

THE ANSPACH ARCHIVES COLLECTION
DOCUMENTING THE TRUE HISTORY OF MONOPOLY®
AS AFFIRMED BY COURT FACT FINDINGS.

By Ralph Anspach ©

WHAT IS UNIQUE ABOUT THIS HISTORIAL COLLECTION?

Since Professor Ralph Anspach uncovered the true history of Monopoly®, other histories have adjusted their narration to self-serving portions of his discoveries. The true history, authenticated by court fact findings, is embedded in the documents in this collection.

These documents prove that:

- While other versions now recognize that Elizabeth Magie invented the forerunner to Monopoly®, The Landlord’s Game, they fail to report that Magie also invented the basic monopoly game concept circa 1904.
- While other versions give some grudging credit to the Atlantic City Quakers for inventing parts of the current Monopoly®, they fail to report that the Quakers alone developed Magie’s monopoly game into the renowned Monopoly® in terms of play action, diversified tokens, and property names and values.
- While other versions now acknowledge that Darrow was erroneously credited with inventing all of Monopoly®, they do not reveal why this happened. This collection proves that the distortion of history was a scheme to appropriate a folk game from the public domain by the fabrication of a false inventor—a scheme to privatize and monopolize the public domain monopoly game.
- Only this collection proves that Monopoly® started its career as an anti-monopolistic spoof of monopoly capitalism. Its creators thought that people would understand that one gets rich in Monopoly® by price-gouging renters, transportation users, and utility customers.
- This collection documents step-by-step the investigation which uncovered the true history of Monopoly® and punctured the false history of the game.

—————

ORGANIZATION OF THE CONTENTS OF THE COLLECTION

The contents of the archive collection are listed in alphabetical order with each topic explained in a background introduction. Every effort has been made to describe the contents of this collection as accurately as possible. If the description(s) are not clear, please ask.

INDEX

	page
INTRODUCTION	3
GLOSSARY	4
CONTENTS (Background and Documents):	
1. Advertisements placed in Ivy College alumni magazines.	4
2. Allphin, William and Catherine. 1920s monopoly players.	4
3. Atlantic City Quaker - Harvey, Cyril.	4
4. Atlantic City Quaker - Hoskins, Ruth.	4 - 5
5. Atlantic City Quaker - Leonard, Dorothy.	5
6. Atlantic City Quaker - MacKain, Joanna.	5
7. Atlantic City Quaker - Raiford, Dorothea.	5
8. Atlantic City Quakers - Homage to their invention of Quaker/Darrow monopoly.	6
9. Atlantic City Quakers Historic Photo.	6
10. Atlantic City Truth Squad.	6 - 7
11. Audio Tapes.	7
12. Bossert, Henry Jr.	7
13. Buckwalter & Latshaws.	7 - 8
14. Copeland, Rudy.	8
15. Compton, Ted R.	9
16. Darrow, Esther.	9
17. Dick, Florence.	9
18. Harvard monopoly game with Boston street names.	9
19. Haverford College monopoly.	9
20. Heap, Roy Wilhelm.	10
21. Information from PB Whistleblowers.	10
22. Lerch, Brooke and Edmond (brothers).	10
23. Mitchell, Alice Armstrong.	10 - 11
24. monopoly/FINANCE as an independent publication.	11
25. Nearing, Scott and Guy (brothers).	11 - 12
26. PB Conduct I: PB fabricates Darrow as inventor of Monopoly.	12 - 13
27. PB Conduct II: monopoly/Finance erased from history.	13 - 14
28. PB Conduct III: The existence of monopoly/FINANCE covered up with new, different PB FINANCE.	14
29. PB Conduct IV: PB markets Monopoly under the name FORTUNE in 1935.	14
30. PB Conduct V: PB uses the Darrow patent to monopolize MONOPOLY.	14 - 15
31. Philadelphia monopoly player: Ruth Raiford.	15
32. Philadelphia Quaker Charles Todd and wife Olive.	15 - 16
33. Phillips, Elizabeth Magie.	16 - 17
34. Pocono Summer Camp monopoly players.	17
35. Photos (additional.)	17
36. Robertson, Priscilla.	17 - 18
37. Rodebaugh, Edward and Grace.	18
38. Sherk, Paul.	18
39. Smith, Phillip H.	18
40. Thun, Louis.	18 - 19
41. Tugwell, Rexford.	19
-- Trial Transcripts.	19
APPENDIX A: Fact findings of the Ninth District Circuit Court of Appeals as upheld by the United States Supreme Court in the case of Anti-Monopoly, Inc. v. General Mills Fun Group.	20
APPENDIX B: Depositions List (Transcribed) – Sorted by last name of deposed.	21

INTRODUCTION

Between 1935 and 1975, Parker Brothers (PB), the publisher of Monopoly®, palmed off a false history of the world's most popular proprietary game. It told of a certain Charles Darrow who invented Monopoly® in 1930 or 1931 or 1932 (the date shifted to accommodate new information which became public) “just for the fun of it.” He was unemployed in the Great Depression and put Atlantic City Street names on his board to commemorate happier days spent in the sea resort. Darrow, helped by PB publicity, became an American folk hero who embodied the American dream: A gutsy, creative person lifts himself out of poverty into great riches — just like the winner of a Monopoly® game.

A great story with only one flaw: it never happened. In 1974, PB sued Ralph Anspach (RA) alleging that he infringed the Monopoly® trademark with his best-selling game Anti-Monopoly®. In 1983, RA finally won the law suit when the Supreme Court refused to hear the case. During the law suit, RA uncovered the real history of Monopoly® which was then confirmed by fact findings by the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals (See Appendix.) This collection reveals the authentic history of Monopoly® and tells how this suppressed history was uncovered. Much of the material in this collection has never been made public and much of what was public can now only be found in this collection.

In fact, Monopoly® has two creators. Elizabeth Magie Phillips invented the basic monopoly game circa 1904. Her game then spread by word of mouth all over the Eastern United States. It was played extensively on home made boards at college campuses and in private homes. The second inventors were a group of Quakers who taught in the Atlantic City Friends School in Atlantic City, NJ. They were introduced to the game around Christmas 1930. They put their own street names on the board which are now immortalized in the Parker Brother's game.

But more important, the Atlantic City Quakers changed Magie's monopoly folk game from an adult game into one which children could also play. This explains its trans-generational success. Children learn it from their parents; the children grow up and teach it to their children and so on. How? In the monopoly folk game, the initial distribution of properties was by an auction system. When a property was first landed upon, it was sold to the highest bidder. Children wouldn't know how much to bid for the properties and therefore couldn't win the game. The Quakers assigned prices to the properties and the player who landed on a property could buy it at the fixed price. Now, children could handle the game.

