Race as a Leading Component in the Anti-Imperialist League's Views on the Annexation of the Philippines, 1898 - 1908

Dierendonck, Merlijn van

RACE AS A LEADING COMPONENT IN THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE'S VIEWS ON THE ANNEXATION OF THE PHILIPPINES, 1898 - 1908

Master's Thesis

North American Studies

University of Leiden

Name: Merlijn van Dierendonck

Student number: s2092948

Date: 30-11-2021

Supervisor: Prof. dr. G.P. Scott-Smith

Second reader: dr. W.M. Schmidli

Abstract

The anti-imperialists in the United States, unified in the Anti-Imperialist League (AIL) used race among various other arguments to oppose the annexation of the Philippines after the Spanish-American War (1898). The primary argument of the AIL was that the annexation devalued the American founding principles, although other arguments, such as race, were raised as well. Earlier works have examined the relation between race and (anti-) imperialism in the context of American imperialism at the end of the nineteenth century, albeit in a broader context. This thesis aims to determine in what ways race was fundamental to the AIL's views of the annexation of the Philippines. To determine how fundamental race was to these views, this thesis analyses documents and speeches of six AIL members, belonging to three different movements within the AIL: the rights activists, the Social Darwinists, and the white supremacists. These documents show that the perception of race plays a role in structuring the argument of race, yet it also structures other political, administrative, and labor-related arguments. These results show that the perception of race was fundamental in the shaping of several arguments against annexation.

Keywords: anti-imperialism, AIL, Philippines, race.

Table of Contents

Introduction

At the turn of the 20th century, in a world largely controlled by global empires, the United States stood on the threshold of becoming one itself. After a war with Spain that began on the 21st of April 1898 and ended on August 13 of that same year, the territory of the United States expanded once again, yet now even further than the territory of Hawaii. The acquisitions of Guam, Samoa, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines steered the country towards a role where it now had the choice to govern beyond its continental borders. This potential new role renewed the debate on an expansionist driven foreign policy – after previous debates on, for instance, the annexation of Hawaii (1893-1898) and the annexation of Texas (1836-1844).

Of the new acquisitions, the Philippines are arguably the most interesting to discuss, considering their geographical position, the number of people inhabiting the archipelago and the national discourse that was created by its annexation. This thesis focuses on the debate regarding the annexation of the Philippines, spanning from 1898 (the year of the annexation) to 1908. Involved in the debate were the imperialists, who advocated American expansion, and the anti-imperialists, who determinedly resisted against American imperialism. The imperialists argued in favor of the spreading of democracy and liberty, financial gain, and being able to compete in the Far East with other empires, who otherwise might have taken an interest in these former Spanish possessions.[1] The anti-imperialists contended primarily that bestowing the Philippines the right to self-govern was the best thing to do in accordance with the United States' founding philosophy: "The adoption of a policy of imperialism, (…) would

[1] Ernest R. May, *American Imperialism: A Speculative Essay* (New York, NY: Atheneum, 1968), 8–10.

mean the denigration of the finest facets of our governmental heritages– the Declaration of Independence, Washington's Farewell Address, the Monroe Doctrine."[2]

In the years leading up to the Spanish-American War, the influential men that shared the anti-imperialist ideas had individually tried to warn the American public of the dangers of imperialism to the United States. In June 1898, roughly two months before the armistice between the United States and Spain was signed in August 1898, a first attempt to unite that anti-imperialist sentiment was made. In Boston's Faneuil Hall, –a rather symbolic place to unite against imperialism– Gamaliel Bradford organized the first meeting, where several of the attendees would play an active role in the American Anti-imperialist movement.[3] The meeting resulted in the establishment of a committee that was tasked with uniting the anti-imperialist sentiment and promoting the anti-imperialist movement across the United States. The movement was consolidated with the founding of the Anti-Imperialist League (AIL) in November 1898 in Massachusetts. Its main goal was "to oppose by every legitimate means the acquisition of the Philippine Islands, or of any colonies away from our shores, by the United States."[4] Even after the ratification of the Treaty of Paris on the 6th of February 1899, the AIL's purpose was "to oppose the colonial idea (…) and to assert the vital truths of the Declaration of Independence embodied in the Constitution and indissolubly connected with the welfare of this Republic."[5] In 1899, the AIL estimated that there were at least "hundred active centers of anti-imperialist work" with the most prominent being in "New York, Philadelphia, Springfield, Cincinnati, Washington, DC., Los Angeles, Portland, Ore., and the recently established society in Minneapolis, after, of course, the central organization in

---

[2] E. Berkeley Tompkins, "The Old Guard: A Study of the Anti-Imperialist Leadership," *The Historian (Kingston)* 30, no. 3 (May 1, 1968): 373, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6563.1968.tb00325.x.
[3] E. Berkeley Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the United States: The Great Debate, 1890-1920* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970), 123–25.
[4] Erving Winslow, *Report of the Executive Committee of the Anti-Imperialist League, Feb. 10, 1899.* (Boston, MA: Anti-Imperialist League, 1899), 1.
[5] Erving Winslow, *Address of the Anti-Imperialist League* (Boston, MA: Anti-Imperialist League, 1899).

Chicago", with the membership of the AIL being well over 25.000 only four months after its creation.[6] Due to the increasing activities of anti-imperialism in the United States, all these separate organizations merged into the American Anti-Imperialist League (AAIL) on the 25th of November 1899. The original AIL had now become the New England branch of the AAIL, however it was this local organization that "carried the American Anti-Imperialist League, instead of vice versa."[7]

The League's membership was diverse, but the more prominent officers came from the well-educated upper echelon of the American society. These members held positions as lawyers, bankers, professors, editors, and clergymen and were in many cases leaders in their respective fields.[8] In addition to their influential occupations, a considerable number of the League's members was active in civil reform and used this in the counterargument to imperialism. They argued that the United States had to focus on improving the domestic situation, rather than reign over a foreign country and not "govern their own large cities honestly and efficiently."[9] Some members went beyond the municipal reform and crossed into the territory of civil rights. Notable in this field were Moorfield Storey, the first President of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and Herbert Welsh, who as an advocate for Native American rights headed the Indian Rights Association.

The AIL's position on the Philippines did neither align with the Republican party nor with the Democrat party. The League obviously opposed the choice of the Republicans, led by President William McKinley, to occupy the Philippines and criticized the indecisive attitude of the Democrats. Nonetheless, the AIL's mission appealed to both Democrats and

---

[6] New England Anti-Imperialist League, *Annual Meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League, Now the New England Anti-Imperialist League* (Boston, MA: N.E. Anti-Imperialist League, 1899), 7; Winslow, *Report of the Executive Committee of the Anti-Imperialist League, Feb. 10, 1899.*, 2.
[7] Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the United States*, 133.
[8] Tompkins, "The Old Guard," 366–67.
[9] James A. Zimmerman, "Who Were the Anti-Imperialists and the Expansionists of 1898 and 1899? A Chicago Perspective," *Pacific Historical Review* 46, no. 4 (1977): 599, https://doi.org/10.2307/3638164; Tompkins, "The Old Guard," 384.

Republicans, who joined more out of their own principle rather than following up the orders of the parties. They were the so-called mugwumps, men who diverted from party lines to make a statement against political corruption and to promote social issues.[10] Therefore, the ranks of the League included Gold Democrats, Bryan Democrats (or Silverites), Republicans and the independent mugwumps.[11] From the League's main perspective, the prevention of American imperialism, it was only logical to support the Democratic candidate William Jennings Bryan instead of the incumbent McKinley, even though Bryan and ten other Democrats had supported the ratification of the Treaty of Paris in 1899.[12] However, the collaboration of the League with Bryan never went much further than a shared interest in anti-imperialism. During the campaign and the elections of 1900, League members either sat out the election or "reluctantly acquiesced and agreed to work for Bryan."[13]

As quickly as the anti-imperialist movement had taken off in the United States, as quickly the League started to fall apart again. The goal of the organization, independence for the Philippines, remained the same, yet the members could not agree on the ways to achieve this goal. Quarrels within the organization about presidential candidates, the death of prominent members, the loss of financial support for the organization and, more importantly, the declining importance of imperialism as a political issue were all factors that contributed to the downfall of the Anti-Imperialist League.[14] In 1904, four years after the crucial McKinley-Bryan election, only the founding New England branch of the Anti-Imperialist

---

[10] Gerald W. McFarland, "Mugwumps," in *The Oxford Companion to United States History* (Oxford University Press, January 1, 2004), http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195082098.001.0001/acref-9780195082098-e-1041.

[11] William Jennings Bryan and his supporters advocated for the addition of silver to the monetary standard in the United States and the unlimited coinage of silver, hence the name Silverites. The Gold Democrats, who favoured the gold standard, argued that a bimetallic system would be detrimental to the American economy: Fred H. Harrington, "The Anti-Imperialist Movement in the United States, 1898-1900," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 22, no. 2 (1935): 215-217, https://doi.org/10.2307/1898467.

[12] Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the United States*, 192.

[13] Tompkins, 153.

[14] Tompkins, 267–69.

League remained as all the other branches had dissolved, and "reassumed its title as *the* Anti-Imperialist League."[15]

Independence for the Philippines remained uncertain under the presidencies of Theodore Roosevelt, Howard Taft and Woodrow Wilson, although the latter granted the Filipinos through the 1916 Organic Act of the Philippine Islands more self-government and the promise that the U.S. would return the Philippines to the Filipinos themselves after a stable government was formed. From the AIL's standpoint, the Organic Act was a slight disappointment since it came too late and did not offer outright independence, yet it was viewed as a step in the right direction.[16]

In the meantime, the members of the AIL broadened their attention to other matters, such as supporting the Pan-American Union and the League of Nations, and by swiftly declaring their support for Belgium and Luxembourg after the two countries were invaded by the German Empire during the First World War.[17] The AIL saw how their initial cause became "part of one great, triumphal, universal movement", one that denounced the militarism and imperialism displayed in the First World War. Moorfield Storey concluded that "now substantially the whole world outside Germany and its subjects, Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey, is united in a great anti-imperialist league."[18] With this sense of achievement, the AIL disbanded in 1920.

Due to the make-up of the AIL, it was not uncommon for members to have different outlooks on society or policy strategies. As indicated before, the League members united under the banner of anti-imperialism but also had their own motives to argue against

---

[15] E. Berkeley Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the United States: The Great Debate, 1890-1920* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970), 134. In this thesis, the abbreviation AIL is used both to indicate the original AIL as for the short-lived AAIL.
[16] Tompkins, 288.
[17] Tompkins, 286–87.
[18] Tompkins, 288.

imperialism. There was a "myriad of political, racial, administrative, religious, military, fiscal, and other problems inherent in colonialism."[19]

For instance, some members worried about whether the annexation yielded the financial benefits claimed by the imperialists, considering the required upkeep –which in turn increased taxation– of the army and navy to keep the Philippines under American control. There were concerns as to how the Philippines should or could be governed and what the status of those Filipinos would be if the Philippines were in the American sphere of influence. Others argued that with the annexation, the Monroe Doctrine was abandoned and therefore would harm the relationship that the United States had with the smaller nations on the American continent. Other arguments concerned the possible detriment of American labor if the "half-breeds and semi-barbaric people of the Philippine Islands" were added to the United States, as well as the addition of a few million people belonging to one single church –the Roman Catholic church– that could become a political force in a nation that previously had a "multiplicity of churches, sects and denominations (…) in every part of the country."[20]

Among the other anti-imperialist reasoning was the argument of race, which was particularly interesting due to the different, often opposite views among the anti-imperialists. Aside from the argument of the existing race problem in the United States, the views on race also connect to or partially shaped the arguments raised in the previous paragraph, such as the political, administrative, and labor-based arguments.

In the light of this thesis' topic, the different views on race within the AIL raise a few questions. For instance, how did the AIL, despite its contrasting opinions and opposite views

---

[19] Tompkins, 183.

