

## Theodore Roosevelt's Legacy in Foreign Policy

Olivia Celeste Perez

Director: Richard Jordan, Ph.D.

At the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Americans witnessed the rise of the United States as a great power. From an isolated nation to one that amassed the capability to fight destructive wars overseas, the Presidential administration of Theodore Roosevelt served as the hinge that enabled this transition. My thesis examines Theodore Roosevelt's influence on international relations and his impact on American leaders following his time in the White House. I discuss the four foreign policy schools offered by Walter Russell Mead: *Hamiltonians*, *Wilsonians*, *Jeffersonians*, and *Jacksonians*; and I compare similarities and differences between each school while speculating the nature of Roosevelt's foreign policy. Focusing on Roosevelt's presidential successors who were in office during the Cold War, I identify tenets of Roosevelt's foreign policy echoed throughout the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Theodore Roosevelt's Legacy in Foreign Policy

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Baylor University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Honors Program

By

Olivia Celeste Perez

Waco, Texas

May 2019

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESIS:

---

Dr. Richard Jordan, Department of Political Science

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM:

---

Dr. Elizabeth Corey, Director

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_



## Table of Contents

Table of Graphs.....	2
Acknowledgments.....	3
Dedication.....	4
Preface.....	5
Chapter One: The Four Schools of Foreign Policy in Relation to Theodore Roosevelt’s Ideas Regarding the Balance of Powers.....	8
Chapter Two: America in Isolation.....	24
Chapter Three: Echoes of Theodore Roosevelt’s Foreign Policy Encountered in American War Strategy During the Cold War.....	42
Chapter Four: The Future of Speaking Softly and Carrying a Big Stick.....	55
Bibliography.....	67

## Table of Graphs

A Comparison of the Four Foreign Policy Schools.....	21
--	----

## Acknowledgments

This project would not have been possible without the help of my thesis director, Dr. Richard Jordan. Dr. Jordan's help was critical to the progression of my thesis. I am grateful for his advice, edits, and recommendations of scholarship. Most importantly, I am grateful that he never doubted the completion and success of this project. His motivation and support allowed me to pursue a topic that I was extremely interested in, and has only further inspired me to continue studying international politics. I am also extremely appreciative of Dr. David Clinton and Dr. David Smith for serving on my thesis defense panel. Their questions and advice were extremely helpful in completing my project.

I am equally grateful to my parents, Arturo and Velma Perez for supporting me throughout my undergraduate studies at Baylor. They have constantly been on the other end of the phone, listening to me work my way through ideas for my thesis despite being unfamiliar with my topic. I am so thankful that they saw that I was capable of undertaking a project as rigorous as this, and pushed me to be successful in my commitment to finish my work.

Lastly, I would like to thank Daniel LaBore, my fiancé. When we met, I told him about my honors thesis, and he immediately began recommending books to me. I loved talking to him about my thesis updates, and I am so grateful that he was always happy to listen. His support and motivation throughout this long project has been so appreciated.

For future students of international politics,  
that you never forget the advice and lessons of President Theodore Roosevelt.



## PREFACE

The first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century witnessed the rise of America as a great power. How the United States went from an isolated nation to one that amassed the capability to fight destructive wars overseas, and ultimately become the hegemon of international order are topics that will be explored in this thesis. Additionally, this thesis will investigate what prompted the U.S. to remain as a stable hegemon for over a century. The focus of this thesis will be on the hinge that Theodore Roosevelt provided during his presidential administration and writings during the Wilson administration. Theodore Roosevelt enabled the U.S. to search beyond its borders for stability and promote American ideals. Theodore Roosevelt's foreign policy inaugurated the U.S. as a world power. This thesis will then investigate Theodore Roosevelt's direct influence on succeeding American leaders who especially furthered his vision for America's place in world power, and conclude with consideration of the future of Roosevelt's influence on American foreign policy.

In my first chapter, I will define Walter Russell Mead's four schools of foreign policy—*Hamiltonian*, *Wilsonian*, *Jeffersonian*, and *Jacksonian*—in order to introduce terms that will be referred to throughout this thesis. I will then compare and analyze each school in respect to its counterparts, and offer examples of their core tenets. Next, I will investigate Roosevelt's classification within the four schools of foreign policy and offer my argument for why Mead does not explicitly assign him to one of the four schools. Lastly, I will discuss the modifications each of the schools made as a result of war in the 20<sup>th</sup> century to support my argument on how the schools are not entirely independent of one another and share subcategories that relate to each other.

In my second chapter, I will briefly trace America's foreign policy from the birth of the nation to Theodore Roosevelt's presidential administration, focusing on how he effected change not only domestically, but also internationally out of his concern with the balance of powers. I will then acknowledge that while one President could not singlehandedly change the nation to bring it out of isolation, Roosevelt used the long transition to enter the world stage and advocate for world peace and military strength. In this section, I will continue to expand on Roosevelt's foreign policy, discussing his famous "Speak softly and carry a big stick" approach to foreign affairs. To conclude this chapter, I will compare the foreign policies of Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, and share Roosevelt's criticisms of the Wilson administration on the verge of the Great War.

Chapter three will begin by exploring the foreign policy of several American Presidents who served their terms during the Cold War, briefly focusing on Truman, Eisenhower, Reagan, and Nixon and their influences from Roosevelt. I will then examine the relationship between Wilsonians and Jacksonians and argue that when working in harmony, the two provide beneficial effects in wartime. Consequentially, I will discuss the presence of Wilsonianism in every U.S. President after Roosevelt's administration and highlight the inability of Wilsonians to reach goals of peace without a Jacksonian's strong military. This chapter will conclude with my argument that emphasizes the similarities Roosevelt has with Jacksonians and categorize him in this foreign policy school.

In my concluding chapter, I will begin by addressing concern for the future of Roosevelt's Jacksonian foreign policy, and I will argue that it will prevail over the other three schools. I will then take a step back to evaluate whether Roosevelt's foreign policy

is good, and argue that it brought the U.S. closer to achieving its moral goals of spreading democracy and providing the foundational structure for rules of wartime engagement.

Next, I will discuss other changes that were anticipated during the Cold War, such as the idea that the 21<sup>st</sup> century would become a military world. Finally, this thesis will end with a speculation of which foreign policy school will allow the U.S. to sustain its role in future generations as a hegemon.

## CHAPTER ONE

### The Four Schools of Foreign Policy in Relation to Theodore Roosevelt's Ideas Regarding the Balance of Powers

The age of isolationism rapidly passed after Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson left The White House. American statesmen in the 1940s were “electrified” by Theodore Roosevelt’s global politics, and Franklin D. Roosevelt was especially left with a “lifelong desire to emulate and surpass his achievements.”<sup>1</sup> To consider Theodore Roosevelt’s influence on international relations and his impact on American leaders following his time in office, special attention must be placed on his presidential successors who were in office during the Cold War. The Cold War, in this context, serves as a critical period in American history in which the nation was transitioning out of a victory in World War II only to be caught in another conflict that tested the nation’s preparedness for another war. The Cold War can arguably be

---

<sup>1</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 65.

distinguished as either a period of time in which the nation struggled for world power out of relevance to the balance of power, or whether the war was a continued moral struggle to expand diplomacy.<sup>2</sup> However, a common misconception is that the U.S. engaged in the Cold War either out of a dedication to morality for disarmament and spreading democratic ideals, or out of a result of aspiration to be the police power of the world. Yet, these two causes are not mutually exclusive. Before considering this subject matter further, I will comparatively distinguish Theodore Roosevelt's foreign ideology from other foreign policy schools in order to show direct influences in the years that ensued from his time in office and his commentaries regarding the Wilson administration.

*An Overview of Hamiltonians, Wilsonians, Jeffersonians, and Jacksonians*

A helpful tool in aiming to classify and strategically compare Theodore Roosevelt's foreign policy is Walter Russell Mead's *Special Providence*. In his work, Mead highlights what he believes are the four most common schools of thought in foreign policy: Hamiltonian, Wilsonian, Jeffersonian, and Jacksonian. In summary, the four foreign policy schools have stark differences in approaches of maintaining America's status as a global power. Scholars who mostly align their beliefs with the Hamiltonian school of thought believe that an alliance between a strong national government and large businesses is crucial to become domestically stable in order to enter global markets and be an effective player abroad. Wilsonians, on the other hand, believe that the United States has a moral obligation to its people and to all people around

---

<sup>2</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *World Order*. Penguin Books, New York City, 2014. Pg. 54

the globe, along with a national interest to spread democratic and social values in hopes of fostering a community that will set and keep international order and law. Jeffersonians believe that the United States should focus on domestic matters and ensuring the popularity of democracy within its borders rather than on trying to spread it to foreign nations. Jeffersonians commonly have isolationist tendencies for the purpose of not allying with other nations that could lead the United States into war. Finally, Jacksonians believe that physical security should be at the forefront of the nation's concerns and be addressed in both domestic and foreign policies, and that the nation should not actively seek to enter into conflicts with other nations, but strongly defend itself when war is waged.

In comparing the schools of foreign policy, Wilsonians and Hamiltonians seek world order in balancing international powers, and believe in making "domestic concessions and changes for the sake of that order," while Jeffersonians and Jacksonians would rather have foreign nations change to become more like the United States.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, the latter two believe that the unique social and cultural aspects of the United States are what make it orderly. Instead of trying to promote American ideals abroad, followers of these two schools believe in defending these values at home in place of spreading them for moral purposes, as Wilsonians believe.

Jeffersonians and Hamiltonians oppose each other in the foundation of what aspect the democratic republic would allow it to be a power on the international scale. Whereas Jeffersonians believe social democratic institutions are vital to being prosperous internationally, Hamiltonians believe that prosperity is the outcome of a "healthy

---

<sup>3</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 175.

capitalist economy” and is necessary for the survival of the nation.<sup>4</sup> To contrast Jacksonians and Hamiltonians, Jacksonians are viewed as “not ungenerous, but...lack(ing) all confidence in the government’s ability to administer charity at home as well as abroad” to spread democratic ideals as following a moral obligation.<sup>5</sup>

As Mead holds that his four popular schools of foreign policy are not comprehensive, it is clear that his inability to fully place Theodore Roosevelt in any single school of foreign policy makes him a complex figure in foreign policy. Rather, different aspects of Theodore Roosevelt’s foreign ideology are present in each of the four schools.

### *Hamiltonians*

Theodore Roosevelt believed Alexander Hamilton was the “most brilliant American statesman who ever lived, possessing the loftiest and keenest intellect of his time.”<sup>6</sup> In the Federalist Papers, the opening essay expresses Hamilton’s view of the new republic as ““an empire in many respects, the most interesting in the world,’ whose successes or failures would prove the viability of self-governance anywhere,” in effect, foreshadowing Woodrow Wilson’s principle of self-governance for all civilizations.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 177.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., Page 245.

<sup>6</sup> Ron Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton*. Page 4.

<sup>7</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *World Order*. Penguin Books, New York City, 2014. Page 239.

