

# THE VIRGINIA TEACHER

Volume XIX

MARCH, 1938

No. 3

## ARMAGEDDON IN ASIA

**T**HE great and terrible war now raging in Asia is the culmination of a century-long struggle. Forces of conflict have been converging for decades and to those who have been living in the Far East the pertinent question was not whether but when the storm would break.

Since both isolationists and internationalists are pressing their points of view upon the American public, it is well that we remind ourselves of our country's historical interest in the Far East. I do not refer to our possession of the Philippines since 1898. These islands will eventually be given their independence. Nor do I mean any of our special rights in China which should have been given up long ago. Historically we have had normal relationships and interests with all foreign countries, including Japan and China. We face the Pacific as well as the Atlantic.

About eight per cent of our foreign trade in recent years has been with Japan, and about three per cent with China. American financial investments of all kinds in Japan amount to a little over \$400,000,000, in China about \$200,000,000. Missionary and philanthropic agencies and institutions own property worth \$50,000,000 in China and \$8,000,000 in Japan. About two thousand American nationals live in Japan and eight thousand in China. However, there is little likelihood that America would go to war, costing billions, to protect a few hundred millions worth of property and investments or a few thousand American citizens who might be endangered by the Sino-Japanese struggle.

Our interests are not merely commercial or philanthropic. We can honestly say that we have no imperialistic designs in Asia and we have promised the Philippines their

liberty. But we do believe in fair international trade. In order to protect China from exploitation by any one country, John Hay, American Secretary of State, influenced the powers in 1901 to declare for the "open door policy."

The United States has enjoyed the friendship of both China and Japan since they were opened to western contacts and has been deeply interested in their progress. It was through the good offices of President Theodore Roosevelt that the Russo-Japanese War was brought to an end and a peace conference called. The American people have recognized Japan's rise as a modern power and have shown appreciation of the splendid qualities of her civilization and people.

Between China and the United States exist many common interests and sympathies and traditional ties of friendship. Our country owns no "concessions" in China. We were the first nation to offer return of the Boxer indemnities to China to be used for education and national development. We were the first nation to recognize the new republic in 1911; we have been sympathetic with China's national aspirations; more Chinese students have studied in America than in any other western country; our government called the Washington Conference at which the Nine Power Treaty guaranteeing China's territorial integrity was signed; and our Secretary of State, Mr. Henry L. Stimson, initiated the "non-recognition policy" with regard to Manchukuo after the first occupation of China's territory in 1931. The American people have always sensed the great possibilities of the Chinese as a people and as a nation. We wish for China the opportunity to work out her own destiny and to become strong, united, and free.

For America now to withdraw sud-

denly from all connections with China and Japan simply because those two nations are locked in armed combat, would be a near-sighted, unwise, and impractical policy. We cannot so escape from the world.

Not only do we have historical interests in the Far East, but we are deeply concerned in what will happen in the Far East. The results of the war between China and Japan are bound to affect us, and all other peoples. The terrific drama upon the stage of Asia is being watched intently by all mankind, and the issues are of serious moment for the future of the world. What are some of the conflicting forces in this Armageddon?

1. We see a clash of East and West. This is not just a war between two eastern nations. It is a war between two eastern nations which have been opened to western influences for nearly a century. China felt the impact of the West first, was exploited more seriously, has been modernized more slowly because of her size and her conservatism. Japan, once forced open, reacted more quickly and in sixty short years has achieved her ambition of becoming a great power in the western sense. Both Japan and China have been stirred profoundly by their contact with the West, and their nationalisms have grown out of this contact. Japan's imperialistic policy developed in the setting of western imperialism at the turn of the century when the United States was acquiring the Philippines and when Great Britain was strengthening her hold upon India. We must bear our share of the guilt for the road which Japan has taken. Moreover, both Japan and China today are fighting with weapons, frightful and destructive weapons, which they have bought or copied from the so-called civilized nations of the West. And over and beyond China, Japan is always seeing Russia in Europe, Soviet Russia, a white people, threatening to obstruct Japan's march upon the continent of Asia because of Russia's great arm in Asia—Siberia.

2. We see a clash between two different national philosophies. Both Japan and China have been trying to build modern states. Japan has been building upon her old feudal organization and a social system in which the warrior and military leader stood at the top of the scale. The respect or worship offered to the Emperor as of divine origin and the sense of divine mission which possesses the people of Japan are driving forces behind the dream of empire. "The sword and the fan" describe two sides of Japanese civilization. There is art and love of beauty in Japan, but there is also a long military tradition which makes easy the growth of a military dictatorship today.

