

competition between these, as being not only beneficial, but essential to the future progress of the race. . . .

What is the proper mode of administering wealth after the laws upon which civilization is founded have thrown it into the hands of the few? And it is of this great question that I believe I offer the true solution. It will be understood that fortunes are here spoken of, not moderate sums saved by many years of effort, the returns from which are required for the comfortable maintenance and education of families. This is not wealth, but only competence, which it should be the aim of all to acquire, and which it is for the best interests of society should be acquired. . . .

There remains . . . only one mode of using great fortunes; . . . in this we have the true antidote for the temporary unequal distribution of wealth, the reconciliation of the rich and the poor—a reign of harmony. . . . It is founded upon the present most intense Individualism, and the race is prepared to put it in practice by degrees whenever it pleases. Under its sway we shall have an ideal State, in which the surplus wealth of the few will become, in the best sense, the property of the many, because administered for the common good; and this wealth, passing through the hands of the few, can be made a much more potent force for the elevation of our race than if distributed in small sums to the people themselves. Even the poorest can be made to see this, and to agree that great sums gathered by some of their fellow-citizens and spent for public purposes, from which the masses reap the principal benefit, are more valuable to them than if scattered among themselves in trifling amounts through the course of many years. . . .

Poor and restricted are our opportunities in this life, narrow our horizon, our best work most imperfect; but rich men should be thankful for one inestimable boon. They have it in their power during their lives to busy themselves in organizing benefactions from which the masses of their fellows will derive lasting advantage, and thus dignify their own lives. The highest life is probably to be reached, not by such imitation of the life of Christ as Count Tolstoi¹ gives us, but, while animated by Christ's spirit, by recognizing the changed conditions of this age, and adopting modes of expressing this spirit suitable to the changed conditions under which we live, still laboring for the good of our fellows, which was the essence of his life and teaching, but laboring in a different manner.

This, then, is held to be the duty of the man of wealth: To set an example of modest, unostentatious living, shunning display or extravagance; to provide moderately for the legitimate wants of those dependent upon him; and, after doing so, to consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds, which he is called upon to administer, and strictly bound as a matter of duty to administer in the manner which, in his judgment, is best calculated to produce the most beneficial results for the community—the man of wealth thus becoming the mere trustee and agent for his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience, and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves. . . .

[O]ne of the serious obstacles to the improvement of our race is indiscriminate charity. It were better for mankind that the millions of the rich were thrown into the sea than so spent as to encourage the slothful, the drunken, the unworthy.

Of every thousand dollars spent in so-called charity to-day, it is probable that nine hundred and fifty dollars is unwisely spent—so spent, indeed, as to produce the very evils which it hopes to mitigate or cure. . . .

[T]he best means of benefiting the community is to place within its reach the ladders upon which the aspiring can rise—free libraries, parks, and means of recreation, by which men are helped in body and mind; works of art, certain to give pleasure and improve the public taste; and public institutions of various kinds, which will improve the general condition of the people; in this manner returning their surplus wealth to the mass of their fellows in the forms best calculated to do them lasting good.

Thus is the problem of rich and poor to be solved. The laws of accumulation will be left free, the laws of distribution free. Individualism will continue, but the millionaire will be but a trustee for the poor, intrusted for a season with a great part of the increased wealth of the community, but administering it for the community far better than it could or would have done for itself. . . .

Such, in my opinion, is the true gospel concerning wealth, obedience to which is destined some day to solve the problem of the rich and the poor, and to bring "Peace on earth, among men good will."

QUESTIONS FOR READING AND DISCUSSION

1. According to Carnegie, what were the revolutionary changes that made it possible for "the poor [to] enjoy what the rich could not before afford"?
2. What did Carnegie believe were the relative advantages and disadvantages of competition, the concentration of wealth, and the "law of competition"?
3. Why should the goal of the truly wealthy be to bring about "the reconciliation of the rich and the poor"? How should they accomplish that goal, according to Carnegie?
4. To what extent would "the millionaire" be a better "trustee for the poor" than government agencies, reform societies, or the poor themselves?

