

Faithful to the Shears

The Unhappy Results of Tampering with the Truth Described by an Apt Story.

The Baltimore Sun is authority for an interesting story that may fairly be applied to the present political situation. It is related by the Sun that at a gathering of several ministers last Monday one of them, who is opposed to the so-called "higher criticism," told the following story:

"One day a member of a certain church, who had listened attentively for five years to the preaching of his pastor, took to the divine his Bible, which was truly a sight to behold, with whole books clipped out here or a passage gone there. Indeed, between the covers there was little else left but a few shreds of paper. The pastor was horrified and rebuked his parishioner for using the Bible so shockingly. The parishioner meekly replied:

"It is the result of your preaching. When I went home from church each Sunday I cut out of the book that which you had criticised in your sermon that day. That verse on the Trinity was an interpolation; so out went the strong verse. Then the canonicity of this book and that was doubtful, so out went this book and that. John did not write the gospel of John, so out went what was called the gospel of John. This bit of history was not history, only allegory, so out went that false and deceiving thing. Positively, sir, I have been faithful with my shears, and this is all the Bible I have left—the two covers and a few tatters."

Those who object to the democratic national platform say they base their opposition upon the money plank in that document. Yet investigation will reveal that after they have had their way so far as concerns the money plank, they would mutilate the platform in other important respects so that it would resemble the copy of the Bible owned by the church member referred to in the Baltimore Sun story.

So far as fidelity to principle is concerned, so far as adherence to truth is concerned, the democratic platform under the reorganizers would not become famous, although we may not doubt that it would go down in history as the platform that was thoroughly "faithful to the shears."

If one would understand the results of such a policy he has but to look at the platform adopted in the interests of Judge Parker, by the New York democratic convention. Referring to that platform, Henry Watterson, somewhat famous as a platform writer, says:

"The first plank of the New York democratic platform is broad enough and strong

enough in itself for the party to stand on and victoriously fight on this year. 'This' it reads, 'is a government of laws, not of men; one law for presidents, cabinets and people; no usurpation; no excessive encroachment upon the legislative or judicial department.'

Bourke Cockran, however, does not place upon the first plank of the New York platform the high estimate given by Mr. Watterson. In his speech before the convention and referring particularly to the first plank, Mr. Cockran said: "They reveal the profound truth that this is to be a government of men and not of something else—another discovery upon which they are to be congratulated—and with a series of equally original and impressive declarations they wind up by saying that Judge Parker should be nominated."

Democrats would do well to take the New York platform as a model of the platform which the reorganizers in the national convention would adopt. Let us see what the result, so far as concerns the national platform, would be.

The platform adopted by the democrats in national convention assembled at Kansas City in 1900, if the reorganizers had their way, would read something like this:

"We, the representatives of the democratic party of the United States, are assembled in national convention. . . .

"We declare again that all governments instituted among men exercise lawful authority. . . .

"We assert that no nation . . . will lead quickly and inevitably to despotism at home.

"Believing in these fundamental principles, we denounce . . . the republican congress.

"We demand the prompt and honest fulfillment of our pledge. . . .

"We condemn and denounce . . . the greedy commercialism . . . of the republican administration . . . entailing an annual expense of many millions . . . is extended at the expense of liberty. . . .

"We are not opposed to territorial expansion when it takes in desirable territory. . . .

"We favor trade expansion. We are in favor of extending the republic's influence among the nations. . . .

"The importance of other questions now pending before the American people is in no wise diminished. . . .

"The declaration in the republican platform adopted at the Philadelphia convention held in June, 1900, 'that the republican party steadfastly

adheres to the policy announced in the Monroe doctrine' is . . . the avowed policy of that party.

"Private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable (except where they are operated by the managers of our candidates' campaign).

"The dishonest paltering with the trust evil by the republican party in state and national platforms is conclusive proof of the truth of the charge that trusts are the legitimate product of republican policies, that they are fostered by republican laws and that they are protected by the republican administration in return for campaign subscriptions and political support. (If there be any 'paltering' with the trust evil by this organization it will not be 'dishonest,' and while the trusts may contribute liberally to our campaign funds, we desire that it be distinctly understood that whatever we may do for them will not be 'in return' for favors received.)

"We pledge the democratic party to an increasing warfare in nation, state and city against private monopoly in every form, (along the lines laid down by the republican party and approved by August Belmont).

"Tariff laws should be amended (according to the suggestions of the tariff barons who name our candidate, our platform and contribute to our campaign fund).

"We condemn the Dingley tariff law as a trust-breeding measure (and promise to 'improve' upon it in accordance with the views of those who dictated the Dingley tariff law).

