

CONSOLODATING EMPIRE: THE UNITED STATES IN
LATIN AMERICA, 1865-1920

Matthew Hassett

A Thesis Submitted to the
University of North Carolina Wilmington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Department of History

University of North Carolina Wilmington

2007

Approved by

Advisory Committee

Kathleen Berkeley

Paul Gillingham

W. Taylor Fain
Chair

Accepted by

Dean, Graduate School

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
DEDICATION.....	v
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
CHAPTER TWO.....	20
CHAPTER THREE.....	41
CHAPTER FOUR.....	63
CONCLUSION.....	82
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	87

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of the foreign policy of the United States in Latin America from the end of the American Civil War in 1865, until the close of the peace negotiations to end the First World War. It contends that Woodrow Wilson refined the policies and strategies of his predecessors to maintain and extend American influence in Latin America. Wilson employed both formal methods, such as military interventions, and informal methods, such as treaties and trade agreements, to insure American dominance in the hemisphere.

The thesis contends that Wilson's prime motivation was the spread of constitutional democracy. Wilson's vision of ideal democratic institutions was informed by his racism. His belief in the inferiority of non-whites allowed him to reconcile his policies of defending and exporting "democracy" when millions of African-Americans and women were denied the franchise and other basic rights in the United States. Wilson's most important contribution to the foreign policy of the United States was the introduction of the insistence on democratic institutions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks go to my wife, Dawn Stewart for enduring my “professional student” status over the past five years. For her encouragement, patience, and assistance I am grateful.

My parents, family and friends have been very supportive and interested in my education and always asking, “How’s your paper coming?”

Joe Moore allowed me the flexibility to earn a living and a degree.

Finally, special thanks must go to the members of my committee who have shown great patience and offered many valuable insights. Their continued encouragement and guidance are greatly appreciated.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to Linda and the Owl, the first historians to inspire and guide me.

CHAPTER ONE

Woodrow Wilson is remembered best for his role in creating the League of Nations at the close of the First World War. Most of the studies of Wilson's vision for a world governing system focus on the short time span between the United States' entry into the war in April 1917, and the peace negotiations in 1919. Historians Thomas Knock and Mark Gilderhus see the precursor for Wilson's League taking form early in his first administration in plans for a Pan American Treaty.¹

This thesis also looks back past 1917 to find the origins of Wilson's foreign policy. Unlike Knock and Gilderhus, it argues that Wilson's policies were a culmination and refinement of the strategies of his predecessors. The United States began an expansion into Latin America long before Wilson took office, and he continued the trend. The new interpretation offered in this thesis is that Wilson was primarily motivated not by economic or strategic concerns, though they certainly played a part, but by the desire to spread democracy. It also contends that Wilson failed to recognize the failure of democracy in the United States, evidenced by the disfranchisement of African Americans, even while he promoted it abroad. His domestic and foreign policies are linked by Wilson's racist beliefs that non-whites were not ready to participate in a democracy and needed white supervision, often over many years, to prepare them. Racism explains how Wilson could justify segregation at home and intervention in Latin America, all in the name of democracy. Through these racist interventions, Wilson became the leader of an American Empire in Latin America.

¹ Thomas J. Knock, *To End All Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992) and Mark Gilderhus, *Pan American Visions: Woodrow Wilson and the Western Hemisphere, 1913-1921* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1986).

Wilson took an early interest in the relations between the United States and Latin America. Among his first foreign policy goals was the plan for a Pan American Treaty linking all the nations of the Western Hemisphere in a mutual security system, with the United States in a leadership role. Knock and Gilderhaus argue this proposed system served as a rough draft for the League of Nations.

Wilson aimed to enlist the support of Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, the most powerful nations in Latin America, to assist in implementing his vision of a Pan-American Treaty. His plan contained two main points. The first was “mutual guarantees of political independence under republican forms of government and mutual guarantees of territorial integrity.” The second was that the signatories to the treaty would “acquire complete control within its jurisdiction of the manufacture and sale of munitions of war.”² The reception of this treaty served as a harbinger of the fate awaiting Wilson’s League of Nations. A promising beginning followed by failure.

The wording of these points is telling. In the first, signatories must guarantee the survival of “republican forms of government.” Wilson believed peace and security rested on the establishment and maintenance of liberal democracies. Member nations would only ensure the maintenance of “republican forms of government.” However, the United States would send in the Navy and Marines to ensure compliant governments regardless of how they came to power.

This thesis argues that Wilson envisioned himself as the leader of a hemispheric association of nations, which was in reality an American empire in Latin America. He used the Monroe Doctrine and the promise of increased freedom as justification for his

² Arthur S. Link ed. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), Vol. XXXI, 469. The Wilson Papers are an invaluable resource for this thesis and will be subsequently cited as PWW.

actions. It also contends that Wilson refined the policies of his predecessors. A state department commercial adviser said that the transition from President William Howard Taft to Wilson was “one of the few instances in which no break is shown, and no national administration overturns the policies of its predecessor.”³ He continued a trend of increasing United States involvement in the affairs of Latin America, which is examined from the close of the Civil War to the end of the First World War. A vital ingredient in these policies, and one Wilson introduced, was the determination to defend or export democracy. Unlike his forebears Wilson introduced the insistence on democracy, building on their legacy he utilized the methods of imperialism (military intervention, economic domination) to carry out his plans.

This thesis argues that the prime motivation for Wilson’s policies was his belief in constitutional, elected government. An integral ingredient of Wilson’s philosophies about government, were his racist beliefs about the inferiority of non-whites. He formed a bond with Progressives and shared their desire to reform politics at home and abroad.⁴ This is not to argue that more practical, economic and security issues were irrelevant for Wilson, however his belief in the necessity of democracy was paramount. Wilson was a Reformer Imperialist, meaning he insisted on “good government” within the nations he dealt with, but reserved the right to judge which states met that criteria, and to take steps to ensure such governments existed within their borders, even as the United States often failed to achieve those same goals.

Like many reformers Wilson believed he knew better what others needed and how to deliver it to them. The primacy of reform for Wilson is evident in his words and actions.

³ Quoted in Lars Schoultz, *Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy toward Latin America*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 222.

⁴ Knock, 17-21.

In a campaign speech in 1912 he declared the United States held a special position in the world as a disseminator of democracy. He said “we are chosen and prominently chosen to show the way to the nations of the world how they shall walk in the paths of liberty.”⁵ This was no idle campaign promise for Wilson and he attempted to deliver on it using the tools of empire.

Wilson’s racism obscured his vision of a new world order. While the president of Princeton University, Wilson successfully persuaded all African Americans to withdraw their applications for admission.⁶ Josephus Daniels, a Wilson campaign manager and later his Secretary of the Navy, stoked racial fears in East St. Louis to garner votes.⁷ Once in office, Wilson told “darky” stories and jokes during cabinet meetings and presided over the segregation of the Department of the Treasury, Post Office and the Bureau of Engraving.⁸ These offices had been desegregated since the end of the Civil War. Wilson refused to condemn the lynching of blacks and the only federal actions taken regarding racial conflict were to keep African Americans from attaining equality.⁹

Wilson’s views on race applied to all non-whites. He often warned against the “yellow peril” emerging from China and Japan.¹⁰ At the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, aware of the ramifications at home, Wilson worked to ensure a Japanese proposal

⁵ PWW. *Campaign Address, May 26, 1912*. 24, 443.

⁶ Henry Blumenthal, “Woodrow Wilson and the Race Question,” *The Journal of Negro History* 48, no. 1 (Jan. 1963) 2.

⁷ David Kennedy, *Over Here: The First World War and American Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 282.

⁸ Kenneth O’Reilly, “The Jim Crow Policies of Woodrow Wilson,” *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, no. 17 (Autumn 1997) 118.

⁹ Robert H. Zieger, *America’s Great War: World War I and the American Experience* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001), 207.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, 51.

proclaiming racial equality was excluded from the League of Nations Covenant.¹¹

Wilson believed that non-whites were unprepared to participate in democratic processes and it was his and the United States mission to educate them on how to do so.¹²

Wilson's beliefs were formed by his upbringing in the South. Wilson was born in Georgia and as a young boy witnessed the Civil War. His parents were southern sympathizers during the war.¹³ As an adult politician and member of the Democratic Party, he relied on the "solid South" as his main area of support. He filled his administration with fellow southerners like Josephus Daniels.¹⁴

He articulated his beliefs on the importance of democracy early in his intellectual career in a paper titled *The Modern Democratic State*. Written in 1885, the paper became the basis for many of Wilson's foreign and domestic policies. He wrote, "democracy is the fullest form of state life." Wilson argued that those new to the process needed a "period of political tutelage," before they were ready to properly participate in the democratic process.¹⁵ This supposed need for a period of tutelage was Wilson's method of justifying interventions in Latin America and the disfranchisement of blacks in the United States. Non-whites needed the guidance of whites, often lasting many years, until they were ready to operate autonomously in a democracy. Of course it was whites who then decided when their pupils passed their civics courses. Political education was the justification for many of Wilson's interventions in Latin America.

¹¹ Paul Gorden Lauren, "The Denial of Racial Equality," in William R. Keylor, *The Legacy of the Great War: Peacemaking 1919* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1998).

¹² Zieger, 55.

¹³ Knock, 3.

¹⁴ Kennedy, 241.

¹⁵ PWW, *The Modern Democratic State*, 5, 61-92.

America's interventions in Korea and later Vietnam along with fear of the spread of Communism prompted scholars to study Wilson's policies in Latin America. Many of Wilson's early experiences with foreign policy were with Latin America. Arthur Link, preeminent Wilson scholar and editor of his papers, argues that Wilson formulated a "Missionary Diplomacy" towards Latin America and the rest of the world. This was a belief that he knew better than other leaders what was best for their nations. The years between 1912 and 1914 were marked by failures because of his administrations' lack of experience in foreign affairs. Wilson also held a misguided belief that morality and reason would bring stability to a volatile region.¹⁶

Link wrote that Wilson was the best informed and wisest of the Big Four at the Paris Peace Conference, a group that included Britain's David Lloyd George, Italy's Vittorio Orlando, and France's Georges Clemenceau. For all of Wilson's wisdom, he had to contend with a hostile Republican Congress and other negotiators who never fully agreed with his positions.¹⁷

Writing at a time when Ronald Reagan was combating the Soviet Empire, Michael Hunt argues that three ideologies have influenced policy makers since the nation's founding. He describes a racist hierarchy, with whites at the top, an aversion to social revolutions, particularly those on the Left, and a belief that for future national greatness, the spread of liberty is essential. These three ideas have influenced all policy decisions in concert with the specific circumstances of each situation.¹⁸

¹⁶ Arthur S. Link *The New Freedom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956) and *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era* (New York: Harper and Row, 1954).

¹⁷ Arthur S. Link, *Wilson: The Diplomatist* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

¹⁸ Michael Hunt, *Ideology and United States Foreign Policy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), 14.

Howard Hill and Lester Langley view race as a major factor motivating the formation of foreign policy. Hill describes a paternalistic tendency in dealing with other people. Langley articulates an attitude held by American leaders that blacks were unable to govern themselves. It was the duty of the United States to lead where and when people were thought incapable of performing the job themselves.¹⁹

Wilson seized the opportunity to transform world politics at the peace conference after the First World War. He imagined the war as one to “make the world safe for democracy” and the League of Nations as a Monroe Doctrine for the world, guaranteeing democratic governments across the globe.²⁰ His Pan American Treaty plans resembled a congress of nations envisioned by Secretary of State James G. Blaine in 1881. Wilson intervened and sent United States troops to stamp out rebellions and bolster sympathetic regimes in Central and South America in the tradition of William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt. He believed the United States would assume the preeminent leadership role in the League of Nations, and the rest of the globe would follow its peaceful and democratic lead, yet Wilson’s rhetoric of self-determination and equality among nations often failed to materialize in his foreign and domestic actions.

John Dobson contends that spreading freedom and democracy were cornerstones of American foreign policy. This combined with economic and political expansion to make America one of the Great Powers. For America to become a Great Power it needed

¹⁹ Howard Hill, *Roosevelt and the Caribbean* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927) and Lester Langley, *Struggle for the American Mediterranean: The United States-European Rivalry in the Gulf-Caribbean, 1776-1904* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1976) See also Lester Langley, *The Banana Wars: An Inner History of American Empire, 1900-1930* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1983) Langley argues the United States intervened in Cuba, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Haiti to restore order for humanitarian reasons. However, heavy-handed tactics and racist assumptions about the local population alienated the native peoples.

²⁰ Knock, 113.

acceptance by the existing Great Powers of Europe.²¹ At the peace Conference American and British representatives worked together to ensure the maintenance of their dominance while declaring they were spreading democracy.

Lloyd Gardner, Walter LaFeber, and Thomas McCormick reach similar conclusions about the importance of liberty. They also argue for three main themes, but rather than race being a motivating factor in foreign policy, commercial markets were preeminent. America's leaders created political and economic systems, which aided commercial expansion. Policy makers believed that as commercial opportunities expanded, freedom and democracy rationally followed. The damage caused by domestic problems such as increasing crime rates and poverty could be alleviated by the expansion of commercial markets providing new raw materials and consumers. Expansion of markets meant more jobs and more opportunity, therefore less crime and poverty.²² The social turmoil of the 1960's with the Vietnam War, racial tension, and the growth of a "counter-culture" sparked an interest in social issues.

This thesis examines United States hemispheric imperialism under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson. The first chapter examines the historiography of Wilson's foreign policy, his efforts at peace making, and the foreign policy of the United States from 1865 to 1920. It also describes the historiography of the patterns exhibited in America's dealings with its Southern neighbors and the nature of empire and imperialism in general.

²¹ John Dobson, *America's Ascent: The United States Becomes a Great Power, 1880-1914* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1978).

²² Lloyd Gardner, Walter LaFeber, and Thomas McCormick, *Creation of the American Empire: United States Diplomatic History* (Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1973), 126. See also Whitney Perkins, *The United States and Caribbean Intervention* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1981) Frederick Merk argues that rather than an aggressive impetus for expansion, Americans have a sense of "mission", which strives to deliver freedom and democracy to other peoples. *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History: A Reinterpretation* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963).

The second chapter begins with the original declaration of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823. The story quickly moves to the conclusion of the Civil War, which marked America's expanding role in world affairs. The doctrine evolved under President Ulysses Grant, who proclaimed the No Transfer Clause while advocating annexation of the Dominican Republic in 1870.²³ Secretary of State James G. Blaine authored a proposal in 1881 for a congress of independent American nations for the prevention of war and civil unrest in the western hemisphere.²⁴

The second chapter then focuses on the 1898 war against Spain and the 1904 Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, which stated that the United States had the right to intervene in Latin America to quell chronic domestic unrest. It also briefly describes the rivalry with Britain, and to a lesser extent, Germany, over the spoils of empire. The chapter concludes with an examination of the 1912 Lodge Corollary, named for its promoter, Massachusetts Republican Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, which stated that the United States had the right to seize any harbor or naval station in the Americas if the nation's interests were threatened.²⁵

The third and fourth chapters explore Wilson's interests in Latin America, which began early in his first administration. It examines the Pan-American Pact and his defense of the League of Nations as a Monroe Doctrine for the world. Opponents of the League feared it would mean the end of the Doctrine, and that Great Britain would become the dominant nation in the new system because of the inclusion of the

²³*Senate Executive Journal*. Grant's Message to the Senate. 41st Congress, May 31, 1870. 461

²⁴*Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1881. *Note of the Secretary of State of the United States inviting the republics of America to a Pan-American Congress*, 13. Subsequently cited as FRUS.

²⁵*Congressional Record*. Henry Cabot Lodge speech on the Senate Floor. 62nd Congress, 2nd Session, 10045. Also Thomas Bailey, "The Lodge Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine," *Political Science Quarterly*, 48, no. 2 (Jun. 1933), 220-239.

Dominions, such as Canada and Australia. Wilson argued that the United States would have as much influence in Latin America as Britain had throughout its far-flung Empire. Latin American nations were ignored at the Peace Conference. Throughout this time period United States leaders of all political stripes claimed they were defending and spreading freedom by their actions and that the Monroe Doctrine served as the bedrock of their hemispheric policies.

This thesis argues that Wilson's belief in the mission to spread democracy, informed by his racist beliefs of the inferiority of non-whites, was the primary motivation for his policies in Latin America. Other concerns certainly factored into all of the policy-making decisions of the Wilson administration. Political, economic, and strategic concerns all influenced Wilson's policies.

Julius Pratt argues that the United States expanded for primarily political and strategic reasons, with economics subordinate to the other concerns. Americans were primarily well intentioned and were accepted by the colonized peoples. Policy makers asserted that the American model of government could be duplicated. The establishment of liberal democracies was beneficial to peace and security, which were necessary ingredients for economic expansion.²⁶

William Appleman Williams agrees with Pratt's contention that Americans were well intentioned in their dealings with others. His disagreement with Pratt is on the importance of economic concerns. The need to expand markets and gain new commercial opportunities for American business, he argues, was the primary motivation in United States foreign policy. American leaders stated that native peoples would share

²⁶ Julius Pratt, *America's Colonial Experiment: How the United States Gained, Governed, and In Part Gave Away A Colonial Empire* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1950), 3.

in the economic benefits. The tragedy for Williams is the absence of an equal sharing of the spoils, which were dominated by American interests.²⁷

Williams writes that Wilson adopted an “imperialism of the spirit.” Wilson was an adherent of Frederick Jackson Turner’s “Frontier Thesis,” which stated that America was able to expand because the frontier would always absorb excess population and surplus goods. Wilson viewed global markets as a substitute for the recently closed frontier. Three principles guided Wilson’s policies, humanitarian impulses, self-determination, and the belief that people must adopt American institutions to truly achieve self-determination. Wilson’s League was an attempt to stamp out revolutions and establish American ideals worldwide. Williams argues that Wilson was not a liberal idealist, but a defender of traditional liberal capitalism.²⁸

Scott Nearing and Joseph Freeman assert the preeminence of economic concerns in American expansion. Unlike Williams, they contend there was no humanitarian impulse in the expansionists’ strategy. Economic power cleared the way for America’s rise. They argue the Monroe Doctrine was a method of controlling the Western hemisphere and gaining commercial advantage, not an altruistic mechanism of protecting weaker Latin American governments from the rapacious Europeans.²⁹

Milton Plesur also views economics as the prime motivation for expansion. Isolationism was not the accepted ideal of America’s role in world affairs, but a tentative

²⁷ William Appleman Williams, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy, New Edition* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1972).

²⁸ Williams. “The Tragedy of American Diplomacy.”

