THE CONTENDER

A year before the Democratic National Convention of 1924 the contest for the party's presidential nomination had become one between William Gibbs McAdoo and Senator Oscar W. Underwood, a wet, conservative Alabamian. A large number of favorite sons and other minor candidates, all hoping for the nomination if the two principals deadlocked, also figured in the preconvention plans of the leaders of the Democratic Party. At the time of the Mullan-Gage episode Al Smith was merely one of these other candidates. A few politicians and other observers had predicted, particularly after Smith's impressive victory in 1922, that he would be a presidential candidate in 1924, but they had usually considered Smith to be only a minor contender for the nomination.[1]

The prominence that Smith received from the Mullan-Gage affair – as well as from his subsequent, somewhat mystifying visit to the Midwest – heightened speculation about his presidential candidacy for a few months and led some of McAdoo's friends to believe that Smith would soon commence an energetic national campaign for the nomination. Only a few commentators during the last half of 1923, however, ranked Smith among the leading contenders; and when he made no apparent effort to undertake an active campaign, they too began to discount his candidacy. By the end of the year, and even into 1924, nearly every published analysis of the Democratic contest either completely ignored Smith or else mentioned him as an afterthought, and even some of Smith's most ardent enemies no longer regarded his candidacy as a serious threat.[2]

---

[1] Shouse to McAdoo, November 9, 1922, Shouse Papers, UKy; John S. Williams to McAdoo, April 5, 1923, Josephus Daniels to McAdoo, May 5, 1923, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, November 17, 1922, December 19, 1922, March 6, 1923, April 6, 1923, May 3, 1923; "Democratic Plans to Win Next Time," Literary Digest, LXXV (December 9, 1922), 10-11; "Governor Alfred E. Smith and the Presidency," World's Work, XLV (March, 1923), 463-465; "Prospective Democratic Candidates," Review of Reviews, LXVII (March, 1923), 239; "Presidential Bees," Independent, CX (March 31, 1923), 211-212; John W. Owens, "Shadows of 1924," New Republic, XXXIV (May 9, 1923), 288-290; Lee N. Allen, "The McAdoo Campaign for the Presidential Nomination in 1924," Journal of Southern History, XXIX (May, 1963), 216. See also Chapter 3, pp. 24-26. The speculation that Underwood was merely a stalking horse for the Northern, urban machines was unfounded. See Frank J. Merkling to R.B. Evins, June 5, 1924, Underwood Papers, ADHA; David L. Rockwell to Charles White, April 22, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, February 24, 1924; Lee N. Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," Alabama Review, XV (April, 1962), 91-92; and Lee N. Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924" (Ph.D. thesis, University of Alabama, 1955), passim, especially p. 56. Smith's possible presidential nomination had aroused dry and Klan opposition as early as 1919. See NYT, December 11, 1922, January 10, 1923, March 1, 1923, March 2, 1923, May 28, 1923, June 8, 1923; Watson (ed.), Bishop Cannon's Own Story, pp. 386-389; and Peter H. Odegard, Pressure Politics: The Story of the Anti-Saloon League (New York, 1928, pp. 25-26, 82.

[2] Goltra to Henry W. Dooley, December 24, 1923, Goltra Papers, MoHS; Roper to McAdoo, June 6, 1923, Love to McAdoo, June 11, 1923, Dodd to McAdoo, June 18, 1923, David H. Miller to Roper, June 25, 1923, McAdoo to McKellar, July 4, 1923, McAdoo Papers, LC; Meredith to McAdoo, June 12, 1923, Meredith Papers, UIowa; NYT, June 10, 1923, June 11, 1923, June 12, 1923, June 13, 1923, June 14, 1923, June 21, 1923, June 25, 1923, November 4, 1923; "Who Will Be the Democratic Nominee?" Literary Digest, LXXVII (June 30, 1923), 5-8; "The Fight on for the Democratic Nomination," Literary Digest LXXVIII (July 21, 1923), 5-7; Edward G. Lowry, "Dark Horses and Dim Hopes," Colliers, LXXII (November 10, 1923), 12, 26; "Democrats May Choose Chicago," Review of Reviews, LXIX (January, 1924), 8-9; Milton, "The South – and 1924," Outlook, CXXXVI (January 2, 1924), 29-30; "The Presidency by Default?" Nation, CXVIII (January 23, 1924), 78; "Other Democratic Favorites," Literary Digest, LXIX (February, 1924), 127; "The Next Hundred Days," Independent, CXII (March 15, 1924), 140; Allen, "The McAdoo Campaign for the Presidential Nomination in 1924," Journal of Southern History, XXIX (May, 1963), 216; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," Alabama Review, XV (April, 1962), 91-92. Democratic losses in the 1923 New York elections cost Smith some prestige. NYT, November 14, 1923; "Decisions at the Polls in November," Review of Reviews, LXVIII (December, 1923, 569.

Those who discounted Smith's candidacy probably shared the judgment of William Jennings Bryan that the New York Governor was an "impossible" candidate. Impartial observers and Smith's adversaries alike identified his wetness as one reason for this view, but Smith's Catholicism also began to attract some attention as a possible barrier to his nomination – though it appears that those who opposed him on religious grounds did not always acknowledge the fact and sometimes used Smith's wetness as a camouflage for their objections to his religion.

In the end, Smith's two major handicaps in 1924 became fused in the minds of many Americans. The New Republic best summed up the common conception of Smith's political standing in late 1923 when it declared that "a Roman Catholic candidate on a wet platform is about as good a definition of unavailability as could be devised." Many observers throughout 1923, nevertheless, expected that Smith would seek to impose his ideas about issues and candidates upon the convention, function as a king maker, or emerge as the vice-presidential nominee. Indeed, Smith's personal unavailability reinforced the conclusion of some observers that he would be merely the instrument of the Eastern organizations in their effort to control the national convention in 1924.[3]

Those who believed that Smith would be only a stalking horse for the Eastern machines were correct. The leaders of these organizations took Smith's candidacy with increasing seriousness after the Mullan-Gage affair and ultimately united behind him as the means to deny the nomination to McAdoo. Few of these leaders thought that Smith could win the 1924 presidential nomination, and there is no persuasive evidence that he believed it himself. Smith reportedly described his candidacy as it developed in late 1923 and early 1924 as simply another favorite-son compliment, and his few extant remarks about it evince a private as well as a public skepticism that his friends' modest activities on his behalf would result in very much. According to all accounts, moreover, Smith knew nothing about the extent of these activities until late April, 1924, which was after New York Democrats had made Smith a formal candidate. His subsequent public confidence was only a pose, for in private he conceded his paucity of votes.[4] Smith

---

[3] Shouse to McAdoo, November 9, 1922, Shouse Papers, UKy; Dodd to McAdoo, June 18, 1923, McAdoo Papers, LC; Moos (ed.), A Carnival of Buncombe, p. 58-59; NYT, May 21, 1923, June 3, 1923, Editorial, June 10, 1923, June 11, 1923, June 14, 1923, June 15, 1923, June 17, 1923, Editorial, June 18, 1923, October 13, 1923, November 14, 1923, January 17, 1924; "Presidential Bees," Independent, CX (March 31, 1923), 211-212; Owens, "Shadows of 1924," New Republic, XXXIV (May 9, 1923), 289-290; "Governor Smith Burns His Bridges," Outlook, CXXXIV (June 13, 1923), 164-165; Editorial, New Republic, XXXVII (November 28, 1923), 3-4; Milton, "The South – and 1924," Outlook, CXXXVI (January 2, 1924), 29-30; William Hard, "Refined Products of Oil," Nation, CXVIII (February 20, 1924), 199; William Hard, "National Public Opinion," Nation, CXVIII (May 14, 1924), 560. Observers occasionally considered Smith's Tammany association to be a major reason why he could not be nominated for the presidency in 1924. See Bryan to C.E. Jones, June 18, 1923, Bryan Papers, LC; NYT, November 14, 1923, and February 24, 1924. Some of Smith's contemporaries maintained that Smith would easily win the nomination in 1924 but for his religion, and others declared that no Catholic could be nominated in 1924. See Joseph T. Robinson to Baruch, December 13, 1922, Baruch Papers, PU; Lithgow Osborne to Noel Buxton, March 17, 1924, T. Osborne, to Daniels, March 28, 1924, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; Sullivan, "The Democratic Dark Horse Pasture," World's Work, XLVI (July, 1923), 288-290; and Editorial, Nation, CXVIII (April 16, 1924), 411. The matter of Smith's Catholicism first became a political question in 1918, but – despite some Democrats' fears and Smith's assertions – the religious issue was not a major one then. NYT, September 27, 1928; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 163-164, 284; Roosevelt, The Happy Warrior, pp. 9-10; Baker, Wilson, VIII, 260n; Freidel, Roosevelt: The Apprenticeship, p. 342n.

[4] Thomas L. Chadbourne to McAdoo, June 4, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, March 3, 1924, April 28, 1924, June 21, 1924, June 22, 1924, June 23, 1924; Stanley Frost, "Nomination by Exhaustion," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 23, 1924), 464-466; Flynn, You're the Boss, pp. 39-40; Warner, The Happy Warrior, p. 142; Josephson and

unquestionably always realized that his candidacy was only a part of the anti-McAdoo movement.

Charles F. Murphy's conception of Smith's candidacy is more complex and obscure than Smith's is, but he too probably did not expect Smith to be nominated for the presidency in 1924. On the one hand, although Murphy surely had a genuine wish to have this Roman Catholic, immigrant-stock, East Sider receive the nomination (in part to extend the symbolic victory that Smith had won in 1918), Murphy did not have to see this ambition realized in 1924. Smith could wait (he was only fifty years old in 1924), and a strong showing might lay the groundwork for a nomination four years later.

On the other hand, though Murphy must have understood the disadvantages of Smith's running for and serving as vice president, the Tammany boss may have been willing – again for the prestige that it would bring to people of Smith's background – to settle for second place in 1924. There is, in fact, some evidence that just before his death Murphy conferred inconclusively with McAdoo's agents regarding a pairing of Smith and McAdoo on the ticket.[5] Murphy's most likely aim, however, was to use Smith's candidacy, among other weapons, to block McAdoo (and perhaps any other dry contender) and force a compromise nominee upon the convention.

The strategy of the New York Democratic leaders regarding the 1924 presidential nomination stemmed primarily from their concern about state politics. Their conviction that a bone-dry, Klan-endorsed nominee would be a disaster for the New York party was probably the foremost of several self-serving reasons for their revived opposition to McAdoo and championship of their own governor. Perhaps some of them mused about the vice-presidency; others seem to have hoped that they could stampede the national convention into nominating Smith for the presidency once the delegates grew familiar with his popularity in his native city, weary of an extended deadlock, and desperate for a nominee.

Most of the New York leaders, however, evidently agreed with those who believed that Smith's religion and stand on prohibition ruled him out of serious consideration for the presidency in 1924. Despite their confident statements about his strength, people like Murphy conceived of Smith's candidacy chiefly as a means of defeating McAdoo and nominating a compromise candidate. Even if in the end they could not nominate either Smith or a compromise candidate, the fact that New York Democrats had fought to the last for these goals would be an asset in their local and state elections that fall.[6]

Josephson, Smith, pp. 303-304; Freidel, Roosevelt: The Ordeal, pp. 164-165. According to McAdoo, Smith admitted in their private meeting during the 1924 convention's deadlock (see pp. 46-47 below) that he could not win and that his sole purpose was to defeat McAdoo, but the ambiguous nature of McAdoo's account makes it impossible to determine when Smith acquired this knowledge and purpose. McAdoo to George Creel, March 2, 1927, George Creel Papers, LC. In Up to Now (p. 284), Smith says only that he realized a few days into the convention that he could not be nominated.

[5] Roosevelt to John G. Saxe, December 27, 1940, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; N.R. Boyd, Jr., to McAdoo, January 23, 1924, Roper to McAdoo, April 23, 1924, Manton to McAdoo, April 25, 1924, McAdoo to Manton, April 29, 1924, Clarence N. Goodwin to McAdoo, May 23, 1924, Samuel B. Amidon to McAdoo, May 30, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, April 27, 1924, April 28, 1924; Stanley Frost, "Democratic Dynamite," Outlook, CXXXVII (June 18, 1924), 265-268; Handlin, Smith, pp. 116-117; Lindley, Roosevelt, pp. 220-222; Rollins, "The Political Education of Franklin Roosevelt," pp. 739-743.

[6] Patrick J. Rooney to John W. Davis, June 23, 1924, John W. Davis Papers, YU; Roosevelt to Bryan, June 20, 1923, Roosevelt to Washburn, August 13, 1923, Roosevelt to Andrew J. Peters, January 3, 1924, T. Osborne to Roosevelt,

Since many other Eastern political leaders thought as New Yorkers did about the prospect of McAdoo's nomination, a coalition to prevent this eventuality was inevitable. It is probably correct to suppose, as Edward J. Flynn asserted, that in the months after the Mullan-Gage affair Murphy set to work constructing such a coalition – one whose first priority was always McAdoo's defeat and not the nomination of the governor of New York. It is impossible to judge the extent and character of Murphy's activities or any understandings that they may have produced, for the Tammany leader never recorded and rarely shared his knowledge of such matters. Furthermore, Flynn's account is vague about when and how Murphy acted, and other reports of Murphy's activities are unsubstantiated.

