

The Commoner.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

VOL. 8, NO. 16

Lincoln, Nebraska, May 1, 1908

Whole Number 380

CONTENTS

MR. TAFT ON TRUSTS
WOOD PULP AND BUNCOMBE
HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN
SAVING THE BOYS
FULL DINNER PAIL IN A GREAT CITY
NINETY-FIVE PER CENT OF RAILROAD
STOCK IS WATER
HOW A TRUST MAKES CRIPPLES AND
DODGES TAXES
MILLION ARMY PLAN
WASHINGTON LETTER
COMMENT ON CURRENT TOPICS
HOME DEPARTMENT
WHETHER COMMON OR NOT
NEWS OF THE WEEK

A FULL GROWN QUESTION

What is the extent of the financial interest held by Joseph Pulitzer, owner of the New York World, in railroad companies and in great corporations commonly known as trusts?

This is a pertinent question because an honest answer might uncover the special interests for which the New York World speaks in its present day attacks upon democrats.

"PITY THE SORROWS OF A POOR OLD MAN"



REP. PRESS— "WHAT! HELP YOU? AN, BE A MAN! HE ISN'T, HURTING YOU MUCH. CHEER UP!"

SAME GENTLEMAN— "HELP! HELP! HE'S KILLING ME!!"

When "the shoe is on the other foot"

SECRETARY TAFT ON TRUSTS

Secretary Taft is rapidly disclosing his ignorance on the trust question, for to believe him ignorant is more charitable than to believe that he does not intend to interfere with the trusts, although his language would justify even this belief. He takes Mr. Bryan to task for favoring the extermination of trusts, and says that to exterminate trusts would be to exterminate industry. The secretary desires to regulate and control the trusts. But has his party not been "regulating" and "controlling" for some eleven years now? And have we not more trusts now than we had when the regulating and controlling began? The trust family is a family big enough to satisfy the president's ideas of the size of a family, and the birth rate is greater than the death rate. The administration has commenced suit against a few trusts, but not against many, and the trusts are still gentle enough to come up and eat out of the hand of the administration. What has been done in regard to the steel trust? Did it not swallow up the Tennessee Coal & Iron company? And was it not given out that the swallowing was done after the administration had been consulted? Is the steel trust fighting Secretary Taft? And what about the International Harvester company? Have the farmers secured any relief yet? And what about the paper trust? The steel trust has something like a billion dollars of water in its stock; it can afford to contribute ten millions to the republican campaign fund, because it can get back many times that out of a republican victory, and this is only one trust out of the many. How can the people hope to regulate or control trusts when the trusts, by the election of their favorite to office, are able to control the government?

The extermination of trusts is not the extermination of business. If, for instance, a single corporation has a monopoly of the production of a necessary of life, and has ten factories in different states for the production

of this particular article, the extermination of this trust would mean the selling off of enough factories to reduce the production of this one corporation to a point where it would no longer have a monopoly. But this would not mean closing up of the factories. The people would still need the article and the article would still have to be produced. But the independent factories coming into competition with the original corporation—now no longer a monopoly—would reduce the price of the article, and the people at large would get the benefit of the reduction. With a reduction in price, the people could buy more of the article produced, and this would increase the demand for labor, and new factories would spring up or existing factories would be enlarged. With a number of factories competing for laborers, the laborers' chance of employment would be better, and his wages would be higher. Then, too, with a number of factories competing for raw material, the price of raw material would increase. In other words, the extermination of the trust, instead of destroying business, would restore business to a healthy condition, while it reduced the price of the product, increased the price of raw material, and improved the condition of the laboring man. Competition is the natural condition, and the extermination of the trust would restore competition. Monopoly is an unnatural condition, and the republican party has fostered monopoly and thus built industry upon a false basis to the detriment of all of the parties concerned except the monopolist, and he has been demoralized by his unearned wealth while the rest of the people have been victimized by the practice of monopoly.

Secretary Taft ought to study the trust question a little more, or discuss it less, for each speech reveals his lack of familiarity with the subject or his lack of sympathy with the people at large.