Hamiltonians, similar in thought to Theodore Roosevelt, believe that the balance of power is what foreign powers base their international capacity on. Mead attributes Hamiltonians as “speak(ing) the same language as Continental realism. Phrases like “the national interest” and “the balance of power” are often on their tongues.”<sup>8</sup> Based primarily on promoting the “national interest”, a Hamiltonian leader would “consider (the nation’s) interests, take stock of its strengths and weaknesses, and develop a policy that would safeguard those interests within the limits of its resources.”<sup>9</sup> While Theodore Roosevelt supported national interests, as seen in promoting a checked sense of nationalism, he believed that promoting national interests implied promoting international rights. In his warning against focusing on national interests and isolationism, and in criticism of the Wilson administration that refrained from entering World War I when it began, Theodore Roosevelt wrote,

“It is right that the United States should regard primarily its own interests. But I believe that I speak for a considerable number of my countrymen when I say that we ought not solely to consider our own interests. Above all, we should not do as the present administration does; for it refuses to take any concrete action in favor of any nation which is wronged; and yet it also refuses to act so that we may ourselves be sufficient for our own protection.”<sup>10</sup>

Hamiltonians aimed to follow the British example for trade, yet realized that the geography of the United States proved a significant advantage for protection

---

<sup>8</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 100.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. New York Times, Nov. 8, 1914.



purposes. The reason Hamiltonians believed in mirroring British economic institutions is because the British proved successful in “developing a global trading system” which, as a result of its financial resources created by this trade, “...enabled Britain to subsidize its temporary Continental allies and to keep its armed forces, especially the navy, up to strength.”<sup>11</sup> Whereas Hamiltonians view commerce as a means of peace, Theodore Roosevelt would agree in part that financial resources allow one to build up its military strength, but would challenge the practice of leaving diplomatic relations out of the equation of fostering international peace. Theodore Roosevelt’s hesitancy to place complete reliance on an open-door form of commerce is that it would “completely disappear as soon as a powerful nation determines to disregard it, willing to run the risk of war rather than forgo its intention” to foster peace.<sup>12</sup>

### *Wilsonians*

Theodore Roosevelt believed that the United States had a duty to share the order of democracy with what he believed were uncivilized societies. As Rudyard Kipling’s poem, *The White Man’s Burden*, was completed in 1898, just before Theodore Roosevelt entered office as vice president, Kipling sent Roosevelt a copy of the poem, believing the “poem about expansionism (would) make (him) rejoice.”<sup>13</sup> Roosevelt later

---

<sup>11</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 101.

<sup>12</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Letter to W.H. Taft, Dec. 22, 1910.

<sup>13</sup> Kipling, Rudyard. *Letters of Rudyard Kipling (Vol 2) 1890-99*. Pinney, Thomas Ed. Macmillan 1990.

forwarded the poem to his friend, Henry Cabot Lodge, and commented that while Kipling's work was "rather poor poetry" it made "good sense from the expansion point of view."<sup>14</sup> Kipling believed that Roosevelt would welcome the poem, despite its unpopularity among society due to its racial and imperialist suggestions. Amidst being at war with Spain in order to free Cuba from being a Spanish colony, the United States entered into peace negotiations leading to the Treaty of Paris in which it was granted Cuba, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. Kipling regarded "the call of Empire (as) a humanitarian one."<sup>15</sup>

Theodore Roosevelt splits from Wilsonianism in believing that preemptive intervention in a foreign nation's government on the basis of acting morally is America's higher calling, its duty. Roosevelt said, "I hold that the laws of morality which should govern individuals in their dealings one with the other, are just as binding concerning nations in their dealings one with the other."<sup>16</sup> He firmly believed that direct intervention and expansionism aligned with carrying out the nation's moral duty and would ensure that the nation "...shall not only refrain from wronging the weak, but shall, according to our capacity, and as opportunity offers, stand up for the weak when the weak are wronged by the strong."<sup>17</sup> In his understanding, world peace could only be attained if other foreign powers had a similar mindset of protecting the weaker powers, introducing

---

<sup>14</sup> Kipling, Rudyard. *"The White Man's Burden": The United States and the Philippine Islands*. Doubleday, New York, 1929.

<sup>15</sup> Hamer, Mary. *Notes on "The White Man's Burden" poem by Rudyard Kipling*. The Kipling Society, Oct. 18, 2009.

<sup>16</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Speech at Oxford, June 7, 1910.

<sup>17</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Kansas City, MO, May 30, 1916.

the notion of collective security in which Wilson would later propose the League of Nations. However, Congress saw possible shortcomings in intervening and pledging U.S. resources to wars that didn't further the nation's interest. Roosevelt knew that a community that respects international law would only be feasible if foreign powers would adequately commit to protecting the international community. Similarly, he believed that for this form of collective security to function, dependence would rest on the "...willingness of nations with courage, cool foresight and readiness for self-sacrifice to defend...international law. No nation can help in securing an organized, peaceful, and justice-doing world community until it is willing to run risks and make efforts in order to secure and maintain such a community."<sup>18</sup> Whereas Roosevelt would have rather had a body similar to the modern-day United Nations Security Council following his term in office, he recognized the difficulty in enforcing international law. What Roosevelt understood as missing in international matters—and continues to be absent today—is the existence of a judge and police power to enforce international law.<sup>19</sup> However he believed that because “we have international duties no less than international rights,” collectively seeking the protection of international rights is a civilized nation's duty to put police power behind international rights in the interests of developing world order.<sup>20</sup>

### **Jeffersonians**

---

<sup>18</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. 1916, Mem. Ed. XX, 235.

<sup>19</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. New York Times, Oct. 18, 1914.

<sup>20</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. First Annual Message, Dec. 3, 1901.

Whereas Theodore Roosevelt's desire for expansion has already been explored, it seems as though he would not have agreed with Jeffersonian to any degree. However, he was a strong proponent of nationalism that served to internally building America's strength in social structures for the purpose of becoming a strong international power. Roosevelt found nationalism as the "absolute prerequisite to internationalism" and patriotism as the "absolute prerequisite to the larger Americanism... (Roosevelt believed) in Americanism because unless our people are good Americans first, America can accomplish little or nothing worth accomplishing for the good of the world as a whole."<sup>21</sup>

For Theodore Roosevelt, fostering strong nationalism is merely a stepping-stone to enter the arena of foreign affairs. With Theodore Roosevelt's concurrence with Jeffersonianism in part, the idea of enhancing protection within a nation's borders has several differences from traditional Jeffersonianism. The interest of solely focusing on domestic issues never appealed to Theodore Roosevelt because he believed that outside influencers were bound to intervene or wage war from the natural instinct of attacking a larger power that appeared to be pacifistic.

Therefore, he agreed that nationalism was important, but completely opposed isolationism. He held that, "...no people can render any service to humanity unless as a people they feel an intense sense of national cohesion and solidarity," arguing that the proposed nationalism Jeffersonians desire is not an end within itself, but has a greater purpose to reach international results for international civilizations."<sup>22</sup> Roosevelt

---

<sup>21</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. 1916. Mem. Ed. XX, Page 529.

<sup>22</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 233.

believed “The United States can accomplish little for mankind, save in so far as within its borders it develops an intense spirit of Americanism,” to further the notion of nationalism as a primary step for rallying up one’s citizens to support the effort of the nation’s international agenda.<sup>23</sup>

### *Jacksonians*

Finally, Theodore Roosevelt’s foreign policy considering military power is closest to Jacksonians. Theodore Roosevelt said, “We must prepare for war in order to preserve peace.”<sup>24</sup> His “Big Stick” foreign policy led Roosevelt to have diplomatic and sincere foreign relations supported by domestic strength at the forefront of his agenda. Roosevelt emphasized the importance of having “equal emphasis on the fact that it is necessary to be respectful toward all people and scrupulously to refrain from wronging them, while at the same time keeping ourselves in a condition to prevent wrong being done to us.”<sup>25</sup> This approach to foreign affairs was seen in action in his Great White Fleet that sailed around the globe. About this journey, Roosevelt said,

“The recent voyage of the fleet around the world was not the first occasion in which I have used it to bring about prompt resumption of peaceful relations between this country and a foreign Power. ...I want to make it evident to every foreign nation that I intend to do justice; and neither to

---

<sup>23</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 233.

<sup>24</sup> Beale, Howard K. *Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power*. John Hopkins Press, 1956. Pg. 57.

<sup>25</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. The Outlook, September 23, 1914. Mem. Ed. XX, 28.

wrong them nor to hurt their self-respect; but that on the other, I am both entirely ready and entirely able to see that our rights are maintained in their turn.”<sup>26</sup>

A similar anxiety Roosevelt felt for his successors was fear that submitting to isolationism would cause the nation to lose its military strength and be unable to make international negotiations in support of peace and national interests. However, he saw more trouble in the possibility of American leaders making boasts about the nation’s strength and not being able to support such assertions, which would open the nation’s borders to infiltration and conflict. Similarly, a common issue presented in regards to Wilsonianism is the possibility of American leaders simply trying to negotiate peace agreements without having any military strength to make the international community listen. An example of this is later seen in Roosevelt’s hesitancy over the League of Nations. He said, “If a man continually blusters, if he lacks civility, a big stick will not save him from trouble; and neither will speaking softly avail, if back of the softness there does not lie strength, power.”<sup>27</sup> Instead, Roosevelt preached that, “The only safe rule is to promise little, and faithfully to keep every promise; to ‘speak softly and carry a big stick.’”<sup>28</sup>

Similar to Wilsonians, Theodore Roosevelt believed the United States had a moral duty to interfere on the behalf of those who have been wronged by oppressive

---

<sup>26</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Letter to Whitelaw Reid, December 4, 1908. *Bailey, Theodore Roosevelt and the Japanese-American Crisis*. Stanford University Press, 1934. Pg. 301-302.

<sup>27</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Minnesota State Fair, Sept. 2, 1901. Mem. Ed. XV, pg. 334.

<sup>28</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. 1913. Mem. Ed. XXII, Page 610.

regimes. Whereas Jeffersonians and Jacksonians are inclined to have isolationist tendencies in protecting domestic policy, Roosevelt was much more in favor of expansion and ensuring that foreign powers knew the power and might that the United States had in order to prevent potential conflicts. He believed that “Every expansion of a great civilized power means a victory for law, order, and righteousness,” and that isolationism provides no benefits for humanity.<sup>29</sup>

### *The Four Schools in Relation to Each Other*

None of the schools is monolithic.<sup>30</sup> In fact, there are at least two major groups within Wilsonianism.<sup>31</sup> Some of these subgroups share similarities with other schools. For example, Right Wilsonians and Hamiltonians agree that the corporate and financial structure of the United States should be spread to other nations as a model for conducting business. Another example is that Radical Wilsonians and Jeffersonians are both hesitant to intervene in a foreign nation’s domestic issues. This is because they both

---

<sup>29</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. *The Works of Theodore Roosevelt*, vol. 13, pg. 336. New York, 1926.

<sup>30</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 92.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid. Mead describes the Right Wilsonians as believing the vision of the Founding Fathers is complete and the United States has a duty to spread its practices and values. On the other hand, the Radical Wilsonians believe that the nation has not yet reached its potential and needs to reform its values before seeking to reform other nations. Page 93.

believe that large multinational businesses are “among the chief obstacles to the spread of true values at home and abroad.”<sup>32</sup>

In addition, each of the four schools has subgroups separating “high flyers” and “low flyers.”<sup>33</sup> The high flyers in a particular school aim to promote the ultimate goal and put each aspect of the school’s doctrine into a systematic shape. On the other hand, the low flyers focus on a specific issue within that school and concentrate on how to resolve issues surrounding it. The example Mead gives sheds light on the relationship between high flyers and low flyers within Wilsonians. While a high flyer Wilsonian would be more interested in the grand scheme of international law and world federalism, a low flyer would rather focus on specific environmental or feminist programs.<sup>34</sup>

The four schools have adapted to social, economic, and political changes within the United States and in response to changes in the international community. For instance, the decline of the British Empire in the twentieth century caused each of the four schools to have a slight evolution process that would aid each respective school in moving forward into the next century.

