
VOICES FOR IMPERIALISM: JOSIAH STRONG AND THE PROTESTANT CLERGY

William H. Berge
Eastern Kentucky University

Expansion was not a new theme in the history of the United States, but by the last decade of the nineteenth century its character had changed considerably. Prior to this time there had been a strong belief that the United States had as its destiny the spreading of its people from Canada to Mexico. As great as was enthusiasm for expansion, there was never any serious feeling that Americans should spread the wings of "their glorious eagle" over other lands. This self-imposed restriction slowly relaxed as the years passed. Contemporaneous with this feeling of aloofness from world affairs and the complete absorption in domestic post-Civil War commercial and industrial expansion, there slowly evolved a feeling of world-destiny and "jingoism" which had as its basis a desire for the United States to assume its rightful place as a world power. The forces calling on the United States to assume this more vigorous role in world affairs made a spirited and vocal appearance in the nineties. In the vanguard of this movement were such men as James C. "Jingo Jim" Blaine and Henry Cabot Lodge, Senators from Maine and Massachusetts, respectively; Alfred Thayer Mahan; Theodore Roosevelt; John W. Burgess, a Columbia University political scientist; John Fiske, a historian; and the Social Gospel leader, Josiah Strong.

Why did this movement find a rather receptive and significant audience in the 1890's when just a few years earlier expansionistic schemes were received with indifference in the United States? While it is true, as the historian Julius Pratt said in 1936, that American imperialism did not clearly dominate the scene until "its surprising triumph in the ratification of the treaty with Spain in February, 1899,"¹ it cannot be denied that the voices raised for expansion were a significant force as early as 1890. Many influences probably helped to foster this change in attitude by the American public. It could well be that the newly implemented colonial activity of Germany and the pleas voiced by American missionaries for the government to protect them and support their work served as important catalysts. The desire to spread democracy (which by this time appeared to have proved its worth) coupled with an intense national pride and a "sense of the white man's burden" are further possibilities. In addition, it could have been the less altruistic impulses given by a "desire for economic gain" and sheer love of power.² All these explanations possess merit and have been suggested by competent observers.³ Another influence that cannot be overemphasized was the great popularity of low-priced periodicals that marked the 1890's; magazines such as *McClure's*, *Cosmopolitan*, and *Munsey's* gave enthusiastic support to such optimistic movements as "the fever for expansion" and the "progress of Manifest Destiny."⁴

All other reasons acknowledged, paramount among the causes for the change of attitude on the part of the American public was the rather thorough indoctrination brought about by the passionate appeals—both oral and written polemics—made by the advocates of expansion. According to Dexter Perkins, expansion found eloquent spokesmen in all fields.⁵ Josiah Strong could well be considered representative of the religious and sociological supporters of the movement.

The significance of this movement became apparent to Americans with the fall of Manila on August 13, 1898. The "Stars and Stripes" was now symbolic of a Pacific power, if not a world power. The acquisition of the Philippines provided the United States with territory that did not come under the purifying influence of the Teller Amendment.

In 1898 the following enlightened, if somewhat cynical, statement appeared in the *Nation*:

Nations trespass against nations without alleged warrant. Then come the apologists with abundant political and moral arguments for the deed: finally, theology takes a hand, and provides the acceptable sanction of religion. Thus, Imperialism, from gross aggression, becomes a high political expediency or moral duty.⁶

That this moral sanction did come from the lips and pens of clergymen is obvious in the following quotations from the June 1898 issue of *Homiletic Review*, a popular religious journal. The Reverend William S. Rainsford, Rector of St. George's Episcopal Church, New York, said, "This war has not been cunningly devised the strategists. America is being used to carry on the work of God in this war, which no politician could create, control, or gainsay."⁷ This sentiment was echoed by the pastor of the Walnut Street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, when he said the United States could have the "confidence of Divine approval."⁸

But the most eloquent statement was made by Wayland Hoyt, Pastor of Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City:

I do not believe that there ever was a war more righteous than that which we have undertaken, nor one closer to the law of the self-sacrificing Christ that we bear one another's burdens. If there ever was a war simply for the sake of humanity with no desire or purpose of national greed of any sort, it is the one that now is upon us, calling our soldiers and the navy to arms).⁹

While these men were sympathetic to the cause of expansion and eloquent in its defense, the most significant voice to be heard among the clergy was that of Theodore Roosevelt's friend, Josiah Strong. Strong's significance lies in his countless publications (which by 1900 included six of his eleven books, numerous articles and addresses, and his editorial activity with *The Kingdom* and *Social Service*), his extraordinary ability as a propagandist, and the position of importance which he commanded in the eyes of his contemporaries as the Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States.