DOCUMENT 18–5

Henry George Explains Why Poverty Is a Crime

*A California journalist and reformer, Henry George was a fierce critic of the economic inequality of the Gilded Age. His book *Progress and Poverty*, published in 1879, became a nationwide best seller. In a speech delivered in Burlington, Iowa, excerpted below, George summarized the basic theme of his book—that poverty was neither inevitable nor natural, but instead resulted from the concentration of wealth in land. George's speech addresses a widespread perception that the economic inequalities so evident during the Gilded Age were somehow wrong and sets out to explain why.*

An Analysis of the Crime of Poverty, 1885

I should like to show you . . . that poverty is a crime. I do not mean that it is a crime to be poor. Murder is a crime; but it is not a crime to be murdered; and a

¹Count Tolstoi: Russian novelist and philosopher Leo Tolstoy (1828–1910), whose

victim of a crime for which others, as well perhaps as himself, are responsible. . . . The curse born of poverty is not confined to the poor alone; it runs through all classes, even to the very rich. They, too, suffer; they must suffer; for there cannot be suffering in a community from which any class can totally escape. The vice, the crime, the ignorance, the meanness born of poverty, poison, so to speak, the very air which rich and poor alike must breathe. . . .

But while a man who chooses to be poor cannot be charged with crime, it is certainly a crime to force poverty on others. And it seems to me clear that the great majority of those who suffer from poverty are poor not from their own particular faults, but because of conditions imposed by society at large. Therefore I hold that poverty is a crime—not an individual crime, but a social crime, a crime for which we all, poor as well as rich, are responsible. . . .

If poverty is appointed by the [divine] power which is above us all, then it is no crime; but if poverty is unnecessary, then it is a crime for which society is responsible and for which society must suffer. I hold . . . that poverty is utterly unnecessary. It is not by the decree of the Almighty, but it is because of our own injustice, our own selfishness, our own ignorance, that this scourge, worse than any pestilence, ravages our civilisation, bringing want and suffering and degradation, destroying souls as well as bodies. . . . And yet the peculiar characteristic of this modern poverty of ours is that it is deepest where wealth most abounds.

Why, to-day, while over the civilised world there is so much distress, so much want, what is the cry that goes up? What is the current explanation of the hard times? Over-production! There are so many clothes that men must go ragged, so much coal that in the bitter winters people have to shiver, such over-filled granaries that people actually die by starvation! Want due to over-production! Was a greater absurdity ever uttered? How can there be over-production till all have enough? It is not over-production; it is unjust distribution. . . .

The dangerous man is not the man who tries to excite discontent; the dangerous man is the man who says that all is as it ought to be. Such a state of things cannot continue; such tendencies as we see at work here cannot go on without bringing at last an overwhelming crash.

I say that all this poverty and the ignorance that flows from it is unnecessary; I say that there is no natural reason why we should not all be rich, in the sense, not of having more than each other, but in the sense of all having enough to completely satisfy all physical wants; of all having enough to get such an easy living that we could develop the better part of humanity. There is no reason why wealth should not be so abundant, that no one should think of such a thing as little children at work, or a woman compelled to a toil that nature never intended her to perform; wealth so abundant that there would be no cause for that harassing fear that sometimes paralyses even those who are not considered *the poor*, the fear that every man of us has probably felt, that if sickness should smite him, or if he should be taken away, those whom he loves better than his life would become charges upon charity. . . . I believe that in a really Christian community, in a society that honoured not with the lips but with the act, the doctrines of Jesus, no one would have occasion to worry about physical needs any more than do the lilies of the field. There is enough and to spare. . . .

