OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO.				
ED 032 332				
CH ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE	
TE 499 930	24	65	RIEJAN70	

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☐ II ☒ III ☐

AUTHOR
Buffinton, Thomas F.

TITLE
Imperialism and the Dilemma of Power. Teacher and Student Manuals.

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
MGG02700	
SP. AG. CODE	SPONSORING AGENCY
RMQ66004	

EDRS PRICE	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO.
0.25	OEC-5-10-158	
REPORT NO.		BUREAU NO.
CRP-H-168		BR-5-1071

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
56p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Imperialism; *Social Studies; *Curriculum Guides; *United States History; *Foreign Policy; Industrialization; Developing Nations; Colonialism; Socioeconomic Influences; Secondary Education; Political Issues; European History; Political Attitudes; Economic Factors; Nationalism; Political Power; Political Influences; Foreign Relations

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT
Exploring the dilemma and responsibilities of power, this social studies unit begins with an article by a Chinese Communist who attacks America as aggressively imperialistic and ends with an article by an Englishman who lauds American imperialism. Sections of the unit discuss (1) the nature of imperialism, (2) the substance of European imperialism, as well as the political pressures and ideologies, at the end of the 19th century, (3) the imperialistic course taken in the early 20th century by the United States in the Philippines and the Caribbean, and (4) the burden of responsibility today in such places as the Dominican Republic and Vietnam. Excerpts from "The Congressional Record" and from messages by Woodrow Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, and Cordell Hull are included as well as charts which compare the economic growth of the world's empires at the turn of the 19th century and which indicate significant events in recent United States History. /Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document./ (Author/JB)

GPO 870-390

EXPERIMENTAL MATERIAL
SUBJECT TO REVISION
PUBLIC DOMAIN EDITION

TEACHER'S MANUAL

IMPERIALISM AND THE DILEMMA OF POWER

Thomas F. Buffinton
Tabor Academy
Marion, Massachusetts

This material has been produced
by the
Committee on the Study of History, Amherst, Massachusetts
under contract with the U. S. Office of Education
as Cooperative Research Project #H-168.

NOTE TO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN EDITION

This unit was prepared by the Committee on the Study of History, Amherst College, under contract with the United States Office of Education. It is one of a number of units prepared by the Amherst Project, and was designed to be used either in series with other units from the Project or independently, in conjunction with other materials. While the units were geared initially for college-preparatory students at the high school level, experiments with them by the Amherst Project suggest the adaptability of many of them, either wholly or in part, for a considerable range of age and ability levels, as well as in a number of different kinds of courses.

The units have been used experimentally in selected schools throughout the country, in a wide range of teaching/learning situations. The results of those experiments will be incorporated in the Final Report of the Project on Cooperative Research grant H-168, which will be distributed through ERIC.

Except in one respect, the unit reproduced here is the same as the experimental unit prepared and tried out by the Project. The single exception is the removal of excerpted articles which originally appeared elsewhere and are under copyright. While the Project received special permission from authors and publishers to use these materials in its experimental edition, the original copyright remains in force, and the Project cannot put such materials in the public domain. They have been replaced in the present edition by bracketed summaries, and full bibliographical references have been included in order that the reader may find the material in the original.

This unit was initially prepared in the summer of 1965

INTRODUCTION

In essence the question presented in this unit is: is the United States an imperial power? No thoughtful person would wish to stand on the street corner and say "yes" too loudly, for such a statement rubs against the American grain, and does damage to our idealized picture of ourselves. Yet what is the alternative? Are we really prepared to bring home the troops, close down the missile bases, scrap NATO and SEATO, and turn the U.N. over to the tourists and the pigeons--and the communists? Thus we are hung on the horns of a dilemma, as we do not, I think, really want to face up to the implications inherent in either alternative.

The aim of the unit is to present the student with some of the ramifications of the problem. At first he may well view imperialism as a simple question of morality: is imperialism good or bad? But the problem rapidly becomes more complex. If it is assumed that imperialism is a concomitant of power, does it follow that imperialism can be good or bad depending on the use to which that power is put? In other words, does the question become one of motives? Were Stalin's tanks in Hungary bad because his motives were bad, but our tanks in Santo Domingo were good because our motives were good? And what about the less powerful nations in the world? Would they be better off if the great powers left them alone? What is it like to stand relatively defenseless and alone in Viet Nam and in Korea, in the Middle East and in West Berlin between great forces over which you have no control?

It would seem that no matter from what direction one approaches the problem of imperialism, the end product is always a question, never an answer. Thus the more deeply the student applies himself to the study of imperialism, the more deeply will he find himself impaled on the horns of the basic dilemma. He will discover that while there may be day to day answers to situations of the moment, these answers are at best only tentative, never final. If, then, the thoughtful student is made unhappy by his investigation, he will come by his unhappiness honestly, for this is not a happy problem. But at the same time he may acquire a greater understanding of the position in which the United States finds itself during this second half of the twentieth century.

This teacher's manual contains mere suggestions for classroom procedures and questions for discussion. Before getting fully launched into the unit, it might be well to consider having the students spend five minutes at the beginning of every period discussing the crisis of the moment, be it Viet Nam or problems in the Caribbean. Sooner or later that discussion will compliment the ideas presented in the unit.

Let it be said again, at this point, that the teacher's role

is to let the student discover the facts, the questions, the ideas and the echoes of ideas. It was C. B. Shaw who said that the teacher was a fellow traveller who pointed out the way ahead only because he had travelled that way before. The act of discovery has been endemic in American history and should be encouraged in the study of that history.

SECTION I

IS AMERICA AN IMPERIALISTIC POWER?

Section I is designed to have the student take a position on the question: is America an imperialistic power? The article by Yu Chao-li was chosen because it is by a Communist and should irritate the student into a negative response. Later he may well find himself struggling to hold his ground. The section was purposely kept short to allow time for a brief student essay on the key question. The point must be clear, however, that the question is not "will we win?" or "are we reactionaries?" or "are we paper tigers?"

Discussion in class could note the following points:

1. Yu Chao-li's use of Marxist "laws": What is the nature of such a law? Does it produce inevitability?

2. Yu Chao-li's use of half-truths: the United States is militaristic because we have 250 bases around the world.

3. The inclusion of some truths and worthwhile thoughts: it is true that the worse we look the better off they are.

4. Yu Chao-li's comment on the atomic bomb: Wars are won by people. What meaning does this statement have for us. What can we do about winning the struggle in South East Asia.

Eventually the discussion should come around to the meaning of the word "imperialism" which leads directly to Section II.

SECTION II

WHAT IS IMPERIALISM?

This section will introduce the student to the problem of

defining "imperialism." He should note that definitions change and that, therefore, the position he has taken on this subject may also be subject to change. He should note that a definition is affected by the time and the circumstances under which it was written, and he should wonder if his own position is influenced in this way. Is Yu Chao-li's position also influenced in the same manner?

Provided, of course, that you have a broad-minded school board or board of trustees, you might liven the discussion by taking Yu's side of the question. Using the latest crisis in the news, are we supporting "reactionaries" there? If you were a citizen of the place, would not the United States appear militaristic? Does possession of the atomic bomb do us any good there? Yu says he wants peace. We say we want peace. Who started the war?

There should be a number of unanswered questions lying around at the conclusion of this discussion. The students should be encouraged to examine these questions using the historian's approach.

SECTION III

EUROPEAN IMPERIALISM

Too often text books treat United States history as though the North American continent continued to be as isolated from Europe as it was in the days of Columbus. To do this with the topic of imperialism is to distort it beyond understanding. American imperialism at the turn of the century was part of a great Western expansion growing from a soil enriched by a burgeoning industrial capitalism and by intensifying nationalism, a soil made increasingly fertile by a strange assortment of ambitious statesmen, Christian missionaries, and irresponsible adventurers all imbued with the prevailing Darwinian theory that survival is to the fit, that only the brave deserve the fair.

Section III presents the students with this western phenomenon and some of the forces which impelled it: economic forces, nationalistic forces, a sense of mission, and a belief in the value of conflict and struggle. He will see that the imperialism which developed at the turn of the century is not altogether analogous to the situation he witnesses today. Should he at this time draw the conclusion that the American product is somehow better than the European variety, let him do so. Later, as he moves on to subsequent sections of the unit he may find himself wanting to reconsider.

Part A of Section III is devoted to a traditional economic interpretation of imperialism. A word needs to be said about the countries and the dates selected for inclusion in the charts. Except for Portugal, the nations listed are those most actively engaged in imperial expansion up to World War I. In a sense, Portugal acts as a control factor, not being one of the great industrial nations yet retaining colonial possessions left over from the older colonialism. The dates have varying significance. 1877 is the point when a distaste for the old colonialism begins to be over-powered by the interest in a "New Imperialism." 1884 is the year in which Bismarck gave in to the German advocates of expansionism and one year before Italy embarked on her imperial adventures in Africa. 1890 reflects the progress of the new expansion. 1900 marks our own entry into the lists along with Russia. 1910 brought Japanese involvement. The student may jump to conclusions here, but it is not illogical to say that the figures reflect not the cause but the result of imperialism which may well have sprung from other causes. The door should be kept open for all ideas.

Lenin's economic determinism in Part A is balanced in Part B by Rhodes's racism and unquenchable desire for the expansion of power, by Stanley's sense of mission, by Ferry's nationalism, and by Chamberlain's amalgam of all these factors. On the subject of the survival of the fittest Darwin is not particularly quotable, yet he and the Darwinians had an enormous impact on the intellectual climate of the times as is evidenced by the three highly Darwinistic statements on war which are also included in Part B. You may wish to assign or bring to class some secondary sources to help the students understand the great effect of Darwin's theory when translated into sociological and political terms.

One further comment may be helpful. Ideas are communicable. Men separated by thousands of miles and by many decades not only express the same ideas but express them in very nearly the same words. As the student moves on to subsequent sections he will hear echoes of the materials in this section. For example Ferry and Mahan both talk about cooling stations; and much of Beveridge sounds like Chamberlain, as does Lyndon Johnson.

SECTION IV

AMERICA FACES IMPERIALISM

Section IV gets to the heart of the question as to whether or not the United States is today an imperialistic power. Once again we begin with the historical approach. In Part A the

student is presented with selections representative of the climate of opinion prevailing at the turn of the century. After reading this section the student may discover that the differences he thought he could detect between the European and American brands of imperialism do not exist in fact.

From the beginning the American attitude toward imperialism has been an ambivalent one. Beveridge and Bryan in Part B typify the contradiction. One argues that since we are the superior race and have the power, we also have a divine mission and imperial destiny. The spokesman for the opposite viewpoint counters that to use our power to enslave others if to repudiate the ideals set forth in the Declaration of Independence and that it should be the destiny of the United States to free men rather than to enslave them.

At this point the student should be encouraged to commit himself as to the role the United States should have played. He may find it relatively easy to commit himself at this point. He will find later that judgment is more difficult as he moves on to modern questions in which he may feel a greater sense of involvement.

