A Brief Resume of the Massachusetts
Trouble in the Niagara Movement.

July 1906—Trotter opposed admission of women to the Niagara Movement, and opposed Miss Baldwin and Mrs. Grimke in particular. Mrs. Morgan favored (1, 2, 3, 5).

Nov. 1906. Trotter republishes a speech of Morgan's italicizing and emphasizing certain parts not so emphasized in the original. This was without Morgan's previous knowledge or consent, and while Morgan was editorial writer on the Guardian, without pay. of Guardian

Nov., 1906. Trotter criticizes Morgan for not belting Gov. Guild, and others in the election (4, 4A, 5)

Feb. 1907. General Secretary interviews Morgan (6) Morgan mentions the publishing of the speech, and says he has stopped writing for the Guardian but insists otherwise he is friendly with Trotter. (6)

Aug. 1907. General Secretary writes Trotter urging unity. (7)

Mrs. Trotter and Trotter resent the General Secretary's words (8, 8A)

General Secretary replies still urging unity. (8B)

Apr. 1907. General Secretary has sent out a call for raising state quotas of Legal Defense fund. Mrs. Morgan replies making first mention of the "Peter Pumpkin-eater" play (8) and urging Boston as a meeting place in August. (8C)

Trotter disclaims any enmity to Morgan (8A) & D.

May 1907. General Secretary writes Morgan and Mrs. Morgan urging unity with Trotter (9, 10)

Morgan replies expressing willingness to cooperate but intimating:

1. That Trotter often usurps Morgan's place as State Secretary.

2. That Trotter seeks to use the Niagara Movement to serve his personal pique and dislike of various persons. (11)

Morgan replies outlining plans for the play and promising caution (12)
General Secretary after vainly trying to take the Niagara Movement to Chicago and elsewhere, and relying on the reasonable attitude of the Morgans and of Trotter, recommended Boston to the Executive committee as meeting place. They assented. General Secretary wrote Morgan (13)

Meantime several letters had passed between General Secretary and Trotter on Niagara Movement matters, e.g. (14, 15, 15A) (16)

June 1897.—Circular letter sent out. (15)

The Play in aid of the Niagara Movement is given in Cambridge under the patronage of Ole Bull's widow, and the wife of the Governor and Mayor. The Trotters do not attend, charging that Mrs. Trotter was not invited to cooperate until late, and that the Forbes were allowed to help. Trotters also object to the patronesses.

Counter-charge of Morgans that Trotters refused to let their boy take part, blocked arrangements, and that without Mrs. Forbes' work in gathering children the play would have failed.

The Play was successful, elicited much comment and despite great expense in staging netted $55 to the Niagara Movement. (17)

June 20. General Secretary, wife and child stay at the Trotter's house and General Secretary confers with Mr. & Mrs. Trotter. All differences are apparently arranged and a peaceful united effort for the Annual Meeting assured. (18)


June 21. On return the Trotters give the General Secretary a written document of 22 pages, virtually rescinding agreement and demanding an official reprimand for Morgan. (20)

General Secretary refuses to criticize any one publicly and again urges unity. (21) sending same letter to both Morgan and Trotter.

June 23. Mrs. Trotter resigns from the Niagara Movement. (22)
June 19. General Secretary writes Morgan and Trotter again from
Montreal urging written efforts.
June 20. August. General Secretary absent in Europe. During this
time the following incidents took place:
July - Meeting of the Massachusetts Niagara Movement 15 out of 55
members present. Mr. Trotter resigned from the Committee of
arrangements.
Policy of Secretary Morgan and Mrs. Morgan attacked.
By vote of 8 to 6 meeting suggested to the committee of arrangements
that neither wives of the Governor nor Mayor nor Mr. and Mrs. Forbes
be asked to aid in entertaining the Niagara Movement at its Annual
Meeting. (23)
Trotter later offers to return to the committee and Morgan refuses.
Trotter complains to General Secretary.
Plans of meeting progress. (24)
August. - General Secretary urges Morgan to reinstate Trotter.
Morgan reinstates Trotter. Trotter refuses to serve.
August 25. - General Secretary returns. Consults Morgan. Morgan
claims that Trotter is thwarting all his plans; General Secretary
consults Trotter. Trotter claims that Morgan has acted in high-handed
manner.

* Counting as members those on the General Secretary's printed list.
See Imura p. 5.
The General Secretary determined to keep this matter out of the meeting if possible.

