

their breath while they wait to see whether or not this sort of thing is what allied trades and labor councils are organized for.

The ticket Senator Hanna has constructed with which to beat Tom L. Johnson and save what he has called his "savings bank"—the street car franchises he owns—is what a street urchin would call "a beauty;" though the street urchin, would probably abbreviate the word, being favorable to silent syllables as well as silent letters. Besides the trades and labor candidate, who reported to his labor organization in favor of Hanna's scheme for extending street car franchises and is nominated for vice-mayor in consequence, Mr. Hanna, has called out one of his array of local legal advisers to take the place of candidate for mayor. Mr. Goulder, the candidate in question, came to the aid of the street car ring in connection with the movement to "riper" the city by overturning all the municipal charters of Ohio. In addition to these two street car nominations, Mr. Hanna has secured a street car platform. As Republican "boss" he has put into the Republican platform a demand—a "demand" mind you—for the very compromise on franchises that as boss of the street car ring he has offered the city, namely an extension of franchises in which cash fares are to remain at 5 cents. If the people of Cleveland do not snow under this combination of street car ring and Republican machine, they will deserve all the reactionary local government that they will certainly get.

By an oversight an objectionable advertisement appeared in part of last week's edition of *The Public*, though it was excluded from the rest. We refer to an announcement by a New York publishing house of Patrick Edward Dove's book, "The Theory of Human Progression." To the publication in *The Public* of any proper advertisement of that very able work, there could be no objec-

tion; but the advertisement in question, quite gratuitously and altogether falsely, insinuated against Henry George a charge of plagiarism, of which there is no evidence and which he during his lifetime specifically and circumstantially denied. The impropriety of such a publication in *The Public* is obvious. We might add, even at the risk of appearing to meddle, that it is a poor tribute to the abilities of Dove to recommend his great book to a thoughtful public upon no better ground than that a better known writer has been charged with plagiarizing it.

Since the question of George's alleged plagiarism, at rest these dozen years, has been thus revived, a statement of the facts will not be out of place. The charge originated in 1889 with J. W. Sullivan, a member of George's editorial staff on the *Standard*. Sullivan occupied George's house in New York while George was abroad on a long journey. During this occupancy he found in George's library a copy of Dove's book. It had been given to George by Dove's son, several years after the publication of "Progress and Poverty," as a token of respect; but George had never yet read it. Observing a similarity of thought on fundamentals between this book and "Progress and Poverty," and subsequently having a disagreement with George, resulting in his discharge from George's employment, Sullivan published in a rival paper, writes George's son in his "Life of Henry George"—

a long article entitled "A Collapse of Henry George's Pretensions," which began with abuse and ended with a charge that "Progress and Poverty" was based upon Patrick Edward Dove's "The Theory of Human Progression." Mr. George would have ignored the article as unworthy of attention had not the charge of plagiarism been extensively noticed in the press and elsewhere. He therefore reprinted the Sullivan article in the *Standard* (October 19, 1889), passed over the abuse, and answered the remainder by showing the absurdity of the charge on its face, and by pointing out that if similarity of thought and priority of authorship on Dove's

part had proved George a plagiarist, then the same reasoning would prove Dove to have copied from Herbert Spencer, who wrote similarly and earlier; it would likewise prove that Spencer stole from William Ogilvie, professor of humanities in King's college, Aberdeen, from 1763 to 1819; that Ogilvie took from Thomas Spence, of Newcastle on Tyne, who wrote an essay on the subject in 1775; and so on.

George's denial of plagiarism in the *Standard* article of October 19, 1899, referred to by his biographer is as follows:

When I first came to see what is the root of our social difficulties and how this fundamental wrong might be cured in the easiest way by concentrating taxes on land values, I had worked out the whole thing for myself without conscious aid that I can remember, unless it might have been the light I got from Bissell's "Strength of Nations" as to the economic character of the feudal system. When I published "Our Land and Land Policy" (1871) I had not even heard of the Physiocrats and the impot unique. But I knew that if it was really a star I had seen, others must have seen it, too. And so with "Progress and Poverty." I said in that book that it would come to many to whom it would seem like the echo of their own thoughts. And beyond what I then knew, I was certain that there must have been others before me who saw the same essential truths. And as I have heard of such men one after the other, I have felt that they gave but additional evidences that we were indeed on the true track, and still more clearly showed that though against us were ignorance and power, yet behind us were hope and faith and the wisdom of the ages—the deepest and clearest preceptions of man.