Darrow copied this game in 1932, and without telling the Quakers, he published it without any substantial changes. He claimed that he invented the game but did not try to patent it. He sold out his first run of 5,000, but then had trouble selling his second run of 7,000.

In 1935, Darrow licensed the game to PB and it became a hit, even though it was out sold by the same monopoly folk game published under the name Finance since 1932. PB found out almost immediately that Darrow was not the inventor of the game and that the game could not be protected against competitors because it was a public domain game like chess. PB then decided to appropriate it from the public domain by fabricating Darrow as its inventor for whom it promptly secured an invention patent. Armed with the patent, PB then eliminated the competition. To cover up the scheme, PB erased from history the true story behind Monopoly® and replaced it with the Darrow legend.

GLOSSARY

monopoly: the monopoly folk game which was invented circa 1903-1906.

monopoly/Finance: The monopoly folk game marketed under the name Finance.

Monopoly: Parker Brothers' Monopoly®

Quaker/Darrow monopoly: The Atlantic City monopoly game which was taught to Darrow and then licensed by him to Parker Brothers.

CONTENTS

1. Advertisements placed in Ivy College alumni magazines:

- Background -

In 1975, ads searching for pre-Darrow monopoly players were placed in a variety of Ivy League alumni magazine by RA or his attorney. Several monopoly players responded which fueled the investigation.

- Documents -

a. Ads from Williams College and Princeton alumni magazines with notes from RA.

2. Allphin, William and Catherine (deceased). 1920s monopoly players:

- Background -

The Allphins played monopoly going back to 1920. Willard Allphin submitted his version of monopoly unsuccessfully to Milton Bradley. This may explain why Milton Bradley later forced PB to grant it a license to the Darrow patent (See #30.) Willard Allphin also had an article published in a British game magazine questioning the Darrow story which was published with an evasive reply by PB.

- Documents -

a. Trial Transcript of testimony by both, pp. 23-37 (Located in transcript folio.)

b. Audio tape of RA interviewing the couple (Located in audio files, see #11a)

c. Willard Allphin, "Who Invented Monopoly" Games & Puzzles, March 1975.

3. Atlantic City Quaker - Harvey, Cyril (deceased):

- Background -

- The Harveys belonged to the Quaker/Darrow monopoly inventor group. His wife, Ruth (deceased) was one of the central forces behind the invention of the game.

- Documents -

a. Deposition of Cyril Harvey, February 4, 1975.

b. Audio Tape of Harvey describing the invention of A.C. Quaker/Darrow monopoly (Located in audio files, see #11c.)

4. Atlantic City Quaker - Hoskins, Ruth (deceased):

- Background -

Ruth Hoskins brought the monopoly folk game to the Atlantic City Friends School. She was introduced to it by Pete Daggett, a friend of Dan Layman (See #14.) She was a core member of the group which changed the folk game to Quaker/Darrow monopoly.

- Documents -

- a. Deposition of Ruth Hoskins, February 4, 1975.
- b. RA notes about conversation with Pete Daggett.
- c. Ruth Hoskins card addressed to RA.
- d. Audio Tape Interview (Located in audio files, see #11c.)

5. Atlantic City Quaker - Leonard, Dorothy:

- Background -

Dorothy Leonard, the daughter of the Harveys, witnessed the invention of Quaker/Darrow monopoly as a child and also played it. She adds many details of the invention process since she has a photographic memory.

- Documents -

- a. Deposition of Dorothy Leonard, February 4, 1975.
- b. Four (4) letters addressed to RA.
- c. Letter about Homage to the A.C. inventors of Quaker/Darrow monopoly (See #8.)
- d. Leonard synopsis of the invention of Quaker/Darrow monopoly.

6. Atlantic City Quaker - MacKain, Joanna (deceased):

- Background -

Joanna is the daughter of Jesse and Dorothea Raiford (See #7.) She played Quaker/Darrow monopoly as a child. When RA was interviewed on a Portland, Oregon TV station, a Mrs. Stevenson called in to report that she had a friend named Joanna who claimed her parents and not Darrow invented Monopoly. This was the first hint RA got that there might be something fishy about the Darrow story which inspired him to investigate the history of Monopoly.

- Documents -

- a. Trial Transcript, pp. 45-47 (Located in transcript folio.)

7. Atlantic City Quaker - Raiford, Dorothea (deceased):

- Background -

Dorothea Raiford was the wife of Jesse Raiford (deceased) and the mother of Joanna MacKain. Jesse was one of the prime movers in the invention of Quaker/Darrow monopoly since he constructed all the prices found now in Monopoly, prices for which Darrow was often lauded because they worked so well in the game.

- Documents -

- a. Deposition of Dorothea Raiford, February 4, 1975.
- b. Fourteen (14) letters addressed to RA.
- c. Letter with three photos of hotels and houses cut out of molding
- d. RA notes about investigation
- e. Trial Transcript, pp. 37-45 (Located in transcripts folio.)
- f. Twelve (12*) 35mm color slides comparing the prices found on Jesse and Dorothea Raiford's monopoly as copied by Ruth Raiford to the Quaker/Darrow prices. Shows the famous Marven Gardens v. Marvin Gardens typo.
(*Slides=11 images, 1 duplicate.)

8. Atlantic City Quakers - Homage to their invention of Quaker/Darrow monopoly:

- Background -

Since Atlantic City continued to perpetuate the Darrow myth even though A.C. residents had invented Monopoly, RA decided to honor the Quakers. A ceremony was held on September 11, 1989, in the Quaker Room of the Quality Inn, located on the intersection of Pacific Avenue and South Carolina Avenue. The Quality Inn was built on the site of a converted Atlantic City Friends School, which explains the appearance of Pacific Avenue and South Carolina Avenue in Quaker/Darrow monopoly. Nearly all the streets in the Quaker game were chosen by the Quakers because they referred to their personal life experiences which can be contrasted to the fabricated story according to which Darrow dreamed of Atlantic City while unemployed. The Quality Inn decorated the Quaker room with a plaque honoring the inventors.

- Documents -

- a. A description of the event and the plaque by Dorothy Leonard.
- b. Press Release by Ed Ratner, Anti-Monopoly's Publicist.
- c. Two articles about the event which appeared in 'The Press - Atlantic City' (copies.)

