

of the world she can lay her hands on? Why did France incorporate Savoy, and why does she plot to reach the boundary of the Rhine? Why was Poland conquered and divided by the surrounding great Powers? Why, in fact, do all nations act in the same way? The answer is in every one's mind. The object with all is self-preservation, the perpetuation of their forms of government and national expansion, interests and grandeur. This being so with the monarchical governments of Europe, how much more ought the United States, for the promotion of liberty and in the interests of civilization and humanity, to extend the blessings of republican institutions over the American Continent? To neglect any opportunity of doing this—and to neglect it in the case of Cuba now—would be the height of stupidity. Had we such a statesman as Bismarck or Napoleon at the helm of affairs the insults of Spain, her atrocities in Cuba and her rule in America would soon be ended.

It was said Mr. Fish expressed fear of the consequences of a bold policy on the part of the United States with regard to Cuba. We blush to think any American could be found so weak, timid, short-sighted and unpatriotic. Fear of whom? Of Spain? Why, if she were silly enough to think of going to war with the United States she has not the means; and if she had she would produce just about as much effect upon this country as the angry waves of a little lake upon the everlasting rocks. Fear of whom? Of England, or France? There need not be the least apprehension of them. They know too well the power of the United States. They would not be so crazy as to interfere; they have enough to attend to in Europe, and will never venture on any Quixotic policy on this side the Atlantic again. We question if they would make a protest even in favor of Spain, and if they should it would be an empty one. Besides, these great commercial nations are learning the fact that the more the United States expands and grows the more will the commerce of the world be promoted and the greater will be their trade.

What we want, then, is a broad and bold policy, with a view to the independence of Cuba. Our Secretary of State does very well so far in vindicating the honor of the American flag and in promising to protect American citizens. But that is not enough; that is not going far enough. We are not sure that he has the courage and wisdom to stick even to this position, and we cannot be at the trouble of driving him up to it always. He is not the man for the State Department at this crisis, when we have the Cuban question and the Alabama claims to settle. He is altogether too timid, too much of an old fogey, and has not the least comprehension of the policy and destiny of this mighty republic. Mr. Sumner is the man for the time and occasion. His statesmanlike speech on the Alabama claims shows this, and we doubt not that he would be equally national, bold and comprehensive with regard to Cuba. By the way, it has been said that these Alabama claims are a stumbling-block to the administration in acting upon the Cuban case. We do not see why. The hasty recognition of the belligerent rights of the rebel States, an integral portion of this republic, by England, and the recognition of such rights, or the independence of Cuba, a distant dependency of Spain and our near neighbor, after more than six months of constant success by the Cubans, are not at all parallel cases, to say nothing of the well established policy of the United States, under the Monroe doctrine, which was long ago announced to the whole world and which now finds a proper application to Cuba. Let us have a statesman in the State Department who will take such broad views and carry out the sentiments and destiny of the republic; and we think Mr. Sumner is the man.

The Administration and the Cuban Question.

We are informed by news from Washington that the Secretary of State has awakened from his Rip Van Winkle sleep of conservatism on the Cuban question, and that he really contemplates vindicating the national honor in the case of Spanish outrages on the American flag and American citizens. It is said he will go so far even as to demand prompt reparation and apology from Spain for these outrages, "if the reports about them be true." So far it is all very well, and considering the character of Mr. Fish and the hesitating conduct of the administration, the American people may say "the smallest favors are thankfully received." But why this "if?" Is it not notorious that Spanish authorities have committed outrages on our citizens and flag on the high seas and even in the waters of a friendly Power? The facts are palpable enough and the cause sufficient to order the American fleet to make reprisals. We suppose Spain will apologize or do anything else to prevent our government from helping, directly or indirectly, the Cubans.

But would it not be more consistent with our national honor and the highest policy to first strike a blow by way of retaliation and hear the apology of Spain afterwards, if Spain should be disposed to apologize? There is, as was said, ample cause for such a course in the outrages perpetrated. Besides, no better opportunity could be desired to carry out American policy and the wishes of the American people with regard to Cuba and Cuban independence. Place England, France or any other great Power in the position of the United States, and see how soon a blow would be struck that would settle at once and forever Spanish insults, diplomatic palaver, the rule of Spain in Cuba and the independence of the Cubans. To paraphrase Shakspeare's language, there is a tide in the affairs of nations which, if taken at the flood, leads on to national fortune. In the case of Cuba the tide is now at the flood. Let our government comprehend this and seize the opportunity.

Timid old fogies who cannot see beyond their noses may foolishly talk about our obligations to Spain as a friendly Power and characterize any decided intervention of the United States as filibustering. But such an argument would be puerile, narrow-minded, and show a want of comprehension of the principles that govern great nations. To preserve and perpetuate the principles or system upon which a nation is founded, to surround a nation with all the bulwarks of national existence, and to promote its interests, expansion and grandeur by every attainable means are the objects pursued by all governments and constitute their highest ambition. The term filibustering cannot be applied to a great nation. Nor are the friendly relations between countries permitted to interfere with questions of high policy and important national interests. No great Power is deterred by such considerations. We need not go far back to history to show this fact.

Why did Prussia seize and incorporate the German States? Why does Russia push her conquests in Asia and Europe? Why does England subjugate India and every other part