THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE OF NEW YORK
906 Broadway, New York City.

Release One O'clock Monday,
afternoon, March 6, 1933.

NOTE TO THE EDITOR:

In order to make a complete connected story the first part of the following address refers, with new sidelights, to some matters that have previously been given out for publication but most of the address covering the letter from Mr. Rockefeller and the details of the interview with Mr. Fosdick has never before been released.

Speaking at the Annual Union Meeting of the Ministers of Central New York at Syracuse Monday, March 5, 1933, William H. Anderson, State Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, Said:

ANDERSON GIVES DETAIL FACTS ABOUT FOSDICK'S RELATION TO CONSPIRACY TO RUIN HIM.

I not only have not accused the District Attorney of New York County of having any part in a conspiracy to ruin me but have explicitly disclaimed intention to make any such charges in anything I have said. However, I shall continue to expose the conspiracy that exists, and the relation of Raymond B. Fosdick, Rockefeller representative to it, regardless of the efforts to silence me by statements about other matters.

When I made the first move to show that Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick Rockefeller employee, had violated confidence to assist those who were trying to blacken and destroy me in advance of the termination of the District Attorney's inquiry, he was reported in the papers as laughing and treating it as a "humorous incident". That he no longer considers it a laughing matter is shown by the fact that both Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. and the Acting District Attorney have made statements in his behalf, both of which I concede to be true but neither of which touches the real issue.

Nobody ever suggested that Mr. Fosdick, as the representative of the Messrs. Rockefeller, has openly lined up with the wets. Denial of that is answering a man of straw. But Mr. Fosdick's personal animus against me has evidently led him to do things for the wets that they could not have done for themselves and which are despicable almost beyond belief. I shall prove by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. himself the clash of opinion which supplies a basis for such animus.

My respect for Mr. Rockefeller, Jr. and my appreciation of what he has done for the Anti-Saloon League in no sense obligate me to submit in silence to the secretly manifested hostility of his employee who has evidently deceived him in some particulars.

With all of Mr. Fosdick's shiftiness and supposed cleverness it will be impossible for him to convince most fair-minded people that he has not been "caught with the goods on" not only in helping to ruin me in the public mind but also in trying to deceive the public and perhaps his employer as to such activity on his part.

THE COURAGEOUS, HONEST COURSE FOR FOSDICK.

If Mr. Fosdick believed I had committed a crime and was sure enough about it to overcome the legal presumption of innocence to which I am entitled, and felt so convinced as to eliminate the possibility that there might be facts not known to him which would be a satisfactory explanation of something that he questioned, it would have been not only his right but his duty to call it to the attention of the District Attorney, and I assume that Mr. Rockefeller, Jr. would have approved such action. This would have been honest, courageous and above-board. If guilty I would have had no right to complain. If wrongfully accused I would have had ample civil remedy for damages.

And apparently that is just what he was afraid of. And the Acting District Attorney's alibi for Mr. Fosdick fixes in the record that Mr. Fosdick lacked the courage, manhood and frankness to make direct to that official the charges that he has helped by indirection to put over on me through propaganda.

Mr. Rockefeller, Jr.'s authorized statement in defense of Mr. Fosdick calls for frankness. It says: "We have ourselves published them (gifts to the Anti-Saloon League) on several occasions * * * * * the source of all receipts of organizations such as the Anti-Saloon League should be made known". Yet, as published without denial and admitted by the District Attorney, Mr. Fosdick went to the District Attorney's office a few days after the inquiry started. The same day the New York City papers were given, evidently by or through Mr. Fosdick, material for a story which they said was authoritative, which gave the public the definite impression that Rockefeller contributions amounting to $100,000 a year had been cut off because of the pending charges. And Mr. Fosdick, representative of a principal who in defending him publicly called for frankness from the Anti-Saloon League, knowing that the Rockefeller contributions had never been as much as $100,000 a year, and knowing that they had been cut about a year and a half before, immediately following his taking charge, and long before these "charges" were even thought of, from about $75,000 a year to $35,000, allowed that viciously false statement to stand and that damaging false impression to be retained by the general public.

Where was the frankness in this on the part of Mr. Fosdick? In the light of his proved animus against me and his undenied effort to eliminate me as Superintendent and his defacto assaults upon even the good faith of the League Board of Directors representing the churches, what possible reason could Mr. Fosdick have had first for inspiring such a story and then for confirming it by silence except a desire to help crush and discredit the administration of the League, - not only the Superintendent but the Board, - by giving and consenting to the false impression that subscribers representing 40% of the League revenue and inferentially representing a controlling interest had repudiated the League management over the matters that formed the basis of the inquiry? Mr. Fosdick makes a great pose of frankness. Why was he not honest enough to tell the truth in this case?

MR. ROCKEFELLER, JR. RECOGNIZED DIFFERENCE OF OPINION.

Now, as to the question of Mr. Fosdick's animus, leaving out here the ancient history. In January, 1921, Mr. Fosdick publicly attacked Governor Miller's enforcement program, - that is, the proposed Mullan-Gage State Enforcement Code which was the program of the churches and backed by the Anti-Saloon League as their agency. There was public controversy between him and me on this question. In the course of this he said for publication the same kind of stuff that the wets are saying today.

Evidently Mr. Rockefeller, Jr. had this controversy in mind and recognized it as a possible basis for animus and a legitimate ground on my part to fear reprisals, or else Mr. Fosdick himself recognized the incongruity of the situation and mentioned it to Mr. Rockefeller, for on April 29, 1921, Mr. Rockefeller, Jr. in notifying me that Mr. Fosdick had been selected to represent them in considering applications of the Anti-Saloon League said "While you and he might not always agree on method or detail, I am confident you can count on his complete sympathy and understanding as regards the vital matter at issue".

Unfortunately, however, as the facts prove, Mr. Fosdick, utterly ignorant of the spirit and genius of the Anti-Saloon League, never having uttered a friendly or helpful word in the fight, proved to be one of those who claim to be in favor of prohibition, but who in fact are against everything that is necessary to win, enforce and hold prohibition, in what is a warfare as distinguished from a debating society, and would rather have no prohibition progress than have it contrary to their notions. He had no hesitation in assuming that he knew off-hand on this question more than the experts in that field.

FOSDICK TRIED TO RUN OFF WITH WHOLE WORKS.

At my first interview with Mr. Fosdick as Rockefeller representative he bluntly said in substance that I was disqualified for the work because I had antagonized so many (wets). All through the League year this was his attitude, becoming aggressive early in 1932. He poured this hostility against me, even questioning the usefulness of the Anti-Saloon League itself, into the ears of an employee whose loyalty to me Mr. Fosdick certified to me while he, Fosdick, was using him in the effort to eliminate me, sending him back to the League office to repeat these attacks to other members of the staff in an effort to alarm and unsettle them.

Mr. Fosdick unctuously and plausibly told me in 1931 that the reason why the Messrs. Rockefeller could not contribute even for another year while giving notice so we could make adjustment, the $75,000 in round figures which they had given each of the three years before, was because a contribution of that size would impose upon them too much responsibility with respect to the management of the League. But Mr. Starr J. Murphy, as much of a Christian gentleman as Mr. Rockefeller himself, who had known the League work from the beginning and was in hearty sympathy with it, had not felt called upon to try to dictate the management of the League for the three years that $75,000 had been given. He never made the slightest effort in that direction. Yet Mr. Fosdick before the first year was over attempted to run off with the League works and junk the Superintendent and Board on the strength of a $35,000 contribution.

ATTEMPT TO RUN ME OUT LAST FALL.

There was an attempt staged by two discharged League employees early last fall to run me out in which Mr. Fosdick was involved. The discredited Robert G. Davey demanded that one of the League directors appear at Fosdick's office. Mr. Fosdick found then, his second attempt, that there was nothing doing and that the League Board could not be stampeded. He evidently found that this discharged employee whom he had been using was too vulnerable, among other things having written me a threatening letter giving me two hours in which to pay a large sum of money to him.

Notwithstanding Mr. Rockefeller's proposal of frankness, Mr. Fosdick when I conferred with him late last fall raised absolutely no objection on the basis of "charges" previously made by this ex-employee. He had in the meantime talked with Dr. Burrell, State President, and gave Dr. Burrell the impression he was entirely satisfied with the facts. I asked him then for an additional subscription of $35,000 to bridge over the damage caused by the cut of $50,000 the previous year without warning. Not a word was said by him in objection to any alleged "commissions". Not a word was said by him as late as last November or early December to the effedt that the Messrs Rockefeller had quit contributing. The only objection that he offered when I talked the matter over with him was that it was unwise to give a larger amount than the $35,000 contribution, - that the public antagonism to prohibition jeopardized successful administration of other benevolences. He admitted previously that most of Mr. Rockefeller's advisers if not hostile to prohibition as it stands were at least unfriendly to the Anti-Saloon League. Either no objection existed in his mind at that time, and the Rockefellers had not cut off their support as the January 30th story inspired by him said, or else instead of being frank, as Mr. Rockefeller suggests, he was deliberately trying to deceive me in order to get something out of me that he could use.

HOW HE MANIFESTLY VIOLATED CONFIDENCE HE HAD ASKED FOR.

At this supposedly friendly interview, when I never dreamed I had to be on guard against a representative of John D. Rockefeller Jr., the Christian man of the world, Mr. Fosdick asked about the $34,700 acknowledged indebtedness due from the Anti-Saloon League upon which I said that I had credited certain money received. He asked if there was anything to show that indebtedness. I answered that there was a report made by a committee and adopted unanimously by the Board. He asked if he might see that report. I agreed unhesitatingly. It was absolutely straight. I was not ashamed of it. I sent him the

original and only copy as I can easily prove. The report covered only part of the story, because the Board knew a great many of the facts which were necessary to a complete understanding of the situation. These would cheerfully have been given upon request. There had been no secret about it. Mr. Rockefeller's office knew of it some years before through Mr. Murphy. It had been publicly stated before some 500 ministers at a public meeting of the ministers of New York City and vicinity by Dr. Burrell, the State President, three years before, and published. I had some delay and trouble getting this report back from Mr. Fosdick.

The facts indicate that in my frank statement to the Board of the obligation of confidence resting upon me, which confidence in the light of proved results secured by the League in advance the Board respected, Mr. Fosdick saw his first, and last, chance to have me discredited through propaganda even if an attempt to indict and convict me should fail.

EFFORT TO COVER FOSDICK'S TRACKS

The Acting District Attorney says that he did not receive his information direct from Mr. Fosdick. I assume that is true. Yet Mr. Fosdick was the only person aside from myself who ever had this report alone in his possession long enough for it to be copied. Then the Evening Mail had it. It could have gotten it only from or through Mr. Fosdick. The Mail reporter who worked up the original story said, in trying to intimidate League employees to enlist against me, that leading contributors to the League were back of this move for "house-cleaning" in the League. There are no such large contributors so involved or inclined except the Messrs. Rockefeller as represented by Mr. Fosdick.

The Evening Mail, however was in touch with the District Attorney's office, as established from both ends. Mr. Stoddard, the editor of the Mail, told me January 35th that the charges against me had been quiescent, but had been revived by the District Attorney, and told me four hours before the inquiry opened that he would know in an hour whether the District Attorney was going ahead. The Acting District Attorney told me that same afternoon that he requested the Mail not to publish anything at that time, and later said for publication that he had made that request because he though such publication might embarrass him in his inquiry. The Acting District Attorney began that very first afternoon on this $34,700 fund in a way which clearly indicated to me that he already had considerable information about it. He must have known the contents of the Mail story or he would have had no basis for his statement that he feared publication of it would embarrass the inquiry. Which raises a bunch of interesting questions.

The scheme was evidently as supposedly clever as it was dark and disreputable. It was evidently intended by Mr. Fosdick to protect himself against any suspicion of complicity by leaving it to the District Attorney to turn up this $34,700 item quite accidentally in questioning on other matters, in which case it would have been utterly impossible to have established any violation of confidence upon Mr. Fosdick's part, or any assistance rendered by him to the movement existing outside of the District Attorney's office to blacken me with charges, regardless of their merit or truthfulness, in advance of the formal outcome of the inquiry.

EVENING MAIL SPILLED BEANS AND EXPOSED FOSDICK

This clever little scheme of smirching me, with Mr. Fosdick safely hidden, would probably have gone through if the Mail's foot had not slipped as usually happens to a frame-up. The Mail, through its star reporter who attempted to intimidate League employees into disloyalty and untruthfulness to bolster up his case, was evidently so afraid that this report would be successfully used in defense, and thus satisfy the public that there was no basis for an inquiry, unless parts of the report could be rushed out in advance, distorted and misrepresented, that he spilled the stuff from this report which only Mr. Fosdick had, before the District Attorney had started the inquiry at all, let alone had an opportunity to discover and be properly interested in the $34,700 item, which fact conclusively fixes

Mr. Fosdick's assistance to the forces which were operating outside the District Attorney's office. If the Mail had not been a hog in its effort to plaster everything on me at once or had heeded the District Attorney's request to hold off entirely for awhile, it would not have smeared Mr. Fosdick.

Any decently fair and honorable man in Mr. Fosdick's place, if he suspected anything wrong from this report, with the frankness Mr. Rockefeller recommends in defending him, would have 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 show-down.

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 gain in the State to be swept away, in order to carry out his desire to get rid of me and to force upon this militant agency of the federated churches a management that would be satisfactory to the wealty 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 only of his representative, could turn up in the hands of those attempting to convict any man in the public mind in advance of official action.

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 the blanket statement issued in his defense?

SOME SELF-EVIDENT REASONS WHY FOSDICK DIDN'T COME OUT OPENLY.

I am not surprised, though, that Mr. Fosdick did not like to come out and openly yoke himself alongside of a discharged, revengeful employee who two days after this conspiracy to prejudice the public against me had begun to operate, destroyed his value as a witness by giving out letters, which were published, which constitute self-conviction of attempted blackmail or extortion against the League Board, and has later confessed to defrauding the Government on his income tax. But if he was good enough for Mr. Fosdick to help along his effort at revenge Mr. Fosdick is not too good to avow him openly as a co-worker.