²⁹ Scott Nearing and Joseph Freeman, *Dollar Diplomacy* (London: George, Allen, and Unwin, 1926)

attempt at acquiring markets without political expansion. Trade was the impetus for a more ambitious drive to a greater stature among nations.³⁰

Kristin Hoganson turns to gender politics to explain the imperialism of the United States. Hoganson argues that policy makers make decisions based partly upon the culture in which they are immersed. A male dominated culture emphasizing force and respect was very influential in pushing the United States to war with Spain and with Philippino insurgents in 1898.³¹

Dana Munro argues that strategic interests are the most important factor in American foreign relations. Caribbean island nations were weak and unstable; conditions which would allow European powers to gain influence. Munro suggests that American motives were entirely self interested but based on political and security interests. The extension of commercial markets was secondary to other concerns. Writing during increasing American presence in Vietnam, Munro claimed that short interventions did not produce good will or lasting results.³²

While no author claims that policies were formulated under the influence of only one source, Charles Campbell argues that a confluence of conditions and ideologies informed American leaders. He writes that between 1865 and 1900 America abandoned isolationism and embraced expansion. Manufacturers pushed for more trade to compensate for shrinking domestic markets. Other influences were the work done by

³⁰ Milton Plesur, *America's Outward Thrust: Approaches to Foreign Affairs, 1865-1890* (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1971).

³¹ Kristin Hoganson, *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

³² Dana Munro, *Intervention and Dollar Diplomacy in the Caribbean, 1900-1921* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964).

missionaries, the desire to acquire a European style empire, racism, and the works of naval advocate Alfred T. Mahan.³³

The first significant scholarly treatment of Wilson's foreign policy appeared soon after Wilson left office.³⁴ Charles Seymour assesses Wilson's work toward the League of Nations and concludes that he was motivated by a desire to ensure a lasting peace for the world. Seymour describes the war as a transition from chaos to order, and Wilson played a large role in the victory. He asserts that Wilson failed in his bid for American acceptance of the League because he refused to compromise, but notes that Wilson should be judged as a prophet, not by his lack of success.

In the 1930's the fate of liberal democracies looked grim. Fascism and Communism reigned in Europe and the United States was foundering in the Great Depression. In 1937 Harley Notter studied the beginnings of Wilson's foreign policy. He identifies three overarching elements of Wilson's policies, which were present before he entered office. These elements were his beliefs in morality, in self-determination, and that the United States had a special mission to export liberty.³⁵

Critics of Wilson's policies have argued that he traveled to Paris with unrealistic expectations and no clear understanding of the workings of diplomacy or international power relations. In 1948 Hans Morgenthau described Wilson as an "idealist" who did not understand power politics. This idea was refined and developed by diplomat, historian, and chief architect of America's Cold War policy George F. Kennan. Kennan

³³ Charles Campbell, *The Transformation of American Foreign Relations, 1865-1900* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976) See also David Healy, *Drive to Hegemony: The United States in the Caribbean, 1898-1917* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988) and *U.S. Expansionism: The Imperialistic Urge in the 1890's* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press,

³⁴ Charles Seymour, *Woodrow Wilson and the World War* (Yale University Press, 1921).

³⁵ Harley Notter, *The Origins of the Foreign Policy of Woodrow Wilson* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1937).

argued in 1951 that the failure of the Treaty of Versailles was responsible for the bulk of the security risks faced by the United States. Kennan also portrays Wilson as an idealist who based his foreign policy on “legalistic” and “moral” arguments that did not account for “realist” power relations and the importance of strong militaries rather than collective agreements for national security. A strong military was also vital to serve as enforcer of a nation’s policies. Due to the growing influence of world governing organizations such as the United Nations and the World Bank, Kenan altered his view of Wilson and describes him as “ahead of any other statesman of his time.” Nearly all subsequent historians studying Wilson have employed the “realist” versus “idealist” vocabulary.³⁶

Lloyd Gardner offers a new interpretation of Wilson’s motivations for a League of Nations. Examining British and American sources, Gardner argues that Wilson sought to end the Balance of Power diplomacy in Europe and spread democracy. Gardner asserts it was the experiences of the Mexican Revolution and the Japanese takeover of the Chinese province of Shantung that persuaded Wilson of the need for a new world organization for security and diplomacy. For Gardner, Wilson failed to bring about a lasting peace or initiate a new world order.³⁷

Robert Quirk examines the Wilson’s intervention in Vera Cruz, Mexico. He mines American and Mexican archives in his account of the eight-month occupation. Quirk is critical of Wilson’s “moral imperialism.” The intervention was a complete failure

³⁶ Hans Morgenthau introduced the “realist” vs. “idealist” debate into the historiography of Wilson. This idea of Wilson as an “idealist” was refined by diplomat and historian George F. Kennan. See: Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf) and George F. Kennan, *American Diplomacy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951) Kennan eventually softened his views of Wilson and described him as “ahead of any other statesman of his time.” See George F. Kennan “Comments on a Paper Entitled ‘Kennan versus Wilson’ by Professor Thomas J. Knock” in John Milton Cooper Jr. and Charles E. Neu eds. *The Wilson Era: Essays in Honor of Arthur S. Link* (Arlington Heights, MI: Harlan Davidson, 1991), 330.

³⁷ Lloyd Gardner, *Safe For Democracy: The Anglo-American Response to revolution, 1913-1923* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

because of the president's ignorance of other cultures and his refusal to compromise with Mexican leaders.³⁸

Kendrick Clements comes to a different conclusion about the intervention in Mexico.³⁹ For Clements, the occupation of Vera Cruz was a success because it denied arms and munitions to the rebellious general, Victoriano Huerta, which led to his downfall. Clements agrees with Quirk about Wilson's lack of knowledge about Mexican culture. Wilson's commitment to the ideal of self-determination left him oblivious to the notion that Latin American leaders would see his interventions as imperialistic.

Other assessments of Wilson have used dependency theory to analyze Wilson's foreign policies. Dependency theory emerged in the 1950's as an explanation for the inequality between nations. A central argument of dependency theorists is that economics primarily directs the development of social, cultural, and political institutions. For them, the international economic system consists of dominant and dependent states. A nation becomes dependent when its economy functions in direct relation to the dominant state. Interaction tends to perpetuate the system of dominant and dependent states.⁴⁰

Mark Gilderhus operates within the Dependency Theory framework in his study of Wilson's attempts to establish the Pan-American Treaty. Wilson envisioned the United States leading the Western Hemisphere in promoting stability and economic prosperity. Gilderhaus argues that Pan-Americanism was a vital part of Wilson's foreign policy throughout both of his terms but assumed a secondary role during the war. He also

³⁸ Robert Quirk, *An Affair of Honor: Woodrow Wilson and the Occupation of Vera Cruz* (Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press, 1962).

³⁹ Kendrick Clements, *Woodrow Wilson: World Statesman*. (Boston: Twayne Publishing, 1987)

⁴⁰ See Louis A. Pérez, Jr. in Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Patterson eds. *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations* Second Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 164-170.

reinforces the argument that Wilson was largely unsuccessful in his dealings with Latin American leaders.⁴¹

David Healy argues that Wilson was the “most interventionist United States president to date.” Healy asserts that the United States intervened in Haiti to install governments sympathetic to American commercial expansion. Wilson spoke of delivering freedom but took control of domestic security forces and ordered United States military direct elections.⁴²

The historiography of empire is voluminous and varied. Some works that are important to this thesis are discussed below. These works offer definitions of the terms empire and imperialism and explore the different types of empire. Some of these works also address the distinctions between formal and informal empires.

David Landes defines empire simply as “the dominion of one country over another.”⁴³ For Landes, imperialism is the “system (principle or spirit) and pursuit of empire.” He argues that empires have existed since the “dawn of history” in everywhere people have organized themselves into states. What sets Landes apart from other scholars of empire is his argument that empire is not primarily concerned with material gain or a byproduct of capitalism.

Niall Ferguson, in his book *Colossus*, describes many types of empire. The form empire assumes is related to the form of government of the imperial state (democracy, monarchy), the methods of rule (military, local elites), the objectives of the imperialists,

⁴¹ Mark Gilderhus, “Pan-American Visions.”

⁴² David Healy, *Gunboat Diplomacy in the Wilson Era: The U. S. Navy in Haiti 1915-1916* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1976).

⁴³ David S. Landes, *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some Are so Rich and Some so Poor* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1999), 422-441.

economic systems, and character.⁴⁴ Ferguson wrote at a time when the United States was the world's only super power. He argues that the United States Empire has been beneficial for the world and should remain actively engaged in empire.

Geir Lundestad offers a similar appraisal of American Empire in the 1940's and 1950's.⁴⁵ Lundestad contends that European nations encouraged the United States to take a more active role in foreign affairs. Americans were able to assume a leading role because they offered a peaceful and beneficial alternative to the force employed by the Soviet Union. Other nations tolerated an increased American presence in return for greater security and economic benefits. Lundestad wrote this article in 1986 during the Cold War when the Soviet Union was still a threatening force and the United States the only nation powerful enough to counter the danger.

Samuel Flagg Bemis argues the United States undertook the role of protector in Latin America.⁴⁶ Latin American nations did not invite United States intervention. Bemis contends that the American public never supported the notion of empire, even though the one that emerged "was not really bad." The goal of the American empire was protection, first of the home territory, and second of the western hemisphere from European interventions. Bemis labels this policy "protective imperialism" or "imperialism against imperialism." Our southern neighbors do not accept this interpretation.⁴⁷ Bemis wrote in

⁴⁴ Niall Ferguson, *Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire* (New York: Penguin Books, 2004), 7-13.

⁴⁵ Geir Lundestad, "Empire by Invitation: The United States and Western Europe, 1945-1952," *Journal of Peace Research*, 23, no. 3 (Sep. 1986), 263-277.

⁴⁶ Samuel Flagg Bemis, *The Latin American Policy of the United States: An Historical Analysis* (New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1943), 386.

⁴⁷ See Aguilar Monteverde, *Pan-Americanism from Monroe to the Present: A View from the Other Side* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1968). Monteverde views American empire as an exercise in oppression and exploitation.

1943 during the Second World War when the United States was a powerful adversary of fascism.

William Appleman Williams, argues that a desire for economic growth was the motivation of American empire.⁴⁸ American policy was aimed at gaining a sphere of influence in world markets. Williams offers a definition of empire. When a strong nation attempts to dominate and direct a weaker economy, this “can with accuracy and candor only be described as imperial.” Williams argues that Wilson’s policies constituted an “Imperialism of the Spirit.” This was a combination of altruistic motives (the spread of democracy) and practical economic considerations.⁴⁹ Although the United States sought to dominate dealings with weaker nations, policy makers did not seek to annex territory. Williams wrote that this constitutes “informal” empire.

John Gallagher and Ronald Robinson argue in their highly influential work on Victorian Era British Imperialism, “refusals to annex are no proof of reluctance to control.”⁵⁰ For Gallagher and Robinson the distinction between formal and informal empire is one of methods of control. “Formal and informal empire are essentially interconnected and to some extent interchangeable.”⁵¹ Force (formal) is utilized when treaties and favorable trade agreements (informal) fail.

Germany successfully utilized the tools of informal empire in South America.⁵² Ian Forbes studied Brazil and Argentina because they were home to the largest number of German expatriates but contends they serve as representative of the entire region.

⁴⁸ Williams, “The Tragedy of American Diplomacy.”

⁴⁹ Ibid, 69.

⁵⁰ John Gallagher and Ronald Robinson, “The Imperialism of Free Trade,” *The Economic History Review*, 6, no. 1 (1953), 1-15.

⁵¹ Ibid, 6.

⁵² Ian L. D. Forbes, “German Informal Imperialism in South America Before 1914,” *The Economic History Review*, New Series 31, no. 3 (Aug 1978), 384-398.

Germany exploited this community to create a system of banks, customs services and trading houses. Military cooperation was also an important link between Germany and Latin America. In 1912 Germany provided 16.6 percent of Argentina's imports and 17.2 percent of Brazil's.⁵³ Surely the presence of the United States and Great Britain were barriers to the formal expansion of German influence in the region, however informal methods also yielded positive results.

This thesis relies on these and secondary works for information and direction. Primary sources serve as support for the argument that Wilson was a reformer imperialist in Latin America, who combined racist assumptions about non-whites with a mission to spread democracy in his attempt to create a Monroe Doctrine for the world. Arthur Link and his staff edited a multi-volume set of Wilson's papers. These are comprehensive and an invaluable source for this paper. In addition to Wilson's papers, the papers of the presidents who served from 1865 to 1920 were consulted, the Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States and the Congressional Record contain a wealth of information about the official government positions on Latin America and the individual nations therein. Memoirs and biographies written by policy makers such as James G. Blaine, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Robert Lansing provided additional insight. Periodicals and newspaper articles and editorials also serve as important sources.

⁵³ Forbes, "German Informal Imperialism in South America Before 1914." 398.

CHAPTER TWO

Woodrow Wilson made Latin America one of his foreign policy priorities and in so doing he followed a long tradition of American policy makers. The lands and resources of Central and South America and the Caribbean Sea have long been seen as key elements of the prosperity and security of the United States. United States leaders coveted these areas for their wealth of natural resources such as silver, oil, sugar, bananas, rice, and other agricultural products. Leaders knew the narrow isthmus connecting North and South America was ideal for a canal that would increase America's wealth by speeding the transfer of goods between the East and West coasts. It was also important for the defense of the nation, conferring the same advantages of speed and efficiency to the Navy as to commercial interests.⁵⁴

More important than leaders' recognition of the value of these areas is the idea that they must remain stable and republican to ensure the continued security and prosperity of the United States. That America could serve as an example of freedom to the rest of the world was not a new concept in 1823, what was new was the notion that the United States would serve as the guarantor of the freedom of the Western Hemisphere and that the fortunes of all American nations were intimately linked.

John Quincy Adams, expressed these sentiments while serving as Secretary of State to president James Monroe in 1823. On April 28 he wrote to Hugh Nelson, the American Minister to Spain, about the possible transfer of Cuba from Spain to Great Britain or France as a result of the war between Spain and France. Adams maintained that the

⁵⁴ Lester Langley, *Struggle for the American Mediterranean: The U.S.-Euro Rivalry in the Gulf-Caribbean, 1776-1904* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1976).

primary causes of European wars were the denial of “civil liberties” and “national independence,” and the United States could not ignore those struggling for such aims. “A feeling of sympathy and of partiality for every nation struggling to secure or to defend these great interests has been and will be manifested by this Union; and it is among the most difficult and delicate duties of the general government, in all its branches, to indulge this feeling so far as it may be compatible with the duties of neutrality.” The United States, John Quincy Adams believed, must work to promote not only independent nations, but also those that respect individual freedoms.⁵⁵

Adams worried that a French victory would mean the introduction of monarchy to Cuba where “the republican spirit of freedom prevails among its inhabitants.”⁵⁶ He also claimed that the inhabitants of the island would be opposed to the transfer of control to any other power and that the United States would aid them in obtaining their independence. Adams presented American actions as a defense of the interests of a weaker nation. He admitted the strong commercial and strategic interests of the United States in Cuba, but also claimed the defense of liberty and the will of the Cuban people.

President James Monroe set forth the American policy that would become the cornerstone of future administrations in dealing with Latin America. Monroe formulated his policy after an overture from British foreign minister Lord George Canning. Canning wanted the United States and Britain to issue a joint policy on Spain’s colonies.⁵⁷ He wrote a draft of the policy stating that Great Britain believed the Spanish colonies would eventually win independence. Canning did not believe that Spain would be able to

⁵⁵ Worthington C. Ford ed. *Writings of John Quincy Adams* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), Vol. VII, 369.

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, 370.

⁵⁷ Ernest May, *The Making of the Monroe Doctrine* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), 5-6.

recover its colonies, but England and the United States would not inhibit reconciliation. The final point stated that the United States and Great Britain did not desire any territory, but could not allow the transfer of the former colonies to another power because of the strategic threat it would pose.

Monroe consulted his mentors Thomas Jefferson and James Madison about the course of action he should pursue. He wrote Jefferson on October 17, 1823 that he was inclined to accept Canning's proposal. Britain, he wrote, "must take her stand either on the side of the monarchs of Europe or of the United States and, in consequence, either in favor of despotism or of liberty." Monroe felt the spread of democracy was vital to the interests of the United States and any nations he enlisted in that enterprise would be to the benefit of both.⁵⁸

Jefferson responded on October 24 by saying it was the most important question "ever offered to my contemplation" since the Revolution.⁵⁹ He reaffirmed George Washington's warning to avoid entangling alliances. He also suggested the Americas develop a "system of her own, separate and apart from that of Europe. While the last is laboring to be the domicile of despotism, our endeavor should surely be to make our hemisphere that of freedom." Jefferson felt that an alliance with England on this point would ensure no other nation would interfere with the western hemisphere. Jefferson saw the fortunes of the entire hemisphere connected, with liberty as the glue binding them together.

⁵⁸ William Benton publisher, *The Annals of America: Volume 5, 1821-1832 Steps Toward Equalitarianism* (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. 1968), 68-69. *Monroe to Jefferson*.

⁵⁹ H. A. Washington ed. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson: Being his Autobiography, Correspondence, Reports, Messages, Addresses and Other Writings, Official and Private* (Washington D.C.: Department of State 1853), Vol. 7, 315-317. *Jefferson to Monroe*.

Monroe delivered what would become known as his doctrine during the annual message on December 2, 1823. The speech contained two main points regarding Latin America. “The occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.” Monroe resisted a joint declaration with Britain disavowing the aim of acquiring more territory. The United States was expanding, and many felt the entire hemisphere might one day be a part of the Union.⁶⁰

Later in the message Monroe wrote of the importance of republican forms of government. The forms of government were what linked the nations of the Western Hemisphere and what separated them from Europe. “We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.” Monroe said the extension of any form of government that was not republican would undermine the security of the United States. Monroe identified democracy and freedom as essential to prosperity and vowed the United States intended to defend that system against any others.⁶¹

The Monroe Doctrine became a cornerstone of United States’ foreign policy but prior to the Civil War the United States lacked the power to enforce it. The nation’s borders extended westward, and territorial expansion was confined to the continent’s mainland.

⁶⁰ Benton, 74-75.

⁶¹ Ibid, 75.

However, the issue of slavery in the Southern states conflicted with the expressed ideals of freedom and democracy, essential elements of the Monroe Doctrine.

The United States annexed Texas in 1845 and then acquired the territory that became the states of Nevada, California, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and part of Colorado from Mexico in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848 following the Mexican American War. The United States added territory in the Southwest with the Gadsden Purchase of 1853. The nation's northwestern borders took shape in 1846 with a treaty between the United States and Great Britain setting the boundary at the 49th parallel.

The 1850's were largely consumed with the administration of the newly acquired territories. The question of slavery became the foremost problem for policy makers in this decade. The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 left the issue to residents, and the Dred Scott Decision declared that slaves were not citizens and were not free because of their residence in free territory. The nation lost over 600,000 dead in the Civil War.

At the close of the war newspaper editors, political, and military leaders put their faith in the Monroe Doctrine as an avenue for reconciliation between North and South. In 1863 the French landed a force of 35,000 men in Mexico and overthrew the government of Benito Juárez.⁶² French Emperor Louis Napoleon installed Austrian Ferdinand Maximilian as Emperor of Mexico. Confederate leaders established ties with Maximilian in an effort to gain French recognition of the Southern States and to open trade routes across the Rio Grande in Texas. That strategy failed to deliver a Confederate victory and soon a few leaders on both sides in the conflict, weary of war, formulated a new plan.