One of the most important aspects of Strong's best known book, *Our Country*, was that he recognized the destiny of the United States on the North American continent. To this he added a doctrine of world mission, which he closely intertwined with a theory of race supremacy).¹⁰ Here was a voice with an audience, which could be of great service to the movement headed by Mahan and Roosevelt. Would they recognize his significance?

It was Theodore Roosevelt who brought Alfred Thayer Mahan and Strong together for the first time. In August 1900, Roosevelt gave Strong a letter of introduction to the naval officer. The importance of this introduction is reflected in Strong's statement of September 1900, from the preface of *Expansion: Under New-World Conditions*:

I desire also to acknowledge the courtesy of Captain A. T. Mahan, the eminent writer on naval subjects, who read several chapters of the book which traverse the field which he is acknowledged to be the highest authority, and who was so good as to give me the benefit of his valuable criticism).¹¹

Thus, there had been some consultation among these three men concerning Strong's book, which was to be one of the most eloquent moral sanctions and practical explanations of American expansion into the area of the Pacific at the turn of the century.

The spark which set off the flame of imperialism appeared in the form of the Spanish-American War. Obviously, this war could not appear to be a war for national aggrandizement, or the forces favoring expansion would suffer an irrevocable setback. "Have we a course of war so clear," asked the *Nation*, "so loftily imperative that all the hideousness of carnage and the fearful blow to civic progress must be hazarded in order to vindicate humanity and righteousness?"¹² The affirmative answers of Strong and other clergymen mirrored a distaste for the "wretched" treatment the Cubans suffered at the hands of Spain.¹³

Strong said that God was everywhere at war with greed and selfishness. Christian people should combat selfishness in nations as well as in individuals, and force should be used if necessary. The motive behind the use of force was the criterion with which to judge the action.¹⁴ There was little doubt in the minds of the pro-war clergymen; the war against "Spanish tyranny" was a judicious use of force. The religious sanction for the war with Spain, which came from the Protestant clergy, was in part the result of intense anti-Catholic feeling. In 1898 Strong could see a challenge and duty for American missionaries in "Cuba and Porto [*sic*] Rico" since a "corrupt Christianity" had left them "practically religiousless."¹⁵ This feeling remained with Strong. In *Our World: The New World Religion*, his final book, Strong stated that many undesirable characteristics of the "so-called Latin races . . . are due to . . . religious training."¹⁶

In addition to the moral sanction for participation in world affairs and for imperialism, the advocates of expansion advanced practical arguments in support of their program—lack of available contiguous land, commercial advantages, and the protection of Americans abroad. Strong maintained that the exhaustion of unsettled arable lands in the temperate zones was a major cause for the shift of attention to the tropics. The time is likely to come, he said, when the greatest hues of commerce "will run between the North and the South, the temperate regions and the tropics."¹⁷ There were many adherents to Strong's belief that "Whether or not the constitution follows the flag, opportunity does."¹⁸

The author of *Our Country* felt that there was need for a large construction of what was to be the function of government in the protection of American Citizens and their property abroad. He called upon the United States to maintain order in Latin America, if need be, and to protect our citizens the world over. "Why should an American missionary," asked Strong, "be a man without a country?" Underdeveloped countries could no longer be allowed to spread disease and disorder throughout the world. He asked that these people be "controlled by enlightened nations both for their own sake and for the sake of the world"¹⁹

The final appeal expressed, from what appeared to be a practical and rational Point of view, was a call for the recognition of imperialism as the climax of a continuing movement. Strong felt that the United States had been destined to be the great imperial power. Had not the idea of "empire" been traveling westward for centuries?²⁰ Another explanation flavored with Darwinism was presented in the October 1900 *Westminster Review*, where the author held that the imperial tendencies of any country were but one step in a process that has been in action since the first social organization.²¹

It should be remembered, however, that the motivating force and ideological basis for Strong's support of

expansion did not lie in a desire to make the United States politically and commercially powerful. It went much deeper than this. Strong was motivated by an intense sense of mission and divine destiny. The ideology of this mission and destiny was a combination of racism, religion, and nationalism.