This explanation is really not necessary except for the benefit of persons who are unfamiliar with Dove's book. Those who have intelligently compared it with George's "Land and Land Policy" and his "Progress and Poverty" readily recognize that George was no more indebted to Dove for his ideas than for his diction. Both undoubtedly saw the same truth, even as both had learned the same language, and Dove saw it first; but in its treatment and development, George is as different from Dove as was Dove from those who had preceded him along the

same lines. Precisely what useful purpose is served, whether of business or something else, by coupling Dove's philosophic work with a malicious and baseless slander upon George, which he has refuted, is not quite apparent.

A "strictly non-partisan" demonstration at Chicago in honor of President Roosevelt, is the strictly ingenious announcement of those Republican papers of Chicago that "Boss" Lorimer controls. And Mr. Roosevelt himself protests that he wouldn't come to Chicago at all at this time, not by any manner of means, except for a "strictly non-partisan" visitation. It is a stunning peculiarity of President Roosevelt's, this habit he has of making his "strictly non-partisan" Presidential visits to strategical political points just on the eve of strictly partisan elections. Did he not nicely arrange his Presidential pilgrimage last year so as to make his non-partisan appearance at about the right moment to throw the Presidential prestige into the scales at pending elections—through New England just before the voting in Maine, and through the West during the campaigns for November? And now he is to exhibit in Chicago less than a week before a municipal election of great partisan importance. It is well that his party newspapers volunteer the assurance, which he personally confirms, that this Presidential exhibition is to be "strictly non-partisan." Otherwise the unsophisticated might think it a transparently partisan affair.

And the unsophisticated would be strictly right. For the sole object of President Roosevelt's visit to Chicago at this time is to further the election of Mr. Stewart as mayor. Worse than that, it is to place "Billy" Lorimer securely upon the throne as Republican "boss" of Illinois; for this would be the effect of Stewart's election. Stewart is Lorimer's man, just as some very good Republicans of Pennsylvania are Quay's men.

And that suggests another of Mr. Roosevelt's peculiarities. He has a marked tendency to be attracted by malodorous "bosses." "Boss" Quay is his favorite in the East (Addicks being only an incident), and now he comes West to help give his party a "Boss" Quay for Illinois in the person of the delectable Lorimer.

Apropos of the Chicago municipal campaign, with especial reference to its bearing on the question of municipal ownership of the street car system, it should be observed that the Republican candidate, while he professes to advocate municipal ownership, proposes to make an adjustment with the franchise grabbers before getting an enabling act. This is a policy of surrender to the monopolists. It gives them the whip hand. They would have the franchises, and the people would have the enabling act—some time, if they could get it. Mayor Harrison's policy of refusing any adjustment with the franchise grabbers until a municipal ownership act has been passed, is the better one. Republicans, at least, have no reason to object to it, if they really believe in municipal ownership; for the legislature is theirs and they could pass an enabling act in a week if they wanted to.

At a recent discussion before the Ministers' Association of Cleveland, the Rev. Harris R. Cooley, a member of Mayor Johnson's cabinet as director of charities, phrased a sentiment which all those good men and women who are impatient to get rid of vice and crime might well take to heart. It would make them more practical, and it might make them better—more religiously thoughtful of their brethren whose lives are cast in less pleasant places. Said Mr. Cooley to his fellow clergymen, "You talk of vice and crime as if it were dirt and mud you are talking about. You forget that it is men and women."

She—Why, of course our church has a Bible class!

He—Yes? And is the class for or against the Bible?—Puck.

THE CHILD LABOR QUESTION.

There is one phase of the child labor question which should interest all who have the cause of justice at heart. This is the tendency of the well-meaning but unthinking average man and woman, when finally aroused by the urgency of the abuse, to attribute it to the greed of parents.

Wrongs done to little children touch every heart. The many men who have nothing but an uncomprehending antagonism towards other evidences of labor trouble, and the women who draw their political knowledge and opinions from these men, are both good loving parents of their own children. As such they can feel what it means that little children should be defrauded of childhood's blessed right to play and develop mentally and physically under sane and wholesome conditions. But they have absolutely no comprehension of the fact that modern industrial child slavery is but one, (even if one of the worst) manifestations of wrong and injustice in economic conditions. This lack of knowledge gives them naturally no foundation upon which to base an intelligent opinion, and they therefore overlook fundamental causation and grasp at any hasty conclusion in their semi-conscious endeavor to find a reason for the abuse.

The reason is easily found in their minds in the "greed of parents who send their children into the mills and the mines that they may have the more money to squander in drink." It is an explanation that fits in eminently well with the attitude of mind of the average upper-class man and woman towards the poor, and it releases such men and women from the necessity of any further, perhaps uncomfortable, investigation into social problems.

In most cases it is only justice to say that this explanation is not adopted from any malice. It springs merely from ignorance and a false angle of vision in the minds of more favored fathers and mothers, who would without doubt come forward generously with financial aid for any philanthropic scheme towards releasing a few of these child slaves from their bondage. But an opinion