

Received

Middleton, Mass., Oct. 26, 1931.

Miss Ida M. Tarbell,
Boston, Mass.

Dear Miss Tarbell:

As I recently promised you, I am writing an outline of the experience in relation to the General Electric Company. I was engaged in the re-filling of electric lamps and was invited to take a license from the General Electric Company's patents, reading "renewals, extensions, or improvements" which leaves it in force. I was told that the National Lamp Co., a separate company, had accepted a license after investigating it.

The National Lamp Company later purchased my business, verbally offering me \$35,000, but later took it over for \$7,900, paying me this sum, the total of the price on machines, etc., no value being given for good-will or license, through negotiations conducted by the Treasurer of my company, who was secretly in their employ, and continued there.

They also bound me to an agreement not to engage in the United States or Canada, with the exception of Nevada and Alaska, directly or indirectly in the manufacture of electric lamps. The National Lamp Co. brought an action in the Supreme Court before Judge Braley, Mr. Alfred Putnam, classmate of Owen D. Young, appearing as their counsel. Injunction was issued June 7, 1907, restraining me from working as manager or employee, for wages or salary, with any individual, firm, partnership or corporation engaged in the manufacture of electric lamps. This, I religiously followed. But in 1912 the Ohio Courts, the National Lamp Company

in suit brought by Attorney General Wickersham, in the so-called Electric Trust investigation, in restraint of trade, charged that the National Lamp Co. was secretly owned by the General Electric Co., from its birth. This was pleaded guilty to by the General Electric Co., and immunity from punishment given on promise nothing further would be done in restraint of trade.

I brought suit at this time for \$900,000 damage. Morefield Storey and Frederick Fish were retained by the General Electric Co. I was approached by William B. Sullivan, a classmate of Owen D. Young, who informed me that he could be of service to me, and suggested my placing with him my evidence, which included my license agreement. He lost these papers and advised me to consult with Mr. Owen D. Young, which I did. Mr. Young advised me that he would think the matter over, and a few days later delegated Mr. Oscar Jackson to effect a settlement with me, paying me \$10,000. At this time I stated to Mr. Jackson that if the agreement had anything to do with my license agreement, which was my future and was worth \$50,000 in itself, I would never sign. Mr. Jackson then told me that that was a separate agreement and had nothing to do with the case, and for me to write to the Licensing Board and that he would do what he could as he felt that if any one was entitled to manufacture lamps, I was. But he now claims that the agreement called for a release from all claims, which included my license.

At this time I went on with my suit, which had been pending, although I had given power of attorney irrevocable to Mr. Jackson to dismiss this action, which he never did. He then

entered suit, making my attorney a defendant with me. My attorney deserted me and brought suit for \$765.05 for legal fee, which is now pending in Superior Court, I defending myself, for he was of no service to me, and betrayed me.

The present legal patent situation I, nor one else, can engage in the lamp business in Massachusetts, by decision secured by William B. Sullivan, representing the defendant, and losing the case to the Company, whom his classmate Young, is chairman of the Board. My own present conditions aggravated by the depression, place me in an embarrassing situation--Torn by trickery and fraud during the best part of my life, I find myself unable to reasonably well support those I love; and were I to receive even the value of my license, leaving out the profits of the enjoyment that I should have had, which to others, like the Hi-Grade Lamp Co., amounted to millions of dollars; surely, if my statements are true, Mr. Young should not close his eyes to the justice if he is half the man you picture him, Miss Tarbell, or the Moses that has presented himself to lead us out of the woods. For surely, he, as Chairman of the Board, when he appealed to the Commission for a right to split the shares of the General Electric 4 to 1 because they were selling too high in the market, and when they reached 386 each again appealed to the Commission for another split, making it 16 to 1, and allowed them sold up to \$250 a share, or 7 and one half billion dollars, for there were 29,700,000 shares at the break in the market, represented by the 1925 value of assets, of a quarter of a billion. Men from Maine to California were stripped of their savings. They, the builders, could no longer express themselves and give employment to their fellowmen. This, together with the many like acts in many of Morgan's leading

Miss I. M. T. - #4

companies, brought ruin and paralysis , and as an aftermath brought down perhaps to a greater extent than we at present know, old banking houses, like Kidder, Peabody. Mr. Peabody, founder of the Company, was brother of my great-grandmother, and due to our international bankers in their relation with Europe, one man's guess is as good as another's, as to how it will come out.

The original discoverer of the Tungsten lamp --Heinie, applying at the Patent Office, was arrested and tried and acquitted, charged with attempting to steal Prof. Whitney's method of the G. E. Company. The second examiner, Mr. Barton, was sentenced to five years in Leavenworth, and served. Upon his release, he entered the employ of the General Electric Co. Mr. Heinie's secretary, Mr. Simon, at first testified, and later appeared and stated he had perjured himself, and reversed his testimony, and was later given a license to manufacture, worth \$50,000. Prof. Whitney withdrew his application, and the General Electric purchased in Europe the Just and Hanniman United States rights for one million, as the period of time of filing had expired and their rights dead, by a special act the period of time for filing was extended, and the patent issued, and a monopoly secured on which hundreds of millions of dollars were made, although Judge Morris of Wilmington, Delaware, ruled they never had a patent. The Lockwood Investigating Committee, represented by Samuel Untermyer, found the General Electric Co. had earned 168,000,000 dollars in four years, and had not shown it, paying no Government income. This caused the president, Mr. E. W. Rice, to retire, and Mr. Gerard Swope came into office, and Mr. Untermyer had the findings recessed. Interesting reading!

Miss I. M. T. - #5

These facts, as stated to you, Miss Tarbell, may possibly if you find that I have been dealt unfairly with and that it is not unreasonable that I should expect a reasonable amount for the license that was never paid for nor never violated on my part and from which I was denied the privilege of making profits that others have enjoyed. If you can find it in your way, and care to, present the matter as you see it, to Mr. Young, of whom you say so many nice things, with a view that he adjust it with me, I most assuredly will appreciate it.

I wish to thank you for the audience you so kindly gave me the other day, and trust you will understand what I have tried to convey to you in this letter.

I remain

Respectfully yours,

Albert A. Wilkins