

PROGRESSIVE FARMER

THE INDUSTRIAL AND EDUCATIONAL INTERESTS OF OUR PEOPLE PARAMOUNT TO ALL OTHER CONSIDERATIONS OF STATE POLICY.

Vol. 5.

RALEIGH, N. C., FEBRUARY 18, 1890.

No. 1

THE NATIONAL FARMERS' ALLIANCE AND INDUSTRIAL UNION.

President—L. L. Polk, Raleigh, N. C.
Vice-President—B. H. Clover, Cambridge, Kansas.
Secretary—J. H. Turner, La Grange, Georgia.
Treasurer—W. H. Hickman, Puxico, Missouri.
Lecturer—Ben Terrell, Texas.

EXECUTIVE BOARD.
C. W. Macune, Washington, D. C.
Alonzo Wardall, Huron, South Dakota.
J. F. Tillman, Palmetto, Tennessee.

JUDICIARY.
R. C. Patten, Macon, Mississippi.
Isaac McCracken, Ozona, Arkansas.
Evan Jones, Dublin, Texas.

NORTH CAROLINA FARMERS' STATE ALLIANCE.

President—Elias Carr, Old Sparta, N. C.
Vice-President—A. H. Hayes, Birdswon, N. C.
Secretary—E. C. Beddingfield, Raleigh, N. C.

Treasurer—J. D. Allen, Falls, N. C.
Lecturer—Thos. B. Long, Longs, N. C.
Assistant Lecturer—R. B. Hunter, Charlotte, N. C.
Chaplain—J. J. Scott, Alfordville, N. C.

Door Keeper—W. H. Tomlinson, Fayetteville, N. C.
Assistant Door Keeper—H. E. King, Mount, N. C.
Sergeant-at-Arms—J. S. Holt, Chalkwell, N. C.

State Business Agent—W. H. Worth, Meigh, N. C.
Trustee Business Agency Fund—W. A. Adam, Macpelah, N. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NORTH CAROLINA FARMERS' STATE ALLIANCE.

S. B. Alexander, Charlotte, N. C.
Chairman; J. M. Mewborne, Kinston, N. C.
J. S. Johnston, Ruffin, N. C.

THE TOBACCO TRUST.

SKIPWITH, Va.

MR. EDITOR:—The meeting of the Farmers' Alliance Bright Tobacco Industrial Union that was recently held in Oxford, is now a thing of the past. The work layed off and the resolutions passed at that meeting are being passed for future consideration. The resolutions can not be published as they are in the hands of a committee who, I hope, will report soon. Although a number of good resolutions were passed and have been published, what will it all amount to if we, the Alliancemen, fail to carry out those resolutions and plans that may be submitted by the committee? No one now except members or employees of the tobacco trust will dare to deny the existence of the trust. I think I can prove by some figures and facts given to the Union by a warehouse man, that the trust not only exists, but that they have combined to lower the price of leaf tobacco and use the power of money to oppress the producer, and that they have levied a tax on the bright tobacco farmer equal to 50,000 per annum and will collect if we quietly submit or wait to see the trust will reduce the price of tobacco, as I heard some Alliancemen during the meeting in Oxford. The warehouse man said that a few days before the meeting he had looked over his books to see if there had been any decline in cutters since the trust, and his books showed that the crop of 1889 up to the trust had averaged \$23.83; since the trust, \$3.82, making an average decline of 80.1. Now I take it for granted that this is about the condition in all of the warehouses since there is only one buyer on each of the leading markets and he gets his orders from a general boss. It was also stated that the trust manufactured last year 100,000 lbs. of tobacco. Now if the average decline is \$5.00, we can see that it will be \$450,000 that the trust take from the farmers. There is not more than 60 counties raising bright tobacco, and the average cannot be more than one-tenth of the soil in each of the 60 counties that will produce bright tobacco. So, then, we have a territory of only fifteen counties in which trust says the farmers shall pay \$450,000 per annum. Now I sit still and listen to the misleading statements in those letters to the members of the trust as read in the Union in which they stated that they were not after the farmers' leaf, but after the poor farmer who had been paying them from eight to ten cents per hundred more than the farmers received for the same tobacco in the warehouse floors? Was ever a love as that for the poor farmer? How deceptive are those statements that what a snare to catch the poor, ignorant farmer (as the trust will say), says the trust, we are trying to do just what you Alliancemen say you do to do—knock out the middle. We want to buy directly from

the farmer on the warehouse floor and give them all it is worth. Notice they do not say all we think it is worth. But when we take our cutters to market we find only one buyer for cutters on the market, and he just prices our tobacco and takes it. But suppose the farmer says you shall not have my tobacco that way. The trust buyer will say there is no one else to buy it, sir, and I have given you all that I think it is worth.

