

# Newberry Herald and News.

VOL. XXII.

RATES: \$2.00 PER ANNUM.  
\$1.00 FOR SIX MONTHS.

NEWBERRY, S. C., WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 1886.

A. C. JONES,  
W. S. BROWN, Publishers and Proprietors.

No. 29

## FARMERS AND POLITICS.

The Nimble Lawyer Monopolizing All the Offices—Only Twelve Farmers in Congress and 273 Lawyers.

[From the Columbia Register.]  
To the Farmers of South Carolina.

We have heard so much during the past few months about the rights and wrongs of the farmers, that one may be pardoned for a little examination into the consistency of some of their chosen advocates as well as that of the farmers themselves, so far as the Third Congressional District is concerned.

It so happens that the farmer Congressman of the District declines a re-nomination; and four or five lawyers, being the natural allies and protectors of farmers, are anxiously studying how they can best serve the interests of their proteges and—secure their own election. In this connection would it not be in order for the farmers to ascertain the extent of their representation in the present Congress, and for the lawyers to prove the necessity for one of their profession being chosen for the important position?

I am credibly informed that the farming interests, the greatest in the United States, is represented by twelve members, including our retiring friend Aiken, and that such was the paucity of material that the Speaker, either in despair or pique, appointed a lawyer as Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture! Now, farmers, how does that sound? Does it look as though you are much represented in that august body in which you stand twelve against two hundred and seventy-three lawyers? We boast of being the bone and sinew of the country, forsooth! In the above proposition we may be the bone, but I'll be hanged if I see where our sinews (or brains) come in! Now, candidly, have you ever thought of this, or did you ever know how well your class is represented in Congress? If not, is it not high time you did begin to think? The United States Senate contains sixty-five lawyers out of seventy-eight all told!

I have not a word to say against lawyers, and deprecated, and will continue to do so, the late attempt to array class against class at home, when we have about eighty farmers in the House to some thirty odd lawyers. Lawyers are a necessity in all legislative bodies, and it would be disastrous for any county to dispense with their services in framing laws. Now, according to the utterances of the leaders of the so-called farmers' movement, we were to have nothing but simon-pure farmers in convention, Legislature, &c., and the upper counties having given birth to this idea one would naturally expect some results and a little consistency, at least in the forthcoming nominations, particularly in the case of Congressman from a purely agricultural district to a body in which farmers literally have no representation as an interest. Do you suppose these 273 lawyers represent you? Don't you suppose, outside of our own four or five lawyer members, that the great bulk of the lawyers derive their income and secure their election through the influence of corporations and monopolies of all kinds? You know that lawyers could not grind \$120,000 out of farmers, as B. F. Butler is said to do out of his clients annually.

What is the use of farmers talking about the reduction of taxes, a revision of the tariff, or any amelioration of the condition of the country with 273 men, most of whom can often clear more money in a day than a large farm can grow in a year, and who know nothing and care less for the anxious cares and poor returns of farmers, so long as they can draw their salaries and make laws bringing more grist to their mills, and, of course, at the expense of the masses of the people?

What has become of the millions of acres of land once belonging to the people? Is it not in the possession of railroads, land grabbers and monopolies of every kind? True, they have some show of title in some cases, but how obtained and through whom? They can point exultingly to statute upon statute passed by Congress legalizing the wholesale plunder, just the same as the Radicals not many years ago in our State stole and swindled under the form of law. If ever there was a time for the farmers of the United States to organize, choose their own representatives, and drive from place and power this regiment of lawyers now fattening, not on their salaries but on the proceeds of so-called legislation inuring to their benefit, as well as to the whole army of pension agents and lawyers generally. We have heard much of organizing the farmers at home in order to secure their rights and to prevent "robbery, oppression and corruption" in our

Legislature, where we are in a decided majority, and ought and are able to carry out any necessary laws for the protection and benefit of ourselves without infringing on the rights of others. Now, if these charges, none of which have been proved, however, have the ghost of probability, what are the chances of agriculture and its followers in the hands of Congress as at present composed? It would be very interesting to know how many of our Representatives in Congress are the regular attorneys for railroads, corporations and monopolies, and how many of their relatives and connections enjoy the same profitable berths; how many pension agents, claim agents, and every other kind of agents, gain an easy and lucrative living out of the people through legislation cunningly devised for this very purpose!

