

# La Guardia for Mayor of New York

By ARTHUR GARFIELD HAYS

TAMMANY, corrupt, exposed, but still unchastened, once more faces a mayoralty election. Never in the history of New York City, however, has it incurred the resentment and wrath of so many and so diverse foes. A crushing tax burden and the failure to apply real economy measures have driven into the camp of its enemies many of its former allies. The revelations of the Seabury investigation, coupled with Tammany's brazen refusal to clean house, have alienated even the ordinarily apathetic citizen.

New York City teeters on the brink of a financial crisis. The five-cent fare, the only benefit the city ever derived from its unproductive investments in the privately operated subways, is threatened. The Board of Education has ceased the licensing of new teachers and the construction of sorely needed new buildings. The rising burden of unemployment relief renders absurd the promise of a balanced budget. With tax collections steadily dwindling, even the salaries of the city's army of 100,000 civil servants are in danger.

The Society of Tammany seems not a whit perturbed. Tammany has never claimed to be a philanthropic organization. Its success is due to its business methods and to the dividends it pays. Its opponents and decriers are presumed to be disinterested, self-sacrificing, non-professional public-spirited citizens, amateur fighters for the public weal. It is not surprising that Tammany's professionals put them to rout.

In the coming election it is safe to say that practically the only supporters of Tammany will be those who will gain, either directly or indirectly, by its success. The fixer in the Magistrate's Court, the deputy who never visits his office, the lawyer who is constantly appointed a referee, the armies who thrive on the city moneys as office-holders, contractors, and what-not, will not falter or grow weary in their fight for Tammany. The independent, the disgusted, the disinterested voters clearly outnumber the Tammany faithful. The difficulty is and always has been in galvanizing and uniting the opposition. Tammany's strength lies not so much in its own numbers as in the disunity and bickering of its foes.

Fusion candidates can no longer content the electorate with the pledge of "good government." The cry of "corruption" is feeble indeed, compared with the issues of a five-cent fare, decent housing, tax relief. A program, as well as a personality, is necessary. The formula for a revolt against Tammany is well known by this time. The fusion forces under the leadership of those Republicans who are not jackals to the Tammany tiger nominate an independent Democrat, preferably a Catholic. Some modification in this formula is necessary today because of the growing importance of the Socialist and independent vote. Independent Democrats whom the formula fits are difficult to find. Samuel Seabury refused the fusion nomination; Joseph V. McKee, whose brief stay in office electrified 234,372 pencil wielders, has removed himself from consideration; Alfred E. Smith is bound by sentimental ties to the sachems of Fourteenth Street; Ferdinand Pecora is too close to Tammany. Norman Thomas would be a splendid candidate but he would probably not accept a Republican indorsement, nor have they sense enough to offer it

to him. One man of incorruptible integrity, a vigorous fighter with practical political experience, stands preeminent as a possible candidate. He is Fiorello H. La Guardia.

Major La Guardia, the only Republican who has carried a city-wide election since 1901, was elected president of the Board of Aldermen in 1919. In the House of Representatives his work has won him the designation, the "Roistering Rebel." He is the only member of the lower House who was described as a man of real merit in "Washington Merry-Go-Round" and "Sons of the Wild Jackass," exposés of life on Capitol Hill. To gain distinction and without political backing to wield power in the regimented atmosphere of the lower House are rare accomplishments. By conscientious preparation, by dramatic presentation, by independence and courage, La Guardia has forced acknowledgement of his ability and leadership in every progressive cause.

During one of the never-ending coal strikes in Pennsylvania he visited the mines and returned to Congress to describe the miners' squalor in unforgettable language. In a New York strike La Guardia went on the picket line. On one occasion in a debate, to focus attention on high meat prices, he drew from his pocket a tiny lamb chop which he declared cost him thirty cents. It was Congressman La Guardia who flew to Boston the night before Sacco and Vanzetti were executed to plead personally with Governor Fuller.

In 1929 Walker defeated La Guardia by about 500,000 votes, but La Guardia's campaign statements that year were treated as mere wild and reckless charges. The average voter, whose head was enmeshed in a wreath of ticker tape, simply could not believe La Guardia's charges of official corruption. It remained for a legislative investigating committee with an appropriation of \$750,000 to prove the truth of his charges. As the *New York Times* has stated: "If there is anyone who has the right to say 'I told you so,' it is La Guardia."

The Mayor of New York must know not only the city government and its budget, but also the political game and how to play it. It has been said that Tammany loves the individual but despises "the people," while the reformers love "the people" but despise the individual. La Guardia will not make that error. His lack of swank is one of his identifying characteristics. The Mayor of New York must avoid the rigidity, the self-righteousness, and the bungling ineptness of the merely good-government reformer. He must have in mind a "Who's Who" of the grafters, chair-warmers, favorite contractors, and the vast and varied medley that prey on the city treasury. La Guardia has held office for twenty years. He knows New York City politics and its politicians.