9. Atlantic City Quakers Historic Photo:

- Background -

Photo commemorates a Quaker/Darrow monopoly party held at the home of the Harveys on January 1, 1933, as confirmed by a dated guest book entry. We see a group of Atlantic City Quakers sitting behind a bridge table on which is displayed a Quaker/Darrow board with houses and hotels cut out of molding plus other game equipment. (The only person not a Quaker was Dorothea Raiford.)

Among the people shown are some of the most important members of the group which invented Quaker/Darrow monopoly: Jesse Raiford, Ruth Harvey and Ruth Hoskins. Also shown are Dorothea Raiford and Cyril Harvey.

- Documents -

- a. Photograph, black & white print, glossy, 8"x10" (includes list of known people.)
- b. Record of Guest – Guest Book of the Harveys (8 Nov1932-18 Feb 1933) (copy.)

10. Atlantic City Truth Squad:

- Background -

The 1975 International Monopoly Tournament celebrated the 40th Anniversary of Parker Brothers' publication of Monopoly. It also bestowed upon the winner the "Darrow Cup" in honor of the inventor of Monopoly even though PB knew through RA's evidence that Darrow had simply copied the game.

The American championship was held in Atlantic City, NJ, the home of the real inventors. It was held without the participation of the Eastern region of the U.S. This deletion occurred because the favorite to win in the Eastern region was Jay Walker, a college student who was in a dispute with PB about his book on Monopoly play strategies.

Jay Walker contacted RA about his problems. RA who was outraged about PB continuing to publicize the fake history, especially in the backyard of the Quaker inventors, and Jay Walker attended the Atlantic City U.S. tournament and the Washington, D.C. final international tournament to set the record straight.

Jay Walker was accompanied by his friend Jeff Lehman. Jay Walker went on to found Priceline.com and Jeff Lehman is now the chancellor of Cornell University.

- Documents -

- a. PB press kit -1975.
- b. Anti-Monopoly Press Release. “Professor against the monopolist; a ‘David and Goliath’ story (This theme was later reflected in RA’s book title.)
- c. Ad in the Atlantic City Press announcing a lecture by RA in Atlantic City.
- d. Mock-up of flyer distributed in the Washington hotel in which the International Monopoly tournament was held.
- e. 11 letters of correspondence between Jay Walker, Jeff Lehman, and PB reps.
- f. Trial Transcript, pp. 4-23 (Located in transcript folio.)
- g. One (1) 35mm color slide of the Darrow cup (Located in slide folio.)
- h. Audio interview with Jay Walker (In audio files, see #11g.)

11. Audio Tapes:

- Documents -

- a. RA interview with the Allphins.
- b. Two (2) tapes of the deposition of Dan Layman.
- c. RA interviews of Cyril Harvey and Ruth Hoskins.
- d. Two (2) tapes of initial interview with Charles and Olive Todd.
- e. RA interviews of Ruth Raiford and Dorothea Raiford.
- f. Barry Farber NY radio talk show. Present are RA and Maxine Brady, the author of “THE MONOPOLY BOOK.” Brady, a national authority on Monopoly, believed like everybody else that Darrow invented Monopoly and she narrates the Darrow story as history in her book. RA breaks the news about Monopoly’s real history.
- g. Jay Walker interview by Burton Wolf about the Monopoly tournament and his dispute with PB.

12. Bossert, Henry Jr. (current whereabouts unknown):

- Background -

Mr. Bossert played monopoly in Oaklane (a suburb of Philadelphia) circa 1917 – 1920. The game was brought to Oaklane from Reading, PA. It was said that it was invented by Scott Nearing, but Nearing denied that to Bossert by letter.

- Documents -

- a. Letter from Bossert – explains monopoly game played 1917-1920.

13. Buckwalter & Latshaws:

- Background -

Joseph Buckwalter (deceased) was one of the earliest monopoly players. His descendants were under an erroneous impression that Buckwalter had invented the game. The descendants date his board back to 1910. The descendants and their Latshaw friends played monopoly themselves in the 1920s (Current whereabouts of Latshaws unknown.)

- Documents -

- a. Deposition of David Irvin Buckwalter, September 23, 1975.
- b. Deposition of Rev. John Linwood Latshaw, September 24, 1975.
- c. Deposition of Elma Latshaw, September 23, 1975.
- d. Newspaper photo of David Buckwalter with original Buckwalter monopoly (1910) board, includes article, Pottsdown Mercury News, June 9, 1975.
- e. Letter from William E. Kline who first wrote RA about Buckwalter.

- f. RA notes about the Buckwalter investigation.
- g. One (1) 35mm color slide of the Buckwalter board (Located in slide folio.)

14. Copeland, Rudy (deceased):

- Background -

After securing the fraudulent Darrow patent, PB sued Rudy Copeland (RC) on June 30, 1936, alleging that his game INFLATION infringed the Darrow patent. PB also published an announcement of the suit in trade magazines to scare away competitors.

Copeland countersued charging that PB knew that the patent was invalid and that PB “has attempted by fraudulent and collusive means to suppress evidence of prior public sale” of the FINANCE game (See 27.)

PB filed for a dismissal of the suit and paid Copeland about \$125,000 in current dollars and also permitted Copeland to continue to sell his game under license from PB without paying royalties. Copeland agreed to defend PB against any challenge of the Darrow patent.

Copeland submitted to the court 37 names of people who played monopoly before Darrow claims to have invented it. Investigation of this list (which does not include the A.C. Quakers) provided the leads which uncovered the monopoly folk game.

- Documents -

- a. Photo (Color 4x6” print) of Inflation game set (board, box, rules, and game pieces.)
- b. Rules to the game of Inflation (copy.)
- c. June 18, 1936, Bill of Complaint, Parker Brothers, Inc. v. Rudy Copeland.
- d. June 30, 1936, Bill of Complaint – PB v. RC, Cover Document.
- e. July 20, 1936, Patent Infringement - Important Notice to the Trade.
On PB Letterhead, trade journal announcement of its lawsuit against Rudy Copeland.
The announcement appeared in “PLAYTHINGS.”
- f. September 9, 1936, Answer - by Defendant (RC) to Plaintiff (PB).
- g. September 21, 1936, Defendant's (RC) Interrogatories to Plaintiff (PB).
- h. October 28, 1936, Plaintiff's (RC) Answers and Objections to Defendant's (PB) Interrogatories.
- i. October 29, 1936, Acknowledged by attorney for Defendant (RC),
for service on October 28, 1936.
- j. December 3, 1936, Agreement between Rudy Copeland and Parker Brothers, Inc.
An option by PB for \$10,000 (~\$125k in current dollars) to purchase Inflation.
Agreement includes a “hush up” clause.
- k. December 3, 1936, Stipulation - agreement to dismiss the PB suit against Copeland.
- l. December 8, 1936, Final Decree - by judge on Stipulation dismissing the PB suit
as agreed.
- m. Letter / Notes (dates and contacts) from David Pytleski to RA.
- n. Notes (dates and contacts) by RA relative to the break-through Copeland investigation.
(See also Barton Deposition, pp. 35-40. Barton explains that he settled the Copeland
suit because Yankees can't get justice in a Texas court.)

