

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

Vol. 10.

RALEIGH, N. C., SEPTEMBER 3, 1895.

No. 30

## THE NATIONAL FARMERS' ALLIANCE AND INDUSTRIAL UNION.

President—J. F. Willetts, Topeka, Kan.  
 Vice-President—H. C. Snavely, Lebanon, Pa.  
 Secretary-Treasurer—Col. D. P. Dunan, Columbia, S. C.

**EXECUTIVE BOARD.**  
 H. L. Loucks, Huron, S. D.; Mann Page, Brandon, Virginia; I. E. Dean, Homocoye Falls, New York; H. C. Deming, Secretary, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; Marion Butler, Raleigh, N. C.

**JUDICIARY.**  
 R. A. Southworth, Denver, Colo.  
 R. W. Beck, Alabama.  
 M. D. Davie, Kentucky.

## NORTH CAROLINA FARMERS' STATE ALLIANCE.

President—Dr. Cyrus Thompson, Richlands, N. C.  
 Vice-President—Jno. Graham, Ridge way, N. C.  
 Secretary-Treasurer—W. S. Barnes, Raleigh, N. C.  
 Lecturer—J. T. B. Hoover, Elm City, N. C.  
 Steward—Dr. V. N. Seawell, Villa now, N. C.  
 Chaplain—Rev. P. H. Massey, Durham, N. C.  
 Door keeper—Geo. T. Lane, Greensboro, N. C.  
 Assistant Door keeper—Jae. E. Lyon, Durham, N. C.  
 Sergeant-at-Arms—A. D. K. Wallace, Raleigh, N. C.  
 State Business Agent—T. Ivey, Raleigh, N. C.  
 Trustee Business Agency Fund—W. A. Graham, Macphelah, N. C.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NORTH CAROLINA FARMERS' STATE ALLIANCE.**  
 A. F. Hileman, Concord, N. C.; N. C. Eaglish, Trinity, N. C.; James M. Newborne, Kins on, N. C.

**STATE ALLIANCE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE.**  
 John Graham, Gatesville, N. C.; Dr. J. F. Harrell, Whiteville, N. C.; T. J. Caudle, Acton, N. C.

## North Carolina Reform Press Association.

Officers—J. L. Ramsey, President; Marion Butler, Vice-President; W. S. Barnes, Secretary.

**PAPERS.**  
 Progressive Farmer, State Organ, Raleigh, N. C.  
 The Farmer, Raleigh, N. C.  
 The People's Paper, Raleigh, N. C.  
 The Plow-Boy, Raleigh, N. C.  
 Carolina Watchmen, Raleigh, N. C.

Each of the above-named papers are requested to keep the list standing on its first page and add others, provided they are duly elected. Any paper failing to advocate the Ocala platform will be dropped from the list promptly. Our people can now see what papers are wished in their interest.

## AGRICULTURE.

Do not cut millet too late in its growth. As soon as the heads begin to form is the proper time. It should never be allowed to stand until the seeds are nearly matured, but cut it when it is more succulent.

An enterprising and observant farmer says that the largest crop of barley he ever grew was from a field where a large crop of turnips had frozen in and rotted in the ground. It grew in his shoulders, and brought him 60 bushels of cleaned barley an acre.

One of the important qualifications necessary for a farmer to make the farm pay is to be satisfied with his call and make the best of his surroundings. The farmer who is always grumbling because his neighbor is getting long better than he, is not the farmer but will make the farm pay.

An excess of moisture packs the soil and excludes the air, and if a drouth follows the crops suffer more than upon and where there is a good drainage, kept lively, the air in the soil and the breeze of moisture from beneath main an chemical action, and it does not suffer so much in a dry season.

The cares of the farmer himself are slight compared with the multitudinous duties of his wife. It is as cruel to bring upon her in the ardest season of the year the harvest shovels. They add to her work and discomfort. There are better ways of doing it.

Very much land would be productive regardless of fertilizing, if the proper amount of moisture could be kept in the soil. Poor crops are usually got only when there are periods of flood or drouth during the growing season. There is a vast amount of plant food in our soils, and a store of moisture makes it available.

As much as to the moisture of the climate the secret of the thick, dense, turf of an old sheep pasture in England is due to the fact that if it is not eaten off closely it is mowed in time to prevent the growing of the over stalks. The new growth will be rapid, and there will be no stubble in the way of the sheep.

