

A STUDY OF THE CONTINUITY IN LEADERSHIP AND PLATFORMS
BETWEEN THE KANSAS ALLIANCE AND
THE POPULIST PARTY

12

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Division of Social Sciences
Kansas State Teachers College

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Richard Dean Pankratz
January 1968

Thesis
1968
P

Patrick G. O'Brien
Approved for the Major Department

James L. Bryan
Approved for the Graduate Council

263633 0

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to the staff of the Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, for their assistance in locating and using materials, and to the members of his graduate committee for their helpful advice and assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. A GENERAL BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION	1
II. CONTINUITY OF LEADERSHIP	11
The 1891 Alliance Legislators	12
The 1889 Alliance Officers and Leaders	26
The Alliance Incorporators	33
Voting Patterns in the 1890-1896 Legislative Elections	35
III. CONTINUITY OF PLATFORMS	40
IV. SUMMARY	57
BIBLIOGRAPHY	61
APPENDIX A. Alliamcemen Elected to the House of Representatives in 1890	71
APPENDIX B. 1891 Alliance Legislators with Civil War Service	75
APPENDIX C. Alliance Legislators of 1891 Listed According to Their Succeeding Political Triumphs	78
APPENDIX D. Election Returns for Twenty-nine Counties with Four Consecutive Alliance-Populist Legislators	82

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Ages of the 1891 Alliance Legislators	13
II. Birthplaces of the 1891 Alliance Legislators	16
III. Education of the 1891 Alliance Legislators	17
IV. Occupations of the 1891 Alliance Legislators	17
V. Previous Political Affiliations of the 1891 Alliancemen	19
VI. Previous Political Experience of the 1891 Alliance Legislators	21
VII. Religious Affiliations of the 1891 Alliance Legislators	23

CHAPTER I

A GENERAL BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

A number of agricultural organizations came into being late in the nineteenth century to improve the American farmer's circumstances. The movement culminated with the Farmers' Alliance in the late 1880's and the early 1890's. There were actually two alliances: the National Farmers' Alliance and the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union or, as they were popularly known, the Northern Alliance and Southern Alliance. The former was an open and the latter was a secret organization.

There are many origins claimed for the National Farmers' Alliance, but historians are in general agreement that Milton George, editor of the Western Rural, organized the first permanent alliance in Cook County, Illinois, in April, 1890.¹ George expanded the local organization into a national alliance later that year. There are a number of possibilities as to where he got the idea for the organization. An alliance was created in New York in 1877, but George Campbell of Kansas claimed the inspiration for the New York Alliance. He insisted that he mailed circulars to every county in the country in 1876 describing the successes in Kansas of The Settlers' Protective

¹Chicago Tribune, May 28, 1899.

Association, generally called the Settlers' League or the Alliance. Settlers established this secret body in 1872 on the so-called "Osage Ceded Lands" to fight railroad attempts to claim their lands.² This Kansas organization became defunct after its mission was fulfilled, but the National Farmers' Alliance expanded and was most successful in the states of the Old Northwest.

In 1874 or 1875, an Anti-Horse Thief Association came into existence in Lampasas County, Texas. This was the earliest known alliance in the South.³ Campbell also claimed that the 1872 Kansas group was the root of the Texas alliance. He believed that a New Yorker familiar with the Kansas association took the idea with him when he moved to Texas.⁴ Regardless of its ideological origin, the first permanent Texas alliance was organized in Parker County in 1879, and the state of Texas issued a charter to the Farmers' Alliance the following year.⁵ The Texas alliance had ups and downs, but in the late 1880's began to spread rapidly throughout Texas and the

²N. A. Dunning, editor, The Farmers' Alliance History and Agricultural Digest (Washington, D.C.: Alliance Publishing Company, 1891), pp. 10-12.

³John D. Hicks, The Populist Revolt (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961; originally published Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1931), p. 104.

⁴Dunning, pp. 10-12.

⁵W. S. Morgan, History of the Wheel and Alliance (Fort Scott, Kansas: J. H. Rice and Sons, 1889), p. 286.

South. Its expansion was aided by timely mergers with agricultural organizations based in Louisiana and Arkansas. This eventually led to the organization's new name, Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union, which was adopted at the 1889 St. Louis convention. That same convention witnessed a futile effort to merge the Northern and Southern Alliances. The Colored Farmers' Alliance, usually regarded as an appendage of the Southern Alliance, was another southern organization. By 1890 the combined strength of the Northern and Southern Alliances was estimated by Alliance leaders at 2,500,000.⁶ Other estimates ranged from 1,000,000 to 3,000,000.⁷

Until the late 1880's, the Northern Alliance had the field to itself in Kansas. There was a state Farmers' Alliance as early as 1881.⁸ Then the farmers' interest waned for a time, but the state alliance was reorganized in the late 1880's. The last Northern Alliance convention apparently met in Peabody in October, 1889.⁹

The Southern Alliance began to challenge its Northern counterpart late in the decade. There are a number of conflicting accounts as to how the Southern Alliance came to

⁶Chicago Tribune, May 28, 1899.

⁷Hicks, p. 113.

⁸Topeka Daily Capital, January 12, 1881.

⁹Kansas Farmer, October 9, 1889.

Kansas. Perhaps the most credible version is that a number of suballiances were formed in Cowley County in 1887 by an unidentified Texan. He was followed by a regular organizer, W. Shires, who started a few more suballiances. In 1888, W. P. Brush, State Organizer for the Southern Alliance, organized alliances in various parts of the state.¹⁰ Another account gives credit to Henry, Leo, and Cuthbert Vincent of the Winfield American Nonconformist. Allegedly they went to Texas, were initiated into the Southern Alliance, and returned to work for members in Cowley County.¹¹ The third version is that a lawyer, W. F. Rightmire, and two newspaper editors, John R. Rogers and Cuthbert Vincent, brought the Southern Alliance to Kansas. Rightmire claimed they were chosen as representatives of the State Reform Association in December, 1888, to find an organization which Kansas reformers, farmers, and laborers could join to work for reform measures. The three went to Texas, decided the secret Farmers' Alliance was the right organization, joined the order, returned to Kansas, and changed a suballiance at Cloverdale, Cowley County, into a secret order. Other suballiances were started, and they formed a state organization at Newton on November 16, 1889.¹²

¹⁰Dunning, p. 242.

¹¹E. N. Barr, "The Populist Uprising," William E. Connelly, compiler, A Standard History of Kansas and Kansans (New York: Lewis Publishing Company, 1918), p. 1140.

¹²W. F. Rightmire, "The Alliance Movement in Kansas,"

Rightmire's account can be questioned on a number of points. For one thing, Alliance rules excluded lawyers from membership. Rightmire does not explain how he circumvented the rules. Second, the state organization was actually set up at Augusta on December 22, 1888.¹³ The Newton convention, which actually met August 14, 1889, heard a report that the state had 470 suballiances with 25,000 members.¹⁴ By October, 1890, the organization claimed 2,886 suballiances and 140,000 members.¹⁵ The remaining Northern Alliance membership went over as a body to the Southern Alliance in Kansas following the unsuccessful merger attempt at St. Louis in December, 1889.¹⁶

The Farmers' Alliance introduced into Kansas from Texas prohibited residents of towns and cities from membership.¹⁷ To circumvent this restriction, an auxiliary group was formed at Olathe early in 1890, and a state Citizens' Alliance was established at a Topeka convention on August 12, 1890.¹⁸

Kansas Historical Collections, IX (1906), pp. 1-8.

¹³Dexter Free Press, December 28, 1888.

¹⁴Meriden Advocate, August 17, 1889.

¹⁵Topeka Daily Capital, October 15, 1890.

¹⁶Kansas Farmer, December 11, 1889.

¹⁷Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union of Kansas Constitution for Subordinate Alliances (Hutchinson: The News, Printers and Binders, 1891).

¹⁸Topeka Advocate, August 20, 1890.

The Citizens' Alliance reflected the views of the Farmers Alliance and Industrial Union and adopted the St. Louis platform intact.¹⁹ Within a short time it was publicized that there were 200 Citizens' Alliances in Kansas.²⁰ Any man or woman over the age of sixteen who would accept the 1889 St. Louis platform could join the organization.

Politics originally held little attraction for the Farmers' Alliance. But members gradually came to believe it was the only way to achieve their goals.²¹ Accordingly, the Alliance platform was sent to all Kansas Congressmen to indicate their approval or disapproval. Only Senator Preston B. Plumb, whose term did not expire in 1891, made a satisfactory reply.²² His colleague, three-term Senator John J. Ingalls, whose term was expiring, refused to take a stand on the Alliance platform.²³ Because of the unsatisfactory responses on the Alliance platform from the old parties' candidates for national, state, and local offices, President Benjamin H. Clover of the Kansas Farmers' Alliance called a meeting of county alliance

¹⁹"Citizens' Alliance Constitution and By-Laws," bound in People's Party Pamphlets, Vol. VII, Kansas State Historical Society.

²⁰Topeka Advocate, August 27, 1890.

²¹Meriden Advocate, October 5, 1889.

²²Rightmire, p. 5.

²³Chicago Tribune, May 28, 1899.

presidents in Topeka on March 25, 1890.²⁴ The presidents resolved that the membership should no longer divide along party lines and should cast votes only for candidates of the people. A resolution was adopted opposing Ingalls' re-election because he had not supported measures ". . . in the interests of the great agricultural and laboring element of Kansas."²⁵

Three months later, June 12, 1890, a convention of industrial organizations met in Topeka, adopted a series of resolutions and the name of "People's Party," and issued a call for a state political convention to meet August 13, 1890. A state central committee was selected to make plans for the convention.²⁶ Delegates from various farm, reform, and labor groups attended the convention, including forty-one Alliance-men, twenty-eight Knights of Labor, ten Farmers' Mutual Benefit Association members, seven Grangers, and four Single Tax Clubbers.²⁷

For many years, historians have assumed that the People's Party was a direct outgrowth of the Farmers' Alliance. They also assumed that leaders of the Farmers' Alliance simply moved into positions of leadership in the Populist party. The

²⁴Topeka Advocate, April 2, 1890.

²⁵Topeka Daily Capital, March 26, 1890.

²⁶Topeka Advocate, June 18, 1890.

²⁷Winfield American Nonconformist, June 19, 1890.

