BOARD OF PARDONS

State of Illinois.

Jan. 6, 1906.

Dear Will:—

I meant every word I said. It may be the fight will go on. I have been around the Legislature longer than any one in the state with one exception. I have seen all sorts of lobbies and all sorts of fights. No one has ever bearded the lion in his den as did Will.

Many times I feared for his personal safety, and it was the cowardice of the "gang" that kept them from him. The saloon power in Illinois feared and hated him more than any man who has ever appeared in opposition to them—this I know.

He writes me he thinks the fight will go on, and that he would hate to feel that a structure he had been five years in building could be so soon torn down. The trouble is, in my mind, the structure has gone to New York! The state is eighty-eight years old—the distillery and brewery interests represent millions, and have had their way until he stopped in their path. When men who have been in the Legislature for years and through many fights begin to beg from one who is not much more than a boy, with not much behind him but a splendid inherited character and a firm determination to do what he believes is right, it is a sight to make one weep.

I have had several tiffs with members who were impugning his motives and casting reflections on him,—the last resort of cowards. I am not in favor of County option, but if he had stayed, it would have gone through.

As Rinsker would say, I am not talking for publication, but I wanted you to feel that I meant what I said. How proud you and the good wife should be of your boys, and then, how proud they should be of their parents.

Am mending slowly. Hope to be all right in two or three weeks.

Yours

Sdlver.

Hon. E. A. Snively,
Springfield, Ill.

My dear Snively:

Although I am rather late in acknowledging it, but I desire to express to you my sincere appreciation together with Mrs. Anderson's for the nice letter you wrote for our boy Will. I don't know whether your remark that the fight was practically ended in this state was of a sarcastic nature or whether you meant by his elimination it has become so. I think not, however, although I am rather of a liberal turn of mind myself, and mildly protested against his taking up this line of work at the beginning, yet the Ohio victory was won on lines of organization in consolidating all the churches and religious denominations, originated by Will, and I think so far as the politicians of this state are concerned that they will be put to come out in the open and declare themselves in favor of carrying out the wishes of the people. No matter what a man's individual sentiments are, it is only the good principles of American citizenship to insist upon the right of voting upon any and all moral questions that affect the public welfare. I don't believe, while it may sound rather egotistical, that they will ever get a man that will fill Will's place in this state, for the boy is pretty well equipped mentally and executive, and for the last three years has done about four men's work, in fact I was in fear all of the time that his health would break down and he would become a nervous wreck. I am glad that he is out of it so far as this state is concerned, because his future duties will reap him the same salary, be much more agreeable and an immense burden lifted from his shoulders.

I am sorry to learn of your affliction, but trust that you are fully recovered at this time, and with my best wishes for the good health of yourself and Mrs. Snively, and lots of prosperity during the coming year, I remain,

Very truly your friend,

[Signature]
Chicago, Ill., February 2, 1906

PERSONAL

Mr. William H. Anderson,
402 S. D. Morgan Building,
Buffalo, N. Y.

My dear Mr. Anderson,

Will you at any time in the near future, be in Chicago? I feel that I must talk to you concerning matters of which you are informed. I realize that I did some things, which, under other circumstances, I would never have thought of doing. I am sure you will bear me out in this. However, I did them and am sorry for it and apologize to you now. I wanted to see you before you went away, but the work here made it impossible. I assure you that I have said nothing to anybody concerning the unrest, etc. in the Anti-Saloon League. I believe I would be unworthy of forgiveness were I to try to poison the mind of anybody against you and I trust that you will take my word for it when I say I have not done so. Never before in my life have I found occasion to be untrue to a person and I shall see to it that I never do it again.

Trusting that I may hear from you, I am,

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
February 3, 1906

Miss E. Edna Barr,

#832 Marquette Bldg.,

Chicago.

My dear Miss Barr:

Your letter of the 2nd requesting an interview duly received. I will be in Chicago between noon the 5th inst. and Friday evening, the 9th. Tuesday, possibly Wednesday, and Thursday are the only days I am likely to be down town. Suppose you address me at my home, #2779 N. Ashland Ave. as to when and where you want to see me. I will then have to adjust myself to Mr. Shields’ plans, as I am coming back partly to assist him.

I am glad to have your statement that you have kept your own counsel and I am glad to know that you have felt that there were certain things that could not be ignored or passed over in silence. I think you will feel, in the light of some information which I may be able to give you, that if you had it to do over again you could not, under even the same circumstances, do certain things. In other words, that the circumstances were not as you concede them.

Fortunately, I have the consolation that the Lord has been gracious enough, as he frequently is, to overrule for good a great many things, and that it is only individuals in proportion to their degree of connection with the case, and not the cause itself which has suffered.

I shall be very glad to hear anything that you may be prompted to say, as I do not wish to continue to entertain unpleasant impressions concerning anyone.

Yours very truly,

"x"
Chicago, Ill. Jan. the 15th. 1908

Reference File, W. H. A.

No. 11/4/c...

The Anti-Saloon League of Illinois.

(The Presbyterian Ministerial Association of Chicago)

having learned of the resignation of Mr. Wm. H. Anderson as Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of Illinois and of his departure for Buffalo to assume the duties of Assistant Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of the State of New-York, desires to place upon record its high appreciation of the faithful-laborious and eminently successful work done by Mr. Anderson in arousing and organizing the moral sentiment of Chicago and of the State of Illinois in the interest of more effective laws regulating the liquor traffic and guarding the rights of the people to decide by vote whether they desire saloons to be opened in the neighborhood of their homes.

For years Mr. Anderson has borne the brunt of the fight against the strongly entrenched liquor interests of the city and the State, and the present state of progress towards just laws is due largely to his efforts. He will ever be remembered by us as the leader in what, when accomplished, will be one of the great moral reforms of the day.

With kind greetings,

[Signature]

Secretary.
Long Distance Telephone, 2367 Harlem

The New York Anti-Saloon League,
(incorporated)

State Branch Offices In
Long Island,
Greater New York,
Poughkeepsie,
Albany,

State Headquarters, And Headquarters Of The
Lincoln Legion,
67 West 128th Street
New York City

February 20th, 1906.

Reference File,

No. 306

Mr. William H. Anderson,
402 D. S. Morgan Building,
Buffalo, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Anderson:

I think you asked me to write something for the personal circular you are printing, but I overlooked it until now. You can insert the following, making any changes in it you may think best.

Yours very cordially,

Howard Hyde Russell,
Superintendent.

Dictated.

Mr. William H. Anderson, just appointed at my request as my associate in the executive oversight of our League, with Headquarters at Buffalo, comes to us with the prestige of a brilliant leadership as the general Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League in Illinois. By authority of our Headquarters Committee, and with great personal joy, I commend Mr. Anderson to the pastors and churches of the Empire State. Give him your most cordial and confident welcome for the work's sake, and for my sake, and you will soon honor him and love him for his own splendid talents and genuine consecration.

- Introduction
- Brewer stuff in pamphlet
June 23, 1906

Rev. Howard H. Russell, D.D.,
Clifton Springs, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Russell:—

The paper containing Raines' defense came in some little time after your letter. I took time to sketch out something at once but as your letter said if I wrote by Friday morning to send it to Clifton Springs, I thought I would let it go over and sleep on it as some of you folks probably think I am not far removed from a fire-eater anyhow, but this morning it just occurred to me that perhaps you meant to get the letter to Clifton Springs by Friday morning. However, it is too late now. I am sending a copy of this to the New York office to be forwarded and I presume you will leave directions at Clifton Springs where to forward your mail.

