

What Will the South Do to Al Smith?

By WILLIAM H. CRAWFORD

ALFRED E. SMITH looms large as the probable nominee of the Democratic Party. It is Smith against the field, and in thirty years of political writing I have never seen the opposition less organized. Should he be nominated, will the combination of Southern and Eastern Democrats be broken?

There is little doubt that Northern and Eastern Democracy will be for Al. He has long been its idol. The question, then, is, will the South support this typical representative of Eastern Democracy?

The Outlook has sent the following telegram to the leading citizens throughout the South, mainly influential editors:

To all appearances Al Smith is to be the Democratic nominee. If he is nominated, what will the South do to him in the election, particularly in your State? We are getting a consensus of views from leaders of public opinion in the South. Would appreciate brief reply from 50 to 150 words by night letter to reach us Tuesday morning.

(Signed) ERNEST HAMLIN ABBOTT,
Editor, The Outlook.

As a political writer who has recently been throughout the South sizing up the political situation, I am interested in commenting on these telegrams.

To begin with, two facts make the question as to whether the South will support Smith a debatable subject. First, Alfred E. Smith is a Roman Catholic. Second, Alfred E. Smith is listed in the public mind as a wet.

Many people believe that either one or both of these facts will engender a sufficient opposition to him in the South to prevent him from carrying this stronghold of Democracy.

It is true that Governor Smith would lose a large number of votes throughout the South because of his religion. The South, with the exceptions of Maryland and Louisiana, was originally settled by Protestant English, and there has been much less infusion of foreign blood in Southern territory than in any other section of the United States. The Anglo-Saxons brought with them to America their customs, prejudices, and political tenets, one of which was that no Catholic could ever become President. This political tenet dates back to the time of the overthrow of the Stuarts in England,

when a provision was made that no one should be allowed to ascend the English throne who did not subscribe to the Established Church. It was surprising how many people believed that this law had been transplanted to America. When Al Smith was first spoken of as a candidate four years ago, I received thousands of letters asking me if it was not against the law for a Catholic to be President.

There is, however, another side of the picture. Equally indoctrinated into the American mind is a love of liberty. The American people have always prided themselves that our Government was founded on the principle of civil and religious liberty. Until this present campaign there has been no opportunity for a testing of the two apparently divergent tenets. Now they are brought face to face with the proposition. They must decide whether their love of religious liberty or their distrust of Rome shall be the deciding influence in casting their vote.

It is my opinion that Smith will lose a larger number of Southern votes because of his religion than the political leaders are willing to admit. Few men are willing to frankly state that they will refuse to vote for the nominee of their party because of religious prejudice, thus violating the spirit of the Constitution of the United States.

Smith will also lose votes throughout the South because of his attitude on prohibition; but the South is not as dry as some of the political leaders would have you believe. Had I consumed all of the cocktails offered me while on my visit to the South I would still be seeing pink rabbits today. It is hard to make me believe that a man who has a case of contraband liquor in his cellar can very vigorously oppose the candidacy of a man because he is reputed to be in favor of the modification of the Volstead Act.

Another element enters into the Southern situation. There is no love for Republicanism in the South.

Here is what a prominent banker of Memphis, Tennessee, Bolton Smith, says in part:

Generally speaking, the South can be depended upon to vote for the nominee. As to those parts of the South where there is already a strong Republican Party, such as Tennessee, this outcome would be affected by the per-

sonality of the Republican nominee. Governor Lowden is very strong in the South, though I think that Mr. Hoover's self-denying and helpful activities in connection with the flood and his repeated visits, which have brought him in touch with leading men, have made him very strong throughout the South, but especially in the States of Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. It seems to be generally acknowledged that there is no chance of electing any Democrat except Smith.

The telegram from George Fort Milton, editor of the Chattanooga "News," exactly expresses my opinion concerning Tennessee and Kentucky. I doubt, however, if his judgment is as accurate concerning the rest of the South. Incidentally, Mr. Milton had always been an ardent supporter of McAdoo. Mr. Milton says in part:

If Governor Smith should be the Democratic nominee, Tennessee would be dangerously debatable, with odds strongly favoring such a Republican as Lowden or Hoover. The elements of Governor Smith's record and policies, which would operate so disadvantageously to him in Tennessee, would, I believe, be felt throughout the South, of course, to varying extents. I believe his nomination would shatter the Solid South. Whether permanently or not is another question.

H. C. Adler, the distinguished editor of the Chattanooga "Times," is not so pessimistic concerning Al Smith's chance of carrying Tennessee. His attitude is entirely in keeping with the policy of the New York "Times:"

The nomination of Al Smith by the Democratic Convention will mean, in the opinion of this newspaper, that Tennessee will give him the usual Democratic majority that it has cast for all Democratic candidates, with the single exception of when President Harding carried the State. Governor Smith has the confidence of the financial, the business, the labor, and the agricultural elements of the State, and, barring a few votes which he may lose because of his religion, he will, in our opinion, get the full Democratic strength and some of the Republican.

