

blood corpuscles. He could not say positively that this was human blood. I am told that a single drop of blood contains several million corpuscles. These are so very small that if one-thousandth part of one drop of blood, which is about as large as the point of a needle, were placed under the lens or magnifying glass of a microscope such as Dr. Smith used there would easily be visible about 10,000 corpuscles. The part of the spot that looked like blood was shown by Dr. Smith's analysis to be paint. If the spot had really been caused by blood from Mary Phagan's head the number of corpuscles would have been countless, and would have been found on all four chips.

As to Conley's testimony, I am obliged to leave it to the intelligence and fair-mindedness of the community whether his successive perjuries, his motive to lie, the most powerful that could actuate a human being, and the utter improbability of his story, do not render it unworthy of belief.

Q.—Why did you not state that Conley could write as soon as you learned that Conley had been arrested on May 1?

A.—On May 1 I was taken to the Tower. I understand that the negro Conley was arrested on the same day, though at that time I did not know it. No suspicions were directed toward Conley at that time, and no one dreamed of what was to follow later. His name was not in the Atlanta newspapers, as far as I remember, from May 1 until May 18, when his first confession appeared. I had no inkling that he was denying he could write, and had supposed that he had been put through the same handwriting test by the police as were all the other suspects in the case, including Lee, Mullinax, and Gantt, as well as myself.

Just as soon as I learned that Conley denied being able to write, I immediately gave the information in regard to Conley's having signed an installment contract for a watch. The detectives took up this clue, located the contract, and thus forced Conley to admit that he could write. His confession thereupon followed. It will thus be seen that I am the very man who enabled the detectives to unearth and prove the most powerful and significant fact in this entire case.

Q.—Conley testified that on Friday, April 25, you asked him to come to the factory Saturday morning to watch. Did you know at that time, or any other time prior to her coming to the factory on Saturday morning, that Mary Phagan was coming to the factory Saturday morning, April 26, or at what hour she was coming, and if you would be alone when she did come?

Thirty Callers That Day.

A.—There was no possible way for me to know or imagine that Mary Phagan would come to the factory on April 26. It is a proven fact that on that day at least thirty people called at the factory, and saw me at my work in my office. I had no idea of how many people were coming to the factory that day or when they were coming. I certainly could have had no knowledge in advance as to when I would be left alone or that I would be left alone at all.

Q.—The record of the case discloses that Conley is the only witness who testified you had been guilty of perjury. What is your theory as to why this was brought into the case?

A.—This was brought into the case to poison the minds of the public and the jury, so that any charge thereafter brought against me, no matter how absurd, would be believed and swallowed whole. In my opinion, this nasty lie is chiefly responsible for my conviction, and its dirty work overshadowed every real issue in the case.

Q.—What of the contention of the State that your wife refused to visit you for ten days after your arrest?

A.—This is a dastardly insinuation and absolutely false. My wife was at the station house to see me on April 29, when first detained. She was on the first floor in company with some of her relatives. I was on the top floor with Rabbi Marx. Word was sent to me that my wife wanted to come up to see me. I consulted with Dr. Marx, and decided that, as I expected to be liberated in a few hours, or a day or so, at the longest, I would save my wife the sight of myself under arrest surrounded by detectives and officers.

My wife hysterically pleaded to see me, but I thought I would soon be out of custody and requested her to return home without seeing me. As long as I was detained at Police Headquarters I was in a private room, where I had the use of a Bell telephone. I had hourly and constant telephone communication with my wife. She still insisted upon coming down to see me, but I refused.

On May 1 I was carried to the tower. There I could use no telephone to communicate with my wife,

but for the next ten days every friend who came down to the Tower who had previously seen her brought a message from her entreating me to allow her to come to see me. I still declined, because I could not bring myself to allow her to see me behind the bars of a jail. When my hopes of immediate release were disappointed I finally consented that she might come. I simply wanted to spare her the pain and distress of seeing me under such conditions. Since then my wife has been to see me every day and spends most of her time with me.

Q.—Conley testified that you and he were in the factory on Saturday, April 26, from four minutes to 1 to 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon. What answer do you make to this?

His Whereabouts After 1 P. M.

A.—On Saturday, April 26, I left the factory at 1 P. M. or a minute or two thereafter, locking the factory doors when I left. Miss Kern testified at the trial that she saw me on the corner of Whitehall and Alabama Streets between 1:05 and 1:10. I caught the car for my home at this corner. Mrs. Miller now says she saw me at the same place and time. Mrs. A. P. Levy, who lives opposite my home, testified she saw me get off the Georgia Avenue car near my home on Georgia Avenue at about 1:20 P. M. My parents-in-law and Minola McKnight testified that I arrived at my home for lunch at about 1:20 P. M., and that I sat down and ate my lunch. Albert McKnight, a prosecution witness, testified he was at my home and saw me there before 1:30 P. M. I certainly could not have been in two places at the same time. The wealth of testimony and the truth refute Conley's unsupported assertion. His statement in regard to what he and I did from 12:56 to 1:30 P. M. on April 26 is a lie out of the whole cloth, is absurd on its face, and has been thoroughly disproved.