What has Congress, after half a year's unseemly and, at times, childish wrangling, accomplished this session? With a pension office fully organized, and after the Republicans' own heart, these conservators of the people's rights have flooded the country with a mass of private pension Acts to benefit parties whose claims, in most instances, have been rejected in the proper quarter, and, fortunately, we have now a President who has the courage to use his veto power in these glaring cases, and has not failed to do so. What a conservative majority, solemnly pledged to economy and reform, what a pitiable spectacle is here presented when one man has to step in and, after carefully examining these Acts, feel compelled to veto scores of them, returning them to the place of their origin as an unmistakable reminder of the gross dereliction of duty of members who have so betrayed their trust!

A few words more to my fellow farmers, and I will close. Are there no farmers in the Third District competent to represent you, or do you prefer a lawyer? That's for you to decide one would suppose. But no sooner is there a vacancy than "somebody" intimates that lawyer is just the man, and this, passing around among other lawyers, more "combinations" are made to strengthen his claim. Mr. — is to step into the incipient Congressman's place; B takes his, C takes B's, D takes C's, and so on. How simple and innocent the whole thing is. The poor farmer, busy with his "crops," is kindly spared all exertions of mind and body, and is not even annoyed or worried with a single question on a subject of so little importance to him! Why, what does he know or care about who (mis)represents him? It's all the same to him; He never has obtained any benefit from Congress, except now and then five cents worth of seed, and does not hope, nor need he, for any, so long as three hundred and thirty-eight lawyers have seats in Congress.

If we pay three-fourths of the taxes, as erroneously asserted, surely as a simple matter of courtesy we might be allowed the poor privilege of sending two or three farmers at least to Congress, where at present we literally have no representation whatever.

While this is addressed to the farmers of this State, it is equally important that this meritorious question should be carefully considered by every farmer throughout this broad land, and by every man, no matter how occupied, who wishes to see prosperity and good government.

A POOR FARMER.

## An Editor's Duty.

Amid all the conflicting elements of life, the editor has a hard time of it. What to do under all circumstances often perplexes his mind. Policy dictates one thing, and principle another. Integrity suggests one course, and expediency suggests another. What then must he do? The editor who "rides the fence," on any subject, sooner or later comes to grief. Expediency will serve him but for a season. The path of honor and truth, is the path for him to tread. He must walk in the path of duty in the fear of no man. He must "do good and eschew" evil, and ever stand up and speak out boldly for the good, the true and the pure, and always against the wrong and the impure, and have no thought for the consequences; God will take care of them. Let the editor pursue this course, and he can laugh at criticism, for then he will know that the path of duty is the only path of safety. The editor who does not follow this course, will find out that his work is a failure. This is the course that we have worked out for ourselves, and despite whatever may cross our path, we intend with God's help to walk in it. We intend to speak the truth in advancing the right and condemning the wrong; to "hew to the line let the chips fall where they may," with malice toward none. If this does not suit anybody, we can't help it.—Orangeburg Times and Democrat.

## CHEAT IN WHEAT.

Observations of an Experienced Farmer—His Views on Some Other Matters.

Messrs. Editors: In your issue of 2nd inst., you asked the farmers to give their experience and observation of cheat in wheat. I am a plain old farmer, without the advantages of a "higher" or scientific education, and shall consequently eschew the use of technicalities and simply give the result of my observation. The first crop of wheat I sowed was in the fall of 1845—known by the old people as "the dry year." The variety sowed was mainly what was then known as the Alabama May or the "little red" wheat. In the same field and at the same time I sowed a large-grain white wheat, known in this vicinity as the Baltimore. The result with both kinds was satisfactory. No cheat appeared this year. The next year, '46, I again used the same varieties, the "little red" still giving satisfactory results, but the Baltimore rusting badly, and among it appearing a large quantity of a plant called among us "cockle." This I apprehend is not a variety of cheat. Thenceforth I discarded the Baltimore and used the "little red" only, for several years without making the acquaintance of the great enemy of Southern wheat growers, the cheat, but cockle was to be seen more or less every year. In 1856 or '57, I think, I seeded a portion of my crop with a new favorite that had made its appearance among us—the Gale, a large white grain—still sticking to my well-tried friend, the red. The result with the Gale was magnificent—eighteen bushels per acre. Eureka! I thought I had found it. But alas for human hopes! The next year I used none other than Gale—foolishly discarding a long-tried friend for something new. The result was almost an entire failure—cheat, rust and cockle predominating. Sorrowfully I hunted up my old friend, the "little red," and continued to use it until about 1862 or '63, when the Mogul appeared and asked to be tried. I was simple enough to do so. Result—cheat and cockle were principally the crop secured. I continued to use the "little red" until Sherman's army of house burners arrived here, on the 22nd February, 1865, when we lost the "little red" and have not been able to obtain pure seed since. We have used, "since freedom came down," several varieties, but cheat and rust appeared in all. We cannot account for the presence of cheat in wheat—the scientific may—but it has come to stay. Some varieties of wheat seemingly degenerate, and the result is cheat. I have frequently noticed on the margins of "sproutly places"—and there are many such in the lands about Rocky Mount—that there is frequently a greater quantity of cheat than wheat. There are, as you mentioned, two kinds of cheat—one in its growth and maturity manifesting some of the characteristics of wheat, and the other of oats. We think the former degenerated wheat and the latter degenerated oats. I have never seen oats change to this species of cheat, save when sown in the fall. Its presence in wheat can, in my opinion, only be accounted for by the seeds being left in the fields or getting mixed at the threshing.

