

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Vol. 3. No. 41.

Lincoln, Nebraska, October 30, 1903.

Whole No. 145.

SERVANTS OF THE TRUSTS

In the November number of Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly appears an article entitled "The National Lobby at Washington," and written by the editors. This article should be read by every American citizen. Although to many it may seem that the authors of this article have made startling revelations, with all the seriousness of the situation as they have described it, the half has not been told.

In the beginning, the authors of "The National Lobby at Washington," explain that there exists "a profound impression that something is wrong with the basic principles of our government as it has been administered for a decade." This impression, the authors attribute to "the robbery of the treasury through bribery, blackmail and petty larceny in the postoffice department; the illegal absorption of public lands with the suspected connivance of officials now removed and of members of congress still in office; the defalcations of the department of justice and in the office of the commissioners of the District of Columbia; the interest of congressmen and senators in glove and tombstone contracts."

It is pointed out that as a matter of fact, the congress of the United States is its own lobby; that in nine cases out of ten the lobbyist sits in the senate with his state behind him or in the house of representatives with his district and his senator behind him; that in nine cases out of ten the senatorial or representative lobbyist acts and speaks for some great corporation which is seeking some vast special privilege which is antagonistic to public interests and to which it has no moral right. In the opinion of these authors the great curse of national legislation is the campaign contribution. Upon the campaign contribution is placed the responsibility for the growth of the new system whereby congress is its own lobby. It is pointed out that in presidential or congressional elections the great corporations pick the candidates and the party to whom they feel they can look for favors; then they contribute enormous sums to carry the election.

"Frequently," say the authors, "a definite bargain is made with the national committee that something shall be done or another one not done. It is a cold matter of business. Commercial Acumen, which has built up vast fortunes in a generation or two like those of the Standard Oil crowd or of Carnegie's coterie of young men, can usually pick a winner or make a winner in a national campaign. It did so in 1888, when it turned its back on Cleveland and contributed to the Harrison fund for M. S. Quay to spend. Again it did so in 1892, when it switched from Harrison back to Cleveland and gave the millions to William C. Whitney and Don M. Dickinson with which they swept the country. It could not choose in 1896 and in 1900 because William J. Bryan was running for president on a platform which made the corporations quake, so Commercial Acumen emptied a sum equal to a king's ransom at the feet of Marcus A. Hanna at the behest of such men as Cornelius N. Bliss, Senator Aldrich, Senator Al-

lison, and Senator Quay." And it is explained by the authors that "the great interests which contributed in these four campaigns got what they paid for."

An interesting feature of "The National Lobby at Washington" relates to the part played by a number of conspicuous senators. Senator Nelson W. Aldrich of Rhode Island is credited with being the most important man in the senate. It is said that Senator Aldrich represents more great interests than any other man in congress, being the representative of the Rockefellers, the Morgans, the James J. Hills, the E. H. Harrimans, the W. K. Vanderbilts, the Schwabs, the Carnegies, the Armours, the Swifts, and the Cramps. It is admitted that the list of interests that Senator Aldrich serves with his voice and his influence is too long to print in an article of limited scope. It is, however, pointed out that Senator Aldrich represents the Standard Oil company. It is explained that the term "Standard Oil company" as here used describes all the enterprises in which John D. Rockefeller has united the greatest aggregation of capital in the world. It is shown that in the proposed currency legislation Senator Aldrich represents the Standard Oil group and the J. Pierpont Morgan group, and that as the servant of these interests when congress meets he will be found pressing a bill to permit the temporary inflation of the currency so it may meet the demand which may be made upon it every time the speculators in Wall street expand prices.

Mr. Aldrich is further referred to as the servant of the sugar trust, of the steel trust, of the beef trust and of the anthracite coal trust. Next to Senator Aldrich in point of influence as the friend of great combinations of capital is Senator Hanna, according to the authors of "The National Lobby at Washington." It is said that in the capacity of chairman of the republican national committee Mr. Hanna "collected in 1896 for the election of McKinley the largest campaign fund ever spent in the United States. Again in 1900, he collected an enormous sum. This money came mostly from the trusts, the great financial institutions and protected manufacturers. With these contributions came responsibilities for Senator Hanna. Not one of the men who gave their money gave it solely to ensure their property against the laws which they feared if Bryan were elected. They all demanded something more. First of all, they wanted a high protective tariff and this they got in the Dingley bill. Rockefeller, Morgan, Hill, Harriman, all wanted to be let alone and permitted to go on with their trust building. Griscom wanted a ship subsidy. The idea which capital detested above all things was that which looked to the broadening of the Sherman anti-trust law. Senator Hanna took emphatic ground that there should be no more anti-trust legislation. In this position he had the hearty support of the old guard in the senate, consisting of Aldrich, Spooner of Wisconsin, Quay of Pennsylvania, Allison of Iowa, Elkins of West Virginia, Foraker of Ohio, and Fairbanks of Indiana. All of these men can be classed as defenders of

trusts and when they unite, they can dominate the senate."

Accompanying this interesting article are several pictures of senators and above each picture is a brief and interesting description of the man. For instance, over Senator Aldrich's picture that gentleman is described as "the most potent influence in the senate and the prime mover in legislation favorable to corporations."

Senator Quay is described as "leader in the fight against restricted immigration on behalf of the foreign steamship lines."

Senator Elkins is introduced as the gentleman "who promoted the agreement between the sugar trust and Senator Gorman who later became leader of the beet sugar lobby."

Senator Millard is referred to as "the strong friend of the beet sugar trust and also a mainstay of the Union Pacific railroad."

Senator Dietrich is called "one of the foremost upholders of beet sugar and protector of the present usurpation of public lands."

Congressman Babcock is referred to as "the spokesman for the brewing interests."

Of Congressman Wadsworth, it is said: "Sent to congress from an agricultural district, but the chief representative of the oleomargarine industry."

Senator Burrows is referred to as "one of the leaders of the beet sugar lobby and violently opposed to reciprocity with Cuba."

It is explained that "most of the senators who are engaged in shielding the trusts and corporations that have so long dominated congress were above the suspicion that they do it for pay; that most of them are millionaires in their own right; that while they are actually the servants of the trusts, they are parts of the trusts."

There are many people to whom the statements of the authors of "The National Lobby at Washington," are not revelations and yet it may not be doubted that there are thousands of others, particularly among the rank and file of the republican party, who really imagine that the Aldriches, the Hannas and the Burrows are statesmen who are greatly concerned for the public welfare. To those who have been really ignorant on this subject, the article in Leslie's Monthly will provide food for serious thought.

Can the American people expect honest representation at the hands of their public officials when the trusts are permitted to choose those officials?

Is it not humiliating to the American citizen when he is told that the men who are presumed to represent public interests are, in fact, the representatives of special interests?

Returning to Scarecrows.

Mr. Hanna must be quite badly scared himself, or else he is pretending to be scared, for he is warning his constituents that if he isn't elected there is going to be a terrible industrial panic. He is quoted as saying that he "earnestly believes" that "if this state goes democratic, or