The following was the Niagara Movement program. (26)

The Trotters and their sympathizers took no part save in business meetings. This nearly ruined the "Pilgrimages" and reduced the Tillie Hall meetings to one (26) which was attended by 800 people.

The Forbes willing helped to serve the dinners and entertain the guests— not however appearing among the members or at the meetings.

Without their aid the Third Annual Meeting would have been a failure.

The General Secretary ruled out one motion (27) but enjoin a motion to appoint a general committee on policy. Afterward a second committee on elections was appointed. The notice for hearings was posted. (28) The General Secretary proposed to admit Grimke because he was invited to membership at Buffalo. Trotter protested (29).

At hearings of committees nearly all the old charges were dropped and an entirely new charge, one never made to the General Secretary's knowing before by Mr. Trotter, appeared; viz: that some of the members of the Niagara Movement in Massachusetts had been illegally elected through the connivance of Morgan. This new charge astounded, angered the General Secretary. He considered that this was a charge against him and not against Morgan, since no member had been elected in Massachusetts for several months, all had been assented to by the Executive Committee, and their names long since printed on the General Secretary's list and had been in the hands of Trotter and others. The General Secretary and the State Secretary admitted formal elections were not the rule in Massachusetts or elsewhere (30).

Charged that Morgan's circular violated the constitution. (31) answered that this circular was sent almost exclusively to men already invited and in many cases already voted in and that in no case was a new reason of this appeal.

The Committees reported August 27 (32)
Morgan resigned. Resignation ruled out by order. General Secretary reelected. States that if he accepts position he will reappoint Morgan. Otherwise the whole burden will rest on Morgan's shoulders and he will be disciplined in part for acts of the General Secretary.

Meeting confirms General Secretary's power to appoint Morgan and committees and Trotter acquaintance.

Third Annual Meeting adjourns.

Sept. 1907. General Secretary starts to settle the matter of Massachusetts membership as first essential step to reconciliation and getting at the real will of the Massachusetts Niagara Movement. By General Secretary's list there were 48 members in Massachusetts. But Trotter protested many names on this list.

Back of this list lay (a) the Massachusetts Founders and charter members voted in in 1905. Of those voted in in 1906, some gave immediate assent and joined. The General Secretary did not hear from the others until in August 1907 (before election took place and before it was known or planned) chiefly in answer to Morgan's circular. (33) Other charter members, already elected in 1906 agreed to join the Niagara Movement. There were then two possible electing bodies. (34) The General Secretary determined to ask the the State Secretary to hold a written ballot election to determine final membership. If the Founders and charter members voted for all disputed names and for a proposed list of new members, and if the members on the General Secretary's list voted for the same new members, then the membership would be settled. In case of disagreement the General Secretary proposed to appeal to the Executive Committee.

The General Secretary and the State Secretary conducted the election jointly in the State Secretary's office. The members were invited to call at that office at specified hours and days - the coming being arranged as to avoid disagreeable encounters among opponents. (35) The election was virtually finished in three days, but the strugglers
prolonged it. Trotter especially asked several days delay and finally refused to vote. All members on the General Secretary’s list voted save 6. Three of these were out of town and could not be reached although letters were sent. The women generally voted at the home of the Women’s Secretary, in the presence of the General Secretary, to avoid coming to the Lawyer’s office down-town. In three or four cases ballots were sent out of the office. Mr. Trotter was one case of this. Mrs. Morgan took 3 ballots and had them filed in ink by persons unable to come out. The General Secretary went to New Bedford and had the members there vote in Mr. Jourdain’s house.

Finally the mail was resorted to. (37) The ballot was entirely free and secret, Absolutely no pressure or arguments were brought to bear. When the voter approached, the General Secretary said “We are trying to determine who are members of the Massachusetts Niagara Movement. Will you kindly fill out this ballot. Advice either asked or given. In several cases after the ballot had been cast the situation was frankly discussed.

To count the ballots three men were chosen: S. O. Fuller, who had presided over the July meeting of the Niagara Movement, Mr. Jourdain a friend of Mr. Morgan but not inimical to Mr. Trotter, Mr. Jourdain, who is employed on the Guardian. They reported the election of all members on the General Secretary’s list and of a number of new members including Mr. and Mrs. Forbes. Their reports and the original tally sheets are appended (38, 39) and the object to this election and the answers there to are here appended:
That there was going on a particular time when it took place was not known except to the Secretary and myself. But the whole matter in dispute and the persons, whose eligibility was in dispute had been discussed in Massachusetts for a year or more. The election was confusing. The ballot used was submitted to the Executive committee. They can judge as to whether or not it was confusing.