Now, Messrs. Editors, we have had our say and confess our inability to explain the *modus operandi* of the cheat, but hope some of the "higher" educated will rise and do so for the benefit of the unlearned farmers.

Having said thus much about cheat in wheat, we are tempted to hand in our protest against some of the deliverances of the Farmers' Convention.

We protest the present is an inauspicious time to foist upon the poor toil-worn taxpayers two more institutions of learning. True, there may exist a necessity for the proposed colleges, but a very large majority of our farmers are too poor to avail themselves of the advantages to give their sons a scientific training so generously offered by our representative men. Many farmers are so circumstanced that they cannot avail themselves of the meagre advantages afforded by our free schools, so greatly are the services of their children needed in the great strife of bread-winning. It would be unjust to place any unnecessary burdens upon them. The wealthy can send their sons and daughters to any institution they may elect, and it is charitably hoped they are too proud to ask that the poor be taxed for their benefit and too just to accept if proffered. Free tuition is not the only requisite. Such homely things as bread, meat and apparel, are essentials—and require ready money, which the poor laboring man cannot procure. The South Carolina College is open to all comers, free of any charges, and the Female College at Columbia and several other

female schools of high grade would doubtless be pleased to receive and instruct your sons and daughters. Send them on—there "yet is room."

We are well pleased with the recommendation to plant less cotton, but the convention had as well advise the cotton planters to jump to the moon. I would be pleased to know how many will take their own prescription!

The farmers of the Cotton States, in our humble opinion, will continue to plant cotton largely so long as negro labor is so plentiful, and bacon, corn and mules can be had on time. We may meet in convention and abuse the lawyers and merchants for the hard times, but we are the cause of "all our woes." The Lien Law is here to stay at least a while longer should we send wise men to make our laws.

By the by, Messrs. Editors, are there no aspirants for political and official honors in the county? Gentlemen, are you afraid of the "farmers' movement"? It is harmless, and won't bite. I do hope to see Fairfield send two lawyers to the next Legislature—"an oligarchy" that will be too wise to saddle the farmers and all other classes with "a real agricultural and mechanical" college and "a school for girls" and this old man will throw up his straw hat and shout "hurrah" for the good people of Fairfield.

OLD MAN.

—Fairfield News and Herald.

## GENERAL JOHN BRATTON.

The Gordon of South Carolina.

In several papers of the State General John Bratton has been suggested as a suitable man to receive the Democratic nomination for Governor of South Carolina. In this connection a few words about the public career of the man whom it is thus proposed to honor may not be out of place.

After a career in the Confederate army, which was conspicuous for bravery, fidelity and efficiency, General Bratton returned home, to take his part in the endeavor to restore the State, in some degree, to the prosperity which had preceded the wreck and ruin of the war. In 1865 he was sent to the State Senate from Fairfield, without opposition. Brief as was the opportunity thus afforded—soon as did the Federal soldier with his bayonet take possession of the government of South Carolina—General Bratton impressed his colleagues and his constituency with his fitness for his trust.

In the trying period from the enforcement of the reconstruction measures to the political revolution of 1876, General Bratton was always at the service of his people, in whatever capacity he might do aught that promised relief from the burden of misrule, robbery and outrage that made South Carolina as conspicuous for the infamies done in her name as she had once been for the greatness of her leaders and the purity of her government. In the movement resulting in the assembling of the Taxpayers' Conventions, he lost no opportunity to further the success of our oppressed citizenship, who saw in the Tax Unions the only means of slowly dragging themselves out of the condition in which the Radical party had placed them.