I had anticipated about some such action as this on Raines' part and had my mind fully made up long ago as to what seemed to me the best thing and there is no essential difference in what he did and what I expected.

It seems to me that the time has come when we must put it up to him so strenuously and with enough poison in the premises to either compel him to come out and make a break which will help us or put him so deep in the hole that we can push the walls of it over on him.

I think that your reply should be very short and crisp and should crack like a whip. It should contain, it seems to me, some pointed questions and a distinct challenge couched in such terms as to goad him into accepting, or if he keeps quiet will thump him every time anybody speaks of it. It seems to me that the specific proposition should not contain a word of argument but be in every line sufficiently biting to float it and make it news, and it may be accompanied as an exhibit or appendix, by a full statement of the facts, but the facts should not be woven in for fear of deadening the concussion or otherwise acting as a non-conductor.

I haven't taken the time to polish up anything because you would want to go over it anyhow and there is no need, but the essential substance without material loss of any of its sting I think ought to go, except where I may have indicated in parenthesis
that I am frankly doubtful, so I herewith enclose something which is my idea of the skeleton of what I would send out if I were doing it myself. It seems to me that this might well be sent to the newspapers over the state in connection with your statement of facts, as an appendix, and I would take plenty of time to get it up.

After looking the thing over and thinking over it further I am more than ever persuaded that the only way we will get attention is by being strenuous. With most people Raines' denial will settle it unless we go so far as to prove to every fair minded person that we would not dare do it if we had not the proof. The question form is the meanest form and therefore the best adapted for this proposition and that last part where it sneers at his courage if he doesn't come out is carefully studied. We have got to do something of this sort of revive the issue or it will go dead on our hands in the county and drop off outside. If we put up something of this sort and challenge him with the reputation he has as a fighter to come out and he doesn't come, it strengthens our case with the entire state. Of course there is a bare chance that he may do like Cassidy and pack the crowd on us, but I don't believe it. I think he is afraid to some and I think absolute fearlessness on our part is the best thing to keep him from coming. If we don't go back at him in about this way he is liable to follow Cassidy's example and challenge us and we then lose the advantage of position, so that while you want to take plenty of time to get it to suit you, it ought to go along as soon as possible. I think it ought also to be sent to the Canajagua papers with a courteous request that they publish it in the interests of fair play.

Yours very cordially,
AN OPEN LETTER.

Hon. John R. Raines,

Canandaigua, N.Y.

Dear Sir:—

Your address to the voters of the Forty-Second Senatorial District which is evidently the statement promised in your letter refusing to discuss publicly the question of your responsibility for the defeat of local option, throws much light upon the real reasons for your refusal to appear before your fellow citizens. Your "statement" is a palpable evasion of some points and an astounding misstatement of others and indicates that you do not realize the extent of the League's knowledge of the various facts upon which its general statement of your responsibility was based.

If the local option bill of 1905 is as faulty as you say how do you explain the fact that the Ohio law passed in 1904, of which our bill of 1905 is a substantial copy, was pronounced by Governor Herrick and the Republican Party of Ohio last fall to be practically an ideal temperance measure.

If our bill of 1905 was faulty why did you refuse to discuss it with me when I made two separate trips clear to Canandaigua for the purpose of getting your suggestions?

Why did you give a reason last fall January for opposing the bill in the preceding session which was different from the reason you gave during that session? What was your real reason?
If the Raines law providing for local option by townships so good a temperance measure, why have you stood in the way of the extension of its operation to cities and residence districts?

You sneer at the legislation in Ohio. Why did you omit to mention that while the Raines law does not give local option to any city in New York State, under the legislation secured in Ohio by the Anti-Saloon League over 200 of the smaller cities have already abolished the saloon?

If as you charge, the local option bill of 1906 was in favor of the liquor interests, how do you account for their strenuous opposition to it?

You deny that you controlled the senate committee on retrenchment. Is it not true that you asked one or more senators who desired to get on that committee whether they would consent to vote on excise matters as you wished?

You say that the request for a rule came up in the last days. Is it not true that you deliberately arranged to have the matter delayed until the very last of the session in order to give you an excuse for saying when it came up that it was not feasible to help it along?

Has the state at large, considering your prominence, any interest in your attitude upon local option or does it concern simply the voters of your district?

What is your attitude anyhow on the question of extending local option to cities?

Since you have raised a number of issues of fact which vitally concern the whole state, therefore, in the name of the Anti-Saloon League, I hereby challenge you, if you believe that your
general ex-party defense will stand examination; if you can answer
these and other questions that will be put to you; and if you
are not afraid to come out into the open before the public where you
must either meet the issues or be seen of all men to dodge them,
to debate the questions involved.

The League is willing to meet you in your home town, in
the presence of your friends, at any time before the primaries,
and pay the expenses of hiring the hall and of advertising the
meetings meeting. At such time I will undertake to prove to the
satisfaction of your own constituency:

1st. That you might have secured the passage of the
local option bill and did not.

2nd: That you did not because you did not want it passed.

3rd: Since you have brought in the question of your general
temperance record, that in 1905 and 1906 you opposed until you
were forced into line, legislation which would be effective
in correcting the infamous abuses connected with the so-called
Raines Law Hotels (The exact wording of this bill have to be
fixed up according to what you can prove concerning his
attitude in 1905 and the exact facts.)

4th: That the defense which you have issued to the electors
Evasive
of your district is flimsy, and not in accordance with the facts
in the case.

If the facts are on your side, Senator, here is an excellent
chance for you to pulverize this opposition and maintain your record
as a fearless, frank, open fighter.

Yours respectfully,
Open Letter to John Raines

ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE'S REPLY

To Senator Raines' Recent Statement to the Voters of his District

Supt. Russell Asks Thirteen Suggestive Questions

On Behalf of League, Urgently Challenges Raines to a Series of Joint Debates at Places in the Senator's District

What the League Will Prove

Headquarters
NEW YORK ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE
67 West 125th Street, New York

Hon. John Raines,
Canandaigua, New York.

June 30th, 1906.

Dear Senator:

I beg to acknowledge receipt on last Saturday of the copies of your Address to the Electors of your district, which you sent to our Headquarters Committee. This is evidently the statement promised in your letter delivered to me by your messenger at Bemis Hall, Canandaigua, Tuesday night, June 19th, declining to discuss publicly the question of your responsibility for the defeat of the local option. Your "statement" throws much light upon the real reasons for your refusal to appear before your fellow-citizens. It is a palpable evasion of some points and an astounding misstatement of others and indicates that you do not realize the extent of the League's knowledge of the various facts upon which its general charge of your responsibility was based. It suggests some interesting questions which you must face in this campaign. Here are some of them:

THE LOCAL OPTION BILL "DEFECTIVE."

Question One: If our bill of 1905 was defective and "good for nothing," and you are the friend of temperance you claim to be, why did you refuse to discuss it with me and point out its defects last December when I arranged dates with you and made two separate trips clear from New York City to Canandaigua, for the purpose of getting your suggestions?

Question Two: If the local option bill of 1905 was as faulty as you claim, how do you explain the fact that the voters of Ohio regarded it with such favor that they overturned Governor Herrick's majority of 114,000 in 1903 and elected Governor Pattison by 43,000 in 1905 because Governor Herrick, in the interest of the liquor dealers, opposed and weakened practically the same measure in the winter of 1904?

Question Three: Why in our conference in the Lieutenant Governor's room last January did you give a reason for opposing the bill in the preceding session, which was totally different from the reason you gave during that session? What was your real reason?
THE BILL “FAVORABLE TO LIQUOR DEALERS.”

