

erence to lynching "anarchists," almost as pointedly as if that, instead of Negro lynching, were its burden. The same remark applies to the Boston Herald editorial with which we introduce the sermon. It is to hoped that in discussing the murder of President McKinley, the Herald has preserved the same balance.

In Russia they make no "fine-spun distinctions" about anarchy. Says a news report of September 12, from St. Petersburg:

The pupils of a young ladies' school near Count Tolstoi's residence at Yasnaya, who, with the teacher and other young persons of the neighborhood, called upon him and presented the count with flowers, have been arrested and their teacher has been dismissed.

That attitude of government toward such anarchists as Tolstoi, influenced as it is by no "fine-spun distinctions" between anarchists who want to kill and those who want to stop killing, ought to be satisfactory even to David B. Hill.

One of the last acts of the city board of equalization of Cleveland was to assess for taxation the value of the land under water on the lake front. It fixed the value at \$1,000,000. The basis of this valuation was \$100 a front foot inside the breakwater, and \$25 outside the breakwater up to the harbor line. Railroads owning this kind of property in Cleveland announce their intention of making a contest in the courts. They have heretofore paid no taxes upon it, and they contend that it is non-taxable.

Rear Admiral Howison, who, after a trial by his associates, has been deposed for bias from the Schley-Sampson naval board, explains his reason for not withdrawing when Schley originally objected to him. He says he was ordered to this duty, and is accustomed, as a naval officer, to obeying orders. But if he had been ordered to sea when physically incapable, he surely would have advised the department of his condition and asked to be relieved. Why could he not have

done the same thing when ordered to sit as a judge in a case upon which his bias made him mentally incompetent?

In a recent article in these columns (p. 165) on the balance of trade theory, Mr. Dadabahia Naoroji, who had drawn out a remarkable letter on the subject from the American treasury department was mistakenly called a Hindu. Mr. Naoroji, the "grand old man of India," as he is affectionately and appreciatively spoken of, is not a Hindu but a Parsee.

It is a serious reflection upon the Salisbury government of Great Britain, if the news report is true that on the 12th the peace conference sitting at Glasgow "passed a resolution to the effect that any nation which refuses its opponent's offer to arbitrate loses the right to be considered a civilized power." The Boers have made arbitration offers to Great Britain both before the war and since it began, but Great Britain rejected them. Has Great Britain lost the right to be considered civilized?

The Boer war ended on the 15th, but the Boers didn't know it. They had forgotten the date.

THE NEW ADMINISTRATION.

With the last rites over his grave performed, President McKinley passes into history; and public attention properly turns to the administration of his successor.

What this administration will probably be, President Roosevelt has indicated in a general way. He has given notice that it will not be distinctively his administration, but will be essentially a continuation of Mr. McKinley's. His words, uttered upon taking the oath of office, were these:

In this hour of deep and terrible national bereavement I wish to state that it shall be my aim to continue absolutely unbroken the policy of President McKinley for the peace and prosperity and honor of our beloved country.

President Roosevelt has confirmed that declaration by requesting Mr. McKinley's cabinet advisers to remain

in office and be his advisers—not merely for "two months," as at first reported, nor for a "few months," according to subsequent reports, but for the remainder of Mr. McKinley's term, which, as vice president, he is filling out.

In thus making the spirit and policy of the old administration the spirit and policy of the new, Mr. Roosevelt is clearly justified. It is not in his own right, with a commission from the people to formulate a new policy even though he might personally prefer to do so, that Mr. Roosevelt comes into the presidential office; but in the right of and as a substitute for his predecessor. In reality it is Mr. McKinley's official term, not Mr. Roosevelt's, which the latter has been called upon to serve.

This may not be the law of the matter. The constitution, in providing for the contingency of a vice presidential succession, imposes upon the vice president no obligation to carry out the policy of his predecessor. Quite the contrary; it distinctly declares (art. ii., sec. i., par. 6) that—

In case of the removal of the president from office, or of his death, resignation or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the vice president.

It is the powers and duties of the office, consequently, and not the policy of the dead or disabled president, that devolve upon the vice president.

Yet there is room for plausible argument, even as a question of constitutional law, that a vice president merely represents the disabled president whose place he takes. The constitution does not declare that he shall be president. It only provides that as vice president he shall perform presidential duties. Mr. Roosevelt, therefore, is not president—so the argument might run; he is vice president acting as president. Upon this hypothesis it could be urged that he has no right to fundamentally alter the policy of the president for whom he acts. "Would it not be revolutionary," might be asked, "for him to do so if the president were disabled only temporarily?" And if revolutionary in those circumstances, why not revolutionary if the disability of the president happens to be permanent—even

if it is occasioned by his death? But that argument could appeal only to the conscience of the individual. No court could interfere.