Populists' contemporaries held the same view.²⁸

This thesis will primarily be a study of the continuity between the leadership of the Kansas Farmers' Alliance and that of the People's party of Kansas. It will also ascertain the continuity of the two groups' programs. The first objective will require a comparative study between the Kansas Farmers' Alliance candidates for the state legislature in 1890 and the legislative candidates in the later Populist campaigns.²⁹ This analysis includes a determination of the identity of these candidates of 1890, who voted for them, whether the voting patterns in later campaigns were the same as in 1890, and whether these men remained active in Kansas Populist politics. A brief examination will also be made of the Farmers' Alliance state officers of 1889 and of the twelve men who incorporated the Kansas Alliance in 1889.

²⁸John T. Morgan, "The Danger of the Farmers' Alliance," Forum, XII, (November, 1891), p. 406; John D. Bright, "Populism in the Nineties," Kansas, The First Century, Vol. I (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1956), p. 478; E. N. Barr, pp. 1140-1142; Hicks, pp. 151, 179, 185; John D. Hicks and John D. Barnhart, "The Farmers' Alliance," North Carolina Historical Review, VI, (July, 1929), pp. 274-275; William Allen White, The Autobiography of William Allen White (New York: Macmillan, 1946), pp. 186, 187, 189, 190; Paul W. Glad, McKinley, Bryan, and the People (New York: J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1964), p. 65; Walter T. K. Nugent, The Tolerant Populists (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), p. 65; Rightmire, p. 8.

²⁹

The 1890 candidates have been designated as Farmers' Alliance candidates because that is the way they were regarded by their contemporaries. The Kansas Secretary of State records them as this in the Seventh Biennial Reports of 1890. Almanacs, yearbooks, magazines, and newspapers all call these

Daily Capital. The other newspapers used were the Winfield American Nonconformist, the Kansas Commoner, the Kansas Farmer, the Augusta Journal, the Dexter Free Press, and the Wichita Weekly Beacon. Some of the contemporary magazines utilized were Forum, Arena, Agora, Nation, and Cosmopolitan. A number of official Alliance histories were consulted, including N. A. Dunning, The Farmers' Alliance History and Agricultural Digest (1891) and W. S. Morgan, History of the Wheel and Alliance (1889). Official publications of both the Alliance and the Populist party, constitutions, campaign handbooks, and assorted pamphlets were also used. The State Historical Society has collected and bound together hundreds of pamphlets that reflect Alliance or Populist philosophies. In many cases these pamphlets were official or authorized publications. These proved of great value, as did the collections of clippings. Official statistics and other election information are contained in the Biennial Reports of the Secretary of State. Almanacs and political yearbooks have additional statistical material. Scrapbooks, kept by individuals in the movements or by their families, contained helpful material.

CHAPTER II

CONTINUITY OF LEADERSHIP

Both before and after the August 13, 1890, Alliance nominating convention, alliances and associated groups throughout Kansas were selecting candidates for the Kansas House of Representatives from their respective districts. Although the Alliance candidates were not to also accept the nominations of other parties, the Democrats in many districts refrained from making nominations to have a better chance of defeating the Republicans. The 1890 campaign was one of the most emotional ever conducted in Kansas. Alliance mainstays, including Mary Elizabeth Lease, Annie L. Diggs, Cuthbert Vincent, and William A. Peffer, were preaching their cause with evangelical fervor. They preached the message of defeating Republican Senator John J. Ingalls' re-election for another term in packed meeting halls, in picnic groves, and at county fairs. These gatherings were usually characterized by a camp meeting spirit. Every rally had a glee club to entertain the crowd with Alliance songs; many of these songs were simply Alliance lyrics put to the tunes of familiar camp meeting hymns. The music helped to enhance the emotional atmosphere of the meetings. Charges that the Republicans were corrupt and lacked concern for the farmers' welfare were two major topics of Alliance speakers. But the major Alliance goal

seemed to be the election of legislators who would not re-elect Ingalls.¹

I. THE 1891 ALLIANCE LEGISLATORS

The election of ninety-two Alliancesmen to the Kansas House of Representatives gave them an overwhelming majority in the 125 member lower house. They are listed in Appendix A according to the district and county they represented. It must be determined who these men were, what their background was, whether they remained active in Populist politics, and who voted for them.

The analysis of the 1891 legislators will be made from biographical information they furnished for Admire's Political and Legislative Hand-Book for Kansas, 1891, and the question can be answered as to who these men were. Many of their brief biographies are incomplete, but generally they included age, birthplace, education, Civil War service, former political affiliation, previous political experience, and church preference.

Ages of the Alliance legislators are tabulated in Table I with the number of men given for each age level. The oldest man in the legislature was seventy-two year old Frank Hickox from Barber County. Speaker of the House Peter Percival

¹Raymond C. Miller, "The Populist Party in Kansas" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1928), p. 101.

Elder of Franklin County at sixty-seven was next. None of the others were above the age of sixty-two. Of the eighty-six Alliancemen whose ages are known, only seven were sixty or older. The youngest was thirty-three year old Representative Arthur H. Lupfer of Pawnee County. Seven other men were in their thirties.

TABLE I
AGES OF THE 1891 ALLIANCE LEGISLATORS

AGE	FREQUENCY	AGE	FREQUENCY
72	1	47	3
67	1	46	3
62	3	45	8
61	1	44	6
60	1	43	4
59	1	42	3
57	6	41	4
56	3	40	5
55	2	39	1
54	4	37	2
52	4	36	1
51	3	35	2
50	6	34	1
49	3	33	1
48	3		

It is readily apparent from Table I that the greatest number of Alliance legislators were in their forties. There were forty-two of the eighty-six, or 48.8 percent, in this age group. Another 33.7 percent were in their fifties. The age most frequently mentioned, by eight, was forty-five. The average age of the eighty-six Alliance legislators was 48.19

years. From the large concentration in the forties and early fifties, it is evident that these were men of experience.

Table II provides information on the birthplaces of ninety-one Alliance legislators, including the number and percentage born in each state or nation. Kansas is conspicuous by its absence from the list. No Allianceman listed Kansas as his birthplace.² Almost 47 percent of the Alliance legislators were from three of the states of the Old Northwest, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. None of the legislators were from the Deep South. There were thirteen from the border states of Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, and Virginia. The contingent from New England was rather small; only five men came from Maine, Vermont, and Connecticut. Twelve of the group came into the United States as immigrants, most of them at a very young age. With the exception of one from Canada, they were from northwestern Europe, nine of them from the British Isles.

The maximum educational level reached by the Alliance legislators is reported in Table III. Forty-one of the biographies contained no reference to the legislator's education. Nine different categories are listed in the table with

²A. A. Burgard of District 11, Wyandotte County, was a native Kansan. Admire listed him as an Allianceman, but the Populist Handbook for Kansas (Indianapolis: Vincent Brothers Publishing Company, 1892), p. 283, listed him as a Democrat. Because of this, Burgard is not included in this study.

the number and percent indicated for each category. The largest group is that indicating no education beyond common school. Of those who supplied information on their education 45.1 percent were in this category. If information were available for the missing forty-one, probably a large percentage of them would also be in this group. From Table III it is evident that the average Alliance legislator had little education above grade school. Very few had had an opportunity to attend high school and fewer still to attend college. Only eleven had an academic education and fourteen had gone on to higher education: one each to seminary, medical college, and normal school, three to law school, and nine to college. Only three of the nine were graduated from college.

A summary of occupations for the Alliancemen is given in Table IV. The statistics include jobs held prior to 1890 as well as positions held at that time. Many of the men listed two occupations, which is why the incidence of jobs will total more than ninety-two. A large majority were or had been farmers. Information is available for eighty-three men, of which seventy-eight were farmers. All thirteen with teaching experience were either farming at the time or had farmed. There were five men not farmers, a salesman, two preachers, a telegrapher, and one had been both a railroad worker and a preacher. Neither lawyer, Peter P. Elder of Franklin County or J. B. Coons of Miami County, was practicing

TABLE II

BIRTHPLACES OF THE 1891 ALLIANCE LEGISLATORS

STATE/NATION	NUMBER	PER CENT OF THE TOTAL
Ohio	25	27.2
Indiana	12	13.0
New York	7	7.6
Illinois	6	6.5
Kentucky	6	6.5
Missouri	4	4.3
Pennsylvania	4	4.3
West Virginia	4	4.3
Ireland	4	4.3
England	3	3.3
Maine	2	2.2
Tennessee	2	2.2
Vermont	2	2.2
Wales	2	2.2
California	1	1.1
Connecticut	1	1.1
Michigan	1	1.1
Virginia	1	1.1
Wisconsin	1	1.1
Canada	1	1.1
Germany	1	1.1
Switzerland	1	1.1
Not Reporting	1	1.1

TABLE III

EDUCATION OF THE 1891 ALLIANCE LEGISLATORS

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	NUMBER	PER CENT OF THOSE REPORTING
Self-educated	2	3.9
Common school	23	45.2
Academic	11	21.6
Normal school	1	2.0
College experience	6	11.8
College graduate	3	5.9
Seminary	1	2.0
Law school	3	5.9
Total reporting	<u>51</u>	
Not reporting	41	

TABLE IV

OCCUPATIONS OF THE 1891 ALLIANCE LEGISLATORS

OCCUPATION	NUMBER	PER CENT OF THOSE REPORTING
Agriculture	78	94.0
Teacher	13	15.7
Businessman	6	7.3
Carpenter	5	6.1
Preacher	5	6.1
Lawyer	2	2.4
Railroad worker	2	2.4
Miner	2	2.4
Telegrapher	1	1.2
Medicine	1	1.2
Sailor	1	1.2
Civil Engineer	1	1.2
Lumberman	1	1.2
Not reporting	9	

in 1890. Both had turned to farming more than twenty years earlier. Wright Hicks of Norton County, trained in medicine, had become a farmer when he came to Kansas from Illinois in 1878. These were men of the people, who knew hard work and the problems of the Kansas farmers. There was hardly an Alliance legislator working at an occupation classified as professional.

The Alliance legislators who were Civil War veterans are listed alphabetically in Appendix B with the district they represented in the legislature and the facts of their military service. Thirty-four Alliancesmen, or 37 percent, mentioned Civil War service. It is quite unlikely that there were others who had been in the war and failed to mention it, because it was something to point to with pride. Only five of the thirty-four indicated they had been officers: Marshall W. Cobun (95), Captain; J. B. Coons (17), Charles D. Drake (67), and Alexander Duncan (3), First Lieutenants; and Marion Patterson (48), Brevet Lieutenant Colonel. The high percentage of old soldiers in the Alliance party refutes the Republican charges that the Alliance party was against Union veterans.