From Henry George, *The Crime of Poverty: An Address Delivered in the Opera House, Burlington, Iowa, April 1, 1885, under the auspices of Burlington Assembly, No. 3135. Knights*

There is a cause for this poverty; and, if you trace it down, you will find its root in a primary injustice. Look over the world to-day—poverty everywhere. The cause must be a common one. You cannot attribute it to the tariff, or to the form of government, or to this thing or to that in which nations differ; because, as deep poverty is common to them all, the cause that produces it must be a common cause. What is that common cause? There is one sufficient cause that is common to all nations; and that is the appropriation as the property of some of that natural element on which and from which all must live. . . .

Now, think of it—is not land monopolisation a sufficient reason for poverty? What is man? In the first place, he is an animal, a land animal who cannot live without land. All that man produces comes from land; all productive labour, in the final analysis, consists in working up land; or materials drawn from land, into such forms as fit them for the satisfaction of human wants and desires. Why, man's very body is drawn from the land. Children of the soil, we come from the land, and to the land we must return. . . . Therefore he who holds the land on which and from which another man must live, is that man's master; and the man is his slave. The man who holds the land on which I must live can command me to life or to death just as absolutely as though I were his chattel. Talk about abolishing slavery—we have not abolished slavery; we have only abolished one rude form of it, chattel slavery. There is a deeper and a more insidious form, a more cursed form yet before us to abolish, in this industrial slavery that makes a man a virtual slave, while taunting him and mocking him with the name of freedom. Poverty! want! they will sting as much as the lash. Slavery! God knows there are horrors enough in slavery; but there are deeper horrors in our civilised society today. . . .

This land question is the bottom question. Man is a land animal. Suppose you want to build a house; can you build it without a place to put it? What is it built of? Stone, or mortar, or wood, or iron—they all come from the earth. Think of any article of wealth you choose, any of those things which men struggle for, where do they come from? From the land. It is the bottom question. The land question is simply the labour question; and when some men own that element from which all wealth must be drawn, and upon which all must live, then they have the power of living without work, and, therefore, those who do work get less of the products of work.

Did you ever think of the utter absurdity and strangeness of the fact that, all over the civilised world, the working classes are the poor classes? . . .

Nature gives to labour, and to labour alone; there must be human work before any article of wealth can be produced; and in the natural state of things the man who toiled honestly and well would be the rich man, and he who did not work would be poor. We have so reversed the order of nature that we are accustomed to think of the workingman as a poor man.

And if you trace it out I believe you will see that the primary cause of this is that we compel those who work to pay others for permission to do so. You may buy a coat, a horse, a house; there you are paying the seller for labour exerted, for something that he has produced, or that he has got from the man who did produce it; but when you pay a man for land, what are you paying him for? You are paying for something that no man has produced; you pay him for something that was here before man was, or for a value that was created, not by him individually, but by the community of which you are a part. What is the reason that the land here,

the reason that land in the centre of New York, that once could be bought by the mile for a jug of whiskey, is now worth so much that, though you were to cover it with gold, you would not have its value? Is it not because of the increase of population? Take away that population, and where would the value of the land be? Look at it in any way you please. . . .

[O]ur treatment of land lies at the bottom of all social questions. . . . [D]o what you please, reform as you may, you never can get rid of wide-spread poverty so long as the element on which and from which all men must live is made the private property of some men. It is utterly impossible. Reform government—get taxes down to the minimum—build railroads; institute co-operative stores; divide profits, if you choose, between employers and employed—and what will be the result? The result will be that the land will increase in value—that will be the result—that and nothing else. Experience shows this. Do not all improvements simply increase the value of land—the price that some must pay others for the privilege of living? . . .

