

The Commoner.

ISSUED WEEKLY

Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class matter.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN
Editor and Proprietor
RICHARD L. METCALFE
Associate Editor

CHARLES W. BRYAN
Publisher
Editorial Rooms and Business
Office, 224-320 South 12th Street

One Year.....\$1.00
Six Months......50
In Clubs of Five or
more, per year.. .75

Three Months..... .25
Single Copy..... .05
Sample Copies Free.
Foreign Post, 5c Extra.

SUBSCRIPTIONS can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents, where sub-agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by post-office money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps or money.

RENEWALS—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus January 21, '12 means that payment has been received to and including the last issue of January, 1912. Two weeks are required after money has been received before the date on wrapper can be changed.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—Subscribers requesting a change of address must give old as well as new address.

ADVERTISING—Rates will be furnished upon application.

Address all communications to

THE COMMONER, Lincoln, Neb.

President Taft seems to have confessed judgment but some of his friends act as if he were execution proof.

President Taft has the gout. Which means that the g. o. p. is suffering from inflammation at both extremities.

Somehow or other Senator Penrose's "revelations" reminds us of the man who amputated his own nose in order to wreak vengeance upon his face.

It may be some consolation to Mr. Taft to know that, in one respect, his record is without parallel. He came in with a majority of one million and goes out by unanimous consent.

Archbald Clavering Gunter's famous novel, "Mr. Barnes of New York," isn't a bit more interesting than Collier's historical sketch of Mr. Barnes of New York, and especially of Albany.

A California democrat is responsible for the statement that the bull moose movement has, upon analysis, been found to be one per cent moose and ninety-nine per cent plain old-fashioned bull.

TAINTED MONEY

Senator Penrose, rising in the senate, passionately denies that the \$25,000 received from Archbold was in the nature of payment for his work on the Standard Oil investigating commission, and insists that it was his share of the Standard Oil campaign contribution of \$125,000.

Mr. Roosevelt, in another statement, declares that the Standard Oil tried to give \$100,000 to the republican campaign committee, but that he, personally, ordered the money returned. The New York World, in commenting upon this, caustically remarks that there are some conspicuous corporation contributions that were not returned, and mentions these:

The Perkins \$48,702.50, which Chief Judge Cullen said involved larceny from the New York Life; and \$50,000 each from two other insurance companies.

The steel trust fund sworn to by Perkins and Counsel Lindabury.

The Philadelphia fund raised by Mr. Stotesbury, a partner of "the Morgan interests that are so friendly."

The beef trust fund boasted of by Armour.

Harriman's \$260,000—or as ex-Governor Odell remembers it, \$240,000—raised with the understanding that Frank Black was to be senator and Mr. Depew an ambassador, and that Harriman was to be consulted about railway recommendations.

And yet it will be remembered that when Parker, on October 29, 1904, declared that the trusts were furnishing Roosevelt money, his assertion was met by Mr. Roosevelt with the lie direct.—Denver News.

Labor and the Trusts

Without industrial liberty the American ideals of social and industrial justice are unattainable. We fear that the new party plan of legalizing industrial monopolies would unwittingly become the instrument of industrial servitude. America seeks for its workingmen shorter hours, higher wages, and better working conditions as the fruits of industrial democracy; but the new party offers them as a substitute for industrial democracy. It asks us to abandon the American ideal of industrial liberty and to establish the German practice of benevolent industrial despotism—to enthrone monopoly made good by law.

The country was horrified recently by the discovery that the steel trust, which had paid fabulous sums to promoters and stockholders, worked many of its employes twelve hours a day seven days in the week—worked them, too, at such low wages that, even if a man toiled his twelve hours each of the 365 days in the year, he could not earn enough to provide a decent living for a small family. The doctrine of legalized monopoly threatens to perpetuate the cause which made such conditions possible and which must breed similar evils in the future. That cause is the huge, overweening power of the great trusts, the inexhaustible resources of organized capital, which enable it to prevent the organization of labor and to make the term ironmaster a reality. America must breed only free men. It must develop citizens. It can not develop citizens unless the workingmen possess industrial liberty; and industrial liberty for the workingman is impossible if the right to organize be denied. Without the right to organize, short hours, high wages, and the best of working conditions, whether introduced by legislation or by the welfare departments of great corporations, can do no more than make slavery luxurious.

The great trusts have made the extermination of organized labor from their own works the foundation stone of their administration. Read this resolution, passed by the steel trust in 1901:

"That we are unalterably opposed to any extension of union labor and advise subsidiary companies to take firm positions when these questions come up and say they are not going to recognize it—that is, any extension of unions in mills where they do not now exist."