**Question Four:** How could the bill favor the liquor interests by “reducing the dry towns by at least fifty per cent.” when the bill in its operation only applies to cities and wet towns and does not apply to nor affect dry towns at all?

**Question Five:** If, as you charge, the bill was in favor of the liquor interests, how do you account for their fierce opposition; the vast amounts of money they spent and the terrific pressure of every kind they employed to defeat it?

YOUR CONTROL OF THE COMMITTEE.

**Question Six:** You deny that you controlled the Senate Committee on Taxation and Retrenchment. Is it not true that in 1905, when you were organizing the Senate Committees, you asked certain senators who applied to you for or conferred with you regarding a place on that committee, whether they would agree to vote on excise matters as you wished? Is it not true that the committee did as you wished on excise bills both in 1905 and 1906?

YOUR REFUSAL TO GIVE A RULE.

**Question Seven:** You say my request for a rule came between 10 and 11 o’clock the last day of the session. Is it not true that you deliberately arranged to have the matter delayed until the very last of the session in order to give you an excuse for saying that it was not feasible to help it along?

**Question Eight:** You quote my letter of 10 A. M. May 3d, telling you Senator Malby had agreed to vote for a rule, and claim there was no time to bring the local option bill to a vote in the closing two hours of the session. Why didn’t you also quote my letter asking the same action by you, written at 5 P. M., May 3d, more than an hour before the Senate adjourned on Wednesday afternoon, May 2d? Would it have been awkward, Senator, to explain to the electors why you did not recommend by a rule to the Senate Wednesday afternoon that they meet Wednesday evening (when in fact no session was held), or at an earlier hour than 10 o’clock on Thursday morning, and thus pass local option without interfering at all with other legislation during the last two hours on Thursday?

THE EXTENSION OF LOCAL OPTION TO CITIES AND RESIDENCE DISTRICTS.

**Question Nine:** You sneer at the legislation in Ohio promoted by our League. Why did you omit to mention that while the Raines law does not give local option to any city or part of a city in New York State, under the legislation secured in Ohio by the Anti-Saloon League both cities as a whole and residence districts now have local option; that more than 400 municipalities have already abolished all saloons and that by a “residence district” law, practically the same as the one you helped to defeat, eighty residence districts in cities have cleared out the saloons.

**Question Ten:** If the Raines law providing for local option by townships is so good a temperance measure, why have you for years stood in the way of the extension of its operation to cities and residence districts?

**Question Eleven:** What IS YOUR ATTITUDE ANYHOW, on the question of extending local option to cities?

A QUEER “FRIEND OF TEMPERANCE.”

**Question Twelve:** Since you are boasting of your seal for the temperance cause, allow me to ask why you stood in the way of the efforts made in 1905 to effectively abolish the horrible “Raines Law Hotels” made possible by the law of which you were the author, and why did you again oppose these efforts in 1906 until you were forced by a political situation to withdraw your antagonism to this legislation?

**Question Thirteen:** Why also, if you pose as a temperance man to the electors, did you actively aid in the passage of the Saxe Bill in 1905, and the still worse Brackett Bill in 1906, which, but for the veto and refusal of his signature by the Governor would have removed the 200 foot protection to churches and would have allowed a bar-room upon the next lot to the church anywhere in the state?
CHALLENGE TO DEBATE THESE AND OTHER ISSUES.

Since you have raised a number of issues of fact which vitally concern our whole state, therefore, in the name and by the authority of the Headquarters' Committee of the Anti-Saloon League, I hereby challenge you, if you believe that your general ex-parte defense will stand examination; if you can answer these and other questions that will be put to you; and if you are not afraid to come out into the open before the public where you must either meet the issues or be seen of all men to dodge them, to debate the issues involved:

I hereby propose to meet you at four places in your district, namely: Canandaigua and Geneva, in Ontario County, and at Clyde and Palmyra in Wayne County, at any dates that will suit your convenience between July 15th and August 15th. The League will pay the expenses of hiring the halls and advertising the meetings; the chairman to be a well-known citizen of each place, mutually agreed upon, and the debates to be under customary rules and with an equal amount of time. I will speak one hour in opening; you speak an hour and thirty minutes, and I will close in thirty minutes. In these debates I will undertake to prove to the satisfaction of your constituents:

First: That the bill of 1905 and of 1906 was a just and reasonable local option bill by which to extend a measure of local option where it is not now provided in this state.

Second: That you never in any way or at any time assisted in this effort to thus extend the principle of local option.

Third: That you actively opposed both years the passage of the local option bill.

Fourth: Since you have brought in the question of your general temperance record, that in 1905 and in 1906, until you were forced into line, you opposed legislation which would be effective in diminishing the evils of the Raines Law Hotels; and that you favored and furthered the passage of the Saxe Bill vetoed by the Governor in 1905, and the Brackett Bill of 1906, which the Governor refused to sign, providing for withdrawing the 200 foot protection to churches and permitting a bar-room right next to a church.

Fifth: That the defense which you have issued to the electors of your district is flimsy, evasive, and not in accordance with the facts in the case.

Kindly reply by July 10th. If the facts are on your side, Senator, here is an excellent chance to demolish this opposition and maintain your record as a fearless, frank and open fighter.

Yours respectfully,

[Signature]

Superintendent,
The New York Anti-Saloon League.
WHO KILLED LOCAL OPTION?
SENATOR JOHN RAINES,
AIDED BY ALDADS AND CASSIDY.

A BRIEF STATEMENT OF FACT.

For two years John Raines, Excise Specialist, and President pro tem. of the Senate, has imposed an unofficial veto upon the Local Option Bill. John Raines controlled a majority of the members of the Committee on Taxation and Retrenchment, to which excise legislation is referred. It is the Committee which guards his pet measure—the Liquor Tax Law. He practically appoints it and has made no secret of his purpose to control it. It is in this committee that the Local Option Bill has for several years been annually interred.

1905.—In 1905, after the Ambler Local Option Bill in the Senate had been amended by the Committee to meet objections made by Senator Raines, he required the Committee to hold it until near the end of the session. In the meantime the Assembly had passed the Wainwright Bill in its original form. On its arrival in the Senate it was referred to the Committee on Taxation, two weeks before the close of the session. Then the Senate Bill was reported. There would have been no chance of passing this altered Senate Bill in the Assembly had it been put through the Senate, but the Chairman of the Committee declared that he could only report the Senate Bill. Further, Senator Raines would not allow even the amended Senate Bill to come to a vote. Thus Local Option perished at his hands in 1905.

1906.—In 1906 the bill was altered to meet Senator Raines' views and finally put in a shape which he declared was satisfactory. The committee, however, never loosed its grip on the bill. Four members, including the Chairman, voted for a report of the bill and were ready to do so at all times. But two up-State Republican Senators, Aldus and Cassidy, who were loyal to Raines and the liquor dealers, but recreant to the people, joined with three men from rum-ruled districts in New York City, to keep it locked up in the committee room, by a vote of 5 to 4, and when on the next to the last day of the session the Local Option Bill came over from the Assembly, Senator Raines refused it the only chance it then had of passage by declining to report a rule from the Rules Committee making the bill a special order. In short, he delayed the bill until it needed strong measures of relief, and then refused to help it through.
LEXINGTON AVENUE BAPTIST CHURCH

Cor. of Sixty-Second St., Chicago, Ill.
Church Telephone, Hyde Park 2679.

MELBOURNE P. BOYNTON, PASTOR.
Telephone Hyde Park 1508.
0301 Greenwood Avenue.

ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS WITH WHICH OUR CHURCH CO-OPERATES:

1. FOREIGN MISSIONS:
   a. American Baptist Missionary Union.
   b. Woman's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society of the West.

2. HOME MISSIONS:
   b. Woman's Baptist Home Mission Society.
   d. Baptist General Association of Illinois.
   e. Chicago Baptist City Mission Society.

3. BAPTIST INSTITUTIONS:
   a. Chicago Baptist Hospital.
   b. Central Baptist Orphanage.
   c. Baptist Ministers' Home.
   d. Home for Missionaries' Children.
   e. Divinity School, University of Chicago.

4. YOUNG PEOPLE AND SUNDAY SCHOOL:
   a. Baptist Young People's Union of America.
   b. Cook County Sunday School Association.

5. GENERAL:
   c. Jackson Park Sanitarium, (for Babies).
   d. Berneh Homes, (for Girls).
   e. Chicago Bureau of Charities, (Woodlawn District).
   f. Woodlawn Improvement Club.

Aug 8 - 1906

Dear Mr. Anderson:

I have been laid up with sickness and am just leaving for the "woods" to rest. I have glanced over your "Mem" which you did me the honor to submit for my judgment. I have no suggestions to make. How can it be your work is wonderfully full, attractive, brief, to the point, strong and clean. We need it everywhere among our workers. Success and more success to you.

Your Boynton.
Columbus, Ohio, August 20, 1906

Mr. Wm. H. Anderson,
Carlinville, Ill.

My dear Anderson:

I send you to-day the manuscript of your booklet. The passages that I have marked in parenthesis, it appears to me, should be stricken out. In some instances I have suggested another work or phrase as the case may be. From my standpoint it does not need much correction. You will probably re-write it. If so, I would try in a number of instances to break up involved sentences. I think, however, Mr. Dinwiddie ought to go through it pretty thoroughly. There are some points touched in the national work that I should like for him to pass upon.

Of course, Scanlon will throw fits after he reads it, but he will probably go on throwing fits just the same. So we cannot spend much time considering him. The foreword and expression from liquor people will come later.

Yours hastily but cordially,

[Signature]

Mr. Wm. H. Anderson,

Buffalo N.Y.

Dear Brother:—

Yours of Sept. 24th, received containing Booklet, (The Church in action against the Saloon) Many thanks for same. I appreciate the value of same and hope it can be brought into general use in the State of Illinois.

I am in the midst of Sheed Campaign at present.

With best wishes for your continued success, I remain,

Yours very cordially,

J. Claude Ewing.
Chicago, October 19, 1906.

Mr. William H. Anderson.

Buffalo, N. Y.

Dear Brother Anderson:

I have just returned from a trip down the state visiting the Champaign and Springfield headquarters and having conferences with Ewing and Danbury in regard to their districts. Ewing met me at Springfield and Danbury at E. St. Louis.

I addressed the Synod of Illinois at E. St. Louis yesterday afternoon. It would have done your heart good to have been there and Baker's too. We have a way out here in the state of Illinois of bringing things around our way. The man who read the report of the Committee on church work made one of the strongest endorsements of the Anti-Saloon League I ever heard, and never even mentioned the Permanent Committee of the Presbyterian church in any shape, manner or form. Before the report was adopted I was called upon to address the Synod. I spoke for about twenty-five minutes and judging from the spirit and enthusiasm manifested and the remarks which followed I had the crowd with me. At the close Pfanstiehl, pastor of the Highland Park Presbyterian church, followed, taking the place of Dr. Boyd on the program, and spoke on the question of the Relationship of the Presbyterian church to the Anti-Saloon League. It was one of the greatest endorsements and one of the strongest speeches I have listened to for a long while. He was simply bubbling over with enthusiasm. When he had finished Mr. Whorley (I think is his name) one of the three representatives of the Permanent Committee on Temperance was present and got up to speak. He had been warned, however, by a number of the people before he got up that if he attacked the Anti-Saloon League that the cork would be pulled out of the bottle and there would be a great well, in substance, he would wish he hadn't, and as Brush put it coming home he tried awful hard to talk and not say anything. After he had spoken about fifteen or twenty minutes making an old fashioned Prohibition speech a man got up and moved that the vote be a standing vote, and right in the face of this man's speech that Synod stood as a body without, I think, one dissenting vote in favor of standing by the League. I felt awfully sorry for the poor fellow but I couldn't help it.

I have read the better part of your hand book of the League and I think without a doubt it is a little master piece on the League idea, and I think I shall try and use it instead of Black Rock together with Dr. Chapmans address on the "Stainless Flag," send the two of them instead of Black Rock, although I do
Mr. W. H. A. -- E --

I don't know how this is going to work out.

I have not been able to do anything in LaSalle county and I think it is too late to try to do anything there now.

Miss Odell has arrived back home, which is a great comfort to the Superintendent of Illinois.

We have arranged for field day at Jacksonville on the 18th of November and you are billed for one of the churches and Curtis for another. You are to eat dinner at the same hotel and sleep in the same bed. By the way, I heard a good one on you while I was down at E. St. Louis which I will never tell until I get a good chance at you before an audience.

Our man Horton in Springfield is having an awful time. He seems to be a natural born Anti-Saloon League man in every way but he can't get the money and it breaks his heart. I think he will make good yet. Scrogin is alright. Smith of course you know has taken a charge and left the League.

Yours respectfully,

[Signature: James K. Shields]

State Superintendent.
Rev. Howard H. Russell,

467 W. 125th St.,

New York.

My dear Dr. Russell:

I wrote you the other night in the fulness of my bitter resentment over what I considered to be gross duplicity and an unprovoked, cowardly attack from the rear in the dark. But life is too short for Christian men to waste any of it in bitterness.

I found myself able this morning to pray that if there were anything lacking, I might forgive you as I would myself like to be forgiven, and also that you might be forgiven even as I have done it.

But I would like also to be able to have respect for you. The hardest thing in all this to me is that you have so misunderstood me and have held so lightly the loyalty and tender feeling I have always entertained for you, as to compel me to go to the point of the sacrifice of our friendship to save you and the work from the weaknesses of Howard H. Russell's great strength.

You have grievously wronged me. Further than that, as you doubtless realize from recent developments, you have put absolute power over the question of your future usefulness in this state into the hands of the man whom you have wronged, and you have fallen into this blunder because you have put yourself above the work. I expect to use that power more generously and charitably than you have used yours. I thank God that I have not even been tempted to use this situation to your hurt to satisfy any personal feeling, but now, as from the beginning, I will use it as I have used my energies, for the good of the work regardless of any man, let the consequences be what they may.

If you care for my respect, if you want my friendship in our future relations in this work, and are willing to acknowledge the wrong that in the light of the recent conference with National Superintendent Baker and the up-state men you
you must know beyond question you have done me, I shall be not only willing, but anxious to meet you more than half-way, and will be willing to come to New York next week after Tuesday night if necessary.

Yours very truly,

Williams H Anderson
Rev. Howard H. Russell,

467 W. 135th St.,

New York.

My dear Dr. Russell:

I wrote you the other night in the fulness of my bitter resentment over what I considered to be gross duplicity and an unprompted, cowardly attack from the rear in the dark. But life is too short for Christian men to waste any of it in bitterness.

I found myself able this morning to pray that if there were anything lacking, I might forgive you as I would myself like to be forgiven, and also that you might be forgiven even as I have done it.

But I would like also to be able to have respect for you. The hardest thing in all this to me is that you have misunderstood me and have held so lightly the loyalty and tender feeling I have always entertained for you, as to compel me to go to the point of the sacrifice of our friendship to save you and the work from the weaknesses of Howard H. Russell's great strength.