For services rendered in times such as our people experienced from 1868 to 1876 there could be neither reward nor the hope of reward, save in the consciousness of duty done under very trying circumstances. Patriotism was here subjected to its highest test, without the incentives which make ambitious men patriotic. The men who were true to the State in those times could expect neither public honors nor popular plaudits. Silent gratitude, even, seemed sometimes wanting. The men who, like John Bratton, served South Carolina then, served her for Carolina's sake—not for their own gain.

It is easy to understand that in the disorganized state in which the white people found themselves in 1876, after every expedient had failed to bring relief from the evils that beset them, the reorganization of the Democratic party was a difficult task. The work of enlisting the good people of Fairfield in a contest that promised little else than difficulty, danger and defeat, was no easy one. That duty was assigned to John Bratton. The fruit of his labors—ably assisted at all times by the County Executive Committee and backed at last by the good people of Fairfield—was seen in perhaps the most effective political organization that has ever existed in South Carolina. That organization was built up on a sentiment—that sentiment which makes "duty the sublimest word in the English language," and which could only be called "duty" in whose sense it was used. It was the fidelity to the cause of 76 General Bratton, likewise a member of the Executive Committee—

where his character and ability were recognized by those upon whom devolved the duty of conducting a political contest, the like of which was never known in this country.

In 1880, General Bratton was called to the chairmanship of the State Executive Committee, to take charge of a campaign which promised to be a troublesome one. It was conceived that there was some grounds to apprehend a break in the front which our people had lately presented to the enemy, and that John Bratton was the man to avoid the breach if possible and heal it if made. The success of that campaign, and the support he had from all the Democracy of the State showed that those who had called him to the post knew the man they had chosen.

In December, 1880, General Bratton was, without any solicitation on his part, elected by the Legislature to the important post of Comptroller-General of the State. It is needless to say that he filled that office in a manner altogether creditable.

In 1884, General Bratton was suggested by good men in various parts of the State for the office of Governor. The State Convention passed no judgment on his merits. A third man was, by a majority of the delegates, thought to be desirable, and the choice was so made.

In 1884, the vacancy in the representation of the Fourth District, occasioned by the death of the lamented Ewins, was filled by the nomination and election of General Bratton for the unexpired term. We have it from those who know, that he was long enough in Washington to impress himself there as one of the soundest and strongest men that have represented South Carolina in the councils of the nation.

General Bratton's record, in all the places to which the confidence of his people has called him from the quiet labors of his farm here in Fairfield, is that of a man who has known no rule of conduct but that which comes of sound judgment, keen sense of duty, and an absolutely unselfish devotion to the people who have trusted him. Never an office seeker, he has held office only at the call of the people. Nothing of a politician, he has engaged in politics by way of service to his people.

The present situation in this State is not without difficulties—we might say not without dangers. To lead the people out of these troubles, to avert these dangers, there is no fitter or better man in all South Carolina than John Bratton, of Fairfield.—Winnaboro News and Herald.

## COMMERCIAL FERTILIZERS.

Does the Use of Commercial Fertilizers Pay to Raise Cotton at 8 Cents?

The above question was ably debated at the farmers' club meeting last Saturday afternoon. Some held that the use of it pays, and that a judicious use of guano will pay under ordinary circumstances. Some even went so far as to say that fertilizers had made the South; that it has built up trade and brought railroads into our country, and has brought out many conveniences, and in fact done many things for the progress of the South that otherwise would not have been done.

We are under the opinion that next to slavery guano is the most iron handed curse that has been imposed upon the South. It has completely destroyed most of our corn cribs, sluck pens, fodder stacks, smoke houses, wheat boxes, hog pens, and in fact has turned the brain of the farmer wild with the visionary dreams of a grand theoretical idea of this one system of farming. Just after the war almost every renter had his hogs, cows, corn cribs, meat houses, and his little cabin had its attractions of comfort and plenty. Then these long time-prices were unheard of, and our country prospered like a rose, and hard times were not known to our people. But alas! the contrast, and we fully believe that guano has been the prime factor in this great struggle of the poor farmer for an honest support. Doubtless he has been working as he thought to his own interest, but there is no mistake about his following the beacon of a misguided ambition. He has made some right nice calculations upon paper, and in his mind, but his practical benefits are few and far between.

