"FREEDOM FUND" OF THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE OF NEW YORK TO MAKE UP WHAT THE WET EMPLOYEE OF THE DRY MESSRS. ROCKEFELLER CUT OFF FROM LEAGUE REVENUE IN HIS EFFORT TO GET CONTROL OF THE LEAGUE AND FORCE IT TO ADOPT A POLICY SATISFACTORY TO THE WEALTHY BEER NULLIFICATIONISTS OF NEW YORK

A Fund of $100,000 a Year in Four Sections of $25,000, Each Divided Into 1,000 Units of $25 Each, Designed to Make the Fighting Dry Enforcement Agency of the Churches Effective as Well as Free—Adequate Support Sought From a Large Number of Givers—Persons Who Are in Sympathy With the Dry Aims of the Churches Represented by the League, and Will Contribute Small, Moderate and Liberal Amounts EXTRA to Keep the League Economically Independent.

THE TRUTH ABOUT ROCKEFELLER CONTRIBUTIONS—WHAT WILL YOU DO ABOUT IT?

This is not an attack upon nor even a criticism of the Messrs. Rockefeller. The Anti-Saloon League has not uttered a discourteous word respecting them. It believes that their contributions to the Anti-Saloon League were prompted by sincere desire to promote prohibition.

But the public has a right to the truth about the falsehoods for which their agent is responsible and which they have allowed to stand.

Since, as proved by the lapse of months, they have not only allowed their agent to withdraw their support of the League, but to use their name and influence to help the wets, it is not only legitimate but a duty to make up the loss from others who are not deceived by liquor propaganda, or untrustworthy employees.

The time has come to show that the Anti-Saloon League cannot be bought by any contribution however large, and that no employee of wealth can dictate the policy of the League on the strength of recommendation of a contribution.

It is also desirable to prove that the League dares, and is able successfully to defy the influence of the greatest financial power in the world when it is improperly used by an unworthy agent for purposes of tyranny, oppression and persecution.

THE GENESIS OF THE "FREEDOM FUND"

In the midst and as part of poison propaganda in a conspiracy not only to ruin the Anti-Saloon-League Superintendent but discredit the Board of Directors representing the churches and usurp control of the League, following carelessly charged part of the Rockefeller representatives they the report of New York featured and those of the whole world carried a statement in effect that Rockefeller contributions to the Anti-Saloon League of New York amounting to $100,000 a year out of a total income of about $250,000 had been withdrawn because of the false charges against the Superintendent. Although this statement was false and known to be such at the time, it was never corrected, and has been constantly repeated by the wets.

THE ACTUAL AMOUNT OF THE ROCKEFELLER CONTRIBUTION

For approximately fifteen years, the contribution from the Rockefeller family to the New York League was $5,000 a year. For three years ending April 30, 1921, it was in round figures approximately $75,000 a year.

For something like twenty years their contributions were made through Mr. Starr J. Murphy, a high-grade Christian gentleman, in sympathy with the League, and thoroughly conversant with its history and methods. Unfortunately for the dry cause, his unexpected death early in 1921 required the selection of a successor.

SELECTED AN ENEMY TO PASS ON ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE CONTRIBUTIONS

Unfortunately, there was selected to succeed him Raymond B. Fosdick, who has trained with the wets, has denied that the legalization of beer would be nullification, an enemy of the Anti-Saloon League and particularly of its Superintendent, and who, only a few months before, had publicly opposed the enactment of a state dry enforcement law. The very first thing, long before these false charges were ever invented, Mr. Fosdick recommended cutting off $50,000 of the $75,000 that had been given for the three preceding years.

CUT WITHOUT NOTICE WHEN IT WOULD DO MOST HARM

The League felt that it was fair to assume that, having given liberally to promote work that made possible the securing of ratification and the state enforcement law, the Messrs. Rockefeller would stand by long enough to realize its public value, and that if they were not willing to do it indefinitely, they would at least give ample notice. For example, when Mr. Andrew Carnegie became unable to ask the Carnegie Corporation to make a contribution, its managers, headed by Elihu Root, counsel for the brewers of America, made a contribution for a full year in advance in connection with notice that it would thereafter be cut off.

But immediately after Mr. Fosdick's appointment, this $50,000 was cut off without notice, in the summer-time, in the face of a financial stringency that had already begun, thus necessitating drastic and disastrous curtailment of League activity.

REAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR REPEAL OF STATE DRY LAW

It was the withdrawal of this money which is more than any other single thing responsible for the repeal of the state dry enforcement code. It cut off the sending out of literature, speakers and organizers. Instead of money to pay the bills for legitimate and necessary educational work there was a deficit. And Mr. Rockefeller's representative was told frankly that the summary withdrawal of funds needed for such purposes would almost certainly result in the loss of the new state law passed only a few weeks before. And this is just what happened.

It is a fair assumption from the facts that the Rockefeller representative desired to cripple the work of the League, both to facilitate the repeal of the dry law opposed by him in the first place, which repeal his undenied activity last winter so helped, and also in order to reduce the League to the point of subjection to his wishes, because the attendant financial situation of the moment would make the remaining $25,000 contribution.

He undertook to dictate the policy and even the personnel, and demanded that the Superintendent be eliminated because he had antagonized certain vital forces that were influential, falsely charging that the Superintendent had attacked the Catholic Church.

NEED FOR "FREEDOM FUND" PAINFULLY IMPRESSED

This attempt at financial pressure which it is reported this same man has made with respect to other agencies, and which is more or less common in the dealing of many wealthy men with agencies that need assistance, is so intolerable that it becomes fundamentally necessary to remove the possibility of the Anti-Saloon League again being placed at the mercy of its repetition. HENCE THE "FREEDOM FUND."
The "FREEDOM FUND" is designed so to develop the support of the League from the church constituency generally that all the imperative expenses of keeping the work going and making steady progress can come from that source. When this point is reached, then the desired large contributions from the small number of broad-visioned, generous, earnest men and women of wealth who are willing to help can be used to hasten the accomplishment of the objective sought, leaving the League in a position where never again can it be brought close to the danger of financial collapse, or be seriously hurt by the sudden withdrawal,—even through some legitimate reason such as death,—of any single large subscription.

The connection of this Rockefeller representative with the Tammany conspiracy to destroy the Anti-Saloon League Superintendent has been set out in detail covering a period of months without a word of denial. Further light is given in the open letter to Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., appended to this statement.

HOW THE "FREEDOM FUND" IS DIVIDED

The "FREEDOM FUND" is to be a fund of $100,000 a year for five years, divided into four sections and each of these is subdivided into 1,000 units of $25 each.

Section No. 1 is the $25,000 that Mr. Fosdick actually recommended for two years, the second year greatly against his will when the League management refused to bow to his dictate.

The second and third sections of $25,000 each represent the $50,000 which the League had for three critical years, but which Mr. Fosdick recommended be cut off, and the loss of which, without notice, made it impossible for the League successfully to block the effort to repeal the dry enforcement law.

The fourth section of $25,000 represents the fictitious balance of the alleged $100,000 subscription, which, in fact, the League never received, but which it told the Rockefeller representative it desperately needed to arouse the people to resist the repeal of the state dry enforcement law.

GRATIFYING VOLUNTARY RESPONSE IN ADVANCE

Having merely announced the "FREEDOM FUND" at the time of the withdrawal of the Rockefeller contribution, the League now for the first time formally lays it before its constituency.

Already the League has had voluntary contributions to it, one as large as ten units, and it has received a few contributions of one unit in each of the four sections, or $100 a year for five years. With 1,000 of these, the entire amount would be covered.

However, the League especially stresses the importance of every person who has been giving a smaller amount assuming an entire unit of $25.00 if possible.

Recognizing that there are friends who cannot afford this amount, the League suggests fractional units of $12.00 a year, which includes subscription to both the State and the National League weeklies, and $6.00 a year which includes subscription to the State weekly,—the AMERICAN ISSUE, New York Edition.

Most of the contributions to the "FREEDOM FUND" are in addition to regular church subscriptions. In some cases where we have received subscriptions to the "FREEDOM FUND" very much larger than former subscriptions, which take the place of the regular contributions. The League is glad to have such increases, but this policy if general would involve a sum larger than $100,000 because the standing smaller regular contributions which are thus absorbed must be replaced in order to make the "FREEDOM FUND" count as $100,000 of net increase.

WILL HELP EMANCIPATE EVERY WORTHY CAUSE

By raising this "FREEDOM FUND," the church constituency of the Anti-Saloon League will not only save the prohibition situation in New York by putting upon a permanent basis of effectiveness the Anti-Saloon League as their agency for practical work, but they will take a long step toward emancipating every church, every philanthropic agency, every hospital and charitable institution, and every institution of learning which needs help from the public and especially from those of large means, but which is unwilling to sell its soul in return for such "help."

THE FEARFUL COST OF FAILURE

The desperation of the tactics employed by Tammany and the forces behind it furnishes conclusive proof of their recognition that nothing except the Anti-Saloon League as the agency of the dry churches stands between the nation and the return of the liquor traffic.

Enforcement of Federal Prohibition in New York can never be satisfactory without a state law and provision for local enforcement legislation. If Tammany clinches its control of the State government and succeeds in changing the Constitution to permit aliens to be counted in figuring the basis of representation in the Legislature, thus giving New York City a majority, there will be no hope of such legislation and nothing ahead, short of a generation at least, but chaos, confusion and lawlessness in New York.

The churches, through the Anti-Saloon League, when they had funds for the necessary work whipped these forces once and with funds to get the truth to the people can do it again. How much will YOU give to meet this crisis?

SUPREME VITAL ISSUES AT STAKE

If the Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League is willing to have his good name assailed and endure persecution to stand on the fighting line in order to keep this agency of the churches free to be responsive to the moral convictions of the church constituency, surely the least that constituency can do is to make some sacrifice if necessary in order to make fully effective this fight in their behalf.

The League management has kept your agency FREE. What will YOU do to keep it as EFFECTIVE as it must be?

Many things of vital importance not apparent on the surface are involved. If Tammany succeeds in the effort to get control of the public school system and stops the teaching of the effect of alcohol in the public schools, the basis for prohibition found in general understanding of the scientific facts about the effects of alcohol will disappear.

Further, the Anti-Saloon League is fought by unscrupulous wealth that manipulates politics for private gain. It fears that the people through the League will learn how to enforce their rights and carry out the will of the majority on other questions. Every honest movement for the common good will be helped by the proof, through the vindication of the prohibition law, that a democracy can make good on the moral convictions of its citizenship.

How much will YOU give for this purpose?

William H. Anderson
(Signed) State Superintendent, Anti-Saloon League of New York.

NOTE:—If you have already made a "FREEDOM FUND" subscription for five years, or if you are unable to do it, hand this statement and attached blank with an appropriate explanation to some friend of law and order and defender of justice and fair play among your acquaintances.
John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Asked to Explain Why His Agent Helped an Indicted Confessed Criminal Prominent in Organized Liquor Activity to Escape Punishment, but Persistently Aided Tammany Liquor Effort to “Frame” and “Railroad” the Leader of the Prohibition Enforcement Agency of Five Thousand Dry Protestant Churches.

Also, If the Name and Power of the Greatest Financial Combination in the World Were to Be Used to Crush an Individual, Why His Agent Operated by Stealth Through Unsavory Assistants, One of Them an Admitted Criminal, and in Connection With Corrupt Political Organization, Instead of Working Openly and Fairly That Redress Could Be Easily Secured for Any Possible Injustice — And Further, Whether in the Interests of “Publicity” Respecting Affairs of the Anti-Saloon League He Will Ask the Governor to Grant a Hearing of the Charges Against the District Attorney and Will Produce His Own Agent, Raymond B. Fodsick, for Examination Under Oath.

WHY THE SECRECY AND LACK OF SPORTSMANSHIP?

4. (a) If your agent had proof that I was guilty of wrongdoing, why was he not frank enough to make a statement to that effect to the Anti-Saloon League Board?

(b) Then, in the improbable event the Board had refused to listen to or consider such proof, instead of using both a discharged ex-convict and also a confessed perjurer and admitted attempted blackmailer, why was your agent not convinced that it would make a fair and lucid statement for a public action so I could have had him or you responsible and in the event of injustice, have force, if necessary, a retraction or other amends?

(c) If I had been guilty how could he or you or the supposed case against me be hurt by such openness?

(d) If he did not have facts and proof to such extent as to make him and you safe, perhaps it was because your agent there then be for his action in accepting the word of and joining in the huge charges of the dry cause on a very broad of the statements of the accredited dry representatives of the organized dry churches?

(e) And if the greatest financial influence in the world was to be used to crush an individual, did not elementary fair-dealing and sportsmanship require that its representatives operate in the open instead of by stealth through unsavory agents in connection with a corrupt wet political organization?

AND WHEN THESE QUESTIONS ARE ANSWERED, THERE ARE YET OTHERS.

5. Finally, since your name as used by this agent of yours is apparently so potent with the nullification Tammany Government, will you not, in connection with the act of my indicted months ago for the Anti-Saloon League, and not for your own representatives, will you not publicly approve my request to the Governor that he appoint a point some representative to hear, under oath and in the open, the testimony I have offered to submit indicating malfeasance on the part of the District Attorney?

And will you not agree that the District Attorney’s associate, your own agent, shall be present and give testimony under the pains and penalties of perjury, in order that we may show that your agent has also been associated with the confessed perjurer star witness who has been paid by the money of liquor interests close to the Tammany administration with which your agent has been working in this affair?

As ground for the above questions I submit the following facts which can be largely supplemented if necessary or desirable:

EIGHT MONTHS AND NO DENIAL OF FALSEHOOD

Although it is eight months since you publicly declared for publicity for Anti-Saloon League finances, yet neither you nor anyone for you has denied the untrue statements about the amount of your contribution to the Anti-Saloon League of New York and the real reason for cutting it off, although it appears the newspapers were obviously in the net of the League and were spread throughout the world by the enemies of dry enforcement.

If your employee, Raymond B. Fodsick, had merely recommended the cutting off of your contribution, whatever the alleged reason, without any attempt to injure the League before the judge, then the Tammany and the Anti-Saloon League of New York and the real reason for cutting it off, although it appears from newspapers were obviously in the net of the League and were spread throughout the world by the enemies of dry enforcement.

If your employee, Raymond B. Fodsick, had merely recommended the cutting off of your contribution, whatever the alleged reason, without any attempt to injure the League before the judge, then the Tammany and the Anti-Saloon League of New York and the real reason for cutting it off, although it appears from newspapers were obviously in the net of the League and were spread throughout the world by the enemies of dry enforcement.

If your employee, Raymond B. Fodsick, had merely recommended the cutting off of your contribution, whatever the alleged reason, without any attempt to injure the League before the judge, then the Tammany and the Anti-Saloon League of New York and the real reason for cutting it off, although it appears from newspapers were obviously in the net of the League and were spread throughout the world by the enemies of dry enforcement.
the Board of Directors elected as direct representatives of the doctors and the Association, the responsibility for what I was forced to say in defense of the Anti-Saloon League and myself, lay entirely with your representative.

This responsibility is fixed by his failure for some six months, long past the time for convincing denial, to deny the explicit charges I made publicly before various church bodies as to his connection with this outrageous affair.

Notwithstanding the undeniable shameful part your employment and the Association was played in the spy-mad name and goodness, I have uttered no word question- ing your personal sincerity or purity of motive. But it is re-tilled, that you instantly had all the facts, that you can- not fail to obtain or refuse to receive the facts about his alleged repentance without becoming fully and personally responsible for that agent's acts.

SURROUNDED BY ADVISERS HOSTILE TO PROHIBITION

Mr. Fosdick admitted to me that you are surrounded by advisers, especially in the Rockefeller Foundation, most of whom if not opposed to prohibition itself are hostile to the Anti-Saloon League and the church. And this further evidence, but the hostility of others connected with the Foundation is a separate story.

Your failure through many months, so at variance with your custom of unfailing courtesy, to make even formal acknowledgment of my letters written solely to acquaint you with facts that it is inconceivable you could have known when you gave your blanket indorsement of Mr. Fosdick, seems to indicate that your agents deny if they have not kept the actual facts from you.

It has been said editorially within the past few weeks by a leading city man of the greater New York City that your re- presentative assisted Tammany in this paper, bitterly antagonsitic to me, flatly branded it an effort to railroad the proposed and unexplained four or five weeks by a leading wet city daily, and quoted from it by other newspapers in the country of your utterings (unpublished and acquiesced in by your representative) and the "incidents" attending the recent triad of times to do me injury: the incident, recently found against me on evidence the District Attorney does not have brought into the light, that is, the effect and the Tammany.

There has been no public denial from your office of any of these public statements, thus indicating acquiescence in the persistence of the efforts to make harmful use of these falsehoods.

THE CRIMINAL WET WHO STOLE YOUR MONEY

About a year and a half ago I exposed the leadership of the National Constitutional League, now known as the American Provisional, as a most nefarious organization whose purpose appeared main active official was one Jerome A. Myers, formerly identified in a manner that would not bear scrutiny with one of the leading wet organizations in the country, and concerning whom we have much other interesting if not edifying information.

As a result of that exposure it came out that in addition to victimizing many prominent citizens, including the President of the United States, to the extent of using their names, this man had imposed upon you by securing payment on your account to speakers and installers for which he stole. He was indicted for grand larceny in the first degree and entered a plea of guilty.

This confessed criminal, allied with the wet, an opponent of prohibition and of the churches, has a good opportunity to prove that this, according to written statement from the District Attorney's office in my possession, was allowed to go scot free on the promise of restitution, it being published that the District Attorney personally recommended this.

As it was your money that was stolen it is self-evident that either personally or through your agent, you approved this leniency to a criminal wet. In the light of later disclosures it would be interesting to know to what extent the well known and long standing animus of your agent against me was responsible for inducing the District Attorney to whom I submitted personally close to take the action which so confirms his attempted treatment of me.

In sharp contrast with this, your agent, Mr. Fosdick, made it a point with me year after year to hold you, have heard of with and persistently, though secretly assisted the conspiracy to "frame" me, an innocent dry.

BITTER BECAUSE OF FAILURE TO CONTROL CHARITY OF THE LEAGUE

Failing to intimidate me into changing the aggressive position held by your agents, I was driven to the use of withdrawal of your subscription, and failing by the same means to have the Board of Directors repudiate their recognition of churches, even before these false charges were invented, into eliminating me as Superintendent, so bitter and relevant items of the facts of "pro-bear" representa- tive that he used his relation to you and the influence of your name with the Board to help to secure a confessed perjurer and admitted blackmailer in his effort to extort money from the Anti-Saloon League and from me. Your agent's later activity indicates that he intended to use my efforts at defense and my final position, and the position of the Rockefeller Foundation, who on this question are neither patriotic nor scientific.

YOUR AGENT WAS THE REAL PROSECUTOR FROM THE RECOMMEN- DATION TO THE ACQUITTAL

Thwarted in this, instead of openly denouncing me as a criminal and making formal complaint as a brave, honest man with the facts and a valid interest might have been expected to do, your agent, Mr. Fosdick, secretly, in base betrayal of confidence he had asked for as your representa- tive, did him almost to help secure my indictment and conviction.

The District Attorney, abandoning as too fimly the other "charges" which had previously been peddled to and rejected by leading wet newspapers and the leading liquor organiza- tion, and in behalf of Ross Murphy of Tammany, concentrated his whole effort for three months on the alleged "evidence" supplied by your agent. There is a wealth of detail avail- able on this.

