

## AN OPEN LETTER TO GEN. FUNSTON.

For The Public.

Exalted and Heroic Dear Sir: It is due you that some recognition be accorded your vigilance at this hour of the nation's peril. All true patriots applaud your timely utterances against treason. While our beloved country is in danger of an invasion by the savages of the Philippine islands we cannot afford to allow malcontents to give these Malay oppressors any sort of comfort. It must be of the greatest satisfaction to you to know that every member of the Marquette club of Chicago, agrees with you that all are traitors who either resist invasion or condone such resistance. In this hour of danger civilians should learn to curb their own opinions, and rely altogether on expert warriors. We all know that our country would have been invaded, and all of us made subjects of the Filipino republic long ago, had it not been for your peerless intrepidity in depriving that power of its head by the timely capture of Aguinaldo. That was a noble action which will make you live in history as the most fortunate of your kind. And your modesty, as well as your gallantry, challenges the admiration of your countrymen. Few heroes, given the opportunities for public utterance that you have encountered, could have resisted reciting the details of this dramatic incident. You resisted the natural tendency to particularize. Yet where, in all the pages of military valor, shall we find the equal of your matchless enterprise? Realizing that you were animated by a regard for the safety of your country from a threatened invasion, you did not hesitate, as lesser men might have done, to appeal to your enemy for food and shelter, and under the cover of his hospitality to make him captive. Our revolutionary fathers pledged their lives, their possessions and their sacred honor in the cause of their country, but none of them rose to the exalted height of violating sacred honor that we might be free from foreign invasion. It must have cost you some discomfort, after having been received with kindness by your host, to turn upon him, but your resolute mastery of your personal feelings in the interests of your cause, proclaims you the grandest hero of all ages. Never before in all history was that kind of military service so well rewarded, which goes to show how much you are beloved by the citizens of our country, and therefore whatever you may say

defining treachery will be accepted as authoritative.

In time of war prepare for peace, is a new reading of an old maxim. In time of war we should unhesitatingly yield to our military superiors, so that when peace comes about we may enjoy the sort of peace our heroes will have prepared for us. While it may be true, as contended by some silly civilians, that the representatives of the people, in congress assembled, have declared no war, the fact remains that we are at war, and facts are more important than theories. No patriot will cavil at any military measure instituted by the enlightened officers of our army at such a time, and he is indeed a traitor who will criticise any action of our martial superiors. I agree with you, therefore, that we should promptly hang any person who so transgresses loyalty as to condemn, or even appear to condemn, the noble work of benevolence which our war department is now promoting in our Pacific (if not pacific) possessions. Whether we pay duty on Manila hemp, or admit it free of duty, its best use will be in the manufacture of rope for the hanging of all such traitors. I congratulate you on the noble support in your timely contention which the Marquette club is affording you. All of us patriots must stand together.

Free speech and free press may be all right in times of peace, subject to certain prudent restrictions. Doubtless you, like myself, are in favor of free speech so long as the speaker exercises his freedom to speak only the things we like to hear. One would be foolish, whether in peace or war, to favor freedom of speech of any other kind. None of us have ever regarded the constitution as being worthy of serious acceptance in such matters. In short, we want freedom of speech, but we will not tolerate abuse of that freedom—and all is abuse that does not conform to the requirements of the military situation. That you may soon rise to be at the very head of the army, is the earnest wish of your ardent admirer,

HERMAN KUEHN.

## SOCIALISM OR INDIVIDUALISM—THE TREND OF THE CENTURIES.

An extract from a private letter commenting upon a plan for more fully socializing society.

All men will probably agree that the world has not yet arrived at the state of perfection anywhere; that there will be continuous change, and, judging from the past, slow but continuous progress; that organizations and aggregations of mankind are intended

for the welfare and happiness of all if possible, certainly for the welfare of the great multitude, and not of the few. It is probable that most men to-day will also agree that the organization known as the United States began with a much more level equality among its citizens than now exists, and that there has been a separation of a few from the masses, and that this separation is becoming more rapid and more marked. I think there will be no dispute that this distinction rests fundamentally upon money or wealth, and we have reached a condition where we have an aristocracy based upon wealth, or, as is the fashion to term it, a plutocracy. My opinion is that most men who are attacking this as an evil are not doing so because of envy, but because they know that the history of every republic the world has ever seen has been a degeneration into an oligarchy, and that these oligarchies rested upon money or property; for example, Rome, Florence, Venice, and the Greek Democracies. They know from the study of history that power has always rested where the wealth or property rested; and this is true whether it be landed property under the feudal system in England, or personal property as in the case of the senators of Rome and senators of the United States. It follows therefore that these men who believe this from their studies or by their blind instincts, believe also that if they would save the liberties of the people, they must in some way procure a more equal distribution of wealth, and must prevent its concentration in the hands of a few. I say again that I believe the motive of the radicals of to-day is not envy or hatred of the rich, but it is fear for the safety of the republic and human liberty. The danger we are in and the evil which is upon us, both to the historical student and to the unread and the unlearned, are so apparent that many "isms" are arising; but each believes his remedy the true one.

The one united party is the Republican, which is the party of this concentrated wealth and power, which necessarily will always be united upon the question of the protection of these property interests. I think it is pretty generally believed among the adherents of these different "isms" that the cause of this concentrated wealth and power in the hands of the few is that the few are reaping the labors of the many, not as a direct tax, as might have been imposed by Louis XV. of France, but indirectly through certain channels. For example: Protection,