

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Amar Thelidji University, Laghouat
Faculty of Letters and Foreign Languages
Department of English



The White Man's Burden and U.S. Past and Present Imperialism: From Civilizing Mission to Democracy Promotion

The Cases of the Philippines (1898-1946) and Afghanistan (2001-2014)

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Master Degree in Civilization and Literature

By:

Sara Maskri

Meriem Boussahoua

Broad of Examiners:

- Mrs Guellil Assia University of Laghouat, Chairman
- Mr. Ahmed Mihoubi , University of Laghouat, Supervisor
- Mr. Nbeg Raouf, University of Laghouat, Examiner

2019-2020

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to our supervisor Mr. Ahmed Mihoubi for his support, patience and insightful comments that guided us throughout this journey.

We would like to express our appreciation to the broad of examiners who accepted to read and evaluate our work.

Special gratitude to our teachers Mrs. Mettidji and Mrs. Zirari for their efforts, guidance and support.

Our deepest thanks to all the teachers who supported us throughout our studies.

Dedications 1

I dedicate my dissertation to all those who stand by me while conducting my work.

A special feeling of gratitude and joy to my loving parents who were always encouraging me. To my little sisters Rania, Nihel and especially to Maroua who never left me and was always helping me.

I also dedicate this work to my husband who gave me support and courage on every single day.

To my soulmate, sister and partner, to you I say thank you for being in my life.

Sara Maskri...

Dedications 2

To my beloved parents, may Allah bless them, who always support me.

To my caring brothers and sisters who never let me in need of support, encouragement and guidance.

To my uncle Halim who always guides and encourages me.

To my friend and sister who was and is still standing by my side throughout my journey.

I dedicate this work...

Meriem Boussahoua...

Abstract

This study aims to explore the imprint of Kipling's "The White Man's Burden" on U.S. past and present imperialism. It therefore aims to investigate the "new" U.S. imperialism of the twenty-first century and its linkage to U.S. imperialism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Moreover, this work aims to examine how the white man's "burden" turned from civilizing mission to democracy promotion, and to demonstrate how the U.S. imperialism in the Philippines and Afghanistan is covered by civilizing mission and democracy promotion. To achieve those aims, the study compares the case of the Philippines (1898-1946) to the case of Afghanistan (2001-2014) and investigated how the two cases have various similarities and revealed the U.S.'s true intentions. Lastly, the study finds that both U.S. past and present actions reflect the sentiments carried in Kipling's poem. Besides, it also discovers that U.S. imperialism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries has a number of similarities to U.S. imperialism in the early twenty-first century. Finally, the study finds that the white man's "burden" turned from spreading civilization to promoting democracy and that the United States uses these moral missions to veil its imperial behavior.

List of Abbreviations

NED: National Endowment for Democracy.

UN: United Nations.

USAID: United States Agency for International Development.

WMD: Weapons of Mass Destruction.

WTC: World Trade Centre complex.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	I
Dedication 1.....	II
Dedication 2.....	III
Abstract.....	IV
List of Abbreviations.....	V
Table of Contents.....	VI
General Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: Background of U.S. Imperialism.....	8
Introduction.....	9
1.1. Background.....	9
1.1.1. The Spanish-American War.....	12
1.1.2. European and American Motives behind Imperialism.....	15
1.2. Political Ideologies Motivating U.S. Imperialism.....	17
1.2.1. American Exceptionalism.....	17
1.2.2. Manifest Destiny.....	18
1.2.3. The White Man's Burden.....	20
1.3. Background of The White Man's Burden.....	20
1.4. The Imprint of the White Man's Burden on American Imperialism.....	23
Conclusion.....	24

Chapter Two: U.S. Imperialism in the Late 19th and Early 20th Centuries.....	26
Introduction	27
2.1. U.S. Imperialism in the Late 19 th and Early 20 th Centuries.....	27
2.1.1.U.S. Imperialism in Cuba.....	28
2.1.2.U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico.....	29
2.1.3.U.S. Imperialism in Guam.....	30
2.1.4.U.S. Imperialism in Hawaii.....	30
2.2.U.S. Imperialism in the Philippines.....	32
2.3.The Philippine American War.....	33
2.4.The Imprint of the White Man’s Burden on U.S. Imperialism in the Philippines.....	35
2.5.How U.S. Imperialism in the Philippines is Covered by Civilizing Mission.....	36
Conclusion.....	41
Chapter Three: U.S. Imperialism in the Early 21st Century.....	43
Introduction.....	44
3.1.Background of U.S. Imperialism in the Early Twenty-First Century.....	45
3.2.9/11 and its Aftermath.....	46
3.3.U.S. Imperialism in the Early Twenty-First Century.....	48
3.3.1.U.S.Imperialism in Afghanistan.....	49
3.3.2.U.S. Imperialism in Iraq.....	52