One may suppose that Murphy did little more than clandestinely sound out possible allies among the party leaders; certainly Murphy did not attempt to attract individual delegates to Smith's standard. Not only had the state parties not yet selected their delegates in 1ate 1923, but such activity would have been contrary both to Murphy's style of operation and to Smith's express wishes at the time. In addition, if Murphy – or Smith –held any consequential personal discussions with prominent Democrats from other states before November, 1923, a press corps that did not usually overlook such things missed these discussions. In the summer of 1923 both men separately visited French Lick Springs, the resort home of Indiana boss Thomas Taggart and a traditional political rendezvous. Many observers surmised that both visits arose from the desire of wet Democrats to discuss their plans, but these trips appeared to be virtually devoid of political activities.[7]

When Murphy returned to French Lick Springs in November, 1923, however, he did not disguise the fact that he was conferring with Taggart and George Brennan of Illinois about the contest for the Democratic presidential nomination, evidently in an effort to settle upon a single candidate with whom to block McAdoo. (Both Taggart and Brennan frequently allied their organizations with the Eastern ones.) Since Taggart supported Indiana's Senator Samuel M. Ralston, the uncommitted Brennan, probably the most

---

March 29, 1924, Louis Howe to T. Osborne, April 1, 1924, James M. Cox to Roosevelt, May 27, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Henry Morgenthau, Sr., to Josephine Morgenthau, June 13, 1924, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., Papers, LC; Bowers to McAdoo, December 29, 1923, Arthur Brisbane to McAdoo, February 13, 1924, Thomas Taggart to McAdoo, April 13, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; T. Osborne to Daniels, March 28, 1924, T. Osborne to Peabody, June 7, 1924, T. Osborne to Frank Tannenbaum, August 5, 1924, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; NYT, June 3, 1923, November 20, 1923, January 17, 1924, February 8, 1924, February 12, 1924, April 16, 1924, April 17, 1924, April 21, 1924, March 5, 1926; "Governor Smith Burns His Bridges," Outlook, CXXXIV (June 13, 1923), 164-165; Samuel G. Blythe, "A Party Up in the Air," Saturday Evening Post, CXCVI (May 31, 1924), 145-146; Frost, "Democratic Dynamite," Outlook, CXXXVII (June 18, 1924), 265-268; Arthur Krock, "The Damn Fool Democrats," American Mercury, IV (March, 1925), 260-261; Smith, Up to Now, p. 284; Freidel, Roosevelt: The Ordeal, pp. 164-169; Lindley, Roosevelt, pp. 220-222; Frank R. Kent, The Democratic Party: A History (New York, 1928), pp. 466-471, 483-487; Thurner, "The Impact of Ethnic Groups on the Democratic Party in Chicago," pp. 180, 186-187.

[7] Roosevelt to Bryan, June 20, 1923, Roosevelt to Marc W. Cole, August 5, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; D. Miller to Roper, June 25, 1923, McAdoo to McKellar, July 4, 1923, Chadbourne to McAdoo, June 4, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; Key Pittman to William Woodburn, April 15, 1924, Key Pittman Papers, LC; NYT, June 10, 1923, June 11, 1923, June 12, 1923, June 13, 1923, June 14, 1923, June 15, 1923, June 17, 1923, June 21, 1923, June 25, 1923, July 14, 1923, July 15, 1923, July 26, 1923, April 27, 1924; "Democratic Candidates," Review of Reviews, LXVII (May, 1923), 459; Flynn, You're the Boss, pp. 41-43; Josephson and Josephson, Smith, p. 306. Belle Moskowitz and many of Smith's other personal friends long had been promoting Smith's name, but Murphy's activities in 1923 and 1924 were undoubtedly of more practical importance than publicity was. See Josephson and Josephson, Smith, pp. 302-304.

powerful organization leader other than Murphy, may have listened to claims for both Smith and Ralston at this meeting. The three leaders reportedly decided that Underwood was unavailable because of his Southern residence and that every other potential anti-McAdoo candidate similarly had at least one serious liability, so they were unable to agree upon a satisfactory opposition candidate. (Ralston was sixty-six and not in good health.)[8]

McAdoo and his principal advisers readily discerned the beginnings of the anti-McAdoo coalition. Although they regarded Underwood as McAdoo's major rival and Smith as a relatively unimportant factor, they suspected that Underwood and Smith's forces were working in harmony. At no time during 1923 did the McAdoo forces grant the opposition coalition much chance of success, and, as late as December, they hoped to draw even Brennan into the McAdoo fold.[9]

This confidence in the McAdoo camp about his candidacy extended into mid-January, 1924, when the Democrats chose the site of their national convention. Herbert Bayard Swope of the New York World, hoping to promote his friend Al Smith as well as his paper, had been campaigning for nine months to bring the convention to New York City. Murphy apparently embraced the idea in the belief that New Yorkers might sway some delegates by impressing them with Smith's popularity in his home city. Smith went along with the plans of his two friends, though apparently without enthusiasm. When the Democratic National Committee selected New York over San Francisco and Chicago, chiefly because it offered the most money, some observers interpreted the decision as a defeat for McAdoo.

McAdoo's partisans disagreed. They probably suspected that wets and Smith's friends had ulterior motives in urging New York City as the convention site, but many of McAdoo's friends on the committee nevertheless voted for New York. They may have decided that the party would now find it more difficult to nominate a wet, a conservative or a New Yorker and that McAdoo's supporters would be more alert than before to Tammany's machinations. McAdoo himself, asserting that he could have compelled the party to choose another city, boldly proclaimed, "I am willing to take my chances in New York."[10]

---

[8] McAdoo to Edith B. Wilson, December 20, 1923, Roper to McAdoo, June 6, 1923, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, November 14, 1923, November 17, 1923, November 22, 1923; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 123-124; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," Alabama Review, XV (April, 1962), 91-92; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," pp. 57-58.

[9] Meredith to McAdoo, June 12, 1923, Meredith Papers, UIowa; Alben W. Barkley to Donald McWain, January 24, 1924, Alben W. Barkley Papers, UKy; Williams to McAdoo, April 5, 1923, Roper to McAdoo, April 23, 1923, Daniels to McAdoo, May 5, 1923, Herbert Bayard Swope to McAdoo, May 25, 1923, McAdoo to Swope, June 6, 1923, Roper to McAdoo, June 6, 1923, Swope to McAdoo, June 14, 1923, McAdoo memorandum to Rockwell, December 18, 1923, McAdoo to E. Wilson, December 20, 1923, Milton to McAdoo, December 20, 1923, McAdoo to Chadbourne, December 24, 1923, McAdoo to D. Miller, December 29, 1923, McAdoo to Joseph H. O'Neil, December 31, 1923, McAdoo to Samuel Untermeyer [sic], January 17, 1924, Rockwell to Woolley, April 9, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC.

[10] Meredith to McAdoo, June 12, 1923, Meredith Papers, UIowa; Robert Lansing to J. Davis, January 18, 1924, Davis Papers, YU; Roosevelt to Bryan, June 20, 1923, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; McAdoo to Chadbourne, January 16, 1924, McAdoo to Roper, January 18, 1924, Roper to McAdoo, January 22, 1924, January 24, 1924, McAdoo to Manton, January 23, 1924, Homer S. Cummings to McAdoo, February 1, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, July 13, 1923, January 16, 1924; Flynn, You're the Boss, pp. 41-43; Warner, The Happy Warrior, p. 143; E.J. Kahn, Jr., The World of Swope (New York, 1965), pp. 281-284.

During the next few weeks, however, the confidence within the McAdoo camp suffered a serious blow. Disclosures in Congressional hearings revealed that McAdoo had received unusually high fees as counsel to Edward L. Doheny, who was implicated in the Teapot Dome affair. Some observers, a number of them friendly to McAdoo, immediately counted him out of the presidential contest. Although they usually exonerated him from any personal wrongdoing, they believed that the Democrats could not effectively attack the Republicans for corrupt rule if McAdoo were the party's nominee. McAdoo and most of his advisers, however, thought that he could weather the storm. Some of McAdoo's friends argued that he ought to withdraw, or offer to do so, in the expectation that the public response to such a gesture might make his candidacy even stronger than it had been. McAdoo, however, rejected such suggestions and became more determined than ever to fight to the end.

Although McAdoo still led in the race for the Democratic nomination, the Doheny episode had at least temporarily crippled the McAdoo candidacy and thrown the race much more into doubt than before. McAdoo's unexpected vulnerability persuaded many political leaders to delay committing themselves to anyone while it strengthened the conviction of McAdoo's enemies that they could block him. Champions of most of the contenders, including Smith, optimistically predicted to reporters that McAdoo's support would disintegrate and that their man would be the chief beneficiary. A few of Smith's supporters even looked for some McAdoo delegates to defect to Smith.

Despite these developments, the plans and expectations of most of Smith's supporters remained basically unchanged. Murphy maintained a watchful attitude, most likely hoping that Underwood – whom Murphy could accept as the nominee if necessary – would eliminate McAdoo altogether in the forthcoming primaries. Murphy kept Smith out of these contests to preserve Smith's silence on issues as well as to avoid needless friction with favorite sons whose delegations might prove crucial in the effort to block McAdoo. The McAdoo camp now seemed to consider Senator James A. Reed of Missouri, an announced candidate for the Democratic nomination and the man chiefly responsible for the disclosure of McAdoo's connection with Doheny, as their greatest threat; and most observers continued to discount Smith's chances. Smith, however, was to be the principal beneficiary of McAdoo's misfortune.[11]

---

[11] F. Walsh to Basil Manly, April 11, 1924, F. Walsh to Roper, September 5, 1924, Walsh Papers, NYPL; William Ayres to Shouse, February 5, 1924, Shouse Papers, UKy; Mitchell to Bennett Clark, February 6, 1924, Mitchell Papers, UMo; Glass to R.L. Ailsworth, February 15, 1924, Glass Papers, UVa; Norman Hapgood to House, February 5, 1924, YU; Howe to Roosevelt, February 6, 1924, February 25, 1924, Louis M. Howe Papers, FDRL; T. Osborne to Roosevelt, March 29, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; T. Walsh to Daniels, February 28, 1924, Daniels to John Burke, March 15, 1924, Josephus Daniels Papers, LC; T. Walsh to Tom Stout, April 4, 1924, Walsh Papers, LC; Long diary entries for February 2 and February 9, 1924, Breckinridge Long Papers, LC; McAdoo to John N. Garner, January 28, 1924, McAdoo to Chadbourne, January 31, 1924, Hapgood to McAdoo, February 5, 1924, House to McAdoo, February 6, 1924, February 23, 1924, McAdoo to House, March 4, 1924, E.D. Flaherty to Brice Clagett, February 8, 1924, McAdoo to Chadbourne, February 27, 1924, Rockwell telegram to McAdoo, February 26, 1924, Milton telegram to McAdoo, February 28, 1924, McAdoo telegram to Rockwell, February 27, 1924, Shouse to Clagett, March 4, 1924, Cummings to Rockwell, March 22, 1924, McAdoo to Robert H. McAdoo, April 29, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, January 17, 1924, January 28, 1924, February 8, 1924, February 12, 1924, February 24, 1924, March 3, 1924, April 30, 1926; Hard, "Refined Products of Oil," Nation, CXVIII (February 20, 1924), 199; Editorial, Nation, CXVIII (February 27, 1924), 217; "Political Straws," Outlook, CXXXVI (April 2, 1924), 542-544; Edward G. Lowry, "The Hunt is On, But Game is Scarce," Colliers, LXXIII (April 15, 1924), 12; Bernard M. Baruch, Baruch: The Public Years (New York, 1960), pp. 180-182; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 108-110; Franklin D. Mitchell, Embattled Democracy: Missouri Democratic Politics, 1919-1932 (Columbia, Missouri, 1968), pp. 69-74; J. Leonard Bates, "The Teapot Dome Scandal and the Election of 1924,"

McAdoo's candidacy revived somewhat when he won a number of primaries, several of them over Underwood, who no longer could be considered a serious contender. Many Democrats – some of them quite reluctantly – consequently turned to Smith as the best or only hope for stopping McAdoo. "Smith was Belgium prepared to hold the Hun until the rest became ready," wrote Henry Morgenthau, Sr. Smith's new supporters included progressives and moderates who became disenchanted with McAdoo after the Doheny affair; wets who previously had looked to Underwood; conservatives who distrusted McAdoo's rural progressivism; and others who believed McAdoo to be a demagogue, a militarist, or an opportunist.[12]

The most notable of Smith's new supporters were those who believed that McAdoo was the preferred candidate of Klan members and their ilk or that he solicited the Klan's backing. When those who feared that pro-Klan elements would capture the Democratic Party began to line up behind Smith, the antithesis of all that the Klan represented, other Democrats who opposed the nomination of someone like Smith began to rally behind McAdoo; and throughout the first half of 1924 the party became increasingly polarized. Smith probably received considerably more unsolicited support than McAdoo did; and although this support gladdened New Yorkers, it remained basically anti-McAdoo, highly unstable, and beyond the control of Smith's managers.[13]

Throughout the spring, support for Smith materialized as state after state chose delegates to the national convention. The presence of a favorite son or other circumstances sometimes obscured the support that was scattered through such states

---

American Historical Review, LX (January, 1955), 307-308; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," Alabama Review, XV (April, 1962), 91-92; Allen, "The McAdoo Campaign for the Presidential Nomination in 1924," Journal of Southern History, XXIX (May, 1963), 222-223; David Stratton, "Splattered with Oil: William G. McAdoo and the 1924 Democratic Presidential Nomination," Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, XLIV (June, 1963), 74-75.

