

in history is also true. And yet, despite the brilliant gala events and the three days of parades, pageants, speeches and song, the old doubt as to the authenticity of the famous declaration will not down. Thomas Jefferson in his letter to John Adams marshalled many and strong reasons in support of his opinion that the declaration was spurious. Many of his arguments have never been satisfactorily answered—probably never can be. Furthermore, historical evidence recently discovered goes a great way in confirming the correctness of Jefferson's belief. W. Henry Hoyt, of the Harvard law school, two years ago, in his book on the Mecklenburg declaration, clearly established by the aid of evidence not available to Jefferson the mythical character of the facts upon which the believers in that document rest their case. Some resolutions were adopted on May 31, 1775, in Charlotte by the committee of safety, but these, when examined, fall far short of the honors claimed for the declaration."

TENNESSEE has a claim. L. S. Ellis of Plainfield, New Jersey, writes to the New York World to say: "In the discussion going the rounds concerning the Mecklenburg declaration of independence, to which your editorial of this morning is an interesting contribution, the claim of Tennessee seems to be overlooked. For it is written: 'Near Johnson City, in 1772, the Watauga Association founded the first free and independent community established by men of American birth in this continent.' They 'founded a republic by a written association, appointed their own magistrates, framed laws for their present occasion and set the people of America the example of erecting themselves into a state independent of the authority of the British king.' This quotation is clipped from a railroad folder of the N. Y. & N. O. Short Line, and so far as I have been able to ascertain from historical records, Tennessee is entitled to the claim of priority of date."

GEORGE A MAURER of Burlington, N. Y., writes to the New York World as follows: "The editorial 'Where Mr. Bryan is to Blame,' in your issue of April 12, seems unfair. Admitting the Nebraskan's attitude toward the tariff when he was a member of the house to have been commendable, you criticize his position on the subject in later years, when there is nothing to indicate that his tariff views have changed in the least. It is true that the money question was made paramount in 1896 and 1900, but is it not unwise to deliberately invite defeat? There is no use denying the fact that the cutting of tariff rates during the Cleveland administration was held responsible (erroneously) by a majority of the people for the panic of that period, and it was a fear of 'free soup' and not of 'free silver' that defeated Mr. Bryan in his first campaign. Why do you fail to attach any blame to the bolters of the party in the Bryan campaigns, who were as much traitors to the party's tariff policy as are certain so-called 'democrats' in congress today? You also admit that 'an excellent tariff plank was adopted by the Denver convention last July,' but claim that Candidate Bryan failed to take advantage of his opportunity. Even Mr. Bryan's most bitter enemies would hardly deny that the Denver tariff plank embodied the candidate's views, and in his speech of acceptance he made the tariff issue paramount. His formal speech on the subject was unanswerable, and while it is true that he advocated other principles, if the World and some other party papers and 'leaders' had paid more attention to propounding the party's tariff plank and less to trying to ridicule the bank guarantee and other planks (which were at least honest of purpose and not sought as a means to foster monopolies and aid special interests), perhaps the World's 'Map of Bryanism' would have been less prophetic. Let us not forget to first remove the mote from our own eye."

E. C. BENEDICT, the banker, who was an intimate friend of the late Grover Cleveland, has recently returned from Europe. In a newspaper interview, Mr. Benedict said: "You can't keep us Americans down. We are so rich not only in resources, but in vital energy, that we rise again after each disaster in spite of the most abominable economic system in the world. I am proud to be an American, notwithstanding the fetters we have put upon ourselves by an absurd tariff, a banking and currency system that is the laughing stock of all other civilized nations, and a sub-treasury sys-

tem derived from savage and backward races who had their money holes in the ground. Our business interests are forced to use a banking and currency system which they profoundly distrust. Every two or three years the money rates in New York City soar to from 25 to 150 per cent per annum. The country condemns Wall Street as the cause of high interest, yet Wall Street is only the dial of the clock whose works are the intricate and highly unscientific systems prevailing throughout the country. When I visited France thirty-nine years ago the money rate there was three per cent. Since then France has paid milliards to Germany and has suffered the Panama and other disasters, yet the rate of interest in Paris never rises above five per cent. What an object lesson to the financiers in congress! We are again on the upward path, but the penalties of our unscientific economic systems will recur, and in greater and greater intensity each time, because of the constantly increasing volume of business."

COMMENTING on the Benedict interview, the Philadelphia North American, a republican paper, says: "It is no socialist nor populist nor muckraker nor agitator nor 'yellow' journalist who talks thus. The idiocy of Americans, who pride themselves upon being shrewd men of affairs, contenting themselves with a panic-breeding, unstable, inelastic yet ever-shifting banking and currency system, has made this nation so notorious that every intelligent tourist learns quickly that we are the butt of the contemptuous laughter of all other nations. What Mr. Benedict, a sane, conservative financier, declared is so patent that even Aldrich, who for nearly thirty years has posed as the high priest in the mysterious sanctuaries of finance, after a trip abroad, actually discovered that our banking and currency system—largely of his creation—is an unscientific absurdity."

