# The United States v. Standard Oil of New Jersey and the Legacy of Antitrust Law

Kaeyln Kwon

Yongsan International School of Seoul

**Abstract**

This paper explores the landmark U.S. Supreme Court case Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey v. United States (1911), which fundamentally reshaped corporate rights and antitrust regulation in the United States. It explores the case within the broader context of American economic history, particularly the emergence of monopolistic practices during the mid-20th century and the slow evolution of regulatory oversight. John D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil Company used aggressive horizontal and vertical integration, predatory pricing, and secret railroad rebates to build a corporate empire that controlled over 90% of U.S. oil refining. The company's practices prompted public outcry, notably through Ida Tarbell's muckraking exposé, and led to the government's antitrust prosecution under the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890. The resulting decision, which broke Standard Oil into 34 separate companies, established the critical "Rule of Reason" doctrine—holding that only unreasonable restraints of trade are illegal. This paper also explores the legacy of the ruling compared to other major antitrust and monopoly cases, and examines the evolving responsibilities of corporations and government institutions to ensure market fairness. Ultimately, the Standard Oil case set enduring legal and economic precedents that continue to influence antitrust enforcement and corporate regulation today.

***Key Words:*** *US Legislation, Sherman Antitrust Act, Monopolies, Rule of Reason, Corporate Regulation*

## Introduction

In 1956, the multinational chemical company DuPont was taken to court, being charged with monopolistic practices stemming from their huge success with their product, cellophane. US prosecutors claimed that they had an unduly high percentage of this market and were thus a monopoly, which was illegal under various US laws. However, the Supreme Court ruled against the prosecution, stating that by defining the sales of cellophane by itself as a singular market was not broad enough and that all flexible packaging materials must be included in the definition of this market.[1] While this case was important in legal history and marked a rare loss for US prosecutors who have successfully brought a monopoly case all the way up to the Supreme Court. Other companies in this position did not get off so easily.

While there is a significant debate amongst scholars on this issue, since the creation of the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890, there have been at least 13 cases brought against companies in the US where the government accused these enterprises of being monopolies. Of these cases, 9 companies were found guilty and forced to either divest, or injunctions were served, and 4 were dismissed. There is little debate amongst scholars, however, that the most impactful and important case of these 13 was the case of the United States vs. Standard Oil of New Jersey.

During the late 19th century, Standard Oil, an American petroleum corporation, began its rise to power. Founded and led by John D. Rockefeller, Standard Oil used aggressive and anticompetitive practices to restrict the capabilities of competitors. Eventually, these practices made Standard Oil a dominant power in the oil industry as it controlled more than 90 percent of the United States' oil refining business. Without robust legislation to target their anticompetitive practices, Standard Oil became a monopoly. The 1911 U.S. Supreme Court case that ordered the breakup of Standard Oil redefined corporate rights and highlighted the responsibility of U.S. institutions to allow free and competitive markets to thrive. This landmark decision established crucial precedents in antitrust law, aiming to ensure fair competition and limit monopolistic practices.

### Corporate Rights in the U.S. in the Late 20th Century

The early history of the United States saw a limited scope of federal regulations with respect to how businesses operated in the union. As corporations were able to operate under a laissez-faire economic philosophy, there was a belief in minimal government interference. In addition, corporations were not the large entities they are known as today, being mostly partnerships or individually run companies. These small businesses were required to obtain charters from the state legislature that outlined the purposes and duration the business could run. These charters were the primary political mechanism for states to control corporations.[2] However, more extensive market behavior was yet to be regulated as corporations could still pursue profit given the capitalist predilections of the United States. Therefore, monopolies and uncompetitive practices such as price-fixing, market cornering, and collusion were common amongst large corporations of this era.

The capitalistic economy, specifically industrial

[1] United States v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., 353 U.S. 586 (1957).

[2] Montague, Gilbert Holland. "The Legend of the Standard Oil Company." The North American Review 181, no. 586 (1905): 352-368.

capitalism, that was prevalent from the early 18th to the early 19th century promoted corporate expansion. Both entrepreneurs and political leaders generally emphasized capitalistic beliefs in economic freedom and minimal state interference.

However, throughout American history, corporations have used lawsuits to expand their rights. One of the most important cases in US legal history was Santa Clara County v. Southern Pacific Railroad (1886), which established that corporations were "persons" under the 14th Amendment and thus granted equal protection under the law. [3] A corporation is considered a distinct entity, possessing the same legal rights and responsibilities as individuals, with only a few limitations and distinguishing factors. While individuals and corporations have Fourth Amendment rights, the legal protections against unreasonable searches and seizures are much stronger for individuals than for corporations.