[12] Merkling to Evins, June 5, 1924, Underwood Papers, ADHA; F. Walsh to Manly, April 11, 1924, Walsh Papers, NYPL; Glass to Henry C. Stuart, July 9, 1923, Glass Papers, UVa; Lansing to J. Davis, January 18, 1924, Davis Papers, YU; T. Osborne to Roosevelt, March 29, 1924, Howe to T. Osborne, April 1, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; H. Morgenthau to J. Morgenthau, June 13, 1924, June 22, 1924, Morgenthau Papers, LC; N. Baker to Ralph Hayes, July 18, 1924, Baker Papers, LC; T. Osborne to Lillian M. Boland, July 26, 1924, T. Osborne to Tannenbaum, August 5, 1924, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; Justine W. Polier and James W. Wise (eds.), The Personal Letters of Stephen Wise (Boston, 1956), pp. 199-200; "The Case for 'Al' Smith," Nation, CXVIII (June 4, 1924), 628; Frost, "Democratic Dynamite," Outlook, CXXXVII (June 18, 1924), 265-268; "The Case for Mr. McAdoo," Nation, CXVIII (June 25, 1924), 724; Krock, "The Damn Fool Democrats," American Mercury, IV (March, 1925), 260-261; Freidel, Roosevelt: The Ordeal, pp. 166-167; Lindley, Roosevelt, pp. 220-222; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 110-112; Huthmacher, Massachusetts People and Politics, pp. 94-95; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," Alabama Review, XV (April, 1962), 91-92; Frederick H. Schapsmeier, "The Political Philosophy of Walter Lippmann: A Half Century of Thought and Commentary" (Ph.D. thesis, University of Southern California, 1965), pp. 145-148.

[13] Howe to T. Osborne, April 1, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Long to C.C. Oliver, May 23, 1924, Long Papers, LC; Peabody to Root, July 14, 1924, Peabody Papers, LC; Chadbourne to McAdoo, June 4, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; T. Osborne to Boland, July 26, 1924, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; N. Baker to Elizabeth L. Baker, July 6, 1924, Baker Papers, Western Reserve Historical Society, Cleveland, Ohio (hereafter WRSH); Polier and Wise (eds.), The Personal Letters of Stephen Wise, pp. 199-200; "Governor Smith in Wisconsin and Elsewhere," Review of Reviews, LXIX (May 24, 1924), 466; Frost, "Democratic Dynamite," Outlook, CXXXVII (June 18, 1924), 265-268; Stanley Frost, " Fear and Prejudice in Deadlock," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 16, 1924), 422-424; Krock, "The Damn Fool Democrats," American Mercury, IV (March, 1925), 260-261; Smith, Up to Now, p. 284; James M. Cox, Journey Through My Years (New York, 1946), pp. 324-326; Pringle, Smith, pp. 302-303; Huthmacher, Massachusetts People and Politics, pp. 95-97; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 110-112; Allen, "The McAdoo Campaign for the Presidential Nomination in 1924," Journal of Southern History, XXIX (May, 1963), 222-223. See pp. 25-31 and 37-39 below for a full discussion of the Klan issue.

as New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Nevada. Smith's support was more palpable elsewhere. In Illinois, Brennan challenged McAdoo's primary slate with an uninstructed but pro-Smith slate. Just before the filing deadline, one of Brennan's local antagonists entered a list of delegates pledged to Smith. Smith, who insisted that this step had been taken without his knowledge or approval, immediately asked that his name be withdrawn, probably to avoid a primary contest with McAdoo and any semblance of an open candidacy as much as to avert a division of his support in the state. Most of those on Brennan's slate swept to victory on April 8, the same day that the Rhode Island state convention enthusiastically endorsed Smith. Neither of these successes, however, meant as much to Smith's candidacy as his victory in the April 1 Wisconsin primary did.[14]

On their own initiative Wisconsin wets entered pro-Smith candidates in the district and at-large delegate contest, often against McAdoo's supporters; and since Smith did not discover this fact until too late, he could not withdraw as he had done in Illinois. With the die cast, Smith maintained a keen interest in the contest and reportedly was elated when he won twenty-three of the twenty-six delegates. Smith's victory surprised most political analysts, who generally thought that it indicated an opposition to prohibition or to McAdoo more than it did significant support of Smith. Nevertheless, like his other spring victories, Smith's triumph in Wisconsin brought him the additional attention that his status as a major contender for the Democratic nominated merited.[15]

Smith's triumph in Wisconsin may have influenced the decision of New York Democratic leaders to present a resolution endorsing Smith at their April 15 convention. The passage of this resolution amounted, in effect, to a formal announcement of Smith's candidacy. The decision to introduce the resolution was apparently a last-minute one; one Tammany insider did not learn about it until the night before the convention. In view of Underwood's decline and McAdoo's recovery, though, Smith's advisers must have realized in early April that they could no longer expect to stop McAdoo unless Smith became an active candidate, and Smith's considerable unforeseen support in other states prompted them to make the plunge.

Of course, most states had already chosen their delegates by mid-April, and many delegates had explicit or implicit commitments to other candidates; but Murphy asked Roosevelt, the only New York Democrat with much experience at the national level, to round up as many individual delegates as he could. Roosevelt told Murphy that Smith

---

[14] Thomas McGee to F. Walsh, June 9, 1924, James W. Walsh to F. Walsh, June 11, 1924, Joseph T. Lawless to F. Walsh, June 12, 1924, Zimmerman to F. Walsh, May 3, 1924, Walsh Papers, NYPL; Joseph F. Guffey to Roosevelt, May 8, 1924, May 10, 1924, Thomas E. Cashman telegram to Roosevelt, June 2, 1924, F.E. McCafferty to Roosevelt, December 26, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Charles W. Bryan to W. Bryan, January 28, 1924, Bryan Papers, LC; Long to Rockwell, April 17, 1924, Long Papers, LC; George Thatcher to Pittman, May 9, 1924, Pittman Papers, LC; Chadbourne to McAdoo, June 4, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, January 29, 1924, February 29, 1924, March 1, 1924, March 3, 1924, April 4, 1924, April 9, 1924, June 1, 1924, June 2, 1924; William Hard, "How to Become President," Nation, CXVIII (April 23, 1924), 478-479; Mitchell, Embattled Democracy, p. 76; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," pp. 129-132, 137-138.

[15] Milton telegram to Clagett, April 2, 1924, Milton to Clagett, April 3, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, January 20, 1924, April 3, 1924, April 4, 1924, April 17, 1924, April 20, 1924; William Hard, "Winds of the West," Nation, CXVIII (April 16, 1924), 425; Editorial, Nation, CXVIII (April 16, 1924), 411; "Governor Smith in Wisconsin and Elsewhere," Review of Reviews, LXIX (May, 1924), 466; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," pp. 125-126, 142-144. Smith's Wisconsin friends did not enter him in the state-wide presidential preference primary, so he may have thought that he was not involved in the primary at all.

would be fortunate to get three hundred votes at the convention, but with the assistance of Louis M. Howe Roosevelt at once set to work trying to increase Smith's delegate total while Murphy continued his quiet cultivation of his fellow leaders. The Smith "organization" consisted of little more than this prior to May 1.[16]

Smith evidently took no part in the campaign on his behalf until Murphy unexpectedly died on April 25. The campaign abruptly halted while observers, political strategists, and Smith himself analyzed the effects of this development. Smith could not rely upon such secret arrangements as Murphy may have made, but at the same time he could not conveniently withdraw from the presidential contest without humiliating both New York Democrats and himself, reneging on commitments that his supporters had made, and probably guaranteeing McAdoo's nomination. Although Smith had hitherto forbidden any open solicitation of delegates (he probably did not know about Murphy's request to Roosevelt), he now decided that an intense campaign to secure delegates was necessary if New York was to retain its prestige and power at the national convention.[17]

Smith could not personally direct a campaign of this sort, principally because he was then considering bills that the recently adjourned New York legislature had passed. He was not able to call upon the new head of Tammany Hall for assistance because internal dissension forced Tammany leaders to create a temporary committee of seven to govern the organization until Smith's presidential candidacy was resolved. Smith could not ask Proskauer to direct the campaign, for he was now a judge. Nor could Brennan take charge, for he could not come to New York City, and the Illinois delegation that he headed was technically uncommitted.

On April 28, therefore, when many Democratic leaders were in New York City for Murphy's funeral, Smith convened a conference to help him select a suitable campaign director. Either on that date or a day or so later, Smith picked Roosevelt for the job. Announcing Roosevelt's acceptance of the post, Smith declared that he was again removing himself from campaign activities in order to complete his work in Albany.[18]

Roosevelt was a natural choice for campaign director: he was nationally known, an upstate Democrat unaffiliated with Tammany Hall, a Protestant, and a Wilsonian. He also had extensive national contacts that might prove to be invaluable. Because Smith and those around him greatly underestimated Roosevelt's mental and physical activities, they expected him to serve merely as Smith's chief spokesman and the

---

[16] F. Walsh to Zimmerman, April 23, 1924, Walsh Papers, NYPL; Saxe to Roosevelt, December 20, 1940, Roosevelt to Saxe, December 27, 1940, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Chadbourne to McAdoo, June 4, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, February 29, 1924, March 3, 1924, April 16, 1924, April 17, 1924, April 30, 1924, May 1, 1924; Warner, The Happy Warrior, p. 151; Pringle, Smith, pp. 302-303; Hapgood and Moskowitz, Up from the City Streets, p. 305; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," pp. 60-61, 64.

[17] F. Walsh to Zimmerman, April 30, 1924, Walsh Papers, NYPL; Peabody to Root, July 14, 1924, Peabody Papers, LC; McAdoo to Chadbourne, April 29, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, April 16, 1924, April 20, 1924, April 26, 1924, April 27, 1924, April 28, 1924, Editorial, April 30, 1924; "What Murphy's Death Means to the Democratic Party," Literary Digest, LXXXI (May 10, 1924), 14; Blythe, "A Party Up in the Air," Saturday Evening Post, CXCVI (May 31, 1924), 20, 145-146, 149; Lynch, "Friends of the Governor," North American Review, CCXXVI (October, 1928), 420; Rollins, "The Political Education of Franklin Roosevelt," pp. 739-743.

[18] NYT, April 20, 1924, April 26, 1924, April 29, 1924, May 1, 1924, May 2, 1924, May 6, 1924, May 11, 1924, May 20, 1924; Flynn, You're the Boss, pp. 41-43; Josephson and Josephson, Smith, p. 307.

figurehead behind whom Smith's key advisers – particularly Proskauer, Belle Moskowitz, and Moses – would direct the campaign.

Smith's emissaries told Roosevelt what his role was to be when they asked him to become the campaign director, but Roosevelt had his own ideas about the part that he would play, and he began to implement them immediately. Smith always kept in touch with Roosevelt's activities and retained ultimate control of the campaign; but for six weeks – owing first to the Tammany situation and the backlog of bills on his desk, then to his mother's illness and death, and finally to a New York City garment workers' strike – Smith allowed Roosevelt to operate a virtually autonomous, energetic campaign of publicity and private correspondence.[19]

Perhaps Smith intended from the moment he became an active candidate to assume personal control of his headquarters once he was free of other obligations. When he did take charge on June 13, however, his action reflected a lessened confidence in Roosevelt, whose handling of the prohibition issue had aroused the displeasure of Smith and his advisers. Smith himself now met with reporters, greeted arriving convention participants, and conferred with important party leaders; and Smith's personal friend John F. Gilchrist and then Brennan took over some of Roosevelt's functions as "field general."[20]

Short of time and without an effective campaign organization for assistance, Roosevelt, while he was the campaign director, zealously promoted Smith's cause. Roosevelt occasionally involved himself in matters of strategy: he declared that Smith would not challenge any of the favorite sons; he privately pledged to McAdoo and other aspirants that Smith's friends would conduct an "eminently proper" campaign; and he refused to speak against the two-thirds rule, one of Smith's assets in the struggle against McAdoo. Roosevelt followed tradition by exaggerating the strength that his candidate would have in the convention, even though he too did not expect Smith to win the nomination and was seeking to achieve a protracted deadlock. Most of the time, however, Roosevelt did what he could to drum up publicity, emphasize Smith's strong points, and establish Smith's positions on various issues.[21]

Smith's supporters distributed a large volume and variety of publicity, including a campaign biography by Henry Moskowitz, a small pamphlet entitled "What Everybody Wants to Know About Al Smith," copies of editorials that endorsed Smith's views on agriculture, a talking movie that featured Smith, a campaign song by Irving Berlin, and a testimonial from Babe Ruth. Roosevelt supplemented propaganda of this nature with press releases and countless personal letters. He emphasized Smith's career as a self-

---

[19] NYT, May 2, 1924, May 3, 1924, May 19, 1924, June 14, 1924; Warner, The Happy Warrior, pp. 149-154; Josephson and Josephson, Smith, pp. 304-307; Freidel, Roosevelt: The Ordeal, p. 169; Lindley, Roosevelt, pp. 221-222; Rollins, Roosevelt and Howe, pp. 211-212; Rollins, "The Political Education of Franklin Roosevelt," pp. 739-743.

[20] NYT, June 6, 1924, June 14, 1924, June 17, 1924, June 19, 1924, June 21, 1924, June 24, 1924; Rollins, "The Political Education of Franklin Roosevelt," p. 763. See pp. 22-24 below for a discussion of Roosevelt and the prohibition issue.

