

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Vol. 4, No. 32.

Lincoln, Nebraska, August 26, 1904.

Whole Number 188

UNREDEEMED PLEDGES

In the republican campaign text book for 1904 it is asserted:

"The pledges of 1896 and those made in 1900 have been redeemed."

In 1896 the republican party promised reciprocity "on such terms as will equalize our trade with other nations, remove the restriction which now obstructs the sale of American products in the ports of other countries and secure and enlarge markets for the products of our farms, forests and factories." But that pledge has not been redeemed.

In 1896 the republican party said: "We are opposed to the free coinage of silver except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the earth, which agreement we pledge ourselves to promote." But that pledge has not been redeemed.

In 1896 the republican party promised that whenever practicable the veterans of the union armies should be given the preference in the matter of appointments to office. But that pledge has not been redeemed.

In 1896 the republican party promised to honestly enforce the civil service law. But that pledge has not been redeemed.

In 1896 the republican party promised the creation of a national board of arbitration. But that pledge has not been redeemed.

In 1896 the republican party promised the admission of the territories. But that pledge has not been redeemed.

In 1896 the republican party promised that the citizens of Alaska were to have representation in congress. But that pledge has not been redeemed.

In 1900 the republican party promised that it would restrain and prevent all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies, to limit production, or to control the prices. But that pledge has not been redeemed. The party also pledged itself to "the associated policy of reciprocity." But that pledge has not been redeemed. It renewed its pledge to enforce the civil service law and likewise, during its second term, it failed to redeem that pledge. It again promised the admission to statehood of the territories of New Mexico, Arizona and Oklahoma, and again it failed to redeem the pledge.

The republican campaign text book declares that under republican administration the gold standard has been "made permanent," and this claim is made in the face of the fact that republican newspapers have had much to say in criticism of Judge Parker because he declared that the gold standard had been "irrevocably" established.

The text book boasts that the laws against the trusts have been strengthened and enforced; and this statement is made in the face of the fact that no effort has been made to enforce the chief feature of the anti-trust law, which is the criminal clause, and no one speaking for the administration has undertaken to explain why that clause has not been appealed to.

The text book refers to "the relation of the trusts to the nomination of the democratic candidate for the presidency," and the readers of the text book are expected to forget that the trusts provided the republican party with their campaign funds in 1896 and in 1900 and that they are expected to make liberal contributions to the same campaign fund in 1904.

Hard to Please

Harper's Weekly is hard to please. In 1896 it was one of the most bitter and malignant of the opposition press. Now it is fighting mad because Mr. Bryan's statement is not such as it would write. In last week's issue appeared an

extract from a recent editorial. It attempts to belittle the reasons given for supporting the ticket. If the reader will examine the speech made by our candidate at the time of the notification he will see that Judge Parker has justified the reasons given by Mr. Bryan and has answered the arguments put forth by the "Journal of Civilization" as Harper's Weekly calls itself. It is determined to be displeased no matter what Mr. Bryan does.

MR. ROOSEVELT ON THE TARIFF

A reader of The Commoner asks if it is true that Mr. Roosevelt was once a "tariff reformer." It is true, and at one time Mr. Roosevelt even went so far as to become a member of a free trade club. When he resigned his membership in that organization he wrote a letter in which he said that he was "a republican first, and a free trader afterwards." If the reader who makes this inquiry will look at pages 66 and 67 of the "Life of Thomas H. Benton," a book written by Mr. Roosevelt, he will find that Mr. Roosevelt wrote as follows:

"The vote on the protective tariff law of 1828 furnished another illustration of the solidarity of the west. New England had abandoned her free trade position since 1824 and the northwest was strongly for the new tariff; the southern sea coast states, except Louisiana, opposed it bitterly; and the bill was carried by the support of the western states, both the free and the slave. This tariff bill was the first of the immediate irritating causes which induced South Carolina to go into the nullification movement. Benton's attitude on the measure was that of a good many other men who, in their public capacities, are obliged to appear as protectionists, but who lack his frankness in stating their reasons. He utterly disbelieved in and was opposed to the principles of the bill, but as it had bid for and secured the interest of Missouri by a heavy duty on lead, he felt himself forced to support it; and he so announced his position. He simply went with his state, precisely as did Webster, the latter, in following Massachusetts' change of front and supporting the tariff of 1828, turning a full and complete somersault. Neither the one nor the other was to blame. For free traders are apt to look at the tariff from a sentimental standpoint; but it is in reality purely a business matter, and should be decided solely on grounds of expediency. Political economists have pretty generally agreed that protection is vicious in theory and harmful in practice; but if the majority of the people in interest want it, and it affects only themselves there is no earthly reason why they should not be allowed to try the experiment to their hearts' content. The trouble is that it rarely does affect only themselves and in 1828 the evil was peculiarly aggravated on account of the unequal way in which the proposed law would affect different sections. It purported to benefit the rest of the country, but it undoubtedly worked real injury to the planter states, and there is small ground to wonder that the irritation over it in the region so affected should have been intense."

Canadians Attack Tobacco Trust

The Canadian government has inaugurated a fight against the tobacco trusts which seems likely to succeed. A bill has passed the house of commons providing for the revocation of the excise license held by manufacturers who sell goods subject to the condition that the purchaser shall not sell or deal in goods of a like kind produced by any other manufacturer or dealer. The measure is a good one and suggests a new anti-trust remedy. Our congress should pass such a law and thus put an end to one of the vicious practices of the trust.

THE "OIL" LITERATURE

An Iowa minister has called attention to a book entitled "The Rise and Progress of the Standard Oil Company," written by Gilbert Holland Montague and published by Harper Bros. It was sent to him without solicitation and without charge and he learned that it had also been sent to other ministers. The book purports to be an impartial review of the growth of the Standard Oil company but it is in fact a plausible plea for the company, evidently intended to relieve the company from censure and to justify the monopoly. As inevitable—"a natural development" as apologists say.

While control of prices, secret rebates, unfairness to competitors and all the other sins charged against the company are cheerfully admitted the tone of the author is apologetic throughout as will appear from the following quotations:

"That the industrial efficiency of the favored company was superior to that of other refiners seems equally demonstrable. By the sheer superiority of its organization, and, so far as is known, quite unaided by discrimination in rates, the Standard Oil company had obtained in 1892 its pre-eminent position."

Wm. H. Vanderbilt is quoted as saying of the Standard Oil officials:

"They are very enterprising and smart men. I never came in contact with any class of men as smart and as able as they are in business." "They are very shrewd men. I don't believe that by any legislative enactment or by anything else, through any of the states or all of the states, you can keep such men down. You can't do it. They will be on top all the time."

"An explicated narrative—such as this has pretended to be—should bear its own judgment upon the agents who accomplished the oil monopoly. That judgment—if the narrative has succeeded in logical clearness—runs somewhat as follows: Since the railway and economic conditions, the progress of the Standard Oil company was quite inevitable. Since it showed at an early time bright promise of industrial efficiency it readily acquired, after the fashion of the period, proportionate discrimination in freight rates."

"If the Standard Oil company were not the strongest refiner, its most powerful rival would most certainly have seized the same control over transportation that the Standard Oil company in fact secured. In the last analysis, monopoly by the Standard Oil company was, under existing conditions, inevitable, simply because it was most efficiently organized."

"And so in what seems at first sight an unaccountable and suspiciously rapid growth may be discerned signs of inevitable development—the operation of motives which are, at any rate, explicable."

"In the period from 1895 to the present, it may be added, the difference between the price of crude oil and the price of refined oil has remained almost constant, which shows that this power of fixing the price of crude oil has not been abused, in spite of the fact that the Standard Oil company during these years refined over eighty per cent of the output of oil."

"There is, he (Mr. Archibald) admits, a certain amount of monopolistic power, coming from the aggregation of capital itself, which keeps prices higher than they would be under severe competition; but at present this power and its effect upon prices are very slight and the lessened cost of doing business on a large scale more than compensates in lowered prices for the slight monopolistic power of getting higher prices."

"The statement has frequently been made that the Standard has reduced its prices in the territory of its competitors and maintained prices at more profitable rates at non-competitive points. Such a practice, as an instance of ordinary busi-