It is no wonder that Mr. Fosdick does not want to appear publicly in such company, in an effort to discredit not only the Superintendent of this agency of the churches but its Board of Directors. And on this I have additional information. It is no wonder that he did not want to admit that he had given assurance that large sums of money could be raised for work under a management that would placate the wealthy wets to a disgruntled employee, later discharged, who was himself trying to bring about a change in the League management that would enable this employee to promise a measure of protection to politicians in return for contributions.

I can understand why Mr. Fosdick was not anxious to be openly associated with a traitor who, while he was still on the League payroll, was proposing to have cut off from the League and contributed to another concern the sum of $25,000 which could not possibly have come from any other source than through Mr. Fosdick. The head of the concern intended to be the beneficiary of this shift was Robert G. Davey, another discharged, discredited employee of the Anti-Saloon League who peddled these charges utilized by Mr. Fosdick's fellow workers, not only to wet newspapers but to the organized wets themselves.

I can readily understand how Mr. Fosdick would have found it embarrassing to come out openly in connection with a blackening campaign timed to explode during the pendency at Albany of the movement to repeal the state prohibition enforcement law the original enactment of which he had publicly opposed.

I would infinitely rather be the victim of a frame-up and conspiracy, and under these false charges of stealing $24,700 from the movement to which I have given my life at a loss of many times $24,700 than to be capable, on so flimsy a basis, of having helped in the attempt to assassinate the character of a man who had done things for the common good that I myself lacked the vision and courage to undertake.

(Signed) WILLIAM H. ANDERSON.

State Superintendent,
Anti-Saloon League of New York.

Publicity Department, Anti-Saloon League of New York,
8th Floor, 906 Broadway, New York City.

Speaking at a Closed Session of the Regular Meeting, Monday Morning, March 26, 1923, of the Methodist Ministers of New York City and Vicinity, with Opportunity for Questions and Answers, William H. Anderson, State Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, Among Other Things, Said:

RAYMOND FOSDICK'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S ACTIVITY -- HIS ALLIANCE WITH DISCHARGED, DISCREDITED EMPLOYEES OF THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE

I am not through with Raymond B. Fosdick. I have already made a case against him, but I intend to complete it and rivet it until it is generally recognized that it is an unpopular and unprofitable undertaking for the hostile hired men of wealthy friends of dry enforcement to lend aid and comfort to propaganda conspiracies calculated to discredit the Anti-Saloon League and its management.

Before finishing, I intend to hang squarely on Mr. Fosdick the unsavory, de facto confederates, especially Davey and Phillips, discharged and discredited, with whom he has in fact allied himself in the movement to destroy me in order to gratify his personal animus. Incidentally, I shall show how callow and half-baked are his doctrinaire ideas even on a subject on which he poses as an authority when it comes into relation with the most important issue before the American people. Further, before I am done with him I shall make known where those who are so inclined can look up the record and find the facts that indicate how he double-crossed one of the greatest organizations in America, undertook to create friction between, misled and finally threw down its representatives.

However, today I have another and entirely different specific point to clinch.

ANOTHER LINK IN THE FOSDICK CHAIN

After Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., issued his statement in behalf of Mr. Fosdick which touched no real point at issue, I publicly showed conclusively three weeks ago, too far back for any tardy denial now, to a great Union Meeting of Ministers of Central New York at Syracuse at which the Post-Standard of that city said there were 400 ministers and other church representatives present, that Mr. Fosdick had a personal animus against me, that he had tried to eliminate me, and that he had been guilty of base betrayal of confidence and had given assistance to a conspiracy of propaganda to ruin me regardless of the effect on the Anti-Saloon League and the cause it represents. The full text of this speech was furnished to all New York papers, shown to him by some of them, and noted in the news reports of most of them.

Today I am going to show you that Mr. Fosdick is the man ultimately responsible for the Acting District Attorney's activity in an effort frankly avowed by that official to indict me for grand larceny for taking money the League Board voted me as justly due after I had risked it to save the League work in this State.

I shall do this without the slightest criticism of the District Attorney. I have been very careful not to accuse the District Attorney of being in any way responsible for this outside conspiracy. Further, if I had been guilty of any crime it would have made little difference to me or to the constituency that I represent that unfair or unsportsmanlike methods had been reported to in order to get the evidence of it. I always have been, am now and shall always be ready to face any facts that anybody in any way can find anywhere at any time.

Having been fooled myself in the beginning by an employee later discharged, who is as plausible as Lucifer, I can understand how the District Attorney could at first have been deceived by him.

Having myself been stung by Mr. Fosdick who pretended friendliness and who certified to me the loyalty of the aforesaid employee when he, Fosdick, was in possession of information at that very time that the man was a traitor to the League, and was using him to get rid of me, I can sympathize with the District Attorney if he also was stung by Mr. Fosdick. My opinion is that Mr. Fosdick either directly or indirectly, through the Evening Mail or some other willing tool, has imposed upon if not actually betrayed the District Attorney's office in an effort to use that office as a catspaw in inflicting punishment for him.

The Assistant District Attorney's recent statement that he had commenced his investigation before Mr. Fosdick came to his office at the time heralded by the newspapers, is undoubtedly true. But I shall go a long way back of that time, and prior to the time when, according to the written statement to me of District Attorney Banton himself, this matter was formally turned over to the present Acting District Attorney.

NEWLY DISCOVERED FACTS ABOUT PHILLIPS' EARLIER RECORD -- FALSEHOOD UNDER OATH

It is not conceivable that the District Attorney's office would rely upon the statements of O.B. Phillips, who, Mr. Fosdick knew, and it probably knew, months ago had tried to blackmail me; who some weeks before the inquiry started tried to blackmail the Board of Directors of the League, the conclusive evidence of this being in the hands of the Acting District Attorney a few days after he began his inquiry; and who I now find out within the last few days, pursuant to a tip that came to the League office, is shown by the records of the District Attorney's office itself to have, in 1916, confessed under oath to the then District Attorney (the former chief of the present District Attorney) when caught, to having a few days before testified falsely under oath before the Chief Magistrate of the city, to shield a man concerned in shady transactions.

The World and Sun were the only New York papers that had the fairness to print these later developments further discrediting the only known prosecuting witness, which the back newspaper files show to have been widely published in 1916, the year before Phillips came to the League. It was a scandal growing out of the theft of Allied munition secrets by a clerk in the Morgan Company establishment who transferred such secrets to the man shielded by Phillips and his associates. Along with Phillips' confession published in several papers, there is publication of the fact that one of the major parties concerned was in touch with a connection of Count von Bernstorff and with a lawyer who had formally represented German interests.

It is not hard to understand that a man who would mix up in a proceeding involving the betrayal of the nations that were fighting the battle of civilization and finally became our Allies, would be ready, through his stool pigeon, Robert G. Davey, exposed by the League for shady transactions, to peddle to the wets a story, most of it false, calculated to injure the Anti-Saloon League of the church. I have reason strongly to suspect that Mr. Fosdick acquired information about Phillips' earlier record before the League acquired it, and that he even now perhaps knows more than the League knows. I happen to know that he did not consider Phillips' story sufficient on which to rely. I also have information that he was ready, however, in a campaign to embarrass the League, to testify in Phillips' behalf in a civil suit against the Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League for compensation alleged to be due, under circumstances which would involve the statement by him that he had been more influenced by this man whom he knew to be a traitor and attempted blackmailer, than by the requests and representations of the Board representing the federated churches.

Although I was badly fooled by Phillips, I am glad I never sent him as a speaker to stand in the pulpit of any church. He did put up a wonderful counterfeit of loyalty and did some effective work in helping get the money that made ratification possible, and I fired him at the earliest possible moment after it became definitely certain that he was unworthy, whereas Mr. Fosdick rendered the greatest assistance to his efforts at revenge after knowledge of his disreputable activities.

This is partly by way of background and partly to establish the fact that the District Attorney must have had some suggestion or assurance, or both, from somebody of reputable standing because of the exceeding improbability that he relied upon Phillips. This is corroborated by the way the Phillips charges were allowed to fade out of sight and the inquiry focused on certain supposedly vulnerable aspects of the $24,700 item, information concerning which came into possession of the New York Evening Mail after Mr. Fosdick had asked for a confidential report which, honestly used, really established the regularity of the entire proceeding.

FACTS THAT REFLECT NO CREDIT ON THE NEW YORK EVENING MAIL

In order to reach Fosdick as the man higher up or the man of mystery whose identity is shielded, it is necessary to say a few words about the Evening Mail. That its responsible ownership is not very squeamish or scrupulous is shown by his giving or selling, I don't care which, the use of his name to the friends if not the representatives of the Imperial German Government who controlled the paper until the United States Government stepped in. Heaven only knows who is the real power behind "his" paper now! This is not the first time the Mail has tried or contemplated trying to run me out. It is not probable that it tried it this time without at least the assurance of "moral" support until such time as "investigation" would disclose things that would seem to justify open support from "contributors to the League". This is where Mr. Fosdick fits into the picture. The Mail's ambassador on this particular story said to members of the Anti-Saloon League staff in a futile effort to enlist them against me, that the attack on the Superintendent was a movement of "drys" and "backed by the leading supporters" of the Anti-Saloon League, meaning the Messrs. Rockefeller as represented by Mr. Fosdick.

The Mail was in touch with the District Attorney's office as established from both sides. Mr. Stoddard of the Mail admitted it. The Acting District Attorney admitted it for publication in his statement that he requested the Mail to hold off its publicity for fear it might embarrass him in the inquiry. In fact the Mail did embarrass him and expose Fosdick, for it spilled the $24,700 item before the District Attorney reached it in his inquiry.

The Mail representative in trying to seduce League employees from their loyalty, gave them to understand that it had positive assurance that I would be indicted. Either this representative of the Mail lied, which is the probable solution and which will throw further light on its ethics, or else it gave the District Attorney away. I leave that for them to settle between themselves. My own opinion is that the Mail representative deceived the District Attorney as to the facts and alleged "evidence", in addition to its attempt to deceive League workers about the alleged assurance that the District Attorney was supposed to have given it.

Mr. Fosdick has been established as being in touch with the Mail directly or indirectly. I focused the question of the proof of Mr. Fosdick's betrayal of confidence on a particular document because of the ease and certainty of proof. But this is not the only violation of confidence of which Mr. Fosdick was guilty, and in addition we can trace back to Mr. Fosdick an attack upon the intelligence if not the good faith of Dr. Burrell, Pastor of the Marble Collegiate Church and President of the State Board of Directors.

DAVEY A DRUMMER FOR MEETING IN FOSDICK'S OFFICE

Before I convict Mr. Fosdick by his own personal admissions direct to me, it is worth note as showing the kind of tools Mr. Fosdick was willing to use to "get" me, that Robert G. Davey early last fall travelled far to find a member of the Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League and urge such director to be present at a meeting in Mr. Fosdick's office evidently staged for the purpose of trying to frighten the directors of the League and its national officials and stampede them into demanding my resignation by the "disclosure" of "Charges" respecting which Fosdick, Davey and Phillips evidently did not know the Board was already fully informed.

Davey, with evident authority to drum up members of the Anti-Saloon League Board for a conference at Mr. Fosdick's office, stated at this time and in this connection, that there were charges against me which were to be laid before the Grand Jury. This not only establishes Mr. Fosdick's relation and intention respecting possible Grand Jury action but it also ties him up with Davey, although the unsavory facts about Davey had been published and were then in Mr. Fosdick's possession. Fosdick knew at the time that Davey and Phillips had been trying, while Phillips was still on the League payroll, to divert $35,000 which could only have come from the Messrs. Rockefeller through Fosdick, from the Anti-Saloon League to the personal alleged enforcement side-show that Davey was then running in connection with the Lord's Day Alliance of New York State, although he has since been forced out of his relation with that organization.

Incidentally, Mr. Fosdick evidently recognized last fall, as I happen to know, that Phillips was in fact attempting to use him and the District Attorney's office as a collection agency to compel the Anti-Saloon League to make some payments on compensation alleged to be due him, yet his animus was so bitter that in his zeal to "get" me, he allowed the Rockefeller influence to be so used.

FOSDICK ADMITS TALK WITH DISTRICT ATTORNEY BANTON

Now as to Mr. Fosdick's direct connection with the District Attorney's office. Months agobefore the present "inquiry" began on January 25, 1933, Mr. Fosdick stated to a person whose name had not been brought into this case that he had been in touch with the District Attorney's office. A little later, but still months prior to the above date, he tried to throw me off the track and mislead me on that point. In November, after I had obtained some specific information as to the District Attorney's activity and put it up to Mr. Fosdick, Mr. Fosdick, when cornered, said that this was to have been confidential, but as I knew it from the District Attorney's office, he then admitted to me personally that Mr. Banton, the District Attorney, had personally called him on the phone about the Phillips charges. In this conversation Mr. Fosdick absolved the District Attorney's office from any desire to take up this matter. He said to me that the District Attorney frankly stated to him that he, the District Attorney, had no wish to attack prohibition or the Anti-Saloon League or to be mixed up in this matter, thus establishing that the District Attorney, who had previously stated to me in writing that he was in possession of the charges made by Phillips, was not willing to go ahead with this matter until there was some backing from some source that was not so shady and vulnerable. As the utmost efforts to get anybody officially responsible in any way for the management of the League or even any substantial contributor to give any countenance to the effort to discredit the Superintendent, that leaves Mr. Fosdick hung up by the gills as the only man furnishing the "moral" support which Mr. Fosdick's own admission to me establishes that the District Attorney's office wanted.

WHY SHOULDN'T THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY HAVE ACTED?

Why should not the District Attorney have started an inquiry when, in addition to the fact that he, being human, must have had in the back of his mind that such a thing would be popular with the general public in New York City and would be eagerly exploited by the press, he was deceived directly or indirectly by so supposedly truthful, conscientious and responsible a man as Mr. Fosdick into believing that two of the largest contributors of the Anti-Saloon League wanted such an inquiry, and that the result of it would be to purge the League of an unworthy Superintendent and, in addition to gratifying the feelings of the wets, would put the drys under lasting obligations On its face, if the charges had been true, it was a sure winner.