---

<sup>32</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 93.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, Page 94.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*



### A Comparison of the Four Foreign Policy Schools

	<b>Hamiltonians</b>	<b>Wilsonians</b>	<b>Jeffersonians</b>	<b>Jacksonians</b>
<b>Internationalist or Isolationist</b>	Isolationist	Internationalist	Isolationist	Internationalist and Isolationist
<b>Idealist</b>	No	Yes	No	Yes
<b>Original core tenets</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Domestic economic protection</li> <li>• Sanctions in lieu of force</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peace talks</li> <li>• Avoid wars</li> <li>• Intervention for morality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid wars</li> <li>• Non-intervention</li> <li>• Force as last resort</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare for war</li> <li>• Get popular support for war</li> </ul>
<b>Modifications during 20<sup>th</sup> Century</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supported free trade</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moral obligation to spread democracy</li> <li>• Accepted hegemonic role</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parted from total-isolation standpoint</li> <li>• Believed in power politics abroad</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopted the need for early preparation for war</li> </ul>
<b>Goals</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Big businesses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peace without use of force</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Domestic stability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Security</li> </ul>
<b>Examples</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• George H.W. Bush</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jimmy Carter</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congressman Ron Paul</li> <li>• Senator Rand Paul</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ronald Reagan</li> <li>• Dwight D. Eisenhower</li> </ul>

Table 1.1<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Information gathered from Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001; and Kissinger, Henry A. *World Order*. Penguin Books, New York City, 2014.

The specific modifications seen in each of the four schools during the Cold War era show that the four schools have “evolved over the decades and centuries” and have even moved away from some key views of the namesake, or founder, for each respective school.<sup>36</sup> Similarly, Mead accepts that “historians cringe” at the fact that he names Wilsonians who have lived and died one hundred years before Woodrow Wilson as such.<sup>37</sup> Thus, Mead invites the further consideration of the evolution of each school, and the possibility of overlap when considering modifications to the followers and great thinkers within each school.

#### *Roosevelt as a Self-Proclaimed Hamiltonian*

Two subgroups exist within Hamiltonians—the Northern Hamiltonians and the Southern Hamiltonians.<sup>38</sup> Whereas both Northern and Southern Hamiltonians agree that the fundamental key to national power rests within national economic development, the Southern Hamiltonians differs in areas regarding domestic spending. Southern Hamiltonians hold that high military spending both aids national interest for protection

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., Page 90.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid. Mead also describes a third group of Hamiltonians that split from the school after the Civil War to follow Davisonianism such as John C. Calhoun. Mead describes Davisonianism, the namesake Jefferson Davis, as a “school of treason” due to the school’s loyalty to slavery, strong policy on tariffs, and the inclination for imperialism and geographic expansion. Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 92-93.

and supports national economic development, lending to federal spending for infrastructure and public projects, and free trade.<sup>39</sup>

It appears unseemly that Theodore Roosevelt described himself as a Hamiltonian. When he was planning his campaign for his second term as President, he became motivated by large businesses and free trade. At the end of his presidency, he was inspired by Herbert Croley's book, *The Promise of American Life*, published in 1909 that associated Hamiltonians with aristocracy, strong government, and special privileges, and described Jeffersonians as essential supporters of equality in democracies for rights and opportunities for all.<sup>40</sup> As a strong proponent of New Nationalism and the Progressive Movement, Theodore Roosevelt was often portrayed as an enemy of big businesses. However, he justified his association with the Progressive Party by arguing that “a political democracy and a business oligarchy cannot permanently exist in the same country side by side.”<sup>41</sup> He maintained that big businesses are not inherently bad for the nation, but firmly held that big businesses exist to primarily benefit individuals and to secondarily benefit the economy. Throughout his terms, Theodore Roosevelt supported large businesses that, rather than produced harm, benefitted the general public on the path to success in the business world.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., Page 93.

<sup>40</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. *The New Nationalism*. 1911. Page 3-33.

<sup>41</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. *The Story of the Progressive Movement in Pennsylvania*, pg. 45. Philadelphia, March 13, 1913.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

## CHAPTER TWO

### America in Isolation

While the progression towards becoming a world power may be traced from previous administrations, Theodore Roosevelt was the necessary hinge that has inspired foreign policy for decades and proved successful throughout periods of conflict.

*A Brief Overview of the Progression of American Foreign Policy that Inspired Change in  
Theodore Roosevelt*

When the British Crown's sovereignty on American soil ceased to exist after the Revolutionary War, the authority to preside over foreign affairs did not reside within the individual States, but in the Continental Congress—the precursor for the Union, a unit in and of itself. Whereas it remains unclear of whether the Framers of the Constitution purposely withheld specific language that delegated power of foreign affairs to a single branch of government, it is clear that the President is the representative and spokesperson of the U.S. to all nations. George Washington, in support of ensuring the President be the

sole representative in foreign affairs said, “the nature of foreign affairs requires caution...success must often depend on secrecy.”<sup>43</sup> For this reason, treaties and other diplomatic proceedings must be negotiated by the President alone for the interest of nation, and for the possibility that widespread circulation of concessions and agreements may negatively influence future negotiations and strain tendencies towards peace.

George Washington similarly stated that it is in the best interest of the U.S. to refrain from forming permanent alliances with other nations. The purpose of remaining independent from alliances is to allow the U.S. the freedom to choose its involvement in disputes and to reserve itself from committing allegiance to a separate nation with different ideals. Therefore, a common practice during the formative years of the U.S. was neutrality in foreign affairs. Not only did neutrality serve as a bargaining tool to promote the advancement of American interests abroad, but it also allowed the U.S. to protect itself from foreign interference and simply focus on strengthening domestic power. By primarily focusing on strengthening the nation, the Framers knew the U.S. would eventually become powerful enough to become a contender on the world stage.

In keeping with this spirit of somewhat indifference towards the balance of powers in the early years of its existence, the U.S. viewed the frequent wars in Europe, such as the Napoleonic Wars, as those that limited humankind from advancing towards universal freedom and world peace that all should seek to achieve. While Napoleon Bonaparte claimed to have sold the Louisiana Purchase for the purpose of creating a balance for England, chiefly to rival its maritime strength, the Americans did not consider

---

<sup>43</sup> George Washington, *1 Messages and Papers of the Presidents*. pg. 194.

this gain as a means to advance itself in foreign affairs.<sup>44</sup> The U.S. was primarily concerned with expansion, with the outlook of becoming a regular participant in foreign affairs in the horizon. The Framers additionally noted that it was to their advantage that two great seas protected America, further separating it from conflict and allowing it to remain neutral and in isolation.

Thomas Paine's words on the potential for peace served as a beacon for the United States. Paine wrote, "Man is not the enemy of man, but through the medium of a false system of government," thus promoting democratic ideals of the republic. It was at the founding of the U.S. when the idea of promoting democratic institutions defined the principles of the legacy sought by the young nation. In considering whether the U.S. should make it a mission to spread democratic ideals in the interest of world peace, Thomas Jefferson's opinion on behalf of the majority showcases the nature of the nation. America would be a "standing monument and example" for all nations.<sup>45</sup> America's theme would be to serve as a model for all nations to aspire to.<sup>46</sup>

The Jeffersonian approach to foreign policy centered on domestic morality and the exhibition of free institutions. As America expanded its power, its leaders wanted the freedom to exercise that power in foreign affairs if the need arose. However, they wanted to do so without the common implications of being accused of reaching for power, as the

---

<sup>44</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, New York City, 1994.

<sup>45</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, New York City, 1994. Page 33.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

European nations were known to do with the concept of *raison d'état*—to do whatever it takes to further the interests of the state.

### *Rapid Growth of Military Might*

19<sup>th</sup> century American foreign policy focused on two main objectives: fulfilling America's "manifest destiny" by expanding westward across North America, and remaining neutral and free of overseas entanglements.<sup>47</sup> As a testament to America's hard stance on staying out of European power politics, in 1821, the then Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams stated that America does not go abroad in "search of monsters to destroy" but rather as the "well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all."<sup>48</sup> An ensuing concern of European power politics was its potential extension to the Western Hemisphere, which prompted the alliance with Great Britain and the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine served as a warning to European powers that America was willing to go to war to protect its interests—to prevent European power politics from infiltrating to the Western Hemisphere and putting American security and peace at risk. However, the doctrine further held that America would remain free of participation in European power politics unless any European power made a move to expand westward. This served as a warning rather than an attempt to directly participate in foreign affairs without an invitation. Thus, the doctrine highlighted the complexity of American involvement and

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid. Pg. 34.

<sup>48</sup> Adams, John Quincy. Independence Day Address to the United States House of Representatives. July 4, 1821.

interests. American leaders recognized that the risks of engaging a foreign nation in a conflict potentially outweigh the nation's capabilities. As Henry Kissinger in his *Diplomacy* writes, "In a nutshell, the foreign policy of the United States was not to have a foreign policy."<sup>49</sup>

For the remainder of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, protection and strength justified America's foreign involvement, which led to its status as a hegemon in the Western Hemisphere in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. For instance, America expanded to incorporate the Republic of Texas as a state. The explanation for this incorporation by President Polk in 1845 was so that a stronger foreign nation would not take over the Republic of Texas and ultimately serve as a threat to the U.S. at its southern border. Similarly, in 1868, President Andrew Johnson explained the reason for purchasing Alaska was to prevent any other foreign nation from claiming it, and likewise to prevent Alaska from anarchy, unrepresented by any government. Additionally, the chief concern of the Union during the Civil War was to ensure the Confederacy was not recognized as its own sovereign body, enabled to negotiate and pull influence from foreign bodies.

By 1885, America had made an almost complete transformation. Its strength was shown in numbers by its booming economy, and an increase in population especially from European immigrants. Yet, America did not use this increase in strength as a ploy for increasing its status in the world arena. In light of this several American leaders dreamed of converting the U.S. into an empire—controlling Canada and Mexico. However, the Senate remained fixed on a domestic view and struck down projects that sought to expand the U.S. or provoke the perception of an American power-grab by other

---

<sup>49</sup> Ibid. Pg. 35.



nations.<sup>50</sup> Thus, Congress kept the army limited to fewer than 25,000 soldiers and the navy weak, evident in how it was ranked fourteenth in the world until 1890, despite being a major industrial power.<sup>51</sup> By 1895, America focused on strengthening its navy and increasing its physical capabilities.

### *The Turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*

It is not a coincidence that America became a great power during the presidency of Theodore Roosevelt. President Theodore Roosevelt was the catalyst that enabled the United States of America to rise from an isolated nation to a great power. At the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the U.S. was in a position that the Founding Fathers dreamed of—it was finally strong enough in its internal institutions to look to become a dominant player in foreign affairs.

Roosevelt believed that promoting American democratic ideals was not mutually exclusive from becoming entangled in foreign affairs. Instead, he reasoned that participating on the global scene could be used strategically for the advancement of American power. First, he sought to increase the security of the U.S. within the Western Hemisphere before pursuing a prime spot on the balance of power. Before entering the world stage, Roosevelt knew he had to work within the isolationist spirit of the traditional American foreign policy. He used the White House as a “bully pulpit” to encourage

---

<sup>50</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, New York City, 1994. Page 33.

<sup>51</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, New York City, 1994. Page 37.

Americans to support the involvement in foreign affairs.<sup>52</sup> He introduced the idea of “policing the world” and argued that it was the duty of a civilized power to “respect the rights of weaker civilized powers (and) put down savagery and barbarism.” In believing the world was divided between civilized states and uncivilized peoples, Roosevelt urged Americans to take up the “white man’s burden” and spread “enlightenment, culture liberty, and order.”<sup>53</sup> Roosevelt led the U.S. with a good-natured spirit while focusing on furthering economic and strategic American interests abroad. Roosevelt knew the strengths and limits of the American arm in foreign affairs, and knew the U.S. had to adopt a foreign policy that fulfilled its capabilities.

