

can feel that it would be disastrous and unrighteous. The man who gets hit can always realize his assailant's wickedness and bad judgment. But if the jingo is right in his theory that it is his duty to impose our superior civilization by force of arms upon reluctant weaker peoples, then by what standard shall the impartial judge decide that any people with adequate martial power, who think their civilization superior, may not rightfully impose it by force of arms upon us?

ANNEXATION OF CUBA.

In 1858 a proposition to buy Cuba for \$30,000,000 was discussed in the United States senate, but was withdrawn after debate. Referring to the same idea over 40 years later, ex-Gov. William J. Stone, of Missouri, prominent in the national councils of the democratic party, said in a speech at Peoria January 8, 1900:

As far back as 1897, nearly a year before the declaration of war against Spain, I declared in public speech that war between the countries, then imminent, was inevitable at an early day, and said I believed that when war did come we should take by force what we tried to buy with money 40 years before.

We are doubtless to infer from this that in 1897 Mr. Stone was in favor of taking Cuba by conquest, just as we have been trying for more than a year to take the Philippine islands. This is the logical and unavoidable inference. And there is no little danger that the democratic platform at Kansas City may be made to favor Cuban "annexation," which would mean nothing less than Cuban conquest.

Now, if Philippine conquest is wrong, Cuban conquest cannot be right. But if Cuban conquest was right in 1897, it cannot be wrong in 1900. Why, then, does not Mr. Stone favor Cuban conquest to-day? No doubt, because of the resolution of congress. But it may occur to many, that one whose resistless eloquence can sweep away the declaration of independence should not stand abashed before a pitiful little resolution of congress. There is some question, moreover, as to whether the Cubans derive their natural rights from the resolution of congress. Who gave

to mankind the right of self-government, anyway? Did it come from the American congress? Where did the Americans obtain this right? Mr. Stone, being a popular and forceful orator, should be able to give sense to jargon, demonstration to absurdity, and consistency to nonsense; but can he tell us where any nation gets the right to arbitrarily force its laws upon another?

Even conceding for the moment that all our former acquisitions of territory were expressly based upon conquest, or the right of purchase of human beings with or without their own consent, that fact could not justify similar wrong-doing to-day. If there is such a thing as the right of self-government, it is a natural right. Such rights exist irrespective of treaty. Treaties may recognize or ignore them, but they cannot create them. God alone can do that. The fact that precedents are established for or against these rights, does not affect their validity in the least. A right to commit injustice cannot be acquired by prescription, nor fortified by precedent. The statutes of limitation do not run against human liberty.

Some democrats favor the annexation of Cuba because they say it is democratic doctrine. And what, pray, is democratic doctrine? Do we get it solely from party platforms? If so, where was democratic doctrine before platforms were written? Jefferson managed to find some of this doctrine before he had the platform to draw from. Where did he get it? There was but one source from which he could have obtained it, and that is still the source of democratic doctrine—the immortal principles of human right as written by the finger of God in the heart of humanity itself. Jefferson quaffed at the fountain of eternal truth, which flowed not less copiously for him than it flows for us to-day, and will flow on to the end of time. The truth is older than Jefferson. He did not create it, nor was all of it known to him. A Jefferson may grasp the truth with a giant's grasp and hurl it with a giant's power against the enemies of the rights of man, but the imperishable principles which throw light into his brain and give strength to his arm

are not more potent than the instrument that wields them. There are few safer guides to democracy than Thomas Jefferson, but even he was neither infallible nor impeccable. The man who would comprehend in his soul the true democracy in all the amplitude and scope of that great concept, must seek it where Jefferson found it—in the living well of truth.

It is said that Jefferson favored the annexation of Cuba. He also favored lotteries. But lotteries are gambling devices, and if Cuban annexation is Jeffersonian democracy, gambling also is Jeffersonian democracy. The fact is that Jefferson, like the bible, is sometimes susceptible of different interpretations.

The democratic platform of 1860, it is true, contained Cuban annexation planks. This was the case with both the Douglas and the Breckenridge platforms. By reaffirming the Cincinnati platform of 1856 they also recognized the institution of domestic slavery. Both planks were inserted by pro-slavery men. They knew that Cuba, if admitted to the union, would be a slave-holding state. That this fact was well known by the statesmen of that day cannot be doubted, for it was openly charged in the political speeches of the time. In 1856 the democratic Cuban policy was well understood, although it had not yet been voiced in the platform. In a speech at Philadelphia, November 1, 1856, Kenneth Raynor, of North Carolina, said: "If he [Buchanan] be elected now, and the difficulties in Kansas be healed, at the end of four years they will spring upon you another question of slavery agitation. It will be the taking of Cuba from Spain, * * * for the purpose of embroiling the north against the south, and if I shall resist that agitation, I shall be called an abolitionist again." Thus it appears that Cuban annexation is not a whit more democratic than domestic slavery, if you take the platform as your authority; and such an annexation plank in a democratic platform of the present day would have about as much business there as a pro-slavery plank.