The first tenet of Strong's argument was an expression of belief in the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race. Strong recognized that the term "Anglo-Saxon" was a misnomer but he continued to use it for want of a better term. As did many others, Strong used "Anglo-Saxon" to designate English-speaking peoples.²² The Anglo-Saxon, according to Strong, was the great race of history. They were! the most vigorous and vital of all peoples, and their ability to adapt themselves to adverse conditions was an innate trait which permitted them to stand apart. While discussing the qualities of inventiveness, diligence, and respect for law, Strong exclaimed: "It is those qualities, slowly acquired through long ages of struggle, and *born in* Anglo-Saxons today, rather than the lands. the riches, the industrial, social and political institutions *into which they are born*, that make Anglo-Saxons free and mighty."²³ He discovered in Anglo-Saxons an overwhelming superiority over the peoples in tropical areas. "Among races, as among individuals of the same race," Strong proclaimed. "there will be permanent differences of temperament and tendency, of adaption and skill."²⁴

One factor which would make the Anglo-Saxons forever invincible, Strong believed, was their ability to expand. They could maintain their dominance easily because they were growing rapidly in numbers, and they possessed enough territory to support a much larger population.²⁵ In 1899 there was a general feeling that Anglo-Saxons were superior to the "doomed" Latins.²⁶ Major political figures such as Joseph Chamberlain, the British statesman, and Chauncey Depew. The American lawyer and politician, praised the Spanish-American War as the blessing that united the two leading families of the Anglo-Saxon race, England and the United States.²⁷ But the main strength of the race., according to Strong, was to be found in two principles which he associated closely with Anglo-Saxons. Every great race has been the promulgator of at least one "great idea." he said. but the Anglo-Saxons were doubly blessed. The English-speaking people were the torch bearers for civil liberty and "a pure spiritual Christianity."²⁸

It was the influence of this unique religion which, in Strong's view at least, gave the Anglo-Saxon some compulsion for expansion. "The essence of Christianity is love," he exclaimed, "and love always gives. It can never be satisfied so long as there is anyone who has not received. By its very nature, therefore, Christianity is expansive. It will have no banks, it must flood the world as the waters cover the sea."²⁹ It was this evangelistic aspect of Christianity which made every Christian, regardless of his status, a missionary. The Anglo-Saxons, with their vigorous nature and "pure" Christianity, appeared to be the people who must assume the burden of world evangelism. Strong's devotion to "civic liberty" and "spiritual Christianity," and the significance he attributed to these ideas. are reflected in this passage from *Our Country*:

Without controversy, these are the forces which, in the past, have contributed most to the elevation of the human race, and they must continue to be, in the future, the most efficient ministers to its progress, It follows then that the Anglo-Saxon, as the great representative of these two ideas, the depository of these two great blessings sustains peculiar relations to the world's future, is divinely commissioned to be, in a peculiar sense, his brother's keeper.³⁰

With his theory of racial superiority, Strong mixed a liberal portion of nationalism. The compound resulting from the ensuing reaction was an "elite" group within this superior race. "Our national genius is Anglo-Saxon," he wrote, "but not English, its distinctive type is the result of a finer nervous organization, which is certainly being developed in this country."³¹ Thus he was expressing his convictions when he said, "to be a Christian and an

Anglo-Saxon and an American in this generation is to stand at the very mountain top of privilege."³² What conditions prevailed which made Strong confident that the United States would be the "home" of the Anglo-Saxons? Strong listed seven physical attributes that contributed to North America's superiority:

- (1) Seven-elevenths of Anglo-Saxon territory is in North America
- (2) All of this territory is contiguous
- (3) There is room to expand
- (4) There are abundant resources
- (5) North America is blessed with an invigorating climate
- (6) It has a splendid location (North America lies on the trade routes between the East and the West.)
- (7) The United States already holds the lead in population and wealth among the Anglo-Saxons.³³

"North America, the future home of this race, is twice as large as all Europe, and," Strong claimed, "is capable of sustaining the present population of the globe."³⁴

In addition to the physical advantages found in North America, Strong listed six features found in Anglo-Saxons which promoted the cause of supremacy:

