

## THE PRESENT WAR.

## Mr. Valentine Upon Practical Expansion.

[The white race and the extermination doctrine. Are there ten millions of Europeans living in Oriental lands?]

EDITOR CONSERVATIVE: In the San Francisco Evening Bulletin of the 19th appeared an excellent contribution from Mr. John Aubrey Jones, propounding some very pointed questions to a clerical expansionist of Oakland.

For the information and edification of your readers I beg your indulgence for quoting the concluding portion of Mr. Jones' article, which, to my mind, is extremely pertinent:

"Dr. Coyle makes light of 'traditionalism' as a safeguard to the perpetuity of the republic. In reply, I would remind him of what James Russell Lowell said when asked by a distinguished foreigner: 'How long will the republic of the United States of America endure?' 'So long as its people adhere to the traditions of its founders,' replied the eminent scholar, litterateur, statesman and diplomat. Speaking of traditionalism, I would warn Dr. Coyle that in advocating departure therefrom and ignoring thereof, he is treading upon very slippery footing. What is apostolic teaching as handed down to us but traditionalism? What would become of Christianity; nay more, civilization, if the world should forsake the traditionalism of the New Testament? Let Dr. Coyle answer if he will."

At this point I will call the attention of the expansionist clergy to the materialism of expansion. First, General Shafter's view:

"I have said before that it may be necessary to kill half the population of the islands in order that the remaining half may be lifted from their semi-barbarity to the civilization we are ready to give them."

To which I will add the following from the Topeka Gazette: "The Anglo-Saxon has entered a world war of extermination of savage races, just as the lion several million years ago entered a world war to kill off the ungainly beasts whose bones now adorn museums of natural history. The survival of the fittest must operate in men as in brutes. It is the same old war, 'bloody with tooth and claw,' that began when the first protoplasm multiplied itself by two. Now brains are weapons, not muscles; mind, not matter; soul, not body; heart, not hand. The Malay is an inferior race—he must die—just as the Indian died. Expansion is the inevitable. It was ordained in the beginning."

Now for an example of the outcome of such expansion doctrines: Captain Albert Otis, giving the results of his own experience at Santa Ana, near Manila, writes:

"I have six horses, and three carriages in my yard, and enough small plunder

for a family of six. The house I had at Santa Ana had five pianos. I couldn't take them, so I put a big grand piano out of a second-story window. You can guess its finish."

This is only one of many such incidents mentioned in the letters of soldiers to their friends in the United States.

The Enquirer of the 19th contained nearly a column and a half of excellent editorial comment setting forth in a very suggestive way the fallacies of compulsory civilization, and among other things, touched upon the extraordinary dictum, above quoted, of the United States general. I will here apply a query from the Sacramento Bee: "Have the Filipinos any rights; have they any business on earth?"

It would also be gratifying to have an answer to two other questions: What do the expansionists think the rights of dark races are? Are they of the opinion that the Almighty in the creation applied his hand exclusively to the white race, and left others to be formed by apprentices or journeymen?

As expansionists deem Washington, Jefferson, Adams, and other of the fathers "back numbers" it may be well, in this connection, for them to ponder the following enunciation of republican doctrine of this generation:

"No man is good enough to govern another without that man's consent. I say this is the leading principle, the sheet anchor of American republicanism."

"When the white man governs himself, that is self-government; but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government, that is despotism."

"All honor to Jefferson—to a man who in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people had the coolness, forecast and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there that today and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling block to the harbingers of tyranny and oppression."

"Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defence is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God cannot long retain it."

It appears that at a meeting of Presbyterian ministers in San Francisco on Monday, the 17th inst., Dr. Coyle being the chief speaker, there was a comparative unanimity of sentiment in favor of President McKinley's benevolent assimilation policy. If Dr. Coyle's interpretation of Christian civilization be correct it merely means the law of organic evolution—the survival of the fittest; in this particular case the survival of the strongest—of the stronger

in point of engines of war, but for a time—eventually of the weaker, because of his better adaptation of the climate of his native tropical country. I say, if his interpretation of the process of Christian civilization sanctioned by the Bible is correct as applied in this case, what need was there of the coming and of the teachings of the Redeemer of mankind? In short, is not the reverend gentleman giving himself over completely to materialistic science rather than adhering to the elevating and refining principles of Christianity—the love of God and of man, as taught by Christ?

I am informed that Dr. Coyle asserted in his remarks before the Presbyterian ministers that there are ten millions of Europeans in Oriental tropical lands. If so I would be glad to learn where they are located.

Dr. Coyle, as reported by the press, has said: "To back out of the Philippines now would lead the nations of the earth to laugh at the great republic of the West, and cause us to lose faith in ourselves."

Think of offering that at the judgment bar of Christ as an excuse for swerving from the path of duty. The same excuse is not infrequently offered in another form, namely, that to withdraw would disgrace us in the eyes of the world.

Now the term disgrace thus used betrays a wrong-headed and obstinate pride persisting in perpetuating a woe-ful injustice because, forsooth, some people in the world might indulge in gibes and sneers, whereas no right-minded, liberty-loving person on earth but would experience a thrill of joy that the United States of America, hitherto the exemplar of democracy and liberty, should have the courage to own itself wrong in this business and fearlessly reverse itself and do what is right. People who talk of disgrace attending our withdrawal from the Philippines before having subjugated the natives are but putting themselves on the level of the small boy who is afraid to do right because his companions may laugh at him, or, with that of the cow-boy who allows himself to be egged on to commit a stage-robbery because he hasn't the moral courage to withstand the taunts of his confederates.

JOHN J. VALENTINE.

San Francisco, Cali., April 22, 1899.

There are a thousand men with physical courage to meet bullets on the battlefield, where there are a dozen with moral courage to tell the truth and stand up for it when the multitude are all on the side of error. To tell the truth against odds, when truth is antagonistic to public prejudice, and public sentiment, requires a brave and self-reliant man. More truth-tellers are needed in the political life of America.