Why should not the District Attorney's office have gone into this when it was probably also deceived by the Evening Mail, which it probably knew was in touch with Mr. Fosdick into believing the Rockefeller contributions were four times as large as they really have been since Mr. Fosdick was selected to handle them, and still further deceived into believing that Mr. Fosdick as the representative of the Rockefellers was the big factor in the active control of the management of the League which the record establishes he actually tried to become.

REVIVED WHEN FOSDICK SAW A NEW CHANCE

Phillips' "charges", after all of this preliminary, were apparently dropped, and Mr. Fosdick gave Dr. Burrell and me at separate times to understand that he was satisfied. Even as late as November he told me personally that Mr. Rockefeller had not cut off his contribution, notwithstanding his acquiescence in January in the published statement that it had been cut off last fall because of the Phillips charges. The whole matter was dormant until Mr. Fosdick, having asked for it under seal of confidence, secured the only copy of a report of a committee to the Board of Directors respecting the payment of the $24,700, which, though perfectly regular, gave Fosdick his chance to harpoon me through the activity of the District Attorney's office because of the statement frankly set out and accepted by the Board in the light of knowledge of results, that these expenditures were confidential.

It was not until after Raymond Fosdick had this report in his possession that the Mail, according to the statement of its representative, began in earnest to build up its campaign, tinctured with venom and falsehood and suppression of material facts under pretense of fairness, predicated on support of contributors to the Anti-Saloon League, which narrows down to Fosdick, and the District Attorney according to the Mail, revived the matter and began the inquiry which focused upon this single item that Fosdick had lately gotten hold of.

FOSDICK'S ATTEMPT TO INJURE HAS HELPED

I regret exceedingly that it has been necessary for me to go into these things in a manner involving Mr. Rockefeller's name, but that is Mr. Rockefeller's misfortune in having such an employee, and not my fault in defending my reputation and my very life as well as the interests of this agency of the federated churches against attacks assisted if not inspired by his representative. If Mr. Fosdick had been honest and wise enough to content himself with merely bringing about the withdrawal of Rockefeller support, I should never have uttered a public word of criticism, even though I knew Fosdick's unfriendly motive behind such withdrawal in the face of the enemy counter-attack.

I have never known it to fail that the wets and their de-facto allies even among the unctuously respectable, have injured themselves and helped the League when they tried most desperately to hurt it. Raymond B. Fosdick offers the latest and perhaps the most shining example. The Lord has used some most unsavory specimens to accomplish His Will, for "He maketh the wrath of man to praise Him". On the other hand, the devil has occasionally had the free use of some supposedly eminently respectable individuals who were so intent on a personal object that they did not watch their step. Mr. Fosdick will probably go down in the some-day-to-be-written history of the Anti-Saloon League movement as the one man who by his reprehensible actions created a situation that forced the Anti-Saloon League in self-defense to impress upon the churches that they must furnish sufficient additional support to keep their agency forever effectively independent of any kind of pressure that can conceivably be exerted by any hostile hireling of great wealth.

(Signed) WILLIAM H. ANDERSON

State Superintendent,
Anti-Saloon League of New York.

Publicity Department,
Anti-Saloon League of New York,
906 Broadway, New York City.

NEW YORK METHODIST ANNUAL CONFERENCE UNANIMOUSLY ENDORSES ANDERSON.

The New York Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church by special motion on the first day of its session invited William H. Anderson, State Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, to address a regular session of the Conference on Thursday morning, April 5, 1923.

Following the address the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"The Anti-Saloon League has been the agency of the churches in outlawing the legalized liquor traffic. We must look to the League to remain the militant church agency until enforcement is assured through the regular law enforcement channels. We are not disturbed by the present assault on the methods and integrity of the Anti-Saloon League. We realize that the League is fighting a desperate and defeated foe that is willing to resort to any means to come back. We refuse to have our attention diverted from the real fight to repeal the Mullan-Gage Law, legalize beer and wine, and ultimately nullify the Eighteenth Amendment. We urge our people not to be confused by the dust in the air. No investigations into the financial methods of the League or its Superintendent can be permitted to be used as a smoke screen behind which the enemy may escape with the repeal or nullification of the Prohibition Law.

"We take pride in that big, upstanding, two-fisted fighter, William H. Anderson. He belongs to us. We assure him of our prayer and confidence, and are sanguine that the present assault upon his methods may result in strengthening the cause he represents. Mr. Anderson is fighting our battles, and we propose to stand by him, and we urge our people to give him the benefit of all the rights and immunities and the presumption of innocence to which every man is entitled.

"We recommend that the pulpits of the Conference be opened annually to the representatives of the Anti-Saloon League to take subscriptions on the present financial basis of the League, and we bespeak for the League, increasing moral and financial support."

In addressing the Conference Mr. Anderson said:

SOME FACTS ABOUT NEW YORK TIMES AND THE CONTINENT (PRESBYTERIAN)

I had not expected to talk about myself unless in the most incidental way but what exponent of truth and justice on the prohibition question, the New York Times, has this morning thrown down a challenge into your teeth and mine. For my part I intend to meet it head on and I expect you will do the same.

When you yesterday graciously invited me to address this conference for what is a very liberal time, considering the pressure of business upon you, the Times dug up a self-confessed attempted blackmailer and self-confessed giver under oath of false testimony to protect shady transactions, its own columns containing the evidence of both, and prints this morning, through him, an offer to furnish this Conference with alleged evidence to support false charges of so-called split commissions.

It happens that I am loaded both for it and its protege who has apparently been on its staff for the last two months whether with or withour pay I do not know, for it is the only newspaper in the city of New York which has stooped so low as to print regularly

and feature the vile attacks of this individual upon the accredited representatives of the militant prohibition churches, Methodism included.

These false charges of splitting commissions were put out in a propaganda conspiracy in an effort to smear things up so as to lay a credible foundation for an effort to "get" me for accepting, pursuant to the official action of the Board, repayment of part of the $24,700 of my own money that I advanced for publicity work to save the prohibition work of the churches in this State nearly 10 years ago. The expected headway not being made with this item, it was natural to suppose that a last desperate effort would be made to revive the flimsy false first charges.

The League Board at its regular meeting on March 27th, in order to complete the record and officially supplement what had been clearly stated by Dr. Burrell, the State President, adopted a statement answering officially once for all these false charges. This statement covers two points; first, the individual who makes the charges; second, the charges themselves. On the first head the Board sets out the attempt to extort money from the Superintendent and also from the Board; his published confession of violation of the Federal law, and that it has just recently been 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 this man had confessed to the District Attorney under oath to having testified falsely under oath a few days before in order to shield a man who was trafficking in stolen Allied munition and supply secrets and had connection with men in touch with representatives of the German Government.

I stop long enough to say that although much of this evidence which we finally dug up as to the disreputable past of this man was found in the files of the Times, the Times lacked the decency and sportsmanship to print any information to this effect so far as we were able to discover it. It evidently feared the effect upon its influence of publication of such exposures respecting the man who is apparently its main reliance in its evident role as volunteer assistant prosecutor.

Among the morning papers only the New York World, which is the most violent opponent of the Anti-Saloon League and the League Superintendent in that relation but which with the Evening World and the New York Herald refused to purchase and handle these charges originally and which refused to stoop even to connivance at an effort to frame an individual no matter how much it may dislike him, printed anything to give the public further light as to the credibility of this only known complaining witness.

This statement of the Board which was purposely held back until such time as any revival of the propaganda conspiracy might make it more effective and which will be furnished to the press generally and published in the AMERICAN ISSUE, explicitly makes clear that any charge that I did anything wrong or received any money except what was voted by the Board for compensation is utterly false and that the only reason it is possible to misrepresent me is because I tried and succeeded in saving the League thousands of dollars in the reduction of its indebtedness.

The Times publishes, for the first time that I have observed in any newspaper, a portion of an editorial from the only religious paper that I know of in this country which has joined with the Times in its demand that the churches eliminate the Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League because the wets and their de facto allies have made false charges against him.

The editor of this religious paper has been an honest, consistent supporter of prohibition for many years, but unfortunately, as the National officers of the Anti-Saloon League well know, this is not the first time that he has gone off half cocked or at a tangent.

As to this editorial in the Continent, which I know has been very bitterly criticized by many leading Presbyterians and by editors of other religious publications, and which has been used to some slight degree by various assorted enemies of the Anti-Saloon

League, it is absolutely untruthful in part of the statement upon which it bases its conclusions, and equally untruthful in the unavoidable implication of other portions. This is no issue of veracity between the Continent and myself. The facts are fixed by official action of the Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League of New York representing the churches. Three Methodists, official representatives of three different annual Conferences in New York State, have been participating in the action of this Board since these charges were made.

I could say, if it were necessary, as I hope it will not be, some things that would throw some light on why this editor has seen fit to disregard the statements of the honored President of the Anti-Saloon League of New York and of its Board of Directors.

There is something, however, which I feel in justice to the cause ought to be said. I believe the editor of the Continent means to be conscientious, but that kind of conscientiousness leaves much to be desired which is not capable of being fair even to a friend or the representative of a cause that one espouses.

When any individual sets himself up as judge and arbiter on the question of ethics it is advisable for him to make sure that he is himself somewhere near chemically pure on the question of consistency. It is a very peculiar brand of conscientiousness exemplified by a religious editor, I mean the editor of a religious paper, who rushes to the front with a demand that the executive officer of an agency of the churches who happens to be a layman of another denomination shall be eliminated for transactions approved and ratified by a Board representing the churches, and yet is dumb as a chlofoformed watch dog for long months respecting a preacher of his own denomination, with an office in the very building from which this editorial was written, who was the real power behind another State-wide movement which also appealed to Presbyterian churches for support, and who had been caught with the goods on in transactions that stand conclusively proved.

I had hoped it would not be necessary to say even this much, but the use made of this editorial has left me no choice.

I suggest that if you do not see the New York Times and the Continent, that you watch the American Issue a couple of weeks hence to see whether these two papers, one a daily paper which claims to be for law enforcement but at the same time stands for beer and wine nullification, the other a great reputable advocate of Prohibition, which has gotten in the same pew with the Times on this particular question, print the full text of this latest action of the Board, including the part covering the total lack of credibility of the only known person making these false charges.

I am in possession of information, some of it from astounding sources, indicating that these charges are reacting strongly in favor of dry enforcement, the Anti-Saloon League and its present management, and I am profoundly convinced that the further the attacks upon the League are carried, the stronger will be that reaction.

The wets have tried to fool me and have not been proud of their success. They have tried to scare me and they were the ones who got bumped. They tried to buy me, with nothing doing. Now the only thing left was to accuse me of stealing $24,700 which it is charged I never had, but which even the wets admit I got tremendous results with, and which the wet papers have been hammering me for spending in securing special services from men who also worked for wet publications. I never had it, but I spent it improperly. Funny, isn't it?

I want to serve notice again, hurling defiance in the teeth of this immoral conspiracy of propaganda, right in this center of nullification activity, that I shall be here on the job tramping the last vestige of life out of a criminal and outlaw liquor traffic, long after its de facto allies, political or financial, who have sought to "frame" me are utterly discredited or have dropped to the botton of the junk heap of forgotten enemies of the common good.

THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE OF NEW YORK
Suite 701, 370 Seventh Avenue
New York City.

Released for Monday, February 11, 1924.

TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE OF NEW YORK:

No moral cause vital enough to generate violent hatreds ever succeeds unless some individuals suffer for it. I have for twenty-four years given my life to destroy the liquor traffic, ready to lay it down at any time if that were necessary. I do not shrink from the greater sacrifice even of having my good name falsely attacked as a result of what I have accomplished.

The God Who led me into this work, Who has upheld me throughout it, and Who has guided in the doing of things otherwise impossible, knows my innocence of the charge against me and the purity of my motives. With that I can afford to wait till the judgments of men are just.

As a result of doing honestly, legally, in the only way it could have been done, according to my best judgment, the work in New York that made prohibition possible for the nation and securing from this state for submission more additional votes than the margin by which the amendment was sent to the states and which brought about ratification of the Eighteenth Amendment in New York, I have been put in a false position in two respects:

(1) By trying to save the League the cost of this work, I left myself open to misrepresentation in case a trusted associate went wrong.

(2) In order to preserve inviolate a confidence respecting the assistance without which these victories would have been impossible, I accepted a situation which would leave me helpless if I were ever unfairly called upon to prove my story.

But I would not give up my part in these irrevocable victories that clinched the ultimate destruction of the liquor traffic even to save myself infinitely greater unpleasantness.

This is a year of unparalleled opportunity for the cause of dry enforcement in New York. I am not willing to assume the responsibility of keeping from the line-up because of dispute over the propriety of my active connection with the League pending the appeal which is certain to vindicate me, a single one of those who are unable to comprehend this kind of service and refuse to believe what they cannot comprehend.

I could not ask a finer loyalty than has been shown by this Board in its repeated certification of the honesty and legality of every one of the transactions attacked including the one which was the basis of the verdict that in my opinion is so at variance with the law and the evidence. In the light of repeated expression by the Board of its confidence in my integrity, and its clear-cut statement of its determination to stand by in my defense, it is not necessary to cover that ground again in your agreement to my request.

For the reason above, and for the further reason that it will afford a sense of inexpressible relief to be able with a clear conscience to lay down for a while the responsibilities which I have never been able to completely to lay down in twenty-four years, I hereby resign the position of State Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, pending the decision of this appeal.

(Signed) WILLIAM H. ANDERSON

New York City
February 5, 1924.

Publicity Department, Anti-Saloon League of New York,
Suite 701, 370 - Seventh Avenue, New York City.