Q.—Conley says that prior to April 26 and during the year 1912 he watched for you on various Saturday afternoons. What is your answer to this?

A.—This is but another of Conley's infamous lies. His story about watching is preposterous on its face. Aside from this, at the trial it was proved that not alone was Conley's story about watching for me untrue, but was impossible. Among those who so testified were Messrs. Darley, Schiff, Bauer, Weinkauff, Montag, Gotthelmer, Mann, Chambers, Payne, Nix, Campbell, Stelker and Holloway. Some of these men were at the factory with me, not alone on the Saturday afternoons in question, but on all other Saturday afternoons. Up to Jan. 15, 1913, the first or street floor of the factory building was occupied by the Clark Wooden Ware Company. Their employes and the National Pencil Company's used the same street entrance—the same entrance that Conley says he watched. The Clark Wooden Ware Company also worked on Saturday afternoons. It was impossible for me—not to speak of Conley—to have controlled any one who wished to enter the building when the entrance was being used by both of the firms.

Could Have Stopped Nobody.

Conley states that April 26 was the first time he watched since Jan. 1, 1913. Conley could have stopped no one previous to Jan. 15, 1913, and, as per his own testimony, he did not watch after that time till April 26. It is a remarkable fact that of all the times he said he watched he never mentioned one person whom he had ever stopped. That is simple to account for. First, he never was watching, and, second, he could not have stopped any one. What white person desiring to enter the building could he have stopped? Any one desiring to enter the factory would have brushed by Conley (if he had been watching) and entered in spite of him.

If, at times, when the first floor was unoccupied, I should have desired any privacy in the factory, I possessed the keys of the building and could have locked the factory doors. If I had desired to be alone, I certainly needed no one (white or black) to watch for me.

Factory officials, employes, salesmen, and friends have all at one time or another visited me in my office on Saturday afternoons. They found me, not behind closed or locked doors, but at work and easily accessible. They never saw a negro look-out or any indecent thing occurring in my office. This was amply brought out at the trial. In addition, my wife was a frequent visitor at my office on Saturday afternoons, often helping me with my work. Against this bulk of human evidence and the physical facts, Conley's unsupported story about watching utterly fails to piece.

FRANK ANSWERS QUESTIONS.

Came from Unfriendly Sources, and His Defenders Are Elated.

Special to The New York Times.

ATLANTA, Ga., March 15.—Leo M. Frank this afternoon made public his answers to a series of questions put to him by persons admittedly hostile to the contention that he was unjustly convicted. He had offered to answer any questions put to him, and the queries he answered to-day were framed by persons who hoped he would fail to make satisfactory replies. Frank's friends, however, assert that his answers completely demolish the case against him. The questions and answers follow:

Q.—Why did you not recognize the notes to be in Conley's handwriting when you and others were examining them at Police Headquarters the Sunday after Memorial Day?

A.—I simply did not know Conley's handwriting. There were seven other negroes employed at the factory in one capacity or another. I had also received notes from some of them. I had no more reason to remember Conley's scrawl than that of any of the others. A Superintendent of a factory cannot be expected to recognize the handwriting of every one of his negro employes.

Q.—The State has convicted you of the murder of Mary Phagan. The theory the State gives is that you committed the murder in the metal room on the second floor of the pencil factory. What answer have you to this?

A.—The State's theory as to the murder being committed on the second floor of the pencil factory rests upon three contentions, viz.: (1) The hair found on the lathe; (2) the spot by the dressing room alleged to be blood; (3) Conley's testimony.

The contention as to the hair has been disproved to every fair-minded man and exploded by Dr. Harris's recent revelation.

The supposed "blood spot" was nothing but paint. There are many such spots all about the factory, on account of the paint used in the painting of pencils. The factory used three or four shades of red paint, which, when on the floor, might look like blood. On the second floor was one of the factory's paint storage rooms, from which paint was distributed to all the factory. On April 26 there must have been about sixty gallons of red and brown paint in the second floor storage room, not to speak of 150 gallons of other colors.

Four Blood Corpuscles.

At the trial Dr. Claude Smith, the prosecution's chemical expert, declared that he examined four chips taken from this spot. He found paint or stain on three of the chips. On the fourth chip he found paint and four