And whatever view might be taken of the law of the matter, only one view is possible with reference to its politics. The American people have shown that they regard the vice president, when acting as president, as the representative, with reference to political policies, of the dead president whose term of office he serves. This is an instance in which the dead hand rules. Four times in the history of our country has the question been brought to a test, and each time it has been decided against the innovating vice president. John Tyler reversed the Harrison policy, and his name gave a new word of unpleasant significance to the language. To "tylerize" is suggestive of political bad faith. Millard Fillmore adopted, and Chester A. Arthur was identified with, policies hostile to those of the presidents they represented; and at the ensuing presidential elections, respectively, each was abandoned by his party. Between these two administrations there was the most impressive example of all. Andrew Johnson, who departed from the policy of Lincoln, was turned upon by his party, which not only overwhelmed him politically, but impeached and almost succeeded in degrading him officially.

Mr. Roosevelt needs no further political justification for his adoption of President McKinley's policies and his retention of President McKinley's cabinet, than the experience of his predecessors as acting president—Tyler, Fillmore, Johnson and Arthur.

Since Mr. Roosevelt has frankly announced his policy, there need be no doubt as to the attitude of the public mind toward his administration, in so far as that policy is to give it character.

People who believe in a protective tariff, those who believe in fostering trusts, those who believe in foreign conquest, those who believe in the maintenance of foreign sovereignty modeled upon the crown colony system of Great Britain, those who believe in a strong central government—all these will cordially and properly

support the new administration with vigor. But men who regard those policies as destructive of equal rights under the law and subversive of the best ideals of our republic, will just as cordially and just as properly oppose the new administration in so far as it promotes policies of that kind. It would indeed be a dark hour for our country if theories of public policy were sanctified by personal affections, if they were made to depend upon men instead of principles, if the bullet of an assassin which kills a president were allowed to destroy liberty of thought and freedom of discussion. No American with the instincts of a patriot, whatever theories of public policy he may hold, will tolerate strangulation of debate.

But it is not certain that President Roosevelt will invite this opposition along the whole line of the McKinley policies. Just before his tragic death, President McKinley indicated in a carefully prepared speech that his policy contemplated a departure from protectionism in the direction of greater freedom of trade. Should President Roosevelt so interpret this speech, and endeavor to give that tendency to tariff legislation, good sense will suggest to all who believe protectionism to be wrong that they shall strengthen his arm.

He himself has intimated that the aggressions of predatory wealth must be checked. Should he turn Mr. McKinley's policy in the direction of doing this, by means not worse than the evil complained of, he should be and doubtless will be, encouraged. A people driven to the verge of despair by the system of class privileges that have grown up since the civil war cannot be indifferent to any honest effort to emancipate them.

So far, then, as tariffs and trusts are concerned it is possible that Mr. McKinley's successor may draw support from hitherto hostile quarters, though J. Pierpont Morgan's reported expressions of satisfaction with the assurance of Mr. Roosevelt are not prophetic of that possibility. But there is little hope in any event of his modifying the colonial policy. It is too much in harmony with his own strenuous nature. With reference, therefore, to the ques-

tion of imperialism, changes in the alignments of public sentiment are not probable, except as advocates of this innovation may be won over. No American who is imbued with the spirit of the angel's song of the Nativity, which, echoing from the hills of Judea, found political expression centuries afterward in our own declaration of independence, that spirit which makes for peace on earth, good will to men, and equal rights for all, regardless of race or nationality or creed or condition—no such American can cease to write and speak and vote against colonial policies so long as a vestige of republican government remains. Whoever opposes, and from what source soever he draws his inspiration, our great wrong against a weaker people must be righted and our departure from high national ideals must be reversed.

Still, it is not certain that Mr. Roosevelt will cling tenaciously to any of his present purposes. Time and new conditions work wondrous changes in political policies. He pledges himself now to carry out the policies of his murdered and lamented chief, and in token of his sincerity he retains the cabinet which he finds already in office. No token was necessary. The sincerity of his word no one doubted. Nor is any doubt implied by the supposition that he may yet part with some of the advisers he now retains and deflect from the policies he now adopts. John Tyler, says the eminent American historian, Alexander Johnston, "retained President Harrison's cabinet, and promised to carry out his policy." John Tyler, too, was doubtless sincere. But as time went by and new conditions confronted him he changed his mind.

With reference, therefore, to the policies of the new administration, all is as yet but speculative, notwithstanding Mr. Roosevelt's declarations and his unquestioned sincerity. But one thing is not speculative. Mr. Roosevelt has begun his career in the presidential office with a marked and encouraging reversion to some of the ideals of republican simplicity which once outwardly distinguished our honored and trusted public servants from feared and hated foreign rulers. The inaugural ceremony was se-

verely simple. This could hardly have been otherwise, owing to the solemnity of the circumstances. It was, moreover, in accord with precedent. But the very circumstances which would have made an inaugural display indecent were calculated to favor a display of military force; and this display Mr. Roosevelt peremptorily forbade. He refused at the outset to allow his person to be surrounded, monarch fashion, by detectives and soldiers. The incident is happily told in the press reports. It occurred before his inauguration, when he was leaving the house of his friend in Buffalo to go to the house where President McKinley's body lay:

As he ran lightly down the steps leading from the lawn to the sidewalk he noticed a movement among the squadrons in the street. A trumpet blared out a command, which the soldierly training of the president had taught him to understand. He stopped and turning a frowning face upon Mr. Wilcox spoke a few sharp words to his host. Mr. Wilcox hastened into the street, where men in yellow striped uniforms were mounting horses. He spoke to the captain of the mounted infantry and the sergeant of police.