William H. Anderson, State Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, Speaking at the Temperance Anniversary of the Genesee Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Held in Central Park Church, Buffalo, N.Y., Friday Night, October 5, Said:

ANDERSON SHOWS UP WET REPUBLICAN MACHINE ASSISTANCE TO TAMMANY AND SO-CALLED RELIGIOUS INFLUENCES THAT ARE SEEKING TO CRUSH THE INFLUENCE OF THE DRY PROTESTANT CHURCHES --- SHOWS HOW CROOKEDNESS OF TAMMANY AND FOLLY OF WET REPUBLICAN MACHINE LEADERS ARE RECRUITING KU KLUX KLAN --- AGAIN TOUCHES UPON CONNECTION OF POLITICO-ECCLESIASTICAL COMBINATION THAT FORCED HIS INDICTMENT WITH HOSTILITY TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND EARLIER BLOW AT PROTESTANT CHURCHES THROUGH KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS PROPAGANDA AGAINST THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION--- GIVES SOME FACTS ON GOVERNOR SMITH'S ATTEMPT TO GET CONTROL OF PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM.

The chances are that your Buffalo papers, which are all wet except one and that one while professing to be for prohibition is opposed to the Anti-Saloon League of the churches, will not print what I am saying tonight. Or if they print some of it, it will probably either be parts that mean little when taken by themselves, or parts which wrested out of their context can be distorted into something that in fact was neither intended or said. Your daily press in Buffalo, on the whole, is about as anti-Protestant, at least on the liquor question, as the press of New York City, and that is the limit.

However, we are getting the facts across to the people of the state notwithstanding the press. We enacted prohibition in spite of the anti-Protestant daily newspapers of the country and we will comsummate enforcement without them. And, in the process, what little moral influence most of them have will be so completely destroyed that they will not be able to render effective service to their real masters on other points.

The wet New York World, after cautious silence for several weeks has at last been kicked by the forces behind it into attempting to answer me. Its "answer" to the facts I have set out is to quote verbatim one paragraph, and then to pick a few detached clauses and sentences, and wind up with the solemn asseveration - "A more dangerous demagogue has not arisen in the State in years".

The World was founded, or at least built up to its present proportions, by a Hungarian Jew whose main interest seemed to be an academic notion of liberty which constitutes so grotesque an exaggeration as to amount to a caricature of the real American conception. His paper has been against practically all the vital moral movements. His offspring, I am informed, have connected themselves with a wet Protestant church which is not American in its genesis and spirit. And the paper continues not only anti-American but violently anti-Protestant. This shriek from it is conclusive evidence that I have, in this short time, cut clear through the hide of the organized, political anti-Protestantism in New York State, which has produced some queer political bedfellows.

You have in Buffalo a newspaper, the Times, whose owner is tied up with the Tammany crowd, - which is just as bad as the New York World, in proportion to its ability and resources, in its violence against prohibition.

I do not intend to be howled down by the wet press. Fortunately, the harder they hammer me for this, the more they will carry the essential facts to the constituency of the Protestant churches to such an extent as to awaken them and put them on inquiry. And, on the other hand, if they are silent, our people, who will get the facts anyhow through an unshackled pulpit and by word of mouth will accept the silence as a confession. It is the occasional irony of justice that this anti-Protestant crowd in its efforts to destroy the dry agency of the Protestant churches has jockeyed itself into a position where anything it does is a mistake, and where it can do nothing that will not ultimately help dry enforcement and strengthen the influence of the dry Protestant churches which stand for prohibition enforcement.

The reception given by the people of the State of New York to the plain talking that I have done since September first after getting the foundation laid is most illuminating and encouraging. Within the past month I have covered the State. I have been east on Long Island and west to Lake Erie, I have spoken within cannon shot of the Canadian border, within less distance of the Pennsylvania line, in Central New York, and within the commuting zone of New York City. Everywhere I have showed up the effort to destroy the influence of the Protestant churches which underlies the illegal political indictments against the dry representative of those churches. Everywhere, in churches of different denominations, the people have made greater financial contribution to the Anti-Saloon League than ever before in the history of the same churches and localities. The support has increased all the way from double to ten times as much.

Last Sunday night in Binghamton in a Presbyterian Church, where to an audience from the best citizenship and constituency of all churches in Binghamton and vicinity which, in spite of the rain filled the auditorium to capacity, I also frankly said that as between Tammany and the forces behind it on one hand and the Ku Klux Klan on the other I infinitely prefer the Klan without knowing anything about it, the people subscribed more than a thousand dollars for the League work for the coming year. This more than doubles the amount ever contributed at any church meeting in Binghamton. And at least nine-tenths of the subscriptions were for five years. The subscription, not counting the loose cash, was made by over one hundred different persons from twenty-three churches of seven denominations and a fifth of it came from persons who indicated no church membership. It was the largest subscription I have ever obtained at an evening service in my twenty-four years of League work and the most general subscription I ever secured at any service. This shows how the wets are succeeding in their plot to "drive away" the church support of the Anti-Saloon League.

The responses at the meetings of the past four weeks with what has been said personally and in writing, convinces me that before the so-called religious backers of Tammany hear the last of what they started by their attempt to "frame" and "railroad" the agent of the dry churches on the testimony of a confessed perjurer whom we now know to have been paid with liquor money, they will be sorry that they did not emulate the example of the Tammany boss, Mr. Charles F. Murphy himself, who when the purchase of the alleged evidence against me was submitted to him by James J. Walker, Tammany leader of the State Senate, turned it down on the ground that it was impossible to tell just how hard or in just what direction the Anti-Saloon League might kick if unduly prodded.

One of the most gratifying things about the plain speaking that I have done during the past month and which I intended to continue until those who have made it necessary are thoroughly cured as respects any attack on the Protestant Churches, through their fighting dry agency, the Anti-Saloon League, is the encouragement that has been given to the public generally which is opposed, not to the Catholic Church as a church, but to some of the unconscionable abuses that have been put over by crooked political Catholics under penalty that anybody who objected would be publicly accused of attacking the Catholic Church.

This so-called "religious" political bunch hates and fears the light because its kind of work and the ignorance and prejudice which it fosters do not thrive in the open.

It has been a revelation to a lot of timid persons who have been afraid to speak above a whisper lest this political influence should reach out and hurt their business or threaten the tenure of their friends and relatives on their positions, that I have not been withered by wrath or in some other mysterious way put out of business for these things I have said.

It is a matter of mingled encouragement and astonishment to a lot of people who have been assiduously fed up with the idea that anybody who dared tell the truth about some Catholics who pretend they are the Church would fall, blighted, under some occult spell, to find that the Catholic Church as a church is too intelligent to pull chestnuts out of the fire for any bunch of Catholic politicians, clerical or otherwise, who are caught offside in practices that will not

bear scrutiny. It is a joy and relief to honest, fair-minded citizens to find that this politico-ecclesiastical outfit which is the real power behind Tammany has worked in the dark so long that when the light is turned on it is as bewildered and nonplussed as an owl that is shoved out into daylight, or a bat that is confronted with a search light.

Not only are the opponents of political "skullduggery" which is perpetrated in the name of religion understanding the fact, but it is beginning to dawn on this anti-Protestant crowd that the very hokus-pokus of ignorance and prejudice which it has invoked in its behalf will rebound and react against it as the light is turned into its haunts, particularly the political tiger jungle. But time is too short to stop for an exegesis of this now.

If I had started the fight on this crowd I would have been put into a false position. But having kept silent all last winter and spring about what I knew to be the real anti-Protestant moving power behind District Attorney Banton and Mr. Rockefeller's representative, Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick, and having waited until, emboldened by my silence, they got in so deep by actually procuring illegal political indictments against me that they could not back out gracefully, I have secured the advantage of position and intend to use it. I have never yet been caught in a jam created by the wets that I could not carve my way out of with the sword of truth if wielded vigorously and resolutely enough, and this will not only be no exception but will prove to be the shining exemplification of the rule. Further, having been forced into this in self-defense I intend to push an offensive defensive and hold also the advantage of the initiative.

I shall this evening touch up by way of merest summary, some of these matters that I have gone into before and develop some new phases of them that I have not heretofore treated in detail.

But, first, I want to hang this same proposition on some of the wet machine Republican assistants of Tammany who are doing the dirty work of Tammany and the anti-Protestant so-called religious influences behind it. Some of the Republican machine leaders are just as disreputable as Tammany in their attitude and activity on this issue and with less excuse, for they are sinning against light and the known sentiment of the majority of their party.

George K. Morris, Republican State Chairman, will probably be surprised to learn that I have the information about his sending to a leading Republican, who he said had plenty of money and would be glad to get anything on me, the confessed perjurer who was offering to sell the Republican wet machine crowd the alleged evidence against me which had been turned down by three of the leading wet newspapers, by the leading wet organization and by Boss Murphy himself. The leader to whom this attempted blackmailer was sent is wet, has no love for the Anti-Saloon League, and hates me, but he at least had more sense than this amateur State Chairman who has declared his defiance of the League and its dry church backing, for my information is that this canny old bird refused even to see this unsavory pal of the District Attorney and of Mr. Rockefeller's representative.

Some wet Republican machine leaders in New York State obviously made a deal with Tammany to throw out the Socialists, relying on the bitter antagonism of the so-called religious influences back of Tammany toward Socialism. The consideration for this was the effort three years ago to destroy the Anti-Saloon League through a threatened legislative investigation preceded by the same kind of poison propaganda by the anti-Protestant press. They got enough and quit before they started. But they put through Al's nullification beer act just as, this year, they put through his repeal of the state dry law.

Three years ago this fall, the backers of Al Smith, who is the wet hope of this so-called religious combination behind Tammany, and of United States Senator Wadsworth, a Republican, made common cause to defeat the pledged enforcement Republican candidate for Governor. But the national sweep carried him through. Wadsworth was elected but ran half a million behind President Harding, although he received at least a quarter of a million Tammany votes.

Senator Wadsworth fooled a good many good people three

years ago into believing he was for enforcement. After election he came out for beer and wine. Recently he came out for modification of the prohibition law on the ground that a lot of criminals violate it. That is all the murderers, the gun men and thieves and thugs generally want, viz::- to change the law so that what they do will not be criminal. We can stop all kinds of defined crime instantly by repealing the criminal law. That is just what Senator Wadsworth proposes on the liquor question.

Senator Wadsworth largely engineered the repeal of the direct primary. Mr. Barnes who has been Wadsworth's political guide, tutor and counsellor, was the real leader in this. One of the reasons Governor Miller was defeated was because he assumed the responsibility for putting it through. Governor Smith campaigned last fall on restoration of the primary. He has not done it. He does not intend to do it. He wants to save his friend Wadsworth, who knows that with a good Republican candidate against him, he could be beaten in the primaries three years from now.

Senator Wadsworth and the other Republican wets are attempting to put over as the Republican candidate for Governor next year Theodore Roosevelt whose sole record on the liquor question in New York State is his vote for Al Cohol Smith's unconstitutional nullification beer act three years ago, who is wet today, and whose brothers are prominent members of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment. Part of the scheme involved in his selection is to keep the primary law from being restored until after Senator Wadsworth "gets by" once more.

I want to say to you frankly that this Republican bunch, United States Senator Wadsworth, Assistant Secretary of the Navy and candidate-for-Governor Roosevelt, State Chairman George K. Morris, National Committeeman Hilles, Collector of the Port of New York Phillip Elting and County Chairman Sam Koenig of New York and the wet bunch generally which is in control, are largely responsible for the worst failures of Federal prohibition in New York. And they are trying to get control of enforcement in New York into the hands of a man who is owned politically by a wet Congressman and who lives in a manner beyond the possibility of an enforcement salary.

I want to say further that the National Republican administration with all of President Coolidge's high principles and his splendid enforcement record, is going to be seriously embarrassed unless some action is taken that gets the former distillery owner, Secretary of the Treasury Mellon and the hostile and in this respect incompetent Internal Revenue Commissioner Blair off the neck of Prohibition Commissioner Haynes so as to give him a chance to function as effectively as possible.

I want you to know the fact that this wet State Republican machine bunch which is just as much responsible as Tammany for the recent dry repeal, since the Speaker of the Assembly who refused to call the caucus that would have prevented it and the necessary Republican vote to put it across was furnished when two honest Democrats stood out, is behind Tammany in the present effort to destroy the Anti-Saloon League. The request by the Tammany Grand Jury for a legislative investigation was so that the Republican outfit would apparently have an excuse for voting for it and granting the money.

This wet Republican crowd is trying to dig in for the future. They are not a bit better than Tammany and in many respects they are worse because they are more dishonest and hypocritical. They profess to be decent while Tammany does not. I can see no gain in electing Republicans in this State, merely because they are Republicans, in order to let them strengthen the control of this wet bunch which works with Tammany on this liquor question and against the Protestant churches.

Whenever a Democratic candidate for the Assembly has voted right or declares right and is a man of such character as to justify confidence in his word and he is opposed by a Republican who refused to declare on the ordinance enabling legislation at the next session and for a state enforcement law at the following session, I believe it is the duty of every friend of law and order to vote for the man who stands right regardless of his party.

If any Republican leader in any community objects to this, tell him that there can be no honest reason under such circumstances for the refusal of the Republican to declare himself, and that such refusal is prima facie evidence of hostility to dry legislation. If the Democrat has committed himself openly the Republican cannot possibly lose by doing the same thing, for that would eliminate the prohibition question and allow the election to be settled on political issues.

There is nothing to be gained in electing a Republican Assemblyman who will do Tammany's bidding. If Tammany control continues to fester and become more rotten until the people overthrow it, we will finally be rid of it. But if we merely put in Republican assistants to Tammany the defeat of Tammany will not greatly improve the situation.

I shall tell you certain things about the public schools but I want to tell you now that this wet Republican crowd is trying to make a fake use of this issue to arouse prejudice and overshadow the dry question and no advocate of prohibition who is wise will be fooled by any such tactics. Let the Republican in a dry district or runnigg against a dry Democrat declare himself on the dry question and other matters will take care of themselves.

The only sure way to prevent betrayal of the Republican party nationally next year by this state crowd, and a victory for beer is to smoke it out before it is too late. And it can be "trimmed". Senator Wadsworth and his political machine were whipped last month in the primaries in his home county of Livingston, which lies within the territory of this conference. To put in a wet as Governor in 1924 and to re-elect the wet Senator Wadsworth in 1926 means that the Republican party in New York State will be an annex of Tammany for many years to come, and may mean its betrayal of the party nationally to such extent that Tammany and the anti-Protestant forces behind it will get the kind of grip on the government of the nation that they now have on the government of the largest city and the most populous state of the Union.