Probably the true condition in Tennessee and in Kentucky lies midway between these divergent opinions. Al Smith will lose some strength in both of these States. He will not hold the entire Democratic strength in either of them. He will, however, have about an equal chance with the Republican nominee of carrying them. The results will depend very largely upon who is the Republican nominee. My observation was that Lowden would be by far the

strongest Republican candidate in Kentucky and Tennessee.

The opinion of Jesse H. Jones, the publisher of the Houston "Chronicle," should have great weight in determining the attitude of the Southern Democrats. For Mr. Jones was the treasurer of the last Democratic Presidential campaign, and occupies one of the seats of the mighty in the Democratic Council. Mr. Jones said:

Texas will give its electoral vote to the Democratic nominee for the Presidency in 1928 by a very large majority, regardless of who the nominee may be, but Governor Smith would probably not get as large a vote as some one more in accord with the sentiments of a majority of the people of Texas on the question of prohibition.

The opinion of the editor of the Houston "Chronicle" exactly coincides with that of its owner.

Eugene Butler, of the Texas edition of the "Progressive Farmer," Dallas, Texas, agrees with Mr. Jones in his opinion concerning Texas. The gist of his message is:

Texas and remainder of South that always goes Democratic would go for Smith, but at greatly reduced majorities. In States such as Tennessee and Oklahoma that sometimes go Republican I shouldn't be surprised if they went Republican with Smith Democratic nominee.

It will thus be seen, first, that the opinion in Texas is unanimous that Smith will receive a smaller vote than any other Democratic nominee; second, that he would carry the State if nominated.

The "Times Picayune" of New Orleans believes that Louisiana is more interested at present in flood control than in National politics; but it closes its telegram with:

"We give this as our opinion, however, that Louisiana's electoral vote will be cast for the Democratic Presidential nominee."

John M. Parker, ex-Governor of Louisiana, and former Vice-Presidential nominee on the Bull Moose ticket, and one of the most influential citizens of the South, says:

If Governor Smith is the Democratic nominee for President, he will carry practically all the Southern States.

Using these opinions as a basis, and adding to them my personal observations, I think it is reasonably safe to assume that Louisiana will support Smith should he be the Democratic nominee.

Frederick Sullens, editor of the Jackson, Mississippi, "News," believes that it will be a calamity for the Democrats

to nominate Al Smith. In discussing the results should Smith be nominated, he said:

If he is nominated, it is practically certain that prohibition forces and Protestant church leaders will oppose his election, and this means splitting the Democratic Party wide open in Mississippi. In brief, Smith's nomination would be political suicide for the Democratic Party.

The opinion of Grover C. Hall, editor of the Montgomery "Advertiser," accurately mirrors the political attitude of Alabama. Personally, I know that Mr. Hall is not an ardent supporter of Governor Smith. He says:

It is my opinion that, if nominated by the Democrats for President, Governor Smith would carry the Solid South, but by a reduced majority.

The name of Howell has for two generations been associated in the South with safe and sound Democratic principles. As a youth I imbibed Democratic doctrines from the writings of Eben Howell, and his son, Clark Howell, the present editor of the Atlanta "Constitution," has continued the high standard and influence formerly held by his father. Mr. Howell doubts the possibility of nominating Smith, but believes that, if nominated, he will carry the Solid South. His reply was:

I have my doubts about Al Smith being able to obtain the necessary two-thirds vote to secure Democratic Presidential nomination, and if this traditional rule is changed and nomination forced by majority action, the nomination would not, in my opinion, be worth having, for it would inevitably result in party split. If, however, Smith can be nominated by two-thirds vote of the Convention, he would, in my opinion, carry the Solid South, and I believe there would be no doubt about Georgia.

Mr. Julian Harris, editor of the "Inquirer-Sun" of Columbus, Georgia, makes some very pertinent points. First, Smith will carry the Solid South if nominated, with the possible exception of Kentucky. Second, no newspaper of influence in Georgia is fighting Governor Smith, though several editors would prefer another nominee, and last, that his own belief is "that Al Smith is the one and only Democrat who has the shadow of a chance to defeat the Republican candidate."

E. D. Lambright, editor of the "Tribune," Tampa, Florida, believes that Smith would encounter strong opposition in Florida because of religious prejudice, his wet views, and his advocacy of present Federal Inheritance Tax Law. "Despite all these," he says, "I believe that traditional Democratic

loyalty would give him Florida's electoral vote, though by alarmingly reduced majority. Smith, however, will never get vote of Florida delegation for nomination."

Frank Shutts, editor of the Miami "Herald," concurs in the opinion that Smith will carry Florida. He says:

If Governor Smith received the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, in our judgment, he will receive the electoral vote of Florida, but possibly by a reduced majority. There has been no public agitation in this State so far, either for or against his candidacy.

William E. Gonzales, editor and publisher of the Columbia "State," does not believe that it would be wise for the Democrats to nominate Smith, "because of bitterness certain to develop in campaign in which issues of liquor and religion will be forced." Mr. Gonzales, however, believes that "the Solid South would support him, if nominated."