[21] F. Walsh to Manly, May 18, 1924, Walsh Papers, NYPL; Roosevelt to McAdoo, May 19, 1924, Roosevelt to A.H. Eastmond, June 14, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Chadbourne to McAdoo, June 4, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, May 2, 1924, May 19, 1924, May 23, 1924, May 25, 1924, June 18, 1924, June 19, 1924; Freidel, Roosevelt: The Ordeal, pp. 170-175; Rollins, Roosevelt and Howe, pp. 211-215; Rollins, "The Political Education of Franklin Roosevelt," pp. 739-763.

made man, his record as an able governor, his expertise in governmental affairs, his aptitude for dealing with problems, his progressive yet businesslike outlook, his broad national support, and his acceptability to virtually all interest groups and classes in New York State. Roosevelt also argued that Smith alone among the Democratic prospects would defeat Calvin Coolidge: only Smith could capture the crucial Northeast, hold the South, and, particularly if there were a third-party candidate, challenge the Republicans in the West.[22]

When Roosevelt attempted to set forth Smith's views on the issues of the day, he found that Smith's religion and wetness overshadowed all other matters. Through the first half of 1924 the question of whether or not a man's Catholicism barred him from being nominated for the presidency and from the presidency itself evoked lively discussion. Smith and his circle believed that "it is time we put the proposition to the test," but they tried to avoid calling further attention to the religious issue. Smith's headquarters, though, did circulate copies of a speech in which Frank P. Walsh, a well-known Catholic lawyer and governmental official in the Wilson Administration, had vigorously attacked the alleged religious discrimination.

Although Roosevelt similarly said nothing about Smith's Catholicism in public, he deplored the existence of the religious issue in his letters. He predicted to some of his correspondents that although Smith, as the nominee, would lose some normally Democratic votes, he would gain others among Roman Catholics and among non-Catholics disturbed by the injection of anti-Catholicism into a presidential campaign. Roosevelt also persuaded Thomas Mott Osborne – an upstate New York Protestant, a Wilsonian, and a delegate to the 1924 national convention – to answer one particularly mean expression of religious bigotry. No one in Smith's headquarters, however, seemed to know how to dispel the religious issue without actually aggravating the problem.[23]

The prohibition issue gave Roosevelt and other Smith leaders even more trouble than the religious issue did, for in 1924 Americans probably conceived of Smith more as "the wet candidate" than as "the Catholic candidate." Roosevelt, while seeking to de-emphasize the prohibition issue altogether, tried to counter the canard that Smith was a drunkard and to present him as a moderate who stood for law enforcement. Roosevelt

---

[22] Roosevelt to Robert C. Murchie, June 6, 1924, Roosevelt to Clarence F. Lea, June 10, 1924, Irving Berlin to Roosevelt, June 19, 1924, Roosevelt to Smith, August 11, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Roosevelt to Thomas H. Robinson, June 6, 1924, Thomas H. Robinson Papers, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Maryland (hereafter MdHS); NYT, May 9, 1924, June 6, 1924, June 17, 1924, June 18, 1924; Franklin D. Roosevelt, "Smith – Public Servant," Outlook, CXXXVII (June 25, 1924), 309-311; Freidel, Roosevelt: The Ordeal, pp. 170-175; Rollins, Roosevelt and Howe, pp. 211-215; Rollins, "The Political Education of Franklin Roosevelt," pp. 739-763. See also Hoey to E.J. Hughes, May 14, 1924, copy in Walsh Papers, NYPL. There are thirty-six boxes of mostly routine material in the Roosevelt Papers relating to the 1924 Smith presidential campaign.

[23] Hoey to F. Walsh, April 7, 1924, F. Walsh to Zimmerman, April 10, 1924, F. Walsh to Edward N. Nockels, April 12, 1924, Hoey to Hughes, May 14, 1924, F. Walsh to Clarence Darrow, June 6, 1924, P.E. Laughlin to F. Walsh, June 10, 1924, Walsh Papers, NYPL; Roosevelt to Murchie, June 6, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Chadbourne to McAdoo, June 4, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; L. Osborne to Buxton, March 17, 1924, Roosevelt to T. Osborne, June 6, 1924, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; Editorial, NYT, April 4, 1924, June 22, 1924; Milton, "The South – and 1924," Outlook, CXXXVI (January 2, 1924), 29-30; Hard, "Refined Products of Oil," Nation, CXVIII (February 20, 1924), 199; "The Problem of the Smith Candidacy," New Republic, XXXVIII (March 19, 1924), 87-88; Editorial, Nation, CXVIII (April 16, 1924), 411; Paul L. Blakely, "May a Catholic Be President?" America, XXXI (April 26, 1924), 31-32; F.H. Simonds, "Could Al Smith Win?" New Republic, XXXIX (June 25, 1924), 120-121; Freidel, Roosevelt: The Ordeal, pp. 171-172; Rollins, "The Political Education of Franklin Roosevelt," pp. 750-752.

intimated to reporters that the New York delegation would not lead a fight for a wet plank, that Smith could run without embarrassment on an innocuous enforcement plank, and that Smith would subordinate his personal opinions to the position of the party platform.[24]

Roosevelt may have surmised from Smith's comments about law enforcement during the preceding seven or eight months – notably at a governors' conference in Washington in October, 1923, and at an ensuing state conference on enforcement that Smith convened four months later – that Smith had decided to beat a strategic retreat on prohibition in order to make himself more acceptable to Democratic drys. Smith's disinclination to condemn prohibition as a whole during this period, the complete silence of New York Democrats on the subject at their April convention, and the explanation by some of them that the country already knew Smith's views on prohibition probably contributed to Roosevelt's decision to soft-pedal the issue.[25]

Roosevelt erred, though, in thinking that Smith had moderated his position on prohibition, and apparently the Governor and his close advisers believed that Roosevelt's comments had so misrepresented Smith's real attitudes on the subject that there had to be an elucidating statement. Roosevelt's draft of this statement belittled the importance of prohibition and only mildly criticized the Volstead Act, but Smith rejected this draft and instead used a letter to a wet pressure group to reiterate vigorously his anti-prohibition views. Although in his letter Smith repeated his opposition to the saloon and his support of law enforcement, he reasserted the principle of states' rights and called for modification of the Volstead Act in terms that no one could mistake. Having clarified his views, Smith refused to say anything more about the subject before the national convention met. It was Roosevelt's handling of the prohibition issue that caused Smith to reduce his position in the Smith organization.[26]

Roosevelt thought that his greatest handicap in calling attention to Smith's views on the real issues – indeed, in promoting his candidacy generally – was Smith's continuing unwillingness to comment on these issues. Smith allowed only a few extended interviews and made only a few important pronouncements in the ten weeks between April 15 and the start of the national convention, and he vetoed several policy statements that Roosevelt had prepared for release. When Smith did comment, he took conventionally Democratic positions on conservation, corruption in government, and such manifestation of "special privileges" as the high Republican tariff. He also attacked overly restrictive immigration laws and sharply criticized centralization in government.

---

[24] F. Walsh to John A. Ryan, May 31, 1924, Walsh Papers, NYPL; Orville S. Poland form letter to Democratic delegates, n.d. [ca. June, 1924], copy in Samuel Wilson Papers, UKy; Roosevelt to Sol Bloom, May 12, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Roosevelt to T. Robinson, June 6, 1924, Robinson Papers, MdHS; T. Osborne to Boland, July 26, 1924, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; NYT, May 25, 1924, June 2, 1924, June 4, 1924, June 5, 1924; "Governor Smith in Wisconsin and Elsewhere," Review of Reviews, LXIX (May, 1924), 466; Reform Bulletin, XV (May 23, 1924); Freidel, Roosevelt: The Ordeal, pp. 171, 174; Rollins, Roosevelt and Howe, pp. 213-215; Justin Steuart, Wayne Wheeler: Dry Boss (New York, 1928), pp. 216-221; Rollins," The Political Education of Franklin Roosevelt," pp. 752-756.

[25] Howe to Roosevelt, February 25, 1924, Howe Papers, FDRL; NYT, October 21, 1923, November 20, 1923, January 17, 1924, February 8, 1924, February 21, 1924, April 16, 1924; "A Dry Edict from a Moist Governor," Literary Digest, LXXX (March 15, 1924), 13; Moskowitz, Smith, pp. 259-262.

[26] F. Walsh to Ryan, May 31, 1924, Walsh Papers, NYPL; NYT, June 6, 1924, June 9, 1924, June 20, 1924, June 22, 1924, June 23, 1924; Rollins, Roosevelt and Howe, pp. 213-215; Rollins, "The Political Education of Franklin Roosevelt," pp. 752-756.

While Smith professed his faith in business leaders and his desire for cooperation between government and business, he also insisted that aid to farmers was necessary and would further the interests of the country as a whole. Though he privately confessed his near ignorance of foreign affairs, Smith publicly endorsed Wilsonian principles, particularly the concept of self-determination, argued that the United States had to maintain proper and reasonable contacts with other countries, and urged a restudy of international organizations.[27]

Smith's positions, of course, were not novel nor especially controversial, and neither were Roosevelt's efforts to supplement them. Although Roosevelt at first admitted to reporters that he knew nothing about Smith's views on foreign affairs, he subsequently tried to depict his candidate as a liberal in this field. A long talk with Smith, Roosevelt asserted years afterward, had led him to this conclusion. Roosevelt failed to get Smith to approve a general statement on the agricultural situation but later implied, without committing Smith to the McNary-Haugen plan, that Smith favored direct relief for farmers.[28] By the time of the convention, however, few people seemed to care that Al Smith had said so little about national issues, for these issues had become secondary not only to the questions of Smith's religion and wetness but even more so to the subject of the Ku Klux Klan.

The Klan issue began to materialize more than a year before the convention met, and by the end of 1923 workers for some of McAdoo's opponents were trying to identify him with the Klan in order to undermine his support. Underwood and his advisers were among the first to see the offensive potential of the Klan issue and were evidently the first to use it. In January, 1924, Underwood indicated that he would seek to have the convention denounce the organization by name, and his managers regarded an anti-Klan position as a vital element of their strategy. Underwood believed that nothing would be lost by denouncing the Klan, and he wrote a friend that such a condemnation by the party would forestall the defection of large numbers of Northern Democrats in November if Smith failed to be nominated – a failure that Underwood expected. According to one account, Underwood's eagerness to provoke a fight on the Klan issue led him, on the eve of the convention, to convince Smith's representative Brennan to join an anti-Klan coalition.[29]

The Smith forces did not need any last-minute prompting for them to take hold of the Klan issue, though, for they had been relying upon it for some time as a weapon with which to block McAdoo. During the strategy sessions, McAdoo's adversaries discussed whether an anti-prohibition or an anti-Klan position would contribute more to the

---

[27] Roosevelt to Hobbs, September 7, 1928, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; H. Morgenthau to J. Morgenthau, June 13, 1924, Morgenthau Papers, LC; NYT, June 22, 1924; Journal of Commerce (New York), June 16, 1924, pp. 1, 3; Freidel, Roosevelt: The Ordeal, p. 173.

[28] Roosevelt to Hobbs, September 7, 1928, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; NYT, May 2, 1924; Freidel, Roosevelt: The Ordeal, pp. 172-174; Rollins, Roosevelt and Howe, p. 213; Rollins, "The Political Education of Franklin Roosevelt," pp. 739-749, 757-764.

[29] Merkling to Evins, June 5, 1924, Underwood Papers, ADHA; Underwood to Charles S. Thomas, May 15, 1924, Charles S. Thomas Papers, State Historical Society of Colorado, Denver, Colorado (hereafter SHSColo); McAdoo to Randolph Bolling, January 6, 192[4], E. Wilson Papers, LC; McAdoo to O'Neil, December 31, 1923, Arthur Mullen to McAdoo, January 8, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, January 17, 1924, January 23, 1924; Evans C. Johnson, Oscar W. Underwood: A Political Biography (Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1980), pp. 396-399; David M. Chalmers, Hooded Americanism: The First Century of the Ku Klux Klan, 1865-1965 (Garden City, New York, 1965), pp. 204-205; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," pp. 225, 232-233.

success of their scheme. Some Democratic leaders believed that an ultra-wet prohibition plank would so embarrass McAdoo that he would refuse to run on it, but the Californian's opponents apparently abandoned this idea because they doubted that the Democratic convention would accept this kind of plank as readily as it would accept an anti-Klan plank.[30]

McAdoo's enemies within the party probably guessed that he was reluctant to criticize the Klan publicly. Although he privately asserted that he had made a "flat-footed" statement on the Klan in mid-1923, McAdoo had not mentioned the organization by name, and he had refused to say anything about the Klan specifically during the ensuing months. McAdoo told his correspondents that if he felt the need to speak out on the organization again, he would do so at this own time and place. In March, 1924, McAdoo made some off-the-cuff remarks that he subsequently characterized to some friends as a criticism of the Klan, but again he did not mention the Klan by name. As the convention drew near, most of McAdoo's advisers disagreed with his policy of silence on the Klan, and numerous supporters warned McAdoo that his enemies were successfully using the Klan issue against him; but McAdoo's friends could not get him to denounce even the Klan's excesses.[31]

McAdoo did not keep silent because he was linked to the Klan, a rumor that he emphatically denied. Why, he asked, should he alone among the possible presidential candidates be required to announce a position on the Klan? McAdoo suspected that his enemies were seeking to trap him into alienating supporters who sympathized with the organization, and he probably realized that his criticism of the Klan would destroy his candidacy. McAdoo believed, furthermore, that the Klan issue ought to be an irrelevant one, and like many other Democratic leaders he thought that to single out the organization would publicize instead of injure it and that an attempt to censure the Klan officially would divide the Democratic Party.[32] McAdoo did not seem to comprehend how deep the antagonism in the East was against the Klan nor how cleverly his enemies were exploiting the issue against him.

---

[30] NYT, November 14, 1923, November 20, 1923, June 20, 1924. For evidence that McAdoo's enemies were using the Klan issue against him throughout early 1924, see William L. O'Connell telegram to Clagett, March 29, 1924, McAdoo to Baruch, April 1, 1924, McAdoo to Roper, April 14, 1924, Cummings to Rockwell, May 3, 1924, Mullen to McAdoo, May 10, 1924, May 26, 1924, and O'Neil telegram to McAdoo, May 29, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC.