[20] Samuel Gompers, "The Future Foreign Policy of the United States," *The American Federationist* 5, no. 7 (1898): 136–40; Carl Schurz, "Thoughts on American Imperialism, September 1898," in *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, ed. Frederic Bancroft, vol. 5 (New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1913), 500–504.

on race, still deemed a policy of non-intervention the best outcome for the Philippines? One could also ask how these differences in opinion represented other disputes in the AIL or to what extent the AIL's opinion on race shaped the transition from a pure political movement to a social movement.[21] However, before these questions can be effectively answered, the main question that remains, is: In what ways was race fundamental in the Anti-Imperialist League's views on the annexation of the Philippines, 1898-1908?

This thesis maintains that the perception of race played a significant part in the arguments of the various movements among the League to oppose the annexation of the Philippines and that these groups used their view on race to back up the AIL's main argument against annexation, namely the violation of the United States' founding principles and its Constitution.

Firstly, this thesis will examine sources published and produced by three different movements within the AIL – the rights activists, the Social Darwinists, and the white supremacists–, to establish the view of each respective group regarding race. To do that, the sub-question that concerns the view on race is: What was their view on race and how was it expressed in their arguments? Secondly, this thesis will establish how each group's view on race corresponds with its view on rights for the Filipinos. The second sub-question is a follow-up question for the first sub-question: How did that view on race correspond with each group's opinion on rights for the Filipinos? Thirdly, this thesis will show how the results of the first two points tie into the AIL's main argument: How does that relate to the AIL's main argument for not governing the Philippines?

As the literature review later shows, historians have examined the connection between race and American (anti-) imperialism at the beginning of the twentieth century before, yet

[21] Michael P. Cullinane, *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism: 1898-1909* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 117, https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137002570.

more as a minor factor within a broader perspective; only Christopher Lasch, Eric Love, and Paul Kramer have made this connection their focus. The same goes for the Anti-Imperialist League and its views on race. The discussed works regarding the AIL mention that race was one of the secondary arguments against annexation or give snippets of the opposing views on race that existed within the League. The analysis in Robert Beisner's *Twelve against Empire* does not feature AIL members, besides Carl Schurz, with an outspoken view on race, although Beisner argues that, barring some exceptions, racial views were used to exclude the Filipinos. Richard Welch's short essay argued that there was a distinction within the AIL between believers in race differences and believers in a master race, although his essay does not offer a thorough breakdown of this distinction, as Welch also studies the anti-imperialists as economic expansionists.

The reason for the absence of material can be the self-explanatory fact that race was not the main argument against empire. However, that does not justify the gap in research. This thesis contributes to what is known about the connection between race and anti-imperialism by dealing with a subject that has largely been brushed aside by other scholars. Furthermore, this thesis adds to the existing research on the AIL, as it emphasizes different schools of thought within the AIL and provides a more in-depth look on how the AIL and its members dealt with the race issue.

The subject of race plays an important role in this thesis, therefore, some elaboration of how this thesis uses race is required. In general, when talking about race, this thesis uses it in the context of one race (the Anglo-Saxon) being superior to another race (the Native Americans, black people, the Filipinos), very much the accepted racial formation that already existed in the United States. That is the common belief that also can be discerned from reading the primary sources. However, there were some anti-imperialists that diverged slightly from that line. For example, some anti-imperialists believed that controlling the

Philippines would lead to race degeneration (of the Anglo-Saxon American) whereas others believed that –much like the imperialist American government– that the Filipinos were unable to adapt to American democracy.

To establish the different outlooks on race within the AIL, this thesis will analyze primary sources written by AIL members, covering three different angles: the rights activist angle, the Social Darwinist angle, and the white supremacist angle. The texts are written by League members that represented these angles within the movement.

Texts by Moorfield Storey and Herbert Welsh will be used to establish the abolitionist/activist angle, as both dedicated themselves to the improvement of non-white people in the United States. In Storey's speeches such as *Is it right?* (1900), *What shall we do with our dependencies?* (1903), and *The importance to America of Philippine independence* (1904) and Herbert Welsh's *The other man's country* (1900) and *The Ethics of Our Philippine Policy* (1900), both argue for the independence of the Philippines from a humanitarian standpoint.

For the Social Darwinist angle, this thesis uses texts and speeches by Carl Schurz and David Starr Jordan. Contrary to the texts by Welsh and Storey, these sources were published around the height of the imperialism debate (1899). The choice to examine Schurz's publications in the light of Social Darwinism is based on the fact that in his works, he argues that people from the tropics were unable to assimilate with Americans and vice versa. Schurz believed that a democracy could not be established in the tropics for a longer period, partially due to the Anglo-Saxon/Germanic inability to settle in the tropical zone, yet more due to the inability of the Filipinos to adapt to the concept of democracy and other aspects defining American society and culture. Starr Jordan is also interesting in the light of Social Darwinism. Having a background in biology, he was well-known for his support of eugenics, and he applied this to the imperialism debate as well.

To establish the angle of the white supremacists among the AIL members, the records of the 3rd session of the 55th Congress (1899) offer interesting opinions by anti-imperialist politicians. Of course, not all anti-imperialist politicians were automatically in favor of white supremacy, yet some of these – often southern– senators were not keen on welcoming another race into the American society– especially so soon after the American Civil War. Especially senators Benjamin Tillman (South Carolina) and Donelson Caffery (Louisiana) had a particularly negative attitude towards the Filipinos. As for the Democrats Caffery and Tillman, they were not the only anti-imperialist politicians with white supremacist views. However, their statements in Congress fit well within the white supremacist angle of the AIL that this thesis wants to highlight.

There are several reasons that justify the choice for these three sides. First and foremost, these three sides offer contrasting opinions ranging from support towards self-government of the Filipino's and possible adjustment problems for the Americans to a tropical environment to the argument that these Filipino savages were detrimental and dangerous to a society that was still struggling with the idea of equality for non-white people. That will help this thesis as it offers good degrees of comparison in opinions ranging from a positive attitude towards colored people to reluctance or slight opposition to hardline opposition. The use of three different opinions in this thesis allows for a more compelling comparison than if it was focused on just one of these sides. Secondly, it exemplifies the diversity of the anti-imperialist organization in the United States as these three groups were the most outspoken on the issue of race, which also explains the amount of source material published by these groups.

This thesis addresses the period between 1898 and 1908. Although the AIL existed until 1920, there is no significant need for this thesis to broaden its scope, as the most

important discussions on this topic took place between 1898 and 1908, more so in the years 1899 and 1900. The chosen period also offers the most relevant sources.

Historiography of the AIL in the Context of the Historiography of American Imperialism

The historiography of the Anti-Imperialist League in the United States is not extensive by itself, and therefore it needs to be placed within the much broader historiography of American empire. Due to the extensiveness of the historiography on imperialism, the following section will emphasize the approach of American empire at the turn of the twentieth century.

The earlier historians who studied the emergence of an American empire during the 1930s and 1940s were often drawn to the relationship between imperialism and public opinion. To appease to the wish of the American people, so they argued, the American government undertook the steps necessary to expand its borders. In his article *Was the Presidential Election of 1900 A Mandate on Imperialism?*, Thomas Bailey studied the assumption that the 1900 elections and its outcome illustrated the American sentiment on imperialism. This assumption was made by "a considerable body of historians" who argued that imperialism was the major issue of that campaign and that William McKinley's reelection was an endorsement of American empire.[22] Bailey concluded the opposite: that it was not solely about (anti-)imperialism, but as much about the gold standard debate if even more. Another historian, Fred Harrington, also emphasized the connection between imperialism and public opinion. He argued that the founders of the AIL, to combat the rising sense of imperialism in the United States, deemed a counter wave of anti-imperialist sentiment necessary. Harrington concluded that to sway the public opinion in favor of the

[22] Thomas A. Bailey, "Was the Presidential Election of 1900 A Mandate on Imperialism?," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 24, no. 1 (1937): 43, https://doi.org/10.2307/1891336.

opponents of expansion, the AIL was created. Harrington also identified the flaws within the organization, as he points out that the disagreements within the AIL often obstructed the common goal that these people shared.[23]

Whereas Bailey and Harrington emphasized public opinion, Julius Pratt approached imperialism from another angle in his book *Expansionists of 1898: The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Island.* He argued that the driving forces were of financial and religious nature, much to what other scholars later would also emphasize, and that the political, religious and business leaders of that time used these motives to shape the popular opinion. Pratt pointed out that the Philippines was the gateway to trade with the Far East and that the annexation of Hawaii was motivated to replace the unstable Polynesian rulers. The church would also have welcomed the opportunity to make "the little brown brother a worthy object of missionary zeal."[24]

The study of American imperialism emerged again soon after World War II. In contrast to their colleagues in the years before the war, historians now approached the subject through other lenses, that emphasized movements and social issues in American society. For instance, Christopher Lasch examined the relation between imperialism and race and how the supporters and opponents of expansion embedded racism in their arguments. He highlights the anti-imperialist side and points out the flaws in their argument. Lasch argues that most of the anti-imperialists shared the same Darwinian view and had "accepted the inequality of man", therefore diverging from the philosophy of the Declaration of Independence.[25] However, Lasch concludes, the anti-imperialists should not be condemned for their racist

---

[23] Harrington, "The Anti-Imperialist Movement in the United States, 1898-1900."
[24] Julius W. Pratt, *Expansionists of 1898: The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Islands*, The Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1936); Thomas A. Bailey, "Expansionists of 1898: The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Islands," *The American Historical Review* 42, no. 4 (1937): 807, https://doi.org/10.2307/1839520.
[25] Christopher Lasch, "The Anti-Imperialists, the Philippines, and the Inequality of Man," *The Journal of Southern History* 24, no. 3 (1958): 321, https://doi.org/10.2307/2954987.

approach: "The fact is that the atmosphere of the late nineteenth century was so thoroughly permeated with racist thought (reinforced by Darwinism) that few men managed to escape it. The idea that certain cultures and races were naturally inferior to others was almost universally held by educated, middle-class, respectable Americans."[26]

Others, such as William Leuchtenburg, argued that the Progressive movement in the United States had a significant role in supporting imperialism. In *Progressivism and Imperialism: The Progressive Movement and American Foreign policy, 1898-1916*, Leuchtenburg argues that the Progressives saw no problem in imperialism, even though some of the Progressive ideals were anti-imperialist of nature. In fact, progressivism and imperialism thrived together. Both expressed the same political philosophy and tended to judge actions by its results rather than its methods. The prospect of expanding the American domain of freedom and democracy heavily outweighed the arguments against imperialism and therefore, the Progressives gladly supported Theodore Roosevelt. This led to the conclusion by Leuchtenburg that Roosevelt's rise to the presidency and the Progressives supporting him is the best expression of the connection between progressivism and imperialism.[27]

Serious pushback against imperialism appeared during the 1960s and 1970s. The tensions of the Cold War and the Vietnam War combined with the emergence of the Wisconsin School and the New Left as dominant movements in the field of foreign policy led to an abundance of imperialism studies. Naturally, the critique on American foreign policy reignited interest in the origin of the American empire, as historians looked for parallels between the Philippine-American War and the Vietnam War. Richard Welch argued that

---

[26] Lasch, 330.

[27] William E. Leuchtenburg, "Progressivism and Imperialism: The Progressive Movement and American Foreign Policy, 1898-1916," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 39, no. 3 (1952): 483–84, https://doi.org/10.2307/1895006.

American imperialism was the answer to an uncertain American future. The United States, convinced of its superiority, was uncertain of what the future would hold for the nation, as there was no more frontier to conquer. Expanding its territories overseas was the outcome that could take this doubt away.[28] William Appleman Williams' book *Empire as a Way of Life* carries the same notion as Welch's book, although Williams argues that the euphoria over acquiring the overseas territories concealed a larger issue. The expansion of the American empire required the development of an ideology to maintain and extend that empire. This is where, according to Williams, the idea of the United States as a benevolent policeman, "to improve the world just as we have perfected ourselves", originated.