INSTRUMENTAL IN GETTING TAMMANY TO ORDER INDICT- MENTS FOR ITS OWN PURPOSES

A grand jury selected for the purpose and held nearly three months, with access to everything available to the latter group, and where every effort was made by the agent of you that his Democratic procities would not interfere with his loyalty to your Republican interests, had been encour- aging the District Attorney to the love of the effort, ob- viously successful, to force the District Attorney's hand. Through the representation of a small pigeon evening paper reputed to be in financial difficulties, your agent charged that the District Attorney had quit for fear of injuring his gubernatorial ambitions and under the threat of forcing the District Attorney to re-open the case and indict me regularly. The District Attorney, and justice would have been public statement last winter that you hoped nothing wrong would be found. And he knew that the Governor, with re- moval power, alone could bring convincing pressure.

YOUR AGENT A NOTORIOUS OPONENT OF EFFECTIVE DRY ENFORCEMENT

Your agent, only a few months before you selected him to pass on the financial applications of the Anti-Saloon League, had publicly opposed the only effective means of dry enforcement and objected to the enactment in the first place of the State law which he in fact so greatly helped last winter and spring, but the enactment and retention of which was urged by the dry Protestant Churches and by the Anti-Saloon League as their agency. He denied to me that legalization of beer would be nullifi- cation of the Constitution and said, and as a man of your character and influence, that it was thought might actually silence me and disrupt this church agency.

MORALLY ASSOCIATED IN THE PUBLIC MIND WITH THIS TAMMANY "PROSECUTION"

Subsequent to, and, wet New York State papers say, be- cause of, this activity of your agent, I wasgrossly and illegally indicted which it is generally held in the community, to which your agent had never committed. As the next step, I, the representative of 5,000 of the churches of my denomination, was called by the grand jury by the same judge, who had given them at the same time to six others who with their attorneys made a most interesting and effective protest against the idea that this thought might actually silence me and disrupt this church agency.

As a result, regardless of whether you wish or even real- ize it, as I assume you do not, because of the denied and now unkept promises of your agent that he would inform the mind of the public and in the thought both of the wet and their press allies and of the dry church constituency of the Anti-Saloon League, I am morally associated with the so-called "prosecution" which the approved and re-elected official representatives of the Anti-Saloon League and your agent, in defiance of the facts and "a monstrous perversion of justice."

In the light of the established facts above set out, I re- spectfully request the withdrawal of your authority, which is the factory answer to the questions in the first part of this communication.

Yours respectfully,

William H. Anderson

State Superintendent, Anti-Saloon League.
An Open Letter to
MR. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, JR.,
New York City.

Dear Sir:

Your agent or agents who by withholding the facts from you have driven me to the employment of the "open letter" last night must bear the responsibility for any annoyance caused by it.

Some of the essential facts showing the reason and basis for the questions herein asked you are set out following the questions themselves. In this connection you will observe that I make positive statements for which I can be held responsible, in glaring contrast with the skulking, cowardly tactics of your representatives.

In behalf of the vitally interested almost unanimous majority of the supporting church constituency of the Anti-Saloon League which has refused to be deceived by the vicious wet propaganda promoted by your agents in conjunction with Tammany and various anti-Protestant elements, I respectfully request you to answer the following questions.

MERCY FOR A CRIMINAL WET—PERSECUTION FOR AN INNOCENT DRY
1. How do you reconcile the approval by your agent of the release without any punishment whatsoever of a man prominent in the organized activity of the liquor interests who has been indicted for grand larceny in the first degree, with the relentless malleus with which your agent has assailed the conspiracy to "frame" and "railroad" under false allegations of crime the executive officer of the enforcement agency of the dry Protestant Churches?

2. And in the first instance to the case of Jerome A. Myers, active head of the so-called "Constitutional League," who stole $5,000 of your money, and who was exposed by me.

3. When the books of the Anti-Saloon League show that it received every cent of all your contributions for its dry federated church work, so that none of your money was involved, just what valid interest had and has Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick as your agent in the Tammany liquor effort to brand as criminal the receipt by me of money which the Board of Directors of the League, and it and legally responsible for it, unanimously say they openly, regularly and officially voted to me as shown by undeniable record in re-payment of money they know to have been advanced by me and for which they know the League to have received value?

Granting that restitution was actually made as well as promised by the influential liquor, political and financial friends who so strangely swarmed to the help of Myers, the wet thief unmasked by the Anti-Saloon League, how does that justify the understand and unqualified hostility activity of your agent in a case where the only persons authorized to speak say that nothing was

ASSAULT ALSO ON DIRECT CHURCH REPRESENTATIVE
3. When did your agent, Raymond B. Fosdick, join with, and give secret help to, the most corrupt political organization in the world, the anti-Protestant, alien-spirited Tammany, in its effort to throw me and other Protestant members of the "reform" crowd and all other "religious" prejudice, in trying to discredit the Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League who were officially chosen by you of the dry Protestant Churches of New York State, and whose action has been approved by those churches?

WHY THE SECRECY AND LACK OF SPORTSMANSHIP?
4. (a) If your agent had proof that I was guilty of wrongdoing, why was he not frank enough to make a statement to that effect to the Anti-Saloon League Board of Directors?

(b) Then, in the improbable event the Board had refused to listen to or consider such proof, instead of using both a discharged supposed graftor and also a confirmed perjurer and admitted attempted blackmailer, why was your agent not courageous enough to make a formal complaint and a public statement so that I could have had the opportunity to reply to it, in the event of injustice, have forced, if necessary, a retraction or other amends?

(c) If I had been guilty how could he or you or the supposed case against me be hurt by such openness?

(d) If he did not have facts and proof to such extent as to make him and you safe, what possible justification can there then be for his action, in the joining with enemies of the dry cause in utter disregard of the statements of the accredited dry representatives of the organized Protestant Churches?

(e) And if the greatest financial influence in the world was to be used to crush an individual, did not elementary fair-dealing and sportsmanship require that its representatives operate in the open instead of by stealth through unavory agents in connection with a corrupt wet political organization?

AND WHEN THESE QUESTIONS ARE ANSWERED, THERE ARE YET OTHERS.
5. Finally, since your name as used by your agent is apparently by ploy with the Tammany Governor to whom he is evidently close, and since it is in-conceivable that a man of your sincerity would recommend publicity for any other fellow only, as you did eight months ago for the Anti-Saloon League, and not for your own representative, will you not do the decent thing and give your approval to the Governor that he appoint some duly accredited representative to hear, under oath and in the open, the testimony I have offered and submit indicating malfeasance on the part of the District Attorney?

And will you not agree that the District Attorney's associates, your own agent, shall be present and give testimony under the pains and penalties of perjury, in order that we may show that your agent has also been associated with the confessed perjurer star witness who has been paid by the money of liquor interests close to the Tammany administration with which your agent has been working in this affair?

As ground for the above questions I submit the following facts which can be largely supplemented if necessary or desirable.

EIGHT MONTHS AND NO DENIAL OF FALSEHOOD
Although it is eight months since you publicly declared for publicity for Anti-Saloon League finances, yet neither you nor anyone for you has denied the untrue statements about the amount of your contribution to the Anti-Saloon League of New York and the real reason for cutting it off, although these falsehoods were obviously put out to injure the League were spread throughout the world by the enemies of dry enforcement.

If your employee, Raymond B. Fosdick, had merely recommended the cutting off of your contribution whatsoever the alleged reason, without any attempt to injure the League before the public in connection therewith, no public comment or statement would have been necessary and possible. When, however, he, by dishonest silence, assumed responsibility for, if he did not give out these malicious falsehoods, and when he gave further aid to Tammany and the other enemies of some 5,000 Protestant Churches in this State in the conspiracy to ruin me, discredit
the Board of Directors elected as direct representatives of the dry churches, and wreck the Anti-Saloon League, the responsibility for what I was forced to say in defense of the League and myself, lay entirely with your representative.

This responsibility is fixed by his failure for some six months, long past, for not seeking denial, to deny the explicit charges I made publicly before various church bodies as to his connection with this outrageous affair.

Notwithstanding the undeniable shameful part your employee, in the effort to destroy my good name and usefulness, I have uttered no word questioning your personal integrity or purity of motives. But it is self-evident that there is a limit beyond which one cannot either fail to obtain or refuse to receive the facts about his supposed activity in undermining fully and personally responsible for that agent's acts.

SURROUNDED BY ADVISERS HOSTILE TO PROHIBITION

Mr. Fosdick admitted to me that you are surrounded by advisers, especially in the Rockefeller Foundation, most of whom it is not necessary to seek to prove themselves hostile to the Anti-Saloon League of the churches. And there is other evidence, the hostility of others connected with the Foundation is a separate story.

Your failure through many months, so at variance with your custom of unfeigned courtesy, to make even formal acknowledgment of my letters written solely to acquaint you with facts that is inconceivable you could have known when you gave your blanket indorsement of Mr. Fosdick, seems to indicate that your agents deny if they have not kept the actual facts from you.

It is said actually within the last few weeks by a leading wet daily of greater New York City that your representative, assisted Tammany in the primary, lists the Anti-Saloon League as a visible brand as an effort to "railroad" me. It has also been published within the last few weeks by another wet public that I have been charged from agents, that the statement of your attitude (as falsely published, and acquiesced in by your representative) and the "indecency" often times is to do" with the illegal indictments recently found against me on evidence the District Attorney dares not have brought into the light, than aiding domes and to Tammany.

There has been no public denial from your office of any of these public statements, thus indicating acquiescence in the persistence of the efforts to make harmful use of these falsehoods.

THE CRIMINAL WET WHO STOLE YOUR MONEY

About a year and a half ago I exposed the leadership of a constitutional, a Tammany, a Constitutional League, whose apparently main active official was one Jerome A. Myers, formerly identified in a manner that would not hear scrutiny with one of the leading wet organizations in the country, and concerning whom we have much other interesting if not edifying information.

As a result of that exposure it came out that in addition to victimizing many prominent citizens, including the President of the United States, to the extent of using their names upon their insurance policies, and passed upon you as the owner of my subscription to an annual installment of $5,000, which he stole for forged security for forgery and larceny in the first degree and entered a plea of guilty.

This confession, allied with the wets, an opponent of prohibition and of the churches that stand for it, according to written statement from the District Attorney's office, if I have my possession, was allowed to go scot free on the promise of restitution, if being published that the District Attorney personally committed this.

As it was your money that was stolen it is self-evident that either personally or through your agent, you approved this leniency to a criminal wet. In the light of later disclosures it would be interesting to know to what extent the well known and long standing animus of your agent against me was responsible for inducing the District Attorney to whom he seems especially close to take the action which so condemns his attempted treatment.

In sharp contrast with this, your agent, Mr. Fosdick, making use of his relation to you, has actively, vitally and persistently, though secretly assisted the conspiracy to "fraudulently" extort money under prohibition.

BITTER BECAUSE OF FAILURE TO CONTROL THE LEAGUE

Failing to intimidate me into changing the aggressive policy of the League by the threat of withdrawal of your subscription, and failing by the same means to coerce the Board of Directors of the League officially representing them, even before the falsehoods originally invented, in eliminating me as Superintendent, so bitter and unfounded as to be the de facto beer-representative of that which he used his relation to you and the influence of your name with the District Attorney's office in helping to condemn me as a criminal wet and having blacked in his effort to extort money from the Anti-Saloon League and from me.

Your agent's later activity indicates that he intended to use my expected subscription to blackmail as the excuse for cutting off your support, an objective I knew to have been long sought by the anti-prohibitionists of the Rockefeller Foundation, who on this question are neither patriotic nor scientific.

YOUR AGENT WAS THE REAL PROSECUTOR FROM BEHIND THE SCENES

Thwarted in this, instead of openly denouncing me as a criminal wet, of which I have been the subject of the false charges by your agent, Mr. Fosdick, secretly, in base betrayal of confidence, which I have ever had in him both as a representative, did his utmost to help secure my indictment.

The District Attorney, abandoning as too flimsy the other "charges" which he had previously made for his benefit by leading wet newspapers and the leading liquor organization, and even by Boss Murphy of Tammany, concentrated his whole effort for the three months during which they were supplied by your agent. There is a wealth of detail available on this.

INSTRUMENTAL IN GETTING TAMMANY TO ORDER INDIRECT INDICTMENTS FOR ITS OWN PURPOSE

A grand jury selected for the purpose and held nearly three months, with access to everything available to the late grand jury which indicted me, unless it be for certain fabrications and perjured testimony evidently born of desperation, would not accept as sufficient basis for indictment the stuff furnished by your man, and was discharged.

The District Attorney who has since publicly admitted discussing the relation of the contemplated indictments to his gubernatorial ambitions evidently had enough and wanted to quit. But your agent who has been so lenient with a criminal wet, and who, notwithstanding his reported assurance to you that he intends to make a record of his loyalty to your Republican interests, had been encouraging the District Attorney, had been giving his attention to the illegal indictment to impress him that the District Attorney had quit for fear of injuring his gubernatorial prospects, and undertook to find means to force the District Attorney to go on with his project of compromising me regardless of the facts and justice and your kind personal public statement that it would be "a grand wrong would be found. And he knew that the Governor, with removal power, alone could bring convincing pressure.

YOUR AGENT A NOTORIOUS OPPONENT OF EFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT

Your agent, only a few months before you selected him to pass on the financial applications of the Anti-Saloon League, had publicly opposed the only effective means of dry enforcement and objected to the enactment in the first place of the State dry law, the repeal of which in fact so greatly helped last winter and spring, but the enactment and retention of which was urged by the dry Protestant Churches and by the Anti-Saloon League as their agency. He denied to force the payment of the annual subscription to the Constitution, and this after you had selected him to pass on the Anti-Saloon League's application.

The Tammany nullification Governor, in whom Mr. Fosdick is understood to be greatly interested, was in a combined panic and rage because the reaction against dry repeal had left him, as he had always feared, the presidential prospects, and was ready for anything which it was thought might actually silence me and disrupt this church agency.

MORALLY ASSOCIATED IN THE PROSECUTION OF TAMMANY'S "PROSECUTION"

Subsequent to, and, wet New York State papers say, because of, this activity of your agent, I was wrongfully and illegally indicted by a Tammany grand jury for offenses never committed. As the next step, I, the representative of 5,000 dry Protestant Churches and a member of the grand jury by the same judge who had given them at the same time to six others who with their attorneys make a most interesting non-Protestant active in the effort, obviously successful and re-elected official representatives of those churches have denounced as being in "defiance of the facts and "a monstrous perversion of justice."

In the light of the established facts above set out, I respectfully point out the New York State and the Nation which has heretofore looked upon you as an ally is fairly entitled to a full, explicit and satisfactory answer to the questions in the first part of this communication.

Yours respectfully,

William H. Anderson
State Superintendent, Anti-Saloon League.
SOME THINGS MR. ROCKEFELLER PROBABLY DOES NOT APPROVE

Mr. Raymond E. Fordick, Rockefeller employee, evidently recognizes he is in deep water, judging from the appeal made by him or in his behalf to Mr. Rockefeller, Jr. It is illuminating that Mr. Fordick does not deny the charges respecting his utterances or his attempt to eliminate me, or the latest very specific charge of gross breach of confidence. Having failed to crush me into silence by the anonymous use of the influence of the Rockefeller money, he evidently now seeks to finish the job by use of a direct statement. In this statement, however, Mr. Rockefeller, Jr. does not even squarely touch let alone meet the real issue.

It not only answers Mr. Rockefeller, but also the statement of the acting District Attorney to say that I have never said anything implying that the District Attorney’s office in the conduct of this inquiry is a knowing part of any conspiracy. The conspiracy lies in the outside non-official attempt to destroy me in advance, to create by propaganda a psychological condition which it is hoped will lead a New York City Grand Jury to indict me and later in that event a New York City jury to convict me.

I do not question that Mr. Rockefeller has approved whatever the record shows Mr. Fordick to have done. It is what lies beneath the record that I am getting at. It is perfectly proper for Mr. Rockefeller to uphold his employee, notwithstanding the effort heretofore to make it appear that the Anti-Saloon League Board was lacking in intelligence or good faith or both when it upheld its own employee.

Mr. Rockefeller says in effect that all facts about League finances should be given out. This is very easy in the conduct of a medical or educational foundation which has no vices, organized opposition, and for those who occupy the unique position of being beyond the possibility of boycott. This statement, however, releases me respecting his own contributions.

I do not question that Mr. Rockefeller approved in May or June, 1921, immediately after Mr. Fordick was selected to report on Anti-Saloon League applications, the cut, without warning, in the summer time, on the eve of a panic and in the face of the grave danger that with such cut it would be impossible to hold against the liquor counter attack the ground which their former contributions had enabled the League to occupy, from approximately $75,000 a year, in round figures, for each of the preceding three years, to about $25,000. He had a perfect right to make this reduction and $25,000 is a generous contribution.

CONTEMPTIBLE ASSISTANCE TO VILE VENAL PROPAGANDA

But the floating of the story, printed with such confidence as to prove inspiration from a Rockefeller employee, after the inquiry started, that the Messrs. Rockefeller, apparently because of this inquiry or these charges, had withdrawn support amounting to $100,000 a year, and the allowing of that viciously false propaganda statement to stand, was beneath contempt in its palpable object to crush me before the public in advance. And yet Raymond Fordick, the supposedly frank, because of personal animus, allowed that to be used against me throughout the two weeks I waited for him to speak. And I shall not believe that Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. approved
that until he specifically confirms it.

Neither shall I believe, until he definitely says so himself, that he approves the turning over for publication in advance of the inquiry, palpably to popularize the inquiry, and convict me in the public mind in advance of formal action, of a document or the contents thereof asked for by and given in confidence only to his representative.

NO NEED FOR TREACHEROUS STEALTH

Mr. Fosdick, as Mr. Rockefeller's representative had a perfect right at any time to recommend the discontinuance of contributions to the Anti-Saloon League. If he thought any wrong had been done and he had sufficient confidence in his omniscience and infallibility to feel warranted in taking the position that not only was the League Superintendent but the League Board representing the churches a set of puppets of crooks, he was within his rights in going to the District Attorney. However, most fair minded men would say there was no occasion for treacherous stealth about something which had been public property for more than three years, the main facts respecting which had long been in the possession of Mr. Rockefeller through the late Mr. Starr J. Murphy. We shall not believe until Mr. Rockefeller says otherwise, that he holds that there can be much merit in an alleged case against a person in my position if the case depends upon secret preparation for presentation to the District Attorney and profluse propaganda in order to make the public take it seriously.

USED LEAGUE EMPLOYER IN EFFORT TO OUST ME

I do not believe that Mr. Rockefeller, Jr. knows of and I shall not believe that he will approve, until he says so himself, the effort of Mr. Fosdick to get control of the Anti-Saloon League and eliminate me through use of a discharged employee whom he, Mr. Fosdick, knew to be guilty of attempted extortion through the writing of threatening letters, and who since this inquiry began has confessed to defrauding the Government on his income tax as per public statement of the Federal Collector.

Unbelievable as Mr. Fosdick's friends will find it, he treacherously certified to me that this man was loyal to me at the very time that he, Fosdick, was using him in an effort to get me out because I had fought hard enough and effectively enough to anger the wealthy men to whom Mr. Fosdick had been giving aid and comfort by opposing Governor Miller's state enforcement law only a few months before a strange turn of fate picked him to superintend contributions to a militant prohibition agency from these two splendid friends of prohibition. It shows what personal feeling and outraged pride will lead a supposedly honorable man to do.

In the light of Mr. Rockefeller's blanket endorsement of Mr. Fosdick, I do not presume to know whether he approved Mr. Fosdick sponsoring an inquiry by the District Attorney in order to absolve that official from any charge that he was acting on complaint made by the wets. I have, however, direct from Mr. Fosdick, whether Mr. Rockefeller knows it or not, Mr. Fosdick's personal admission that he had been in touch with the District Attorney months before. But I will not believe until Mr. Rockefeller, Jr. himself says it that he would have approved the initiation by any representative of his of any such action until there had been at least a request for an explanation, thus himself granting to the representative of this agency of the churches the presumption of innocence that the law gives to every man.
Mr. Rockefeller's suggestion to the effect that an agency like the League should have no secrets, amounts to a statement that in warfare the plans of the army should be published to the enemy in advance, for if this is not a civic warfare against a desperate, powerful and unscrupulous enemy of civilization then there is no such thing.