The ambivalence of the prevailing attitudes toward imperialism is illustrated in the course of our relations with our Caribbean neighbors. Theodore Roosevelt becomes a case in point as he discusses the value of arbitration and then declines to use arbitration in handling the crisis in the Dominican Republic. Was President Roosevelt blind to the paradox or was there, as far as he was concerned, no paradox at all because he had two sets of rules: one for a situation where power clashed with power and another for a situation where power operated in a vacuum?

With Wilson the ambivalence is clear. Proclaiming a policy based on respect for national integrity and on the equality of nations, he proceeds to act in quite a different vein in his dealings with Mexico, Haiti and the Dominican Republic. (See Appendix) Why?

The New Deal "Good Neighbor Policy" comes out looking very well indeed. This did not necessarily mean, however, that we had escaped the ambivalence of the past. It may mean only that during the period there were no problems calling for drastic action and that the depression had given the nations of the hemisphere a common concern.

President Johnson's handling of the situation in the Dominican Republic in 1965 would seem more in keeping with the philosophy of Teddy Roosevelt than of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Despite the rhetoric and resolutions from Bryan to Hull, have we now espoused an imperialistic policy? Does our response to the present day crisis in Viet Nam or Santo Domingo make us an imperialistic nation? Or have conditions changed so drastically as to render obsolete definitions and policies formulated in earlier eras?

SECTION V

THE NEW IMPERIALISM: WHOSE BURDEN?

The last section presents the advice of two Englishmen: Kipling who urged us in 1899 to accept our mission, and Fairles who, sixty-six years later, urges us to wear the purple proudly. Recognition of the fact that we are the guardians at the gate may not make any easier our decisions as to how we should cope with recurrent and continuing world crises, but it may make it easier to bear the burden.

EXPERIMENTAL MATERIAL
SUBJECT TO REVISION
PUBLIC DOMAIN EDITION

STUDENT'S MANUAL

IMPERIALISM AND THE DILEMMA OF POWER

Thomas F. Buffinton
Tabor Academy
Marion, Massachusetts

This material has been produced
by the
Committee on the Study of History, Amherst, Massachusetts
under contract with the U. S. Office of Education
as Cooperative Research Project #H-168.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Know then thyself, presume not God to scan:
The proper study of mankind is man.

Alexander Pope

Of all the tools that aid in an understanding of man in general and oneself in particular, history, when properly used, is most easily used. In this unit you are to be the historian. Through the writings and speeches of men who were imperialists and men who were anti-imperialists you are to gather the facts, the beliefs, and the attitudes that will lead to an understanding of imperialism. Such an understanding should lead to a far more important goal, which is to see your own position on imperialism in a new light.

The unit is made up of a number of original documents. We are not particularly interested in having you memorize anything here but rather to reflect on what you read, bringing to that reflection the knowledge and beliefs that you already have. Facts are not, like gems, to be stored in the vault of the mind but are tools to be used to build a better understanding of the world you live in.

SECTION I

IS AMERICA AN IMPERIALISTIC POWER?

Following is an article by Yu Chao-li, a writer for the Communist Foreign Languages Press:[1]

> [Yu Chao-li argues that world capitalism, led by the United States, is imperialistic, but because of various factors, primarily the opposition of the people and "peace-loving countries," it is on the decline. He claims that the United States tries to use nuclear weapons to frighten the people but the atom bomb is a "paper tiger" that will eventually be destroyed by the people. According to Yu Chao-li it is Marxist law that the Communist parties will eventually triumph.]

---

[1] Yu Chao-li, "The Forces of the New Are Bound to Defeat the Forces of Decay," in Imperialism and All Reactionaries are Paper Tigers (Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1958), 65-75, in passim.

SECTION II

WHAT IS IMPERIALISM?

This section presents a variety of definitions of "imperialism" and the related word "colony." These definitions were formulated in varying times and places.

1. The 13th edition of The Encyclopaedia Britannica published in 1926 in Great Britain, did not contain the word imperialism. The 1944 printing of the 14th edition also published in Great Britain, reads in part as follows:[1]

> [In this article imperialism is defined in political and ideological terms. After a brief survey of imperialism the article concludes with an analysis of "the new fascist imperialism" which aims at world domination based on the idea of the master race. It suggests that the struggle against fascism on the part of those imbued with "humanitarian, Christian and democratic tradition" may eventually lead to the end of imperialism through the recognition of the equality of nations.]

2. By 1964 the Encyclopaedia Britannica had been purchased by American interests.[2] The article on imperialism now read:

> [Imperialism is defined as the control of one state over people beyond its borders who are unwilling to accept such control and therefore it is considered "morally reprehensible." The article suggests that because of the difficulty of identifying imperialism in actual cases it has been used by nations for polemic purposes against opponents. It concludes by indicating that, although the term is relatively new, it is "as old as civilization" as a phenomenon.]

---

[1] "Imperialism," Encyclopaedia Britannica (Encyclopaedia Britannica, Ltd., London, 1944).

[2] "Imperialism," Encyclopaedia Britannica (Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago, 1964) XII, 121.

3. Collier's Encyclopedia published in the United States in 1962 puts it this way:[3]

> [The author of this article makes a case for identifying imperialism in broader terms than just direct political or military domination. Although imperialism can be found throughout history its characteristics and the national motives behind it vary considerably.]

4. While "imperialism" is a relatively new word, "colony" is not. The ninth edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica printed in 1875 has this to say:[4]

> COLONY. The term colony, often loosely applied, is most commonly used to denote a settlement of the subjects of a sovereign state in lands beyond its boundaries, owning no allegiance to any foreign power, and retaining a greater or less degree of dependence on the mother country. The founding and the growth of such communities furnish matter for an interesting chapter in the history as well of ancient as of modern civilization; and the regulation of the relations between the parent state and its dependencies abroad gives rise to important problems alike in national policy and in international economics. . . .
>
> It is rather the force of circumstances than the consistent maintenance of any definite policy that has shaped the relation of England to her various dependencies. But the colonial policy of the future has of late been largely debated, and with widely divergent issues. The "colonial system" so long maintained by England, as well as by all other powers, had been finally abandoned. No one now claims that the mother country has the right, still less that in self-defence she is bound, to restrict and hamper the trade of the colony for her own benefit; nor are there now found many to advocate the differential duties in favour of colonial produce, which that ancient system rendered all but necessary. Many, indeed, go to an opposite extreme, and argue that for both sides it would be better that the interdependent relation should be totally sundered, and each colony, as soon as possible, left to shift for itself. The trade of neither party, it is alleged, gains anything by the maintenance of the connection; the European state is exposed to needless risk in time of war by her responsibility to her scattered dependencies, and to additional expense in providing against that risk; while the colonies are liable to be dragged into wars with which they have no concern. The good-will arising from the sense of common origin would, it is said, amply maintain all the mutual advantages enjoyed under the present system, and would secure a virtual confederacy. . . .

---

[3] "Imperialism," Collier's Encyclopedia (The Crowell-Collier Publishing Company, 1962), XII, 545.

[4] "Colony," The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 9th Edition (Samuel L. Hall, New York, 1878), VI, 158-160.

5. The 11th edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica printed in 1910 reflects a different attitude. After beginning with a definition almost identical with that of the 9th edition, the author concludes with this comment about Great Britain:[5]

> /The author of this article claims that the "English-speaking race" is universally recognized as having the greatest capacity for and system of colonization./

6. The 1964 edition had this to say:

> /This article states that colonialism has taken on a negative connotation with many critics of European policy who consider it immoral and illegal. The article also notes the attempts by Great Britain to keep its colonies affiliated with it through the commonwealth in the mid-20th century, though reforms were hastened by colonial unrest and United States pressures./

---

[5]"Colony," The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th ed. (Cambridge, England: at the University Press, 1910) VI, 716.

[6]"Colony," Encyclopaedia Britannica (Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago, 1964), VI, 85.

SECTION III

EUROPEAN IMPERIALISM

This section explores the origins of what historians have called the "New Imperialism," which developed late in the nineteenth century. Unlike Athena, expansionism did not spring full grown on the American continent isolated from the rest of the world but was, rather, part of a Western phenomenon of that era.

A. Capitalism and Imperialism

Traditional interpretations of imperialism stress heavily its economic basis. The following charts give some statistical evidence about the growth of empires:

1. Growth of Empire[a]

Dependencies		1877	1890	1900	1910
France (Including Algeria)	Area	693,900	1,195,340	3,740,756	4,776,126
	Population	8,502,453	29,074,493	56,401,860	41,653,650
Germany	Area	---	1,045,525	1,027,820	1,027,820
	Population	---	2,030,000	14,687,000	14,546,000
Great Britain	Area	7,647,000	9,686,140	11,605,238	11,345,894
	Population	203,345,000	306,546,365	345,222,339	351,286,331
Italy	Area	---	336,070	188,500	175,518
	Population	---	5,958,000	850,000	867,000
Japan	Area	---	---	---	27,264
	Population	---	---	---	3,484,868
Portugal	Area	709,469	402,066	801,060	802,952
	Population	3,258,141	3,588,951	9,216,707	9,144,316
United States[b]	Area	---	---	174,491	137,962
	Population	---	---	10,548,282	8,777,285

[a]Area represented in square miles. All statistics drawn from The Statesman's Year-Book (Macmillan and Co., London) for the year indicated. Figures for Africa in the period are probably unreliable.

[b]Oklahoma, previously a territory, became a state in 1907.

2. Production of Iron, Coal, and Oil - 1877 to 1910[a]

		1877	1884	1890	1900	1910
France	iron[b]	---	2,033,000	1,688,976	2,484,200	3,632,105
	coal	16,949,031	20,803,000	24,588,880	30,797,900	36,633,000
	oil	---	---	---	---	---
Germany	iron[b]	2,702,537	3,286,406	4,337,121	6,881,466	11,805,321
	coal	47,413,340	52,094,885	65,386,000	96,280,000	147,671,149
	oil	---	---	---	---	---
Great Britain	iron[b]	6,365,420	8,586,680	7,893,000	8,609,719	9,056,851
	coal	131,867,105	156,499,977	169,935,219	202,054,516	261,528,795
	oil	---	---	---	---	---
Italy	iron[c]	---	215,000	230,575	200,709	539,120
	coal	95,954	---	327,665	314,222	480,029
	oil	---	---	---	---	---
Japan	iron[c]	---	13,528	18,605	30,217	5,734,314
	coal	---	881,261	1,256,691	5,019,639	13,578,846
	oil	---	---	---	262,000	1,431,085
Portugal	iron[c]	---	---	7,920	2,519	---
	coal	---	---	---	22,541	4,614
	oil	---	---	---	---	---
United States	iron[b]	2,052,821	4,623,323	6,489,738	11,773,934	15,963,018
	coal	45,413,340	92,219,454	132,731,608	214,255,093	406,921,046
	oil	---	30,053,500	27,346,018	55,354,233	179,572,479

[a]Statistics for iron and coal production are in tons; those for oil in barrels. All statistics drawn from the Statesman's Year-Book for the year indicated.

