

A CHRISTMAS HYMN

No tramp of marching armies,
No banners flaming far;
A lamp within a stable,
And in the sky a star.

Their hymns of peace and gladness
To earth the angels brought;
Their "Gloria In Excelsis"
To earth the angels taught.

When in the lowly manger
The holy mother maid
In tender adoration
Her Babe of Heaven laid.

Born lowly in the darkness,
And none so poor as he,
The little children of the poor
His very own shall be.

No rush of hostile armies,
But just the huddling sheep,
The angels singing of the Christ
And all the world asleep.

No flame of conquering banners,
No legions sent afar;
A lamp within a stable,
And in the sky a star.

—Margaret E. Sangster in Collier's Weekly.

Rayner's bill giving a pension of \$125 a month, cut the amount of the pension to be allowed to about a third of the sum proposed. Senator Rayner took exception to the proposed cut, in view of the distinguished services to his country of Admiral Schley.

When the bill was to come up before the senate Senator Rayner reviewed the career of Admiral Schley and pleaded for public recognition of his services by the granting of pensions to his widow of sufficient size to show thanks for extraordinary public service. He carried his point, for the senate voted with him to fix the pension at \$125 a month.

MR. BRYAN AND THE ADMINISTRATION

Editorial in the Cincinnati Enquirer: The ambitions of William Jennings Bryan, his policies, his plans, his anticipated relations with the incoming administration, are being discussed very freely in the public press and by politicians of all parties at this time.

Mr. Bryan holds no office, as yet, and some of his closest friends doubt if he would accept even the premiership of the next administration if the place should be offered to him.

He has not in any public way, either before or since the election, indicated that he expected or desired to become a cabinet counselor of the next president.

Persons inimical to the gentleman from Nebraska are quite busy in assigning him to the role of dictator of the policies of the new administration. Some of those he hath offended have marked him as one determined to rule or ruin the democratic party, and still others of the same class are charging him as already planning to break down Wilson by 1916, in order that he himself may become the nominee of the democratic party in that campaign.

To analyze this charge is to refute it.

It carries its own denial, for the platform upon which Mr. Wilson was elected expressly declares for a single term of office for the president and fully commits the party to the nomination of another person than the president-elect as the candidate in the next contest.

It is not, therefore, necessary for any ambitious democrat to strive to eliminate Mr. Wilson in 1916, but there is powerful incentive for every democrat aspiring to the presidency to strengthen the incoming president's hands in the execution of sound, safe and wise policies of administration, to aid in preserving party harmony, in promoting unity in the organization, in order that it can repeat its victory of the present month.

Mr. Bryan, we take it, is too discreet a man, too experienced a politician, too careful in his utterances, to have given any basis to these tales of attempted dictation as to the policies of the new administration.

There are those experienced in political affairs who see Mr. Bryan as a more influential and powerful factor in the affairs of the party and the republic as an independent American citizen during the next four years than if he were a mere dispenser of federal patronage, or bound in speech and action to be the defender, through loyalty to his chief, of policies that

The Commoner.

International Justice, Fraternity and Good Will
to be Substituted for "Dollar Diplomacy"

The following timely and interesting editorial appeared recently in the St. Louis Republic:

There is a rhetorical trick which consists in treating matters which are sharply in controversy as if in fact they were beyond dispute or difference and all sensible men were in agreement upon them. A flagrant instance of this is to be found in the opening part of President Taft's recent message on foreign affairs. He said:

"The fundamental foreign policies of the United States must be raised high above the conflict of partisanship and wholly dissociated from differences as to domestic policy. In its foreign affairs the United States should present to the world a united front. The intellectual, financial and industrial interests of the country and the publicist, the wage-earner, the farmer and citizen of whatever occupation must cooperate in a spirit of high patriotism to promote that national solidarity which is indispensable to national efficiency and to the attainment of national ideals."

Nothing could be falser. The "difference as to domestic policy" now dividing democrats from republicans are of such a character as vitally to affect the policies of the United States as a member of the family of nations. The conflict between the champions of equal opportunity and those of a reign of special privilege and centralized power at home is inextricably mixed up with the question of "dollar diplomacy" versus something better and more decent abroad. This conflict between the worship of Mammon and the practice of real democratic principles in our foreign policy is irrepressible. There are few things more important in our national life today.

Here is the president's own statement of the purposes of that diplomacy which should be "raised high above the conflict of partisanship and wholly dissociated from differences as to domestic policy:

"The diplomacy of the present administration has sought to respond to modern ideas of commercial intercourse. This policy has been characterized as substituting dollars for bullets. It is one that appeals alike to idealistic humanitarian sentiments, to the dictates of sound policy and strategy, and to legitimate commercial aims. It is an effort frankly directed to the increase of American trade upon the axiomatic principle that the government of the United States shall extend all proper support to every legitimate and beneficial enterprise abroad."