Previous political affiliations of Alliance legislators are shown in Table V. Many of them had changed parties numerous times. Peter P. Elder (15), Henry W. Ruble (84), and A. J. Cory (25) went from Republican to Greenback to Union Labor to Alliance. Jason Helmick (58) was a former Democrat,

Republican, and Greenbacker. Others who were well-traveled politically include William H. Mitchell (93), from Republican to Liberal Republican to Greenback to Alliance; I. N. Goodvin (116), from Republican to Greenback to Alliance; P. C. Wagoner (105), from Republican to Union Labor to Alliance; and George E. Smith (104), from Greenback to Union Labor to Alliance.

TABLE V

PREVIOUS POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS OF THE 1891 ALLIANCEMEN

PARTY	NUMBER	PER CENT OF THOSE REPORTING
Republican	62	69.7
Democrat	19	21.3
Greenback	11	12.4
Union Labor	11	12.4
Prohibition	4	4.5
Radical Republican	2	2.2
Union	1	1.1
Independent	5	5.6
No party listed	3	

Of the eleven former Union Laborites, five were former Greenbackers, three had been Republicans, and one was an ex-Democrat. All who had affiliated with the Prohibition party had also been Republicans. Most, 71.9 percent, of the Alliance legislators had once been associated with the Republican party. Only 21.3 percent of them were ex-Democrats. The Republican party furnished most of the Alliance legislators, followed by the Democratic party, and a solid minority of previous third party followers.

Past political experience of the Alliance legislators is shown in Table VI. More than half of them had previous political experience, mostly in local political offices. Only nine of the ninety-two Alliancesmen had served in a state legislature before. Speaker Peter P. Elder was an exception to the general trend among Alliance legislators. He was a member of the Kansas Territorial Council in 1859, and a state senator when the state government was organized in 1860. After a term in the Kansas Senate in 1867, he was elected lieutenant-governor of Kansas in 1870. In 1875, 1876, and 1877 he was elected to the Kansas House as a Republican. He had been chosen speaker of the house in 1877 by his Republican colleagues. In 1883, he was elected for his fourth term in the House, but this time as a Greenbacker. He was the Union Labor candidate for governor in 1888, and he had been chairman of the Union Labor national committee. No other Alliancesman had near his history of office-holding. Other members with past legislative experience were Marshall W. Cobun (95), four years in the West Virginia State Senate; John Hartenbower (62), service in the Minnesota and Iowa legislatures; Frank Hickox (90), experience in the Missouri legislature; Charles D. Drake (67), Kansas House of Representatives, 1866, 1869, 1870, and 1872; Joseph D. Hardy (44), Kansas House, 1873; John S. Doolittle (64), Kansas House, 1881; Wellington Doty (47), Kansas House, 1888; and William Campbell (94), Kansas House, 1888.

had more than a vague knowledge of legislative procedure and custom. There were not even enough experienced men to fill the important committee chairmanships.³ In addition to the nine with legislative background, forty-three had held some office, generally as township trustees or justices of the peace. Neither office afforded any particular training for the state legislature. Farmers' Alliance members had been well-schooled in Alliance platforms and beliefs. The lecture system of the Alliance insured that, but only experience could show them the inner workings of the legislature. There were thirty-five legislators with no known political background.

The religious affiliations of the Alliance legislators are shown in Table VII. An impressive minority, 40 percent of them, did not indicate whether they affiliated with a religious group. It is significant that the predominant religious groups listed--Methodist, Christian, United Brethren, and Baptist--were churches of the common people. The so-called "high" churches have small representation. The Alliancemen belonged mostly to the evangelical churches which preached the type of religion that matched the emotional politics preached by the Alliance.

The question regarding the Alliancemen and their background has been answered. They were a group with an average

³James C. Malin, A Concern About Humanity (Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, 1964), p. 224.

age of 48.19. None of them were native Kansans; almost half of them came from Ohio, Indiana, or Illinois. Most had little education beyond grade school. In occupation, 94 percent either were or had been farmers. There were thirty-four men who saw military service during the Civil War. Quite a few former third party men were in the Alliance ranks, but over two-thirds were ex-Republicans. The average Alliance legislator either had no office-holding record or had held only local positions. Those who listed a church preference usually belonged to a church of the "common people." These were the Alliance legislators of 1891.

TABLE VII

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATIONS OF THE 1891 ALLIANCE LEGISLATORS

DENOMINATION	NUMBER	PER CENT OF THE TOTAL
Methodist	15	16.3
Methodist Episcopal	7	7.6
Christian	7	7.6
Presbyterian	7	7.6
Baptist	5	5.4
United Brethren	5	5.4
Congregational	4	4.3
Roman Catholic	2	2.2
Church of Christ	1	1.1
Church of God	1	1.1
Evangelical Lutheran	1	1.1
No affiliation	2	2.2
Total reporting	57	62.0
No information	35	38.0

An analysis of the election statistics in the Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Biennial Reports of the Secretary of State of Kansas reveals that fifty of the ninety-two Alliance legislators remained active, at least for a time, in Populist party politics. These fifty men are grouped in Appendix C according to their success in the succeeding elections. There were thirty-eight Alliancemen who became Populist candidates for re-election in 1892; twenty-two retained their seats. The sixteen defeated candidates do not again appear as Populist leaders. Their political careers at the state level were ended with the exception of David M. Howard of Shawnee County, who was returned to the Kansas House in 1908 as an independent Democrat.⁴ There were seven representatives who tried to move up to the Kansas Senate in 1892. They were Hugh M. Reid, Crawford County; Samuel Henry, Montgomery County; George E. Smith, Smith County; Levi Dumbauld, Lyon County; Jason Helmick, Chautauqua County; William Rogers, Washington County; and Michael Senn, Dickinson County. Only Samuel Henry was not victorious. There were four men who were not candidates for office in 1892 but did try again in 1894. All were defeated. The remaining member of the fifty was the long-time Kansas reformer, Peter P. Elder. He remained active in Populist politics, but was not a candidate for the state legislature

⁴Sixteenth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas (Topeka: State Printing Office, 1908), p. 122.

again until 1900, when he was seventy-seven. He was unsuccessful.

A number of the men made third and fourth races for office. A. A. Newman of Clay County, George H. McKinnie of Mitchell County, and William Campbell of Stafford County all served three consecutive terms in the lower house and retired undefeated. McKinnie was also elected to the Kansas House in 1906 as a Democrat.⁵ There were four men--Darius Watson, Washington County; P. C. Wagoner, Phillips County; Henry Ruble, Sedgwick County; and John Doubleday, Sumner County--who were re-elected in 1892 but defeated in 1894. William Kenton of Rice County was re-elected in 1892 but defeated in 1894 and again in 1898. Marshall Cobun of Barton County was re-elected in 1892; he did not run again until 1900 when he was also victorious. Jason Helmick, who had been elected state senator in 1892, was returned to the senate in 1896 but defeated in 1900. Pawnee County's Arthur Lupfer was returned to the Kansas House in 1892 and 1894; in 1896 he was sent to the Kansas Senate.

⁵Fifteenth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas (Topeka: State Printing Office, 1906), p. 186.

He was again elected, as a Democrat, to the lower house in 1904.⁶

In 1893 twenty-eight of the Alliance representatives were back in the legislature, twenty-two in the Kansas House and six in the Kansas Senate. They formed a nucleus of experienced Populist personnel as they tried to enact their programs. That forty-five Alliance members of the Kansas House of Representatives in 1891 were Populist candidates for the state legislature in 1892 indicates a strong continuity of leadership between the Alliance and the Populist party on the state level.

II. THE 1889 ALLIANCE OFFICERS AND LEADERS

Study of another group of men, the officers of the Kansas Farmers' Alliance in 1889, can also determine continuity of leadership between the two movements. The major officers were Benjamin H. Clover, president; W. H. Biddle, vice-president; J. B. French, secretary; A. E. Dickinson, state lecturer; and Van Buren Prather, assistant state lecturer.⁷

Of the preceding officers, two did not enter politics as office-seekers. Secretary J. B. French had a full-time job

⁶Fourteenth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas (Topeka: George Clark, State Printer, 1904), p. 156.

⁷Topeka Advocate, August 31, 1889.

with the Alliance and held it until 1896.⁸ His involvement in politics was confined to being president of the Alliance Tribune Publishing Company of Topeka, which printed a Populist-oriented newspaper.⁹ State Lecturer A. E. Dickinson opposed the Alliance entering politics. He and W. P. Brush, the ex-state organizer for the Alliance, worked vigorously against the Alliance and particularly against Ben Clover, candidate for Congress, in the 1890 campaign.¹⁰

Ben Clover, twice president of the Kansas Alliance, was also twice elected vice-president of the National Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union.¹¹ Nominated for Congress by the third district Alliance convention, he was victorious by a margin of 4400 votes.¹² As a Congressman, he was not a success. By sleeping through the vote on a bill in which he was especially interested, he made himself a laughingstock in Washington.¹³ When he became involved in a Washington scandal, his wife sued for divorce.¹⁴ The Populist party refused to

⁸Advocate, December 11, 1895.

⁹The Alliance Tribune, January 7, 1892.

¹⁰Winfield American Nonconformist, October 30, 1890.

¹¹Advocate, December 10, 1890.

¹²Seventh Biennial Reports, p. 194.

¹³Miller, p. 185.

¹⁴Advocate, August 8, 1894.

re-nominate him in 1892; he became disgruntled and returned to the Republican party in 1894, but only after charging the Populist leaders with betraying the principles of the party and the Alliance.¹⁵ In 1896 Clover returned to the Populist party.¹⁶

W. H. Biddle, twice vice-president of the Kansas Alliance, was a candidate for state treasurer in 1890, 1892, and 1894. He won office only in 1892 by the narrow margin of 3800 votes.¹⁷ He continued to be active in Kansas Populist activities.

Van Buren Prather was very active in forming the Alliance. He had also attended the organizational meeting of the Kansas Citizens' Alliance and was commissioned as an organizer.¹⁸ He was an assistant state lecturer in 1889 and elected state lecturer in 1890.¹⁹ He was active at the third-party conventions 1890 through 1896. In 1892 he was nominated

¹⁵"Circular of the Kansas Republican State Central Committee," September, 1894, bound in Populist Party Clippings, Vol. I, Kansas State Historical Society.

¹⁶Advocate, September 2, 1896.

¹⁷Eighth Biennial Report, p. 108.

¹⁸Declaration of Principles and Proceedings of National Citizens' Industrial Alliance (Topeka: Alliance Tribune Job Print, 1891), p. 42.