One of the reasons why the Wadsworth-Roosevelt wet Tammany-Republican backing has been secretly aiding and abetting this effort against the churches to destroy me through Tammany's control of the machinery of justice is because Senator Wadsworth fears that if I survive, and I intend to, I will get over to all of the people whom he fooled last time that his middle initial W stands for "wet" to such extent that he, a hangover from a political regime that is as anachronistic as the dodo, will politically join the other leaders whose philosophy and methods he seeks to perpetuate beyond their day.

My statement that the failure of the Tammany administration to provide adequate public school facilities in New York, a condition comparable to but worse than the situation in other cities of large foreign population and with the same kind of a political machine controlled by the same kind of so-called religious influences, may be part of the general effort to break down the public school, has evidently gotten under the hide. I have a communication from the architect of the Board of Education of New York City, evidently pushed forward as the goat, telling me about how many more pupils can be taken care of some time in the future by buildings yet to be erected or started. From this I gleann the interesting fact that while plans are being considered and buildings under construction seating 150,000 pupils, new buildings were opened this year seating only 15,000, while more than 150,000 are now on part time and buildings are not allowed to catch up with the increase of population although there is plenty of money to waste.

Since this notice has been taken of what I have said about the public school system, I will proceed to cut a little closer.

I stop to repeat that I am not attacking the Catholic Church or the religion of any sincere man or woman to whom the Catholic Church represents the expression of religious convictions and aspirations. And if the Catholic Church will confine itself to being a church and carrying on its own religious education, every Protestant who is wise and discriminating enough to be a true lover of liberty will defend it in the enjoyment of its religious rights.

However, when any attempt is made to break down the public school system it is time for every American who stands for a free church, a free school and a free people to fight that issue to a finish. Further when the same crowd, largely through the same means, carry their efforts into the field of the Protestant churches as organized and mobilized for the protection and enforcement of prohibition, then so long as I am Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League in the Empire State, I shall tell the truth regardless of whom or what it hits.

One scheme of Governor Smith has been to take away from the State Board of Regents the selection of the Commissioner of Schools of the State of New York and vest his appointment in the Governor. When it is known that Tammany hopes and is planning to get permanent control of the government of the State, a volume would not tell more.

Further, I have some information about Tammany efforts to hamper and cripple the teachers training school at Albany which I am advised does a most valuable work in training teachers for the state schools, many of them rural schools.

And I am advised of an effort to allow the Board of Education of New York City whose control under a Tammany administration needs no diagram, to choose the chairman of the Board of Examiners which not only passes on new teachers coming into the public school system but also the eligibility for promotion of those now teaching. Enough said! At least for the moment.

I wonder if you fully understand just what Tammany is trying to put across?

Already under the Constitution of the United States which provides that Congressmen are to be elected on the basis of population, Tammany controls seven or eight Congressmen from New York State who in fact represent the million and a half to two millions of aliens in this State. The Constitution of New York State prevents that outrageous situation and aliens cannot be counted in apportionment for election of members of the State Legislature.

Tammany wants to count these aliens in order to enable it to elect, to "represent" them, members of the Legislature whom it can control. This would give it a strangle-hold on the Government of New York State, for heaven help the commonwealth if New York City under its present political control ever gets a majority of the Legislature.

And one of the reasons why this politico-ecclesiastical bunch turned thumbs down upon me and compelled the finding of indictments against me when the District Attorney, even with the Governorship as bait, had gotten his fill of the job and abandoned it last spring, is because I have shown up this purpose of Tammany and have also started a movement to change the Constitution of the United States to conform with the Constitution of New York State. This, especially in cities with a large foreign element, would take away Congressional representation of this alien population which otherwise, some day, with the electoral vote split up, perhaps by design, might determine the election of a President of the United States by the National House of Representatives.

I do not criticize, for I am a member of both, the Y.M.C.A. and the Masons, and believe they were both actuated by high purposes of patriotism, nevertheless I regret, first, that the Masonic fraternity of America did not give the public the truth when they were double-crossed in favor of the Knights of Columbus, a proceeding in which Raymond B. Fosdick, Rockefeller representative, played a most discreditable part, and, second, that the Young Men's Christian Association did not tell its constituency generally and particularly the Protestant churches upon whose moral support it depends, the truth about the vile propaganda put across throughout America and the world in behalf of and evidently by the Knights of Columbus.

For a long time certain so-called religious influences which have apparently been far more political than religious have looked with envy and enmity upon the Y.M.C.A. They undoubtedly accused the Y.M.C.A. of doing a great many things it never did or dreamed of doing. These politico-ecclesiastics evidently assumed that the Y.M.C.A. did what they would have done if they had had the chance which they thought

the Protestant churches had through the Y.M.C.A. Evidently there were limits beyond which these ecclesiastical politicians dared not show their hands, working in their own proper persons, so there came into being the "Knights of Columbus", apparently designed as a political engine of both offense and defense.

If the Knights of Columbus and those back of it had been content to do for Catholic men what the Y.M.C.A. was doing for any man who wanted its benefits there could have been no possible legitimate objection to it. But with the adventure into this field, the same as in the educational field these sinister forces were not content to stand on the merits of their own activities but have undertaken to cripple or destroy what was already in existence.

The attempt to prostitute the machinery of justice by indicting, in an effort to convict and railroad to State's prison, the dry agent of the Protestant churches is the boldest, most wicked thing that this crowd has ever yet attempted in America so far as I have the facts. But the effort to destroy the good name of the Young Men's Christian Association probably ranks next, at least as an assault upon the Protestant churches. The effort to destroy the public schools is deeper and more fundamental even than the attack upon the churches.

But I can promise this crowd that while in the Y.M.C.A. matter, the churches could not fight back at them because of lack of control and while the Y.M.C.A. itself was not in the best position to make a fight, the churches are both willing and able to fight back through the Anti-Saloon League to resist the attempt to break down prohibition.

And the constituency of the Protestant churches will not only fight Tammany and the influences behind it on the prohibition question through the Anti-Saloon League, but through other means it will fight them on every other question in which this church constituency has a vital interest. This alien influence will find that the effort to break down prohibition in order to keep its grip through the debauchery of the citizenship and its retention in drunken ignorance, will awaken this constituency to a realization of the things that need attention in every field.

And the ultimate victory of prohibition that is certain through the Anti-Saloon League will encourage the timid to the point of cleaning up on everything else that is operating against the development of genuine Americanism. The blundering calf in the orchard that knocked over the bee-hive had a quiet and uninteresting time compared with what these forces will find they are up against as a result of their misguided zeal in the matter of these indictments.

Every individual and every collection of individuals that goes wrong makes a fatal blunder sometime. These influences, apparently ignorant of the fact that because of lack of control over the Y.M.C.A. the churches could not fight through it and for it, evidently took the quiescence of the Protestant churches, because the Y.M.C.A. furnished no leadership on this issue, as evidence that the Protestant churches are without fighting spirit.

But when they tackled the Anti-Saloon League, however, they tackled the fighting-est fighting concern that was ever created, equipped and charged for business, - and on an issue that stirs up more fight than anything else before the public. The difference between what they encountered on the Y.M.C.A. question and what they are in for on this Anti-Saloon League proposition is comparable to the difference in the astonishment thereby caused if an individual who thought he had plugged in on a mild electric current to run a massage machine for his scalp had in fact by mistake plugged into a high voltage wire which instead of curing his dandruff snatched him bald-headed and knocked him into the middle of next week.

The Protestant churches, through the Anti-Saloon League, are going to be abundantly able to take care of the prohibition issue so far as this ecclesiastical influence back of Tammany is concerned. And the Anti-Protestant crowd, typified by Tammany,

intoxicated by its success against the Y.M.C.A., is forcing the church constituency to use something else, for example, the Ku Klux Klan, in dealing with other issues.

I suspect that these political indictments in New York, designed to destroy both prohibition and the influence of the Protestant churches,will add from one hundred thousand to a quarter of a million to the Ku Klux Klan in New York State, and anywhere from half a million to a million in the country at a conservative estimate. This is not because these prospective Klansmen are interested in me as an individual but because the sentiment is in existence, and like a match in the powder magazine all that was necessary was to touch it off. They see that if the representative of five thousand dry Protestant churches is not safe from being "framed", then nobody is safe.

I want to say for the benefit of all anti-Protestant newspapers which have been whipped once and are going to be whipped again on this issue in spite of their money and supposed political influence, that I have not the slightest hesitation, without being a member or ever having been a member and precluded from every being one by my obligation to keep the Anti-Saloon League free from any other kind of controversial entanglement, in saying that the Ku Klux Klan as it now manifests itself in New York State and through portions of the country, has been made necessary by just the kind of thing that has been attempted by this politico-ecclesiastical combination behind Tammany and its new political agency, the Knights of Columbus.

Just this week I learned directly that high officials in one of the greatest public utilities in America, representing close to a billion dollars, have discovered that the Knights of Columbus within its roster of employees have a little "Anchor Club", which exists solely for the purpose of getting Protestants and Masons out of their positions, filling the vacancies with Knights of Columbus and holding in their positions Knights of Columbus who may already be employed. Hence the name "anchor". No wonder they throw fits of rage, when we throw on the light.

Further, although I know nothing whatever about the Klan from the inside I am satisfied as a matter of general principle from my knowledge of conditions that the Klan will grow and operate and continue until this ungodly influence which is not content to exist and stand on its merits but seeks to destroy everything free in America, has been taught such a lesson that it will not dare shows its head in the same way for a generation.

I note that in New Jersey the Klan has announced that it is going to operate in the open. The attacks upon it made by known enemies of the common good have so impressed upon the general public the need for something of the sort that it probably finds that it is now or soon will be able to operate in this way.

And if the discovery forced by the excesses of this crowd impress upon the church constituency of the Anti-Saloon League and upon the general constituency of the Klan that the enemies of both are common and resorting to the same kind of tactics, with the result that supporters of prohibition in their individual capacity as citizens lend support to the Klan and Klansmen in their capacity as citizens back up the enforcement efforts of the Anti-Saloon League, this Tammany crowd and its so-called religious backers will have only themselves to blame for the hastening of what was eventually coming to them anyhow.

I have a special grievance against this anti-Protestant politico-ecclesiastical combination typified by Tammany and supported by the wet Republican beer politicians, viz:- they have found and compel some limberspined and weak-kneed Protestants to do their dirty work. The District Attorney of New York County is a sample of a Protestant and a Mason who has betrayed the conceptions of honor and justice held by both, to work with this anti-Protestant anti-Masonic crowd at their bidding for his own supposed political advantage.

Further, as I am addressing a Methodist Conference I might as well be frank and say that if it had not been for a recreant Methodist in each, the repeal of dry enforcement would not have passed either house last May.

The one vote in the Senate that let the bill go through was cast by a Methodist Sunday School Teacher. It is true that they threatened his business, his family and his life, but he should not have taken any such position in the first place unless he was willing to stand by to the bitter end. He weakened after he had said for publication that his conscience wouldn't let him vote for repeal.

When a bill has passed by only one vote, every man who votes for it becomes responsible for it. An official member of a Methodist Church of Sullivan County in violation of his sacred pledges to his people voted for repeal. Otherwise it would not have gone through the Assembly. If I am correctly advised he traded out his principle for a road appropriation and then failed to get the road.

Therefore, it is clear that one of the things we need to do is so thoroughly to repudiate men who claim to stand for the principles of the dry churches, but betray those principles that people outside will have still more respect for our intelligence, our discrimination, our persistence, our self-respect and our ability to punish our enemies.

I am profoundly persuaded that the next result of these attacks upon the dry Protestant churches will do more to stimulate sentiment that will hasten the ultimate victory of dry enforcement than anything that the dry forces themselves could have devised. The only condition is that we shall refuse to be fooled by propaganda, refuse to be bluffed by the bluster of those that scream that we are attacking a church when we tell the truth about unworthy invidivuals who work in the shadow of a church, and that we shall fight as often, as hard, and as long as we find it necessary.

(Signed) WILLIAM H. ANDERSON

State Superintendent.

Publicity Department, Anti-Saloon League of New York,
16th Floor, 906 Broadway, New York City.

Speaking at a Closed Session of the Regular Meeting, Monday Morning, March 26, 1923, of the Methodist Ministers of New York City and Vicinity, with Opportunity for Questions and Answers, William H. Anderson, State Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, Among Other Things, Said:

RAYMOND FOSDICK'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S ACTIVITY -- HIS ALLIANCE WITH DISCHARGED, DISCREDITED EMPLOYEES OF THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE

I am not through with Raymond B. Fosdick. I have already made a case against him, but I intend to complete it and rivet it until it is generally recognized that it is an unpopular and unprofitable undertaking for the hostile hired men of wealthy friends of dry enforcement to lend aid and comfort to propaganda conspiracies calculated to discredit the Anti-Saloon League and its management.

Before finishing, I intend to hang squarely on Mr. Fosdick the unsavory, de facto confederates, especially Davey and Phillips, discharged and discredited, with whom he has in fact allied himself in the movement to destroy me in order to gratify his personal animus. Incidentally, I shall show how callow and half-baked are his doctrinaire ideas even on a subject on which he poses as an authority when it comes into relation with the most important issue before the American people. Further, before I am done with him I shall make known where those who are so inclined can look up the record and find the facts that indicate how he double-crossed one of the greatest organizations in America, undertook to create friction between, misled and finally threw down its representatives.

However, today I have another and entirely different specific point to clinch.

ANOTHER LINK IN THE FOSDICK CHAIN

After Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., issued his statement in behalf of Mr. Fosdick which touched no real point at issue, I publicly showed conclusively three weeks ago, too far back for any tardy denial now, to a great Union Meeting of Ministers of Central New York at Syracuse at which the Post-Standard of that city said there were 400 ministers and other church representatives present, that Mr. Fosdick had a personal animus against me, that he had tried to eliminate me, and that he had been guilty of base betrayal of confidence and had given assistance to a conspiracy of propaganda to ruin me regardless of the effect on the Anti-Saloon League and the cause it represents. The full text of this speech was furnished to all New York papers, shown to him by some of them, and noted in the news reports of most of them.

