

**THE MORAL OF THE CUBAN WAR.**

War, the almost certain concomitant of empire, is alleged to have a most blessed effect on the internal harmony of nations. This we are told not only in the press, but from the pulpit; some going even so far as to intimate that the restoration of national harmony was a sufficient object for this war. The moral world would be strangely out of joint if a nation could cure itself of factiousness or of any internal disorder by shedding the blood and seizing the possessions of its neighbors. War has no such virtue. The victories of the Plantagenets in France were followed by insurrections and civil wars at home, largely owing to the spirit of violence which the raids on France had excited. The victories of Chatham were followed by disgraceful scenes of cabal and faction as well as of corruption, terminating in the prostration of patriotism and the domination of George III and North. Party animosities in the United States do not seem to have been banished or even allayed by the Cuban war. Setting party divisions aside, no restoration of harmony appeared to be needed, so far as the white population was concerned. Not only peace, but good will between the North and South had been restored in a surprising degree. The blue and gray had fraternized on the field of Gettysburg. It was to harmonize white and black that some kindly influence was manifestly and most urgently needed. But all through the war and since the war American papers have been almost daily recording cases of lynching, sometimes of such a character as to evince the last extremity of hatred and contempt. The negro is lymphatic, apathetic, patient of degradation and even of insult. But San Domingo saw that he had a tiger in him; and when the tiger broke loose hell ensued. There has been at least one instance of the retaliatory lynching of a white man; and now we have a bloody battle of races at Virden. Why should the American commonwealth want more negroes?

\* \* \* \* \*

What is this mood styled "imperialism," "jingoism," "expansionism," "Greater Britain," which has suddenly come over the world? How is it that all at once moderation, regard for right, and what was deemed common prudence are discarded, and in their place we hear avowals of thirst for aggrandizement, and proclamations of the law of force, far more philosophic in form, but hardly more moral in spirit, than the utterances of Attila or Timur? Europe has become an arsenal and drilling-ground. The bread is taken from the mouths of toil to furnish destruction with its implements; the toiler himself is pressed into its hosts; mad competition in armaments has gone on till the Czar himself stands aghast and appeals to reason and humanity. The

people everywhere groan. Socialism and anarchism, as a natural consequence, prevail. America at last catches the infection, and, as might be expected from her receptivity and vivacity, in its extreme form. Lord Salisbury, casting the world's horoscope, predicts that the weak nations will all be devoured by the strong, and apparently that the process will go on till, instead of the community of nations, each contributing out of its special treasure to the common store, there will be left only one great predatory power. That power, we flatter ourselves, will be the Anglo-Saxon; and we think that the nations ought to look forward with gladness to its sole domination. But the nations may differ from us in taste; at all events they may prefer variety. What, again, we would ask, is the explanation of this paroxysm of aggrandizement? Is it the sudden opening by exploration of Africa and other regions hitherto unappropriated by civilized man? Is it the intense thirst of gain? Is it mere restlessness and satiety of peaceful industry and life? Is it the removal of religious restraints on self-aggrandizement by the decadence of Christianity? It seems not altogether to be the last, since one mode of expansion is to send a missionary in advance, and, when he gets into trouble with the natives, to follow him up with a "punitive expedition."

\* \* \* \* \*

When we talk of "the great commonwealth of English-speaking people," and think of it as pursuing a common policy, it is as well to remember that the British part of it comprises two hundred millions of Hindus, who with other alien races comprehended in the empire, form about four-fifths of the whole. Its interests, relations, and liabilities are not likely to coincide very closely with those of the United States.

It is with the imperialist party in England which is also in the main that of aristocracy and militarism, that the alliance would practically be formed. By that party it is that the prospect of an Anglo-American combination for the purpose of common aggrandizement is so eagerly hailed. At present, thanks to the recoil from home rule which threatened the dismemberment of the United Kingdom, imperialism is completely in the ascendant. But when home rule has been fairly buried, there may be a liberal and moderatist revival. Already there have been symptoms of it in more than one of the recent by-elections.

For the propagation of Anglo-Saxon ideas and institutions no diplomatic or military combination is required. Ideas are propagated by the press; while parliamentary government and trial by jury have made the round of the civilized world without the firing of a gun. To impose peace upon all nations by the fiat of the two great Anglo-Saxon

powers, we are sometimes told, would be the beneficent object of the combination. The nations would presently object to having peace or anything else imposed upon them by anybody's fiat; they would take arms to assert their independence; and the end, instead of universal peace, might be a general war.—Goldwin Smith in the November Forum.

**NO HALF WAY "DESTINY."**

We carry no exemption from the evils that have overtaken that other nation, as proud, as self-confident as we ourselves. Give us a few generations of foreign wars and splendid victories and colonial domination, and we may expect to emulate the Spanish character, and to hold as high a place as the Spaniards in the estimation of the world.

If we adventure ourselves in the course that lies so invitingly open to us, and go forth in quest of glory and power, after the Spanish fashion, it seems likely that we shall achieve what we go for; but we must take it with its liabilities, for ourselves as well as for others. It may, indeed, be, as so many are ready to assure us, that there is a great destiny before us. Are we ready to accept that destiny, the whole of it, to the end? There is an illuminating story of Zeno, that highly orthodox Stoic philosopher of the ancient time. His slave had been found out a thief, and was tied up for punishment, but pleaded in mitigation, "O Zeno. I was predestinated to steal." "Yes," said his master, "and predestinated to be flogged for it." We cannot take half this destiny and leave the rest.—From a sermon by the Rev. Dr. Leonard W. Bacon.

**MY LORD SALISBURY.**

It has been for years the habit of the American press to berate and beslime the name of Lord Salisbury as an English statesman who was always busy in "backing down" under every serious complication with foreign powers. In no single instance has the illustrious survivor of the Cecils failed to compel admiration for his steadiness and force in every serious crisis which England has had to confront during his long public service. If either Englishmen or Americans would know the real reach and courage of this powerful statesman in great international controversies, they would do well to recall the "peace with honor" which Lord Salisbury and Disraeli brought to London from Berlin, or pay a short visit to Paris at about this time.

The Society Lecture Course at the State Normal School, Peru, Nebraska, for the ensuing winter promises to be very entertaining and instructive. Citizens of Nebraska City may find it to their advantage and improvement to attend the same. The first lecture will be given on November 19, by James Hedley.