In post-Civil War America, the stock exchange had become very active and had a rapidly growing participation rate amongst US citizens.[4] All sorts of novel sectors emerged as new technological frontiers spread throughout the world. However, along with this excitement came a high degree of volatility, and many emerging corporations were commonly publicly owned. The ownership of this type of corporation is distributed among its shareholders and stockholders. It is within these groups that ownership, profit, and dividends are distributed based on percentage ownership and the number of shares held by individuals.

**Responsibilities of Institutions to Ensure Fair Competition**

Before the implementation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, the activity of corporations in the market was, by and large, unregulated. As a result of emerging monopolies and abuse of power in the market, concern with limiting the freedom of corporations increased.[5] Under the Sherman Antitrust Act, the US government could now legally prevent and abolish monopolies and unfair business practices. However, just limiting restraints against trade did not ensure fair competition between companies. At the time of the oil boom in the mid-nineteenth century, minimal regulations-controlled corporations' activities in the 33 states of the US. As there were no giant companies such as Standard Oil, the idea of government regulation on corporations was a foreign concept. For instance, some of the only laws regarding corporations at the time were the state regulations covering the general topics of workers' rights, taxes, and corporate charters. These corporate charters would outline the

[3] Harlan, John. "Santa Clara County v Southern Pacific Railroad." US Supreme Court. Accessed December 16 (2011).

[4] EBSCO. "Stock Markets and Corporate Stocks." Research Starters: Business and Management. Accessed May 1, 2025. https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/business-and-management/stock-markets-and-corporate-stocks.

[5] Winkler, Adam. 2018. "The Long History of Corporate Rights." https://www.bu.edu/bulawreview/files/2018/11/WINKLER-4.pdf.

purpose of a company as well as the basic structure and principles it will follow. Such charters come in the form of a legal document that was filed by the state government. It was a crucial process for corporations to go through if they wanted to gain official legal recognition as a group. States could sometimes grant special privileges, such as exclusive rights to operate within a region, making them somewhat complicit in monopolistic actions. On the other hand, charters could limit the legal ability of corporations within the remit of the charters, which meant that companies could not expand beyond certain levels.

The Standard Oil Company used corporate charters extensively as a part of its business strategy. Starting with the first charter it obtained in 1870, they gained legal recognition to issue stocks, raise capital, and limit the personal financial liability of its shareholders within the state of Ohio. These rights provided financial security as they separated Rockefeller and the company shareholders' personal and business assets. Accordingly, the Federal government had minimal control over corporations in the lead-up to the rise of the Standard Oil Company.

As it was becoming more and more likely that the Sherman Antitrust Act would be passed, the Standard Oil Company made massive efforts to influence Congress not to pass the Act. As Rockefeller had strong political connections, he was able to lobby politicians with money to pressure them not to pass any legislation that was harmful to his companies, meaning that a lot of political maneuvering would be, at the very least, not detrimental to Rockefeller's interests and in general very favorable. These actions included outright bribing lawmakers to oppose the bill while it was being passed. Not only did he try to influence politicians, but Rockefeller also used public relations campaigns to get the general public on his side. These campaigns would dismiss the dangers of monopolies, even promoting them, claiming large businesses, such as Standard Oil, are very beneficial for the local economy, delivering jobs, well-made and reliable products, and lowering the price of petroleum products.[6]

The Sherman Antitrust Act was passed into legislation in 1890 after a long battle fought between Standard Oil and the government.[7] This law would be one of the first attempts to restrain the power of large corporations. Although it technically considered restraints of trade and monopolistic practices to be illegal, its initial real-world impact was negligible.

**Background on Standard Oil and Monopolistic Practices**

The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey v. The United States case emerged due to the enormously powerful corporate monopoly built

[6] Stephen R. Leccese, "John D. Rockefeller, Standard Oil, and the Rise of Corporate Public Relations in Progressive America, 1902–1908," The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era 16, no. 3 (2017): 245–63, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781417000184.

[7] Act of July 2, 1890 (Sherman Anti-Trust Act), Enrolled Acts and Resolutions of Congress, 1789–1992, General Records of the United States Government, Record Group 11, National Archives.

by John D. Rockefeller at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries. The Standard Oil Company began as a humble enterprise that Rockefeller and a few associates started as the oil boom was in its early stages in Ohio. As it grew in strength, the company took advantage of smaller businesses by exploiting external relationships between Rockefeller and the railroad business.