⁶² James McPherson, *Battle Cry Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 683-684. For a full account of the installation of Maximilian see Jasper Ridley, *Maximilian and Juarez* (London: Phoenix Press, 1992).

Northern and Southern leaders saw an opportunity for reconciliation through enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine. The citizens of both regions would unite in a common cause, liberty, which would spread to Mexico, and eliminate all European influence on the continent. In January 1865 the *New York Times* reported that the *Albany Argus* and the *Richmond Enquirer* advocated the union of Northern and Southern armies in order to capture Canada and drive the French from Mexico.⁶³

French and British leaders both feared this plan would come to fruition. Reports from London said the general feeling was that “the employment of the united armies of the north and south to carry out the Monroe Doctrine at once, and to its fullest extent, is considered the most probable event that can happen.”⁶⁴ Three days later the Paris correspondent sent a dispatch to New York. “The *Monde*, the leading Catholic paper, which has always been against the Union because it is a republic and Protestant, says; ‘France and England will perhaps be obliged to defend themselves against the Monroe Doctrine- the latter its colonies, the former its expeditions.’”⁶⁵

General Ulysses Grant took an interest in the proposition and sent one of his generals to confer with Confederate leaders in Texas. On January 14, 1865 he received a letter from Major General Lewis Wallace describing a meeting between Wallace and an old school friend. “There was one point in his conversation to which he reverted several times, and which was suggestive of a new idea; it was that, if overtures were now made

⁶³ *The New York Times*, “A Coincidence of Sentiment,” sec.1, January 9, 1865. 4.

⁶⁴ *The New York Times*, “The ‘First Act’ Ended-Dread of War With America-Canada and Mexico the Means of Reconciliatio,”sec.1, May 5, 1865. 2.

⁶⁵ *The New York Times*. “Our Paris Correspondence,” sec.1, May 8, 1865. 1. European governments remained fearful of war with the United States after the Civil War ended. They learned “many Northern and Southern generals have expressed themselves in favor of the armed liberation of Mexico.” *The New York Times*, “France-Mexico-The United States,” sec. 1, August 7, 1865. 4. See also Robert Ryal Miller, *Arms Across the Border: United States Aid to Juarez during the French Intervention in Mexico* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1973).

to them, he believed the rebel soldiery in Western Texas, would gladly unite with us, and cross the river under the Juárez flag.” Wallace felt such a union of the armies would “stagger the rebellion.”⁶⁶ Wallace saw foreign policy as a cure for domestic problems.

Grant authorized Wallace to travel to Texas to confer with Confederate General J.E. Slaughter, commander of West Texas, and Colonel J.S. Ford.⁶⁷ Wallace met the men and wrote to Grant on March 14, 1865 that the Southern leaders were “not only willing but anxious” to conclude an agreement. They “entered heartily into the Mexican project.” The plan was never set in motion after the surrender of Robert E. Lee and Joseph Johnston in the East.⁶⁸

This proposition of joint action against the French demonstrates the evolution of the Monroe Doctrine. The Doctrine’s original intent, to exclude European powers from the Western Hemisphere, was subsumed. Northern and Southern leaders saw the value of using foreign policies as a cure for domestic strife. They hoped to end the destruction of the Civil War and forge a swift reunion of the warring states by focusing on a foreign enemy. Advocates of this plan also stressed the dangers of a monarchy on the nation’s doorstep could pose.

With the war over, President Andrew Johnson and his administration could spend more time on the Mexican question. In December he declared his position on the

⁶⁶ John Y. Simon ed., *The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967-1991) Vol. 13, note 283. *Maj. Gen. Lewis Wallace to USG*. Other Confederate Generals also expressed interest in an expedition to Mexico. In June the *New York Times* reported that “The Mobile News says that the rebel Generals Taylor and Cockerill lately expressed the wish that the government would allow them to take their commands and join the Federal forces for maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine in Mexico.” *The New York Times*, “From New Orleans,” sec.1, June 21, 1865, 1.

⁶⁷ Simon, *PUSG*. Vol. 13, 286. *Wallace to USG*.

⁶⁸ Union Military leaders still advocated a forcible ejection of the French from Mexico. General Phillip Sheridan “had entertained the hope that the president, true to his strong adherence to the Monroe Doctrine, would encourage him in a ‘defense of Mexico’” *The New York Times*, “General News,” sec. 1, August 20, 1865, 4. In October Grant aired similar sentiments. “He declares that the government will vindicate the Monroe Doctrine at an early day, and that Maximilian must leave Mexico.” *The New York Times*, “Alleged Expressions Made by Lieut.-Gen. Grant,” sec. 1, October 5, 1865, 1.

Mexican situation. “We should regard it as a great calamity to ourselves, to the cause of good government, and to the peace of the world, should any European Power challenge the American people, as it were, to the defense of republicanism against foreign interference.” Democracy, freedom, and peace were thus all linked to the security of the nation.⁶⁹

France was growing weary of the expedition and Napoleon III needed a graceful way out. In November 1865 he met with American diplomat James Watson Webb who introduced the idea of a phased French withdrawal.⁷⁰ He announced to the French Legislature January 22, 1866 that all French troops would be out of Mexico by October 1867.⁷¹ Although this left Maximilian in a tenuous spot, he refused to abdicate his position. President Johnson faced mounting pressure at home to enforce the Monroe Doctrine and expel the foreign forces from the hemisphere. On January 8, 1866 E. George Squier, a United States commissioner to Peru from 1863-1865, sent Johnson a letter and newspaper accounts of a meeting at New York’s Cooper Institute “in favor of the vindication of the Monroe Doctrine.”⁷²

Speakers at the meeting and those who wrote letters of support frequently cited the need to eliminate monarchical governments from the hemisphere. Senator J.W. Nesmith of Oregon asserted that France tried to end republicanism in the Americas and he supported military action to end the threat. “I have to state that I am earnestly in favor of our government reasserting the Monroe Doctrine, and if need be, vindicating it at the

⁶⁹ *The New York Times*, “The Presidents’ Interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine,” sec.1, December 7, 1865. 4. The paper disavowed any intention of territorial expansion on the part of the United States. “Those half breeds and miserable mixture of Indians and Negroes and whites would never be suited to our institutions and civilization.”

⁷⁰ Ridley, 238.

⁷¹ *Ibid*, 239.

⁷² Leroy P. Graf and Ralph W. Haskins eds. , *The Papers of Andrew Johnson* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967-1999), Vol. 9, 581. *From E. George Squier.*

mouth of the cannon.”⁷³ A European monarch’s proxy was not acceptable to the attendees of the meeting.

The meeting resolved that the United States must “vindicate the great principle enunciated by Monroe.” “We have assumed a responsibility toward our sister republics, and an obligation to defend and protect them,” and finally to state that the United States will not abide the establishment of monarchy in the Americas. The speakers and those who sent letters of support asserted that the continued prosperity of the nation depended on the maintenance of republican forms of government in the western hemisphere. Democracy would bring stability and that in turn would lead to increased commercial opportunities for all American nations.

Juárez supporters captured Maximilian on May 15, 1867. His capture followed increased United States pressure on his supporters. America threatened an invasion of Egypt with black troops if the French sent military aid to Maximilian.⁷⁴ Johnson threatened to terminate diplomatic relations with Austria if they continued to aid the Emperor.⁷⁵ Maximilian was executed June 19, 1867. The lenient policy the United States adopted toward European involvement in Mexico during the Civil War, came to an end after the surrender of Southern forces.

The acquisition of territory was not the primary interest of the United States. The expulsion of rival powers from the neighborhood was the desired outcome with the defense of republican government the stated motive. Although the belief in the benefits

⁷³*The New York Times*, “Meeting at Cooper Institute to Enforce Monroe Doctrine,” sec.1, January 7, 1866. 8. Also giving speeches were Senator John Conness from California, Honorable Daniel Dickinson from the United States District Attorneys Office, Horace Greely, and president of the meeting William Cullen Bryant. Also sending letters of support were Generals Dan Sickles and James A. Garfield, Senator B. F. Wade of Ohio and Speaker of the House Schuyler Colfax.

⁷⁴ Ridley, 244.

⁷⁵ Ibid, 245.

of freedom were sincere, the language used by policy makers accentuated the positives for the recipients of United States actions and downplayed the profits enjoyed by America. In June 1865 Charles Sumner, Republican senator from Massachusetts, wrote to a friend, “I have a letter from a member of the Cabinet, telling me of a strong pressure on the President to enforce the Monroe Doctrine as a safety-valve now, and to divert attention from domestic questions.”⁷⁶ The most important domestic questions at the time were the citizenship and voting status of freed African Americans. Johnson was urged to defend the republican form of government in Mexico and to deny it to millions in the United States.

Ulysses Grant won the presidential election in 1868. He also spoke of the Monroe Doctrine as a means for spreading democracy. He was a strong advocate for the annexation of the Dominican Republic. The addition of the island would bring a number of advantages to the United States. On May 31, 1870 he said, “I believe it will redound greatly to the glory of the two countries interested, to civilization, and to the extirpation of the institution of slavery.” Grant stated the Dominican Republic was one of the richest lands on earth and capable of supporting many more inhabitants than currently resided there. He asserted that the Monroe Doctrine was accepted by all political parties and deemed “it proper to assert the equally important principle that hereafter no territory on the continent shall be regarded as subject of transfer to a European power.”⁷⁷ This phrase was added because Grant claimed the inhabitants of Santo Domingo wished for annexation and did not want them to appeal to a European power if the United States

⁷⁶ Edward L. Pierce ed., *Memoirs and Letters of Charles Sumner* (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1893), *To R. Schleiden*. Vol. 4, 254.

⁷⁷ *Congressional Record*. 41st Congress, Senate Executive Journal: Tuesday May 31, 1870. *Message from Grant to the Senate*. 461.

refused. It was an adherence to the Monroe Doctrine because it would spread freedom, enhance the security of the nation and increase markets.

In his annual message on December 5, 1870 Grant stressed the importance of giving Santo Domingo a “stable government, under which her immense resources can be developed,” which would “give remunerative wages to tens of thousands of laborers, not now on the island.” He argued “Porto Rico and Cuba will have to abolish slavery, as a means of self preservation, to retain their laborers.”⁷⁸ Grant expressed a common theme of American policy makers, the necessity of stability, which is only possible under republican forms of government, for economic growth.

Grant viewed this acquisition as a stepping-stone to other areas in the hemisphere. In a message to Congress dated April 5, 1871 he declared, “I do not favor the acquisition of territory, no matter how desirable, at the cost of strict justice to all parties concerned. But if acquisitions by honorable means, pave the way for other acquisitions let them come.”⁷⁹ He believed that the residents of Santo Domingo wanted to become a part of the United States and indicated this could lead to further expansion in the future. As he stated before, Grant believed the acquisition of the island would end slavery, increase the security of the United States, and increase the commercial markets and opportunities for the nation.

Grant did not express the view held by most Americans. The acquisition of Santo Domingo never received Congressional approval. Republican Senator Carl Schurz of Missouri explained that if the United States acquired the island more territory would follow. In a speech delivered to the Senate on January 11, 1871 he also claimed those

⁷⁸ Simon, *PUSG*. Vol. 21, 52. *Annual Message*.

⁷⁹ Simon, *PUSG*. Vol. 21, 281. *To Congress*.

living in tropical climates were unsuited to democracy. He encouraged his fellow Senators to examine the history of the island. “Read that history, read that of all other tropical countries and then show me a single example of the successful establishment and peaceful maintenance, for a respectable period, of republican institutions, based upon popular self-government, under a tropical sun.”⁸⁰ The annexation of Santo Domingo would not, Schurz claimed, lead to the extension of republicanism, but of strife, which would then be the problem of the United States. Schurz shared the racist assumptions of most Americans. The majority of the Haitian population was non-white, therefore inferior intellectually and unsuited to democracy in the minds of many Americans.

Schurz also attacked the claim that the Monroe Doctrine justified annexing territory. He argued, “that the Monroe Doctrine refers to nothing else but to the establishment of new colonies by European Powers upon American soil. The Monroe Doctrine is a veto against that and nothing else.”⁸¹ Schurz cautioned against the extension of the Monroe Doctrine. He felt it would lead to more problems for the United States, rather than alleviate them. Rather than increased prosperity due to larger markets, America would become bogged down in a region that was not suited to a republican form of government.

Thirty-two years before Wilson advanced his idea for a Pan-American Union, Secretary of State James G. Blaine introduced his own version in 1881. Blaine was a believer in “cultural progress.” His definition of progress meant a strong economy with technological advancement and the expansion of markets at home and abroad.⁸²

⁸⁰ Frederick Bancroft ed., *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz* (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1913), Vol. 2, 71. *Speech in United States Senate.*

⁸¹ Bancroft, *Speeches.* Vol. 2, 110-111. *Speech in United States Senate.*

⁸² Edward Crapol, *James G. Blaine: Architect of Empire* (Wilmington DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2000), 19. Crapol argues that Blaine laid the groundwork for the later expansion under William McKinley, John Hay and Elihu Root. He opposed territorial annexation on racist beliefs of the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race and felt American economic strength and leadership would gain the nation

Blaine's blueprint was to use the Monroe Doctrine as a guiding light for Pan-Americanism and the United States leadership of the hemisphere.⁸³

Blaine was a Republican Senator from Maine from 1876 through 1881. While in the Senate he was a strong advocate of improved transportation between the American nations. He argued for a merchant marine to help improve commerce with Latin America. On June 5, 1878 he requested funds for a steamship line to Brazil and rail lines through Mexico.⁸⁴ Blaine was especially concerned with the threat of British influence in Latin America. "I am sure you could get a unanimous vote in the British House of Commons against the grant of this aid by the American Congress."⁸⁵ Blaine wanted American commerce to be the wedge that drove Europe out of the hemisphere.

Blaine served as Secretary of State in James Garfield's administration but served only a few months because of Garfield's assassination. His main involvement in South America concerned border disputes. The War of the Pacific was a boundary dispute over guano fields rich in nitrates, between Chile on one side and Peru and Bolivia on the other. Colombia and Costa Rica also contested the line of their borders and turned to European leaders for arbitration. Blaine asserted that this violated the Monroe Doctrine.⁸⁶

As a method for ending disputes that disrupted commerce and to keep European influence from growing in South America, Blaine invited the American republics to a

hegemony in the hemisphere. Unlike Crapol, Russell Bastert claims that Blaine did not enter the State Department with a clear plan to draw the United States closer to Latin America, but only formed his policies in response to the War of the Pacific. See "A New Approach to the Origins of Blaine's Pan American Policy," *The Hispanic American Historical Review*, 39, no. 3 (Aug. 1959), 375-412. and Russell Bastert, "Diplomatic Reversal: Frelinghuysen's Opposition to Blain's Pan-American Policy in 1882," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 42, no. 4 (Mar. 1956), 653-671.

⁸³ Crapol, 38.

⁸⁴ David Saville Muzzey, *James G. Blaine: A Political Idol of Other Days* (Port Washington NY: Kennikat Press, 1934), 146.

⁸⁵ *Congressional Record*. 45th Congress, 2nd Session. 4131.

⁸⁶ Muzzey, 209.

meeting in Washington D.C. on November 22, 1882.⁸⁷ On November 29, 1881 Blaine sent his invitations through the minister in each country. “The time is ripe for a proposal that shall enlist the good-will and active cooperation of all the states of the western hemisphere, both north and south, in the interest of humanity and the common weal of nations.”⁸⁸ The Congress would study ways to avert wars or the “even worse calamity of internal strife”, and to improve commercial relations among nations. Blaine assured the other leaders it was not meant as a means for American intervention in their affairs or that the United States was the “predestined and necessary arbiter of disputes.” Wilson’s proposal was very similar in the intention of ending wars and internal conflict. Blaine and Wilson shared the belief that the United States would be the leader of the hemisphere and reap large commercial rewards from these unions. Blaine was on his way out of the State Department and the proposed conference would never meet.

A disgruntled office seeker shot and killed Garfield July 2, 1881. His successor, Chester Arthur, did not share Blaine’s enthusiasm for the proposed conference. Although a number of states had already agreed to attend, the new Secretary of State Frederick Frelinghuysen rescinded the invitations, arguing all friendly nations would have to be invited since the Monroe Doctrine was a well-established fact.⁸⁹

Arthur and Frelinghuysen thought Blaine was promoting a foreign policy that was too aggressive. The *New York Times* echoed this sentiment. The paper reported that Blaine’s retirement “will be received with a general sense of relief.” The editors cautioned against

⁸⁷ Ibid, 217.

⁸⁸ FRUS, 1881. *Note of the Secretary of State of the United States inviting the republics of America to a Pan-American Congress*. 13.

⁸⁹ Muzzey, 217. This was the cause of embarrassment for Blaine as Venezuela, Guatemala, Brazil, Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, Bolivia, Costa Rica and Mexico had agreed to attend and his ministers were receiving conflicting instructions about the conference.

a vigorous foreign policy. “With the world renowned traits of America among nations, the last thing she needs is a reputation in her foreign policy for bustle, stir, vigor, and ‘go.’ But, on the other hand, there are many reasons for a policy of silence.”⁹⁰ The author of the article articulated that the United States should abstain from interfering in the affairs of Latin American nations.

In February the paper pointed out inconsistencies in Blaine’s proposals. The author noted his good intentions. The proposal was “so full of sweetness and brotherly love that to criticize its purpose or its sentiments puts one in the attitude of pointing out flaws in the Ten Commandments.” They pointed out he had previously argued for an American “monopoly” over the right to arbitrate disputes but later claimed the “whole world” could assume that role. The article concluded with a statement that geographical proximity did not necessarily equate to cultural and political affinity.⁹¹

Blaine did not accept his criticism in silence. In September 1882 he wrote a paper titled *The South American Policy of the Garfield Administration* in which he described two aims of his foreign policy: “to bring about peace and prevent future wars” and “to cultivate such friendly commercial relations with all American countries as would lead to a large increase in the export trade of the United States.” The increased prosperity that peace would bring also kept European powers from assuming too large a role in the affairs of the Americas.⁹²

In his annual message to Congress, President Chester Arthur provided an explanation for his South American policies. Forcing nations to give up territory “would almost inevitably lead to the establishment of a protectorate, a result utterly at odds with our past

⁹⁰ *The New York Times*, “The Department of State,” sec.1, December 10, 1881. 4.

⁹¹ *The New York Times*, “The New World Conference,” sec. 1, February 2, 1882. 4.