This statement of Mr. Rockefeller ignores the fact that the League has furnished to his representative every year as the basis for a request for a contribution, a statement of all receipts and a statement as to what was spent for the different items and lines of work, similar to that given to every newspaper in the State every year after the Certified Public Accountants have finished their examination of the books for report to the State Board of Trustees.

SAVED LEAGUE MYSELF WHEN WEALTHY MEN COULD NOT HELP

Further, Mr. Rockefeller seems to be unaware of the fact that not only was this the only case of the sort, but that it was not the League money that was spent in 1913 and 1914. It was my money that was spent by me at my risk, with the certainty that I would lose it unless I could show results. I can prove it was known at the time I was doing it, aside from the money the books show I loaned the League to cover ordinary matters. Further, the League was not only not liable, but was never asked to pay it until the results were accomplished and the Board, knowing the League had had full value, ordered it paid.

At the time that money was paid out by me, Mr. John D. Rockefeller was giving exactly $5,000 a year to the Anti-Saloon League, and Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., was contributing nothing. It was the investment of my own money which I had obtained under unusual but perfectly proper circumstances, which put the Anti-Saloon League on its feet when not a single wealthy man who could be reached had sufficient vision to contribute enough extra for the daring pioneer unusual work that was essential to success.

It was because of what I had the faith and courage to do at my own risk that the League was built up to a position of influence where the Kears. Rockefeller felt later that it was worthy of their larger contributions which were indispensable to the educational work that enabled the moral sentiment of this State to compel ratification.

I have nothing but the highest regard for Mr. Rockefeller and the most grateful appreciation of the splendid support he and his Father have given. This is not in any respect charged by the fact that he considers it necessary on general principles to uphold his employee who has undoubtedly deceived him or else has done things which were not authorized in this respect. However, that regard is not sufficient to silence me respecting the utterly indefensible things done by Mr. Fendick/which helped a conspiracy to ruin me before formal charges, if there are any, can be determined upon their merits.

HOW CHURCHES RESPOND TO CHALLENGE

As a sample of how the people are responding as they understand the conspiracy, just one year ago the church where I spoke yesterday subscribed
for last year's work of the League $256. Yesterday after I had outlined
the conspiracy and Mr. Fosdick's betrayal of confidence, and proposed
that they make up any money lost through the League's refusal to submit
to dictation by a hostile Rockefeller employee, the congregation of the
same church subscribed $659 for the coming year's work. And approximately
$600 per year was subscribed for each of the next four years, since the
League is now using a five year subscription.
BURRELL ENDORSES ANDERSON'S ACTS

Directors Must Share Guilt, if Any, Says Anti-Saloon League Head

LAYS CHARGES TO WETS

Makes Public Report Giving Dates of Anderson's Outlay— Pecora Marks Time

The Rev. Dr. David James Burrell, pastor of the Marble Collegiate Reformed Church, New York City, who is President of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, yesterday afternoon gave his final report on the financial issue. The interview took place at the home of Dr. Burrell, at Madison, N. J. Dr. Burrell has been in bad health for a month. Throughout the interview Dr. Burrell defended Mr. Anderson, saying that if the League was to become an organization, it must be an organization of the people who lived in the cities. He also defended Mr. Anderson, saying that if the League was to become an organization, it must be an organization of the people who lived in the cities.

"What was Mr. Anderson's salary when he came to New York?"

"It was $5,000."

"Was that intended to be permanent?"

"It was not; we proposed to make it $10,000 as soon as our income would warrant it."

"What was the league's income to be increased?"

"That was Mr. Anderson's particular business."

"And who was to determine when the $10,000 salary should begin?"

"That was the league's business."

"How long did it take?"

"We set the league's income was nearly quadrupled."

"Where did the board's income before Mr. Anderson came to New York?"

"Somewhere, about $30,000; that's why we sent for him. He is the only man that ever put prohibitions across the country."

"He'd make Sing Sing Dry"

"Go where? To Sing Sing? The members of our board would have to go along with him; for we are all precisely as innocent as he. And anyway, if Mr. Anderson were to make Sing Sing dry in a fortnight, I'll suppose we'll have to keep him here, somehow."

Tells of Commission Plan

"The board saw the difficulty and decided that while the money made in the hump sum it must be paid sooner or later, somehow. So Mr. Phillips made the offer on the hump."

"Was this for Mr. Anderson's benefit?"

"Rather, it was for the league, but partly in the hope that Mr. Anderson would thus be enabled to work more efficiently."

"Was there any suggestion that Mr. Anderson should be roused from his present position of time without crippling the league?"

"No. There was no preparation in my mind."

"Where did Mr. Anderson go?"

"He is still organizing the league."

"Quite so, the answer."

"Where did Mr. Phillips go?"

"He is still organizing the league."

"That had been made by Mr. Phillips himself, Mr. Anderson's statement of the staff was being listened to."

"Presently."

"Did Mr. Anderson profit by that arrangement?"

"This had been half paid."

"That's the way it came."

"Did Mr. Anderson spend it?"

"He did. (Note: This must be considered in connection with other statements that make clear that this was a loan, and not a salary to the League.)"

"Mr. Phillips paid him at various times before the agreement, and it is the same amount was contributed by the league itself, so that finally our office meeting Mr. Anderson has been paid."

"If Mr. Anderson has been satisfied up to the time the league parted with it?"

"Not for over a year, I should say. He had apparently lost interest, wanted Mr. Anderson to go with him to solicit, etc. I don't know why; but Mr. Phillips seemed to our service, to keep Mr. Anderson in the office."

"Why do you think so?"

"Partly because he kept coming to me for a hypothesis of all the things that were being done in the league, and he never would own it; also because of his persistent efforts to borrow money. However, I would prefer to say nothing more on that point. I was sorry for him."

"Are you not quite as proper for Mr. Phillips as for Mr. Anderson to collect money on a 3 per cent basis?"

"Read the resolution of the board again and you will see why not."

"And the resolution of Mr. Anderson from percentages on his extra-church collections applied toward the cost of the $3,470 which the League owed him?"

"Money From Phillips"

"So far as I know, Mr. Anderson never received any, except through Mr. Phillips, and every penny of that was applied in this way."

"This was finally reported to the board by Mr. Anderson."

"We also asked the question about the time we parted with Mr. Phillips. The board did not expect such a report. Mr. Phillips, one of the outstanding members in that movement, was going on."

"Is it your opinion that there is nothing whatever in the charges against Mr. Anderson?"

"Certainly: not a thing," replied Dr. Burrell. "Why should they be pressed so vigorously for Mr. Anderson?"

"That's easy. If the 'wets' could drive Anderson out of the state, the League would go, and the League out of the Anti-Saloon League. The league were an important body before the took charge of it. I congratulate the 'wets' on knowing how to drive Anderson out of the league, the churches that support it and the cause of prohibition, and the dis-charged and disgruntled employees in precisely this way."

"Suppose Mr. Anderson should be indicted?"

"I don't think you would indite anyone. It would be too hard to find a jury of a 'wet' court or before any jury without the shadow of a doubt. But if the 'wets' should do it, they would reasonably look for a suspension of opera-tions."

"If Mr. Anderson were indicted, where would leave you and the members of your board?"

"Call Case Laughable"

"That's what I can't quite see. There isn't a thing that he has done which has not been authorized or unanimously ratified by the board. Nevertheless, it is insisted that the charges are not directed against Mr. Anderson at all. At the Anti-Saloon League, or at the churches of the State, which are its main support, or at its official body, but simply a 'crooked man. It is to laugh."

"Do you yourself feel it?"

"Let me tell you a little story. Forty-eight years ago, when I was a boy in Iowa, the church tried to put prohibition across, and after three years of prodigious effort had about given up. One day, a man came to us wet's waylaid a Methodist minister, George Hard-lock, and William T. Maclaurin and a witness meeting in Sioux City and killed him. That woke up the decent people of the State and they put pro-hibition across at the next election with a ma-jority of $5,000."

"They have nearly worried the life out of this man Anderson, but fortunately he has more lives than all the cats of Kilkenny, and such tactful, persistent and unconturable courage as he has never known. The time will come when you and every other honest man will wonder when remember that once you joined the gang and threw things at him."

Report of Committee of Board of Directors of Anti-Saloon League Disapproves Acting District Attorney's Accusation That Board Did Not Investigate Expenditure of $24,700 Publicity Fund, Repayment of Which It Authorized

Not content with statements which, as handled by the press, reflect upon the Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League, the Acting District Attorney has made statements carried by the spirit of the good faith of the Board of Directors of the League, representing the federated churches comprising the League's constituency. This attack appeared in the same issue of the New York Times that appeared the Sunday after the meeting of the committee of the report of which the Board acted, which report shows that the Board had knowledge before the expenditures of the offer to conduct a campaign of publicity at the risk of the new Superintendent; that it frauds the Board. The details respecting the expenditures as the work was conducted by the persons who did the work were considered by the Board, and the Board were all listed as printed in the New York Times. As a result, the appointment of Mr. Anderson as Superintendent, his salary to be $5,000 per annum, and other parts of the report should be clearly advised that the problem of financing the league (See other side.)
Some Supplemental Statements of Fact by the State Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League, Answering Some Specific Falsehoods Respecting the Charges Against Him by a Discharged, Revengeful Former Employee.

Gives Dates of Payments
"Mr. Anderson itemizes the sums advanced for publicity, which are all naturally in the nature of advertising expense, and disbursements to and by other persons in that behalf. Nearly all of these items are wholly confidential.

"Your committee therefore respectfully reports that, in our opinion, Mr. Anderson has a consistent claim challenging the propriety of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, and that it is consistent with the interest of said moneys advanced for him by the league for publicity during the years 1912 and 1914, pursuant to the agreement made by the league with him by the resolutions above referred to, amounting to the sum of $25,700, together with interest thereon at 6 percent per annum.

"The indebtedness to Mr. Anderson has, of course, not been paid off, and appears on the league's books up to this time, being wholly contingent upon the sufficient financing of the league and continuing to be so contingent until it can be paid in full. The payment of the indebtedness should be entered as indebtedness upon the books of the league and the amount of the indebtedness is from time to time satisfied.

The Anti-Saloon League Does Not Pay Commissions
The old-time story, now revived, that the league pays light commissions on all sales made even those taken at churches, is utterly false. The league has never made any such attempt to buy the support of the church. The only thing that can be said is that the church has been made by the league to help it to publicize its message.

There was an action of the board years ago authorizing a temporary and conditional increase of the amount of salary of the staff to $500 per annum for the purpose of drawing up the complete list of all of the subscriptions secured by each worker by personal canvassing during the period of employment. The list of subscriptions to the Anti-Saloon League was not in any sense confiscatory. The list was a thing that was done to aid the league in its work of propaganda.

Unfairness of Press—No Refusal to Show Books
The disposition somewhere, somehow, always to give the league and its Superintendent the worst possible light, and to make out that there was any refusal to open the league books. They were taken to the District Attorney's office cheerfully and left for weeks in his custody.

Refused to Be Blackmailed
Granting freely that it is unfortunate that I allowed myself to be fooled by a man who although he had good reason to believe that I was capable of betraying the League, of attempted extortion, as it was, and who, in any case, if I held to the facts of the agreement, I was to be the victim of extortion to cover up such an error of judgment.

Where the Wets Figure In This
The wet always is there in the midst of legislative investigation and the attempt to discredit the movement is that of an attempt to discredit the management of the league in connection with a contribution. We do not believe that this is the motive of the press of the city, Rockefeller, who are unquestionably sincerely in favor of prohibition. However, while grateful for their help, we believe the league can make out for itself and make its pretenses to make up any subscription so lost (if in fact there were any lost), and would not be satisfied with any other way of explaining the matter than to have the matter put to an end as soon as possible, and to have the press treated just as it should be, without any further comment.

No Occasion for Feeling Disturbed, Even in the Event of an Indictment
Since Dr. Burrell has referred to the possibility of an indictment, I can do so without hesitation or regret.
An indictment proves nothing. It merely calls for proof, and the proof must prove wrongdoing. I committed no wrongful act.
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BURRELL ENDORSES
ANDERSON'S ACTS

Directors Must Share Guilt, if Any,
Says Anti-Saloon League Head

LAYS CHARGES TO WETS

Makes Public Report Giving Dates of
Anderson's Outlay — Pecora Marks Time

The Rev. Dr. David James Burrell, pastor of the Marble Collegiate Reformed Church, New York City, who is President of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, yesterday afternoon gave his first public the light of his reforming fire on the issue. The interview took place at the home of Dr. Burrell, at Madison, N. J. Dr. Burrell had been in bed for a month. Throughout the interview Dr. Burrell defended Mr. Anderson.

"Do you believe Mr. Anderson to be innocent?"

Dr. Burrell was asked.

"Yes," he replied.

"Do you know the circumstances of the case?"

Dr. Burrell then explained.

"Has Mr. Anderson ever appropriated any Anti-Saloon League funds to his personal use?"

"Not a penny, except with the approval of the Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League, as Mr. Anderson himself has come to his salary."

"Is Mr. Anderson's salary $15,000?"

"It is not."

"Burr and started at $5,000"

"What was Mr. Anderson's salary when he came to New York?"

"It was $5,000."

"Was that intended to be permanent?"

"It was not. We proposed to make it $10,000 as soon as our income would warrant it."

"You have not presented any evidence upon the question of Mr. Anderson's particular business."

"And who was to determine when the $10,000 salary should be increased to the board's business."

"How long did it take?"

"We settled it when our income was nearly quadrupled."

"To what did he increase the board's income before Mr. Anderson came to New York?"

"Something like $5,000, which is why we sent for him. He is the one man that every put to a test of its existence. The same thing is the most important thing in the world to try to drive him out."

"Will he go?"

"He'll Sing Sing Dry"

"Go where? To Sing Sing? The members of our board would be too along with him; for we are all precisely as innocent as he. And anyway it would not work. The only way to stem the league would be in a sort. No, I suppose we'll have to keep him here, somehow."

"But how about that $24,000? How did Mr. Anderson spend it?"

"For publicity," Dr. Burrell replied. "As to details, ask any similar corporation. That is the board of directors' business."

"When and how was it reported to the board?"

"It came to the Chairman of the board that Mr. Anderson had been spending out of his own pocket to put the Anti-Saloon League in front of the country. By the time he had mortgaged his home, I then suggested two things to the board, first, that his salary should be raised to $10,000, and, second, that he should be reimbursed for every penny that had been spent distinctly and exclusively in our service."

"Did you call for a report from Mr. Anderson?"

"We did; and he specified the amounts expended, and it was told that it would have given us further information; but in view of our explicit instructions and explicit censure we preferred to have him withhold it."

"How could you pay him $24,000 out of your resources without crippling the league?"

"Tell of Commission Plan"

"The board met and decided that while the money could not be paid in a lump sum, it must be paid. A committee was appointed to confer on the matter. The result, after a year or more of discussion and deliberation, was to authorize a deduction from the salary of any member of the league's staff that engaged in personal solicitation on a per cent basis outside the regular channels of income from the churches."

"Was this for Mr. Anderson's benefit?"

"It was to increase our income, but partly in the hope that Mr. Anderson would thus find himself engaged in the course of time without crippling the league."

"Was Mr. Anderson asked?"

"Quite so was."

"Where did Mr. Anderson go?"

"This question had reference to B. Bertell Phillips, former agent of the league."

"Mr. Phillips, without being advised of the arrangement, came to Mr. Anderson with a proposition to make collections and divide commissions with Mr. Anderson."

"But Mr. Phillips says Mr. Anderson made that proposition to him."

"That was Anderson Half Repaid"

"He did (Note: This must be considered as unconfirmed."

"I did not make it clear that such money was all accounted for to the league."

"In all years of private and public about $5,000, and $4,000 and with all the same amount was contributed by the league itself."

"But I am going to say, our obligations to Mr. Anderson has been paid."

"Has this committee been satisfactorily up to the time the league parted with him?"

"Not for about a year, I should say. He had apparently lost interest, wanted Mr. Anderson to go where he will. We don't know why; but Mr. Phillips seemed to be desperately hard up."

"Why do you think so?"

"Partly because he kept coming to me for a share of the league and the league owed him; also because of his persistent efforts to borrow money. However, I would prefer to say nothing more on that point. I was sorry for him. He's quite as proper for Mr. Phillips as for Mr. Anderson to collect money on a per cent.

"Read the resolution of the board again and you will find that was the case."

"Was the income of Mr. Anderson from percentages on his extra-church collections applied toward the cost of the creation of the $24,000 which the League owed him?"

"Money From Phillips"

"So far as I know, Mr. Anderson never received any, except through Mr. Phillips, and every penny of that was deposited in that."

"Was this finally reported to the board by Mr. Anderson?"

"Not until about the time we parted with Mr. Phillips. The board did not expect such a report. We let things go; what we thought things were going on."

"In your opinion then that there is nothing whatever in the charges against Mr. Anderson?"'

"There was asked.

"Certainly; not a thing," replied Dr. Burrell.

"Then should they be pressed so vigorously?"

"That's easy. If the 'wets' could drive Anderson out of the State before he got to the bottom of the Anti-Saloon League. The league was an impotent thing before he took charge of it. I congratulated the 'wets' on knowing how to attack it. The churches that support it and the cause of prohibition by using the discharge of a disgruntled employee in precisely this way."

"Suppose Mr. Anderson should be indicted?"

"Mr. Anderson would not court or before any jury without the shadow of a doubt. Mr. Anderson would not court or before any jury without the shadow of a doubt. He would reasonably look for a suspension of operation for a fine."'

"If Mr. Anderson were indicted, where would it leave you and the members of your board?"

"That's what I can't quite see. There isn't a thing he has done which has not been authorized or unanimously ratified by the board. Yet, it is, it is, it is."

"How do you feel about it?"

"Let me tell you a little story. Forty odd years ago, in Iowa, the churches tried to put prohibition across, and the farmers put a tax on what they gave up hope—when something happened. The 'wets' way laid a Methodist minister, George Haddock, and the 'drys' way laid a peace meeting in Sioux City and killed him. That woke up the decent people of the State and they put prohibition across at the next election with a majority of $2,000."

"They have nearly worried the life out of this man Anderson, but fortunately he has more lives than all the cats of Killiney, and such tactful, persistent and unconquerable courage as I have never known. The time will come when you and every other honest man will remember that once you joined the gang and threw things at him."

Report of Committee of Directors of Anti-Saloon League Disproves Acting District Attorney's Accusation That Board Did Not Investigate Expenditure of $24,700 Publicity Fund, Repayment of Which It Authorized

Not with contentions which, as handled by the press, reflect upon the Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League, the Acting District Attorney, counsel for the prosecution, are based, says the unanimous verdict of the Board of Directors of the League, representing the federated churches comprising the League's constituency. This attack appeared in the same issue of the New York Times, to which the full text, given out by him as he was one of the committee of the report upon which the Board acted, which report shows that the Board had instructed the Examiner of the expenditure of the fund, to the risk of the Board, and it frankly told that the details respecting these expenditures and the names of the persons who did the work were confidential and that it was explicitly stated to the Board that the Superintendent would lose the money rather than violate that confidence. The following extract from the report of the Committee is reprinted from the full text as printed in the New York Times."

"He also orally offered to conduct on behalf of the league a political campaign in the press of New York City and State, which he would finance at his own risk of its success; that is, if it did not succeed the expense of it was to be his loss, but if successful and the league should receive sufficient income to repay such expenses over and above, the reimbursement would be immediately made, but not otherwise."

