

by an exterior explosion—that of a submarine mine. It did not assume to place the responsibility. That remains to be fixed.

In any event, the destruction of the *Maine*, by whatever exterior cause, is a patent and impressive proof of a state of things in Cuba that is intolerable. That condition is thus shown to be such that the Spanish Government can not assure safety and security to a vessel of the American Navy in the harbor of Havana on a mission of peace, and rightfully there. . . .

The long trial has proved that the object for which Spain has waged the war can not be attained. The fire of insurrection may flame or may smolder with varying seasons, but it has not been and it is plain that it can not be extinguished by present methods. The only hope of relief and repose from a condition which can no longer be endured is the enforced pacification of Cuba. In the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in behalf of endangered American interests which give us the right and the duty to speak and to act, the war in Cuba must stop. . . .

attained: gained

insurrection: rebellion

repose: peacefulness

enforced pacification: halting of all acts of aggression, imposed peace

For more information see
Chapters 29-31, Book 8, *An Age of Extremes*.

70. From Theodore Roosevelt, *The Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine* (1904)

In 1904, President Theodore Roosevelt announced a new United States policy toward Latin America. Fearful that European countries might intervene in Latin America to collect debts or defend the property or lives of their citizens, he asserted the right of the United States to exercise "international police power" in Latin America. The Roosevelt Corollary changed the Monroe Doctrine from a policy designed to protect the Americas from European intervention to one justifying U.S. intervention in Latin America.

The Dominican Republic (then known as Santo Domingo) was unable to pay its debts to several European countries. To prevent European intervention, Roosevelt asserted the United States' right to intervene in Latin America to prevent "chronic wrongdoing." In 1905, he persuaded the Dominican Republic to allow the United States to supervise its debt repayment to France, Germany, and Italy. Over the next 20 years, the Roosevelt Corollary provided justification for American intervention in Cuba, Nicaragua, Mexico, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic.

It is not true that the United States feels any land hunger or entertains any projects as regards the other nations of the Western Hemisphere save such as are for their welfare. All that this country desires is to see the neighboring countries stable, orderly, and prosperous. Any country whose people conduct themselves well can count upon our hearty friendship. If a nation shows that it knows how to act with reasonable efficiency and decency in social and political matters, if it keeps order and pays its obligations, it need fear no interference from the United States. Chronic wrongdoing, or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may in America, as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the United States, however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of such wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power. If every country washed by the Caribbean Sea would show the progress in stable and just civilization which with the aid of the Platt amendment Cuba has shown since our troops left the island, and which so many of the republics in both Americas are constantly and brilliantly showing, all question of interference by this Nation with their affairs would be at an end. Our interests and those of our southern neighbors are in reality identical. They have great natural riches, and if within their borders the reign of law and justice obtains, prosperity is sure to come to them. While they thus obey the primary laws of civilized society they may rest assured that they will be treated by us in a spirit of cordial and helpful sympathy. We would interfere with them only in the last resort, and then only if it became evident that their inability or unwillingness to do justice at home and abroad had violated the rights of the United States or had invited foreign aggression to the detriment of the entire body of American nations. It is a mere truism to say that every nation, whether in America or anywhere else, which desires to maintain its freedom, its independence, must ultimately realize that the right of such independence can not be separated from the responsibility of making good use of it.

In asserting the Monroe Doctrine, in taking such steps as we have taken in regard to Cuba, Venezuela, and Panama, and in endeavoring to circumscribe the theater of war in the Far East, and to secure the open door in China, we have acted in our own interest as well as in the interest of humanity at large. There are, however, cases in which, while our own interests are not greatly involved, strong appeal is made to our sympathies. . . . But in extreme cases action may be justifiable and proper. What form the action shall take must depend upon the circumstances of the case; that is, upon the degree of the

Chronic: constant
impotence: weakness

adherence: sticking

flagrant: extreme

Platt amendment: act that supported and outlined American involvement in Cuban affairs

obtains: prevails, wins

cordial: gracious

detriment: loss
truism: obviously true statement

circumscribe: draw boundaries around, limit

atrocious: outrageous, abusive act

territorial aggression: attempts to invade and control a foreign country or government

tort: wrongful act

liable: likely

defaulting: falling behind on a payment schedule

atrocious and upon our power to remedy it. The cases in which we could interfere by force of arms as we interfered to put a stop to intolerable conditions in Cuba are necessarily very few.

From Annual Message, December 5, 1905

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

Moreover, we must make it evident that we do not intend to permit the Monroe Doctrine to be used by any nation on this Continent as a shield to protect it from the consequences of its own misdeeds against foreign nations. If a republic to the south of us commits a tort against a foreign nation such as an outrage against a citizen of that nation, then the Monroe Doctrine does not force us to interfere to prevent punishment of the tort, save to see that the punishment does not assume the form of territorial occupation in any shape. The case is more difficult when it refers to a contractual obligation. Our own Government has always refused to enforce such contractual obligations on behalf of its citizens by an appeal to arms. It is much to be wished that all foreign governments would take the same view. But they do not; and in consequence we are liable at any time to be brought face to face with disagreeable alternatives. On the one hand, this country would certainly decline to go to war to prevent a foreign government from collecting a just debt; on the other hand, it is very inadvisable to permit any foreign power to take possession, even temporarily, of the custom houses of an American Republic in order to enforce the payment of its obligations; for such temporary occupation might turn into a permanent occupation. The only escape from these alternatives may at any time be that we must ourselves undertake to bring about some arrangement by which so much as possible of a just obligation shall be paid. It is far better that this country should put through such an arrangement, rather than allow any foreign country to undertake it. To do so insures the defaulting

republic from having to pay debt of an improper character under duress, while it also insures honest creditors of the republic from being passed by in the interest of dishonest or grasping creditors. Moreover, for the United States to take such a position offers the only possible way of insuring us against a clash with some foreign power. The position is, therefore, in the interest of peace as well as in the interest of justice. It is of benefit to our people; it is of benefit to foreign peoples; and most of all it is really of benefit to the people of the country concerned. . . .

duress: strain

71. From Declaration of the Conservation Conference (1908)

Toward the end of his second term, President Theodore Roosevelt held the first national conference on conservation in Washington, D.C. The conference was attended by governors, members of Congress, the cabinet, the justices of the Supreme Court, and national prominent conservationists and scientists. In his opening address, the President called the depletion of the nation's timber and mineral resources "the weightiest problem before the nation." The following declaration, drafted at the end of the conference, called for the federal government to establish a National Conservation Commission to inventory the nation's water, mineral, soil, and forest resources. As a result of the conference, 36 states also established conservation commissions.

As President, Roosevelt added 130 million acres of timberland to federal forest reserves, established more than 50 wildlife sanctuaries, and created five new national parks. He also preserved 18 areas as national monuments, including the Grand Canyon. Roosevelt and his chief forester, Gifford Pinchot, were the first to apply the word "conservation" to environmental policy.

We the Governors of the States and Territories of the United States of America, in Conference assembled, do hereby declare the conviction that the great prosperity of our country rests upon the abundant resources of the land chosen by our forefathers for their homes and where they laid the foundation of this great Nation.

We look upon these resources as a heritage to be made use of in establishing and promoting the comfort, prosperity, and happiness of the American People, but not to be wasted, deteriorated, or needlessly destroyed.

For more information see Chapter 25, Book 8, *An Age of Extremes*.

deteriorated: run down