[b]Pig iron

[c]Iron ore

3. Comparison of Statistics for Trade and Defense[a]

		1877	1884	1890	1900	1910
France	Exports	168,886,480	142,976,000	129,840,000	156,004,000	220,466,000
	Defense[b]	28,865,536	33,730,783	32,468,820	41,755,652	50,431,531
Germany	Exports	23,287,883[d]	162,235,000	167,630,100	200,528,250	328,473,000
	Defense[c]	16,863,711	18,339,044	20,754,420	29,446,380	42,544,070
Great Britain	Exports	223,465,963	306,660,714	318,031,674	329,680,197	378,379,000
	Defense[c]	26,642,555	31,420,755	31,021,300	47,212,000	62,578,000
Italy	Exports	42,286,090	46,232,000	35,677,381	48,142,772	73,348,920
	Defense[c]	10,061,355	---	12,343,907	15,253,645	17,292,587
Japan	Exports	4,000,409	7,499,206	12,978,338	16,619,852	41,351,000
	Defense[c]	1,960,000	2,637,513	3,193,436	5,216,400	10,761,491
Portugal	Exports	4,444,071	5,499,025	7,323,504	7,601,592	6,765,347
	Defense[b]	1,071,738	1,398,941	1,561,123	2,295,089	2,904,380
United States	Exports	580,114,291	823,839,402	730,283,609	1,203,931,222	1,728,203,271
	Defense[c]	49,890,015	49,883,904	71,000,000	296,586,380	279,659,739

[a]All statistics drawn from the Statesman's Year-Book for the year indicated. Figures represent pound sterling, except for those for the United States which are given in dollars.

[b]Ministries of War, Marine and Colonies

[c]Army (War) and Navy

[d]Exports to Britain only.

4. One of those commenting on the economic scene at the beginning of the twentieth century was Nikolai Lenin. While in exile in Switzerland, he wrote the following in 1916:[1]

> [Lenin claims that capitalistic countries are by inclination and necessity imperialistic. He describes how capitalistic imperialism has divided the world into colony-owning countries, colonies, and financially and diplomatically dependent countries.]

B. Ideology, Politics, and Imperialism

Some of the statesmen and capitalists who were responsible for much of the "New Imperialism" did not at all agree with Lenin's brand of economic determinism. They felt other forces at work.

1. Cecil Rhodes found a fortune in diamonds in South Africa and remained to found an empire. Dreaming of Anglo-Saxon world dominion, he believed it was his duty to work to this end. In a letter to a friend he explained:[2]

> [Rhodes is quoted from three different statements in which he argues for the expansion of Anglo-Saxon civilization over the rest of the world and the eventual unification of the world under the control of Anglo-Saxons. He dismisses the moral arguments against expansion as being irrelevant because of the inevitability of European dominance.]

Cecil Rhodes had read Darwin, and Darwin had written:[3]

> [Darwin claims that the civilized races will eventually "exterminate and replace" the uncivilized races.]

Perhaps the most revealing statement Rhodes made was:[4]

> [Rhodes expresses regret that he cannot annex the planets.]

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism (International Publishers, New York, 1939), 78, 79, 82-86. (Footnotes omitted). (By permission of International Publishers Co., Inc.)

[2] Stuart Cloete, Against These Three (Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1945), 119, 269, 181-182.

[3] As quoted in Ibid., 183.

[4] Ibid., 186

2. In 1890 Karl Pearson, a famous British Scientist, said in a lecture entitled "National Life from the Standpoint of Science":[5]

> [Pearson claims advanced civilization is produced through competition between the races and the survival of the fittest.]

3. The popular German lecturer Heinrick von Treitschke during the same period wrote in a book translated under the title Politics:[6]

> [von Treitschke justifies war as part of the "law of life." Furthermore, peace is not only impossible but immoral.]

4. Consider these remarks by another German, Friedrick von Bernhardi:[7]

> [Bernhardi justifies war as a political necessity and necessary for "biological, social and moral progress."]

5. Another empire builder was H. M. Stanley. He penetrated the Congo basin to find Livingston for the New York Herald Tribune and an eager reading public. He remained to establish the enormous Congo Free State for Leopold of Belgium. Here his wife explains his motives:[8]

> [Stanley's wife describes Stanley's plans for the civilizing and economic development of the Congo.]

6. Jules Ferry, premier of France in 1881 and again in the period 1883-1885, had extended French domination over Tunis in North Africa, Annam and Tonkin in Indo-China, Madagascar in the Indian Ocean, and part of Somaliland on the east coast of Africa. On July 28, 1885 he defended his policy before the French Senate.[9]

---

[5]Quoted in Carl A. Becker, Modern History (Silver Burdett Company, New York, 1952), 652.

[6]Ibid., 653.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Dorothy Stanley, ed., The Autobiography of Sir Henry Morton Stanley (Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1909), 333.

[9]Thomas F. Power, Jr., Jules Ferry and the Renaissance of French Imperialism (King's Crown Press, New York, 1944), 191-192. (Footnotes omitted).

[Ferry justifies France's colonial policy by relating it to the rightful expansion of civilization and the necessary development of markets. The alternative, as he sees it, is for France to abdicate its place as a first rank power.]

7. A much more extensive defense of colonialism was given by Joseph Chamberlain before the British House of Commons in 1893. In reply to a speech by a member of the opposition voicing fear that the dispatch of an investigating mission to Uganda would lead to further British expansion in the area, Mr. Chamberlain stated:[10]

[Chamberlain argues the necessity of sacrifice in colonizing Uganda. He discusses the advantages of this colonization in humanitarian and economic terms.]

---

[10] Charles W. Boyd, ed., Mr. Chamberlain's Speeches (Constable and Company Ltd., London, 1914), I, 342-353, passim.

SECTION IV

AMERICA FACES IMPERIALISM

Two questions should be kept uppermost as you read the documents in this section. First, are there any differences between American imperialism and the European variety? Second, does our imperialist past shed light on our present problems?

The section is divided into three parts: the first deals with the ideas current at the turn of the century; the second is concerned with the fight over the annexation of the Philippines; the third traces our problems in the Caribbean in the twentieth century. Over all hangs the question of whether or not imperialism can be justified.

A. The Spirit of the Age

> No man, no party, can fight with any chance of final success against a cosmic tendency, no cleverness, no popularity, avails against the spirit of the age. . . .
>
> John Hay, 1904

The spirit of any period is, in part, a reflection of the ideas of the time. You have come in contact with the ideas of some Europeans of this period. Here are three selections which reflect the ideas current in America at the close of the 19th century.

1. The first selection is from a widely read book, Our Country, by the American minister Josiah Strong, which was published in 1885:[1]

> It is not necessary to argue to those for whom I write that the two great needs of mankind, that all men may be lifted up into the light of the highest Christian civilization, are, first, a pure, spiritual Christianity, and, second, civil liberty. 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

---

[1] Josiah Strong, Our Country (The American Home Missionary Society, New York, 1885), 161-180 passim.

progress. It follows, then, that the Anglo-Saxon, as the great representative of these two ideas, the depositary of these two greatest blessings, sustains peculiar relations to the world's future, is divinely commissioned to be, in a peculiar sense, his brother's keeper. Add to this the fact of his rapidly increasing strength in modern times, and we have well nigh a demonstration of his destiny. In 1700 this race numbered less than 6,000,000 souls. In 1800, Anglo-Saxons (I use the term somewhat broadly to include all English-speaking peoples) had increased to about 20,500,000, and in 1880 they numbered nearly 100,000,000, having multiplied almost five-fold in eighty years. At the end of the reign of Charles II, the English colonists in America numbered 200,000. During these two hundred years, our population has increased two hundred and fifty-fold. And the expansion of this race has been no less remarkable that its multiplication. In one century the United States has increased its territory ten-fold, while the enormous acquisition of foreign territory by Great Britain--and chiefly within the last hundred years--is wholly unparalleled in history. This mighty Anglo-Saxon race, though comprising only one-fifteenth part of mankind, now rules more than one-third of the earth's surface, and more than one-fourth of its people. And if this race, while growing from 6,000,000 to 100,000,000, thus gained possession of a third portion of the earth, is it to be supposed that when it numbers 1,000,000,000, it will lose the disposition or lack the power to extend its sway? . . .

It is not unlikely that, before the close of the next century, this race will outnumber all the other civilized races of the world. Does it not look as if God were not only preparing in our Anglo-Saxon civilization the die with which to stamp the peoples of the earth, but as if he were also massing behind that die the mighty power with which to press it? My confidence that this race is eventually to give its civilization to mankind is not based on mere numbers--China forbid! I look forward to what the world has never yet seen united in the same race; viz., the greatest numbers, and the highest civilization.

There can be no reasonable doubt that North America is to be the great home of the Anglo-Saxon, the principal seat of his power, the center of his life and influence. . . . Our continent has room and resources and climate, it lies in the pathway of the nations, it belongs to the zone of power, and already, among Anglo-Saxons, do we lead in population and wealth. . . .

But we are to have not only the larger portion of the Anglo-Saxon race for generations to come, we may reasonably expect to develop the highest type of Anglo-Saxon civilization. If human progress follows a law of development, if

"Time's noblest offspring is the last,"

our civilization should be the noblest; for we are

"The heirs of all the ages in the foremost files of time,"

and not only do we occupy the latitude of power, but our land is the last to be occupied in that latitude. . . . Whipple says: "There has never been a great migration that did not result in a new form of national genius." Our national genius is Anglo-Saxon, but not English, its distinctive type is the result of a finer nervous organization, which is certainly being developed in this country. . . . The roots of civilization are the nerves; and other things being equal, the finest nervous organization will produce the highest civilization. . . . The physical changes accompanied by mental, which are taking place in the people of the United States are apparently to adapt men to the demands of a higher civilization. . . . During the War of the Confederacy, the Medical Department of the Provost Marshal General's Bureau gathered statistics from the examination of over half a million of men. . . . Americans were found to be superior to Englishmen not only in height, but also in chest-measurement and weight. Such facts afford more than a hint that the higher civilization of the future will not lack an adequate physical basis in the people of the United States.

Mr. Darwin is not only disposed to see, in the superior vigor of our people, an illustration of his favorite theory of natural selection, but even intimates that the world's history thus far has been simply preparatory for our future, and tributary to it. He says: "There is apparently much truth in the belief that the wonderful progress of the United States, as well as the character of the people, are the results of natural selection; for the more energetic, restless, and courageous men from all parts of Europe have emigrated during the last ten or twelve generations to that great country, and have there succeeded best. Looking at the distant future, I do not think that the Rev. Mr. Zincke takes an exaggerated view when he says: 'All other series of events--as that which resulted in the culture of mind in Greece, and that which resulted in the Empire of Rome--only appear to have purpose and value when viewed in connection with, or rather as subsidiary to, the great stream of Anglo-Saxon emigration to the West.'"

