

which brings his private interests into conflict with his public duties. By resigning his position on the school board Mr. Loesch now recognizes the impropriety of his original appointment and acceptance. Other members of the Chicago school board similarly situated should promptly follow his example; and in filling vacancies the mayor should not be again unmindful of the rebuke which is involved in Mr. Loesch's resignation.

Why is it that so many educated men are so feeble at distinguishing differences? An example occurs to us in connection with the recent proclamation of Mrs. Eddy, the Christian Science leader, in which she advises her followers to bow before hostile public sentiment to the extent of allowing the employment of physicians in the treatment of infectious and contagious diseases. It ought to be perfectly plain to any fair-minded man of intelligence that this is no recantation. There is nothing in the proclamation to indicate that Mrs. Eddy hasn't as much faith as ever in the efficacy of her teachings. On the other hand it is a manifest mark of respect for the rights of others. Since others than Christian Scientists fear these diseases and have no confidence in her theory regarding them, a persistence in her methods would subject them, at any rate in their own minds, to the dangers of sickness and death. She therefore proposes that their right to protect themselves by their own methods against infection and contagion, even though she thinks those methods superstitious, be recognized by her followers. Her conduct in this matter should command respect. It is infinitely more exalted than the narrow behavior of many of her adversaries who regard her teachings as superstitious. Yet it is made the occasion of fresh attack, and in at least two instances that have come to our attention she is grossly misrepresented. Two Chicago clergymen of education, and presumably honest, referred in their sermons last Sunday

to this action of hers as a recantation. Neither seemed capable of appreciating the difference between recantation and generous acknowledgment of the rights of others.

Although the election of Dr. Garvin to the governorship of Rhode Island is not unnaturally pleasing to single tax men everywhere, since the governor-elect is a single tax man of the most orthodox and intelligent kind and of long standing; yet his election at the head of the Democratic ticket is in no sense a single tax victory. There was no mention of the single tax in the platform upon which he stood, nor was it discussed upon the stump during the campaign. Several causes contributed to the gratifying result. One was popular indignation at the high-handed act of the Republican legislature in placing the police department of Providence in the hands of a commission appointed by the governor. Another was the resentment kindled against the present governor, the defeated candidate for reelection, because he sent troops to the city of Pawtucket to overawe the strikers in the street railway strike last Summer. Still another was a general desire for a change in the antique document which now serves as a charter or constitution for the State of Rhode Island. All these causes contributed in greater or less degree to Dr. Garvin's election. There is no reason for supposing that he could have been elected at this time on the single tax issue. Yet his election, should it be followed by a good administration, as it doubtless will be, will contribute in no small measure to the propagation and popularization of single tax principles.

One of those "understandings between statesmen," which, according to Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, have existed between the Tory government of Great Britain and the Republican ringmasters of the United States, has come to grief. In 1899, by direct orders from London and Washington (vol. ii, No. 53, p. 5) British and

American war vessels wantonly bombarded native villages near Apia, in Samoa, killing many Samoans and ruining much European property in Apia. They did so in the face of German protests. It was evident to impartial observers at the time that this was an aggression upon the native Samoans, an insult to Germany, and a violation of treaty obligations; and now an impartial arbitrator, King Oscar II, of Sweden and Norway, so decides. He accordingly holds Great Britain and the United States responsible for the individual losses caused by their unwarranted bombardment. While it is to the shame of both countries that the imperialistic adventurers who have for five years controlled their policies were allowed to put them into this disgraceful situation, it is unfortunate that the other infamous exploits of these imperialistic freebooters, their unpardonable wars of aggression and conquest—one in the Philippines and the other in South Africa—in which they encouraged each other for the benefit of their common cause of imperialism, could not also have been tried before so high minded an arbitrator as King Oscar. Though they won in the forum of might they would have been condemned in a forum of right.

If Clarence S. Darrow fails to flay the hypocritical manipulators of the coal trust, when he finally presents the miners' case to the board of arbitrators and the common conscience of the country, it will not be for lack of inviting opportunities. These serpentine gentlemen have bared themselves well for the flaying process. What, for instance, could be more tempting to a man like Darrow than the plea of the trusts that the anthracite coal miners get more than they earn and are living in beautiful cottages luxuriously furnished with pictures and pianos which they improvidently buy with the extravagant wages paid by the poor people of the country in exorbitant prices for coal!

When it is remembered that the