⁹² *The New York Times*, “Mr. Blaine Defends Himself,” sec.1, September 14, 1882. 5.

policy, injurious to our present interests, and full of embarrassment for the future.”⁹³ He also rescinded the invitations to the Pan-American Congress on the advice of Congress. Arthur thought the United States showed too much interest in weaker nations which could be easily controlled and ignored the stronger ones. “This is a very one sided way to go about the business of encouraging universal peace.” Blaine would get a second chance however, as the Secretary of State for Benjamin Harrison in 1889.

Harrison was more amenable to the prospect of an international conference of American nations, with the aim of expanded American economic influence in Latin America.⁹⁴ On May 19, 1890, Harrison proposed that Congress provide funds to survey rail lines between the United States and South America and on the 27th suggested an international bank headquartered in New York City with branches in other commercial centers.⁹⁵ Latin American nations were once again invited to the United States in the hopes of formalizing a union of the nations.

Representatives from thirteen Latin American nations assembled in Washington in October 1889. They embarked on a six-week tour of the nation and elected Blaine as president of the meeting.⁹⁶ Joseph Sheldon, writing in the *New England and Yale Review*, made several suggestions for the delegates to consider. Among them were an endorsement by all nations of the Monroe Doctrine, the promotion of international

⁹³ *The New York Times*, “The President’s Message,” sec.1, December 5, 1882. 3.

⁹⁴ Lars Schoultz, *Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy Toward Latin America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 106.

⁹⁵ J.D. Richardson ed., *Compilation of Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1908* (Washington: Bureau of National Literature and Art, 1909), Volume XI, 5504.

⁹⁶ Muzzey, 433.

arbitration, and the establishment of regular communication between ports in both hemispheres.⁹⁷

Blaine's resolutions for reciprocity treaties, arbitration, and a common currency failed to pass. The visiting delegates believed the United States would hold too much power and influence in the dealings between the nations. Mexican delegate M. Romero, key powerbroker, and soon to be father in law to president Díaz explained, "It was thought by some that the purpose of the United States was to establish a permanent court of arbitration at Washington, and that was looked upon as a way of giving the United States a decided preponderance in all questions affecting the continent."⁹⁸ Delegates argued they would abandon too much power to the United States by entering into the treaties envisioned by Blaine.

Blaine continued to advocate increased involvement with Latin America and eventually reciprocity treaties were signed with fifteen nations between April 1, 1891 and July 1892. They would all be abrogated by 1894.⁹⁹ One lasting effect of the initial meeting was the establishment of the International Bureau of the American Republics. There would be regular meetings and the organization became known as the Pan-American Union in 1910.

The vision Blaine had for closer relations with Latin America was reflected in Woodrow Wilson's plan two decades later. Greater commercial ties would ensure the prosperity of all the nations and tend to strengthen the United States as it weakened ties

⁹⁷ Joseph Sheldon, "Suggestions to The Pan-American Congress," *The New England and Yale Review*, 51, no. 237 (Dec. 1889) 470.

⁹⁸ M. Romero, "The Pan-American Conference," *The North American Review*, 151, no.407 (Oct. 1890) 411.

⁹⁹ Muzzey, 453.

between Europe and the Americas. The increase in commercial activity would help guarantee peace and national security for the United States.

The security and prosperity of the United States and humanitarian protection of Cubans were the ostensible reasons for the war with Spain in 1898. Cubans revolted against Spanish rule in 1895 and provoked a harsh Spanish response. Cubans were herded into garrisons and concentration camps.¹⁰⁰ Newspaper accounts, many of dubious credibility, appeared portraying the Spanish as brutal and uncivilized.¹⁰¹ In his war message of April 11, 1898 William McKinley made no mention of the Monroe Doctrine.¹⁰² He foreshadowed the policies of Roosevelt and Wilson by expressing the need of other American nations to maintain order within their own borders. Some aims of the war were to “secure in the island the establishment of a stable government, capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligations, ensuring peace and tranquility, and the security of its citizens.”¹⁰³ The goals set forth by McKinley were not simply the cessation of hostilities and the end of the suffering of the Cuban people, but the establishment of a stable and secure nation open to American goods. This was a precursor of the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine and very similar to Wilson’s belief that stability was a prerequisite for the spread of prosperity.

The conclusion of the war brought new territories to the United States. Cuba became a protectorate and Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines also fell under United States

¹⁰⁰ Harold Eugene Davis, John J. Finan and F. Taylor Peck, *Latin American Diplomatic History: An Introduction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), 144.

¹⁰¹ Schoultz, 131-132. See also Hoganson, 46-50.

¹⁰² FRUS, 1898. *Message: To The Congress of the United States*. 750-760.

¹⁰³ FRUS, 1898. *Message: To The Congress of the United States*. 759.

control. Despite the disavowal of territorial expansion in the Congressional authorization for McKinley to use force in Cuba¹⁰⁴, the United States was there to stay.

Theodore Roosevelt, one of Wilson's arch rivals laid the next stone on the path Wilson took toward his notion of a Monroe Doctrine for the world. In his annual message to Congress on December 3, 1901 Roosevelt declared, "The Monroe Doctrine should be the cardinal feature of the foreign policy of all the nations of the two Americas, as it is of the United States." He continued, "It is simply a step, and a long step, toward assuring the universal peace of the world by securing the possibility of permanent peace on the hemisphere."¹⁰⁵ Roosevelt claimed the Monroe Doctrine was the tool for world peace.

In that spirit, Roosevelt introduced the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine in 1904. He expanded the scope of the doctrine beyond the interference of European powers to policing the Western Hemisphere. "Chronic wrongdoing or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may in America, as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation" and "the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the United States, to the exercise of an international police power."¹⁰⁶ The United States now claimed the right to intervene in the internal affairs of other nations for the stated goal of preserving peace and prosperity.

Roosevelt expanded on this theme in a 1906 message. He envisioned "an all-American public opinion" which would "prevent international wrong, and narrow the causes of war, and forever preserve our free lands from the burden of such armaments as

¹⁰⁴ Richardson, Vol. XIII, 6297.

¹⁰⁵ FRUS, 1901. *Message to the Congress of the United States*. December 3, 1901. XXXVI.

¹⁰⁶ Congressional Record. 39th Congress, 1st Session. 19.

are massed behind the frontiers of Europe.”¹⁰⁷ These ideas closely resembled Wilson’s drafts of a Pan-American Pact drawn up in 1914. His two points called for the mutual guarantee of “republican forms of government” and complete state control of armaments.¹⁰⁸ Roosevelt and Wilson believed that the United States could best guarantee republican government in the Americas and that this would ensure peace and prosperity for the world, not simply the Western Hemisphere.

United States policy towards Latin America underwent several changes from the end of the Civil War to 1913 when Wilson entered office. Union and Confederate leaders advocated an alliance to oust the French from Mexico. This would achieve several goals including the elimination of a rival power on the southern border. In Wilsonian language, proponents of the plan invoked the defense and dissemination of liberty. The easing of domestic strife was a beneficial side effect of enforcing the Monroe Doctrine.

President Grant championed expansion into Latin America. Like Wilson would some forty years later, he stressed the benefit to American business and spoke in lofty terms about exporting freedom. He claimed slavery would not be viable and the new territory would create jobs for millions of Americans. Congress did not approve of Grant’s plans and President Arthur continued the non-expansionist philosophy.

The policies of President Roosevelt and James G. Blaine foreshadowed the Pan-American Pact Wilson attempted to establish. All three sought increased commercial cooperation between the United States and Latin America. Blaine claimed the right for American mediation in the disputes of Latin America and Roosevelt expanded on that theme to claim the right to intervene to ensure stability in foreign nations. Wilson added

¹⁰⁷ Richardson, Vol. XIV, 7059. *Message To The Congress of the United States*. December 3, 1906.

¹⁰⁸ PWW. Vol. XXXI, 469. *House’s Diary*.

his touch to the policy of intervention to bring not only security and peace to other nations but also democracy, a combination of idealist rhetoric and realist action. A belief that democracy was the only legitimate form of government guided all of Wilson's foreign policies, in Latin America and with Europe at the conclusion of the First World War. Forging closer ties with Latin America became Wilson's first major foreign policy endeavor.

CHAPTER THREE

By the time Woodrow Wilson took office in 1913, previous generations of American leaders had expanded the Monroe Doctrine beyond the original intention of keeping Europe out of the hemisphere to Roosevelt's notion of the United States as a hemispheric police force. Wilson, unsuccessful in his initial attempts to establish a Pan-American pact had an unprecedented opportunity to shape international policy at the end of the First World War.

This chapter analyzes Wilson's empire and the uniqueness of America's Empire. It also examines the origins of Wilson's foreign policies and how they diverged from his predecessors. Wilson made Latin America one of his first foreign policy priorities. His plans for a hemispheric community based on the cooperation of democratically elected governments became the basis for his League of Nations.

For the purpose of this thesis an "empire" is defined as a nation that controls a weaker state. This is achieved most often by military force, but also secured by political and economic means.¹⁰⁹ The Spanish-American War and the acquisition of Guam, Puerto

¹⁰⁹ Wilson often employed the military to achieve his goals of ensuring democratic governments in the Western Hemisphere but also used a policy of "non-recognition." He would not deal with the governments of nations, such as Mexico and Cuba, which came to power by violence or revolution. For Wilson, democracy equaled stability and was the only acceptable condition for commercial cooperation and prosperity for the United States and other nations. Joseph Byrne Lockey argued that Wilson chose Pan Americanism, a system of cooperation, over empire, which he defined as annexation of territory in *Essays in Pan-Americanism* (Port Washington NY: Kennikat Press, 1939), 158. Historians describe many forms of "imperialism" such as cultural, economic, racist, commercial, and religious. See Emily Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890-1945* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982). Rosenberg contends that private interests such as entrepreneurs, bankers and missionaries began outward thrust and their defense became the policy of the federal government. Lester Langley, *The Banana Wars: An Inner History of American Empire, 1900-1934* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1983). United States intervention was for humanitarian and economic reasons to ensure stability and a safe commercial climate but because of racism and excessive military force the local populations became alienated. Ernest May, *American Imperialism: A Speculative Essay* (New York: Atheneum, 1968). May argues that American policy makers were following the example of European powers and disputes the arguments of Walter La Feber that expansion was a quest for markets and Julius Pratt's assertion that leaders felt it was a form of Social Darwinism.

Rico, and the Philippines are often described as America's Imperial stage.¹¹⁰ Wilson became the leader of an American Empire. The United States exerted influence over weaker nations' politics and economics but did so with pliant domestic administrators propped up by American military and economic support. Wilson defended this relationship in altruistic terms, arguing he was bringing security and prosperity to the weaker nations while downplaying the advantages gained by the United States.

Wilson and his predecessors utilized both formal (military force, annexation) and informal (treaties, trade agreements) tools to acquire an empire. These tools were similar to the British tactics described by Gallagher and Robinson.¹¹¹ The American Empire has been labeled Informal but the underlying basis for its maintenance was overwhelming economic and military force.¹¹² Wilson differed in his approach to empire by attempting to reform the internal structures of the nations in which he intervened. He insisted on democratic government and believed this would result in economic and social uplift. Wilson required "good" government, which he defined as constitutional democracy, not simply compliant government. This of course implies that Latin Americans were inferior and needed the tutelage of the United States to improve their lot. It is ironic considering the lack of democratic rights for African-Americans and women in the United States during Wilson's time as president.

The United States emerged from the First World War as one of the world's preeminent powers. As president, Woodrow Wilson saw an opportunity to create a new diplomacy, one that would bring an end to nations resorting to warfare to settle disputes.

¹¹⁰ Pratt, *America's Colonial Experiment* and David Trask, *The War with Spain in 1898* (New York: Macmillan, 1981).

¹¹¹ John Gallagher and Ronald Robinson, "The Imperialism of Free Trade."

¹¹² Williams, 47. See also Ferguson, 54.

The League of Nations was based on Wilson's Fourteen Points, his plan for a postwar settlement, which called for open markets, freedom of the seas, general disarmament, and an end to secret treaties and secret diplomacy. Wilson's Fourteenth Point called for the establishment of a League of Nations.

One of the central tenets of Wilson's Fourteen Points was the concept of "self-determination." When settling colonial disputes, "the interest of the populations concerned must have an equal weight" with the colonial power. Russia should have the opportunity for the "independent determination of her own political development and national policy." Self-determination was to be the rule for the people of Austria-Hungary, Poland, Turkey, Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro.¹¹³

The fulfillment of the ideal of self-determination took a back seat to the maintenance of the empires of the major victorious powers, including the American Empire in the Western Hemisphere. A study of Wilson's administration from his earliest addresses through the creation of the drafting committee of the League of Nations, the language of the document, and the arguments for and against the League, demonstrate that the United States sought more power and influence in Latin America and was the leader of an informal empire in the Western Hemisphere. At Wilson's insistence, the Covenant for the new League officially recognized the Monroe Doctrine as the principle instrument for the maintenance of that Hemispheric American Empire.

Wilson entered office with little experience in foreign affairs, but with a clear vision of America's role in world affairs, which would guide him throughout his administration in Latin America and at the Peace Conference. Wilson remarked to a friend before assuming office "It would be the irony of fate if my administration had to deal chiefly

¹¹³ PWW. V 51, 252-253.

with foreign affairs.”¹¹⁴ Although he lacked experience with diplomacy, he believed the spread of democracy was America’s mission and this would benefit every nation, not only the United States.

The primary source of Wilson’s vision about foreign policy came from his Presbyterian religion, racist assumptions about the inferiority of non-whites, and a belief in the power of democracy.¹¹⁵ Wilson received the endorsement of prominent African American leaders W.E.B. DuBois and Bishop Alexander Walters. DuBois urged African Americans to support Wilson for president in his paper *Crisis*. Wilson sent Walters a handwritten note promising “should I become President of the United States they (African Americans) may count on me for absolute fair dealing and for everything by which I could assist in advancing the interests of their race in the United States.”¹¹⁶ Wilson promptly reneged on this promise of support when he entered the White House. Segregation was reintroduced in federal offices, many African Americans lost jobs or were demoted, and Wilson refused to meet with black leaders to address their concerns.¹¹⁷ Wilson argued that it would take many years of struggle for conditions to improve and legislation could not hasten the arrival of equality.¹¹⁸ Wilson’s actions actually worsened the condition of many African Americans.

Incorporated in this system was the notion that the United States had a special mission to spread democracy to the rest of the world. Writing in 1902 as the president of

¹¹⁴ Quoted in Arthur S. Link *Wilson: The New Freedom*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956. 277.

¹¹⁵ Link. “Wilson the Diplomatist: A Look at his Major Foreign Policies.” See also Clements and N. Gordon Levin Jr., *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America’s Response to War and Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968) and Harley Notter, *The Origins of the Foreign Policy of Woodrow Wilson* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1937).

¹¹⁶ W.E. Burghardt DuBois, “My Impressions of Woodrow Wilson,” *The Journal of Negro History*, 58, no. 4 (Oct. 1973) 454.

¹¹⁷ O’Reilly, 117.

¹¹⁸ Blumenthal, 1.

Princeton University, Wilson expressed the idea that a rising America would usher in a new world order. “Let us lift our thoughts to the level of the great tasks that await us, and bring a great age in with the coming of our day of strength.”¹¹⁹ Wilson asserted that America was destined to join the ranks of the world’s great powers and by spreading democratic ideals, create a peaceful and prosperous world order, even as the United States disenfranchised African-Americans, restricted Asian immigration, and millions of women were denied the franchise.

Wilson believed that foreign policy was strictly the domain of the president. As a historian Wilson wrote, “one of the greatest of the president’s powers...is his control, which is very absolute, of the foreign relations of the nation.”¹²⁰ This belief was evident in the formation of all his foreign policies from his earliest attempts at establishing a Pan-American Treaty to his dealings with the Senate during the League of Nations fight and with any who would offer conflicting views from the State Department.

These views led Wilson to alter the policies of his predecessors in a significant way. Wilson added a moral element to his policy making. Wilson and his first Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan offered a “New Freedom” in contrast to Presidents Roosevelt and Taft’s “Dollar Diplomacy.” The “New Freedom” was based on economic gain accompanied by the export of democracy.¹²¹ Stability was no longer sufficient, constitutional government was required or Wilson would not recognize it as legitimate.

Wilson bypassed the State Department and ignored policy advice from experts who disagreed with him. Spreading democracy to foreign nations was of secondary

¹¹⁹ Woodrow Wilson, *The Atlantic Monthly*, 90, no. 542. 721-734.

¹²⁰ Woodrow Wilson, *Constitutional Government in the United States* (Edison NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2001), 77-78.

¹²¹ Lars Schoultz, 241. See also Link, “Wilson: The New Freedom,” and “Wilson the Diplomatist: A Look at his Major Foreign Policies,” and Clements.

importance to the maintenance of stable governments for the State Department. In March 1900, former Secretary of State Richard Olney warned against the policy of intervening in other nations to spread democracy. “Were the United States to enter upon its new international role with the serious purpose of carrying out any such theory, it would not merely be laughed at but voted a nuisance by all other nations- and treated accordingly.”¹²² This notion was American policy until Wilson took office in 1913. State Department counselor John Bassett Moore warned Wilson of the dangers of his policies in May 1913. “We cannot become the censors of the morals or conduct of other nations. We regard governments as existing or not existing. We do not require them to be chosen by popular vote.”¹²³ Wilson believed stability was not possible without a popularly elected government. Stable democracies were also necessary for Wilson’s second objective, economic growth. Wilson was blind to the fact that the southern United States did not meet his requirements. Blacks were disenfranchised and lived in constant fear of the lynch mob. Wilson argued that legislation could not solve racial problems, that the federal government did not have the authority to intervene to prevent racial violence, and that over time, the condition of blacks would improve.¹²⁴ Under white tutelage, everyone would prosper eventually.

Wilson’s foreign policies appeared altruistic but economic factors were a crucial if secondary objective.¹²⁵ In a speech in 1912 Wilson stated the United States must enter foreign markets and “release our energies upon the great field which we are now ready to

¹²² Richard Olney, *The Atlantic Monthly*, 85, no. 509 (March 1902), 301.

¹²³ PWW. *Moore to Wilson*. May 15, 1913.

¹²⁴ Henry Blumenthal, “Woodrow Wilson and the Race Question,” *The Journal of Negro History*, 48, no.1 (Jan. 1963) 1.

¹²⁵ Clements, 125. Clements argues that Wilson’s policies were a mix of spreading democracy at any cost and economic expansion.

enter, and enter by way of conquest.”¹²⁶ Wilson spoke of conquering markets, not acquiring additional territory for the United States. In Wilson’s view economic expansion followed and sustained democracy, but democracy came first.

Wilson did not believe in colonizing additional territory, but he was willing to use the military and put economic pressure on other nations to install governments that would legislate policies favorable to the United States. Woodrow Wilson was not the architect of the American Empire, however he embraced his role as its custodian. From the beginning of his administration he advocated intervention while speaking in altruistic terms. He stated the United States would operate to insure the maintenance of constitutional, legitimate, representative governments, and would not recognize those that the United States did not feel lived up to those criteria.