There is abundant reason to believe that the Anglo-Saxon race is to be, is, indeed, already becoming, more effective here than in the mother country. The marked superiority of this race is due, in large measure, to its highly mixed origin. . . . Concerning our future, Herbert Spencer says: "One great result is, I think, tolerably clear. From biological truths it is to be inferred that the eventual mixture of the allied varieties of the Aryan race, forming the population, will produce a more powerful type of man than has hitherto existed, and a type of man more plastic, more adaptable, more capable of undergoing the modifications needful for complete social life. I think, whatever difficulties they may have to surmount, and whatever tribulations they may have to pass through, the Americans may reasonably look forward to a time when they will have produced a civilization grander than any the world has known." . . .

Among the most striking features of the Anglo-Saxon is his money-making power--a power of increasing importance in the widening commerce of the world's future. We have seen, in a preceding chapter, that, although England is by far the richest nation of Europe, we have already outstripped her in the race after wealth, and we have only begun the development of our vast resources.

Again, another marked characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon is what may be called an instinct or genius for colonizing. His unequaled energy, his indomitable perseverance, and his personal independence, made him a pioneer. He excels all others in pushing his way into new countries. It was those in whom this tendency was strongest that came to America, and this inherited tendency has been further developed by the westward sweep of successive generations across the continent. So noticeable has this characteristic become that English visitors remark it. Charles Dickens once said that the typical American would hesitate to enter heaven unless assured that he could go further west.

Again, nothing more manifestly distinguishes the Anglo-Saxon that his intense and persistent energy; and he is developing in the United States an energy which, in eager activity and effectiveness, is peculiarly American. . . . . Moreover, our social institutions are stimulating. In Europe the various ranks of society are, like the strata of the earth, fixed and fossilized. There can be no great change without a terrible upheaval, a social earthquake. Here society is like the waters of the sea, mobile; as General Garfield said, and so signally illustrated in his own experience, that which is at the bottom today may one day flash on the crest of the highest wave. Every one is free to become whatever he can make of himself; free to transform himself from a rail-splitter or a tanner or a canal-boy, into the nation's President. Our aristocracy, unlike that of Europe, is open to all comers. Wealth, position, influence, are prizes offered for energy; and every farmer's boy, every apprentice and clerk, every friendless and penniless immigrant, is free to enter the lists. Thus many causes co-operate to produce here the most forceful and tremendous energy in the world.

What is the significance of such facts? These tendencies infold the future; they are the mighty alphabet with which God writes his prophecies. May we not by a careful laying together of the letters, spell out something of his meaning? 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 to-day 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 races, for which the Anglo-Saxon is being schooled. Long before the thousand millions are here, the mighty centrifugal tendency, inherent in this stock and strengthened in the United States, will assert itself. Then this race of unequaled energy, with all the majesty of numbers and the might of wealth behind it--the representative, let us hope, of the largest liberty, the purest Christianity, the highest civilization--having developed peculiarly aggressive traits calculated to impress its institutions upon mankind, will spread itself over the earth. If I read not amiss, this powerful race will move down upon Mexico, down upon Central and South America, out upon the islands of the sea, over upon Africa and beyond. And can any one doubt that the result of this competition of races will be the "survival of the fittest"? "Any people," says Dr. Bushnell, "that is physiologically advanced in culture, though it be only in a degree beyond another which is mingled with it on strictly equal terms, is sure to live down and finally live out its inferior. Nothing can save the inferior race but a ready and pliant assimilation. Whether the feebler and more abject races are going to be regenerated and raised up, is already very much of a question. What if it should be God's plan to people the world with better and finer material? Certain it is, whatever expectations we may indulge, that there is a tremendous overbearing surge of power in the Christian nations, which, if the others are not speedily raised to some vastly higher capacity, will inevitably submerge and bury them forever. These great populations of Christendom--what are they doing, but throwing out their colonies on every side, and populating themselves, if I may so speak, into the possession of all countries and climes?" To this result no war of extermination is needful; the contest is not one of arms, but of vitality and of civilization. "At the present day," says Mr. Darwin, "civilized nations are everywhere supplanting barbarous nations, excepting where the climate opposes a deadly barrier; and they succeed mainly, though not exclusively, through their arts, which are the products of the intellect?" Thus the Finns were supplanted by the Aryan races in Europe and Asia, the Tartars by the Russians, and thus the aborigines of North America, Australia and New Zealand are now disappearing before the all-conquering Anglo-Saxons. It would seem as if these inferior tribes were only precursors of a superior race, voices in the wilderness crying: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord!" . . .

In my own mind, there is no doubt that the Anglo-Saxon is to exercise the commanding influence in the world's future; but the exact nature of that influence is, as yet, undetermined. How far his civilization will be materialistic and atheistic, and how long it will take thoroughly to Christianize and sweeten it, how rapidly he will hasten the coming of the kingdom wherein dwelleth righteousness, or how many ages he may retard it, is still uncertain; but it is now being swiftly determined. . . . When Napoleon drew up his troops before the Mamelukes, under the shadow of the Pyramids, pointing to the latter, he said to his soldiers: "Remember that from yonder heights forty centuries look down on you." Men of this generation, from the pyramid top of opportunity on which God has set us, we look down on forty centuries! We stretch our hands into the future with power to mold the destinies of unborn millions.

"We are living, we are dwelling,
In a grand and awful time,
In an age on ages telling--
To be living is sublime!"

Notwithstanding the great perils which threaten it, I cannot think our civilization will perish; but I believe it is fully in the hands of the Christians of the United States, during the next fifteen or twenty years, to hasten or retard the coming of Christ's kingdom in the world by hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of years. We of this generation and nation occupy the Gibralter of the ages which commands the world's future.

2. While the Reverend Strong continued to preach the coming of the Anglo-Saxon millennium, his contemporaries were singing a new hymn:[2]

[This hymn glorifies the task of building a "Kingdom of the right" as part of God's plan.]

---

[2]William DeWitt Hyde, 1904, in The Pilgrim Hymnal (The Pilgrim Press, Boston, 1931), 316.

3. Admiral Alfred T. Mahan, a highly respected American naval officer, was one of the American representatives to the first Peace Conference at The Hague in 1899. Here he discusses arbitration and the nature of war:[3]

> The conviction of a nation is the conviction of the mass of individuals thereof, and each individual has therefore a personal responsibility for the opinion he holds on a question of great national, or international, moment. Let us look, each of us, --and especially each of us who fears God,-- into his own inner heart, and ask himself how far, in his personal life, he is prepared to accept arbitration. Is it not so that the reply must be, "In doubtful questions of moment, wherever I possibly can, knowing my necessary, inevitable proneness to one-sided views, I will seek an impartial adviser, that my bias may be corrected; but when that has been done, when I have sought what aid I can, if conscience still commands, it I must obey. From that duty, burdensome though it may be, no man can relieve me. Conscience, diligently consulted, is to the man the voice of God; between God and the man no other arbiter comes." And if this be so, a pledge beforehand is impossible. I cannot bind myself for a future of which I as yet know nothing, to abide by the decision of any other judge than my own conscience. . . .
>
> A concrete instance, however, is always more comprehensible and instructive than a general discussion. Let us therefore take the incidents and conditions which preceded our recent war with Spain. . . . In the island of Cuba, a powerful military force, --government it scarcely could be called, -- foreign to the island, was holding a small portion of it in enforced subjection, and was endeavoring, unsuccessfully, to reduce the remainder. In pursuance of this attempt, measures were adopted that inflicted immense misery and death upon great numbers of the population. . . . /It/ had become apparent to military eyes that Spain could not subdue the island, nor restore orderly conditions. The suffering was terrible, and was unavailing.
>
> Under such circumstances, does any moral obligation lie upon a powerful neighboring state? Or, more exactly, if there is borne in upon the moral consciousness of a mighty people . . . that the duty of stopping

---

[3]Alfred T. Mahan, Lessons of the War with Spain and Other Articles (Little, Brown, and Company, Boston, 1899), 220-233 passim.

the evil rests upon them, what is to be done with such a case of conscience? Could the decision of another, whether nation or court, excuse our nation from the ultimate responsibility of its own decision? But, granting that it might have proved expedient to call in other judges, when we had full knowledge of the circumstances, what would have been our dilemma if, conscience commanding one course, we had found ourselves antecedently bound to abide by the conclusions of another arbiter? For let us not deceive ourselves. Absolutely justifiable, nay, imperative, as most of us believe our action to have been, when tried at the bar of conscience, no arbitral court, acceptable to the two nations, would have decided as our own conscience did. A European diplomatist of distinguished reputation, of a small nation likeliest to be unbiassed, so said to me personally, and it is known that more than one of our own ablest international lawyers held that we were acting in defiance of international law as it now exists; just as the men who resisted the Fugitive Slave Law acted in defiance of the statute law of the land. Decision must have gone against us, . . . on the legal merits of the case. Of the moral question the arbiter could take no account; it is not there, indeed, that moral questions must find their solution, but in the court of conscience. Referred to arbitration, doubtless the Spanish flag would still fly over Cuba. . . .

Step by step, in the past, man has ascended by means of the sword, and his more recent gains, as well as present conditions, show that the time has not yet come to kick down the ladder which has so far served him. Three hundred years ago, the people of the land in which the Conference was assembled wrenched with the sword civil and religious peace and national independence from the tyranny of Spain. Then began the disintegration of her empire, and the deliverance of peoples from her oppression, but this was completed only last year, and then again by the sword -- of the United States.

In the centuries which have since intervened, what has not "justice, with valor armed," when confronted by evil in high places, found itself compelled to effect by resort to the sword? To it was due the birth of our own nation . . . . The control, to good from evil, of the devastating fire of the French Revolution and of Napoleon was due to the sword. The long line of illustrious names and deeds . . . has in our times culminated -- if indeed the end is even yet nearly reached -- in the new birth of the United States by the extirpation of human slavery, and in the downfall, but yesterday, of a colonial empire identified with tyranny. What the sword, and it supremely, tempered only by the stern demands of justice and of conscience, and the loving voice of charity, has done for India and for Egypt, is a tale at once too long and too well known for repetition here. Peace, indeed, is not adequate to all progress; there are resistances that can be overcome only by explosion. . . .

Power, force, is a faculty of national life; one of the talents committed to nations by God. Like every other endowment of a complex organization, it must be held under control of the enlightened intellect and of the upright heart; but no more than any other can it be carelessly or lightly abjured, without incurring the responsibility of one who buries in the earth that which was intrusted to him for use. And this obligation to maintain right, by force if need be, while common to all states, rests peculiarly upon the greater, in proportion to their means. Much is required of those to whom much is given.. . . Until it is demonstrable that no evil exists, or threatens the world, which cannot be obviated without recourse to force, the obligation to readiness must remain; and, where evil is mighty and defiant, the obligation to use force -- that is, war -- arises.

