

THE AVAILABLE MAN

The savage, turbulent struggle for the 1924 Democratic presidential nomination firmly established Al Smith as one of the handful of American political figures who commanded immediate and serious nationwide attention. In the succeeding four years, his political successes and forceful administration as governor of New York kept him in the public eye and earned him widespread respect, while speculation about the 1928 presidential nomination shadowed nearly every action that he took.¹

Although Smith's record as governor was his most impressive credential as a presidential contender, this was not all that people perceived when they thought about him and his possible candidacy. Since Smith combined in his person certain qualities and forces that had never before found a major representative in presidential politics and that roused explosive extremes of hostility and devotion, his potential candidacy put the Democratic Party in an agonizing dilemma. How Smith was able to capture the 1928 Democratic presidential nomination on the first ballot, despite the misgivings of some Democrats and the conviction of others that he was an unsuitable choice, is a singular study in political availability. In retrospect, Smith's many strengths and the political bankruptcy of the Democratic Party of the 1920s make his victory, which he and his friends actually did little to achieve, seem as logical as anything can be in American politics, perhaps even inevitable.²

Smith demonstrated his political strength by winning re-election in 1924 and 1926. His renomination in 1924 remained in doubt until almost the eve of the state convention in late September. Smith evidently had many personal reasons for retiring from the governorship in 1924, and a number of political circumstances also argued against his running again. There was always the chance, of course, that Smith would lose, particularly because he would be running for a third term – unprecedented in modern

¹ NYT, July 12, 1924, Editorial, March 29, 1925, April 1, 1925, Editorial, April 16, 1925, May 17, 1925, Editorial, September 24, 1925, September 26, 1925, November 5, 1925, Editorial, November 5, 1925, Editorial, November 15, 1925, January 10, 1926, February 28, 1926, May 5, 1926, May 13, 1926, Editorial, January 6, 1927, November 10, 1927, January 28, 1928; Editorial, Michigan Daily, March 17, 1926; Editorial, New Republic, XLII (April 1, 1925), 142; "Al' Smith, Hypnotist," Nation, CXX (April 8, 1925), 372; "Governor Smith's Tax Victory," Literary Digest, LXXXV (April 11, 1925), 11-12; "Albany and Governor Smith," Review of Reviews, LXXXI (May, 1925), 466; "Political Wonder-Worker," New Republic, XLIV (November 18, 1925), 317-319; "Governor Smith's Victory," Nation, CXXI (November 18, 1925), 562; Editorial, New Republic, XLV (December 30, 1925), 148; Editorial, Nation, CXXII (January 20, 1926), 49; "'Paternalism' – or Slums?" New Republic, XLV (January 20, 1926), 230-231; "Raiding Water-Power," Nation, CXXII (February 17, 1926), 170; "Housing the People," Nation, CXXII (March 10, 1926), 246; Editorial, New Republic, XLVI (March 10, 1926), 56-58; "Governor Smith's Plan to End New York City Slums," Literary Digest, LXXXVIII (March 13, 1926), 5-7; T.R.B., "Washington Notes," New Republic, XLVIII (September 1, 1926), 42-44; Editorial, Nation, CXXIII (December 22, 1926), 651; "Al Smith a Candidate," Independent, CXVIII (January 15, 1927), 61; "Substitute for Regulation," New Republic, L (March 30, 1927), 157-158; "The Week," New Republic, LII (October 12, 1927), 194-195; "Governor Smith and the Vote in New York," Outlook, CXLVII (November 23, 1927), 360; "American Preoccupations," Round Table (London), XVIII (December, 1927), 73; "A Gain Through Defeat," Outlook, CXLVIII (April 4, 1928), 525-526; "Al Smith's Valedictory as Governor," New Republic, LIII (January 11, 1928), 208-209; Timothy L. McDonnell, The Wagner Housing Act: A Case Study of the Legislative Process (Chicago, 1957), 23-25; Eldot, "Smith," passim. In many ways, Smith corresponds to the model of the "new bureaucratic hero" that Theodore P. Greene describes in America's Heroes: The Changing Models of Success in American Magazines (New York, 1970), pp. 310-334 passim, and this may in part account for Smith's high reputation.

² Edmund A. Moore, A Catholic Runs for President: The Campaign of 1928 (New York, 1956), pp. 104-105, 110-112.

New York history – and because, as in 1920, he would have to overcome a weak national ticket, party division, and a strong Republican trend.

Some of Smith's friends therefore suggested that he might do the Democratic cause, and his own career, the most good by stumping the country for the national ticket, and the extensive speaking tour that party leaders at first announced for Smith seemed to preclude his candidacy for governor. Finally, Smith undoubtedly realized that, win or lose, he was sure to run far ahead of the national standard bearers, Davis and Bryan, and that this would lead many Democrats around the country to believe that Tammany had again deserted the national ticket, a conviction that could hardly help Smith's political reputation.³

Other political considerations, however, argued for a fourth gubernatorial campaign. If Smith ran again, both Tammany and he would graphically demonstrate their willingness to support the national ticket. Smith might even carry Davis and Bryan to victory in New York – an unlikely but not impossible outcome. Should Smith ignore his apparent duty to his party in 1924, moreover, he could scarcely expect the party to support him enthusiastically in the future. Certain factors involving New York State Democratic politics, particularly the absence of any obvious successor and the revived influence of Hearst, also prompted Smith to run again.

Although Smith's sense of duty to his fellow New York Democrats was probably the major reason behind his decision to seek another term, the desire of national leaders, particularly Davis, that Smith make the race must have influenced him as well. Davis publicly stated his eagerness to have Smith on the ticket in New York, and in several conferences with the Governor Davis sought to persuade Smith to run again by reminding him of his frequently reiterated pledge to help the Democratic presidential candidate. Smith finally let it be known that he would not refuse the nomination, and a few days later the state convention renominated him by acclamation.⁴

Smith and his advisers were confident that he would defeat the Republican gubernatorial nominee, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., whom the Smith forces regarded as a weak opponent, despite his name, because of his inexperience and his embarrassing though minor involvement in the Teapot Dome scandal. The Smith-Roosevelt contest attracted interest throughout the country, and Smith himself drew attention through his association with the national campaign. Smith and Davis evidenced nothing but accord and cooperation during the campaign, belying

³ J. Davis to C.E. Smith, September 11, 1928, Davis Papers, YU; Woolley to House, July 29, 1924, August 5, 1924, House Papers, YU; Roosevelt to Peters, January 3, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Untermyer to McAdoo, July 30, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; T. Osborne to Smith, July 29, 1924, T. Osborne to Sweet, August 23, 1924, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; NYT, January 3, 1924, July 10, 1924, July 15, 1924, July 25, 1924, July 29, 1924, July 30, 1924, August 1, 1924, August 23, 1924, August 26, 1924, August 28, 1924, Editorial, August 29, 1924, August 31, 1924, September 3, 1924, September 11, 1924, September 12, 1924, September 27, 1924, August 27, 1925; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 291-295; Warner, The Happy Warrior, p. 163.

⁴ Arthur Krock telegram to Baruch, September 13, 1924, Baruch Papers, PU; Woolley to House, July 29, 1924, August 5, 1924, House Papers, YU; Pittman to T. Walsh, September 30, 1924, Walsh Papers, LC; McAdoo to Chadbourne, July 15, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; T. Osborne to Smith, July 29, 1924, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; NYT, July 10, 1924, July 11, 1924, July 12, 1924, July 16, 1924, July 22, 1924, July 26, 1924, July 27, 1924, July 29, 1924, July 30, 1924, July 31, 1924, August 2, 1924, August 5, 1924, August 28, 1924, August 31, 1924, September 11, 1924, September 12, 1924, September 13, 1924, September 18, 1924, September 20, 1924, September 27, 1924; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 291-295; Warner, The Happy Warrior, p. 163.

reports of dissension between them. Several times Smith reaffirmed his wholehearted support of Davis (and even of Bryan, who was anything but popular in New York), and Davis praised Smith's magnanimity and endorsed the Governor in his campaign for re-election.⁵

Smith fulfilled his pledge to travel outside of New York on behalf of the national ticket, but his tour was short-lived. When it became likely that Smith would run again in New York, the national headquarters staff had to delay and then to shorten the ambitious tour that they had earlier planned for him. After he had made only two addresses away from New York, Smith's chronic rheumatism in his foot recurred, and he had to cancel the remainder of his out-of-state engagements.⁶

In the two speeches that Smith did make, he vigorously assailed the Republicans and ably discussed national issues. In Manchester, New Hampshire, on October 6, Smith attacked the Republicans for the Teapot Dome and Veterans' Bureau scandals and for failing to live up to their 1920 campaign promises. Smith criticized President Coolidge's silence on issues and termed the public's confidence in its government the key question in the election. Speaking in Boston the next day, Smith returned to the theme of the Republicans' silence. He also condemned the tariff and called for a nonpartisan and scientific tariff that would not favor special interests, accused the Republicans of lacking a foreign policy, and denounced the Ku Klux Klan. Everywhere he went in New Hampshire and Massachusetts, but especially in Boston, Smith received a very enthusiastic reception.⁷

Notwithstanding his confidence in his own victory and his rheumatic foot, Smith conducted a grueling re-election campaign. Although he sometimes effectively linked state and national issues, Smith generally carried out his stated determination to restrict the gubernatorial campaign to state matters. When he did mention national issues, he spoke in broad terms about the Republican record and the need for honest, forthright leadership in government. The state Democratic platform criticized the tariff, Republican tax policies, the oil-lease scandal, and prohibition; but Smith, for the most part, ignored the opportunity to discuss these matters. The state platform also attacked the Klan; and Smith, provoked by a burning cross in Ithaca, vigorously assailed the organization before several big-city audiences.⁸

⁵ Abram I. Elkus to Roosevelt, October 20, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Moskowitz (ed.), Progressive Democracy, pp. 11-19; NYT, July 27, 1924, August 3, 1924, Editorial, September 22, 1924, September 26, 1924, September 27, 1924, October 3, 1924, October 6, 1924, October 15, 1924, October 16, 1924, October 17, 1924, November 2, 1924; "The Big Stakes in the Smith-Roosevelt Bout," Literary Digest, LXXXIII (October 11, 1924), 8-9; "For New York's Self-Respect," Outlook, CXXXVIII (October 15, 1924), 231; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 291-295; Lawrence H. Madaras, "Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Versus Al Smith: The New York Gubernatorial Election of 1924," New York History, XLVII (October, 1966), 372-388.

⁶ NYT, August 23, 1924, August 26, 1924, August 27, 1924, August 31, 1924, September 3, 1924, September 6, 1924, September 16, 1924, September 30, 1924, October 9, 1924, October 20, 1924; Smith, Up to Now, p. 293.

⁷ NYT, October 7, 1924, October 8, 1924.

⁸ Moskowitz (ed.), Progressive Democracy, pp. 3-19, 253; NYT, August 8, 1924, September 27, 1924, October 4, 1924, October 15, 1924, October 16, 1924, October 17, 1924, October 18, 1924, October 19, 1924, October 21, 1924, October 22, 1924, October 23, 1924, October 24, 1924, October 25, 1924, October 26, 1924, October 28, 1924, October 29, 1924, October 31, 1924, November 1, 1924, November 2, 1924, November 4, 1924; Madaras, "Roosevelt Versus Smith," New York History, XLVII (October, 1966), 381-387.

As noted earlier, the Klan's part in the national convention of 1924 and Smith's failure to gain the nomination embittered many Eastern Democrats, especially Catholics and minority-group members. Some observers, including prominent Democrats, charged that revenge-minded New Yorkers would knife Davis and Bryan, perhaps by trading votes with New York Republicans in order to secure Smith's re-election. Despite denials that Democrats would employ such tactics and evidence that Tammany in particular was working diligently for the national ticket, reports of disloyalty persisted until election day.⁹

The widespread ticket-splitting in the election in New York – Smith defeated Roosevelt by a little over 100,000 votes while Davis fell nearly 900,000 votes behind Coolidge – may have derived, in part, from sabotage or vote-trading by some Democratic leaders, but other factors also were at work. Coolidge's enormous popularity, Davis's rather maladroit campaign, LaFollette's third-party candidacy, and Smith's strength, especially in metropolitan and ethnic areas, probably accounted for most of the differential between the Governor's vote total and that of Davis. Throughout the Northeast Davis lost middle-class voters to Coolidge and labor and ethnic voters to LaFollette while in New York Smith drew support from all of these groups. In addition, New York Republicans neglected the state race in their effort to destroy LaFollette and insure Coolidge's victory, and young Roosevelt proved to be an inept campaigner.¹⁰

Although some observers continued to accuse Tammany of treachery and others questioned Smith's political power because of his failure to carry a single running mate to victory with him, Smith's 1924 triumph, Davis's resounding repudiation, and McAdoo's failure to redeem his promises to Davis all bolstered Smith's position within the party. His victory in a Republican year also quickened the speculation about his possible nomination for the presidency in 1928. Some Democrats, as well as many commentators, described Smith as the indisputable leader of the party, but there were also predictions of a fierce Smith-McAdoo battle again in 1928. Walter Lippmann was probably correct when he suggested that Smith now began to take his presidential prospects seriously, for it is certain that many other Americans now did.¹¹

⁹ Lippmann to House, July 10, 1924, Woolley to House, July 29, 1924, House Papers, YU; Roosevelt to Smith, July 28, 1924, Roosevelt to N. Mack, August 5, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Roscoe Irwin to Woolley, October 20, 1924, Robert W. Woolley Papers, LC; Untermeyer to McAdoo, July 30, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; L. Osborne to Polk, July 23, 1924, T. Osborne to Sweet, August 23, 1924, Arthur Bullard to L. Osborne, October 3, 1924, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; NYT, July 16, 1924, July 30, 1924, August 29, 1924, September 10, 1924, September 18, 1924, September 27, 1924, October 1, 1924, October 7, 1924, October 14, 1924, October 20, 1924, October 22, 1924, Editorial, August 24, 1928; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 290-292, 294; Bowers, My Life, p. 123. Smith was also instrumental in the selection of a chairman for the Eastern states who might be able to mollify disaffected Democrats, especially Catholics, in that section. Roosevelt to Mack, August 5, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; McAdoo to Chadbourne, July 15, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, August 1, 1924; Roper, Fifty Years of Public Life, p. 225. Davis and his supporters later denied, though not always convincingly, that they suspected Smith or Tammany of disloyalty in 1924. Davis to Howard B. Cotton, August 15, 1928, Davis to C. Smith, September 11, 1928, Davis Papers, YU; John W. Davis Memoir, CUOHC, pp. 151-152; NYT, November 7, 1924; Julia Davis, Legacy of Love (New York, 1961), p. 217.