## HENRY'S HOT SHOT.

### HE LEAVES THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND GIVES HIS REASONS WHY—TRUE TO HIS PROMISE.

"I Told the People in the Campaign of 1892, That if the Democrat Party Did Not Keep its Promises, I Would Leave the Party"—Hon. W. R. Henry Will Now Fight in the Populist Ranks

Others withdrew from the Democratic party long since because they thought it would prove corrupt and false to the people. I have remained with the organization, and to the extent of my ability have helped to fight its battles, until

I KNOW THAT IT IS FALSE—until it has shown itself false—until there is no longer room for doubt or hope.

So confident was I of the integrity and fidelity of the Democratic party and its intention to convert the pledges of the Chicago platform into law, that I, together with other Democratic speakers, told the people in the campaign of 1892, that if the Democratic party did not keep its promises, I would leave the party.

The Democratic record is made up; and it is a record of incompetency or corruption, and largely of both. I now

SEVER MY CONNECTION with the organization called the Democratic party, and think it proper that I should state at some length the reasons that impel me to this course. It is not without regret that I part politically with many of those who still cling to the so-called Democratic party, for I know that the rank and file and many of the leaders of the party are men of the noblest type and patriots of the loftiest impulses—but they have been unable to "break" "the machine" and to convert party pledges into law, so much needed by a suffering people.

In taking this course I am fully aware that part of the Democratic press, especially some miserable penny- liners of the towns and cities and scribblers with cross-roads environment, will endeavor to lift themselves temporarily from obscurity by assailing me with cowardly insinuation, vilification and misrepresentation of motives.

So far as integrity and character are concerned, I stand on a pinnacle built of the Democratic endorsement of

THREE GREAT COMMONWEALTHS, far above the falsehoods and unscrupulous partisan endeavor of such contemptible creatures. So far as political work is concerned, I will simply say, I have sweated enough for the Democratic party to drown some of my calumniators. I feel that it is unnecessary for me to assure those who know me that I would in no event leave the Democratic party if it had

KEPT ITS PROMISES to the people, or if I saw any prospect of its doing so. This I wrote to prominent leaders of the party as far back as fourteen months ago. On the 18th day of June, 1894, I wrote one of the most prominent Democrats in this State these words:

"When I find that the Democratic party is false to the people, then, and not until then, will there be occasion for supposing that I will leave the party. Should I, in the future, see cause to change my party affiliation, neither the hope nor prouder of office can influence me one way or another. I believe in the Democratic principles that were formulated and made glorious by Thomas Jefferson, and that have been

DESPISED AND BETRAYED by Grover Cleveland."

The effort will be made to obscure the facts and charges of my address, by an unjust and cowardly attack upon my motives. The voters of this State are not concerned about my personal grievances, nor have my personal wrongs ought to do with my political course. The people desire information. They demand truth and not falsehood and vituperation. They will wish the Democrats and the Democratic press to

ANSWER THE FACTS

I have asked many of the most prominent Democrats in this State to give me satisfactory answers to the following questions. I have told them of my present views on public matters, and begged them to justify, if possible, the deeds and omissions of Cleveland and his

COTERIE OF CONSPIRATORS. They have one and all declared they could not do so. I am satisfied that it cannot be done. The following, among

others, are the questions I have asked prominent Democrats, which have left them in every case, with all the symptoms of political paralysis:

### SOME QUESTIONS.

1st. After criminal delay, resulting in the passage of an inadequate and undemocratic tariff law, why did not a Democratic Congress, as pledged by the platform and promised by the representatives of the party, still further reduce the tariff during the short session of Congress?

2nd. Why did not a Democratic Congress pass a free coinage bill as promised by the platform of 1892?

3rd. Why did a Democratic President veto the Bland seigniorage bill, which would have put in circulation about \$52,000,000 in silver?

4th. Why did the Democratic Congress fail to repeal the 10 per cent. tax on State banks to which the party was pledged?

5th. Why did Democratic Chief Justice Fuller, of the Federal Supreme Court, and Democratic Associate Justice Field vote against the income tax law, when either of their votes would have saved it?

