on the grass under the snow, though it is not the buffalo grass, and the cattle-men feed their stock about fifteen bushels of corn per head during the winter. In the summer they are fed a still smaller entree of corn. When they are sent to the packing houses in the Fall the cattle actually weigh heavier than the all-corn-fed product. Such an industry which takes advantage of the soil and the indigenous grasses saves a lot of non-productive energy. On the side hills of the north-western counties of Nebraska, land which is unfit for cultivated cereals, this wiry, flat grass grows luxuriantly. Its possibilities for cattle have been overlooked, because it is not the famous buffalo grass, which, in a dry sheath or husk, preserves the juicy ear through the coldest winter.

Profanity.

Adults are partially to blame for the swearing done by youngsters. The coarseness of the language employed on the highways by the high-school and university youth is appalling. Even the small boys in the grades sprinkle their conversation with obscene and profane oaths. In the boys it is not so much ingrained coarseness as it is imitation of men who know its futility and puerility. The small boys and the youth's ideal is manhood, and as most of the men they hear, swear and smoke and drink, they imitate, first, the accomplishment they can afford—swearing. Of all the vices, swearing is the most futile and puerile. It is a habit which increases with encouragement. The groups of fraternity men and high school boys conversing upon the streets do not intend to be offensive to the women who pass within ear-shot, but if they are interested in the subject of conversation, expression falls into its customary gait without the consciousness of the speakers. There are exceptions in the university and in the high-school, as there are fraternities where profane language is tabooed, but the language of the average university student and high-school boy indicates that education has not essentially refined him. The appearance of cleanliness, respectability and refinement imparted by neat clothing and high, white collars which the under-graduates of the university and high-school affect, is just an appearance. Their language conforms to it only when they are in what appears to be society or while they are conversing with mothers and sisters. It is a curious fact that these same mothers and sisters are unaware of the language their sons and brothers use when speaking to their comrades and within the chance hearing of all the rest of the world.

Swearing has become a *façon de parler*, but English oaths are still shocking to women, and profanity in society is still tabooed. It is not so in Spain, in France, in Germany and in Italy, where women swear by the name of the Deity, by Heaven, by thunder and lightning as unconsciously as the population of the streets and alleys in America. To the gradual lowering of the moral tone to the grade of the language, I think the degenerate fibre of the Romance peoples is partly due. Language is the expression of an idea and if daily language is habitually obscene or profane, the fate of the race is foreshadowed. The day will come when the English equivalent of *Mon Dieu* or *Mein Gott* is as permissible in polite English society as it is in French or German society now, unless the men and boys can be taught better taste and better morals. The little girls are protected,

but the little boys are their future companions, and the neglect of the boys means bad company for life for the girls, the introduction of profanity into the family, and the consequent degredation of the race.

Mothers and sons who read this sweeping arraignment with indignation are advised to investigate, the former their son's daily speech on the play-ground, the campus and on the streets and the latter to take note of their own and their companion's speech. Dr. Wharton's address last Sunday on the subject of the responsibilities of the citizens of Lincoln towards the students that throng the streets of Lincoln during the school year, is worth considering, just from a commercial point of view. Lincoln is either a good or a bad place to establish a youth in for four years. Sons must leave home some time, but it is within the power of society and fraternity and debating club influence to discourage profanity and encourage clean thinking and speaking. It is as easy to establish a moral standard as it is to make a fashion of high, mirror-polish collars, and the effect upon this generation and the next will be more important. The unlined faces, insouciant, all-sufficient bearing of the boys who come to Lincoln for education, indicate that they are easily impressed and may still be induced, if it be the fashion, to speak good, clean English, even while talking with each other and out of the hearing of the mothers and sisters who said good bye to them with forebodings and a wrench of the tie that binds.

George Bancroft—Historian.

Worcester, Massachusetts, is preparing to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the birth of George Bancroft, on October 3, 1800. The celebration will last throughout October. The antiquarian and historical societies in Massachusetts, so many and so industrious, are preparing to celebrate the anniversary with fitting ceremonies. It is not generally remembered that it was while Bancroft was secretary of the navy, and by his initiative (under President Polk) that the naval academy at Annapolis was established. His historical works, though lacking the verity and the careful verifying character of modern historical essays, are still read with interest and profit. His work is classed with that of Macaulay rather than with that of the historians of the last decade.

He was of literary breed. His father was the Rev. Aaron Bancroft of Essex, N. H., minister, and lecturer in Phillips academy. George Bancroft was graduated by Harvard in 1817, and after studying for four years in Goettingen, Heidelberg and Berlin, he returned to this country and began the life of productiveness which has added to American annals. The History of the United States, beginning with the earliest colonization and ending with his history of the formation of the constitution. He was also the author of essays on Abraham Lincoln, Johnathan Edwards, Dr. Channing, Andrew Jackson, William H. Prescott and Washington Irving. His outward life was spent as a professor of Greek for one year at Harvard, in founding the Round Hill school at Northampton, Mass., on the model of Eton, and as collector of the port in Boston, 1838, appointed by President Van Buren. In 1845 and 1846 he was secretary of the navy and in this capacity founded the Naval Academy. Also, as secretary, he forestalled action, by giving instructions for the seizure of California (Mr. Ban-