You have grievously wronged me. Further than that, as you doubtless realize from recent developments, you have put absolute power over the question of future usefulness in this state into the hands of the man whom you have wronged, and you have fallen into this blunder because you have put yourself above the work. I expect to use that power more generously and charitably than you have used yours. I thank God that I have not even been tempted to use this situation to your hurt to satisfy any personal feeling, but now, as from the beginning, I will use it as I have used my energies, for the good of the work regardless of any man, let the consequences be what they may.

If you care for my respect,— if you want my friendship in our future relations in this work, and are willing to acknowledge the wrong that in the light of the recent conference with National Superintendent Baker and the up-state men you
you must know beyond question you have done me, I shall be not only willing, but anxious to meet you more than halfway, and will be willing to come to New York next week after Tuesday night if necessary.

Yours very truly,

William H. Anderson
Rev. Wm. Anderson,
Buffalo, New York.
My Dear Mr. Anderson:--

In a letter from Mr. Shields I note that you wish to be handled gently on November 18th. I think that I must have you to speak in the morning at the Westminster Presbyterian church in Jacksonville because they seem to think there that you are the whole works; but, after the morning service you surely could get some sort of a visit with your family before the conventions opens Monday night following. If five dollars will pay for one hundred copies of your new blue book you might send them to me C. O. D. and I will appropriate them to my personal use. I sincerely hope that you can fill this Jacksonville date.

Yours, 

[Signature]

Springfield, Ill., October 26, 1906.
SUGGESTED LETTER OF ANNOUNCEMENT BY DR. RUSSELL.

Dear Sir and Brother:—

The time has come for a division of work and a strengthening of forces at our headquarters office in order more effectively to build the anti-saloon sentiment which has grown so rapidly during the past few years, into an organization in harmony with the most approved methods and capable of coping with the organized liquor traffic.

For the purpose of assisting in this, with the approval of the National Headquarters Committee, Mr. William H. Anderson has accepted my invitation to become Superintendent of the Greater New York District and as Assistant State Superintendent to take charge of the business management of the New York office and the details of executive management of the state work, leaving me greater freedom for the more general duties of the superintendency.

Mr. Anderson organized the churches of Illinois through the different denominational bodies, into the most perfect official church temperance federation in the country. He was the first State Superintendent to call in a business expert to reorganize the business system of the League in matters of bookkeeping, records, vouchers and the handling of cash. National Superintendent Baker says,—"He possesses the genius of organization".

He has been learning the New York problems while engaged since January 1st in organizing the up-state districts, which are already, under the district superintendents he has selected, doing strong aggressive work.

His fitness for his important and difficult duties in our great metropolis is indicated by the enclosed folder showing some of the things said of his work by the preachers meetings and religious papers of the next largest city in the union at the time he came to New York.

Yours for Christian Conquest,
Mr. Wm. H. Anderson,
205 D.S. Morgan Bldg.,
Buffalo, N.Y.

My Dear Mr. Anderson:

I have read your booklet, "The Church In Action Against The Saloon," with much pleasure and profit. It certainly presents a high conception of the Anti-Saloon League and is a very valuable treatise on practical temperance activity.

I believe that its wide distribution would be of great benefit to the League, to the ministers and to the people, and expect to arrange soon to use a large number of copies in this district.

I feel under personal obligations to you for having placed in my hands in such compact form so much valuable information.

Yours very truly,

Geo. D. Conger
Asst. Supt.
The Anti-Saloon League of New York
(The Church in Action Against the Saloon)

Western Division

Comprising
Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Southern and Northern Districts

William H. Anderson, Superintendent
Alton H. Cowles, Asst. Sup't, Buffalo District

Suite 205 D. S. Morgan Building

Buffalo, N.Y.

Oct. 24, 1906

Rev. John Lewis Clark,
447 Linden St.,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

Dear Sir:

I acknowledge receipt of the official notification of the action of the Headquarters Committee of the New York Anti-Saloon League that my contract will not be renewed and that Dr. Russell is empowered to discontinue my services at any time he may desire.

Regarding this action I have to say:

First.-- It appears to be ill advised and in violation of my contract.

Second.-- It seems to disclose absolute lack of conception on the part of the Committee of the condition for which it has stood responsible before the world.

A letter of mine in July seems to have been the foundation of Dr. Russell's decision and the Committee action. I did not at the time believe that letter could be justified as a single transaction. I have never justified it beyond insisting that it was not a wanton attack, but that it was rather an honest effort to bring a realization of and correct a real peril, and therefore, no matter how serious a mistake it was, it was entitled to be treated as an honest blunder.

Before it was written I had had the forethought to tell National Superintendent Baker of an aggravated instance in which Dr. Russell had absolutely prevented my discussing these matters frankly face to face. I told Dr. Baker in order to be prepared to prove in just such a contingency, that I had tried to reach Dr. Russell in a natural way and had failed. He said "That's just like Russell." And when I reminded him of it recently Dr. Baker remembered my telling him.

But whatever the circumstances, my explanation of my movements was fully and cordially accepted by Dr. Russell and this letter was wiped out from consideration. To bring it up again as the basis for adverse action without notice to me, was an unqualified breach of faith.

A second letter, which I am informed was the final basis of the action, was concerning things actually talked about in our
conference at Elmira, and which would be talked about in the next one. I was told at Elmira, October 3rd, to feel at liberty to speak with perfect freedom. I was later told at Wolcott, October 6th, before this letter had been received (I had written it to New York before I knew I was to see Dr. Russell at Wolcott) that he wanted me to feel free to say anything by correspondence or otherwise which would throw light on the situation. Therefore, that letter was a privileged communication and could not be honorably used against me.

Further, in view of the fact that the whole case was opened up and talked over at Elmira, I had a right to talk or write about anything, if in the right spirit, which would tend to bring about a better understanding, without its being used to my prejudice. To bring this letter before the committee under the circumstances was gross bad faith.

To use these two letters as the basis of my dismissal, without notice to me, while I was allowed to believe that negotiations were still on looking toward coming to New York, was indefensible, and looks like duplicity. The facts would seem to sustain the hypothesis that I was being forced into a position that would be ground for dismissal, to stop my clancor for immediate genuine, complete reform.

For the Committee to allow those letters, in view of these facts, to be used for this purpose was unjustifiable. And if the Committee acted without knowledge of the facts its action became injustice to me, and an injury to the work.

Even if Dr. Russell may have thought that this sort of action was necessary to protect him in his position, it does not lessen the wrong done me. I had explicitly told him at the beginning that if anything came up we could not bridge, I should leave. National Superintendent Baker said, when the negotiations concerning my coming over here were in progress, that if Dr. Russell should give his attention to the national publication or some other phase of national work in the course of some years, and I had made good, I would be his logical successor. He knows and can certify, and will if asked, that I have all along been very clear in my statements that I did not have any ambition to be superintendent of any great state soon, and that there were special reasons why I did not want New York. Unless Dr. Russell knew he was holding an absolutely untenable position there was no reason for his alarm.

The only case that could possibly have given any ground for such fear on Dr. Russell's part was the fact that one of the district superintendents, it came to me last May, had construed things which I had said in a frank discussion with him at the time he was considering coming into the work, as an intention to attempt to supplant Dr. Russell. The very day that this was brought to my notice I wrote the district superintendent fully, stating that I believed he had not fully understood me, but that even if I had said anything from which he drew that inference, or had inadvertently blundered into saying anything he was justified in so interpreting, it was contrary to any real intention, and explicitly defined my position. I sent this whole correspondence to Dr. Russell in the
same mail. I did not then anticipate anything of this sort, but I submit that I would hardly have been likely to have brought this to the Doctor’s notice so he could inquire into it if I had anything to conceal.

