

ROSE SCHNEIDERMAN

Working Women and the Vote (1912)

The efforts to gain voting rights for women reached a crescendo during the early twentieth century. In New York a state senator sought to deflect such efforts by claiming that women were not suited for the rough-and-tumble tactics of the political arena: "Get women into the arena of politics with its alliances and distressing contests—the delicacy is gone, the charm is gone, and you emasculize women." His incendiary comments outraged proponents of female suffrage and prompted a meeting with New York legislators at the Cooper Union on April 22, 1912. Several working women spoke on behalf of voting rights. Among them was Rose Schneiderman (1884–1972), a Polish immigrant who worked in a cap factory and served as the chief organizer of the women's trade union movement. She concluded that women needed the vote in order to force legislators to pass laws improving the most exploitative labor conditions.

From *Miss Rose Schneiderman, Cap Maker, Replies to New York Senator on Delicacy and Charm of Women* (New York: Wage Earners' Suffrage League, 1912), pp. 1–8. [Editorial insertions appear in square brackets—Ed.]

Fellow-workers, it already has been whispered to you that there is a possibility that our New York Senators don't know what they are talking about. I am here to voice the same sentiment. It seems to me that if our Senators really represented the people of New York State, they ought to know the conditions under which the majority of the people live. Perhaps, working women are not regarded as women, because it seems to me, when they talk all this trash of theirs about [women's] finer qualities and "man's admiration and devotion to the sex." . . . "Preserving Motherhood"—"Woman's duty to minister to man in the home"—"The delicacy and charm of women being gone," they cannot mean the working women. We have 800,000 women in New York State who go out into the industrial world, not through any choice of their own, but because necessity forces them out to earn their daily bread.

I am inclined to think if we were sent home now we would not go home. We want to work, that is the thing. We are not afraid of work, and we are

not ashamed to work, but we do decline to be driven; we want to work like human beings; we want to work for the welfare of the community and not for the welfare of a few.

Can it be that our Senators do not realize that we have women working in every trade but nine? We have women working in the foundries, stripped to the waist, if you please, because of the heat. Yet the Senator says nothing about these women losing their charm. They have got to retain their charm and delicacy and work in foundries. Of course, you know the reason they are employed in foundries is that they are cheaper and work longer hours than men.

Women in the laundries, for instance, stand for 13 or 14 hours in the terrible steam and heat with their hands in hot starch. Surely these women won't lose any more of their beauty and charm by putting a ballot in a ballot box once a year than they are likely to lose standing in foundries or laundries all year round.

There is no harder contest than the contest for bread, let me tell you that. Women have got to meet

it and in a good many instances they contest for the job with their brother workman. When the woman is preferred, it is because of her weakness, because she is frail, because she will sell her labor for less money than man will sell his.

When our Senators acknowledge that our political life has *alliances and distressing contests* which would take the charm away from women if she got into them, let me reassure the gentlemen that women's great charm has always been that when she found things going wrong she has set to work to make them go right. Do our Senators fear that when women get the vote they will demand clean polling places, etc.? It seems to me that this rather gives them away. Is it their wish to keep the voters in such a condition that it is a disgrace for anybody to come in contact with them?

Is not this Senator's talk about political contests and alliances an insult to all honest voters? What about the delicacy and charm of women who have to live with men in the condition of a good many male voters on election day? Perhaps the Senators would like them to keep that condition all year round; they would not demand much of their political bosses, and he could be sure that they would cast their votes for the man who gave them the most booze.

I did some lobbying work last year for the 54-hour [workweek] bill, and I can tell you how courteous our Senators and Assemblymen are when a disenfranchised citizen tries to convince them of the necessity of shorter hours for working women. *I assure you chivalry is dead.*

During the hearing at Albany our learned Senators listened to the opposition very carefully; they wanted to be able to justify themselves afterwards when they voted against our bill. But when the Committee, who spoke for the working women came to plead for the bill, there was only one Senator left in the room—he was the chairman—he couldn't very well get out; we had to make our arguments to the chairman of the Committee, all the other Senators had left. Mind you, we were pleading for a shorter work week for working-women. We had our evidence to show that physical exhaustion leads to moral exhaustion, and the phys-

ical and moral exhaustion of women will lead to the deterioration of the human species. What did these men care? We were voteless working women—no matter what we felt or thought we could not come back at them.