Mr. Wade H. Harris, editor of the Charlotte, North Carolina, "Observer," believes that religious prejudice against Smith is so strong that none of the Southern States except Florida and Louisiana would vote for him. Concerning this issue he said:

The liquor issue does not operate against Smith so potently as does the religious issue. It may be regarded as an unfortunate fact, but it is a fact all the same, that fear of Catholic influences at some time dominating Smith in the Presidential chair, exists. It is widespread and defies the cry of intolerance and bigotry. It is being boldly proclaimed as the chief objection to Smith, and it is a sentiment so deeply rooted in this section of the Nation that it might as well be accepted as ineradicable.

Mr. Louis I. Jaffe, editor of the Virginia "Pilot," of Norfolk, has exactly the same opinion concerning the hostility in the South against Smith because of his religion as was expressed by his distinguished fellow-editor, Mr. Harris, of North Carolina. But he interprets the result differently. While many Virginians will oppose Smith because of his religion, he believes that the State would go for him in the general election. He concludes his telegram with:

If he is nominated, he will have the cordial support of Virginia's most influential newspapers. The judgment that Smith would carry Virginia is concurred in by many of our most experienced politicians and almost unanimously by detached observers not affiliated with the organized prohibition forces or with the Ku Klux Klan.

Mr. Richard H. Edmond, of Baltimore, the distinguished editor of "Man-
(Continued on page 285)



Windows on the World

By MALCOLM WATERS DAVIS

THE PERSON OF CHRIST is to be the rallying figure for the Christian Church in China. Reports from the Far East tell us that the native Christians are abandoning the denominations under which American and European missionaries have preached to them divided doctrine. Evidently the dogmatic disputes of the Occident confuse Orientals, and seem to them immaterial in contrast to the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth.

Some American church circles have been upset by the accounts of what is happening. But why should there be Chinese Adventists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterians, and other sorts of Protestants? With characteristic logic—and with the highest authority—the Chinese have decided that it is the practice and not the profession of the faith which matters.

In any event, if there are to be schisms and splits, they prefer to have them on Chinese grounds—not American or European. And we may hope that they will succeed in setting an example of accord to Christians of the West.

While this movement toward unity in China has been proceeding a proposal of another sort has come forward at Washington. Briefly, it is a plan for appointment of American diplomatic agents to each of the several regional factions in the Chinese civil war, outlined in newspaper reports of a recommendation by Senator Hiram Bingham, of Connecticut, to Secretary Kellogg. Both as a friend of China and in our own ultimate interest, I question the value of such a departure from the traditional American policy favoring unification of China. Certainly the Chinese would think our various diplomatic missions as

hard to understand as they have apparently found our denominational missions.

“**N**OW YOU MAY TALK,” the Dictator of Spain has in effect told the members of the new Advisory National Assembly. It is a practically hand-picked body of men, elected by the Government to represent the states, provinces, and towns, and financial, industrial, scientific, and social groups. So, after four years of administration by the decrees of General Primo di Rivera, Spain again has a parliament—not a legislature, for the Assembly has no lawmaking power.

Prophecies of doom for King Alfonso and the army régime, from Professor Julian Besteiro, the chief of the Socialist Party and of the Spanish Federation of Labor, added a touch of interest as the Deputies gathered for the inauguration of the Assembly by the King. Professor Besteiro had refused a seat. But the King proceeded to open the sessions, the police arrested some five hundred people implicated in a general strike and revolt conspiracy, and nothing happened.

The members of the Advisory Assembly may converse and even debate on affairs of State—but Spain still takes dictation.

Execution by proxy is the novel penalty now being suffered by Bishop Fan S. Noli, formerly Premier of Albania, and eight other members of the Committee for Liberation of Albania. Sentences of death by default followed their signature of a Communist manifesto protesting against the régime of the President and Premier, Ahmed Zogu, who drove Bishop Noli out by force of arms in 1924. In refuge abroad, Bishop Noli—like Mark Twain—probably finds reports of

his official death greatly exaggerated.

FRANCE has sent Christian Rakovsky, the Soviet Ambassador, away from Paris, and Japan is to have a chance to see how she can get along with him. Chicherin, the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, does not want him in Moscow—for Rakovsky sympathizes with the extremist opposition to the Government—and has arranged to exchange him for Valerian Dvoglevsky, Soviet Ambassador at Tokyo.

Rakovsky had an opportunity for a distinguished achievement at Paris. The French Government appeared ready to conclude new commercial agreements and gave him a friendly welcome. But his evasive tactics in regard to any agreement for payment of Russian debts wore out French patience, and his indorsement of an International manifesto calling for the overthrow of the French “bourgeois” Government brought an end to French temper and courtesy. He quit the capital without an official farewell and with the Quai d’Orsay obviously in a mood of “good riddance.”

France has hopes of the new Ambassador, who has not made a reputation as a Soviet propagandist. But she is likely to find that the face may be the face of Rakovsky or Dvoglevsky, but the voice is the voice of Moscow.

Mustapha Kemal, President of Turkey and of the so-called People’s Party, has been delivering by radio, at the opening of the National Assembly, an address of 400,000 words reviewing the progress of Turkish nationalism and economic development from the defeat at the end of the World War to the present day of triumph. He took seven days to deliver it—setting a horribly suggestive example to Congressional filibusterers. Ke-