[31] Long diary entry for July 15, 1924, Long Papers, LC; McAdoo to Mullen, December 12, 1923, McAdoo to O'Neil, December 31, 1923, Mullen to McAdoo, January 8, 1924, McAdoo to Chadbourne, January 16, 1924, McAdoo to Untermeyer [sic], January 17, 1924, Chadbourne to McAdoo, January 24, 1924, McAdoo to Martin J. Wade, March 15, 1924, McAdoo to Roper, April 14, 1924, Mullen to McAdoo, May 10, 1924, May 26, 1924, Callahan to McAdoo, June 6, 1924, McAdoo speech for June 21, 1923, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, June 21, 1924; Arthur Mullen, Western Democrat (New York, 1940), pp. 242-243; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, p. 111n. See also Roper to McAdoo, April 23, 1923, McAdoo Papers, LC; and Joseph Gerard Green, "Patrick Henry Callahan (1866-1940): The Social Role of an American Catholic Lay Leader" (Ph.D. thesis, Catholic University of America, 1963), pp. 145-146.

[32] McAdoo to Chadbourne, January 16, 1924, McAdoo to Untermeyer [sic], January 17, 1924, McAdoo telegram to O'Connell, March 31, 1924, McAdoo to Roper, April 14, 1924, McAdoo to Callahan, June 11, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; McAdoo to Creel, March 2, 1927, Creel Papers, LC; Bowers, My Life, p. 113; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 86-87, 110-111, 118-120. McAdoo's supporters included many people who did not sympathize with the Klan and many Catholics; one Catholic denounced the organization when he seconded McAdoo's nomination at the Democratic National Convention. NYT, June 28, 1924; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 119-120.

The success of the anti-Klan movement, particularly once the furor over McAdoo's connection with Doheny abated, vindicated those Democratic leaders who believed that the Klan issue would be the most effective line of attack against McAdoo. His silence cost him many supporters, especially some Roman Catholics, while it reinforced Smith's ranks. Even though McAdoo was not a Klansman and did not actively seek Klan support, many immigrant-stock Americans who resented the prejudices that the Klan symbolized interpreted McAdoo's silence as a sign that he was in fact "the Klan candidate." Of course, Smith attracted large number of these people not just because of the Klan issue but because they believed that in the sphere of politics he personified their challenge to traditional America. Smith's candidacy and the Klan issue became vehicles through which they could assert their pride, resentment, and political influence.[33]

Since the Eastern Democratic machines depended heavily upon the support of ethnic voters, the leaders of these machines readily responded to their constituents' pressure to oppose the Klan. These leaders realized, moreover, that skillful manipulation of the Klan issue would lure back to the Democratic fold ethnic voters who had deserted the party in 1920 and would help to retain others who might desert to Senator Robert M. LaFollette if he ran for president. In addition, opposition to intolerance promised to attract black voters, who might prove to be the balance of power in such states as Illinois, Ohio, and New York. One further attraction of the Klan issue was that it gave wets a "moral" cause with which they could embarrass the drys, who were already using morality against them. A specific denunciation of the Klan seemed all the more appealing to Eastern Democrats after the Republican Party wrote a mild platform plank on this question that did not condemn the Klan by name.

There was, of course, more than mere political expediency to the campaign against the Klan. Many machine politicians as well as other Democrats genuinely loathed the organization and were eager to strike at it; furthermore, many of them so interwove the Klan issue with the religious issue that their desire to challenge the supposed disqualification of Catholics merged with their desire to damn the Klan. The combination of deeply felt emotion and shrewd exploitation made the Klan issue a formidable weapon for McAdoo's opponents in 1924.[34]

---

[33] Peabody to Root, July 14, 1924, Peabody Papers, LC; House to McAdoo, July 11, 1924, House Papers, YU; McAdoo to Carter Harrison, October 22, 1928, McAdoo Papers, LC; Frost, "Democratic Dynamite," Outlook, CXXXVII (June 18, 1924), 265-268; Stanley Frost, "The Klan's ½ of 1 per cent Victory," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 9, 1924), 384-387; Frost, "Fear and Prejudice in Deadlock," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 16, 1924), 422-424; Krock, "The Damn Fool Democrats," American Mercury, IV (March, 1925), 260-261; Josephson and Josephson, Smith, pp. 302-303; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 86-87; Glazer and Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot, p. 265; Huthmacher, Massachusetts People and Politics, pp. 95-97; Samuel Lubell, The Future of American Politics (New York, 1952), p. 39; Allen, "The McAdoo Campaign for the Presidential Nomination in 1924," Journal of Southern History, XXIX (May, 1963), 222-223; Thurner, "The Impact of Ethnic Groups," p. 180.

[34] F. Walsh to Nockels, April 12, 1924, Hoey to Hughes, May 14, 1924, Laughlin to F. Walsh, June 10, 1924, Harry B. Hawes to F. Walsh, June 18, 1924, Walsh Papers, NYPL; Chadbourne to McAdoo, June 4, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; Polier and Wise (eds.), The Personal Letters of Stephen Wise, pp. 199-200; NYT, November 20, 1923, June 12, 1924, June 29, 1924, March 5, 1926; Frost, "Fear and Prejudice in Deadlock," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 16, 1924), 422-424; Krock, "The Damn Fool Democrats," American Mercury, IV (March, 1925), 260-261; George F. Milton, "Can We Save the Democratic Party?" Century, CX (May, 1925), 94-100; Smith, Up to Now, p. 284; Huthmacher, Massachusetts People and Politics, pp. 95-97; Robert K. Murray, The 103rd Ballot: Democrats and the Disaster in Madison Square Garden (New York, 1976), pp. 110-111, 154-155; Thurner, "The Impact of Ethnic Groups," p. 180. See also Becker, "Smith," pp. 127-128. Perhaps it was no coincidence that Smith was speaking in

During the last few weeks prior to the convention, the anti-McAdoo leaders who supported Smith differed among themselves over how aggressively they ought to press the Klan issue. Smith, Roosevelt, and most other New Yorkers apparently hesitated to initiate a battle for a plank that would denounce the organization by name and were willing to settle for a more general condemnatory plank. Brennan and many other Smith leaders, however, were eager to commit the convention on the Klan and therefore advocated a plank that censured the organization by name. In the end this latter group prevailed within the Smith camp. This development upset any possibility of a compromise with the McAdoo forces and set in final motion the train of events that fractured the 1924 Democratic National Convention.[35]

Despite many admonitions, McAdoo and probably the majority of his advisers did not fully recognize the potency of the Klan issue until shortly before the convention assembled in late June. Similarly, they failed until then to appreciate the reasons for Smith's popularity in many Eastern area and the stature that Smith's candidacy had gained since the early part of the year.

Not even Smith's success in Massachusetts and Connecticut, where he won substantial support among immigrant-stock voters in particular, alerted the McAdoo circle to Smith's strength. In the April 29 Massachusetts primary, an independent candidate for delegate-at-large who had pledged himself to Smith performed the nearly unprecedented feat of outpolling most of the party organization's candidates – who were unpledged but preponderantly friendly to Smith – and many of the candidates for district delegates who had endorsed Smith also won. In Connecticut, Smith's popularity had grown so much by early May that McAdoo's leaders there had to abandon their plan to use Homer S. Cummings as a stalking horse for McAdoo; they had to settle at the state convention for an uninstructed delegation that contained many Smith supporters.

McAdoo and most of his friends remained confident almost to the end that he had outstripped Reed, Underwood, and the other contenders and could secure at least a majority of the delegates' votes. The McAdoo organization thought that success was in sight when it should have recognized that the opposition was obdurate and rapidly coalescing behind Smith. Only in June, apparently, did the McAdoo forces cease underrating Smith as a rival, and only then did McAdoo himself finally become convinced that his fight was with Smith and that it would be a long and bitter one.[36]

Harlem at the same time that Murphy and other party leaders were in Indiana discussing the virtues of the Klan issue as an anti-McAdoo weapon. NYT, November 20, 1923.

[35] Woolley to House, June 24, 1924, House Papers, YU; McAdoo to Harrison, October 22, 1928, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, June 8, 1924, June 13, 1924, June 23, 1924, June 25, 1924, June 29, 1924; Krock, "The Damn Fool Democrats," American Mercury, IV (March, 1925), 260-261; Smith, Up to Now, p. 284; Mullen, Western Democrat, p. 241; Freidel, Roosevelt: The Ordeal, p. 178; Rollins, "The Political Education of Franklin Roosevelt," pp. 766-767. Smith had taken a clear position against the Klan: in 1923 he signed a bill that strictly controlled the organization in New York; and in June, 1924, he publicly attacked the Klan. Smith did not think, however, that it was wise to make hostility to the Klan a party policy. NYT, May 24, 1923, June 9, 1924; Smith, Up to Now, p. 284.

[36] Woolley to House, June 6, 1924, House Papers, YU; McAdoo to E. Wilson, June 4, 1924, E. Wilson Papers, LC; Long to Perry T. Allen, May 13, 1924, Long Papers, LC; McAdoo to Chadbourne, January 16, 1924, Cummings to McAdoo, February 1, 1924, Brisbane to McAdoo, February 13, 1924, Cummings to Rockwell, March 22, 1924, May 3, 1924, McAdoo to Callahan, March 26, 1924, McAdoo to Baruch, April 7, 1924, D. Miller to McAdoo, April 7, 1924, James Heslin to McAdoo, April 10, 1924, Baruch to McAdoo, April 12, 1924, Taggart to McAdoo, April 13, 1924, Milton to Arthur Hungerford, April 19, 1924, Edmund Billings to McAdoo, May 5, 1924, McAdoo to D. Miller, May 5, 1924, Peters to McAdoo, May 5, 1924, McAdoo to W. Jett Lauck, May 6, 1924, Rockwell to Frank

In spite of McAdoo's clear lead in the contest for the presidential nomination, it was Al Smith who dominated the 1924 Democratic National Convention. He was the most exciting of the many contenders; he was the host governor; his fellow New Yorkers vigorously promoted his candidacy; he symbolized the most sensational of the issues before the party; and he stood like a modern Horatius in the struggle to keep the nomination from McAdoo.

Some of the disputes that troubled the 1924 convention stemmed principally from disagreements or factional allegiances at the state and local levels; but at this convention, unlike most other political gatherings, it was paramount national matters and basic loyalties that divided the participants into warring camps. The three major groups within the Democratic Party of the 1920s – the Eastern, the Southern, and the Western – came to New York City with widely divergent attitudes toward the leading political and economic issues of the day, although on many of these the South and the West were aligned against the East. Since regional differences, cultural antagonisms, and the deep antipathy between city and country split the party along much the same lines as these political and economic issues did, the convention was polarized, and a tumultuous battle royal resulted. The fact that McAdoo and Smith had not yet met in a clear-cut test of strength contributed significantly to the intensity of intra-party tension.[37]

The welcome that many New Yorkers extended to the delegates and visitors to the convention aggravated the tensions within the party. Many of these guests complained that the convention's hosts cynically lavished entertainment and alcohol upon the delegates in order to win votes for Smith, and they were annoyed that large numbers of New Yorkers – hotel employees, taxi drivers, and even police officers – sought to impress the visitors with Smith's prodigious popularity among his constituents. The efforts to promote Smith's candidacy were often so extravagant and artificial – some of the overzealous New Yorkers confided that their employers had ordered such behavior – that many delegates and observers found the exaggerated hospitality and the boisterous pro-Smith propaganda offensive.[38]

Roberson, May 9, 1924, Mullen to McAdoo, May 10, 1924, LaRue Brown to McAdoo, May 15, 1924, Rockwell to McAdoo, May 28, 1924, McAdoo to R. McAdoo, June 11, 1924, Robert S. Hudspeth to McAdoo, June 13, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, April 23, 1924, May 10, 1924, June 21, 1924; Bowers, My Life, p. 113; Daniel C. Roper, Fifty Years of Public Life (Durham, North Carolina, 1941), p. 219; Huthmacher, Massachusetts People and Politics, pp. 94-97; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," pp. 139, 166. The belief of many of McAdoo's backers that Smith sought only the vice-presidential nomination must have reinforced their skepticism about his potential as a rival. See pp. 4-5 above.

[37] Hard, "How to Become President," Nation, CXVIII (April 23, 1924), 478-479; "Economic Questions Involved," Review of Reviews, LXX (August, 1924), 130; Milton, "Can We Save the Democratic Party?" Century, CX (May, 1925), 94-100; Roper, Fifty Years of Public Life, pp. 222-225; Levine, Defender of the Faith, pp. 361-362; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 6-27, 114; Allen, "The McAdoo Campaign for the Presidential Nomination in 1924," Journal of Southern History, XXIX (May, 1963), 216-217. For evidence that the atmosphere of the convention was highly charged, see NYT, June 29, 1924; Frost, ""The Klan's ½ of 1 per cent Victory," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 9, 1924), 384-387; and Kent, The Democratic Party, p. 491.

