SPALDING CLEANS UP THE DECK

WRITES A FINAL BASEBALL LETTER TO JOHN T. BRUSH.

Declares That the Absolute Surrender of the Freedman Combine Is the Only Way Out of the Present League Tangle, and That Freedman Must Be Ousted by the New York Stockholders.

A. G. Spalding, President of the National League, concluded his baseball correspondence relative to the situation yesterday. In doing so, Spalding "cleared the decks" for action which may be looked for at an early date. The letters follow:

Mr. John T. Brush, Indianapolis, Ind.:

DEAR SIR: Your belated letter written the 8th—published the 9th—reached me Saturday evening of the 11th, and found my correspondence department so choked up with other work that I could not get off a reply until to-day.

To avoid further argument and for the sake of cleaning up these ancient transactions I will plead guilty to every baseball crime you have accused me of previous to the year 1901, including the so-called gum shoes of 1887, the Indianapolis League "hold-up" of 1890, the Brotherhood mistakes of 1889 and 1890, and, in fact, all other baseball mistakes made by me or anybody else previous to the year 1901, except the one colossal, unfortunate and unaccountable blunder that you made in the spring of 1899 when you gave up your baseball individuality and became the servile "Uriah Heep" to Mr. Andrew Freedman.

The firm of Freedman & Brush formed at that time is the direct cause of the present prostrate condition of the old National League, whose reputation and fame I believe you honestly tried to guard until this unfortunate partnership was formed.

Aside from your resurrections of foreign events and the sarcastic parts of your letter, which appear to furnish you so much amusement, I note only the following points that would seem to call forth an answer from me:

I positively refuse to have the parentage of this infamous so-called Freedman-Brush "busted" trust scheme sworn on to me. You told me in Mr. Hart's office in Chicago, and in his presence that Mr. Andrew Freedman was its father. You amaze me by stating that this trust scheme "was never discussed in any League meeting." Mr. Young told me it was discussed to the exclusion of nearly everything else for nearly three days at the recent League meeting, and for corroboration of Mr. Young's statement you are referred to the official stenographic verbatim report of that meeting.

Mr. Soden's letters to me, which I was forced to make public because of these and similar barefaced falsehoods that the "Freedman Four" persist in giving out also, shows that this notorious Freedman-Brush trust scheme was discussed at length in the last League meeting, and also at a conference at Red Bank last August in the presence of Messrs. Freedman, Brush, Soden and Robison.

Now, Mr. Brush, I claim the honor of having been your first tutor in baseball politics, and until you formed the firm of Freedman & Brush I was rather proud of my pupil, but the statement in your letter that "the Freedman trust scheme was never discussed in any League meeting" is beyond my comprehension and I can only construe it as another evidence of the baneful influence that "Freedmanism" has upon you.

You admit in your letter that I was President of the National League for sixty-six hours, and I ask you, am I any less the President now than I was during that time? To remove an official from office impeachment is necessary.

During those sixty-six hours of my uninterrupted occupancy of the Presidential office—which covered a Saturday afternoon holiday and a Sunday—there were only thirteen business hours and during that time I presided at the final session of the League on Saturday, Dec. 14, when considerable business was transacted, among other things the election of a Board of Direction, an Arbitration Board, Committee on the Revision of the Constitution and Playing Rules, and last but not least a Schedule Committee, of which latter committee I am "it." The actual results of this two hours' session makes a striking comparison to the "deadlock" results of your previous four days' session, in which you claim in your letter that not one word was uttered about the Freedman-Brush trust scheme.

You say I did not "butted in" everything would have been lovely—yes, lovely for an extension of Freedmanism. But surely, friend Brush, you do not mean to imply that it took four days to discuss A. G. Spalding? Of course everybody knows what you did, but I think it is fair to know what you claim you did during these four long days of the recent League meeting. Neither the press representatives nor myself could swallow the daily statement that was given out—"Nothing done except routine work and the consideration of amendments to the constitution." Mr. Young tells me that his official records as secretary of the meeting do not show any changes in the constitution.

