

UNUSUAL CAMPAIGN, COMPLEX FROM START, ENDS IN UNCERTAINTY

Pressing Issues Which Split the
Parties Have Made Many
States Doubtful.

EVEN PROPHETS NERVOUS

But Republicans Seem More
Positive in Their Forecasts
of Victory.

BOTH SIDES COUNT MAJORITY

Norris's Defection to Smith Raised
New Element of Doubt in
Middle West.

A survey by States of the political situation and the party claims as to the New York State result will be found on Page 1 of the Second News Section.

By RICHARD V. OULAHAN.

Special to The New York Times.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 3.—The most intensive, emotional, unusual and altogether complex Presidential campaign in many years came to an end tonight. On Monday evening, Governor Smith, the Democratic candidate for President, will deliver a radio address, a last word, from New York, and Herbert Hoover, the Republican candidate, will have his final say in his home town, Palo Alto, Cal., but to all intents and purposes, tonight's appeals of the two party nominees will close their direct contact with the voters throughout the country, a literal contact not only by personal appearance before vast throngs, but through the blasting voice which radio broadcasting on a comprehensive scale has made possible for the first time in history.

Perhaps the most striking feature of this most remarkable of our quadrennial national political contests is the uncertainty that exists in many minds at the very end of the campaign over the outcome of the battle between Hoover and Smith. Both Presidential candidates express absolute confidence of victory.

Among their following of workers this confidence is less marked. But in another way, many of those close to the Democratic and Republican campaign organizations are in a state of puzzlement as to how it will all eventuate at the polls.

Perhaps it may be said that where confidence exists among those active in these organizations, with their intimate knowledge of existing conditions of public sentiment, it is somewhat more marked among the Republicans. At the same time, this confidence is modified by a perceptible nervousness. If the argument of Republican workers to show that Mr. Hoover will be elected appears to lack conviction, they are able to fall back on what to a myriad of on-lookers is the best argument of all. "There are more Republicans than Democrats in this country," they say.

Party Lines Rent Asunder.

That seems to be true, judging by returns of past Presidential elections, but it is equally true that this year party lines are rent asunder by the injection of issues that have stirred the emotions as much as the reasoning powers of the electorate. To appreciate this it is necessary only to recall what is common knowledge.

Governor Smith's religion has brought uncertainty as to whether some States of the Solid South will cling to their traditional allegiance to the Democratic Party. Mr. Hoover's views as to measures of relieving the conditions of which many farmers complain have produced party revolt in the normally Republican agricultural areas of the Middlewest and Northwest. Wet Republicans, especially in the larger cities, will vote for the Democratic Presidential nominee in large numbers, while segments of dry Democrats are expected to support the Republican candidate.

The contrasting personalities of the two aspirants for residence in the White House have had their influence upon segments of the voters. Mr. Hoover's long residence abroad is being weighed in comparison with Governor Smith's affiliation with the sidewalks of New York. Smith's record of accomplishment as legislator and Governor in behalf of ameliorating the condition of workers is contrasted with Hoover's services to humanity in directing relief work in Europe.

While Smith is criticized in some portions of the country for his association with Tammany Hall, Mr. Hoover comes in for implied condemnation for membership in the Harding Cabinet, during the orgy of official corruption participated in by some of those who sat at the Cabinet table with him and held important places in the Administration, and for his membership in a party which countenances such political machines as those in Chicago and Philadelphia and in Indiana.

Power and Other Issues.

Government ownership and operation of hydroelectric power plants, which Governor Smith espouses and Mr. Hoover attacks as embodying what he calls State socialism, furnishes a live issue in certain sections. The views of the rival Presidential candidates on the proposed inland

Continued on Page Twenty-five.

UNUSUAL CAMPAIGN COMPLEX FROM START

By RICHARD V. OULAHAN.

Continued from Page 1, Column 5.

waterway, designed to give an outlet from the Great Lakes to the sea, have had a controlling influence on large numbers of voters in parts of the country where the construction of such a waterway is expected to furnish great relief to those who complain of high transportation rates for shipping crops.

The Democratic Party in its Houston platform abandoned its long opposition to the Republican principle of protection, but the Republicans, with their Vice Presidential candidate, Senator Charles Curtis of Kansas, foremost in stressing it, have attempted to make the tariff a major issue, insisting that the Democratic Party cannot be expected to carry out the protective policy.