[38] McAdoo to E. Wilson, August 9, 1924, E. Wilson Papers, LC; NYT, June 24, 1924, June 27, 1924, June 30, 1924, July 12, 1924; Bruce Bliven, "The Democracy Fumbles," New Republic, XXXIX (July 9, 1924), 176-178; Frost, "The Klan's ½ of 1 per cent Victory," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 9, 1924), 384-387; Ernest Hamlin Abbott, "A Party Civil War," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 9, 1924), 381-384; Hendrick Willen Van Loon, "The Agony of the Democrats," Nation, CXIX (July 16, 1924), 66-67; Editorial, Nation, CXIX (July 23, 1924), 85-86; William Hard, "Davis the Double-Edged," Nation, CXIX (July 23, 1924), 94-95; Roper, Fifty Years of Public Life, pp. 224-225; Thomas M. Storke, California Editor (Los Angeles, 1958), pp. 260-266; Nevins, Lehman, pp. 91-92; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 114-116; Murray, The 103rd Ballot, p. 109; White, Politics, pp. 93-95. Smith received

All varieties of Democrats – among them Klan members and ethnic Americans, aggrieved farmers and complacent business leaders, drys and wets, conservatives and liberals – assembled in the soon-to-be-razed Madison Square Garden for the sessions that began on June 24. Virtually every important party leader was in New York City, and, contrary to custom, nearly every formal candidate and dark horse personally commanded his campaign for the nomination – perhaps the best sign that no one held the position of favorite.

Former Ambassador John W. Davis seemed to attract the most attention among the half-dozen or so secondary candidates. Others in this category, such as Senators Underwood, Thomas J. Walsh of Montana, and Carter Glass of Virginia, saw themselves as "logical" compromise choices if neither of the leaders could obtain the required 732 of the 1,098 votes. Twenty or so favorite sons and dark horses – Senator Copeland of New York was probably the most noteworthy member of this group – undoubtedly entertained the same thoughts about themselves, however limited their visible support was.[39]

Preconvention estimates of the votes that Smith and McAdoo would receive did not accurately reflect either man's authentic support. Each had an implacable core of followers who would never countenance the nomination of the other, but large segments of each man's forces gave their candidate only nominal, strategic support. Only the unit rule kept many delegates in McAdoo's column, and quite of few of them, it was

---

generally friendly newspaper coverage. See D. Miller to McAdoo, April 7, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; and Herbert Eaton, Presidential Timber: A History of Nominating Conventions, 1868-1960 (New York, 1964), pp. 296-297. For examples of the copious pro-Smith (and sometimes anti-McAdoo) propaganda, see NYT, June 20, 1924; and Tammany: A Patriotic History (pamphlet; New York, 1924). Although the pro-Smith propaganda may not have influenced the delegates and their leaders very much, other things that Smith's friends said probably did impress them. Some of Smith's Catholic followers reportedly tried to pressure their co-religionists; and other Smith supporters, while declaring that he would receive a heavy Eastern vote if he were nominated, also sometimes warned that many Easterners would resent his defeat in the convention. See NYT, June 30, 1924, July 1, 1924, July 4, 1924, July 5, 1924; and Mullen, Western Democrat, pp. 244-246.

[39] Merkling to Evins, June 5, 1924, Underwood Papers, ADHA; Glass to Stuart, July 9, 1923, Glass Papers, UVa; J. Davis to Lansing, January 28, 1924, Davis Papers, YU; Boyd to McAdoo, January 23, 1924, Brisbane to McAdoo, February 13, 1924, McAdoo telegram to Rockwell, March 6, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; T. Osborne to Peabody, June 7, 1924, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; N. Baker to E. Baker, July 6, 1924, Baker Papers, WRHS; Polier and Wise (eds.), The Personal Letters of Stephen Wise, pp. 199-200; Editorial, NYT, January 13, 1924, January 28, 1924, February 21, 1924, February 29, 1924, March 20, 1924, March 26, 1924, March 31, 1924, April 6, 1924, April 14, 1924, May 1, 1924, May 23, 1924, June 4, 1924, Editorial, June 4, 1924, June 12, 1924, June 15, 1924, June 16, 1924, June 18, 1924, June 19, 1924, June 20, 1924, June 22, 1924, June 23, 1924, June 25, 1924, June 26, 1924, June 27, 1924, June 30, 1924, Editorial, June 30, 1924; "The Presidency by Default?" Nation, CXVIII (January 23, 1924), 78; Levine, Defender of the Faith, p. 304; Kent, The Democratic Party, pp. 485-486, 489; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," pp. 171-173, 201; J. Leonard Bates, "Senator Walsh of Montana, 1918-1924: A Liberal Under Pressure" (Ph.D. thesis, University of North Carolina, 1952), pp. 394-395; Schapsmeier, "The Political Philosophy of Walter Lippmann," pp. 145-148. For reports of the Klan's presence at the convention, see W.J. Vollor to F. Walsh, June 9, 1924, Walsh Papers, NYPL; Frost, "The Klan's ½ of 1 per cent Victory," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 9, 1924), 384-387; and Charles C. Alexander, The Ku Klux Klan in the Southwest (Lexington, Kentucky, 1965), pp. 168-169. Many Eastern Democrats seemed to prefer Davis or Underwood after Smith, whereas the Southern and Western Democrats appeared to look to Glass or Ralston after McAdoo. See Long diary entry for February 2, 1924, Long Papers, LC; NYT, June 28, 1924; and Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 122-126. New York Democrats were especially concerned that Copeland might gather momentum as a compromise choice, and Copeland later maintained that he would have been nominated except for Smith's opposition to him. NYT, July 3, 1924; "Backstage in Washington," Outlook, CLV (August 6, 1930), 540.

reported, were ready to vote for Smith.[40] Because of these circumstances, it became increasingly obvious during the pre-convention period that the convention would remain in a lengthy deadlock until one or both leaders were eliminated from the contest and that the party would end up with a compromise candidate as its nominee.[41]

The prospect that McAdoo's enemies would control one-third of the delegates' votes led some of his supporters to hint as the convention approached that they would challenge the venerable two-thirds rule. They realized, however, that a challenge to this rule had its risks. McAdoo's friends were quite confident that they could prevent Smith from obtaining two-thirds of the votes, but they feared that the New Yorker might somehow be able to piece together a majority. Furthermore, numerous Democrats – particularly the Southerners, who supplied many of McAdoo's votes – strongly supported the two-thirds rule because they regarded it as their protection against domination by other segments of the party. McAdoo's followers also were concerned that if they challenged the two-thirds rule they might prompt Smith's supporters to call for the abolition of the unit rule, which was a source of much of McAdoo's strength. Because Smith's backers intended only to block McAdoo, they saw no advantage in criticizing the two-thirds rule and nearly always refused to comment on it. In the end both sides decided to leave the status quo undisturbed, but McAdoo's hints about challenging the two-thirds rule had alienated many Democratic leaders and delegates.[42]

The initial battle of the convention revolved around the question of whether the party platform should condemn the Ku Klux Klan by name. Most of the platform aroused little controversy or interest, but the committee on resolutions could not agree on what to say about the Klan (and about the League of Nations) in time to report the platform on schedule; and so while the committee continued to debate these matters, the convention proceeded to the nominating speeches. The nominating speech for Underwood, which included a denunciation of the Klan, touched off a rousing demonstration by foes of the organization but antagonized Klan sympathizers and laid bare the deep divisions within the party. Encouraged by their impressive

---

[40] McAdoo to Hampton, November 29, 1926, Hampton Papers, DU; Chadbourne to McAdoo, June 4, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, June 3, 1924, June 21, 1924, June 22, 1924, June 24, 1924, June 27, 1924, July 1, 1924, July 4, 1924, July 6, 1924, July 7, 1924, May 13, 1926; Frost, "Democratic Dynamite," Outlook, CXXXVII (June 18, 1924), 265-268; Frost, "The Klan's ½ of 1 per cent Victory," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 9, 1924), 384-387; Frost, "Fear and Prejudice in Deadlock," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 16, 1924), 422-424; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, p. 121; Shannon, The American Irish, pp. 175-176. One of McAdoo's advantages was his control of or influence over several important committees. Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, p. 117; Allen, "The McAdoo Campaign for the Presidential Nomination in 1924," Journal of Southern History, XXIX (May, 1963), 224-225.

[41] Glass to Shouse, April 7, 1924, Shouse Papers, UKy; Glass to Stuart, July 9, 1923, Glass Papers, UVa; J. Davis to Lansing, June 6, 1924, Davis Papers, YU; Roosevelt to Washburn, August 13, 1923, Howe to T. Osborne, April 1, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Chadbourne to McAdoo, January 25, 1924, McAdoo to Lewis T. Humphrey, April 15, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, November 14, 1923, November 22, 1923, January 17, 1924, January 20, 1924, March 4, 1924, April 21, 1924, April 25, 1924, April 28, 1924, June 7, 1924, June 11, 1924; "Democratic Candidates," Review of Reviews, LXVII (May, 1923), 459; Owens, "Shadows of 1924," New Republic, XXXIV (May 9, 1923), 288-290; "Governor Smith in Wisconsin and Elsewhere," Review of Reviews, LXIX (May, 1924), 466; Mark Sullivan, "Who Will Lead the Democrats?" World's Work, XLVIII (June, 1924), 146-149.

[42] McAdoo to Humphrey, April 15, 1924, July 17, 1924, McAdoo to D. Miller, May 5, 1924, Chadbourne to McAdoo, June 4, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, April 25, 1924, May 13, 1924, May 23, 1924, June 10, 1924, June 11, 1924, June 18, 1924, June 19, 1924, June 20, 1924, June 21, 1924, June 22, 1924, June 25, 1924; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 120-121; Murray, The 103rd Ballot, pp. 113-114. See also James C. Prude, "William Gibbs McAdoo and the Democratic National Convention of 1924," Journal of Southern History, XXXVIII (November, 1972), 621-628.

demonstration, McAdoo's opponents redoubled their efforts to use the Klan issue to muster resistance to him.

As the appeals to the few undecided delegates continued, McAdoo's supporters made several backstage attempts to reach a compromise on the Klan issue – a non-platform resolution attacking the organization, an agreement to let the presidential nominee decide the issue, and a mild anti-Klan plank – but the anti-McAdoo camp refused to give any ground. Perhaps they sensed that McAdoo's offer to compromise was a sign of weakness, but, in addition, the Klan issue had acquired fresh strategic value for McAdoo's opponents. By broaching the issue early in the convention, they now believed that they could brand him as "the Klan candidate," embarrass him in a test vote before the presidential balloting began, and smoke out much of his hidden support. A test vote on almost any other issue, by contrast, would have revealed the paucity of votes that the Smith forces controlled.

McAdoo, surmising his opposition's strategy, twice failed to get the presidential balloting underway before the convention began to debate the Klan plank. Immediately after the nominating speeches the convention turned to the alternative planks that the still-divided committee on resolutions reported to it. One plank, which a majority of the committee preferred, simply endorsed the civil liberties that the Constitution recognizes and rebuked any efforts to "arouse religious and racial dissensions"; the other, which most of the Klan's varied opponents and a minority of the committee supported, denounced secret political societies, assailed the Klan by name, and pledged the Democratic Party to resist racial prejudice and violations of political freedom and religious liberty.[43]

Emotions intensified as the long-awaited showdown dragged through five hours of debate and two more hours of vote-tallying. The inconclusive result – the majority plank won by only one vote, though a later computation slightly widened the margin of victory – satisfied no one and probably exacerbated the tensions within the convention and the party. McAdoo's enemies, nonetheless, could consider the outcome an achievement. McAdoo had given his delegates a free rein on the Klan issue, but they did not line up as solidly behind the majority plank as Smith's followers did behind the minority plank. At the same time, even though the voting was an inaccurate delineation of pro- and anti-Klan sentiment within the convention, the fact that half of the delegates refused to antagonize the Klan must have convinced Smith and his leaders – if they needed further proof – that he could not be nominated in 1924.[44]

After this struggle the presidential balloting might have been anti-climactic, but it developed a liveliness of its own. One by one the candidates were nominated while the Klan issue hung over the convention. When Smith's turn came, it was Roosevelt who made his way, laboriously and dramatically because of his polio, to the rostrum. With

[43] NYT, June 26, 1924, June 27, 1924, June 28, 1924, June 29, 1924; Levine, Defender of the Faith, pp. 310-311; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 117-120. The 1924 platform buried the prohibition issue with a strong stand for states' rights, a step that dissatisfied some New York Democrats. See NYT, June 27, 1924, June 28, 1924, and July 22, 1924. According to one reporter, Smith pronounced the platform as satisfactory after just glancing at its three major planks. NYT, June 30, 1924.

[44] James M. Geraghty to George F. Christensen, May 27, 1926, James M. Geraghty Papers, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington (hereafter UWash); NYT, June 27, 1924, June 29, 1924, June 30, 1924; Pringle, Smith, pp. 308-309; Alexander, The Ku Klux Klan in the Southwest, p. 168-169; White, Politics, pp. 79-84.

Cockran dead and Smith eager to be nominated by a prominent Protestant, Roosevelt was, again, the logical choice – although reportedly Smith considered and even auditioned some other men. Once again, too, Roosevelt wanted to do things his own way. Proskauer provided him with a nominating address that he and a number of Smith's other advisers had composed, but Roosevelt termed it too "poetic" and held out for his own version. Since Smith could not resolve the matter himself, he asked Swope to choose between two unsigned speeches. Swope preferred Proskauer's draft – the "Happy Warrior" address for which both Smith and Roosevelt were to become so well-known.[45]

Roosevelt spoke for thirty minutes, and then Smith's enthusiasts took over Madison Square Garden. Many Democrats who did not support Smith had become increasingly concerned as his candidacy developed during 1924 that Tammany would try to intimidate the convention by packing the galleries, and the behavior of the crowds to this point in the convention had seemed to bear out these fears. What the Democrats who had been troubled about this matter saw now left no doubt in their minds.