My predecessor in office also tells me that you voted your partner, Freedman, the sum of $15,000 as rental of Manhattan Field for last year, against which Freedman claims there was practically no offset in the way of rentals received for use of the grounds during that time. How about the one item of over $10,000 that a published statement by Columbia College declared had been paid the New York club for the use of its grounds for football matches? You surely cannot indorse such shell-game bookkeeping methods that would permit this $10,377.41 football rental to be credited to the Polo Grounds account, when it was understood with the League that all such business should go to the Manhattan Field account? This rental item is only one of the minor results of "Freedmanism" and it is amazing that you, Soden, Conant and Robison can indorse or even apologize for its author.

In closing my comments on your sarcastic reference to the small amount of work I accomplished during those thirteen business hours, I will again call your attention to the platform on which I waseleted, which is the policy of the National League

"To promote, foster, elevate and perpetuate the game of baseball, the national field sport of America.

"To eliminate all objectionable features that may tend to degrade and demoralize the sport.

"To inculcate in the governors of the game, club officials, umpires, players and every one interested in or connected with this national sport, a realization of what true sportsmanship is and to subordinate the financial side of the game.

"To cultivate among the players a desire for the highest athletic development, that they may by their skillfulness, integrity and gentlemanly deportment, both on and off the field raise their profession to a high plane and add lustre and interest to the national game.

"To establish a central governing body in which all professional baseball interests shall be properly represented, this body to be clothed with ample power to carry into effect these and other objects that tend to maintain the integrity and high standard of the game."

Then again you say, "We disclaim all responsibility for draft principles." File the records show that the "Freedman Four" instituted a suit for the sole purpose of deceiving the public, belonging the real issues by contesting my election as President of the National League, to which office Col. Rogers and I claimed we had a right, I had been elected unanimously, Dec. 14, 1901. I shall maintain that my election is legal until a court of competent jurisdiction hears the case on the merits and shall render a final decision.

It is the interest of the National League and of the individual clubs composing the "Freedman Four" is to be regretted that your faction ignored the League meeting and took refuge under the shelter of a temporary injunction, by which either the New York, Brooklyn, Cincinnati and St. Louis clubs are tied up and cannot, while the Supreme Court of New York sits on the Bench of Brooklyn, participate in the Tournament Flag of Baseball for a still higher court.

Now, Mr. Brush, having in my letter of the 11th to Mr. Robison announced that my correspondence with you and with the Boston and Philadelphia clubs would be left for the public to read at leisure, I will simply say that I have spared time to more fully explain my position than I would have done had I not been anxious to have the public see how fair I have been in my dealings with the Brotherhood and how unfair and unjustifiable the "Freedman Four" have been to the National game.

Mr. Brush, having in my letter of the 11th to Mr. Robison announced that my correspondence with you and with the Boston and Philadelphia clubs would be left for the public to read at leisure, I will simply say that I have spared time to more fully explain my position than I would have done had I not been anxious to have the public see how fair I have been in my dealings with the Brotherhood and how unfair and unjustifiable the "Freedman Four" have been to the National game.

To establish a central governing body in which all professional baseball interests shall be properly represented, this body to be clothed with ample power to carry into effect these and other objects that tend to maintain the integrity and high standard of the game.

Then again you say, "We disclaim all responsibility for draft principles." File the records show that the "Freedman Four" instituted a suit for the sole purpose of deceiving the public, belonging the real issues by contesting my election as President of the National League, to which office Col. Rogers and I claimed we had a right, I had been elected unanimously, Dec. 14, 1901. I shall maintain that my election is legal until a court of competent jurisdiction hears the case on the merits and shall render a final decision.

It is the interest of the National League and of the individual clubs composing the "Freedman Four" is to be regretted that your faction ignored the League meeting and took refuge under the shelter of a temporary injunction, by which either the New York, Brooklyn, Cincinnati and St. Louis clubs are tied up and cannot, while the Supreme Court of New York sits on the Bench of Brooklyn, participate in the Tournament Flag of Baseball for a still higher court.

Now,