15. Compton, Ted R. (Current whereabouts unknown):

- Background -

Compton played monopoly in 1929, in New York City. Compton states that he was told that “the game was developed by some socialist group and was designed to demonstrate the evils of private enterprise and the capitalistic system.”

- Documents –

- a. Compton letter, September 11, 1975 – explains playing monopoly in 1929, NY.

16. Darrow, Esther (deceased):

- Background -

Esther was Darrow’s wife. She was a school mate of Charles Todd (see below) who met Todd by accident in Philadelphia which led to Darrow’s introduction to the Quaker’s version of the monopoly folk game. She refused to attend the trial as a witness but was forced to give a deposition. She acknowledged meeting Todd but remembered almost nothing about her husband’s invention of Monopoly and gives him credit only for a few design changes like the twin locomotives. She testified that she has no evidence of Charles Darrow’s invention of the game in her possession.

- Documents -

- a. Deposition of Esther Darrow, April 23, 1975.
- b. RA notes and description of Esther Darrow deposition.

17. Dick, Florence (Current whereabouts unknown):

- Background -

Mrs. Dick of Montclair, NJ, played monopoly in Buffalo, NY, in 1922 or 1923.

- Documents -

- a. Letter from Mrs. Dick – account of playing with friends while in Buffalo, NY.

18. Harvard monopoly game with Boston street names:

- Background -

Mrs. Douglas G. Hill (current whereabouts unknown) was unable to attend the trial because of illness but provided an affidavit stating that she was the secretary of Harvard Professor Sam Bass and that Professor Bass brought a monopoly game to the office sometime before 1931. Others made copies and it became quite the “in” thing.

- Documents -

- a. Letter from Mrs. Hill to RA, August 8, 1975.
- b. Affidavit by Mrs. Hill, August 21, 1975.
- c. B&W photo copies of title cards with typical Boston street names.
- d. RA notes of telephone conversation with Mrs. Hill, July 20, 1975.

19. Haverford College monopoly:

- Background -

‘monopoly’ was a popular game in Haverford in the early 1920s.

- Documents -

- a. 1924 Year Book entry for Edward Bernard Roskam in which he mentions “his excitement over the great name (sic) of Monopoly” (Page copy.)
- b. Two letters from Harvard Professor Howard Comfort (who was a school mate of Roskam) explains that the “name” was a typo for “game.” Discusses learning monopoly in 1920 or 1921.

20. Heap, Roy Wilhelm (deceased):

- Background -

Heap played monopoly in 1911. He testifies that his father learned it from a man named Ralph Kinsey who in turn got it from Scott Nearing. He kept his board and also his title cards and draw cards.

- Documents -

- a. Deposition of Roy W. Heap, February 3, 1975.
- b. RA notes of Heap conversation.
- c. Black and white photos of board, board details, game piece set, and draw cards.
- d. Color photo of the Heap board.
- e. One (1) 35mm color slide of the Heap board (Located in slide folio.)

21. Information from PB Whistleblowers:

- Background -

RA was in contact with two whistleblowers employed by PB whose present whereabouts are unknown. One introduced herself as having been a friend of Elizabeth Magie Phillips. She related that PB persuaded a crucial witness not to testify by giving him a wooden board (See #40 Thun section.) Bill 'X', a former executive of PB, (he asked RA not to use his name because he still had business connections with PB) corresponded and talked by phone repeatedly with RA. He revealed that documents about the history of Monopoly were locked up in a secret black box. He related that one document stated that, "from now on, we say that Darrow is the inventor of Monopoly." Another document was the rules sheet for Darrow's self-published 1935 game. A handwritten notation on its back proves the existence of concealed documents.

- Documents -

- a. RA notes of conversation with E.M. Phillips friend, May 26, 1975.
- b. RA note (with name excised) of phone call from other PB informant.
- c. Original 1935 Quaker/Darrow monopoly rules. This 1935 rule set bears the name of Charles Darrow and carries no copyright notice. The rules were gifted to RA by 'Bill X', a PB executive. The handwritten inscription on the back states: "Return to small black-box Sec'y (sic) shelf."

22. Lerch, Brooke and Edmond (brothers) (current whereabouts unknown):

- Background -

The Lerches played monopoly from about 1925-26. They belonged to the Wyomissing group of Thun, Layman, and Sherk (See #24, 38, 40.)

- Documents -

- a. Deposition of Brooke Lerch, September 11, 1975.
- b. Edward Lerch trial testimony, Transcript, pp. 97-109 (Located in transcript folio.)

23. Mitchell, Alice Armstrong (present whereabouts unknown):

- Background -

Mrs. Mitchell played the game in 1933, the year she married. Her husband George had played it in prior years when he was teaching at Columbia University. He got the game from Rexford Tugwell, a Professor at Columbia. She reported that the game was invented to prove how nasty monopoly is.

- Documents -

- a. Deposition of Alice Armstrong Mitchell, May 19, 1976.
- b. RA notes of phone conversations with Mrs. Mitchell.
- c. Full page color photo copy of Mitchell bridge table linen cloth board.

24. monopoly/FINANCE as an independent publication:

- Background -

The first successful commercial publication of monopoly occurred in the spring of 1932 or 1933, with rules copyrighted in 1932. It was published by Dan Layman, who had learned monopoly at Williams College from the Thun group (See #38, 40.) He marketed it through 'Electronic Laboratories' in Indianapolis. He changed the name from monopoly to FINANCE because he was told by a lawyer the name monopoly was used in the public domain and hence could not be trademarked anymore. (Hence we will refer to it as monopoly/FINANCE.) The game was played with the typical adult-level folk game auction rules which probably explain why it was so popular among professors and graduate students. Layman published a letter in TIME (February 21, 1936) in which he protested TIME attributing the invention of Monopoly to Darrow

- Documents -

- a. Deposition of Dan Layman, January 17, 1975.
- b. FINANCE rules copyrighted 1932 by Electronic Laboratories of Indianapolis (copy.)
- c. Color Photo of Electronic Labs Finance board (courtesy of Thomas Forsyth.)
- d. Color photo of Knapp Electric Finance board (courtesy of Thomas Forsyth.)
- e. Color photo of Dan Layman holding his wooden home made monopoly board.
- f. Layman letter in TIME magazine with evasive reply by PB (copy.)
- g. One (1) 35mm color slide of Layman's monopoly game board (located in slide folio.)
- h. One (1) 35mm color slide of the monopoly/Finance game board.