¹⁰ NYT, November 6, 1924; Editorial, Nation, CXIX (November 12, 1924), 507; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 136-140, 238-239; Lawrence H. Fuchs, The Political Behavior of American Jews (Glencoe, Illinois, 1956), pp. 140-141; Madaras, "Roosevelt Versus Smith," New York History, XLVII (October, 1966), 372-388; Bruce Rawnsley Andrews, "Religious and Ethnic Influences on Voting Behavior: A Study of the Syracuse Electorate from 1918 to 1957" (D.S.S. thesis, Syracuse University, 1961), pp. 198-200.

¹¹ McCafferty to Roosevelt, December 26, 1924, S.R. Lee to Roosevelt, December 26, 1924, Julius Aichele to Roosevelt, January 5, 1925, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Pittman to N. Davis, November 11, 1924, Pittman Papers,

When Smith in 1925 and 1926 once again let it be known that he wished to leave the governorship, those of his friends who hoped that he would run for president debated whether or not retirement from office would enhance or impair his chances for the 1928 Democratic presidential nomination. Some of them contended that, out of office, Smith could free himself from the burdens of state government, gain national exposure and a broad perspective on national affairs, and solidify his position as the leading Democrat in the United States.

Most of Smith's friends, however, realized that he could enjoy the most political influence as a fourth-term governor of New York and that his retirement from office in 1926 – particularly if the Republicans captured the governorship – would inevitably lead to charges that he had deserted the party. Again, state political forces seem to have persuaded Smith to set aside his personal wishes. He was eager, above all, to implement his program of governmental reorganization, which would take effect in January, 1927, and to perpetuate Democratic control of the state government, at best an uncertainty if he did not run again.¹²

Smith's re-election campaign against Representative Ogden L. Mills inevitably attracted considerable national notice. Smith, however, referred to the presidency only once as he and his friends discouraged talk of the 1928 nomination and sought to center the campaign on state issues. On one occasion Smith reviewed his record on prohibition and termed the Republicans' 1924 enforcement pledge hypocritical; he criticized Mills's views on immigration, but only because Mills had introduced the issue; and he responded to Republican charges that he was a spender and a radical in economic matters by questioning the efficaciousness of the Coolidge Administration's economy measures.

Smith, however, was unable to focus the contest on substantive state issues, largely because Mills and the Republicans concentrated on Smith's alleged failure to prevent the marketing of impure milk. Smith did not campaign with all of his characteristic aggressiveness and finesse, but he still defeated Mills by nearly 250,000 votes. The Governor lost some ground in New York City but ran better than usual upstate. There was more talk now that Smith would receive the Democratic presidential nomination in 1928, but he remained silent about his political future.¹³

LC; Byron R. Newton to McAdoo, November 8, 1924, Clagett to Milton, November 17, 1924, McAdoo to Antoinette Funk, November 18, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; Walter Lippmann Memoir, CUOHC, pp. 129-133; NYT, July 13, 1924, September 24, 1924, October 6, 1924, October 8, 1924, October 26, 1924, November 6, 1924, November 7, 1924, November 21, 1924; "Al' Smith as Democracy's Leader," Literary Digest, LXXXIII (November 15, 1924), 9; Editorial, New Republic, XL (November 19, 1924), 282-283; "The Results in New York," Review of Reviews, LXX (December, 1924), 571-572; "The Smith Demonstration in November," Review of Reviews, LXX (December, 1924), 571-572; "The Religious Issue in the Democratic Party," World's Work, XLIX (January, 1925), 234-235; Duncan Aikman, "If You Want Conversation, Say 'Al Smith,'" Outlook, CXLVIII (April 11, 1928), 573, 600.

¹² Roosevelt to Smith, September 17, 1926, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; NYT, April 1, 1925, June 12, 1925, October 18, 1925, October 19, 1925, October 20, 1925, November 5, 1925, January 9, 1926, January 15, 1926, January 16, 1926, Editorial, March 31, 1926, May 13, 1926, Editorial, May 14, 1926, June 7, 1926, June 9, 1926, July 18, 1926, August 15, 1926, September 15, 1926; Bliven, "Al Smith, New Yorker," New Republic, XLVI (March 10, 1926), 67-71; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 355-356; Warner interview.

¹³ N. Mack to Smith, October 2, 1926, Mack Papers, BECHS; Gregory to House, February 7, 1927, House Papers, YU; N. Baker to H.L. Snyder, August 25, 1926, Baker Papers, LC; McAdoo to F.H. McAdoo, October 6, 1926, McAdoo Papers, LC; Ferdinand Pecora Memoir, CUOHC, pp. 431-434; NYT, February 12, 1926, September 25, 1926, October 1, 1926, October 2, 1926, October 4, 1926, October 9, 1926, October 17, 1926, October 22, 1926,

Smith's victories in 1924 and 1926 stemmed in part from the lack of effective opposition and the general demoralization of the New York State Republican Party, but they also confirmed Smith's continued domination of his own party. Smith kept upstate Democrats in line and, of greater importance, maintained his mastery of a somewhat reluctant "new Tammany." Nothing drew national attention to this mastery more effectively, though, than Smith's decisive and widely noted intervention in the New York City mayoralty contest of 1925 on behalf of Jimmy Walker.¹⁴

Smith's excellent record as governor of the nation's most important state made him eminently available as a contender for the 1928 Democratic presidential nomination. The presidency, however, is as much a symbolic position as it is a political or administrative office. Since the American people prefer a president who seems to them to represent America, a presidential candidate's personal qualities, his associations, and the groups that he personifies are important to the voters.

Quite understandably, then, Americans between 1924 and 1928 were less concerned with Smith's record than with what sort of man he was and what his nomination and election would signify for the nation. Smith himself, whether or not he realized it, focused attention on certain aspects of his personality by refusing to speak to the substantive national issues of the day.¹⁵

October 26, 1926, October 28, 1926, November 4, 1926, July 26, 1927, November 7, 1928; T.R.B., "Washington Notes," New Republic, XLVIII (September 1, 1926), 42-44; Editorial, New Republic, XLVIII (October 27, 1926), 256-257; "Four Important Candidates," Review of Reviews, LXXIV (November, 1926), 459-460; "Governor Smith's Triumph," Outlook, CXLIV (November 10, 1926), 326; "Voting as Expected to No Purpose," New Republic, XLVIII (November 17, 1926), 363-365; "Smith and McAdoo Sharpening Their Battle-Axes," Literary Digest, XCI (December 4, 1926), 8-9; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 257, 366; Hapgood and Moskowitz, Up from the City Streets, p. 167. See also Hampton to McAdoo, October 20, 1926, Hampton Papers, DU; and Chapter Two, p. 21.

¹⁴ Claude Bowers to T. Walsh, September 30, 1925, Walsh Papers, LC; NYT, August 30, 1925, September 6, 1925, September 17, 1925, September 27, 1925, November 4, 1925, November 5, 1925, Editorial, November 5, 1925, January 10, 1926; "The Smith-Hylan Battle," Literary Digest, LXXXVI (September 12, 1925), 8-9; "Hylan or Walker?" Independent, CXV (September 19, 1925), 309-310; "Smith's Triumph over Hylan and Hearst," Literary Digest, LXXXVI (September 26, 1925), 8; T.R.B., "Washington Notes," New Republic, XLIV (September 30, 1925), 152-153; Editorial, Nation, CXXI (September 30, 1925), 343; "Democratic Politics Involved," Review of Reviews, LXXII (October, 1925), 353; "Political Wonder-Worker," New Republic, XLIV (November 18, 1925), 317-319; "Governor Smith's Victory," Nation, CXXI (November 18, 1925), 562; Tucker, "Tammany Gives a Hostage to Fortune," Independent, CXV (December 26, 1925), 728-729; "Alfred E. Smith's Presidential Ambitions," World's Work, LI (January, 1926), 234-236; Edward James Woodhouse, "The South Studies Governor Smith," Independent, CXVI (January 9, 1926), 45-47, 54. When New York voters in 1925 approved the four constitutional amendments that Smith had proposed and battled hard for, they enhanced his image as a persuasive political leader. See NYT, September 26, 1925, November 5, 1925, January 10, 1926; "Political Wonder-Worker," New Republic, XLIV (November 18, 1925), 317-319; and "Governor Smith's Victory," Nation, CXXI (November 18, 1925), 562. See also Chapter Two, pp. 26 and 31-43 and pp. 19-23 below.

¹⁵ Editorial, NYT, September 28, 1927, Editorial, June 27, 1928, Editorial, June 29, 1928; Ruby A. Black, "Al Smith in Texas," Nation, CXXV (July 6, 1927), 14-15; Lippmann, "The Wetness of Al Smith," Harper's Monthly Magazine, CLVI (January, 1928), 133-139; "Al Smith's Valedictory as Governor," New Republic, LIII (January 11, 1928), 208-209. Smith and his friends regarded his record as his major asset. See Roosevelt to William Healy, November 19, 1926, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; and NYT, March 5, 1926, November 21, 1926. Many people contended that Americans actually knew little about Smith other than his personal qualities, associations, and group identifications. See James A. Hoyt memorandum, July, 1927, James A. Hoyt Papers, USCar; Manly to F. Walsh, April 25, 1927, Walsh Papers, NYPL; Abbott to Wald, April 10, 1928, Wald Papers, NYPL; Editorial, NYT, September 24, 1925, July 1, 1928; "The Political Zoo," Nation, CXXIII (September 22, 1926), 260; Sam Acheson, "Al Smith and the Solid South," Southwest Review, XIII (Fall, 1927), 119-122; Dixon Merritt, "Al Smith and the Doubtful Seaboard," Outlook, CXLVII (November 30, 1927), 398-400; Merz, "Preconvention Portraits,"

Smith's immigrant-stock heritage, working-class origins, New York City upbringing, career as a Tammany politician, long-standing opposition to prohibition and reputation as a wet, and, above all, Roman Catholic faith all inspired much opposition to him and raised obstacles in the path of his nomination and election. The interaction of these attributes compounded the opposition that each of them aroused alone. Although most Americans did not record or articulate their attitudes toward Smith, many of them judged that he was not the sort of man whom they wanted as their president; indeed, to some of Smith's fellow Americans, he was the very antithesis of their "model" president.

Paradoxically, then, many of the same factors that had helped Smith to establish his enviable record in New York were barriers to his attainment of political success at the national level. It is often forgotten, however, that the same characteristics that repelled some also attracted important political support nationwide to Smith that partly or wholly counterbalanced the opposition that they inspired and made it difficult for the Democrats to reject him in 1928. Smith was at the same time unpopular and popular, weak and strong, but he was a formidable candidate to friend and foe alike.¹⁶

Smith's immigrant extraction worried many "native" Americans, not all of whom deserve to be called xenophobes. Between 1924 and 1928 there were frequent appeals, many of them from Protestant clergy, for Anglo-Saxon unity against "newcomers" who not only had alien manners and customs but who presented a challenge to the mores of traditional American society and to Anglo-Saxon predominance. Smith personified this challenge even more after 1924 than he had before. For apprehensive advocates of the older America, Smith provided a convenient target – even though he was actually a third-generation American and despite the fact that European commentators and others often characterized him as "marvelously American" in his attitudes and behavior and in his embodiment of American ideals.¹⁷

The same factors that led traditional America to fear and resist Smith strengthened him in other quarters. Large numbers of ethnic-stock Americans believed that Smith personified their struggle against discrimination and the pressure to conform to Anglo-Saxon standards and their struggle to attain their rightful share of political power. Many people expected Smith, if nominated, to attract hundreds of thousands of immigrant-

Independent, CXX (January 14, 1928), 33-34, 48; and Tugwell, "Platforms and Candidates," New Republic, LV (May 30, 1928), 44-45.

