

## 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,

which is only a payment to the protected manufacturer of a heavy subsidy from the pockets of the masses of people who are consumers of the manufactured articles; subsidies, as in the beet sugar subsidy and the proposed ship subsidy, which are direct payments out of the people's treasury to the subsidized beneficiary. Second, franchises, such as the monopoly of the streets for railway and other purposes, a monopoly of the highways and the right of eminent domain for railway purposes, etc. And, third, the private ownership in land is deemed a privilege on the theory that the earth itself is limited, and its desirable portion still more limited, and its concentrated wealth deposits, such as coal and iron, still more limited; and it is not thought right by many that any person should hold land by the old feudal paper title and fence it off from those who would be glad to use it, while he himself puts it to no use whatever. This becomes more apparent in city property. The owner by paper title takes to himself the benefit arising from improvements and increased values given by the whole mass of citizens. It is also apparent when it secures practically entire control of any material of limited amount, as say, anthracite coal or petroleum.

These ideas being obvious, many of the followers of the different "isms" take one or the other of two roads. One is socialism, leading to the government ownership or control of all industries—everything is monopolized by government; and the other philosophical anarchism, which seeks to bring about absolute personal liberty, in which law, order, government, or whatever you choose to term it, shall be evolved wholly from the voluntary association of individuals, and not by any compulsory idea, as statute law or other law enforced upon a minority of peaceful citizens by a majority of peaceful citizens.

I think most people would be inclined to admit that as an ideal, philosophical anarchy is the most attractive, because it rests upon a theory, which as a theory, at least, is the most to be desired, and is the most beautiful, namely, the right of every one to do as seems best to him, so long as he does not invade the rights of his fellow men; and the right of every one freely to associate himself with those of his own way of thinking and to live as they voluntarily elect to live as free beings, so long as they do not invade the rights of any other associate or community or individual. Socialism, on the other hand, for its perfect

operation requires the surrender of the liberty of every individual in the state to the state. To insure success each one must be absolutely under the control of the government. It is said that the government will be of the people themselves; that is what is said now, and that is the theory of our present government; but it is not true. This is not a government of the people. It is not even a government of the majority. It is the government of a few politicians who arrange matters at primaries and conventions which they control, and use the majority as the instruments to declare their power. The House of Representatives is not a House of Representatives. It is not a Chamber of debate. The minority has no right to be heard, and argument is a waste of time. The majority, even, are only puppets to be counted, and the real control is in the speaker and one or two party leaders. If you have more government with greater powers, I believe the same selfish desires and political practices which have put a few men in power and in control of the "welfare" of the country under our present system, will put just such men in control of the still more highly-organized machinery of socialistic government. This plan has never worked, even in the small socialistic communities which have experimented with it among themselves; even if it has worked among them, it is so small an experiment that I could not accept it as an argument.

I am in favor of philosophical anarchism, or personal liberty as an idea; and I am opposed to the socialistic or governmental idea. Your plan seems to me to be one of the many which have for a foundation the socialistic or governmental idea; and beside, it strikes me as exceedingly intricate and dependent in its last solution upon an arbitrary and forcible carrying out of the decrees of the government, and I am not clear from your plan but what that government might be the mere majority just as it is today. In other words, you seek more laws to compel more just conditions, as you think. I believe in less laws, or, if practically possible, no law, so that men may be free to work out their own salvation, unrestrained except when they attack or invade others. I know of no thoughtful man who expects, and certainly I do not expect, ever to abolish poverty, to abolish crime, and to produce an absolutely dead level of equality among men. I hope for a higher moral standard, I hope for greater equality of prosperity, but I certainly never expect to

see the natural inequality among men destroyed; nor do I think it would be desirable if possible. And I believe the ideal condition, if it ever shall be obtained in the distant future, will be that which allows the nearest approach to absolute freedom in the well behaving individual; which leaves each one free to use such gifts, talents, and energies as have been vouchsafed him. Toward that goal I think our present steps should tend. It will, in my opinion, be centuries before it is approached. The world as a whole is not ready for it, and if instituted to-morrow it would produce chaos. But I believe the true line of development is toward greater freedom, not greater government; and I think the intermediate stages will be sooner reached the sooner we begin the discussion, and model our reforms upon the idea of less law instead of more law.

I have probably bored you with these views, but I have intended it in the sense of a compliment, because I believe it desirable that men who discuss these matters should come as nearly together as possible. The theorist does much, but he is always ahead of his generation. There is always a present and practical issue. So I think the Democratic party, or some new party, ought clearly and unequivocally to advocate free trade, and let it be understood that absolute free trade is meant just as soon as it is feasible. I do not mean a tariff for revenue with incidental protection; and I do not mean a tariff for revenue only, which is an open door for protection; but I mean the abolishment of all tariff, leaving the trade of this country with the rest of the world absolutely free. This will set all industry upon an open and natural competition. It will also necessarily compel the raising of revenue from other sources; and I think the seed is already planted which will eventually flower in the taxation of raw land at its proper rental value, or something to this effect. If that be so, many of the benefits which you yourself are striving for will be reached, because no man could then afford to hold land out of use for speculation only; to make his land holdings profitable, he must put them to profitable use.

A necessary incident will be change in our written constitutions, Federal and State, but certainly they cannot be expected to remain any more fixed in the future than they have in the past. Have you read Herbert Spencer's "Plea for Liberty"?

Yours very truly,

C. E. S. WOOD.

Chicago, Mar. 13, 1902.