

Yes, We'll Not Stand for Garner

Discussing the merits of various Democratic possibilities for the Presidency, Mr. Frank Kent, white, writing in the Baltimore Sun last week, dwelt at length upon John J. Garner (Dem., Texas), Speaker of the House.

Mr. Kent admitted that prejudice against any candidate from the erstwhile rebel states still exists in the North, but does not think that is a sufficient reason to disqualify Mr. Garner with Northern white Democrats. The war is over and we are a united nation, he says.

As to colored Democrats in pivotal states like Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, New Jersey and New York, who might not find Mr. Garner acceptable because he hails from a "jim crow" state where "A Negro is still a 'nigger'," Mr. Kent hastens to add that the Negro vote "doesn't count anyhow," since few colored persons vote Democratic in the national election.

If the newspapers offer any index to the situation, Mr. Kent's last statement is at least 50 per cent wrong. Of the six newspapers with largest circulation among colored people east of the Mississippi in the last campaign, three were for Al Smith, two were for Hoover and one was neutral.

If Al Smith is a candidate again, there is indication that four of the six would be for him. The same thing could have been said of Governor Ritchie before the Salisbury lynching.

However, if Garner of Texas is nominated by the Democrats for President, not a single one of the six will be for him.

All signs point to 1932 as a Democratic year, provided the party acts sanely. The country has had enough of Mr. Hoover and, rightly or wrongly, feels that a change of leaders may bring a move toward prosperity.

So far as Negroes and many northern whites are concerned, nothing could unite Democrats and Republicans so unreservedly as the nomination of Texas's Garner.

With far abler men like Roosevelt, Smith, Baker and Ritchie available, there is no need to commit political hari-kari, but that is what the nomination of Mr. Garner would mean.