

of Kansas has been enough of a man and Christian to refuse to turn himself into a hangman. Consequently there have for several years been no hangings in Kansas, though about 50 capital convicts are in prison. Under the law any Governor of the State might at any time order these men out for execution.

*

This is what some citizens of Kansas want Gov. Hoch to do, and among those citizens there is at least one clergyman—the Rev. R. A. Ellwood of Leavenworth. That loving brother in a fraternal faith recently wrote an open letter to Gov. Hoch demanding the lives of those 50 or more imprisoned men. And here is Gov. Hoch's justly indignant and contemptuous reply:

I shall not decree that these men be put to death and furthermore will never decree the hanging of any man. Do you suppose that if I had a man on the gallows with my hand on the lever ready to spring the trap I'd do it? Suppose I should say to that poor creature, "Do you believe in the immortality of the soul?" and he should answer "Yes." "Do you believe in heaven and hell and that you will go to one or the other of these places?" and he should say "I do." Do you suppose I would spring that trap and say "Go to hell then?" Indeed, I would not. What a beautiful spectacle it would be to see 50 men, all in a row, hanged at the same time! What a spectacle we have here! A minister of the gospel, whose work it is to teach tenderness, thoughtful consideration of others and who is supposed to emulate the example of the Savior, suggesting that the State demand an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. He had better read the remainder of the Savior's injunction along that line.

If there were more such sensitiveness to the sacredness of human life, this barbarism of legal murder would soon pass away for lack of hangmen. Even the apparent necessity for it would decrease, for there is no longer room for rational doubt that official murder does not stop private murder but promotes it.

* *

Legal Lynching in Chicago.

If such sensitiveness as Gov. Hoch's were more general, we should not have had the spectacle in Chicago last week of an official lynching—for that is what the hanging of young Ivens was. A woman had been brutally murdered, and her body carried to a place where this boy would probably, in the ordinary course of his work, be the first to find it. He was the first to find it. He reported the fact. The police seized him and put him through the "sweat-box" process. They secured a confession, which showed that he had most unnaturally carried the body of the woman

he had murdered at night to a place where he would be the first to find it in the morning, or else that the confession was false. He afterwards repudiated this "sweat box" confession and denied all knowledge of the crime. But upon the confession and under the spur of newspaper clamor he was convicted. His case involved the most important and novel legal point conceivable, namely, whether the confession of a prisoner, coaxed from him by his official custodians without a warning that it would be used against him, is valid evidence. Such confessions having more than once in the past turned out to be false, they were wisely rejected by the courts as unreliable until the comparatively recent innovation of the police "sweat box." But in this case that cautious practice was departed from at the trial, and the Supreme Court of Illinois refused to postpone the hanging until it could deliberately pass upon the question. Had there been only a few hundred dollars at stake, there would have been a stay of proceedings; but with a human life in the balance, Justice could not wait. So this boy was hanged, with the law of his case undecided by the court of final authority. Doesn't that seem very much like a legal lynching?

* *

Bryan's Fidelity.

The attempts to make it appear that Bryan will yield to the blandishments of the plutocratic crowd that is pushing for seats in the Bryan band wagon, are failing miserably. For Bryan will talk, and he talks with his same old candor. In one of his interviews he declares himself on the trust question in a manner that leaves no room for doubting his fidelity:

There is some talk of controlling the trusts. You might as well talk of controlling burglary. We do not say men shall only steal a little bit, or in some particular way, but that they shall not steal at all. So of private monopolies. It is not sufficient to control them or regulate them. They must be absolutely, totally destroyed. Corporations should be controlled and regulated, but private monopolies must be exterminated, root and branch. Now, you can call that a radical doctrine. Yet it is more conservative to apply this remedy now than to wait until predatory wealth has by its lawlessness brought odium on legitimate accumulations. What used to be called radical is now called conservative because people have been investigating. The doctrine has not changed, but public sentiment is making progress.