croft was a democrat), in the event of a war with Mexico, and as acting secretary of War, he gave orders for the first occupation of Mexico by the United States. He was a democrat, but he and the other democrats of that day knew that the quickest way to end a war was by forestalling the enemy. From 1846 to 1849 Bancroft was minister to Great Britain, and from 1868 to 1874 he was minister to Germany. While at Berlin he prepared the argument of the United States against Great Britain in the Northwestern boundary case, which had been referred to the King of Prussia. During all this time the historian's spare hours were given to the study and writing of the history of the United States. He died at Washington, D. C., ninety one years old, after a life of unceasing activity, a simple, dignified life, such as the best and worthiest Americans are leading now. The celebration in thankfulness for such a life as his, which lasted throughout all but nine years of the nineteenth century, is a lesson to young America more emphatic than his books or a biography. On Bancroft hill in Worcester, where his father lived, a Norman tower is being built by Mr. Stephen Salisbury, president of the Antiquarian society. The dedication of this tower will be part of the anniversary ceremonies.

The Fathers vs. Bryan.

"There is nothing new under the Sun," and beyond it we do not know. Mr. Bryan is anxious that we should believe that Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Madison, Seward, Grant, Albert Gallatin, Douglas and others were like him and could foresee disintegration if expansion proceeded, as it has since the colonial era.

George Washington said of Canada, in a letter to General Sullivan, June 16, 1776. "I see no objection to our indulging a hope that this country (Canada), of such importance in the present controversy, may yet be added to and complete our Union." And in the plan of campaign for the year 1682, drawn up by Washington at Newburg, May 1, 1782, he wrote: "And lastly, another Province (Nova Scotia), which some time ago was very desirous of it, would be added to the Federal Union. It may not be amiss to give Bermuda some consideration, as circumstances in the course of the campaign may lead to the conquest of this island, without incurring much expense, or interfering with other plans. Policy in this case may invite the measure whether it is adopted with a view of retaining or ceding the island by way of composition at a general pacification. Some good and no bad consequences can result from an attempt to take this island by surprise. The island might be carried without much, if any opposition; for it is presumed very little would come from the inhabitants; who have often expressed a wish to be united with America and enjoy the benefits of its support." President Washington said to congress, in his speech, December 3, 1793, that "The United States ought not to indulge a persuasion that, contrary to the order of human events, they will forever keep at a distance those painful appeals to arms with which the history of every nation abounds. There is a rank due to the United States among the nations of the world which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness."

And Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, is certain that the Americans will go marching on: "We should then have only to include the North in our Con-

federacy, which would be of course in the first war, and we should have such an empire for liberty as she has never surveyed since the creation: and I am persuaded no constitution was ever so well calculated as ours for extensive empire and self-government."

Abraham Lincoln repeatedly expressed his affirmative opinion of the acquisition of new territory, and the constitutional authority for it. In his first annual message to congress, on December 3, 1861, he said: "Having practiced the acquisition of territory for nearly sixty years, the question of constitutional power to do so is no longer an open one with us. The power was questioned at first by Mr. Jefferson, who, however, in the purchase of Louisiana, yielded his scruples on the plea of great expediency. Mr. Jefferson placed the importance of procuring Louisiana more on political and commercial grounds than on providing room for population."

"To carry out the plan of colonization (of the negroes who had been liberated) may involve the acquiring of territory, and also the appropriation of money beyond that to be expended in the territorial acquisition."

General Grant had no fear of weakening the government by additions of new territory. In his second inaugural address on March 4, 1873, he said: "I do not share in the apprehension held by many as to the danger of governments becoming weakened and destroyed by reason of their extension of territory. Commerce, education and rapid transit of thought and matter by telegraph and steam have changed all this. Rather do I believe that our Great Maker is preparing the world, in his own good time, to become one great nation, speaking one language, and when armies and navies will be no longer required." In his second message, on December 5, 1870, were these words: "The acquisition of San Domingo is desirable because of its geographical position. It commands the entrance to the Caribbean Sea and the Isthmus transit of commerce. Its possession by us will, in a few years, build up a coastwise commerce of immense magnitude, which will go far towards restoring to us our lost merchant marine. In case of foreign war it will give us command of all the islands referred to (the West India islands), and thus prevent an enemy from ever again possessing himself of rendezvous upon our very coast. The acquisition of San Domingo is an adherence to the Monroe doctrine; it is a measure of national protection; it is asserting our just claim to a controlling influence over the great commercial traffic soon to flow from West to East by way of the Isthmus of Darien. It is, in line, a rapid stride toward that greatness which the intelligence, industry and enterprise of the citizens of the United States entitles this country to assume among nations."

Alexander Hamilton's ideas concerning the best interests of the United States are thus expressed in a letter to James McHenry, on June 26, 1799: "Besides the eventual security against invasion, we ought certainly to look to the possession of the Floridas and Louisiana, and we ought to squint at South America." To H. G. Otis, on January 26, 1699: "I have been long in the habit of considering the acquisition of those countries (Louisiana and Florida) as essential to the permanency of the Union." In his "Vindication of the Measures of Congress," in 1774: "The Farmer, I am inclined to hope, builds too much upon the present disunion of Canada, Georgia, the Florida, the Mississippi and Nova Scotia from other colonies. I please myself with the flattering prospect that they will, ere long, unite in one