

DAILY PEOPLE

VOL. 12, NO. 39.

NEW YORK, TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 1911.

ONE CENT.

EDITORIAL

THE GENUS WICKERSHAM.

By DANIEL DE LEON

“DON’T believe any such talk,” about the big Trusts’ going on just as before only under other external forms, was Attorney-General Wickersham’s declaration in his address at Hancock, Mich., on July 21. “Take my assurance for it,” he proceeded to say, “that those big combinations are going to be split up into a number of separate and distinct parts, no one of which shall have any connection or control over any other.”

The declaration is superfluous.

The several plants, hitherto connected organically, will cease to be so. Probably the bookkeeping of each will exemplify the completeness of the rupture. More than probably no plant will have any control over any other.

Time was when armies moved in solid bodies. The degree of compactness was the measure of the army’s power. The development of weapons wrought a change. Now a compact army would have but slight show against the gunnery of the foe. The lines of attack have been dissolved, and the nature of line formation has been changed. Not, however, the nature of the generalship. Whether compact or dissolved the army lines remain under one command. The means of connection between the general and the rank and file have been changed, not the connection itself. The precision of movements has not lessened. If any thing it has been perfected.

So it is now with the economic army wherewith the “Captain of Industry” delivers battle. The one time separate plants were first consolidated. The consolidation being formed in the Trust, the open and above and brutally frank Trust, and opposition having arisen thereto, the plants are again separated—but THE CONTROLLING STOCK REMAINS IN THE HANDS OF ONE GENERAL, AN INDIVIDUAL OR COLLECTIVE ONE, thereby preserving that oneness and precision of action of the separated parts that formerly distinguished the consolidated parts and that

rendered them so redoubtable.

The Attorney-General may know all this or he may not. If he does, then he approves himself truly bourgeois in double dealing. If he does not, then he approves himself truly bourgeois in dullness. Bourgeois in either case.

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official website of the Socialist Labor Party of America.
Uploaded June 2012

slpns@slp.org