¹⁶ NYT, February 3, 1927; "Alfred E. Smith's Presidential Ambitions," World's Work, LI (January, 1926), 234-236; Lippmann, Men of Destiny, pp. 1-9; Robert Moats Miller, American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939 (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1958), p. 49; Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, pp. 92-94, 99-104.

¹⁷ Furnifold M. Simmons to Charles A. Webb, April 21, 1928, Furnifold M. Simmons Papers, DU; Dickson to Chenery, September 13, 1928, Dickson Papers, MDHA; Daniels to J.O. Carr, May 5, 1928, Daniels Papers, LC; NYT, August 9, 1926, Editorial, August 13, 1927, January 16, 1928; Milton, "Can We Save the Democratic Party?" Century, CX (May, 1925), 94-100; Christian Index, CVII (June 30, 1927), 3-7, 20, 22-24; Pierre Crabités, "Is It Time for a Catholic President?" Outlook, CXLVI (August 17, 1927), 504-508; Walter Lippmann, "The Sick Donkey," Harper's Monthly Magazine, CLV (September, 1927), 415-421; Bulletin of the Sons and Daughters of Washington, IX (September, 1927); "The Issue," Christian Index, CVII (October 6, 1927), 10; "A Catholic Judge on Governor Smith," Religious Herald, C (October 20, 1927), 10-11; S.K. Ratcliffe, "The American Presidential Year," Contemporary Review (London), CXXXII (November, 1927), 565-574; "American Presidential Comedy," New Statesman (London), XXXI (April 14, 1928), 5-6; Bent, "Al Smith: Executive," Independent, CXX (June 23, 1928), 592; James Cannon, Jr., "The Election of a Dry President a Missionary Question," Missionary Voice, XVIII (July, 1928), 250-251, 276; Hapgood and Moskowitz, Up from the City Streets, pp. 3-12, 16-17, 30; Josephson and Josephson, Smith, pp. 18-19; Lippmann, Men of Destiny, pp. 1-9; Leslie M. Gower, "The Election of 1928 in Tennessee" (M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1959), pp. 107-108.

stock citizens – including those who had deserted the Democratic Party in 1920 and 1924 and those (particularly women) who had never voted. At the same time, party leaders feared the resentment that many ethnic voters would feel if Smith failed to win the Democratic presidential nomination. Smith was the first immigrant-stock politician to have both the ability and the opportunity to become president, and both old-stock Americans and newcomers knew it.

The belief that no able (white) man, whatever his ancestry, should be automatically barred from the presidency might benefit Smith, it was thought, for it was anticipated that some native Americans would support him because of this belief. Their votes, along with those of newcomers, might offset Smith's expected losses among those who believed that only an Anglo-Saxon should be president. Smith's nomination in 1928 would not only be a victory over nativism but would signify the Democrats' recognition that their party could not ignore ethnic leaders and voters.¹⁸

Smith's humble start among the working class also inspired opposition to his presidential candidacy. Whether out of simple snobbishness or a sincere regard for the image of the presidential office, many Americans, even among the working class itself, believed that Smith lacked the cultivation and respectability to be president of the United States. Some people also thought that Mrs. Smith was crude and uncultured, though she was in fact both refined and intelligent. When Smith's admirers emphasized his Horatio Alger-like rise to fame, they probably increased the doubts about his qualifications. In actuality, Smith by this time had left the working class far behind, and he was almost disdainfully proud of his rise. He nevertheless reminded many other successful Americans of the large underside of society that could threaten their predominance.¹⁹

By contrast, a great many working-class Americans were prepared to vote for Smith as their representative and champion. Still more of them might do so if they thought that he was being rejected because of his lowly beginnings. Other Americans believed that to elevate the unpretentious Smith to the nation's highest office would confirm their faith that someone of humble origins could become president. Not surprisingly, commentators frequently compared Smith to the conventional democratic models,

¹⁸ House to Robert Bingham, December 2, 1927, House Papers, YU; "The Impending Conflict," New Republic, XLV (December 2, 1925), 29-31; Frank R. Kent, "The Democrats in 1928," Scribner's Magazine, LXXXII (November, 1927), 515-520; "Behold: The Bridegroom," New Republic, LV (July 11, 1928), 186-188; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 224, 228-236, 242-243; Huthmacher, Massachusetts People and Politics, pp. 163-170; Lippmann, Men of Destiny, pp. 1-9; Lubell, The Future of American Politics, pp. 35-43. See also pp. 45-47 below.

¹⁹ William H. Murray to E.A. Walker, February 3, 1936, William H. Murray Papers, UOkla; Raymond Tolbert to J. Tolbert, September 20, 1928, Tolbert Papers, UOkla; Moskowitz (ed.), Progressive Democracy, p. 28; NYT, September 12, 1925; Milton, "Al Smith and the Nation," Outlook, CXLIV (December 15, 1926), 496-498; "Suds from Sudbury," Colliers, LXXXI (January 7, 1928), 40; "The Issue Precipitated," Christian Register, CVI (January 6, 1927), 2-3; Merritt, "Six Questions for Governor Smith," Outlook, CXLVII (December 7, 1927), 428-429; Milton, "Al Smith and the Solid South," North American Review, CCXXV (March, 1928), 269-276; Wayne C. Williams, "Al Smith and the Dry Democrats," Christian Century, XLV (March 15, 1928), 348-350; Collins, "Mrs. Al Smith in the White House," Woman's Home Companion, LV (April, 1928), 10, 63; Lloyd-Smith, "First Lady of New York," Outlook, CXLVIII (April 25, 1928), 662-663; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 187-190; Paul A. Carter, "The Campaign of 1928 Re-examined: A Study in Political Folklore," Wisconsin Magazine of History, XLVI (Summer, 1963), 265-272.

Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln, and it was possible to see the electorate's decision regarding Smith as the "acid test" of American democracy.²⁰

It was probably less Smith's working-class origins than his New York City background that troubled many Americans. Many of the commentators who compared Smith to Jackson and Lincoln saw him as an urban version of the democratic model, and for many Americans this was a source of concern. Many rural-minded people (not all of them rural residents) thought of America's urban centers as "pest holes," looked askance at many city dwellers, and feared the growing cultural influence and political power of the city.

New York City was the ultimate embodiment of all that rural-minded people feared and disliked about the city. They conceived of Manhattan as the seat of crime, vulgarity in the arts, and permissiveness in moral standards; and they blamed the "New York sector" for the liberalism that seemed, to them, to threaten traditional values. "To most of America," George Fort Milton declared, "New York is not a thing of pride; it is more of the alien force, a huge agglomeration of wealth and power, unwilling to adhere to the laws of the country, and largely ignorant of our National aspirations and needs."

More and more between 1924 and 1928, Smith became, as William Allen White said, the "herald" of the urban challenge to rural America. Smith, as another writer remarked, was the symbol of the urban masses – "of tenements, of municipal machines, invading foreigners, insolent wets, liberals, clubs, and New York – the forces deemed wicked and unholy." It mattered little to most Americans that Smith had spent his boyhood in a section of Manhattan that resembled a small town in both its physical features and its values; that in manhood he had forsaken the downtown tenement district for the swank uptown hotel and the leisure of the countryside; and that he was a dedicated homebody whose views on family, morality, culture, and society in general were quite orthodox. He was seen, despite all of this, as a "typical product" of New York City, and for many this disqualified him from the presidency.²¹

²⁰ Pope to M.J. Cunningham, April 15, 1927, Pope Papers, IdHS; Baruch to M. Sullivan, May 11, 1927, Baruch Papers, PU; NYT, February 11, 1927, Editorial, March 1, 1927, September 7, 1927, Editorial, June 29, 1928; "Alfred E. Smith's Presidential Ambitions," World's Work, LI (January, 1926), 234-236; Morgenthau, "Why I Support Alfred E. Smith," Review of Reviews, LXXVII (February, 1928), 148-153; Douglas, "Can a City Man Be President?" Commonweal, VIII (June 6, 1928), 123-124; Bent, "Al Smith: Executive," Independent, CXX (June 23, 1928), 590-591; William B. Munro, "Jackson and Smith: Two Battling Democrats – A Century Apart," Century, CXVI (October, 1928), 641-645; S.K. Ratcliffe, "The Triumph of Herbert Hoover," Contemporary Review (London), CXXXIV (December, 1928), 689-697; Huthmacher, Massachusetts People and Politics, pp. 169-170; Villard, Prophets True and False, pp. 3-5; White, Masks in a Pageant, p. 475.

²¹ Dickson to Cheney, September 13, 1928, Dickson Papers, MDHA; W. White to George W. Easton, July 14, 1928, William A. White Papers, LC; Long to W.R. Hollister, January 9, 1928, Long Papers, LC; N. Baker to Ernest Harvier, January 11, 1927, Baker Papers, LC; Newton to McAdoo, November 8, 1924, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, November 20, 1925, March 1, 1926, January 29, 1927, February 27, 1927, September 12, 1927, September 23, 1927, November 27, 1927, Editorial, January 8, 1928, February 26, 1928, Editorial, June 26, 1928, July 8, 1928, October 14, 1928; "The Impending Conflict," New Republic, XLV (December 2, 1925), 29-31; Woodhouse, "The South Studies Governor Smith," Independent, CXVI (January 9, 1926), 45-47, 54; Milton, "Al' Smith and the Nation," Outlook, CXLIV (December 15, 1926), 496-498; Crabités, "Is It Time for a Catholic President?" Outlook, CXLVI (August 17, 1927), 504-508; "A Catholic Judge on Governor Smith," Religious Herald, C (October 20, 1927), 10-11; Tucker, "The Story of Al Smith," Review of Reviews, LXXVII (February, 1928), 154-161; Williams, "Al Smith and the Dry Democrats," Christian Century, XLV (March 15, 1928), 348-350; "The Wigwam Looks at the White House," Nation, CXXVI (May 2, 1928), 503-504; Charles Willis Thompson, "The Unseen Factors in Politics," Commonweal, VIII (May 30, 1928), 94-96; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 24-25, 85; Moskowitz, Smith, p. 25;

As an urbanite and a New Yorker, Smith, however, possessed a number of political advantages. His political triumphs in his home state seemed to indicate that he had a special ability to energize and attract urban voters. In a presidential election Smith was expected to receive sympathetic support from many who resented the hostility directed toward the city, as well as from other Americans who believed that “birth and rearing in a great city [should] not close the door of political hope to any man.” As the Democratic nominee Smith, it was said, would guarantee the party’s victory in New York, and he was expected to run well throughout the crucial Northeast; he might gain enough votes in the cities that Republicans had dominated for so long to give the election to the Democrats.

Rural support, particularly in the traditionally Democratic South and among disaffected Republicans in the farm belt, would be valuable to Smith, but it was the populous Northeast that would make or break the Democratic Party in 1928. Smith was the Democrat most likely to win in that section of the country, and so the party, it was thought, might be willing to gamble that Smith’s strength in this region would more than offset the losses that his candidacy would produce in rural areas. Smith’s nomination would be a victory for the growing cities as well as an acknowledgement of the leading part that the urban machines had come to play within the Democratic Party.²²

Many Americans, of course, disliked urban machines and feared that their power was indeed expanding, and Tammany Hall was the very symbol of the city political machine. The organization’s unsavory national reputation stemmed largely from the notoriety attained by bosses William March Tweed and Richard Croker, a notoriety that periodic exposures of Tammany officials kept alive. In addition, some Democrats charged that Tammany often abandoned the party’s presidential candidates and that it now hoped to use the Democratic Party to extend its influence onto the federal level. Tammany’s sincere critics conceived of it and other urban machines as by nature corrupt, anti-democratic, and inimical to the American political tradition. Tammany symbolized for them all that was ignoble in urban politics, and Smith, in turn, suffered from his long association with the New York City organization.

Smith’s opponents naturally sought to make the most of this association. In late 1927, Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., launched a Republican campaign to tar Smith with the Tammany stigma, and similar efforts continued into 1928. Smith’s enemies inside and outside the party also circulated a considerable amount of anti-Tammany propaganda. Although Smith had gained his independence from Tammany Hall and had even

Hapgood and Moskowitz, Up from the City Streets, pp. 3-12, 16-17, 30; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, pp. 77-79; Lippmann, Men of Destiny, pp. 1-9, 32-33; Walker, The Night Club Era, p. 65; White, Masks in a Pageant, pp. 465, 479; Carter, “The Campaign of 1928 Re-examined,” Wisconsin Magazine of History, XLVI (Summer, 1963), 265-272; Richard L. Watson, Jr., “A Political Leader Bolts – F.M. Simmons in the Presidential Election of 1928,” North Carolina Historical Review, XXXVII (October, 1960), 524-543; Hillyer H. Straton and Ferenc M. Szasz, “John Roach Straton and the Presidential Election of 1928,” New York History, XLIX (April, 1968), 206-217; Gower, “The Election of 1928 in Tennessee,” pp. 107-108.