¹⁹Advocate, October 22, 1890.

for state auditor and won election by 8500 votes.²⁰ His re-election attempt in 1894 was a failure.

There are five other Alliance leaders whose careers in Kansas politics offer interesting and supporting evidence even though they were not State Alliance officers in 1889. John F. Willits, president of the Jefferson County Farmers' Alliance in 1889, is one of these.²¹ Active in the formation of the new party, he was on the first state central committee and the first nominee for governor.²² Although he lost the election, he was rewarded with national prominence by being elected national lecturer of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union at Ocala, Florida, in the December, 1890 convention.²³ Willits became unhappy with leaders of the Kansas Populist party and joined other dissident Populists in 1894; they fought the re-election efforts of Populist Governor Lewelling's administration. He was elected president of the Kansas Farmers' Alliance in the same year.²⁴ The next year he was chosen president of the National Alliance at the Raleigh,

²⁰Eighth Biennial Report, p. 106.

²¹Advocate, October 12, 1889.

²²Advocate, August 20, 1890.

²³Advocate, December 10, 1890.

²⁴Advocate, December 12, 1894.

North Carolina, convention.²⁵ In 1896 he was again outside the Populist mainstream; he was a leader of the faction that opposed uniting with the Democrats in support of William Jennings Bryan for the presidency.²⁶

Stephen M. Scott, another important leader, was an outstanding organizer for the Kansas Alliance in 1889 and 1890.²⁷ He was influential in the decision to take the Alliance into politics. Elected assistant state lecturer of the Alliance in 1890, he moved up to the state lectureship the following year and held that post for three years.²⁸ His only attempt at election to a major office in 1894 resulted in a defeat by 6000 votes for fourth district Congressman.²⁹ Populist Governor Lewelling, nevertheless, rewarded Scott with an appointment to the Board of Public Charities.³⁰ After serving as a delegate to the 1896 national Populist convention, he returned to

²⁵Advocate, February 13, 1895.

²⁶"Populist Campaign Literature," Kansas State Historical Society.

²⁷Stephen M. Scott, Champion Organizer of the Northwest (McPherson, Kansas: n. p., 1890), p. 7.

²⁸Advocate, December 13, 1893.

²⁹June G. Cabe and Charles A. Sullivant, Kansas Votes, National Elections, 1859-1956 (Lawrence: Government Research Center, University of Kansas, 1957), p. 122.

³⁰Handbook of Kansas Legislature, 1895 (Topeka: George W. Crane, 1895), p. 5.

Kansas and zealously campaigned for the state and national Populist ticket.³¹

Louis P. King of Cowley County was one of two Alliance members in the Kansas Senate in 1890. He had been elected to the Kansas House in 1884 and 1886 and to the Kansas Senate in 1888 as a Republican.³² Cowley County Alliancemen selected him as their delegate to the state convention at Newton in 1889. He was also treasurer of the Kansas Alliance Exchange Company.³³ He was active in Alliance matters for many years and also moved into the Populist party. In 1892, 1896, and 1900 he was elected from the 27th district as a Populist to the Kansas Senate.³⁴ He appears to hold the Populist record for longevity in the Kansas Legislature. His political life did not end with the demise of Populism. In 1912, as a Democrat, he was elected to the state senate.³⁵ Once more, in 1924,

³¹Advocate, October 14, 1896.

³²Directory of the Kansas State Senate, 1889 (Topeka: Kansas Publishing House, 1889), p. 18.

³³Advocate, January 23, 1890.

³⁴Twelfth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas (Topeka: W. Y. Morgan, State Printer, 1901), p. 111.

³⁵Eighteenth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas (Topeka: Kansas State Printing Office, 1912), p. 97.

Cowley County sent him to the senate, still as a Democrat.³⁶

Frank McGrath was an active Alliance worker and participated in the political campaign of 1890 as a member of the state central committee.³⁷ The Alliance members elected him state president in 1890.³⁸ His tenure was stormy with accusations of treachery and corruption hurled at him by the Populist press. McGrath wanted to go slow about turning the Alliance over to the Populist party, and as a consequence he was not re-nominated in 1891.³⁹ After that, McGrath told an interviewer he would support the Alliance, but he had harsh words for the Populist party and its leaders.⁴⁰ The break was completed when he returned to the Republican party in 1892.⁴¹

W. L. Rightmire was the Union Labor nominee for state attorney general in 1888.⁴² He was a founder of the Kansas Citizens' Alliance and its first secretary.⁴³ He was the

³⁶Twenty-fourth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas (Topeka: Kansas State Printing Plant, 1924), p. 115.

³⁷Capital, August 14, 1890.

³⁸Advocate, October 22, 1890.

³⁹Kansas Farmer, October 28, 1891.

⁴⁰Wichita Weekly Beacon, October 30, 1891.

⁴¹Advocate, August 10, 1892.

⁴²Newton Commoner, September 7, 1888.

⁴³Advocate, August 20, 1890.

Alliance nominee for Chief Justice of the Kansas Supreme Court in 1890.⁴⁴ In later years he quarreled with other party leaders and virtually left the party he had helped found.⁴⁵

This brief analysis of prominent early leaders in the Alliance has demonstrated the continuity between the Alliance and the Populist party. A. E. Dickinson is the only leader who did not actively engage in politics. The activities of some others were minor, and some even rejected the Populist party. Nevertheless, the involvement was there and supports the claims for continuity of leadership between the two movements.

III. THE ALLIANCE INCORPORATORS

A look at a third group of men will further substantiate claims for continuity of leadership between the Alliance and the Populist party. The charter of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union of Kansas was filed November 10, 1890, with the secretary of state, and twelve men affixed their names to the document.⁴⁶ Frank McGrath, John F. Willits, W. H. Biddle, Stephen M. Scott, and J. B. French have been discussed above.

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵Advocate, June 6, 1894.

⁴⁶Corporations Book No. 42, Secretary of State of Kansas, Kansas State Historical Society Archives, p. 197.

At least four of the other signers were later participants in the Populist party. Joseph V. Randolph from Emporia had been active in every reform movement since 1873, and the Populist party was no exception.⁴⁷ He was a Populist campaign speaker in 1892.⁴⁸ John S. Coddington, a former Republican legislator, was also a campaign orator in 1892.⁴⁹ P. B. Maxson of Lyon County was another long-time reformer who worked in the Populist party. Governor Lewelling rewarded his efforts for the party with an appointment to the state railroad commission.⁵⁰ F. G. Rawson was elected as a Populist to the Kansas House in 1892 from District 69, Sedgwick County.⁵¹

Apparently the three remaining incorporators either were not active as Populists or were active only at local levels. John Pembroke Marshall organized the Wakefield Farmers' Cooperative Association in 1890 and managed it for thirty years.⁵² A. C. Easter was treasurer of the Kansas Farmers' Alliance in 1892.⁵³ S. J. Adkins had been active in the Alliance

⁴⁷Emporia Republican, September 10, 1900.

⁴⁸Advocate, September 28, 1892.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Hand-Book of the Kansas Legislature, 1895 (Topeka: George W. Crane, 1894), p. 5.

⁵¹Eighth Biennial Report, p. 124.

⁵²Twenty-seventh Biennial Report, Kansas State Historical Society (Topeka: Kansas State Printing Plant, 1931), p. 100.

⁵³Advocate, July 20, 1892.

since its beginning and was present at the 1890 conference of county alliance presidents that favored Alliance involvement in politics.⁵⁴

Nine of the twelve incorporators were active at some time in the Populist party. This strong carryover is further evidence that there was continuity of leadership between the Alliance and the Populist party.

IV. VOTING PATTERNS IN THE 1890-1896

LEGISLATIVE ELECTIONS

A study of who voted for the Alliance legislators in 1890 can be combined with an examination of the voting patterns in the legislative elections of 1890, 1892, 1894, and 1896. There seems little doubt that most of the members of the Farmers' Alliance and associated farm groups were loyal to the legislative nominees of the Alliance.⁵⁵ But not all of the Farmers' Alliance members forsook the Republican party in 1890. There were more than two hundred Farmers' Alliancemen, Farmers' Mutual Benefit Association members, and Knights of Labor followers as delegates at the 1890 Republican state convention.⁵⁶ Three Farmers' Alliancemen who stayed with the old party--

⁵⁴Capital, March 26, 1890.

⁵⁵Miller, p. 119.

⁵⁶Twenty-ninth Republican State Convention (Topeka: n. p., 1890), p. 43.

Charles H. Phinney, Jefferson County; Dr. N. Simmons, Douglas County; and Alfred Pratt, president of the Hamilton County Farmers' Alliance--were elected to the Kansas House in 1890.⁵⁷ The highest state-wide vote for an Alliance candidate in 1890 was 116,683 for W. F. Rightmire, running for Chief Justice.⁵⁸ The Alliance claimed 140,000 adherents in 1890, including 100,000 voters.⁵⁹ Since women and youngsters of sixteen were eligible for membership, the sizeable vote for the Alliance ticket demonstrates the loyalty of the Farmers' Alliance members to their ticket in 1890. The Citizens' Alliance, claiming 22,144 members, also supported the ticket, both with words and votes.⁶⁰

Information from the Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Biennial Reports of the Secretary of State of Kansas was used to establish a voting pattern for the Alliance legislative victory of 1890 and the Populist vote in 1892, 1894, and 1896.

In the 1890 election, ninety-two Alliancemen were elected to the Kansas House from districts in sixty-nine counties. Only ten of the counties failed to elect at least

⁵⁷W. W. Admire, Admire's Political and Legislative Hand-Book for Kansas, 1891 (Topeka: George W. Crane and Company, 1891), pp. 443, 444, 449.

⁵⁸Seventh Biennial Report, pp. 87-88.

⁵⁹Kansas Farmer, November 5, 1890.

⁶⁰Advocate, October 29, 1890.

one Populist representative in the three succeeding elections. The ten counties were Shawnee, Jackson, Brown, Marshall, Pottawatomie, Riley, Chautauqua, Marion, McPherson, and Commanche. Most of these ten counties are in the northeastern part of the state. Of the fifty-nine counties which returned Populist legislators to Topeka, forty-seven were the backbone of Kansas Populism. These counties returned Alliance-Populist legislators in at least three out of the four elections. And in twenty-one counties at least one district followed the Alliance success with three straight Populist victories.

In twenty-six counties, at least one district voted for the Alliance legislators in 1890 and then for the Populists two out of three times. Fourteen of these counties are located in middle Kansas; they were Cowley, Butler, Geary, Cloud, Ottawa, Saline, Sumner, Kingman, Rice, Osborne, Barton, Rush, Rooks, and Phillips. The six in the east were Atchison, Wabaunsee, Franklin, Linn, Bourbon, and Labette. In western Kansas the six were Clark, Ness, Graham, Scott, Decatur, and Sherman. The last three counties had no representative in 1890 but returned Populists in the next three elections.