Today I am going to show you that Mr. Fosdick is the man ultimately responsible for the Acting District Attorney's activity in an effort frankly avowed by that official to indict me for grand larceny for taking money the League Board voted me as justly due after I had risked it to save the League work in this State.

I shall do this without the slightest criticism of the District Attorney. I have been very careful not to accuse the District Attorney of being in any way responsible for this outside conspiracy. Further, if I had been guilty of any crime it would have made little difference to me or to the constituency that I represent that unfair or unsportsmanlike methods had been reported to in order to get the evidence of it. I always have been, am now and shall always be ready to face any facts that anybody in any way can find anywhere at any time.

Having been fooled myself in the beginning by an employee, later discharged, who is as plausible as Lucifer, I can understand how the District Attorney could at first have been deceived by him.

Having myself been stung by Mr. Fosdick who pretended friendliness and who certified to me the loyalty of the aforesaid employee when he, Fosdick, was in possession of information at that very time that the man was a traitor to the League, and was using him to get rid of me, I can sympathize with the District Attorney if he also was stung by Mr. Fosdick. My opinion is that Mr. Fosdick either directly or indirectly, through the Evening Mail or some other willing tool, has imposed upon if not actually betrayed the District Attorney's office in an effort to use that office as a catspaw in inflicting punishment for him.

The Assistant District Attorney's recent statement that he had commenced his investigation before Mr. Fosdick came to his office at the time heralded by the newspapers, is undoubtedly true. But I shall go a long way back of that time, and prior to the time when, according to the written statement to me of District Attorney Banton himself, this matter was formally turned over to the present Acting District Attorney.

NEWLY DISCOVERED FACTS ABOUT PHILLIPS' EARLIER RECORD -- FALSEHOOD UNDER OATH

It is not conceivable that the District Attorney's office would rely upon the statements of O.B. Phillips, who, Mr. Fosdick knew, and it probably knew, months ago had tried to blackmail me; who some weeks before the inquiry started tried to blackmail the Board of Directors of the League, the conclusive evidence of this being in the hands of the Acting District Attorney a few days after he began his inquiry; and who I now find out within the last few days, pursuant to a tip that came to the League office, is shown by the records of the District Attorney's office itself to have, in 1916, confessed under oath to the then District Attorney (the former chief of the present District Attorney) when caught, to having a few days before testified falsely under oath before the Chief Magistrate of the city, to shield a man concerned in shady transactions.

The World and Sun were the only New York papers that had the fairness to print these later developments further discrediting the only known prosecuting witness, which the back newspaper files show to have been widely published in 1916,,the year before Phillips came to the League. It was a scandal growing out of the theft of Allied munition secrets by a clerk in the Morgan Company establishment who transferred such secrets to the man shielded by Phillips and his associates. Along with Phillips' confession published in several papers, there is publication of the fact that one of the major parties concerned was in touch with a connection of Count von Bernstorff and with a lawyer who had formally represented German interests.

It is not hard to understand that a man who would mix up in a proceeding involving the betrayal of the nations that were fighting the battle of civilization and finally became our Allies, would be ready, through his stool pigeon, Robert G. Davey, exposed by the League for shady transactions, to peddle to the wets a story, most of it false, calculated to injure the Anti-Saloon League of the church. I have reason strongly to suspect that Mr. Fosdick acquired information about Phillips' earlier record before the League acquired it, and that he even now perhaps knows more than the League knows. I happen to know that he did not consider Phillips' story sufficient on which to rely. I also have information that he was ready, however, in a campaign to embarrass the League, to testify in Phillips' behalf in a civil suit against the Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League for compensation alleged to be due, under circumstances which would involve the statement by him that he had been more influenced by this man whom he knew to be a traitor and attempted blackmailer, than by the requests and representations of the Board representing the federated churches.

Although I was badly fooled by Phillips, I am glad I never sent him as a speaker to stand in the pulpit of any church. He did put up a wonderful counterfeit of loyalty and did some effective work in helping get the money that made ratification possible, and I fired him at the earliest possible moment after it became definitely certain that he was unworthy, whereas as Mr. Fosdick rendered the greatest assistance to his efforts at revenge after knowledge of his disreputable activities.

This is partly by way of background and partly to establish the fact that the District Attorney must have had some suggestion or assurance, or both, from somebody of reputable standing because of the exceeding improbability that he relied upon Phillips. This is corroborated by the way the Phillips charges were allowed to fade out of sight and the inquiry focused on certain supposedly vulnerable aspects of the $24,700 item, information concerning which came into possession of the New York Evening Mail after Mr. Fosdick had asked for a confidential report which, honestly used, really established the regularity of the entire proceeding.

FACTS THAT REFLECT NO CREDIT ON THE NEW YORK EVENING MAIL

In order to reach Fosdick as the man higher up or the man of mystery whose identity is shielded, it is necessary to say a few words about the Evening Mail. That its responsible ownership is not very squeamish or scrupulous is shown by his giving or selling, I don't care which, the use of his name to the friends if not the representatives of the Imperial German Government who controlled the paper until the United States Government stepped in. Heaven only knows who is the real power behind "his" paper now! This is not the first time the Mail has tried or contemplated trying to run me out. It is not probable that it tried it this time without at least the assurance of "moral" support until such time as "investigation" would disclose things that would seem to justify open support from "contributors to the League". This is where Mr. Fosdick fits into the picture. The Mail's ambassador on this particular story said to members of the Anti-Saloon League staff in a futile effort to enlist them against me, that the attack on the Superintendent was a movement of "drys" and "backed by the leading supporters" of the Anti-Saloon League, meaning the Messrs. Rockefeller as represented by Mr. Fosdick.

The Mail was in touch with the District Attorney's office as established from both sides. Mr. Stoddard of the Mail admitted it. The Acting District Attorney admitted it for publication in his statement that he requested the Mail to hold off its publicity for fear it might embarrass him in the inquiry. In fact the Mail did embarrass him and expose Fosdick, for it spilled the $24,700 item before the District Attorney reached it in his inquiry.

The Mail representative in trying to seduce League employees from their loyalty, gave them to understand that it had positive assurance that I would be indicted. Either this representative of the Mail lied, which is the probable solution and which will throw further light on its ethics, or else it gave the District Attorney away. I leave that for them to settle between themselves. My own opinion is that the Mail representative deceived the District Attorney as to the facts and alleged "evidence", in addition to its attempt to deceive League workers about the alleged assurance that the District Attorney was supposed to have given it.

Mr. Fosdick has been established as being in touch with the Mail directly or indirectly. I focused the question of the proof of Mr. Fosdick's betrayal of confidence on a particular document because of the ease and certainty of proof. But this is not the only violation of confidence of which Mr. Fosdick was guilty, and in addition we can trace back to Mr. Fosdick an attack upon the intelligence if not the good faith of Dr. Burrell, Pastor of the Marble Collegiate Church and President of the State Board of Directors.

DAVEY A DRUMMER FOR MEETING IN FOSDICK'S OFFICE

Before I convict Mr. Fosdick by his own personal admissions direct to me, it is worth note as showing the kind of tools Mr. Fosdick was willing to use to "get" me, that Robert G. Davey early last fall travelled far to find a member of the Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League and urge such director to be present at a meeting in Mr. Fosdick's office evidently staged for the purpose of trying to frighten the directors of the League and its national officials and stampede them into demanding my resignation by the "disclosure" of "charges" respecting which Fosdick, Davey and Phillips evidently did not know the Board was already fully informed.

Davey, with evident authority to drum up members of the Anti-Saloon League Board for a conference at Mr. Fosdick's office, stated at this time and in this connection, that there were charges against me which were to be laid before the Grand Jury. This not only establishes Mr. Fosdick's relation and intention respecting possible Grand Jury action but it also ties him up with Davey, although the unsavory facts about Davey had been published and were then in Mr. Fosdick's possession. Fosdick knew at the time that Davey and Phillips had been trying, while Phillips was still on the League payroll, to divert $35,000 which could only have come from the Messrs. Rockefeller through Fosdick, from the Anti-Saloon League to the personal alleged enforcement side-show that Davey was then running in connection with the Lord's Day Alliance of New York State, although he has since been forced out of his relation with that organization.

Incidentally, Mr. Fosdick evidently recognized last fall, as I happen to know, that Phillips was in fact attempting to use him and the District Attorney's office as a collection agency to compel the Anti-Saloon League to make some payments on compensation alleged to be due him, yet his animus was so bitter that in his zeal to "get" me, he allowed the Rockefeller influence to be so used.

FOSDICK ADMITS TALK WITH DISTRICT ATTORNEY BANTON

Now as to Mr. Fosdick's direct connection with the District Attorney's office. Months agobefore the present "inquiry" began on January 25, 1933, Mr. Fosdick stated to a person whose name had not been brought into this case that he had been in touch with the District Attorney's office. A little later, but still months prior to the above date, he tried to throw me off the track and mislead me on that point. In November, after I had obtained some specific information as to the District Attorney's activity and put it up to Mr. Fosdick, Mr. Fosdick, when cornered, said that this was to have been confidential, but as I knew it from the District Attorney's office, he then admitted to me personally that Mr. Banton, the District Attorney, had personally called him on the phone about the Phillips charges. In this conversation Mr. Fosdick absolved the District Attorney's office from any desire to take up this matter. He said to me that the District Attorney frankly stated to him that he, the District Attorney, had no wish to attack prohibition or the Anti-Saloon League or to be mixed up in this matter, thus establishing that the District Attorney, who had previously stated to me in writing that he was in possession of the charges made by Phillips, was not willing to go ahead with this matter until there was some backing from some source that was not so shady and vulnerable. As the utmost efforts to get anybody officially responsible in any way for the management of the League or even any substantial contributor to give any countenance to the effort to discredit the Superintendent, that leaves Mr. Fosdick hung up by the gills as the only man furnishing the "moral" support which Mr. Fosdick's own admission to me establishes that the District Attorney's office wanted.

WHY SHOULDN'T THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY HAVE ACTED?

Why should not the District Attorney have started an inquiry when, in addition to the fact that he, being human, must have had in the back of his mind that such a thing would be popular with the general public in New York City and would be eagerly exploited by the press, he was deceived directly or indirectly by so supposedly truthful, conscientious and responsible a man as Mr. Fosdick into believing that two of the largest contributors of the Anti-Saloon League wanted such an inquiry, and that the result of it would be to purge the League of an unworthy Superintendent and, in addition to gratifying the feelings of the wets, would put the drys under lasting obligations. On its face, if the charges had been true, it was a sure winner.

Why should not the District Attorney's office have gone into this when it was probably also deceived by the Evening Mail, which it probably knew was in touch with Mr. Fosdick into believing the Rockefeller contributions were four times as large as they really have been since Mr. Fosdick was selected to handle them, and still further deceived into believing that Mr. Fosdick as the representative of the Rockefellers was the big factor in the active control of the management of the League which the record establishes he actually tried to become.

REVIVED WHEN FOSDICK SAW A NEW CHANCE

Phillips' "charges", after all of this preliminary, were apparently dropped, and Mr. Fosdick gave Dr. Purrell and me at separate times to understand that he was satisfied. Even as late as November he told me personally that Mr. Rockefeller had not cut off his contribution, notwithstanding his acquiescence in January in the published statement that it had been cut off last fall because of the Phillips charges. The whole matter was dormant until Mr. Fosdick, having asked for it under seal of confidence, secured the only copy of a report of a committee to the Board of Directors respecting the payment of the $24,700, which, though perfectly regular, gave Fosdick his chance to harpoon me through the activity of the District Attorney's office because of the statement frankly set out and accepted by the Board in the light of knowledge of results, that these expenditures were confidential.

It was not until after Raymond Fosdick had this report in his possession that the Mail, according to the statement of its representative, began in earnest to build up its campaign, tinctured with venom and falsehood and suppression of material facts under pretense of fairness, predicated on support of contributors to the Anti-Saloon League, which narrows down to Fosdick, and the District Attorney according to the Mail, revived the matter and began the inquiry which focused upon this single item that Fosdick had lately gotten hold of.

FOSDICK'S ATTEMPT TO INJURE HAS HELPED

I regret exceedingly that it has been necessary for me to go into these things in a manner involving Mr. Rockefeller's name, but that is Mr. Rockefeller's misfortune in having such an employee, and not my fault in defending my reputation and my very life as well as the interests of this agency of the federated churches against attacks assisted if not inspired by his representative. If Mr. Fosdick had been honest and wise enough to content himself with merely bringing about the withdrawal of Rockefeller support, I should hardly have uttered a public word of criticism, even though I knew Fosdick's unfriendly motive behind such withdrawal in the face of the enemy counter-attack.

I have never known it to fail that the wets and their de-facto allies even among the unctuously respectable, have injured themselves and helped the League when they tried most desperately to hurt it. Raymond B. Fosdick offers the latest and perhaps the most shining example. The Lord has used some most unsavory specimens to accomplish His Will, for "He maketh the wrath of man to praise Him". On the other hand, the devil has occasionally had the free use of some supposedly eminently respectable individuals who were so intent on a personal object that they did not watch their step. Mr. Fosdick will probably go down in the some-day-to-be-written history of the Anti-Saloon League movement as the one man who by his reprehensible actions created a situation that forced the Anti-Saloon League in self-defense to impress upon the churches that they must furnish sufficient additional support to keep their agency forever effectively independent of any kind of pressure that can conceivably be exerted by any hostile hireling of great wealth.

(Signed) WILLIAM H. ANDERSON

State Superintendent,
Anti-Saloon League of New York.

Publicity Department, Anti-Saloon League of New York,
16th Floor, 906 Broadway, New York City.