How do you justify the spectacle of the Democratic Chief Justice writing the opinion that

NULLIFIED THE INCOME TAX LAW, while Republican Associate Justice Harlan voted in its favor and declared that he feared that the nullification of said law would prove the "first step towards the submergence of the liberties of the people in a sordid despotism of wealth, that the decision of the court in this great case is fraught with immeasurable danger to the future of the country, and approaches the proportions of a national calamity," and while Republican Associate Justice Brown voted for the law and said:

"This decision may well excite the gravest apprehension. It strikes at the very foundation of national authority in that it denies to the General Government a power which is or may at some time, in a great emergency such as that of war, become vital to the existence and preservation of the Union."

Sid another great authority: "This decision is another victory of greed over need. Great and rich corporations by hiring the ablest lawyers in the land, have secured the exemption of wealth from paying its just share towards the support of the government that protects it. The people will not

ACCEPT THIS LAW AS JUSTICE."

"No decision can make wrong right. It is not right that the entire cost of the Federal Government shall rest upon the masses. It is not right that wealth shall pay no more than poverty towards the support of the National Administration. Democratic principles are violated in the most flagrant manner, when a man worth \$10,000,000 pays no more in gross than the man who is worth \$100,000, or when the man with an income of \$1,000 is called upon for substantially the same amount as the man with an income of \$100,000."

Mr. Thomas G. Shearman, in the November, Forum, 1889, says that "the average annual income of the richest one hundred Americans, cannot be less than \$1,200,000 and probably exceeds \$1,500,000 per annum.

If one hundred working men could earn each \$1,000 a year, they would have to

WORK 1,200 OR 1,500 YEARS to earn as much as the annual income of one of these one hundred richest Americans. And if a working man, could earn \$1,000 a year, he would have to work until he was 547 years old or die never take a day off before he could earn as much as some Americans are worth."

If this be so, and it has never been denied, how about the Western farmer with wheat at 60 cents and the Southern planter with 5 cent cotton.

The wealth of Croesus was estimated at \$8,000,000, but there are 70 American estates that

AVERAGE \$35,000,000 EACH, and there are 1,400 millionaires in the two cities of New York and Brooklyn whose fortunes range from one to two hundred million dollars.

Last winter in New York at the Metropolitan Opera House was seen one of the most magnificent sights ever presented on this continent. The fashionable women of those two cities under the blaze of electric lights, glistened and scintillated with the sparkle and flash of \$29,000,000 worth of diamonds. And \$2,500,000,000 were possessed by the men who owned the grand tier of boxes.

Last winter fifty capitalists had a supper in New York city that cost \$15,000. In the centre of the banquet table, was a crystal lake thirty feet in diameter, on which swam superb swan, fenced in with flagree work. Miniature valleys and mountains bor-

dered the lake, while around the table were golden plates and golden knives and forks, with luxuries from all quarters of the globe. Hamburg grapes at ten dollars per pound, and first Florida strawberries, fourteen in a cup, at four dollar per cup. Outside the banquet hall, a woman shivered on the pavement with a

STARVING BABE AT HER BREAST, and beyond her were the millions of unemployed and the suffering men, women and little children of this land.

The People's party alone declares, in its platform, that those who live in such kingly magnificence, ought and should pay to the government: an income tax in order to lessen the tax burdens of the people. The Democratic party being in power, and fearing the growing sentiment of the voters of the land, passed an income tax law which, while far short of what it should have been to equalize taxation, was nullified by Democratic judges.

How can this be defended?

6th. Why has this administration failed to prosecute the trusts which are sapping the life blood of the Republic, and which the Democratic party was pledged to annihilate?

7th. A New York Democratic daily declared not long since, that "when Democratic speakers were telling the people in 1892, that the pension system was costing the people, after thirty years of peace, as much per annum as it required to support every standing army in Europe—promising that the Democratic party would reduce it to a just and honorable basis—there were 700,000 pensioners. Now, more than two years after the Democratic party came into power, there are more than a million on the rolls."

What has this Democratic administration done to mitigate and to correct the infamous pension robbery so bitterly and so justly denounced by the representatives of the party?

8a. Why are forty per cent of the Republican officeholders still in office, to the exclusion of those who have worked all their lives for the Democracy and the ascendancy of its principles?

b. Why are fifteen Republican consuls in office two years and a half after the inauguration of a Democratic President?

c. Is it true that Republican Senators have used their influence with a Democratic President to retain said consuls?

d. Has the negro postmaster at Fayetteville been turned out?

e. Why did the Democratic Senate confirm the appointment of the four negro United States consuls appointed by Grover Cleveland? Didn't Ransom vote for their confirmation? Has he denied it? Was he afraid the President would refuse to let him control the patronage of this State unless he supported his appointments and policy?