(See other side.)
Gives Dates of Payments

"Mr. Anderson itemsizes the sums advanced for publicity, which are all naturally in round numbers, with the explanation that made representation to the District Attorney's office which made that oftentimes feel that it must act, it is a fact that the wets are planning, under what they hoped to do and they already have a plan, a provision for no more free referrers of beer and wine or in any way, but the Mullan-Gage State enforcement code.

The board will take care of and be vindicated and the cause will ultimately get the benefit of the favorable reaction.

In fact the possibility of a complete or a partial victory, the news of victory vital that every friend of dry enforcement shall rally in it and it is said not to keep up but greatly increase the support of the League as a whole. The time to act is now.

The board will be vindicated and the cause will ultimately get the benefit of the favorable reaction.

The publication was in connection with a statement that Mr. Raymond B. Forsdick, representing the Mears, Rockefeller, said in his speech on the floor of the legislature that he was not only a partisan of the cause but a supporter of the League generally.

The Rockefeller never gave as much as $100,000 to the New York League in any one year of the preceding ten years and, in fact, even the largest single payment was $50,000. The Rockefeller's contributions amounted to over $1 million in the entire period.

No money was paid direct from the League to any member of staff on this or any other occasion.

The Unfairness of Press—No Refusal to Show Books

The dispositions of the New York League were always made in the most secret manner, and the records of the League were not open to inspection.

Refused to Be Blackmailed

Granting freely that it is unfortunate that I allowed myself to be fooled by a man who although occasionally a little too clever for his own good, was undoubtedly capable of betraying the League, of taking advantage of weaknesses, of being untruthful and sometimes dishonest, I do not feel that the statement is entirely honest or just. The transaction was a perfectly business-like one, and I was never made a party to any such arrangement as was described.

The "charges" were peddled, either by Phillips or Robert D. Davey, another discharged and discredited employee of the Anti-Saloon League, to three leading newspapers in New York, including the New York Times, and they all exhibited the same campaign. They were also peddled to the wets.

It seems to me that the only way to get a clear run for the league to have all this come out and fought through, with the assurance to the League continued, the best course would be to publish the facts, anything possible that could be dug up and pieced together by the press. The New York Times had a whispering campaign of slander for many years.

(Signed) WILLIAM H. ANDERSON.
New York, February 16, 1923.
BURRELL ENDorses ANDERSON'S ACTS

Directors Must Share Guilt, if Any, Says Anti-Saloon League Head

LAYS CHARGES TO WETS

Makes Public Report Giving Dates of Anderson's Outlay—Pecora Marks Time

The Rev. Dr. David James Burrell, pastor of the Marble Collegiate Reformed Church, New York, who is President of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, yesterday afternoon gave his first and in all likelihood his last statement on the William P. Pecora issue. The interview took place at the home of Dr. Burrell, at 353 E. 55th St. Dr. Burrell has been ill for a month. Throughout the interview Dr. Burrell defended Mr. Anderson.

"Do you believe Mr. Anderson to be innocent?"

"Of course," Dr. Burrell was asked.

"Then, would you have replied, "Do you know the circumstances of the case?"

"No."

"Has Mr. Anderson ever appropriated any Anti-Saloon League funds?"

"No."

"Not a penny, except with the approval of the Board of Directors of the league as given to him." Mr. Anderson's salary $5,000

"Is it not?"

"It is not."

"Started in at $5,000"

"What was Mr. Anderson's salary when he came to New York?"

"It was $5,000."

"Was that intended to be permanent?"

"It was not; we proposed to make it $10,000 as soon as our income would warrant it."

"How long was the league's income to be increased?"

"That was Mr. Anderson's particular business."

"And you left it to determine when the $10,000 salary should begin?"

"That was my business." The Wall Street Journal.

"How long did it take?"

"We soon discovered that our income was nearly quadrupled." The Wall Street Journal.

"What was the board's income before Mr. Anderson came to New York?"

"Some members of the board say that's what we sent for him. He is the only man that ever put prohibition in this State. The wets are doing the cleverest thing in the world in trying to drive him out to try."

"Will he go?"

"He's all Sing Sing Dry"

"Go where? To Sing Sing? The members of our board must go along with him; for we are all precisely as innocent as he. And anyway it seems singular that an agency which did so well in a fortnight. No, I suppose we'll have to keep him here, somehow."

"But how about that $24,707? How did Mr. Anderson spend it?"

"For publicity."

"For publicity? How did you learn it?"

"As to details, ask any similar corporation. That is the policy of our business." The Wall Street Journal.

"When and how was it reported to the board?"

"It came to my knowledge as Chairman of the board and Mr. Anderson had been spending that money. I told him, "You are borrowing money."

"When and how was it reported to the board?"

"I told him, "You are borrowing money."

"And the board, first I should say, I should be reimbursed for every penny that had been spent distantly and exclusively in our service."

"You call for a report from Mr. Anderson?"

"We did; and he specified the amounts expended at all expense of which had not been given us further information; but in view of our implicit confidence in his integrity we stated that we preferred to have him withhold it."

"How could you pay him $24,707 out of your resources without crippling the league?"

"That is a question which I could not answer."

"Tells of Commission Plan"

"The board's treasury and decided that while the money could not be paid in a lump sum it must be paid sooner or later, somehow."

"We decided to begin on the matter. The result, a year or more of delay, was the result of the fact that of any member of the league's staff engaged in the collection of the league's regular salaries by personal solicitation on a 5 cent per cent basis outside the regular channels of income from the churches."

"Was this for Mr. Anderson's benefit?"

"It was chiefly for his benefit, but partly in the hope that Mr. Anderson would thus be enabled to continue his course of time without crippling the league."

"Was Mr. Anderson satisfiable?"

"Quite so, was the answer."

"Where did all the money come in?"

"This question had reference to O. Bertall Phillips, former chief financial agent of the league. Mr. Phillips, without being advised of the arrangement, came to Mr. Anderson with a proposal to make collections and divide commissions with Mr. Anderson."

"But Mr. Phillips says Mr. Anderson made that proposal to him."

"Uncertain whether Mr. Phillips' statement, one of the staff was "listening in.""

"Ind Mr. Anderson profit by that arrangement?"

"I do not know; Mr. Anderson has said that he did not." Mr. Phillips' statement, one of the staff was "listening in.""

"Report of Committee of Board of Directors of Anti-Saloon League Disproves Acting District Attorney's Accusation That Board Did Not Investigate Expenditure of $24,700 Public Fund, Repayment of Which It Authorized

Not content with statements which, as handled by the press, reflect upon the Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League, the Acting District Attorney has made statements, a report grounded on statements, thereby creating an impression that it has not

He also orally offered to conduct on behalf of the league a publicity campaign in the press of New York City State, which he would finance at his own rate of its success; that is, if it did not succeed the expense of it was to be his loss, but if successful and the league should receive sufficient income to repay such expenses over and above his remuneration, he would be clearly reimbursed, but not otherwise. This committee reported to the board at a special meeting Jan. 6, 1913, recommending the appointment of Mr. Anderson as Superintendent, his salary to be $5,000 per annum, and that this Superintendent should be clearly advised that the problem of financing the league

(See next page.)
The clear-cut, convincing statements contained in the finding and recommendation of the Anti-Saloon League's New York, to the New York "Times," reprinted opposite, judging from the reaction to it, were hopelessly wet or prejudiced as to be set on trial to find support for the $24,700,000 of the Superintendents or the Anti-Saloon League, or both, supplementing the unsatisfactory action of the State Board on January 30, are accepted as correct and satisfactory by the constituency of the League, friends of dry enforcement and the law-abiding public.

However, there has been such a mass of misrepresentation and so much of irrelevancy, the explanation of which is beyond the power of me to give you the facts, an appeal to your judgment, may well support the statement of Dr. Burrell by some facts of law over my own signature.

What Are the Charges?
The first charge, that I compelled an employee to split off $10,000 to the Anti-Saloon League, is absolutely unfounded. The fact is, I had no employee in my employ at the time this affair occurred. This is a complete and absolute misrepresentation, and the fact that the writer did not have the facts, I have no alternative but to state this publicly, as an employee of the Anti-Saloon League, I have never received any money from a contributor.

The facts are that Mr. Rockefeller, or some other representative of the Anti-Saloon League, was a contributor of money to the cause, and was paid for his services by the Anti-Saloon League. The facts are, I have never received any money from a contributor.

Gross Falsehood Respecting Rockefeller Contributions—Their Representative Had Criticized League Policy and Sought to Manufacture a Case Against Me Before Any "Charges" Were Made.

The published statement that Messrs. John D. Rockefeller and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., had been the target of the dogged selection of the report of the committee on which I had been seated, was turned over to the League. Every phase of the report in which I had been shown to be the official of the board and had been fully approved and reported.

No one has any right to make the charge of anything that has been said about me in any of the newspapers.

The Rockefeller was never as much as $20,000 to the New York league in any one year. In another, they had selected me to the Anti-Saloon League for any "Charges" were made.

The publication of this false statement in connection with a statement that Mr. Raymond B. Comstock, the representative of the Rockefeller, had gone to the District Attorney's office, was evidence in the case of a very large number of church subscriptions, without any increase in expense, over and above what it was necessary to make the League's contributions to the League's contributions to the League's contributions to the League's contributions.

The League never gave as much as $20,000 to the New York league in any one year. In another, they had selected me to the Anti-Saloon League for any "Charges" were made.

Unfairness of Press—No Refusal to Show Books

The disposition somewhere, somehow, always to give the impression that I have the worst of it is indicated by the attempt to make out that there was any and the league had books. They were taken to the District Attorney's office, and left for weeks in his custody.

Whether the Acting District Attorney intended it or not, the green has given an unfavorable interpretation to the proceedings and statements respecting the progress of the inquiry.

Refused to Be Blackmailed

Granting freely that it is unfortunate that I have been placed in a position wherein I have been blackmailed in an unusual way at last proved to be capable of their usual tactics of extortion and vicious falsehood respecting an entire set of facts that I could not refuse to submit to blackmail or allow the league to use the same set of tactics to cover up such an error of judgment.

The "charged" were held, either by Phillips for the sake of the public and discredited employee of the Anti-Saloon League, to three, or by the two wetter, and they turned them down. This was also peddled last fiscal year. Before there were any charges made. Mr. Rockefeller attacked the only practical source of enforcement, which was the court and the trial of the cases. He had publicly made this charge, which was not committed to the wet campaign. This was the first time any representative of the Messrs. Rockefeller ever attempted to interfere with the management of the league in connection with a contract. I believe that this policy is desired or approved by the Messrs. Rockefeller, who are unquestionably sincerely in favor of prohibition and its uses, but for their help, we believe the league constituency precludes any and anything so lost (in fact, it is lost, of which the league has no official notice), rather than allow any representative of any financial interest to say nothing of a man who only a few months before had been making public declarations hostile to the league policy to undermine the league work until it satisfied the wants of the political and social leaders of New York City, who are in open rebellion against the anti-saloon cause.

The Anti-Saloon League Does Not Pay Commissions

The old-time story, now revived, that the league pays commissions on all subscriptions, even those made by the churches, is utterly absurd. The league has never paid any commission or anything equivalent for subscriptions taken at churches or public meetings.

There was an action of the board years ago to stop the checking of the salary of every member of the staff NOT RAISING MONEY by an amount equal to 5% of the total of subscriptions secured by each worker by personal solicitation and NOT COUNTING ANYTHING RECEIVED BY THE CHURCHES OR OTHER INSTITUTIONS.

Such a proposition, as an inducement to special efforts on the part of the staff would, of course, at a cost of $5, would secure $1,000,000 of money otherwise and without the help of church subscriptions, would have produced a greater increase in subscriptions, with an increase in expense, over and above what it was necessary to make the League's contributions to the League's contributions to the League's contributions to the League's contributions.

Refused to Be Blackmailed

Granting freely that it is unfortunate that I have been placed in a position wherein I have been blackmailed in an unusual way at last proved to be capable of their usual tactics of extortion and vicious falsehood respecting an entire set of facts that I could not refuse to submit to blackmail or allow the league to use the same set of tactics to cover up such an error of judgment.

The "charged" were held, either by Phillips for the sake of the public and discredited employee of the Anti-Saloon League, to three, or by the two wetter, and they turned them down. This was also peddled last fiscal year. Before there were any charges made. Mr. Rockefeller attacked the only practical source of enforcement, which was the court and the trial of the cases. He had publicly made this charge, which was not committed to the wet campaign. This was the first time any representative of the Messrs. Rockefeller ever attempted to interfere with the management of the league in connection with a contract. I believe that this policy is desired or approved by the Messrs. Rockefeller, who are unquestionably sincerely in favor of prohibition and its uses, but for their help, we believe the league constituency precludes any and anything so lost (in fact, it is lost, of which the league has no official notice), rather than allow any representative of any financial interest to say nothing of a man who only a few months before had been making public declarations hostile to the league policy to undermine the league work until it satisfied the wants of the political and social leaders of New York City, who are in open rebellion against the anti-saloon cause.

The Anti-Saloon League Does Not Pay Commissions

The old-time story, now revived, that the league pays commissions on all subscriptions, even those made by the churches, is utterly absurd. The league has never paid any commission or anything equivalent for subscriptions taken at churches or public meetings.

There was an action of the board years ago to stop the checking of the salary of every member of the staff NOT RAISING MONEY by an amount equal to 5% of the total of subscriptions secured by each worker by personal solicitation and NOT COUNTING ANYTHING RECEIVED BY THE CHURCHES OR OTHER INSTITUTIONS.

Such a proposition, as an inducement to special efforts on the part of the staff would, of course, at a cost of $5, would secure $1,000,000 of money otherwise and without the help of church subscriptions, would have produced a greater increase in subscriptions, with an increase in expense, over and above what it was necessary to make the League's contributions to the League's contributions to the League's contributions to the League's contributions.

Refused to Be Blackmailed

Granting freely that it is unfortunate that I have been placed in a position wherein I have been blackmailed in an unusual way at last proved to be capable of their usual tactics of extortion and vicious falsehood respecting an entire set of facts that I could not refuse to submit to blackmail or allow the league to use the same set of tactics to cover up such an error of judgment.

The "charged" were held, either by Phillips for the sake of the public and discredited employee of the Anti-Saloon League, to three, or by the two wetter, and they turned them down. This was also peddled last fiscal year. Before there were any charges made. Mr. Rockefeller attacked the only practical source of enforcement, which was the court and the trial of the cases. He had publicly made this charge, which was not committed to the wet campaign. This was the first time any representative of the Messrs. Rockefeller ever attempted to interfere with the management of the league in connection with a contract. I believe that this policy is desired or approved by the Messrs. Rockefeller, who are unquestionably sincerely in favor of prohibition and its uses, but for their help, we believe the league constituency precludes any and anything so lost (in fact, it is lost, of which the league has no official notice), rather than allow any representative of any financial interest to say nothing of a man who only a few months before had been making public declarations hostile to the league policy to undermine the league work until it satisfied the wants of the political and social leaders of New York City, who are in open rebellion against the anti-saloon cause.
AN OFFICIAL ANSWER TO THE FALSE CHARGE THAT WILLIAM H. ANDERSON, STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE OF NEW YORK PERSONALLY PROFITED FROM ANY SO-CALLED "SPLIT COMMISSIONS".

(At The Regular Meeting, March 27, 1923, The Following Was Unanimously Adopted.)

The Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, in full legal control of the finances of the League, in addition to its general approval and ratification of the acts of William H. Anderson, State Superintendent and its explicit certification that the money ordered paid to him to cover advances for pioneer publicity work was justly due him, desires to make a further statement with regard to the false charges against Mr. Anderson respecting alleged "split commissions":

A. THE PERSON MAKING THE FALSE CHARGES:

(1) The only known complaining witness, a discharged employee, seeking revenge, was shown by facts developed shortly before his discharge to have been guilty of treachery to the League.

(2) He tried to extort money from the Superintendent as the promised price of silence respecting these charges.

(3) Within a few days after settlement in full with him by this Board of all claims for compensation in return for a general release covering every claim of every sort against the League or any person employed by it, he was guilty of attempted blackmail or extortion or an equivalent offense against this Board as represented by its President.

(4) He was recently caught and confessed violation of the Federal Income Tax law and that fact was generally published.

(5) It is now discovered that the records of the District Attorney's office show, as widely published in 1916, a year before he came to the League which he deceived as to his record, that he had admitted to the District Attorney under oath having testified falsely a few days before in a proceeding before the Chief Magistrate of New York City in order to shield a man who was trafficking in stolen Allied munition and supply secrets and had connection with men in touch with the representatives of the German Government.

B. THE FACTS AS TO THE FALSE CHARGES THEMSELVES.

(1) No commission or proportionate compensation has ever been paid by the League on any subscription received at a church service or other public meeting or by mail renewal.

(2) Above a certain fixed salary, proportionate compensa- tion was paid to one person, under one contract in the past, under unusual conditions, the only arrangement of the sort ever authorized, in order to protect the League in securing at a reasonable cost special large contributions to supplement money received from the churches. This proportionate compensation did not exceed 10%.
(3) The charge that the Superintendent of the League forced the person working under such arrangement to divide his compensation is absolutely false. The Superintendent is fully corroborated by another trusted employee of the League, to the effect that such employee offered payment for special services rendered him, out of compensation already previously fixed by the Board.

(4) This was accepted by the Superintendent solely in order that he might thereby reduce the indebtedness of the League.

(5) This money was received by the Superintendent as representative of the League, so that the League always had the benefit of it and the full details were formally reported to the Board at the first meeting after the employment of such employee was terminated and the amount could be finally determined.

(6) Not a cent of the money in question ever came from any church or church subscriber. After befriending and financing out of his own money this employee who was always broke, the Superintendent turned all the net proceeds over to the League and thus reduced by several thousands of dollars the indebtedness of the League.

(7) This Board had long been urging personal solicitation by members of the staff not giving their entire time to that work, was always ready to make reasonable financial recognition of efforts in that direction, and years ago specifically authorized the payment therefor direct from the League treasury. Under this action the Superintendent would have been strictly within his legal rights in accepting and keeping for his own use not only all the money in question, but a larger sum of money. But instead he not only did not take a cent from the League treasury for such special service rendered by him, but turned over to the League, in reduction of the League's indebtedness, every cent he received from this League employee out of money which did not belong to the League.

With all fair-minded people it is a recognized principle that it is the intent that governs where there is a difference of opinion as to the wisdom of details and there is no place for technical quibbles where a great moral issue is involved. It is a fact which cannot be successfully denied or questioned that Mr. Anderson personally never received any money whatever from so-called commissions. We regret that Mr. Anderson has been the victim of such unjust accusation in this connection. On the other hand, we congratulate him on the showing after two months of effort to destroy him in public esteem, that the worst that can be brought against him after twenty-three years of relentless fighting against an unscrupulous foe, proves to be without merit or substance.
AN OFFICIAL ANSWER TO THE FALSE CHARGE THAT WILLIAM H. ANDERSON,
STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE OF NEW YORK
PERSONALLY PROFITED FROM ANY SO-CALLED "SPLIT COMMISSIONS".

(At The Regular Meeting, March 27, 1923, The Following Was
Unanimously Adopted.)

The Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League of New
York, in full legal control of the finances of the League, in
addition to its general approval and ratification of the acts of
William H. Anderson, State Superintendent and its explicit cer-
tification that the money ordered paid to him to cover advances
for pioneer publicity work was justly due him, desires to make a
further statement with regard to the false charges against Mr.
Anderson respecting alleged "split commissions":

A. THE PERSON MAKING THE FALSE CHARGES:

(1) The only known complaining witness, a discharged
employee, seeking revenge, was shown by facts developed shortly be-
fore his discharge to have been guilty of treachery to the League.

(2) He tried to extort money from the Superintendent as
the promised price of silence respecting these charges.