Admiral Mahan's contribution was not limited to comments on war and arbitration. In 1890 he published his book The Influence of Sea Power Upon History, 1660-1783. Its impact was astonishing. A French naval expert declared that Mahan "profoundly modified in his own lifetime the history of of the age in which he lived."[4] The British called it "the gospel of England's greatness."[5] Kaiser Wilhelm II wrote, "It is on board all my ships. . . . Our future lies upon the water; the trident must be in our fist."[6] The captain of every Japanese man-of-war was given a copy with his command.[7] In America Theodore Roosevelt became his disciple. Here are passages from that book.[8]

> /Mahan argues that any nation which tries to gain sea power must of necessity have colonies with friendly naval stations, both for commercial purposes in time of peace and defensive purposes in time of war./

---

[4]Robert B. Downs, Books That Changed the World (The New American Library, New York, 1962), 107.

[5]Ibid., 104.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid., 105.

[8]Alfred T. Mahan, The Influence of Sea Power Upon History, 1660-1783 (Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1932), 27-28, 82-83.

B. The Question of the Philippines

The United States' plunge into the main stream of imperialism came with the Spanish-American war. Strangely enough, the thorny problems pertaining to imperialism, both theoretical and practical, did not arise with the onset of the war which had assumed in the minds of many Americans the character of a crusade, but as an aftermath of that war when the future status of the Philippines was at issue. The question of annexing the Philippines was not an easy one to face and was made more difficult by the struggle then being waged in which patriotic Filippinos under Aguinaldo were fighting American soldiers to gain their freedom.

1. Senator Albert Beveridge of Indiana was not only an outspoken advocate of imperialism but also one of the leaders of progressive wing of the Republican party. The following selection is drawn from his famous speech on annexation:[9]

> Mr. President, the times call for candor. The Philippines are ours forever, "territory belonging to the United States," as the Constitution calls them. And just beyond the Philippines are China's illimitable markets. We will not retreat from either. We will not repudiate our duty in the archipelago. We will not abandon our opportunity in the Orient. We will not renounce our part in the mission of our race, trustee, under God, of the civilization of the world. And we will move forward to our work, not howling out regrets like slaves whipped to their burdens, but with gratitude for a task worthy of our strength, and thanksgiving to Almighty God that He has marked us as His chosen people, henceforth to lead in the regeneration of the world.
>
> This island empire is the last land left in all the oceans. If it should prove a mistake to abandon it, the blunder once made would be irretrievable. If it proves a mistake to hold it, the error can be corrected when we will. Every other progressive nation stands ready to relieve us.. . .

---

[9] Congressional Record, XXXIII, Part I, 56th Cong., 1st Sess., 704-712, passim.

Lines of navigation from our ports to the Orient and Australia; from the Isthmian Canal to Asia; from all Oriental ports to Australia, converge at and separate from the Philippines. They are a self-supporting, dividend-paying fleet, permanently anchored at a spot selected by the strategy of Providence, commanding the Pacific. And the Pacific is the ocean of the commerce of the future. Most future wars will be conflicts for commerce. The power that rules the Pacific, therefore, is the power that rules the world. And, with the Philippines, that power is and will forever be the American Republic.

China's trade is the mightiest commercial fact in our future. Her foreign commerce was $285,738,300 in 1897, of which we, her neighbor, had less than 9 per cent, of which only a little more than half was merchandise sold to China by us. We ought to have 50 per cent, and we will. And China's foreign commerce is only beginning. Her resources, her possibilities, her wants, all are undeveloped. She has only 340 miles of railway. I have seen trains loaded with natives and all the activities of modern life already appearing along the line. But she needs, and in fifty years will have, 20,000 miles of railway. . . .

But if they did not command China, India, the Orient, the whole Pacific for purposes of offense, defense, and trade, the Philippines are so valuable in themselves that we should hold them. I have cruised more than 2,000 miles through the archipelago, every moment a surprise at its loveliness and wealth. I have ridden hundreds of miles on the islands, every foot of the way a revelation of vegetable and mineral riches.

No land in America surpasses in fertility the plains and valleys of Luzon. Rice and coffee, sugar and cocoanuts, hemp and tobacoo, and many products of the temperate as well as the tropic zone grow in various sections of the archipelago. I have seen hundreds of bushels of Indian corn lying in a road fringed with banana trees. The forests of Negros, Mindanao, Mindora, Paluan, and parts of Luzon are invaluable and intact. The wood of the Philippines can supply the furniture of the world for a century to come. At Cebu the best informed man in the island told me that 40 miles of Cebu's mountain chain are practically mountains of coal. Pablo Majia, one of the most reliable men on the islands, confirmed the statement. Some declare that the coal is only lignite; but ship captains who have used it told me that it is better steamer fuel than the best coal of Japan.

I have a nugget of pure gold picked up in its present form on the banks of a Philippine creek. I have gold dust washed out by crude processes of careless natives from the sands of a Philippine stream. Both indicate great deposits at the source from which they come. In one of the islands great deposits of copper exist untouched. The mineral wealth of this empire of the ocean will one day surprise the world. I base this statement partly on personal observation, but chiefly on the testimony of foreign merchants in the Philippines, who have practically investigated the subject, and upon the unanimous opinion of natives and priests. And the mineral wealth is but a small fraction of the agricultural wealth of these islands. . . .

It will be hard for Americans who have not studied them to understand the people. They are a barbarous race, modified by three centuries of contact with a decadent race. The Filipino is the South Sea Malay, put through a process of three hundred years of superstition in religion, dishonesty in dealing, disorder in habits of industry, and cruelty, caprice, and corruption in government. It is barely possible that 1,000 men in all the archipelago are capable of self-government in the Anglo-Saxon sense. . . .

Senator Beveridge then took up the questions of the war against the Filipino insurrectionists.

This war is like all other wars. It needs to be finished before it is stopped. . . . A lasting peace can be secured only by overwhelming forces in ceaseless action until universal and absolutely final defeat is inflicted on the enemy. To halt before every armed force, every guerrilla band, opposing us is dispersed or exterminated will prolong hostilities and leave alive the seeds of perpetual insurrection.

Even then we should not treat. To treat at all is to admit that we are doing wrong. And any quiet so secured will be delusive and fleeting. And a false peace will betray us; a sham truce will curse us. It is not to serve the purposes of the hour, it is not to salve a present situation, that peace should be established. It is for the tranquillity of the archipelago forever. It is for an orderly government for the Filipinos for all the future. It is to give this problem to posterity solved and settled; not vexed and involved. It is to establish the supremacy of the American Republic over the Pacific and throughout the East till the end of time. . . .

Senators must remember that we are not dealing with Americans or Europeans. We are dealing with Orientals. We are dealing with Orientals who are Malays. We are dealing with Malays instructed in Spanish methods. They mistake kindness for weakness, forbearance for fear. It could not be otherwise unless you could erase hundreds of years of savagery, other hundreds of years of orientalism, and still other hundreds of years of Spanish character and custom. . . .

They are not capable of self-government. How could they be? They are not of a self-governing race. They are Orientals, Malays, instructed by Spaniards in the latter's worst estate.

They know nothing of practical government except as they have witnessed the weak, corrupt, cruel, and capricious rule of Spain. What magic will anyone employ to dissolve in their minds and characters those impressions of governors and governed which three centuries of misrule has created? What alchemy will change the oriental quality of their blood and set the self-governing

currents of the American pouring through their Malay veins? How shall they, in the twinkling of an eye, be exalted to the heights of self-governing peoples which required a thousand years for us to reach, Anglo-Saxon though we are?

Let men beware how they employ the term "self-government." It is a sacred term. It is the watchword at the door of the inner temple of liberty, for liberty does not always mean self-government. Self-government is a method of liberty--the highest, simplest, best--and it is acquired only after centuries of study and struggle and experiment and instruction and all the elements of the progress of man. Self-government is no base and common thing, to be bestowed on the merely audacious. It is the degree which crowns the graduate of liberty, not the name of liberty's infant class, who have not yet mastered the alphabet of freedom. Savage blood, oriental blood, Malay blood, Spanish example--are these the elements of self-government? . . .

The Declaration of Independence does not forbid us to do our part in the regeneration of the world. If it did, the Declaration would be wrong, just as the Articles of Confederation, drafted by the very same men who signed the Declaration, was found to be wrong. The Declaration has no application to the present situation. It was written by self-governing men for self-governing men.

It was written by men who, for a century and a half, had been experimenting in self-government on this continent, and whose ancestors for hundreds of years before had been gradually developing toward that high and holy estate. The Declaration applies only to people capable of self-government. . . .

Mr. President, this question is deeper than any question of party politics; deeper than any question of the isolated policy of our country even; deeper even than any question of constitutional power. It is elemental. It is racial. God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-contemplation and self-admiration. No! He has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns. He has given us the spirit of progress to overwhelm the forces of reaction throughout the earth. He has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among savage and senile peoples. Were it not for such a force as this the world would relapse into barbarism and night. And of all our race He has marked the American people as His chosen nation to finally lead in the regeneration of the world. This is the divine mission of America, and it holds for us all the profit, all the glory, all the happiness possible to man. We are trustees of the world's progress, guardians of its righteous peace. The judgment of the Master is upon us: "Ye have been faithful over a few things; I will make you ruler over many things." . . .

Blind indeed is he who sees not the hand of God in events so vast, so harmonious, so benign. . . . Craven indeed is the heart that fears to perform a work so golden and so noble; that dares not win a glory so immortal.

Do you tell me that it will cost us money? When did Americans ever measure duty by financial standards?. . .

Do you remind me of the precious blood that must be shed, the lives that must be given, the broken hearts of loved ones for their slain? . . . That flag is woven of heroism and grief, of the bravery of men and women's tears, of righteousness and battle, of sacrifice and anguish, of triumph and of glory. It is these which make our flag a holy thing. Who would tear from that sacred banner the glorious legends of a single battle where it has waved on land or sea? . . .

Pray God the time may never come when Mammon and the love of ease shall so debase our blood that we will fear to shed it for the flag and its imperial destiny. . . .

2. Some of the most eloquently phrased opposition to annexation came from William Jennings Bryan, the Democratic nominee for the Presidency. Here are passages from his acceptance speech delivered on August 8, 1900.[10]

[Bryan argues that there is no reasonable military, political, economic or religious justification for an American annexation of the Philippines. He endorses the Democratic party's plan of establishing an independent, stable government in the Philippines under the protection of the United States.]

3. In his annual message to Congress President William McKinley defended his decision to retain the Philippines as a territorial possession and discussed the Philippine insurrection against American authority.[11]

The future government of the Philippines rests with the Congress of the United States. Few graver responsibilities have ever been confided to us. If we accept them in a spirit worthy of our race and our traditions, a great opportunity comes with them. The islands lie under the shelter of

---

[10] Speeches of William Jennings Bryan (Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York, 1909), II, 24-47, passim.