The voters were unknown.

This is not true. Every man elected as a charter member was known to every member of the Niagara Movement at that time, including Mr. Trotter. Every member on the printed list of the General Secretary was known to Mr. Trotter, and a list had been furnished him in the Spring. Other lists could easily have been furnished if he had made known his wishes to the General Secretary. At the time when the election was going on, other lists could not have been furnished, because the Secretary did not have them with him and he could not let Mr. Trotter take the list which he was using at the time, nor could he give up that list for Mr. Trotter to copy.

That the real opinion of the Massachusetts membership was not expressed. This I am thoroughly convinced of. I am thoroughly convinced on the other hand, as never before, the members of the Massachusetts branch really had a chance to say what they wanted without being bullied and black mailed into silence. They had in this case a chance to utter what their real thought was. I believe in this respect an unusually fair election. I also, that, of the other hand, the vote in the meeting where the ballot was eight to six, was anything but fair. It was without a "stacked" house.
Certain members have alleged that they voted under coercion and mis-
apprehension.

That they were in the slightest respect at any time or in any way
coerced or urged or influenced by me is an impudent, flat and bald
lie. That they misapprehended the ballot is possible but improbable.

Moreover, since each one of these members (except one) voted as Mr.
Trotter wished, a change of vote on their part would but confirm the
undoubted vote of the majority. Not only did I put no pressure on
Massachusetts members but, too, I have none on the Executive committee
in any case. I made the simple first statement and nothing more. I
did not even send explanations when asked, because full explanation
was impossible, and partial explanation, misleading. I do not doubt
but what urgent insistence in the case of far-off Western and South-
erm members would have gotten me a bare majority, but I do not stoop
to such methods. If there is any Massachusetts member who thinks I
would beg or ask his vote for any side he is surely acquainted with
me.
That the election was unduly extended and the order of voting unfair. The election was unduly extended, but this was chiefly due to Mr. Trotter's own request for delays. As originally planned the election was to take place in three days. Mr. Trotter was called in the group on the third day; this was not in reason of any discrimination against him but simply, as I have said elsewhere in this report, to keep opposing groups from clashing right in the office. I asked first, as was natural, those men whom Mr. Morgan knew best. Secondly the women whom Mrs. Morgan could get hold of. Thirdly the crowd whom Mr. Trotter could bring. Every one had equal rights. Somebody had to vote first. It did not make a particle of difference which one voted first. The second group of objections to the election charge against Mr. Trotter and his friends. First it is said that the Morgan had undue influence in the election. Mr. Morgan was State Secretary of the Niagara Movement; the election was necessarily in his hands. Mrs. Morgan is at the head of all Niagara Movement Women. The election as far as the women were concerned was necessarily largely in her hands. I could have usurped the place of these secretaries in conducting the election even if I wanted to and I did not want to. The place of voting was the State Secretary's office, and the State Secretary's home. What other could have been chosen? I was staying at Mr. Trotter's home, I could not ask them to come there. I had no right to take the election out of the hands of the State Secretary. His office and house was the place to hold it, and was the place where other meetings of the Niagara Movement in Massachusetts had been held. That Mr. Morgan proposed the names of those to be voted on as new members. He did, in his capacity as State Secretary, which is perfectly right and legal and is done in all the States. General Secretary engineered for certain persons and allowed Mr. Morgan to do the same, and did not allow Mr. Trotter and his friends.
This is absolutely false. In not a single case did the General Secretary attempt to influence the vote of any voter. In no case was Mr. Morgan or his friends allowed extra privileges over Mr. Trotter and his friends, except in the necessary case that Mr. Morgan was State Secretary and was conducting the election. In the

11. In the third place it is charged that the General Secretary went beyond his power and his duty.

I have already shown that the election was conducted by the General Secretary and the State Secretary, and that in no case did the General Secretary usurp the power of the State Secretary or presume to conduct the election without his consent and help.

12. That the State Secretary misled the Executive committee in his letter announcing the vote.

All the minutes and documents are laid before the Executive committee for their judgment as to this. (32, 41)

13. That the General Secretary tried to make the Executive committee vote in undue haste.

The haste which the General Secretary recommended was not that he wanted a stampede, because he wanted to stampede the State Secretaries. It was because he assumed that they relied upon his fairness and judgment and would be willing to take the statement of the case from him, and from the three tellers. If he had dreamed of their real attitude he would not have attempted to ask them to vote at any particular time.