- (1) the love of civil liberty
- (2) the prevalence of spiritual Christianity
- (3) a great money making power (England was the richest country of Europe, Strong asserted, but the United States was even more wealthy than England.)
- (4) a genius for colonizing
- (5) a persistent energy among its people
- (6) the elasticity of American social institutions (The opportunity for vertical mobility in American society was stimulating.)³⁵

In 1891 Strong advanced, as proof of American superiority, the fact that inventors from the United States were accorded more honors and prizes than were inventors from other countries. He strengthened his claim substantially when he demonstrated, with official government statistics, that Americans had achieved a higher level of physical development than other peoples.³⁶ This, combined with the superior intellectual power which he attributed to Anglo-Saxons, left Americans as a people unique in history.³⁷ An additional attribute which made Anglo-Saxons in the United States superior to those in the British Isles is (in the tone of Darwin's theory of Natural selection) the race's "highly mixed origin." He said that mixed races such as the Greeks, Romans, Egyptians, and Anglo-Saxons had always been superior to pure races. This claim does not, however, remove him from the "racist" class; he qualified his stand somewhat by adding that the "new blood" brought into the United States would largely be the same elements which make up the Anglo-Saxon mixture and, therefore, the general type would be preserved.³⁸

Strong was outspoken in his demand for stringent governmental regulation of immigration. Obviously, he was quite content to see population flow from "acceptable areas" such as Northwest Europe, but the observation that late nineteenth-century immigration was coming from other quarters concerned him. He recognized American attractiveness, improved travel facilities, and "Old World" purges as being the greatest inducements for emigration to the United States. Thus, he lamented the fact that his country was getting the potentially dangerous malcontents of Europe. The "typical immigrant is a European peasant," he said in 1891, "whose horizon has been narrow,

whose moral and religious training has been meager or false [i.e., Catholic], and whose ideas of life are low." Many of these people, he added, "belong to the pauper and criminal class."³⁹ The principal basis for Strong's anti-immigration feeling was fear of Rome. That lie considered Catholicism to be a serious obstacle in the path of American and Anglo-Saxon greatness is reflected in this passage from *Our Country*:

The growing spirit of charity which thinketh no evil, is slow to recognize the fact that most Roman Catholics are Catholics first and citizens afterward. The fact remains, however, and makes it possible to throw the Roman Catholic Church into a single political scale. Those who do not believe that the priesthood has both the power and the disposition to cast a substantially solid Catholic vote, simply do not know what some others do know.⁴⁰

He punctuated his claim by stating that it was the Catholic vote which kept Tammany Hall in power.

Strong thus believed that the uniqueness and strength of the "race" could be preserved only if the federal government took steps to exclude from the United States political "amoebae," whose votes could be molded at will by a religious hierarchy. In contrast, he welcomed, and would have even condoned the soliciting of, immigration by "invertebrates" who had been nurtured on a pure and spiritual religion. Ostensibly, the only basis for his anti-Catholic feeling was his belief that their dictated vote would be a serious infringement upon the American democratic process.⁴¹

Upon establishing the Anglo-Saxon, and especially the Americans, in a place of honor, Strong demanded that they fulfill the mission they had as the greatest representatives of the pure spiritual Christianity. Surely this nation had to spread not only its religion, but also its material blessings, throughout the world.⁴² Even more significant than Strong's recognition of the mission of this race, found in its purest and most vital form in the United States, was his belief that the Anglo-Saxon's destiny had guidance from God. In the evolutionary process which Strong saw as forming the Anglo-Saxon into the mightiest race of all time, there was evidence of the divine hand. To Strong, evolution must have been God's most glorious method of making His presence known. The fact that the United States had the greatest deposits of minerals and was blessed with other natural resources was no accident, Strong thought. "When storing away the fuel of the ages," he said, "God knew the place and work to which he had appointed us. . . ."⁴³ That God's influence was apparent to Strong in 1900 is revealed in a passage from *Expansion*:

As there are forces at work in human affairs which are mightier than human power, so there is an intelligence higher than human knowledge, which is guiding human destinies. The fact that the Anglo-Saxons laid hold of what proved to be the best portions of the earth-lands which commanded the commerce, the population, and the power of the world's future, and lands which are defended from invasion by nature-was not due to the foresight of any man or of any number of men.⁴⁴