Speaking at a Closed Session of the Regular Meeting, Monday Morning, March 26, 1923, of the Methodist Ministers of New York City and Vicinity, with Opportunity for Questions and Answers, William H. Anderson, State Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, Among Other Things, Said:

RAYMOND FOSDICK'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S ACTIVITY -- HIS ALLIANCE WITH DISCHARGED, DISCREDITED EMPLOYEES OF THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE

I am not through with Raymond B. Fosdick. I have already made a case against him, but I intend to complete it and rivet it until it is generally recognized that it is an unpopular and unprofitable undertaking for the hostile hired men of wealthy friends of dry enforcement to lend aid and comfort to propaganda conspiracies calculated to discredit the Anti-Saloon League and its management.

Before finishing, I intend to hang squarely on Mr. Fosdick the unsavory, de facto confederates, especially Davey and Phillips, discharged and discredited, with whom he has in fact allied himself in the movement to destroy me in order to gratify his personal animus. Incidentally, I shall show how callow and half-baked are his doctrinaire ideas even on a subject on which he poses as an authority when it comes into relation with the most important issue before the American people. Further, before I am done with him I shall make known where those who are so inclined can look up the record and find the facts that indicate how he double-crossed one of the greatest organizations in America, undertook to create friction between, misled and finally threw down its representatives.

However, today I have another and entirely different specific point to clinch.

ANOTHER LINK IN THE FOSDICK CHAIN

After Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., issued his statement in behalf of Mr. Fosdick which touched no real point at issue, I publicly showed conclusively three weeks ago, too far back for any tardy denial now, to a great Union Meeting of Ministers of Central New York at Syracuse at which the Post-Standard of that city said there were 400 ministers and other church representatives present, that Mr. Fosdick had a personal animus against me, that he had tried to eliminate me, and that he had been guilty of base betrayal of confidence and had given assistance to a conspiracy of propaganda to ruin me regardless of the effect on the Anti-Saloon League and the cause it represents. The full text of this speech was furnished to all New York papers, shown to him by some of them, and noted in the news reports of most of them.

Today I am going to show you that Mr. Fosdick is the man ultimately responsible for the Acting District Attorney's activity in an effort frankly avowed by that official to indict me for grand larceny for taking money the League Board voted me as justly due after I had risked it to save the League work in this State.

I shall do this without the slightest criticism of the District Attorney. I have been very careful not to accuse the District Attorney of being in any way responsible for this outside conspiracy. Further, if I had been guilty of any crime it would have made little difference to me or to the constituency that I represent that unfair or unsportsmanlike methods had been reported to in order to get the evidence of it. I always have been, am now and shall always be ready to face any facts that anybody in any way can find anywhere at any time.

Having been fooled myself in the beginning by an employee, later discharged, who is as plausible as Lucifer, I can understand how the District Attorney could at first have been deceived by him.

Having myself been stung by Mr. Fosdick who pretended friendliness and who certified to me the loyalty of the aforesaid employee when he, Fosdick, was in possession of information at that very time that the man was a traitor to the League, and was using him to get rid of me, I can sympathize with the District Attorney if he also was stung by Mr. Fosdick. My opinion is that Mr. Fosdick either directly or indirectly, through the Evening Mail or some other willing tool, has imposed upon if not actually betrayed the District Attorney's office in an effort to use that office as a catspaw in inflicting punishment for him.

The Assistant District Attorney's recent statement that he had commenced his investigation before Mr. Fosdick came to his office at the time heralded by the newspapers, is undoubtedly true. But I shall go a long way back of that time, and prior to the time when, according to the written statement to me of District Attorney Banton himself, this matter was formally turned over to the present Acting District Attorney.

NEWLY DISCOVERED FACTS ABOUT PHILLIPS' EARLIER RECORD -- FALSEHOOD UNDER OATH

It is not conceivable that the District Attorney's office would rely upon the statements of O.B. Phillips, who, Mr. Fosdick knew, and it probably knew, months ago had tried to blackmail me;who some weeks before the inquiry started tried to blackmail the Board of Directors of the League, the conclusive evidence of this being in the hands of the Acting District Attorney a few days after he began his inquiry; and who I now find out within the last few days, pursuant to a tip that came to the League office, is shown by the records of the District Attorney's office itself to have, in 1916, confessed under oath to the then District Attorney (the former chief of the present District Attorney) when caught, to having a few days before testified falsely under oath before the Chief Magistrate of the city, to shield a man concerned in shady transactions.

The World and Sun were the only New York papers that had the fairness to print these later developments further discrediting the only known prosecuting witness, which the back newspaper files show to have been widely published in 1916, the year before Phillips came to the League. It was a scandal growing out of the theft of Allied munition secrets by a clerk in the Morgan Company establishment who transferred such secrets to the man shielded by Phillips and his associates. Along with Phillips' confession published in several papers, there is publication of the fact that one of the major parties concerned was in touch with a connection of Count von Bernstorff and with a lawyer who had formally represented German interests.

It is not hard to understand that a man who would mix up in a proceeding involving the betrayal of the nations that were fighting the battle of civilization and finally became our Allies, would be ready, through his stool pigeon, Robert G. Davey, exposed by the League for shady transactions, to peddle to the wets a story, most of it false, calculated to injure the Anti-Saloon League of the church. I have reason strongly to suspect that Mr. Fosdick acquired information about Phillips' earlier record before the League acquired it, and that he even now perhaps knows more than the League knows. I happen to know that he did not consider Phillips' story sufficient on which to rely. I also have information that he was ready, however, in a campaign to embarrass the League, to testify in Phillips' behalf in a civil suit against the Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League for compensation alleged to be due, under circumstances which would involve the statement by him that he had been more influenced by this man whom he knew to be a traitor and attempted blackmailer, than by the requests and representations of the Board representing the federated churches.

Although I was badly fooled by Phillips, I am glad I never sent him as a speaker to stand in the pulpit of any church. He did put up a wonderful counterfeit of loyalty and did some effective work in helping get the money that made ratification possible, and I fired him at the earliest possible moment after it became definitely certain that he was unworthy, whereas Mr. Fosdick rendered the greatest assistance to his efforts at revenge after knowledge of his disreputable activities.

This is partly by way of background and partly to establish the fact that the District Attorney must have had some suggestion or assurance, or both, from somebody of reputable standing because of the exceeding improbability that he relied upon Phillips. This is corroborated by the way the Phillips charges were allowed to fade out of sight and the inquiry focused on certain supposedly vulnerable aspects of the $24,700 item, information concerning which came into possession of the New York Evening Mail after Mr. Fosdick had asked for a confidential report which, honestly used, really established the regularity of the entire proceeding.

FACTS THAT REFLECT NO CREDIT ON THE NEW YORK EVENING MAIL

In order to reach Fosdick as the man higher up or the man of mystery whose identity is shielded, it is necessary to say a few words about the Evening Mail. That its responsible ownership is not very squeamish or scrupulous is shown by his giving or selling, I don't care which, the use of his name to the friends if not the representatives of the Imperial German Government who controlled the paper until the United States Government stepped in. Heaven only knows who is the real power behind "his" paper now! This is not the first time the Mail has tried or contemplated trying to run me out. It is not probable that it tried it this time without at least the assurance of "moral" support until such time as "investigation" would disclose things that would seem to justify open support from "contributors to the League". This is where Mr. Fosdick fits into the picture. The Mail's ambassador on this particular story said to members of the Anti-Saloon League staff in a futile effort to enlist them against me, that the attack on the Superintendent was a movement of "drys" and "backed by the leading supporters" of the Anti-Saloon League, meaning the Messrs. Rockefeller as represented by Mr. Fosdick.

The Mail was in touch with the District Attorney's office as established from both sides. Mr. Stoddard of the Mail admitted it. The Acting District Attorney admitted it for publication in his statement that he requested the Mail to hold off its publicity for fear it might embarrass him in the inquiry. In fact the Mail did embarrass him and expose Fosdick, for it spilled the $24,700 item before the District Attorney reached it in his inquiry.

The Mail representative in trying to seduce League employees from their loyalty, gave them to understand that it had positive assurance that I would be indicted. Either this representative of the Mail lied, which is the probable solution and which will throw further light on its ethics, or else it gave the District Attorney away. I leave that for them to settle between themselves. My own opinion is that the Mail representative deceived the District Attorney as to the facts and alleged "evidence", in addition to its attempt to deceive League workers about the alleged assurance that the District Attorney was supposed to have given it.

Mr. Fosdick has been established as being in touch with the Mail directly or indirectly. I focused the question of the proof of Mr. Fosdick's betrayal of confidence on a particular document because of the ease and certainty of proof. But this is not the only violation of confidence of which Mr. Fosdick was guilty, and in addition we can trace back to Mr. Fosdick an attack upon the intelligence if not the good faith of Dr. Burrell, Pastor of the Marble Collegiate Church and President of the State Board of Directors.

DAVEY A DRUMMER FOR MEETING IN FOSDICK'S OFFICE

Before I convict Mr. Fosdick by his own personal admissions direct to me, it is worth note as showing the kind of tools Mr. Fosdick was willing to use to "get" me, that Robert G. Davey early last fall travelled far to find a member of the Board of Directors of the Anti-Saloon League and urge such director to be present at a meeting in Mr. Fosdick's office evidently staged for the purpose of trying to frighten the directors of the League and its national officials and stampede them into demanding my resignation by the "disclosure" of "Charges" respecting which Fosdick, Davey and Phillips evidently did not know the Board was already fully informed.

Davey, with evident authority to drum up members of the Anti-Saloon League Board for a conference at Mr. Fosdick's office, stated at this time and in this connection, that there were charges against me which were to be laid before the Grand Jury. This not only establishes Mr. Fosdick's relation and intention respecting possible Grand Jury action but it also ties him up with Davey, although the unsavory facts about Davey had been published and were then in Mr. Fosdick's possession. Fosdick knew at the time that Davey and Phillips had been trying, while Phillips was still on the League payroll, to divert $35,000 which could only have come from the Messrs. Rockefeller through Fosdick, from the Anti-Saloon League to the personal alleged enforcement side-show that Davey was then running in connection with the Lord's Day Alliance of New York State, although he has since been forced out of his relation with that organization.

Incidentally, Mr. Fosdick evidently recognized last fall, as I happen to know, that Phillips was in fact attempting to use him and the District Attorney's office as a collection agency to compel the Anti-Saloon League to make some payments on compensation alleged to be due him, yet his animus was so bitter that in his zeal to "get" me, he allowed the Rockefeller influence to be so used.

FOSDICK ADMITS TALK WITH DISTRICT ATTORNEY BANTON

Now as to Mr. Fosdick's direct connection with the District Attorney's office. Months agobefore the present "inquiry" began on January 25, 1923, Mr. Fosdick stated to a person whose name had not been brought into this case that he had been in touch with the District Attorney's office. A little later, but still months prior to the above date, he tried to throw me off the track and mislead me on that point. In November, after I had obtained some specific information as to the District Attorney's activity and put it up to Mr. Fosdick, Mr. Fosdick, when cornered, said that this was to have been confidential, but as I knew it from the District Attorney's office, he then admitted to me personally that Mr. Banton, the District Attorney, had personally called him on the phone about the Phillips charges. In this conversation Mr. Fosdick absolved the District Attorney's office from any desire to take up this matter. He said to me that the District Attorney frankly stated to him that he, the District Attorney, had no wish to attack prohibition or the Anti-Saloon League or to be mixed up in this matter, thus establishing that the District Attorney, who had previously stated to me in writing that he was in possession of the charges made by Phillips, was not willing to go ahead with this matter until there was some backing from some source that was not so shady and vulnerable. As the utmost efforts to get anybody officially responsible in any way for the management of the League or even any substantial contributor to give any countenance to the effort to discredit the Superintendent, that leaves Mr. Fosdick hung up by the gills as the only man furnishing the "moral" support which Mr. Fosdick's own admission to me establishes that the District Attorney's office wanted.

WHY SHOULDN'T THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY HAVE ACTED?

Why should not the District Attorney have started an inquiry when, in addition to the fact that he, being human, must have had in the back of his mind that such a thing would be popular with the general public in New York City and would be eagerly exploited by the press, he was deceived directly or indirectly by so supposedly truthful, conscientious and responsible a man as Mr. Fosdick into believing that two of the largest contributors of the Anti-Saloon League wanted such an inquiry, and that the result of it would be to purge the League of an unworthy Superintendent and, in addition to gratifying the feelings of the wets, would put the drys under lasting obligations. On its face, if the charges had been true, it was a sure winner.

Why should not the District Attorney's office have gone into this when it was probably also deceived by the Evening Mail, which it probably knew was in touch with Mr. Fosdick into believing the Rockefeller contributions were four times as large as they really have been since Mr. Fosdick was selected to handle them, and still further deceived into believing that Mr. Fosdick as the representative of the Rockefellers was the big factor in the active control of the management of the League which the record establishes he actually tried to become.

REVIVED WHEN FOSDICK SAW A NEW CHANCE

Phillips' "charges", after all of this preliminary, were apparently dropped, and Mr. Fosdick gave Dr. Burrell and me at separate times to understand that he was satisfied. Even as late as November he told me personally that Mr. Rockefeller had not cut off his contribution, notwithstanding his acquiescence in January in the published statement that it had been cut off last fall because of the Phillips charges. The whole matter was dormant until Mr. Fosdick, having asked for it under seal of confidence, secured the only copy of a report of a committee to the Board of Directors respecting the payment of the $24,700, which, though perfectly regular, gave Fosdick his chance to harpoon me through the activity of the District Attorney's office because of the statement frankly set out and accepted by the Board in the light of knowledge of results, that these expenditures were confidential.

It was not until after Raymond Fosdick had this report in his possession that the Mail, according to the statement of its representative, began in earnest to build up its campaign, tinctured with venom and falsehood and suppression of material facts under pretense of fairness, predicated on support of contributors to the Anti-Saloon League, which narrows down to Fosdick, and the District Attorney according to the Mail, revived the matter and began the inquiry which focused upon this single item that Fosdick had lately gotten hold of.

FOSDICK'S ATTEMPT TO INJURE HAS HELPED

I regret exceedingly that it has been necessary for me to go into these things in a manner involving Mr. Rockefeller's name, but that is Mr. Rockefeller's misfortune in having such an employee, and not my fault in defending my reputation and my very life as well as the interests of this agency of the federated churches against attacks assisted if not inspired by his representative. If Mr. Fosdick had been honest and wise enough to content himself with merely bringing about the withdrawal of Rockefeller support, I should never have uttered a public word of criticism, even though I knew Fosdick's unfriendly motive behind such withdrawal in the face of the enemy counter-attack.