The twenty-one counties from which at least one district returned Alliance-Populist representatives four consecutive elections are enumerated in Appendix D. The information includes the representative district numbers for 1890 and 1892, and the district vote for the major candidates in each of the four

elections. Of the twenty-one counties, twelve were in central Kansas: Clay, Sedgwick, Harper, Barber, Pratt, Stafford, Edwards, Pawnee, Lincoln, Mitchell, Jewell, and Smith. There were six eastern counties with a consistent record of electing Alliance-Populist candidates: Jefferson, Osage, Lyon, Elk, Crawford, and Cherokee. The remaining three counties were in northwestern Kansas: Norton, Sheridan, and Thomas. There were fifteen of these twenty-one counties that also voted for the Populist candidates for state senator in 1892 and 1896. The counties were Clay, Harper, Barber, Pratt, Stafford, Edwards, Pawnee, Lincoln, Mitchell, Jewell, and Smith in central Kansas. The two eastern counties were Osage and Elk. The remaining two counties, Sheridan and Thomas, were in northwestern Kansas.

An additional nineteen counties would have had at least one district with a perfect Alliance-Populist voting record had it not been for the disastrous defeat of 1894. This was because strict Populists rejected cooperation, or fusion, with the Democrats. Consequently, there were often three candidates in the legislature races, which, with the opposition split, meant a Republican triumph.

The pattern of success for both the Alliance and the Populists is the same. Both were strong in the central part of the state, which was the area hardest hit by the economic collapse in 1887 and 1888. This was where the mortgage load

was the heaviest. A majority of the farms lived on by their owners were mortgaged.⁶¹ After the boom collapsed, the rural population in central Kansas dropped 13 per cent. Around 10 per cent of the farmers actually had their property foreclosed.⁶² The Populist success can be attributed to the almost solid support received from the middle third of the state. In this region only Harvey and Russell counties never elected an Alliance or Populist representative. The two other areas in Kansas where the movements enjoyed success were the southeastern corner, where the mining centers were hard-hit by economic depression, and northwestern Kansas, an area hard-hit by drought. The Populists had success in eastern Kansas only when they fused with the Democrats.⁶³

⁶¹Raymond C. Miller, "The Background of Populism in Kansas," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XI (March, 1925), p. 483.

⁶²Ibid., p. 485.

⁶³Ibid., p. 481.

CHAPTER III

CONTINUITY OF PLATFORMS

Farmers' Alliance and Populist party members apparently believed that no local meeting was complete unless a series of resolutions was adopted and published in Alliance or Populist newspapers. On both the national and state level, the adoption of a platform was a primary order of business at every convention. A study of the continuity of programs between the Kansas Alliance and the Kansas Populist party can be made by analyzing the two groups' platforms and supporting resolutions. Major planks of the platforms will be traced from 1889 through 1896.

Platforms to be examined include the 1889 Jefferson County Farmers' Alliance Declaration of Purposes and Platform.¹ The Jefferson County Alliance participated in the 1889 county elections and was one of the first Kansas alliances to enter politics. Other Kansas platforms are the 1889 Alliance Declaration of Purposes and Platform,² the 1890 People's Party Platform,³ the 1892 Kansas Populist Platform,⁴ the 1894

¹Kansas Farmer, October 30, 1889.

²Advocate, June 4, 1890.

³Advocate, September 10, 1890.

⁴Advocate, June 29, 1892.

Populist Platform,⁵ and the 1896 Populist Platform.⁶

Because the Kansas groups often endorsed the national platforms in one sentence and then proceeded to Kansas concerns, a number of national platforms are included in this study. These platforms are the 1889 St. Louis Farmers' Alliance (Southern),⁷ the 1890 Ocala Demands,⁸ the 1891 Cincinnati Platform,⁹ the 1892 St. Louis Platform,¹⁰ the 1892 Omaha Populist Platform,¹¹ and the 1896 St. Louis Populist Platform.¹² An earlier national platform that will also be referred to is the 1888 national Union Labor Platform.¹³

The People's party of Kansas, which earlier in this study was designated the Alliance party, adopted a program in 1890 almost identical to that of the Kansas Alliance. The Farmers' Alliance platform had twelve demands; all of them

⁵Advocate, June 20, 1894.

⁶Advocate, March 25, 1896, and Advocate, August 12, 1896.

⁷Dunning, pp. 122-123.

⁸Advocate, October 7, 1891.

⁹Advocate, September 23, 1891.

¹⁰Advocate, March 16, 1892.

¹¹Advocate, July 6, 1892.

¹²Advocate, July 29, 1896.

¹³Carey Smith, Condition of Our Country (Dodge City: The Dodge City Times, Printers and Binders, 1888), pp. 139-142.

were copied word for word by the People's party. The People's party document had an additional five planks referring to railroads and one each relating to land and labor. The succeeding Kansas Populist platforms of 1892, 1894, and 1896 lacked the forcefulness and inclusiveness of the earlier platforms. Generally the latter three reaffirmed the principles of the national Populist platforms with a single statement and then confined themselves to Kansas affairs, primarily to railroad matters.

A prominent issue throughout the Alliance-Populist era was the free and unlimited coinage of silver. The three earliest Kansas platforms included this plank, although each used slightly different terminology. In 1892, the Kansas Populists did not specifically mention free silver; however, it was included in their blanket endorsement of the 1892 St. Louis platform. The 1894 Kansas platform paralleled the 1892 Omaha demand by calling for the unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one. Again in 1896, the Kansas Populists copied the national platform by stating that the United States should practice free coinage of silver regardless of what other countries might do. Unlimited coinage of silver was a plank carried on by the Alliancemen and Populists from the Union Labor movement.

Demands that Congress pass laws forbidding alien land ownership and provide for government purchase of lands already

owned by aliens appeared in the Jefferson County, the 1889 Kansas Alliance, and the 1890 Kansas People's platforms. The three later Kansas Populist documents did not spell out this idea, but accepted it with their endorsements of national platforms. A corollary to this demand was a call for laws compelling railroads to relinquish all lands they did not actually use. Again, the Union Labor party had presented this idea earlier.

Government ownership and operation of communication and transportation systems were demanded by all platforms with the exception of the Jefferson County platform. Out-right ownership and operation were called for by the Kansas Alliance and the 1890 People's platforms. The 1892 and 1894 Kansas Populists accepted this plank by their endorsements, respectively, of the 1892 St. Louis and 1892 Omaha platforms. The Kansas Populists differed in 1896 by voicing an idea stated earlier in the 1890 Ocala and 1891 Cincinnati demands. This plank urged very strict government control, and if that failed, the government should then take them over. The 1888 Union Labor platform had contained the demand in the same form as that of the Kansas Alliance platform.

One of the main complaints of the Alliance-Populist adherents was the shortage of currency in circulation. The three earliest Kansas platforms called for government regulation of the amount of money per capita as necessitated by

changing economic conditions. Through their endorsement of national platforms, the 1892 and 1894 Kansas Populists called for an increase of the money in circulation to fifty dollars per capita. By endorsing the 1896 St. Louis platform, Kansas Populists demanded a sufficient volume of currency to conduct the business of the country. This was another echo of a Union Labor plank.

A demand that the country's money, as much as possible, be kept in the hands of the people was an article in both the Kansas Alliance and the 1890 People's platforms. Accompanying this demand was a call for all levels of government to practice strict economy in their operations. In 1892 and 1894 Kansas Populists accepted this plank by endorsements.

Expressing a belief in equality for all segments of society, a number of the platforms protested the use of tax money at any governmental level to aid one interest at the expense of others. Both the Kansas Alliance and 1890 People's platforms stated this plank in the identical wording of the 1889 St. Louis platform. In 1892 the Kansas Populists merely stated that everyone should be treated equally. An endorsement of the 1892 Omaha demands by the Kansas Populists in 1894 included their acceptance of a plank opposing any federal assistance to a private corporation. The Ocala and Cincinnati platforms likewise reflected the idea that one interest or industry should not be built up at the expense of the others.

One point emphasized, in varying forms, by the Alliance and continued by the Populists was the demand that national banks be abolished and legal tender treasury notes be substituted for the national bank notes. The Jefferson County, the Kansas Alliance, and 1890 People's platforms also requested that all money issued by the federal government be declared legal tender for payment of all debts. The St. Louis and Omaha platforms of 1892, endorsed by the Kansas Populists in 1892 and 1894, both demanded a flexible currency issued only by the national government. This currency should be placed in the hands of the people not through banking corporations but through a system of direct government loans to the people, such as the sub-treasury would provide. A belief that all money should be issued by the government was one of the tenets of the 1896 Kansas Populists. Every national Alliance and Populist platform and the 1888 Union Labor platform contained a demand that national banks be eliminated.

Sympathy for the laboring classes was expressed in almost every Alliance and Populist platform. The Jefferson County Alliance in 1889 echoed the 1888 Union Labor demands and called for an end to the importation of foreign laborers under contract. The Declaration of Purposes of the Kansas Alliance in 1889 expressed a willingness to help the laboring classes prosper. A specific plank added to the 1890 People's platform was the reduction of workers' hours when labor-saving

machinery was used. The workers, as well as the employer, should benefit from the technological advances. The 1892 Kansas Populists concluded their platform by resolving that the party would work for the welfare of the laboring classes even though its members were chiefly farmers. Earlier they had commended the Populist House of Representatives for passing anti-Pinkerton and anti-blacklist bills, which the Republican Senate had refused to pass. Also, by endorsement they accepted the statement from the 1892 St. Louis platform that the interests of the farmer and the urban worker were identical. In 1894 Kansas Populists contented themselves with expressing sympathy with the workers' goals. But through endorsement of the 1892 Omaha platform they approved the eight-hour day for government workers, immigration restriction, laws forbidding importation of contract labor, and anti-Pinkerton laws. Kansas Populists boasted in 1896 that they were responsible for a law requiring weekly payment of wages and expressed sympathy with workers striking the Kansas City, Kansas plant of the Armour Packing Company. They also condemned the Republican-controlled House of Representatives for not passing the anti-Pinkerton bill adopted by the Populist Senate and demanded laws preventing the products of convict labor from competing with those of free labor. By endorsement they accepted the St. Louis resolution calling for public works projects for the unemployed in times of economic depression.