When you ask these gentlemen why they oppose the bill so shamefully, they will tell you it is the fault of the Republican Assembly; that the Democrats would have passed it, only that the Republicans held up the bill to consider the canning industry. That is what they say this year, but when you ask them what was the matter last year, when both houses were Democratic, they don't know what to say.

It seems to me that the working women ought to wake up to the truth of the situation; all this talk about women's charm does not mean working women. Working women are expected to work and produce their kind [children] so that they, too, may work until they die of some industrial disease.

We hear our anti-suffragettes saying, "Why, when you get the vote it will hinder you from doing welfare work, doing uplift work." Who are they going to uplift? Is it you and I they want to uplift? I think if they would lift themselves off our shoulders they would be doing a better bit of useful work. I think you know by now that if the workers got what they earn there would be no need of uplift work and welfare work or anything of that kind.

We want to tell our Senators that the working women of our State demand the vote as an economic necessity. We need it because we are workers and because the workers are the ones that have to carry civilization on their backs.

What does all this talk about becoming manish signify? I wonder if it will add to my height when I get the vote. I might work for it all the harder if it did. It is too ridiculous, this talk of becoming less womanly, just as if a woman could be anything else except a woman.

This vote that she is going to cast is going to work this marvelous change in her all of a sudden. Just by beginning to think of how the laws are made and using such intelligence as she has to

put good men in office with her vote she will be made over into a creature without delicacy or charm.

Poor Mr. Senator, you don't expect us to put any faith in you when we have seen women working in electric works, working all day with sleeves rolled up until they had developed the muscles of their arms as strong and hard as a strong man's; yet these women were intelligent and charming.

No man need be ashamed of the working-women. They do more than their share of the world's work. Our Senators do not think *long hours* is making them mannish or less delicate or less womanly. Not at all. If you tell these men "Those women ought to work only eight hours a day," they will answer, "No, a woman is a free American citizen; you must not hinder her, let her work as many hours as she pleases."

I honestly believe that it is fear of the enfranchisement of working-women that prompts the Senators to oppose us. They do not want the working-women enfranchised because politicians know that a woman who works will use her ballot intelligently; she will make the politician do things which he may not find so profitable; therefore, they come out with all these subterfuges.

Senators and legislators are not blind to the horrible conditions around them, especially among women workers. Some of these Senators come from the canning district where women and children may be working 24 hours a day, the canning districts *where little children fall asleep while at work in the pens*. Others of these Senators come from the textile district, where the whole family goes to work and there is no one to do the administrating of the so-called home; again, others of these Senators come from the New York district where women have to sew 37 SEAMS FOR ONE CENT and where a woman has to IRON 70 DOZEN SKIRTS A DAY TO EARN \$1.25! It does not speak well for the intelligence of our Senators to come out with statements about women losing their charm and

attractiveness, when they begin to use their intelligence in the face of facts like these. If these men really were representatives of the people, if they knew how the people lived, then they would think and act differently. They have a few women in mind, to whom they think it would be a bad thing to give the vote—these are some of the well-to-do women—they are afraid that these women, instead of going down to the settlements to teach a girl how to use her knife and fork, how to be lady-like, etc., might turn their energy into political house-cleaning. And what would the Senator do then, poor thing?

Those Senators who have opposed the enfranchisement of women will be ashamed of themselves in a few years. The vote has got to come whether they like it or not. It is the next step. This republic has got to come to it, and it is going to before long.

Every working woman ought to work to hasten the day. I assure you we are not going to sit down on our job; we are going to push "Votes for Women" among working women everywhere. Those of you who want to be on the winning side of this abolition movement better join right now.