²² L.E. Garvin to Chase Osborn, May 8, 1928, Chase Osborn Papers, MHC; A.H. Roberts to Hull, January 2, 1928, Hull to Roberts, January 4, 1928, Cordell Hull Papers, LC; Editorial, NYT, January 29, 1927, Editorial, March 1, 1927, September 12, 1927, June 11, 1928, June 27, 1928; “Disintegration of the Democratic Party,” New Republic, XLIX (February 9, 1927), 316-318; Douglas, “Can a City Man Be President?” Commonweal, VIII (June 6, 1928), 123-124; Lippmann, Men of Destiny, pp. 1-9, 32-33.

incurred some disfavor within the organization, his identification with Tammany was nearly complete in the public eye.²³

Smith's association with Tammany Hall was not, however, altogether a political liability. Democratic leaders expected that his nomination would insure the wholehearted loyalty of the New York City machine and its allies in such cities as Boston and Chicago, and an energetic effort on the part of these organizations was essential if the Democrats were to win the presidency in 1928. In addition, it was thought that the memory of Tammany's support of the South during the grim days of Reconstruction and the Force Bill crisis of 1890 might induce Southern Democrats, eager for victory, to support a candidate identified with the Hall.

Not all Americans, moreover, viewed Tammany as the monster of old. Many of them believed that it had been undergoing a remarkable reformation, and as its reputation rose so did Smith's. During his years as governor, and especially after Walker's victory in 1925, the notion that a "new Tammany" had emerged gained wide currency. Smith and Walker were cooperating, many observers said, to shape a more responsible, reputable, and progressive organization by introducing new leadership and by disciplining powerful and avaricious district leaders.

Within a few years, these district leaders and other Tammanyites who had chafed under the pressure to behave would take control of the organization, Walker would prove to be a disappointment, and the image of the "new Tammany" would dissolve. In the meantime, though, Smith's apparent success in dominating and reforming the machine that had spawned him brought him a good deal of national respect. This achievement crowned his record of personal independence and good government and indicated that the presence of a Tammany brave in the White House did not inevitably mean disaster for the country.²⁴

²³ Georgia E. White to William A. Comstock, March 15, 1928, William A. Comstock Papers, MHC; Callahan to F. Walsh, September 9, 1927, Walsh Papers, NYPL; Baruch to J. Robinson, April 5, 1927, April 18, 1927, Baruch to M. Sullivan, May 11, 1927, Baruch Papers, PU; Joseph C. O'Mahoney draft article, November, 1927, in Joseph C. O'Mahoney Papers, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming (hereafter UWy); Simons to Daniels, June 4, 1928, Daniels Papers, LC; Milton to John G. Evans, March 5, 1928, in Hull Papers, LC; Machold to Snell, March 23, 1928, in Mills Papers, LC; McAdoo to Marshall Hicks, December 15, 1927, McAdoo to James H. Moyle, June 6, 1928, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, November 8, 1925, Editorial, November 9, 1925, August 10, 1926, August 12, 1926, October 4, 1926, January 29, 1927, February 3, 1927, May 12, 1927, September 2, 1927, September 12, 1927, September 18, 1927, September 24, 1927, October 1, 1927, October 2, 1927, November 27, 1927, April 18, 1928, May 1, 1928, May 24, 1928, June 3, 1928; Long, Roosevelt or Smith?, pp. 46-48; "Governor Smith as a Candidate," Watchman Examiner, XV (May 19, 1927), 616; "Is Governor Al Smith a Suitable Candidate for the Presidency?" Western Recorder, CI (May 19, 1927), 11; Christian Index, CVII (June 30, 1927), 3-7, 20, 22-24; Lippmann, "Tammany Hall and Al Smith," Outlook, CXLVIII (February 1, 1928), 163-165; "The Wigwam Looks at the White House," Nation, CXXVI (May 2, 1928), 503-504; John G. Evans, "'Turn the Rascals Out' as the Democrats' Fighting Platform," Current History, XXVIII (June, 1928), 350-352; "The 'New Tammany,'" Nation, CXXVI (June 13, 1928), 659; "Pretty Pussy!" Colliers, LXXXI (June 30, 1928), 40; Charles Willis Thompson, "The Tammany Monster," Catholic World, CXXVIII (October, 1928), 1-9; Flynn, You're the Boss, p. 48; Henry F. Pringle, The Life and Times of William Howard Taft: A Biography (New York, 1939), pp. 1063-1065; Weiss, Murphy, p. 1; Borner, Labor Politics in a Democratic Republic, p. 101; Villard, Prophets True and False, pp. 15-16; Straton and Szasz, "Straton and the Election of 1928," New York History, XLIX (April, 1968), 206-217; Gower, "The Election of 1928 in Tennessee," pp. 102-103.

²⁴ Comstock to G. White, March 15, 1928, Comstock Papers, MHC; Baruch to J. Robinson, April 18, 1927, Baruch Papers, PU; O'Mahoney draft article, November, 1927, O'Mahoney Papers, UWy; T. Walsh to W.L. Bywater, April 26, 1927, Walsh Papers, LC; NYT, November 5, 1925, November 8, 1925, Editorial, November 9, 1925, November 11, 1925, November 12, 1925, April 20, 1927, Editorial, August 18, 1927, May 27, 1928; Editorial, New Republic,

Tammany might have hurt Smith's chances for the presidential nomination had not its leaders and the organization itself generally remained in the background as his candidacy gained strength after 1924. Only occasionally did Tammany lend credence to the charges that it was grasping for power. In April, 1927, the Tammany Society, a nonpolitical organization to which many New York City Democratic leaders belonged, revealed plans to expand into other states. Despite declarations that this step had no connection with Smith's political future, and despite the fact that the Society had long talked of re-establishing branches outside of New York, many people regarded the proposed expansion as a part of the movement to nominate Smith in 1928. Smith and other key Tammany leaders had not been present when this proposal was broached, and when they learned of the plan to expand they quickly quashed it. Later in 1927, reports circulated that a large group of Tammany Democrats would attend the seating of Senator-elect Robert F. Wagner when the new Congress convened, but when this news generated a reaction that threatened to embarrass Smith, Tammany abandoned the idea.

Tammanyites continued to act with discretion throughout the course of the Democratic National Convention in 1928. Many people, including some of Smith's enemies, commented on the composition of the New York delegation, its sobriety, moderation in dress and language, reasonableness in dealing with troublesome issues, and well-mannered behavior even during the convention's demonstrations. If Tammany could not be completely invisible – and some of Smith's friends always worried that it was too openly promoting his candidacy – at least it sought to avoid giving offense and accentuating its connection with Smith.²⁵

Some of the fiercest opposition to Smith came from prohibitionists, who maintained that he was simply too wet to be president. Some of them went so far as to charge that American wets had long been plotting to use Smith and his party to spearhead a movement to discredit, and ultimately to repeal, prohibition. Although dries feared the consequences for prohibition of a Smith victory, many of them appeared to welcome a political showdown in 1928 with anti-prohibitionists and their purported leader. By late 1928 some dries were already eagerly preparing for battle by organizing, collecting campaign funds, and speaking out against a wet candidate and a wet platform plank. Smith was the focus of many dry attacks, which ranged from slurs on his personal life to

XLIV (October 14, 1925), 188; Tucker, "Tammany Gives a Hostage to Fortune," Independent, CXV (December 26, 1925), 728-729; "Governor Smith's Triumph," Outlook, CXLIV (November 10, 1926), 326; Hapgood, "Why 'Al' Smith is Great," Nation, CXXIV (February 16, 1927), 164-165; "Why Tammany Is Leaving the Old Wigwam," Literary Digest, XCV (December 31, 1927), 34-38; Lippmann, "Tammany Hall and Al Smith," Outlook, CXLVIII (February 1, 1928), 163-165; Aikman, "If You Want Conversation, Say 'Al Smith,'" Outlook, CXLVIII (April 11, 1928), 573, 600; "Pretty Pussy!" Colliers, LXXXI (June 30, 1928), 40; Pringle, "What's Happened to Tammany?" Outlook, CLII (May 15, 1929), 83-86, 117-118; Fowler, Beau James, pp. 212-219.

²⁵ Joseph Tumulty to Baruch, May 21, 1927, Baruch to McAdoo, May 30, 1927, Baruch Papers, PU; Long to House, July 7, 1928, House Papers, YU; Roosevelt to L. Osborne, February 7, 1928, Osborne Family Papers, SyrU; NYT, November 11, 1925, November 12, 1925, March 19, 1927, April 19, 1927, April 20, 1927, April 27, 1927, May 12, 1927, October 12, 1927, Editorial, October 13, 1927, November 11, 1927, January 3, 1928, February 5, 1928, February 13, 1928, March 1, 1928, June 3, 1928, Editorial, June 4, 1928, June 8, 1928, June 21, 1928, June 23, 1928, June 24, 1928, June 28, 1928, June 29, 1928, June 30, 1928, July 1, 1928, Editorial, July 5, 1928; Lewis S. Gannett, "It's All Al Smith," Nation, CXXVII (July 4, 1928), 8; Henry F. Pringle, "Heat at Houston," Outlook, CXLIX (July 4, 1928), 374-377; Lewis S. Gannett, "The Big Show at Houston," Nation, CXXVII (July 11, 1928), 34-35; McGoldrick, "The New Tammany," American Mercury, XV (September, 1928), 2; Bowers, My Life, pp. 186-188; Watson (ed.), Bishop Cannon's Own Story, p. 415. By early 1928 the Tammany Society did have at least two out-of-state branches, whose origins are unclear. NYT, February 12, 1928, March 15, 1928.

a recital of the Mullan-Gage repeal bill and his alleged failure to enforce the prohibition laws.²⁶

Smith surprised those who expected him to moderate his position on prohibition in order to disarm his dry opponents. Although he proposed a national referendum on prohibition soon after his re-election in 1924 and publicly suggested repeal on two occasions during his final two terms as governor, Smith – when he said anything at all on the subject – usually just reiterated his earlier statements on enforcement and modification of the Volstead Act. His only significant action regarding prohibition came in 1926, when he happily signed a bill that authorized a statewide referendum proposing liberalization of the Volstead Act. During the fall campaign he urged the voters to approve the measure; and when they did so, Smith hailed their vote and similar actions in other states.

Whether Smith's unwillingness to discuss prohibition derived from his conviction that it was improper for him to speak about this "national" issue, his belief that he had made his views quite clear, political expediency, or indecision is unclear. In any event, Smith's nearly complete silence on the subject until the eve of the Democratic National Convention gave his dry enemies every opportunity to criticize, and to distort, his stand on prohibition.²⁷

It was widely accepted that prohibition would be an important factor in the 1928 presidential contest. Smith himself thought that it would be the principal issue, although he did not consider the election to be a mandate on prohibition. A number of state contests between 1924 and 1928 demonstrated the ability of the issue to arouse the dries and to polarize the Democratic party. Some commentators maintained that prohibition would cause an even deeper division in 1928, and a few of them went so far as to declare that the party was facing its gravest crisis since the Civil War. As early as 1925 many people, including some Smith supporters, predicted that disaffection would be widespread in the South and West if Smith were the presidential nominee and that some Democrats might even desert their party on this issue. Opinion was hardly unanimous on this point, but there was enough evidence on the subject to cause many

²⁶ McAdoo to Baruch, October 2, 1926, Baruch to McAdoo, October 9, 1926, Baruch Papers, PU; Meredith to Wilson, December 21, 1927, Ed Harris to Meredith, January 19, 1928, Meredith Papers, UIowa; Callahan to Love, April 25, 1928, in Smith Papers, USCar; Hull to H.B. McGinness, March 2, 1928, Hull Papers, LC; McAdoo to Simmons, April 6, 1927, McAdoo to John Dickinson, January 23, 1928, McAdoo Papers, LC; NYT, November 16, 1925, March 1, 1926, May 5, 1926, May 14, 1926, August 9, 1926, August 31, 1926, October 4, 1926, October 20, 1926, November 17, 1926, November 28, 1926, December 11, 1926, January 29, 1927, May 19, 1927, May 21, 1927, June 6, 1927, September 26, 1927, November 28, 1927, December 3, 1927, January 9, 1928, February 2, 1928, February 3, 1928, February 24, 1933; "Governor Smith and the Contest of 1928," Review of Reviews, LXXIII (May, 1926), 458; "The Dry Battle of 1928," Christian Century, XLIV (January 13, 1927), 40-41; "What a Record?" Religious Herald, C (April 28, 1927), 10-11; Christian Index, CVII (June 30, 1927), 3-7, 20, 22-24; "Governor Al Smith, Presidential Candidate," Western Recorder, CI (December 15, 1927), 12-13; "The Pope and the Presidency," Current History, XXVII (March, 1928), 792; Williams, "Al Smith and the Dry Democrats," Christian Century, XLV (March 15, 1928), 348-350. The American Association Against the Prohibition Amendment did almost nothing to assist Smith's candidacy. See NYT, April 9, 1927, and January 12, 1928.