The country has become poorer, and this one-side idea has led many a man into headlong bankruptcy. It has forced him to neglect his crops and caused his cotton crop to rot in the field, and has begotten this idea about raising guano, which to buy supplies, has failed to pan out as supposed to do by the great champions of its wonderful powers. The extravagant use of guano is the father of hard times, directly or indirectly, and it is time to stop and think.—Woodruff Progress.

## TEACHERS' DEPARTMENT.

ARTHUR KIBLER, EDITOR.

Programme for August 7.

What should be the character of school exhibitions, and what are they worth? G. A. Mills. "The teacher as a student," T. B. Mitchell. "The value of school journals," Miss Beulah Gronerker. Two papers were read at last meeting, one on geography, the other on the teacher at playtime. These subjects will be discussed at the next meeting.

Mr. J. M. Henry, of the class of 1886, has commenced teaching about three miles below town. We wish him success, and hope that he will be pleased with the occupation he has chosen. We are glad to see the ranks of the army of teachers gradually becoming stronger. Education is the hope of the country.

We will commence in time to insist that the teachers come to the next meeting of the association. Our last meeting was forgotten, we are afraid, by many. Don't forget the time of the next meeting. It will be on the 7th of August. Some of you may live some distance, but try to come nevertheless. We notice that some attend regularly, although their homes are some distance from town. If those who live near were as thoroughly interested as some who live at a distance, we believe that the meetings would be better attended. You have let the opportunity of hearing some good lectures pass, by not coming to the association.

Who doubts that the teachers' column has the support of the teachers? Who at the same time doubts that it is a silent support? This silent aid may be of great benefit, but we fail to realize it, and unless it is felt it might as well be withheld. We have never yet complained of the teachers not writing for their column, because we do not believe that it will do any good. We think, however, that it is high time that we should have something to read, written by the teachers of the county. Teachers, let us hear from you, and no longer remain in that inactive and seemingly un sympathizing state.

## Words Misused.

Carry for conduct, lead, or escort.—The misuse of this word is very frequent and very flagrant. It properly means "to convey or transport," either in person or by means of a vehicle of some sort. The person or thing carried makes no exertion in the case, but submits to the action of the carrier.

If, therefore, I escort a lady to church, I do not carry her. If I lead a horse to water, I do not carry him. If I drive the cows to the pasture, I do not carry them. And yet, we hear the word used in all these ways.

Infallible for inevitable.—"Infallible" means "that can make no mistake, or be deceived." "Inevitable" means "that can not be avoided." And yet, we hear people speaking of the infallible consequences of a course of conduct, manifestly intending to imply that the consequences are unavoidable.

Mad for angry.—"Mad" is a much stronger word than "angry," and is not usually appropriate as a substitute for it. Madness is the disorder or distraction of the intellect, or the condition of a madman. Anger is only a strong emotion of the mind, excited by a real or supposed injury, and may be and often is of short duration. It admits, however, of different degrees, passing through the successive stages of wrath, rage, and fury, up to madness; so that one who is indulging in very violent passion may without much impropriety be said to be temporarily mad. But this admissible use of it in extreme cases does not justify its use on all trivial occasions of anger or resentment.—Naiad.

## The Democratic Party and the Farmers.

So far as we are concerned, we are perfectly willing to trust the destinies of the Democratic party of the county to the farmers. They have always been true to the best interest of the county and State, and we do not see why any one should feel the least alarm about the present movement. As taxpayers they should take a lively interest in public affairs, and the fact that they are doing so is one of the most hopeful signs of the future. Let the farmers come to the Democratic Convention, with well formulated plans for carrying into operation their views, and they will have no trouble in executing them. Majority rule is the fundamental principle upon which the Democratic party is built, and the farmers being largely in the majority in the party, have a right to rule its counsels, and no good Democrat has a right to object to this, as the minute he does so he ceases to be a Democrat. This being the case, say to the farmers of Orangeburg County, elect your very best Convention representative in the Co. 22d instant, which meets at these delegates. If needs be, obtain policy to carry out your views. In this way you will do what you please, and put in offices whom you please. We would advise the farmers, however, to shun demagogues and take as successful men of their calling who are successful in their business. Men who claim to be farmers, but who do not demonstrate the fact by a successful career on the farm are hardly the men to lead us out of the wilderness. These men are place hunters, and it makes no difference to them how they secure it. Our farmers should be represented by the most successful of their class.—Orangeburg Times and Democrat.