Let us demonstrate to our Senators and Assemblymen and all other anti-suffragettes everywhere, that the citizens of New York, the voting citizens of New York, stand by this democratic demand for "Votes for Women."

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Why were women workers paid less than male workers?
2. How did opponents of the vote for women justify their opposition?
3. What does Schneiderman claim were the real motives behind legislators' opposition to female suffrage?

IDA B. WELLS

FROM **Lynch Law in America (1900)**

While Progressives helped improve the lives of immigrants, provide the vote to women, and establish national parks, they did little to address the surge of racism that welled up at the turn of the century. Throughout the South, state after state passed laws effectively stripping black men of the vote and instituting statutory segregation of public facilities. The most vicious manifestation of this new racism was the vigilante lynching of blacks accused of various crimes. On average, over one hundred African Americans were lynched each year, most of them in the South. An investigative journalist, Ida Wells, born a slave in 1862, sought to organize in the early twentieth century a national crusade against lynching. Despite her efforts it would be another generation before Congress addressed the issue.

From Ida B. Wells, "Lynch Law in America," *Arena* 23 (January 1900):15–24.

Our country's national crime is *lynching*. It is not the creature of an hour, the sudden outburst of uncontrolled fury, or the unspeakable brutality of an insane mob. It represents the cool, calculating deliberation of an intelligent people who openly avow that there is an "unwritten law" that justifies them in putting to death without complaint under oath, without trial by jury, without opportunity to make defense, without right of appeal....

The alleged menace of universal suffrage having been avoided by the absolute suppression of the negro vote, the spirit of mob murder should have been satisfied and the butchery of negroes should have ceased. But men, women, and children were the victims of murder by individuals and murder by mobs, just as they had been when killed at the demands of the "unwritten law" to prevent "negro domination." Negroes were killed for disputing over terms of contracts with their employers. If a few barns were burned some colored man was killed to stop it. If a colored man resented the imposition of a white man and the two come to blows, the colored man had to die, either at the hands of the white man then and there or later at

the hands of the mob that speedily gathered. If he showed a spirit of courageous manhood he was hanged for his pains, and the killing was justified by the declaration that he was a "saucy nigger." Colored women have been murdered because they refused to tell the mobs where relatives could be found for "lynching bees." Boys of fourteen years have been lynched by white representatives of American civilization. In fact, for all kinds of offenses—and for no offenses—from murders to misdemeanors, men and women are put to death without judge or jury; so that, although the political excuse was no longer necessary, the wholesale murder of human beings went on just the same. A new name was given to the killings and a new excuse was invented for doing so.

Again the aid of the "unwritten law" is invoked, and again it comes to the rescue. During the last ten years a new statute has been added to the "unwritten law." This statute proclaims that for certain crimes or alleged crimes no negro shall be allowed a trial; that no white woman shall be compelled to charge an assault under oath or to submit any such charge to the investigation of a court of law. The result is that many men have been put to death

whose innocence was afterward established; and today, under the reign of the "unwritten law," no colored man, no matter what his reputation, is safe from lynching if a white woman, no matter what her standing or motive, cares to charge him with insult or assault.

It is considered a sufficient excuse and reasonable justification to put a prisoner to death under this "unwritten law" for the frequently repeated charge that these lynching horrors are necessary to prevent crimes against women. The sentiment of the country has been appealed to, in describing the isolated condition of white families in thickly populated negro districts; and the charge is made that these homes are in as great danger as if they were surrounded by wild beasts. And the world has accepted this theory without let or hindrance. In many cases there has been open expression that the fate meted out to the victim was only what he deserved. In many other instances there has been a silence that says more forcibly than words can proclaim it that it is right and proper that a human being should be seized by a mob and burned to death upon the unsworn and the uncorroborated charge of his accuser. No matter that our laws presume every man innocent until he is proved guilty; no matter that it encourages those criminally disposed to blacken their faces and commit any crime in the calendar so long as they can throw suspicion on some negro as is frequently done, and then lead a mob to take his life; no matter that mobs make a farce of the law and a mockery of justice; no matter that hundreds of boys are being hardened in crime and schooled in vice by the repetition of

such scenes before their eyes—if a white woman declares herself insulted or assaulted, some life must pay the penalty, with all the horrors of the Spanish Inquisition and all the barbarism of the Middle Ages. The world looks on and says it is well.