The adoption of the Australian ballot was of more concern on the state level than it was on the national. The two earliest Kansas platforms called for the Australian ballot and the Crawford County primary election system. The Alliance members in the Kansas House of Representatives passed the Australian ballot bill in 1891, but the Republican-controlled Senate reneged on the 1890 Republican platform and refused to approve it. This was noted in the 1892 Kansas Populist platform. In 1894 Kansas Populists endorsed the Omaha plank calling for the Australian ballot. By 1896 the Australian ballot was law in Kansas; and the Populists took full credit for this in their platform. The 1892 Omaha platform was the only national Populist platform ever to contain this plank.

Among the most controversial issues associated with the Alliance and the Populists was the subtreasury scheme, which provided for direct government loans to farmers based on the security of nonperishable farm products. The idea was first presented to Alliance members at the December, 1889 St. Louis conference. Conceivably the Kansas People's party platform of 1890 could have included this plank, but it did not. The first national platform to endorse this scheme was the 1890 Ocala Demands, followed by the 1891 Cincinnati, 1892 St. Louis, and the 1892 Omaha platforms. An earlier Union Labor idea, direct government lending to citizens upon land security, was also added by the Ocala and Cincinnati platforms.

The two 1892 national platforms reflected the controversy associated with the subtreasury scheme by equivocating on the issue. The platforms called for the implementation of the subtreasury ". . . or some better system."¹⁴ Apparently the Populists did not want to alienate those who opposed the subtreasury scheme but accepted the other party tenets. In 1896, the plank was no longer in the national platform. No Kansas platform ever specifically included the subtreasury scheme. The Populists of 1892 and 1894 accepted it only by endorsement.

Direct election of United States Senators was one of the planks in the 1888 Union Labor platform. This proposal, with modifications, was included in many Alliance and Populist declarations. The Jefferson County plank called for the direct election of all officers in the national government. The proposal was not made in a Kansas Populist platform until 1894, and then it was accepted through endorsement of a national platform. The 1896 national Populist platform added a plank on the direct election of the President and Vice-President, which the Kansas Populists later endorsed.

The earliest Kansas platform, that of the Jefferson County Alliance, borrowed from the Union Labor party when it demanded a graduated income tax. Both platforms called it the most equitable system of taxation. This demand was omitted

¹⁴Advocate, July 6, 1892.

by both the Kansas Alliance and the People's platforms. None of the later Kansas platforms specifically included this demand, but all of them endorsed completely national platforms that demanded institution of the graduated income tax.

The 1889 Kansas Alliance and 1890 People's platforms wanted the salaries of public officials based on current economic conditions, the wages received by other workers, and the current price of goods. This was a primitive cost-of-living index pay scale, but the Alliance thought it would reduce the wages of office holders. In 1896 Kansas Populists again demanded the reduction of public salaries to correlate with current wages and prices. Only one national platform, the 1896 St. Louis, ever contained this plank, and then it was appended at the end with a series of general proposals.

Laws to prevent the organization and maintenance of "trusts" were requested in the 1889, 1890, and 1896 Kansas platforms. The Jefferson County platform had earlier called for laws to make all combinations restricting trade felonious. The Kansas convention of Populists in 1892 encouraged their representatives in the Kansas Legislature and Congress to fight against monopolistic corporations. All national platforms, as well as the 1894 Kansas platform, ignored this plank.

Mortgage laws, which offered more protection to the landowner from foreclosure, were favored by the Kansas Alliance

and 1890 People's platforms. They wanted laws affording ". . . a reasonable stay of execution in all cases," and a ". . . reasonable extension of time before the confirmation of sheriffs' sales."¹⁵ Again, no Alliance or Populist national platform ever declared for the mortgage protection law. The only other Kansas platform mentioning mortgage laws was that of 1896 which boasted that a redemption law had been enacted since the People's party had entered Kansas politics.

A declaration in favor of laws forbidding exorbitant interest and prescribing penalties for violators was another plank in the Alliance and 1890 People's platforms that did not appear in any other platform. According to the 1896 Kansas platform, the Populist Senate had passed a bill in 1895 lowering the legal interest rate and establishing penalties for usury, but the Republican House of Representatives had refused to pass it.

A plank of the Alliance which the Populists did not express was the call for enough fractional paper currency ". . . to facilitate exchange through the medium of the United States mail."¹⁶ The only three expressions of that idea--all in identical wording--were in the 1889 St. Louis, Kansas Alliance, and 1890 People's platforms.

¹⁵Advocate, September 10, 1890.

¹⁶Ibid.

An important issue to the Alliance, which the Populists more or less ignored, was the dealing in agricultural futures. The Jefferson County, Kansas Alliance, and 1890 Kansas People's platforms demanded laws which forbade dealing in agricultural futures with stiff penalties for violators. On the national level, the 1889 St. Louis and 1890 Ocala conventions approved this plank. The 1892 St. Louis platform appended this plank, in its "Additional Resolutions." An endorsement of the St. Louis platform by the Kansas Populists in 1892 implied their acceptance of this plank.

Pensions for ex-Union soldiers and sailors were never specifically included in any national or Kansas platform of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union. An "Additional Resolution" to the Cincinnati platform did not use the word "pension" but called for the payment of money due the men for their services. It stated they should be paid in money just as good as the government paid the bondholders. The 1890 People's platform favored pensions for every Union soldier and sailor. In 1892 Kansas Populists wanted a liberal pension law, and in 1894 they demanded pensions for privates that would equal those of officers. The 1896 Kansas platform had no statement on pensions, but endorsed the St. Louis platform, which had a resolution favoring pensions for all disabled Union soldiers.

None of the national Farmers' Alliance or Populist platforms requested boards of arbitration to settle labor disputes. The Union Labor declaration of 1888 had asked for arbitration to replace strikes and other harmful methods of resolving labor disputes. Two Kansas platforms, those of 1890 and 1894, did raise the issue. The 1890 plank, referring only to railroads, demanded a three member board appointed to handle labor disputes. One member would be chosen by the employer, the second by the workers, and the third by the other two members. In 1894 Kansas Populists demanded state and national arbitration boards to resolve labor disputes.

A proposal not advanced by the Alliance but presented by the Populists was the request for postal savings banks. None of the national Alliance platforms or pre-1892 Kansas platforms mentioned this. In fact, none of the Kansas platforms ever mentioned it specifically; it was accepted only by endorsement in 1892, 1894, and 1896. The postal savings bank proposal can be traced back to the Union Labor movement.

The initiative and referendum was **not** a major issue with the Alliance people. It was added as a separate resolution to the 1892 Omaha platform, and it was also included as a plank in the 1894 Kansas Populist platform. In 1896, the Kansas Populists endorsed the St. Louis platform, which included a plank for the initiative and referendum.

Female suffrage was mentioned by two Kansas and three national platforms. The 1888 Union Labor plank stated that the suffrage was a fundamental right of citizenship, regardless of sex, and called for action by the states. The Cincinnati platform recommended the issue to the states for favorable consideration. The first it was mentioned in Kansas was in the 1892 Populist platform, which merely favored letting the men of Kansas vote on it. Kansas Populists favored women suffrage in 1894 but did ". . . not regard it as a test of party fealty."¹⁷ The other mention of female suffrage came in the 1892 St. Louis platform, which called for a vote by the states.

Republicans in national politics sought to make the tariff an issue, but to most Alliance and Populist followers other issues had greater significance. The Jefferson County Alliance wanted the tariff changed so that the heaviest duties were put on luxuries and the lightest on necessities. The same thought was voiced in the Ocala Demands. No other platform raised the tariff question.

All four Kansas campaign platforms, 1890-1896, had planks or resolutions dealing with the railroads. Among those in the 1890 platform were requests that freight cars be equipped with safety couplers and automatic air brakes, that

¹⁷Advocate, June 20, 1894.

an arbitration board be established, and that railroads not be permitted to bring in Pinkerton detectives to coerce workers. In 1892 the Populists condemned the state board of railroad assessors for reducing the valuations on railroad property. They also favored pension laws for railroad workers injured on the job, a maximum freight rate law, and abolition of railroad passes. Railroads were charged with discriminating in freight rates against interior cities in favor of Missouri River points. In 1894 and 1896, the issues of freight rates and discrimination were again raised.

The only declarations favoring prohibition, a system of free schools, and no renewal for patents were in the Jefferson County platform. Demands for public telephones and telegraph lines to be supplied by the government and free home mail delivery to everyone wherever practical were two items that appeared only in 1892. In 1894, the Kansas platform contained a plank favoring the creation of a state irrigation department, which would study irrigation techniques and water supplies. Two demands not previously voiced--an end to the use of court injunctions against striking labor leaders and a demand that the power be taken from the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to issue or sell government bonds without Congressional approval for each separate issue--appeared in the 1896 Kansas Populist platform.

Religious overtones are discernible in only one Kansas platform. The 1890 People's platform preamble recognized

. . . Almighty God as the rightful sovereign of nations, from whom all just powers of government are derived and to whose will all human enactments ought to conform. . . ¹⁸

The two national platforms of 1892 invoked the protection and blessings of God upon the activities of their conventions. Aside from these, secularism was the rule in Populist platforms.

During the period 1889-1896, Kansas Alliance and Kansas Populist platforms have in common at least nine major issues. Free and unlimited coinage of silver was included in every platform. Laws forbidding alien land ownership were demanded by the first three platforms and requested by the last three through endorsement. Only the Jefferson County platform did not demand government ownership of the means of communication and transportation. Demands for an increase in the amount of money in circulation appeared in three Kansas platforms and were covered in the other three by endorsement. Strict economy in government and keeping the money in the hands of the people were accepted in all but the Jefferson County document. All Kansas platforms but the Jefferson County and 1896 Populist platforms opposed the use of tax money to help one interest at the expense of the others. All Kansas platforms favored abolition of national banks and the substitution of legal tender treasury notes. Every Kansas platform

¹⁸Advocate, September 10, 1890.

expressed sympathy for the laboring classes, and most approved specific recommendations to help workers. Only the Jefferson County platform failed to approve adoption of the Australian ballot.

A number of Alliance issues were not adopted by the Populists. Demands that public officials' salaries be based on current economic conditions were not included in any Populist platform prior to 1896. Anti-trust planks likewise did not appear before 1896 in Populist declarations. Only the Alliance platforms called for the issuance of fractional paper currency. Laws which forbade dealing in agricultural futures were of more concern to the Alliance than the Populist party. Only in 1892 was that legislation requested by the Kansas Populists, when they endorsed the 1892 St. Louis platform.

