



Courtesy Weyhe Gallery

NEW YORK ROOFS

An etching by Emil Ganso

Emil Ganso was a baker when his talent was discovered. He is now living near Woodstock, New York

The Outlook

Volume 147

November 30, 1927

Number 13

THE WEEK

Out to Beat Al Smith?

DIVERSE reports come to us concerning the policy of Southern politicians toward the candidacy of Governor Smith.

From a well-informed correspondent in the extreme South comes, on the one hand, the report that, especially in the cotton States, the impression seems to grow that the way to defeat Governor Alfred E. Smith in the Democratic nomination is to concentrate on defeating him. According to this impression, the plan is to drop other political interests and to put all effort into the naming of delegations to the Democratic National Convention pledged to nobody, but oath-bound against Governor Smith's candidacy. One instance is cited in which the women of the Protestant churches of a little city in Texas had banded together for the exclusive purpose of fighting Governor Smith's nomination. Another instance is that of a Southern Methodist conference in which the defeat of the Smith candidacy was made the subject of a resolution which only the more diplomatic members prevented the conference from passing in its original form, but which was finally passed in a form which left little doubt as to its meaning.

Dry, anti-Catholic, anti-Tammany, and anti-New York City sentiments, it is said, all furnish motives for the movement. But the theory behind it is, of course, that if the Smith campaign leaders learn before the Convention that there are a decisive number of votes which they never can have, that campaign will collapse the sooner and leave the anti-Smith forces free to pick a satisfactory candidate at their leisure.

As political strategy the obvious weakness of this plan is that it makes Governor Smith the sole figure on the Democratic landscape. Saint or horned demon, he would receive from this, if the plan were carried out, an extraordinary amount of personal advertising. If all who are not against Smith in the South are thus driven to be for him, the Smith

campaign will almost necessarily, it is argued, attract a large number of Southern adherents who would normally be disposed to neutrality.

It may be replied that such a plan once succeeded. In 1916 the Republican bosses saw to it that a sufficient number of delegates were pledged to nobody in particular, but against ex-President Theodore Roosevelt to assure Roosevelt's defeat. So honest were these delegates that when the bosses changed their minds they could not change the delegates' minds. But that was more than ten years ago. Perhaps that cannot be done now.

At any rate, the impression among the original Smith following, according to this report, is growing that their candidate is being politically martyred. This impression may even extend to some who now are opposed to Governor Smith. It is suggested, therefore, that the anti-Smith movement might prove more effective if it opposed the Governor, not with the vote of general antipathy, but with a better candidate.

The question thus arises whether it is best to try to beat Governor Smith with nobody.

Or Out for Other Men?

ON the other hand, we get from our Washington correspondent, who has been traveling through the South, the report that nobody in the South—certainly no politician—is lying awake nights hating Al Smith. Those who are opposed to Governor Smith, according to this report (in which, of course, we have great confidence), do not seem to think of him much unless he is called to their attention. As a matter of fact, they talk about other candidates. There may be localities in which Democratic voters are content with being against Governor Smith, but they are not numerous or significant—at least in Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia. It is true that the

Democratic voters in the South are not combined on a candidate. If they should be, our correspondent believes, the result would be a repetition of the fratricide of Madison Square Garden. Any candidate upon whom the Southern States might now concentrate would inevitably become a successor to McAdoo, and therefore become the man whose mission was to stop Smith; and that would mean dissension.

As a matter of fact, we are told, Southern Democrats are interested in a number of candidates, some of whom are not enemies of Governor Smith at all. They are interested in Ritchie of Maryland and Reed of Missouri, both wets, and decidedly interested in Donahy of Ohio, a dry. Kentucky's mind is running strongly to Evans Woollen of Indiana. Tennessee is thinking of a Southern candidate—especially McReynolds, of the Supreme Court, and Representative Hull, both Tennesseans. Others are thinking of Meredith of Iowa, Baker of Ohio, and Houston, now of New York.

According to this report, Governor Smith is not as strong now as he was before Mr. McAdoo withdrew. There is less bitterness than if all Democrats opposed to him were united now on one candidate. Some of the Southern leaders appear to think that Governor Smith is already beaten. But, in any case, another fight like that of 1924, it is argued, and the argument seems reasonable, means ruin to the Democratic Party.

Perhaps the adherents of Governor Smith would like to see their opponents pick somebody now for his opponent.

Oil Prospects in Mexico

QUARRELS about oil have embittered relations between Mexico and the United States ever since the Mexican Congress passed the Petroleum Law of 1925.

That law was enacted under the new