No need to charge the president with anything less than frankness in this latter utterance. "Substituting dollars for bullets" is peculiarly exact. For bullets, in the international relations, are the instruments of force, pure and simple; behind them is the good old principle that might makes right. We wonder whether President Taft realized how exactly he was describing our diplomacy in Panama, in Nicaragua, in Santo Domingo, in China, when he wrote that the dollar was but substituted for the bullet. A Daniel come to judgment upon the "new diplomacy!"

In Cuba and in Mexico President Taft has stuck to the traditional American principle of nonintervention and friendly help; to him be the honor which is his due therefor. But in the other countries mentioned diplomacy has been frankly used as an instrument to pull from the fire of national disturbances the chestnuts of a

might not command his full and hearty approval.

Noncommissioned field marshal of the democratic party, as he is today, he wields an influence the power of which would not be increased, the sphere of which would not be so wide, if he were a cabinet officer of even the first rank, yielding that deference to the views of the executive that the very nature of cabinet positions demands.

This discussion of Mr. Bryan's plans, aims and ambitions, brought on by those in opposition to him, seems keen recognition of his power in past and present political affairs, and betrays the fear of an increase in that power during the future.

HOLIDAY GIFT BOOKS

The Signs of the Times. To which is added "Faith," an address delivered before several

colleagues of Wall street investors.

Nor is this all. American money used to be invested abroad with care and prudence, subject to the knowledge on the part of investors that wars and revolutions are as hard on loans as they are traditionally on laws. Today, with the resources of the American army and navy behind the money-changers, no such scrupulousness is necessary.

Let us consider this new policy of "protection to American investments" for a moment as it relates itself to the political life of the countries affected on the Caribbean and elsewhere. In many of these countries society is yet unstable and the state boils like a pot. Contending factions make the government a plaything.

In the Spanish-speaking part of South America there are two republics which have achieved a true national life—Argentina and Chile. Each has developed a national type and republican institutions that work. And each of these countries has come to nationality as the United States of America came to it—by working out its own destiny, through wars, tumults and revolutions, untyrannized by outside powers.

Suppose that in, say, 1850, when the future of Argentina hung in the balance, certain capitalists belonging to some foreign power had made an investment there at the moment of the triumph of some one of the shadowy administrations that came and went.

Suppose that the power in question had followed this investment up by seizing and administering the custom-houses at Buenos Aires and elsewhere, and supporting by force an administration which would otherwise have collapsed by its own weight? This would undoubtedly have conserved the dollars of the said "friendly power." But which would have been the better for Argentina, such foreign interference or fighting her way, as she did, to national consciousness and a true national life?

But let us bring the thing closer: Our own nation passed through a "twilight time" between the revolution and the adoption of the constitution. Lucky for us, 4,000 miles of salt water, unvexed by a steamer's keel, kept Europe three months away from us and permitted us to work out our own destiny. Would the intervention of a financial overlord who "substituted dollars for bullets" have been good for us? He might have rendered unnecessary, then and in the years that followed, the amateur efforts of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Webster, Marshall, Jackson and Benton to "form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Mr. Taft's new diplomacy has nothing to do with such out-of-date matters as perfect national union and the blessings of liberty.

Prating of "idealistic humanitarian sentiments" it prostitutes all nobler things to "an effort frankly directed to the increase of American trade." It enthrones the money-changer in the temple of liberty and bids the patriot take orders from the manipulator of syndicates and the promoter of speculative enterprises. One of the first concerns of the democrats will be to re-enthroned the old diplomacy, concerned neither with bullets nor with dollars, but with international justice, fraternity and good will.

colleagues. Mr. Bryan has made several formal and extended addresses, in different parts of the world, since the issue of his "Selected Speeches" in two volumes. None of these were probably prepared with more care, or were more worthy of preservation and study than "The Signs of the Times." And "Faith" happily supplements this, in this dainty book. 16mo., Flexible Leather, Gilt Top. Sent prepaid to any address on receipt of price, 75 cents.

The Fruits of the Tree. A notable address delivered by Mr. Bryan at the World's Missionary Conference, Edinburgh, Scotland, June 17, 1910. A very dainty and acceptable gift book. 12mo., beautiful Art Board covers, illuminated with handsome design in full gilt. Sent prepaid to any address on receipt of price, 50 cents.

Address all orders to The Commoner, Lincoln, Neb.