A negro, Charles J. Taylor, was appointed Recorder of the District of Columbia,

AGAINST THE BITTER PROTEST of its citizens, at a salary of \$18,000 per annum, and confirmed by a Democratic Senate, while hundreds and thousands of the best Democratic workers of this and other States were insulted and ignored, and hundreds of others, glad to obtain insignificant positions in the departments at Washington and in the Revenue service of the Government were passed by.

The Washington Post, at administrative paper stated that this same negro Recorder had

PERSECUTED WHITE WOMEN

holding subordinate positions under him by demanding that they submit themselves to his will on penalty of dismissal from office, and demanded to know why his resignation was not required by a Democratic administration? Have these things been done? Have these changes been made by the Democratic administration; and if not, why not, if it is expected to make political capital of the Fred Douglas resolution episode?

What has Mr. Cleveland left the Democrats to say on the color line? Anglo Saxon supremacy is a mighty political slogan, but will not the many negroes remaining in the Democratic service of the Government, under a Democratic administration, the appointment and confirmation of negro consuls, the retention of the negro postmaster at Fayetteville and the appointment and retention in the service of the negro Taylor at Washington

PROVE A FATAL HANDICAP to the color line argument and relegate the leaders to the principal issue now before the people, to-wit, gold, or silver?

bership of the National Democratic committee since he betrayed his people by voting with John Sherman against the further coinage of silver?

10th. Will not ex Senator Ransom continue to

BOSS THE "DEMOCRATIC MACHINE" in North Carolina? If you think not, please state the basis of your opinion.

11th. Was not Ransom's vote against silver bought with patronage by Grover Cleveland, who is hand in glove with capitalists in Wall street?

12th. In coercing Congress by withholding patronage, by issuing his infamous letter to Governor Stone, threatening in substance his 200,000 officeholders with loss of position if they failed to support his administration, and to disseminate gold standard arguments against the money of the Constitution, and by sending his cabinet junketing over the country at the

EXPENSE OF THE TAXPAYERS,

to attack their views and to jeopardize their welfare, has not Grover Cleveland shown himself a tyrant and has not centralization, heretofore denounced by the Democratic party, reached its zenith under this so-called Democratic administration?

13th. Does not Senator Morgan declare that the repeal of the Sherman law caused the issue of \$160,000,000 of bonds which were sold at 104 when they were worth 120, involving a loss to the taxpayers of the country of more than \$9,000,000?

14th. Has not this bond deal of Cleveland's been denounced as infamous throughout the country? Was it not infamous? Was it not done in the

INTEREST OF BONDHOLDERS, capitalists, and gold monometallism? How can it be defended?

15th. This is the richest and most powerful country on the globe!

Why did Mr. Cleveland give the Morgan Rothschild syndicate, in that bond transaction, an option on any further bond issue of this government until October, 1895? Has the credit of the republic sunk so low under a Democratic administration that it must, in order to sell its bonds, pay a bonus by way of granting an option to New York and London bankers? If not, is it not clear that there is some corrupt, concealed motive behind that option?

16th. What hope is there that the Democratic party will be purged of Clevelandism, Sherman and Ransomism?

If you entertain such hope, please state the foundation for the same.

17th. What hope is there in the Democratic party for free, unlimited and independent coinage of silver? Please give me the grounds of such hope if you entertain it.

18th. Has not the Democratic party in State after State, declared for the gold standard, and has not a large part of the party and its press in North Carolina rebelled against the silver resolutions recently adopted by the Democratic State Executive Committee?

19th. Why has not the Democratic party of North Carolina, if it is true to the people, and not dominated by a goldbug machine—in State convention assembled, protested against, denounced and repudiated the treachery and methods of Cleveland and Ransom, and demanded the ex Senator's resignation from the national committee?

20th. Will not Mr. Ransom continue his grip on the "machine" in North Carolina? And if the legislature should be Democratic in 1896, would it not return Ransom to the United States Senate?

