

## Two Reasons

[Extracts from Address of Mr. Bryan at a mass meeting in Asheville, N. C., December 14, 1917.]

"There are two arguments in favor of the Thrift Campaign in the interests of War-Savings Certificates.

"The by-products of this war are already numerous and important. Among them three are especially worthy of consideration in this connection.

"First, the immediate effect of the war has been to reveal more clearly than before the evil of alcoholic liquors. In such a crisis as that through which we are passing the nation needs 100 per cent men, and intoxicating liquor impairs the economic value of the citizen as a producer, and the military value of the soldier at the battle front. The lessons learned from the war are increasing the prohibition sentiment in this country and elsewhere; and it now looks as if the national prohibition amendment would soon be submitted and it is quite certain to be adopted when it is submitted.

"Second, the voluntary giving that has been necessary has in it a certain spiritual value. The heart is enlisted, the sympathies are expanded, and altruism makes headway against selfishness. All religious and ethical movements are likely to be stimulated because the giving impetus has been aroused.

"Third, our people have never used the government bond as a savings bank to the extent that people in other countries have. The Liberty Loan has led millions to invest in government bonds as a matter of patriotism and the investment will continue as a matter of business. The government bond is the best security in the world and the safest savings bank. There is, therefore, a real economic value in the formation of the habit of entrusting the government with surplus money. It is a good way to provide with certainty against the uncertainties of life and to make sure provision for old age.

### SECOND REASON

"The Thrift and War-Savings Stamps are the most profitable form of patriotism that the citizen will have a chance to manifest. It is the duty of the citizen to support the government along every line and in every possible way. It is his duty to support the government by word and by deed in whatever it may see fit to undertake, because ours is a people's government, and it speaks for the citizen.

"There are several ways in which the citizen may serve the government, principal among which are through military service, through taxation, and through loans made to the government—three kinds of burdens which the citizen may be called upon to bear in time of war.

"Of these three, military service is the heaviest because it may involve the sacrifice of life. No pecuniary burden can, therefore, equal the burden borne by the soldier.

"Next in weight is taxation. It is lighter than military service, because it is paid out of the income or, at most, out of the property, while military service may demand life, which is more than income or property.

"Loans made to the government are easier than taxation. When the government takes money through taxation, it does not promise to return it. But when it borrows money, it pays it back with interest, and interest at 4% is, I think, more than the average rate paid by the savings banks of the country.

"But the War-Savings Certificates have three advantages over the Liberty Loan. First, the interest is compounded every three months. Second, it can be subscribed in small amounts to suit the ability of the subscriber and at such times as may suit his convenience. Third, the money loaned can be collected at any time on ten days' notice, so that it can never fall below par or embarrass the holder. And in addition to these advantages it has a value which can hardly be over-estimated in that it teaches thrift, economy, and saving. It is no exaggeration to say that the lesson which the boys and girls will learn in the purchase of Thrift Stamps and War-Savings Stamps will be worth far more to them than the money invested, and they will get their money back, besides, and interest on it. It is more than eating your cake and keeping it, without counting the aid that it is giving the government.

"Military service, taxes, and loans—these three—and the easiest of these is loans."

### COL. BRYAN IN LEWISTON

[From The Lewiston, Me., Journal, Dec. 7, 1917.]

Col. Bryan's address on live-wire lines of universal democracy drew a large and enthusiastic audience to Lewiston city hall last evening. Col. Bryan is the most entertaining talker the writer has ever heard; but whatever he was when he was enfranchised as the Boy Orator of the Platte, Col. Bryan is not the great orator of America today and that, perhaps, for want of occasion. And for that matter, one knows not whether we have in the United States an orator in the sense embodied in Patrick Henry, Wendell Phillips or Ward Beecher and the group of great anti-slavery orators of "The Fifties." All depends, however, on definitions. Perhaps the most dramatic orators of this period are women like Mrs. Livingston, because the prophetic sees the coming of the Lord in politics and in society more vividly than the prophet. Roosevelt is not a great orator but he is our pre-eminent statesman and seer.

Oratory is either declamation nor talk. Oratory is the product of periods of intense moral and social agitation. Not all great men and women who have deep emotions and serious consciences and great minds are orators. Other equipment is essential. No great orator is possible without intense convictions and forceful mentality plus fertility of imagination, humor and dramatic fire. The orator is an artist. He must portray and picture the crisis. He must draw on an affluent imagination—a rich vocabulary is not enough. Words made flesh are the organic requirement of oratory.

It is easily possible that under the stress of emergency and while the fires of truth and untarnished idealism were flaming on the altars of his mind, that the Boy Orator of the Platte was both orator and talker, but in last evening's address he drew not on potentials of oratory but on actualities of conviction. "Sixteen to one" never has and never will elicit a great Phillipic. Not since Wendell Phillips lectured in Lewiston 50 years ago on "The Lost Arts," have we heard so fascinating a talker as the late Boy Orator of the Platte.