If God has had any interest in human affairs, it will have been in "progress and in civil and religious liberty."⁴⁵

Strong insisted that God's work was evident in places other than the United States. "God has two hands. Not only is He preparing in our civilization the die with which to stamp nations," declared Strong, "he is preparing mankind to receive our impress."⁴⁶ God's destiny for this race of the greatest numbers is best summarized in Strong's words:

It seems to me that God, with infinite wisdom and skill, is training the Anglo-Saxon race for an hour sure to come in the world's future. Heretofore there has always been in the history of the world

a comparatively unoccupied land westward, into which the crowded countries of the East have poured their surplus populations. But the widening waves of migration which millenniums ago rolled east and west from the valley of the Euphrates, meet today on our Pacific coast. There are no more new worlds. The unoccupied arable lands of the earth are limited, and will soon be taken. The time is coming when the pressure of population on the means of subsistence will be felt here as it is now felt in Europe and Asia. Then will the world enter upon a new stage of its history-the *final competition of racer, for which the Anglo-Saxon is being schooled*.⁴⁷

Is there any doubt that a man with these convictions could, in all sincerity, condone and sanction a war such as the one with Spain? With this frame of reference Strong's declaration concerning the use of force in Cuba is understandable:

The forging of nations is a long process. Often the fires which bring the great mass to the right temperature are slow, and the changes which take place are obscure. Then suddenly on God's great anvil of war are struck the mighty blows which shape the nation to higher uses.⁴⁸

The finest possible example demonstrating Strong's theories at work in a polemical defense of expansion is found in the arguments he and his friends used to sanction the action of the United States in connection with the Philippines. In examining the effect of the war with Spain, Strong beheld "new possibilities" open to Americans at the turn of the century.⁴⁹ These "new possibilities" were largely the same commercial advantages becoming apparent to American businessmen. Strong reminded his readers of the proximity of the Philippines and China, the great potential market of the world with her four hundred million mouths to feed and a like number of backs to clothe. Continuing his appeal for annexation of the Islands, Strong termed the Pacific Ocean the "New Mediterranean." This ocean, he explained, will command the same position, as center of the world's commerce, that the Mediterranean held before the discovery of the New World.⁵⁰

Strong demanded that Anglo-Saxons acknowledge their obligations and opportunities by assuming leadership in this strategic area. If, he asked, we placed in the Pacific an adequate navy, with sufficient bases, what could prevent it from becoming an Anglo-Saxon sea?⁵¹ Strong maintained that one means of insuring Anglo-Saxon dominance in the Pacific would be for the United States to fulfill of Theodore Roosevelt's fondest dreams by building a canal across Central America. Strong's eagerness to support his friend is reflected in the book *Expansion*. In a section devoted to a series of pro-canal arguments -geographic commercial and political-Strong said:

The cutting of the Isthmian Canal will be the last geographical event of the first magnitude. There are no more isthmuses the severing of which would shift the commerce of the world. The Suez Canal gave England an immense advantage. The Nicaragua Canal will transfer the advantage to the United States, with the certainty that it cannot again be shifted by any geographical cause. The commercial supremacy of the Pacific will be final.⁵²

In the case of the Philippines, moral arguments were offered in behalf of annexation. It is our duty, urged Strong, to keep the Philippines, if for no other reason in that these people are not capable of home rule. If the United States left, anarchy would follow or, even worse, they would fall into the hands of a foreign power. Recognizing that there were both practical and moral sanctions for support of annexation, Strong concluded: "As I see it, duty and polity unite in lung us to retain them."⁵³ What could be more convincing than this? The Philippine problem was bound to Strong's doctrine of racial superiority. He could see but one race posing a threat to the Anglo-Saxon: the

"Slav." The most vital Slavic people were the Russians, whose geographical proximity to China and the Philippines made them ominous indeed. "Is the Anglo-Saxon or the Slav," questioned Strong, "to command the Pacific and therefore the world's future?"⁵⁴ Strong prophesied that the twentieth century would see Russia and the United States facing each other across the Pacific.