China, on the other hand, has been predominantly a nation of scholars and farmers. "Scholar, farmer, laborer, merchant,"—that was the social scale, with the soldier at the bottom. Since the overthrow of the Manchu Dynasty hordes of provincial soldiers and mercenaries of regional warlords have engaged in civil wars. But with establishment of the Nationalist Government at Nanking in 1927 and the emergence of General Chiang Kai-shek as outstanding military leader and statesman, order has come out of disorder and great progress toward unification was made by political as well as military means. Only within the past decade has China, a traditionally peaceful country, been driven by dangers from without to build up a real modern army. This was not yet ready to compete with Japan's highly equipped and trained forces when the war began in July of last year. A study of the history of the peoples and civilizations shows us why Japan prepared more quickly for war and for war in the western way. But the conflict between a peace-loving and a war-making people is not limited to Asia. The desirers of peace and the makers of war face each other all over the world.

3. The Sino-Japanese War has its economic factors, but it is not a struggle between "have" and "have-not." Japan and

China are both poor measured by western and especially American standards of living. In both countries the average farm holding is very small, only about three acres per household. China has a large population to feed just as Japan does and the density of population is about the same in the fertile areas of the two countries. China has larger undeveloped mineral resources. On the other hand Japan is an industrial giant compared with China. Japan has become an industrial nation dependent on imported raw materials. She has built up a great merchant marine. Since trade barriers were raised against her cheap goods in many western countries, she sought China's raw materials and markets. These she could have secured easily by a policy of respect for China's sovereignty and of friendship for the Chinese people.

It is a tragedy that she has chosen the way of armed force. A war to secure political control of China's economic resources will cost Japan far more than the purchase of raw materials would have cost her. And by war she is destroying the very market in China which she wanted to develop. By insisting on her special rights in Asia and by trying to limit or stop the trading of other countries she is losing the sympathy of the world in her continental adventure. From the experience of Formosa, Korea, and Manchuria, we know that Japan would not develop China for the benefit of the Chinese people, nor for the benefit of the people of Japan. Japan's colonization or rather exploitation enriches chiefly the few large industrial families who work hand-in-glove with the present military regime. China in the last decade has demonstrated that she has the leadership and the organization necessary for development of her own economic resources and for the building of a modern state. Both nations would profit by trade and economic cooperation based upon mutual respect.

But the war in Asia reflects the national economic dissatisfactions that are world-

wide. For Asia and for the world there must be a more radical and more daring attempt to solve the basic questions of international trade, raw materials, and distribution of markets. The question of colonies must be seriously faced. I believe that the day of colonies has passed. All peoples have the right of self-determination and the right to develop their own resources. On the other hand we must not starve nations which are dependent upon raw materials from abroad. Progress today in this difficult field of economic readjustment will require some far-seeing and unselfish statesmanship and a will to co-operate for the good of all mankind. This readjustment should take place through orderly processes of conference and diplomacy. Armed force and attempts at conquest in the twentieth century will only make the whole problem more difficult of permanent solution.

4. To say that the Far Eastern War is a struggle between fascism and communism is an over-simplification of the issues, but there is some truth in the statement. Japan has steadily moved in the direction of a totalitarian fascist-military state. She is linked together with the two other fascist nations, Italy and Germany. There are forces in Japan, however, not very articulate as yet, working against this tendency. Japan claims that she is fighting communism in China. To Japan anything anti-Japanese is communistic. It is true that the Chinese revolution of 1927 was influenced by communism. But it is also true that the Nationalist Government of China from 1928 to 1936 used both military and economic measures in an effort to drive the communist army and communist influence out of China. It is true that the communist armies in northwest China joined the nationalist armies early last year in a united front against further Japanese aggression, and that communist methods of guerilla warfare are being used effectively now against Japan. But it is also true that all classes in China, government leaders, sol-

diers, students and people are absolutely united in their determination to defend their country. It is *China* and all China today against the armies of Japan. China was trying to find a middle road between fascism and communism and to work out a form of government and program of national and social reconstruction suited to the needs of her people and in line with the genius of her history. China today is not communist. But if the war is prolonged for years and China can get help from no country except Russia there will be greater danger of China becoming communist in the Russian sense.

What China needs most now is to be assured of the support of the democracies of the world who realize that she has the possibility of becoming a great democracy. China has always had a large measure of village self-government, a rough form of local democracy. She is on the road to national democracy, not fascism or communism, if she can win her war of independence and be given encouragement and aid from other democracies in the world.