(3) Within a few days after settlement in full with
him by this Board of all claims for compensation in return for a
general release covering every claim of every sort against the
League or any person employed by it, he was guilty of attempted
blackmail or extortion or an equivalent offense against this Board
as represented by its President.

(4) He was recently caught and confessed violation of
the Federal Income Tax law and that fact was generally published.

(5) It is now discovered that the records of the District
Attorney's office show, as widely published in 1918, a year before
he came to the League which he deceived as to his record, that he
had admitted to the District Attorney under oath having testified
falsely a few days before in a proceeding before the Chief Magis-
trate of New York City in order to shield a man who was trafficking
in stolen Allied munition and supply secrets and had connection
with men in touch with the representatives of the German Government.

B. THE FACTS AS TO THE FALSE CHARGES THEMSELVES:

(1) No commission or proportionate compensation has
ever been paid by the League on any subscription received at a
church service or other public meeting or by mail renewal.

(2) Above a certain fixed salary, proportionate compen-
sation was paid to one person, under one contract in the past, under
unusual conditions, the only arrangement of the sort ever author-
ized, in order to protect the League in securing at a reasonable
cost special large contributions to supplement money received from
the churches. This proportionate compensation did not exceed 10%.
(3) The charge that the Superintendent of the League forced the person working under such arrangement to divide his compensation is absolutely false. The Superintendent is fully corroborated by another trusted employee of the League, to the effect that such employee offered payment for special services rendered him, out of compensation already previously fixed by the Board.

(4) This was accepted by the Superintendent solely in order that he might thereby reduce the indebtedness of the League.

(5) This money was received by the Superintendent as representative of the League, so that the League always had the benefit of it and the full details were formally reported to the Board at the first meeting after the employment of such employee was terminated and the amount could be finally determined.

(6) Not a cent of the money in question ever came from any church or church subscriber. After befriending and financing out of his own money this employee who was always broke, the Superintendent turned all the net proceeds over to the League and thus reduced by several thousands of dollars the indebtedness of the League.

(7) This Board had long been urging personal solicitation by members of the staff not giving their entire time to that work, was always ready to make reasonable financial recognition of efforts in that direction, and years ago specifically authorized the payment therefor direct from the League treasury. Under this action the Superintendent would have been strictly within his legal rights in accepting and keeping for his own use not only all the money in question, but a larger sum of money. But instead he not only did not take a cent from the League treasury for such special service rendered by him, but turned over to the League, in reduction of the League's indebtedness, every cent he received from this League employee out of money which did not belong to the League.

With all fair-minded people it is a recognized principle that it is the intent that governs where there is a difference of opinion as to the wisdom of details and there is no place for technical quibbles where a great moral issue is involved. It is a fact which cannot be successfully denied or questioned that Mr. Anderson personally never received any money whatever from so-called commissions. We regret that Mr. Anderson has been the victim of such unjust accusation in this connection. On the other hand, we congratulate him on the showing after two months of effort to destroy him in public esteem, that the worst that can be brought against him after twenty-three years of relentless fighting against an unscrupulous foe, proves to be without merit or substance.
Tammany Catholic Political Bunch have Evidently Gotten Cold Feet and Instructed their Protestant Masonic District Attorney to Look for a Protestant Masonic Republican Up-State Judge to do their Dirty Work.

TO THE DRY PROTESTANT PASTORS OF NEW YORK STATE:

The Irish-Catholic masters of District Attorney Banton of New York County, judging from the District Attorney’s own words, have evidently gotten cold feet. Just as they were scared out of bringing on my trial before election as a part of the campaign to elect a Tammany Assembly, so now they seem to have weakened on the proposition of trying to “railroad” me at a trial presided over by one of the Tammany Catholic judges who ordinarily try charges such as those made against me.

There is ample reason to believe from what the District Attorney says that these Tammany Catholic judges themselves have refused or served notice that they would refuse to go through with the schedule.

Whether it is the political or ecclesiastical end of the politico-ecclesiastical combination that is backing up and operates through Tammany which has stepped in, I do not pretend to know. Naturally, the Catholic politicians in Tammany are not anxious to have a case made against them too clearly on the eve of their attempt to control the Democratic National Convention. On the other hand, the political ecclesiastics recognize the danger to them that is involved with the Ku Klux Klan growing by the minute.

TAMMANY JOB BUT NOT TAMMANY JUDGE

The essential thing is that it evidently has been determined so definitely that nothing but inability to accomplish the purpose will interfere, that “safety first” makes it necessary to have the trial which Tammany’s stupidity still believes is essential to save its face, conducted under the presidency of a judge who, on the face of it, would seem to have no connection with Tammany.

This brings up legitimately a consideration of the kind of judge that they will try to have assigned for this particular duty in New York.

SORT OF JUDGE TAMMANY IS SEEKING

Tammany is Catholic,—therefore, an effort will undoubtedly be made to find a judge who is a Protestant, at least nominally.

Tammany is Democratic,—therefore the natural effort will be to find a judge who is Republican, and of course Tammany has always found Republicans who would work with it.

TAMMANY LIKES MASONS AS WELL AS PROTESTANTS FOR TOOLS

As the Catholic forces which control Tammany are anti-Masonic, the natural move in covering up Tammany tracks would be to get a Mason. The Masons as a whole throughout the country are not only for law and order, but are strongly in common with most Protestants. However, there are wet Masons, and there are Masons who will use their connection with Masonry to serve their own personal ends, politically, financially, or otherwise.

I have scoured to use the fact that I am a thirty-second degree Mason in any respect to promote my own ends. In the twenty-four years that I have been in Anti-Saloon work I have never tried to exploit my Masonic membership or work it in my own interest. However, I have felt justified in exposing the connection of District Attorney Banton, a high Mason, with the conspiracy of forces that are anti-Protestant and anti-Masonic, and his close alliance with Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick, whose relation to the double-crossing of the Masons of the country in the interests of the Knights of Columbus is set out in a report to the Grand Lodge of New York, the report being signed by a Democratic Justice of the Supreme Court of New York State.

The fact that Mr. Banton is a Mason makes it more strongly probable that he will try to find a judge who is a Mason, in order that the vicious, hostile, dishonest, anti-Protestant, wet press of New York City may complete its propaganda preparation by immediately heralding the fact that the judge so named is a Mason, a Protestant and a Republican.

BASED ON PAST PERFORMANCES

In figuring out the probabilities arising from Mr. Banton’s definite statement, I have in mind the story of a valuable horse that was lost and for which a reward was offered. The village half-wit brought him in and claimed the reward. Somebody said, “How did you know where to find him?” He replied: “I thinks to myself ‘what would I do was I a hoss?’ I did and he had.” I have followed the maneuvers of the wet politicians and their more or less respectable supposedly dry tools for twenty years, and have a pretty good idea of how they re-act.

Not only will the District Attorney try to cover the points above, but he would naturally prefer a judge who is wet in his personal sympathies; a judge who is politically ambitious and believes that the wet side is the
popular side; also if possible a judge who, while nominally a Protestant, has played with the Catholics politically and otherwise, carrying favor with the Knights of Columbus and opposing the Ku Klux Klan.

TAMMANY’S IDEAL JUDGE TO “SOAK” THE DRY PROTESTANT LEADER

In short, the ideal judge for Tammany purposes to conduct the trial of an Anti-Saloon League man is one who is:

1. A Protestant,—at least nominally.
2. A Mason,—the higher the better.
3. A Republican.
4. A wet,—at least politically, and secretly hostile to the Anti-Saloon League.
5. Politically ambitious.
6. Specially friendly with the Catholics.
7. Familiar with the “ropes” around New York City Courts.
9. Independent through recent election for a long term.

It remains to be seen whether they can find such a man, and we say to the pastors—“You watch and see what happens, and what kind of a judge is finally selected, and how he tallies with these specifications.”

A GENERAL ANALYSIS BEFORE DESIGNATION

It is important that I get this material out to the pastors in advance of the selection and assignment of any judge for the purpose, and before anything I say can be imagined to be aimed at any judge, because very desperate efforts would be made to stigmatize and if possible punish me for “Contempt of Court” if I should make any statements in advance of the trial about any judge who is selected even though the initiated know that he is as much of a de facto Tammany “heeler” as the Irish-Catholic judge that the District Attorney last August had in mind, according to rumor, to try the case.

TRIED TO CATCH ME FOR CONTEMPT

For example, Judge McIntyre, according to his own statement, was looking up the law respecting “contempts” to see if it was not possible to cite me for contempt because of a statement which I gave out, but which was suppressed by the New York City press, calling attention to the absurdity of his quoted explanation of his release of an indicted principal in a $9,000,000 fraudulent failure, who had entered a plea of guilty,—when contrasted with the facts that would have been disclosed in my case if I had been given access to the Grand Jury minutes. The judge “hung up” when he found the lawyer he was talking with was interested in the Anti-Saloon League.

I shall welcome any attempt at punishment for contempt by any judge who seeks to impose such punishment for something which in fact is not contempt, but is within my rights as a citizen to say in proper and legitimate criticism after a judicial transaction is closed.

And the pastors themselves, and publicly for their people, can point out the parallel between the selection made and my prognostication and analysis of what Tammany would try to put across. It will not be necessary for any pastor to put himself in contempt of court by saying the slightest thing impugning the motives or intentions of any judge so appointed. All that is necessary is to use the parallel column of actual facts.

RIGHT TO CRITICIZE JUDGE FREELY AFTER TRIAL IS OVER

Then after the trial is over the people have a right to express their opinions, and I myself can make public any fact respecting the testimony or the rulings of the court.

I did not make any comment whatsoever about the motives or reasons of the Tammany Irish-Catholic judge who denied me an inspection of the Grand Jury minutes. I merely set out the facts which are of record. But the wave of indignation throughout the state and even among the leaders of the nation, when the facts were gotten out in spite of the New York anti-Protestant wet press conspiracy of suppression, was sufficient to scare Tammany out of a fall campaign trial and now, evidently, out of trying to go through with its program of a trial with one of its own judges at the helm.

LEAGUE CANNOT BE BLUFFED OUT OF TELLING TRUTH ABOUT JUDGES

So, while of course any judge who is appointed is so hedged about and protected that it will be practically impossible for me to say anything until the trial is over, yet, after it is over, if testimony is admitted which plainly ought not to be admitted, or testimony is denied admission which ought to be admitted, or if the “case” is allowed to go to a jury at all when it ought to be summarily dismissed, or if improper comment is made or permitted during the trial, or if the charge to the jury denies justice, the way is open to set out the actual facts from which the public can draw its own conclusions.

While it would be improper for me to send this document for example to any of the judges even before assignment, I can use it after the case is disposed of.
The League cannot be deterred from publishing the truth by any oily, plausible, hypocritical talk about “respect for the courts.” No judge is entitled to any more respect than he himself shows for his judicial office. Proceedings of courts are matters of record, and the record belongs to the public. If the judge does the right thing, the publication of it will inure to his credit and ultimate official advantage. If he does not do the right thing, then he deserves to have it published.

The whole conspiracy to destroy prohibition by disrupting the Anti-Saloon League of the dry Protestant Churches and discrediting its agent reeks of politics of the rottenest sort, inspired by wet religious fanaticism, aroused, exploited and manipulated by the politico-ecclesiastical combination back of Tammany.

WHY SHOULD AN UP-STATE JUDGE WISH TO BE THE “GOAT”

If Irish Catholic Tammany judges are not willing to go through with this proposition after learning the reaction of the public following the denial of the Grand Jury minutes, that speaks volumes for the sinister purpose of the forces which own and control those courts to try to force a verdict of guilty regardless of future consequences. This has to be true because no Tammany Catholic judge would be condemned or could be injured by dealing justly with the executive officer of the dry agency of thousands of Protestant Churches in the State.

Therefore any up-State judge who is approached by Tammany, by the District Attorney or his emissaries, or whose designation is asked for although he is not approached directly, may set it down that it is believed by Tammany either that he is capable for his own political advantage or through some prejudice which Tammany knows he possesses, of carrying through the Tammany program, or else that Tammany believes he is so ignorant of conditions that exist that he will not understand what is going on and that he will permit this anti-Protestant politico-ecclesiastical combination to “get away with murder” on the trial regardless of what the higher courts do in the case if or when it reaches them.

It would seem that no self-respecting up-State judge would feel complimented over an invitation that would seem to imply that he is capable of being either a willing or an innocent but ignorant factor in this effort not only to destroy prohibition but to make the machinery of justice in fact an engine of persecution, oppression and gross injustice.

THE EXTENT OF THE CONSPIRACY

The conspiracy against me is probably the deepest, most far-reaching as well as the most iniquitous ever framed up against a dry worker. The entire political power of Tammany which controls the Government of the greatest and wettest city of the world, the power of that portion of the Roman Catholic Church which has been massed through a Catholic Governor, through those priests who are political before they are religious, and through the silent and tacit consent of the others who will not descend to active participation, the Rockefeller fortune, the greatest in the world, the influence of which has been thrown into the scale, the wet Republican bosses, who have played with Tammany, and then on top of this the New York City newspapers which have been guilty of probably the most vicious piece of combined distortion through malicious propaganda and of wilful and malicious suppression that could be charged against them even in this City, have all been employed.

PROOF OF PROTESTANT POWER

It is a most gratifying thing that the attitude and expressions of the Protestant denominational bodies through the year, and the instinctive reaction of a decent and fair-minded public have scared this crowd out of their original intention to stage a trial during the campaign or not to have it conducted at all by a Tammany judge unless they are unable to find any other judge who will serve their purpose.

THE JUDGE MAY FOOL THEM

However, while the selection of a judge by this Tammany crowd to try this case indicates Tammany’s opinion as to his natural bias, nevertheless it is entirely possible that the judge so selected may fool the Tammany crowd by faithfully discharging his obligations under his judicial oath. And it is possible that in the last analysis, if unable to get a judge from outside of New York County who can be “trusted” by them, the matter may be brought before a Tammany judge with the understanding that HE is free to discharge his duty. And it is entirely possible that such a judge may understand that in the last analysis the best service he can render to the political organization that made him and to the Church to which he professes allegiance is to stop this proposition before it goes any further by refusing to tolerate the continuance of a farce in the guise of a judicial proceeding.

It is a fair assumption that the reason the District Attorney objected to an inspection of the minutes was because he knew that the indictments must be dismissed if an inspection were granted. It is a fair assumption that the Tammany judges who understand the facts know that they must dismiss the alleged case against me before it reaches a jury and that they do not wish to do that. It is possible that in the last analysis Tammany would like to have an up-State judge dismiss the whole proceeding rather than have it done by one of its own. However, every reasonable probability points to the intention on the part of Tammany, if possible, to secure a verdict of guilty under the ruling of a judge who is known by the public to be Protestant, Masonic and Republican, AND NOT KNOWN TO THE PUBLIC TO BE WET, POLITICALLY AMBITIOUS, AND PLAYING TO THE CATHOLICS.

WORTH WHILE FOR AROUSEMENT PURPOSES

It is a gratifying indication of the power of truth, also of the influence of an aroused Protestantism, that Tammany is looking for some other than a Tammany judge. It is a striking vindication of the wisdom of the policy of exposing the nature of the conspiracy, and of my frank talk about certain Catholics and the politico-ecclesiastical combination, and also my talk respecting the Ku Klux Klan.
The pastors need not feel worried if this matter does come to trial and Tammany secures its judge and the result is a hostile verdict. If pressure of public sentiment has reached the place where Tammany has decided to hide out when most of the pastors believed the case would never be brought to trial, the sentiment that will be stirred up when the pastors and church constituency find by an actual hostile verdict that Tammany has persisted in challenging them in actually trying to railroad their representative, will be worth while.

VALUE OF THE "DEFENSE FUND"

This situation makes all the more important the pressing of the "Defense Fund" NOW. All that the churches that I represent ask for me and all that I ask for myself is justice and a square deal. The consciousness that the constituency of thousands of churches are watching these proceedings will make these conspirators watch their step.

It is true that most of the judges of New York were politicians, some of them very practical politicians, many of them wet politicians. On the other hand, while there are some judges in New York yet who are no credit to the bench, who are still politicians, and who, to put it mildly, are not above being influenced by their preferences and prejudices, yet it is undoubtedly true that the large majority of them honestly try to discharge their duty faithfully, have gotten out of politics in its ordinary sense, and would not knowingly do a wrong or an unjust thing.

I believe that it will not be possible for this bunch in New York to get a single judge from up-State New York who, if he knows the facts, will willingly be a party to what these conspirators are trying to accomplish.

And while it would be grossly improper to approach any judge with the idea of influencing his decision in case he should be called, yet every judge has a right to have the information that is common to the public as to the real facts in this or any other case in order that he may be on his guard against being deceived by the prosecution, just as much as he should be on his guard against any efforts in behalf of the defense.

PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE THE FACTS

The people need to be given the facts to prevent their being deceived by the poison press propaganda. If the facts are given there is no possible doubt as to the ultimate outcome. Only if they have the facts can any miscarriage of justice be turned back disastrously upon those responsible for it.

There is no effort being made to influence either public sentiment or courts or juries in favor of the defense in disregard of the law and the evidence. However it is not only proper for the churches but it is their solemn duty to see to it that they say and do whatever is necessary to offset the deliberate, calculated efforts to influence public sentiment and courts and juries unfavorably against their representative in defiance of the facts.

The anti-Protestant crowd working through the District Attorney and the wet press which they control started this proposition. It is essential for the safety of the citizenship generally and for the protection of the interests committed to the churches that these conspirators be thrown for such a loss that they will not dare try it again.

THE NEED AND VALUE OF PRAYER

Finally, the best weapon against "principalities and powers," against the forces of the underworld in high places, is the power of prayer.

My heart has been warmed by the statements of scores if not literally hundreds of pastors, besides many men and women from the membership of the churches, who have told me personally that they are praying for me. I know it in two ways: first, they tell me; second, I can feel it. I am conscious of its sustaining power.

I am fighting with every faculty that the Lord gives me, fighting without hatred or anger, fighting coolly and cheerfully with many a smile that the Lord has given me as a weapon. I am fighting to awaken the churches to a realization of the menace that confronts them, fighting for the happiness and homes that are threatened by the return of the liquor traffic desired by these conspirators. I am also fighting like any honest man, for the defense of my own good name.

I could not have held out this long or made the showing that has been made without help and support from two sources: first, immediately and obviously, from the League constituency, the loyal, discriminating, true-hearted pastors and an open-minded, courageous church membership; second, support that comes from on high. I am fighting for a victory that will hasten the advancement of the Kingdom.

Therefore, I venture to express the hope that not only will the pastors urge their people to contribute the means necessary to block this wicked conspiracy, but that they urge their people to weigh into this defense not only all their money, but their heart interest and pre-eminently their prayers, to the end that God may be glorified, that righteousness and justice may prevail, that prohibition may be enforced and bring its blessings to the children of men, that the churches which have led in this fight may be vindicated, and that the rights under the law of every citizen may be safeguarded.

Yours to work with Him who maketh the wrath of man to praise Him,

(Signed)

William H. Anderson

State Superintendent, Anti-Saloon League of New York.

New York City, Nov. 19th, 1923.
TO THE DRY PROTESTANT PASTORS OF NEW YORK STATE:

The Irish-Catholic masters of District Attorney Banton of New York County, judging from the District Attorney's own words, have evidently gotten cold feet. Just as they were scared out of bringing on my trial before election as a part of the campaign to elect a Tammany Assembly, so now they seem to have weakened on the proposition of trying to "railroad" me at a trial presided over by one of the Tammany Catholic judges who ordinarily try charges such as those made against me.

There is ample reason to believe from what the District Attorney says that these Tammany Catholic judges themselves have refused or served notice that they would refuse to go through with the schedule.

