

Tucson, February 26, 1931.

Miss Ida M. Tarbell,
C% University of Arizona,
Tucson.

Dear Madam:

I had the pleasure of hearing your lecture on "Lincoln" and after learning your sympathetic views on World Unionism I am venturing to take the part of one of the questioners to whom you so pleasantly referred.

First, I take it for granted that World Unionism is in reality what the newspapers so rabidly attack as Internationalism, or the breaking down of antagonistic governments. If I am right this at once brings up the question of perpetual peace and other kindred subjects.

Would it be permissible to list these problems in the probable order of their importance:

1. Some economic system that would supply work and abolish poverty, the anticipation of want, and these inequalities in social position that have their most horrible development in the caste system of India.

2. Some re-arrangement under which the armed forces of the world might be under the supervision and control of one government, i.e. the elimination of rival war forces.

3. A scientific method for the amalgamation of different races, which might include the changing of such typically nationalistic name brands as Schlippenbach, Poniatowsky etc. for others that would harmonize with the language of the dominant civilization.

4. Racial divisions that would ensure the dominance of the white race as the highest type of civilization.

I have not mentioned such generalities as education and the elimination of superstition, the spread of scientific knowledge etc. which need no emphasis.

History seems to show that no government that is not founded on force is at all possible, yet there are many who claim to believe otherwise. To the people who would abolish armies on the assumption of a social contract binding on the upright and moral element of our population let me respectfully suggest that in any state of society where there is no sufficient force to compel obedience to the laws and our obligations generally, this is what would probably happen:

No one would consent to pay rent and Proudhon's doctrine that "Le propriete' est le vol" would rapidly take root; a large percentage, constantly increasing, would refuse or neglect to pay debts of any kind; the strong man who needed food, clothing or shelter would simply take them. Individuals would cease to produce wealth knowing it might be confiscated. Even a government founded on moral principles would be unable to undertake great industrial enterprises for the same reason.

Might I most respectfully suggest that even the Christian religion made very little headway until it was backed by the armies of Constantine and it is no secret that Mohammedanism is spread by the sword. You will also find that even in India, where the pretence of passivity and peace are kept up, the system of Caste can only be changed by an upheaval backed by a forcible revolution.

My excuse for this letter is that I am merely expressing the ideas held by a great many people, most of whom have been taught that they must not discuss the two subjects of religion and politics, by which I mean scientific government.

Allow me to apologize for the intrusion of this letter on the attention of one whom the world recognizes as an authority on the subjects touched on.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. Weber

725 E. Third St., Tucson.