The conditions which led to friction and misunderstanding fall under two general divisions:

First, — Those respecting the executive administration of the work.

Second, — Concerning the handling of money.

On the first point Dr. Russell failed absolutely to work according to recognized League principles or the general rules for carrying on any organized work. Although remonstrated with and promising to keep within bounds, he constantly and persistently crossed our lines, went over the heads of the up-state district men and so interfered with them as to greatly prejudice the best interests of the work.

It was not claimed that he intended to annoy us. We made allowances for the fact that with the first of January he was up against a new proposition in his League career, at an age when men adjust themselves with more or less difficulty, and without ever having had any League experience which would give him the view point of the under men.

One specific instance will suffice. It is the one concerning which there can be least question because it has gotten out to the public. And because it is the latest one it is most illuminating as showing the persistence of this condition and the seriousness of its consequences.

When Dr. Russell came back from the west “refreshed and strengthened”, as his recent circular says, after having assured me that he would work “regular”, one of the first things he did was to again violate our contract by entering Mr. Bristol’s district and without consulting Mr. Bristol or the people of that county, he made a deal with Senator Allds and wired different places that opposition was withdrawn, quite regardless of the fact that Mr. Bristol had helped bring out an independent candidate and that the League was under moral obligations. When the people repudiated him and his deal he had to wire the Senator that it was off. The result is the League will get no credit if Allds is beaten—it will have his antagonism probably, if elected. And the movement is hurt in public estimation throughout that district.

Other cases of this sort will be given you by the up-state district men, as it was agreed by Dr. Russell and Dr. Baker that these men might, if I desired, appear before you and make to
you the statements which they made to Dr. Russell in the presence of
Dr. Baker, and any others which are pertinent, in justice to the
work and incidentally in justice to me. I have fought for nothing for
myself. I have contended solely for the right of my co-laborers
up-state to work effectively and in peace.

The financial affairs of the League raise an entirely
different question. The insurance investigations have made clear
the sensitiveness of the people upon the question of the faithful
administration of trust funds.

Matters of policy can wait, but there can never be any
excuse whatever for delay in putting the administration of
philanthropic work and the expenditure of trust funds upon a basis
which is absolutely defensible. Policies and their execution raise
only the question of efficiency. The handling of money involves
the question of honesty. The defense that changes are being made
to insure accuracy and honesty, is a confession and no defense. They
must have been already made to constitute defense against gossip
or attack. Four year's delay in making them is evidence of in-
competence, or ground for suspicion.

It must be clearly understood that I am not myself making
charges that go beyond laxness and incompetence in certain particulars.
I expressly disclaim even the expression of opinion as to the truth
of anything except what I state as a fact within my own knowledge.
I do not put myself under or behind any of these things. The sole
point is the fact that they were said to me or somebody else who told
me. When I give the name of my informant, or the name of the man to
whom it was stated, as I am ready to do, I have made good. The fact
that such things were said at all, and might get circulation was
sufficient means to the work, regardless of their truth or falsity.
This is particularly true when they are said by men in a position to
know, and when there is enough of known truth in lesser matters to
raise a presumption of the truth of more serious things in the mind
of a cynical, unfriendly, general public.

I reserve the right to specify, if I desire, any
additional matters which may drop out or get into usable shape. It
should be clearly understood that I have proposed and contended for
internal reorganization in lieu of charges to the National Superin-
tendent or a request for an investigation that might cause publicity
and needless harm to the work.

Mr. Engel was in the New York office as a sort of
confidential clerk. He knew practically everything about inside
details of the office. He is one of the kind who seems easily to
acquire information of a sort sometimes spoken of as gossip. He went
with Dr. Russell and Mr. Reed and Dr. Banks to meetings. He was
frequently with Dr. Russell and others at lunch and on the cars and
in company where the men were talking freely. During the wagon trips
he talked freely to me and others. I have not made any effort to
distinguish in the following statements between what he told me and what he told others, but I am ready to particularize at the proper time. The freedom with which he talked alarmed us by raising a constant question of whether he might not inadvertently say some of these things outside.

Out of much intangible stuff and some things partially forgotten, certain specific statements stand out clear in recollection.

Either Mr. Engel or the State Treasurer (the party to whom this was said is not now prepared to state definitely which one it was, but that it was one of them) stated that Dr. Russell kept some man who had threatened to expose something, upon the pay roll for six months without his performing any service for the League.

Mr. Engel said that after reminding Dr. Russell repeatedly to turn in the case collected at meetings where the League work was presented, without its seeming to have any effect, he came to the conclusion that the Doctor did not want to be reminded and quit reminding him.

Some one, (the one to whom it was stated does not now state explicitly that it was Mr. Engel, yet has a strong impression that it was) said that Dr. Banks had said to him that all of Dr. Russell's household expenses were paid out of the League treasury. There is no pretense of knowing whether Dr. Banks ever said that. Whether he did, or whether we believe he did is not material. The essential point is the fact that it was said that he did, at a time when it couldn't be proved that there was a financial system which would make it impossible. And if this did not come from Mr. Engel it is the more serious as indicating that this sort of thing is in general circulation.

Mr. Engel has said that he did not believe that Mr. Reed of the New York office made any proper accounting of the money which he received.

Mr. Engel spoke frequently of the absolute waste in the New York office, mentioning one time the figure of $200.00 per month in supplies, printing and similar things. And further said that much as a fellow hated to give up a job, he at times felt tempted simply to throw up his position and quit because of the lack of efficiency and utter confusion existing in the New York office.

All of these things are given far greater significance than might otherwise attach to them by the fact that Mr. Engel, the state treasurer, connected with the work ever since Dr. Russell's coming to New York, said to one of the workers when the question of Mr. Engel being discharged was up, "It would not do to let Engel go, he knows too much. He could do us a lot of harm if he wished."

I found no complete or intelligent financial records in the Buffalo office. There was no accurate or satisfactory financial
system in any Western Division office. One of the retiring district men told me that after the money had been subscribed it cost to collect it about 40% of the cash actually secured. The collection system was not such as to amount to a guaranty of honesty. My predecessor told me that a collector had not settled satisfactorily with him for League subscriptions collected.

Till January 1, the district men generally did not send any money whatever to New York. They collected their money and spent it as they pleased without any real regard for the state policy, and gave the people no equivalent in return.

It was apparent to every man beginning work up-state that only by announcement of absolute reorganization could he have any standing or get into the churches. Yet Dr. Russell told me in October that my use of the word "re-organization" was distasteful to him. It was a matter of common gossip among the pastors that the League representatives up-state had collected enough money to pay their salaries and expenses to go out and get more money to pay more salaries and expenses. As late as September a Presiding Elder told me that they had been on the point of advising their pastors not to open their churches.

Many pastors have asked me, even as late as October, what was done with the money; why no account was given; why they were not told of the amount their churches subscribed, though they had asked Dr. Russell and been promised that they would be told.

Throughout the whole up-state region was the cry that promises had been broken; that agreements to do certain work had been made; and that subscriptions had been made in return for those promises and that the promises had been violated, and yet the financial system made it impossible for the state superintendent to correct these abuses without changing men.

Until very recently at least, and I have had no reason to believe that it has been changed, the management of the financial details of the New York City office has been so incompetent and inefficient as to preclude assurance of accurate crediting of money received.