* * *

Quite a number of the one-third alleged cases of assault that have been personally investigated by the writer have shown that there was no foundation in fact for the charges; yet the claim is not made that there were no real culprits among them. The negro has been too long associated with the white man not to have copied his vices as well as his virtues. But the negro resents and utterly repudiates the effort to blacken his good name by asserting that assaults suffered far more from the commission of this crime against the women of his race by white men than the white race has ever suffered through his crimes. Very scant notice is taken of the matter when this is the condition of affairs. What becomes a crime deserving capital punishment when the tables are turned is a matter of small moment when the negro woman is the accusing party. . . .

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. According to Wells, what rights were denied to accused blacks?
2. What was one of the most common charges leveled against black men? In what way did this reveal a double standard?

BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN

The Use of Violence against Southern Blacks (1900)

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, southern whites brazenly accelerated their efforts to restore “all-white” rule in the region’s social, economic, and political life. Senator Benjamin R. Tillman, whose nickname was “Pitchfork Ben” (because he once threatened to stick a pitchfork in President Grover Cleveland because of his hard-money financial policies) played a leading role in the efforts to disfranchise blacks and enforce racial segregation. A vocal white supremacist from Edgefield County, South Carolina, Tillman recruited and inspired racist white militias and vigilantes. He served as governor of South Carolina from 1890 to 1894. Elected to the Senate in 1895, he promoted the interests of small farmers and greater regulation of railroads. He also continued to promote white supremacy—by any means necessary. In the following speeches to the Senate, Tillman defended the use of violence to intimidate African Americans.

From “Speech of Senator Benjamin R. Tillman, March 23, 1900,” *Congressional Record*, 56th Congress, 1st Session, pp. 3223–24. [Editorial insertions appear in square brackets—Ed.]

[I]t can not be denied that the slaves of the South were a superior set of men and women to the freedmen of today, and that the poison in their minds—the race hatred of the whites—is the result of the teachings of Northern fanatics. Ravishing a woman, white or black, was never known to occur in the South till after the Reconstruction era. So much for that phase of the subject. . . .

. . . And he [Senator John C. Spooner of Wisconsin] said we had taken their [blacks’] rights away from them. He asked me was it right to murder them in order to carry the elections. I never saw one murdered. I never saw one shot at an election. It was the riots before the elections, precipitated by their own hot-headedness in attempting to hold the government, that brought on conflicts between the races and caused the shotgun to be used. That is what I meant by saying we used the shotgun.

I want to call the Senator’s attention to one fact. He said that the Republican Party [during Reconstruction] gave the negroes the ballot in order to protect themselves against the indignities and

wrongs that were attempted to be heaped upon them by the enactment of the black code. I say it was because the Republicans of that day, led by Thad Stevens, wanted to put white necks under black heels and to get revenge. There is a difference of opinion. You have your opinion about it, and I have mine, and we can never agree.

I want to ask the Senator this proposition in arithmetic: In my State there were 135,000 negro voters, or negroes of voting age, and some 90,000 or 95,000 white voters. General [Edward] Canby set up a carpetbag government there [after the Civil War] and turned our State over to this majority. Now, I want to ask you, with a free vote and a fair count, how are you going to beat 135,000 by 95,000? How are you going to do it? You had set us an impossible task. You had handcuffed us and thrown away the key, and you propped your carpetbag negro government with [federal] bayonets. Whenever it was necessary to sustain the [Reconstruction] government you held it up by the Army.

Mr. President, I have not the facts and figures here, but I want the country to get the full view of the Southern side of this question and the justification for anything we did. We were sorry we had the necessity forced upon us, but we could not help it, and as white men we are not sorry for it, and we do not propose to apologize for anything we have done in connection with it. We took the government away from them [blacks] in 1876. We did take it. If no other Senator has come here previous to this time who would acknowledge it, more is the pity. We have had no fraud in our elections in South Carolina since 1884. There has been no organized Republican party in the State.