In an effort to increase power, Roosevelt focused on expanding the navy. When he entered office, only 20 major ships made up the navy, with some still under construction.<sup>54</sup> Roosevelt said in a 1910 letter to William Howard Taft, “I utterly disbelieve in the policy of bluff, in national and international no less than in private affairs or in any violation of the old frontier... Never draw unless you mean to shoot.” Therefore, on December 16, 1907, the Great White Fleet embarked on its journey around the globe. It was made up of 16 battleships along with other escorts of smaller ships. The purpose of sending the fleet out was because Roosevelt believed in presenting the growing American military capabilities. Therefore, the fleet made friendly “visits” to nations overseas while showcasing the potential the U.S. had in becoming involved as a key player in foreign affairs. From being ranked the 14<sup>th</sup> greatest naval power in the

---

<sup>52</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. “Big stick speech at State Fair. Sept 3, 1901.

<sup>53</sup> Jones, Howard. *Crucible of Power: A History of American Foreign Relations from 1897*. Page 32.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.* Page 32.

world, to ranked second in 1907 just below Britain and above Germany, “the U.S. navy remained in the top three naval programs in the world on the eve of the Great War of 1914.”<sup>55</sup>

The geographic location of the U.S. uniquely allowed it to foster a strong foreign policy. It was not in direct threat of any nations nor did it need to exercise military force among its neighbors. During Roosevelt’s administration, the U.S. helped establish world peace by mediating the end of the Russo-Japanese war, and prevented another war from emerging solely by remaining neutral.<sup>56</sup> In his *Autobiography*, Roosevelt wrote, “When I left the presidency, I finished seven and a half years of administration, during which not one shot had been fired against a foreign foe. We were at absolute peace, and there was no nation in the world... whom we had wronged, or from whom we had anything to fear.”<sup>57</sup> While he had not expressed his dissatisfaction with American foreign policy until the Great War, Roosevelt began to write heavily on the subject during the Wilson administration.

For Roosevelt, neutrality was inadequate to achieve global peace. Remaining neutral in international conflicts served no purpose. Roosevelt believed that “if a nation was unable to act to defend its own interests, it could not expect others to respect it.”<sup>58</sup> If

---

<sup>55</sup> Jones, Howard. *Crucible of Power: A History of American Foreign Relations from 1897*. Pg. 33.

<sup>56</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, New York City, 1994.  
Page 41.

<sup>57</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. *An Autobiography*. Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1941. Pg. 932.

America wanted to become involved in foreign affairs, it needed the military might to defend its ideals. Roosevelt firmly held that international moral law required force and ultimate disarmament in order to be successful.

Before World War I, honor and civility were seen as the most championed war tactics. Roosevelt chose to trust that all countries were honorably pursuing common goals of peace and prosperity. However, he strongly believed that this trust of one's honor needed to be properly backed by force and incentives. In supporting the United States' adherence to the Monroe Doctrine, Roosevelt said, "Any country whose people conduct themselves well" by acting with "reasonable efficiency and decency in social and political matters (and) keeps order and pays its obligations, it need fear no interference from the United States" and "can count upon our hearty friendship."<sup>59</sup> This statement also furthered Roosevelt's position that if a nation was not acting within the realm of civilized society, the United States would "reluctantly" be forced to intervene as an "international police power."<sup>60</sup>

Roosevelt's famous motto, "speak softly and carry a big stick" was inspired by an African proverb that he first became attached to when he was Governor of New York, advocating for a stronger naval presence to support America's rising power. In practice, this motto was illustrated by Roosevelt's decision to send the Great White Fleet. Upon

---

<sup>58</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *World Order*. Penguin Books, New York City, 2014. Page 248.

<sup>59</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. "The Roosevelt Corollary" of the Monroe Doctrine. Dec 6, 1904.

<sup>60</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *World Order*. Penguin Books, New York City, 2014. Page 250.

learning that Japan was rumored to be preparing for a possible war with the expansion of its navy, Roosevelt knew he had to act quickly to manage the Asia-Pacific equilibrium.<sup>61</sup> His immediate intention was to show restrained aggression and thwart Japan's inclination to start a war or expand further into the Pacific. In defense of his response to Japanese military development, Roosevelt said he did not believe there would be a war with Japan, but he did believe "that there is enough chance of war to make it eminently wise to insure against it by building such a navy as to forbid Japan's hoping for success."<sup>62</sup> However, Roosevelt made sure to remain strictly diplomatic in dealing with the Japanese. He made sure the sailors in the fleet would not be given leave in Tokyo if they would possibly insult the Japanese.<sup>63</sup> Roosevelt wanted to make sure his military was diplomatic and respectful to mirror his own foreign policy.

The interest in maintaining a stable Asia-Pacific equilibrium was prompted by the notable rise of Japan at the turn of 20<sup>th</sup> century. At first, Roosevelt championed Japanese victories and its growing power because he believed the Japanese were mirroring American interest and strategy in expansion. However, his mindset about Japan's expansion shifted during the Russo-Japanese War, when it became clear that Japan was capable of defeating Russia. If Japan defeated Russia, Roosevelt feared the Empire would soon threaten the American position in Southeast Asia and, ultimately, the Hawaiian

---

<sup>61</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, New York City, 1994. Page 41-42.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, Page 253.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*

Islands.<sup>64</sup> Therefore, Roosevelt acted as a mediator to end the Russo-Japanese War with the Treaty of Portsmouth in 1905. He was the first American to receive the Nobel Peace Prize for his diplomacy, but his main objectives for ending this war were to prevent a Russian collapse and limit Japanese expansion.<sup>65</sup>

Roosevelt believed the United States was in a unique position geographically because it has fronts on both the Atlantic and the Pacific. While its geography and distance arguably protected it from early involvement in European power politics, it also posed a problem to Roosevelt's navy. If Roosevelt called for an assembly of all battleships in either the Atlantic or Pacific, the ships would be forced to sail around South America to get to their ordered positions. Therefore, when France abandoned the difficult task of building the Panama Canal, Roosevelt successfully convinced Congress to purchase the project from the French for \$40 million.<sup>66</sup> However, the building of the canal came to a halt when Colombia claimed its right to the land purchased by the United States. Subsequently occurring at this time was a small Panamanian movement that advocated for its independence from Colombia.<sup>67</sup> Roosevelt provided military support to the movement, and upon Panama's victory, he was able to negotiate with the new government to obtain perpetual rights to the land in which the canal was to be built. Roosevelt's impressive strategy in participating in this foreign affair allowed the United States to easily shift its navy from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., Page 252.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

<sup>66</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, New York City, 1994. Page 39.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

In the Atlantic, Roosevelt took note of Germany's rise in power and its naval expansion, mirroring the Japanese. At the end of his second term, he feared that Britain would not be able to maintain the international equilibrium in the balance of power. In 1914, a retired Roosevelt criticized President Woodrow Wilson for not getting involved early in WWI. Roosevelt wrote that the United States should enter the war on the side of the Triple Entente—Britain, France, and Russia—to prevent the threat of war from spreading to the Western Hemisphere. Roosevelt argued that the United States would not achieve anything by merely advocating for international goodwill, as was Wilson's strategy at the time. Roosevelt claimed Wilson's strategy would harm the United States by "making grand pronouncements of principle" while not being in a position to enforce them against opposition."<sup>68</sup> Roosevelt argued, "our words must be judged by our deeds."<sup>69</sup>

On the other hand, Wilson essentially reverted to isolationism. He strongly believed in remaining neutral in foreign affairs, which is something Roosevelt was wholeheartedly opposed to.<sup>70</sup> Wilson's defense for not getting involved in the outbreak of the war was that he intended to protect America from seeming imperialistic, as if it was trying to gain something from the war. Wilson attempted to use Roosevelt's mediation strategy in the Russo-Japanese War with Britain and Germany, but his efforts proved to

---

<sup>68</sup> Ibid. Page 254.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

<sup>70</sup> Roosevelt was always quick to criticize neutrality in wars. He said neutrality is "never moral, and may be a particularly mean and hideous form of immorality...it is never anything of which to be proud... It is a wicked thing to be neutral between right and wrong. Impartiality does not mean neutrality. Roosevelt, Theodore. 1916. Mem. Ed. XX, 239; Nat. Ed. XVIII, 206.

no avail. Wilson refused to enter the war as an ally of the Triple Entente, and instead led the nation to emerge as an associate power against Germany. To argue for his decision to intervene in the war and protect America's association he stated, "We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind."<sup>71</sup>

Wilson believed that the values that America held were innate values in all civilization and said that American policies and principles are the policies and principles "of forward looking men and women everywhere, of every modern nation, of every enlightened community."<sup>72</sup> He continued to defend America's intervention in the war by stating that its purpose was not simply to end Germany's power grab, but to change the German government. Wilson said WWI was "the war to end all wars."

Roosevelt most certainly despised Wilson's claim that the United States had a providential duty to remain isolated until it was capable of adequately and peacefully spreading its democratic values. He wrote to British diplomat Cecil Spring Rice to complain about the irony of the countries that claim to be:

"Most humanitarian...most interested in internal improvement tend to grow weaker compared with other countries which possess a less altruistic civilization. I abhor and despise that pseudo-humanitarianism which treats advance of civilization as necessarily and rightfully, implying a weakening of the fighting spirit, and which therefore invites destruction of the advanced civilization by some less-advanced type."<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Wilson, Woodrow. War Message to Congress. April 2, 1917.

<sup>72</sup> Wilson, Woodrow. Address of the President of the United States to the Senate following the entrance in the Great War. Jan 22, 1917.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid. Page 249.



While Theodore Roosevelt's goal of entering the global stage was due to his interest in the balance of powers and his belief that such a balance could not be complete without American participation, Wilson believed America had a duty to share her values with the rest of the world—it was America's obligation.<sup>74</sup> Thus, Theodore Roosevelt brought America to its position as a key player in international relations, and Wilson therefore had a platform to share his ideas of creating an international institution and spread democracy. Theodore Roosevelt made it possible to conceive of an international institution as a consequence of his desire for peace, diplomacy, and participation in the balance of power.

Wilson essentially stepped back from Roosevelt's strong power politics, with an interest of having a role as a mediator among the great powers rather than be the forerunner. While Roosevelt accused Wilson of returning to an isolationist position in his foreign policy, Wilson kept Roosevelt's foreign policy of expansion with an outlook of preserving America in its current form and later spreading its values to nations recovering from war. Wilson's basis for considering America's position as providential, in favor with God, and willed to spread the moral exceptionalism of democracy showed the same ambitions to participate globally as Roosevelt aspired to, but Wilson took a more "global crusade" approach.<sup>75</sup>

#### *Wilsonianism in Action*

---

<sup>74</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, New York City, 1994. Page 30.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, Page 47.

Following his terms in office, Theodore Roosevelt's legacy in foreign affairs would be marginalized by Woodrow Wilson, as Wilson simply sought to encapsulate the moral obligation of the U.S. to protect international rights. As World War I approached, America entered the arena "not on the basis of Roosevelt's geopolitical vision but under a banner of moral universality not seen in Europe" since the Crusades to defend common motives.<sup>76</sup> Wilson proclaimed that America had intervened in the war to make the world safe for democracy rather than to restore the European balance of power or to base world order on how similar a foreign nation's domestic institutions reflected the "American example".<sup>77</sup> Wilson told the graduating class at West Point in 1916, "It was as if in the Providence of God a continent had been kept unused and waiting for a peaceful people who loved liberty and the rights of men more than they loved anything else, to come and set up an unselfish commonwealth."