One thousand organized marchers burst into the Garden through police lines to join demonstrating delegates, and the overflow audience of more than seventeen thousand contributed to the pandemonium with their voices and with such mechanical noisemakers as dismounted sirens. For more than an hour Smith's partisans responded with near precision to his floor leaders' signals and to the music of the half-dozen or so bands that were scattered throughout the building. McAdoo's delegates, some of them clutching tightly their state standards, could do little more than form hollow squares with women in the center and watch the spectacle around them with amazement and resentment.[46]

The demonstration for Smith produced an adverse reaction, even among some of Smith's advisers, a number of whom later doubted the wisdom of the awesome display for him. For the remainder of the convention, however, the galleries continued to express their opinions lustily, chanting "Ku Klux McAdoo," rudely harassing Bryan during the debate on the Klan plank, and cheering and booing frequently throughout the balloting. Some of McAdoo's followers became inordinately apprehensive about the galleries; and many of them, along with others who attended the 1924 convention, remembered long afterward what they thought had been the rowdyism and unfairness

[45] NYT, May 27, 1924, June 27, 1924; Proskauer, A Segment of My Times, pp. 50-51; Freidel, Roosevelt: The Ordeal, pp. 175-177; Kahn, The World of Swope, pp. 284-285; Lindley, Roosevelt, p. 222. At least one of Smith's friends suggested to him that the drama and sympathy that would accompany Roosevelt's appearance as the nominator would aid Smith's cause. H. Morgenthau to Smith, June 13, 1924, Morgenthau Papers, LC. Years afterward, Smith took credit for lifting Roosevelt back into prominence when – against the recommendations of some party leaders, Smith said – he selected Roosevelt to nominate him in 1924. It is likely that the later frictions between the two men distorted Smith's recollection. See fragment of speech found in Smith's file of articles for the McNaught newspaper syndicate, about May, 1932, Smith Papers, NYSL; John T. Flynn, The Roosevelt Myth (Chicago, 1948), p. 266. For previous political uses of the "Happy Warrior" sobriquet, see NYT, June 27, 1908, and Bradley Gilman, Roosevelt: The Happy Warrior (Boston, 1921).

[46] F. Walsh to William P. Harvey, June 28, 1924, Walsh Papers, NYPL; McAdoo to Roper, January 18, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; Howe to T. Osborne, April 1, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; NYT, April 23, 1924, June 25, 1924, June 27, 1924, June 28, 1924; Smith, Up to Now, p. 285; Freidel, Roosevelt: The Ordeal, pp. 176-177; Murray, The 103rd Ballot, pp. 130-134. Smith's partisans may have sabotaged the electrical amplification of McAdoo's nominating speech. See NYT, June 27, 1924.

of the Madison Square Garden crowds and the manipulation of the galleries by Smith's friends.[47]

With the preliminaries completed, the delegates began to vote on the presidential nominee. For ballot after ballot McAdoo remained at around four or five hundred votes; Smith, after beginning with only 241 votes, held steadily at slightly over three hundred votes; and the balance of the 1,098 votes were sprinkled among a score or so of other candidates. The deadlock, which lasted for ten days and over one hundred ballots and ultimately fatigued, impoverished, and angered the visiting delegates, caused some observers to wonder if large segments of the party might temporarily or even permanently desert the Democrats. Reports of the deadlock held the country's attention throughout late June and early July, and a national radio audience was able to listen to portions of the proceedings.[48]

Whereas McAdoo's supporters sought to speed the voting in order to prove their candidate's numerical superiority, his opponents usually sought to delay it and even, some observers suggested, to bring about an endurance contest. While McAdoo's managers worked desperately to garner at least a majority of the votes in the hope that the convention would not deny the nomination to a man who could obtain a majority, the Smith forces simply kept intact the coalition of anti-McAdoo delegates and waited patiently for their strategy to bear fruit. In the meantime, Smith's followers talked confidently of his eventual nomination, tried to keep the lesser candidates in the contest by teasing them with the prospect of Smith's ultimate backing, and frequently polled some of the McAdoo delegations to reveal how narrowly he controlled them under the unit rule.[49]

---

[47] G.O. Marshall to Roosevelt, January 7, 1925, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; McAdoo to Hollins Randolph, March 17, 1927, McAdoo Papers, LC; Editorial, NYT, June 27, 1924, June 28, 1924, July 1, 1924, July 3, 1924, July 5, 1924, July 10, 1924, Editorial, November 9, 1925, November 16, 1925, June 8, 1928; Bliven, "The Democracy Fumbles," New Republic, XXXIX (July 9, 1924), 176-178; Van Loon, "The Agony of the Democrats," Nation, CXIX (July 16, 1924), 66-67; Hard, "Davis the Double-Edged," Nation, CXIX (July 23, 1924), 94-95; Hiram Wesley Evans, "The Klan's Fight for Americanism," North American Review, CCXXIII (March-May, 1926), 48; Tucker, "The Story of Al Smith," Review of Reviews, LXXVII (February, 1928), 154-161; Bowers, My Life, p. 119; Watson (ed.), Bishop Cannon's Own Story, p. 335; Storke, California Editor, pp. 264-266; Levine, Defender of the Faith, pp. 311-312; Chalmers, Hooded Americanism, p. 206; Paul L. Flint, Jr., "Self-Criticism of the Democratic Party, 1924-1926" (M.A. thesis, Georgetown University, 1951), p. 42. New Yorkers had pledged fairness to all candidates when they presented their city's bid for the convention to the Democratic National Committee. NYT, January 16, 1924. Smith, who once acknowledged that convention galleries do candidates little good and sometimes much harm, contended that New Yorkers did not bully the 1924 convention. His daughter, reflecting his views, has denied that Tammany packed the galleries. Smith, Up to Now, p. 285; Smith, The Citizen and His Government, pp. 114-115; Warner interview. Some reports indicate that the New York delegation was more mannerly than the crowds were. See NYT, June 27, 1924, and July 3, 1924.

[48] N. Baker to E. Baker, July 1, 1924, July 4, 1924, Baker Papers, WRHS; NYT, July 4, 1924, July 6, 1924, July 10, 1924; Frost, "Fear and Prejudice in Deadlock," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 16, 1924), 422-424; Milton, "Can We Save the Democratic Party?" Century, CX (May, 1925), 97; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, p. 120; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," pp. 238-239. To show that Smith's forces possessed an absolute veto, his managers "borrowed" enough votes to push his total just over 366 – one-third – on several ballots. On twelve ballots near the end of the voting Smith finally surpassed McAdoo. NYT, July 8, 1924, July 10, 1924; Murray, The 103rd Ballot, p. 189. Smith suffered some mild embarrassment when two McAdoo supporters in the New York delegation, though reportedly with Smith's permission, permanently defected to McAdoo after the thirty-sixth ballot. NYT, July 2, 1924, July 3, 1924, July 7, 1924.

[49] NYT, June 27, 1924, June 28, 1924, June 30, 1924, July 2, 1924, July 3, 1924, July 4, 1924, July 6, 1924, July 8, 1924; Frost, "Nomination by Exhaustion," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 23, 1924), 464-466; Roper, Fifty Years of

Smith and McAdoo refused to withdraw in favor of the other or some compromise candidate, and spokesmen for both men cited General Ulysses S. Grant's vow that he would persist even if victory took all summer to achieve. McAdoo and his backers feared that his withdrawal would give the nomination to Smith or to another undesirable wet, and they continued to hope that they would be able to attract enough delegates away from the minor candidates to nominate their man – possibly by a simple majority vote if they could persuade the convention to adopt a change in the rules.

Smith and his supporters, declaring that McAdoo's defeat meant as much to them as Smith's nomination did, made it known that the Governor would remain in the running as long as McAdoo did. Since they relied upon a deadlock to defeat McAdoo, they steadfastly opposed the various plans to break the stalemate, including McAdoo's proposal after the seventy-seventh ballot that the convention nominate its candidate by a simple majority vote. Smith denied rumors that he would accept the vice-presidential nomination on a fusion ticket with McAdoo, and it was reported that he rejected such an offer from an emissary from McAdoo.[50]

What many observers initially interpreted as an effort by Smith's followers to end the impasse was actually an elaborate stratagem to embarrass McAdoo. After the sixty-sixth ballot a Smith delegate proposed suspending the rules in order to allow all the candidates to address an executive session of the convention. McAdoo asked his friends to defeat the resolution; and although it won a bare majority, it failed to receive the necessary two-thirds vote. Roosevelt immediately offered another resolution that invited Smith, as the host governor, to speak to the convention. Many delegates (including some of McAdoo's backers) who had voted against the first proposal because they did not want to hear more oratory nonetheless desired to hear Smith – probably, for most of them, for the first time – or to avoid a patent discourtesy to him; and so they voted for Roosevelt's resolution. It too failed to pass, however, although it did win a larger majority than the initial resolution had.[51]

McAdoo and his advisers evidently did not perceive soon enough that both resolutions were designed to make McAdoo appear to be reluctant to face the delegates, afraid to have them compare him to Smith, and unwilling to let them hear Smith at all. After the defeat of the second resolution, McAdoo asked the delegates to let Smith speak, but it was too late. The Smith forces, savoring McAdoo's embarrassment, refused to accept what they termed a "favor" from their opponent and suggested that the offended Smith might use other means (for example, renting Carnegie Hall) to get his views on the issues, on his availability, and on the religious question – which Smith reportedly now blamed for much of the opposition to his candidacy – before the party and the people.

Once Smith's friends had squeezed as much political capital as they could out of the incident, they let it drop. Most analysts agreed that Smith's forces had outsmarted

---

Public Life, p. 219; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 121-124; Mitchell, Embattled Democracy, p. 76; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," pp. 238-239.

[50] Roosevelt to Bryan Mack, February 21, 1928, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; McAdoo to T. Walsh and Cordell Hull, July 6, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, July 3, 1924, July 4, 1924, July 5, 1924, July 6, 1924, July 7, 1924, July 8, 1924, July 9, 1924, July 10, 1924; Mullen, Western Democrat, p. 245; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 121-124; Kent, The Democratic Party, p. 493; Rollins, "The Political Education of Franklin Roosevelt," pp. 767-768.

[51] NYT, July 5, 1924; Murray, The 103rd Ballot, pp. 184-186.

those of McAdoo and that the episode had put McAdoo on the defensive. The ability of McAdoo's adversaries to assemble a majority behind both resolutions, moreover, was an ominous sign for his candidacy.[52]

Perhaps it was this setback that led McAdoo's managers to launch an all-out attempt to secure a majority for their candidate. Their maximum accomplishment (530 votes on the sixty-ninth ballot), however, fell twenty votes short of the goal. Some of McAdoo's friends told him that the struggle was now hopeless, but McAdoo would not withdraw. After eight more ballots, though, first Smith and then the more reluctant McAdoo yielded to a request from Cordell Hull, the party's chairman, and Senator Walsh, the convention's permanent chairman, that the two leaders personally discuss the situation, and they met privately and apparently amicably for about an hour.

In their meeting, Smith told McAdoo that neither of them could be nominated, asked (some accounts suggested that he either begged or commanded) McAdoo to withdraw for the good of the party, and stated that he would quit the race when McAdoo did. McAdoo still refused to withdraw, however. The conversation ended after an inconclusive discussion of possible compromise choices should both men be removed from the contest. A few hours later Roosevelt, speaking for Smith, announced to the convention that even though Smith was leading he would withdraw when – but not until – McAdoo quit.[53]

Roosevelt's virtual admission that Smith could not win produced one last surge for McAdoo (to 421 votes on the ninety-sixth ballot), but the persistent downward trend in McAdoo's vote total after his failure to reach a majority finally convinced him that he could not win. After the ninety-ninth ballot, McAdoo released a cryptic letter that freed delegates who were pledged to him, but he did not withdraw his name from consideration. McAdoo's support declined sharply on the next several ballots, though, and it appeared that he was finally finished as a serious contender. Chiefly because of lingering suspicions that McAdoo might somehow regain strength, Smith's backers switched from him less rapidly than McAdoo's supporters abandoned their candidate.[54]

Most of Smith's followers, though they probably preferred Underwood to any of Smith's other rivals, must have realized that the Alabamian had little chance to win the nomination because of his extreme wet and anti-Klan positions. Their next preferences were Davis, who had maintained his standing as the strongest second choice by running third throughout most of the balloting, and then Glass. If Smith's followers precipitately reassembled behind Davis, however, they feared that they would frighten off significant numbers of McAdoo's erstwhile supporters and those of other candidates as well.

Many of Smith's friends, who had prepared for his eventuality by intimating that Underwood was their second choice, therefore began to shift to the Alabamian in the

---

[52] McAdoo to T. Walsh, July 4, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, July 5, 1924, Editorial, July 5, 1924, July 1, 1928; Murray, The 103rd Ballot, pp. 184-186.

[53] Milton to McAdoo, March 28, 1927, McAdoo to Milton, April 4, 1927, McAdoo Papers, LC; Long diary entry for October 16, 1924, Long Papers, LC; McAdoo to Creel, March 2, 1927, Creel Papers, LC; NYT, July 5, 1924, July 9, 1924, July 10, 1924; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 288-289; Baruch, Baruch, p. 183; Murray, The 103rd Ballot, pp. 197-199.