Why is it that ex-Congressman McGillicuddy, for example, draws a full house in the city of his birth? Why did the late Senator Frye crowd the benches whenever he talked to his neighbors? Not merely for the message, worthy though that average to be, but because action enriched language. When a great dramatist takes a leading part in a dialogue, we average to be little interested. Oratory requires wholesome emotion, identification of the man with the message. And such identification is impressive only when the man and the message are a unit organic. This is why Patrick Henry's cry for liberty put a universal phase on American politics, this is why Ward Beecher made England ashamed of her American policy in 1861-4, this is why Boston's Faneuil Hall is a citadel of liberty not unlike Independence Hall in Philadelphia. Whether the disappearance of great orators is due to a diminished demand, and whether diminished demand is due to decline of moral and spiritual forces, is another matter on which we would not dogmatize. Some say the newspaper has eliminated the demand for orators. Not so! The theatre can not be destroyed by the movies, drama and poetry will revive. The new internationalism and the world's bettering democracy will evoke a demand such as elicited that group of immortals who followed John Brown as well as Abraham Lincoln.

While Bryan is delicately dramatic and witty, he is neither philosophical nor profound. And were he metaphysical like Emerson who put a Lewiston audience to sleep in the '50's, Bryan would be neither an entertaining talker nor a popular force. It is Bryan's fine human quality as it was the fine human quality of Lincoln that gives him his place in American politics. Bryan preserves no commonplaces on ice. He is a better democrat than Jefferson because Jefferson was a theoretical, not an intuitive democrat. Jefferson was a natural aristocrat, who got democracy into his system by the way of France, not by the way of Monticello. His Virginia castle was the home of a feudal lord converted to theoretical equality of men and women. Jefferson as a slaveholder did great stunts against making good the fine sentiments which dominated his emotions but failed to possess his intellect. So the sideboards of many American politicians are in conflict with the water wagon while on

equal suffrage camouflage promotes a tired feeling at the fence.

A striking element of the situation at city hall last evening, accordingly, was Col. Bryan's appearance as a democrat, taking issue with Tammany democracy and republicanism such as today struggle to re-elect Curley as mayor of Boston and such as combined to defeat re-election of Mayor Mitchel, the best democrat who ever ruled our great commercial capital. The conflict between sections of American parties is now as acute as it was when Lincoln was elected to be president. President Wilson, like Jefferson, is an ardent democrat, but not of the Bryan school. The present incumbent of the white house is a natural aristocrat, meaning thereby no disrespect because His Excellency is an intellectual and cultural force—and we are inclined to believe the greatest in these two respects than any previous president. What Wilson lacks is what Lincoln did not lack and what Roosevelt and Bryan do not lack—a fellow-feeling that makes us wondrous intimate. Two such men as Wilson and Bryan can hardly pull together. The commoner and statesman have different points of view. One can not sit down with Wilson and get at him as he can sit down with Bryan and commune, heart to heart. There was no more sympathy between Lincoln, the commoner, and Stanton, the autocrat, than between the present incumbent of the White house and his first chosen secretary of state. However, the conflict between Bryan democracy and Wilson democracy is in a measure arrested by the present war. So the pressure of civil war made it possible for Lincoln to tolerate the otherwise impossible Stanton and McClellan and the mere politician, Seward, behind whom, it will be recalled, was Tammany Republican Thurlow Weed.

It is one of the fine effects of the supreme issue of the world democracy that Col. Bryan now drops pacifism and pulls heartily with the American people to put on the map a democracy more fit for the world. While Col. Bryan is in conflict with political reaction in both old parties as was Lincoln, Bryan yields not to the alien temptation to which the Copperheads surrendered in 1861. As in war democrats helped Lincoln beyond measure, so Bryan and many other devotees of peace, finding war inevitable, join hands as heartily to defend the nation as did the great majority of northern democrats who voted for the Missouri Compromise and for Buchanan. In standing for equal suffrage, prohibition and the popular initiative and referendum, Bryan stands for a finer future as well as for a better present, and every friend of good government is with him, overlooking his silver dollar heresy—and not ignoring the fact that economic events have recently put Bryan's consecrated ratio of "16 to 1" on the map of relative value, while silver happily is yet a commodity responsive to the law of supply and demand under a single standard of gold. Fortunately, we have kept the old yardstick in spite of profiteering kings of worsted and cotton.

It has taken the serious consequence of two years' conventional, inconsequential and conversational "preparedness" to convert Wilson to demand rate-regulation law for want of which Prussianism in Europe is yet bumptious because promoted by profiteering in America. Col. Bryan, Secretary of Navy Daniels and other statesmen were more prophetic than Wilson and saw the point long ago.

One of the most impressive features of Bryan's speech was his analysis of the unearned increment and of meritorious millionarism. Concurring that a man may be worth well-earned \$500,000,000, the colonel laid the ghost of profiteering—intimating that such men as Lincoln are a bargain at \$500,000,000 and that the difference between the man who deserves to be millionaire and the prevailing multi-millionaire is embodied largely in spiritual justice. He tells us that such spiritual millionaires as Lincoln have no time to collect \$500,000,000 of the people though they may have contributed more than that to public welfare, while the man who has \$500,000,000 of money in his keeping has necessarily devoted himself to collecting the money. Col. Bryan's putting of social value is telling. A man has the right to that proportion of the world's wealth which he puts into the common store, but all social science challenges the gross perversion of this principle which would make manhood the serf of property and profiteered assets more sacred than assets earned by decent industry and right use of human faculty.