We frequently hear farmers say (and Alliancemen at that) "there is no remedy, the trust has got the money and we can do nothing that will amount to anything." They seem to lose sight of the fact that the producer first owns the tobacco, and if we can manage to control one-half of our cutters we will have given the trust a death blow. The question arises now can it be done? Yes, if the Alliance will stand as a unit on such plans as the committee may formulate. But if we begin to say "I cannot agree to that or this as it is against the tobacco market in my section that we are trying to build up," the trust will grind us down lower and lower. Now, while the Oxford meeting will be a means of formulating some plans to defeat the object of the trust in lowering the price of leaf tobacco, yet the great remedy to defeat all trusts and combines was started at the meeting of the National Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union, in St. Louis, known as the sub-treasury plan. How long could the tobacco trust last if the farmers could store their tobacco and draw 80 per cent of its value for 12 months at one per cent? Who will answer?

Yours fraternally,
T. Y. ALLEN.

RESOLUTIONS AND A NOTE FROM SWAIN COUNTY.

MR. EDITOR:—At a meeting of Swain County Alliance, No. 1,748, on January 25th, 1890, the following resolution was offered by Rev. J. M. Eads and was unanimously adopted by the Alliance:

WHEREAS, The North Carolina Farmers' State Alliance, at its session in the month of August, 1889, declared itself in favor of a Railroad Commission in North Carolina by a series of resolutions; therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Swain County Farmers' Alliance, at its regular session in the month of January, 1890, by unanimous vote, ratify said series of resolutions, and use every effort to carry them into effect.

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to send a certificate of the action of this body to the Secretary of the State Alliance.

Mr. Editor, I further desire to say that our Alliancemen in Swain county are making fine progress. The best men of our county are all coming to the Alliance. Vice-President Hayes remarked a few days ago that he was becoming stronger and stronger as an Allianceman. So I think if he gets much stronger than he is, I do not know what he will turn to next.

Fraternally yours,
L. LEE MARR, Sec'y S. F. A.

LETTER FROM ORANGE COUNTY

HILLSBORO, N. C.

MR. EDITOR:—I write to let you know that Orange Academy Alliance, No. 1,073, is still moving. Our membership is not so large as some others, yet we are true Alliancemen. We are having applications for membership at each meeting. At our last meeting Bro. Morris, the County Organizer, delivered a fine speech. He showed how the wealth of the country was made by the labor and how it was being used to enslave him. He closed his speech with an earnest appeal to all the members to unite in our cooperative store which is to be at Hillsboro. One thing about our members, they all killed more hogs this year than they have for many years. We are coming more and more to the self-supporting system. We have bought less during the past year than we have for many years, showing an increase of economy.

Our members are all down on the Tobacco Trust, and think we ought not let it slip for this reason. A company that has made as much since the war as W. Duke & Co. has made will hardly do to trust at this hour when our staple is at stake. Mind, boys, the thing you do. My idea about the hard times is to correct it both ways—make more and spend less, work more and do nothing less. Our Alliance doctrines are that the same thing that made money ten years ago will not make it now. In all our workings we should use common sense.

In writing it is not my purpose to

change the views of any one. What I want is for all to think and speak. I want the careless to become interested and do away with such expressions as, "I can live if everybody else can." No, its not the possibility of living that should most engage our minds, but the best possible way, the way we can live to accomplish the most good without doing any harm. Independence is what we want, both in word and deed.

In conclusion I will say, stick to the Alliance. Your cause is right and progressive. Success to THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER.

A FARMER'S SON.

QUESTIONS FOR OUR CONGRESSIONAL SOLONS TO ANSWER.

BY OLD FOGY.