Likewise, the Republicans are insisting that prosperity reigns in the country and attributing it to the benefits of the high tariff wall which they have erected, while Governor Smith and other outstanding figures in the Democratic campaign have contended that the claims of prosperity advanced by their opponents are refuted by the prevalence of an abnormal amount of unemployment in industry.

Interwoven into this fabric of national issues are local political reactions which will affect the Presidential vote in some States. Where separate ballots are provided for, Presidential Electors and candidates for State offices, the voters will have a better opportunity to differentiate between national and State issues in determining for what candidates to vote.

This policy of separate ballots is conducive to splitting party tickets, and much splitting is expected in many States on account of the complicated nature of the appeals to the Electorate. If Minnesota, for example, should elect Democratic Presidential Electors that result may be accompanied by the election of a Republican Governor and a Farm-Labor candidate for United States Senator.

Plenty of opinion exists that whichever way Nebraska goes in the Presidential election, it will choose a Democratic Governor and a Republican United States Senator.

It is not a strange thing to see party lines all shot to pieces in Wisconsin, but this year there is a prospect that the election returns from that State will furnish a patchwork of victorious candidates of all parties and intra-party factions.

Comparison With 1916 Campaign.

In attempting to analyze in the light of the past the conditions which are influencing the electorate this year it is necessary to go back to 1916. The outcomes of the Presidential elections of 1920 and 1924 afford no sure guide. In those years the state of the public mind was complicated by conditions, which in a sense were abnormal, in the one case through the recent ending of the World War and in the other through the religious intolerance slant given to the Madison Square Garden con-

vention and the uncertainty produced by the candidacy of Robert M. La Follette on a third party ticket.

The result of the 1916 election is analogous to the current battle in that it proved that a Presidential candidate could be victorious without the Electoral vote of New York and other Eastern States with big numerical showings in the Electoral College. More than that it proved that the Democratic Party could win at the polls with the votes of Western States almost always found in the Republican column.

This year the uncertainty that exists in many minds as to what will happen next Tuesday is found in the likelihood that Governor Smith, in addition to having much strength in the Western agricultural areas, is especially strong in Eastern States with large representation in the Electoral College, such as New York and Massachusetts.

President Wilson, candidate of the Democrats for re-election in 1916, lost New York and Massachusetts, but managed to win over Charles E. Hughes, the Republican nominee, by receiving majorities in a number of Western States whose aggregate of Electoral votes overcame Mr. Hughes's showing. But, of course, Mr. Wilson had the Solid South as a fundamental of his success, and one of this year's uncertainties comes from the strong anti-Smith trend in that traditionally Democratic geographical division.

States Carried by Wilson.

In 1916 Mr. Wilson carried Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington and Wyoming. His total of electoral votes was 277 against 254 for Mr. Hughes.

California, with its thirteen electoral votes, decided the contest. That State, the determining factor in a contest the result of which was uncertain for days after election, was won by Wilson by a mere 3,806 votes in a total of 999,542 cast for Presidential Electors. If California had gone to Hughes he would have been elected President by an Electoral vote of 267, or a majority of only two in the Electoral College.

If Wilson had lost California he would have lacked just two votes of getting the Presidential prize again.

Wilson and Hughes won some States by the smallest of margins. New Hampshire went to Wilson by a mere majority of 56 in a total of more than 87,000 votes cast. Minnesota went into the Hughes column by a plurality of 392. Likening the uncertainty existing now as to the outcome of next Tuesday's election to the uncertainty that existed in 1916, it is easy to understand the reason for a fairly widespread opinion among politicians that the contest of 1928 will be extremely close.

Others detect signs which suggest a landslide. Another view is that so little is known of what is in the minds of the voters in many States that there may be a landslide either way—a landslide for Hoover or a landslide for Smith.

The early contention of Chairman Raskob of the Democratic National Committee that Smith would be elected by an Electoral vote of 309 may be dismissed as intended for effect on public sentiment. So with

early Republican claims that Hoover would receive more than 400 Electoral votes and the election at hand, there is a disposition of politicians to be more careful in appraising the outcome of the Presidential contest.

One informed semi-authoritative Democratic estimate is that Smith is practically assured of 260 Electoral votes, or within six of the number necessary to a Presidential choice. Those responsible for this appraisal contend that Smith has more than an even chance of obtaining the votes of that necessary six from among a good-sized batch of States classified as doubtful.

States Claimed for Smith.