Wilson believed that the need for foreign powers to reposition themselves on the balance of power following periods of conflict would be cured through allowing each nation, comprised of linguistic and ethnic unity, to be represented on the international scale and given a state.<sup>78</sup> He supported the presence of cultural unity within a state and believed all states should follow the American way of practicing democracy and promoting international rights. Through this form of self-government led by example,

---

<sup>76</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *World Order*. Penguin Books, New York City, 2014. Page 256.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>78</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *World Order*. Penguin Books, New York City, 2014. Page 260.

Wilson believed that civilizations could adequately express their motives and intentions and lead to “international harmony.”<sup>79</sup> After self-governing nations achieve national unity and independence from other foreign powers, Wilson argued that they would “no longer have an incentive to practice aggressive or self-interested policies.”<sup>80</sup> Because Wilson blamed the outbreak of World War I on the inflexibility of the balance of powers and pre-existing alliances, he made it clear that his intention for carrying out his foreign policy agenda was to create a “community of power” rather than a “balance of power.”<sup>81</sup>

Theodore Roosevelt was “slow to criticize Wilson’s diplomacy” until 1914, illustrating his tolerance for Wilsonianism during peacetime.<sup>82</sup> However, it was Woodrow Wilson’s neutrality during the first two years of the world war that brought Theodore Roosevelt to despise him. It was not until then Theodore Roosevelt became undoubtedly vocal about his position in foreign politics. He soon wrote a series of magazine and newspaper articles discussing foreign affairs and what the United States ought to be doing during the war. While criticizing Wilson and attacking what he believed was a pacifist foreign policy, he firmly argued that if the United States could not act as the police power as he envisioned it, the international community was in need of a League of Peace. Thus community would be made up of “great nations which sincerely desire peace

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., Page 262.

<sup>82</sup> William N. Tilchin and Chalres E. Neu, *Artists of Power: Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Their Enduring Impact on U.S. Foreign Policy*. Praegar Security International, Westport, Connecticut, 2006. Page 170.

and have no thought themselves of committing aggressions.”<sup>83</sup> On his deathbed, Roosevelt maintained the belief that harnessing strong military power within a nation would determine its survival amidst conflict and aggression. Just before he passed away, he was in communication with British and French leaders urging them against Woodrow Wilson’s quest for “peace without victory.”<sup>84</sup> Rather, Roosevelt sought to rally the Allied powers into overpowering the enemy and bestow harsh punishments in order to agree and reach peace terms.<sup>85</sup>

Concerning the proposed League of Nations, Theodore Roosevelt wrote that while he was in support of such a League, he warned against “expect(ing) too much from it.”<sup>86</sup> In his caution against the League of Nations, Roosevelt wrote, “I am not willing to play the part which even Aesop held up to derision when he wrote of how the wolves and the sheep agreed to disarm, and how the sheep as a guarantee of good faith sent away the watchdogs, and were then forthwith eaten by the wolves.”<sup>87</sup> In light of the failure of the League of Nations, especially following the entry of the United States into World War II, it was evident that Wilson’s vision for the United States to achieve international peace over one generation through the Great War was idealized and incompatible with

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., Page 171.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85</sup> William N. Tilchin and Chalres E. Neu, *Artists of Power: Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Their Enduring Impact on U.S. Foreign Policy*. Praegar Security International, Westport, Connecticut, 2006. Page 170-171.

<sup>86</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Letter to Rider Haggard, Dec 6, 1918. Mem. Ed. XXIV, 547; Bishop II, 468.

<sup>87</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Letter to Lord Bryce. Found in Thompson, J. *Never Call Retreat: Theodore Roosevelt and the Great War*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. Page 282.

international politics. The tragedy of Wilsonianism is that “it bequeathed to the twentieth century’s decisive power an elevated foreign policy doctrine unmoored from a sense of history or geopolitics.”<sup>88</sup> Henry Kissinger attributes Wilson as the founder of the of foreign policy that America reverts to in the aftermath of conflict to “secure peace through democracy, open diplomacy, and the cultivation of shared rules and standards.”<sup>89</sup> Similarly, Richard Nixon, “whose foreign policy in fact embodied most of Theodore Roosevelt’s precepts, considered himself a disciple of Wilson’s internationalism.”<sup>90</sup> Nixon’s admiration of both Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson in international affairs supports the impression that while the two remain similar, Roosevelt set the stage for America to exit isolationism and enter the international arena. Roosevelt’s foreign policy remains on the realist spectrum despite supporting Wilson’s ideals on the best method to secure an international peace. Another former U.S. President, Lyndon B. Johnson, echoes the principles of Theodore Roosevelt’s expansionist view of America’s international duty. Johnson said, “Any man and any nation that seeks peace, and hates war, and is willing to fight the good fight against hunger and disease and misery, will find the United States of America by their side, willing to walk with them, walk with them every step of the way.”<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *World Order*. Penguin Books, New York City, 2014. Page 269.

<sup>89</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *World Order*. Penguin Books, New York City, 2014. Page 269.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, Page 268.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, Page 277.

## CHAPTER THREE

Echoes of Theodore Roosevelt's Foreign Policy Encountered in American War Strategy

During the Cold War:

A Brief Reflection on Roosevelt's Echoes during the Cold War

Remnants of Theodore Roosevelt's foreign policy are often overlooked when considering America's engagement in war. However, his foreign policy has echoed throughout the years succeeding him, and has influenced the nation's role in wars fought. The interventionist ideal preached by Roosevelt outlived him, and continues in practice today. Even George F. Kennan, a diplomat and scholar during the Cold War, supported military intervention in principle. While Kennan is known for holding firm to a strategy of containment when engaging aggressive powers, he is said to have espoused a "more elaborate form of (Roosevelt's) 'Speak softly and carry a big stick'" political ideology.<sup>92</sup>

The idea of a police force for the world inspires a sense of familiarity between Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt. On numerous occasions,

---

<sup>92</sup> Stephenson, Anders. *Kennan and the Art of Foreign Policy*. Harvard University Press, 1989. Pg. 98.

Theodore Roosevelt wrote that he wished for America to have the future role as world policeman on the balance of powers. During World War II, Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR) amended this idea to become his vision of the Four Policemen. The Four Policemen would be comprised of four great powers: the United States, Great Britain, France, and a defeated Germany, with minor influence from China.<sup>93</sup> This group would be tasked with balancing the growing Soviet Union. The significance of maintaining the balance of power, something Theodore Roosevelt cautiously understood, was resurrected by FDR after being put aside by Woodrow Wilson.

President Harry S. Truman succeeded FDR without having spent much time involved in considering World War II strategy. Truman was given the task to end a war that he did not start. He addressed Congress in a joint session with a speech that reminded the nation of Theodore Roosevelt.<sup>94</sup> Truman said, “Nothing is more essential to the future peace of the world than continued cooperation of the nations which had to muster the force necessary to defeat the conspiracy of the axis powers to dominate the world,” calling on all world powers that the use of force is a last resort to defend morality and international law.<sup>95</sup> Truman’s speech effectively condemns the use of force and engagement in war when not faced with an existential threat to peace. Like his predecessors traced back to Theodore Roosevelt, Truman firmly held that the United States is tasked with the responsibility to defend international peace.

---

<sup>93</sup> Kissinger, Henry A. *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, New York City, 1994. Pg. 395.

<sup>94</sup> Truman, Harry S. *Public Papers of the President of the United States*, 1945 vol. April 16, 1945.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*

Dwight D. Eisenhower provides the closest image of what Roosevelt would have been like had he been President during the Cold War. Eisenhower was an advocate for international peace and disarmament. In his Farewell Address delivered in 1961, Eisenhower reflected on his presidential terms with a “definite sense of disappointment” caused by the failure of disarmament.<sup>96</sup> He argued that it is imperative for future generations to “learn how to compose difference not with arms, but with intellect and decent purpose.”<sup>97</sup> His inability to see lasting international peace in the near future brought disappointment, yet instilled inspiration to gain progress on the ultimate goal of world peace.

While disarmament and peace remained at the forefront of Eisenhower’s objectives, he remained strong in his position that supporting a strong military is vital to attain peace. Similar to Roosevelt’s “speak softly and carry a big stick” mindset, Eisenhower said, “Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.”<sup>98</sup> Eisenhower used military strength as his shield on his quest for peace and disarmament. He used military strength as a means to support the ultimate end he sought. Had Roosevelt been alive to witness Eisenhower’s administration, I argue he would have fully supported him. As a spokesperson for using the Golden Rule, Roosevelt would have agreed “America’s leadership and prestige depend, not merely upon our unmatched material progress, riches,

---

<sup>96</sup> Eisenhower, Dwight D. Farewell Address. 1961.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid.



and military strength, but on how we use our power in the interests of world peace and betterment.”<sup>99</sup>

On the other hand, Jeffersonians would despise Eisenhower’s developments in the military, which included the creation of a permanent armaments industry to avoid “risk(ing) emergency improvisation of national defense” if called to war.<sup>100</sup> The effect of creating this new weapons industry initiated the new norm of “annually spend(ing) more on military security than the net income of all United States corporations.”<sup>101</sup> Whereas Eisenhower discusses the need to ensure power is not misplaced due to the increase in resources for the military, Jeffersonians would believe that unbalanced power in the armed forces within a state is inevitable. Jeffersonians view war as a cause for states to increase the power of their armed forces and place added force “in the hands of the central government.”<sup>102</sup> Jeffersonians fear “growth of a military-industrial-financial complex” that illustrates a positive correlation between government money spent on building up armed forces and the number of people identified as military weapons contractors and other stakeholders.”<sup>103</sup>

*On Whether Wilsonianism Can Stand on its Own*

---

<sup>99</sup> Ibid.

<sup>100</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 188.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., Page 187.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., Page 188.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid.

All Presidents succeeding Roosevelt tended to echo some form of Wilsonianism—the willingness to place emphasis on diplomatic conversations rather than on military action. They all sought to further the character of the United States by being an advocate for world peace. The inclusion of Roosevelt in Wilsonianism is necessary, even though Roosevelt held office before Wilson brought forth his foreign policy ideals. Roosevelt set the blueprints to ease the transition of the U.S. into pursuing world peace. Where Roosevelt and Wilson differ is in their prioritization of domestic power and international peace. Whereas Roosevelt sought domestic strength as a precursor to advocating for world peace, Wilson primarily aimed to achieve peace and ultimately use force if necessary.

Whereas FDR was inspired by Wilson and considered himself a Wilsonian, he was most similar to Theodore Roosevelt on the Jacksonian spectrum. He shared Roosevelt’s focus on diplomacy, his public popularity, and his readiness to defend America.<sup>104</sup> A difference between FDR and Roosevelt was the promptness to which action occurred. For instance, the direct attack on the U.S. at Pearl Harbor pushed FDR to declare war on Japan, even though it was only a side effect of the world war that began about 2 years before. In his speech to Congress calling for the declaration of war, Eisenhower emphasized that American interests were in grave danger.<sup>105</sup> It wasn’t until

---

<sup>104</sup> Ambrose, Stephen E. and Douglas, Brinkley G. *Rise to Globalism: American Foreign Policy Since 1938*, 9<sup>th</sup> Ed. Penguin Books, 2011. Page 24. The authors wrote that FDR was a “self-confident pragmatist, he was sure that he could handle situations as they arose.” During WWI, he kept “war aims vague, (and) prevented bickering among the Allies... it was a brilliant stroke.”