3.4.The Imprint of Kipling's The White Man's Burden on U.S. Imperialism in Afghanistan.....	53
3.5.How U.S. Imperialism in Afghanistan is Covered by Democracy Promotion.....	55
Conclusion.....	59
General Conclusion.....	61
Works Cited.....	65

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

In the recent few years, the United States is seen as the world superpower. This paved a way to it to be the world protector. It also led to the American intervention in other countries in the name of liberty and democracy. The United States is therefore claimed by its people to be the savior of countries under dictatorial regimes. Besides, Americans believe that they are created for a mission to fulfill. Their mission is to liberate, promote democracy and defend human rights. According to many Americans, the U.S. intention is not to invade or to gain profit from the other countries, but it is merely to provide humanitarian aid.

The September 11 attacks in 2001 had a significant impact on the American history and foreign policy. After this devastating incident, the United States emerged as the world police protecting people from tyrannous misrule. Americans assumed that the lack of democracy in the Middle East led to the spread of terrorism. This drove the United States to protect the Middle East particularly and the whole world generally from the threat of terrorists.

The current U.S. intervention in the Middle East countries is claimed by many Americans to be totally justified. According to them, the United States has shouldered the white man's burden across the Middle East just as Kipling urged over than a century before. The rhetoric used by American government to justify its invasion of the Middle East countries in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks explicitly reflects Kipling's sentiments in his influential poem "The White Man's Burden." This led many to question whether there are any similarities between U.S. imperialism of the twenty-first century and U.S. imperialism of the late nineteenth century when Kipling's poem was first written in 1898.

By the late nineteenth century, the British poet Rudyard Kipling wrote his poem entitled "The White Man's Burden" urging the United States to take up the burden of empire as had several European powers. The United States was ordered to spread the blessing of the Anglo-Saxon civilization all around the world. Americans believed that it was their duty and

responsibility to civilize and uplift backward people particularly those living in the region across the Pacific and the Caribbean. They also believed that they have a mission to fulfill in the former Spanish colonies who suffered for hundreds of years from Spaniards' dominance.

The linkage between Kipling's poem and U.S. imperialism is not new. It has been, for many years, a centre of interest among various politicians, historians and researchers. Indeed, a number of recent significant researches have been done about this topic. It has been quite notable among researchers that the relationship between past and present U.S. imperialism and "The White Man's Burden" is very clear either implicitly or explicitly.

Anthony Arnove claimed in his article entitled "The New White Man's Burden: U.S. Imperialism Past and Present" that most of supporters of the American invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan believed that the United States is a benevolent power with special duties and responsibilities, and it is a force for democracy and civilization motivated by the common good not by greed or dominance. He stated in his article that anyone who studied the rhetoric used by the Bush administration to justify its wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and the "war on terror" it launched in the aftermath of 9/11 attacks would notice how similar it was to the language used by President McKinley justifying his imperial behavior after Kipling's call for shouldering the burden of empire. Arnove examined the parallels between Kipling's moments and the moments of the twenty-first century. He believed that the rhetoric used to justify the American war against the Filipinos has various parallels to the arguments for invading Iraq.

Moreover, in his book *Empire*, Niall Ferguson stated that the United States has taken up some kind of universal burden just as Kipling urged. Americans considered themselves responsible not only for launching a war against terrorism but also for spreading the benefits of capitalism and democracy around the world. He added in the final chapter of his book entitled "In Defense of the Pax Americana" that in the early twentieth century, the United

States spoke about spreading civilization and taking up the white man's burden. Today, Americans are talking about spreading democracy and defending human rights (qtd. in Foster and McChesney).

Additionally, in their article "Kipling, the White Man's Burden and U.S. Imperialism," John Bellamy Foster and Robert W. McChesney discussed the obvious linkages between U.S. imperialism of the twenty-first century and the U.S. imperialism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. They stated that it is not clear if President George W. Bush has read Kipling's poem. However, today's American imperial behavior reflects Kipling's thoughts as did the past U.S. imperialism when the poem was first written in the aftermath of the Spanish American war.

Historian Sidney Lens has also examined the notion of "America the benevolent." He stated in his book *The Forging of the American Empire* that anyone who looks at the American deeds in other countries will notice that the U.S. policy has not been motivated by an idealistic regard for the other peoples' needs, but by America's own desire for lands, commerce and spheres of influence. He added that the primary motive has not been moral but imperial and that America the benevolent does not exist and has never existed (qtd. in Arnove).