> Our fundamental, persistent way of life is predicated upon a charming but ruthless faith in infinite progress fueled by endless growth. Hence empire as a way of life projected beyond the continent of the world. Growth is the key to individual liberty and progress. The substance of growth is empire. Thus empire is benevolent. Hence the policeman who guarantees the growth of the law and order that is necessary to progress is undeniably benevolent.[29]

Others expanded on the territory that Pratt briefly touched on earlier: commercial reasons. One example is *The New Empire* by Walter LaFeber, who argues that the economic forces appeared to be "the most important causes and results in the nation's diplomatic history of that period."[30] He argued that American control of overseas territories in the mid-1890s was the logical consequence of two assumptions being met. First, the agreement among the American corporate sector and the policy makers that overseas expansion would solve the political, social and economic problems. Second, the belief that the United States

---

[28] Richard E. Welch Jr., *Response to Imperialism: The United States and the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1979).
[29] William Appleman Williams, *Empire as a Way of Life: An Essay on the Causes and Character of America's Present Predicament, along with a Few Thoughts about an Alternative* (New York [etc.]: Oxford University Press, 1980), 112–13.
[30] Walter LaFeber, *The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898*, Cornell Paperbacks (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1963), 8.

needed to protect those overseas assets by establishing "strategic bases if it hoped to compete successfully with government-supported European enterprises in Asia and Latin America."[31]

The interest in imperialism also benefitted the scholarship on the AIL. A significant amount of material on the anti-imperialist movement was being published, as scholars were eager to find parallels between the AIL and the Vietnam Anti-War movement. E. Berkeley Tompkins' *Anti-imperialism in the United States: the Great Debate, 1890-1920* is, as claimed by Tompkins, the first comprehensive study of anti-imperialism in the United States. He particularly highlights the members of the AIL, as he claims that the diverse make-up of the AIL was its biggest advantage. Due to the various backgrounds and professions of its members, the AIL was able to engage Americans in every layer of society. In his conclusion, Tompkins connects the earlier period of American imperialism with the state of American foreign policy at that time. He argues that the acquisition of the Philippines was a grave mistake, as "the position of the United States in contemporary international affairs would certainly be stronger, especially with the people of the crucial Third World, if the nation had never become an imperialist power."[32]

In his essay *Anti-Imperialists and Imperialists Compared: Racism and Economic* Expansion, Richard Welch challenged the idea of the anti-imperialists "being as racist and (…) rather more selfish and hypocritical" and argued that the Imperialism debate of 1898 was more than "an idle bit of shadow-boxing between like-minded Social-Darwinists who quarreled only over the degree to which American imperialism should be camouflaged."[33] He argued that, despite the "strong antipathy to the idea of 'tropical races' being incorporated in

[31] LaFeber, 412.
[32] Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the United States*, 293; Tompkins, "The Old Guard."
[33] Richard E. Welch Jr., "Anti-Imperialists and Imperialists Compared: Racism and Economic Expansion," in *American Imperialism & Anti-Imperialism*, ed. Thomas G. Patterson (New York, NY.: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1973), 119.

the American Republic", there still was a distinction between the idea of differences among races and the notion of a master race.[34]

Robert Beisner also emphasized the members of the AIL, especially those of the top tier of the organization. He examined twelve key members, all part of the anti-imperialist mugwumps, and their arguments against imperialism. Despite the differences amongst them, Beisner notes how they all shared the same idea that an American empire was undesirable: "Imperialism to them was both an example and a product of a large number of unfortunate and dangerous developments that had taken place since the Civil War."[35]

Lastly, there was Daniel Schirmer who focused on the New England part of the anti-imperialist movement. According to Schirmer, it was no coincidence that some of the loudest voices against imperialism belonged to Massachusettsians and other New Englanders. In the years before the acquisition of the Philippines, Massachusetts had led the charge in the anti-slavery crusade and contributed to the victory of the Northern states. The prospect of a revival of slavery due to a foreign war, in which the Filipino would replace the recently freed black slaves, needed to be avoided at all costs.[36] Apart from highlighting the New England branch, Schirmer emphasized the relation between imperialism and racism. He credits the anti-imperialists to be the first "to point out a connection between the struggle against imperialist foreign policy and the fight for black rights at home."[37]

The spike in imperialism material of the nineteen sixties and nineteen seventies seemed to decline in the following decades, before rising again at the turn and into the first decade of the twenty-first century. The pattern corresponded with what happened during the

---

[34] Welch Jr., 121–22.
[35] Robert L. Beisner, *Twelve against Empire: The Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900* (New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1968), 222.
[36] Daniel B. Schirmer, *Republic or Empire: American Resistance to the Philippine War* (Cambridge, MA: Schenkman, 1972), 7–8.
[37] Schirmer, 259.

Cold War and Vietnam War. The idea of American empire that had been rejected in the years before, changed after the September 11, 2001.[38] This time, the United States was embroiled in wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. With the accusation of imperialism being one of the factors that had fueled the wars, historians revisited earlier imperialism debates. The emphasis in these works often lies on circumstances that allowed the United States to grow to the status of an imperial power and the actual transition to empire. In *Ideology and U.S. foreign policy,* Michael Hunt identified three core values that significantly influenced America's foreign policy in the early twentieth century: the promotion of liberty, the drive to maintain the white American's supremacy and its supportive attitude towards revolutions. These three core values –in particular the promotion of liberty– formed a keystone in a nationalist foreign policy ideology that, when presented the opportunity in the late 1890s, "McKinley had warmly embraced it."[39] Daniel Immerwahr argues that the United States, faced with the question of overseas expansion, encountered a trilemma. Values such as republicanism, white supremacy and overseas expansion all mattered here, yet "the country could have at most two." Looking at its history, republicanism and white supremacy had shaped the country to its current form. Overseas expansion could possibly upset that balance. However, expansion was the next phase of Manifest Destiny and the imperialists were willing to put aside republicanism, at least for the lesser deemed races, to start that phase.[40]

The essay collection *Colonial Crucible* by Alfred McCoy and Francisco Scarano covers the transition to empire more extensively. They find that the United States, without the experience of a colonial infrastructure, was "suddenly confronted with the complexities of colonial rule in an era that witnessed both intensified imperial expansion and a resurgence of

---

[38] Charles S. Maier, *Among Empires: American Ascendancy and Its Predecessors* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), 4.
[39] Michael H. Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009), 41.
[40] Daniel Immerwahr, *How to Hide an Empire: A Short History of the Greater United States*, 1st ed. (London: Vintage, 2020), 80–81.

nationalist resistance" and that "American officials had to deal with native elites determined to realize their own nationalist agendas for change either by confronting or collaborating with the new colonials."[41]

Paul Kramer's *The Blood of Government* studies the Philippines under American rule, with an emphasis on the connection between race and empire. He argues that where other historians examined "colonial racial formations as 'exports' or 'projections' of prior, 'domestic ones'", the conditions of empire in the Philippines established new racial formations. It created an "inclusionary racial formation that both invited and delimited Filipino political agency in colonial state-building."[42] For instance, Kramer illustrates how racialization of the Filipinos during the Philippine-American War as savages justified how the American soldiers waged war upon them, sometimes to the extent of extermination. In the following years, a different racial formation was instated to "persuade its Filipino participants that they were 'brothers' and not 'serfs'."[43]

The AIL received some new attention as well. Michael Cullinane disputes the image of the anti-imperialists as a movement of "perennial losers." He argues that this one-sided image is mostly based on the AIL's political setbacks and the differences between its members. However, Cullinane finds that the common denominator of the AIL's members – a love for liberty – was the base for the movement's success as an organization of "constitutional, humanitarian, and transnational activism."[44]

Eric Love challenges the idea that race and white supremacy made up a significant part of the pro-imperialist narrative as much as it did for the anti-imperialist narrative. In fact,

---

[41] Alfred W. McCoy, Francisco A. Scarano, and Courtney Johnson, "On the Tropic of Cancer," in *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State* (Madison, Wis: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009), 11.
[42] Paul A. Kramer, *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, & the Philippines* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 3–5.
[43] Kramer, 90, 161.
[44] Cullinane, *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism*, 4.

the imperialists understood the possible risk of building their imperial policies around nonwhites in a time dominated by "racial fear, hatred, reaction and violence." They rather denied that race had any meaning to their plans for expansion nor did they get provoked by the racist accusations of the anti-imperialists. [45]

This thesis diverges from other works regarding the AIL and race, as it concentrates exclusively on the view on race by three different groups within the AIL. Cullinane's *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism* also emphasizes the Anti-Imperialist League, although not exclusively on the issue of race, and other books and articles focus on race, but not that much in the context of the AIL. This thesis determines to what extent the issue of race was a leading component in the AIL's arguments against the annexation of the Philippines, rather than just one argument among many.

Chapter Outline

The chapters of this thesis that concern the three different groups follow the same structure, as each chapter addresses one specific group and the three formulated sub-questions. The first chapter of this thesis emphasizes the rights activists among the AIL. Publications by Moorfield Storey and Herbert Welsh, leading figures within the rights movement, are the foundation to establish the activists' opinions on race and on rights for the Filipinos. The second chapter focuses on the Social Darwinists, Carl Schurz and David Starr Jordan and the third chapter features the white supremacist group, led by Donelson Caffery and Benjamin Tillman.

In the final chapter, the conclusion, the results of the three main chapters will be used to answer the research question of this thesis. It will also include a discussion of the most

[45] Eric Love, *Race over Empire: Racism and U.S. Imperialism, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), xi–xii.

important findings on each group and how the views of each group compare to the other groups.

Chapter 1 The AIL Rights Activists' View on Race in the Case of the Philippine Annexation

The impending annexation of the Philippines and its consequences concerned the many League members with a connection to the reform and abolitionist movements. Particularly, the members who devoted themselves to improve the treatment and status of black people and the Native Americans found that their ideals ran parallel with the League's mission. This interest "made them especially sensitive to the rights and treatment of colored peoples everywhere, and obviously affected their opposition to imperialism."[46] Their views on the equality and rights of the Filipinos ran deep through the argumentation of the rights activists. As they promoted their anti-imperialist ideas, they often invoked the words and interpretations of their champion, Abraham Lincoln: "When the white man governs himself, it is self-government, but when he governs himself and also governs another man, it is more than self-government– that is despotism."[47] This first chapter discusses the views of the AIL rights activists on race by examining texts from Moorfield Storey and Herbert Welsh, two leading authorities on the subject of rights and equality within the League.

To Moorfield Storey and other League members with a background in abolitionism, the annexation of the Philippines was detrimental to everything that Lincoln, the abolitionists, and reformers had achieved thus far. Recreating a situation in which a non-white race was again subordinate to the white American, had to be avoided at all costs. As he argued in a letter to a friend in 1899, the treatment of colored people had violated the nation's founding principles, and the United States paid for it with the Civil War. "No American –least of all, as

[46] Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the United States*, 156–57.
[47] American Anti-Imperialist League, "Platform of the American Anti-Imperialist League," in *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, ed. Frederick Bancroft, vol. 6 (New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1913), 77–79.