<sup>105</sup> Franklin D. Roosevelt, Washington D.C. December 8, 1941. In his famous “A Day That Will Live in Infamy” Speech following the attack on Pearl Harbor, Franklin D. Roosevelt said, “Hostilities exist. There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our

the attack on Pearl Harbor that FDR realized his diplomatic conversations towards peace in the Pacific with the Japanese were not proving successful. Had Theodore Roosevelt been alive, he most certainly would have criticized FDR for his negligence toward America's international duty as he criticized Wilson.<sup>106</sup> Roosevelt firmly held that any chronic wrongdoing would result in the intervention of a civilized nation in the Western Hemisphere and would force the United States to assume the responsibility of maintaining order as an "international police power."<sup>107</sup>

The attack on Pearl Harbor forced FDR to leave his Wilsonianism cover and become a Jacksonian during America's involvement in the war. The attack held him to his promise of intervention given the previous summer, something Theodore Roosevelt would have been proud of:

---

territory, and our interests are in grave danger. With confidence in our armed forces, with the unbounding determination of our people, we will gain the inevitable triumph—so help us God.”

<sup>106</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. *First Annual Message*. December 3, 1901. In response to the honor and sense of duty Roosevelt saw for the United States, he said, “Whether we desire it or not, we must henceforth recognize that we have international duties no less than international rights.” As a result of having inalienable international rights, Roosevelt believed the United States had a duty to protect these rights when they were violated abroad, thus shedding light on his idea of becoming the world's police power.

<sup>107</sup> John Lewis Gaddis, *Surprise, Security, and the American Experience*. Harvard University Press, 2004. Pg. 20-21. “As Roosevelt put it in 1904, ‘chronic wrongdoing, or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may... ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere... may force the United States, however reluctantly... to the exercise of an international police power.’ The United States therefore assumed the responsibility for maintaining order, collecting revenues, and paying off debts were ever indigenous regimes in the Caribbean or Central America were unable to do so.”

“We, too, born to freedom, and believing in freedom, are willing to fight to maintain freedom. We, and all other who believe as deeply as we do, would rather die on our feet than live on our knees.”<sup>108</sup>

FDR was quick to declare war on Japan after the attack. His focus on Wilsonian practices could no longer hold American interests safe, which was why he joined the Jacksonian school during the war. Finally enmeshing Wilsonianism and Jacksonianism as Theodore Roosevelt did, he was successful in carrying out his effective foreign policy strategies, aided by the public’s trust to protect national interests.<sup>109</sup> Though Wilson successfully ran for reelection with the campaign slogan, “He Kept Us Out of War,” Theodore Roosevelt showed us that in some cases, it is best to go to war to protect American interests and international decorum.

*Similarities Between Eisenhower and Roosevelt: The complexity of categorizing these two leaders in one foreign policy school*

While Mead does not specifically classify Eisenhower in any of the four schools, I argue that Eisenhower is captured in the Jacksonian school with Wilsonian tendencies. It would be a mistake to include Eisenhower solely with one or the other. If

---

<sup>108</sup> FDR, *Message from the President conveyed by his Secretary, Edwin M. Watson, to a special convocation of the University of Oxford held at Harvard Commencement, Cambridge, Massachusetts*. June 19, 1941.

<sup>109</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. “The two Roosevelts and Eisenhower were three presidents who were able to harness public trust to the task of carrying out an effective foreign policy. It was Nixon’s anticommunist credentials with Jacksonian America that made his opening to China possible; Reagan’s Jacksonian backing enabled him to make the most sweeping disarmament proposals of any American president during the Cold War.” Page 330.

he was a true Jacksonian and entirely separate from Wilsonianism, his Wilsonian elements were a result of the new world order that socially required America's pursuit of peace. On the other hand, if he predominantly followed Wilsonianism, he broke with the school in his decision to aggressively prepare for war against the Soviet Union. Whereas most evidence suggests the former, Eisenhower remains a difficult leader to categorize in one class, similar to Roosevelt. Rather than place all his faith in peace talks and leave going to war as a last resort, Eisenhower was a realist who closely followed Roosevelt's legacy: a nation must prepare for war in peacetime in order to prevent it from being attacked. As a desired result, the United States did not engage in direct war with the Soviet Union.

Eisenhower's invocation of the Truman Doctrine's containment strategy to avoid war echoes Roosevelt's foreign policy that focused on preparation for war and brinkmanship. Roosevelt believed if a nation was struck by its enemy, it must be prepared to retaliate and strike back harder. In acknowledging the dangers of war and its inevitability when diplomacy fails, Roosevelt held that the main difference between victors and losers is preparedness for war.<sup>110</sup> He warned future generations to strongly consider the problems causing the desire to go to war, along with the problems that would surface as a result of war. All in all, Roosevelt argued that the main problem to consider

---

<sup>110</sup> Theodore Roosevelt, Metropolitan, August 1915. Mem. Ed. XX, 369; Nat. Ed. XVIII, 317. On how preparedness for war serves as an insurance against war, Roosevelt said, "Preparedness against war does not always avert war or disaster in war any more than the existence of a fire department, that is, of preparedness against fire, always averts dire. But it is the only insurance against war and the only insurance against overwhelming disgrace and disaster in war. Preparedness usually averts war and usually prevents disgrace in war.

is preparation for war.<sup>111</sup> Because the containment strategy to prepare for war against the Soviet Union was successful, we see that Roosevelt's idea regarding the importance of preparation before war begins was accurate in this case. The continuous preparation for war allowed the U.S. to quickly fire back if fired upon without igniting the war by setting the first spark.

While Roosevelt's idea regarding preparation in peacetime is a premature version of containment, it remains that his position on the accuracy of this strategy outlived him and proved successful. While preparing for war, the U.S. watched the Soviet Union's domestic institutions collapse, inadvertently losing a war that was not due to a failure of war strategy. In the next section, I will highlight the importance of nationalism as a type of preparation for wartime that Roosevelt predicted four decades before the U.S. was similarly threatened by internal forces during the Cold War.

### *Nationalism and Character in Determining Wars*

In his reflection of Cold War history, *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History*, John Lewis Gaddis argues that one of the most, if not *the* most, critical factor for determining the victor in war is the character of the nation. In his consideration of studying causes for the Cold War as "a contest of good versus evil", Gaddis acknowledges that this viewpoint holds merit.<sup>112</sup> For instance, he noted that the Red

---

<sup>111</sup> Ibid.

<sup>112</sup> Gaddis, John Lewis, *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1997. Page 286.

Army's occupation of Germany after the end of World War II primarily stained the Soviet Union's reputation to the Germans. Rather than encourage Germans to adopt communism and authoritarianism over democracy and capitalism, the Soviet Union drove away the Germans because of the Red Army's brutal behavior towards German nationals. More specifically, Gaddis recalled that the rape of German women and other brutality caused by Red Army soldiers was most appalling. The civil misconduct from the Red Army towards Germans ultimately "played a major role in determining which way the Germans would tilt in the Cold War that was to come."<sup>113</sup>

The primary reason the Red Army carelessly lost the Cold War before it began is because of the Soviet Union's regime—the regime of the victors in a war determine how the losers will be treated. Because the Red Army soldiers were accustomed to "a culture of brutality...it did not occur to many of them that there was anything wrong with brutalizing others."<sup>114</sup> In contrast, democratic regimes are tasked with treating their defeated opponents in war with the same humanitarian conduct found within the democracy. In summary, the Red Army's brutality against the Germans did little to coerce Germany to adopt communism and align with the Soviet Union. From this scenario, it is evident that leaders who treat others with respect rather than induce fear and submission make people more inclined to follow.

A similar occurrence is seen in Roosevelt's Great White Fleet, in which Roosevelt warned the senior officers aboard the ship to not let the enlisted sailors step off the ship if it was possible they would cause offense to the host country. Roosevelt understood that

---

<sup>113</sup> Gaddis, John Lewis, *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1997. Page 287.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*

maintaining a respectable character of the U.S. would be most beneficial while sailing across the world to show military power. The scene echoes the importance of honor, tolerance, and respect when dealing with international affairs, which mostly disappeared after Roosevelt's term, yet have reappeared after the Cold War in counterterrorism strategy.<sup>115</sup>

George F. Kennan would agree with the importance of displaying a unified nationalist front. In his lecture series that traced the Cold War from American foreign policy in 1900, Kennan held that the most important factor for being victorious in the Cold War was maintaining a respectful character. He argued that the U.S. was tasked with showing the Soviet Union that Americans were united, not divided by domestic issues. However, Kennan also argued that when considering war, it must be understood that no total military victories are possible.<sup>116</sup> In his defense of why war has no total victors, Kennan said,

“We can avoid, this time, the tyranny of slogans. We can avoid confusing ourselves with grandiose and unrealistic, or even meaningless, phrases designed simply to make us feel better about the bloody and terrible business in which we are engaged. We can remember that war—a matter of destruction, brutalization and sacrifice, of separations, domestic disintegration, and the weakening of the deeper fabrics of society—is a process which of itself can achieve no positive aims: that even military victory is only the prerequisite for some further and more positive

---

<sup>115</sup> I mention counterterrorism strategy in reference to rules of engagement in the war on terror given by Former Secretary of Defense, Jim Mattis in 2017. These rules aim to limit civilian casualties when engaging with an enemy, thus inhibiting preemptive strikes. This strategy is considered one that will eventually gain the trust of the civilians in a regime that the United States is trying to reform.

<sup>116</sup> Kennan, George F., *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1951. Page 101.



achievement which it makes possible but by no means assures. We can have the moral course, this time, to remind ourselves that major international violence is, in terms of the values of our civilization, a form of bankruptcy for us all...<sup>117</sup>

Similarly, Roosevelt believed that war was “in itself neither moral nor immoral,” but rather the purpose and object of the war reveals its nature and righteousness.<sup>118</sup> While it is unlikely that Kennan said this while knowing his speech shared similarities with Roosevelt, it remains that Roosevelt held similar views about a half-century before. Roosevelt said, “The only proper rule is never to fight at all if you can honorably avoid it, but never under any circumstances...fight in a half-hearted way. When peace comes, it must be the peace of complete victory.”<sup>119</sup> Roosevelt did not entirely condemn all wars as immoral or unjust. Instead, he knew that fighting wars was a last resort. He was never quick to search for an opportunity to attack another nation. Whereas wars present evils and injustices between civilizations, fighting wars can present the inspiration of acting for a moral purpose, such as for peace.

While addressing students at the Naval War College as Assistant Secretary of the Navy in June 1897, Roosevelt predicted that preparedness for war was critical in determining whether the nation would actually go to war. In his speech, Roosevelt said, “If in the future we have war, it will almost certainly come because of some action, or

---

<sup>117</sup> Kennan, George F., *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1951. Page 144.

<sup>118</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Metropolitan, August 1915. Mem. Ed. XX, 369; Nat. Ed. XVIII, 317.

<sup>119</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Metropolitan, September 1917. Mem. Ed. XXI, 33; Nat. Ed. XIX, 28.

lack of action, on our part in the way of refusing to accept responsibilities at the proper time, or failing to prepare for war when war does not threaten.”<sup>120</sup> It is here that we see a trace of Jeffersonianism in the aim for preparedness to protect domestic institutions from falling victim to war. However, Jeffersonians prepare for war while retreating from the scene. Out of a sense of realism, Jeffersonians will step off the international platform if the cost for peace is too high. On the other hand, the idealist Roosevelt would prepare for war and continue to pursue American interests abroad, enmeshing a Hamiltonian focus on national interest with the Jeffersonian will to prepare. In *Democracy and Leadership*, Irving Babbitt argues a follower of Roosevelt desires preparedness and cannot “be counted on to mind his own business.”<sup>121</sup> The downfall Babbitt poses against the humanitarian Roosevelt pursuing his “program of service” is that it is too difficult to meddle in foreign affairs without becoming “involved in a program of world empire.”<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Address as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Naval War College, June 1897. Mem. Ed. XV, 256-257; Nat. Ed. XIII, 196-197.