This Democratic claim credits these States to the Smith column, the Electoral vote of each being given herewith: Alabama 12, Arkansas 9, Florida 6, Georgia 14, Louisiana 10, Maryland 8, Massachusetts 18, Minnesota 12, Mississippi 10, Missouri 18, Montana 4, Nebraska 8, New Mexico 3, New York 45, North Carolina 12, Rhode Island 5, South Carolina 9, Tennessee 12, Texas 20, Virginia 12, Wisconsin 13.

It is to be noticed that this table comprises an extremely modest claim. The table does not include such States as Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Kentucky, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oklahoma and South Dakota, some of which are regarded as having strong Democratic leanings. Granting that the table is a rather modest appraisal of Governor Smith's chances, it does not require any great stretch of the fancy to transfer to his credit from the doubtful column the six votes essential to his success in the contest for the Presidency.

This table is cited merely to show that in spite of the Literary Digest polls and opposition to Governor Smith in the South and some other sections on account of his religion and his anti-prohibition views, the leaders in the Democratic organization feel that they have cause for a measurable degree of confidence that their Presidential candidate will win the election.

States Claimed by Republicans.

The Republicans feel that they can counter with claims to the electoral votes of enough States to put Hoover in the White House. Their claims and hopes may be set down in the following table of electoral votes:

California 13, Colorado 6, Connecticut 7, Delaware 3, Idaho 4, Illinois 29, Indiana 15, Iowa 13, Kansas 10, Kentucky 13, Maine 6, Maryland 8, Michigan 15, Minnesota 12, Montana 4, Nebraska 8, Nevada 3, New Hampshire 4, New Jersey 14, Ohio 24, Oklahoma 10, Oregon 5, Pennsylvania 38, South Dakota 5, Utah 4, Vermont 4, Washington 7, West Virginia 8 and Wyoming 3.

These make a total of 295 electoral votes or a majority of 30 in the Electoral College. Not included in the table are a number of States in several of which the Republicans claim they have a good or an even chance of carrying for Hoover. They are Arizona with 3 electoral votes, Missouri 18, New Mexico 3, North Carolina 12, North Dakota 5, Rhode Island 5, Tennessee 12 and Wisconsin 13, a total of 71. In two of these, Arizona and Rhode Island, the Republicans believe their chances of success are superior to those of the Democrats.

But not adding any of these States

with their 71 electoral votes to the Hoover list, an analysis of the sure and suppositious 295 votes in the Hoover table finds strong exception taken by some political experts to the inclusion of certain of them.

Contention is made that they are too doubtful to even hazard a guess as to how they will go election day with any assurance of certainty. States classified as doubtful under this contention would be Colorado, Connecticut, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Oklahoma and South Dakota, with a total of 86 electoral votes. Deduct these 86 from the total of 295, and Hoover is left with only 209 votes, or 57 less than the majority of the Electoral College necessary to the Presidential choice.

Another Table is Discussed.

There is another table which may be considered as having Republican leanings, but for which it is claimed that it was prepared without bias. This gives Hoover 227 certain electoral votes and Smith 102 certain votes. States classified as uncertain but likely to go for Hoover have 58 electoral votes, and those additional States classified as likely to go for Smith have 98 electoral votes.

This gives Hoover a potential strength of 285 votes and Smith a potential strength of 200. In this table States with 46 electoral votes are listed as doubtful. If Smith's certain strength is placed at 200 electoral votes and he should be credited with all the 46 doubtful votes he would lack 20 votes of the necessary majority.

But among the States listed as certain for Hoover are Colorado, Connecticut and Minnesota, whose total of electoral votes is 25, while those listed as uncertain, but having a Hoover trend, are Delaware, Kentucky, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island and South Dakota with electoral votes aggregating 58. Some of these States Democrats claim as practically certain to go for Smith.

If the 25 electoral votes and the 58 electoral votes mentioned as questioned, but showing a Hoover tendency, be deducted from the Hoover potential strength of 285, the remainder is 202 votes, or 63 less than Hoover needs to bring about his election.

Norris Puzzles Experts.

Many feel that they know how the contest will eventuate at the polls next Tuesday, but the fact is that nobody is able to tell with certainty. There are elements in the situation which puzzle those political experts who are conservative in making estimates.

One of these elements, for example, is the recent declaration for Governor Smith's candidacy by Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska, leader of the insurgent Republican bloc in the Senate. To what extent Norris's espousal of the Democratic Presidential candidate will affect those of his large following in Nebraska, Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota, who were uncertain whether or not to desert their Republican allegiance, is something that nobody has the prescience to determine.

The Presidential contest is full of such puzzlements, and it is partly for that reason that the campaign presents an extremely alluring picture to the American people.