Not long after the founding of Standard Oil, Rockefeller resorted to monopolistic and anticompetitive practices. As other smaller companies that, like Standard Oil, refined and sold oil and its byproducts started to appear in the market, Rockefeller quickly bought them out and added them to the collection of enterprises that made up Standard Oil. In addition, he influenced and coerced railroad companies to charge higher rates to companies other than Standard Oil. This practice, which became known as predatory pricing, would impede them in the market, ensuring they would not become bigger than Standard. These practices began eliminating any competition Rockefeller faced.

In addition, aggressive vertical integration allowed Rockefeller to take control of the supply chain, accumulate huge additional profits, and save costs and time at every stage of the process of extracting oil, refining it, and selling its various forms of byproducts to consumers. Rockefeller ruthlessly pursued horizontal integration, acquiring or merging with competitors in the oil industry to expand market share and reduce competition. Eventually the company controlled every part of oil production and sales as they gained control of pipelines, railroads, refineries, and marketing outlets. The rapid growth due to these business strategies resulted in the Standard Oil Company dominating 90% of the oil refining and distribution industry in the United States by the 1880s.[8] By the early 1900s, the Standard Oil Company had accumulated a total net worth of over 200 billion dollars at today's rate. This made it the largest and most profitable corporation of the time. Accordingly, Rockefeller became the richest man in history, with a total net worth of 400 billion dollars in modern USD, making him wealthier than both Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos combined.

Little was known about these ruthless practices until some thorough investigative journalism, also known as muckraking, conducted by Ida Tarbell revealed these unfair practices to the public. Tarbell exposed the corruption, injustices, and societal problems in order to spark public awareness and demand governmental reform. She published a book titled “The History of the Standard Oil Company,” which detailed all of the anticompetitive practices that the Standard Oil Company had been using. After years of thorough research in the form of attending and analyzing public court trials, testimonies, newspaper coverage, and public records, she was able to collect all of the information that was

[8] Tarbell, Ida M. *The History of the Standard Oil Company (2 Volumes in 1)*. Cosimo, Inc., 2010.

required to back up the claims in her exposé.[9]

**Overview of the Court Case**

After years of operating with little to no interference from the government, the government began scrutinizing Standard Oil in 1904 when President Theodore Roosevelt ordered the Bureau of Corporations to look into Standard Oil's business practices.[10] It was soon after this that the Bureau reported Standard Oil's use of anti-competitive practices like predatory pricing, secret railroad rebates, and market manipulation.

It was only after the Bureau's investigation that the administration filed the first court case against Standard Oil. This case took place in the Circuit Court for the Eastern District of Missouri in 1906. While the Missouri State government found Standard Oil guilty of being a monopoly, the company appealed, and thus, the case was passed on to the Supreme Court. The primary claim that the United States made about Standard Oil was that their practices were a form of restraint of trade on other companies competing in the oil market, and therefore, they were violating the Sherman Antitrust Act. Standard Oil was accused of using a form of monopolization as the corporation had exclusive resources that were used to completely dominate the industry and predatory pricing that was aimed at selling products below the cost of similar items and forcing competitors out of business.[11] In addition, Standard Oil was accused of railroad rebate schemes. Railroad rebates were secretly negotiating discounted shipping rates for sending oil with railroad companies and receiving rebates on competitors' shipments, giving them a significant and unfair cost advantage. These rebates were a crucial factor that allowed Standard Oil to dominate the oil market, as its competitors were burdened with much higher prices than those that Standard Oil had to pay when using the same railroad.

On the other hand, Standard Oil's defense centered around the benefits they claimed came from their effective management and efficiency, which were technically legal methods of competing in a free market. They argued that they were not hurting the industry or the general public but rather were helping by offering lower prices and better services for customers.[12]

After more than a year of deliberation, in May 1911, the Supreme Court ruled that Standard Oil was indeed a monopoly and must be broken up to halt the monopolistic practices it had been using for decades. This case became a turning point for corporate rights in the United States because it addressed the long-overlooked issue of corporations' abuses of power.

[9] Weinberg, Steve. Taking on the Trust: How Ida Tarbell Brought Down John D. Rockefeller and Standard Oil. 2008.

[10] Johnson, Arthur M. "Theodore Roosevelt and the bureau of corporations." The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 45, no. 4 (1959): 571-590.

[11] Bringhurst, Bruce. Antitrust and the oil monopoly: the Standard Oil cases, 1890-1911. Praeger, 1979.

