

The New York City Election

The election of Tammany candidate Hylan, in New York, is the November sensation. His majority was even greater than his friends expected. Mayor Mitchel had a very distinguished support—two ex-presidents, Mr. Taft and Mr. Roosevelt, and the late republican candidate, Governor Hughes. All appeared upon the stump in his behalf and appealed for his election on the ground that he alone represented the "Support-the-President" sentiment in New York. He had the support, too, of prominent democrats and nearly all of the leading daily papers. It is rather surprising, therefore, that the Tammany candidate, supported by Mr. Hearst's papers, had nearly twice as many votes as Mr. Mitchel and that the socialist candidate, without the support of any prominent papers, received almost as many votes as Mayor Mitchel.

A popular election gives the people a chance to express themselves, and they do not always take the advice of the metropolitan papers. They sometimes insist upon expressing their own views in their own way, and this is at times convincing—not to say embarrassing—to those who assume to interpret their vote in advance.

It was insisted by the supporters of Mr. Mitchel that the vote for mayor would declare to the world the city's attitude on the war—a vote for Mitchel meaning approval and a vote against him meaning a protest. No such interpretation is likely to be insisted upon now since the vote of the socialist candidate, running on a declaration in favor of an early peace and refusing to buy Liberty bonds, is almost equal to the vote cast for Mayor Mitchel. As a matter of fact, a great many patriotic citizens refused to allow the newspapers and the supporters of Mr. Mitchel to speak for them or to construe their purpose, just as a great many of Mr. Hillquit's supporters voted for him regardless of his attitude on the war.

During the campaign the Mitchel advocates declared that the Tammany candidate's support was made up of pro-Germans and Hearst's followers; they will hardly admit now that any large percentage of the Hylan vote represents an unpatriotic element or that Hearst has as large a following as the Hylan vote would indicate. Mr. Hylan himself takes early opportunity to deny that his election indicates opposition to the President. His statement, quoted below, will be more generally accepted by the Mitchel leaders now than it was during the campaign, and it deserves wide publication:

"I want to make it plain to the world that there was no issue of Americanism or loyalty involved, insofar as I am concerned. There could be none, for I am as good an American as any man, as loyal to my flag, as loyal to my country and as firm and determined in support of every act of the government in this war as any man. I ask the editors of the newspapers in this city and in other cities to give prominence to this declaration, so that there may not go abroad to the people of this country who have no appreciation of our local situation the slightest intimation that the question of the war or the war policy of President Wilson and the United States government are in the slightest way involved. My first utterance in this campaign in response to a question put by a reporter was that I stood uncompromisingly behind the President in support of the acts and policies of my country and that the war must be fought to a conclusion which would bring an honorable peace to America."

W. J. BRYAN.

COMMENT BY THE NEW YORK WORLD

Tammany has come back to power. By the irony of fate it has come back to power under the most unfit, incompetent candidate for Mayor that it has nominated since consolidation.

The story of Tammany's triumph is the old story of a divided opposition. That is what elected Van Wyck and gave New York over to the most shocking era of corruption that it had known since Tweed. That is what has elected Hylan and given New York over to whatever calamities Murphy and Hearst may have in store for it.

Mayor Mitchel was beaten for mayor at the republican primaries by republican treachery and perhaps by worse. There have been charges

"Prohibition Works Out All Right," Says Mayor Dahlman of Omaha

"I Can't Make Speeches for Saloons Again and be Honest; My Arguments are Shot to Pieces; the City was Never in a Better Condition," He Tells Visitor

[From the Omaha Daily News.]

The mayor of Omaha, one-time leader of the wets and determined opponent of prohibition, has deserted his former allies and now is lined up with the men who believe prohibition is a good thing.

For years the mayor opposed closing the saloons on the ground that their abolition would mean ruin to a city and that taking away a man's right to freely buy intoxicating liquor would mean taking away his personal liberty.

The mayor's municipal campaigns were made chiefly upon the "personal liberty" issue.

During the existence of the eight o'clock closing law the mayor on various occasions denounced that measure and took no active steps to enforce the law.

In those days the mayor stood for a "wide open" town.

He led the fight against prohibition last November, lined up the democratic machine against the dries, formed political alliance with the wets and did everything one man could do to defeat prohibition.