"We favor an amendment to the federal constitution, providing for the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people (in the event that we conclude that the people are entitled to that favor).

"We are opposed to government by injunction (if that will gain us any votes, and if not, we favor an enlargement of the powers of the injunction judge).

"Believing that our most cherished institutions are in great peril, that the very existence of our constitutional republic is at stake and that the decision now to be rendered will determine whether or not our children are to enjoy these blessed privileges of free government, we earnestly ask for the foregoing declaration of principles the hearty support of the liberty-loving American people, regardless of previous party affiliation."

Gold Bugs Working the Exposition,

Mr. G. W. Alexander, of Indianapolis, applied for leave to prepare a paper for the monetary exhibit at the St. Louis exposition, and received the following reply:

David R. Francis, President.
Wm. H. Thompson, Treasurer.
Walter B. Stevens, Secretary.
James L. Blair, General Counsel.
UNIVERSAL EXPOSITION, ST. LOUIS, 1904.

Commemorating Acquisition of Louisiana Territory.

Frederick J. V. Skiff, Director of Exhibits.
Howard J. Rogers, Chief of Department.

SOCIAL ECONOMY.

St. Louis, U. S. A., March 30, 1904.

Mr. G. W. Alexander, 816 Temple ave., Indianapolis.—Dear Sir: Your letter of the 29th is at hand, and I send you a publication of the Division of Exhibits, which contains a resume of the work of my department. The exhibit of group 135 would include a monetary exhibit, and I should be glad to have anyone get one up. If a logical exhibit were prepared, demonstrating the fallacy of some of the popular crazes which seem to float over the country occasionally, such as fiat money, greenback bases, free silver, double standards, etc., it would be a very valuable and much appreciated exhibit. If you know any one who would prepare such an exhibit based upon charts and statistics, I should be glad to give them space. Yours respectfully, (signed)

HOWARD J. ROGERS.

From this it would seem that the managers of the St. Louis exposition are attempting to make

a partisan affair out of what ought to be a great non-partisan exhibit. Mr. Rogers, who has charge of the department of social economy, is evidently a gold bug, and he is willing to give room for Mr. Alexander's paper if the latter would "demonstrate the fallacy of some of the popular crazes which seem to float over the country occasionally, such as fiat money, greenback bases, free silver, the double standards," etc. Such an exhibit would, in Mr. Rogers' opinion, be "very valuable and much appreciated." He would be glad to give space to such an exhibit.

What business has the Louisiana Purchase Exposition to be in politics? The money contributed by the national government is the money of all the people, and it is not contributed to deceive the public. The money furnished by Missouri is furnished largely by democrats who are interested in good government, but not in the spending of money for the presentation of republican and Wall street views on finance.

Mr. Francis, a Cleveland democrat, is president of the association. Whether Mr. Rogers acts under his instructions or not does not appear, but if Mr. Francis does not approve of this misuse of the functions of the exposition he would better call Mr. Rogers down, or substitute some one who will have a sense of propriety and some appreciation of the dignity of his position.

Was Not Loyal.

The Philadelphia Record intimates that Mr. Bryan has given an "inside" intimation that he is favorable to the nomination of Judge Gray of Delaware. After what has been said in The Commoner it ought not to be necessary for Mr. Bryan to deny that he is favorable to the nomination of Judge Gray or any other man who was not loyal to the ticket in 1896. It is not a question whether

a man has good qualities or not; a democrat who helped the republican party in 1896 cannot expect to arouse the enthusiasm of those who, in the face of threats and abuse, supported the party in its effort to resist the encroachments of organized wealth. No man ought to be considered at St. Louis who was not loyal to the party in both campaigns. There are thousands of loyal democrats from among whom to choose. Even the support of the ticket would not be sufficient to make a man available if he is now in sympathy with the plutocratic tendencies of the times or his candidate is so in the hands of the money changers as to obligate him to them.

A Misleading Press Report.

In the Associated press report of the Nebraska state democratic convention, held in Omaha, June 1, the following paragraph appeared:

"There was but a handful of delegates who had not been pledged to the support of a reaffirmation of the Kansas City platform, and they came from Lancaster, Mr. Bryan's own county."

There are two false statements in that short paragraph. First, there was not even a "handful of delegates not pledged to a reaffirmation of the Kansas City platform," and, second, the Lancaster county delegation was pledged to reaffirmation and every member of the Lancaster county delegation favored reaffirmation even before instructions were issued by the county convention that selected them.

But one county in the state opposed reaffirmation, and in that county the call for a convention was published in a republican paper. If the delegates from the county in question attended the convention they managed to keep their identity well concealed.