<sup>121</sup> Babbitt, Irving, *Democracy and Leadership*. LibertyClassics, Indianapolis, 1979. Page 296.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### The Future of Speaking Softly and Carrying a Big Stick:

#### *Roosevelt as the Modern Leader of Jacksonians*

Modern Jacksonians are closer to Roosevelt than the namesake for the Jacksonian school, Andrew Jackson. However, it becomes necessary to identify how Andrew Jackson influenced Roosevelt. While Jackson was “subtle, sophisticated, and in many ways a surprisingly modern statesman,” he is commonly associated with his “unreflective, uneducated” populist followers.<sup>123</sup> Using Jackson as the namesake for the populist foreign policy school parallels the confusion his image as President has been associated with.

Roosevelt believed that there were two reasons why Jackson was successful in his political career: he identified with the people, and he was popular among politicians who sought to influence him according to their own interests.<sup>124</sup> Roosevelt said, “As President,

---

<sup>123</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 90.

<sup>124</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. 1887. Mem. Ed. VIII, 87-88; Nat. Ed. VII, 76.

Jackson did much good and much evil.”<sup>125</sup> He despised Jackson for making controversial decisions in office that led to additional strife within the nation. However, he also admired some of Jackson’s actions that he believed furthered nationalism. Roosevelt said,

“Jackson had many faults, but he was devotedly attached to the Union, and he had no thought of fear when it came to defending his country... With the exception of Washington and Lincoln, no man has left a deeper mark on American history; and though there is much in his career to condemn, yet all true lovers of America can unite in paying hearty respect to the memory of a man who was emphatically a true American, who served his country valiantly on the field of battle against a foreign foe, and who upheld with the most staunch devotion the cause of a great Federal Union.”<sup>126</sup>

While the four-school approach may or may not be sustained by historical records, or be reconciled with intellectually coherent theories of domestic or international politics, this approach sheds light on the nature of Roosevelt’s foreign policy.<sup>127</sup> Not only is this four-school approach helpful in identifying commonalities and differences between great foreign policy thinkers, it also explains how the U.S. has been successful despite its variety of leaders that have held vastly different methods of leading the nation to success.<sup>128</sup> Despite uncertainty regarding the given names of the

---

<sup>125</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Chautauquan, January 1891. Mem. Ed. XII, 443; Nat. Ed. XI, 202.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid.

<sup>127</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 95.

<sup>128</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. “Whatever its drawbacks, this approach to American foreign policy does at least explain why a democratic republic with a notoriously erratic and undisciplined foreign policy process has nevertheless found

four schools, it remains critical to understand the evolution and fluidity of the schools in response to contemporary affairs.<sup>129</sup> The four schools change over time, “they mix and blur... and are part of political history rather than the history of ideas. They are movements and communities of interest and feelings rather than abstract principles. They are churches rather than creeds.”<sup>130</sup> And as such, remnants of previous foreign policies resurface while others are set aside, waiting to be rediscovered at a future time.

*Theodore Roosevelt’s Influence on American Foreign Policy Remains at the Forefront of  
Modern Engagements*

At this point, we must now take a step back and consider the larger picture. What comes next? Will elements of Roosevelt’s foreign policy continue to thrive throughout future generations in America? Will the ideas from his legacy continue to stand despite tests of new wars and trials? I argue that they will.

---

its way, through many generations and in many varieties of circumstance, to foreign policies that have consistently advanced the country toward greater power and wealth than any other power in the history of the world.” Page 96.

<sup>129</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. “To call nineteenth-century Wilsonians “idealists” is just as anachronistic as to call them Wilsonians; the pseudo-precision of the abstract term lends to an unjustifiable air of political science authority to the discussion that the softer, less precise “Wilsonian” doesn’t carry. To call Jeffersonians “libertarians” or Jacksonians “populists” similarly would create at least as many confusions as the labels I have chosen.” Page 96-97.

<sup>130</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Page 91.

Roosevelt's surviving ideas allow the United States to remain as the hegemon, and not just strive to stay afloat.<sup>131</sup> While U.S. Presidents succeeding him may not have been conscious of their influence from Roosevelt, it is clear that Roosevelt embodied a pathway to bring the nation out of isolation and to its current state as a hegemon. In evaluation of Roosevelt's legacy on American foreign policy, we must consider the question: is Roosevelt's influence on foreign policy beneficial to our society and to the international community? In Roosevelt's own words,

“The world has moved so far that it is no longer necessary to believe that one nation can rise only by thrusting another down. All far-sighted statesmen, all true patriots, now earnestly wish that the leading nations of mankind, as in their several ways they struggle constantly toward a higher civilization, a higher humanity, may advance hand in hand, united only in a generous rivalry to see which can best do its allotted work in the world. I believe that there is a rising tide in human thought which tends for righteous international peace; a tide which it behooves us to guide through rational channels to sane conclusions.”<sup>132</sup>

Roosevelt advocated for international peace on a complex platform that enmeshed military strength, nationalism, and honor. He believed a nation would earn respect by having a strong military. A strong military would thus protect the nation from foreign aggression and provide a channel through which to promote international peace and

---

<sup>131</sup> While hegemony was far beyond what Roosevelt could have foreseen, especially during his lifetime, he knew he wanted a strong police-power position in the balance of powers. Rather than seeking to return to isolation and focus on domestic dominance, as a Jeffersonian would, Roosevelt envisioned the United States as entering the world stage and remaining there in its strong position for decades to come.

<sup>132</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Speech at Jamestown Exposition, Va. April 26, 1907. Mem. Ed. XII, 586; Nat. Ed. XI, 306.

goodwill. By means of building up and supporting a strong military, nationalism was integral, but not ultimately supreme. Similar to Hamiltonians in having national interest at the forefront of policies, Roosevelt believed one must loyally love his country above all others.<sup>133</sup> Using nationalism as a medium between self-interest and disloyalty, he argued that “A really great nation (acts) toward other nations in a spirit not in the least of mere self-interest, but paying heed chiefly to ethical reasons... (With a) tendency of the individuals comprising a nation to require (it) to act with justice towards its neighbors (as it) steadily grows and strengthens.”<sup>134</sup>

Roosevelt sought justice and honor from America’s position on the balance of powers as a hegemon seeking international peace. Rather than take advantage of America’s position to overindulge in power and militarily expand in imperialism, he practiced caution in respect to power. Time and again, Roosevelt reminded Americans, “power invariably means both responsibility and danger.”<sup>135</sup> Roosevelt saw the United States as being in a unique position, bestowed with power and equipped with responsibility to harness it for good use in spreading democratic ideals. In his speech, “The Strenuous Life”, Roosevelt famously said,

---

<sup>133</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. 1916. Mem. Ed. XX, 233. Nat. Ed. XVIII, 201. Roosevelt said, “The man who loves other nations as much as he does his own, stands on par with the man who loves other women as much as he does his own wife.”

<sup>134</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Sixth Annual Message, Washington. December 3, 1906. Mem. Ed. XVII, 450; Nat. Ed. VX, 383.

<sup>135</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Inaugural Address as President, Washington, March 4, 1905. Mem. Ed. XVII, 312; Nat. Ed. XV, 268. He also said a similar version of this quote: “Power always brings with it responsibility. You cannot have power to work well without having so much power as to be able to work ill” at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, September 7, 1905. Mem. Ed. XV, 457; Nat. Ed. XIII, 545.

“I wish to preach, not the doctrine of ignoble ease, but the doctrine of the strenuous life, the life of toil and effort, of labor and strife; to preach that highest form of success which comes, not to the man who desires mere easy peace, but to the man who does not shrink from danger from hardship or from bitter toil, and who out of these wins the splendid ultimate triumph.”<sup>136</sup>

His position was significant because he fused the pursuit of peace with the necessity of power. He remained vocal in arguing that the mere desire for world peace was unattainable without strife—without the realism of having a strong military presence. He argued that America’s “chief usefulness to humanity rests on... combining power with the high purpose” of world peace.<sup>137</sup> As such, having the high purpose of world peace “by itself (without the) power to put it into effect” is useless.<sup>138</sup>

### *Why Jacksonianism Prevails*

Military preparedness and quickness to engage in war are what make Jacksonians most prominent and successful in foreign affairs. The lack of hesitancy Jacksonians have to get involved in war is attributed to the connection between a Jacksonian’s conscience and the ability to act. The obligation a Jacksonian like Roosevelt has to the nation’s morality causes him to immediately act against a power that has done wrong. However,

---

<sup>136</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. “The Strenuous Life.” Chicago, Illinois, April 10, 1899.

<sup>137</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. *The Outlook*, September 9, 1911. Mem. Ed. XVIII, 426; Nat. Ed. XVI, 319).

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*



this obligation goes beyond simply being reactionary. The obligation to protect the people results in preemptive measures of preparedness to avoid war.

Since the Cold War, we have moved away from the military world Eisenhower warned against in his farewell speech on misplaced power.<sup>139</sup> Our modern war is one against terror. Our enemy is not known, nor does he have a face. America's greatest protection against acts of terror is intelligence and a strong military, prepared to act on a moment's notice. Though the standoff against terror occurs a century after Theodore Roosevelt's death, he nonetheless knew this strategy would prove successful for ages to come.

Using military preparedness as a strategy for protection, Roosevelt envisioned the position we are in today—a nation that prides itself on diplomacy, morality, and power—and prophesied the national security strategies we use daily. Roosevelt treated the long walk between peace and engagement in war almost as a battle. He argued that gathering intelligence and preparing for future wars was a defense strategy against conflicts with foreign nations.<sup>140</sup> While “Speak softly and carry a big stick” is his most popular slogan, “Preparedness for War is in reality a preparedness against war” should be just as

---

<sup>139</sup> Dwight D. Eisenhower, Farewell Address. January 17, 1961. “Down the long lane of history yet to be written, America knows that this world of ours, ever growing smaller, must avoid becoming a community of dreadful fear and hate, and be, instead, a proud confederation of mutual trust and respect. . . We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.”

<sup>140</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Preface to *Hero Tales* with H.C. Lodge, 1895. Mem. Ed. IX, xxi; Nat. Ed. X, xxiii. “Intelligent foresight in preparation and known capacity to stand well in battle are the surest safeguards against war.”

popular.<sup>141</sup> Roosevelt treated war as a last resort, and aimed to do everything in his power to avoid war. However, if the call to war came, Roosevelt would not have tolerated hesitancy in getting involved, as seen in his criticism of Wilson at the beginning of World War I.

Military preparedness hardly seems like a strategy exclusive to Roosevelt. However, the explicit idea that preparedness should be used as a strategy to avoid war was novel in the Roosevelt administration.<sup>142</sup> Entering the world stage in foreign affairs essentially put a target on the U.S. either as a potential ally or a potential threat. Emerging from isolation, the bulk of our foreign policy and “diplomatic activity was actively designed to deflect other powers.”<sup>143</sup> Yet, rather than deflect other powers, the U.S. was suddenly pushed to the forefront of international security with its police power duty introduced by Roosevelt. The U.S. was forced to change its historically outdated foreign policy from merely deflecting other powers to becoming a stable hegemon. As such, Roosevelt introduced the modern practice of harnessing power with the necessary

---

<sup>141</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. Letter To Mr. Van Zile, January 8, 1915. “Preparedness for War is in reality preparedness against War. There is nothing more important for our people to understand that sooner or later disaster, shame and disgrace will come to use if we do not keep ourselves in shape to guard against our own vital rights.”