What induced our fore-fathers to rebel against England? Was it not oppression? Did not our fore-fathers build a government where "the greatest good to the greatest number" was the paramount idea? Are not your methods radically different? Do you consider the wants of the people—the labor and farmer—or the wants and wishes of the manufacturer, the banker and railroad magnates? Do you send for farmers to testify before your investigating committees, or for bankers and manufacturers?

Do you heed the cries that go up from the farmer and laborer, as expressed in their demands—in their papers—or do you bow down and worship before the golden calf your modern Aarons have made for you?

Was it not the policy of the framers of this government to give homes to the people?

What have you done? Have you not given their homes to syndicates, to railroad companies; and have you not allowed those who have fought against us, who have with purse, brain and life opposed the freedom of the people to come here and buy our lands, and thus prevent the people who gave their treasures and blood from having free homes? How long will free homes be possible under the policy you have inaugurated?

Was it not the primitive policy of our government to issue and coin money for all the people?

What have you done? Have you not given to banks that power, you only reserving the power of printing it?

Have you not thus evaded the spirit of the Constitution?

Do you now contemplate passing a law to prevent the coinage of silver?

Is this the policy our fore-fathers inaugurated or one entirely opposite?

Have you not taxed the people and then hoarded the money wrung from them in your vaults, and when your vaults were full to overflowing, have you not loaned the people's money to corporations? and these corporations were by you empowered to loan the people's money to themselves at as high a rate as could be wrung from them, while you are paying these corporations 4 to 4½ per cent. for money; you reloan this borrowed money to your corporate pets at 1 per cent, and follow this by making deposits equal to your loans at no charge at all.

Is not this the worst class legislation on record?

Do you not know that all panics and hard times come and come only from restricted currency?

Do you not know that trusts force the price of all commodities higher and higher and your most infamous money trust is forcing rates higher and higher than ever before?

Do you not know that this power has made in the short space of four hours in one day, greenbacks depreciate more in value than the South did in four years of war?

Did it not take the best of security to borrow money at 40 per cent. in Wall street, N. Y., and within the last month, thus depreciating a dollar in four hours to as low a rate as it ever touched?

Do you not know that whenever a Black Friday occurs that the government pours out millions to prevent the smaller merchant and manufacturer from being driven into the ranks of the desperate?

Do you not know that if ten millions stop a panic, that a hundred millions would do ten times as much and a billion one hundred times as much good?

Do you not know that if the National indebtedness were paid in currency, the debt would be no greater than now?

Do you not know that it would save the people fifty millions yearly in interest?

Do you not know that money issued on railroad or municipal indebtedness,

or mortgages, is no better than issued on a chattel mortgage on products of the soil?

Do you not know that your pet banks will not take real property for security, but demand personal security—just the same we offer?

Do you not know that 1,000 bales of cotton is better security than a mile of railroad?

You do know that product certificates would aid the farmer while certificates based on indebtedness injure him at least to the extent of his part of the interest.

You do know that in 1862-3-4 the issuing of money enabled this government to prosecute the most expensive war of modern times, and that the great abundance of money then in the country built up manufacturing more than all the tariffs have ever done.

Knowing this, and that all our periods of great prosperity were those when money was abundant, and all periods of depression were years when the currency was limited, why do you not give the struggling farmer and laborer as good a chance as you do those who do not fight the country's battles.

Why do you not take the silver from the vaults and pay it to those who robbed when you taxed cotton \$15 a bale and incomes of \$1,000 and upwards?

You say you can't get silver out in circulation. Pay the people in these dollars you took from them and see how easily it will get into circulation.

The truth is, you know all these facts, and I am sorry to have to say you seem to care no more for the people—you seem to heed their demands no more than King George did, and you may discover as he did, some day, that the people will not quietly suffer such unjust oppression.

Washington, D. C.

WHAT DOES THE ALLIANCE MEAN?