21st. What scandal has been uncovered in a Republican administration, not barring Credit Mobiler, Delano Babcock, Star Route, Whiskey Rings, &c., that equalled or at least surpassed that of the sugar scandal of the late Democratic Congress?

22d. Grant concentrated the United States Army at Washington to give the Presidency to Mr. Hayes and the Republican party. But has not Cleveland given his army of officeholders "orders" to help him deliver the prosperity of the people and the destiny of the republic into the hands of American and British goldbugs?

23rd. Are men's party status fixed by what they say, or by what they do? If a man claiming to be a Democrat sings the goldbug song of John Sherman, votes for what Sherman has voted, and stands where the Republican party has stood against the free coinage of silver, what is he but a Republican? If he is not a Republican, what is the badge of Republicanism?

I agree with a great Democratic journal of North Carolina, which on

June 15th, 1895, used these words in an editorial:

"Whenever a Democrat declares that he is for a single gold standard, he is simply declaring that he has severed his connection with the Democratic party. Goldbug doctrine is Republicanism, true and simple. The Republican party is its parent and has even watched over and cherished it during its growth to full maturity."

Says the Atlanta Constitution: "Those who believe in Republican doctrine

CANNOT BE DEMOCRATS, and those who believe in Democratic doctrines cannot be Republicans. Those who accept and endorse the Republican act of demonetization with all its consequences can no more be called Democrats than an Arab can be called a Christian."

"But the people now have before them the singular spectacle of men high in office burying their heads deep in the bosom of Republicanism and leaving their hind legs kicking and flourishing about in the Democratic camp."

24th. For many years one of the principal arguments against the Republican party was its rigorous execution of the "infernal revenue system."

For years one of the principal arguments of Democrats against the ascendancy of the Republican party was the "infernal revenue system." Senator Vance ridiculed and denounced revenue officers as "red legged grasshoppers." The Democratic party of this State was pledged to the abolishment of the system, or at least to a mitigation of its hardships.

I have not heard of anything being done to abolish the system, and as to whether there has been any decrease in seizures, illegal arrests, &c., and prosecutions on shadowy and insufficient evidence, the people are to be heard from, especially the hundreds of our citizens dragged before the Federal courts during the past two years and more.

Have the people of North Carolina become less law-abiding than in the past? How is it that revenue officers have doubled and trebled in value since the incoming of a Democratic administration. Is it true as I have seen it suggested by the highest authority, that Democratic officials have stretched the law forgotten the promises of the party and prosecuted the people in a mad scramble for fees. It seems that the Democratic "red legged grasshoppers" are quite active, and that many of them have been metamorphosed into goldbugs.

GROVER CLEVELAND

I regard Grover Cleveland as the most dangerous man to American institutions yet evolved by American political conditions. A traitor to his people, a violator of the Constitution, a coward in the execution of the Monroe Doctrine, a bungler, if not worse, in the Hawaiian matter, a pigmy statesman born of chance, whose stubbornness, tyranny, treachery and corruption are called by his friends and sycophants, broad-mindedness, purity and patriotism. This Benedict Arnold No. 2, would betray to Britain not one army post, but he would surrender North America to the grinding grasp of English gold. This cutthroat, this American czar, who with one foot spurned the Democratic platform of 1892 and kicked the Democratic Congress into adopting the most of his policies, while he placed the other upon the necks of the American people, sets his opinions and methods against those of Jefferson and Jackson and the fathers of the Republic.

CLEVELAND AND CENTRALIZATION.

Touching the tyranny and autocratic and centralizing methods of Grover Cleveland, the following extracts will prove interesting. This is from a Democratic paper that warmly supported Mr. Cleveland:

"What is this Administration talk? Does it mean that the people's servant, their hired man, Mr. Cleveland, is now assuming to have more power than even the Constitution conferred on really great men like Washington and Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln?"

Does this man from Buff do cherish some sort of an idea that he is the people, and that the battle of 1890, and the fiercer struggle of 1892, was all over the election of a President? Has he some sort of a notion that the control of the House and the Senate was not in the people's mind?"

A man elected by the same votes that elected our State legislatures and Congressmen; calling around him a cabinet of other hired men, setting himself and these subservient tools up as an Administration!

To do what? To dictate to our other servants? This, then, is the Administration that we are hearing about? It is the influence that is seducing our Congressmen from the honest purpose they were elected to carry out, and with promises

[CONTINUED ON FOURTH PAGE]