I know, yourself– can find any cause for just pride in our dealings with the Indians, or treat our course as a precedent to be followed with another race. We have (…) held them 'in the hollow of our hand,' and we have abused our power."[48] In *Is it Right?* (1900), Storey ends his address by comparing the attitude of the American government to the Pharaoh's attitude towards the Israelites in biblical times: "as we ourselves for three-quarters of a century refused to give the colored race their freedom until we had seen 'every drop of blood drawn by the lash paid by another drawn by the sword,' so we may now make a new experiment of injustice, and again ignore the Declaration of Independence."[49]

In the true fashion of Lincoln's legacy, the equal and just treatment of people –never mind the color of their skin– influenced Storey's views or ideals on race. To him, first and foremost, every person was a human being with a similar human nature: "We may be sure that the essential qualities and tendencies of human nature are the same, whatever the race to which a man belongs and whatever the color of his skin; and in these qualities lie causes which under like conditions produce like effects, whether the scene be set in Asia, Africa, or Europe, and whether the time be now or two thousand years ago."[50] Therefore, Storey's view could not have been more different from the course of the United States government under McKinley and his successors. He criticized the idea, one that was supported by the imperialists, of the Americans as a "superior people, enjoying the highest civilization known to man", who found the people living in the American dependencies inferior "and unfitted to govern themselves." According to McKinley, it was the duty of the United States to fully control them, educate them on language, religion, and science, and "gradually to bring them up to our level as their capacity will admit." This theory also argued that "other civilized

---

[48] Moorfield Storey, *Our New Departure. I. Letter to a Friend, October 21, 1899. II. Speech at Brookline, October 26, 1900.* (Boston: G. H. Ellis, 1901), 4,9, https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000465904.
[49] Moorfield Storey, *Is It Right?* (Chicago, IL: American Anti-Imperialist League, 1900), 13.
[50] Moorfield Storey, *What Shall We Do with Our Dependencies? The Annual Address before the Bar Association of South Carolina, Delivered in Columbia, January 16, 1903* (Boston, MA: G. H. Ellis, 1903), 2.

nations have thus dealt successfully with inferior races, and that we can succeed as well." [51] Advocates of this theory, such as Theodore Roosevelt and Elihu Root, were convinced that the United States was destined to guide the Filipinos. Roosevelt, as quoted by Storey, stated that "what has taken us thirty generations to achieve, we cannot expect to see another race accomplish out of hand, especially when large portions of that race start very far behind the point which our ancestors had reached even thirty generations ago." Elihu Root, the Secretary of War under William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt, had described the Filipinos as "treacherous foes" and had attributed to them "the barbarous cruelty common among uncivilized races." [52]

Storey argued that this theory that emphasized 1) the superiority of the United States and 2) the inability of the Filipinos to govern themselves was preposterous and he condemned Roosevelt and Root for their statements: "It is a bold man who undertakes to say what our ancestors were doing a thousand years ago, and a much bolder who says that large portions of the Filipino race are *very far behind* the point they had then reached. The language, however, clearly indicates how far below the plane of civilization upon which the President places himself and his countrymen are the depths in which the Filipinos dwell."[53] Bringing the Filipinos up to a level of civilization that was on par with the American civilization was according to Storey certainly not a task for the American government nor would it create equality amongst Americans and Filipinos: "Between races the differences are as ineffaceable as between the oak and the palm. Civilization for each race means the development of its powers along the lines fixed by its nature (…) We in our ignorance are trying to make Filipinos into Americans instead of trying to make them better Filipinos."[54]

---

[51] Storey, 3.
[52] Storey, 27.
[53] Storey, 28.
[54] Storey, 21.

As for the so-called inferiority of the Filipinos, Storey referred to the Irish overcoming their inferiority to the British. He based this on the 19th-century British historian Thomas Macauley, who described in *History of England* (1849) the feelings of the Englishmen towards the Irish when James II brought Irish troops back to England. Storey quoted Macauley: "No man of English blood then regarded the aboriginal Irish as his countrymen. (…) They were distinguished from us by more than one moral and intellectual peculiarity. (…) [The Englishman] was a freeman; the Irish were the hereditary serfs of his race."[55] Storey disputed Macauley's observation by listing the accomplishments and contributions of Irish to the world, arguing that they "have won laurels and proved their valor and their ability. How completely has one 'inferior race' demonstrated the falsity of its oppressor's verdict!"[56] According to Storey, this specific precedent proved that the Filipinos should not be viewed as inferior, and their potential should not be overlooked. He admitted that while the European race was superior in some qualities, the Asiatic race was at least equal in qualities that contributed to spiritual elevation.[57]

Storey also pointed out the equality struggles in the United States. Despite the "questions presented by black Americans at home, we propose to raise new questions by subduing brown Asiatics thousands of miles away."[58] Even though promising amendments were made to the constitution after the Civil War, it did not undo the racial prejudice against colored people. They were still discriminated against through other laws: "These laws are passed for the expressed and avowed purpose of disfranchising the negroes. (…) The

---

[55] Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The History of England, from the Accession of James II*, Cambridge Library Collection - British & Irish History, 17th & 18th Centuries (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 332, **quoted in** Moorfield Storey, *What Shall We Do with Our Dependencies? The Annual Address before the Bar Association of South Carolina, Delivered in Columbia, January 16, 1903* (Boston: Geo. H. Ellis Co., 1903).
[56] Storey, *What Shall We Do with Our Dependencies?*, 7.
[57] Storey, 8.
[58] Moorfield Storey, *The Importance to America of Philippine Independence: Address Delivered before the Harvard Democratic Club at the Harvard Union, Cambridge, October 28, 1904.* (Boston, MA: New England Anti-Imperialist League, 1904), 6.

Republican party, which in its last national platform asserts that 'it came into existence dedicated (…) to the great task of arresting the extension of human slavery'; (…) finds no words to condemn this assault upon human rights."[59] Storey questioned the ability of the United States government to avoid another race problem, and whether the American people really wanted "to be responsible for despotic government over a foreign race, who long for independence", several thousands of miles away.[60]

As the government claimed to be superior, Storey asked himself how that superiority had shown in dealing with preceding race problems. Especially in the southern states, the racial formation of the inferior, colored person remained intact, often accompanied by crimes committed against colored people that were considered the work of savages. Storey saw this as a sign of "how contact with an inferior race brutalizes us" and warned against the normalization of this behavior, as the perpetrators were not held responsible.[61] His worries about this behavior transferring to the Philippines were confirmed only a few years later, when in 1906 the United States army slaughtered an estimated 1,000 Moros, an ethnic Muslim group, on the island of Jolo during a counterinsurgency operation. Storey denounced the action: "The spirit which slaughters brown men in Jolo is the spirit which lynches black men in the South. When such crimes go unpunished (…), the youth of the country is taught an evil lesson. Race prejudice is strengthened and the love of justice, the cornerstone of free institutions, is weakened."[62]

The activists within the AIL were clear on what should happen to the Filipinos regarding their rights: the Filipinos should have the right to self-government, as they, according to the anti-imperialists, had a capable government in place. Yet, the American

[59] Storey, 8.
[60] Storey, 20.
[61] Storey, 12.
[62] Moorfield Storey, *The Moro Massacre* (Boston, MA: Anti-Imperialist League, 1906), 2–3.

government never had the intention of bestowing this right to them. This issue had already been addressed during the Congressional debates on the ratification of the Treaty of Paris when the Democratic Senator Samuel McEnery (Louisiana) had proposed a resolution that stated:

> That by ratification of the pending treaty of peace with Spain, it is not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of said islands into the citizenship of the United States, nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States. But it is the intention of the United States to establish on said islands a government suitable to the wants and conditions of the inhabitants of said islands, to prepare them for local self-government, and in due time to make such disposition of said islands as will best promote the interests of the citizens of the United States and the inhabitants of said islands.[63]

The resolution passed through Congress with 26 yeas to 22 nays, whereas a resolution that would have granted the Filipinos independence as soon as a stable government had been established, was defeated by the deciding vote of Vice-President Hobart a few days earlier.[64] The addition of the McEnery resolution did not sit well with the League: "After the insurgents had driven out the Spaniards under our general directions, and had organized a government which their understanding of the bargain justified them in doing, we proceeded, without asking their consent, to buy sovereignty over them."[65] The benevolent purpose that the American government pursued, was "to govern the Philippine Islands for the benefit and welfare and uplifting of the people of the islands, and gradually to extend to them as they shall show themselves fit to exercise it a greater and greater measure of popular self-government."[66]

---

[63] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 1847
[64] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 1845
[65] Herbert Welsh, "The Ethics of Our Philippine Policy," *International Journal of Ethics* 10, no. 3 (1900): 314.
[66] Moorfield Storey, *The Duty of the United States towards the Philippine Islands* (Cambridge, MA: Press of Cambridge, 1908), 7.

The AIL, however, was convinced that this would leave the Filipinos to have "no political rights, no assured voice in their own government; only such privileges as Americans may see fit to give to them."[67] The argument that the United States had the right to rule over the Philippines as the Filipinos were believed to be incompetent to do so themselves, found resistance in the AIL. Moorfield Storey, in his letter to a friend who supported the imperialist side, argued that, by annexing the Philippines, "you would decide for your fellowman without consulting him, *first*, that he is savage, and, *second*, what sort of government is best for him; and then you would force him to accept it. You would decide for yourself that you are wiser and better than he, and by superior strength compel him to obey you."[68]

Storey connected how Filipinos were denied their rights with the situation of black people in the southern states. The Republican party, Storey admitted, had promoted freedom and equality and was responsible for giving black Americans the ability to be protected by the Constitution. As "the party of equal rights", it "must believe in the equal rights of all men and it must put these principles into practice or it has abandoned its high mission."[69] Then how was it justifiable that these brown Christian people were deemed unfit to govern themselves, whereas the millions of black men were fit not only to govern themselves, "but to govern their white neighbors?"[70]

Since the right to self-government was not an option in the foreseeable future and as the Filipinos became American subjects, Storey and his fellow activists assumed that the Filipinos should at least be able to enjoy the rights laid out in the American Constitution.

Yet again, this did not occur, much to the AIL's dismay: "Our country today exercises absolute power over more than ten million of human beings, – Filipinos, Porto Ricans, and

---

[67] Storey, *Is It Right?*, 3.
[68] Storey, *Our New Departure. I. Letter to a Friend, October 21, 1899. II. Speech at Brookline, October 26, 1900.*, 6.
[69] Storey, *The Importance to America of Philippine Independence*, 9.
[70] Storey, 9.

Hawaiians, – twice as many as the whole population of the United States a century ago. (…) They are not American citizens, nor are they likely to become such." They had no Constitutional rights, such as the right of habeas corpus and the right of trial by jury, and the people that ruled over them, the President and Congress, could give or deny them privileges at any point. To the League, this made the United States government no better than the former owner of the Philippines, the Spanish empire. [71] If the United States had supported and protected the Filipino government until the moment that it was fully ready to exercise its authority and resist the urge of "the temptation to which others have succumbed", the Americans would have gained "the affection and sympathy of these people. (…) The moral influence so exerted would have given us prestige not only in the East but in South America, to the great benefit of our commercial interests."[72]

As with the issue of race, the activists within the AIL believed in equal rights for the Filipinos and the other subjects in the American territories. Herbert Welsh, the advocate for Native American rights, argued: "In the Christian sense the Filipino is now our neighbor; and it is our duty to treat him not as one from whom we seek to realize a selfish profit, but as a man whose rights of every kind we are bound to respect, and whose welfare in due subordination to the law of our own being we must first consider."[73] He argued that there was a doctrine in the United States that "teaches that the moment we get beyond the individual and reach the larger social group or nation we must, in order to promote our strength and growth, violate the rights of others, and even rob and kill them."[74] He referred to his own experience with the treatment of the Native Americans, as some people argued that the

[71] Storey, *What Shall We Do with Our Dependencies?*, 1; Storey, *Our New Departure. I. Letter to a Friend, October 21, 1899. II. Speech at Brookline, October 26, 1900.*, 6.
[72] Welsh, "The Ethics of Our Philippine Policy," 315.
[73] Herbert Welsh, *The Other Man's Country; an Appeal to Conscience* (Philadelphia, PA: J.B. Lippincott, 1900), 10.
[74] Welsh, "The Ethics of Our Philippine Policy," 315–16.