Wilson viewed revolution and violence in Latin America as an anathema to stability and economic prosperity in the United States. He stated that a major theme of his foreign policy would be the cultivation of cooperation between the United States and Central and South America. Early in his first term in office he described his vision for stability in Latin America. Wilson stated the United States would only work with legal, constitutional governments, which were not created for the benefit of an individual or minority. On March 12, 1913 Wilson asserted the United States would “lend our influence of every kind to the realization of these principles in fact and practice.”¹²⁷

In an address to the Southern Commercial Congress in October 1913, Wilson spoke of liberating Latin American nations from the dominance of foreign capitalists in their

¹²⁶ PWW. *Address to Commercial Club of Omaha*. 10/5/1912. V25 341.

¹²⁷ PWW. *A Statement on Relations with Latin America*. 3/12/1913 V 27, 172. Also present were the ministers to the United States from Costa Rica, Bolivia, Peru, and Panama.

domestic affairs.¹²⁸ He committed American assistance to the realization of their freedom to demonstrate the United States as a true champion of liberty and constitutional government. Wilson wanted to “say that the United States will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest.”¹²⁹ Wilson was not a colonialist in the traditional sense, but he acted imperially through the use of force and economic influence to bolster pliable governments and policies in Latin America.

Secretary of State Robert Lansing urged Wilson to expand the Monroe Doctrine to include the suppression of domestic revolution in addition to its primary function, the exclusion of European Powers from intervening in the Western Hemisphere.¹³⁰ He argued that native populations should be the primary beneficiaries of this policy and Wilson should bear in mind “what has already been done in Cuba, Panama, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti, and what may have to be done in the small neighboring republics.”¹³¹ Lansing argued it was vital for the national security of the United States, particularly in the Canal Zone, that stable and honest governments are in power. This was a continuation of the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine and another example of Wilson attempting to reform the governments to the south of the United States.

Wilson responded on November 29, saying Lansing’s argument was “unanswerable,” which meant that he agreed with Lansing’s plan.¹³² Wilson indicated that he would not publicly declare Lansing’s recommendations official United States policy, but that he would use the memorandum when the time came to declare it official. These memoranda

¹²⁸ PWW. *An Address on Latin American Policy in Mobile Alabama*. 10/27/1913 V 28, 448

¹²⁹ PWW. *Ibid.* V 28, 451.

¹³⁰ PWW. *From Robert Lansing, with Enclosure*. 11/24/1915 V 35, 246-252.

¹³¹ PWW. *Ibid.* V 35, 237.

¹³² PWW. *To Robert Lansing*. 11/29/1915 V 35, 263.

demonstrate Wilson's desire to operate through formal diplomatic channels, in language colored with altruism, even as the United States reserved the right to use force when and where it deemed necessary.

To achieve closer cooperation with Latin American nations Wilson formulated a Pan-American Treaty. Wilson prepared the treaty in January 1915 and submitted it to the leaders of Latin American nations. It contained four main articles: the mutual guarantee of territorial integrity and political independence, a provision for the arbitration of international disputes, governmental control of arms and armaments, and an agreement of a one-year investigation and arbitration period before the resort to war to settle disputes.¹³³ Wilson envisioned this treaty as an expansion of the Monroe Doctrine.¹³⁴ He felt that all nations should guarantee constitutional and legal governance but that the United States should remain dominant.

This treaty was not well received by the larger Latin American republics, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile. Enunciating the same reservations they had to James G. Blaine's proposals, they argued that the treaty opened the door to increased rather than decreased United States involvement in their domestic affairs. Argentine Foreign Minister Estanislao S. Zeballos opposed the treaty on the grounds that the United States would intervene to end civil strife in violation of international laws and without the consent of the native government.¹³⁵ The Chilean newspaper *Mercurio* articulated the official government view that the treaty would lead to foreign intervention in the domestic affairs of Latin American nations. The editorial also stated that the preponderant power of one

¹³³ FRUS, 1916, 3-4. This was a memorandum from Lansing to the American Missions in Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, Peru, El Salvador, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

¹³⁴ Knock, 39.

¹³⁵ Gilderhus, 12.

nation in the hemisphere was counter to the notion of union and would further distance North and South America.

The Pan-American plan met resistance in Mexico as well. On August 9, 1916, Henry Fletcher, United States Ambassador to Mexico, wrote to Secretary of State Robert Lansing that no progress had been made in receiving an acceptance from the Mexican government.¹³⁶ General Pershing was pursuing Pancho Villa, and American troops were on Mexican territory. The nations were on the brink of war, and the Mexican government was hostile to Wilson.

Fletcher warned that if the United States proceeded with the treaty without the support of Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, these nations would turn to Europe for economic investments. To counter United States influence, Mexico and Argentina attempted to formulate a Pan-Hispanic system, forcing the United States to concentrate their efforts on Brazil.¹³⁷ This opposition to the Pan American Treaty demonstrates the opposition to, and fear of, American intervention in Latin America.

Europe, particularly Great Britain and Germany, offered the greatest competition to the American Empire in Latin America. Trade and national security were major concerns of American policy makers. In 1878 the British had £140,000,000 invested in Latin America.¹³⁸ United States exports to Latin America remained relatively constant between 1865 and 1896 at just under \$100,000,000 per year. Imports doubled, mainly Cuban sugar and Brazilian coffee, during the same time period.¹³⁹ Great Britain held the greatest influence in Latin America into the 1880's. Almost half of the trade in Latin

¹³⁶ Gantenbein, 104.

¹³⁷ Gilderhus, 81.

¹³⁸ Robert G. Albion, "Capital Movement and Transportation: British Shipping and Latin America, 1806-1914," *The Journal of Economic History* 11, no. 4 (Autumn 1951), 361-374. 371.

¹³⁹ Schoultz, *Beneath the United States*. 83.

America was with the British, and less than 20 percent with the United States. The British merchant fleet was four times larger than that of the United States.¹⁴⁰

The balance of power began to tip in favor of the United States in the 1890's. In 1895 Venezuela appealed to the United States to arbitrate a boundary dispute with Great Britain under the pretext of enforcing the Monroe Doctrine.¹⁴¹ This marked the turning point whereby any use of force by a European power was regarded a strategic threat to the United States.¹⁴² In January 1896 Britain agreed to arbitration, marking the first time a European power accepted enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine and signaling greater cooperation with the United States against Germany.¹⁴³

By 1900 about 350,000 Germans lived in Brazil with significant population also in Argentina.¹⁴⁴ Great Britain and Germany together had seventy bank branches in South America.¹⁴⁵ Germany used its large expatriate population to gain political influence and create a network of commercial and military connections in Latin America.¹⁴⁶ The United States main competition remained Great Britain, even as British influence waned in the area.

British leaders took steps to appease the United States in the first decade of the twentieth century. The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty waived British objections to American control of a Panamanian canal.¹⁴⁷ Great Britain welcomed a more forceful American

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 85.

¹⁴¹ Harold Eugene Davis, John J. Finan, and F. Taylor Peck, *Latin American Diplomatic History: An Introduction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), 142-143.

¹⁴² Lester Langley, *America and the Americas: The United States in the Western Hemisphere* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989), 97.

¹⁴³ Ibid, 143.

¹⁴⁴ Ian L.D. Forbes, "German Informal Imperialism in South America Before 1914," *The Economic History Review*, New Series 31, no. 3 (Aug 1978) 384-398. 388.

¹⁴⁵ Kaufman, "United States Trade and Latin America: The Wilson Years." 345.

¹⁴⁶ Forbes, "German Informal Imperialism" 391.

¹⁴⁷ Niall Ferguson, *The Pity of War* (New York: Basic Books, 1999), 54-55.

political and military presence in Latin America.¹⁴⁸ The British were reluctant to challenge the United States military and in July 1903 the Committee of Imperial Defense (CID) approved the withdrawal of some forces from Halifax, Barbados, Trinidad, Bermuda, and Jamaica. On March 31, 1905, George Clark, secretary of the CID wrote “we believe that the idea of opposing the navy of the United States...close to its bases must be abandoned.”¹⁴⁹ American power was growing, but Britain was still an economic powerhouse and their military withdrawal displayed a clever strategy of allowing the United States to shoulder the burden of ensuring stability in Latin America.

Britain still threatened American economic opportunities during Wilson’s first term as president. In 1913 Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy warned that the British government was fomenting insurrection in Mexico to benefit their petroleum companies.¹⁵⁰ In 1908 there were sixteen coaling stations in Latin America, most of which were controlled by Britain and stocked with coal from Wales.¹⁵¹

The American empire was extensive before the outbreak of World War One and expanded significantly during the course of hostilities. Working for a panel of American scholars and experts employed to advise Wilson and the United States panel at the Peace Conference, John Barrett, and W.C. Wells prepared a report about American involvement in Latin America.¹⁵² The report stated that the United States controlled 90 percent of the import trade to Latin America. By 1918 the National Bank of New York City had branches in the capitals of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Peru, Venezuela, and Uruguay.

¹⁴⁸ Langley, *America and the Americas*. 106.

¹⁴⁹ Aaron L. Friedberg, *The Weary Titan: Britain and the Experience of Relative Decline, 1895-1905* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 195-204.

¹⁵⁰ Schoultz, 244.

¹⁵¹ Albion, “Capital Movement and Transportation,” 370.

¹⁵² Gilderhus, 131.

The Commercial Bank of Boston, American Foreign Banking Corporation of New York, and the Mercantile Bank of America also had branches in Central and South America.

In 1913, direct United States investment in Latin America was valued at \$1,242,000,000. With the outbreak of hostilities in 1914, European investment fell in Latin America and the United States filled the void. By 1929 direct investment totaled \$5,889,353,000.¹⁵³ In the five Central American states United States investment more than doubled during Wilson's term in office. In 1912 total investments totaled \$40 million and reached \$93 million by 1920.¹⁵⁴ The United States under Wilson would use formal and informal measures to protect these investments and ensure stability. Wilson preferred informal methods but often resorted to military intervention to ensure compliance with United States demands.

Cuba was an important piece of the American Empire from 1898 to 1934. The 1903 Cuban-American Treaty, which included the terms of the Platt Amendment of 1901, giving the United States the right to intervene in Cuba to preserve independence and quell domestic unrest, opened the door to American intervention. The treaty gave the United States the right to intervene at any time to protect its interests.¹⁵⁵ This treaty was forced upon the Cubans and was used by Wilson to intervene in 1916.

In 1916, there was a revolt to replace the U.S.- backed president, Mario Menocal. During the 1916 election, Cuban liberals felt they were being denied voting rights by force, and the results were so close that they were thrown out. Wilson supported

¹⁵³ Gilderhus, 133.

¹⁵⁴ Calcott, 461.

¹⁵⁵ Gordon Connell-Smith, *The United States and Latin America: An Historical Analysis of Inter-American Relations* (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1974), 102.

Menocal and proclaimed that the leaders of the revolt would be held personally responsible for any damage to foreign investments.¹⁵⁶

The rebellion against Menocal continued, and in February of 1917 the *U.S.S. Petrel* entered Santiago Harbor to establish order.¹⁵⁷ Several battalions of troops were stationed in Cuba and Menocal declared war on Germany the day after Wilson asked Congress for a declaration in the United States.¹⁵⁸ United States troops were protecting United States investments and propping up an unpopular president. Wilson acted against the principle of self-determination and worked to tie the Cuban and American economies more closely together. Due to his racist views, Wilson believed the Cubans were not able to rule themselves without the guidance of the United States. A government based on the model provided by the United States was the only way to ensure security and prosperity.

The United States protected its citizen's investments and tightly controlled the Cuban economy. The United States worked with Britain to set price controls on Cuban sugar. These prices were fixed to protect American beet-sugar producers.¹⁵⁹ The United States also controlled Cuban purchases of coal and flour. When Cuban sugar producers protested price controls, the United States withheld flour and other foodstuff shipments, forcing the Cubans to capitulate to the price controls protecting American farmers.¹⁶⁰ The United States used the military and economic measures to coerce Cuba to formulate policies favorable to American interests.

¹⁵⁶ Jenks, 189.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid, 190.

¹⁵⁸ Abraham Lowenthal ed., *Exporting Democracy: The United States and Latin America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), 20.

¹⁵⁹ Jenks, 198.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, 199.

Wilson oversaw similar policies in Haiti. In 1915 a rebel army took control of Cap-Haitian. The local government appealed for help to the foreign consuls who all petitioned the United States to send naval vessels.¹⁶¹ Rumors that Germany was bidding for coaling stations, to support military efforts in World War One, prompted Wilson to send warships to the area. The sinking of the *Lusitania* by a German submarine in May 1915 also strained relations with Germany. Lansing supported Wilson's decision, and argued that the Monroe Doctrine should be expanded to include "European acquisition of political control through the agency of financial supremacy of an American Republic."¹⁶² The United States would tolerate neither informal nor formal European control of any area of Latin America.

United States troops oversaw rigged elections, and pro-U.S. Philippe Dartiguenave won the election. Wilson said the United States must "take charge of elections and see that real government is erected which we can support."¹⁶³ The Haitian army and police force were replaced by an American-led gendarmerie. In addition to the gendarmerie, the United States exercised control over Haitian government finances. Secretary of State Lansing called American intervention "more or less an exercise of force and an invasion of Haitian independence."¹⁶⁴ Wilson justified his policies by arguing that the Haitians were unprepared to participate in a democracy. This was the same racist rhetoric he utilized in all his dealings with people of color. For Wilson, whites were superior and non-whites needed guidance and time to learn how to operate within democratic society.

¹⁶¹ Healy, "Gunboat Diplomacy," 17.

¹⁶² PWW. *From Robert Lansing: With Enclosure*. 11/24/1915 V 35, 246-252.

¹⁶³ PWW. *To Robert Lansing*. 8/4/1915 V 34, 79.

¹⁶⁴ PWW. *From Robert Lansing*. 8/13/1915 V 34, 183.

American troops remained and oversaw the 1917 Congressional elections, then dissolved the Congress on the eve of passage of a new constitution. The State Department drafted a version of a Haitian Constitution, and in a rigged plebiscite where only five percent of the population participated, it passed by a vote of 98,225 to 768 in 1918.¹⁶⁵ Haiti became a protectorate of the United States and American troops remained there until 1934.

Wilson relied on the Navy to restore order in the Dominican Republic as well. In 1913, the United States sent observers to monitor elections. Marines remained to oversee the 1916 elections in which pro-German factions were not allowed to participate.¹⁶⁶ Beyond the American policy of not allowing European influence in the western hemisphere, the First World War was in its second year and the United States was increasingly linked financially to Great Britain.¹⁶⁷ On June 26, 1916, Rear Admiral W.B. Caperton, the Commander in Chief of United States forces in the Dominican Republic issued a proclamation stating that the occupation forces were there to suppress any revolutionary movements and would remain there until they were “stamped out and until such reforms as are deemed necessary for the future welfare of the country” were adopted.¹⁶⁸

Dominican officials protested these actions. A. Perez Perdomo, the Dominican Ambassador to the United States, wrote to Lansing December 4, 1916. Perdomo’s protest stated that the Dominican government viewed the American occupation as a

¹⁶⁵ Lowenthal, 18.

¹⁶⁶ Lowenthal, 17.

¹⁶⁷ Robert Zieger, *America’s Great War: World War I and the American Experience* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000), 30-31.

¹⁶⁸ FRUS. 1916, 228. *Admiral Caperton to the People of Santo Domingo.*

violation of Dominican sovereignty.¹⁶⁹ Wilson ignored this protest and the American occupation continued until 1924. He was the ultimate formulator of policy in Dominican affairs.

Wilson initiated an attack on the port of Veracruz in Mexico and attempted to oust General Victoriano Huerta. United States investments in Mexico totaled over \$1 billion, more than domestic Mexican investment.¹⁷⁰ Huerta came to power by murdering the popular Francisco Madero. Wilson refused to recognize the Huerta administration, following his policy of non-recognition of governments that were not democratically elected in his view. Venustiano Carranza formed a group opposed to the Huerta regime. Wilson offered to arbitrate their dispute and both parties refused him. He used the arrest of the paymaster and whaleboat crew from the U.S.S. *Dolphin* as justification to invade Veracruz in April 1914.¹⁷¹ Carranza eventually took power and denounced Wilson for his intervention. African American leaders justifiably asked Wilson why he would intervene in Mexico to protect the lives and property of American citizens, but would not order southern governors to do the same.¹⁷²

Wilson intervened in Mexico again from March 1916 until February 1917. Pancho Villa, one of Carranza's rivals, initially enjoyed United States support. Villa promised liberal reforms and did not harass United States business interests in Mexico.¹⁷³ Wilson abandoned Villa and threw his support to Carranza. Villa mistakenly thought that

¹⁶⁹ Gantenbein, 694.

¹⁷⁰ Faragher et al. , 591.

¹⁷¹ P. Edward Haley, *Revolution and Intervention: The Diplomacy of Taft and Wilson with Mexico, 1910-1917* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1970), 131.

¹⁷² Blumenthal, 12.

¹⁷³ Friedrich Katz, "Pancho Villa and the Attack on Columbus, New Mexico," *The American Historical Review*, 83, no. 1 (Feb. 1978), 107-108.

Carranza signed a number of secret agreements with the Wilson administration, severely curtailing Mexican sovereignty.¹⁷⁴

Friedrich Katz argues that Villa's belief of secret agreements between Wilson and Carranza led to the event that triggered the second American intervention.¹⁷⁵ On March 9, 1916 Villa and approximately 450 men attacked the town of Columbus, New Mexico. The group killed seventeen Americans and wounded eight.¹⁷⁶ Wilson promised the public Villa would be captured and his group dispersed. Without seeking permission from Carranza, Wilson ordered General John J. Pershing into Mexico and the so-called Punitive Expedition began on March 15, 1916.¹⁷⁷

Pershing entered Mexico with a force of 10,000 men.¹⁷⁸ American troops engaged Villa's forces several times and by June 9, 1916 had killed 125 and wounded 85 of his supporters. The army failed to capture Villa but did succeed in angering the local population. United States soldiers entered Mexican towns despite orders to avoid populated areas. On April 12, 1916 the army clashed with civilians in the town of Parral.¹⁷⁹

Carranza asked Pershing and his men to leave, but to no avail. After several more forays by American troops into Mexican towns, Carranza's men confronted the expedition in the town of Carrizal on June 21, 1916. Mexican forces captured twenty-

¹⁷⁴ Ibid, 102.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid, 102.

¹⁷⁶ James A. Sandos, "Pancho Villa and American Security: Woodrow Wilson's Mexican Diplomacy Reconsidered," *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 13, no. 2 (Nov. 1981) 301.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid, 302.

¹⁷⁸ Katz, 101.

¹⁷⁹ Sandos, 303.

four Americans.¹⁸⁰ Pershing finally withdrew back across the border on February 17, 1917.¹⁸¹

Pershing spent over a year in Mexico and failed to capture Villa.¹⁸² The expedition was a failure on a number of counts. First, Villa remained free, so the stated purpose of the intervention went unfulfilled. Second, it alienated the Mexican public and the Carranza government. Finally, the expedition was a clear demonstration of Wilson's willingness to disregard the sovereignty of other nations. Pershing remained in Mexico for almost a year after Carranza requested he withdraw.