This analysis of the Alliance and Kansas Populist platforms leads to the conclusion that there was a strong continuity in the platforms of the two movements. Nine planks were specifically found to have appeared in all or almost all of the platforms. Other planks which were examined above were found to have recurred less frequently, but still often enough to demonstrate continuity.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

Historians have long held the assumption that leaders of the Kansas Alliance stepped into positions of leadership in the Kansas Populist party. Four groups of Alliancemen were studied to learn whether this assumption was justifiable.

The ninety-two Alliance candidates who were elected to the state legislature in November, 1890 were analyzed in detail to determine their background, as well as their involvement in Populist politics. Biographical information on these men supplied in 1891 for W. W. Admire's political handbook revealed that the average Alliance legislator was 48.19 years old. Relatively few of them had educational opportunities beyond grade school. Almost half of the Alliance legislators had been born in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois; none were native Kansans. Farming either had been or was the occupation of 94 per cent of them. Thirty-four of the ninety-two were Civil War veterans. More than two-thirds were ex-Republicans. The average Alliance legislator either had no office holding experience or had held only local positions. Of the fifty-seven Alliance legislators who responded to a question on their religious preferences, the majority belonged to the churches of the common people. Such was the background of the Alliance legislators.

Fifty of the ninety-two Alliance legislators ran for the legislature in succeeding years as Populists. Thirty-eight ran for re-election in 1892, and twenty-two were successful. Seven ran for the Kansas Senate in 1892; six were victorious. The fact that forty-five of the 1891 Alliancemen were Populist candidates for the legislature in 1892 indicates a strong continuity of leadership between the two movements on the state level.

A second group of men that were analyzed was a selected group of 1889 State Alliance officers and leaders. Of the five major officers and five prominent leaders examined, only one was not an active participant in Populist politics on the state level.

The third group of men were the twelve who signed the 1889 incorporation papers for the Kansas Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union. Nine of the twelve are known to have campaigned actively for the Populist party.

There is a continuity in the support given to the Alliance and later the Populist candidates in the legislature contests. The same voting patterns appeared in the Farmers' Alliance victory in 1890 and in the Populist efforts of 1892, 1894, and 1896. Sixty-nine counties returned at least one Allianceman in 1890. Only ten of those counties failed to choose at least one Populist in the succeeding elections. Forty-seven counties provided solid support for the Alliance-

Populist legislature candidates. In twenty-one counties at least one district followed the 1890 Alliance success by sending Populists to Topeka for three consecutive terms. The other twenty-six counties voted for Populist legislators two out of three elections following the Alliance victory. More than half the counties that were loyal to the Alliance-Populists were located in central Kansas. There is a correlation (not explored in detail in this study) between the counties that supported the Alliance-Populist movement and the counties that suffered severely from the economic collapse in 1887-1888. Other areas of Kansas that provided strong support were the drought-stricken northwest and the economically depressed mining areas of the southeast.

A corollary study was made of Alliance-Populist platforms and supporting resolutions to determine continuity of major planks. Nine primary demands were found to have been contained in almost all Kansas Alliance and Kansas Populist platforms. These demands were free and unlimited coinage of silver, laws forbidding alien land ownership, government ownership of transportation and communication systems, an increase in the amount of money in circulation, economy in government, opposition to using tax money to help one interest at the expense of the others, abolition of national banks, sympathy for the laboring classes, and the adoption of the Australian ballot. Proposals which the Alliance had backed

but the Populists ignored were basically those that appealed only to farmers.

This analysis of the Kansas Alliance-Populist leaders and platforms demonstrates a strong continuity in both areas. Most of the Alliance legislators and leaders examined were active as Populists. The assumption that Kansas Alliance leaders moved into positions of leadership in the Kansas Populist party has been borne out by this study. Likewise the platforms of the Populists have been shown to be but a continuance of the Alliance documents.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Government Documents

Seventh Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas, 1889-1890, Topeka: Clifford C. Baker, State Printer, 1890.

Eighth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas, 1891-1892, Topeka: Edwin H. Snow, State Printer, 1892.

Ninth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas, 1893-1894, Topeka: Edwin H. Snow, State Printer, 1894.

Tenth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas, 1895-1896, Topeka: J. K. Hudson, State Printer, 1896.

Eleventh Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas, 1897-1898, Topeka: J. S. Parks, State Printer, 1898.

Twelfth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas, 1899-1900, Topeka: W. Y. Morgan, State Printer, 1901.

Fourteenth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas, 1903-1904, Topeka: George A. Clark, State Printer, 1904.

Fifteenth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas, 1905-1906, Topeka: State Printing Office, 1906.

Sixteenth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas, 1907-1908, Topeka: State Printing Office, 1908.

Eighteenth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas, 1911-1912, Topeka: State Printing Office, 1912.

Twenty-fourth Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of Kansas, 1923-1924, Topeka: State Printing Office, 1924.

Secretary of State Corporations Book No. 42, Archives, Kansas State Historical Society.

2. Newspapers

Advocate, Meriden and Topeka, 1889-1896.

Kansas Farmer, Topeka, 1889-1892.

3. Autobiographical

Admire, W. W., Admire's Political and Legislative Hand-Book for Kansas, Topeka: George W. Crane and Company, 1891.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Books and Pamphlets

The Alliance and Labor Songster, Winfield, Kansas: H. and L. Vincent, 1890.

Barr, E. N., "The Populist Uprising," William E. Connelly, compiler, A Standard History of Kansas and Kansans, New York: Lewis Publishing Company, 1918.

Bright, John D., editor, Kansas: The First Century, New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1956.

Cabe, June G. and Charles Sullivant, Kansas Votes: National Elections, 1859-1956, Lawrence: Government Research Center, University of Kansas, 1957.

Clark, Ira G., Then Came the Railroads, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1958.

Constitution and By-Laws, People's Party Club, 1892, Topeka: Hamilton Printing Company, 1892.

Daniels, Percy, A Crisis for the Husbandman, Girard, Kansas: Western Herald Print, 1889.

Declaration of Principles of the National Citizens' Alliance, Topeka: Alliance Tribune Job Print, 1891.

Directory of the Kansas Senate, 1889, Topeka: Kansas Publishing House, 1889.

Dunning, N. A., editor, The Farmers' Alliance History and Agricultural Digest, Washington: Alliance Publishing Company, 1891.

The People's Railroad Handbook for Kansas, Topeka: People's Party State Central Committee, 1892.

Pollack, Norman, The Populist Response to Industrial America, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Populist Handbook for Kansas, Indianapolis: Vincent Brothers, 1891.

Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, Topeka: Kansas Publishing House, 1890.

The Railroad Question, Hutchinson: News Print, 1890.

Scott, Stephen M., Champion Organizer of the Northwest, McPherson: n.p., 1890.

Scott, Stephen M., The Sub-Treasury Plan and the Land and Loan System, Topeka: Hamilton Printing Company, 1891.

Smith, Carey, Condition of Our Country, Dodge City: The Dodge City Times, Printers and Binders, 1888.

Taylor, Carl C., The Farmers' Movement, 1620-1920, New York: American Book Company, 1953.

Tracy, Frank Basil, "The Rise and Doom of the Populist Party," Sigmund Diamond, editor, The Nation Transformed, New York: George Braziller, 1963.

Twenty-ninth Republican State Convention, Topeka: n.p., 1890.

White, William Allen, The Autobiography of William Allen White, New York: Macmillan Company, 1946.

Wiest, Edward, Agricultural Organizations in the United States, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1924.

2. Articles

Butterfield, J. Ware, "The Legislative War of 1893," Kansas State Historical Society Transactions, VII (1906), pp. 453-458.

Davis, C. Wood, "Why the Farmer Is Not Prosperous," Forum, IX (April, 1890), pp. 231-241.

- Malin, James C., "The Kingsley Boom of the Eighties," Kansas Historical Quarterly, IV (Summer, 1935), pp. 164-187.
- Malin, James C., "Notes on the Literature of Populism," Kansas Historical Quarterly, I (February, 1932), pp. 160ff.
- Miller, Raymond C., "The Background of Populism in Kansas," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XI (March, 1925), pp. 469-489.
- Morgan, John T., "The Danger of the Farmers' Alliance," Forum, XII (November, 1891), pp. 399-409.
- Nugent, Walter T. K., "How the Populists Lost in 1894," Kansas Historical Quarterly, XXI (Autumn, 1965), pp. 245-255.
- Nugent, Walter T. K., "Some Parameters of Populism," Agricultural History, XL (October, 1966), pp. 255-270.
- Peffer, William A., "The Farmers' Alliance," Cosmopolitan, X (April, 1892), pp. 694-699.
- Rightmire, W. L., "The Alliance Movement in Kansas," Kansas State Historical Society Collections, IX (1906), pp. 1-8.
- Rightmire, W. L., "Organization of the National People's Party," Kansas State Historical Society Collections, XVII (1926-1928), pp. 730-733.
3. Newspapers
- Alliance Tribune, Topeka, 1889-1892.
- American Nonconformist, Winfield, 1887-1891.
- Commoner, Newton, 1887-1889.
- Daily Capital, Topeka, 1881, 1890-1894.
- Daily Republican, Salina, 1893.
- Eagle, Wichita, 1890.
- Free Press, Dexter, 1888-1889.
- Journal, Augusta, 1889.
- Knights of Labor Journal, Philadelphia, 1891.

Lantern, Mapleton and Fort Scott, 1890-1891.

Republican, Emporia, September 10, 1890.

Standard, Emporia, 1890-1891.

Star, Kansas City, 1891.

State Journal, Topeka, 1891.

Tribune, Chicago, May 28, 1899.

Tribune, Junction City, 1890, 1892-1894.

Weekly Beacon, Wichita, 1889-1891.

4. Collections

Biographical Scrapbook "D," Vol. IV, Kansas State Historical Society Library.

Biographical Scrapbook "P," Vol. II, Kansas State Historical Society Library.

John Davis Scrapbooks, Vol. A-I, Kansas State Historical Society Library.

Farmers' Alliance Clippings, Vol. I, Kansas State Historical Society Library.

Peffer Scrapbooks, Kansas State Historical Society Library.

People's Party Pamphlets, Vol. I-VII, Kansas State Historical Society Library.

Populist Campaign Literature, Kansas State Historical Society Library.

Populist Party Clippings, Vol. I-III, Kansas State Historical Society Library.

5. Unpublished Manuscript

Miller, Raymond C., "The Populist Party in Kansas," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1928.