²⁷ N. Mack to Smith, May 12, 1926, May 17, 1926, Mack Papers, BECHS; Love to McAdoo, October 27, 1926, Thomas B. Love Papers, Dallas Historical Society, Dallas, Texas (hereafter DHS); NYT, November 16, 1924, January 8, 1925, May 19, 1926, May 20, 1926, July 17, 1926, September 3, 1926, September 28, 1926, September 29, 1926, October 4, 1926, October 17, 1926, November 3, 1926, November 7, 1926, January 6, 1927, Editorial, January 6, 1927, December 3, 1927, December 4, 1927, Editorial, December 5, 1927, January 5, 1928.

Democrats to think twice about nominating a candidate so closely identified with the cause of the wets.

Prohibition was, however, an issue that cut two ways as far as Smith's candidacy was concerned. Just as many dries would ally against Smith, so many wets were likely to unite behind him. Although the extent of anti-prohibition sentiment in the United States was something of a mystery, wets seemed to be concentrated in just those urban and Eastern areas that a Democratic presidential nominee needed to win in order to be elected. Smith, it was thought, might attract a sufficient number of wet Republicans and independents in these places to counterbalance his losses among Democratic dries in other areas.

Many Americans, neither irreconcilably wet nor dry, were dissatisfied with the consequences of prohibition: widespread crime, hypocrisy, and a disrespect for the laws. They might vote for a frank opponent of prohibition who nevertheless pledged himself to enforce the law. Additionally, many people were concerned about the considerable political influence of the dries and the dry lobby. The more that dries exercised this influence, the more a wet candidate like Smith would gain, especially if dries attacked him unfairly. Dries were not the only ones who wanted to turn the 1928 presidential election into a "referendum" on prohibition; confident wets and those Americans who were eager to have a resolution of this political issue also looked forward to such a contest.²⁸

As Smith emerged after 1924 as a leading candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, his Roman Catholicism evoked more controversy than anything else about him did. The opinion was widespread that Smith's Catholicism would prevent him from receiving the Democratic nomination or would cause his defeat in the election if he were nominated. As evidence for their contentions, those who held to this view cited the long tradition of anti-Catholicism in the United States, the religious battle that had erupted in 1924, and indications that many voters were quite willing to enforce the unwritten proscription of a Catholic candidate.²⁹

²⁸ J.D. Whelan to Pope, March 28, 1927, Moore to Pope, April 6, 1927, Pope Papers, IdHS; C.W. Tillett to Joseph M. Proskauer, April 26, 1928, in John H. Kerr Papers, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina (hereafter UNC); J. Tolbert to Democratic Publicity Bureau, March 31, 1928, June 11, 1928, Tolbert Papers, UOkla; Bruce to Roosevelt, June 29, 1928, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; McAdoo to Shouse, November 8, 1926, McAdoo Papers, LC; Editorial, NYT, November 9, 1925, November 16, 1925, March 5, 1926, October 3, 1926, October 4, 1926, April 6, 1927, April 9, 1927, April 11, 1927, April 23, 1927, June 4, 1927, June 7, 1927, July 18, 1927, November 15, 1927, January 8, 1928, February 2, 1928, February 3, 1928, February 4, 1928, March 25, 1928, April 22, 1928, May 20, 1928, Editorial, May 21, 1928, June 10, 1928, June 28, 1928, June 29, 1928; "Governor Smith's Victory," Nation, CXXI (November 18, 1925), 562; "Politics and Prohibition," New Republic, XLV (January 6, 1926), 178-179; "Governor Smith and the Contest of 1928," Review of Reviews, LXXIII (May, 1926), 458; "Prohibition Issue," Independent, CXVII (October 16, 1926), 431; "Irrepressible Prohibition," New Republic, XLVIII (October 20, 1926), 232-234; George W. Hays, "When Tammany and Dixie Unite," Independent, CXVII (October 23, 1926), 466-468; "The Dry Battle of 1928," Christian Century, XLIV (January 13, 1927), 40-41; T.R.B., "Washington Notes," New Republic, LIII (January 11, 1928), 217-218; "Prohibition and the Presidency," Colliers, LXXXI (February 18, 1928), 54; Williams, "Al Smith and the Dry Democrats," Christian Century, XLV (March 15, 1928), 348-350; David Y. Thomas, "Party-Splitting, 1860 and 1928," Southwest Review, XIII (Spring, 1928), 283-286; Flynn, You're the Boss, p. 66.

²⁹ Pope to Whelan, April 6, 1927, Pope to Moore, April 11, 1927, Pope Papers, IdHS; Baruch to Cox, November 29, 1926, Baruch Papers, PU; Harris to Meredith, November 29, 1926, Meredith Papers, UIowa; Bowers to McAdoo, September 3, 1926, McAdoo Papers, LC; Editorial, NYT, September 24, 1925, Editorial, August 2, 1926, Editorial, December 5, 1926, May 5, 1927, September 12, 1927, October 23, 1927, April 1, 1928, June 10, 1928; Bliven, "Al

Some people, however, including many of Smith's backers, consistently denied that "the religious issue" was an important one, either because they were eager to counter opposition to Smith or because they were confident that tolerance was overcoming prejudice in twentieth-century America. Smith himself rejected the idea that his religion would make a difference. He refused to disguise the fact that his family and he were devout Catholics and often proclaimed his faith in the open-mindedness of his fellow citizens. "The minority of intolerant people in our land," Smith said in 1926, "is soon hushed by the chorus of disapproval which arises when intolerance and hatred raise their voices." Smith's attitude on the religious question stemmed to a considerable extent from his naiveté about religious matters in general and his ignorance of Protestant America. As in 1924, he was unprepared for the vigorous anti-Catholicism that the prospect of his presidential candidacy aroused.³⁰

Anti-Catholicism was in part a by-product of the nativism of the 1920s. To nativists, the Catholic Church, with its seat in Rome and its millions of immigrant-stock communicants, seemed a particular threat to America's "Puritan civilization." Non-Catholic nativists looked askance at the "foreign" customs and beliefs of Catholics and used Catholicism as a scapegoat for the nation's problems. The widespread impression that the Catholic Church was growing in numbers, prestige, influence, and political consciousness fanned nativist anxieties, as did the prevalent suspicion that all Catholics were subject to a "foreign potentate" and that some of them were actually scheming to turn America into a Catholic state. Large numbers of nativists regarded the presidential candidacy of a Catholic as a call to arms in a battle between civilizations, and they welcomed the opportunity to reaffirm that Anglo-Saxon, Protestant values prevailed in the United States.³¹

Most of the opposition to a Catholic presidential candidate, however, was a direct expression of simple religious prejudice. A vocal assortment of editors, preachers, Klan members, and professional Catholic-baiters fanned the prejudice against Catholics,

Smith, *New Yorker*," New Republic, XLVI (March 10, 1926), 67-71; "A Catholic President?" New Republic, L (March 23, 1927), 128-131; George Fort Milton, "Progressive Democrats in a Quandary," Independent, CXIX (October 8, 1927), 350-352; Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, pp. 86-90; Flint, "Self-Criticism of the Democratic Party," pp. 29-31. Background for the following discussion of anti-Catholicism can be found in Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, *passim*; Richard Pancoast Longaker, "Anti-Catholicism in the United States, 1919-1929" (M.A. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1950), *passim*, especially pp. 202-210; Roberta Rosen, "A Roman Catholic Runs for President" (M.A. thesis, Smith College, 1961), pp. 24-25, 45-46; and Norman F. Weaver, "The Knights of the Ku Klux Klan in Wisconsin, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan" (Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1954), pp. 17-19.

³⁰ N. Mack to Roosevelt, April 8, 1927, Mack Papers, BECHS; Moore to Pope, April 6, 1927, Pope Papers, IdHS; L. Osborne to Roosevelt, January 28, 1927, Roosevelt to L. Osborne, February 2, 1927, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; N. Baker to Harvier, January 11, 1927, Baker Papers, LC; Moskowitz (ed.), Progressive Democracy, p. 253; NYT, September 18, 1925, Editorial, November 9, 1925, November 10, 1925, January 10, 1926, June 22, 1926, September 8, 1926, October 20, 1926, Editorial, November 22, 1926, January 3, 1927, April 4, 1927, April 9, 1927, April 10, 1927, May 5, 1927, June 11, 1928, June 19, 1928; "Protestants and Partisan Politics," America, XXXV (August 14, 1926), 415; Editorial, New Republic, XLIX (January 26, 1927), 260; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, "Why Democrats Favor Smith. II. As a Practical Realist," North American Review, CCXXIV (November, 1927), 472-475; Kent, "A Good Look at Al Smith," Colliers, LXXXI (March 3, 1928), 8-9, 51-53; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 413-414; Warner, The Happy Warrior, p. 156; Pringle, Smith, pp. 122, 345; Moses, A Tribute to Governor Smith, pp. 51-52.

³¹ "Is it Jesuitry or Stupidity?" Lutheran Witness, XLV (November 2, 1926), 360; "A Catholic President - A Joke or a Menace?" Lutheran Witness, XLVI (May 3, 1927), 157-158; Christian Index, CVII (June 30, 1927), 3-7, 20, 22-24; "The Religious Issues," Christian Century, LXV (October 18, 1928), 1251-1253; John Higham, Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925 (revised edition; New York, 1963), pp. 265-270, 286-299.

frequently for their own opportunistic purposes. These anti-Catholics, many of whom were unvarnished bigots, often appeared eager to do battle with a Catholic candidate. “Frankly,” one of them confided, “I would not have the Democrats fail to nominate [Smith] for half of my kingdom.” The most prominent of these agitators was Senator J. Thomas Heflin of Alabama. Long an assailant of the Catholic Church and informally affiliated with the Ku Klux Klan, Heflin attracted much national attention – and no little sympathy for Smith – with a series of ill-informed and rabidly anti-Catholic, anti-Smith speeches in the Senate and on the lecture circuit.

With the increase in Smith’s political strength after 1926, anti-Catholics began forming alliances, stepped up their public denunciations of the Catholic Church and Smith, and increased their distribution of sensational anti-Catholic propaganda. The largest part of this propaganda merely repeated the hoary tales of immorality and corruption within the Catholic Church and, as in the past, raised questions about the loyalty of American Catholics, but this literature of bigotry found a new and receptive audience in the 1920s. The most widely circulated single piece of scurrilous literature appears to have been a spurious Knights of Columbus “oath” that made that organization seem vicious and even treasonable.³²

Although most bigots went beyond lurid propaganda of this sort to raise, however disingenuously, serious questions about some of the Roman Catholic Church’s ostensible doctrines and policies, not everyone who raised these questions deserves the epithet of “bigot”; and not all criticism of the Catholic Church can be dismissed as misguided and intolerant. Many non-Catholics objected to a Catholic as president for what they regarded as political rather than religious reasons. The implications of the Church’s doctrines and policies for American secular society and certain incidents in the history of the Roman Catholic Church were genuinely disturbing to these criticism of Catholicism. Among them were well-informed people whose criticism was reasoned and dignified and who preferred to seek assurances that would allay their misgivings about a Catholic presidential candidate rather than to proscribe one automatically.

Both bigoted and unbigoted critics of the Catholic Church held that Catholicism was incompatible with American values and institutions. They questioned the Church’s

³² Mrs. D.S. Raines telegram to Editor, Abilene, Texas, Reporter, September 17, 1927, J. Frank Norris to R.B. Creager, January 19, 1928, J. Frank Norris Papers, Dargan-Carver Library, Nashville, Tennessee; Josiah W. Bailey to B. Moskowitz, May 14, 1928, Josiah W. Bailey Papers, DU; Baruch to Milton, March 23, 1928, Baruch Papers, PU; DuPuy to Meredith, November 7, 1927, Meredith to Milton, December 21, 1927, Meredith Papers, UIowa; [Tolbert] to Editor, Oklahoma City Daily Oklahoman, March 13, 1928, Tolbert Papers, UOkla; Frederick I. Thompson to Daniels, June 5, 1928, Daniels Papers, LC; James D. Phelan to T. Walsh, January 21, 1928, Walsh Papers, LC; Congressional Record, 70th Congress, 1st Session, pp. 1649-1665 (January 18, 1928), 1864-1875 (January 23, 1928), 5095-5102 (March 21, 1928), 9542-9551 (May 23, 1928); NYT, June 15, 1926, November 28, 1926, March 3, 1927, Editorial, March 25, 1927, June 19, 1927, July 2, 1927, August 7, 1927, January 19, 1928, January 29, 1928, March 9, 1928, June 1, 1928, June 20, 1928; Hiram W. Evans, “The Catholic Question as Viewed by the Ku Klux Klan,” Current History, XXVI (July, 1927), 563-568; Bulletin of the Sons and Daughters of Washington, IX (September, 1927); Alexander, The Ku Klux Klan in the Southwest, p. 232; Burner, The Politics of Provincialism, p. 92n; Douglas C. Stange, “Al Smith and the Republican Party at Prayer: The Lutheran Vote – 1928,” Review of Politics, XXXII (July, 1970), 347-352; Caldwell, “The Presidential Election of 1928 in Virginia,” pp. 13-15; Longaker, “Anti-Catholicism,” p. 178; Hugh D. Reagan, “The Presidential Campaign of 1928 in Alabama” (Ph.D. thesis, University of Texas, 1961), pp. 90-94; Rosen, “A Roman Catholic Runs for President,” p. 36n; Ralph Mervis Tanner, “James Thomas Heflin: United States Senator, 1920-1931” (Ph.D. thesis, University of Alabama, 1967), pp. 117, 124-132. See also Michael Williams, The Shadow of the Pope (New York, 1932), passim. For the bogus Knights of Columbus oath, see Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, p. 105.

commitment to religious liberty and toleration; its recognition of freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and individual conscience; its acceptance of public education; and, especially, its recognition of the separation of church and state in the United States. Critics also charged that the Catholic hierarchy often meddled in political matters and unduly influenced Catholic voters and officeholders. They worried, finally, that a Catholic official like Smith might find himself caught between his allegiance to his church and the responsibilities of his office.