25. Nearing, Scott and Guy (brothers) (deceased):

- Background -

Professor Scott Nearing was a homespun American radical memorialized in an introductory interview in Warren Beatty's movie "Reds." In the first few years of the 1900s, Scott spent summers in the progressive, Bohemian community of Arden, Delaware. The village implemented the ideas of Henry George. As a result, the village benefited from land appreciation. This allowed it to pay generously for cultural activities which attracted intellectuals, radicals, and artists. Elizabeth Magie also frequented Arden. Scott Nearing and his brother were enthusiastic players of the monopoly folk game version even though they still called it Landlord's at this point. We know this because Guy Nearing sent a letter to a Professor Rosenquist who had been researching the monopoly history and the letter stated that the Landlord's Game played by Guy featured combinations which allowed players who owned all the parts of the combination to raise rents. Scott Nearing, who taught economics at the Wharton School of Finance, taught his students the game as a spoof of monopoly capitalism and thereby became the conduit for spreading the game into the Eastern U.S. from Arden, Delaware.

One can differentiate the two versions of Magie's game by the play action. In Magie's monopoly folk game, only those players reap the reward of monopoly pricing who own the designated number of members of a designated group. In the case of Magie's Georgist game the monopoly folk game principles were applied to railroads and

utilities; but, the play action changes for landowners. Here, when all the lots in a section of the board are developed with different levels of houses, the monopolistic rent increases benefit any owner of a parcel regardless of how many parcels he owns in that section.

Some of the monopoly folk game players were under the false impression that Nearing had invented monopoly. He always denied it and attributed it to someone in Arden whose name he and his brother had forgotten but he did remember that the inventor was a woman from Baltimore (clearly Lizzie Magie who lived in Baltimore) who was a “single taxer” for the purpose of proving “the wickedness of land monopoly.” (Thun Deposition, p. 51, see ref. #40.)

- Documents -

- a. Copy of letter from Scott Nearing to Ferdinand Thun, April 26, 1929.
- b. Copy of letter from Scott Nearing to Professor Rosenquist, August 8, 1961.
- c. Copy of letter from Guy Nearing to Professor Rosenquist, September 8, 1961.
- d. Letter from Scott Nearing to RA, November 1974. Reply was hand written by Nearing on back of original letter from RA to Nearing.
- e. Letter from RA to Nearing, November 9, 1974.

26. PB Conduct I: PB fabricates Darrow as inventor of Monopoly:

- Background -

In March 1935, PB licensed Quaker/Darrow monopoly from Darrow. PB learns in April that Darrow did not invent this game and that it was in the public domain. PB asked Darrow to explain but receives an evasive answer. Darrow offers to give PB an affidavit about Quaker/Darrow monopoly affirming that he was its inventor but PB does not request the affidavit from Darrow, explaining in court that his willingness to do it was enough for PB.

PB then made a corporate decision to fabricate Darrow as inventor because a public domain game can not be protected from competition (See Informants above.) PB then filed for a Darrow patent on August 31, 1935. On December 31, 1935, the Darrow patent which covers nearly everything about Monopoly was issued. Darrow is asked to clear what he says about the game with the PB PR department.

The claimed dates on which Darrow first started working on Monopoly shifted around from 1933 to the late 1920s to accommodate new information about the game’s history. The story about what inspired Darrow to invent Monopoly also shifts around. For example, the initial story talks about Darrow being inspired by a friend who heard a Princeton Professor talk about a business game concept played with scrip. Once the Magie patent is licensed by PB, Darrow explains that he came across her patent and decided to improve her work.

- Documents -

- a. RA notes of investigation
- b. Correspondence between Robert B.M. Barton and Darrow about Darrow’s invention.
 1. March 20, 1935. Barton asks Darrow to detail when and how he invented Monopoly.
 2. March 21, 1935. Darrow explains he got the idea for Monopoly from a Princeton Professor who gave his class scrip money to make imaginary investments.
 3. April 15, 1935. Letter, Barton to Darrow. A Vice-President of PB informs Barton that Monopoly is based on a 1902 trading game and that FINANCE is outselling Monopoly 10 to 1. Barton asks Darrow to give him an

affidavit about his invention of Monopoly.

4. April 17, 1935. Letter, Darrow to Barton. An evasive reply; Darrow will provide the affidavit but only “to the best of my knowledge and belief” since he has no records about his invention. Darrow also offers to give an affidavit that he has never seen a game called Monopoly in the stores.
- c. Collections of media publications showing Darrow’s shifting invention stories. (Also see Phillips above for two newspaper articles in the Boston Sunday Post and The Evening Star).
- d. Two Western Union telegrams showing that Darrow refers information about his invention of Monopoly to PB.
- e. 1957 PB Press Release about Darrow’s invention of Monopoly.
- f. August 31, 1935 application for Darrow patent by PB attorneys.
- g. The Darrow patent.
- h. Legal analysis of Darrow patent showing it covers nearly everything in Monopoly.
- i. TIME story that Darrow’s invented another game “Bulls and Bears” February 1, 1937.
- j. Barton Deposition, p 51. Barton declares that Darrow had nothing to do with “Bulls and Bears.” PB just used his name to push the game.
- k. NY TIMES obituary of Darrow, August 29, 1967. The newspaper of record enshrines the Darrow invention story in history.
- l. Letter from Darrow to HOLIDAY magazine. An evasive explanation about his history of game.
- m. Letter from Edward P. Parker, President of PB, to Professor Samuels who was investigating the history of Monopoly, March 8, 1972, stating Darrow was inspired to invent Monopoly by a Geologist lecture at the University of PA.
- n. Deposition of Robert B. M. Barton, May 8, 1975.
- o. Trial Transcript of Robert B. M. Barton testimony: pp. 63-84, 224-268 (see folio.)
- p. 1973 booklet by Parker Brothers entitled, “The incredible story behind MONOPOLY® and how it became a legend in its own time.” This shows the pre-trial PB story of Darrow as inventor of Monopoly®.