For example, one of the superintendents found down there envelopes indicating remittances from his district. He asked for the money and was told that it had been banked and could not be given to him. He asked, "How do you give credit to the subscribers?" (The books were in his, an outside district office) and was told, "Why, we sent the subscriber a receipt for it," which would of course have resulted in another notice being sent by the district superintendent, with a remonstrance and complaint, possibly distrust of the League and probably the loss of the subscriber, if indeed he did not advertise the fact.

One of the district superintendents after receiving the treasurer's receipt for a subscription made before he came into the work, received a second notice calling on him to pay his subscription.
The treasurer made an error in finding the balance on hand one month of about $1200.50, and checks were issued and the League overdrawn to that extent. Serious trouble was averted by Dr. Russell stopping one check and "kiting" a check on somebody in Idaho to cover the balance.

Although subscriptions were taken upon such representations concerning the Lincoln Magazine as to constitute an actual contract to send the magazine to the subscribers, there has been absolute incompetence in dealing with the mailing, and no serious attempt to correct it until recently. It is now "being corrected." Scores and scores of complaints have come from all over the state from people who are not getting the magazine. They criticize our management and some of them repudiate their subscriptions. I was called to Danville to help straighten out a matter on the magazine during Dr. Russell's absence in the west. I felt positively humiliated before those business men over the manifest lack of organization or system. One result is that much of the money expended for a magazine was absolutely wasted.

I hold a contract which provides that Superintendent Russell and I shall consult about the finances. It was suggested by Dr. Baker and acquiesced in when I agreed to come to the state, that I should see monthly statements that would give me information upon which to base advice as to expenditures. I was never consulted about them, unless when I happened to be around, my opinion would be perfunctorily asked about something already determined on. I was never consulted about any general policy, or put in any position to investigate the conditions without seeming to pry, although the men I had called into the work, and I, were on half pay. I never saw even a statement of totals of receipts and expenses till August, after I had asked for it. Possibly it was because the books were in such a shape that it would have entailed great labor and vast amount of work upon the Treasurer.

The figures in this statement when it came lack much of giving a full idea of the situation. However, it was disclosed that the New York office alone had received $33,787.59 in seven months and that all of the districts including Long Island District, outside of New York City, had received $15,072.08, or $1,001.50 less than their expenses, in spite of the fact that we were just getting a line of subscriptions started. If, as probable, the "expenses" were taken from the monthly reports as the easiest way to get them, the deficit in districts outside of New York was more than offset in the matter of actual expenditure by the unpaid balance on the salaries of the men, which amounted to approximately $1600.50, and would leave New York City $600.50 ahead.

We are not informed whether this $33,787 marked as receipts, included, as receipts, the money which Dr. Russell charged off and assumed himself during the summer.

All of it was paid out. That much is certain. But we are not given any facts as to how much was paid out. The statement does
not show whether more was paid out than received, indicating an
increase in the debt. And even if the receipts included the money
which Dr. Russell charged off, that is offset on the other side.

Mr. Tower has stated that he wrote to New York that he
suspected that the debt had been increased, asked about it, and
said that he would be glad to be informed that it was less than
$12,000.aa (In January Superintendent Russell told the
Superintendents that it was something over $8,000.aa) and that he
had received no reply.

So that on the face of it the Central office expenses,
with four regular salaried speakers and the general administration
expenses, have been at the rate, approximately, of from fifty-five
to sixty thousand dollars a year, and possibly even more, depending
on the extent, if any, to which the net indebtedness was increased.
And yet, the state of Ohio with its seventeen or eighteen men, with
its sixteen page weekly paper with a wide circulation, carried on
the whole work and carried on a state-wide campaign that defeated
Governor Herrick, with aggregate receipts for the twelve months
of less than $75,000.aa.

There was no statement as to what the money was spent
for; how much was for stationery, how much for the magazine, how
much for stenographers, how much for postage, or the other items.
As no explanation was given the men, they were left to their own
conjectures.

In January, Mr. Tower, in the presence of other
workers, made statements to Dr. Russell which amounted to a charge
of extravagance and incompetency in executive management, and pre-
dicted upon the strength of his experience in the past that the
debt would be increased. No general denial, or what I believed to
be adequate defense, was made by Dr. Russell. His statements, if
not true, were ground for instant dismissal.

Mr. Tower has had floating around the state a type-
written statement, of which I have seen more than one copy, charging
specific instances of extravagance of a character that would cause
the gravest injury to the work if it fell into unfriendly hands. I
am not in sympathy with Mr. Tower or the contention he has been
standing for. I know nothing of the truth or falsity of his state-
ments. I do not believe that he understands the real League idea.
I believe him to be personally thoroughly irresponsible, a belief
shared in by National Superintendent Baker; but to my mind his very
irresponsibility is the gravest menace for there is no telling what
he will do or when he will talk. The question will not keep down.
If his statements are not true, why hasn't he been discharged long
ago?

It is a matter of common knowledge among the men that
there has been extravagance in the purchasing of supplies. For
example, there has been no uniformity or regularity in things that
in some form were used over the entire state. It has been impossible
to get supplies promptly from New York because of lack of any executive head in the management of detail matters. The result is that the men have been driven to purchase supplies in the most expensive manner, viz., in small quantities with the cost of composition added at each district headquarters until the up-state men commenced to combine orders.

In short, it was common talk in the New York office that conditions concerning the handling of money were not right and that there would be trouble if the facts were known. Two members of the New York office force, including the treasurer, this fall signed a petition to Dr. Russell for a conference at which it was to be demanded that he submit to a check in financial matters. If all these things would come out in short notice, at long range, it is not surprising that the up-state men would wonder what an explosion would uncover.

The Liquor Dealers by their inflated reports of the money the League receives, which has been given notoriety through the papers, have fostered the impression that it was handling amounts of money all out of proportion to work done.

The active political campaigns which the League has commenced to carry on have exposed it to the hostility of the saloon politicians, and they and the liquor interests generally are sufficiently alarmed to pay money for information which would be damaging. And it is well known that there are enough papers which would gladly give circulation to such statements.

In the face of these unquestionable facts regarding laxness in the system of handling funds, any publication of the more serious statements above or of other things, even though malicious falsehoods, would be believed by a large section of the public.

A mere statement in defense that after nearly five years the League was making changes in conditions which ought never to have existed, would be evidence to those not influenced by considerations of personal friendship for Dr. Russell, that intolerable conditions had been tolerated so long as to demonstrate either incompetence or lack of recognition of what is expected of a man in a fiduciary relation; and would weaken public confidence in his judgment on all matters to such degree as to destroy his usefulness in this state.

I submit that four years toleration of such a lack of financial system as has existed even during this year, and persistence in delay in putting into operation an approved method was, in the face of these conditions, such recklessness with the good repute of a great movement for which God will hold somebody responsible, as to be absolutely indefensible. Further, that in the face of the whole facts set out, it was prima facie, if not conclusive, evidence that desperate means were necessary and that nothing need be expected until pr. Russell was stung into action by something biting enough to prevent his forgetting the situation, and determined enough to convince him that further temporizing was useless.
My integrity and that of the un-state man was at stake. We had stated at first, on the strength of what we had promised, when I agreed to come, that there was a perfectly defensible financial system. But there was not; it was only being made so; and in spite of my urging and pleading, over six months had already been expended in only partly doing that which required but an instant's decision, with sufficient oversight to see that it was carried out.