[54] NYT, July 9, 1924; Murray, The 103rd Ballot, pp. 199-201.

hopes of producing a countertrend to Davis among the impatient delegates. A large number of McAdoo's supporters – ignoring their former leader, who now recommended that they vote for either Senator Walsh or former Secretary of Agriculture Edwin T. Meredith – and many other delegates swung to Davis on the 101st and 102nd ballots. The opportune moment for joining the rapidly growing movement to Davis had arrived, and sufficient numbers of Smith's friends did so on the next ballot to help push Davis over the top.[55]

Shortly after the final presidential ballot, a dozen party leaders, including Davis, met as Smith's guests to decide upon a suitable vice-presidential nominee. Smith, the only other former candidate present, proposed Governor George S. Silzer of New Jersey on the grounds that he would strengthen the ticket in the important Northeast. The group turned to other possibilities, however, when Davis informed the gathering that he was now a resident of New York. Someone finally suggested Governor Charles W. Bryan of Nebraska, the younger brother of "the Peerless Leader." According to one preconvention report, Smith's aides had spoken of Governor Bryan as a possible running mate for Smith; but Smith now objected to him, declaring that the name Bryan would cost the party votes in the East. In the end, however, Davis accepted Bryan as his running mate. The choice was not a popular one among the surprised delegates; but after they heard New York unanimously endorse Davis's preference, enough of them switched to Bryan to nominate him on the first ballot. After more than two hectic weeks, the fragmented Democrat Party finally had a ticket.[56]

Smith briefly addressed the convention during its final session to signify his personal approval of Davis. Some of Smith's admirers and others later described his speech as one of his most uninspired and unimpressive addresses, chiefly because the exhausted Smith talked mainly about himself and New York. Most of the delegates, however, responded enthusiastically to Smith – in large part because he assured them that he did not resent his defeat and earnestly pledged his full assistance to the national ticket. Smith's appearance not only won him new respect from many delegates and enlivened a predominantly routine concluding session but symbolized the pre-eminent position that he played at the national convention in 1924.[57]

---

[55] Glass to Stuart, July 22, 1924, Glass Papers, UVa; Pittman to Thatcher and Woodburn, May 20, 1924, Pittman Papers, LC; T. Osborne to Victor F. Nelson, August 9, 1924, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; NYT, June 28, 1924, Editorial, July 5, 1924, July 6, 1924, July 9, 1924, July 10, 1924; Frost, "Nomination by Exhaustion," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 23, 1924), 464-466; Richard C. Bain, Convention Decisions and Voting Records (Washington, 1960), pp. 225-226; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 125-127; Murray, The 103rd Ballot, pp. 203-205; Allen, "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1924," pp. 125-126, 133-139, 166, 171-173, 201, 276-277. According to one account, Smith himself favored Underwood. Polier and Wise (eds.), The Personal Letters of Stephen Wise, pp. 199-200. Some New Yorkers disliked Davis's association with the J.P. Morgan interests and so voted for Walsh on the final few ballots; but Smith's leaders, some of whom reportedly saw Walsh as "almost a Protestant," ruled the Senator out. They feared that the party would blame Walsh's Catholicism for his defeat in November and therefore would be reluctant to nominate Smith in 1928. See NYT, July 6, 1924, July 10, 1924; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 124-125; Roche, The Quest for the Dream, p. 115; and Paul A. Carter, "The Other Catholic Candidate: The 1928 Presidential Bid of Thomas J. Walsh," Pacific Northwest Quarterly, LV (January 1964), 4.

[56] NYT, June 6, 1924, July 10, 1924; Kerney, "A Personal Portrait of Governor Al Smith," Scribner's Magazine, LXXX (September, 1926), 246; Smith, Up to Now, p. 290; Levine, Defender of the Faith, p. 317n.

[57] Goltra to N. Mack, October 3, 1925, Goltra Papers, MoHS; James H. Hawley to Roosevelt, September 29, 1928, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; NYT, July 10, 1924, July 11, 1924, May 28, 1926, July 1, 1928; Editorial, Nation, CXIX (July 23, 1924), 85-86; Hapgood, "Why 'Al' Smith is Great," Nation, CXXIV (February 16, 1927), 164-165; Smith,

Most Eastern Democrats regarded the results of the convention, particularly Davis's nomination and McAdoo's defeat, as victories over their intra-party foes. A few of the Eastern leaders, however, including several of Smith's close associates, were dissatisfied with the convention's outcome and with Smith's actions during the convention. There were also complaints about how Smith's headquarters had been run. Observers, including some New Yorkers, frequently singled Brennan out for criticism, especially for his emphasis of the Klan issue.[58]

Many Democrats, especially Roman Catholics, were particularly bitter about the result of the convention because they attributed Smith's defeat to religious prejudice alone. The anti-Catholicism that Smith's candidacy had aroused also disturbed many among Smith's supporters who had realized that he had not been a bona fide candidate. Many of these Democrats were determined to see Smith vindicated in 1928. Although Smith did not evidence any resentment, or even any disappointment, when he appeared before the convention, he too was disturbed by what he believed had been an intolerant reaction to his candidacy. In 1924 and in later years he publicly asserted that the Klan had controlled the convention, that many delegates had opposed him solely because of his Catholicism, and that the religious question had been the major issue in his contest with McAdoo. Nevertheless, Smith was probably less bitter about his failure to win the nomination than amazed at the reaction to his religion.[59]

McAdoo's bitterness over the results of the convention was unmistakable, and some observers thought him a poor loser. Unlike Smith, McAdoo did not promise the delegates that he would support the ticket and contented himself with a terse congratulatory wire to Davis. Just before he sailed for Europe a few days later, however, McAdoo met with Davis, endorsed him, and promised to aid the campaign after he returned from overseas in September.[60]

McAdoo held Brennan and the other Eastern bosses more responsible for his defeat than he did Smith; and in later years, as his rancor seemed to grow, McAdoo bombastically denounced his 1924 enemies. McAdoo and some of his friends accused the Eastern bosses of fabricating a "Klan issue" solely to defeat him; injecting a fictitious religious question so as to obscure their desire to nominate a wet or a conservative; cooperating with the Republicans, the liquor interests, and big business in an effort to block a progressive Democrat; employing bribery and other underhanded methods

---

Up to Now, p. 290; Proskauer, A Segment of My Times, pp. 53-54; Hapgood and Moskowitz, Up from the City Streets, pp. 311-312; Becker, "Smith," pp. 159-160. See also Chapter Three, p. 5.

[58] Pell Memoir, CUOHC, pp. 330-331; NYT, June 27, 1924, July 5, 1924, July 7, 1924, July 22, 1924, March 5, 1926; Flynn, You're the Boss, pp. 44-45; Mullen, Western Democrat, p. 241; Weiss, Murphy, pp. 73-75; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 125-126; Potter, "Copeland," pp. 336-337. See also McAdoo to Thomas W. Gregory, October 29, 1928, Thomas W. Gregory Papers, LC.

[59] Roosevelt to Smith, July 28, 1924, Roosevelt to N. Mack, August 5, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; L. Osborne to Frank L. Polk, July 23, 1924, T. Osborne to William E. Sweet, August 23, 1924, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; N. Baker to E. Baker, July 5, 1924, Baker Papers, WRHS; NYT, July 5, 1924, July 6, 1924, July 9, 1924, July 15, 1924, August 28, 1925, July 1, 1928, October 24, 1940; Editorial, Nation, CXIX (July 23, 1924), 85-86; Kerney, "A Personal Portrait of Governor Al Smith," Scribner's Magazine, LXXX (September, 1926), 246; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 284-290; Bowers, My Life, p. 123. Although Senator Walsh received some of McAdoo's votes on the last few ballots, he blamed anti-Catholics for his failure to win the nomination. Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 124-125; Bates, "Senator Walsh of Montana," p. 398. There was indeed much anti-Catholicism in the 1924 convention, but there was more to the opposition to Smith than mere religious intolerance.

[60] NYT, July 10, 1924, June 12, 1924, July 13, 1924.

during the convention; and risking the destruction of the party for their own narrow and negative purposes. The bitterness of McAdoo and some of his followers was so intense that many observers thought that it made Smith's nomination or election forever impossible.[61]

Most Americans, especially after Davis's dismal showing in November, came to regard the imbroglio of the 1924 convention as a disaster for the Democratic Party. The controversy over the responsibility for the fiasco began even while the deadlock was in progress and continued for years afterward. Members of the party's two major factions hurled the expected recriminations at one another. Outsiders often differed emphatically on who was most to blame for what befell the party, but no candidate and his followers escaped blame altogether.[62]

All of the convention's participants, indeed, must bear some of the responsibility for what happened. Smith's forces willfully aroused the most powerful emotions and tied up the convention in order to block McAdoo. McAdoo and his friends refused to acknowledge his failure when it became apparent that he could not win, alienated delegates who might have given him at least a majority, and did not try to assemble a winning coalition behind an alternate figure – something that they probably could have done during most of the convention. The minor candidates and their supporters held out for ballot after ballot in the unlikely hope that lightning would strike them; had they pooled their strength they could have created a powerful third force within the convention.

Moreover, the delegates and their leaders seemed uncommonly selfish. Each faction of the party sought to dominate the gathering for the sake of domination and placed its own goals above the interests of the party as a whole. As Elmer Davis, the reporter, wrote at the height of the deadlock, "While all the delegates are desperately determined

---

[61] Long diary entry for October 16, 1924, Long Papers, LC; McAdoo to Hampton, November 29, 1926, Hampton Papers, DU; McAdoo to House, August 21, 1924, House Papers, YU; McAdoo to Gregory, October 29, 1928, Gregory Papers, LC; McAdoo to E. Wilson, August 9, 1924, E. Wilson Papers, LC; McAdoo to Untermeyer [sic], July 15, 1924, McAdoo to William Hard, July 17, 1924, McAdoo to W. Bryan, July 17, 1924, McAdoo to Mrs. Peter J. Oleson, November 14, 1924, McAdoo to Urey Woodson, November 28, 1924, McAdoo to Mark Sullivan, March 19, 1927, McAdoo to Wayne Williams, April 9, 1927, McAdoo to Edward Cowles, July 30, 1928, McAdoo Papers, LC; McAdoo to T. Walsh, October 6, 1926, Walsh Papers, LC; T. Osborne to Nelson, August 9, 1924, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; McAdoo to Creel, March 2, 1927, Creel Papers, LC; NYT, September 4, 1925, April 22, 1927, February 4, 1928; Editorial, Nation, CXIX (July 23, 1924), 85-86; Editorial, New Republic, XL (October 1, 1924), 107; Milton, "Al Smith and the Nation," Outlook, CXLIV (December 15, 1926), 496-498; David Y. Thomas, "The Campaign of 1928," Southwest Review, XIV (Winter, 1929), 219-229; Mullen, Western Democrat, pp. 244-246; Storke, California Editor, pp. 264-265; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, p. 89; Shannon, The American Irish, pp. 175-176.

[62] See, for example, the following: Beecher Hitchcock to Pope, March 19, 1928, Pope to Hitchcock, April 4, 1928, Pope Papers, IdHS; McAdoo to T. Walsh, October 6, 1926, T. Walsh to Mrs. A. Walsh Donahue, April 24, 1928, Walsh Papers, LC; McAdoo to Theodore A. Price, November 18, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; T. Robinson to Elmer Cook, July 5, 1924, Robinson Papers, MdHS; Pell Memoir, CUOHC, pp. 330-331; NYT, July 4, 1924, July 6, 1924, July 7, 1924, Editorial, July 7, 1924, July 9, 1924, November 16, 1925, October 10, 1926; "Strategy of Obstruction," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 16, 1924), 413-414; Frost, "Fear and Prejudice in Deadlock," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 16, 1924), 422-424; Editorial, New Republic, XXXIX (July 16, 1924), 193-194; Editorial, Nation, CXIX (July 23, 1924), 85-86; Flynn, You're the Boss, pp. 44-45; and Rollins, "The Political Education of Franklin Roosevelt," pp. 767-774.

that somebody shall not be nominated, few of them are determined that somebody shall be nominated."[63]

It is easy, however, to judge the participants in the 1924 convention too harshly. All of them functioned under very trying circumstances, particularly as the convention dragged on; and the party's leaders were often powerless to affect the course of events. Even Smith and McAdoo could do little to control, or sometimes even to influence, their followers because of the emotions and group loyalties that actuated them and made them scorn any accommodation with their adversaries. Although the clusters of delegates who supported the minor candidates were on the whole more highly disciplined than the Smith and McAdoo followings were, they were individually impotent and without the skillful leadership that could have overcome their proud independence of one another.

The candidates themselves experienced such very human emotions as anger, pride, hatred, and, above all, ambition that warped their sense of reality and lessened the chances for party harmony. Smith regarded himself as the savior who stood between his party and disaster; McAdoo was convinced that he could and should be president; each of the minor contenders aspired to be the king maker – or the compromise nominee – of the convention.[64]

The rough-and-tumble gathering in Madison Square Garden was democracy in its most primitive and savage form, with all the liabilities connected with such a free-for-all. In actuality, no one controlled the convention, which epitomizes the predicament of the Democratic Party in the 1920s. As Professor David Burner has written, the 1924 convention showed that the Democrats were not "torpid" and that they had the potential for real vitality once they would be able to settle their internal difficulties. In the meantime, they resolved not to allow another melee like the Madison Square Garden convention to take place – a determination that would work to Al Smith's great advantage between 1924 and 1928.[65]

[63] NYT, July 4, 1924; Frost, "Fear and Prejudice in Deadlock," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 16, 1924), 422-424; Murray, The 103rd Ballot, pp. 91-92, 181, 191-194.

[64] NYT, July 4, 1924, July 5, 1924; Frost, "The Klan's ½ of 1 per cent Victory," Outlook, CXXXVII (July 9, 1924), 384-387; Shannon, The American Irish, pp. 175-176; Allen, "The McAdoo Campaign for the Presidential Nomination in 1924," Journal of Southern History, XXIX (May, 1963), 226-227. Smith realized – and McAdoo must have, too – that the exigencies of the convention would control his followers. See Chadbourne to McAdoo, June 4, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; McAdoo to Creel, March 2, 1927, Creel Papers, LC; NYT, July 7, 1924; and Smith, Up to Now, pp. 284, 289.

[65] Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 3-4. See also Chalmers, Hooded Americanism, p. 300.