La Guardia's defeat in 1929 was caused in large measure by the fact that the Republican organization deliberately knifed its own candidate. He was too radical for the Republicans and so, as La Guardia says, they voted for Norman Thomas. After La Guardia's defeat no less than twelve Republican clubs of Italian-Americans left that party. It is said that since then the enrolment of Italian-Americans in the Democratic Party has increased 50 per cent. The vote of this group, comprising from 350,000 to 375,000 persons, is

not to be overlooked. La Guardia has also a tremendous following among the Jewish voters and is strong with labor. He appeals to independent Democrats who like to regard themselves as progressive.

In 1932 John P. O'Brien, Democrat, received 1,056,119 votes; Lewis H. Pounds, Republican, 443,901; Morris Hillquit, Socialist, 249,589; Joseph V. McKee, independent, 234,372; while 227,309 persons who voted did not even take the trouble to pull down the lever for mayor. The anti-Tammany vote was therefore 1,155,171, exceeding the Democratic total. If La Guardia retains most of the Republican and independent vote and gains the support of labor, he may be the next Mayor of New York.

Fusion leaders have a real opportunity. La Guardia as mayor can end the banker domination of City Hall; he can begin with federal funds to raze the dingy rookeries of the poor and erect in their place garden apartments; he can drive out the political parasites that drain the city's blood; he can make transit unification a fact and not a shibboleth. Liberals will not need to blush for the Board of Education and, more important, La Guardia as a practical politician can build up a machine or a following that may make for permanence in the never-ending fight against Tammany. La Guardia has the personality, the integrity, the record, the program, and the philosophy. In addition he is more likely to be elected than anyone else in sight.

# The Intellectuals of the World and Hitler

By KARL LANGER

*Vienna, June 29*

THIS year's annual congress of the International P. E. N. Clubs which met during the last week in May in the Yugoslav town of Dubrovnik (Ragusa) on the Adriatic, presented a sorry picture of the lack of moral stamina and convictions of the literary world. The first P. E. N. Club was founded in Great Britain for the express purpose of promoting international solidarity among writers and freedom of literary expression. Since then the movement has spread to forty nations in Europe and America, and is today the most respected and numerically the strongest organization of creative intellectuals in the world.

It seems self-evident that the assemblage should take a stand on the ousting by Hitler Germany of some of the German Pen Club's most distinguished members, on its suppression of all independent literary activity, on its burning of the works of Germany's foremost writers, and on the persecution of its outstanding artists, authors, and scientists for reasons of race and conviction. The men of literature who had inscribed the fight for intellectual freedom on their banners could not possibly ignore the greatest spiritual tragedy of our decade.

The reactionary rulers of the Dritte Reich knew this only too well. The German section of the P. E. N. Club, usually represented at these international meetings by men like Hauptmann, Remarque, Feuchtwanger, Toller, Zweig, and the brothers Mann, having been purged of all radical and Semitic elements in the initial stages of National Socialist rule for its "racial, cultural, and political purification," was represented by Schmidt-Pauli, Elster, and Captain Busch, writers whose names are little known outside of Germany, but who make up for their obscurity by their absolute subservience to the Fascist cause. But not enough. The German government permitted participation only on the condition that the Dubrovnik congress take no formal action against its persecution of German authors and that the official delegates remain in constant touch by telephone with the proper authorities at home. It announced also that condemnation of the German government would result in the immediate suppression of the German P. E. N. Club.

Preposterous to relate, the threat of the cultural bar-

barians who have so successfully suppressed all opposition within the Reich was no less effective beyond national borders. Influential circles did their utmost to prevent an open break with the Nazi regime. The executive committee of the American Pen Club, through its only representative, Henry Seidel Canby, editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature*, had submitted a resolution which, it was piously hoped, would uphold the standards of the organization without precipitating it into "political altercations." It read:

We, the members of the American Center of the P. E. N. Club, call upon all other centers to affirm once more those principles upon which the structure of this society was raised and call particular attention to those resolutions presented by the English, French, German, and Belgian delegates at the Fifth International Congress of P. E. N. Clubs in Brussels in 1927 and passed there unanimously:

1. Literature, national though it be in origin, knows no frontiers, and should remain common currency between nations in spite of political or international upheavals.

2. In all circumstances, and particularly in time of war, works of art, the patrimony of humanity at large, should be left untouched by national or political passion.

3. Members of the P. E. N. will at all times use what influence they have in favor of good understanding and mutual respect between the nations.

We likewise call upon the international Congress to take definite steps to prevent the individual centers of the P. E. N., founded for the purpose of fostering good-will and understanding between races and nations, from being used as weapons of propaganda in the defense of persecution inflicted in the name of nationalism, racial prejudice, and political ill will.

The French, Polish, and Belgian delegations came prepared to submit a resolution of indignant protest against German terrorism; the Society of Socialist Authors in Austria, through its member Sonka, submitted a resolution signed by Oskar Maria Graf, Hermynia zur Muehlen, D. J. Bach, Fritz Bruegel, Josef Luitpold, and others which reiterated "the loyalty and warm friendship of the assembled delegates to all writers and others who have had to suffer for their words and works" and sent "greetings to Karl Von Ossietzky, Ludwig Renn, Erich Muehsam, Sigmund Freud, Heinrich

Copyright of Nation is the property of Nation Company, L. P. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.