We did not disfranchise the negroes until 1895. Then we had a constitutional convention convened which took the matter up calmly, deliberately, and avowedly with the purpose of disfranchising as many of them as we could under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. We adopted the educational qualification [for voting] as the only means left to us, and the negro is as contented and as

prosperous and as well protected in South Carolina today as in any State of the Union south of the Potomac. He is not meddling with politics, for he found that the more he meddled with them the worse off he got. As to his "rights"—I will not discuss them now. We of the South have never recognized the right of the negro to govern white men, and we never will. We have never believed him to be equal to the white man, and we will not submit to his gratifying his lust on our wives and daughters without lynching him. I would to God the last one of them was in Africa and that none of them had ever been brought to our shores. . . .

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is Tillman's underlying premise for justifying the forceful restoration of all-white rule in South Carolina?
2. How does Tillman justify the benefits of slavery to slaves?

THE NIAGARA MOVEMENT

Declaration of Principles (1905)

The progressive impulse at the turn of the century fostered efforts by black activists to promote the interests of African Americans. Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, the first black American to earn a doctoral degree from Harvard University, emerged as a powerful counter force to the accommodationist stance promoted by Booker T. Washington. Du Bois insisted that blacks focus on obtaining full political rights and social equality, not simply vocational opportunities. In 1905 Du Bois and twenty-eight other black activists met at Niagara Falls (on the Canadian side because no American hotel would host them), where they drafted a list of political and social demands. The Niagara Movement provided the foundation for the formation of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in 1910.

From Joanne Grant, ed., *Black Protest: History, Documents, and Analyses, 1619 to the Present* (New York: Fawcett, 1968), pp. 206–09.

Progress: The members of the conference, known as the Niagara Movement . . . congratulate the Negro-Americans on certain undoubted evidences of progress in the last decade, particularly the increase of intelligence, the buying of property, the checking of crime, the uplift in home life, the advance in literature and art, and the demonstration of constructive and executive ability in the conduct of great religious, economic and educational institutions.

Suffrage: At the same time, we believe that this class of American citizens should protest emphatically and continually against the curtailment of their political rights. We believe in manhood suffrage; we believe that no man is so good, intelligent or wealthy as to be entrusted wholly with the welfare of his neighbor.

Civil Liberty: We believe also in protest against the curtailment of our civil rights. All American citizens have the right to equal treatment in places of public entertainment according to their behavior and deserts.

Economic Opportunity: We especially complain against the denial of equal opportunities to us in economic life; in the rural districts of the South this amounts to peonage and virtual slavery; all over the South it tends to crush labor and small business enterprises; and everywhere American prejudice, helped often by iniquitous laws, is making it more difficult for Negro-Americans to earn a decent living.

Education: Common school education should be free to all American children and compulsory. High school training should be adequately provided for all, and college training should be the monopoly of no class or race in any section of our common country. We believe that, in defense of our own institutions, the United States should aid common school education, particularly in the South, and we especially recommend concerted agitation to this end. We urge an increase in public high school facilities in the South, where the Negro-Americans are almost wholly without such provisions. We favor well-equipped trade and technical schools for the training of artisans, and the need of adequate and liberal endowment for a few

institutions of higher education must be patent to sincere well-wishers of the race.

Courts: We demand upright judges in courts, juries selected without discrimination on account of color and the same measure of punishment and the same efforts at reformation for black as for white offenders. We need orphanages and farm schools for dependent children, juvenile reformatories for delinquents, and the abolition of the de-humanizing convict-lease system.¹

Public Opinion: We note with alarm the evident retrogression in this land of sound public opinion on the subject of manhood rights, republican government and human brotherhood, and we pray God that this nation will not degenerate into a mob of boasters and oppressors, but rather will return to the faith of the fathers, that all men were created free and equal, with certain unalienable rights.