<sup>142</sup> Roosevelt was heavily influenced by McKinley’s acts of preemption. McKinley’s decision to take the Philippines was not out of American imperialism, but because doing so would thwart potential efforts of other powerful states—such as Japan or Germany—to take them upon the downfall of Spain. This strategy of preemption caused Roosevelt to focus on the need for preparation in order to avoid war. Gaddis, John Lewis. *Surprise, Security, and the American Experience*. Harvard University Press, 2004. Page 20-21.

<sup>143</sup> Kennan, George F., *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1951. Page 47.

delicacy to not preemptively pose a threat to other powers, but rather as a soldier waiting to jump into action.

A similarly unique position was Roosevelt's encouragement of all other nations to prepare for war. He believed that preparing for war disillusioned the stakes for declaring war against another nation.<sup>144</sup> Similar to Eisenhower's Farewell Address in which he addresses his disappointment with the lack of envisioning peace in the horizon of the world, Roosevelt wrote that all free and "liberty-loving" nations had a duty out of honor to honorably defend itself and its vital interests.<sup>145</sup>

*How Nationalist Jacksonian Leaders will Avoid Resurgence of Isolationism, and the Problem with Jeffersonians in the New World Order*

Roosevelt heavily despised Thomas Jefferson. He wrote that the more he studied Jefferson, the "more profoundly (he) distrust(ed) him and his influence, taken as a whole."<sup>146</sup> Roosevelt was always quick to criticize Jefferson, openly arguing that

---

<sup>144</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. 1915. Mem. Ed. XX, xxiv; Nat. Ed. XVIII, xxiii. "Preparedness against war does not always avert war or disaster in war any more than the existence of a fire department, that is, of preparedness against fire, always averts dire. But it is the only insurance against war and the only insurance against overwhelming disgrace and disaster in war. Preparedness usually averts war and usually prevents disgrace in war. Preparedness, so far from encouraging nations to go to war, has a marked tendency to diminish the chance of war occurring."

<sup>145</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. 1915. Mem. Ed. XX, xxiv; Nat. Ed. XVIII, xxiii; And Dwight D. Eisenhower, Farewell Address. January 17, 1961.

<sup>146</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. To H. C. Lodge, September 21, 1907. Lodge Letters II, 282.

Hamilton was an infinitely better and capable leader.<sup>147</sup> The only aspect of Jeffersonian tendencies Roosevelt could agree with was being “for the people”.<sup>148</sup> On Jefferson, Roosevelt said,

“Jefferson, though a man whose views and theories had a profound influence upon our national life, was perhaps the most incapable executive that ever filled the presidential chair; being almost purely a visionary, he was utterly unable to grapple with the slightest actual danger, and, not even excepting his successor, Madison, it would be difficult to imagine a man less fit to guide the State with honor and safety through the stormy times that marked the opening of the present century.”<sup>149</sup>

Whereas the future of the nation remains uncertain, I argue that Jacksonian leaders will sustain the hegemonic of the nation. Some political scientists believe that our current politicians have tendencies to be too vocal and abrasive towards other nations, and that our biggest caution will be stepping back from becoming too interventionist.<sup>150</sup> They believe the survival of the nation rests with Jeffersonians. However, Jeffersonians face the increasing doubt of being able to sustain America’s power. If Jeffersonians who oppose possibilities of war take control of the White House and the nation’s foreign

---

<sup>147</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. To Frederick Scott Oliver, August 9, 1906. Mem. Ed. XXIV, 27-28; Bishop II, 23-24. “Thank Heaven, I have never hesitated to criticise Jefferson; he was infinitely below Hamilton.”

<sup>148</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. To Justice W. H. Moody, September 21, 1907. Mem. Ed. XXIV, 82; Bishop II, 71. “Heaven knows how cordially I despise Jefferson, but he did have one great virtue which his Federalist opponents lacked—he stood for the plain people, whom Abraham Lincoln afterward represented.”

<sup>149</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. 1882. Mem. Ed. VII, 424; Nat. Ed. VI, 373.

<sup>150</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. Mead writes that the United States needs “Jeffersonian caution” and the “Jeffersonian passion for limits,” to keep the nation from becoming too interventionist. Page 334.

policy, we would be degenerating from the growth of power experienced since the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Jeffersonian politicians may be beneficial for the purpose of bringing the character of the nation back to “speaking softly” while remaining a great power.

However, without the influence of Jacksonians, the U.S. faces the serious consequence of the resurgence to isolationism.<sup>151</sup>

In closing, a similar reason Jacksonians remain popular in office is because of their all-in-this-together approach. With a touch of populism, Roosevelt aimed to rally Americans up to participate in war efforts during World War I. He did not simply target soldiers, but argued that every American citizen’s support mattered. He wanted the American people to feel important and closely connected to its cause to enter the war. By doing so, he tied the support of the American people with the protection, safety, and freedom of the United States.

“Let us prepare not merely in military matters, but in our social and industrial life. There can be no sound relationship toward other nations unless there is also sound relationship among our own citizens within our own ranks. Let us insist on the thorough Americanization of the newcomers to our shores, and let us also insist on the thorough Americanization of ourselves. Let us encourage the fullest industrial activity, and give the amplest industrial reward to those whose activities are most important for securing industrial success, and at the same time let us see that justice is done and wisdom shown in securing the welfare of every man, woman, and child within our borders.”<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup> Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001. “If our leadership class continues to produce politicians who have only weak claims on the respect of Jacksonian America, then the nation’s ability to follow an effective foreign policy will be seriously diminished.” Page 330.

<sup>152</sup> Roosevelt, Theodore. 1916. Mem. Ed. XX, 261; Nat. Ed. XVIII, 225.

While other foreign policy schools may become popular during certain times, Roosevelt's Jacksonian and Wilsonian ideas will always remain part of the nation's mission, so long as the United States seeks to be a voice for the voiceless and maintain hegemonic stability.

## Bibliography

Ambrose, Stephen E. and Douglas, Brinkley G. *Rise to Globalism: American Foreign Policy Since 1938*, 9<sup>th</sup> Ed. Penguin Books, 2011.

Babbitt, Irving, *Democracy and Leadership*. LibertyClassics, Indianapolis, 1979.

Beale, Howard K. *Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power*. John Hopkins Press, 1956.

Chernow, Ron. *Alexander Hamilton*.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. *Farewell Address*. January 17, 1961.

Gaddis, John Lewis. *Surprise, Security, and the American Experience*. Harvard University Press, 2004.

Gaddis, John Lewis. *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1997.

Hart, Albert Bushnell and Ferleger, Ronald Herbert, Ed. *Theodore Roosevelt Cyclopedia*.  
Roosevelt Memorial Association, Roosevelt House, New York City, 1941.

Jones, Howard. *Crucible of Power: A History of American Foreign Relations from 1897*.  
Scholarly Resources Inc., Wilmington, DE, 2001.

Kennan, George F. *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950*. The University of Chicago Press,  
Chicago, IL, 1951. Kissinger, Henry. *Diplomacy*.

Kipling, Rudyard. *Letters of Rudyard Kipling (Vol 2) 1890-99*. Pinney, Thomas Ed.  
Macmillan 1990.

Kissinger, Henry A. *World Order*. Penguin Books, New York City, 2014.

Kissinger, Henry A. *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, New York City, 1994.

Mead, Walter Russell. *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It  
Changed the World*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2001.

Roosevelt, Franklin D. *Message from the President conveyed by his Secretary, Edwin M.  
Watson, to a special convocation of the University of Oxford held at Harvard  
Commencement, Cambridge, Massachusetts. June 19, 1941*.



Roosevelt, Franklin D. Washington D.C., December 8, 1941.

Roosevelt, Theodore. 1915. Memorial Edition, XX, xxiv; National Edition, XVIII, xxiii.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Letter to H. C. Lodge, September 21, 1907. Lodge Letters II, 282.

Roosevelt, Theodore. To Frederick Scott Oliver, August 9, 1906. Memorial Edition,  
XXIV, 27-28; Bishop II, 23-24.

Roosevelt, Theodore. To Justice W. H. Moody, September 21, 1907. Memorial Edition,  
XXIV, 82; Bishop II, 71.

Roosevelt, Roosevelt. 1882. Memorial Edition, VII, 424; National Edition, VI, 373.

Roosevelt, Roosevelt. 1916. Memorial Edition, XX, 261; National Edition, XVIII, 225.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Letter to Mr. Van Zile, January 8, 1915.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Preface to *Hero Tales* with H.C. Lodge, 1895. Memorial Edition,  
IX, xxi; National Edition, X, xxiii.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Chautauquan, January 1891. Memorial Edition, XII, 443; National  
Edition, XI, 202.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Chautauquan, January 1891. Memorial Edition, XII, 443; National Edition, XI, 202.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Speech at Jamestown Exposition, Va. April 26, 1907. Memorial Edition, XII, 586; National Edition, XI, 306.

Roosevelt, Theodore. 1916. Memorial Edition, XX, 233. National Edition, XVIII, 201.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Sixth Annual Message, Washington. December 3, 1906. Memorial Edition, XVII, 450; National Edition, VX, 383.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Inaugural Address as President, Washington, March 4, 1905. Memorial Edition, XVII, 312; National Edition, XV, 268.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Milwaukee, Wisconsin, September 7, 1905. Memorial Edition, XV, 457; National Edition, XIII, 545.

Roosevelt, Theodore. "The Strenuous Life." Chicago, Illinois, April 10, 1899.

Roosevelt, Theodore. The Outlook, September 9, 1911. Memorial Edition. XVIII, 426; National Edition, XVI, 319.

Roosevelt, Theodore. 1887. Memorial Edition, VIII, 87-88; National Edition, VII, 76.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Metropolitan, September 1917. Memorial Edition, XXI, 33;  
National Edition, XIX, 28.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Address as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Naval War College,  
June 1897. Memorial Edition. XV, 256-257; National Edition, XIII, 196-197.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Metropolitan, August 1915. Memorial Edition. XX, 369; National  
Edition, XVIII, 317.

Roosevelt, Theodore. First Annual Message, December 3, 1901.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *An Autobiography*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1941.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *The Works of Theodore Roosevelt*, vol. 13, pg. 336. New York,  
1926..

Roosevelt, Theodore. *The Story of the Progressive Movement in Pennsylvania*, pg. 45.  
Philadelphia, March 13, 1913.

Roosevelt, Theodore. The Outlook, September 23, 1914. Mem. Ed. XX, 28.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Letter to Whitelaw Reid, December 4, 1908. *Bailey, Theodore Roosevelt and the Japanese-American Crisis*. Stanford University Press, 1934.

Pg. 301-302.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *The Works of Theodore Roosevelt*. 1916, Memorial Edition. Ed. XX, 235.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *New York Times*, Oct. 18, 1914.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *First Annual Message*, Dec. 3, 1901.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *Roosevelt, Memorial Edition*, XX, 529. 1916.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *New York Times*, Nov. 8, 1914.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *Letter to W.H. Taft*, Dec. 22, 1910.

Stephenson, Anders. *Kennan and the Art of Foreign Policy*. Harvard University Press, 1989.

Tilchin, William N. and Neu, Chalres E. *Artists of Power: Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Their Enduring Impact on U.S. Foreign Policy*. Praegar Security International, Westport, Connecticut, 2006.

Truman, Harry S. *Public Papers of the President of the United States*, 1945 vol. April 16,  
1945.

Washington, George. *1 Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, pg. 194.