[11] A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1907 (Bureau of National Literature and Art, 1908), X, 172-174, passim.

our flag. They are ours by every title of law and equity. They cannot be abandoned. If we desert them we leave them at once to anarchy and finally to barbarism. We fling them, a golden apple of discord, among the rival powers, no one of which could permit another to seize them unquestioned. Their rich plains and valleys would be the scene of endless strife and bloodshed. The advent of Dewey's fleet in Manila Bay instead of being, as we hope, the dawn of a new day of freedom and progress, will have been the beginning of an era of misery and violence worse than any which has darkened their unhappy past. The suggestion has been made that we could renounce our authority over the islands and, giving them independence, could retain a protectorate over them. This proposition will not be found, I am sure, worthy of your serious attention. Such an arrangement would involve at the outset a cruel breach of faith. It would place the peaceable and loyal majority, who ask nothing better than to accept our authority, at the mercy of the minority of armed insurgents. It would charge us with the task of protecting them against each other and defending them against any foreign power with which they chose to quarrel. In short, it would take from the Congress of the United States the power of declaring war and vest that tremendous prerogative in the Tagal leader of the hour . . .

Until Congress shall have made known the formal expression of its will I shall use the authority vested in me by the Gonstitution and the statutes to uphold the sovereignty of the United States in those distant islands as in all other places where our flag rightfully floats. I shall put at the disposal of the Army and Navy all the means which the liberality of Congress and the people have provided to cause this unprovoked and wasteful insurrection to cease. If any orders of mine were required to insure the merciful conduct of military and naval operations, they would not be lacking; but every step of the progress of our troops has been marked by a humanity which has surprised even the misguided insurgents. The truest kindness to them will be a swift and effective defeat of their present leader. The hour of victory will be the hour of clemency and reconstruction.

No effort will be spared to build up the waste places desolated by war and by long years of misgovernment. We shall not wait for the end of strife to begin the beneficent work. We shall continue as we have begun, to open the schools and the churches, to set the courts in operation, to foster industry and trade and agriculture, and in every way in our power to make these people whom Providence has brought within our jurisdiction feel that it is their liberty and not our power, their welfare and not our gain, we are seeking to enhance. Our flag has never waved over any community but in blessing. I believe the Filipinos will soon recognize the fact that is has not lost its gift of benediction in its world-wide journey to their shores.

C. Twentieth Century Diplomacy in the Caribbean

During the time when the European colonial powers were occupied extensively with the arranging of affairs in Africa and in Asia, the United States in the western hemisphere was confronted with the dilemma posed by the possession of great power amid a number of weak and inefficient governments.

The following selections deal with American diplomacy in the

Caribbean in the twentieth century.

1. Following the Spanish-American War Congress passed the Platt Amendment which required the new Cuban government to agree to include certain provisions in the Cuban constitution. These provisions were embodied in a treaty signed by the United States and Cuba.[12]

Article I.

The Government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes, or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

Article II.

The Government of Cuba shall not assume or contract any public debt to pay the interest upon which, and to make reasonable sinking-fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which, the ordinary revenues of the Island of Cuba, after defraying the current expenses of the Government, shall be inadequate.

Article III.

The Government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the Treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the Government of Cuba.

Article IV.

All acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

---

[12] Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, . . . 1776-1903, W. M. Mallery, ed. (61st Cong., 2nd Sess., Senate Doc. No. 357, Washington, 1910), I, 363-364.

Article V.

The Government of Cuba will execute, and, as far as necessary, extend the plans already devised, or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the Southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

Article VI.

The Island of Pines shall be omitted from the boundaries of Cuba specified in the Constitution, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

Article VII.

To enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the Government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations, at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

Article VIII.

The present Convention shall be ratified by each party in conformity with the respective Constitutions of the two countries, and the ratifications shall be exchanged in the City of Washington within eight months from this date.

In witness whereof, we the respective Plenipotentiaries, have signed the same in duplicate, in English and Spanish, and have affixed our respective seals at Havana, Cuba, this twenty-second day of May, in the year nineteen hundred and three.

H. G. Squiers /Seal./

Carlos De Zaldo /Seal./

2. Theodore Roosevelt in his fourth annual message to Congress in December, 1904, explained American policy toward the nations of the Caribbean area, a policy which came to be known as the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. In his fifth annual

message, Roosevelt reiterated this policy, discussing it in relation to current political and economic problems in Santo Domingo. In that same message he also discussed the question of arbitration as a substitute for war. Juxtaposed, as they are, these statements make an interesting comment on American policy, not only in the Caribbean but wherever American power held sway.[13]

> This renders it proper at this time to say something as to the general attitude of this Government toward peace. More and more war is coming to be looked upon as in itself a lamentable and evil thing. A wanton or useless war, or a war of mere aggression--in short, any war begun or carried on in a conscienceless spirit, is to be condemned as a peculiarly atrocious crime against all humanity. We can, however, do nothing of permanent value for peace unless we keep ever clearly in mind the ethical element which lies at the root of the problem. Our aim is righteousness. Peace is normally the handmaiden of righteousness; but when peace and righteousness conflict then a great and upright people can never for a moment hesitate to follow the path which leads toward righteousness, even though that path also leads to war. . . . /T/here are demagogues of peace just as there are demagogues of war, and in any such movement as this for The Hague conference it is essential not to be misled by one set of extremists any more than by the other. Whenever it is possible for a nation or an individual to work for real peace, assuredly it is failure of duty not so to strive, but if war is necessary and righteous then either the man or the nation shrinking from it forfeits all title to self-respect. We have scant sympathy with the sentimentalist who dreads oppression less than physical suffering, who would prefer a shameful peace to the pain and toil sometimes lamentably necessary in order to secure a righteous peace. . . . At present there could be no greater calamity than for the free peoples, the enlightened, independent, and peace-loving peoples, to disarm while yet leaving it open to any barbarism or despotism to remain armed. So long as the world is as unorganized as now the armies and navies of those peoples who on the whole stand for justice, offer not only the best, but the only possible, security for a just peace. . . . As the world is now, only that nation is equipped for peace that knows how to fight, and that will not shrink from fighting if ever the conditions become such that war is demanded in the name of the highest morality.

---

[13] A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1907, XI, 1149-1156, passim.

So much it is emphatically necessary to say in order both that the position of the United States may not be misunderstood, and that a genuine effort to bring nearer the day of the peace of justice among the nations may not be hampered by a folly which, in striving to achieve the impossible, would render it hopeless to attempt the achievement of the practical. But, while recognizing most clearly all above set forth, it remains our clear duty to strive in every practicable way to bring nearer the time when the sword shall not be the arbiter among nations. At present the practical thing to do is to try to minimize the number of cases in which it must be the arbiter, and to offer, at least to all civilized powers, some substitute for war which will be available in at least a considerable number of instances. Very much can be done through another Hague conference in this direction, and I most earnestly urge that this Nation do all in its power to try to further the movement and to make the result of the decisions of The Hague conference effective. I earnestly hope that the conference may be able to devise some way to make arbitration between nations the customary way of settling international disputes in all save a few classes of cases, which should themselves be as sharply defined and rigidly limited as the present governmental and social development of the world will permit. If possible, there should be a general arbitration treaty negotiated among all the nations represented at the conference. Neutral rights and property should be protected at sea as they are protected on land. There should be an international agreement to this purpose and a similar agreement defining contraband of war. . . .

One of the most effective instruments for peace is the Monroe Doctrine as it has been and is being gradually developed by this Nation and accepted by other nations. No other policy could have been as efficient in promoting peace in the Western Hemisphere and in giving to each nation thereon the chance to develop along its own lines. If we had refused to apply the doctrine to changing conditions it would now be completely outworn, would not meet any of the needs of the present day, and, indeed, would probably by this time have sunk into complete oblivion. It is useful at home, and is meeting with recognition abroad because we have adapted our application of it to meet the growing and changing needs of the hemisphere. When we announce a policy such as the Monroe Doctrine we thereby commit ourselves to the consequences of the policy, and those consequences from time to time alter. It is out of the question to claim a right and yet shirk the responsibility for its exercise. Not only we, but all American republics who are benefited by the existence of the doctrine, must recognize the obligations each nation is under as regards foreign peoples no less than its duty to insist upon its own rights.

That our rights and interests are deeply concerned in the maintenance of the doctrine is so clear as hardly to need argument. This is especially true in view of the construction of the Panama Canal; and this means that we must be thoroughly alive to our interests in the Caribbean Sea. . . .

All that this country desires is that the other republics on this continent shall be happy and prosperous; and they cannot be happy and prosperous unless they maintain order within their boundaries and behave with a just regard for their obligations toward outsiders. It must be understood that under no circumstances will the United States use the Monroe Doctrine as a cloak for territorial aggression. We desire peace with all the world, but perhaps most of all with the other peoples of the American Continent. There are, of course, limits to the wrongs which any self-respecting nation can endure. It is always possible that wrong actions toward this Nation, or toward citizens of this Nation, in some State unable to keep order among its own people, unable to secure justice from outsiders, and unwilling to do justice to those outsiders who treat it well, may result in our having to take action to protect our rights; but such action will not be taken with a view to territorial aggression, and it will be taken at all only with extreme reluctance and when it has become evident that every other resource has been exhausted.

Moreover, we must make it evident that we do not intend to permit the Monroe Doctrine to be used by any nation on this Continent as a shield to protect it from the consequences of its own misdeeds against foreign nations. If a republic to the south of us commits a tort against a foreign nation, such as an outrage against a citizen of that nation, then the Monroe Doctrine does not force us to interfere to prevent punishment of the tort, save to see that the punishment does not assume the form of territorial occupation in any shape. . . . On the one hand, this country would certainly decline to go to war to prevent a foreign government from collecting a just debt; on the other hand, it is very inadvisable to permit any foreign power to take possession, even temporarily, of the custom houses of an American Republic in order to enforce the payment of its obligations; for such temporary occupation might turn into a permanent occupation. The only escape from these alternatives may at any time be that we must ourselves undertake to bring about some arrangement by which so much as possible of a just obligation shall be paid. It is far better that this country should put through such an arrangement, rather than allow any foreign country to undertake it. To do so insures the defaulting republic from having to pay /a/ debt of an inproper character under duress, while it also insures honest creditors of the republic from being passed by in the interest of dishonest or grasping creditors. Moreover, for the United States to take such a position offers the only possible way of insuring us against a clash with some foreign power. The position is, therefore, in the interest of peace

as well as in the interest of justice. It is of benefit to our people; it is of benefit to foreign peoples; and most of all it is really of benefit to the people of the country concerned.

This brings me to what should be one of the fundamental objects of the Monroe Doctrine. We must ourselves in good faith try to help upward toward peace and order those of our sister republics which need such help. Just as there has been a gradual growth of the ethical element in the relations of one individual to another, so we are, even though slowly, more and more coming to recognize the duty of bearing one another's burdens, not only as among individuals, but also as among nations.