I have never known it to fail that the wets and their de-facto allies even among the unctuously respectable, have injured themselves and helped the League when they tried most desperately to hurt it. Raymond B. Fosdick offers the latest and perhaps the most shining example. The Lord has used some most unsavory specimens to accomplish His Will, for "He maketh the wrath of man to praise Him". On the other hand, the devil has occasionally had the free use of some supposedly eminently respectable individuals who were so intent on a personal object that they did not watch their step. Mr. Fosdick will probably go down in the some-day-to-be-written history of the Anti-Saloon League movement as the one man who by his reprehensible actions created a situation that forced the Anti-Saloon League in self-defense to impress upon the churches that they must furnish sufficient additional support to keep their agency forever effectively independent of any kind of pressure that can conceivably be exerted by any hostile hireling of great wealth.

(Signed) WILLIAM H. ANDERSON

State Superintendent,
Anti-Saloon League of New York.

Publicity Department,
Anti-Saloon League of New York,
906 Broadway, New York City.

WILLIAM H. ANDERSON, STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE OF NEW YORK, SPOKE SUNDAY, JUNE 17, 1923, IN THE MORNING AT THE REGULAR HOUR OF SERVICE AT THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH OF JAMESTOWN, N.Y., AND AT NIGHT AT PLYMOUTH METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, BUFFALO. BY WAY OF PRELIMINARY TO HIS ADDRESS HE SAID:

The mess of political remnants, to which state it was reduced by trying to play second fiddle to Tammany on the liquor question, which by courtesy is known as the Republican State machine and its alleged leadership, has just served notice that it would rather stay dead than be decent.

I want to stop here to say that not only is the overwhelming majority of the membership of the Republican Party in New York dry but also a very large proportion of its leadership in various localities, and a goodly number of its actual State leaders, are if not actually dry at least politically honest and intelligent enough to stand for the party's taking the moral and patriotic end of the issue of dry enforcement and doing it sincerely enough to deserve dry support. It is the "machine" that is wrong.

The Republican State Committee by its semi-formal announcement last Thursday that it will not submit to "dictation" by a "bloc" has advertised its submission to dictation by a tank.

For more than a generation, with one brief interval, the Republican State machine has worked the brewers while Tammany worked the saloonkeepers. From before the days of the Raines Law which allowed the Republican machine to "stick up" the liquor traffic for campaign funds, until 1918 when the people retired the wet Republican leaders of the Senate, the Republican machine, as distinguished from the Republican Party as a whole, has pretended to be dry and actually been wet. It has made promises to the drys and delivered the goods to the wets. Before what was left of its leadership fully recovered its breath the machine was compelled to stand for ratification in 1919, but then immediately left the reservation of decency and mired down again in the booze swamp, conniving at the nullification beer act of three years ago.

The Republican machine management never intended to be decent enough to pass the recently repealed State enforcement code in the first place. It had actively or passively sold out Governor Miller in a deal that threw wet Democrats to Wadsworth in return for wet Republican votes for Smith. However, Governor Miller, being thus betrayed, with the aid of dry support because of his declaration for enforcement, and assisted by the National Republican sweep, was elected and made good his public promise to the people.

This wet Republican machine which now, through its journalistic mouthpieces in New York is vociferating that Governor Miller was a prohibition candidate and that his defeat proves that dry support is a liability, tried to betray Governor ~~Miller in 1920 exactly as it betrayed~~ Governor Whitman in 1918, and again actually sold him out to Governor Smith as the Tammany candidate in 1922, being helped in their treachery by Governor Miller's own amazing blunders.

Governor Miller was not a prohibition candidate in any sense of the word. He was wet. He was for beer. He bid for wet support by leaving out of the platform adopted by the Republican Convention which he controlled, any declaration for enforcement or approval of the enforcement law which he had put through. He refused to take up the enabling "Triplets", which the League recommended but did not ask for as a favor, which not only would have protected localities in the event of repeal but would have prevented the possibility of repeal by giving local sentiment a chance to organize effectively to uphold the law. He wantonly affronted the League of Women Voters which was overwhelmingly dry. He repealed the direct primary so the great dry majority of the party would be helpless in naming candidates. He had no more use for the Anti-Saloon League than he had for the League of Women Voters. He

deliberately and purposely handled the passage of the enforcement code in such manner as to try to deprive the Anti-Saloon League of any credit, although he could never have gotten it through if the League had not come to his rescue in marshalling the dry sentiment of the State and focusing it on the Legislature. While perfectly courteous to the League which never asked any favor of him, he evidently expected last fall to win under such conditions that he could say that it was not in any respect due to dry support, at which time he undoubtedly expected at the first opportunity to refer the League to what he hoped was its ultimate destination.

The League knew of these things but played the game because it knew perfedtly well that it would be on the job increasing in influence while every man who attempted to destroy the influence of the moral sentiment which it represented would succeed only in destroying himself politically.

The League has no grievance against Governor Miller. He did everything he said he would do, for he gave no assurance to the League which was not given to the public. Personally I respect him highly as a frank, out-spoken wet. I think he is the fairest, most honest wet who has come to the surface in New York State politics. I have been thus frank about him for two reasons: (1) because it was necessary to answer the false charge of the wet papers that Governor Miller was defeated as a prohibition candidate; (2) because, having had the very best and fairest and most honest wet there is in the State and having thus had the conclusive proof that no wet knows how to appeal for dry support or is disposed to go beyond the letter of his public assurances in the vindication of the dry law, the dry majority of the Republican Party insists on a candidate who is personally in favor of the law he must enforce.

Of all the stupid, blundering, futile alleged campaigns ever conducted, the so-called Republican campaign of last fall was the most pitiably ridiculous.

And yet the men who through treachery or ineptness, and some of the leaders combined both, were responsible for the condition in which the party finds itself today, headed by the wet State Chairman picked by Governor Miller, have the gall to announce that they intend to continue to listen to the wet minority which plays safe by voting for the Tammany candidate in any event, and to continue to refuse to listen to the dry majority of the party and thereby win with the aid of dry Democrats and dry Independents.

But I can assure the dry and decent Republicans that these machine leaders are not half as bold as they try to make out. The only thing they are waiting for today is to find out whether the dry forces mean what they say, or whether it is a mere bluff.

If the dry church constituency, which furnishes the bulk of the character and intelligence of the Republican Party, will serve notice personally, and publicly through the pastors as its local leaders, that the Republican organization must choose, and that it can no longer fool the drys while in fact serving the wets, there will be no serious difficulty about either nominee or platform next time.

Incidentally, we stop long enough to suggest that if the next Republican candidate is nominated by convention, as the State Chairman announces, instead of by a restored primary, his chances of winning will be very much less.

The wet Republican press of New York City, assisted by the wet Democratic papers which are afraid that the Republican organization will win by standing dry and decent, are charging that the League Superintendent is attempting to dictate to the party. The fact is that the Board of Directors, officially representing some 4,000 to 5,000 churches of this State, quietly informed the Republican management, so early that it could not claim it was taken by surprise, that if it expects dry support it must nominate candidates and adopt policies favored by the dry majority of the party membership to whom it looks for the votes to elect its candidates. The uproar is a confession of past perfidy and present purpose for the future.

These papers are afraid to say openly what they really think of people like you and the church constituency of the State ge erally. They think it is safe to hammer me and apparently have not yet learned after nearly ten years how little good such hammering does them and how little harm it does me.

These wet papers of New York City have betrayed the purpose of the conspiracy of propaganda against me which they abetted last winter, in their present pretended surprise over the fact that I have refused to be silenced by the false charges which they published, without making any fair statement of the collapse of these charges such as was made by the up-State papers that have stood for fair play.

These wet papers in New York now find to their horror tha all of the publicity which they gave for the prupose of destroying the League Superintendent personally, and crushing the influence of the League movement, and dissipating the power of the League constituency has simply made the issue more acute and the dry following more influential since the failure to make these false charges stick and the failure to deceive and disturb the League support.

The frenzied assistance rendered by Republican wet papers of New York City to the effort of the Tammany Mayor of New York to drive away the League's contributors bears eloquent testimony to the recognition by these papers of the extent to which the dry majority of the Republican Party is rallying not only to the moral but the financial support of the League since the shock of actual repeal has awakened the law-abiding citizenship of the State to a realization of the duplicity of the Republican machine leadership.

For example, the New York Herald and the New York Tribune, ostensibly Republican papers, laid down on the Republican candidate for Governor in 1918 in order to allow "Al" Smith to be elected in the first place. They laid down on the Republican candidate for Governor in 1920 and gave no adequafe warning of the deal between the Republican backers of Senator Wadsworth and the Tammany backers of Governor Smith, connived at even by the National Republican leaders. They gave no support to Governor Miller in New York City in his pressing of the law enforcement issue in 1920. They were dragged and kicked into line for enforcement only after the enforcement bill put through by him was a certainty. They laid down on the Republican candidate for Governor again last fall and refused to print the things that might have given him a chance, although it must be admitted that he has no just grievance against them, because he refused to say or do anything that would have compelled them to print matter that would appeal to and arouse the dry element.

The Evening Mail is another Republican paper that laid down. It claims to be dry, but it led off in the effort to destroy the influence of the League last winter. Its avowed purpose, openly stated by its accredited representative, was to bring about a reorganization of the League that would be satisfactory to certain financial and political interests. The real character of the Mail ownership is disclosed by the fact that it was sold to friends or representatives of the German Government during the War and the man who is its present reputed owner allowed his name to stand at the masthead of the paper while the Mail was attacking prohibition and saying things that led the United States Government to step in and take possession of it, at which time he secured a certificate of patriotism from Col. Roosevelt when he again took over active control of the paper.

The Republican Party would be infinitely stronger in New York State if it would kick entirely out of the party the New York City management which is wet before it is Republican, and at the same time repudiate any wet newspaper spokesmen which have been dumb-dogs every time there was a deal on between the city Republican leaders and Tammany to knife a dry law-enforcement Republican.

There is a growing determination on the part of the decent, moral, law-abiding element of the Republican Party, led by the constituency of the churches, to wreck the party completely if necessary to

eliminate the parasites, rather than allow wet leaders to prostitute the party to Tammany.

The State management of the Republican Party needs to be disinfected, deodorized and then dry cleaned, and this is the time to do it, for the simple reason that by signing the repeal Governor Smith has clinched for himself all of the wet Republicans as well as Democrats to such extent that refusal to make a square appeal to the dry and law and order sentiment is so foolish as to be obviously crooked.

We neither attempt to dictate nor ask for favors. We cordially invite this collection of political flotsam and jetsam with the smell of the beer keg and the mash tub on their political garment to nominate their wet candidate if they wish, and elect him if they can.

(Signed) WILLIAM H. ANDERSON

State Superintendent,
Anti-Saloon League of New York.

RELEASE MONDAY, JUNE 18, 1923.

Publicity Department, Anti-Saloon League of New York,
16th Floor, 906 Broadway, New York City.

William H. Anderson, State Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of New York, Speaking at the Regular Sunday Morning Service of the South Third Street Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, March 25, 1923, Said:

FOSDICK FORCED ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE IN SELF-DEFENSE TO ADVERTISE THAT IT CANNOT BE BOUGHT.

The real originator of the Anti-Saloon League's "FREEDOM FUND", the success of which was assured in advance, was Raymond B. Fosdick, hostile hired man of the John D. Rockefellers. If, as Rockefeller representative, he had been content merely to recommend withdrawal of Rockefeller contributions, the Anti-Saloon League would have had no possible justification for any adverse comment or any public appeal based upon such action.

But when Mr. Fosdick allowed his venom, based upon years of personal hostility and accentuated by the dismal failure of his efforts first to control and second to eliminate me because I antagonized the wealthy beer nullificationists of New York City, to lead him into use of alleged withdrawal of Rockefeller contributions as part of a propaganda conspiracy to crush me and injure the Anti-Saloon League, and allowed his spleen to betray him into acquiescence in the false statement that the Rockefeller contribution is four times as large as it really is, he compelled me in self-defense to set out the facts respecting both the contribution and himself.

If Mr. Rockefeller is embarrassed by any of this publicity all blame belongs on the blunder of his own representative who started it and forced my hand.

It was Mr. Fosdick, in his effort to gratify his personal animus against me, who forced the League to utilize the unparalleled opportunity presented by him, of advertising to the public that the Anti-Saloon League is not for sale, and that the man who gives twenty-five dollars or even a single dollar counts just as much in determining the policy of this organized exponent of the righteous and law-abiding conviction of the people, as the man who gives twenty-five thousand dollars, and infinitely more than the hostile representative of any such liberal giver.

Four years ago, when ratification was effected in New York it was currently reported, and generally believed, that the Messrs. Rockefeller had given that year, for that purpose, fifteen million dollars. I knew at the time of a private statement to that effect by an agent of the Rockefeller Foundation. The truth is they gave for that fiscal year about seventy-five thousand dollars, or one-half of one per cent of that amount.

However, the withdrawal of $50,000 of that $75,000 immediately after Mr. Fosdick was put in a position to pass on such things, coming without warning, in the face of the greatest danger the dry cause ever faced, sadly crippled the work for a whole year. The threatened withdrawal now of the last $25,000 will further hamper the work unless it is replaced.

Therefore, that this agency of the churches, this exponent of the moral conviction of the people which we have always kept free, may not only remain free but be fully effective as well as free, we appeal to the exponents of untrammelled righteousness and a free Americanism to furnish $100,000 a year of additional funds, not only to make up the loss due to the threatened Rockefeller withdrawal but to furnish enough additional funds, so that no such unhappy chance as the death of a friendly Rockefeller representative and the appointment of a hostile one in his place, can ever again jeopardize the work of the Anti-Saloon League as the agency of the churches.

(Signed) WILLIAM H. ANDERSON.

State Superintendent,
Anti-Saloon League of New York.