

paper and paper materials. That tariff is the real strength of the paper trust, and its repeal would at once put the manufacture of paper upon a competitive basis. But this remedy would be a slap in the face of that old fetish, protection. Therefore the American Publishers' association, while asking congress for relief from high prices of paper, suggests no method.

How the federal treasury is to be benefited by the process of refunding the national debt with two per cent. 30-year bonds is not quite obvious. With money piling up in the treasury under the stimulation of war taxes, it would be much more profitable to pay off the bonds as they fall due than to fund them at two per cent. It may be that the four per cent. bonds could not be paid off in 1907, as they amount to \$500,000,000. But consider the five per cents. due in 1904 and the three per cents. due in 1908. The former amount to only \$75,000,000 and the latter to \$200,000,000. To pay full interest on these until maturity and then pay them off altogether would have saved the treasury something like \$120,000,000, as compared with this two per cent. refunding law. Here is the calculation:

5 per cent. on \$75,000,000 due in '04...	\$15,000,000
3 per cent. on \$200,000,000 due in '08..	48,000,000
Total interest	\$63,000,000

That is the amount, \$63,000,000, that it would be necessary to pay in interest if these bonds were to be redeemed as they fall due, which could be done with the amount of surplus now in the treasury. But under the new law the amount necessary to be paid in bonuses and interest runs up to \$183,926,525, thus:

Bonus on bonds of 1904.....	\$7,556,325
Interest for 30 years on substituted 2 per cent. bonds	45,000,000
Bonus on bonds of 1908.....	11,370,200
Interest for 30 years on substituted 2 per cent. bonds	120,000,000
Total bonuses and interest.....	\$183,926,525
Deduct interest on old bonds as shown above	63,000,000
bonds as shown above.....	63,000,000

Net amount in bonuses and interest donated to bondholders...\$120,926,525

So much for the bonds that might easily be redeemed with the treasury surplus as they fall due. They are to

be extended 30 years at a loss to the government of more than \$120,000,000.

Now consider the bonds that fall due in 1907, which, as they amount to \$500,000,000, might not be easily redeemed at maturity. The total bonus required to refund them would amount to \$58,382,500. Then the interest for 30 years at two per cent. on the bonds substituted for them would come to \$300,000,000. Interest and bonus together would consequently amount to \$358,382,500. But it was not necessary to refund for 30 years. The sale of our three per cent. ten-year war bonds, in 1898, showed that a three per cent. bond could be readily placed. If, then, the bonds that could not be redeemed by 1907 had been refunded at three per cent. for ten years, by which time they and all the others could well enough be cared for if present taxes are to be maintained, the whole debt could have been discharged in a decade at an interest cost of \$150,000,000, thus effecting a saving over the plan of the gold standard law of \$208,000,000. As it is, increased burdens have been created and the debt has been extended for 30 years. Is it unreasonable to suppose that such was the intention?

"I maintain," says Dr. Julia Holmes Smith, of Chicago, in a paper read before the Illinois Homeopathic Medical association, "that 999 out of every 1,000 mothers are not fit to bring up their children from the day the little ones are born." This is a sweeping assertion. But Dr. Smith explains that her figures "are based on observations made among only two classes of people—the two extremes of social life." By these extremes she means definitely "the society woman who dawdles from the time she rises until she goes to the ball, and the working woman who spends her days in the factory or shop; both exhaust their vitality, and although they may possess all the instincts of motherhood they are not able to do their duty to the child." Dr. Smith

here emphasizes a truth which is too easily overlooked. She shows in a startling way that in a disordered social life, one in which the overwork of one class goes to enervate with luxury the idle of another, both classes are degraded. Excessive work and excessive idleness, the complementary evils of social disorder, work together to produce social death. It is a tremendous object lesson for justice.

THE GORED OX.

Lord Salisbury's speech at the annual meeting of the Primrose league of British jingoism indicates that the British ministry is nervous. Either that, or Salisbury aims to intensify the martial spirit of England in the interest of further conquest. It is more likely that the ministry is nervous. A ministry that kicks up a little 30-day war, which has already extended itself out to seven months and drawn 200,000 men into the field to fight 50,000, cannot feel altogether comfortable in face of the traditional fear of a possible invasion of England.

At any rate, Lord Salisbury in his speech deplored this possibility with unusual earnestness. But for that matter the whole English-speaking world deplores it. An invasion of England would strike horror to the hearts of us all.

Yet what is the difference between an invasion of England by a stronger power, and the invasion of the Transvaal by England? It is only in the point of view.

The invaders would not be horrified. They would regard it as patriotic, and eloquently describe it as an obligation they owe their civilization. Their Kiplings might lift it even into the regions of the spiritual by singing, for example, the "Burden of the Slav." And who shall say that they would be wrong? The Anglo Saxon jingo himself is doing his best to destroy all moral tests. If the British may righteously invade the homes of other peoples to extend British civilization, why may not other peoples—the Latins, the Slavs, or the Turks—if they get the military power—righteously invade England to extend their civilization?

Of course we of English traditions

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