Here is a steel trust advertisement:
"Wanted—Sixty-two house men, tanners, catchers, and helpers to work in open shops; Syrians, Poles, and Roumanians preferred; steady employment and good wages to men willing to work; fare paid and no fees charged for this work. Central Employment Bureau, 628 Pennsylvania avenue."

The result is that about eighty per cent of the unskilled laborers in the steel and iron business are foreigners of these classes. This ability of the great combinations of capital to overcome combinations of workingmen is confidently relied upon by the advocates of trusts as one of the savings of combination. Montague in his "Trusts of Today," in explaining the trusts' "Improved Position in Dealing with Labor," says:

"By its preponderant influence in the business, the trust has an enormous advantage in its dealings with combined labor. In 1899, during the smelters' strike in Colorado, the American Smelting and Refining company closed the mills in which the strikers had been employed and transferred the work to its other mills; the effect was immediately to break the strike. The United States Steel corporation had similar success in 1901 with the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers. Had the association been dealing with competing employers, each eager to keep his mills running and to get orders which his recalcitrant rivals could not accept, its demands would soon have been granted."

The success of the German steel trust appears to be due in part to this same ability to frustrate the aspirations of the workingman, as shown by the following passage quoted in President Van Hise's "Concentration and Control":

"Another advantage obtained by the members from the existence of the cartel (trust) is in dealing with strikes and labor difficulties. Whenever a strike threatens, the concern can transfer its quota to some other mill where there are no labor difficulties. Furthermore,

the syndicate contract contains a provision releasing the mill from obligation to deliver goods whenever a strike is on. Such an arrangement would have been impossible under the competitive system, and losses growing out of strikes would undoubtedly have been much greater if the syndicate had not existed."

The italics in these quotations are ours. The labor policy of the steel trust is not exceptional. The harvester trust, the beef trust, the smelter trust, the tobacco trust, the sugar trust, and many others can all boast of their triumphs over organized labor. Denial to labor of the right to combine is a policy common to the great combinations of capital; and against that policy labor battles in vain. Its loosely banded, ill-provisioned forces, however valiant and self-sacrificing, are no match for the compact power of the huge trusts with inexhaustible resources of money and of brains. Too great inequality in power is necessarily destructive of liberty—be it political or industrial. There is but one choice. We must keep democracy, or we must pass rapidly on to state socialism.—Collier's Weekly.

WHY HE IS FOR WILSON

Dean of the Yale Law School (Taft's Own University) Gives His Reasons

By Henry Wade Rogers: I shall vote for Woodrow Wilson for president for these reasons:

To punish the republican party as the representative of the mercenary interests that have preyed upon the people for a generation, and to punish it for the sins of big business in partnership with crooked politics.

Because the policies of the republican party tend to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. Those policies widen the gulf between the rich and poor. The crying need today confronting all civilized states is to narrow the too-wide gulf between those who are too rich and those who are too poor. The republican party in recent years, and after accomplishing the abolition of slavery, has shown a singular indifference to the divine injunction to consider the poor.

Because Woodrow Wilson possesses the energy, the ability, the courage, the independence, the respect for the constitution and laws which are so necessary if one is to fill the high office of president of the United States.

I believe that his personal qualities are such that he will be more successful in getting things done than Roosevelt or Taft. Roosevelt certainly was not successful in getting his measures through congress. He was too mandatory and belligerent. He was too abrupt and irritating in his way of doing things.

Mr. Taft has been much more successful than Roosevelt in dealing with congress, yet in the most important of all matters before congress, that of the tariff, he could not win congress to revise the tariff downward according to his own and his party's promise.

There is no office in which personality counts for more than in the presidency, and Woodrow Wilson has the right personality. I concede the charm of Mr. Taft's personality. He has all the charm McKinley had, and more. But a president needs to have, in addition to his charm, great political and personal tact and a resolute will and determined purpose.

Mr. Taft is a fine type of gentleman, and I believe him the most misrepresented and least understood man in our public life. But it is not within his power to accomplish the reforms which are so necessary to the welfare of the American people at this time.

THE LORD'S SIDE

"A tariff that will enable American manufacturers to pay our workingmen wages and so arranged that the workingmen will get those wages."—Beveridge.

Long Mr. Beveridge was a United States senator. Long he declared the prohibitive tariff which he helped to make was issued to give workingmen high wages and that it did that very thing. Now he admits that the policy with which he has been identified so many years was a fraud. Did he know he was one of the mainstays of a huge swindle? Or has he just found out that he was in the wrong?

In any event, we assure him, he is now really fighting on the Lord's side.—Milwaukee Journal.