I cannot go over all the points I would like to try, but I wish to call your attention to the utter absurdity of private property in land! Why, consider it, the idea of a man's selling the earth—the earth, our common mother. A man selling that which no man produced—a man passing title from one generation to another. Why, it is the most absurd thing in the world. Why, did you ever think of it? What right has a dead man to land? For whom was this earth created? It was created for the living, certainly, not for the dead. Well, now we treat it as though it was created for the dead. Where do our land titles come from? They come from men who for the most part are past and gone. Here in this new country you get a little nearer the original source; but go to the Eastern States and go back over the Atlantic. There you may clearly see the power that comes from land ownership. As I say, the man that owns the land is the master of those who must live on it. . . . That which a man produces, that is his against all the world, to give or to keep, to lend, to sell or to bequeath; but how can he get such a right to land when it was here before he came? Individual claims to land rest only on appropriation. . . .

[T]he way of getting rid of land monopoly . . . is not . . . to divide up the land. All that is necessary is to divide up the income that comes from the land. In that way we can secure absolute equality; nor could the adoption of this principle involve any rude shock or violent change. It can be brought about gradually and easily by abolishing taxes that now rest upon capital, labour and improvements, and raising all our public revenues by the taxation of land values; and the longer you think of it the clearer you will see that in every possible way will it be a benefit.

QUESTIONS FOR READING AND DISCUSSION

1. In what ways, according to George, was poverty a "social crime"? Why was it a "crime" rather than simply the inevitable result of the differing talents and energies of individuals?
2. Why did George believe it an "absurdity" that overproduction caused poverty? What caused overproduction? What caused poverty? What did George mean by asserting that "there is no natural reason why we should not all be rich"?
3. Why did George believe that "he who holds the land on which and from which

4. Why did George believe that "private property in land" was an "utter absurdity"? How did private property in land create poverty, according to George? Do you think George considered private land ownership a crime?
5. Why did George believe a single tax on land, unlike other reforms, would reduce or eliminate poverty?

COMPARATIVE QUESTIONS

1. How did Andrew Carnegie's views of the obligations of wealthy people compare with those of Henry George and William Graham Sumner?
2. How did Marshall Kirkman's belief in the efficiency of railroad corporations compare with Henry Demarest Lloyd's critique of monopolies?
3. Carnegie, George, and Lloyd offered sharply contrasting characterizations of rich people and the social consequences of their wealth. What accounted for their differences? How would George and Lloyd have replied to Carnegie and vice versa?
4. What can you detect about Kirkman's, Sumner's, and Carnegie's views of democracy? How did George's and Lloyd's views of democracy differ? To what extent did these men believe democracy and freedom were compatible? What did they think was the proper source of political power?
5. Each of the documents in this chapter focuses on the striking inequalities among Americans in the Gilded Age. To what extent did these authors perceive inequality as a problem, and what did they propose to do about it? Did they believe in the ideal of equality? If so, to what degree?

Women in the Farmers' Alliance, 1891

It must be evident to every intelligent man and woman to-day that there is something radically wrong in the affairs of the Nation. It must be evident to every thinking man and woman that we have reached a crisis in the affairs of this Nation which is of more importance, more fraught with mighty consequence for the weal or woe for the American people, than was even that crisis that engaged the attention of the people of this Nation in the dark and bleeding years of civil war. We are confronted to-day by a crisis in which every instinct of common duty, of justice, and of patriotism demands prompt and decisive action.

Twelve years ago . . . [a United States senator] said, "There is no use in any longer trying to disguise the truth. We are on the verge of an impending revolution. Old issues are dead, and the people are arraying themselves on one side or the other of a portentous conflict. On one side is capital, strongly intrenched and privileged, grown arrogant by repeated triumphs and repeated success; on the other side is labor demanding employment, labor starving and sullen in cities, resolutely determined to endure no further [the status quo] under which the rich are growing richer and the poor are growing poorer, a system that gives a [capitalist such as Jay] Gould or a Vanderbilt possession of wealth beyond even the dreams of avarice and condemns the poor to a poverty from which there is no refuge but starvation and the grave." . . .