Wilson ordered these interventions without regard for, or in consultation with, native leaders. He decided which governments measured up to his ideals and were worthy of recognition, he decided on the use of military force, and he ultimately appointed the men that governed areas deemed unfit to govern themselves. Again, the United States was not fully democratic. African American leaders rightly questioned Wilson why he would send troops to Mexico to protect American lives and property but would not order southern governors to do the same in the United States. Wilson disingenuously claimed the federal government did not have the constitutional authority to intervene to protect blacks.¹⁸³

Wilson often spoke of these interventions in altruistic terms. In 1916 he wrote to Lansing "It shall not lie with the American people to dictate to another what their

¹⁸⁰ Ibid, 306.

¹⁸¹ Katz, "Pancho Villa and the Attack on Columbus, New Mexico." 101.

¹⁸² Joseph Allen Stout, *Border Conflict: Villistas, Carrancistas, and the Punitive Expedition, 1915-1920* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1999). See also Mark Gilderhus, *Diplomacy and Revolution: U.S.-Mexican Relations under Wilson and Carranza* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1977). John S. D. Eisenhower, *Intervention: The United States and the Mexican Revolution, 1913-1917* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1993). Kenneth Grieb, *The United States and Huerta* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1969).

¹⁸³ Blumenthal, 12.

government shall be.” Lansing wrote sardonically in the margin, “Haiti, S. Domingo, Nicaragua, Panama.”¹⁸⁴ Wilson’s ambassador to Great Britain, Samuel Hines Page, offered a different view. Commenting on United States policy in Latin America, he said that if the outcome of elections was not to the liking of America “we’ll go in again and make em’ vote again. The United States will be here for two hundred years and it can continue to shoot men for that little space till they learn to vote and rule themselves.”¹⁸⁵ It was Wilson’s policy to intervene in the political and economic affairs of Latin American nations in order to promote stability and governments friendly to American interests regardless of the wishes of the native populations.

Wilson did not always rely on military force to pressure Latin American nations. In 1913 he announced the “Wilson Doctrine.” Wilson stated he would not recognize the legitimacy of any government that was not democratically elected.¹⁸⁶ This strategy was employed against Costa Rica in 1917. Despite the fact that Federico Tinoco declared war on Germany and offered the use of their ports and harbors, Wilson refused to recognize his government and discouraged American investment because Tinoco came to power in a coup.¹⁸⁷

Wilson’s actions in Latin America were a dress rehearsal for his trip to Paris. Wilson entered office with little interest or experience in foreign affairs as was evident in his dealings with other nations. He disregarded advice from more qualified advisers, particularly those in the State Department who could have offered the most assistance. He routinely bypassed the State Department and ignored precedents and policies that did

¹⁸⁴ Fergusson, “Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire,”

¹⁸⁵ Lowenthal, 14.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid, 34.

¹⁸⁷ David Lloyd George, *Memoirs of the Peace Conference* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939), 135. See also Calcott, 458-459.

not fit into his rigid world-view, based on his idea, underpinned by racist beliefs, that democracy must be exported and taught to inferior non-white peoples.

Wilson's policies often ended in failure. This was mainly due to his belief that democracy was a cure-all for any problems a nation faced. He believed the American model was transferable to any nation and if adopted peace, stability and prosperity would soon follow. He oversimplified complex issues and took no interest in the cultures and practices of native populations.¹⁸⁸

Wilson's consistent and numerous interventions in the domestic affairs of Latin American nations further complicated his efforts. The more powerful nations, most notably Argentina, Brazil, and Chile saw in his Pan-American pact the legal and legitimizing document for American military intervention in the region. Leaders of these nations also knew this would be a one-way street with American Marines traveling south while they were powerless to respond in the opposite direction.

Latin American nations saw United States intervention in Mexico and feared similar incursions on their territory. These interventions impinged on the sovereignty of the nations being invaded. The peace and stability, which were sometimes achieved, were often short lived and the presence of American troops only served to postpone more violence and a permanent solution.

The United States was the frequent beneficiary of the interventions, not the foreign governments. While interventions more than doubled under Wilson's administration, United States companies were selling three times the amount of goods to Latin America in 1919 than in 1914.¹⁸⁹ Much of the increase was due to the loss of trade with Europe

¹⁸⁸ Link, "The Diplomatist." Also, Notter.

¹⁸⁹ Clements, *Woodrow Wilson: World Statesman*.

because of World War One, but United States pressure gained many favorable trade conditions for American producers.

Wilson used his Pan-American Treaty as a template for the League of Nations.¹⁹⁰ Although his policies were largely failures in the western Hemisphere, he saw a new opportunity for world settlement. Wilson headed to Paris with an unprecedented popularity and believed this was the perfect opportunity to achieve a lasting peace, guided by the morally and militarily superior United States.

¹⁹⁰ Knock, *To End All Wars* and Gilderhus, *Pan-American Visions*.

CHAPTER FOUR

When Wilson traveled to Paris for the 1919 Peace Conference his primary objective was the formation of a League of Nations. The American delegation to the Paris Peace Conference, Wilson, adviser Edward House, General Tasker Bliss, Secretary of State Lansing and Republican diplomat Henry White, intended to safeguard American influence in Latin America. Wilson had enormous political capital because of America's role in the victory and was greeted by enthusiastic crowds in the cities he visited. His counterparts at the Peace Conference were not so enamored of Wilson as were their constituencies. David Lloyd George of Great Britain, Georges Clemenceau of France, and Vittorio Orlando of Italy, along with Wilson, would take charge of the Peace Conference and became known as the Big Four.

Wilson envisioned the League of Nations as a Monroe Doctrine for the world. In his famous "Peace Without Victory" speech of January 22, 1917, he said, "I am proposing, as it were, that the nations should with one accord adopt the doctrine of President Monroe as the doctrine of the world."¹⁹¹ He likened his vision of collective security to the terms of the Monroe Doctrine pledging the United States to defend the integrity of independent Latin American nations.

During his speaking tour in defense of the draft of the Peace Treaty, Wilson argued that the Monroe Doctrine was not weakened but strengthened because it was specifically protected in the covenant. During a speech in Los Angeles on September 20, 1919, he argued that the Treaty's Article X, which guaranteed the sovereignty of each nation, was

¹⁹¹ PWW. *Address to Senate*. 1/22/1917 V 40, 539.

the “Monroe Doctrine applied to the world.”¹⁹² It is important to remember that Wilson envisioned the United States as the driving force behind the League of Nations with veto power in the League Council.

Wilson raised great hopes of openness in diplomacy and equality of nations with his Fourteen Points. Yet from the opening of the conference the Big Four acted imperially towards the smaller nations of the world. The questions of which nations would be represented, the drafting of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and representation on the Permanent Council were all decided by the major powers. Thirty-two countries were invited to send delegates to the conference. The full conference met only eight times which was a source of tension between the Big Four and representatives of the smaller nations. Evidence of the United States’ informal empire in Latin America is clear in the records of the Peace Conference.

The concerns of the Latin American states were not guaranteed a hearing at the Peace Conference. On April 17, 1918 Secretary of State Lansing wrote to Dr. S.E. Mezes, head of the Inquiry, a group of scholars and experts in various fields that advised the American delegation, instructing him to prepare a report on conditions in Central and South America in case they came up at the Peace Conference, even though “they may not be considered at all.”¹⁹³ The agenda of the Peace Conference had not been set by the time Lansing wrote to Mezes, however. Wilson prepared to attend the Conference with the goal of establishing a League of Nations and he and the secretary of State were deciding what issues would be discussed at Versailles.

¹⁹² PWW. *A Speech in Los Angeles*. 9/20/1913 V 63, 403.

¹⁹³ FRUS. *The Secretary of State to Dr. S. E. Mezes* 4/17/1918 PPC 1919. Vol. 1 76.

In planning the agenda and representation of the conference, the other major powers supported the imperialism of the United States. On November 15, 1918 Edward House, one of the American delegates to the Conference and one of Wilson's closest advisers, sent Lansing a memorandum outlining the French Foreign Office's proposed Scheme of Procedure for the upcoming conference.¹⁹⁴ The memorandum detailed the French plans, and House made notes questioning or objecting to certain proposals. The memorandum suggested that the Congress of the Conference would be "composed of representatives of the belligerent powers which have taken actual part in the war...A place must be reserved to the theoretical belligerents...the South American States (Cuba, Panama, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Haiti, Honduras) which might be represented by the United States to avoid crowding." House did not question or challenge this portion of the memo. The French Foreign Office and House appeared confident that the United States represented the interests of Latin American nations.

The leaders of the Big Four powers were concluding a peace treaty for a war in which they were the victors. Great Britain, France, Italy, and the United States were the most responsible for that victory. It was understandable that they would be in charge of the peace process. However, they were also forming a global institution to guarantee peace and prosperity for all nations. The smaller nations rightly wanted a stronger voice in affairs that would affect their interests. For Latin American nations, the United States acted as though it was speaking for the entire hemisphere, despite Latin American requests for representation at the conference.

American representatives recognized they were the dominant power in the hemisphere but did not want to acknowledge the fact publicly. Legal adviser to the American

¹⁹⁴ PWW. *French Foreign Office Remarks*. 11/15/1918 Vol. 53 89.

delegation David Hunter Miller stated, “It is, of course, true that Liberia, Cuba, Haiti, and Panama are practically under the direction of the United States, and this might also be said of Nicaragua, but this fact is hardly one which can by us be emphasized.”¹⁹⁵ A similar admission of United States hegemony came from Wilson to Lloyd George. In notes relating a meeting of the Big Four the secretary present recorded Lloyd George arguing for Canadian representation on the Council of the League of Nations. He pointed out that nations such as “Nicaragua, Honduras, etc. could be represented and the United States influence in those countries was greater than the influence of the United Kingdom in Canada.”¹⁹⁶ The account says Wilson “demurred to this” but did not want Lloyd George to use that fact to bolster his argument for Canadian representation. Wilson and the American commission recognized the extent of the influence the United States wielded and sought to preserve it at the Peace Conference.

The United States decided which Latin American nations would attend the Peace Conference. On November 19, 1918 Robert Lansing wrote to U. S Ambassador Edwin Morgan in Brazil asking him to inform the Brazilian government that its representation was not needed at the preliminary sessions of the conference.¹⁹⁷ Morgan replied on November 25 informing Lansing that the Brazilian president wished his representatives present at the preliminary meetings of the council.¹⁹⁸ Brazil was one of the few relatively powerful Latin nations. They had objected to American interference and intervention in the past. American delegates did not want any opposition to their hemispheric plans.

¹⁹⁵ FRUS. *Memorandum by Mr. D.H. Miller on Revised French Proposals of November 21, 1918*. PPC 1919 V1 355.

¹⁹⁶ FRUS. *Notes on a meeting Held at President Wilson’s House in the Place des Etats-Unit, Paris on Tuesday, May 6, 1919 at 11a.m.* PPC 1919 V5 477.

¹⁹⁷ FRUS, *The Secretary of State to the Ambassador in Brazil (Morgan) 11/19/1918*. PPC 1919 V1 223.

¹⁹⁸ FRUS. *The Ambassador in Brazil (Morgan) to the Secretary of State 11/25/1918*. PPC 1919 V1 223.

Brazil had severed diplomatic ties with Berlin and declared war on Germany, and other Latin American nations had done the same, either directly influenced by the presence of United States troops on their soil, like Cuba, or in an attempt to win influence over the post war settlement. On November 29, 1918, Lansing wrote to the United States Minister in Panama, William Price, that the State Department did not think that representatives of minor belligerent nations were needed at preliminary sessions of the conference.¹⁹⁹ Price was instructed to forward the message to the United States ministers in Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Honduras.

Latin American nations that had severed diplomatic relations with Germany or declared war wanted greater representation at the preliminary sessions. The agenda for the rest of the conference was being decided at the preliminary sessions and these nations wanted a voice in those sessions. On December 24, 1918, Assistant Secretary of State Frank Polk forwarded a telegram from the Uruguayan Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dr. Brum, to the American delegation, asking for such representation on issues concerning American affairs.²⁰⁰ Polk advised the American delegation that there was “very strong sentiment” in Latin American countries that if they were not represented they “will feel aggrieved and consider that their following lead of United States in the World War has not been appreciated.” Again on December 30, Polk advised the American delegation to allow the participation of belligerent nations from Latin America or they may feel they “had gained nothing” for their cooperation.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁹ FRUS. *The Secretary of State to the Minister in Panama (Price)* PPC 1919 V1 225.

²⁰⁰ FRUS. *The Acting Secretary of State to the Commission to Negotiate Peace.* 12/24/1918. PPC 1919 V1 227.

²⁰¹ FRUS. *The Acting Secretary of State to the Commission to Negotiate Peace.* 12/30/1918. PPC 1919 V1 229-30.

This advice from Polk was having some effect on the peace delegation. On December 27, 1918 Lansing sent him a telegram stating the United States was sympathetic to the desires for representation by the belligerents and those who had severed ties with Germany. He informed Polk that the commission would “at the appropriate moment extend its good offices” on their behalf.²⁰² Lansing also told Polk to inform the Latin American governments that although they could not promise to secure representation to send delegates to be on hand if they were needed. The United States delegation was deciding when and if the Latin American delegations would be heard at the peace conference, in which one of the conference’s tasks was to construct a League of Nations for the stability and peace of the world.

Most Central and South American nations took some form of action against Germany during the war. Their actual contribution to the Allied victory having been small, they were referred to as “theoretical belligerents.” The nations that declared war on Germany were Brazil, Cuba, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Panama, while Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru severed diplomatic ties with Germany. Argentina, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela all remained neutral throughout the war. All of these nations had to rely on the United States for representation at the Peace Conference. America used its influence to decide which nations would be represented and what issues would come before the Commission. When the war ended, “Wilson reigned dominant over the Western hemisphere, though, admittedly by less formal political means than the president had desired.”²⁰³ Wilson and other American

²⁰² FRUS. *The Commission to Negotiate Peace to the Acting Secretary of State*. 12/27/1918. PPC 1919 V1 228.

²⁰³ Gilderhus, 157.

policy makers worked to ensure they remained in the dominant position and defended the Monroe Doctrine.

A potential threat to the Doctrine arose early in the conference. On January 4, 1919, Frank Polk wrote to the American commission that the government of Peru was considering asking the Peace Congress to settle a border dispute with Chile. Polk wrote, “it might be considered European intervention in an American question and therefore action contrary to what it has been our policy to permit in the past.”²⁰⁴ Polk wanted clarification on United States policy. David Hunter Miller replied that he agreed with Polk’s assessment and that he should do everything possible to prevent Peru from submitting this dispute.²⁰⁵ It was never submitted to the Peace Congress.

Wilson was able to persuade the rest of the Peace Congress that the Covenant for a League of Nations should be included in the Treaty of Peace with Germany. American delegate Tasker Bliss articulated the prevailing sentiment of Wilson and the rest of the delegation when he wrote to Sidney Mezes, head of the Inquiry, that the basic idea of the League would be a world government “in which the ideas of the best class of men in the great civilized powers shall dominate.” He also maintained that the Great Powers, including the United States, should always be involved in the League to insure its success because “the number of great, really civilized powers, will be pitifully small.” The United States would be able to maintain a sphere of influence in the Western Hemisphere, and America would “dominate” affairs in Latin America. He wished to “prevent the

²⁰⁴ FRUS. *The Acting Secretary of State to the Commission to Negotiate Peace*. 1/4/1919. PPC 1919 V1 559.

²⁰⁵ FRUS. *The Technical Advisers to the Commission to Negotiate Peace (Miller, Scott) to the Secretary of State*. PPC 1919 V1 560.

government of the world from passing into the hands of the lesser advanced peoples, or, at least, being to some extent controlled by them.”²⁰⁶

The American Council debated the merits of letting various nations sign the Peace Treaty, the first section of which was to be the Covenant of the League of Nations. A memo from Miller to the American delegation advised that Cuba, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, and Nicaragua as belligerents should be allowed to sign.²⁰⁷ Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, and El Salvador should also be allowed to sign as neutrals. Both groups participation in the League “would seem to be an interest of the United States.” Santo Domingo was not allowed to sign because the United States completely controlled her foreign relations. Miller also advised that Argentina and Chile be allowed to sign because they were necessary if the League of Nations were to “embrace Latin America.” He also felt it may be in the interest of the United States to include Mexico, though Mexico was never invited to sign the treaty. The American delegation debated which nations it would allow to sign the Peace Treaty and join the League of Nations, and the debate always centered on the interests of the United States and not the interests of the Latin American nations.

Samuel Walker McCall, Governor of New Jersey, wrote to Wilson on February 26, 1919 that incorporation of the Monroe Doctrine into the League Covenant would make it part of recognized international law. McCall felt that the United States was beneficial to the rest of the hemisphere. “Every independent government upon this hemisphere is modeled upon our own. Our republic is the mother of them all.” McCall shared

²⁰⁶ FRUS. *General Tasker H. Bliss to the Chief of the Section of Territorial, Economic, and Political Intelligence of the Commission to Negotiate Peace (Mezes)* PPC 1919. V1, 523.

²⁰⁷ FRUS. *The Technical Advisors to the Commission to Negotiate Peace (Scott, Miller) to the Secretary of State* PPC 1919 V1 305-315.

Wilson's vision of a connected hemisphere, with governments based upon the American model, and led by the United States.²⁰⁸

Wilson responded to McCall two days later and he assured the governor that he would work to safeguard the Monroe Doctrine and win its recognition by the other Great Powers. Wilson believed if the other members of the Peace Congress felt the Doctrine were consistent with the League Covenant, they "would be quite willing to leave to us the single responsibility of safeguarding territorial integrity and political independence of American states." The Great Powers were willing to acquiesce to America's request for continued hegemony without hearing the representatives from other American states.²⁰⁹ The Americans returned the favor, telling an Irish delegation their struggle for independence from Britain was a domestic affair, they lived in a democracy, and the problem could be solved by democratic means.²¹⁰ The leaders of the Great Powers worked to ensure their continued hegemony.

Initial drafts of the Treaty also met with resistance in the Senate and from Wilson's political rivals. One of the reasons was the fear that the new League would invalidate the Monroe Doctrine. Opponents to initial drafts, such as Henry Cabot Lodge, Republican Senator from Massachusetts and Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and former Republican President William Howard Taft felt that the League would allow European intervention in the Western Hemisphere. Taft was also on the Executive

²⁰⁸ PWW. *From Samuel Walker McCall*. 2/26/1919 V55, 293.

²⁰⁹ PWW. *To Samuel Walker McCall*. 2/28/1919 V55, 328-329.

²¹⁰ Margaret MacMillan, *Paris 1919: Six Months that Changed the World* (New York: Random House, 2003), 11.