27. PB Conduct II: monopoly/Finance erased from history:

- Background -

The monopoly/FINANCE game posed a serious threat to the monopolization of Monopoly by PB for two reasons:

- (1) The producers of this game knew the history of monopoly and that it is a public domain game.
- (2) monopoly/FINANCE was outselling Monopoly. PB makes its move after Barton receives a threatening letter from David Knapp, distributor of FINANCE, September 13, 1935. Barton asks for a private meeting with Knapp, September 17, 1935. Electronic Laboratories, the publisher of FINANCE sells FINANCE to Knapp Electric, January 10, 1936. The Agreement binds Electronic Laboratories to keep secret everything about its connection to FINANCE and to assist Knapp and PB to keep their “monopoly” of FINANCE or any similar game. The next day, Knapp sells monopoly/FINANCE to PB, for \$9,750 (about 100,000 in current dollars) pledging to assist PB in protecting its intellectual property rights in MONOPOLY. Mysteriously, in a letter dated December 6, 1957, from Barton to the then- President of Electronic Laboratories,

Barton acknowledges that PB bought monopoly/FINANCE in 1935 for \$7,500 from Electronic. One can guess that the 1935 sale was an option to buy if the Darrow patent issued.

- Documents -

- a. Letter from David Knapp to Barton, September 13, 1935.
- b. Letter from Barton to Knapp, September 17, 1935.
- c. Agreement of sale of monopoly/FINANCE by Electronic Laboratories to Knapp Electric, January 10, 1936.
- d. Agreement of sale of monopoly/FINANCE by Knapp to PB, January 11, 1936.
- e. Correspondence between Garstang of Electronic and Barton, December 1957.
- f. RA notes of investigation of monopoly/FINANCE sale to PB.
- g. See #21c for "black box" document.

28. PB Conduct III: The existence of monopoly/FINANCE covered up with new, different PB FINANCE:

- Background -

PB reissues monopoly/FINANCE as a simplified version of Monopoly. Interviews with old timers in the industry by RA reveal that the industry came to believe that monopoly/FINANCE was a knock-off of Monopoly (rather than the other way around) and that PB, to avoid legal costs, bought it and then reissued it in an improved version.

- Documents -

- a. Rules for PB FINANCE.
- b. One (1) 35 mm color slide comparing monopoly/Finance with the PB Finance.

29. PB Conduct IV: PB markets Monopoly under the name FORTUNE in 1935:

- Background -

PB, unsure of its rights to the Monopoly trademark, publishes the Monopoly game temporarily under the name FORTUNE in 1935.

- Documents -

- a. Photocopies of box, board, cards, and rules for FORTUNE.

30. PB Conduct V: PB uses the Darrow patent to monopolize MONOPOLY and make monopoly-high profits:

- Background -

PB, armed with the Darrow patent, gets rid of the competition.

1. Purchase of monopoly/FINANCE with hush-up Agreement (See #14.)
2. Hush-up Agreement with Copeland (See #14.)
3. PB licenses Landlord's Game and Darrow patents to Milton Bradley for Easy Money since, apparently, MB knew of the monopoly public domain history through Allphin submission (See #2.) According to Barton testimony, this was the only case in the history of Parker Brothers where it licensed the rights to a best seller to a major competitor.
4. PB Infringement charges against Amesbury's NEW YORK game and Transogram's BIG BUSINESS drives them off the market.
5. PB raises prices of Monopoly after eliminating competition.

After this demonstration of market power based on an invention patent and other intellectual property rights, no one else challenges the monopoly of MONOPOLY until Anti-Monopoly in 1973.

- Documents -

- a. Agreement between PB and Milton Bradley under which PB licenses the Phillips and Darrow patents to Milton Bradley for its game EASY MONEY, February 8, 1936.
- b. Correspondence between PB and Milton Bradley about EASY MONEY license.
- c. Agreement between PB and Amesbury under which Amesbury takes New York from the market.
- d. PLAYTHINGS advertisements by Knapp and PB in 1935 show that Knapp was selling FINANCE for \$1.00, while PB was charging \$2.00. After buying the monopoly/FINANCE competition in February 1936, PB increased the price of Monopoly to \$2.50.

31. Philadelphia monopoly player: Ruth Raiford: (deceased):

- Background -

Mrs. Ruth Raiford, though not a Quaker, was married to the Quaker Eugene Raiford and lived in Philadelphia. He was the brother of Atlantic City's Jesse Raiford (See #7) who created the fixed prices in Monopoly. The Philadelphia Raifords were introduced to the game by the Atlantic City inventors. Her husband Gene and she were friends of the Todds (See #32) and joined the Todds in teaching Darrow how to play Quaker/Darrow monopoly. She answered an ad placed by Anti-Monopoly searching for early Monopoly players and thereby helped fill in the missing link between the already discovered monopoly folk game and Monopoly.

- Documents -

- a. Deposition of Ruth Raiford, February 4, 1975.
- b. Twenty (20) letters to RA from November 7, 1974 to September 17, 1976.
- c. Letter from John Droeger (Anti-Monopoly's attorney) to Ruth Raiford, December 18, 1974.
- d. Affidavit by Ruth Woodworth affirming that she played monopoly with Ruth Raiford.
- e. Letter from Pauline Smith that she played monopoly with Ruth Raiford.
- f. Copy of letter by Gene Raiford to Vince Leonard protesting his dissemination of the false Darrow story.
- g. RA comparison of prices used by Raiford, Todd and Darrow. Darrow's prices are exactly the same as the ones found in the Raiford and Todd games with one typographical exception.

32. Philadelphia Quaker Charles Todd and wife Olive (Charles Todd is deceased, current whereabouts of Olive Todd unknown.):

- Background -

Todd inadvertently transmitted the Quakers' Atlantic City game to Darrow. He had been a school mate of Esther Jones who married Darrow. Todd encountered her by accident on a street in Germantown (suburb of Philadelphia), invited the Darrows for a game of monopoly, a game to which he had been introduced by Gene and Ruth Raiford. Monopoly parties followed attended by the three couples during which the game was taught to Darrow — he had known nothing about it before. Todd, upon request by Darrow, had his secretary type a set of monopoly rules for Darrow. (Todd did not keep a

copy of these rules and no credible copy of them has ever surfaced.) Soon thereafter, Darrow began selling the game in the neighborhood, claiming that he had invented it. Whenever the Todds encountered the Darrows on the street, the Darrows crossed the street to avoid talking to the Todds. The Todds never saw the Darrows again. Todd wrote to PB but got no answer.

- Documents -

- a. Trial transcript (located in transcripts folio.)
- b. Depositions of Charles Todd and Olive Todd, February 6, 1975.
- c. Twelve (12) letters to RA and RA attorney #2.
- d. Article about the Todds going to the trial (Augusta Herald, May 6, 1976.)
- e. RA notes on encounters with the Todds.
- f. One (1) 35mm slide of the Todd board (Located in slide folio.)