Health: We plead for health—for an opportunity to live in decent houses and localities, for a chance to rear our children in physical and moral cleanliness.

Employers and Labor Unions: We hold up for public execration the conduct of two opposite classes of men: The practice among employers of importing ignorant Negro-American laborers in emergencies, and then affording them neither protection nor permanent employment; and the practice of labor unions in proscribing and boycotting and oppressing thousands of their fellow-toilers, simply because they are black. These methods have accentuated and will accentuate the war of labor and capital, and they are disgraceful to both sides.

Protest: We refuse to allow the impression to remain that the Negro-American assents to inferiority, is submissive under oppression and apologetic before insults. Through helplessness we may submit, but the voice of protest of ten million Americans must never cease to assail the ears of their fellows, so long as America is unjust.

Color-Line: Any discrimination based simply on race or color is barbarous, we care not how hal-

¹ After the Civil War, southern governments rented convicts, mostly blacks, to landowners.

lowed it be by custom, expediency or prejudice. Difference made on account of ignorance, immorality, or disease are legitimate methods of fighting evil, and against them we have no word of protest; but discriminations based simply and solely on physical peculiarities, place of birth, color of skin, are relics of that unreasoning human savagery of which the world is and ought to be thoroughly ashamed.

"Jim Crow Cars": We protest against the "Jim Crow" car, since its effect is and must be to make us pay first-class fare for third-class accommodations, render us open to insults and discomfort and to crucify wantonly our manhood, womanhood and self-respect.

Soldiers: We regret that this nation has never seen fit adequately to reward the black soldiers who, in its five wars, have defended their country with their blood, and yet have been systematically denied the promotions which their abilities deserve. And we regard as unjust, the exclusion of black boys from the military and naval training schools.

War Amendments: We urge upon Congress the enactment of appropriate legislation for securing the proper enforcement of those articles of freedom, the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Constitution of the United States.

Oppression: We repudiate the monstrous doctrine that the oppressor should be the sole authority as to the rights of the oppressed. The Negro race in America stolen, ravished and degraded, struggling up through difficulties and oppression, needs sympathy and receives criticism; needs help and is given hindrance, needs protection and is given mob-violence, needs justice and is given charity; needs leadership and is given cowardice and apology, needs bread and is given a stone. This nation will never stand justified before God until these things are changed.

The Church: Especially are we surprised and astonished at the recent attitude of the church of Christ—of an increase of desire to bow to racial prejudice, to narrow the bounds of human brotherhood, and to segregate black men to some outer

sanctuary. This is wrong, unchristian and disgraceful to the twentieth-century civilization.

Agitation: Of the above grievances we do not hesitate to complain, and to complain loudly and insistently. To ignore, overlook, or apologize for these wrongs is to prove ourselves unworthy of freedom. Persistent agitation is the way to liberty, and toward this goal the Niagara Movement has started and asks the cooperation of all men of all races.

Help: At the same time we want to acknowledge with deep thankfulness the help of our fellowmen from the Abolitionist down to those who today still stand for equal opportunity and who have given and still give of their wealth and of their poverty for our advancement.

Duties: And while we are demanding and ought to demand, and will continue to demand the rights enumerated above, God forbid that we should ever forget to urge corresponding duties upon our people:

The duty to vote.

The duty to respect the rights of others

The duty to obey the laws.

The duty to be clean and orderly.

The duty to send our children to school.

The duty to respect ourselves, even as we respect others.

This statement, complaint and prayer we submit to the American people, and Almighty God.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Summarize the rights that Du Bois demanded for blacks.
2. Why do you think Du Bois included a list of "duties" for blacks? What was the significance of each?
3. How might whites have claimed that Du Bois was demanding social as well as political equality?