14. In general it is charged that the whole policy of the election was wrong. In answer to this let me say that something had to be done. To leave the Massachusetts branch in the position where nobody knew who had the right to vote and who did not, would have been to invite more trouble than we have now. That matter at least had to be settled and settled right off. Then too as to Mr. Forbes; I have known Mr. Forbes for a long time; I disapproved of his actions toward Mr. Trotter as heartily as any one. I am not perfect, however,
myself, and I do not propose to punish men forever. Mr. Forbes has

of his own accord helped the Niagara Movement. If it had not been

for Mr. & Mrs. Forbes it would have been impossible to hold the

third Annual Meeting in Boston. And that too after the Trotters and

others had consented to its coming. For us now to repudiate a man

like that and refuse to let his work with us, is not only a reflection

upon our good faith but is a matter of personal humiliation to

me. The question which we have got to decide with regard to the

Niagara Movement is this: Is this Movement a great movement which

invites co-operation from all the race or is it a small affair which

is using the Movement to settle personal debts and petty animos-

ities? If it is the latter, then I do wish to belong to it. I am

sure however that it is not. I am sure that when we ask people to

join us we mean it, and that if they are willing to stand upon our

platform then we want them and we are not going to ask what they

believe before. Most of us are converts to this cause. Finally I regret

to say that while no one has defended Mr. Trotter more than I have

or believe more than I do in the worth of his work and the great

sacrifices that he has made, nevertheless, I am reluctantly compelled

to believe that Mr. Trotter is a burden to the Niagara Movement at

present; and that it is impossible for him to work with other people

without dictating their course according to his own somewhat narrow

program. It has come to a pass when the question is: Can the Niagara

Movement longer afford to carry Mr. Trotter and be responsible for

his opinions and deeds? I for my part am decided that the Niagara

Movement can not do this.

To return now to the history of the case:

After the election the General Secretary then urged the Executive

Committee to settle the matter quickly. (40)

This haste was to avoid just what has happened: the frittering on
away of the year in a local matter. The Executive Committee asked to vote consisted of 29 men (68).

(On Jan. 1 executive committee will consist of 29 men (68)).

The committee voted as follows:

Sept. 24 Meeting at Trotter's Executive Committee (40)

Sept. 25 Report of General Secretary (41)

Sept. 26 Vote of David -- Approval

Vote of Morgan -- Approval

Sept. 27 Vote of G. R. Waller -- Approval (42)

Sept. 27 Vote of G. M. Waller -- (43)

Sept. 27 Letter from Trotter (44)

Sept. 28 Vote of Macfarland -- Approval (45)

Sept. 29 Vote of McKenna -- (46)

Sept. 27 Printed protest of Trotter (47)

and letter (43)

(About this time 2nd edition of this protest with names of persons alleging coercion in voting. General Secretary has not seen this paper)

Oct. 1 Letter of Bentley (marked "confidential") declining to vote

Oct. 1 Vote of Murray, disapproval (49)

Oct. 3 Letter of Murray (50)

Oct. 4 O. M. Waller changes vote--asents except to Mr. & Mrs. Forbes (51)

Oct. 4 Vote of Herschaw, asents except to Forbes (52)

Oct. 4 Murray orders election suspended (53)

Oct. 6 Vote of Clifford, declining to vote (54)

8. Letter of Boyer, withdrawing vote (55)


10. Letter from Pickens (56)

II: " Gunner declining to vote (57)

13: " Hagan postponing vote (56)
 I4. Protest from Murray. (50)

Result of vote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First vote</th>
<th>Subsequent vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval except Forbes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproval</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining and postponen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not heard from</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The General Secretary was of course from this vote quite unable to say what the attitude of the Executive Committee was. He decided on this course:

1. To regard the Massachusetts election as Legal.
2. To regard therefore the Forbes, Mr. Grimes etc as already associate members of the Niagara Movement (Comm. 11/10)

3. To lay the whole matter before the Executive Committee.

At this juncture Dr. Bentley proposed a mid-winter Conference (61)
The General Secretary cordially assented, but declined to attend (62)
The meeting was called (65, 64) and the above matters are hereby respectfully submitted to it.

W.E. Dugdale, Dr. Chiv.

General Secretary.