33. Phillips, Elizabeth Magie (EMP) (deceased):

- Background -

EMP is the indisputable inventor of the monopoly folk game (1903-06). Initially it was played under the name Landlord's Game, but then its name was changed in most cases to monopoly. Whichever name was used, it is monopoly because it features combinations of properties which allow their owner to price gouge players who land on them. The combinations were either color-coded or identified by different letters of the alphabet.

Once EMP became a devoted disciple of the Henry George doctrine (the Single-Tax doctrine,) she lost interest and track of what happened to her invention because she concentrated on Landlord's Games which espoused faithfully the principles of Henry George as she taught them as principal in a Henry George school. For example, her latest Landlord's Game featured get-rich monopoly-like Landlord's rules but also alternative Georgist rules called Prosperity. In Prosperity, when one landlord gets too rich, the other players can vote to switch to Georgist rules which eliminate all taxes and replaces them by a land tax. Property owners are only allowed to collect rents paid for improvements.

In 1924, Magie had patented one of her updates of the Georgist game. This patent had some claims which PB used to bolster the fraudulent Darrow patent. Parker Brothers apparently persuaded her not to publicize anything which could hurt the Darrow patent in exchange for publishing her Georgist Landlord's Game. When PB did publish her game four years after she licensed it to PB, it excised that part of the game which taught the Georgist doctrine. She felt betrayed but it was too late for her to tell the truth about Monopoly, probably because her story would no longer be credible since she had not said anything for four years.

It is also worth noting that the Darrow invention story changed once PB bought the EMP patent. Instead of Darrow being inspired by a story about a lecture in Princeton, he is now inspired by EMP's invention.

- Documents -

- a. Photo of the 1903 Arden, DE Woolery game which was called the Landlord's Game but plays like monopoly and which is attributed to EMP.
- b. Photo of Landlord's Game by EMP, published by "The Economic Game Company."
- c. Photo of Landlord's Game produced in 1939 by PB.
- d. Elizabeth Magie's 1904 Landlord's Game patent.
- e. EMP 1924 Landlord's Game patent.

- f. Rules of EMP self-published Landlord's Game with the alternative Prosperity rules.
- g. EMP November 5, 1935 assignment of her 1924 Landlord's Game patent to PB.
- h. Article from the Washington, DC, Evening Star, January 28, 1936. It is accompanied by a picture of EMP displaying a mock-up of a board which is labeled four times with MONOPOLY. She claims invention of monopoly thereby. The article states that Darrow "retrieved her game from the oblivion of the Patent Office and dressed it up a bit to get it going."
- i. Article from the Boston Sunday Post, February 16, 1936. It repeats the same Darrow invention story but omits any mention of her 1904 patent. The 1904 patent incorporated most of the Darrow claims which meant they had already been dedicated to the public domain
- j. Copy of EMP ode to PB upon their licensing her Landlord's Game.
- k. Copy of EMP letter to Foster H. Parker of PB (1939) expressing her joy about PB preparing to publish her Landlord's Game.
- l. Letter from William D. Boutwell, EMP's supervisor in the US Office of Education. He relates how everybody in her office was outraged that PB published only the monopoly side of her game.
- m. RA Notes on Magie diary which has not yet been made public. She writes that the crook Darrow stole her game and she went to see George Parker who promised her that he would stop the fraud and would pay her what Darrow got, which never happened.
- n. One (1) 35mm color slide of Magie's "Landlord's and Prosperity" board (Slide folio.)

34. Pocono Summer Camp monopoly players:

- Background – (Current whereabouts of these players unknown.)

Pocono Lake was a summer camp much frequented by students from Haverford College. The monopoly folk game was a popular diversion in the camp from 1920 till at least 1928. It was introduced there by a student from the University of Pennsylvania.

- Documents -

- a. Deposition of Lawrence R. Taylor, September 12, 1975.
- b. RA notes of conversations with Pocono Lake players William Cook, Edward Taylor, Howard Comfort, Lawrence Taylor, and Chauncey G. Paxson.
- c. Letters from Edward Taylor, William Cook, Lawrence Taylor.

35. Photos (additional):

-Documents -

- a. Newspaper photo of Willard Allphin
- b. Newspaper photo of Robert B.M. Barton
- c. Photo of Cyril and second wife Irene

36. Robertson, Priscilla (Current whereabouts not know):

- Background -

Mrs. Robertson played monopoly under the name of Landlord's in 1933 or 1934 while attending Columbia University as a spoof of monopoly capitalism. She was introduced to the game by George and Alice Mitchell (See #23.) Mrs. Robertson writes it was a point of honor among the players not to sell it to a commercial company because they were afraid it would be turned into a pro-monopoly game. She reports that players drew the board on linen cloth.

- Documents -

- a. Rules for a game called Landlord's which was played like monopoly
- b. Two (2) letters to RA dated August 4, 1978, and October 1, 1975.

37. Rodebaugh, Edward and Grace (Current whereabouts now known):

- Background -

Edward Rodebaugh was introduced to the game in the early 1920s in Swarthmore by Professor J. Russell Smith who taught at Columbia University, but lived in Swarthmore. He reports that game was so popular at Swarthmore that they held (monopoly) tournaments and one tournament winner he remembers was Hugh Denworth.

- Documents -

- a. Trial Transcript, pp. 84-95 and 95-96.
- b. Printed monopoly rules with hand-written prices (photocopy) with cover letter to RA.
- c. RA notes of interviews.
- d. Polaroid photo of monopoly board.

38. Sherk, Paul:

- Background -

Sherk belonged to the Reading/Wyomissing group (See #40.) He says that a student at the University of PA brought the game to Reading in 1916. The story was that it was developed by Nearing. Sherk told RA that Barton visited him in 1936 and bought his game from him for the PB archives. Barton paid \$50 (about \$500 in current dollars.) Sherk made an exact copy of it without the knowledge of Barton. When Anti-Monopoly requested everything about the history of Monopoly for the trial, Sherk's board was not provided. Sherk wrote to NEWSWEEK protesting the Darrow story.

- Documents -

- a. RA notes of meetings with the Thuns and Sherk.
- b. Letter from Newsweek to Sherk about his protest of the Darrow story and Barton's explanation to Newsweek which focuses on Phillips and Darrow coming across the Landlord's Game in a lecture which gave him the idea for Monopoly.

39. Smith, Phillip H.:

- Background -

Smith played monopoly in New York from 1924 to 1927. He was introduced to the game by a Professor Orchard, Columbia University. It came from Rex Tugwell. A group of eight friends played it continuously. They made home made boards out of window sash. They were thinking of commercializing it but one of the main reason they did not do it was that they did not know who had invented the game and hence did not feel authorized to market it.