Whether it is the political or ecclesiastical end of the politico-ecclesiastical combination that is backing up and operates through Tammany which has stepped in, I do not pretend to know. Naturally, the Catholic politicians in Tammany are not anxious to have a case made against them too clearly on the eve of their attempt to control the Democratic National Convention. On the other hand, the political ecclesiastics recognize the danger to them that is involved with the Ku Klux Klan growing by the minute.

TAMMANY JOB BUT NOT TAMMANY JUDGE

The essential thing is that it evidently has been determined so definitely that nothing but inability to accomplish the purpose will interfere, that "safety first" makes it necessary to have the trial which Tammany's stupidity still believes is essential to save its face, conducted under the presidency of a judge who, on the face of it, would seem to have no connection with Tammany.

This brings up legitimately a consideration of the kind of judge that they will try to have assigned for this particular duty in New York.

SORT OF JUDGE TAMMANY IS SEEKING

Tammany is Catholic,—therefore, an effort will undoubtedly be made to find a judge who is a Protestant, at least nominally.

Tammany is Democratic,—therefore the natural effort will be to find a judge who is Republican, and of course Tammany has always found Republicans who would work with it.

TAMMANY LIKES MASONS AS WELL AS PROTESTANTS FOR TOOLS

As the Catholic forces which control Tammany are anti-Masonic, the natural move in covering up Tammany tracks would be to get a Mason. The Masons as a whole throughout the country are not only for law and order, but are strongly dry in common with most Protestants. However, there are wet Masons, and there are Masons who will use their connection with Masonry to serve their own personal ends, politically, financially, or otherwise.

I have scorned to use the fact that I am a thirty-second degree Mason in any respect to promote my own ends. In the twenty-four years that I have been in Anti-Saloon work I have never tried to exploit my Masonic membership or work it in my own interest. However, I have felt justified in exposing the connection of District Attorney Banton, a high Mason, with the conspiracy of forces that are anti-Protestant and anti-Masonic, and his close alliance with Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick, whose relation to the double-crossing of the Masons of the country in the interests of the Knights of Columbus is set out in a report to the Grand Lodge of New York, the report being signed by a Democratic Justice of the Supreme Court of New York State.

The fact that Mr. Banton is a Mason makes it more strongly probable that he will try to find a judge who is a Mason, in order that the vicious, hostile, dishonest, anti-Protestant, wet press of New York City may complete its propaganda preparation by immediately heralding the fact that the judge so named is a Mason, a Protestant and a Republican.

BASED ON PAST PERFORMANCES

In figuring out the probabilities arising from Mr. Banton's definite statement, I have in mind the story of a valuable horse that was lost and for which a reward was offered. The village half-wit brought him in and claimed the reward. Somebody said, "How did you know where to find him?" He replied: "I thinks to myself 'what would I do was I a boss?' I did and he had." I have followed the maneuvers of the wet politicians and their more or less respectable supposedly dry tools for twenty years, and have a pretty good idea of how they re-act.

Not only will the District Attorney try to cover the points above, but he would naturally prefer a judge who is wet in his personal sympathies; a judge who is politically ambitious and believes that the wet side is the
popular side; also if possible a judge who, while nominally a Protestant, has played with the Catholics politically and otherwise, currying favor with the Knights of Columbus and opposing the Ku Klux Klan.

**TAMMANY'S IDEAL JUDGE TO “SOAK” THE DRY PROTESTANT LEADER**

In short, the ideal judge for Tammany purposes to conduct the trial of an Anti-Saloon League man is one who is:

1. A Protestant,—at least nominally.
2. A Mason,—the higher the better.
3. A Republican.
4. A wet,—at least politically, and secretly hostile to the Anti-Saloon League.
5. Politically ambitious.
6. Specially friendly with the Catholics.
7. Familiar with the “ropes” around New York City Courts.
9. Independent through recent election for a long term.

It remains to be seen whether they can find such a man, and we say to the pastors—“You watch and see what happens, and what kind of a judge is finally selected, and how he tallies with these specifications.”

**A GENERAL ANALYSIS BEFORE DESIGNATION**

It is important that I get this material out to the pastors in advance of the selection and assignment of any judge for the purpose, and before anything I say can be imagined to be aimed at any judge, because very desperate efforts would be made to stigmatize and if possible punish me for “Contempt of Court” if I should make any statements in advance of the trial about any judge who is selected even though the initiated know that he is as much of a de facto Tammany “heeler” as the Irish-Catholic judge that the District Attorney last August had in mind, according to rumor, to try the case.

**TRIED TO CATCH ME FOR CONTEMPT**

For example, Judge McIntyre, according to his own statement, was looking up the law respecting “contempts” to see if it was not possible to cite me for contempt because of a statement which I gave out, but which was suppressed by the New York City press, calling attention to the absurdity of his quoted explanation of his release of an indicted principal in a $9,000,000 fraudulent failure, who had entered a plea of guilty,—when contrasted with the facts that would have been disclosed in my case if I had been given access to the Grand Jury minutes. The judge “hung up” when he found the lawyer he was talking with was interested in the Anti-Saloon League.

I shall welcome any attempt at punishment for contempt by any judge who seeks to impose such punishment for something which in fact is not contempt, but is within my rights as a citizen to say in proper and legitimate criticism after a judicial transaction is closed.

I am within my rights in putting out this material in advance analyzing the whole situation, and the League can publish after the assignment, as a mere matter of fact without any comment, the actual facts of record about the judge who is selected.

And the pastors themselves, and publicly for their people, can point out the parallel between the selection made and my prognostication and analysis of what Tammany would try to put across. It will not be necessary for any pastor to put himself in contempt of court by saying the slightest thing impugning the motives or intentions of any judge so appointed. All that is necessary is to use the parallel column of actual facts.

**RIGHT TO CRITICIZE JUDGE FREELY AFTER TRIAL IS OVER**

Then after the trial is over the people have a right to express their opinions, and I myself can make public any fact respecting the testimony or the rulings of the court.

I did not make any comment whatsoever about the motives or reasons of the Tammany Irish-Catholic judge who denied me an inspection of the Grand Jury minutes. I merely set out the facts which are of record. But the wave of indignation throughout the state and even among the leaders of the nation, when the facts were gotten out in spite of the New York anti-Protestant wet press conspiracy of suppression, was sufficient to scare Tammany out of a fall campaign trial and now, evidently, out of trying to go through with its program of a trial with one of its own judges at the helm.

**LEAGUE CANNOT BE BLUFFED OUT OF TELLING TRUTH ABOUT JUDGES**

So, while of course any judge who is appointed is so hedged about and protected that it will be practically impossible for me to say anything until the trial is over, yet, after it is over, if testimony is admitted which plainly ought not to be admitted, or testimony is denied admission which ought to be admitted, or if the “case” is allowed to go to a jury at all when it ought to be summarily dismissed, or if improper comment is made or permitted during the trial, or if the charge to the jury denies justice, the way is open to set out the actual facts from which the public can draw its own conclusions.

While it would be improper for me to send this document for example to any of the judges even before assignment, I can use it after the case is disposed of.
The League cannot be deterred from publishing the truth by any oily, plausible, hypocritical talk about
"respect for the courts." No judge is entitled to any more respect than he himself shows for his judicial office.
Proceedings of courts are matters of record, and the record belongs to the public. If the judge does the right
thing, the publication of it will inure to his credit and ultimate official advantage. If he does not do the right
thing, then he deserves to have it published.

The whole conspiracy to destroy prohibition by disrupting the Anti-Saloon League of the dry Protestant
Churches and discrediting its agent reeks of politics of the rottenest sort, inspired by wet religious fanaticism,
aroused, exploited and manipulated by the politico-ecclesiastical combination back of Tammany.

WHY SHOULD AN UP-STATE JUDGE WISH TO BE THE "GOAT"

If Irish Catholic Tammany judges are not willing to go through with this proposition after learning the
reaction of the public following the denial of the Grand Jury minutes, that speaks volumes for the sinister
purpose of the forces which own and control the District Attorney to force a verdict of guilty regardless of
future consequences. This has to be true because no Tammany Catholic judge would be condemned or could
be injured by dealing justly with the executive officer of the dry agency of thousands of Protestant Churches
in the State.

Therefore any up-State judge who is approached by Tammany, by the District Attorney or his emissaries,
or whose designation is asked for although he is not approached directly, may set it down that it is believed by
Tammany either that he is capable for his own political advantage or through some prejudice which Tammany
knows he possesses, of carrying through the Tammany program, or else that Tammany believes he is so igno-
rant of conditions that exist that he will not understand what is going on and that he will permit this anti-
Protestant politico-ecclesiastical combination to "get away with murder" on the trial regardless of what the
higher courts do in the case if or when it reaches them.

It would seem that no self-respecting up-State judge would feel complimented over an invitation that would
seem to imply that he is capable of being either a willing or innocent but ignorant factor in this effort not
only to destroy prohibition but to make the machinery of justice in fact an engine of persecution, oppression
and gross injustice.

THE EXTENT OF THE CONSPIRACY

The conspiracy against me is probably the deepest, most far-reaching as well as the most iniquitous ever
framed up against a dry worker. The entire political power of Tammany which controls the Government of the
greatest and wettest city of the world, the power of that portion of the Roman Catholic Church which has been
massed through a Catholic Governor, through those priests who are political before they are religious, and
through the silent and tacit consent of the others who will not descend to active participation, the Rockefellar
fortune, the greatest in the world, the influence of which has been thrown into the scale, the wet Republican
bosses, who have played with Tammany, and then on top of this the New York City newspapers which have
been guilty of probably the most vicious piece of combined distortion through malicious propaganda and of wil-
ful and malicious suppression that could be charged against them even in this City, have all been employed.

PROOF OF PROTESTANT POWER

It is a most gratifying thing that the attitude and expressions of the Protestant denominational bodies
through the year, and the instinctive reaction of a decent and fair-minded public have scared this crowd out
of their original intention to stage a trial during the campaign or not to have it conducted at all by a Tam-
many judge unless they are unable to find any other judge who will serve their purpose.

THE JUDGE MAY FOOL THEM

However, while the selection of a judge by this Tammany crowd to try this case indicates Tammany's
opinion as to his natural bias, nevertheless it is entirely possible that the judge so selected may fool the Tam-
many crowd by faithfully discharging his obligations under his judicial oath. And it is possible that in the last
analysis, if unable to get a judge from outside of New York County who can be "trusted" by them, the matter
may be brought before a Tammany judge with the understanding that HE is free to discharge his duty.
And it is entirely possible that such a judge may understand that in the last analysis the best service he can
render to the political organization that made him and to the Church to which he professes allegiance is to
stop this proposition before it goes any further by refusing to tolerate the continuance of a farce in the guise
of a judicial proceeding.

It is a fair assumption that the reason the District Attorney objected to an inspection of the minutes was
because he knew that the indictments must be dismissed if an inspection were granted. It is a fair assumption
that the Tammany judges who understand the facts know that they must dismiss the alleged case against me
before it reaches a jury and that they do not wish to do that. It is possible that in the last analysis Tammany
would like to have an up-State judge dismiss the whole proceeding rather than have it done by one of its own.
However, every reasonable probability points to the intention on the part of Tammany, if possible, to secure a
verdict of guilty under the ruling of a judge who is known by the public to be Protestant, Masonic and Republican,
AND NOT KNOWN TO THE PUBLIC TO BE WET, POLITICALLY AMBITIOUS, AND PLAYING TO THE

WORTH WHILE FOR AROUSEMENT PURPOSES

It is a gratifying indication of the power of truth, also of the influence of an aroused Protestantism, that
Tammany is looking for some other than a Tammany judge. It is a striking vindication of the wisdom of the
policy of exposing the nature of the conspiracy, and of my frank talk about certain Catholics and the politico-
ecclesiastical combination, and also my talk respecting the Ku Klux Klan.
The pastors need not feel worried if this matter does come to trial and Tammany secures its judge and the result is a hostile verdict. If pressure of public sentiment has reached the place where Tammany has decided to hide out when most of the pastors believed the case would never be brought to trial, the sentiment that will be stirred up when the pastors and church constituency find by an actual hostile verdict that Tammany has persisted in challenging them in actually trying to railroad their representative, will be worth while.

**VALUE OF THE "DEFENSE FUND"**

This situation makes all the more important the pressing of the "Defense Fund" NOW. All that the churches that I represent ask for me and all that I ask for myself is justice and a square deal. The consciousness that the constituency of thousands of churches are watching these proceedings will make these conspirators watch their step.

It is true that most of the judges of New York were politicians, some of them very practical politicians, many of them wet politicians. On the other hand, while there are some judges in New York yet who are no credit to the bench, who are still politicians, and who, to put it mildly, are not above being influenced by their preferences and prejudices, yet it is undoubtedly true that the large majority of them honestly try to discharge their duty faithfully, have gotten out of politics in its ordinary sense, and would not knowingly do a wrong or an unjust thing.

I believe that it will not be possible for this bunch in New York to get a single judge from up-State New York who, if he knows the facts, will willingly be a party to what these conspirators are trying to accomplish.

And while it would be grossly improper to approach any judge with the idea of influencing his decision in case he should be called, yet every judge has a right to have the information that is common to the public as to the real facts in this or any other case in order that he may be on his guard against being deceived by the prosecution, just as much as he should be on his guard against any efforts in behalf of the defense.

**PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE THE FACTS**

The people need to be given the facts to prevent their being deceived by the poison press propaganda. If the facts are given there is no possible doubt as to the ultimate outcome. Only if they have the facts can any miscarriage of justice be turned back disastrously upon those responsible for it.

There is no effort being made to influence either public sentiment or courts or juries in favor of the defense in disregard of the law and the evidence. However it is not only proper for the churches but it is their solemn duty to see to it that they say and do whatever is necessary to offset the deliberate, calculated efforts to influence public sentiment and courts and juries unfavorably against their representative in defiance of the facts.

The anti-Protestant crowd working through the District Attorney and the wet press which they control started this proposition. It is essential for the safety of the citizenship generally and for the protection of the interests committed to the churches that these conspirators be thrown for such a loss that they will not dare try it again.

**THE NEED AND VALUE OF PRAYER**

Finally, the best weapon against "principalities and powers," against the forces of the underworld in high places, is the power of prayer.

My heart has been warmed by the statements of scores if not literally hundreds of pastors, besides many men and women from the membership of the churches, who have told me personally that they are praying for me. I know it in two ways: first, they tell me; second, I can feel it. I am conscious of its sustaining power.

I am fighting with every faculty that the Lord gives me, fighting without hatred or anger, fighting coolly and cheerfully with many a smile not to say broad grin and hearty laugh over the many humorous phases of this grim farce. I am fighting to awaken the churches to a realization of the menace that confronts them, fighting for the happiness and homes that are threatened by the return of the liquor traffic desired by these conspirators. I am also fighting like any honest man, for the defense of my own good name.

I could not have held out this long or made the showing that has been made without help and support from two sources: first, immediately and obviously, from the League constituency, the loyal, discriminating, true-hearted pastors and an open-minded, courageous church membership; second, support that comes from on high. I am fighting for a victory that will hasten the advancement of the Kingdom.

Therefore, I venture to express the hope that not only will the pastors urge their people to contribute the means necessary to block this wicked conspiracy, but that they urge their people to weigh into this defense not only some money, but their heart interest and pre-eminently their prayers, to the end that God may be glorified, that righteousness and justice may prevail, that prohibition may be enforced and bring its blessings to the children of men, that the churches which have led in this fight may be vindicated, and that the rights under the law of every citizen may be safeguarded.

Yours to work with Him who maketh the wrath of man to praise Him,

(Signed)

William H. Anderson

State Superintendent, Anti-Saloon League of New York.

New York City, Nov. 19th, 1923.
BANTON SQUEAKS THROUGH TREATY OF LIBEL PROCEEDINGS

New York District Attorney Apparently Bluffing to Keep Representatives of Dry Protestant Churches from Telling the Truth—New Pungent Editorial from Brooklyn Standard Union.

New York City, December 6, 1923.

TO THE DRY PROTESTANT PASTORS OF NEW YORK CITY.

Joah H. Banton, Protestant, high Mason, Southern Demo-

crat, Tammany District Attorney, is "kicking against the pricks." It is alleged that Mr. Banton evidently was not in the slightest degree worried by what he was doing to further what is obviously his purpose to sell Tammany's bond issues. If we believe that Catholics now ruling in New York through the Tammany organization. He is of course very much disturbed when the representatives of the dry Protestant Churches fall publicly what he is doing, and the press publishes what they tell.

BANTON'S NERVES EVIDENTLY "JUMPING"

For some time Mr. Banton has shown signs of the "jumping" that his feelings are raw over the exposure and public estimate of his actions that prompted the reaction that so distresses him is betrayed by utterances equally raw. We can respect ruthlessness that is consistent. But the combination of ruthlessness and sneering!!! If not.

Mr. Banton evidently was not in the slightest degree worried by what he was doing to further what is obviously his purpose to sell Tammany's bond issues. If we believe that Catholics now ruling in New York through the Tammany organization. He is of course very much disturbed when the representatives of the dry Protestant Churches fall publicly what he is doing, and the press publishes what they tell.

Mr. Banton evidently was not in the slightest degree worried by what he was doing to further what is obviously his purpose to sell Tammany's bond issues. If we believe that Catholics now ruling in New York through the Tammany organization. He is of course very much disturbed when the representatives of the dry Protestant Churches fall publicly what he is doing, and the press publishes what they tell.

BANTON'S SQUEAK OF DEFANCE

The New York papers generally contained on last Sun-
day an emanation from the District Attorney's press bureau as to a notice that appeared in the Times, heads and all; also, the heads and series of paragraphs preceding the identical same statement as it appeared in the Herald. He had all the backwash of prevailing hostile prints as printed in the same day in an adjoining column.

BANTON WARNS THOSE WHO WOULD LIBEL HIM

Will Deal in Due Course with Any Libel Attacks Framed to Help Anderson.

District Attorney Joah H. Banton declined yesterday to make any definite statement in reference to reports that a notice appeared in the New York Times heads and all; also, the heads and series of paragraphs preceding the identical same statement as it appeared in the New York Herald's last Sunday's edition, a declaration of prevailing hostile prints as printed in the same day in an adjoining column.

BANTON CHARGES LIBEL BY ANDERSON'S FRIENDS

Resorts Attacks by Dry Leader's Supporters and May Sue.

Despite the advice of his brother and legal counsel, Mr. Banton decided yesterday to bring action for libel against supporters of William H. Anderson, Superintendent of Tammany and one of those who represented that Mr. Banton is a party to a party, wet and anti-Protestant conspiracy against Mr. Anderson. (New York Herald, Dec. 2, 1923)

ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE VIEW OF BANTON'S OWN

In an address at the NEW YORK HERALD of Friday last of the statement issued by the Anti-Saloon League of New York addressed to Mr. Banton, the Anti-Saloon League of New York, under the pen-name "Mr. Banton," as it is believed, did not of course intend to intimate its concurrence or opposition to the appointment of Mr. Anderson as District Attorney.

Mr. Banton or the administration of the office of which he is the head, has not been subjected to any personal or official integrity of public officials who have been found to be untrustworthy or injurious to the public interest. (New York Herald, Dec. 2, 1923).

A BLUFF THAT IS PROMPTLY CALLED

Mr. Banton should keep both his temper and his injured innocence in leash. Last summer when compelled with his sister to separate out business it will make me Governor — which we are prepared to show by the utter-

lessness. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitted enough to establish slight connection beyond reasonable doubt. He is not so far below a duly constituted tribunal, he admitte...
JUST WHAT WET TAMMANY-CATHOLIC CROWD WOULD WANT HIM TO DO

If Mr. Banton and if the Tammany-Irish-Catholic crowd of a few powerful politicians and priests who cannot be convinced by the pressure of anything, they cannot be convinced of short tactics, as for example with a jury, that will increase the reaction and intensify the gathering storm of public reaction. They, in this case, will be expected to be looking for some way to break the damaging effects of the anti-Saloon League. I can figure that a liberal seat to keep the League Superintendent busy until the election of 1924 and engross the attention of the legislature under these circumstances could serve its purpose.