But suppose our platform of 1900 should overrule the Cuban policy of

1860. Would not the platform of 1900 control? I think so, at least; especially in view of the fact that the annexation of the island would result in throwing it into the hands of the money barons of New York, who, owning the plantations, transportation facilities and finances of the country, would enthrall the people thereof in as galling slavery as was ever witnessed south of Mason and Dixon's line. This the democratic party is not willing to permit. It has come back to the other side of the slavery question since 1860.

SPEED MOSBY.

Jefferson City, Mo.

NEWS

The latest authentic information from the seat of war in South Africa which we were able to give last week was contained in reports from Lord Roberts bearing date the 30th and the 1st. This was vague, though the London correspondents inferred from it that heavy fighting was in progress somewhat to the north of Thaba N'Chu and that the Boers were putting the British on the defensive. Those reports from Roberts were followed by one from him dated the 2d, in which he said that the Boers had been driven by the right of his line at Thaba N'Chu from their position at Houtnek, which is north of Thaba N'Chu and that they were retreating in several directions, mainly to the north and east. Two days later Lord Roberts had evidently begun his advance to Pretoria. With 50,000 men he then had a front 40 miles long, extending eastward from the railroad, and was pushing slowly forward. On the 3d he had captured Brandfort, which lies to the north of Bloemfontein. It had been the right of the Boer line which recently extended southeastwardly to Wepener; but no serious efforts were made by the Boers to prevent its capture. Pushing on to the north from Brandfort, the British, after sharp fighting on the 6th, crossed the Vet river about 20 miles northeast of Brandfort, and took possession of Smaldeel, the junction station where the railroad from Winburg connects with the main line. They subsequently took Winburg without resistance, the Boers withdrawing to the Zand river, 25 miles north of Smaldeel, where they are expected to make another stand, and where an engagement has since been

fought, in which 8,000 British were driven back. On the 9th Lord Roberts was still at Smaldeel, with the greater part of the forces, engaged in repairing the line of railroad to Bloemfontein and the bridge across the Vet river. According to an Associated Press dispatch of the 6th from Smaldeel, his advance to that point was secured by maneuvers which placed the Boers at a disadvantage at all points of contact. "Lord Robert's admirable strategy," says this dispatch, "resulted in placing everywhere five British to one Boer.

The general movement of which the advance to Smaldeel and Winburg described above is part, extends from the eastern border of the Orange Free State near Thaba N'Chu to the southwestern corner of the Transvaal near Fourteen Streams. The far western division is under command of Gen. Hunter, Methuen having apparently been subordinated. Gen. Hunter, having crossed to the west bank of the Vaal river at Windsorton and proceeded toward Fourteen Streams, had on the 4th fought his way to Warrenton, and on the 8th taken possession of Fourteen Streams without opposition.

Gen. Buller's command in Natal, which has been for some weeks awaiting orders, was reported on the 9th as having been ordered to move on Biggarsberg with a view of cooperating with Lord Roberts.

American peace in the Philippines is as warlike as ever. In a fight on the island of Panay, reported from Iloilo on the 3d, 4 Americans were killed and 16 severely wounded. Reinforcements came in the nick of time to save their comrades from destruction. In another fight on the same island the Americans lost on the 2d 3 killed and 7 wounded. Two Americans were killed and five wounded in a fight in Luzon on the 13th, and more fighting has occurred near Catubig, in northern Samar. On the island of Leyte the dispatches report an engagement in which the Americans had two men wounded but killed 125 Filipinos. Two important captures of prisoners are reported from Manila—Gen. Pantelon Garcia, the highest Filipino military officer next to Aguinaldo, and Pedro Paterno, formerly president of Aguinaldo's cabinet. This report is accompanied by news of the reappearance

of Aguinaldo. He is said to be in the north of Luzon, where he has assembled a considerable force and is planning to resume fighting in the rainy season now at hand.

Gen. Otis has begun his voyage home from Manila, having at his own urgent request been relieved by Gen. MacArthur.

American casualties in the Philippines since August 6, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out at Washington to May 9, 1900, are as follows:

Killed	475
Died of wounds, disease and accidents	1,244
Total deaths	1,719
Wounded	2,103

Total loss	3,822
Total loss reported last week....	3,822
Total deaths reported last week..	1,719

The foregoing figures represent only those casualties that are reported in detail from time to time and given to the daily press. The list is as yet incomplete, owing to lack of detailed reports for the past three weeks.

Preparations for the presidential campaign are fast vitalizing American politics. At the populist national convention, held at Sioux Falls, South Dakota, on the 9th, P. M. Ringdell, of Minnesota, was elected temporary chairman. The middle-of-the-road populists, who met at Cincinnati on the 9th, had ex-Congressman Howard, of Alabama, for temporary chairman. No further business had been done at the hour of this writing by either convention.

The democrats of Iowa, meeting on the 3d, named delegates at large to the national convention, with Cato Sells at the head and John S. Murphy of the Dubuque Telegraph next. They denounced imperialism, held the protective tariff responsible for trusts, expressed sympathy for the Boers, indorsed the Chicago platform, and demanded the nomination of Bryan. The republicans of West Virginia, meeting on the 8th, indorsed the gold standard, imperialism and the McKinley administration. On the 9th the convention of the republicans of Maryland was held, and elected delegates to the Philadelphia convention. It indorsed the McKinley administration. Connecticut republicans met on the same day and took