The Alliance makes its own declaration of purposes, clear, distinct and unequivocal. One of its purposes is not to break the Democratic party on the one hand, or the Republican party on the other. Why then do political editors insist that they mean to do first one, then the other, and sometimes both, and to set up in their room an oath bound, secret, political organization. We have denied this until we are tired denying it. Once more, the thing is not true. The Alliance does not aim at the destruction of political parties, but the reform and control of them. No purpose is entertained by the organization of setting men by the ears, nor of indulging in the asperities which have so long disgraced political debate. Our purpose is, if we can, to take the political parties out of the hands of the petty bosses, including those of every kind and degree. We intend to assert the power of numbers in the primaries, and thereby, if we can, take the party nominations out of the hands of people who have controlled them, and to nominate and elect better men. This we have a clear right to do, and we cannot be driven from our purposes by the idle denunciations and "noisy breath" of constituted censors, editors or others. If they have a fancy to fill the air with this sort of "inarticulate howls," no man will hinder them. Neither will any sensible man any more regard them than does the howling of the idle wind. Such people have been giving us advice gratis and unsolicited, and by wholesale. We are not in that line of business, but in order to make them a fair return we desire to say that if such people think such howlings are in the smallest degree going to influence any person's conduct, we are of the opinion that they are mistaken. Men who are in earnest are open to the influence of reason, and they are at all times ready to listen to appeals from responsible and reasonable sources, but they are not to be cowed or coerced by the frothings of irresponsible and empty-headed bosses. We believe certain great reforms in the financial system of the government are necessary, and at the same time that they will benefit all classes of the people. If we insist upon these reforms while the bosses oppose them, and we, by controlling the primaries, nominate men pledged to them, is that breaking up the party? Are they going to break up the party because they can no longer run it for the personal ends and ambitions of their set? When it comes to this it is a question whether a "secret, oath-bound political organization" is better or worse than such a political banditti. These men take the position that they will smash the party unless they can rule for their own purposes or in furtherance of

their own views. If the Alliance, a majority of the party, will not admit to hold by them, a very small minority, and to vote as directed by them, and nominate and elect candidates set up by them, the Alliance is chargeable with breaking up the party. Was ever such nonsense heard before? It is high time we had heard the last of it. It would be an easy and cheap way to break up the Alliance, and reduce its voting strength to subjugation to the political boss, the professional politician, the party caucus, if it could be made effectual. Nothing is so cheap as this kind of wrath, which, if it cost anything to manufacture, would not be so lavishly poured out. It is a species of natural gas which explodes spontaneously and makes a great sputter, and emits a bad smell, but illuminates nothing. Doubtless these persons are giving us their best counsel, and if they knew how valueless we hold it, they would take the only brief piece of gratuitous advice we have for them and shut up. The situation of American agriculture is far too serious, the depressed and degraded condition of those who man all the great production industries of this great country is far too grievous for the Alliance to turn aside from its great mission to bandy words in idle dissension with these party henchmen. If parties cannot discover a modus vivendi with the Alliance we are afraid they must go. We desire a few closing words with those earnest patriotic leaders of both parties whose abilities, whose experience and whose services, entitle them to the respect of the people. That there are such men in both parties we freely concede; we believe a greater number of them than is generally admitted. We say to them that they are in duty bound to give due diligence to the study of the true meaning of this Alliance movement on the part of those who, impelled by necessity, have concerted together to take measures for their common safety. We ask them to give to the solution of the great economic question which must be solved, on a non-partisan basis, the benefit of their talents, and experience, and influence. And we tell them plainly we will not consent to give indefinite support to men who are known to us to be at heart hostile to us, and unfriendly to our interests. We can not be relied upon to continue to give voting strength to parties which despise our necessities, and leaders who deliberately insult our intelligence. If this be party treason, make the most of it!—J. Springs Davidson, in Charlotte Democrat.

PRIVILEGES TO LAWYERS.

The Extraordinary Favoritism that is Customarily Shown Attorneys.

A subject of widespread interest is reviewed in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat as follows:

The observer of current events in our courts and legislative bodies cannot have failed to wonder from time to time how it comes that so many privileges are given to lawyers which are denied to all other classes of citizens. By some curious process of favoritism all the ordinary rules of responsibility and propriety seem to have been suspended for the benefit of this particular fraternity, and to be a lawyer nowadays is to enjoy immunities that amount to practical exemption from restraints which in the case of the great majority of people are supposed to be indispensable to the safety and welfare of society. Hardly a day passes that this fact is not glaringly illustrated. Under the plea of professional privilege the most flagrant breaches of personal right and courtesy are constantly being committed, and the victims of these outrages are expected and required to submit, on the singular theory that a man who contrives to gain admission to the bar is by that happy chance invested with the authority to violate the very laws and obligations which he undertakes to define and enforce.