Council of The League to Enforce Peace, formed in 1915, which advocated a set of procedures for mediating international disputes.²¹¹

Opponents of the initial draft advised Wilson to add an amendment that recognized the validity of the Monroe Doctrine. Lansing advised the president the American people would not accept a League that did not do this.²¹² Lansing himself was opposed to a treaty that allowed European powers to intervene in American republics. “Such authority would be a serious menace to the Monroe Doctrine.”²¹³ These warnings of European involvement reflect Wilson’s own vision of continued hegemony in the Western hemisphere.

Wilson received advice from political rivals as well. Taft sent him a telegram on March 18 that served as his model for the amendment recognizing the Monroe Doctrine.²¹⁴ Taft requested several other amendments to the League Covenant but suggested the treaty would probably be ratified if the amendment guaranteeing the Monroe Doctrine were included. Wilson set to work to get recognition of the Doctrine explicitly stated in the League Covenant.

Taft sent Wilson another letter signed by other members of the League to Enforce Peace, Henry Taft, the former president’s brother, A. Lawrence Lowell, president of Harvard, and George Wickersham. They insisted that Wilson secure acceptance of the Monroe Doctrine in the Covenant, “rendering its continued existence unaffected by the Covenant.”²¹⁵ Having the Doctrine declared valid would eliminate any challenge from

²¹¹ Zieger. 175-76.

²¹² Robert Lansing, *The Peace Negotiations: A Personal Narrative* (New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1921), 169.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, 40.

²¹⁴ Ray Stannard Baker, *Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement: Volume I.* (Gloucester MA: Peter Smith, 1960), 324.

²¹⁵ *League of Nations*, V2 1919. (Boston World Peace Foundation)

European powers and also from any Latin American powers. If it was recognized in the Covenant, it could not be challenged at meetings of the League.

This amendment was not embraced by all of Wilson's allies. House worried that it would set a dangerous precedent. In a diary entry on March 18, 1919, he wrote that if concessions were made to America other nations would seek similar guarantees. Japan could ask for a sphere in Asia. There was "no telling where it would end." House felt the proposed amendment would jeopardize passage of the entire covenant.²¹⁶

Lloyd George was also opposed to a specific recognition. He felt it would give the United States a "special prerogative" and "localize the League of Nations."²¹⁷ He aired this objection at a meeting of Peace delegates at which Lansing, White and Bliss were present. One of the major concerns of the European powers was that the United States would not only use the provision of the Monroe Doctrine to keep Europe out of the Americas, but would also invoke its other provision, which stated the United States would not intervene in European affairs. French representatives, especially, wanted assurance the United States would not shirk League responsibilities in Europe by citing the Monroe Doctrine.²¹⁸

Wilson repeatedly assured the French representative, Fernand Larnaude, that the United States had every intention of honoring its obligations under the League Covenant.²¹⁹ Larnaude pressed Wilson to define the Monroe Doctrine in his proposed amendment. Wilson always resisted this and asked Larnaude if he felt the United States was acting in bad faith. Larnaude responded that he trusted Wilson but could not speak

²¹⁶ PWW. *From the Diary of Colonel House*. 3/18/1918 V56 82.

²¹⁷ FRUS. *Minutes of the Daily Meetings of the Commissioners Plenipotentiary, Thursday, March 27, 1919* PPC 1919 V11 133.

²¹⁸ PWW. *League of Nations Commission*. 4/10/1919 V57 227.

²¹⁹ PWW. *Ibid*. V57 227-231.

for future American leaders. Wilson eventually won this debate. A diary entry from British delegate Sir Robert Cecil gives a picture of the American position. On March 26, 1919 Cecil wrote, “As the Conference goes on the dominating position of America becomes more and more evident.”²²⁰ He concluded by writing the greatest need for the future was money, and only the United States out of the Allied Powers had it. This condition greatly strengthened Wilson’s hand at the Conference.

There is one recorded instance in which Wilson granted that the new Covenant took precedence over the Monroe Doctrine.²²¹ In the transcript of an address delivered to delegates of the Peace Congress, Wilson is quoted as saying the Covenant took precedence over the Doctrine. Arthur Link attributes this either to Wilson’s fatigue or poor stenography. Wilson consistently defended the Monroe Doctrine and worked to have it recognized in the Covenant where it would become international law. He consistently disavowed this interpretation in public speeches and in addresses to the Congress.

On July 11, 1919 the *New York Times* reported that Wilson had succeeded in getting the amendment added to the Covenant.²²² He said it not only recognized the Monroe Doctrine but also strengthened it because the League would now enforce the Monroe Doctrine and keep European powers from intervening in the Americas. Wilson had kept from defining the Monroe Doctrine and the United States was able to interpret it and apply it without fear of censure from European powers, strengthening America’s grip on Latin America.

²²⁰ PWW. *From the Diary of Lord Robert Cecil*. 3/26/1919 V56 297.

²²¹ PWW. *Remarks on the Monroe Doctrine*. 4/11/1919 V57 267.

²²² PWW. *Hankey’s Notes of a Meeting of the Council of Four*. 7/11/1919 V60 437-438.

The wording of the amendment was not satisfactory to some still worried about the Monroe Doctrine being undermined by the League. The amendment became Article 21 in the final draft of the Covenant. It read:

Nothing in this Covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace.²²³

Elihu Root an influential Republican and former Secretary of War for Presidents McKinley and Roosevelt, felt the language was too vague.²²⁴ Root contended that the Monroe Doctrine was not properly protected. The *New York Times* reported July 25, 1919 that the Senate wanted a reservation stating the Monroe Doctrine was “an essential national policy of the United States” and the United States alone would determine the extent and necessity of its use.²²⁵

Having secured the tool of American empire, the Monroe Doctrine, in the League Covenant, American and British delegates set out to deny racial equality the same protections. Japanese delegates approached Wilson with a proposal to end racial discrimination. Wilson’s friend and advisor Colonel Edward House met with Baron Nobuaki Makino, a former premier, and Viscount Sutemi Chinda, Japan’s ambassador to Great Britain.²²⁶ Chinda and Makino delivered two drafts of their proposal for Wilson to study and amend.

The proposal Wilson returned was “practically meaningless.”²²⁷ The Japanese tried again but when Wilson read a printed draft of the Covenant, the racial equality proposal

²²³ Lansing, 310.

²²⁴ PWW. *David Hunter Miller to Gordon Auchincloss*. 6/26/1919 V61 233.

²²⁵ PWW. *Two News Reports*. 7/25/1919 V61 620.

²²⁶ Lauren, 243.

²²⁷ *Ibid*, 243.

was not included. On April 11, 1919 at the final session of the League of Nations council the Japanese delegates requested a vote on their amendment. Eleven of seventeen member nations voted in favor of the resolution. Wilson promptly declared that it failed to pass because the decision was not unanimous.²²⁸ Wilson knew the ramifications for the United States if the League adopted the racial equality measure. He again failed to match his idealistic rhetoric about freedom and equality in his actions.

With the final version of the Covenant completed, Wilson returned home to persuade the Senate to ratify the treaty. Senators that supported Reservations to the League Covenant were concerned about the loss of Congressional power and the infringement on the sovereignty of the United States. Reservation Number 5, which dealt with the Monroe Doctrine, stated “the United States will not submit to arbitration or to inquiry by the Assembly or by the Council...any questions which in the judgment of the United States depend upon or relate to its long established policy, commonly known as the Monroe Doctrine.”²²⁹ The Senators did not feel that it was enough to simply gain recognition of the Monroe Doctrine but to prevent any further review of the policy.

Senator William Borah, Republican from Idaho, felt that even safeguarding the Monroe Doctrine in the League Covenant, would be disastrous for the United States. He felt American membership in the League would lead to a repudiation of George Washington’s warning against “entangling alliances” and invite European intervention in the Americas. “I think that insofar as language could protect the Monroe Doctrine, it has been protected. But as a practical proposition, as a working proposition do you think that you can intermeddle in European affairs, and second, never to permit Europe to interfere

²²⁸ Lauren, 251.

²²⁹ Congressional Record. 66th Congress, 1st Session. 8777-8778.

in our affairs.”²³⁰ Borah felt it would be impossible to keep Europe from infringing on American sovereignty. Through the actions of the League Council, Europe “will control, whether it wills or no, the destinies of America.”²³¹

The United States Senate eventually passed fifteen “reservations” to the treaty that would apply to the United States alone. The reservation concerning the Monroe Doctrine contained wording which placed the Monroe Doctrine “outside of the jurisdiction of the League of Nations.”²³² Senators decided against requesting that they become amendments to the actual treaty, because this would require further negotiations and acceptance by all signatories. Reservations were a way to safeguard America’s interests without rewriting the entire Covenant.

It has been noted that Wilson believed the president held the ultimate authority in formulating the foreign policy of the United States. He also had a particular disregard for the Senate. When he first saw his newborn grandson he quipped, “With his mouth open and his eyes shut, I predict that he will make a senator when he grows up.”²³³ Wilson thought he crafted a groundbreaking instrument for ensuring world peace and American leadership. The Senate, with the reservations, meddled in matters he felt were beyond their grasp and responsibility.

Wilson opposed all the reservations and embarked on a tour of the nation to garner support for the League. He defended the Monroe Doctrine on a number of occasions, arguing that it was safeguarded in the Covenant and stating that he could not understand how the language of the Covenant could be misunderstood as not recognizing the Monroe

²³⁰ Congressional Record. 66th Congress, 1st Session. 8783.

²³¹ Congressional Record. 66th Congress, 1st Session. 8784.

²³² Henry Cabot Lodge, *The Senate and the League of Nations* (New York: Charles Scribner Sons, 1925), 186.

²³³ Quoted in Zeiger, 218.

Doctrine. On September 8 during an address in Omaha, Nebraska he stated, “The Monroe Doctrine is adopted. It has been swallowed hook, line and sinker.” He declared that it is recognized for the first time ever “by all the great nations of the world.”²³⁴

The Monroe Doctrine was not, however, recognized by the Latin American nations. Policarpo Bonilla, a delegate from Honduras, asked for the inclusion of a definition of the Doctrine and a guarantee that the doctrine did not hinder Latin American states from forming their own confederation. He also asked that Article 21 state that Latin American nations have the right to independence and freedom from intervention in their internal affairs.²³⁵ Uruguay and Panama expressed unreserved support for the League.²³⁶ The Argentine Minister of Foreign Affairs challenged the Monroe Doctrine’s validity at the Peace Conference. He argued that it was unilateral and “was never accepted either expressly nor implicitly by other nations of the continent.”²³⁷ Argentina and Mexico stated they did not recognize the Monroe Doctrine when they joined the League and El Salvador requested a definition and an appraisal of possible future applications from the State Department.²³⁸

Latin American nations were reluctant to join the League of Nations because they feared the United States would dominate and gain more power.²³⁹ Lester Langley wrote that many Latin American leaders believed the League legitimized the Monroe Doctrine and this would further erode their power but later endorsed membership after the United

²³⁴ PWW. *An Address in Omaha*. 9/8/1919 V63 103.

²³⁵ Calcott, 455-456. Also, Macmillan, 96. Macmillan writes that the Honduran delegate spoke out against the Monroe Doctrine but because he spoke in Spanish was largely ignored.

²³⁶ F.P. Walters, *A History of the League of Nations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1952), 38.

²³⁷ Quoted in John H. Spencer, “The Monroe Doctrine and the League Covenant,” *The American Journal of International Law*, 30, no. 3 (Jul. 1936), 411.

²³⁸ FRUS 1920. *Parades to the Secretary of State*. 223-225. See also Gordon Connell-Smith, *The United States and Latin America: An Historical Analysis of Inter-American Relations* (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1974), 144.

²³⁹ Calcott, 492.

States refused to join.²⁴⁰ Lars Schoultz argued that Latin American leaders viewed the League as their means of countering more powerful nations.²⁴¹ Wilson denied these nations a role in the formation of an organization supposedly based on the equality of all nations.

Wilson spoke in his most imperial tone in Spokane on September 12, 1919. He stated the Monroe Doctrine was a principle regarding foreign interference in the Western Hemisphere “which the United States is at liberty to apply in any circumstances where it thought it pertinent. That means the United States means to play big brother to the western hemisphere in any circumstances where it thinks it wise to play big brother.” He also explained that he avoided including a definition of the Doctrine in the Covenant because the United States might wish to expand it.²⁴²

On only two occasions during his tour did Wilson acknowledge the American Empire in Latin America. Defending the League against accusations that the British Empire would control six votes to the one of the United States, Wilson pointed out that the United States greatly influenced Cuba and Panama. On September 19 in San Diego he stated those countries were “under the direction and directorate of the United States.”²⁴³ The next day at the Shrine Auditorium he reiterated that the two nations were “very much under the influence of the United States.”²⁴⁴ Wilson admitted these nations were under the control of the United States, but he still refused to acknowledge the extent of the American Empire in Latin America. This slight of hand directly contradicted his statements of self-determination for all nations.

²⁴⁰ Langley, “America and the Americas: The United States in the Western Hemisphere,” 492.

²⁴¹ Schoultz, 284.

²⁴² PWW. *An Address in Spokane*. 9/12/1919 V63 230.

²⁴³ PWW. *An Address in San Diego*. 9/19/1919 V63 377.

²⁴⁴ PWW. *An Address in Shrine Auditorium*. 9/20/1919 V63 414.

The Senate debated the question of accepting the treaty that October. The issue of United States control of Latin American nations emerged during debates about voting equality in the League. Senator Thomas of Colorado argued that it might appear to outsiders that the United States controlled the foreign policy of “certain countries to the south of us.”²⁴⁵ Senator Fall of New Mexico asked if Thomas felt that was in fact the case, and he responded he did not know. Thomas continued that Panama was “entirely under the influence of the United States.” He stated that he did not believe America would use that position to influence Panama’s voting in the League of Nations. However, the United States used that influence to prop up compliant governments, and it would surely use its influence to sway the votes of those nations in the League of Nations. The instrument of American intervention was the Monroe Doctrine and Wilson and the Senate fought to have it recognized at Paris.

Senator Thomas spoke altruistically of the American role in Nicaragua. He said that government “stands, and has rested for years on the bayonets of the United States marines.” He argued that the government of Haiti also survived because of the marines. “We have then, in a political sense, and probably in an economic sense, four dependencies in this hemisphere.” Thomas again asserted his belief that the United States government would not use that position to influence any of the votes of those countries in the League. This was political double speak however, Wilson admitted as much to Lloyd George in Paris and twice during his speaking tour.²⁴⁶ With the Monroe Doctrine safeguarded in the League Covenant, and other powerful nations eager to

²⁴⁵ Congressional Record 66th Congress, 1st Session. October 25,1919. 7500.

²⁴⁶ Congressional Record. 66th Congress, 1st Session. October 25, 1919. 7501.

perpetuate their own empires, United States interventions would certainly continue and hegemony of the hemisphere was assured.

The United States Senate never ratified the Versailles Peace Treaty. Wilson's vision for an expanded Monroe Doctrine for the world was not recognized by the United States. Despite his assertions of the equality of large and small nations and the ideals of self determination, he continually intervened in Latin America to install governments that were sympathetic to or compliant with American interests.

Republicans and Democrats were eager to preserve the instrument of American intervention, the Monroe Doctrine. Wilson fought for its inclusion and recognition in the Covenant of the League of Nations, effectively removing Central and South America from the League's protective mechanisms. Wilson only grudgingly admitted to United States influence in Latin nations. He always spoke in altruistic terms about American interventions even when confronted with foreign ministers asking for independence or a simple definition of United States policy.

CONCLUSION

Woodrow Wilson was a Reformer Imperialist. His policies were shaped by the desire to spread democracy in order to foster peace and prosperity. His racism informed his imperialist foreign policies. Wilson made Latin America the object of his first foreign policy endeavors. In his famous Mobile Address in 1913, he promised a new era in the relations between the nations of the Americas based on friendship and equality. More important than material interests was “the development of constitutional liberty in the world.” The United States was not interested in territorial acquisition he assured his audience, but “human liberty and national opportunity.” The relationship of the United States to the rest of the hemisphere “is the relationship of a family of mankind devoted to the development of true constitutional liberty.”²⁴⁷ Wilson argued that without democracy, prosperity and security were not possible. He enforced this belief through imperial methods of intervention, non-recognition, and economic dominance, justified by a racist view that no-whites needed training in the workings of democracy.

Wilson built upon the work of his predecessors but deviated in his insistence on democratic governments. He disregarded state department experts who warned him against this new plan. This is evident in his rhetoric about the relationship between the American states and his actions in Costa Rica, refusing to recognize the Tinoco regime even after being offered the use of harbors and ports and a Costa Rican declaration of war against Germany. He intervened in Haiti, Cuba, and Nicaragua insisting on constitutional reform under American guidance before withdrawal.

²⁴⁷ PWW, *Address at Mobile Alabama*. 28, 448-452.

Wilson saw his actions as beneficial to both the United States and the nations in which he intervened. This leads to the question, is empire ever a good thing? The Imperial nation surely benefits in its dominant role with other nations. What about the dominated? Niall Ferguson argues that there are a number of benefits that may accompany imperial rule. He lists greater security, improved government, and increases in health, education, and economic opportunity.²⁴⁸

These benefits are not guaranteed to apply equally to all or even to many. Security and peace are desirable but if the bayonets of a foreign army provide them, with no accountability, the local population may not feel so secure. Education is a great benefit, however if native cultures, customs, and language are supplanted by the imperial powers, the cost is too great and the benefits flow away from the native population. Education is often accompanied by religious instruction, another way weaker peoples feel their culture is robbed by imperialism.

The subjects of empire and imperialism offer many avenues for further research. A comparative study of the British and American empires in South and Central America would be a major contribution. This would provide an opportunity to examine how Latin Americans attempted to manipulate the two powers against one another for their own benefit and how oppressed people react to the supposed benefits of being linked to a strong economy.

Venezuela appealed to the United States to arbitrate a border dispute with England in 1895 citing the Monroe Doctrine.²⁴⁹ The Latin American response to the Monroe Doctrine and the effort to obtain a definition would also make an important addition to

²⁴⁸ Ferguson, *Colossus*. 12.

²⁴⁹ Davis, 142-43.

the literature of the subject. The example of Venezuela demonstrates that some nations found the Monroe Doctrine beneficial. Playing one side against the other could bring short-term gain, or the exchange of one imperial power for another closer to home.

Wilson was unique in his formation of foreign policy because his was based on a moral as well as practical foundation. However, he exerted United States influence with little regard to the protests of other American nations or realizing the failure of the United States to deliver freedom and security to millions of its own citizens. American and British leaders formulated the core of the Monroe Doctrine without consulting foreign governments. The initial targets of the Doctrine were other European nations, not Latin American nations but it became a way of legitimizing interference in the affairs of other states. This reflects Wilson's notions of a racial hierarchy with whites in the dominant role, guiding the less civilized people of the world.

