

### ORGANIZED CAPITAL

Mr. Plain Denies the Right of Organization Except it be in Harmony With Principles of Justice

Editor Independent: In the discussion of the question of the rights of any class, whether it be capital or labor, one must take into consideration the rights that are involved. None will deny the right of any citizen who is interested with his fellow citizen in any business pursuit to organize, unless the working of such an organization is not in harmony with the rights of every other citizen. If an organized body of certain lines of business were to disregard the right of the consumer or user of the output of such a combination, then that organization would be detrimental, hence it would not be in harmony with the idea of "justice to all, privileges to none."

Government is not for the purpose of exploiting the resources of a country, but its greatest duty is, first, to make the citizen safe and secure; next, to so guard the natural resources of the country, that opportunities are open to all alike. The ultra-distinction of a vigorously administered government is its capacity to adjust its workings so the burdens will fall on all alike.

In a previous article on governments, their duties and their purposes, we spoke of the citizen, distinguishing between a government which had ingrafted into it the paternalistic idea, which is but an effort of the few to enrich themselves, and that which gives to all according to the principles of equity. In calling attention to these principles, we wish to bring to our fellow citizens the clear cut idea, that governments are as good as the people make them. And, in proportion as the people realize the fundamental principles, that are the framework of a constitutional government, in just that proportion will they be able to discharge their whole duty to their fellowman.

An ignorance of the equity of free institutions, gives the legislative thug, the political prostitute, a latitude that is ripe with perfidy, and political rapine. In keeping the common people ignorant, or by thwarting their will, the minority can shift the fruits of labor into the hands of the few. But should the people apply the principles that are fundamental, there could be no such a thing as the right of any set of citizens organizing, if that organization is in its workings detrimental to the commonweal.

How can we judge these questions? Which is right, capital or labor? There must be some principles set up as a standard, before we can get our bearing. The only principles which we know are those that are fundamental to the rights of each and every citizen: rights which mean that each and every citizen must enjoy "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." If the principles of freedom are to be our standard of measurement, there can possibly be no equity in organized wealth as it is conducted today.

In bringing forth the principle of liberty as the standard of equity, we not only judge the question according to the highest standards, but adjust our reasoning to the great idea "that all men are created equal." In fact we rejuvenate the maxim with the idea that "justice to all, privileges to none," will bring us civic virtue; hence, will be the crucial test which leads us away from the quagmires of plutocratic perfidy.

In allowing the idea of discrimination to coil its slimy tentacles around our body politic, we gave the first breath to the prostituting of justice, for no other purpose than to foster the very rich at the expense of the many. Discrimination is the harlot which has raped justice, and left her mangled body as a sweet morsel for plutocratic vultures to feast and fatten upon.

No citizen who has any civic virtue can defend such principles of political piracy. It seems as though the rich, the erudite, and those who have a preconceived idea about the rights of the learned, are the only ones who can defend such a theory. Of course that is easily explained: they are the beneficiaries of such a theory; but in nearly all reforms the ultra-opulent and erudite are always on the wrong side. The plutocratic theory, which has always been fathered by the erudite and the opulent, is nothing less than the doctrine of thrones.

The fact is that this theory is based on the idea that, if labor earns five dollars per day, it is only to get two dollars as its part, and capital is to get three dollars as its part, so that the idle holders of wealth can build up an aristocracy which will pride itself, not only on its power to accumulate, but to give labor employ-

ment, also make a display of its wealth, which is wrung from the brow of the toiler, and the thought might be followed farther—followed till it brings one to the palace of the rich; and, too, the institutions of learning, which are kept up by wealth, that is obtained, like the vampire that sucks the blood of his victim, from the misery and poverty of the masses. Follow the thought to its ultimate and see where wealth is illegitimately obtained, subsidizes the press and turns its endowed institutions into kindergartens of false ideas about the rights of man, and teaches fallacious doctrines of wealth as the highest science of economy.

If we are to allow an idea, which gives to labor only a part of what it justly earns, to become part and parcel of our economy, then why not look farther and see the destitution which such doctrine causes? We mean if we are to allow the plutocratic theory to be our standard, then why not see the poverty and misery which is the natural result of such doctrine? It is bad enough to allow individuals to prostitute themselves, but it is a thousand times worse to make wealth a harlot, which serves as a libertine, to ravish and prostitute the virtue of the whole people. If we are to allow the doctrine of wealth to warp our government from the true and tried paths of equity and justice, we will become sponsor for a theory as perfidious as that which made Pharaoh king of Egypt, and denied to Joseph's brethren the straw they needed in brick-making.

The question is, where will this theory lead us? or where will it not lead us? It will lead us into paths made gory by the blood of conquest; teach us that some are made to serve, others to govern. Such would divide the nation into servers and rulers; and define a parallel, which has for its opposite lines, ultra-opulence and poverty.

The great principle that is the guide, and is superfine in its equity, is that no government that is justly administered, can recognize the right of either capital or labor to organize, if the workings of such a combination is a detriment to the welfare of each and every citizen.

If we build upon the idea that capital has a right beyond the legitimate bounds of its business, or has a right to destroy competition, and that, too, without any regard for the consumer, we would destroy every barrier, which would make potent the idea of equality.

To destroy the bounds of legitimate business, and say that capital has a right to monopolize the avenues of opportunity, would be to teach a doctrine that is as vicious as the divine rights of kings. Such doctrine would become a Nero or a Caligula, more than a citizen of our enlightened republic. Nothing could help the monarchical idea more than to say that the working class are the servers of opulence; and that labor must be the one that carries the "dainty idler" on his back. Nothing could foster an aristocracy of wealth more than to say that such doctrine is the most exalted of the sciences and is the only science that deals with progress of mankind.