Santo Domingo, in her turn, has now made an appeal to us to help her, and not only every principle of wisdom but every generous instinct within us bids us respond to the appeal. It is not of the slightest consequence whether we grant the aid needed by Santo Domingo as an incident to the wise development of the Monroe Doctrine or because we regard the case of Santo Domingo as standing wholly by itself, and to be treated as such, and not on general principles or with any reference to the Monroe Doctrine. The important point is to give the needed aid, and the case is certainly sufficiently peculiar to deserve to be judged purely on its own merits. The conditions in Santo Domingo have for a number of years grown from bad to worse until a year ago all society was on the verge of dissolution. Fortunately, just at this time a ruler sprang up in Santo Domingo, who, with his colleagues, saw the dangers threatening their country and appealed to the friendship of the only great and powerful neighbor who possessed the power, and as they hoped also the will to help them. There was imminent danger of foreign intervention. The previous rulers of Santo Domingo had recklessly incurred debts, and owing to her internal disorders she had ceased to be able to provide means of paying the debts. The patience of her foreign creditors had become exhausted, and at least two foreign nations were on the point of intervention, and were only prevented from intervening by the unofficial assurance of this Government that it would itself strive to help Santo Domingo in her hour of need. In the case of one of these nations, only the actual opening of negotiations to this end by our Government prevented the seizure of territory in Santo Domingo by a European power. Of the debts incurred some were just, while some were not of a character which really renders it obligatory on or proper for Santo Domingo to pay them in full. But she could not pay any of them unless some stability was assured her Government and people.

Accordingly, the Executive Department of our Government negotiated a treaty under which we are to try to help the Dominican people to straighten out their finances. This treaty is pending before the

Senate. In the meantime a temporary arrangement has been made which will last until the Senate has had time to take action upon the treaty. Under this arrangement the Dominican Government has appointed Americans to all the important positions in the customs service, and they are seeing to the honest collection of the revenues, turning over 45 per cent to the Government for running expenses and putting the other 55 per cent into a safe depository for equitable division in case the treaty shall be ratified, among the various creditors, whether European or American. . . .

Under the course taken, stability and order and all the benefits of peace are at last coming to Santo Domingo, danger of foreign intervention has been suspended, and there is at last a prospect that all creditors will get justice, no more and no less. If the arrangement is terminated by the failure of the treaty chaos will follow; and if chaos follows, sooner or later this Government may be involved in serious difficulties with foreign Governments over the island, or else may be forced itself to intervene in the island in some unpleasant fashion. Under the proposed treaty the independence of the island is scrupulously respected, the danger of violation of the Monroe Doctrine by the intervention of foreign powers vanishes, and the interference of our Government is minimized, so that we shall only act in conjunction with the Santo Domingo authorities to secure the proper administration of the customs, and therefore to secure the payment of just debts and to secure the Dominican Government against demands for unjust debts. The proposed method will give the people of Santo Domingo the same chance to move onward and upward which we have given to the people of Cuba. It will be doubly to our discredit as a Nation if we fail to take advantage of this chance; for it will be of damage to ourselves, and it will be of incalculable damage to Santo Domingo. Every consideration of wise policy, and, above all, every consideration of large generosity, bids us meet the request of Santo Domingo as we are now trying to meet it.

3. Although the treaty referred to by President Roosevelt was not ratified by the Senate at that Session, its provisions were, nevertheless, implemented by the President. The treaty was resubmitted in 1907 and was ratified on July 8. American troops were withdrawn some three weeks later on July 31. The treaty with the Dominican Government became a pattern for subsequent agreements which also implemented the Roosevelt Corollary.[14]

---

[14] Treaties, Conventions, International Acts. . . 1776-1909, W. M. Mallory, ed., I, 418-420.

Whereas during disturbed political conditions in the Dominican Republic debts and claims have been created, some by regular and some by revolutionary governments, many of doubtful validity in whole or part, and amounting in all to over $30,000,000, nominal or face value;

And whereas the same conditions have prevented the peaceable and continuous collection and application of National revenues for payment of interest or principal of such debts or for liquidation and settlement of such claims; . . .

And whereas the Dominican Government has now effected a conditional adjustment and settlement of said debts and claims . . .

And whereas a part of such plan of settlement is the issue and sale of bonds of the Dominican Republic to the amount of $20,000,000 bearing five per cent interest payable in fifty years and redeemable after ten years at 102½ and requiring payment of at least one per cent per annum for amortization, the proceeds of said bonds. . . . to be applied first to the payment of said debts and claims as adjusted and second out of the balance remaining to the retirement and extinction of certain concessions and harbor monopolies which are a burden and hindrance to the commerce of the country and third the entire balance still remaining to the construction of certain railroads and bridges and other public improvements necessary to the industrial development of the country;

And whereas the whole of said plan is conditioned and dependent upon the assistance of the United States in the collection of customs revenues of the Dominican Republic and the application thereof so far as necessary to the interest upon and the amortization and redemption of said bonds, and the Dominican Republic has requested the United States to give and the United States is willing to give such assistance;

The Dominican Government, . . . have agreed:

I. That the President of the United States shall appoint, a General Receiver of Dominican Customs, who, with such Assistant Receivers and other employees of the Receivership as shall be appointed by the President of the United States in his discretion, shall collect all the customs duties accruing at the several customs houses of the Dominican Republic until the payment or retirement of

any and all bonds issued by the Dominican Government in accordance with the plan and under the limitations as to terms and amounts hereinbefore recited; and said General Receiver shall apply the sum so collected, as follows:

First, to paying the expenses of the receivership; second, to the payment of interest upon said bonds; third, to the payment of the annual sums provided for amortization of said bonds including interest upon all bonds held in sinking fund; fourth, to the purchase and cancellation or the retirement and cancellation pursuant to the terms thereof of any of said bonds as may be directed by the Dominican Government; fifth, the remainder to be paid to the Dominican Government.

The method of distributing the current collections of revenue in order to accomplish the application thereof as hereinbefore provided shall be as follows:

The expenses of the receivership shall be paid by the Receiver as they arise. The allowances to the General Receiver and his assistants for the expenses of collecting the revenues shall not exceed five per cent unless by agreement between the two Governments.

On the first day of each calendar month the sum of $100,000 shall be paid over by the Receiver to the Fiscal Agent of the loan, and the remaining collection of the last preceding month shall be paid over to the Dominican Government, or applied to the sinking fund for the purchase or redemption of bonds, as the Dominican Government shall direct.

Provided, that in case the customs revenues collected by the General Receiver shall in any year exceed the sum of $3,000,000 one half of the surplus above such sum of $3,000,000 shall be applied to the sinking fund for the redemption of bonds.

II. The Dominican Government will provide by law for the payment of all customs duties to the General Receiver and his assistants, and will give to them all needful aid and assistance and full protection to the extent of its powers. The Government of the United States will give to the General Receiver and his assistants such protection as it may find to be requisite for the performance of their duties.

III. Until the Dominican Republic has paid the whole amount of the bonds of the debt its public debt shall not be increased except by previous agreement between the Dominican Government and the United States. A like agreement shall be necessary to modify the import duties. . . .

IV. The accounts of the General Receiver shall be rendered monthly to the Contaduria General of the Dominican Republic and to the State Department of the United States and shall be subject to examination and verification by the appropriate officers of the Dominican and the United States Governments.

V. This agreement shall take effect after its approval by the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the Dominican Republic.

Done in four originals, two being in the English language, and two in the Spanish, and the representatives of the high contracting parties signing them in the City of Santo Domingo this 8th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1907.

Thomas C. Dawson
Emiliano Tejera
Federico Velazquez H.

4. In a speech before the Southern Commercial Congress in Mobile, Alabama, on October 27, 1913, Woodrow Wilson seemed to indicate a change in the policy of the United States toward its Latin American neighbors.[15]

> [Wilson asserts that American policy toward Latin America will be different from the past and will be based on common understanding.]

After stressing the fact that the opening of the Panama Canal would put Latin America on the main line of world commerce, the President continued:

> [Wilson goes on to deprecate past American policies in Latin America and asserts that the United States will no longer seek commercial or territorial gains in Latin America but will work for friendship on terms of "equality and honor."]

5. On March 4, 1933 Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his first inaugural announced that the United States would base its relations with the Latin American countries on the principle of the "good neighbor," a policy

---

[15] The Messages and Papers of Woodrow Wilson (George H. Doran Company, New York, 1924), I, 32-36.

which came to be called "The Good Neighbor Policy." Secretary of State Cordell Hull elaborated this policy in a speech before the Conference of American States in Montevideo, Uruguay:[16]

It is in these inspiring circumstances that I and my associates have come to the Conference here in Montevideo. We come, too, for the reason that the people and the Government of the United States feel the keenest interest in this Conference and have the strongest desire to contribute to it success. We come because we share in common the things that are vital to the entire material, moral, and spiritual welfare of the people of this hemisphere, and because the satisfactory development of civilization itself in this West World depends on cooperative efforts by all the Americas. No other common aspiration could so closely draw peoples together. We can have no other objective than these. Our common hopes and responsibilities, chaperoned by common sense and initiative, beckon to all of us. We sense a yearning here for a spirit of fine cooperative endeavor. We know, too, that in this great region, the future possibilities of which no man dare calculate, the world is being given another chance to right itself. With you, pooling all our resources in an unselfish spirit, we shall undertake to meet the test of service to ourselves and to humanity, and make the most of the spacious opportunities that lie ahead. We know when we survey our assets that we have the foundations laid in this part of the world for the greatest civilization of all the past -- a civilization built upon the highest moral, intellectual, and spiritual ideals. . . .

In its own forward-looking policy, the administration at Washington has pledged itself, as I have said, to the policy of the good neighbor. As President Roosevelt has defined the good neighbor, he "resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others". We must think, we must speak, we must act this part. . . .

May I for a moment direct attention to the significance of this broad policy as my country is steadily carrying it into effect under the Roosevelt administration, the extent and nature of which should be familiar to each of the nations here represented. My Government is doing its utmost, with due regard to commitments made in the past, to end with all possible speed engagements which have been set up by previous circumstances. There are some engagements which can be removed more speedily than others. In some instances disentanglement from obligations of another era can only be brought about through the exercise of some patience. The United States is determined that its new policy of the New Deal -- of enlightened liberalism -- shall have full effect and shall be recognized in its fullest import by its neighbors. The people of my country strongly feel that the so-called right of conquest must forever be banished from this hemisphere and, most of all, they shun and reject that so-called right for themselves. The New Deal indeed would be an empty boast if it did not mean that.

---

[16] Addresses and Statements of The Honorable Cordell Hull (U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1935, No. 594) 32, 34-36.

Let us in the broad spirit of this revitalized policy make this the beginning of a great new era of a great renaissance in American cooperative effort to promote our entire material, moral, and spiritual affairs and to erect an edifice of peace that will forever endure. Let each American nation vie with the other in the practice of the policy of the good neighbor. Let suspicion, misunderstanding, and prejudice be banished from every mind, and genuine friendship for and trust in each other and a singleness of purpose to promote the welfare of all be substituted. Let each nation welcome the closest scrutiny by the others of the spirit and manner in which it carries out the policy of the good neighbor. Let actions rather than mere words be the acid test of the conduct and motives of each nation. Let each country demonstrate by its every act and practice the sincerity of its purposes and the unselfishness of its relationships as a neighbor.

It is in this spirit that the Government and the people of the United States express their recognition of the common interests and common aspirations of the American nations and join with them in a renewed spirit of broad cooperation for the promotion of liberty under law, of peace, of justice, and of righteousness.