[12] Boyd, Josh. "The rhetoric of arrogance: the public relations response of the Standard Oil Trust." Public Relations Review 27, no. 2 (2001): 163-178.

Arguably, the most important legal precedent established in this case would come to be known as the "Rule of Reason," stating that only "unreasonable" restraints of trade should be considered illegal in United States law. Ultimately, the case of Standard Oil v. The United States would become a foundational legal precedent used to punish and identify monopolies.[13]

When Standard Oil was found guilty, it was dissolved into 34 separate companies. Despite this resolution, the breakup of Standard Oil did not mean the end for Rockefeller's participation in the oil industry. In fact, after this breakup, Rockefeller received even more profit than he did while in charge of Standard Oil. Though these smaller companies were no longer directly operated by Rockefeller, he still held many shares within them. Eventually, each company grew individually, with groups like ExxonMobil and Chevron rising to be top-earning oil companies. Though they were smaller on their own, the collective profit in each new corporation would accumulate Rockefeller more wealth than that he was gaining from Standard Oil alone. Three years after the breakup, his personal wealth grew by 200%, making him worth $900 million dollars. By the time of his death in 1937, he was the richest man who ever lived.[14]

All in all, the court case of Standard Oil v. The United States marked a major turning point in the regulation of corporate power and rights in America. As the case forced the government to establish new restrictions on corporations, it diverted attention towards the need for government supervision of monopolies. In fact, the legal principles that were introduced, such as the Rule of Reason, still guide antitrust laws cases today. The legacy of this case as the first ever investigation on monopolies and the execution of antitrust acts would exemplify the requirements for dominant powers within industries for a fair market.

**Legacy of the Standard Oil Decision**

Despite the imperfect nature of the Antitrust Act, it became an important foundation for future laws such as the 1914 Clayton Antitrust Act, which would soon expand the laws that the Sherman Antitrust Act first introduced. The Clayton Antitrust Act made it illegal for businesses to implement price discrimination, ensuring proper competition and thus resulting in fair prices for the market.[15] It also prohibited tactics used by corporations to avoid antitrust laws, such as mergers, which directly enabled Rockefeller to remain dominant in the oil market before the implementation of the Clayton Antitrust Act. This would increase competition in the market and effectively fill the legislative gaps that the Sherman Antitrust Act

[13] Wilgus, Horace LaFayette. "The Standard Oil Decision; The Rule of Reason." Michigan Law Review 9, no. 8 (1911): 643-670.

[14] Tom Nicholas and Vasiliki Fouka, "John D. Rockefeller: The Richest Man in the World," Harvard Business School Case 815-088, December 2014, revised March 2018.

[15] Federal Trade Commission. "The Antitrust Laws." Guide to Antitrust Laws. Accessed May 1, 2025. http://ftc.gov/advice-guidance/competition-guidance/guide-antitrust-laws/antitrust-laws.

left behind.

Modern-day monopolies, according to some experts, mostly take the shape of large technology groups such as Google, Amazon, Apple, and Microsoft.[16] It should also be noted that many experts do not believe that these companies' business practices amount to monopolistic practices, but rather, they offer high-quality services that resonate with customers, of course, this type of rhetoric is very reminiscent of the arguments used by Standard Oil to defend their business practices at the turn of the century. In modern history, the most notable legal milestone in the study of monopolies was the breakup of AT&T. AT&T was an American telecommunication and phone company that provided both mobile and home telephone services in both the US and overseas and would become the world's largest corporation in the 1970s.[17]

After operating and controlling the majority of the US phone market, the company grew more ambitious and wanted to expand into computer services as well. However, in 1974, the United States government filed a lawsuit against AT&T for using price discrimination and excluding competitors from access to telephone equipment markets. It took over a decade to come to a final legal ruling regarding this case, reflecting how complicated and difficult it was to settle, given the complexity of the legal and logistical challenges of breaking up the company responsible for the entire US communication system. Under the Sherman Antitrust Act, the court ruling successfully broke up the company into several regional telecommunication corporations called Bell Operating Companies, as well as a smaller version of the original AT&T corporation.[18]

The US would go on to accuse Microsoft of violating the antitrust laws in 1998 by blocking competitor browsers on all devices that used its operating system. By doing so, almost all competition in the Web Browser market was eliminated, and users had no choice but to use Microsoft's built-in search engine – Internet Explorer. By some measures, at the time of the csae, the company wielded 90-95% of the market share, very similar to that of the Standard Oil case almost 90 years previous. The prosecutors argued that Microsoft broke the Rule of Reason precedent as they were using exclusionary practices akin to the tactics Standard Oil used to maintain its market power. In the ruling handed down by the District of the District of Columbia court, Microsoft was ordered to split into separate entities for different markets, where their products and operating systems would be handled separately so that Microsoft could no longer bundle Internet Explorer and coercively control such a large portion of the market. However, on appeal, the government and company came to an agreement that certain

[16] Lamoreaux, Naomi R. "The problem of bigness: From standard oil to Google." Journal of Economic Perspectives 33, no. 3 (2019): 94-117.