"extermination, removal, or wrong of some kind, was a hard necessity in our treatment of the Indians, in order that a greater good might come to civilized humanity in our own advancement."[75] Welsh believed that it was "perfectly possible to meet all the needs of the growing race in the best and most practical way, and yet to preserve to the individual of the weaker race his rights and opportunities."[76]

The entire AIL, including the activists, had an incredible fascination with the philosophy behind the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, and the activists found no greater disrespect of the documents than the annexation of the Philippines. Moorfield Storey believed that the Constitution's purpose, "to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure [sic] domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity" was missed in the case of the Philippines. The government that was supposed to secure "certain benefits to the people of this country, and especially to insure for them and their children the blessings of liberty" was apparently only there for the American citizens.[77] Welsh pointed out that the foundation of American democracy was that "men are created to be equal; not equal in talent or wealth, of course, but in rights: equal in the right to develop, without a straight-jacket being put on them by others", and that "government *par excellence* derives its just powers from the consent of the governed."[78] Since the Filipinos were not granted the same rights as American citizens and had the American government forced upon them, Welsh argued that this government by force was a "tyranny."[79] Storey argued that the only stable foundation of a republic was "the belief of the people that men have equal rights." To Storey,

---

[75] Welsh, 316.
[76] Welsh, 316.
[77] "U.S. Senate: Constitution of the United States," accessed August 15, 2021, https://www.senate.gov/civics/constitution_item/constitution.htm; Storey, *Our New Departure. I. Letter to a Friend, October 21, 1899. II. Speech at Brookline, October 26, 1900.*, 7.No Reference
[78] Welsh, "The Ethics of Our Philippine Policy," 310.
[79] Welsh, 310.

race and rights were an integral part of that belief. Once that belief was twisted, such as when the stronger, wiser, or better men are taught to have the right to rule others, that foundation crumbles.[80]

The views of the activists on race and rights tie – unsurprisingly– right into the AIL's main argument. Considering what the United States itself had experienced to become independent from a tyrannic empire and the belief that all men are created equal and have certain unalienable rights, the activists believed that all of this would be for naught with the annexation of the Philippines. As advocates for equal rights and treatment, their arguments followed precisely what the Constitution prescribed: that the Filipinos, initially, should have had the right to self-government without another government looming over them. Second, that despite the annexation, the Filipinos should be recognized as a part of the United States and therefore should receive the same treatment and protection as American citizens.

The activists among the AIL argued on the fundamental principle that whether it concerned Filipino, black, Native, or white people, everyone was a human being, and deserved to be treated equally. Treating colored people differently from white people had severely affected the United States in the past and getting trapped in another unpredictable race situation was undesirable. Moreover, the domestic race situation was still an active issue that exposed, at least according to the AIL, the inability of the American government and the Republican party to honor its promise of freedom and equality to the black population. The League believed that the government's inability, as well as the experience from historical dealings with black and Native people, would likely extend to the governing of the Filipinos, much to the detriment of the latter. The AIL also disapproved of the notion of the American government assuming its superiority over the inferior Filipinos and the mission to uplift the Philippines close to the level of the United States.

---

[80] Storey, *What Shall We Do with Our Dependencies?*, 58.

Regarding their view on rights, the activists within the AIL followed the same line as their opinion on race: equality was the most important thing in dealing with the Filipinos. Moorfield Storey and Herbert Welsh argued that Filipinos were perfectly capable of governing themselves and should have been given the right to self-government. With that out of range due to the acquisition of the Philippines by the Americans, the activists of the AIL shifted their attention to the conferment of the rights and protections that the American Constitution provided to American citizens.

Due to their devotion to equality, the views on race and rights by the activists connect well with the AIL's main argument against the annexation of the Philippines. Governing the Philippines contradicted the American founding philosophy, which claimed to pursue equality and rights for everybody. If that equality was taken away or could not be provided, it would be detrimental for the Philippines as well as the United States.

Chapter 2 The AIL Social Darwinist's View on Race in the Case of the Philippine Annexation

In the efforts to justify their ideals, both the imperialists and the anti-imperialists turned to the idea of natural selection.[81] As Christopher Lasch pointed out, the idea of inequality among men and the inferiority of some races to others was part of the zeitgeist. Applying those ideas of natural selection, inspired by the likes of Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer, to the anti-imperialist cause made perfect sense in the eyes of the AIL's Social Darwinists.[82] After all, even the prominent Social Darwinists among the League, Carl Schurz and David Starr Jordan, believed in the same "peaceful settlement of all international controversies" and "devoted themselves to the causes of international arbitration and peace", just as the other League members.[83] This chapter will discuss the views of the Social Darwinists within the Anti-Imperialist League by examining texts from Schurz and Jordan.

The Social Darwinist contingent of the League found the annexation of the Philippines undesirable for multiple reasons, yet the belief of the inequality of man was its starting point. Based on their defense of earlier expansions of the United States, such as the Louisiana Purchase and the acquisition of Alaska, controlling the Philippines did not meet those requirements. For instance, the former had been, barring Alaska, on the same continent and contiguous to the American borders and being "chiefly peopled by nomad barbarians

---

[81] Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought, 1860-1915* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1944), 146.

[82] Spencer interpreted Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* and his ideas on selection as a "survival of the fittest" and tried to translate it to the field of sociology. Spencer argued that "as societies evolve, they become more complex by elaborating different types of social structures (and corresponding cultures) along four fundamental axes." This evolution of societies was, in Spencer's view, often driven by warfare. For more information on Spencer's idea and its reception in the United States, see: Jonathan H. Turner and Seth Abrutyn, "Returning the 'Social' to Evolutionary Sociology: Reconsidering Spencer, Durkheim, and Marx's Models of 'Natural' Selection," *Sociological Perspectives* 60, no. 3 (2017): 529–56; Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought, 1860-1915* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1944).

[83] Tompkins, *Anti-Imperialism in the United States*, 90.

who made no use of the land, and whose rights the Anglo-Saxon has never cared to consider.[84] Moreover, these territories were situated in a temperate climate zone, where democratic institutions would thrive, making mass immigration possible, and they "could be organized as territories in the usual manner, with the expectation that they would presently come into the Union as self-governing States with populations substantially homogenous to our own."[85]

In contrast, the Philippines were situated in the heart of the tropics, a region that Jordan described as "Nature's asylum for degenerates."[86] Whereas the activists of the AIL were convinced that the Filipinos could and should be treated equally, the Social Darwinists were more concerned of how the Philippines and the Filipinos would be harmful to the Anglo-Saxon race to which the Americans belonged. To Schurz and Jordan, it was "a fact of universal experience" that the tropical regions of the world had certain qualities –qualities that could not be taken away– that had prevented Anglo-Saxons and other men of Northern races to ever mass migrate and settle there.[87] Moreover, there was simply no room left for any Americans, since the Philippines were already densely populated with races "to whom the tropical climate is congenial: (…) Malays, Tagals, Filipinos, Chinese, Japanese, Negritos and various more or less barbarous tribes", a population that "cannot be exterminated on the one hand, nor made economically potent on the other, except for slavery."[88] Even the British, "the best colonizers in history", had never successfully established "democratic

---

[84] Carl Schurz, "The Issue of Imperialism: Convocation Address Delivered before the University of Chicago, Jan. 4, 1899.," in *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, ed. Frederick Bancroft, vol. 6 (New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1913), 5; David Starr Jordan, *The Question of the Philippines: An Address Delivered before the Graduate Club of Leland Stanford Junior University, on February 14, 1899* (Palo Alto, CA: John. J. Valentine, 1899), 23.
[85] Schurz, "The Issue of Imperialism: Convocation Address Delivered before the University of Chicago, Jan. 4, 1899.," 5.
[86] Jordan, *The Question of the Philippines*, 24.
[87] Schurz, "The Issue of Imperialism: Convocation Address Delivered before the University of Chicago, Jan. 4, 1899.," 6–7.
[88] Schurz, 6; Jordan, *The Question of the Philippines*, 24.

commonwealths of the Anglo-Saxon type, like those in America or Australia" in the tropics.[89] To the Social Darwinists, the prospect of dealing with inferior races in an environment that had never successfully known the civilization of the Anglo-Saxon race was therefore not worth pursuing.

In his speech *The Question of the Philippines*, Jordan argued that white men could "live through officialism alone", which was not possible in a tropical region. The tropics, he claimed, caused Anglo-Saxons and other civilized races to degenerate mentally, morally, and physically.[90] This race degeneration, which Jordan described as "the continuous lowering of the mental or physical powers of each successive generation", manifested itself in three variations: race decline, personal degeneration, and social decay. It was caused by "unwholesome conditions which destroy first the bravest, strongest, and most active, leaving feeble, indolent, and cowardly to perpetuate the species", conditions that, according to Jordan, were apparent in the Philippines.[91] Jordan believed that people in the tropics had a bigger chance on personal decay: "The swarm of malarial organisms, the loss of social restrictions, the reduced value of life, the lack of moral standards, all tend to promote individual laxity and recklessness."[92] By abiding by the famous line in Rudyard Kipling's *The White Man's Burden*, "Send forth the best ye breed", Jordan concluded that "with the selection of the best for exile and destruction, the standard of the race at home inevitably declines."[93]

---

[89] Schurz, "The Issue of Imperialism: Convocation Address Delivered before the University of Chicago, Jan. 4, 1899.," 8.
[90] Jordan, *The Question of the Philippines*, 24.
[91] Jordan, 24.
[92] Jordan, 25.
[93] David Starr Jordan, *Imperial Democracy: A Study of the Relation of Government by the People, Equality before the Law, and Other Tenets of Democracy, to the Demands of a Vigorous Foreign Policy and Other Demands of Imperial Dominion* (New York, NY: D. Appleton, 1899), 110.

As one-sided as their view on race was, the Social Darwinists' view on rights for the Filipinos was more ambivalent and – at times– contradicting. Considering their view on the inferior races, the Social Darwinists believed that the Filipinos and the Philippines lacked the necessary qualities to ever be on an equal level with American standards. They frowned upon the idea that under American guidance, the Filipinos would adapt to American standards and institutions. After all, the nation "cannot expand where freedom cannot go. Neither the people, nor the institutions of the United States can ever occupy the Philippines."[94] Most of the Filipinos were "utterly alien to us, not only in origin and language, but in habits, traditions, ways of thinking, principles, ambitions– in short, in most things that are of the greatest importance in human intercourse and especially in political cooperation."[95] In fact, the situation of the Filipinos would only deteriorate more if American institutions were installed in the Philippines, because "under the influences of their tropical climate, they would prove incapable of becoming assimilated to the Anglo-Saxon. They would, therefore, remain in the population of this Republic a hopelessly heterogeneous element– in some respects much more hopeless than the colored people now living among us."[96] As to the Filipinos, the Americans would always be unsympathetic foreigners, even more than the Spaniards were to them. As Schurz said: "People of our race are but too much inclined to have little tenderness for the rights of what we regard as inferior races, especially those of darker skin. It is of ominous significance that to so many of our soldiers the Filipinos were only 'niggers', and that they likened their fights against them to the 'shooting of rabbits.'" [97]

---

[94] Jordan, *The Question of the Philippines*, 25.
[95] Schurz, "The Issue of Imperialism: Convocation Address Delivered before the University of Chicago, Jan. 4, 1899.," 8.
[96] Schurz, 8.
[97] Carl Schurz, "The Policy of Imperialism: Address at the Anti-Imperialistic Conference in Chicago, Oct. 17, 1899.," in *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, ed. Frederick Bancroft, vol. 6 (New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1913), 112.