By comparing and contrasting the two races, Strong demonstrated the reasons for his claim that these two peoples would stand above all others and compete for world supremacy. The resemblances of the two "races" were listed in *Expansion*:

- (1) They are equal in numbers.
- (2) Both are growing rapidly.
- (3) Both races have remarkable powers of assimilation, and they are the only races that have this power.
- (4) Each race has a genius for organization and government-and they are the only races of which this can be said.
- (5) Each race is in possession of a vast territory.⁵⁵

At this point there would seem to be no advantage on one side or the other. The seminal ideas which drive these two groups mirror a decisive difference. The Slavic people, Strong contended, represent absolutism, in both religion and politics, while the Anglo-Saxons are the representatives of religious and civil liberty).⁵⁶ There could be no doubt in Strong's mind that the "final death-struggle between absolutism and liberty" would have "the Slav on one side and the Anglo-Saxon on the other."⁵⁷ With this in mind, Strong made a plea for the United States to retain the insular possessions she controlled after the Spanish-American War. They were needed to assist Anglo-Saxons in obtaining control of the Pacific so that they could do God's work in this vital area. Strong asserted his belief that the United States needed these islands because "Russia's influence in Korea" was growing.⁵⁸

By 1901 expansion had become a reality. The champions of imperialism had won their battle. What had been the influences which had elicited their aid in this battle? Mahan's motive could well have been "national power for its own sake." The love of adventure and the highest type of patriotism prompted Roosevelt to carry the banner of imperialism. Perhaps Strong's most valuable attribute was his evangelical fervor. He preached a gospel proclaiming a new age in world politics.; the laws of "Love" and "Service" are as binding upon nations as upon individuals. The United States has been selected by God to demonstrate this to the world. To carry out its "divine mission" the "home of the Anglo-Saxons" must be a world power. The United States, Strong pleaded, must educate, by example, all peoples to this new world-view. Regardless of the reaction of other nations, the United States must treat all countries in a manner revealing the Christian ethic.⁵⁹ Permeated with this altruistic spirit, Strong begged the United States to accept her responsibilities "in behalf of Christian civilization."⁶⁰ "My plea is not," said Strong, "save America for America's sake, but, save America for the world's sake."⁶¹

Expansionists such as Roosevelt and Mahan were as able as Strong in their presentation of moral sanctions, but they realized that justification was more palatable if it had its genesis in the pulpit. and Strong's following was large. In addition to helping bring about a change in America's outlook as to her place in world affairs, these optimistic exponents of expansion added another rung to the ladder which led to "missionary diplomacy."⁶² Americans are careful to have just moral cause for their actions in world politics, and the "expansionists of 1898" were a scintillating example of this fact. Real or imagined, moral justification was provided when needed. In their obsession with moral sanctions, Strong and his contemporaries surely "walked in the shadow of John Calvin."⁶³

NOTES

1. *Expansionists of 1898: The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Islands* (The Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History, 1936: New York: Peter Smith, 1951), p. vii.
2. Howard K. Beale, *Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power* (The Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History, 1953: Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1956), p. ix.
3. See Willard Thorp, Merle Curti, and Carlos Baker (eds.). *American Issues*, Vol. 1: *The Social Record* (Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1941), p.893; Carl Schurz., "Armed or Unarmed Peace?" *Harper's Weekly*, 41 (June 19, 1897), p. 603; and Henry Steele Commager, *The American Mind: An Interpretation of American Thought and Character since the 1880's* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), p. 47.
4. Frank Luther Mott, "The Magazine Revolution and Popular Ideas in the Nineties," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, 44 (April 21,1954), 195-203.
5. *Hands Off: A History of the Monroe Doctrine* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1941), p. 230.
6. *Nation*, 66 (June 16, 1898), 454.
7. "The National Obligation," *Homiletic Review*, 35 (June 1898), 518.
8. Stephen W. Dana. "Our Business," *Ibid.*, p. 520.
9. "A Righteous War." *Ibid.*, p. 518.
10. Josiah Strong. *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (rev. ed.; New York: Baker and Taylor Company, 1891), pp. 29-43. Hereinafter cited as *Our Country*.
11. Strong, *Expansion: Under New-World Conditions* (New York: Baker and Taylor Company, 1900), p. 10. Hereinafter cited as *Expansion*.
12. *Nation*, 66 (March 24, 1899), 218. The same article reported that military men (Admiral William F. Sicard and General Nelson S. Miles) and the Navy Department had expressed opinions that we were ready for war.
13. Especially odious to Americans were the atrocities committed by General Valeriano Weyler. Thomas A. Bailey, *A Diplomatic History of the American People* (3rd ed.; New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts. Inc.,1946), pp. 495-99.
14. Strong, "The Preacher in Relation to the New Expansion," *Homiletic Review*, 42 (March 1898), 493.
15. *Ibid.*, p.488.

