

#flo #hw

1 | Yawp

- as american imperialism increased, so did immigration into the US
 - imperialism and immigration both raised the questions of
 - * who was american
 - * what is america's role in foreign environments

american intervention

- first unincorporated territories of the US were the guano islands
 - precedent for future acquisitions
 - "interventionist attitude"
 - intervention w/ Huerta in Mexico
 - justified by potential bearing on the United States
 - not true for intervention in the middle east!
 - Should the United States act as an empire?
 - Or were foreign interventions and the taking of territory antithetical to its founding democratic ideals?
 - What exactly would be the relationship between the United States and its territories?
 - And could colonial subjects be successfully and safely incorporated into the body politic as American citizens?
 - one view, America had a "duty to discharge" around the world
 - American Anti-Imperialist League with lots of big names started
 - idea was to protect the rights of self-governance for everyone
 - "big stick" was what Roosevelt wanted
 - but wasn't actually good enough, so instead people used "dollar diplomacy" to assert dominance
- Roosevelt and friends "manly duty" of the US to intervene and spread its superiority
- dollar diplomacy was cheaper than military and didn't require a military
 - also, gave opportunities to bankers
 - * strapped for cash leaders took out massive loans w/ insane interest rates
 - "turnover in regimes interfered with the repayment of loans" Jesus Christ
 - immigration was a big thing,
 - people were worried that so much immigration would be bad
 - so they added lots of restrictions
 - and viewed immigrants as inferior

2 | Perez

- battleship, Maine, exploded
 - lots of people died
 - during a period of tension w/ Spain
 - people thought it was the Spaniards
 - * bam! war. (ten days later, officially)
- ofc, the Maine was only the proximal cause
 - but maybe not? many view the sinking of the Maine to be the main cause
 - or simply, made an avoidable war inevitable
 - * ended all hope for peace
- another interpretation, the explosion made war acceptable to the general public, even if not inevitable
 - the concept of inevitability itself bothers me in this context.. what does it even mean?
 - and also, ofc, the argument that this shift in public viewpoint made it inevitable
 - * heavy linkage from public opinion and the war!
 - doesn't need to be rational, and thus, doesn't need to be explained
- "the unthinking American masses"
 - "spontaneous emotional reaction to a random incident"

but, this linkage has problems!

- were people outraged instantly? or were they only outraged after people "determined" the explosion to be done by the Spaniards?
 - diff evidence for each!
 - wait this is the big argument? really? why do we care?
- verification is not possible for most of this stuff
- some say that the country forced the gov into war after the Maine
- the president was forced into war by the populace and congress
 - some people think he couldn't have avoided the war, despite his best efforts
 - others disagree (wow)
 - * they say he wasn't strong enough, and was weak-kneed. spineless, etc.

what is this reading?? Christ.

- maybe it was about the yellow press
 - the fault of the irresponsible press
- after the Maine, the Cuban question dominated public consciousness
- almost **every explanation of the war has the Maine at its center.**

- the war was not a failure of american diplomacy
 - it was despite american diplomacy
 - cus american people wanted the war
- portrayed as caused by: accident, spanish "medievalism," or the masses
-