Rather than apologizing for raising questions about the Catholic Church, bigot and non-bigot alike asserted it to be their duty to scrutinize the religious beliefs of any presidential candidate before that person was elected to the most prestigious and powerful office in the country. Anti-Catholics denied that Article VI, Section 3 of the Constitution restricted their right to question, oppose, or vote against a Catholic.³³

A number of incidents involving the Roman Catholic Church abroad between 1924 and 1928 disturbed many American non-Catholics. The annulment of the Marlborough-Vanderbilt marriage, a paper encyclical reiterating the Catholic Church's uniqueness and insisting on dogmatic conformity, and the bitter church-state conflict in Mexico all undoubtedly damaged Smith politically. The most important of these events was the crisis in Mexico in 1926-1927 that led some Catholics in the United States to call for American intervention. Many non-Catholics wondered if a Catholic president would be able to resist ecclesiastical pressures to intervene. Concerns of this sort probably hurt Smith especially among Southerners, who were very much opposed to American intervention in Mexico; and Smith's prolonged silence on the Mexican question scarcely helped him with the Protestant electorate.³⁴

³³ Pope to Whelan, April 6, 1927, Pope Papers, IdHS; NYT, December 26, 1926, April 25, 1928; "If Rome Ruled!" Walther League Messenger, XXXIII (October, 1924), 74-75, 121; "Is It Jesuitry or Stupidity?" Lutheran Witness, XLV (November 2, 1926), 360; "The Issue Precipitated," Christian Register, CVI (January 6, 1927), 2-3; "Roman Catholicism and the Presidency," Outlook, CXLV (April 13, 1927), 459-460; "A Good American and a Good Catholic," New Republic, L (April 27, 1927), 260-262; "Governor Smith Replies," Christian Century, XLIV (April 28, 1927), 518-519; "A Catholic President – A Joke or a Menace?" Lutheran Witness, XLVI (May 3, 1927), 157-158; Ernest Hamlin Abbott, "To American Catholics," Outlook, CXLVI (May 4, 1927), 8-10; "Governor Smith as a Candidate," Watchman Examiner, XV (May 19, 1927), 616; Christian Index, CVII (June 30, 1927), 3-7, 20, 22-24; Evans, "The Catholic Question," Current History, XXVI (July, 1927), 563-568; "Governor Al Smith, Presidential Candidate," Western Recorder, CI (December 15, 1927), 12-13; "The Pope and the Presidency," Current History, XXVII (March, 1928), 767-778; "Constitution, Article Six," Christian Register, CVII (March 22, 1928), 231; "The Democratic Nomination," Christian Century, XLV (July 12, 1928), 874-876; Paul Blanshard, God and Man in Washington (Boston, 1960), pp. 164-176; Charles C. Marshall, Governor Smith's American Catholicism (New York, 1928), pp. 1-43 *passim*; Miller, American Protestantism and Social Issues, pp. 58-61; Williams, The Shadow of the Pope, p. 192; James H. Smylie, "The Roman Catholic Church, the State, and Al Smith," Church History, XXIX (September, 1960), 321-322; Longaker, "Anti-Catholicism," pp. 114-123, 202-204; Beryl F. McClerren, "The Southern Baptist State Newspapers and the Religious Issue During the Presidential Campaigns of 1928 and 1960" (Ph.D. thesis, Southern Illinois University, 1963), pp. 155-201.

³⁴ Baruch to Cox, November 29, 1926, Baruch Papers, PU; Milton to W.W. Howes, September 7, 1926, Meredith Papers, UIowa; Mercer Johnston to Manly, March 25, 1927, H. Moskowitz to Hapgood, March 25, 1927, in Mercer Johnston Papers, LC; NYT, November 13, 1926, November 15, 1926, November 20, 1926, November 22, 1926, November 23, 1926, November 26, 1926, November 27, 1926, November 29, 1926, November 30, 1926, March 3, 1927, April 25, 1927, July 2, 1927, January 11, 1928; Editorial, Nation, CXXIII (August 18, 1926), 140-141; "Is It Jesuitry or Stupidity?" Lutheran Witness, XLV (November 2, 1926), 360; "A Test for Governor Smith," New Republic, L (April 6, 1927), 182-183; "The Silence of Governor Smith," Nation, CXXIV (April 20, 1927), 412; Watson (ed.), Bishop Cannon's Own Story, pp. 397-400; John Robert Moore, Senator Josiah William Bailey of North Carolina: A Political Biography (Durham, North Carolina, 1968), p. 42; Mollie C. Davis, "American

Smith's own political record, naturally, did not escape the scrutiny of those who were wary of a Catholic president. Attention in this regard centered on Smith's seeming support of state aid to parochial schools during the 1915 New York Constitutional Convention and on his appointments as governor. Smith had indeed proposed removing New York's ban on aid to parochial schools, but he had done so only to quash another measure that he believed was prejudicial to the Catholic Church. Smith's critics accused him of favoring Catholics in appointments as governor and predicted that he would do the same as president, but these charges were groundless.³⁵

Nothing irritated and alarmed Smith's non-Catholic critics more than his manner of greeting a papal legate and six other cardinals who stopped in New York City in June, 1926, en route to a Eucharistic Congress in Chicago. Smith twice knelt in public and kissed the rings of the legate and of Cardinal Hayes of New York, setting off a flurry of disapproving comments and giving his non-Catholic opponents a convenient weapon with which to assail him. "No Governor can kiss the papal ring and get within gunshot of the White House . . .," proclaimed one Methodist bishop, and other critics declared that Smith's action proved his acknowledgement of the superiority of the Roman Catholic Church over the American state. Even some of Smith's supporters believed that he had acted improperly. His attendance at the Congress and his enthusiastic reception there probably compounded the political damage that he had done to himself.³⁶

Smith declined to defend his kissing of the cardinals' rings, merely responding to reporters' questions about the incident with a smile. Smith, in fact, refused up until early 1927 to answer any questions at all concerning the religious issue. Privately, he contended that his religion was his own business and that many Catholics would regard anything that he said about his faith as apologetic. His record in office and his oaths to uphold the Constitution sufficiently demonstrated, he said, that he was a loyal American and that he had not let his religion influence his official actions.

Smith could not remain silent forever, though, and pressure mounted by early 1927 for him to speak out on the issue of his religion. Smith found it imperative to do so when the Atlantic Monthly, in its April, 1927, issue, published an open letter to him from Charles C. Marshall and thereby precipitated the most noteworthy single incident in Smith's entire political career.³⁷

Religious and Religious Reaction to Mexico's Church-State Conflict, 1926-1927: Background to the Morrow Mission," Journal of Church and State, XIII (Winter, 1971), 79-96; Tanner, "Heflin," p. 112n.

³⁵ Tolbert to Democratic Publicity Bureau, March 14, 1928, Tolbert Papers, UOkla; NYT, June 19, 1927, March 9, 1928; Christian Index, CVII (June 30, 1927), 3-7, 20, 22-24; Appointments by Governor Smith, *passim*; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 144-145. See also J. Bailey to George G. Battle, June 22, 1928, Bailey Papers, DU; Howe to Roosevelt, April 15, 1925, Howe Papers, FDRL; NYT, April 7, 1925, June 5, 1926, June 5, 1928, June 10, 1928, June 26, 1928; "Italian Jesuits Pull for Governor Smith," Christian Century, CXLV (June 28, 1928), 816-817; Smith, Up to Now, p. 373; Warner, The Happy Warrior, p. 177, Josephson and Josephson, Smith, p. 361; and Kahn, The World of Swope, p. 282.

³⁶ Wellington Wright to Milton, June 16, 1926, Milton to Howes, September 7, 1926, in Meredith Papers, UIowa; NYT, June 16, 1926, June 21, 1926, June 22, 1926, August 9, 1926, August 10, 1926, August 16, 1926, September 14, 1926; "Smith Against the Field," Literary Digest, XC (August 28, 1926), 5-7; "The Issue Precipitated," Christian Register, CVI (January 6, 1927), 2-3; Christian Index, CVII (June 30, 1927), 3-7, 20, 22-24; Josephson and Josephson, Smith, p. 362; Kahn, The World of Swope, p. 282. See also "If Rome Ruled!" Walther League Messenger, XXXIII (October, 1924), 74-75, 121.

³⁷ L. Osborne to Roosevelt, January 28, 1927, Roosevelt to L. Osborne, February 2, 1927, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; NYT, August 10, 1926; "A Catholic President?" New Republic, L (March 23, 1927), 128-131; Charles C. Marshall,

Marshall, a New York City lawyer, long had had a keen interest in Roman Catholic theology and its possible conflict with American principles and institutions. A High-Church Episcopalian, Marshall differed with Catholics principally in the areas of papal authority and church-state relations. Some of his writings on the religious question came to the attention of the editor of the Atlantic Monthly, Ellery Sedgwick, who invited Marshall to write a piece on this topic for the magazine. Sedgwick hoped that the article and subsequent responses by Smith and by Catholic prelates would not only sell magazines but also raise the debate on the question of a Catholic presidential candidate to the highest possible level and advance Smith's chances for the nomination of his party by resolving the doubts of many non-Catholics.

Marshall, who believed that Smith's candidacy embodied the "official and theoretical claims" of the Roman Catholic Church, hoped to draw attention to these claims (and to publicize his own views about the Church's doctrines) by engaging Smith in a theological debate. Marshall praised Smith, was publicly and privately courteous to him, and appeared to be sincerely interested in helping a Catholic presidential candidate to resolve the questions about his religion, if possible, rather than in obstructing Smith's candidacy. Marshall later wrote that he was "very glad" if the exchange of letters had helped Smith. Some of Smith's opponents charged that his friends had planted the open letter in order to provide Smith with a public forum, but there is no evidence that his supporters had anything to do with the publication of Marshall's open letter.³⁸

In what Sedgwick later termed an "unreadably intelligent" essay, Marshall summarized many of the apprehensions that sincere critics had about a Catholic president. Quoting extensively from papal documents of the late nineteenth century, Marshall asked if there were not, in some areas at least, an irrepressible conflict between "authoritative Roman Catholic claims on the one hand and [American] constitutional law and principles on the other." "Is there not here a quandary for that man who is at once a loyal churchman and a loyal citizen?" he inquired.

Citizens who waver in your support [Marshall wrote] would ask whether, as a Roman Catholic, you accept as authoritative the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church that in the case of contradiction, making it impossible for the jurisdiction of that Church and the jurisdiction of the State to agree, the jurisdiction of the

"An Open Letter to the Honorable Alfred E. Smith," Atlantic Monthly, CXXXIX (April, 1927), 540-549; Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, pp. 50, 60-79.

³⁸ Ellery Sedgwick to Roosevelt, March 3, 1927, Roosevelt to Sedgwick, March 19, 1927, Roosevelt to Smith, March 10, 1927, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Milton to McAdoo, April 2, 1927, McAdoo Papers, LC; Edward Weeks to Charles C. Marshall, March 24, 1927, Smith to Marshall, March 30, 1927, Sedgwick to Marshall, March 31, 1927, April 14, 1927, Marshall to Smith, April 7, 1927, Marshall to F.R. Coudert, May 14, 1927, Marshall to Editor, Moody Bible Institute Monthly, July 9, 1927, Marshall to J.C. Hild, September 1, 1927, Marshall to Irving Lehman, August 20, 1927, unsent letter Marshall to Smith, undated, 1928, Charles C. Marshall Papers, LC; NYT, April 19, 1927, April 23, 1927; Editor's head note to Alfred E. Smith, "Catholic and Patriot: Governor Smith Replies," Atlantic Monthly, CXXXIX (May, 1927), 721; "Is Governor Al Smith a Suitable Candidate for the Presidency?" Western Recorder, CI (May 19, 1927), 11; Ellery Sedgwick (ed.), Atlantic Harvest: Memoirs of the Atlantic (Boston, 1947), pp. xxi-xxiii; Marshall, Governor Smith's American Catholicism, pp. 1-43, 72-84; Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, pp. 66-79. Probably a majority of commentators, including Catholics, considered Marshall well-intentioned, and Smith ultimately thought so too. See Whelan to Pope, April 7, 1927, Pope Papers, IdHS; Michael Williams to Marshall, April 22, 1927, Marshall Papers, LC; NYT, April 4, 1927; "The Marshall-Smith Correspondence," Outlook, CXLV (April 27, 1927), 522; Smith, Up to Now, p. 412; and Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, p. 68.