There are insults heaped upon witnesses in common legal proceedings by attorneys pretending to be anxious only to discover the truth, which serve to make a mockery of the dignity and decency that should prevail in the halls of justice. The lawyer would not think for a moment of taunting and provoking a man upon the streets in any such fashion; nor would a man thus insulted in any other place be obliged to forego the right of self-defense. Individuals are promptly and properly punished every day for offenses which lawyers persistently indulge in for the mere purpose of confusing honest witnesses and making the worse appear the better cause; and if the witness asks for pro-

tection the judge sagely informs him that the lawyer is a much privileged person, who must be allowed to choose his own methods of examination. There are cases, no doubt, where the bulldozing of men on the witness stand is justifiable, but they are certainly not so numerous that the attorneys should be permitted to assume as a general rule that witnesses are always ready to perjure themselves, and can only be prevented from doing so by systematic rudeness on the part of the questioner.

A still wider and harsher license of insult is practiced toward litigants in the speeches of the lawyers to Judges and juries. The most pronounced slanders are frequently uttered; men's motives are impugned and their acts misrepresented quite as a matter of course. It happens far oftener that the parties to a suit are treated with violent injustice than that they are dealt with in a spirit of even tolerable fairness. The lawyer must make a vigorous and stinging address, and if the material is lacking he proceeds to invent it, regardless of the rights or feelings of the person concerned. In short, it is held that what a private citizen may not do without being knocked down or compelled to pay damages for a lawyer may do with the approval of the court, and be accounted a model of professional force and skill. It is difficult for the average observer to understand why blackguardism should be tolerated as an agency in the enforcement of the laws under any circumstances; but there can be no doubt about the fact that it is so recognized, and that all protests against it are met with the assurance simply that it is a privilege custom and precedent in the legal profession.

We are also taught that a lawyer may with perfect propriety accept a fee for acting as a lobbyist and helping to pass or defeat given schemes of legislation. If an editor, a minister, a physician, or a merchant takes money in that way, we say he is bribed, and the community distrusts and denounces him accordingly. But a man having license to practice law may go into a legislature or a city council, and, upon the pretext of being employed as an attorney, do everything in his power to embarrass the proper course of business and to thwart the will of the people, and we are estopped from saying that his behavior is dishonest and mischievous. The courts will not even require him to appear as a witness and tell what he knows about the corrupt appliances which may have been used by himself or others to bring about a particular result. He has only to say that he cannot give such testimony without divulging facts possessed in his capacity as a lawyer, and he is at once excused. The shield of professional privilege conveniently protects him in all contingencies of that sort. No matter how important his testimony may be to the promotion of the public interests, or the detection of actual and monstrous crime, he is allowed to withhold it by merely pleading that he has a client in the case who has paid him a retainer, and whose secrets he is bound to keep. This is called professional honor, and learned Judges resolutely and solemnly uphold it as such. Possibly it is necessary to grant to a special class so much in the way of privilege to pervert the principles and methods of justice, morality and property which are rigidly applied to all other classes; but if so, it has yet to be satisfactorily demonstrated—and the average observer may, therefore, be pardoned for entertaining some doubt upon the subject, to say the least.

THEIR TRUCK FARM DEVELOPS INTO A PHOSPHATE BED.

About four years ago Mr. P. B. Key, of Statesville, and the late Col. V. Q. Johnston, met in Florida, and while there they were attracted by a piece of land which was regarded as a fine tract for trucking purposes. It was offered cheap and they bought it. The tract contains 2,460 acres and is located in Citrus county, near Ocala. It looks now like this purchase is to turn out a real bonanza, as it is located in the very centre of the recently discovered phosphate beds in Florida, about which there has been such a great excitement lately. Fabulous prices are being offered for this and adjoining lands. Capt. H. P. Johnson is now in Florida looking after the interests of himself and Mr. Key. The excitement over the phosphate discoveries there is said to be intense, and the truck farm being in the centre of the phosphate area, is in big demand, and is expected to bring a bigger sum than would be paid for a gold mine.

—Charlotte News.

68306