If the Filipinos could not handle themselves when confronted with American values and ideals, then what was to become of them? One of the options was granting them the right to self-rule, which was endorsed by Carl Schurz. If Congress had decided that the Cubans were capable of self-government, how did that not apply to the Philippines and Puerto Rico? Schurz wondered how "you sincerely recognize the right to freedom and independence of one and refuse the same right to another in the same situation, and then take his lands? Would not that be double-dealing of the most shameless sort?"[98]

Of course, having a government that resembled the Anglo-Saxon idea was out of the Filipinos' grasp, yet, Schurz argued, "they may succeed in establishing a tolerable order of things in their fashion, as Mexico, after many decades of turbulent disorder, succeeded at last, under Porfirio Diaz, in having a strong and orderly government of her kind."[99] Surely, this kind of government would not be accepted within the American Union, but it would help the Filipinos in building a decent government structure and respectable relations with the rest of the world. In that sense, Schurz approved American interference with the Filipinos, to "put them on their feet, and then give them the benefit of that humanitarian spirit which, as we claim, led us into the war for the liberation of Cuba. To this end, we should keep our troops on the islands until their people have constructed governments and organized forces of their own for the maintenance of order."[100] However, this should be the only exception, since Schurz argued that "the duties that we owe to the Cubans and the Porto Ricans and the Filipinos and the Tagals of the Asiatic islands" did not automatically relieve the Americans from their duties to their own citizens: "I deny that they compel us to aggravate our race troubles, to bring upon us the constant danger of war and to subject our people to the galling

[98] Schurz, "The Issue of Imperialism: Convocation Address Delivered before the University of Chicago, Jan. 4, 1899.," 24–25.
[99] Schurz, 34.
[100] Schurz, 34.

burden of increasing armaments. (…) Whatever our duties to them may be, our duties to our own country and people stand first."[101]

David Jordan, on the other hand, found no prospect in helping the Filipinos to work out their version of self-government. The available solutions, self-rule or imperialism, were both "virtually impossible."[102] He pointed out that one of the traits of American expansion should be the "*equality of all men before the law*", something that could not be granted to the Filipinos, whether it was due to the unwillingness of the American government or the Social Darwinist belief that the Filipinos would not be able to benefit from it.[103] Jordan thought it to be better that the Filipinos worked out their own destiny, "or else go into slavery. Perhaps the latter is their manifest destiny."[104]

There was one other solution, which was to bring in the Philippines and the other overseas territories into the American political arena. This scenario clashed with the Social Darwinist idea though, and the negatives heavily outweighed the positives. Yet Jordan suggested this as a last resort, since it would still be a better option than resorting to imperialism. According to him, it was better "to endow them with the rights of our citizens, to give them the services of our own politicians and let natives and carpet-baggers work out their own salvation under our forms of law. I cannot imagine any other government much worse than this might be, but it is safer than Imperialism, if these lands and these people become a part of our democratic nation."[105] At least this option would respect the republican form and the American civil government ideals. Imperialism, in Jordan's view, would bring the United States into a state of half democracy, half empire, a state that the "Union can never

[101] Schurz, 31–32.
[102] Jordan, *The Question of the Philippines*, 27.
[103] Jordan, 32.
[104] Jordan, 58.
[105] Jordan, 55.

endure": "We cannot run a republic in the West and a slave plantation in the East. We must set our bondsmen free, however unready they may be for freedom."[106]

Nevertheless, this was a solution –the lesser of two evils– that even Jordan did not fully support. Right after he spoke about this in *The Question of the Philippines*, Jordan moved to his point that "governing inferior races" remained a dangerous affair: "Wherever degenerate, dependent or alien races are within our borders today, they are not part of the United States. They constitute a social problem; a menace to peace and welfare."[107] Therefore, granting them equality in government would not be beneficial to the Filipinos:

> To admit the Filipinos to equality in government is to degrade our own citizenship with only the slightest prospect of ever raising theirs. (…) The relation of our people to the lower races of men of whatever kind has been one which degrades and exasperates. Every alien race within our borders is, today, an element of danger. When the Anglo-Saxon meets the Negro, the Chinaman, the Indian, the Mexican as fellow-citizens, equal before the law, we have a raw wound in our political organism.[108]

Jordan argued that in a well-functioning democracy, it was essential to have similar aims and purposes throughout the population, as well as the individual's ability to uphold its freedom. If non-Anglo-Saxons (i.e., the Filipinos and other inferior races) could not uphold their rights given by the Americans, the American system with its values and ideals would overrun them.[109]

The denial of inclusion of the Filipinos was supported by Carl Schurz, although Schurz's reason for concern differed from Jordan's. To Schurz, the most alarming was the

---

[106] Jordan, 55; Despite the abolition of slavery in the United States, slavery was allowed in the region of Sulu due to the Bates Treaty. In this agreement, the Sultan of Sulu had recognized the sovereignty of the United States but had been promised in return that the United States would not meddle with the customs and affairs of the Sultan and the region of Sulu. For more information see: Michael Salman, *The Embarrassment of Slavery: Controversies over Bondage and Nationalism in the American Colonial Philippines* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001).
[107] Jordan, *Imperial Democracy*, 44.
[108] Jordan, *The Question of the Philippines*, 62.
[109] Jordan, 62.

prospect of the new American acquisitions participating in the American democracy, and the inability of the American people to stand up to this if imperialism became the norm. If the Philippines and other new territories would become states on the same level as the continental states, Schurz argued, "they will not only be permitted to govern themselves as to their home concerns, but they will take part in governing the whole Republic, in governing us, by sending Senators and Representatives into our Congress to help make our laws, and by voting for President and Vice-President to give our National Government its Executive."[110] Schurz found the introduction of dozens of Congress members and votes to the Electoral College, to represent "people utterly alien and mostly incapable of assimilation to us in their tropical habitation– to make our laws and elect our Presidents, and incidentally to help us lift up the Philippines to a higher plane of civilization" too shocking to be even entertained.[111]

The Social Darwinists held America's founding principles and its democracy in high regard, even though their views on race and rights regarding inferior races would suggest otherwise. Their belief in the inferiority of certain races did not suppress their beliefs in equality and the rights laid out in the Constitution. However, whether the Constitution was endangered by annexation, was an issue among the Social Darwinists Schurz and Jordan. Carl Schurz feared that the imperialist course would destroy the democracy at home and was concerned that the "great paean of human liberty, the American Declaration of Independence" had lost its value. The Declaration, "with its talk about human equality and 'consent of the governed,'" would be reduced to "antiquated rubbish": "Its fundamental principle was that 'governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.' (…) If you tell me that we cannot govern the people of those new possessions in accordance with that principle, then I answer that this is a reason why this democracy should not attempt

[110] Schurz, "The Issue of Imperialism: Convocation Address Delivered before the University of Chicago, Jan. 4, 1899.," 8.
[111] Schurz, 13–14.

to govern them at all."[112] The government of the people, for the people and by the people would then turn into "a government of one part of the people, the strong, over another part, the weak", something that was undesirable for a democracy:

> A democracy cannot so deny its faith as to the vital conditions of its being– it cannot long play the King over subject populations without creating in itself ways of thinking and habits of action most dangerous to its own vitality– most dangerous especially to those classes of society which are the least powerful in assertion, and most helpless in the defense of their rights. Let the poor and the men who earn their bread by the labor of their hands pause and consider well before they give their assent to a policy so deliberately forgetful of the equality of rights.[113]

Whereas Schurz believed that annexation would severely endanger the American core values of the Constitution, David Jordan offered a contrasting opinion. He argued that the argument of annexation as a violation of the American Constitution was not conclusive enough to be "fatal to our Constitution or fatal to democracy": "The only poison that can kill is personal corruption, the moral rottenness of our people. (…) May this shame be enduring, for it is our guarantee that we shall not do the like again."[114] That corruption would inevitably follow and, in time, would let the American public realize that annexing the Philippines was a mistake. Jordan: "The appointment of civil officials in the Philippines means the carnival of the spoilsmen. The United States must prepare itself for scandal and corruption in greater measure than it has ever yet known."[115]

Nonetheless, the Social Darwinist view on race and rights relate to the AIL's overarching argument. To Jordan and perhaps more to Schurz, the acquisition of new

---

[112] Carl Schurz, "For Truth, Justice and Liberty: Address Delivered at Cooper Union, New York City, Sept. 28, 1900, in Opposition to the Re-Election of President McKinley," in *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, ed. Frederick Bancroft, vol. 6 (New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1913), 236; Schurz, "The Issue of Imperialism: Convocation Address Delivered before the University of Chicago, Jan. 4, 1899.," 10.
[113] Schurz, "The Issue of Imperialism: Convocation Address Delivered before the University of Chicago, Jan. 4, 1899.," 10–11.
[114] Jordan, *Imperial Democracy*, 151–52.
[115] Jordan, 153.

territories –inhabited by inferior races– meant that the important values of the American democracy were left behind. Maintaining the form of a democratic government at home, while at the same time knowing that holding of the colonies was only viable through an institution as slavery was in their eyes not sustainable. On the other hand, allowing the Filipinos the virtues of American democracy, as per the Constitution, was also not going to solve the problem; the Filipinos were unable to improve themselves, and Americans and other Anglo-Saxons would only deteriorate in the tropics.

The Social Darwinists' views on race and rights were primarily built on the belief of the inequality of men. They argued that the Filipinos, like other non-Anglo-Saxon or Nordic races, did not have the capacity to understand or use the institutions that had benefitted the Americans. The question to the Social Darwinists remained: why would one give someone the gift of democracy, equality, and rights if they were not able to use that for their own good? Moreover, building the right framework to rule these overseas territories in the same way as the United States would require American presence, and like any other member of the Anglo-Saxon race, Americans would be affected by the tropical climate and the many barbarous tribes that lived there.

Unlike the activists among the AIL, the Social Darwinists had little care for the destiny and the rights of the Filipinos. As Jordan said, if the Anglo-Saxon race would meet the inferior races of the world as equal, that would cause a wound in American politics. They seemed more concerned about what imperialism would do to the stable democracy that had ruled over the United States for roughly two centuries. The fear was that the United States became a country that was half republic and half empire, –since the Philippines (and other countries in the tropical zone) could only function through slavery– and that scenario could cause an implosion of American society.

The loss of the values of American democracy due to the annexation of the Philippines –the biggest issue that the Social Darwinists had with imperialism– was part of the AIL's main argument against expansion. The Social Darwinists used their views on race to support that overarching argument, albeit in the opposite way that the AIL rights activists were doing.

Chapter 3 The White Supremacist's View on Race in the Case of the Philippine Annexation

In contrast to the rights activists and the Social Darwinists, the prominent white supremacist thinkers in the AIL fought against imperialism primarily in the political arena of Capitol Hill. In the Congressional debates leading up to the ratification of the Treaty of Paris in February 1899, they tried to prevent the annexation of the Philippines, to no avail. The criticism of the white supremacists to imperialism was similar to the Social Darwinist critique. However, as this group consisted largely of Southern Democrats, theirs was perhaps more dominated by their experiences in the South before and in the aftermath of the Civil War than by the 'science' that Carl Schurz and David Starr Jordan propagated. This chapter discusses the views of the white supremacists of the AIL, illustrated by Senator Donelson Caffery (D-LA) and Senator Benjamin Tillman (D-SC).