6. Miscellaneous

Appleton's Annual Cyclopedia and Register of Important Events,
New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1890, 1891, 1892,
1893, 1894, 1896.

"Organization Sheet for Citizens' Alliance No. 41," n.p.,
n.d., Kansas State Historical Society Library.

Rhoades, Henry E., editor, Tribune Almanac, New York: Dearborn
and Company, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897,
1898.

Willits, John F., "Final Address to Populists," Topeka:
Populist State Central Committee, n.d.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

ALLIANCEMEN ELECTED TO THE HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES IN 1890

District	Name	County
3	R. P. Fisher	Atchison
5	Marshall Reckards	Jefferson
12	C. M. Dickson	Johnson
15	Peter Percival Elder	Franklin
16	J. P. Stephens	Franklin
17	J. B. Coons	Miami
19	John Wesley Tucker	Linn
20	J. M. Alexander	Anderson
23	B. F. Fortney	Bourbon
24	Hugh M. Reid	Crawford
25	A. J. Cory	Crawford
26	James H. Chubb	Cherokee
27	John T. Jones	Cherokee
28	James I. Tanner	Labette
29	P. A. Morrison	Labette
30	Alexander Duncan	Labette
31	Samuel Henry	Montgomery
32	Archibald L. Scott	Montgomery
33	George E. Smith	Neosho
34	Merit A. Clover	Neosho
35	Adolphus Ziba Brown	Wilson
37	O. M. Rice	Coffey
38	David Shull	Osage
39	Robert W. Lewis	Osage
40	David Millington Howard	Shawnee
43	P. H. Steward	Jackson
44	Joseph D. Hardy	Brown
45	Richard D. McCliman	Nemaha
46	Ezra Carey	Nemaha
47	Wellington Doty	Marshall
48	Marion Patterson	Marshall
49	James L. Soupene	Pottawatomie
50	C. F. Hardick	Pottawatomie
51	Josephus Harner	Riley
52	T. M. Templeton	Geary
53	John Rehrig	Wabaunsee
55	Levi Dumbauld	Lyon
56	John Bryden	Greenwood

APPENDIX A (continued)

District	Name	County
57	George W. Crumley	Elk
58	Jason Helmick	Chautauqua
60	J. L. Andrews	Cowley
61	Lyman J. Davidson	Cowley
62	John Hartenbower	Butler
63	O. W. Jones	Butler
64	John Stubbs Doolittle	Chase
65	Dallas Rogers	Marion
67	Charles D. Drake	Morris
68	H. C. Harvey	Dickinson
69	Michael Senn	Dickinson
70	A. A. Newman	Clay
71	Darius M. Watson	Washington
72	William Rogers	Washington
73	J. T. Ingram	Republic
74	C. R. Cleveland	Republic
75	Simeon Oliver Everly	Cloud
76	D. S. Steele	Cloud
77	George McConkey	Ottawa
78	Patrick H. Dolan	Saline
79	John B. Maddox	McPherson
80	Fred Jackson	McPherson
83	R. W. Hurt	Sedgwick
84	Henry Wesley Ruble	Sedgwick
85	Gary E. Meeker	Sumner
87	John Monroe Doubleday	Sumner
88	George H. Coulson	Harper
89	John Day	Kingman
90	Frank W. Hickox	Barber
91	J. C. Pierson	Pratt
92	Henry Dandridge Freeman	Reno
93	William H. Mitchell	Reno
94	William Campbell	Stafford
95	Marshall W. Cobun	Barton
96	William Miller Kenton	Rice
97	William W. Stanley	Ellsworth
99	A. N. Whittington	Lincoln
100	George H. McKinnie	Mitchell
101	Benjamin Matchett	Osborne
102	Elbert F. Barnett	Jewell
103	Christopher C. Vandeventer	Jewell
104	George E. Smith	Smith
105	P. C. Wagoner	Phillips

APPENDIX A (continued)

District	Name	
106	Reuben Rowse	Rooks
108	John Lovitt	Rush
109	Arthur H. Lupfer	Pawnee
110	D. G. Donovan	Edwards
111	George W. Hollenback	Commanche
112	B. F. Morris	Clark
116	I. N. Goodvin	Ness
118	W. H. Milligan	Graham
119	Wright Hicks	Norton
121	Willis J. Barnes	Sheridan
123	Charles Vail	Thomas
36*	Robert W. Leedy	Woodson
66*	E. W. Maxwell	Marion

*seated by the Alliance-controlled House after contested elections.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

1891 ALLIANCE LEGISLATORS WITH CIVIL WAR SERVICE

Name	District	Service
J. M. Alexander	20	Co. I, 80th Illinois Infantry
Willis J. Barnes	121	Co. C, 25th Iowa Infantry
Elbert F. Barnett	102	unit unknown
Adolphus Brown	35	Troop D, 1st Iowa Cavalry
W. M. Campbell	94	Co. K, 7th Indiana
M. A. Clover	34	Co. H, 28th Illinois
Marshall Cobun	95	Captain, Co. H, 10th W. Va. Inf.
J. B. Coons	17	Co. A, 14th Ohio Infantry First Lieut., Co. I, 38th Ohio
A. J. Cory	25	Co. A, 152nd Indiana
Lyman J. Davidson	61	Co. I, 12th Michigan
John M. Doubleday	87	Co. D, 20th Indiana
Charles Drake	67	First Lieut., Co. E, 11th Kansas
Alexander Duncan	30	Co. E, 67th Pennsylvania Vol. First Lieut., Co. E, U.S. Colored Troops
Simeon Everly	75	West Virginia Militia
R. P. Fisher	3	Battery H, 1st W. Va. Artillery
B. F. Fortney	23	quartermaster department
I. N. Goodvin	116	corporal, unit unknown
Joseph D. Hardy	44	Co. F, 118th New York
H. C. Harvey	68	Co. A, 62nd Ohio Vol. Infantry U. S. Signal Corps
Jason Helmick	58	Co. C, 7th Iowa Infantry

APPENDIX B (continued)

Name	District	Service
R. W. Hurt	83	1st Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry
Fred Jackson	80	Co. A, 116th New York
Benjamin Matchett	101	Union spy
George H. McKinnie	100	Co. F, 73rd Illinois Vol. Inf.
William H. Mitchell	93	Co. A, 24th Indiana
Marion Patterson	48	4th New York Artillery Captain, 19th U. S. C. T. Brevet Lt. Col., U. S. Vol.
William Rogers	72	Co. E, 74th Illinois Infantry
Reuben Rowse	106	Co. C, 9th Iowa Infantry
Archibald L. Scott	32	Co. B, 4th Ohio Infantry
Michael Senn	69	Co. B, 1st Colorado
James L. Soupene	49	Troop K, 9th Kansas Cavalry
D. S. Steele	76	Co. H, 75th Illinois Inf. Co. E, 45th Illinois
Christopher Vandeventer	103	Co. K, 42nd Illinois
Darius Watson	71	Co. F, 82nd Indiana

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

ALLIANCE LEGISLATORS OF 1891 LISTED ACCORDING TO
THEIR SUCCEEDING POLITICAL TRIUMPHS

Defeated for re-election in 1892

Name	1892 district	County
C. M. Dickson	12	Johnson
Archibald Scott	28	Montgomery
Adolphus Brown	30	Wilson
O. M. Rice	32	Coffey
David Howard	35	Shawnee
Joseph Hardy	40	Brown
Josephus Harner	44	Riley
John S. Doolittle	55	Chase
Dallas Rogers	56	Marion
Gary E. Meeker	70	Sumner
Henry D. Freeman	76	Reno
William H. Mitchell	77	Reno
Reuben Rowse	89	Rooks
John Lovitt	91	Rush
George W. Hollenback	95	Commanche
I. N. Goodvin	99	Ness

APPENDIX C (continued)

Successful in re-election in 1892

Name	1892 district	County
John W. Tucker	17	Linn
P. A. Morrison	27	Labette
Richard D. McCliman	41	Nemaha
George W. Crumley	50	Elk
A. A. Newman	59	Clay
Darius Watson	60	Washington
Simeon O. Everly	62	Cloud
George McConkey	63	Ottawa
Patrick H. Dolan	64	Saline
Henry W. Ruble	67	Sedgwick
John M. Doubleday	71	Sumner
George H. Coulson	72	Harper
William Campbell	78	Stafford
Marshall Cobun	79	Barton
William M. Kenton	80	Rice
A. N. Whittington	83	Lincoln
George H. McKinnie	84	Mitchell
Elbert Barnett	86	Jewell
P. C. Wagoner	88	Phillips
Arthur H. Lupfer	92	Pawnee
B. F. Morris	96	Clark
Willis J. Barnes	104	Sheridan

APPENDIX C (continued)

Candidates for the Kansas Senate in 1892

Name	State senate district	County
Hugh M. Reid	9	Crawford
Levi Dumbauld	24	Lyon
Jason Helmick	26	Chautauqua
Michael Senn	22	Dickinson
William Rogers	20	Washington
George E. Smith	40	Smith
Samuel Henry *	12	Montgomery

* Unsuccessful

Defeated candidates for the House after 1892

Name	District	Year	County
Wellington Doty	41	1894	Nemaha
C. F. Hardick	43	1894	Pottawatomie
John Hartenbower	54	1894	Butler
John B. Maddox	65	1894	McPherson
Peter P. Elder	15	1900	Franklin

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D (continued)

Stafford, 94 (78)	Pawnee, 109 (92)
1890: 1099-665	1890: 686-490
1892: 1212-857	1892: 770-591
1894: 992-861	1894: 631-583
1896: 1205-728	1896: 585-540
Lincoln, 99 (83)	Edwards, 110 (93)
1890: 1351-683	1890: 495-312
1892: 1284-953	1892: 424-387
1894: 1074-943	1894: 399-373
1896: 1183-837	1896: 444-341
Mitchell, 100 (84)	Norton, 119 (102)
1890: 1902-1033	1890: 1047-685
1892: 1840-1495	1892: 1081-1055
1894: 1509-1352-289	1894: 1002-939
1896: 1805-1455	1896: 1226-942
Jewell, 102 and 103 (86)	Sheridan, 121 (104)
1890: (102) 1186-816	1890: 463-238
1890: (103) 1169-629	1892: 428-342
1892: 2205-2014	1894: 305-274
1894: 2013-1999-157	1896: 345-338
1896: 2254-1960	
Smith, 104 (87)	Thomas, 123 (106)
1890: 1790-993	1890: 499-412
1892: 1906-1392	1892: 658-516
1894: 1776-1376-174	1894: 428-408
1896: 1884-1397	1896: 443-330