

*Kansas»Nebraska Debate.*

The third annual debate between the universities of Kansas and Nebraska occurred at Lawrence, Kas., last Friday evening. Kansas won. The debate was listened to by a good sized audience. Each speaker was listened to attentively, the audience being an exceedingly responsive one. Chancellor Snow of Kansas University presided.

G. W. Green of Nebraska opened the discussion for the affirmative. He said in part: To intelligently discuss this question we must understand exactly what we mean when we say it should be the policy of the United States to extend her boundaries. The interpretation put upon the question is important because the judges must refer all our arguments back to the basic position which we take at the beginning of the debate. We advocate simply the natural opportune extension which has characterized our entire history as a nation. We believe we should "grow by assimilating all that we incorporate," that we should "increase by accretion rather than by the addition of large masses of territory held together by the cohesion of force." In proposing this policy we but follow in the footsteps of Jefferson, Madison, Polk, Everett, Fish, Seward and all the other great advocates of the American policy of national expansion. There is no reason for placing a strained construction upon the question. Its meaning can be ascertained only from our history and the utterances of our public men. Why is not the policy proposed by us a desirable one? Why should we turn our backs on our history? Why should not our political organism occupy its natural physical organism? Why should not the Teutonic race occupy this territory for its own and the world's best interests? Why should not our own political organism keep pace with our social and industrial organism? It is incumbent upon

our opponents to answer all these questions satisfactorily.

C. M. Sharpe of Kansas opened the debate for the negative. He started out at once with his argument and completely ignored the questions of his opponent. He urged that the aim of the U. S. should be not to acquire more commercial advantages but to develop spiritual strength among the people. The expansive policy meant cupidity and the fulfillment of the greed and avarice of men. Mr. Sharpe spoke fluently but failed to clearly outline the negative side of the question. He did not have his argument logically arranged and his speech was not as convincing as it otherwise would have been.

J. D. Dennison followed on the affirmative. The affirmative propose a natural, gradual, and opportune expansion in accordance with the economy of events and the natural law of political gravitation. Society is an organism, living, growing, and expanding, requiring new territory and new resources to meet its increasing needs. Its purpose is progress, its law is growth. The history of the Teutonic Race demonstrates its capacity to absorb and assimilate weaker races. History shows it the dominant race always pushing outward in proportion to internal development and expanding boundaries according to national needs.

Modern means of transportation and intercommunication make our nation coherent, harmonious, and homogenous. Throughout our dominions the English language, common law, freedom of the press, religious toleration, and Anglican self government are established. The Saxon is primarily a governing race—every zone knows him, every clime claims him, every environment receives him—and he conquers them all. Our population is now essentially Aryan and predominantly Teutonic. The federal government provides for local particularism and insures national unity. It combines within itself all the elements necessary for controlling a wide and widening domain, allowing expansion with social, commercial and industrial growth. Local autonomy is permitted and national