The white supremacists still struggled with the idea that colored people in the United States had been granted the same rights and freedoms after the Civil War. Confederate Army veteran Caffery and Tillman, who (much to his dismay) could not serve due to an injury, longed for the days of the Confederacy and staunchly defended the practices of the Antebellum South. They did not shy away from using the annexation debate to prove the mistakes of the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868 and to defend the institution of slavery. Benjamin Tillman accused the Republicans of hypocrisy, as they were now "contending for a different policy in Hawaii and the Philippines" –which included the subjugation of the Filipinos– yet gave the slaves in the South self-government and forced the white Southerners, "at the point of the bayonet" to agree with this: "Why the difference, Why the change? Do you acknowledge that you were wrong in 1868?[116]

[116] *Congressional Record*, 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 837

Their contempt for colored people in the United States resonated in their view of the Filipinos, whether it was subtle in the case of Caffery or more obvious in the case of Tillman. Caffery believed that a superior race could not rule "over millions of an inferior race inhabiting a country where the superior race cannot impress upon the inferior race its institutions." The extension of power was possible, but extending "your nationality, extend your institutions, extend your liberty" was only possible to "people of your own kind. (…) Every other extension is a weakness. (…) You cannot obliterate the nationality of 10,000,000 Malays."[117] Therefore, he argued that it was "impolitic, unwise, and dangerous" to allow the "dusky" Filipinos, being of a different race, and with contrasting laws, religions, and habits to be incorporated into the Union, even if they were capable of self-government and approved American interference.[118]

Caffery believed that there was no significant upside to the annexation for both the United States and the Philippines. The United States could never help the Filipinos in bringing them up to a level comparable to the American civilization. He referred to historic precedents, arguing that influences such as Genghis Khan and Caesar never made a permanent impression on Europe or the nationalities of the conquered, or that India was still as little British as it was since it came under English control. History had shown that "God Himself has set bounds to the habitations of the different peoples of the earth."[119] To the United States, distant possessions posed an "enormous element of weakness", as the inhabitants would "shed the last drop of their blood to retain them", especially a race so savage as the Filipinos. Caffery: "The great weakness of any free people is holding subject

[117] *Congressional Record*, 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 438
[118] *Congressional Record*, 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 433
[119] *Congressional Record*, 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 437

peoples as distant colonies. No greater weakness can be imagined. No greater crime can be conceived than to recklessly incur it."[120]

Tillman, one of the more outspoken among the AIL politicians, argued that of the possible 10,000,000 Filipinos to be added to the United States, more than half were "barbarians of the lowest type": "It is to the injection into the body politic of the United States of that vitiated blood, that debased and ignorant people, that we object."[121] That was not the only race-based objection that Tillman raised. He was also concerned that the annexation of the Philippines would allow millions of Filipinos "to get on the first ship that they can reach and come here and compete in the labor market of the United States, if they see fit, or if capitalists see fit to import them."[122]

Similar to other anti-imperialists, Tillman had no interest in expanding the current race question within the United States, let alone creating a new one. He already mockingly referred to himself as a "Senator from Africa", since the colored population outnumbered the white population 750,000 to 500,000 in his home state, South Carolina. At all costs, he "would save this country from the injection into it of another race question which can only breed bloodshed and a costly war and the loss of the lives of our brave soldiers."[123]

All but five Senators who had dealt with the colored race before had voted against the Treaty of Paris. For Tillman, this was evidence that southerners were the most capable of assessing the dangers of having multiple races live side by side. They understood and realized that these races could not mix, without harming both races and leading to the destruction of the civilization of the higher. Tillman argued that the South had carried "this white man's burden of a colored race in our midst since their emancipation and before."[124] That burden

---

[120] *Congressional Record*, 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 437
[121] *Congressional Record*, 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 837
[122] *Congressional Record*, 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 1380
[123] *Congressional Record*, 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 1389
[124] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 1532

continued to exist, even with the emancipation of black people, and would still be held against whites from the South. The burden of race antagonism had always existed in the United States; it was "ineradicable" and would "continue as a governing factor wherever the races come into contact." The condition of the South was the very proof of that.[125] Tillman described it as "the shirt of Nessus", inherited from previous generations. He believed that "the Anglo-Saxon is pretty much the same wherever you find him, and he walks on the necks of every colored race he comes into contact with. Resistance to his will or interests means destruction to the weaker race."[126] While this domestic problem was a known fact, Tillman asked: "Why do we as a people want to incorporate into our citizenship ten millions [sic] more of different or of differing races, three or four of them?"[127] The Senator from South Carolina felt that the "White Man's Burden", even though he insisted that slavery and the existing race question were inheritances from the past, was held against the South: "Because the Southern whites have felt constrained to deprive some of the negroes of a share in the Government, thus denying to them the recognition embodied in the declaration that 'governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed,' is that any reason why this great Republic should seek to subjugate more men of the colored race, and deny them that great blessing?[128]

To retort Republican criticism on his ideas, Tillman argued that he and other southerners "have never acknowledged that the negroes were our equals, or that they were fitted for or entitled to participate in government; therefore, we are not inconsistent or

---

[125] Benjamin R. Tillman, "Causes of Southern Opposition to Imperialism," *The North American Review* 171, no. 527 (October 1900): 443.
[126] Benjamin R. Tillman, 443.
[127] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 1532
[128] Benjamin R. Tillman, "Causes of Southern Opposition to Imperialism," 444.

hypocritical when we protest against the subjugation of the Filipinos, and the establishment of a military government over them by force."[129]

That opinion already gave away the white supremacist stance on rights for the Filipinos, albeit under the guise of supporting freedom and independence for the Filipinos. Caffery argued from the premise that "the government of the United States being 'of the people, by the people, and for the people,' is inhibited from acquiring the territory for the purpose of incorporating it and its people into the Union against their will or without their consent." If territory was acquired by the United States, it should grant the inhabitants of that territory American citizenship.[130] However, that did not automatically give the Philippines the status of a State, which Caffery deemed crucial in extending citizenship to the Filipinos. He separated individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution, such as the right of free speech, from the right of the franchise. He argued that, long before the Fourteenth Amendment was created "especially for the colored people," the individual States decided to whom they granted citizenship or who they would exclude from it, and that right was in his opinion "not curtailed by that amendment."[131]

Furthermore, the United States had "held up this example of a free Government as one to be copied by all the nations of the earth. We have by that act stopped ourselves from setting up any kind of government anywhere, under any circumstances, other than a free government based upon the consent of the governed."[132] Therefore, Caffery contended, the citizens from the Philippines had a constitutional right to "free government", which he interpreted as a government by the Filipinos' consent: "We must have a free people,

[129] Benjamin R. Tillman, 445.
[130] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 433
[131] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 434
[132] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 433

governed according to their own volition and choice, and not subject ground beneath the heel of despotism, even if it be the despotism of such a free Republic as the United States."[133]

The Philippines could never be part of the United States. Unlike Americans, the people of the Philippines had not been instilled with the sacred idea of "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" as an effect of the Spanish colonial regime. That left some of them "fairly well civilized", whereas others were still "naked savages."[134] Caffery believed that the sacred sentence was the "basic principle of our political life, and faith, and hope", a part of the American's being, that made him distinct from "the vassal of king, Kaiser, prince, or potentate." It also announced that "freemen govern freemen", which makes it even harder to believe that Caffery implied anything more than that Americans were supposed to be governed only by Americans, and not by outsiders such as the Filipinos.[135]

Tillman, already afraid of a United States-bound stream of Filipinos, argued that they were not suited to these American institutions: "They are not ready for liberty as we understand it. They do not want it. Why are we bent on forcing upon them a civilization not suited to them and which only means in their view degradation and a loss of self-respect, which is worse than the loss of life itself?"[136]

The white supremacists interpreted the ideas of "consent by the governed" as well as "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" as the foundation of an exclusive American government. To Tillman, government by consent was not just determined by any person's vote. He argued that "the only legitimate and honest interpretation of the words is that in any Commonwealth, the power to govern must emanate

---

[133] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 433
[134] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 1532
[135] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 432
[136] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 1532

from within, and be by consent of the people governed. (…) in contradiction of the doctrine of the divine right of Kings or of force from without."[137] By literally interpreting "emanate from within", Tillman referred to the fact that the true power to govern should be held by the white population, as the Founding Fathers would have done.[138] Any other form of government would be despotism, which the white supremacists claimed to despise.

Furthermore, he claimed that the "disfranchisement of the ignorant Southern negroes in some of the States" had always been within Constitutional limits –thereby defending slavery–, and never affected the celebrated idea of governments deriving their powers by the consent of the governed: "The Constitution which our fathers gave us recognized slavery (…), did not prevent the idea from becoming a religion to the people who enjoy the blessing of living under this Republic."[139] In this train of thought, Tillman tried to separate the idea of "consent of the governed" from the instated civil rights amendments three decades earlier, which further emphasized the path of exclusion that Tillman supported.

As the preceding paragraphs already show, the white supremacists heavily relied on the founding principles of the United States to make their case against imperialism during the Treaty debates. Benjamin Tillman concluded, a day after the Treaty of Paris had passed through the Senate with a two-thirds margin of 57 to 27, that there was no Constitution left:

> The only rule which governs Congress now is the rule of the majority. We had an illustration of that when the Hawaiian treaty was rejected by the constitutional one-third, more than one-third refusing to ratify it, and the majority brought in and passed its resolution of annexation by which the Constitution was overridden. (…) the two-

[137] Benjamin R. Tillman, "Causes of Southern Opposition to Imperialism," 443.
[138] Benjamin R. Tillman, 443.
[139] Benjamin R. Tillman, 443.

> thirds vote to ratify a treaty is the only scintilla of the original instrument which now remains to hamper the majority.[140]

The founding documents and the philosophy behind them had always protected the United States from becoming a corrupted empire like Great Britain or Spain. "We have in our veins the best blood of the northern races, who now dominate the world. (…) We have had an experience in free government, government based on the will of the governed (…) and we have been taught by that government (…) both the firmness to rule and the power of obedience to that rule."[141] All of that, according to Tillman, had now been squandered by the ratification of the Treaty.

Caffery's supremacist plea in Congress against annexation was an extensive ode dedicated to the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg, which he called the embodiment of basic and fundamental principles of the American government. In the United States, the individual was the "maker of his own government", and the governments were made "by and for the people."[142] It was created by the founders "for all their posterity, native and adopted," which, to Caffery, also included annexed persons.[143] This was opposite to ancient democratic states, where the state became supreme over the individual. The proposition to annex the Philippines would nullify the limitations and modifications set by the Constitution on the political branch, and it would mean that the principles of the American government were left behind: "Without limitation, without modification, Congressional power is set up to be supreme over them, without a

---

[140] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 1530
[141] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 1532
[142] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 433
[143] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 433

check in any direction. That proposition is fraught with more danger to our institutions than any other made in this House or in the other."[144]

The white supremacist view on race and rights was tied to their interpretation of the Constitution. Since the Constitution and other fundamental principles of the American government were tossed aside by the annexation of the Philippines, the white supremacist argument aligned with the AIL's main argument. However, the sincerity of this argument was overshadowed by their idea of the Filipinos and the prospect of incorporating them into the Union, as they separated constitutional rights from civil rights such as the right to franchise.

Even though the annexation question surpassed the continental borders of the United States, Caffery, Tillman, and their like-minded followers seemed more concerned about the consequences to the American home front than the fate of the Philippines and the Filipinos. The incompetent, barbaric Filipinos deserved, in the white supremacists' opinion, as much a place in the United States as the African Americans, even though the latter were an inheritance of past generations. Caffery and Tillman had no interest in adding a few million Filipinos to an already intense race question and believed that the Filipinos should fend for themselves, without any American interference.

As for rights, the only right that the Filipinos should be granted, was the right to self-government. In the white supremacists' view, the United States was a prime example to other nations of how a country should be governed, and therefore, the Philippines should follow that example by having a free government by the Filipinos' consent. This meant that the United States was not required to help the Filipinos or export its institutions to the Philippines. The latter, the supremacists believed, was futile nonetheless, since the Filipinos were not suited for the institutions that had benefitted the Americans for so long.

---

[144] *Congressional Record,* 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899), 433

It was out of the question that the Filipinos would be involved in American politics by giving them the right to vote. In the same way the white supremacists resented the fact that black people had the right to have a say in American politics, they wanted to deny the Filipinos this right as well. Americans should be governed by Americans, and not by inferior races. Furthermore, granting them the right of franchise was impossible as that was a right that was and should be extended by the States, and the Philippines could not be granted statehood.

The annexation of the Philippines was, according to the white supremacists, the fatal blow to the Constitution, which meant a severe change in the principles of the American government. The checks and balances provided by the Constitution in regard to the political branch were about to be cast away, leaving it to the whims of the majority on the Congressional levels to govern over the United States.

Conclusion

The view on race by the Anti-Imperialist League members was fundamental in shaping several of their arguments to oppose the annexation of the Philippines. This thesis has shown, by offering compelling examples from the most relevant groups with an opinion on race in the AIL, in what ways race was fundamental in the abovementioned context.

The issue of race evidently came up in the argument of the existing race problem in the United States between colored and white Americans, yet it also transferred to other arguments such as rights, self-government, Filipino participation in American politics, labor, and the main argument of the AIL, the departure from the American founding documents and its philosophies.

As mentioned in the introduction, the rights activists differed severely from the Social Darwinists and the white supremacists. The former opposed the annexation of the Philippines with the best interest of the Filipinos in mind, by, for instance, arguing for equal treatment and self-government of the Filipinos. The latter opposed the annexation in the defense of their own principles, emphasizing how dealing with the Filipinos, in general, would deteriorate the American race and the American standards and values.