What means it that [another United States senator] . . . stood in the Senate a few days ago and bade this Nation beware of further ignoring the will of the people, and prophesied dark, disastrous days to come if the will of the people be longer defied? What means it that that grand old Governor of Iowa stood before the Republican Club of New York and prophesied that a storm would break over this country that would bring ruin, devastation, and bloodshed? What means it that John J. Ingalls [Republican Senator from Kansas], whom the women of Kansas had the pleasure of defeating (applause),—what means it that in his death-bed speech a few days ago he bade the House, the Senate, and the Executive beware of further ignoring and defying the will of the people, and told us most emphatically and plainly that there were two great dangers that menaced the safety, ay, threatened the very existence of this Republic to-day—a corrupt ballot and the tyranny of combined, incorporated, conscienceless capital? . . .

Senator [William Morris] Stewart [of Nevada] tells us in a recent speech . . . that every act of legislation since the close of the [Civil] war has been in pursuance of the policy of the combined bondholders to enslave the American people and contract the currency of this Nation, and [former president James A.] Garfield and [former Senator John Alexander] Logan [of Illinois] unite in telling us that whoever controls the money of the Nation controls the commerce, the industrial interest of the Nation.

My friends, the lash of the slave-driver's whip is no longer heard in this country, but the lash of necessity is driving thousands to unrequited toil. Conscienceless capital is robbing manhood of its prime, mothers of their motherhood, and sorrowful children of sunshine and joy. Look around you. What do you behold to-day? A land which less than four hundred years ago we received fresh from the

From Mary E. Lease, "Women in the Farmers' Alliance," *Transactions of the National Council of Women of the United States, Assembled in Washington, D.C., February 22 to 25, 1891*, ed. Rachel Foster Avery (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1891), 157–59, 214–16.

hands of God, a continent of unpeopled land for all humanity, a land where we have the bounteous hand of Nature has been the one of her children; and yet, in this day of humanity is going up from every corner of the land, the moans of starving children, the beats of humanity. . . .

[T]o-day the American toiler is in the worst, the black slavery that has given the American laborer nothing to show for his toils to the rivers bridged, to the transcontinental railroads, to wonderful churches and cathedrals, to the system of agriculture that ever brings forth the most against the silken garments his toil produces, by the side of the home he has built, and the weary face and reflect that the two hundred million own one billion five hundred million dollars of sixty-four millions of American people. Our Governors and our legislators and our judges do name them, and they have no power to fix the price of ton of coal.

For one hundred years the same system of gamblers of this Nation have known that Congress has in every case acceded to the demands out of the public treasury amounting to millions permitted to tap the veins of trade, and the politic circulating medium which makes term these [acts] constitutional. For years farmers come timidly knocking at the door, and howl went up. . . .

We are living in a grand and wonderful time, old ideas, old traditions, and old customs are being thrown away. We are living in a time when the great principles there is no difference between the laborer and the intelligent man; . . . we are living in a time when the trial societies and the [Farmers'] Alliance are the politics of this nation; when the hearts of men of this world from every corner are tallizing into action.

Organization is becoming the life of the farmers, slow to think and slow to act have been compelled to think. They are slow to give taxation, unjust tariffs, and they are on the brink of their own despair. In all the world there is no unswerving loyalty and patriotism. They are too lazy to do their own thinking. They are too gogues of both the old political parties. They have voted poverty and degradation for their wives and their children.

hands of God, a continent of unparalleled fertility, magnificent in golden promise for all humanity, a land where we have all diversity of soil and clime, a land where the bounteous hand of Nature has given a wonderful heritage to each and every one of her children; and yet, in this land of plenty and unlimited resources, the cry of humanity is going up from every corner of this Nation. The plaint of motherhood, the moans of starving children! Capital buys and sells to-day the very heart-beats of humanity. . . .