This cuts to the marrow. To plundering plutocrats it is a warning that they can expect no favors from Bryan; to the democratic Democrat and democratic Republican it is an assurance that the

Bryan movement is a forward and not a backward one. Bryan is not seeking the Presidential nomination; but he leaves no doubt that if it comes to him, he will stand for democratic ideals. He could say of himself to-day as he said at the St. Louis convention two years ago: "You may dispute whether I have fought a good fight; you may dispute whether I have finished my course; but you cannot deny that I have kept the faith."

* * *

An Undiscovered Species of Monopoly.

As a rule the Chicago Record-Herald is pretty sound editorially on its abstract economics; but what shall we do with its remarkable admonition of the 25th to Bryan in response to his condemnation of monopolies? We quote: "The monopoly which cheapens goods and divides the economies of superior organization with consumers is beneficial to society." We suspect that the monopoly which divides its advantages with consumers, whether advantages of superior organization or anything else, has yet to be discovered. The pretty well established fact is that monopolies give consumers a share of their advantages as and only as they cease to be monopolies.

* * *

THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

Those of us who have these many years been trying, apparently in vain, to gain the public ear in behalf of just and therefore sane principles of wealth distribution, may be pardoned our amazement at the present state of the public mind on this subject. The change in the trend of thought has been so sudden, and the current runs all at once so swift, as to make the vast phenomenon seem almost miraculous.

Not that public sentiment as yet demands just principles of distribution, either in generals or by any particular method; but it does distinctly recognize the fact that the results of the prevailing system of distribution are morally unjust and socially dangerous. Regardless of its great significance this recognition is of the utmost importance. It has been impossible heretofore to arouse public opinion to any realization whatever of the iniquities and dangers of prevailing modes of wealth distribution. The principal criticisms of Henry George's epochal work, "Progress and Poverty," were not that its argument was fallacious but that its premises were false. The premises alluded to were George's contention, then denied but now appreciated, that progress tends to

enrich the privileged idler and to impoverish the unprivileged worker; or, as it was commonly interpreted by those who denied it, that "the rich grow richer and the poor poorer." These premises are now so generally conceded that those of us who have long been vainly trying to bring them to public attention must enter somewhat into the spirit of Sill's suggestive lines:

Before the monstrous wrong he sits him down—
One man against a stone-walled citadel of sin.
For centuries those walls have been a-building;
Smooth porphyry, they slope and coldly glass
The flying storm and wheeling sun. No chink,
No crevice, lets the thinnest arrow in.
He fights alone, and from the cloudy ramparts
A thousand evil faces jibe and jeer him.
Let him lie down and die; what is the right,
And where is justice in a world like this?
But by and by earth shakes herself, impatient,
And down, in one great roar of ruin, crash
Watch-tower and citadel and battlements.
When the red dust has cleared, the lonely soldier
Stands with strange thoughts beneath the friendly
stars.

*

The signs of this marvelous change in public sentiment regarding the distribution of wealth are too abundant for enumeration. In a general way, it has been the theme of the commencement day orations this year of the presidents of nearly every college and university of importance in the country. Senator Elkins has within a few days publicly declared that "there is enough wealth to prevent poverty, but we have not learned how to distribute it." One of the commencement day orators, a St. Louis clergyman, gave picturesqueness to the same idea when he paraphrased Andrew Carnegie, saying that it is not alone a disgrace to die rich but "it is a disgrace to grow rich." Perhaps, however, the most significant of all the expressions of this common recognition of the unjust and socially dangerous distribution of wealth are to be found in the leading paper of the North American Review for June. The authorship of this paper is a secret, but the editor of the Review vouches for him as "the most profound philosopher living in the United States to-day," and the paper itself testifies abundantly to his statesmanlike ability.

*

He divides American society roughly into three classes—"those who have much more money than is good for them, those who have perhaps as much money as is good for them, and those who have much less money than would be good for them."

In this classification there appears to be no