Church shall prevail; whether as a statesman, you accept the teaching of the Supreme Court of the United States that, in matters of religious jurisdiction of the State shall prevail; and, if you accept both teachings, how you will reconcile them.

Marshall also requested Smith to comment on several specific matters, including his church's tolerance of other denominations, its attitude toward the separation of church and state in America, public education, the Marlborough-Vanderbilt annulment, and the Mexican crisis. Marshall closed by inviting Smith either to disavow "the convictions here imputed" or "justly [to] turn public opinion in [his] favor" by addressing all these points.³⁹

Reports that Smith would gladly reply in detail to Marshall's open letter immediately appeared. Smith in his political career often had successfully parried questions intended to challenge or to embarrass him and, indeed, relished doing so, but he at first balked at responding to the letter. Not even comprehending most of the abstruse theological matters that Marshall discussed, Smith reacted with instinctive hurt, resentment, and frustration toward what he considered an affront to his faith and his freedom to worship as he pleased. Smith also knew that a frank and full reply to the letter would oblige him to break his silence on the presidency.

After satisfying themselves that the article was sincerely motivated, some of Smith's key advisers, especially Belle Moskowitz and Proskauer, prevailed upon Smith to answer it. They pointed out that he could hardly evade answering, for not only had Marshall addressed his questions directly to Smith, but both Sedgwick and Marshall had sent the Governor prepublication copies of the open letter. Smith would appear to be a coward if he ignored Marshall, and continued silence would only multiply the questions about the religious issue. The letter immediately attracted widespread attention, and many Americans regarded it as a decisive test for Smith. As his advisers recognized, the open letter was potentially ruinous to his candidacy, but Smith could help himself (and his church) and possibly spike the religious issue if he replied thoughtfully and convincingly to Marshall. In the end, Smith agreed that an answer would lose him little and could gain him much.⁴⁰

The decision made, Smith and his advisers decided to call upon Father Francis P. Duffy, a widely respected and much-decorated World War chaplain, for theological advice. Duffy, an exponent of a distinctly American Catholic Church, welcomed the opportunity to use Smith's reply to Marshall as the means of expressing the brand of

³⁹ Marshall, "Open Letter," Atlantic Monthly, CXXXIX (April, 1927), 540-549; Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, pp. 68-69.

⁴⁰ Pope to Moore, March 30, 1927, Pope to Whelan, April 6, 1927, Pope Papers, IdHS; Sedgwick to Roosevelt, March 3, 1927, Roosevelt to Smith, March 10, 1927, Roosevelt to Sedgwick, March 19, 1927, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Weeks to Marshall, March 24, 1927, Smith to Marshall, March 30, 1927, Marshall Papers, LC; NYT, March 26, 1927, March 28, 1927, April 4, 1927, April 10, 1927, April 18, 1927, April 19, 1927, October 26, 1967; "A Test for Governor Smith," New Republic, L (April 6, 1927), 182-183; "Roman Catholicism and the Presidency," Outlook, CXLV (April 13, 1927), 459-460; "The Silence of Governor Smith," Nation, CXXIV (April 20, 1927), 412; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 238-244, 366-368, 395-396; Proskauer, A Segment of My Times, pp. 54-57; Sedgwick (ed.), Atlantic Harvest, pp. xxi-xxiii; Warner, The Happy Warrior, pp. 181-184; Hapgood and Moskowitz, Up from the City Streets, p. 315; Josephson and Josephson, Smith, pp. 359-361; Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, pp. 70-73. See also Cox to N. Mack, April 2, 1927, Mack Papers, BECHS; Johnston to Smith, April 6, 1927, Johnston Papers, LC; and Lerond Curry, Protestant-Catholic Relations in America: World War I through Vatican II (Lexington, Kentucky, 1972), p. 13.

Catholicism that Duffy espoused. Proskauer and Duffy wrote most of the reply, but Smith made revisions in his characteristic writing style and contributed an eloquent “creed” that closed the piece.

Marshall had questioned Smith as an individual Catholic, not as a spokesman for his church, and Smith’s reply capitalized upon this distinction. Smith categorically disclaimed the beliefs that Marshall had attributed to him, quickly adding, however, that he spoke only as a layman “meeting a challenge to his patriotism and his intellectual integrity.” Citing the absence of any clash between his religious beliefs and his official duties during his long public career, Smith denied that the Church’s doctrines conflicted with American principles, and he insisted that Catholic clergymen had never sought to influence his official decisions.

Smith went on to accuse Marshall of quoting non-dogmatic encyclicals and other sources out of context and objected to having to answer for theological interpretations that he, as a lifelong Catholic, had never heard of. Smith then quoted a number of Catholic authorities to rebut Marshall’s arguments and insinuations point by point. In addition, Smith affirmed the constitutional guarantees of religious liberty, defended his record of impartial appointments and support for public education, and opposed American intervention in Mexico.

After first submitting his reply to Cardinal Hayes for assurances that it conformed to Catholic dogma, Smith delivered it to a representative of the Atlantic Monthly. One of his friends privately predicted that the published article would be “hot stuff” without any “casuistry.” Certainly it was the former, but whether or not it was the latter was a matter of contention.

The Atlantic Monthly, which printed Smith’s reply in its May issue under the title, “Citizen and Patriot: Governor Smith Replies,” anticipated the great public interest in the issue and ordered an extra-large press run. The unauthorized publication of Smith’s uncorrected text by a Boston newspaper and Sedgwick’s subsequent frantic efforts to rush copies of the magazine into circulation enhanced the impact of the article, which attracted much attention even outside the United States. Most American newspapers published sizable excerpts from Smith’s reply, and discussion of it in news reports, editorials, and scores of secular and religious periodicals insured that Smith’s words reached a majority of the American people.⁴¹

Smith’s supporters, prominent political leaders, editorial writers, and even some of Smith’s opponents – McAdoo was not among them – acclaimed Smith’s reply as a forthright, statesmanlike, and persuasive statement. According to one Democrat, it was “the most remarkable state paper . . . since Mr. Wilson dropped his pen.” Many of those

⁴¹ H. Moskowitz to Hapgood, April 8, 1927, in Johnston Papers, LC; Francis P. Duffy to Coudert, June 3, 1927, Marshall to Lehman, August 20, 1927, Marshall Papers, LC; NYT, April 9, 1927, April 17, 1927, April 18, 1927, April 19, 1927; Smith, “Citizen and Patriot,” Atlantic Monthly, CXXXIX (May, 1927), 721-728; Smith, Up to Now, pp. 366-368; Proskauer, A Segment of My Times, pp. 55-61; Warner, The Happy Warrior, pp. 181-185; Paul Blanshard, Communism, Democracy, and Catholic Power (Boston, 1951), 219-228; Curry, Protestant-Catholic Relations in America, p. 13; Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, pp. 67n, 73-79; Marshall, Governor Smith’s American Catholicism, pp. 1-43; Warner interview.

who praised Smith's reply to Marshall declared that the two men had settled the religious question by bringing it into the open and discussing it intelligently.⁴²

Those Catholics who commented on Smith's article generally applauded its firmness and endorsed its reasoning. Most Catholic clergymen remained discreetly silent or restricted themselves to oblique references to the religious issue, although, according to Duffy, many of them privately greeted Smith's reply with great enthusiasm. Although publicity forced the Vatican to declare several times that the Catholic Church was officially indifferent to the purely American matter of the presidential candidacy of Al Smith or any other Catholic, the Osservatore Romano printed Smith's article, noted its favorable reception in the United States, and stated that the piece had removed the religious issue from American presidential politics.⁴³

Not everyone, of course, believed that Smith's reply to Marshall disposed of the religious question. Some doubted that Smith had convinced more than a handful of open-minded readers, while others, including some who acknowledged Smith's sincerity and candor, were not wholly satisfied with his reasoning. Although only a few commentators totally rejected Smith's arguments, many contended that he had misinterpreted the nature of Marshall's questions, avoided the issues that Marshall had raised, or misrepresented orthodox Roman Catholic teachings. They pointed out, in addition, that no matter how admirable Smith's position as an individual Catholic was, he could not speak for his church nor could he foreclose the possibility of ecclesiastical interference in secular affairs. Any other Catholic candidate would have to answer the same questions.

To many critics of Smith's reply, the silence of the Vatican and of the American Catholic hierarchy regarding Smith's interpretation of Catholic doctrines indicated not that the Church approved of Smith's views but only that it had decided that silence was the wisest policy under the circumstances. Marshall himself was dissatisfied with Smith's reply and attempted to continue the dialogue with an immediate rebuttal and in several

⁴² N. Mack to Smith, April 19, 1927, Mack Papers, BECHS; Baruch to J. Robinson, April 18, 1927, Baruch to Smith, April 19, 1927, Lincoln Colcord to Baruch, May 4, 1927, Baruch Papers, PU; Bingham to House, May 16, 1927, House Papers, YU; Howe to Roosevelt, April 18, 1927, Howe Papers, FDRL; McAdoo to O'Neil, April 22, 1927, McAdoo Papers, LC; Roosevelt to Smith, May, 1927, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Duffy to Coudert, May 9, 1927, Lehman to Marshall, August 30, 1927, Marshall Papers, LC; NYT, April 18, 1927, Editorial, April 18, 1927, April 19, 1927, April 20, 1927; "The Marshall-Smith Correspondence," Outlook, CXLV (April 27, 1927), 522; Editorial, Nation, CXXIV (April 27, 1927), 463; "A Good American and a Good Catholic," New Republic, L (April 27, 1927), 260-262; "Governor Smith Replies," Christian Century, XLIV (April 28, 1927), 518-519; "What a Record?" Religious Herald, C (April 28, 1927), 10-11; "The Governor Replies," Independent, CXVIII (April 30, 1927), 457; "Governor Smith's Declaration of Independence," Literary Digest, XCIII (April 30, 1927), 5-8; "How the Protestant Press Take the Smith Letter," Literary Digest, XCIII (May 14, 1927), 30-31; "Governor Smith as a Candidate," Watchman Examiner, XV (May 19, 1927), 616; Evans, "The Catholic Question," Current History, XXVI (July, 1927), 563-568; John McHugh Stuart, "The New Minute Men," Commonweal, VIII (October 3, 1927), 539; Lippmann, Men of Destiny, pp. 37-44; Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, pp. 76-79.

⁴³ Duffy to Coudert, May 4, 1927, in Marshall Papers, LC; NYT, April 20, 1927, May 8, 1927, May 10, 1927, May 11, 1927, Editorial, May 12, 1927, May 14, 1927, March 19, 1928; "Governor Smith's Reply," America, XXXVII (April 30, 1927), 53; "The Pope and the Presidency," Current History, XXVII (March, 1928), 778-785; Bernard Fäy, "Catholic America," Living Age, CCCXXXV (September, 1928), 53-56; Smylie, "The Church, the State, and Smith," Church History, XXIX (September, 1960), 337-338. Some foreign Catholic periodicals questioned Smith's dogmatic orthodoxy. See "Al Smith's Letter in Spain," Living Age, CCCXXXII (June 15, 1927), 1046-1048; "Catholicism and Politics in America," Living Age, CCXXXIII (September 15, 1927), 486-488; and Marshall, Governor Smith's American Catholicism, pp. 1-43.

subsequent writings. Since Smith refused to say any more on the subject, however, and the Atlantic Monthly dropped its plans for an extended discussion of the religious issue, Marshall received little further attention.⁴⁴

Smith's advisers obviously agreed with those who thought that his reply to Marshall would be politically beneficial to the Governor, for his headquarters ultimately distributed many thousands of reprints as a part of its preconvention publicity campaign. In Proskauer's opinion, and apparently in Smith's as well, the Smith-Marshall colloquy persuaded the leaders of the Democratic Party to nominate Smith in 1928.