[T]o-day the American toiler in his bitterness and wrath asks us, Which is the worst, the black slavery that has gone or the white slavery that has come? Has the American laborer nothing to show for twenty years of toil? Oh yes: he can point to the rivers bridged, to the transcontinental railway connecting ocean with ocean, to wonderful churches and cathedrals; he can point to the most wonderful system of agriculture that ever brought joy to a hungry world; he can jostle his rags against the silken garments his toil has secured; he can walk shelterless and sad by the side of the home he has helped to build; he can wipe the sweat from his weary face and reflect that the twenty thousand of American millionaires who own one billion five hundred million dollars, gathered from the toils and tears of sixty-four millions of American people, have it in their power to name their Governors and our legislators and representatives and Congressmen—and they *do* name them, and they *have* named them for the last quarter of a century, and they have it in their power to fix the price of labor and to fix the price for every ton of coal.

For one hundred years the speculators, the land-robbers, the pirates and gamblers of this Nation have knocked unceasingly at the door of Congress, and Congress has in every case acceded to their demands. They have gotten money out of the public treasury amounting to tens of millions of dollars. They were permitted to tap the veins of trade and commerce and withdraw from the body politic the circulating medium which is the life-blood of the Nation, and our lawmakers term these [acts] constitutional, and when for the first time in one hundred years farmers come timidly knocking at the doors of Congress asking for relief, a howl went up. . . .

We are living in a grand and wonderful time; we are living in a day when old ideas, old traditions, and old customs have broken loose from their moorings . . . ; we are living in a time when the gray old world begins to dimly comprehend that there is no difference between the brain of an intelligent woman and the brain of an intelligent man; . . . we are living in a day and age when the women of industrial societies and the [Farmers'] Alliance women have become a mighty factor in the politics of this nation; when the mighty dynamite of thought is stirring the hearts of men of this world from centre to circumference, and this thought is crystallizing into action.

Organization is becoming the key-note among the farmers of this nation. The farmers, slow to think and slow to act, are to-day thinking for themselves; they have been compelled to think. They have been awakened by the load of oppressive taxation, unjust tariffs, and they find themselves standing to-day on the very brink of their own despair. In all the years which have flown, the farmers, in their unswerving loyalty and patriotism to [political] party, have been too mentally lazy to do their own thinking. They have been allowing the unprincipled demagogues of both the old political parties to do their thinking for them, and they have voted poverty and degradation not only upon themselves but upon their wives and their children.

that there is
dent to every
of this Nation
for the weal
ged the atten-
civil war. We
n duty, of jus-

no use in any
ending revolu-
on one side or
trenched and
ccess; on the
ullen in cities,
which the rich
ives a [capital-
ond even the
ch there is no

in the Senate a
he will of the
f the people be
a stood before
uld break over
What means it
omen of Kan-
t in his death-
the Executive
d told us most
t menaced the
a corrupt ballot
? . . .

cent speech . . .
in in pursuance
an people and
L] Garfield and
g us that who-
industrial inter-

rd in this coun-
il. Conscience-
otherhood, and
do you behold
d fresh from the

ms of the National
February 22 to 25,
7-59, 214-16.

But to-day these farmers, thank God! are thinking, and also their mothers, wives, and daughters, "their sisters, their cousins, and their aunts." We find, as a result of this mighty thought in the hearts of the people, a movement of the great common people of this nation, and that is the protest of the patient burden-bearers of the world against political superstition, a movement which is an echo of the life of Jesus of Nazareth, a movement that means revolution,—not a revolution such as deluged the streets of Paris with blood in 1793 [during the French Revolution], but the revolution of brain and ballots that shall shake this continent and move humanity everywhere. The voice which is coming up to-day from the mystic cords of the American heart is the same voice which Lincoln heard blending with the guns of Fort Sumter. It is breaking into a clarion cry which will be heard round the world, and thrones will fall and crowns will crumble, and the divine right of kings and capital will fade away like the mists of the morning when the angel of liberty shall kindle the fires of justice in the hearts of men.