If Mr. Banton is serious and not merely bluffing, this would strengthen the belief that his main intention is to clear his name behind him, because of the obvious fact that he would be doing that without the aid of a twenty percent of the national plans of this crowd in an effort to make as graceful a retreat as possible. Many politicians have his choice between the unavoidable inference in case he is serious, or the natural and probable inference of his intentions.

A LIBLET SUIT EXCEEDINGLY VALUABLE FOR DEMONSTRATION PURPOSES

I am rather inclined to think that a libel suit brought by a Tammany District Attorney would be worth many times whatever it would cost to defend it as far as he cares to go. The value of such a suit is no doubt the fact of the power and the political and ecclesiastical influence behind Tammany is obnoxious to all. It is all the more obnoxious if it comes to an issue of prestige because, for his wounds, it is likely to be many a long, cold day before anybody else tries to repeat this outrage, and the implications concerning the rest of the League's history will be cheap at the price.

BIGGER GAME THAN NEW YORK CITY, AND OTHER FIGHTS

In these proceedings we are not making this fight alone. We are fighting for the years to come. We intend to teach the politicians and ecclesiastics that they cannot do as they please. We intend to make an object lesson of politicians who lend themselves to the purposes of these influences.

Further, we are after bigger game than New York City. I have already referred to the political and ecclesiastical influence behind Tammany which has gained, in the case of its past leaders, the confidence of organized labor. The whole city of New York City can be crushed into submission to the law of the land, and, as a result, will be crushed into submission as has happened on other things. The League plans for at least two more years. It is only by attacking them that we can hope to get one that will be honest and thorough. Or is that the kind you want as respecto your office?

MR. BANTON'S EFFORTS TO SCARE THE PRESS OR GIVE IT AN EXCUSE

This talk about libel evidently had two purposes. The first one was to scare the press. What is reprinted above indicates it succeeded with the Herald. The publication of the article by The New York Statesman and The New York Times which in the main has been fair in its new campaign has added hundreds of the minutes or any facts about Tammany's panic of plans (from having an Irish Catholic Judge preside of the anti-Saloon League) by the New York Statesman which has printed very little, and with its probably publicizing the plan of action which the Tammany politicians are going to attempt to retain the construction of the League, and then to proceed to the consequent danger that the Legislature might act, evi- dence that the result is not the result of any one of them feel that something desperate had to be done to stop any further publication last it completely explode their aid. The results of the failure of these efforts is a clear indication to print even other facts as further developed.

EVIDENTLY INTENDED TO SCARE THE PASTORS AND DRY OUT THE AFTER SALE

Having failed so ignominiously in the effort made by his office, betrayed by the assistant delegate to be added to the dirty work of the Republicans, I think that Banton evidently recognizes signs of cracking in his heretofore almost unchallenged position and is trying to bolster himself and his office. The exposure of the refusal of the anti- Protestant presses to print the facts about the anti-Protestant campaign was an indication of the way in which the papers feel that they must print anything else that does not agree with the views of the men they have been forbidden to print. This libel threat by the District Attorney might easily have been intended to give these newspapers the idea of printing anything anything but printing to print even other facts as further developed.

THE LEGAL DEPARTMENT OF THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE

The Legal Department of the Anti-Saloon League will not only help any pastor who wants to go to the limit and yet be entirely safe, to do the right thing, but also to safeguard the reputation of the District Attorney and the forces whose purposes he is in fact carrying out, and we stand by any pastor in any trouble that may be threatened him through statement of exactly what he is being asked to do.

In past years, I have endeavored to explain that our attitude is not to attempt the other. The spectacle of a Tammany official trying to punish the representatives of the churches would make such an effort useless and we express our belief that the issue! Even New York City might be carried on the issues that such an effort will afford. We know the District Attorney lacks keenness of discrimination, but even we stop short of accusing him of that. But there may be forces back of him or on him that are doing the same. What is needed is an investigation by the legislature. But they cannot get away with it.

SOME QUESTIONS CALCULATED TO DRAW BLOOD

1) Why, if your "prosecution" is on the level, are you afraid to let the Anti-Saloon League Superintendent have the file for 90 days and many minutes into the possession of the perjured testimony or fear of exposure of lack of a case? What is preventing him from doing it? Is he under any legal restrictions? Is he being forced to do anything?

2) Why, if you had nothing to fear, did not you ask the Governor to appoint somebody to hear the testimony and pass judgment on the official actions, specifically your refusal to prosecute a crime, and the refusal of your forces to answer the challenge of an investigation of the Anti-Saloon League? Has the Governor left you so long to make up your mind to fear? Isn't that substantially the question that you and your backers were asking the Anti-Saloon League constitutionally, or was it the conduct of the Governor which led to an investigation of the Anti-Saloon League? Has the Governor done everything it could to get one that will be honest and thorough? Or is that the kind you want as respecto your office?

3) Did you know that he has not been widely published that your star witness confessed to perjury in the Hagenbeek case? How is it possible for you to have had the confidence of such a witness? And did you not know that he admitted attempted by others to influence the evidence? If no action is taken upon the Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League?

4) Why, after your admission for publication of your discretionary power of publication of your guaranty to the impression of the indictment of the Anti-Saloon League, did you not act? Did you not take the necessary action upon the Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League?

5) Why, after your admission for publication of your discretionary power of publication of your guaranty to the impression of the indictment of the Anti-Saloon League, did you not act? Did you not take the necessary action upon the Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League?

WHAT CONVINCING ANSWER CAN THERE BE?

1) What kind of propaganda did you mean when you made your last statement as to the number of persons from whom you say he stole unanimously deny your charge?

2) What kind of "preparation" did you mean you made when you made your statement in the face of your previous statement that you would not be ready for trial on 24 hours' notice?

3) Is the conviction of his service and action he leaves behind him irrefutable? Does the conviction of absolute impossibility of any wet Catholic influence, did you not ask for a trial judge who is dry and not on the board to start it?

AN ANTI-TAMMANY-GOVERNMENT IN REMOVE THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY

I am not concerned about any libel suit brought against me. There have been a number of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League which has been fair in its new campaign has added hundreds of the minutes or any facts about Tammany's panic of plans (from having an Irish Catholic Judge preside of the anti-Saloon League) by the New York Statesman which has printed very little, and with its probably publicizing the plan of action which the Tammany politicians are going to attempt to retain the construction of the League, and then to proceed to the consequent danger that the Legislature might act, evi- dence that the result is not the result of any one of them feel that something desperate had to be done to stop any further publication last it completely explode their aid. The results of the failure of these efforts is a clear indication to print even other facts as further developed.

There is another aspect of this. There are indications that some of the New York City press is getting very restive of the amount of influence wielded by influence of Tammany. The suppression of the facts regarding the defense in this case are an indication that some of the press, probably the Herald, is apprehensive to the extent that it is willing to make an open denial of the minutes or any facts about Tammany's panic of plans (from having an Irish Catholic Judge preside of the anti-Saloon League) by the New York Statesman which has printed very little, and with its probably publicizing the plan of action which the Tammany politicians are going to attempt to retain the construction of the League, and then to proceed to the consequent danger that the Legislature might act, evi- dence that the result is not the result of any one of them feel that something desperate had to be done to stop any further publication last it completely explode their aid. The results of the failure of these efforts is a clear indication to print even other facts as further developed.

There are another aspect of this. There are indications that some of the New York City press is getting very restive of the amount of influence wielded by influence of Tammany. The suppression of the facts regarding the defense in this case are an indication that some of the press, probably the Herald, is apprehensive to the extent that it is willing to make an open denial of the minutes or any facts about Tammany's panic of plans (from having an Irish Catholic Judge preside of the anti-Saloon League) by the New York Statesman which has printed very little, and with its probably publicizing the plan of action which the Tammany politicians are going to attempt to retain the construction of the League, and then to proceed to the consequent danger that the Legislature might act, evi- dence that the result is not the result of any one of them feel that something desperate had to be done to stop any further publication last it completely explode their aid. The results of the failure of these efforts is a clear indication to print even other facts as further developed.

There is another aspect of this. There are indications that some of the New York City press is getting very restive of the amount of influence wielded by influence of Tammany. The suppression of the facts regarding the defense in this case are an indication that some of the press, probably the Herald, is apprehensive to the extent that it is willing to make an open denial of the minutes or any facts about Tammany's panic of plans (from having an Irish Catholic Judge preside of the anti-Saloon League) by the New York Statesman which has printed very little, and with its probably publicizing the plan of action which the Tammany politicians are going to attempt to retain the construction of the League, and then to proceed to the consequent danger that the Legislature might act, evi- dence that the result is not the result of any one of them feel that something desperate had to be done to stop any further publication last it completely explode their aid. The results of the failure of these efforts is a clear indication to print even other facts as further developed.
WHY DIDN'T HE THINK OF REPUTATION BEFORE? Mr. Banton talks about his reputation. Why didn't he think about his reputation before he got into this hole by doing a deal with the local authorities? And other things that can very easily be shown. Why didn't he think about the reputation of other people? Is not my reputation an asset to those who know me? I'd be surprised that I fight to defend it even though he is a legal question before the court.

Why didn't Mr. Banton think about his reputation when he started his propaganda? I kept silent last all winter and spent the whole time on the side of the issue. If I had procured my indictment last summer without a brass hand, there wouldn't have been any effect at all. The discharge of his official duties, the chances are that I should not have opened up on him. He started the outside and external propaganda, which I tried hard, honestly, trying to hold together the fragments of his shattered moral.

AN IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT
There is an irrepressible conflict anticipated for years which Mr. Banton has helped precipitate. The opposing influences are:

1. The law-abiding Protestant, American, law-abiding element of the community.

2. The wet, anti-Protestant, nullificationists, largely alien to the community, plus the fact that Mr. Banton can hardly claim he is helping the first group.

PROOF THAT HE HAS NOT SILENCED ANYBODY
Now, to prove that he hasn't silenced me and in defiance of the law, let me put on record a prosecution charge that the very thing Mr. Banton is pointing to with pride through his activities in New York and his pronunci- dence seems to establish even more clearly his lack of good faith in his proscribed desire for a fair trial.

Mr. Banton and a number of the local presses are creating a false impression, and the people in the know are feeling that they would try to undo responsibility on an up-state judge who is a Protestant, a Republican, and a Mason. They have been saying that as soon as such an announcement was made, would hasten to play up the fact that Mr. Banton is a Mason and a Republican, and that it would suppress certain other facts.

PROPAGANDA AND SUPPRESSION
The next day New York City papers carried an announcement from Mr. Banton of his "unnecessary information" and his "assertion" of the suppression of certain statements that I made in the papers, in announcing this, he brushed that the judge so to be designated might be a Mason, a Protestant and a Republican. I have no objection to the statement that the Tammany, Irish-Catholic church had evidently gotten cold feet for a moment of such indiscretion to the State judge. This enabled them to suppress the fact that, in addition to predicting that the District Attorney would try to get his hands on me, he said that if I were a Mason and a Protestant, I had predicted he would try to get one who is also wet, who is also politically ambitious, who has tried to ingratiate himself with the Catholics, and who is a close personal friend.

WHY SO ANXIOUS TO CONCEAL CERTAIN FACTS?
The New York City press, which, evidently by inspiration and suggestion of the Tammany, is carrying out the press which suppressed the startling, vital facts about the denial of the Grand Jury minutes to me and also suppressed the release of the list of the contempt of court, the statements that this appointment exploded my charges had published in the past liquidation of the Tammany, are not a body to be trusted. The press suppressed the facts about the judge. Mr. Banton's selection suggests a body of men which I am not familiar with the facts that he wanted suppressed.

FACTS TO PREVENT A PROPAGANDA PLANT
In the light of the apparently deliberate and calculated effort on the part of Mr. Banton, it is necessary that I speak of the selection of judge based upon only part of the facts, it should also be known that the District Attorney and the press well know that if I did not put in the charges which two years ago vigorously criticised the judge selected by Mr. Banton, because I did not know of the charges which are exemplified in liquor criminals given jail sentences by a colleague of the man in the district, and that this criticism (the facts now known) were the subject of the report published in the press, being printed in full by the leading newspapers of the New York City.

If Mr. Banton and his propaganda allies of the press did not believe that the fact of this emphatic criticism created a doubt in the public mind as to the ability of the League Superintendent, why should they suppress it when they have the chance? I am not going to go into the various facts in detail, but if you will read them all, you will see that the entire story is not to be found in the Anti-Saloon League in the ten years since the present superintendent has been in office, and that his record is thoroughly clean and free of any suspicion or dishonesty, in the entire county of which that is true.

NO REFERENCE TO JUDICIAL CAPACITY OR OFFICIAL ATTITUDE OF JUDGE
I have not stated, nor do I wish to state, that the judge has any responsibility to the American press for his support or his attitude in the case. I have no objection to make to this judge and no occasion to say anything that touches upon the dis- charge of his official duties. It is my duty to assume that this judge, if appointed by the governor, will discharge his official duties fairly and impartially, and I give him a square deal according to his conception of what is required by fidelity to his judicial oath.

But Mr. Banton has confused the issue. All the jobbers of the judges generally and the judge of his own selection is apparently not a wet, for there is no intent on the part of the judge to secure a judge personally favorable to him, whatever good he thinks that will do him, whereas I have raised the question of the appointment to the State judge to every person that I believe is personally unfavorable to me, and I believe whatever good it may do him will do me no good at all. I have not the least intention to seek a justice of the peace or anything else. I am seeking to bring about the anti-Saloon League in its management will merely seek to carry on the work of the organization as it now stands.

ALSO PROTECTED BY PREDICTION IN FAVOR
I am also absolutely protected in this matter as clean of conspiracy. I do not believe that Mr. Banton is not favorably disposed toward prohibition, the Anti-Saloon League or its management will merely seek to carry on the work of the organization as it now stands. I refer to the District Attorney and the influences whose wishes and purposes the District Attorney evidently is seeking to carry into effect.

WHY I REFUSE FOR ASK FOR A CHANGE OF VENUE
The securing of an up-State judge confirms the suspicion which I have expressed that Tammany was not only willing but anxious to get the case completely away from New York, and that, while there might have been a perfunctory show of resistance, the District Attorney would have been very glad if I had requested Governor O'Connell to have the case transferred to the District Attorney in this action, to ask for a change of venue and the re-appointment of the District Attorney.

I decided months ago, however, that having the advantage of position on Tammany, since the District Attorney cannot interfere in the case, the best means of doing anything that would let Tammany escape from any unpleasant consequences of the opinion of the court.

Since I failed to fall into Tammany's trap on this point, and was able to get a jury that was prejudiced against me, the case out of New York County, the best Tammany could do was to ask for an up-State judge to come down to New York County with the support of the draft and sobriety, attempt to do by the weakness of his case."
THE LEGISLATURE MIGHT ASK FOR AN EXPLANATION

THOUSANDS OF DRY PROTESTANT CHURCHES THROUGH ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE BOARD OF DIRECTORS ASK LEGISLATIVE INVESTIGATION OF NEW YORK CITY DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND JUDGES.

Clear by his own admission respecting his political ambitions, the character of the District Attorney's chief witness, the connection between this Tammany affair and the Rockefeller affair, the attitude of the district attorney's chief witness, and the fact that in the legal official authorization of the payment of the money charged to be stolen, and finally the discrimination of the District Attorney in the granting of the grand jury subpoenas, all of which would be revealed by the investigation. The District Attorney's chief witness, and the grand jury are all of which would be revealed by the investigation. The District Attorney's chief witness, and the grand jury are all of which would be revealed by the investigation.

Yours to make it cost them dear,

State Superintendent, Anti-Saloon League of New York.

(EDITORIAL FROM BROOKLYN STANDARD-UNION, Tuesday, December 4, 1923, which is editorially vet, but the Only Paper in Greater New York City that has Played Fair and Told the People the Truth about This and Related Transactions.)

THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE OF NEW YORK

Release Friday, November 20, 1923.

To the Republican Mayor of the New York Metropolitan Area:

The Anti-Saloon League of New York, in the name of over a million members, and after extensive and careful investigation of the case, hereby presents the following facts:

1. THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
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To the Editor of the Post-Standard:

My attention has been called to Mr. Myron H. Bent's discussion of William H. Anderson in your column Thursday morning. It so happens that I am one of those individuals who, according to Mr. Bent, are entitled to no sympathy because we remain loyal to the object of the gentleman's attack. As a matter of fact, Mr. Editor, I don't feel particularly in need of sympathy, and suggest that it were better saved for those people who are so mentally constituted that they can glory in the conviction of Mr. Anderson.

Why is our friend so anxious to convince us of the fairness of Anderson's trial? Is not his frenzied attempt to show that the trial was entirely just, indicative of his fear that people will not think the treatment of the case wholly regular? Our friend begins his discourse by calling Mr. Anderson a tyrant. This he justifies by Anderson's habit of fighting back regardless of who his foe might be, or how powerful his opponent's influence. Because intimidation was non-effective, because he would not compromise with the evils with which he fought, he becomes suddenly a tyrant.

Because he was such a superb fighter, such an irresistible foe of the liquor traffic, he has been "riding for a fall," not unconsciously, but fully aware that the repeatedly worshiped boa constrictor, unable to win an affair, open fight, were attempting to accomplish by unfair means that which they could never accomplish by fair.

We respectfully suggest that if the gentleman will read the evidence as presented to the jury he may be able to revise his second paragraph without our assistance, but inasmuch as the text of his letter indicates that he either has no source of reliable information, or in the other event is unwilling to use it, I will endeavor to help him obtain a little better grasp of the salient points of the case. I wonder if he had been in Anderson's place and had been tried in a city whose "wet" press had created a tremendous prejudicial influence against him, by a jury of men who were opponents of the cause for which he had worked and in whose service he had acquired their animosity, he would still believe, beyond reasonable doubt that the trial was absolutely just and unimpeachably fair.

The writer says that "if he was one of the dryest of the drys" (which he very evidently isn't, judging from the blind prejudice with which his letter abounds), and had been sitting on the Anderson jury he would have convicted him for insulting his intelligence with such a fantastic tale. By "fantastic tale" I presume he refers to the account of John T. King, Harry Mann and his two assistants, Green and Johnson, who were pictured by the prosecuting attorney and the "wet" press as being imaginary, mythical figures.
In the first place the evidence presented in connection with these men had absolutely no relation to the forgery charge, and no verdict could be rightfully returned which was based thereon. In so far as it affects Mr. Anderson's guilt of the crime charged in the forgery indictment it makes not one particle of difference whether the statements regarding these men are true or not. Secondly, Messrs. Mann, Green and Johnson were identified during the last day of the trial by Mr. Bloomer who happens to be engaged in the same business as they, that of "publicity men". Only the story of Mr. King could not be substantiated, due, probably, partly to the lapse of time, and partly to the fact that Anderson was pledged to secrecy to protect Mr. King, a pledge which an honorable man would not break even to save himself from being victimized by the misunderstanding sure to result. No great amount of credulity is required to picture a man of wealth, who, because of business connections, found it necessary to give money under an assumed name, in order that he might be protected from the common practice of intimidation among the wets. But as I have previously suggested, it is not germane to the question of a forgery of the Anti-Saloon League's books, and is consequently of no importance in determining Mr. Anderson's guilt or innocence of the charge.