[17] Stone, Alan. "Wrong number: The breakup of AT&T." (No Title) (1989).

[18] U.S. v. AT&T, Inc., 552 F.Supp. 131 (D.D.C., 1982).

behavioral restrictions, such as sharing parts of its application programming interface with third parties, in exchange for not being forced to split up.[19] This case set implications for other big tech groups as it brought attention to large tech corporations and the need to update antitrust laws.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the case of the United States v. Standard Oil marked a turning point in legislation and government oversight of corporate practices. This case exemplified the critical role that the government must play in controlling the power of large companies such as Standard Oil. Moreover, it demonstrated to all citizens and enterprises alike that the Sherman Antitrust Act was not only enforceable but was one of the most important pieces of business legislation that US prosecutors could use and was the first antitrust-focused law, with many more on the political horizon.

Though it is vital for companies to have a high degree of freedom in the free market, it is equally essential for governments to enact protective regulations so that companies do not have the right to restrict the freedom of other independent companies in the industry and that consumer rights are protected. While not perfect, the Sherman Antitrust Act and the infamous case of the United States vs. Standard Oil of New Jersey set a precedent that US legal institutions still follow to this day.

**Works Cited:**


1. Act of July 2, 1890 (Sherman Anti-Trust Act). Enrolled Acts and Resolutions of Congress, 1789–1992. General Records of the United States Government. Record Group 11. National Archives.
2. Boyd, Josh. "The Rhetoric of Arrogance: The Public Relations Response of the Standard Oil Trust." Public Relations Review 27, no. 2 (2001): 163–178.
3. Bringhurst, Bruce. Antitrust and the Oil Monopoly: The Standard Oil Cases, 1890–1911. Praeger, 1979.
4. Federal Trade Commission. "The Antitrust Laws." Guide to Antitrust Laws. Accessed May 1, 2025. http://ftc.gov/advice-guidance/competition-guidance/guide-antitrust-laws/antitrust-laws.
5. Harlan, John. "Santa Clara County v. Southern Pacific Railroad." U.S. Supreme Court. Accessed December 16, 2011.
6. Johnson, Arthur M. "Theodore Roosevelt and the Bureau of Corporations." The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 45, no. 4 (1959): 571–590.
7. Lamoreaux, Naomi R. "The Problem of Bigness: From Standard Oil to Google." Journal of Economic Perspectives 33, no. 3 (2019): 94–117.
8. Leccese, Stephen R. "John D. Rockefeller, Standard Oil, and the Rise of Corporate Public Relations in Progressive America, 1902–1908." The Journal of the Gilded Age


[19] United States v. Microsoft Corp., 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001)

and Progressive Era 16, no. 3 (2017): 245–263. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781417000184.

9. Montague, Gilbert Holland. "The Legend of the Standard Oil Company." The North American Review 181, no. 586 (1905): 352–368.

10. Nicholas, Tom, and Vasiliki Fouka. "John D. Rockefeller: The Richest Man in the World." Harvard Business School Case 815-088, December 2014. Revised March 2018.

11. Stone, Alan. "Wrong Number: The Breakup of AT&T." 1989.

12. Tarbell, Ida M. The History of the Standard Oil Company (2 Volumes in 1). Cosimo, Inc., 2010.

13. EBSCO. "Stock Markets and Corporate Stocks." Research Starters: Business and Management. Accessed May 1, 2025. https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/business-and-management/stock-markets-and-corporate-stocks.

14. United States v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., 353 U.S. 586 (1957).

15. United States v. Microsoft Corp., 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001).

16. U.S. v. AT&T, Inc., 552 F. Supp. 131 (D.D.C., 1982).

17. Wilgus, Horace LaFayette. "The Standard Oil Decision; The Rule of Reason." Michigan Law Review 9, no. 8 (1911): 643–670.

18. Winkler, Adam. "The Long History of Corporate Rights." 2018. https://www.bu.edu/bulawreview/files/2018/11/WINKLER-4.pdf.