MAYOR HAS CHANGED FRONT

But the mayor has changed front. Confronted by the facts demonstrated by five months of prohibition in Omaha, he now acknowledges that Omaha has benefited by the abolition of saloons.

He explained his changed attitude in a recent interview with William J. Johnson, associate secretary of the Presbyterian board of temperance.

So strongly did the mayor present the virtues of prohibition in Omaha that Mr. Johnson uses his statements as an argument for a "dry Chicago." He is quoting Omaha's mayor as follows:

"I found the mayor to be very approachable, genial and frank in his discussion of the prohibition question.

"I said to him, 'Mayor, we are getting ready for a big fight on the saloon question in Chicago and I have come here to see how prohibition has hurt Omaha.'

"He said: 'Prohibition has not hurt Omaha; everything is all right.'

"What effect has it had on crime, on the number of arrests?

"There is not so much crime, not nearly so many arrests. There is not so much quarreling between husbands and wives, not so many cases of non-support, and not so many divorce cases.'

"Of course it has hurt business?

"He said: 'It has helped business. People are able to buy more and collections are much better. It's easy to understand that when we had saloons a man would stop in a saloon and spend half of his week's pay before he went home. Now, he takes the money home to his family. In the evening he will clean up, eat his supper and come down town with his wife to buy groceries.'

"There must be a great many vacant buildings, which were formerly occupied by saloons?

"There has not been time for a complete readjustment, but most of the property is rented.'

"The rentals can't be as good?

"They are about the same and in some cases better.'

"I have been walking all about the business section and have seen only two vacant buildings which were formerly rented to saloons, but I suppose there are a great many more farther out?

"No, there are very few. Nearly all of the saloon property is rented. The rentals are about the same as before, and in some cases better.'

"I assume that there are many men who were bartenders and workers in the breweries who are out of employment?

"No, there are no unemployed; there is plenty of work. You know I used to be wet and used to make speeches on the wet side, tell how many people would be thrown out of employment, how many millions of dollars of business would be lost, and the lot of vacant houses there would be, but it has not panned out that way. Arguments, outside of that of personal liberty, so generally used by anti-prohibitionists, are shot to pieces so far as our city is concerned, as they have not materialized.'

"What about the confiscation of the breweries?

"Oh, they are all busy making soft drinks and other things, and are employing as many people as before.'

"As we walked toward the elevator I took him by the arm and said: 'Mayor would you make speeches for the saloon again?'

"I couldn't, and be honest, and I wouldn't be dishonest. I used to think prohibition would be a bad thing, but it has not turned out that way.'

"As I grasped his hand to say goodbye I said, 'Mayor, I am glad you are converted.' He smilingly replied, 'I can not go against facts.'"

of a deal between Tammany and the republican machine by which Tammany was to knife the democratic presidential and state tickets last year in consideration of republican aid in carrying the municipal election this year. Be that as it may, the democratic presidential and state tickets were slaughtered in 1916 and Tammany has won in 1917. The beginning of its victory was the republican primary election, in which fusion was assassinated and Mayor Mitchel was deprived of the republican nomination and left without a party indorsement.

In the circumstances the mayor was under no obligations to run, but he made the fight, and the fact that he made it is wholly to his credit. That he was defeated in spite of the splendid record of his administration is not to the credit of the intelligence or civic patriotism of New York, to say nothing of the broader question of patriotism.

Judge Hylan's election can be regarded only with the gravest apprehension. The man has shown no capacity whatever for administering the affairs of this city, least of all in times like these, and the influences behind him could hardly be more sinister. He has shown no intelligent understanding of the city's complex

problems of government. Nevertheless, New York has elected him and New York must take what it gets.

Four years of Hylanism, Murphyism, Hearstism—and Hillquitism—may teach New York some of the lessons that it is so evidently determined to learn only through bitter and shameful experience.—New York World.

REVOLT IN RUSSIA

The situation in Russia is alarming. The Kerensky government has been overthrown in Petrograd and it remains to be seen whether he can hold the country and regain control of central government.

It is by no means certain that those who at present occupy the capital represent a majority of the people. It may yet be necessary for Russia to learn that democracy means the rule of the PEOPLE as a whole, and not the rule of any class. If Russia is to improve her opportunity and establish a republic she must lay the foundation in an appeal to ALL the people, not in giving to any class or group of classes a monopoly of rights and privileges.

W. J. BRYAN.