The fact that reorganization got only so far and then persistently stuck, to our minds intensified the danger, because if known, it would argue in the minds of outsiders the question whether there was some reason not apparent on the surface. What possible good reason can there be for a League superintendent to stop reorganization short of making the treasurer fully responsible for the funds? What defensible reason can there be for a superintendent protecting himself by submitting, as any other worker, to the operation of a uniform financial system.

Hearing on the question of whether there was such performance of these promises of financial reorganization as to put us in a defensible position, I am informed, and am ready to give the name of my informant when necessary, that when the accountant went over the books for the League's fiscal year, which ends on or about May 31, 1906, there were several thousand dollars for which no vouchers could be found, and they would not pass the accounts without an affidavit from Dr. Russell. And I am informed that although they were anxious to get this affidavit and close up the matter, Dr. Russell left for the West in August without having given it.

I therefore submit that the fundamental law of self defense justified me in doing anything or in using any methods to correct such conditions, and that it does not lie in the mouth of the man who drove me to it to complain of the methods. I submit that I have exercised great patience and manifested large forbearance when I simply took it up with Dr. Russell instead of carrying it to the Committee and the State Board, and preferring charges with the General Superintendent of the National League upon the grounds provided in the constitution, "the administration of his office in such a manner as to compromise, prejudice or injure the work of the League in his own or any other state", which could have been done without my having to substantiate any personal charges.

For example. To break into a house ordinarily is burglary. To shake and beat a sleeping inmate is, in addition, assault and battery. But if the house is on fire the case is different. And in a case of this sort, that which, of itself, standing alone, is inexcusable is not only permissible, but may be even creditable if it is so correct something worse; and I was justified in doing anything which would give at once a system that amounted to assurance of fidelity in the administration of trust funds.

If these things which have been stated are true, I owe no apology to anybody for forcing a crisis out of which a change must come.
If they are not true, I have performed such service for the League by insisting upon eliminating them as further menace as to make it incumbent upon the Committee to treat me on a very different basis than as subject to the mere whim and personal feeling of Superintendent Russell.

His lack of practical recognition that a movement of this sort must be above suspicion and that the bigger it gets the more careful it must be, and his reckless disregard of the safety of the movement and of his own and other men's reputations are utterly reprehensible. When to this he adds an attempt to discharge a man for whom he says he entertains the kindest feelings and whom he admits had performed a great service for the work, simply because of the manner of that man's contention for immediate reform in these particulars, and brings about the dismissal under such circumstances as to appear to try to discredit him so thoroughly as to preclude the possibility of his getting the facts before the Committee, Superintendent Russell has gone past the place where he can be longer allowed absolute control of a movement of this sort, and permitted to handle and appropriate its revenue.

The state is too great and the work too important to leave its increasing revenue at the mercy of a man with such a financial record in this state, which follows a record for extravagance and lack of financial sense which can be easily ascertained from the recognized leaders of the work in the country who are familiar with his early history. The time has come, when, if Dr. Russell is to continue to be superintendent there must be in the New York office a man who has the veto power upon expenditures, and in the exercise of this power is not answerable to Dr. Russell.

This is not an application on my part to be allowed to come to New York City. When it became apparent that somebody was needed in New York and that Dr. Russell would probably concede that, I talked with at least two of the state men about one of them going down, and when Dr. Baker made the first proposition for me to go to New York City, I proposed that one of the other men go. I can show by Dr. Baker that I never sought the New York City position, and considered it only from a sense of duty.

However, the work is too important and the need for men who can do it too great to spare from the state a man concerning whom Dr. Russell brings no charge whatever beyond the fact that he doesn't feel comfortable in working with him. The Committee cannot justly permit the work to be sacrificed without better reason. The Committee has done me an injustice by acting without the facts. To persist in my leaving in the face of the facts would be to do the work an injustice.

I am content to continue in my present relations. I insist upon my right to stay for another year, or until I can find a satisfactory opening. If Dr. Russell is going to give, as he says, large time toward the raising of money in New York City, I am still
needed up-state. The work if far from being done up here; confidence is far from being restored. The up-state region has a right to my services.

I am perfectly willing to do anything that can be expected of a Christian man, in order to be reconciled to Mr. Russell so that he may feel comfortable. And it ought not be hard for him to feel comfortable, if, as he admits, he entertains kindly feelings toward me and that he has nothing whatever to charge against my Christian character and my ability to do the work. I submit that Mr. Russell doesn't know whether he can get along with me or whether he likes my present relation, until he has given me a chance to work free from apprehension of a scandal.

And if he admits the wrong which he has done me in the matter of this dismissal, and acknowledges in such control of the financial system as to make us safe, I can very easily respect him for what he has done, and for his paramount ability in so many regards, and for what I believe at heart he wants to do and be. For I do not believe there has been intentional dishonesty or criminal action on his part.

The time has come when the Committee must take actual control of the work and administer affairs with the sole idea of the good of the work, or else take the responsibility for the consequences.

It is not the matter of leaving that I protest against; it is the manner of it. Here are the facts. Dr. Russell advised me that he did not want to continue me as Associate Superintendent and invited me to New York. I proposed certain conditions to make clear that our minds met in the contract. If they were not acceptable or I refused to accept the proposed changes, it was his privilege to reject them. It was then my right to decline his offer, which would have terminated my connection with the expiration of my contract. Then there could have been no complaint at the manner, although leaving at that time would have put me at a disadvantage because desirable openings that I might have gone into have closed since I have been in the state.

But instead of that, after it is all over and summed up, it stands out, susceptible of absolute demonstration, which no action can obliterate or cure if I leave the state, that the facts concerning the financial system were such that it was common talk among the employees that there would be scandal if they became known, and that because I sought to correct these conditions and had the courage, even to my hurt, to use any means which were forced upon me, I was discharged, precipitately, stealthily, in breach of faith. If the New York office management can stand daylight, if conditions were not serious, and can be easily explained, if there is a perfect defense, as claimed, what explanation can there be for the studied completeness and careful preparation for the plan to discredit me.
and cut me off in such manner as to prevent the possibility of my getting to the Committee with the facts, even going to the extent of looking up the law point of whether I could be summarily put out by paying me up in full to the expiration of my contract.

So that by the injustice which Dr. Russell has led the Committee into doing me, in view of the fact that everything open to me now is a palpable loss of position and standing, I am forced into the place where I must in self-defense tell my friends the truth in order to prevent their thinking that I have been doing something that will not stand the light.

If the Committee takes no action or again decides adversely without a fair hearing, at which Mr. Baker and the up-state men are present, that will force me to consider whether conditions have not reached the place where the duty rests upon me to take steps, and in any manner necessary to secure it, bring about an investigation, which will insure the churches of the state against repetition of those abuses which have continued so long, by resulting in such organization as will make them utterly impossible.

In conclusion I will again call attention to the fact that I have stood for reorganization within the League without publicity, by the present management, in such manner as to save the work the great ability which Dr. Russell possesses in many directions, and have done nothing radical until forced into it. It is up to the Committee to decide whether they will protect me in the effort which I have made to protect the League in this manner.

Yours respectfully,

[Signature]

Associate State Superintendent.
My Dear Anderson.

I am all right again.

I appreciate very much your sending me the "Revolution Magazine." I shall read it with great interest.

I have had a talk with Mr. Burke (who was in Denver) and have very few hours to spare so to delay it will be granted.

It would be suicidal on our part to let both of you go at this time.

And may the splendid success you have had in this great work in Illinois follow you to New York! I am sure it will.

I have great faith in you. I look to see you make your self felt in New York on the certain day. Illinois Auto Odlom league and the same others owe you a large debt of gratitude and honor.

May God Bless you always.

Yours sincerely, John Faville.