

Activity #1: An Introduction to Woodrow Wilson

Student Name _____ Date _____

Directions: Consult the following resources to answer the questions below.

Wilson—A Portrait: http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/wilson/portrait/wp_wilson.html

1912 Democratic Party platform: http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/wilson/filmmore/fm_platforms.html

Wilson’s First Inaugural Address: http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/wilson/filmmore/fm_inaugural1.html

Question	Answer
What were some major influences on Wilson as he was growing up?	
How did Wilson develop a national reputation as a reformer?	
What was Wilson like as a person?	
What were Wilson’s leadership traits?	
What did he promise to do if elected President?	

What sorts of reforms did he carry out as President?	
What did Wilson believe was America's place in the world?	

Activity #2: Traditionalists and Innovators

Student Name _____ Date _____

Definition of Wilsonianism

1. **Spreading democracy:** means the people of a certain nation or nationality have the right to choose and consent to a democratic form of government and that the United States should help or even pressure people to choose democracy as their form of government.

Tip: See Wilson’s Second Inaugural Address.

2. **Open markets:** means nations should reduce tariffs and other obstacles to trade between one another. Also known as “free trade” and “the open door,” open markets are associated with capitalist economies and democratic governments.

Tip: Wilson was not the first President to call for open markets, as you can learn by reading William Taft’s explanation of “Dollar Diplomacy” and George Washington’s Farewell Address (see below). The key question for Wilson was: how much should the U.S. government itself do to promote or protect open markets? As you will see, he and Taft had different answers to this question. How different were Washington and Wilson?

3. **An international organization dedicated to keeping peace:** a group of nations that promise to protect the security of each other. If a non-member nation attacks a member, the other nations in the organization promise to defend the attacked country. Wilson believed this commitment, known as “international collective security,” could prevent future wars and promote the spread of democracy, based on the principle that democracies do not go to war against one another.

Tip: See Wilson’s “Peace without Victory” speech and Second Inaugural Address. Do you think Washington would have agreed with Wilson’s statement, “It is inconceivable that the people of the United States should play no part in [negotiating an end to World War I]”?

4. **An active global role for the U.S.:** By this Wilson meant that the international promotion of democracy, open markets, and collective security were not possible unless the United States set an example and provided leadership.

Tip: Compare Wilson’s statement of neutrality, issued in August 1914, with his Second Inaugural Address, delivered in March 1917. How had Wilson’s ideas about America’s part in World War I changed?

Activity #2: Traditionalists and Innovators

Student Name _____ Date _____

Directions: Read the following documents as a group. As you do so, fill in the chart that your teacher will give you.

Set #1:

Wilson's rejection of Dollar Diplomacy (1913): <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/ww83.htm>

We are informed that, at the request of the last administration, a certain group of American bankers undertook to participate in the loan now desired by the government of China (approximately \$125 million). Our government wished American bankers to participate along with the bankers of other nations, because it desired that the goodwill of the United States toward China should be exhibited in this practical way, that American capital should have access to that great country, and that the United States should be in a position to share with the other powers any political responsibilities that might be associated with the development of the foreign relations of China in connection with her industrial and commercial enterprises . . .

The conditions of the loan seem to us to touch very nearly the administrative independence of China itself; and this administration does not feel that it ought, even by implication, to be a party to those conditions. The responsibility on its part which would be implied in requesting the bankers to undertake the loan might conceivably go to the length, in some unhappy contingency, of forcible interference in the financial, and even the political, affairs of that great Oriental state, just now awakening to a consciousness of its power and of its obligations to its people.

The conditions include not only the pledging of particular taxes, some of them antiquated and burdensome, to secure the loan but also the administration of those taxes by foreign agents. The responsibility on the part of our government implied in the encouragement of a loan thus secured and administered is plain enough and is obnoxious to the principles upon which the government of our people rests.

The government of the United States is not only willing but earnestly desirous of aiding the great Chinese people in every way that is consistent with their untrammelled development and its own immemorial principles. The awakening of the people of China to a consciousness of their possibilities under free government is the most significant, if not the most momentous, event of our generation. With this movement and aspiration the American people are in profound sympathy . . .

The government of the United States is earnestly desirous of promoting the most extended and intimate trade relationships between this country and the Chinese Republic. The present administration will urge and support the legislative measures necessary to give American merchants, manufacturers, contractors, and engineers the banking and other financial facilities which they now lack, and without which they are at a serious disadvantage as compared with their industrial and commercial rivals. This is its duty. This

is the main material interest of its citizens in the development of China. Our interests are those of the open door a - door of friendship and mutual advantage. This is the only door we care to enter.

Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine (1904):

<http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=56&page=transcript>

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.

William Howard Taft on "Dollar Diplomacy" (1912): <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/taft2.htm>

The foreign relations of the United States actually and potentially affect the state of the Union to a degree not widely realized and hardly surpassed by any other factor in the welfare of the whole nation. The position of the United States in the moral, intellectual, and material relations of the family of nations should be a matter of vital interest to every patriotic citizen. The national prosperity and power impose upon us duties which we cannot shirk if we are to be true to our ideals. The tremendous growth of the export trade of the United States has already made that trade a very real factor in the industrial and commercial prosperity of the country. With the development of our industries, the foreign commerce of the United States must rapidly become a still more essential factor in its economic welfare . . .

The diplomacy of the present administration has sought to respond to modern ideas of commercial intercourse. This policy has been characterized as substituting dollars for bullets. It is one that appeals alike to idealistic humanitarian sentiments, to the dictates of sound policy and strategy, and to legitimate commercial aims. It is an effort frankly directed to the increase of American trade upon the axiomatic principle that the government of the United States shall extend all proper support to every legitimate and beneficial American enterprise abroad . . .

In China the policy of encouraging financial investment to enable that country to help itself has had the result of giving new life and practical application to the open door policy. The consistent purpose of the present administration has been to encourage the use of American capital in the development of China by the promotion of those essential reforms to which China is pledged by treaties with the United States and other powers . . .

In Central America the aim has been to help such countries as Nicaragua and Honduras to help themselves. They are the immediate beneficiaries. The national benefit to the United States is twofold. First, it is obvious that the Monroe Doctrine is more vital in the neighborhood of the Panama Canal and the zone of the Caribbean than anywhere else. There, too, the maintenance of that doctrine falls most heavily upon the United States. It is therefore essential that the countries within that sphere shall be removed from the jeopardy involved by heavy foreign debt and chaotic national finances and from the ever present danger of international complications due to disorder at home. Hence, the United States has been glad to encourage and support American bankers who were willing to lend a helping hand to the financial rehabilitation of such countries because this financial rehabilitation and the protection of their customhouses from being the prey of would-be dictators would remove at one stroke the menace of foreign creditors and the menace of revolutionary disorder.

The second advantage to the United States is one affecting chiefly all the Southern and Gulf ports and the business and industry of the South. The republics of Central America and the Caribbean possess great natural wealth. They need only a measure of stability and the means of financial regeneration to enter upon an era of peace and prosperity, bringing profit and happiness to themselves and at the same time creating conditions sure to lead to a flourishing interchange of trade with this country.

Set #2:

George Washington's Farewell Address (1796): <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/washing.htm>

[A] passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions; by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill-will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld. And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation), facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country . . .

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop. Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none; or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns.

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world . . . Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting

exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing (with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them) conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied, as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that, by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion, which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

Wilson's statement of neutrality (1914):

http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/wilson/filmmore/fm_neutrality.html

The effect of the war upon the United States will depend upon what American citizens say and do. Every man who really loves America will act and speak in the true spirit of neutrality, which is the spirit of impartiality and fairness and friendliness to all concerned . . .

The people of the United States are drawn from many nations, and chiefly from the nations now at war. It is natural and inevitable that there should be the utmost variety of sympathy and desire among them with regard to the issues and circumstances of the conflict. Some will wish one nation, others another, to succeed in the momentous struggle. It will be easy to excite passion and difficult to allay it . . .

Such divisions amongst us would be fatal to our peace of mind and might seriously stand in the way of the proper performance of our duty as the one great nation at peace, the one people holding itself ready to play a part of impartial mediation and speak the counsels of peace and accommodation, not as a partisan, but as a friend.

I venture, therefore, my fellow countrymen, to speak a solemn word of warning to you against that deepest, most subtle, most essential breach of neutrality which may spring out of partisanship, out of passionately taking sides. The United States must be neutral in fact, as well as in name, during these days that are to try men's souls. We must be impartial in thought, as well as action . . .

Wilson's "Peace without Victory" speech (1917):

http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/wilson/filmmore/fm_victory.html

It is inconceivable that the people of the United States should play no part in [negotiating an end to World War I]. To take part in such a service will be the opportunity for which they have sought to prepare themselves by the very principles and purposes of their polity and the approved practices of their Government ever since the days when they set up a new nation in the high and honorable hope that it might in all that it was and did show mankind the way to liberty. They can not in honor withhold the service to which they are now about to be challenged . . .