16. Strong, *Our World: The New World Religion* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1915), p. 203. Hereinafter cited as *New World Religion*.
17. *Expansion*, pp. 21-29, 34, 42, 43.
18. Strong, *Homiletic Review*, 42 (March 1898), 488. Earlier Strong said that "commerce follows the missionary" (*Our Country*, p. 28).
19. *Expansion*, pp. 245-46, 249.
20. *Our Country*, p. 215.
21. Ernest D. Bell, "The Mission of Empire," *Westminster Review*, 154 (October, 1900), 446-50. For an excellent denial of the argument which sanctions imperialism as a step in the process of evolution, see J. C. Giffin, "Evolution vs. Imperialism," *Arena*, 23 (February 1900), 141-48.
22. *Expansion*, pp. 38, 187.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 38, 19, 76.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
25. *Our Country*, pp. 210-11.
26. *Nation*, 69 (December 28, 1899), 481-82.
27. *Homiletic Review*, 36 (July 1898), 47.
28. Spiritual Christianity, according to Strong, was necessarily Protestantism. Much of his anti-immigration sentiment was caused by fear of what the Catholic immigrants from southern and eastern Europe would do in the way of corrupting our "brand" of Christianity. In addition, he felt that our civil liberty would be in jeopardy. Strong did not trust, at the polls, any member of a church which was controlled by a hierarchy.
29. Strong, *Homiletic Review*, 42 (March 1898), 488-94.
30. *Our Country*, p. 210.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 216-17.
32. Strong, *The New Era* (New York: Baker and Taylor Company, 1893), p. 354. Hereinafter cited as *New Era*.
33. *Our Country*, p. 214.

34. *New Era*, p.75.
35. *Our Country*, pp. 220-21.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 26-27,218.
37. *New Era*, pp. 54-67.
38. *Our Country*, pp. 2 19-20.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 45, 56.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 96.
41. He remained consistent in his abhorrence of religions with a hierarchy. Mormons were no less exempt from his attacks than were Catholics. "I do not mean to imply that there are no waste lands in Utah," Strong said. "Portions of the territory are as worthless as some of its people." *Ibid.*, p. 32.
42. *Ibid.*, pp. 222-23.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
44. *Expansion*, p. 209.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 208.
46. *Our County*, p. 225.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 222.
48. *Expansion*, pp. 18-19.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
50. *Ibid.*, pp. 132-33, 163.
51. *Ibid.*, pp. 185, 204, 205.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 164; see also, pp. 135-62.
53. *Ibid.*, p.201.
54. *Ibid.*, pp. 186, 194.

55. *Ibid.*, pp. 187-89.
56. *Ibid.*, pp. 190-91.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 203.
58. *Ibid.*, pp. 195, 201-203, 287-92.
59. *Ibid.*, pp. 257-64, 272; Strong, *Homiletic Review*, 42 (March 1898), 489-91; and *New World Religion*, pp. 191, 194.
60. *Expansion*, p. 302.
61. *New Era*, p. 80.
62. The term "missionary diplomacy" appears in Arthur S. Link, *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era, 1910-1917*, in *The New American Nation Series*, eds. H. S. Commager and Richard B. Morris (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1954), pp. 81-82. Professor Link uses the term in the same manner as it is used here. That is, it has to do with diplomacy, carried out by moralists with an acute awareness of America's mission, which has as its genesis a concern for the welfare of other nations.
63. Ralph H. Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought* (2nd ed.; New York: Ronald Press Company, 1956), p. 385.

Copyright © 1973, 2000, Middle Tennessee State University.
Border States On-Line is hosted by [Georgetown College](#).
This page was last updated on 3/30/00. | [Border States On-Line](#) | [Site Map](#)

This web page is maintained by
Dr. Harold D. Tallant, Department of History, Georgetown College
400 East College Street, Georgetown, KY 40324, (502) 863-8075
E-mail: htallant@georgetowncollege.edu