REFERRING to the Benedict interview and the North American editorial the Omaha World-Herald says: "It is strange what an unmasking of the republican party has been brought about by the panic and a couple of years of business depression. No one any longer prates about republican administration being a guaranty against hard times. No one any longer claims the republican tariff is perfect, immaculate, flawless. No one any longer claims that the republican party has a monopoly on the understanding of the financial question and of the courage, skill and business ability required to handle it. Out of the mouths of its own leaders, out of the mouths of American bankers, business men and financiers, the republican party is arraigned and convicted. Two million idle workmen; thousands of mills and factories either closed or running on short time; business slow and dull and enterprise timid and backward in nearly every section of the country (with Nebraska and Omaha splendid exceptions) while at the same time crops have been abundant and the production of gold and other precious minerals unprecedented—these things prove the republican party a quack, a false pretender. Its boasted omniscience and omnipotence and infallibility are shown as mere glittering pretense. Now that the fetish is shattered and the myth demolished; now that people understand that the republican party is both fallible and sinful, like the rest of us, perhaps we can hope to get a verdict on political issues hereafter based on merit, and a study of the question, and not on idolatry and fear. For this much thanks."

ONE OF THE talented writers on the Philadelphia North American conducts a department in that newspaper which he styles "The Optimist." The real name of "The Optimist" is Lee Mitchell Hodges. It is Mr. Hodges' business to tell the readers of the North American who are living just now under republican administration to cheer up. A Philadelphia reader writes to Mr. Hodges this interesting letter: "I am an optimist. For years I have read optimism and preached optimism, and prided myself on having been able to point out to many people the silver lining to their clouds. But now I am in a quandary, and I come to you for help. In the last few weeks something has been happening to my optimism. I am beginning to doubt. Let me explain. I know a young lady who lives in the mill district. She worked in the mills several years, contracted tuberculosis, as so many others do, and was compelled to stop. She is almost well now, but must not go

back to work, so she keeps house for the rest of the family, in place of her invalid mother. An elder sister also worked in the mills, was seized with consumption and had to stop work. She is still suffering, and this young lady takes care of her. She has two younger sisters who are working in the mills now. If you could see with what anxiety she watches their faces, day after day, as they come home; how she harkens for the sound of that dreaded cough which she knows must come—you would realize why I write. But there is no help for it. They must work if they are to live. There are two little girls of eleven and seven, growing up, to enter the mills as soon as they are old enough. Now, what shall I tell this young lady when I meet her again? What ray of sunlight can I bring into her life? How may I point out the silver lining to her cloud? Is there a silver lining? Perhaps not. Perhaps our optimism—yours and mine—comes from three hearty meals a day, plenty of fresh air and a congenial occupation. Perhaps if we—you and I—nursing one consumptive, saw the white plague reaching out for four other sisters, and were powerless to stop it, we, too, would fail to see the sun! If you and I and the other optimists had to tramp the streets day after day, in search of a chance to work, we, too, might not be optimists. If you and I and the others had to stand in that long miserable line before the door of the 'Sunday Breakfast Association' to get a cup of 'coffee' and a roll in return for a prayer to Jesus, perhaps we would not be optimists! Tell me, my dear Mr. Hodges, or some of your 'Optimist' readers, is there anything in optimism? I shall watch for a reply. Till then, I am, yours in doubt."

ONE OF THE curious things about the story of death by violence, according to the Technical World Magazine, is that human life is cheapest, not in the large cities, though of course the total number of deaths is greatest there, as the casual observer might suppose, but in the smaller cities. The Technical World adds: "Nowhere are lives held so lightly as in the smaller cities of Pennsylvania. Measured by the deaths of violence human life is cheapest in Butler, Pennsylvania, where the annual rate is 379.4 per 100,000 population. Pittston in the same state stands second with a rate of 359.6. Iron Mountain, Mich., is third in rank with a rate of 290.7, then comes McKeesport, Pa., 290.1; Shenandoah, Pa., 278.9; Pottsville, Pa., 276. Pueblo, Colo., is seventh in the list with a rate of 269.3. Altogether there are more than a score of small cities half of them in Pennsylvania; the rest in New Jersey, Massachusetts, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana and Maryland, in which the death rate by violence exceeds the highest rate in any large city. The highest rate for a large city, 190.9 per 100,000, is found in Pittsburg. If to this be added the death rate from typhoid fever and other preventable diseases, Pittsburg may be deemed fairly entitled to such glory as may attach to the fact that human life is held cheaper within its boundaries than in any other civilized community. The total number of deaths by violence in 1906 and the rate per 100,000 inhabitants from that cause in seventeen of the larger cities are set forth in the following table:

City:	Rate.	Total Deaths.
Pittsburg	190.9	716
New Orleans	135.3	425
Kansas City	126.7	231
Buffalo	123.6	472
Boston	122.5	738
Cincinnati	118.2	408
San Francisco	116.8	429
Greater New York	105.1	4,323
Washington	101.1	311
Philadelphia	100.8	1,453
St. Louis	97.2	631
Chicago	97.0	1,988
Baltimore	95.5	529
Detroit	93.0	331
Milwaukee	69.8	252
Minneapolis	69.8	191
St. Paul	59.9	122
		13,550

BANK GUARANTY GROWS

The house of representatives of the Florida legislature has passed a bank guaranty bill by a vote of thirty-one to twenty-eight. This makes five states in which one branch of the legislature has acted favorably, besides three states in which a compulsory system has been adopted. Let the good work go on.