

# The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

Vol. 5. No. 13

Lincoln, Nebraska, April 14, 1905

Whole Number 221

## CONTENTS

"HUSH MONEY"

ONE-SIDED CO-OPERATION

JUDGE DUNNE'S VICTORY

CAMPAIGN FUNDS

THE DES MOINES BANQUET

BACK TO THE PEOPLE

WORDS OF CHEER FROM ALL SECTIONS

GOOD WORK WELL UNDER WAY

COMMENT ON CURRENT TOPICS

THE PRIMARY PLEDGE

NEWS OF THE WEEK

### ONE-SIDED CO-OPERATION.

The Civic association in sending out its literature says "in these days of lurid literature and indiscriminate denunciation of corporations, the enclosures referring to the Standard Oil company are worth reading by thoughtful men. But few persons appreciate that this is an age of organization, and that 'corporation' means 'co-operation.'"

It is easy to see from what standpoint the Civic association views the trust question. It is not likely, however, to fool many people with the assertion that corporation means co-operation. Co-operation cannot be properly used to describe a corporation. It is nothing but a vast partnership in which the business of the partnership is managed by a majority of the partners as measured by the amount of stock held.

In this case of the Standard Oil company few persons hold a controlling interest and run the Standard Oil company according to their personal ambitions and desires. Even the interests of the minority stock-holders are not always regarded by the managers of a corporation. Sometimes the managers move the stock up and down for speculative purposes, and freeze out the small holders or cause them great loss. The employees of a corporation are not taken into consideration and the persons who buy the product are not consulted. It is certainly a false use of the term co-operation to apply it to a corporation which acts as task master in the employment of thousands of laborers and then acts as an extortioner in dealing with the consumers.

The Civic association is doubtless engaged in a labor of love in its efforts to defend the trusts, but it will find it impossible to secure a very widespread approval of its pleas in behalf of the very one-sided co-operation which the corporation—especially a trust corporation—presents.

### GOOD READING

Readers of The Commoner who write to express their approval of the primary pledge plan have provided some "mighty interesting reading" for this issue. It is to be hoped that every Commoner subscriber will carefully read every one of the letters appearing on pages 3, 5 and 7. It must be apparent to everyone that this primary pledge plan has taken a firm hold upon democrats everywhere and it is to be hoped that every newspaper that is in sympathy with democratic principles will lend a hand in this good work. Let every democrat take hold of The Commoner tow line and with a long pull, a strong pull, a pull together, the democratic party will win a victory that will be worthy of all the effort and sacrifice made in its behalf.



The Sphinx has spoken

## "HUSH MONEY"

The following letter, written for the Homiletic Review, in response to a request for an opinion upon the subject, is reproduced in The Commoner because of the current interest in the matter discussed.

Editor Homiletic Review, New York City:

Dear Sir: In response to your request for an opinion on the subject of gifts, like that proposed by Mr. Rockefeller to the American Board of Foreign Missions, I beg to say that the subject is one of exceeding importance and one upon the right decision of which much depends. Rev. Washington Gladden, of Columbus, Ohio, has very forcefully presented several of the objections which may be urged to the acceptance of such a gift, and Dr. Epiphanius Wilson has, so far as I have seen, presented the most extreme view on the other side. There are several distinctions to be drawn in the consideration of the subject.

First—We should distinguish between the acceptance of money from a penitent wrong-doer and the acceptance of money from one who is not only not penitent but persistent in his course, and to all appearances denies that he is guilty of wrongdoing. We must also distinguish between the acceptance of gifts from those who are dead, and therefore no longer personally interested, and the acceptance of gifts from those who are alive and who may have a selfish purpose to serve. We may also draw a distinction between contributions that are made in such a way as to raise no obligation in return, and those which place the receiver under obligation to the donor. For instance, there would

scarcely be a dispute as to the wisdom of accepting a gift from one who brought it to the church as a result of the working of his own conscience and because it was impossible to return the money to the ones from whom he had taken it. In such a case the gift would be accepted and applied to some good use, but the minister accepting the same would not only be free to condemn the methods by which the money was accumulated, but could use the incident as an argument against the accumulation of money in such a way by others.

The acceptance of a bequest after the death of the donor might be justified even though the money was acquired in a way that the church would not be willing to defend, although in this case there might be some doubt as to the wisdom of accepting, because of the encouragement that the church's action might give to others still living and engaged in accumulating money in the same way.

If one attending a church deposits money in the contribution box, his identity being unknown, his contribution imposes no obligation upon the church, and there would be no disposition to inquire into the source from which it came. If, however, the money came from one in regular attendance upon the church and came in such an amount as to make the minister hesitate about condemning the source from which it came or the occupation by which it was accumulated, a question would be raised as to the wisdom of accepting it.

Among the things to be considered in deciding this question are, first, the effect that the acceptance of the gift would have upon the donor; second, the effect that the acceptance of the gift would have upon the donee; and, third, the effect