In searching for the justice of the organization of capital, one must take into consideration the whole bearing in the case. What is the aim of capitalists forming commercial combines? Is it to make a cheaper article? Is it to manufacture a better class of goods? Or is it to reach into new territory, where a different people are the consumers? Does such combination confine their work to the legitimate channels of their trade, or do they combine for the purpose of making a monopoly of the whole business?

In retracing the pages of history, we there find that nearly every reform which was started on one side were the erudite and opulent; on the other, the struggling masses, who have long been ground down by the patrician.

All of the struggle that has come to the toiling millions is a burden which has been laid on by those who enriched themselves at the expense of the masses. All new doctrines that have been advanced, all forms of new thought which carried with it the betterment of the masses, sprung to life in the ranks of the overburdened; in fact, the whole struggle with the masses has been for the purpose of self-preservation. It has been more of a struggle of self-defense than anything else.

The cause of all of this is simply the giving to a certain class more than what was their due. We mean by that discrimination in the way of tariffs, special privileges and exemption from taxation, and otherwise evading the just burdens of government.

# Every Department OF THIS BIG STORE

## Is Filled to Overflowing with the Seasons Newest and Choicest Goods. . . . .

### Large Assortments

In the garment section, Suits, Jackets, Skirts and Waists. Spring Millinery, the best of the season styles at lower prices than you are asked to pay elsewhere.

### Silk and Dress Goods

White goods, and Wash Dress Fabrics, whatever is new in these lines can be found here. Send for samples

MAIL ORDERS WILL RECEIVE PROMPT ATTENTION

## A. Herpolsheimer & Co

LINCOLN, - NEBRASKA

That is the cause which produces so much discord in our body politic. That cause has been the curse of the past, and is of the present, and will be the cause of our republic dropping into the throes of political prostitution; and is really today purifying the manhood and laying bare a political perfidy, that can only be equalled by the intrigue and rapine of the followers of the Roman tyrants.

The prototype of legislative larceny is a species of robbery that was begotten in the centralized wealth of Macedonia, Persia, Egypt, Greece and Rome. While the centralization of the wealth of those old monarchies was crude in its workings, the larceny and the prostitution of the whole people is so interwoven with our body politic that it seems almost impossible for the common people to get what is justly their due. With ultra-precision the whole people is robbed, that the few may live in palaces, and practice plutocratic philanthropy. The whole course of human progress is strewn with deformed humanity, simply because there is a class who believe in the privileges of the few.

If we take a clear view of the whole subject, take it not as the partisan, but as one seeking light, we undoubtedly would grasp the idea that governments, justly administered, cannot discriminate against any citizen; but that the duty of governments is to guard the rights of the citizen, and that, too, without regard to his wealth or his poverty.

In concluding these remarks, we wish to impress upon our readers that constitutional governments can be as oppressive as that of a tyrant. And monarchical governments can be liberal enough for its subjects to enjoy a large amount of freedom. Where the whole difference comes in is that the subject may concede that the office of chief magistrate may, as far as he is concerned, be inherited by the royal family; but that the individual rights of his fellow subjects must not be abridged. Therefore, a subject, by a zealous regard for the rights, not only of himself, but for every other subject of a monarch, can enjoy a greater liberty than a

Samuel B. Hams—Attorney  
**NOTICE TO NON-RESIDENT DEFENDANTS**  
In The District Court in and for Lancaster county Nebraska. Luther Batten Plaintiff vs. John Young, Mrs. John Young first name unknown, Emerson Young, Mrs. Emerson Young his wife, first name unknown, Mrs. Edward Rayburn first name unknown and Edward Rayburn her husband, Defendants.  
The defendants John Young, Mrs. John Young first name unknown, Emerson Young and Mrs. Emerson Young his wife first name unknown, Mrs. Edward Rayburn first name unknown and Edward Rayburn her husband, non-residents and defendants in said cause will each take notice that the said plaintiff on February 11th 1903 filed his amended petition against said defendants, and each and all of them, in the District court of Lancaster county, Nebraska, the object and prayer of said amended petition being to have the title to the real estate described in said petition, being the north half (N. 1/2) of southwest quarter (S. W. 1/4) of section eight (8) township (11) range six (6) in said county quieted in Luther Batten the said plaintiff and to have the cloud cast on plaintiff's title to said real estate by any claims of said defendants and each and all of them removed, and to have said defendants and each and all of them and all persons claiming by or through or under them or any of them forever barred from asserting title or right of any kind or character to any of said real estate, and to have the record title of said John Young as to said lands cancelled and held for naught. The defendants are required to answer to said amended petition on or before Monday the 18th day of May, A. D. 1903.  
**LUTHER BATTEN,**  
Plaintiff.

citizen of a republic, who is careless of his rights. A citizen who tolerates discrimination, and who believes in the virtue of trusts and combines, and who by legislation helps maintain legislative piracy, is but little better than the Greek helot. The black man was kept in bonded slavery, but the white man, by servility to Mammon, is an intellectual slave, more despicable than the most degraded of barbarians. The negro knew he toiled under chattel chains, but the citizen by prostituting his God-given intellect, becomes like the parasite, which without the guilDED blindness of servility, would soon perish and die. Moral cowardice, which is the parent of intellectual slavery, is on the same plane with the thug who fiendishly enjoys the cry of the murdered, and gloats over the wall of the ravished.  
**PERRY D. PLAIN,**  
Atwater, Ill.