Every president from Monroe through Wilson reaffirmed or expanded the Monroe Doctrine. The French intervention in Mexico and installation of Emperor Maximilian was a major test of the Doctrine. With the United States enmeshed in the Civil War, American leaders were unable or unwilling to enforce the long-standing policy meant to prevent European intervention in the Western Hemisphere.

The threat of enforcement was still a concern to European leaders. As the Civil War drew to a close Confederate and Union Generals, including Ulysses Grant entertained the idea of joining forces to oust the French from Mexico. This strategy served to fulfill the original intent of the Monroe Doctrine, eliminating European powers from the Western Hemisphere, but also aid the spread of democracy and ease domestic tensions.

The American colonies had expanded before they became a sovereign nation. Territorial and economic expansion often went hand in hand. After 1898, American leaders including Wilson stated they did not wish to annex any additional territory. As the nation became industrialized, economic expansion replaced territorial gain as vital to the nation's security and prosperity. Wilson sought to ensure greater economic prosperity for the United States through the exportation and defense of democracy. He also believed the white leaders of the United States were obligated to guide non-whites on their march to democracy.

Wilson entered office with little experience in foreign affairs but a powerful ideological vision, which was the foundation of his dealings with all other nations and domestic leaders. He believed democracy was the sole legitimate form of government and the United States had a duty to export freedom to the world. His disregard for State Department policies and expertise led to many failures in Latin America and in the fight for the ratification of the Versailles treaty by the United States Congress. His unwillingness to compromise led to the defeat of his peace plan in the United States Senate. His racism and reliance on southern votes blinded him to the fact that true democracy did not exist in the United States. Millions of African Americans and women were not able to determine their own leaders.

Wilson intervened in the neighboring countries when and where he chose, with little regard for the wishes of the local population. He tried to create a Pan-American pact under United States leadership, but Latin American nations rebuffed the plan for fear of increased American involvement in their internal affairs. Wilson chose which Latin American nations were allowed at the Paris Peace Conference, operated in private with

other major powers, and they decided what topics would be discussed at the table. The destruction of the victorious powers' empires was not high on the priority list.

This thesis argues that Wilson was a reformer imperialist and one of the most interventionist of all the presidents. He understood that the United States would be the principle beneficiary of his policies, but he believed all people would be uplifted also. Wilson attempted to reform and improve the internal structures of the nations he dealt with. Wilson, however, was racist and believed in the superiority of whites. He told degrading jokes and stories at cabinet meetings, refused to meet with black leaders, and did little to stop racial violence. He was sincere in his beliefs that United States tutelage would benefit the entire hemisphere, but like many reformers, treated those he aimed to help as inferiors, incapable of formulating their own strategies for uplift. He decided which governments were acceptable, when to use force, dictated peace terms, and reserved the right to intervene in the internal affairs of other sovereign nations. Wilson also believed the native populations would benefit with improved communications and infrastructure, stable government, increased security, peace, and prosperity. These can all be of great benefit, but when forced by outsiders who also bring degradation and humiliation, the cost is too great.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Government Records

United States Congress. *Congressional Record, 1865-1921.*

Department of State. *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States 1865-1921.*

Papers, Writings, and Correspondence:

Baker, Ray Stannard. *Woodrow Wilson and the World Settlement.* Gloucester: P. Smith, 1922.

Bancroft, Frederick ed. *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz.* New York: G. P. Putnam Sons, 1913.

Blaine, James G. *Twenty Years of Congress from Lincoln to Garfield. With a Review of the Events which led to the Political Revolution of 1860.* Norwich: The Henry Bill Publishing Co. 1884-1886.

Bryan, William Jennings. *Bryan on Imperialism.* New York: Arno Press, 1970.

Cronon, E. David. Ed. *The Cabinet Diaries of Josephus Daniels, 1913-1921.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963.

Daniels, Josephus. *Shirt Sleeve Diplomat.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947.

DuBois, W.E.B. "My Impressions of Woodrow Wilson." *The Journal of Negro History* 58, no. 4 (Oct. 1973): 453-459.

Ford, Worthington C. *Writings of John Quincy Adams.* New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.

Graf, Leroy P. and Ralph W. Haskins eds. *The Papers of Andrew Johnson.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1967-1999.

Lansing, Robert. *The Peace Negotiations: A Personal Narrative*. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1921.

Link, Arthur ed. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966-1995.

Lodge, Henry Cabot. *The Senate and the League of Nations*. New York: Charles Scribner Sons, 1925.

O'Shaughnessy, Edith. *A Diplomat's Wife in Mexico: Letters from the American Embassy at Mexico City, covering the Dramatic Relations on April 23, 1914, Together with an Account of the Occupation of Vera Cruz*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1916.

Nevins, Allan ed. *Letters of Grover Cleveland, 1850-1908*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1970.

Pierce, Edward L. ed. *Memoirs and Letters of Charles Sumner*. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1893.

Richardson, J.D. ed. *Compilation of Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1908*. Washington: Bureau of National Literature and Art, 1909.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *The Works of Theodore Roosevelt*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1924-1925.

Simon, John Y. ed. *The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967-1991.

Newspapers and Periodicals:

New York Times

The Atlantic Monthly

North American Review

Harper's

The New England Magazine

The Living Age

The Century

The American Journal of International Law

Secondary Sources

- Albion, Robert G. "Capital Movement and Transportation: British Shipping and Latin America, 1806-1914." *The Journal of Economic History*. Vol. 11, No. 4 (Autumn 1951) 361-374.
- Ambrosius, Lloyd. *Wilsonianism: Woodrow Wilson and his Legacy in American Foreign Relations*. New York: Macmillan, 2002.
- Bailey, Norman. "The United States as Caudillo" *Journal of Inter-American Studies*. Vol. 5, No. 3 (Jul. 1963) 313-324.
- Bailey, Thomas. "The Lodge Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine" *Political Science Quarterly*. Vol. 48, No. 2 (Jun. 1933) 220-239.
- Baker, George W. Jr. "The Wilson Administration and Panama, 1913-1921" *Journal of Inter-American Studies*. Vol. 8, No. 2 (Apr. 1966) 279-293.
- Bastert, Russell. "A New Approach to the Origins of Blaine's Pan American Policy" *The Hispanic American Historical Review*. Vol. 39, No. 3 (Aug. 1959) 375-412.
_____. "Diplomatic Reversal: Frelinghuysen's Opposition to Blaine's Pan American Policy in 1882" *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*. Vol. 42, No. 4 (Mar. 1956) 653-671.
- Beale, Howard. *Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1956.
- Beisner, Robert. *From the Old Diplomacy to the New, 1865-1900*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1975.
- Bemis, Samuel Flagg. *The Latin American Policy of the United States: An Historical Interpretation*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1943.
- Betts, Raymond. *Uncertain Dimensions: Western Overseas Empires in the Twentieth Century*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985.
- Blumenthal, Henry. "Woodrow Wilson and the Race Question." *The Journal of Negro History* 48, no. 1 (Jan. 1963): 1-21.
- Bucklin, Steven. *Realism and American Foreign Policy: Wilsonians and the Kennan-Morgenthau Thesis*. Westport: Praeger, 2001.

- Buehrig, Edward. Ed. *Wilson's Foreign Policy in Perspective*. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1970.
- Calcott, Wilfrid Hardy. *The Caribbean Policy of the United States, 1890-1920*. New York: Octagon Books, 1966.
- Calder, Bruce J. *The Impact of Intervention: The Dominican Republic during the U. S. Occupation of 1916-1924*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1984.
- Campbell, Charles. *The Transformation of American Foreign Relations, 1865-1900*. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.
- Clayton, Lawrence. "The Nicaragua Canal in the Nineteenth Century: Prelude to American Empire in the Caribbean." *Journal of Latin American Studies*. Vol. 19, No. 2 (Nov. 1987) 323-352.
- Clements, Kendrick A. *Woodrow Wilson: World Statesman*. Boston: Twayne Publishing, 1987.
- Coletta, Paolo. "William Jennings Bryan and the United States- Colombia Impasse, 1903-1921" *Hispanic American Historical Review*. Vol. 47, No. 4 (Nov. 1967) 486-501.
- Collin, Richard. *Theodore Roosevelt's Caribbean: The Panama Canal, the Monroe Doctrine and the Latin American Context*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990.
- _____. *Theodore Roosevelt, Culture, Diplomacy and Expansion: A New View of American Imperialism*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985.
- Cooper, John Milton Jr. *Breaking the Heart of the World: Woodrow Wilson and the Fight for the League of Nations*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2001.
- Cooper, John Milton Jr. and Charles E. Neu eds. *The Wilson Era: Essays in Honor of Arthur S. Link*. Arlington Heights, MI: Harlan Davidson, 1991.
- Crapol, Edward P. *James G. Blaine: Architect of Empire*. Wilmington DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2000.
- Davis, Harold Eugene and John J. Finan and F. Taylor Peck. *Latin American Diplomatic History: An Introduction*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977.
- Dobson, John. *America's Ascent: The United States Becomes a Great Power, 1880-1914*. DeKalb: University of Northern Illinois Press, 1978.
- Dulles, Foster Rhea. *Prelude to World Power, American Diplomatic History, 1860-1900*. New York, Macmillan, 1965.

- Eisenhower, John S.D. *Intervention: The United States and the Mexican Revolution, 1913-1917*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1993.
- Ferguson, Niall. *Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire*. New York: Penguin, 2004.
- _____. *The Pity of War*. New York: Basic Books, 1999.
- Ferns, H.S. "Britain's Informal Empire in Argentina, 1806-1914." *Past and Present*. No. 4 (Nov. 1953) 60-75.
- Fleming, Thomas. *The Illusion of Victory: America in World War I*. New York: Basic Books, 2003.
- Forbes, Ian L. D. "German Informal Imperialism in South America before 1914." *The Economic History Review*. New Series Vol. 31, No. 3 (Aug. 1978) 384-398.
- Friedberg, Aaron L. *The Weary Titan: Britain and the Experience of Relative Decline 1895-1905*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Gallagher, John and Ronald Robinson. "The Imperialism of Free Trade" *The Economic History Review*. New Series, Vol. 6, No. 1 (1953) 1-15.
- Gardner, Lloyd, Walter LeFeber and Thomas McCormick. *Creation of the American Empire: United States Diplomatic History*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.
- Gilderhus, Mark. *Pan-American Visions: Woodrow Wilson in the Western Hemisphere, 1913-1921*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1986.
- _____. *Diplomacy and Revolution: U.S.-Mexican Relations under Wilson and Carranza*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1977.
- Grenville, J.A.S. and George Berkeley Young. *Politics, Strategy, and American Diplomacy: Studies in Foreign Policy 1873-1917*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.
- Grieb, Kenneth. *The United States and Huerta*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1969.
- Haley, P. Edward. *Revolution and Intervention: The Diplomacy of Taft and Wilson with Mexico 1910-1919*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1970.

- Healy, David. *Drive to Hegemony: The United States in the Caribbean 1898-1917*. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.
- _____. *U.S. Expansionism: The Imperial Urge in the 1890's*. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press.
- _____. *Gunboat Diplomacy in the Wilson Era: The U. S. Navy in Haiti 1915-1916*. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1976.
- Herrick, Walter. *The American Naval Revolution*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1966.
- Hill, Howard. *Roosevelt and the Caribbean*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.
- Hogan, Michael J. and Thomas G. Patterson eds. *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations, Second Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Hoganson, Kristin. *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Hunt, Michael. *Ideology and United States Foreign Policy*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1987.
- Jenks, Leland Hamilton. *Our Cuban Colony: A Study in Sugar*. New York: Vanguard Press, 1928.
- Johnson, John. *A Hemisphere Apart: The Foundations of United States Policy Toward Latin America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.
- Judis, John. *The Folly of Empire: What George W. Bush could Learn from Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson*. New York: Scribner, 2004.
- Katz, Friedrich. "Pancho Villa and the Attack on Columbus, New Mexico" *The American Historical Review*. Vol. 83, No. 1 (Feb. 1978) 101-130.
- Kaufman, Burton I. "United States Trade and Latin America: The Wilson Years" *The Journal of American History*. Vol. 58, No. 2 (Sep. 1971) 342-363.
- Kennan, George. *American Diplomacy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Kennedy, David M. *Over Here: The First World War and American Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Knock, Thomas. *To End All Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

- Landes, David S. *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some are so Rich and Some So Poor*. New York: W.W. Norton Company, 1999.
- Langley, Lester and Thomas Schoonover. *The Banana Men: American Mercenaries and Entrepreneurs in Central America 1880-1930*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1995.
- Langley, Lester. *Struggle for the American Mediterranean: The U.S.-Euro Rivalry in the Gulf-Caribbean, 1776-1904*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1976.
- _____. *The Banana Wars: An Isthmian History of American Empire, 1900-1983*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1983.
- _____. *America and the Americas: The United States in the Western Hemisphere*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989.
- LeFeber, Walter. *The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967.
- Levin, N. Gordon Jr. *Woodrow Wilson and World Politics: America's Response to War and Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Lieven, Dominic. "Dilemmas of Empire 1850-1918. Power, Territory, Identity." *Journal of Contemporary History*. Vol. 34, No. 2 (Apr. 1999) 163-200.
- Link, Arthur. *Woodrow Wilson: Confusion and Crisis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- _____. *Wilson: The Diplomatist*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- _____. *Wilson: The Struggle for Neutrality*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.
- _____. *Wilson: The New Freedom*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956.
- _____. *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era*. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.
- _____. *Woodrow Wilson: Revolution, War, and Peace*. Arlington Heights: Harlan Davidson, 1979.
- Lockey, Joseph. "Pan Americanism and Imperialism" *The American Journal of International Law*. Vol. 32, No.2 (Apr. 1938) 233-243.
- _____. *Essays in Pan-Americanism*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1939.
- Lunardine, Christine A. and Thomas Knock. "Woodrow Wilson and Woman's Suffrage: A New Look." *Political Science Quarterly* 95, no. 4 (Winter 1980): 655-671.
- Lundestad, Geir. "Empire by Invitation: The United States and Western Europe, 1945-1952." *Journal of Peace Research*. Vol. 23, No. 3 (Sep. 1986) 263-277.
- McPherson, James. *Battle Cry Freedom: The Civil War Era*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

- MacMillan, Margaret. *Paris 1919: Six Months That Changed the World*. New York: Random House, 2003.
- May, Ernest. *American Imperialism: A Speculative Essay*. New York: Atheneum, 1968.
 _____. *The Making of the Monroe Doctrine*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Mayer, Robert. "The Origin of the American Banking Empire in Latin America: Frank Vanderlip and the National City Bank." *Journal of Inter-American Studies and World Affairs, Special Issue: Foreign Investment and Dependence in Latin America*. Vol. 15, No. 1 (Feb. 1973) 60-76.
- Merk, Frederick. *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History, A Reinterpretation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.
- Miller, Robert Ryal. *Arms Across the Border: United States aid to Juarez during the French Intervention in Mexico*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1973.
- Monteverde, Aguilar. *Pan-Americanism from Monroe to the Present: A View from the Other Side*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1968.
- Morgan, H. Wayne. *America's Road to Empire: The War With Spain and Overseas Expansion*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.
- Munro, Dana. *Intervention and Dollar Diplomacy in the Caribbean, 1900-1921*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- Muzzey, David Saville. *James G. Blaine: A Political Idol of Other Days*. Port Washington NY: Kennicat Press, 1934.
- Nearing, Scott and Joseph Freeman. *Dollar Diplomacy*. London: George, Allen, Unwin, 1926.
- Newfarmer, Richard ed. *From Gunboats to Diplomacy: New U.S. Policies for Latin America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.
- Norman, Albert. *The Monroe Doctrine Expanded*. Northfield: 1968.
- Notter, Harley. *The Origin of the Foreign Policy of Woodrow Wilson*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1937.
- O'Rielly, Kenneth. "The Jim Crow Policies of Woodrow Wilson." *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* no. 17(Autumn 1997):117-122.
- O'Toole, G.J.A. *The Spanish War: An American Epic—1898*. New York: Norton, 1984.

- Perez, Louis. *Cuba Under the Platt Amendment 1902-1934*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1986.
- Perkins, Dexter. *The Monroe Doctrine 1867-1907*. Gloucester MA: Peter Smith, 1966.
 _____. *The United States and the Caribbean*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.
- Perkins, Whitney. *The United States and Caribbean Intervention*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1981.
- Phillips, Kevin. *William McKinley*. New York: Times Books/Henry Holt, 2003.
- Plesur, Milton. *America's Outward Thrust: Approaches to Foreign Affairs 1865-1890*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1971.
- Pratt, Julius. *Expansionists of 1898: The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Islands*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1936.
 _____. *America's Colonial Experiment: How the United States Gained, Governed, and In Part Gave Away a Colonial Empire*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1950.
- Quirk, Robert. *An Affair of Honor: Woodrow Wilson and the Occupation of Vera Cruz*. Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press, 1962.
- Rappaport, Armin ed. *The Monroe Doctrine*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.
- Ridley, Jasper. *Maximilian and Juarez*. London: Phoenix Press, 1993.
- Rosenberg, Emily. *Spreading the American Dream: America's Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890-1945*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1982.
- Sandos, James A. "Pancho Villa and American Security: Woodrow Wilson's Mexican Diplomacy Reconsidered" *Journal of Latin American Studies*. Vol. 13, No. 2 (Nov. 1981) 293-311.
- Schoonover, Thomas. *Uncle Sam's War of 1898 and the Origins of Globalization*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2003.
 _____. *The United States in Central America, 1860-1911: Episodes of Social Imperialism and Imperial Rivalry in the World System*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Schoultz, Lars. *Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy Toward Latin America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

- Smith, Robert Freeman. *The United States and Revolutionary Nationalism in Mexico, 1916-1932*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- Smith, Tony. *America's Mission: The United States and the Worldwide Struggle for Democracy in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Smith, Woodruff. *European Imperialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Chicago: Nelson Hall, 1982.
- Spencer, John H. "The Monroe Doctrine and the League Covenant" *The American Journal of International Law*. Vol. 30, No. 3 (Jul. 1936) 400-413.
- Stout, Joseph Allen. *Border Conflict: Villistas, Carrancistas, and the Punitive Expedition, 1915-1920*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1999.
- Tansill, Charles. *The Foreign Policy of Thomas F. Bayard, 1885-1897*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1940.
- Trask, David. *The War With Spain in 1898*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996.
- Traxell, David. *1898: The Birth of the American Century*. New York: A.A. Knopf, 1998.
- Van Alstyne, Richard. *The Rising American Empire*. New York: WW Norton and Co., 1960.
- Wilgus, A. Curtis. "James G. Blaine and the Pan American Movement" *The Hispanic American Historical Review* Vol. 5, No. 4 (Nov. 1922) 662-708.
- Williams, William Appleman. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy, New Edition*. New York: WW Norton, 1972.
- Yerxa, Donald. *Admirals and Empire: The United States Navy and the Caribbean, 1898-1945*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991.