6. On April 25, 1965, a revolt in the Dominican Republic deposed President Donald Reid Cabral. A provisional government supported by army units was established. It announced that it would act as a caretaker government until the earlier deposed President, Juan Bosch, could return to power. The air force under General Wessin y Wessin remained loyal to Reid with the result that virtual civil war existed. By April 28th a condition of near anarchy existed in the capital city, Santo Domingo.

The following announcements by President Johnson appeared in The New York Times on the days indicated. They suggest the deteriorating conditions in the Dominican Republic and the actions taken by the United States government.[17]

[These series of brief excerpts from articles in The New York Times summarize the United States government's actions and President Johnson's statements related to the revolt in the Dominican Republic in 1965.]

---

[17] The New York Times, April 28 and 29, May 1 and 3, 1965.

7. President Johnson threw additional light on his reasons for intervening in the Dominican Republic when, in a speech delivered in July 28, 1965, he explained the reasons for American intervention in Viet Nam:[18]

> [Johnson argues that we must defend South Vietnam both because we have learned in past wars that retreat imperils our security and because commitments have been made to defend South Vietnam against "the growing might and the grasping ambition of Asian communism." He contends that if the United States does not stay in Vietnam, both Asia and the United States would be threatened by Communist domination.]

---

[18] The New York Herald Tribune, July 29, 1965, 6.

SECTION V

IMPERIALISM TODAY: WHOSE BURDEN?

There is no easy answer to the dilemma of power faced by the United States in today's world, nor does this unit attempt to offer any. It can only present a background on which continued search for answers can be based.

1. Rudyard Kipling, poet of British imperialism, pointed to a course for the United States in 1899 with "The White Man's Burden" which he directed toward Americans:[1]

> [In this poem Kipling encourages the White man to "take up the White Man's burden" and to expand his form of civilization throughout the world.]

2. Another Englishman, Henry Fairlie, separated in time from Kipling by some 66 years, has a final comment to make on the role played by the United States in today's world. A British political writer for The Spectator and The Daily Telegram of London, Fairlie wrote the following article, entitled "A Cheer for American Imperialism," in the summer of 1965.[2]

> [Fairlie argues that the United States is an empire and that this is fortunate for those who live under it, as it allows them to lead peaceful and fruitful lives under law.]

---

[1] Collected Verse of Rudyard Kipling (Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., New York, 1931), 215. ("From COLLECTED VERSE OF RUDYARD KIPLING. Reprinted by permission of Mrs. George Bambridge and Doubleday and Company, Inc.")

[2] The New York Times Magazine, July 11, 1965, 7ff.

APPENDIX

The United States and The Question of Imperialism:

Selected Events

1867 - MIDWAY ISLANDS occupied in name of U. S.
ALASKA purchased from Russia for $7,200,000
Treaty with Denmark for purchase of VIRGIN ISLANDS defeated in the Senate.

1870 - President Grant's attempt to annex SANTO DOMINGO defeated in the Senate.

1873 - "Virginius" Affair. Spaniards executed American members of crew of this arms-running ship which was attempting to supply Cuban revolutionaries. Secretary Fisk negotiated the moderate demand of an $80,000 indemnity.

1875 - Signing of a comercial reciprocity treaty with Hawaii which stipulated no annexation by a third power.

1878 - U. S. granted nonexclusive rights to establish a naval station at Pago Pago in the SAMOAN ISLANDS.

1889 - An agreement signed by U. S., Great Britain, and Germany provided for SAMOAN independence and autonomy under a tripartite protectorate. Agents of the three powers were to have considerable authority over the municipality of Apia and were to advise the King of Samoa.

1891 - Sailors from U. S. cruiser Baltimore attacked by mob, Valparaise, CHILE. Talk of war ended by an official apology and an indemnity of $75,000.

1893 - Attempted annexation of HAWAII, initiated by Hawaiian sugar interests, blocked by President Cleveland.

1895 - Under a broad interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine President Cleveland forced the British to accept arbitration in the boundary dispute between British Guiana and VENEZUELA.

1898 - Spanish American War
HAWAII annexed
WAKE ISLAND acquired

1900 - Hay's Open Door policy toward CHINA finally accepted by Germany, Russia, and Great Britain
The treaty dividing SAMOAN ISLANDS between Germany and U. S. ratified in the Senate.
PUERTO RICO made an organized territory of the U. S.

1901 - Platt Amendment on CUBA passed.
Hay-Pauncefote Treaty gave U. S. exclusive right to construct an ISTHMIAN CANAL

1902 - PHILIPPINE Government Act made the islands an unorganized territory.
U. S. proposed arbitration in dispute between Great Britain, Germany and VENEZUELA.

1903 - U. S. recognized the REPUBLIC OF PANAMA
Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty with PANAMA gives U. S. control of a canal zone across the Isthmus.

1904 - Roosevelt corollary stated in his fourth annual message.

1905 - U. S. intervention in SANTO DOMINGO carried out by Roosevelt.

1907 - U. S. proposes a peace conference between COSTA RICA, GUATEMALA, HONDURAS, NICARAGUA and SALVADOR following an outbreak of war in Central America.

1909 - President Taft institutes "Dollar Diplomacy" in CHINA.

1911 - U. S. intervenes in NICARAGUA.

1912 - Lodge Corollary forbade the encroachment of non-American powers on the West Coast of North or South America.

1913 - President Wilson used pressure to bring about removal of reactionary dictator of MEXICO, General Huerta. It failed.
August 16 - Wilson envoked a policy of "watchful waiting" toward MEXICO.

1914 - Wilson stationed U. S. Naval units off Vera Cruz, MEXICO, to block arms shipments to Huerta.
U. S. forces bombarded Vera Cruz, MEXICO and occupied the city.
May 20, Wilson accepts ABC powers offer of mediation in the MEXICAN dispute.
July 15, Huerta leaves office.
November 23, U. S. forces withdrawn from Vera Cruz.

1915 - Revolt in HAITI led to landing of U. S. marines.
HAITI by treaty became virtual U. S. protectorate.

1916 - General Pershing led 15,000 American troops into MEXICO in search of Panco Villa.
Bryan-Chamorro Treaty. U. S. acquired exclusive rights to a canal route and naval base in NICARAGUA.
Internal disorder and financial difficulties in SANTO DOMINGO led to full military occupation by U. S. forces.
Jones Act stated U. S. intention to withdraw from PHILIPPINE ISLANDS as soon as stable government established.

1917 - Denmark ceded VIRGIN ISLANDS to U. S. for $25,000,000. U. S. appointed governor, grants limited home rule to inhabitants.
Jones Act. PUERTO RICO made a U. S. territory; citizenship granted to its inhabitants.
Woodrow Wilson's famous "Fourteen Points" includes a call for self-determination of nations after World War I.

1924 - U. S. Marines withdrawn from SANTO DOMINGO.

1927 - Difficulties with MEXICO over oil and land rights settled in favor of Americans.
U. S. landed troops in NICARAGUA in support of Conservative Adolfo Diaz for President against Liberal insurrectionists.

1928 - January 16, U. S. blocked acceptance at the Havana Conference of American States of a non-intervention resolution.

1929 - President Hoover made a good-will tour of eleven Latin-American nations.

1933 - Hoover withdrew troops from NICARAGUA.
President Roosevelt instituted "Good Neighbor Policy."
Secretary Hull supported non-intervention pact at Montevideo Conference of American States.
Legislation passed promising independence to the Philippines in ten years subsequently delayed until the end of World War II.

1934 - U. S. abrogated the PLATT AMENDMENT.
U. S. withdrew troops from HAITI.
PANAMA permitted the commercial rights of a sovereign nation in the canal zone.
Tydings-McDuffie Act providing for PHILIPPINE independence passed congress and accepted by Philippine legislature.
Reciprocal trade agreement with CUBA reduced duties on sugar.

1936 - Territorial legislature for VIRGIN ISLANDS.

1938 - MEXICO nationalized U. S. oil companies. By 1942 mediation settled the resulting controversy.

1939 - Financial aid for economic development granted to BRAZIL.
Declaration of Panama issued by Inter-American Conference. Belligerent powers warned to refrain from naval action in zones specified.

1940 - Act of Havana. Inter-American Conference proclaimed right of American states, collectively or individually, to take over any European possessions in this hemisphere.
U. S. acquired from the British a 99 year lease on naval and air bases in NEWFOUNDLAND, BERMUDA, BAHAMAS, JAMAICA, ST. LUCIA, TRINIDAD, ANTIQUA, and BRITISH GUIANA.

1941 - Atlantic Charter.

1953 - Puerto Rico is granted the status of a "free commonwealth" voluntarily associated with the United States.

1965 - April, United States sends troops to SANTO DOMINGO.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

There are a number of short stories that offer valuable insights into some of the problems arising from imperialism. Of these Heart of Darkness by Joseph Conrad is probably the best known. Strength of the Strong by Jack London and Departure and Other Stories by Howard Fast are both possible sources. Rudyard Kipling of course wrote a number of stories about life in British India. Two former British Imperial officers complete the list: Leonard Woolf, whose Diaries in Ceylon (The Hogarth Press, London, 1963) give a factual account of the life of a British colonial officer and also contain three short stories, commenting on life in the Far East; and George Orwell, who served in Burma, writes some wonderfully penetrating observations in "shooting an elephant" which can be found in A Collection of Essays (Doubleday, Anchor Books). A comparison of the Woolf diary with the experiences of those serving in the Peace Corp would be valuable. See, for example, Iris Luce, ed., Letters from the Peace Corp (Robert B. Luce, Inc., Washington, 1964).

For those interested in documents, a number of collections are readily available. Louis L. Snyder, ed., The Imperialism Reader (D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., Princeton) treats both European and American imperialism. Social Science Department, University of Chicago, eds., The People Shall Judge (The University of Chicago Press) is a valuable two volume collection of documents in American history with a fine selection on foreign affairs. Another source is Arban G. Whitaker, ed., Nationalism and International Progress (Howard Chandler, Publisher, San Francisco, 1960).

Most text books in European history have significant chapters on European imperialism. As for text books, Carl Becker's Modern History (Silver Burdett Company, New York, 1952) has a simplified account of European imperialism. A more detailed account is given in Hall and Davis, The Course of Europe Since Waterloo (Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1957). A more sophisticated but highly regarded discussion of imperialism can be found in Hans J. Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1951).

For those interested in the climate of opinion in the United States at the turn of the century, the chapter on "Racism and Imperialism" in Hofstadter, Social Darwinism in American Thought, 1860-1915 (University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1944) is revealing. Eric F. Goldman handles this subject well in Rendezvous with Destiny (Vintage Books, New York, 1956), particularly Chapter V.

Two books on widely devergent aspects of imperialism conclude this list. Stuart Cloete, Against These Three (Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1945) writes excitingly about the early days of imperial expansion in South Africa. David Halberstam, The Making of a Quagmire (Random House, New York, 1964) writes a penetrating and thought-provoking account of our present day commitment in South Viet Nam.