"The vice president absolutely declines to be followed by an escort of this character. He has not asked for it, and he does not want it," Mr. Wilcox was heard to say.

"But the vice president should have the protection of the properly constituted authorities," protested the captain of mounted infantry. "The vice president requires no protection from any military or semimilitary body in the streets of an American city," exclaimed Mr. Roosevelt, who had come up in time to hear the protest of the captain.

"But we have orders to act as your escort, sir," said the captain.

"Then say to your commanding officer that I revoked your orders. You must not follow this carriage."

Even since that time, despite all protests, Mr. Roosevelt has insisted upon maintaining this republican simplicity. He refuses a body guard.

This is an inspiring thing. Raised to a conspicuous place by a lawless act which has evoked universal execration, driving press, pulpit, and mob into paroxysms of futile anger and bewildered fear, circumstances which might well excuse senseless precautions for his own protection, Mr. Roosevelt's determination is most reassuring. In these trying circum-

stances, his appeal to the imaginations of the people, not with pompous displays of military force, but with the spectacle of the foremost citizen of the land, the foremost servant of the republic, freely and trustfully mingling with his fellow citizens, is suggestive of a revival of at least some of the best American ideals.

And this manner of life is in fact his greatest security. It was the life adopted by the late President Harrison, who tolerated no personal guards. He believed that such precautions cannot possibly save the president from a maniac's blow. Surrounding him with an army, yet the cunning of the madman will find a way to take his life. As to the rest, Mr. Harrison held that there was no danger. And there is none, except as fits of emotional insanity may be awakened in weak minds by presenting the president to popular imagination in the role of a "ruler," like the oppressive rulers of Europe. Let the president appear to the world simply as a public servant, simply as one of the people, simply as a man among men, and his life will be safer than detectives and soldiers or restrictive laws upon press and speech can make it. Even then he may be assassinated. But the danger of his assassination is much reduced, and the danger of assassinating free institutions is infinitely less.

Though Mr. Roosevelt should do nothing more to deserve commendation, in this one respect he has done much. But this determination to appear before the public not as a ruler panoplied with power, but as a man, as a citizen, as a public servant, attending to the people's business in obedience to their will, is in itself significant of even better things.

NEWS

The encouraging news we were able last week to republish from the sick chamber of President McKinley in Buffalo, gave place almost before the ink was dry to news of far different import. On the 12th Mr. McKinley was reported to be out of danger and steadily improving, but early in the morning of the 13th he suffered a relapse so serious as to arouse immediate fears of a fatal outcome. Yet

hope was not abandoned until about eight o'clock in the evening of that day. The announcement was then authoritatively made that he had not more than 20 minutes to live. He survived, however, until 2:15 in the morning of the 14th, when he died. Mr. McKinley had been unconscious for several hours, and his death was unattended with pain.

An autopsy was made during the day by 14 surgeons and medical men, who joined in signing the following report:

The bullet which struck over the breast bone did not pass through the skin and did little harm. The other bullet passed through both walls of the stomach near its lower border. Both holes were found to be perfectly closed by the stitches, but the tissue around each hole had become gangrenous. After passing through the stomach the bullet passed into the back walls of the abdomen, hitting and tearing the upper end of the kidney. This portion of the bullet track was also gangrenous, the gangrene involving the pancreas. The bullet has not yet been found. There was no sign of peritonitis or disease of other organs. The heart walls were very thin. There was no evidence of any attempt at repair on the part of nature, and death resulted from the gangrene which affected the stomach around the bullet wounds as well as the tissues around the further course of the bullet. Death was unavoidable by any surgical or medical treatment and was the direct result of the bullet wound.

Among the signatures attached to this report are those of Herman Mynter, two army surgeons, and Edward G. Janeway.

The funeral ceremonies began at 11 o'clock on the 15th, in the house of Mr. Milburn, where the president had died. After a simple ceremony there, the body was carried to the city hall of Buffalo, where it lay in state until the 16th, when it was borne to Washington. The funeral train left the New York Central station at 8:30 in the morning of the 16th, and upon arriving in Washington the body was taken to the white house. From the white house it was removed to the capitol, and during the 17th lay in state beneath the capitol dome, where, on that day, the official funeral ceremony took place. This service began with the singing of "Lead, Kindly Light." Prayer was spoken by the presiding elder of the Methodist churches in the District of Columbia—the Rev. Dr. Naylor. He was followed by the sing-