Although the topic of U.S. imperialism and Kipling's *The White Man's Burden* has been tackled by several researchers, little researches have discussed how the burden turned from spreading civilization to promoting democracy, and how these two moral missions are used to veil U.S. imperial ambitions. Indeed, U.S. foreign policy in the early twenty-first century is apparently distinctive from that of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The U.S. imperial behavior in the past was veiled by the American inevitable mission of civilizing "backward" people. However, by the dawn of the twenty-first century the United States

emerged as the sole superpower whose mission was devoted for spreading democracy among non-democratic states because they claim that the world is no longer in need of civilization but of democracy and human rights.

The current U.S. intervention in other countries particularly of the Middle East starting from the aftermath of 9/11 to the Arab spring are always justified and claimed to be in the name of democracy and human rights. Americans assumed that they have taken up the burden of empire across the Middle East just as Kipling called for. That is what led to investigate the history of U.S. imperialism. It also led to show that the United States being as a benevolent hegemon is not true and to falsify their claim that their mission is not to occupy but to liberate. Besides, it led to the exposing of the U.S. motives behind its interventions throughout its history and since its first establishment of the American nation were to pursue its interests and not to liberate as they claimed.

The United States's claim that it is a benevolent hegemon is a problematic issue. Many historians and researches question why the American intervention is always justified and believed to be the whites' burden. Besides, what is more questionable than this is the issue of how the imprint of "The White Man's Burden" on U.S. present imperialism of the early twenty-first century is as notable as it is on U.S. past imperialism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and how the white man's "burden" turned from spreading civilization to promoting democracy.

This study aims to explore Kipling's "The White Man's Burden" in the context of U.S. past and present imperialism. Moreover, it aims to investigate the "new" U.S. imperialism of the twenty-first century and its linkage to U.S. imperialism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The study also attempts to examine how the white man's "burden" turned from civilizing mission to democracy promotion in the context of U.S. imperialism. Lastly,

the study aims to demonstrate how the U.S. imperialism in the Philippines and Afghanistan is covered by civilizing mission and democracy promotion.

The following questions will be answered to reach these objectives:

- To what extent has “The White Man's Burden” had an imprint on U.S. past and present imperialism?
- What are the connections and historical linkages between the "new" U.S. imperialism of the twenty- first century and U.S. imperialism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries?
- How does U.S. imperialism claim to be a force for civilization and democracy motivated by sense of good with unique duties and responsibilities?
- How is U.S. imperialism in the Philippines covered by spreading civilization?
- How is U.S. imperialism in Afghanistan covered by promoting democracy?

This research will follow comparative methods. It will investigate the linkages between past and present imperialism. It will also explore the similarities between the rhetorics used to justify American imperialism of the late nineteenth century and early twenty-first century. Besides, it will compare the burden that Americans used to cover their imperial mission in the Philippines and Afghanistan. The main instrument used in this study following the quantitative approach is data collection.

This dissertation consists of three chapters. The first chapter will represent the historical background of U.S. imperialism. It will discuss the early roots of American imperialism from the first establishment of the nation. It will then talk of the Spanish-American war as a starting point of U.S. imperialism by the late nineteenth century. Furthermore, the chapter will explore the motives behind imperialism with special focus on the political ideologies motivating

American imperialism which are American Exceptionalism, Manifest Destiny and the White Man's Burden. At the end, the chapter will investigate Kipling's poem The White Man's Burden and its impact on U.S. imperialism. The second chapter will discuss U.S. imperialism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries which emerged after the Spanish-American war. It will discuss U.S. imperialism in the former Spanish colonies Cuba, Guam, Puerto Rico taking the Philippine as a case study. It will finally explore the imprint of Kipling's poem on U.S. imperialism in the Philippine and how this latter was covered by civilizing mission. The last chapter will tackle U.S. imperialism in the early twenty-first century which emerged in the aftermath of the September attacks. It will take U.S. imperialism in Afghanistan as a case study. At the end, it will examine the imprint of The White Man's Burden on U.S. imperialism in Afghanistan and how this imperial mission was covered by democracy promotion.