- Documents -

- a. Three letters to RA.
- b. Color photo of his monopoly board.

40. Thun, Louis (deceased):

- Background -

Louis Thun was introduced to monopoly in the early 1920s by his elder sister Wilma, who was introduced to it by a cousin at the University of Pennsylvania.

Subsequently, a group of friends around Louis Thun, including Paul Sherk and the Lerch brothers (See #22) formed a monopoly playing group in high school. Thun then went to Williams College and became a Deke fraternity brother (Delta Kappa Epsilon.) The Dekes played a lot of monopoly. Layman was a Deke and that's where he learned to play monopoly.

The group thought of commercializing the game and made up printed rules for it, rules which reflected its anti-monopolistic roots. They dropped the project when they learned that they could not get a patent for it because they had not invented the game. They also learned that they could not trademark the word monopoly because it also was in the public domain. This explains why Layman later changed the name to FINANCE.

In 1936, Thun was visited by Barton to see if Thun would challenge PB about its Monopoly. Thun said he was in the textile business and would not interfere in the game business. He also told me that Barton showed him the Monopoly game and Thun, not being told about the Quakers, thought it was sufficiently different to allow Darrow to get some kind of patent on it. Barton then sent Thun in thanks one of the most expensive luxury boards PB was producing.

- Documents -

- a. Deposition of Louis Thun, June 17, 1975.
- b. RA notes on Thun inquiries.
- c. Typed rules for a game called Monopoly prepared 1931-32. The game plays like the PB Monopoly except for the auction system upon first landing.
- d. 1931 correspondence between Thun and friends exploring the possibility of marketing their game.
- e. Letter from Mrs. Louis Thun explaining that Louis Thun had learned the game from friends of his elder sister.
- f. Letter from Louis Thun, August 25, 1978, discussing RA's book.

41. Tugwell, Rexford

- Background -

Tugwell was a key player in the FDR administration — one of Roosevelt's braintrusts. He became Roosevelt's Attorney-General famous for his relentless attacks on monopolistic companies. Tugwell played monopoly under that name while a Professor at the University of Pennsylvania as a spoof of monopoly capitalism, and introduced his students to the game while at the U. of PA, and also later when he taught at Columbia University.

- Documents -

- a. Letter by Tugwell to Anti-Monopoly's attorney, October 30, 1975.

Trial Transcripts

Reporters' daily transcript (~370 pages)
ANTI-MONOPOLY, INC. vs. GENERAL MILLS FUNFOOD GROUP, INC.
November 1976

APPENDIX A.

The History of Monopoly according to the fact findings of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in the case of Anti-Monopoly, Inc. v. General Mills Fun Group, decided August 26, 1982. (648 F 2d 1316)

Note: These court fact findings are final since the U.S. Supreme Court upheld them by refusing to intervene in the litigation.

. . . “Moreover, the [lower] court’s reference to Darrow as the inventor or creator of the game is clearly erroneous. The record shows, as we stated in Anti-Monopoly I, that the game of “Monopoly” was first played from 1920 to 1932 on various college campuses by a small group of individuals, many of whom were related by blood or marriage. In late 1932 or early 1933 one of these players introduced Charles Darrow to the game, and gave him a handmade game board, rules, and associated equipment. Immediately, thereafter Darrow commenced commercially producing and selling ‘Monopoly’ game equipment.” 611 F2d at 299.

We have re-examined the entire record on appeal. Here is what it shows. At some time between 1904 and 1934, the game of monopoly developed. Early equipment was handmade and copied from earlier handmade equipment. All the witnesses presented by Anti-Monopoly insisted that the game was known as “Monopoly” by all who played it, although in most cases the name did not appear on the board itself. The game was played in Reading, Pennsylvania, sometime between 1911 and 1917, but this date may be a little early. In the early 1920’s the game was played in Princeton University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Smith College, the University of Pennsylvania, and Haverford College. On occasion the rules were privately printed. The game was offered to, but rejected by, Milton Bradley, a leading competitor of Parker Brothers. It was played in and around Reading, Pennsylvania from the early 1920’s to the early 1930’s. It may have been brought there from the University of Pennsylvania. Players in Reading made up and sold some half dozen sets of equipment at Williams College and University of Michigan. The game next appeared in Indianapolis, where some players marketed it under the name of “Finance.” (Players in Reading sold some of those games, too.) The game of monopoly was brought to Atlantic City, New Jersey in 1931 or thereabouts. The street names used in the game were then changed to Atlantic City street names. The game was taught to Darrow. He sold it to Parker Brothers in 1935, claiming that it was his own invention. Parker Brothers also bought the Finance game from its owners... Robert B.M. Barton, the former President of Parker Brothers, who negotiated with Darrow in 1935, testified that he did not believe Darrow’s claim [that Darrow invented Monopoly.]

It is true that Darrow, in his correspondence with Parker Brothers, claimed to have invented the game and offered to sign an affidavit stating his story. However, Robert B. M. Barton, the former president of Parker Brothers, who negotiated with Darrow in 1935, testified that he did not believe Darrow's claim.”

APPENDIX B.

DEPOSITIONS LIST (Transcribed) – Sorted by last name of deposed

1. Barton, Robert B.M. – Deposition of, May 8, 1975.
2. Buckwalter, David Irvin - Deposition of, September 23, 1975.
3. Darrow, Esther - Deposition of, April 23, 1975.
4. Harvey, Cyril - Deposition of, February 4, 1975.
5. Heap, Roy Wilhelm - Deposition of, February 3, 1975.
6. Hoskins, Ruth - Deposition of, February 4, 1975.
7. Latshaw, Elma - Deposition of, September 23, 1975.
8. Latshaw, John Linwood (Rev.) - Deposition of, September 24, 1975.
9. Layman, Dan - Deposition of, January 17, 1975.
10. Leonard, Dorothy - Deposition of, February 4, 1975.
11. Lerch, Brooke - Deposition of, September 11, 1975.
12. Mitchell, Alice Armstrong - Deposition of, May 19, 1976.
13. Raiford, Dorothea - Deposition of, February 4, 1975.
14. Raiford, Ruth - Deposition of, February 4, 1975.
15. Taylor, Lawrence R. - Deposition of, September 12, 1975.
16. Thun, Louis - Deposition of, June 17, 1975.
17. Todd, Charles - Depositions of, February 6, 1975.
18. Todd, Olive - Depositions of, February 6, 1975.