5. The struggle in Asia today is intensifying the conflict between the philosophies of isolationism, nationalism and internationalism in all countries, especially in democracies. The British Cabinet has split over the question of whether the fascist dictatorships should be appeased or not. In our country there are those who advocate extreme detachment, absolute neutrality, avoidance of any policy that might conceivably lead to war. Others defend collective action and co-operative efforts to re-establish the crumbling structure of international law and order. Our geographical isolation and the desire of the democracies to use peaceful methods encourage a tendency in America to say "hands off." Yet we cannot look with complacency upon the growth of great empires based upon military force and upon the increasing dangers of international lawlessness.

The alternatives are not, as I see them,

irresponsibility and inaction or war. Can we be utterly irresponsible and neutral when the League of Nations, the Nine Power Conference, the governments of the United States and Great Britain have all adjudged Japan the aggressor, when a great people like the Chinese are being so terribly wronged by a ruthless and relentless military invasion, and when great issues of national independence, democracy, and international order are at stake?

Space here does not permit a lengthy discussion of American policy or policies with regard to the war in Asia. Let me recommend that you secure and read an excellent little pamphlet just issued by the American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, New York City, "America and the Far Eastern War." As an American who has spent most of his life in the Far East, and as a Christian missionary, I believe that we must have a positive peace policy. A selfish peace policy that thinks only of the safety of America will not save us. We are bound up in the issues of war and peace throughout the world. We must do our part in helping to bring world peace. This means an earnest and persevering effort on the part of our government and people to promote necessary world economic adjustments by methods of peaceful change. I do not want to see America drawn into war. But I hope that America will exert moral and spiritual leadership in the world. And I hope that the people of America will unite with peace-loving people throughout the world in continuous protest against aggression anywhere and any time, by moral force and by economic non-co-operation with aggressor nations.

Whatever our government may or may not do, there are three things which the people of America can do to hasten a just peace in the Pacific. First, a people's boycott of Japanese goods will implement our moral protest against the policy of her military leaders, will weaken Japan's buying power abroad for war materials, and will

increase the economic strain and popular discontent within Japan and so make the position of the military dictatorship more precarious. Second, through the Red Cross and other agencies we can give to the relief of the millions in China who are suffering because of war and indirectly help the Chinese people to maintain their morale until victory is won. Third, we can continue to support and to strengthen missionary work in both Japan and China; a world-wide church and universal Christian fellowship will furnish those spiritual bonds between nations and peoples which, together with more material bonds, will some day bring about a true world community.

FRANK W. PRICE

## MAN'S DESTRUCTION OF HIS ENVIRONMENT

THE Germans say that he who knows the Fatherland best loves it best, that patriotism is based on knowledge. This is true only as circumstances permit. We speak of Mother Earth with affection because it nourishes us, and we love our native land for that reason; of we admire the beauty of the vales, the hills, and streams, and we love it for that reason. The sentiment of some toward their country is determined by the opportunities for sportsmanship and recreation that it offers. It thrills them to outwit the sly fox, the elusive trout, the wary turkey, the fleet deer and antelope. But it so happens that wherever the demands of biologic necessity have been solved properly, there is no complaint from the other two groups, because beauty and the essential wildlife of field, stream and forest are inevitable consequences.

Therefore it is obvious that the three groups cannot divorce their interests from each other and serve the demands of the

state, the nation, and future generations. The hunter, the husbandman, and the nature lover must become partners in a fundamental common cause—the preservation of man's necessary organic environment, the crowning glory of which is its wildlife. This involves many profound and complicated considerations. There is no form of life on the earth that is not linked intimately with all other forms, and no single form of it can be destroyed without important, if not disastrous, consequences.

Man could not exist on the earth if all bacteria were destroyed, any more than he could exist if all bird life were destroyed, or tree life.

The interdependence of the various types of life is universal, and the individual thrives best where there is the greatest variety. Whether the variety is large or small is contingent on the habitat, the character of which has come to be determined largely by the practices of man himself.

Man has always sought out those places where other life—or wildlife, if you please—was plentiful and varied. The presence of these things attracted him because he instinctively, and without effort, recognized that the companionship of other creatures was not only essential to his higher purposes, but here awaited him the greatest comfort and happiness. The longer he kept his wild friends about him, the longer he remained in that place.

We seldom stop to consider the matter of man's permanency on the earth, or in other words the length of his expected tenure. Will he ever become extinct? And if he does, for what reason? The trilobite, which dominated the seas for hundreds of millions of years, finally passed out of the picture, either because of some superior or insidious form that came into being and destroyed it, or because of some profound geologic, or cosmic change, which resulted in a new environment entirely unfit for its continued existence. This same thing is true of all forms of life that lived and became

A paper presented to students of the State Teachers College at Harrisonburg on March 4, 1938.