The equality of nations upon which peace must be founded if it is to last must be an equality of rights; the guarantees exchanged must neither recognize nor imply a difference between big nations and small, between those that are powerful and those that are weak. Right must be based upon the common

strength, not upon the individual strength, of the nations upon whose concert peace will depend. Equality of territory or of resources there of course cannot be; nor any other sort of equality not gained in the ordinary peaceful and legitimate development of the peoples themselves. But no one asks or expects anything more than an equality of rights. Mankind is looking now for freedom of life, not for equipoises of power.

And there is a deeper thing involved than even equality of right among organized nations. No peace can last, or ought to last, which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property. I take it for granted, for instance, if I may venture upon a single example, that statesmen everywhere are agreed that there should be a united, independent, and autonomous Poland, and that henceforth inviolable security of life, of worship, and of industrial and social development should be guaranteed to all peoples who have lived hitherto under the power of governments devoted to a faith and purpose hostile to their own.

Wilson's Second Inaugural Address (1917):

<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/inaug/wilson2.htm>

These, therefore, are the things we shall stand for, whether in war or in peace:

That all nations are equally interested in the peace of the world and in the political stability of free peoples, and equally responsible for their maintenance; that the essential principle of peace is the actual equality of nations in all matters of right or privilege; that peace cannot securely or justly rest upon an armed balance of power; that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed and that no other powers should be supported by the common thought, purpose or power of the family of nations; that the seas should be equally free and safe for the use of all peoples, under rules set up by common agreement and consent, and that, so far as practicable, they should be accessible to all upon equal terms; that national armaments shall be limited to the necessities of national order and domestic safety; that the community of interest and of power upon which peace must henceforth depend imposes upon each nation the duty of seeing to it that all influences proceeding from its own citizens meant to encourage or assist revolution in other states should be sternly and effectually suppressed and prevented.

Activity #2: Traditionalists and Innovators

Student Name _____ Date _____

Directions: Your teacher has placed you in one of two groups: “traditionalists” or “innovators.” As you read the two sets of documents above, explain how (if you are a traditionalist) the statement by Wilson is similar to statements by earlier presidents; or (if you are an innovator) describe how Wilson’s statement differs from those of earlier presidents.

Set 1 Primary Sources	Traditional	Innovative
<p>Wilson's rejection of Dollar Diplomacy (1913): http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/ww83.htm</p>		
<p>Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine (1904): http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=56&page=transcript</p>		
<p>William Howard Taft on “Dollar Diplomacy,” (1912): http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/taft2.htm</p>		

Set 2 Primary Sources	Traditional	Innovative
<p>George Washington's Farewell Address, 1796: http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/washing.htm</p>		
<p>Wilson's statement of neutrality (1914): http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/wilson/filmmore/fm_neutrality.html</p>		
<p>Wilson's Peace without Victory speech (1917): http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/wilson/filmmore/fm_victory.html</p>		
<p>Wilson's Second Inaugural Address (1917): http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/presiden/inaug/wilson2.htm</p>		

Activity #3: Traditionalists vs. Innovators: A Debate

Student Name _____ Date _____

Directions: Following the directions below, you and the other members of your group will debate the following question with members of the opposing group: “How new was Wilson’s foreign policy?”

Debate Instruction Sheet

A well-structured debate should meet these three criteria: one, there are the same number of speakers for the affirmative or “pro” side and the negative or “con” side; two, each side has the same amount of time to speak; and three, the affirmative or “pro” side is allowed to speak first and last. In this debate, the “innovators” are the affirmative or “pro” side, while the “traditionalists” are the negative or “con” side. The debate will proceed as follows:

First “pro” speech 10 minutes

Tip: the speaker should offer the traditionalists’ strongest historical evidence showing the parallels between Wilsonian foreign policy and the policies of previous presidents.

First “con” speech 10 minutes

Tip: the speaker should offer the innovators’ strongest historical evidence showing what was different about Wilsonian foreign policy.

Second “pro” speech 10 minutes
 Second “con” speech 10 minutes
 First “con” response 5 minutes
 First “pro” response 5 minutes
 Second “con” response 5 minutes
 Second “pro” response 5 minutes

Adapted from Robert E. Dunbar, How To Debate rev. ed. (Chicago: Franklin Watts, 1991).