The consequences of this entire episode are not that clear-cut and simple, however. Reports that anti-Catholicism remained a potent force continued to haunt Democratic leaders, but, of course, they could not accurately predict its significance in the event of Smith's actual nomination. In addition, anti-Catholicism took a particularly insidious turn after the Smith-Marshall exchange. Overt attacks on Smith's religion tapered off, to be sure, but large numbers of diehard anti-Catholics seem to have expanded the already-spirited whispering campaign against Smith or began to rely upon other issues in order to generate opposition to him.⁴⁵

Many of Smith's anti-Catholic opponents now turned easily to the prohibition issue, and some of them doubtlessly used this as a convenient cloak for their prejudice. Since many anti-Catholics belonged to churches that had long supported prohibition, the religious and prohibition issues virtually became one for them. Although opposition to

⁴⁴ John J. Chapman to Elizabeth Chapman, June 13, 1928, John J. Chapman Papers, HU; Callahan to F. Walsh, June 27, 1927, Walsh Papers, NYPL; Herbert Croly to Frankfurter, April 18, 1927, in Louis D. Brandeis Papers, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky; Roosevelt to Stephen Bonsal, May 24, 1927, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL; Sedgwick to Marshall, April 14, 1927, Marshall to Coudert, May 14, 1927, Marshall to Lehman, August 20, 1927, Marshall to J. Chapman, November 21, 1927, Marshall Papers, LC; NYT, April 19, 1927, April 20, 1927, April 26, 1927, November 26, 1927, April 1, 1931; "A Catholic President – A Joke or a Menace?" Lutheran Witness, XLVI (May 3, 1927), 157-158; Theodore Graebner, "Is the Roman Peril Real?" Walther League Messenger, XXXV (June, 1927), 622-623, 665-666; "Al Smith's Letter in Spain," Living Age, CCCXXXII (June 15, 1927), 1046-1048; Christian Index, CVII (June 30, 1927), 3-7, 20, 22-24; Louis I. Jaffe, "The Democracy and Al Smith," Virginia Quarterly Review, III (July, 1927), 323; "The Candidate of the Holy See," Theological Monthly, VII (July, 1927), 213; John Jay Chapman to Editor, Religious Herald, C (December 1, 1927), 8-9; "The Pope and the Presidency," Current History, XXVII (March, 1928), 767-796; Blanshard, Communism, Democracy, and Catholic Power, pp. 219-228; Marshall, Governor Smith's American Catholicism, pp. 1-43, 72-84; Miller, American Protestantism and Social Issues, pp. 58-61; Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, pp. 76-79. See also many of the references in footnote 42. Senator Walsh, the other major Catholic presidential contender, later declared that he shared the views that Smith advanced in the Atlantic Monthly article. T. Walsh to James J. Irwin, March 7, 1928, Walsh Papers, LC.

⁴⁵ Woodbridge N. Ferris to Carleton G. Ferris, January 26, 1928, Woodbridge N. Ferris Papers, MHC; N. Davis to Meredith, April 18, 1927, Meredith Papers, UIowa; Howe to Roosevelt, April 18, 1927, Howe Papers, FDRL; NYT, June 19, 1927, Editorial, Nation, CXXIV (April 27, 1927), 463; "The Governor Replies," Independent, CXVIII (April 30, 1927), 457; Dixon Merritt, "What Mississippi and Alabama Think of Al Smith," Outlook, CXLVII (November 9, 1927), 306-307, 309; Smith, Up to Now, p. 368; Bowers, My Life, p. 175; Proskauer, A Segment of My Times, p. 61; Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, pp. 77-79, 102-104. See also many of the references in footnotes 30, 43, and 47 in this chapter. Smith's advisers regarded his reply so highly that they included it in the selection of his state papers that they had published in early 1928. Moskowitz (ed.), Progressive Democracy, pp. 254-269. Many people accused Smith and his supporters of cynically trying to turn the religious issue to his political advantage. See Daniels to R.B. Redwine, February 7, 1928, Daniels Papers, LC; Callahan to N. Baker, October 13, 1927, Baker Papers, LC; Milton to McAdoo, April 5, 1927, McAdoo to W. Williams, April 9, 1927, McAdoo Papers, LC; "Alfred E. Smith's Presidential Ambitions," World's Work, LI (January, 1926), 234-236; "Is Governor Al Smith a Suitable Candidate for the Presidency?" Western Recorder, CI (May 19, 1927), 11; and "Governor Al Smith, Presidential Candidate," Western Recorder, CI (December 15, 1927), 12-13.

Smith focused more on his wetness than on his religion after the Smith-Marshall exchange, the religious objection still existed. It was simply more difficult to identify – and to counter – than it had been before.⁴⁶

Once again, however, an apparent impediment to Smith's nomination also served as a political asset for him. Many Catholics saw Smith's candidacy as the means of challenging the belief that a Catholic could not be elected president of the United States. Smith, as a consequence, attracted substantial – though far from unanimous – support among his co-religionists, some of whom, unfortunately, were as bigoted as the worst of the anti-Catholics were. Catholics often maintained, furthermore, that Smith's candidacy was a test of tolerance, and even freedom of worship, in the United States. Many fair-minded non-Catholics agreed and protested attacks on Smith and his church. A good many Americans, therefore, were sympathetic to Smith's candidacy because they regarded it as a vehicle for expressing their faith in the principle of religious liberty. Smith's nomination, for some of them, thus became an end in itself.⁴⁷

Most Democratic leaders were more interested in winning the election than in defending religious liberty or in challenging the unwritten law against a Catholic president, much as they may have prized these two objectives. Party leaders doubtlessly realized that the religious issue cut two ways, and they hoped that attacks on Smith's religion during the presidential campaign would strengthen the strong pro-Smith reaction among Catholics and non-Catholics alike and that they might offset some of the losses that Smith would surely sustain among intransigent anti-Catholics.⁴⁸ Many people predicted, moreover,

⁴⁶ Goltra to Rachel Tingle, May 15, 1928, Goltra Papers, MoHS; Ella Boole form letter, April 30, 1927, in Meredith Papers, UIowa; Milton to McAdoo, April 2, 1927, April 5, 1927, McAdoo to W. Williams, April 9, 1927, McAdoo Papers, LC; Moos (ed.) A Carnival of Buncombe, pp. 154-158; NYT, November 16, 1925, April 9, 1927, Editorial, April 20, 1927, April 21, 1927, October 23, 1927, February 3, 1928, Editorial, June 20, 1928; "What a Record?" Religious Herald, C (April 28, 1927), 10-11; "Governor Smith's Declaration of Independence," Literary Digest, XCIII (April 30, 1927), 5-8; "Governor Smith a Candidate," Watchman Examiner, XV (May 19, 1927), 616; "Is Governor Al Smith a Suitable Candidate for the Presidency?" Western Recorder, CI (May 19, 1927), 11; Christian Index, CVII (June 30, 1927), 3-7, 20, 22-24; "Governor Al Smith, Presidential Candidate," Western Recorder, CI (December 15, 1927), 12-13; Williams, "Al Smith and the Dry Democrats," Christian Century, XLV (March 15, 1928), 348-350; "Editorial Comment," Catholic World, CXXVII (April, 1928), 103-104; Cannon, "The Election of a Dry President a Missionary Question," Missionary Voice, XVIII (July, 1928), 250-251, 276; "Nonpartisan, but Dry," Christian Advocate, CIII (July 12, 1928), 867-868; Miller, American Protestantism and Social Issues, pp. 50-56; Carter, "The Campaign of 1928 Re-examined," Wisconsin Magazine of History, XLVI (Summer, 1963), 265-272.

⁴⁷ Pope to Moore, April 11, 1927, Cunningham to Pope, April 14, 1927, Pope to Cunningham, April 15, 1927, Pope Papers, IdHS; Comstock to William H. Bahlke, July 6, 1928, Comstock Papers, MHC; Goltra to Burriss A. Jenkins, May 17, 1928, Jenkins to Goltra, May 21, 1928, Goltra Papers, MoHS; Thomas to N. Mack, May 9, 1927, Thomas Papers, SHSColo; Oscar B. Colquitt to W.H. Garrett, February 13, 1928, Oscar B. Colquitt Papers, University of Texas, Austin, Texas; Daniels to John Stuart Bryan, October 12, 1927, N. Mack to Daniels, May 4, 1928, Daniels Papers, LC; N. Baker to Hayes, July 2, 1928, Baker Papers, LC; Jones Memoir, CUOHC, pp. 486-487; Editorial, NYT, September 24, 1925, Editorial, December 5, 1926, April 26, 1927, May 10, 1927, June 7, 1927, January 16, 1928, January 22, 1928, June 30, 1928; "Governor Smith's Victory," Nation, CXXI (November 18, 1925), 562; "The Political Zoo," Nation, CXXIII (September 22, 1926), 260; Martin Conboy, "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion," Forum, LXXIX (June, 1928), 950-952; Charles Willis Thompson, "What They Did at Houston," Commonweal, VIII (July 11, 1928), 265-267; Radcliffe, "The Triumph of Herbert Hoover," Contemporary Review (London), CXXXIV (December, 1928), 689-697; Bowers, My Life, p. 175; Sam Hanna Acheson, Joe Bailey, The Last Democrat (New York, 1932), pp. 397-401; Moore, Josiah Bailey, pp. 42-50; Lippmann, Men of Destiny, pp. 1-9, 35-44; Miller, American Protestantism and Social Issues, pp. 49-50; Flint, "Self-Criticism of the Democratic Party," pp. 29-31. See also Roosevelt to Murchie, June 6, 1924, Roosevelt Papers, FDRL.

⁴⁸ Goltra to Tingle, May 15, 1928, Goltra Papers, MoHS; Daniels to W.B. Snow, August 2, 1927, Daniels Papers, LC; William H. King to T. Walsh, September 30, 1927, Walsh Papers, LC; Pittman to Woodburn, May 14, 1928,

that if the Democratic Party did not nominate Smith in 1928, large numbers of Catholics as well as some non-Catholics would attribute this fact solely to his religion. In these circumstances, it was thought, Smith's supporters might block the nomination of any other candidate, thus producing a repeat of the 1924 deadlock, or might lead a mass desertion in the fall, stripping the party of vital strength, particularly in the East and the cities. Voters who deserted the Democratic Party on this issue, it was said, might never return to it and might even establish a new political party. Anyone who won the nomination after Smith's rejection would likely find it an empty honor.

Because of Smith's conspicuous availability between 1924 and 1928, he thrust a cruel dilemma upon Democratic leaders. Given his origins and attributes and what he represented to Americans, party leaders endangered the future of their party and risked losing the 1928 election whether they nominated Smith or rejected him. They were forced to decide which course of action would be more damaging to both the short- and long-range interests of the party. Because of the party's weaknesses and the discreet management of Smith's candidacy, most of the Democratic leaders ultimately concluded that there was only one sensible way to resolve this dilemma.⁴⁹

Pittman Papers, LC; Editorial, NYT, November 17, 1925, June 15, 1926, August 10, 1926, Editorial, August 10, 1926, Editorial, December 5, 1926, February 9, 1927, Editorial, March 25, 1927, Editorial, May 22, 1927; James L. McConaughy, "President Urges Tolerance in Matriculation Address," Wesleyan University Alumnus, XI (October, 1926), 69; "'Al' Smith or 'Tom' Heflin," Outlook, CXLVIII (February 1, 1928), 182-183. See also pp. 29-30 above.
⁴⁹ Underwood to Dabney White, October 24, 1927, Underwood to E.W. Pettus, March 30, 1928, Underwood to R.B. Smyer, June 2, 1928, Underwood Papers, ADHA; Pope to Moore, March 30, 1927, Pope to W.T. Sterling, February 27, 1928, Pope Papers, IdHS; Comstock to W. Ferris, February 25, 1928, Comstock form letter, May, 1928, Comstock Papers, MHC; Fred Biermann to Meredith, January 2, 1928, Meredith Papers, UIowa; John H. Kerr to D.W. Bradsher, April 21, 1928, John H. Kerr Papers, UNC; Glass to George Eastin, May 2, 1927, Glass Papers, UVa; O'Mahoney draft article, November, 1927, O'Mahoney Papers, UWy; J. Davis to Marshall W. MacDonald, March 19, 1929, Davis Papers, YU; Woolley to House, April 12, 1927, Bingham to House, May 16, 1927, House to Gregory, June 25, 1927, House Papers, YU; S.B. Whitehead to Roosevelt, December 11, 1928, Democratic National Committee Papers, FDRL; N. Davis to Hull, February 2, 1928, Hull to J. Davis, February 3, 1928, Hull Papers, LC; Jesse H. Jones to Victor H. Hanson, December 4, 1927, Jones Papers, LC; N. Baker to Hayes, September 22, 1927, Baker Papers, LC; Eugene C. Crowe to author, January, 1969; Moos (ed.), A Carnival of Buncombe, pp. 154-158; Carroll Kilpatrick (ed.), Roosevelt and Daniels: A Friendship in Politics (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1952), pp. 88-89; NYT, January 3, 1927, April 4, 1927, April 18, 1927, April 23, 1927, April 24, 1927, September 7, 1927, September 12, 1927, January 8, 1928, January 12, 1928, April 1, 1928, Editorial, June 20, 1928; George Washington Hays, "The Solid South and Al Smith in 1928," Forum, LXXVI (November, 1926), 696-701; Marion L. Fox, "A Forecast," Atlantic Monthly, CXL (September, 1927), 382-389; Milton, "Progressive Democrats in a Quandary," Independent, CXIX (October 8, 1927), 350-352; Kent, "The Democrats in 1928," Scribner's Magazine, LXXXII (November, 1927), 515-520; Merritt, "Al Smith and the Doubtful Seaboard," Outlook, CXLVII (November 30, 1927), 398-400; "The Rumbling of Al Smith's Band-Wagon," Literary Digest, XCVII (April 28, 1928), 10-11; Mark Sullivan, "The Presidential Race," World's Work, LVI (May, 1928), 44-49; Stanley Frost et al., "Al Smith and a Catholic Party – A Three-Cornered Debate," Forum, LXXIX (June, 1928), 809-825; Mark Sullivan, "Al Smith's Chances," World's Work, LVI (July, 1928), 242-249; Moore, A Catholic Runs for President, pp. 94-95, 99-105, 110-112.