

men in pursuing their common welfare.

Protectionism, as developed in the United States, is profoundly opposed to patriotism. It begets a temper forgetful of the public welfare, exacting in private claims and full of personal strife. This is its own inner disposition; and, once established as a public policy, it carries this disposition with it everywhere in all forms of civic action.

The little kernel of sound theory that may in the beginning have lain at the bottom of protection, was shortly lost sight of in a greedy struggle between ever-increasing claimants to retain old and win new advantages. The common aims for which legislation was ordained were more and more brushed aside, and every man, busily occupied with his own interests, was taught to antagonize them to the interests of others in public affairs. Our civic life became a game of hurly-burly, in which each man sought a place for himself. How natural was it that the steel combine, bred and built up on this pabulum of protection, should, in the recent strike, make no vindication of policy, no appeal to the public, show none of that "decent respect for the opinions of mankind" which our forefathers thought fitting, but should rely simply on the hard fact of force to maintain and extend the power the public had conceded to it! The temper was, Let those workmen whine and propound and propitiate. We know our business and propose to pursue it in our own way. We will not kick the less because we have grown fat at the public crib. We will not resist combination the less because we are the largest combination in the world.

One of the surprises in the development of our national life has been the spirit of private appropriation, as opposed to the public welfare, which has taken possession of us. We have set no limits to individual enterprise. If a franchise could be secured, no scruples have stood in the way. Legislation which aimed at an equal division of advantages, as in the restricted sale of public lands, has been baffled in every variety of method. Lands which were devoted to public education became the prey of the land grabber. The policy of private thrift, which gained such a foothold in protection, has spread everywhere. Our railroads have been left in the hands of corporations for narrow and personal uses. Private property has grown up in our streets and highways, and the commercial opportunities which have been the fruit of our common enterprise, have been converted into personal possessions. The indirect evils of protection have far exceeded

its direct evils. A temper has been engendered which has respected no public claim, and spared no common privilege.

If there has been war, we have had shoddy clothing, embalmed beef, and a rush of the incompetent into prominent positions. We have made of office another form of spoil. No interest of peace or of war has been of too grave moment to be exploited by those nearest at hand. In protection we unleashed the eager pack of hounds that now rush sniffing and baying in all directions till not a cat nor a kitten can escape. The doctrine of the equality of rights simply furnishes the obstructions to be leaped in this hurdle race.

This temper has already gone far to endanger the public safety. Our chief misrule is the corruption of our cities, and their corruption is primarily the product of the political contributions of corporations which buy the good will of political parties in absolute indifference to the public welfare. They remain idle spectators of the abuses of government, if their own schemes are left to prosper.

Is not the public welfare identical with the wealth of individuals? This is the question we have put ourselves, and we have answered it with the policy of protection, till we have difficulty in resisting a ship subsidy to redound to the benefit of such corporations as the Standard Oil Company. Patriotism cannot thrive in the atmosphere we have provided for it. If we would restore and strengthen love of country, we must get back to the prosperity of the masses of men—the people and the nation—as the true aim of government.

ABOUT MONEY.

Editor Conservative:

In your issue of the 5th, I find a few questions from W. Hardy, of Lincoln, Neb. You can sometimes answer a question by asking one, and on that proposition I will ask Mr. Hardy if this Congress or any member of it, is asking for the issuing of gold bonds for the redemption of silver dollars? Also if any political party is on record as asking for this kind of a bond issue? Again, is our silver dollar unsound; if so, will Mr. Hardy please inform a reader of The Conservative? Again, Mr. Hardy does not agree with himself; for in one statement he says: "Silver dollars were worth more than gold dollars in any part of the world, but at the same time six hundred dollars would buy as much of the six great necessities of life one year with another." But he forgets to say that six hundred of one of those dollars, under free coinage of both, would buy more than the other. If one was worth more at that time, un-

der free coinage, what would keep them from the same or greater variations now, under the same coinage? What's the matter with our present silver dollar, the one that's in circulation; five of them buy as much and pay as much debt as any five dollars in gold. When he speaks of stopping the coining of silver or restricting the supply, I presume he refers to the act of 1873. If he will look up the records, it will be found that more silver was coined in 1874 than any ten years previous, and from the direct cause of the act of 1873; the supply of silver was greater than ever before, and the very act complained of by the silver men was granted by request of the silver producing states through their representative in congress, and for the benefit of the silver mine owners.

Separate the note system from our other circulations of would-be money and Mr. Hardy, as well as others, may, if they study carefully, find a cause for all this trouble in our finances and the very foundation for our panics, especially those that affect the government.

Respectfully yours,

A. M. GLOVER.

Aurora, Neb., Dec. 9, 1901.

THE CHRISTMAS SPIRIT.

The Christmas spirit is about the best thing there is in all the year. What else is there that we do that is so unselfish as this giving of gifts to celebrate the returning sun? We don't want to receive presents; we want to make them. There is no child so small but expresses, involuntarily, along with his eager hopes for what Santa Claus may bring him, an interest in what his little brother or sister, or the neighbors' children, may also receive; and who so happy as the child that can give another a present? Giving of gifts has a perilously fine edge sometimes; do people ever make presents from a sense of duty or to put themselves in the light of a benefactor? Never at Christmas time; we give then to bestow pleasure, not to be thanked; the greatest happiness, we all feel, would be to observe unseen the receipt of our gifts and the joy it might call into some friend's or loved one's face.

"I never told you, mamma," said one blessed ten-year-old, "the reason I always cry Christmas morning; it's because I get so many more things than you do."

UNSOLICITED.

When the flare of Bryan's campaign had died out, the announcement of the publication of the Commoner seemed to prophesy Bryan as a new force in influencing public opinion. The prophecy has failed. Nevertheless a paper in Nebraska is a force in public opinion. That paper is The Conservative. It is a bright, sensible and substantial paper, and deserves the success it is having in teaching W. J. Bryan what real journalism is.—Everett Republican.