

Autobiography:

In handling the Standard Oil story the genesis in mind is not in the office; if it had not been for Whitman's keen interest in Lloyd's book, his pinning me down to recall my own recollections - hardly that, but my recollections coming up some how in our discussion, I doubt when we began in the office to fumble about what could be done about the trust question I doubt if I would have been able to think of it in the terms of a historical development. That is Lloyd had brought back to me ^{That way of mind,} those exciting years of youth. ~~My~~ ^{That way of mind,} natural way of mind, I suppose, of wanting to see how a thing began and developed. It was the only way I could look at it. What was it? Was it right or wrong this thing? It certainly had the ~~realization~~ ^{probability} of success at this time.

Had this thing grown by legitimate methods; that is, in harmony with the spirit of democracy. That was really the thing that was in my mind and I did not know whether for or against. I was against the whole matter of using national transportation in the interest of anyone, but how about it. Had they done so much more than others? Might it not be that they had been driven by what others did to take the position they did? Really ~~they~~ ^{present victim} were in a sense victims. It is a habit now-a-days and it is amusing enough to me as I remember those early days to say that everybody ^{took} rebates - everybody tried for them. Easy explanation.

Well, then I went into that work with a very non-committal way, not quite knowing whether I was for or against

and not having any prejudices against the big thing. *was a fairly big thing*
 Indeed it seemed to me a big thing might be inevitable under
 our conditions - an honesty inevitable.

I certainly must give full attention to that
 first interview with Mr. Rogers and how my heart went back into
 its place, partly at least, when I got out of my cab at the door
 of his house where the interview was to take place, and saw him
 looking out of the library window evidently watching for me.
 Well, if the great ^{was} watching for me why should I tremble?

Must make the point that he was the only man in
 the lot, excepting John O'Day probably, that I could ^{Sam} have ed
 with or did talk frankly with. With John Archibald there was no
~~the same~~ a picture of his greatness and of his philanthropy.
 talking. / And to have broken bread with him, as he told one of
 my friends, was a sufficient condemnation of my viciousness.
 Of course Mr. Rockefeller was out of the question. Mr. Rogers
 asked me, "Would you talk with Mr. Rockefeller?" And I said I
 would ask nothing better. And he then said, "I'll see if I can
 arrange it." But he never did arrange it. ~~I was instinctively~~
~~against it.~~ But he did arrange that I see Mr. Flagler and I
 should not like to set down the impression of unspeakable hypocrisy
 that I carried away, justly or unjustly. He was ended for me.

It was another matter with John O'Day. ^{Sam} He had
 been in Titusville, an Irish boy who grew up there. (Tell
 O'Day's story) He had been a fighting and loyal Standard Oil man
 as all the great Irishmen in the bunch were. I shall always
 remember the sorrow with which he said when I said, "How could
 you explain or justify ~~Mr.~~ so and so? And he said, "It was
 terrible. We ought not to have done it."

All these things must be elaborated, particularly somehow that early interview with Stead with a picture of Stead and full credit to Lloyd and the fact it was there that Lloyd came in earlier. And the fact that I had vaguely in mind the existence of the examinations - that one of 1872, 1880 and the uproar in 1880 over the suits. How much of that do I remember? That was the time when I was leaving College, going to Poland and I remember vaguely and perhaps can bring it back of Robert Walker saying, "These things cure themselves. There are abuses but in the end they always overdue themselves." Bad for business to make such a row as is being made now.

Certainly in Ohio and Pennsylvania there was a row.

*What LaSalle could not see & few saw
there was monopoly which then healthy up
on good American taking in.*

Interview with Harry Dounce now of Liberty, who is writing a life or study of Elbert Hubbard. See letter of July 9th, 1930.

Think it might be possible to introduce into the Third Volume of the Standard Oil History the efforts of the Company to counter-act public opinion, the foolishness of such a book print as Hubbard produced should be emphasized. Their true point of attack, though it seems to me would have been to have taken up one by one the sensational and unfounded statements particularly they should have presented to the public such lawless undertakings as the Uncle Sam Refinery. An effort to found a business largely on the popular hostility to the method of the Standard. Capitalize public indignation.

A severe house-cleaning would have been their best answer but as the Government suit showed they ~~touchd up these~~ *continued* competition and railroad rebates long after the attack was made, ~~on the~~ *public* convinced. The climax of the old methods came in the Standard Oil Company of Indiana under Stuart.

GRAND HÔTEL DES THERMES
SALSOMAGGIORE
(PARMA)

Standard -

Picture of Q. B. in 18 & 8, corrupting - Malt
Contrasts - Independence - weakness -
crime (lack of) self-reliance - ~~but~~ Perseus
Centurion - cutting loose parts of carcase
at Rousselle & gaining slim - no
wealth of refinement - careers & charac-
ters of men running them - Courage
hope energy in air - young men
eager - A slight-skinned man -
unusually impulsive - An industry
is a body of rare material - good; refining
= strength - Manipulation - never brittle
used to ring - not carrying equally
So, Lm. Co. Scott etc sketches of little
men - various with Cleveland refineries -
union with Lm. Co. Effect of knowledge
of contract - with on Q. B. opposing
seems - annulling - Hydra killed - relief
but momentary. Dying. Strife.

NOTE.

It is certain that they were using their vast power in a most prodigal way. So confident had the company grown that they even allowed the quality of their oil to deteriorate. The oil sent to Europe by the Standard in 1877-78 (?) was so bad that Mr. Welch testified before the Hepburn Commission ~~that both at Hamburg~~

Both at Hamburg and in London oil buyers held indignant meetings. And all of this shows the power in which the Standard indulged as soon as they realized that Mr. Rockefeller's dream was really coming true, and that they practically controlled the oil business.

Equipped

/with such information the Standard agents

in the territory where the independent oil was going could stop delivery, undersell to whatever he thought wise. His duty was to interfere.

The independents claimed that this ^{pretty}/scheme had never been abandoned, that it was even more alive then they declared the rebates to be.

I could hardly believe it. And then there unexpectedly came to my desk a mass of proofs that not only was this early arrangement enforced but that it ~~was enforced~~ ~~that it was enforced~~ had been developed into a system of elaborate bookkeeping.

"It looks sometimes," Mr. Rogers had said to me, in our first interview, "that something has the Standard Oil Company by the neck, something bigger than we are."

We agreed. Something had them by the neck which they had never thought played a part in their business. There was something in the long run bigger than they.