The gentleman states very positively that Anderson had a fair trial. Certainly justice sometimes takes a peculiar form. Here we have a man accused of a crime against a corporate body which denies that such a crime was committed, and which denial is subsequently substantiated in the trial, but, despite this, we find the District Attorney's Office zealously engaged in an effort to secure an indictment, we see the case submitted to a grand jury, which, on a basis of the same evidence on which the trial jury voted a conviction, failed to find an indictment, we see the case re-submitted to another grand jury which voted a true bill, and also recommended a legislative investigation, thereby giving their actions a strong political flavor. We find Mr. Anderson's counsel denied permission to inspect the minutes of the second grand jury, although the same court granted this privilege in six other cases then pending, including a murder case.

Those people who are familiar with the facts of the case know that there was no moral wrong, and these things make them wonder if the verdict of guilty even on a technicality is not a gross miscarriage of justice. Any alteration of the demands' books such as Anderson ordered made with the intent to injure or defraud, to constitute forgery in the third degree. Thus the prosecution was unable to do, being hindered chiefly by the fact that no injury did result. In fact, the evidence, if I may be allowed to hazard an opinion, tends to show that an injury did occur but could not have occurred under the circumstances.
Why isn't William H. Anderson in jail? Simply because the forces which brought about his conviction dare not put him there as long as there is any prospect of an appeal because they know there would be very little probability of a higher court sustaining the verdict, which, in event Mr. Anderson served time, would make them liable to a suit for false imprisonment.

The statements regarding the Anti-Saloon League are so obviously incorrect that I need not discuss them. If the gentleman really believes them and is sincere in his attitude I trust that he will take the trouble to look up the facts of the case before he indulges in any further criticism. It is very easy to kick a man when he is down.
Is William H. Anderson, Former Dry Leader, a MARTYR? NO.

By ANDREW B. WOOD

The convict appellant, a former employee of the Anti-Saloon League, thinks of himself as such.

A dry leader who was closely associated with him eight and a half years and is now a Pastor in Brooklyn thinks the case grates on the sympathies of friends of prohibition, but is a necessary challenge to unethic outlooks on behalf of a good cause. Religious bodies should consider.
So frequently have I been asked what I think of the case of William H. Anderson, that I decided that one who before his troubles began had stood side by side with him for over eight and a half years, for live and a half of them as Assistant State Superintendent—for more years than anyone except his official secretary—should state his position.

Of course I was interviewed by representatives of the press, by the District Attorney’s Office which I believe has done a good public service, and by others, who have been much impressed by the story. Neither my voice nor my silence has ever been purchased by fear or favor. My first concern was to determine the facts, and I have gone twenty-five months at a time now to say something more than I have ever said, and, even though the principal is in the public eye the activities of some enthusiastic dry advocates and religious bodies that are following the lead of the Prohibitionists is of some concern. It persists, and inject into the public mind a question to which they profoundly desire an answer.

WAT WILL CHURCHES DO? Was it right for Anderson while already engaged and paid by the League for its investigation to carry on the work for the benefit of the churches and the clergy? May not they, as well as others, do the same thing? Surely the churches shall have a voice in the case, and the public shall have the advantage of the results. It is not easy to say what shall be the outcome, but I am sure that the churches will not be silenced. They are a great force for good and shall not be kept from their work, and, in the long run, the people will see that they are right.

ENDORSE? Was it right for Anderson to act as an endorser for the League paid by the League for its investigation of the cases? Will he be held responsible for the payments to the church for his service as an endorser? Will he be held responsible for the services of the funds paid to him by the League? It is likely that he will be held responsible for the services of the funds paid to him by the League. It is likely that he will be held responsible for the services of the funds paid to him by the League.

WAS IT RIGHT FOR ANDERSON TO SERVE AS ENDORSER? Was it right for Anderson to serve as endorser presented to the League Directors on March 30th, 1918, that he had raised and advanced for the League a substantial sum of money? Was it right for Anderson to raise and advanced for the League a substantial sum of money? Was it right for Anderson to serve as endorser presented to the League Directors on March 30th, 1918, that he had raised and advanced for the League a substantial sum of money?

WHAT IS THE LEAGUE? And what is the purpose of the League? Is it to benefit the churches? Is it to benefit the clergy? Is it to benefit the people? Is it to benefit the churches? Is it to benefit the clergy? Is it to benefit the people? Is it to benefit the churches? Is it to benefit the clergy? Is it to benefit the people? Is it to benefit the churches? Is it to benefit the clergy? Is it to benefit the people?
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Editorial from the N. Y. Westchester Globe, February 16, 1924.

---

ANDERSON VERDICT.

One of the remarkable features in the conviction of William H. Anderson, Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of the State of New York, is the detailed explanations that are being made by the various officials connected with the case.

When a person is convicted of a crime, he is brought before the court, and after a few words is given his sentence.

In the Anderson case the sentence was given by the court after an exhaustive explanation of why the degree of punishment rendered and prison was given. Never in the history of this city has a presiding judge and prosecuting attorney given such a detailed explanation of the part they took in a criminal case, and also the part that the jury assumed, with a record of their politics, religious religion and race, as in this case. Why all this explanation over the conviction of Anderson? It certainly was not made because of the position he held, because a prominent political supporter of the bootlegging interests in this city remarked over a year ago that "they were going to guzzle Anderson".

Is not the real reason of these explanations made by the judge who presided at the trial, and by the District Attorney at a church service, that it is back of Anderson, fighting for the greatest cause since the time of human slavery, comprising millions of God-fearing, Christian people, that they are endeavoring to explain the work they did in the Anderson case? When Justice Tompkins was giving his explanation of the verdict, was he not thinking of the thousands of church spires pointing heavenward throughout this great commonwealth, and throughout the nation, with the millions of Christian people who are united on one great battlefront fighting the greatest curse that ever visited mankind? Anderson stood before him a single individual. Back of him were millions of people. When a member of the "underground railroad" that freed thousands of colored slaves before the Civil War, was being tried in the county court at West Chester, Pa. the attorney for the slave owner said that the south did not fear the man who had committed the alleged crime of trying to set men free, but the millions of people that sympathized with him was what the south was fearful of.

The indictment and conviction of Anderson was staged like a drama. Every detail was evidently planned by the Tammany political machine of this city. It was a Tammany District Attorney that conducted the trial, and a Tammany Governor that designated the judge that presided in the court.

In the prologue to the trial Tammany in its effort to dodge the responsibility portrayed the judge as an enrolled Republican from up the state, a Protestant and Grand Master of Masons of the State of New York, and the District Attorney as an elder in a Protestant Church. This is the same Tammany that is supporting every movement that is now working to break down the strict enforcement of the prohibition law, so that the grog shop can return again.

Never in the history of this country was a trial so staged to convict one of the leaders of the prohibition cause as the one against Anderson. It took over a year to complete the work.
The passage of the Eighteenth Amendment came through the halls of legislation. That is the only way it could be accomplished. Fifty years ago a small band of men and women started an organization called the "Good Templars" in this country. To belong to that organization you had to be a hero. The purpose of it was the ultimate wiping out of the liquor curse in this country. The job looked to them to be a big one, and it was. Back of it was all that stood for morality and Christianity. Its membership was small, but the power of its purpose was great. Like a ball of snow rolling down the mountain side, it increased in size as the years passed on. The men who laughed and jeered at it in the halls of legislation, realized that it demanded their support, and if refused, would encompass their defeat.

As the years rolled on, Congress began to realize its force, and the day arrived when the forces for prohibition became so strong that Congress passed measures authorizing the states to vote upon a constitutional amendment. That amendment had to have the approval of the Legislatures of thirty six states. The state of New York, with its great metropolitan center, controlled politically by Tammany Hall, the powerful ally of the liquor interests, was determined to go on record against that amendment, while thousands of Christian people were determined to place the great empire state in the group of thirty six states that was going to ratify it. It was then that the Anti-Saloon League, composed of a number of Protestant ministers, sought the strongest and most fearless leader they could get to lead the fight against the most powerful political liquor combine in the nation. William H. Anderson was the man selected, and with the promise that he would make the fight in his own way, he became the leader.

Anderson made the fight and won the victory. The state of New York was placed on the roll of states that championed a cause that gave to the people of the nation their greatest blessing. He became the centre of attack from the most vicious and corrupt influence in the life of the republic. His fight for a great cause stands without a parallel in the history of any nation who has come out of tyranny into freedom. Nearly all the great crusaders in the progress of the human race have had to suffer prison and death, while those who opposed have disappeared in the onward march of American civilization.

The prosecution of Anderson cannot be explained to the satisfaction of the Christian people of this state and nation by any Tammany public official who never assisted in helping to bring prohibition to this state. The martyr in a prison cell has never weakened the cause of right, and strengthened the cause of wrong.
THE CONVICTION OF WILLIAM H. ANDERSON

The temperance forces of America have all been greatly disturbed by the conviction of William H. Anderson, an officer of the Union League of New York State, who was charged with forgery.

We are well acquainted with Mr. Anderson. He served us as attorney when we tried a cause for a client of Mrs. Smith, and we served him in the same capacity in the state of New York. He now has served for twenty-four years. We have seen him under every conceivable kind of trial, of trouble, sorrow, and even of temptation, and on every occasion we have seen him only exhibit the highest qualities of Christian manhood.

We were distressed, as were others, over the charge against him in New York, and we were somewhat chagrined over the outcome. But we were prepared to meet the storm that was coming from New York city, better, probably, than most people do.

The Treasurer of the Union League of New York, a man of near fifty years in New York against an impecunious enemy, and as such he has had the opportunity to gain considerable experience in the art of forgery and to learn the value of each note, and in some cases, the value of a note is small enough to do with the question of his guilt. We do not believe that it would be possible for any lawyer to prove him guilty in New York City before a jury on behalf of prohibition. If there would be a jury for Mr. Anderson, we think on which the case could be decided the other way, we know there would be a jury that would believe Mr. Anderson in New York City, that he would be so much better off.

We have read very carefully and have made personal investigation of the character of all the people charged with forgery, and we can assure you that Mr. Anderson was as good as any that ever walked in the State of New York.

It must be a source of satisfaction to all of the prohibition leaders and workers in America to hear in mind that after nearly thirty years of the prohibition movement, and the money that has been raised by the churches known as the Anti-Saloon League, there has not been a single case of forgery in the United States.

The judge has been publicly charged with appropriating funds of the Anti-Saloon League to his personal ends, and has been clearly shown to have taken large sums of money which he did not possess.

Let us understand exactly what this charge was of. This charge was of a forgery, in which the Anti-Saloon League, a religious body and an organization, committed the crime of forger the change of currency, but it was not forgery as it is committed by the forgery of the book of the Anti-Saloon League.

It was charged that the check was forged as a forgery, and that the Anti-Saloon League had committed this crime. But it was made out of the book of the Anti-Saloon League, and the check was signed by the person who signed the check, and the check was given to the person who signed the check.

It was a forgery, as a forgery, the Anti-Saloon League, a religious body and an organization, committed the crime of forgery, and committed the crime of forgery with the purpose of covering the purpose of the forgery.

And such as a Tammany con- trolled district, in a whiskey controlled district, in a personally aggressive district to a man as effective as Mr. Anderson was, they were able to find his guilty.

And of course, there has been the greatest amount of publicity given to this and the greater because Mr. Anderson was an officer of the Tammany Hall, or the Anti-Saloon League workers in this country. There was no greater amount of publicity than was given to this case, and it was given to this case that seriously reflected upon him personally in any other way. But let us go further. We are sorry to tell you how he originally received the money which he has been charged with forgery, but we are not prepared to say that he did not receive the money.

This testimony of his was not germane to this case, and it is not germane to this case in any way, and it is not germane to under cross-examination. But Mr. Anderson vol- untarily testified before the jury, and the jury un- stand undoubtedly because of a clear conscience and a clear conscience.

The story of how he receiieved it when judged by the manner in which most people receive money was a story of forgery.

But we will not go into any detail of the conditions which existed in Baltimore at the time and the conditions which existed in New York, and that desire for some people who were glad to contribute the funds, and this is the way we would like to conceal their identity, it is not as fantastic as it is. As a rule of two or three years ago, a contribution was taken up in their city for the Anti- Saloon League, and this was taken up within the last forty thousand dollars, the competition be- itance basket, $50,000, within any name, and all the carriers only gave as it was called.

But in any case, Mr. Anderson was con- victed only on this technical charge. And we do not believe there is a single individual who has heard the record of the thing with anything like an unbiased mind that believes there was any evidence adduced or at least thought ever entertained by Mr. Anderson as to any ulterior intent whatever in making that neces- sary charge upon the books if the transaction which was committed.

Had he any ulterior motive, he would not have brought the charge against him, nor would he have put the money in his pocket without any evi- dence. And the fact that the whole transaction is to be understood by the jury that the whole transaction take place in a manner as to satisfy the prosecution, and only in a part of the whole transaction, because the solicitor turned the funds over to him personally. Mr. Anderson would only needed to show in any case that the solicitors turned the money upon him upon the books and the site of the system that there has ever been or ever has been done, he had made a contribution of that amount by exception.

But Mr. Anderson did not do this. He made the books appear as they were, and he charged the amount of $4,000, and appearing as being handed to the solicitor as an excepted amount, he acknowledged that Mr. Anderson did not personally profit and hand over the $4,000, but that it was the solicitor that was to receive the payment, and that any manner by this transaction. But technically, it was a forgery, but it was sufficient to convict Mr. Anderson in that kind of a case.

Who those men who know Mr. Anderson's career up to this time and particularly those who have been associated with him in his great work to promote the cause of the anti-saloon, have found him boundless faith and confidence in his personal character and integrity. And instead of being disturbed in our own mind over this, we have learned from the study of the facts of this case, and from the study of the facts, will consider it amazing that a man can hold such a position in the Anti-Saloon League, fighting energy, striking, constant, hard at the struggle, and as an experienced man to be experienced in his mind, has such a clear and clear character.

It is a question of the light of opposition and criticism and defeatfulness upon a year of years with probably a million dollars going through his hands and administered and that they had to reach down to a technic of this character into a court of Tammany, and they had to go to the court to his name himself.

A book showed exactly what had taken place. There was an attempt at self-defense. Some people might object to the solicitor soliciting on a per- sonal basis. But whatever it may be, the question of the conviction of Mr. Anderson, and believe that would be a question of the conviction of Mr. Anderson, and believe that would be a question of the conviction of Mr. Anderson, and believe that would be a question of the conviction of Mr. Anderson, and believe that would be a question of the conviction of Mr. Anderson.
LEADER OF DRY'S VICTIM OF WETS, PASTOR STATES

Jailing of Anderson Causes Protest Sermon by Rev. Dr. Cushman.

Protest against the jailing of William M. Anderson, former head of the Anti-saloon League was made publicly at Tompkinsville Christian Church by Rev. Dr. C. A. Cushman.

A militant membership in the congregation of 1,000 people, Dr. Cushman said, would not allow the jailing of the Anti-saloon leader on charges of a breach of the law.

Dr. Cushman, a Methodist, said that he had grown up on the west coast of the country and knew what it was to be deprived of all needful things by the law.

Predicting a defeat for drys, the pastor said that if the drys were defeated in the state, the movement to make America dry would fall flat.

JUNE 23, 1913

State of New York, Superior Court of Kings County,

Robert W. Anderson,

Prominent leader of the Anti-Saloon League, was granted habeas corpus yesterday by Judge George H. McNeill.

Dr. Cushman, the pastor of the Tompkinsville Christian Church, said that he had not heard of the court action, but that he expected the drys to lose.
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Clifton Springs Woman Observes 86th Birthday

Rochestrians Attend Wagner-Seager Wedding in Home at North Rose
SYRACUSE, Mar. 5—William Anderson, state superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, addressing the annual meeting of the ministers of central New York today, renewed his charge that Raymond B. Fosdick, representative of the Rockefeller family, has been supporting a conspiracy to ruin him and has helped bring the inquiry now before one of his representatives could turn up in the hands of those attempting to convict any man in the public mind in advance of official information.

"If it was a creditable thing to try to convict me of a crime, why did not Mr. Fosdick go to the district attorney's office and make a complaint or come out in the open and formally ask for an investigation in accordance with the policy of frankness called for in his recent statement issued in his defense?"
about the grand jury investi-
gating conducted into Anderson's
allegation of a $24,700 publicity item on the
league's books.

While repeating his charge against
Mr. Fosdick, Mr. Anderson denied
that he had accused Assistant District
Attorney Pecora of New York of hav-
ing any part in the alleged conspiracy
against him. Mr. Fosdick, he said,
knew all the details of the league's
financial affairs, and had he believed
irregularities were present, should
have called for an inquiry in stead
of allowing others to start it and then
adding it.

Mr. Fosdick's personal animus
against him, Mr. Anderson declared,
was first made manifest in January,
1921, when Mr. Fosdick attacked Gov-
ernor Miller's prohibition program
while the league supported it. In
April of the same year Mr. Anderson
continued, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., in
appointing Mr. Fosdick his personal
representative, openly recognized the
friction between the two men.

Mr. Anderson charged that from that
time on, Mr. Fosdick systematically
tried to "run me out" of the league
and tried "to get something he could
use against me."

Let Him See Report

"At a supposedly friendly inter-
view," the speaker continued, "Mr.
Fosdick asked about the $24,700 ac-
nowledged indebtedness due from the
Anti-Saloon League on which I said
that I had credited certain money re-
ceived. He asked if there was any-
things to show for that indebtedness. I
answered that there was a report
made by a committee and unanimously
adopted by the board. He asked if he
might see that report. I agreed un-
hesitatingly. It was absolutely straight.
The report covered only part of the
story because the board knew a great
many of the facts which were neces-
sary to correct understanding of the
situation.

"Any decently fair and honorable
man in Mr. Fosdick's place, if he
found anything wrong from this re-
port, with the frankness Mr. Rocke-
teller expresses in..."
Notice of Hon. Edwin C. Smith, the Surrogate of the County of Steuben, in Surrogate's Court, notice is hereby given that all persons having claims against Milo M. Acker, late of the city of Hornell in said County of Steuben, deceased, are required to exhibit the same with the vouchers thereof to the undersigned, the Executrix of the last Will and Testament of said deceased at her residence, 29 Center Street in the City of Hornell in the said County of Steuben, on or before the 20th day of March, 1923.

Dated September 14, 1923.

MARY C. ACKER,
Executrix

SHIRLEY E. BROWN,
Attorney for Executrix,
Hornell, N. Y.

Notice to Creditors
Estate of John W. GIlbury
Pursuant to an order of Hon. Edwin C. Smith, the Surrogate of the County of Steuben, in Surrogate's Court, notice is hereby given that all persons having claims against John W. Gilbury, late of the city of Hornell in said County of Steuben, deceased, are required to exhibit the same with the vouchers thereof to the undersigned, the Executrix of the last Will and Testament of said deceased at her residence, 29 Center Street in the City of Hornell in the said County of Steuben, on or before the 20th day of March, 1923.

Dated September 14, 1923.

MARY C. ACKER,
Executrix

SHIRLEY E. BROWN,
Attorney for Executrix,
Hornell, N. Y.
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had asked me or the league board for an explanation. He asked nothing and said nothing. The fact that he did not follow this policy of frankness would seem to indicate clearly that Mr. Fosdick knew that if this thing were brought out openly and I had the slightest warning that he was raising any question about the $24,700, he would get the worst of it on a showdown.

Says It Personal Fight

"The facts seem to establish beyond reasonable doubt that Mr. Fosdick was willing to injure the Anti-Saloon League, attacking its board, representing the churches and allow all gains in the state to be swept away in order to carry out his purpose to get rid of me and to force upon this militant agency of the churches a management that would be satisfactory to the wealthy wet business interests in New York City.

"I will not believe, until Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., definitely says so himself, that he approves, in the interests of frankness, any kind of secret, stealthy manipulation by which the contents of a document in the possession of only
material and of good taste could desire to post yourself on what to wear for the coming season. Without hesitation, select the right now while selecting the best.
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