An injury to one is the concern of all. Founded upon the eternal principles of truth and right, with special privileges to none, the farmers' movement could not well exclude the patient burden-bearers of the home. And so we find them opening wide the doors of this new and mighty movement, the Farmer's Alliance, admitting women into the ranks of the organization, actually recognizing the fact that they are human beings, and treating them as such, with full privileges of membership and promotion. And the women who have borne the heat and the burden of the day were not slow to accept the newly-offered privileges, undeterred by the fact that the new organization was political, though non-partisan, and they gladly accepted the privileges extended them, until we find to-day upwards of half a million women in the Farmers' Alliance, who have taken up the study of social and political problems, and are studying and investigating the great issues of the day, fully cognizant of the fact that in the political arena alone can these great problems be satisfactorily settled.

You will wonder, perhaps, why the women of the West are interested so much in this great uprising of the common people. . . . I will tell you, friends: if you will refer to your old school-maps, you will find that that portion of our country now the valuable, teeming, fruitful West, was twenty-five or thirty years ago marked there as the "Great American Desert, the treeless plain." About that time, the women of the East turned their faces towards the boundless, billowy prairies of the West. They accompanied their husbands, sons, and brothers; they came with the roses of health on their cheeks; they left home and friends, school and church, and all which makes life dear to you and me, and turned their faces towards the untried West, willing to brave the dangers of pioneer life upon the lonely prairies with all its privations; their children were born there, and there upon the prairies our little babes lie buried. After all our years of sorrow, loneliness, and privation, we are being robbed of our farms, of our homes, at the rate of five hundred a week, and turned out homeless paupers, outcasts and wanderers, robbed of the best years of our life and our toil. Do you wonder that women are joining the Farmers' Alliance and the Knights of Labor? Let no one . . . for one moment suppose that this Alliance movement is but a passing episode of a brief political career. We have come to stay, for we are advocating principles of truth, right, and justice. Our demands are founded on the Sermon on the Mount, and that other command, that ye love one another. We seek to put into practical operation the teachings of Christ, who was sent to bring about a better day. Then there shall be no more coal kings nor silver kings, but a better day when there shall be no more millionaires, no more paupers, and no more waifs in our streets.

QUESTIONS FOR READING AND DISCUSSION

1. What, according to Lease, was "the great wrong"? Who did she believe shared her view?
2. What did Lease mean by "declaring the heart-beats of humanity"?
3. Why did Lease say that farmers had "no thinking"? In her opinion, who had the power to "ignite" "the mighty dynamite of change"?
4. How had women contributed to the movement? How did the Alliance aid women?
5. What reason did Lease give to explain why women were interested so much in this great uprising?

DOCUMENT

White Supremacy in Wilmington

Black southerners affiliated with the Republican Party defeated Democrats. Such a fusion of Republican and Democratic forces, including the mayor and aldermen of Wilmington, resulted in the election of 1894 and 1896, resulting in the election of a fusion government, including the mayor and aldermen of Wilmington, with a campaign of terror and intimidation at the polls by what Gunner Jesse Blake called "the rebellion," recalled the event for a sympathetic, excerpted here, illustrates the explosion of white supremacy and ultimately undermined the Populist movement.

Gunner Jesse Blake

Narrative of the Wilmington Rebellion

"So, I am going to give you the inside story of the Wilmington Rebellion. It succeeded, "wherein the white people of Wilmington overthrew the municipal authority overnight and substituted their own, and with some needless bloodshed, to the detriment of the colored people, and with the exclusion of the Negroes from the political life of the city, was the very beginning of Negro disfranchisement, the first step in the establishment of 'White Supremacy' in the South."

"The Rebellion was an organized movement of the white citizens of this community to overthrow the municipal authority, because it was dominated by the colored people, because the better element here wished to see the state and throughout the South, and to drive the ignorant Negroes from their numerically dominant position."

From Harry Hayden, *The Wilmington Rebellion*