Concisely, the view of the studied groups on race was predominantly determined by their belief in equality or the inequality among men. The latter was already established by Christopher Lasch in his article *The Anti-Imperialists, the Philippines, and the Inequality of Man* in the late 1950s, in which Lasch concluded that the belief in inequality at times overshadowed the beliefs of the American Constitution. This was a key point on which other works, for instance, Eric Love, Michael Cullinane, and this thesis could expand and show that the view of racial inequality touched more than just the beliefs of the Constitution and

the Declaration of Independence or that there are multiple ways to interpret the AIL's arguments than just through the lens of race.

This thesis shows how the AIL's arguments, some significantly more than others, are closely connected to race and therefore places race as fundamental to other arguments as to the arguments that concerned the Constitution. Again, the accepted idea of inequality among men is, to some extent, unimaginable in this and must be taken into consideration: especially when the research includes white supremacists. On the other hand, in the case of the rights activists, and perhaps Carl Schurz as well, one could argue that they fit more into the category of believers in differences among races that Welch proposed in his essay. As Welch stated in this essay –and this thesis supports that notion–, there was a distinction between people who believed that the Filipinos were inherently incapable to benefit from liberty and to govern themselves and people who did not believe that. For example, the rights activists argued that the Filipinos –and other races in general– should not be treated differently from the white Americans, whereas Schurz believed that the Filipinos could form their own government, just not in the fashion of the American government.

The other conclusion of this thesis is that other works regarding the Anti-Imperialist League itself do not emphasize the role of race. It is an undercovered theme in the contemporary literature on the AIL, which was a reason to start this thesis to begin with. Of course, the AIL's main argument was about the betrayal of American principles, as laid out in e.g., the Constitution, and if viewed separately, race is not automatically connected to that. For instance, Michael Cullinane concluded that love for liberty was the common denominator for the AIL members to support their cause, or at least kept the AIL together. He addressed race to some extent, but it was never the focus of his book.

On the other hand, this thesis further explored the notion made by Daniel Schirmer that anti-imperialists connected the struggle against imperialism to the struggle for equality

for the colored Americans. That specifically applied to Moorfield Storey and the other rights activists, who, as opposed to the other two studied groups, emphasized that the lack of equal treatment of colored people in the United States could transfer to the Filipino situation. Furthermore, this thesis proved by its analysis of three different groups, and by raising more examples than Beisner's lone example of Carl Schurz, Schirmer's notion that most of the anti-imperialists used their view on race to justify the exclusion of the Filipinos.

This thesis has further explored the takes by Beisner and Schirmer by adding the texts of AIL members such as Herbert Welsh and David Starr Jordan, who in other works (e.g., Beisner, Schirmer, and Cullinane) have not received sufficient attention. Especially the addition of the academic scholar David Starr Jordan to the more familiar Carl Schurz gave a better insight into the Social Darwinists' view on race.

The results of this thesis also work well with Eric Love's *Race over Empire*, which is written from the imperialist point of view and states that imperialists refrained from bringing race into this discussion as opposed to the anti-imperialists. As Love's work spans a larger period, multiple imperialism debates, and is written from the imperialist standpoint, this work adds to that with its specific focus on the anti-imperialism side in the debate regarding the Philippine annexation.

A few questions for further research on this topic were already raised in the introduction, and for two of those, this thesis could function as a steppingstone: to the question of how, despite contrasting opinions within the organization, the AIL still thought that a policy of non-intervention was the best solution for the Philippines and whether or how the AIL's transition from a political movement to a social movement was changed by the opinions on race. As to the first question, this thesis, as well as other works (Tompkins, Cullinane), showed that the anti-imperialists rallied together when it concerned the betrayal of the American ideals and values by an imperialist policy. As to the second question, one

could take the views of the discussed groups and focus on if or how that changed in the years following 1908 to the disbandment of the AIL.

The purpose of this thesis was to shed some more light on the view of race in the AIL's arguments against the annexation of the Philippines. Not only to emphasize the importance of race in the relation to anti-imperialism but also to add to the existing knowledge on the AIL. The topic and the angle of this thesis have shown that it does both.

Bibliography

Digital Archives and Collections

Govinfo by the United States Government Publishing Office, Washington D.C. https://www.govinfo.gov/

HathiTrust. https://www.hathitrust.org/

The United States and its Territories, 1870 - 1925: The Age of Imperialism, University of Michigan Digital Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/p/philamer/

Primary sources

American Anti-Imperialist League. "Platform of the American Anti-Imperialist League." In *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, edited by Frederick Bancroft, 6:77–79. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1913.

Benjamin R. Tillman. "Causes of Southern Opposition to Imperialism." *The North American Review* 171, no. 527 (October 1900): 439–47.

Congressional Record, 55th Cong., 3rd Sess. (1899). Washington, DC

Gompers, Samuel. "The Future Foreign Policy of the United States." *The American Federationist* 5, no. 7 (1898): 136–40.

Jordan, David Starr. *Imperial Democracy: A Study of the Relation of Government by the People, Equality before the Law, and Other Tenets of Democracy, to the Demands of a Vigorous Foreign Policy and Other Demands of Imperial Dominion*. New York, NY: D. Appleton, 1899.

———. *The Question of the Philippines: An Address Delivered before the Graduate Club of Leland Stanford Junior University, on February 14, 1899*. Palo Alto, CA: John. J. Valentine, 1899.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington. *The History of England, from the Accession of James II*. Edited by Hannah More Macaulay Trevelyan. Vol. 2. Cambridge Library Collection - British & Irish History, 17th & 18th Centuries. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

New England Anti-Imperialist League. *Annual Meeting of the Anti-Imperialist League, Now the New England Anti-Imperialist League*. Boston, MA: N.E. Anti-Imperialist League, 1899.

Schurz, Carl. “Thoughts on American Imperialism, September 1898.” In *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, edited by Frederic Bancroft, 5:494–513. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1913.

———. “The Issue of Imperialism: Convocation Address Delivered before the University of Chicago, Jan. 4, 1899.” In *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, edited by Frederick Bancroft, 6:1–36. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1913.

———. “The Policy of Imperialism: Address at the Anti-Imperialistic Conference in Chicago, Oct. 17, 1899.” In *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, edited by Frederick Bancroft, 6:77–120. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1913.

———. “For Truth, Justice and Liberty: Address Delivered at Cooper Union, New York City, Sept. 28, 1900, in Opposition to the Re-Election of President McKinley.” In *Speeches, Correspondence and Political Papers of Carl Schurz*, edited by Frederick Bancroft, 6:215–56. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1913.

Storey, Moorfield. *Is It Right?* Chicago, IL: American Anti-Imperialist League, 1900.

———. *Our New Departure. I. Letter to a Friend, October 21, 1899. II. Speech at Brookline, October 26, 1900.* Boston: G. H. Ellis, 1901.

———. *What Shall We Do with Our Dependencies? The Annual Address before the Bar Association of South Carolina, Delivered in Columbia, January 16, 1903*. Boston, MA: G. H. Ellis, 1903.

———. *The Importance to America of Philippine Independence: Address Delivered before the Harvard Democratic Club at the Harvard Union, Cambridge, October 28, 1904.* Boston, MA: New England Anti-Imperialist League, 1904.

———. *The Moro Massacre*. Boston, MA: Anti-Imperialist League, 1906.

———. *The Duty of the United States towards the Philippine Islands*. Cambridge, MA: Press of Cambridge, 1908.

Winslow, Erving. *Address of the Anti-Imperialist League*. Boston, MA: Anti-Imperialist League, 1899.

———. *Report of the Executive Committee of the Anti-Imperialist League, Feb. 10, 1899.* Boston, MA: Anti-Imperialist League, 1899.

Welsh, Herbert. “The Ethics of Our Philippine Policy.” *International Journal of Ethics* 10, no. 3 (1900): 307–17.

———. *The Other Man’s Country; an Appeal to Conscience*. Philadelphia, PA: J.B. Lippincott, 1900.

Secondary sources

Bailey, Thomas A. "Was the Presidential Election of 1900 A Mandate on Imperialism?" *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 24, no. 1 (1937): 43–52. https://doi.org/10.2307/1891336.

———. "Expansionists of 1898: The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Islands." *The American Historical Review* 42, no. 4 (1937): 806–8. https://doi.org/10.2307/1839520.

Beisner, Robert L. *Twelve against Empire: The Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Cullinane, Michael P. *Liberty and American Anti-Imperialism: 1898-1909*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137002570.

Harrington, Fred H. "The Anti-Imperialist Movement in the United States, 1898-1900." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 22, no. 2 (1935): 211–30. https://doi.org/10.2307/1898467.

Hofstadter, Richard. *Social Darwinism in American Thought, 1860-1915*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1944.

Hunt, Michael H. *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009.

Immerwahr, Daniel. *How to Hide an Empire: A Short History of the Greater United States*. 1st ed. London: Vintage, 2020.

Kramer, Paul A. *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, & the Philippines*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

LaFeber, Walter. *The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898*. Cornell Paperbacks. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1963.

Lasch, Christopher. "The Anti-Imperialists, the Philippines, and the Inequality of Man." *The Journal of Southern History* 24, no. 3 (1958): 319–31. https://doi.org/10.2307/2954987.

Leuchtenburg, William E. "Progressivism and Imperialism: The Progressive Movement and American Foreign Policy, 1898-1916." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 39, no. 3 (1952): 483–504. https://doi.org/10.2307/1895006.

Love, Eric. *Race over Empire: Racism and U.S. Imperialism, 1865-1900*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Maier, Charles S. *Among Empires: American Ascendancy and Its Predecessors*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.

May, Ernest R. *American Imperialism: A Speculative Essay*. New York, NY: Atheneum, 1968.

McCoy, Alfred W., Francisco A. Scarano, and Courtney Johnson. "On the Tropic of Cancer." In *Colonial Crucible : Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*, edited by Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano, 3–33. Madison, WS: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009.

McFarland, Gerald W. "Mugwumps." In *The Oxford Companion to United States History*. Oxford University Press, January 1, 2004. http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195082098.001.0001/acref-9780195082098-e-1041.

Pratt, Julius W. *Expansionists of 1898: The Acquisition of Hawaii and the Spanish Islands*. The Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1936.

Salman, Michael. *The Embarrassment of Slavery: Controversies over Bondage and Nationalism in the American Colonial Philippines*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001.

Schirmer, Daniel B. *Republic or Empire: American Resistance to the Philippine War*. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman, 1972.

Tompkins, E. Berkeley. "The Old Guard: A Study of the Anti-Imperialist Leadership." *The Historian (Kingston)* 30, no. 3 (May 1, 1968): 360–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6563.1968.tb00325.x.

———. *Anti-Imperialism in the United States: The Great Debate, 1890-1920*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.

Turner, Jonathan H., and Seth Abrutyn. "Returning the 'Social' to Evolutionary Sociology: Reconsidering Spencer, Durkheim, and Marx's Models of 'Natural' Selection." *Sociological Perspectives* 60, no. 3 (2017): 529–56.

"U.S. Senate: Constitution of the United States." Accessed August 15, 2021. https://www.senate.gov/civics/constitution_item/constitution.htm.

Welch Jr., Richard E. "Anti-Imperialists and Imperialists Compared: Racism and Economic Expansion." In *American Imperialism & Anti-Imperialism*, edited by Thomas G. Patterson, 118–25. New York, NY.: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1973.

———. *Response to Imperialism: The United States and the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1979.

Williams, William A. *Empire as a Way of Life: An Essay on the Causes and Character of America's Present Predicament, along with a Few Thoughts about an Alternative*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Zimmerman, James A. "Who Were the Anti-Imperialists and the Expansionists of 1898 and 1899? A Chicago Perspective." *Pacific Historical Review* 46, no. 4 (1977): 589–601. https://doi.org/10.2307/3638164.