

1130

GEORGE VAUX,
1715 ARCH STREET,
PHILADELPHIA.

See Rev J
12.5.98

11th Mo. 29th, 1898.

Rufus M. Jones,

Respected friend.

A friend has sent me thy paper of the twenty fourth instant, and called my attention to an article in it relative to the proceedings of a recent Monthly Meeting in appointing a committee on overseers, evidently the meeting of which I am a member. This article states that "It seemed desirable to a certain section of the meeting, to control the appointment of overseers; therefore some of the friends who held this view, nominated each other in rapid succession and so got a controlling influence on the committee". And then it is intimated that a "ring" had been formed to frustrate the free course of the Monthly Meeting.

I do not know the source from whence thy information was derived, but thee has certainly been imposed upon. So far as the conservative members of the committee are concerned there is not a solitary word of truth in what is stated. I was present at the M. M. in question. I had not given the matter of overseers any consideration or conversed with any one on the subject before the Clerk announced the business. When he read his minute a person of decided Western views almost immediately arose and named the most pronounced and radical person in that line of thought in the meeting, thus securing the chairmanship of the committee. Both were members of Haverford Meeting which has less than one ninth of the membership. After a pause I named a friend who presented to my mind and this was followed by three other names, two conservatives and one of Western proclivities. The person first named rose and stated that he was unwilling to serve on the

committee. That constituted as it was and holding the views that he did, he was satisfied that he could never unite with the others in a report. How far this was a dignified statement or in accordance with what Friends are accustomed to, thee can judge. I was perfectly astonished. I have attended our M. M. for more than forty years, and I have never known the like. I was at once impressed with the thought, — there has been an attempt to pack this committee in the Western interest — nothing else can account for this disappointment and irritation — and this man has given it away. There was a pause when I rose and said, I thought after what we had heard, that the meeting should at least give consideration to the request of the member to be excused. This was followed by a considerable number of persons strongly urging the person first named to serve, and the naming of two others of Western proclivities. In all three conservatives were named and four of the other class. One of the latter positively declined and the Clerk finally announced the committee as consisting of six, three of whom including the chairman were of Western proclivities and three were conservative.

The fact that some one has told thee that the conservatives tried to pack the committee, is confirmatory evidence to me, that the Western Contingent endeavored to do that very thing itself. They failed, and that failure accounted for the irritation and disappointment betrayed both in the M. M. and afterwards.

I had no conversation with any one on the subject of overseers before the M. M. and from my knowledge of the character of the other Friends of conservative thought, I do not believe they would descend to what is charged.

The statements I have criticised are decidedly sensational and yellow in character. It would have been wiser to have investigated the charges before publishing them. As it is, the accusation has only recoiled on the accusers.

Sincerely thine,

George Vaux