Report of the Industrial Commission (1901)

The emergence of huge industrial combinations known as trusts generated rising levels of public concern in the late nineteenth century. As corporations developed near monopolistic control over their respective industries they threatened to control prices and to regulate production in their own interest. To deal with the problem, Congress passed the Sherman Anti-Trust Act (1890) which outlawed any "combination . . . in restraint of trade." Still, the problem did not go away. In June 1898, Congress established an industrial commission made up of five senators, five congressmen, and nine representatives of different industries and authorized it to hire a staff of experts. The commission was to study "trusts" and other industrial combinations, and from time to time to report to Congress, recommending appropriate legislation. After three years of investigation, during which it questioned more than a hundred business leaders, the commission reported on, among other things, why businesses were consolidating.

From U.S. Congress, *Report of the United States Industrial Commission* (Washington, D.C., 1901), 13:v–vii.

By what devices do business combines prevent competitive prices? How does "standardization" of product benefit both the producer and the consumer?

It is clearly the opinion of most of those associated with industrial combinations that the chief cause of their formation has been excessive competition. Naturally all business men desire to make profits, and they find their profits falling off first through the pressure of lowering prices of their competitors. The desire to lessen too vigorous competition naturally brings them together.

A second way of increasing profits is through the various economies which they think will come by consolidation. . . .

THE SAVINGS OF COMBINATION

1. Among the economies that are generally recognized as resulting from combination is the regulation of production. Where there is no general understanding among producers there is a strong tendency to overproduction, so that markets become demoralized and competition excessive. The combination

is able so to fit the supply to the demand that while customers can be fully supplied at reasonable prices there is no danger of over-production. It is thus a means of preventing panics and periods of depression.

2. Closely allied with this adaptation of supply to demand is the advantage that comes from the possibility of carrying much smaller stocks of goods. This saves not merely the investment of capital, but also interest on running capital, insurance, storage charges, shop-work charges, etc.
3. This same control of production enables the combination to keep its factories running full time, thus keeping labor fully employed. . . .
4. When a large proportion of an industry is under the control of one central management, it becomes essential to success that the various products be standardized. In this way the quality of goods can be made much more uniform than would otherwise be the case, and its excellence can be guaranteed. Furthermore, the number of styles of goods can regularly be very much reduced, thus

- lessening the cost of manufacture and effecting a saving in the amount of stock that needs to be carried.
5. The same influence leads to the larger use of special machinery, and to the adaptation of the workmen and the superintendents to the special departments for which they are best suited. In many cases through this specialization more can be saved than through the introduction even of new machines. . . .
 6. The specialization mentioned above saves also materially through a lessening in the cost of superintendence, which is sometimes very large. Likewise the increased efficiency often enables the manufacturer to lessen the number of laborers per unit of product.
 7. There are also noteworthy savings along somewhat similar lines in connection with the cost of selling, for example, the number of traveling men can often be greatly reduced. . . . Substantial economies can be made through direct sales instead of through middlemen; and the cost of advertising can be materially lessened, owing to more intelligent distribution and method of advertising. Advertising in a large way permits also the securing of more favorable rates. The popularity of a trade-mark can be more readily secured when the sales are direct.
 8. There is often through combination a better knowledge and control of credit conditions, so that bad debts may be guarded against. . . .
 9. Of course there is a very material saving in many instances through shipping goods to customers from the nearest plants. In this matter of freight saving also the large combinations can often supply themselves with storage facilities at central points and then ship their goods in large quantities during the seasons of the year when freight rates are lowest, thus often securing the advantages of water transportation which otherwise would not be available.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What advantages did companies seek by consolidating themselves into larger units?
2. How, if at all, did consumers benefit from such mergers?
3. Are such monopolistic tendencies evident in today's economy?

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

FROM Message to Congress (1901)

Although the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890 ostensibly dealt with the problem of corporate monopolies, in practice it left much to be desired, as least so far as Progressives were concerned. Its phrasing was vague. It never defined what a "trust" or "monopoly" involved. And the Supreme Court threw out many of the government's efforts to prosecute trusts under the Sherman Act. When he assumed the presidency in 1901, Theodore Roosevelt recognized that the trust issue remained an acute economic and political problem. In his first message to Congress he distinguished between good and