

year (1899) alone showing a record of over \$5,000,000 devoted by him to the good of the public. Among the many benevolent institutions established, the institute at Pittsburg which bears his name, deserves special mention. Pittsburg being the home city of many of his employees and the headquarters of his great manufacturing institutions, properly received special consideration, and the magnificent Carnegie institute, costing nearly \$4,000,000, testifies to Mr. Carnegie's regard for that city.

Mr. Carnegie's private gifts are numerous and liberal and are known to be in keeping with his public benefactions. He does not refer to them as "charities," however, as he does not want his beneficiaries to feel that they are regarded as objects of charity. He was the largest individual contributor to the relief fund for the Johnstown flood sufferers, and during the financial stress of 1894, when so many workmen throughout the country were without employment, he offered to duplicate every dollar subscribed by the people of Pittsburg and Western Pennsylvania for the relief of the unemployed of Pittsburg, besides keeping his own large force of workmen in employment at a sacrifice to himself. The public contributed about \$126,000 by popular subscription to the fund, and Mr. Carnegie promptly gave his check for an equal amount.

We cannot take leave of Andrew Carnegie without mentioning other qualifications worthy of note. With but little school education to commence his career and with active responsibilities at an early age, which necessarily demanded his whole energies, one would hardly expect to find in him a man of great learning and profound judgment on all questions of public importance and national welfare. Nevertheless, this is exactly what we do find, and no man of our time has a better understanding of the issues of the day, both social and political, and no man has pronounced more wisely upon them. On the grave questions of national concern, which the past two years have forced upon us, the strong stand taken by Mr. Carnegie for national justice, national honor and true Americanism, is worthy of the greatest of American statesmen. As a writer on the important questions of the day his work shows the most careful analysis and accurate judgment, for the author of "Triumphant Democracy" is not only a careful student of human affairs, but a master scholar likewise, in the knowledge of those great principles which control both individual and national welfare.

So then, do we find Andrew Carnegie, ironmaster, philanthropist and scholar—an American citizen of whom his country may well be proud.

A. J. TULLOCK,

Leavenworth, Kansas.

OUR PUTTY PRESIDENT.

The difference between clear-cut statesmanship and evasive wabbling is plainly shown in the addresses made, respectively, by the Hon. Whitelaw Reid before the Massachusetts Club on Saturday, and that made on the same day by President McKinley before the Ohio Society of New York. In the first instance, we have the line of policy defined which it is essential that our government should follow, if not only the rewards of our efforts in securing outlying possessions are considered, but, also, if we are to safeguard the future industrial and political well-being of the inhabitants of these possessions. In the latter address we have nothing practical or tangible brought forward, but, on the contrary, merely glittering generalities and phrases, which can be construed either one way or the other. The former address showed that the man who delivered it had carefully studied the various conditions that qualify the problem, and was prepared, as the result of this study, to outline a course of procedure which our government should follow. The latter address indicated, on the part of the one who made it, a state of mind which had no firm, intellectual grasp on any of the involved problems. It was the address of one who did not dare to commit himself to anything—who was so to speak, wholly at sea as to what was the proper course to pursue, and was disposed on this account to be influenced by phrases—as, for example, when he repudiated what he termed "imperialism."

Meaning of Imperialism.

What imperialism signifies in Mr. McKinley's mind we have no means of knowing, but we should judge that he looks upon the word as embodying something corresponding to the government of the Czar of Russia or that of the German emperor. As a matter of fact, it has no connection whatsoever with dynastic forms of control, but refers simply to the difference which should exist between the government of a homogeneous and of a heterogeneous people. In this respect there is no trace of cloudiness of vision in Mr. Reid's remarks. He realizes that, having assumed the responsibility for the future political control of people in the West Indies and the East Indies we owe it, both to ourselves and to them, to devise a form of government which shall conform with their social and industrial aptitudes. To assume that we are to take them into our own country, to make them one with us in the enjoyment of, and responsibility for, our political institutions, is to subject these to a strain which they cannot by any possibility endure. The editor of that entirely irresponsible newspaper, the New York Journal, has recently said:

"The eyes of all the western world are

fixed upon Porto Rico. If our flag had brought instant prosperity and happiness there; if we had welcomed the Porto Ricans in the spirit in which they welcomed our soldiers, all Latin America would have waited expectantly for our next invitation."

And further:

"We ought to have Mexico and Central America knocking at our gates begging us to let them in. The realization of Jefferson's dream of continental union ought to be prayed for by the people of the countries not yet fortunate enough to have been invited into our great partnership."

This is expansion under territorial conditions, in contradistinction to extension under what might be termed

Expansion.

the imperial theory. But what does it imply? The transformation of the homogeneous government of the United States into what Mr. Reid forcibly termed "a political crazy quilt" of discordant patchwork. We have found in the past, and are likely to find in the future, sufficient trouble in maintaining the purity and efficiency of our political institutions in consequence of the extent of our country, as it has been, with its diversified sentiments and conflicting interests. We have had an illustration recently afforded in the senatorship of Montana of the demoralization which may result among English-speaking people from the absence of well-settled political sentiments and a strong, healthy and well-organized public opinion. But when one takes into account that the political institutions of Latin-Americans, while republican in name, are simply military despotisms in disguise; that the free will of the people is no more expressed in these republics than it is in Turkey, the vista that is open to us by these clamorers for continental extension and annexation, with the corruption and violence in political life that would result therefrom, can hardly be shut out from the gaze of Americans who have any conception of what our country stands for and the conditions which alone make possible its future continuance.

Unless the people of a country have been brought up to the political level of

Political Equality Necessary.

the American people they should not be taken in as part of our country, even if we become possessors of their country. If we should thus take them in, we should inevitably undermine the stability of our own government. It would be fatal to have senators and representatives in Congress nominally representing constituencies which were in all respects alien to the American political ideal. It may be that in a quarter of a century from this time the force of events will compel us to possess ourselves of territory in Central and South America. This now seems improbable, but no more improb-