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

Introduction

U.S. imperialism is viewed by Americans to be distinctive and unique. According to them, it is a force for democracy and civilization. Besides, U.S. governments have always claimed that American imperialism is motivated by good reasons. The American Empire, unlike the European empires, has through centuries brought backward people into the light of civilization. For centuries, the United States has been exercising its role as the most powerful and most liberal country of the western hemisphere nations. This chapter discusses the historical background of the American Empire. It includes the circumstances that led to the establishment of the American Empire, the different motives of U.S. imperialism, the three main ideologies supporting the American imperial behavior during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. And at the end, this chapter investigates Kipling's *The White Man's Burden* and explores its imprint on past and present U.S. imperialism.

1.1. Background of U.S. Imperialism

The United States, along its history, has been representing itself as a special nation featured by its unique roots, ideals and values. Americans believed that these unique ideals and values have to be spread to all people around the world. They claimed that it is their duty to spread civilization and uplift backward people all over the world. Americans had been using this claim to justify the American imperial behavior. They believed that the United States had taken the responsibility of providing better life to all people around the world since the first establishment of the nation.

It is widely believed that the United States appeared for the first time as an imperial power by the late 1800s. However, many historians believe that this imperial behavior was not new to America. Indeed, territorial expansions were not new to the United States, it had been

moving westward since the first settlers arrived at Jamestown and Plymouth (Kinzer). Furthermore, according to Oliver Stone and Peter Kuznick, the American expansionist impulse shaped settlement, growth and conquest from the establishment of the earliest British colonies. This expansionist impulse was later embodied in the notion of “Manifest Destiny,” and reflected in the Monroe Doctrine. As quoted in their book *The Untold History of the United States*, Yale historian Paul Kennedy said: “from the time the first settlers arrived at Virginia from England and started moving westward, this was an imperial nation, a conquering nation” (XV). Moreover, a number of early America’s leaders accepted the idea that their new nation would grow up to be an empire. The American president George Washington described the early United States as an “infant empire.” Besides, the American leader Thomas Jefferson envisioned an “empire of liberty”(Maier).

The United States has been expanding its territory since its first establishment in what is known as westward expansion, which is considered by many to be an imperial behavior. However, the actual American imperial behavior is believed to appear by the late nineteenth century when the United States decided to abandon the policy of isolation and think of establishing an empire as had many European nations.

The late nineteenth century was a period of imperial expansion. It was known as “the Age of Imperialism.” Both the U.S. and other major powers were busy in expanding their territorial possessions. Thus, the American story with imperialism during that period was different from the European nations in terms of roots, motives and policies.

Determining the actual beginning of American imperialism is not easy. Some historians suggest that it started with the writing of the constitution; the historian Donald W. Meinig argues that the American imperial behavior dates back to the Louisiana Purchase. Generally, the United States appeared as a great victor of imperial behavior from the late 1800s to the

years following the Second World War. America during this “Age of Imperialism” imposed its political, social and economic control over countries such as the Philippines, Cuba, Germany, Austria, Korea and Japan (“American Imperialism”).

The Purchase of Alaska from Russia in 1867 is viewed to be the United States’ first venture beyond its borders. In the years following the Alaska purchase, The United States brought no additional lands under its control. In the 1890s, however, international circumstances led the American government to adopt a different foreign policy (“American Imperialism”).

The roots of American expansionism in the last decades of the 19th century were varied. Internationally, European powers during this period were busy carving up lands and competing for influence and trade. Many Americans on the other side including influential figures such as Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Elihu Root, believed that in order to protect its own interests, the United States had to reshape its spheres of influence as well. The United States was eager to establish an empire as had many European nations (“American Imperialism”).

During this decade, according to Bryn O’Callaghan, Britain, France and Germany were busy taking lands which they could control. Americans thought that the United States should do the same and shift from the policy of isolation. Many influential Americans believed that the United States had to rethink being an isolationist nation. One of these influential figures is Senator Orville Platt who said in 1893: “A policy of isolation did well enough when we were an embryo nation, but today things are different, we are the most advanced and powerful nation on earth and our future demands an abandonment of the policy of isolation, it is to the ocean our children must look, as they once looked to the boundless west” (qtd. in O’ Callaghan 84).

1.1.1. The Spanish-American War

The Spanish-American war fought in 1898 marked a turning point in U.S. history. The war marked American entry into world affairs. Before the Spanish-American war, the United States foreign policy was characterized by isolationism. The war ended Spain's colonial empire in the western hemisphere and led to the U.S. acquisition of territories in the western Pacific. The American victory in the war secured the position of the country as a Pacific power emerging for the first time as a world power ("Spanish-American War").

The origins of the Spanish-American War date back to the Cuban struggle for independence from Spain which began in February 1895. The United States had long held an interest in Cuba, which lies only 90 miles south of Florida. This Spanish colony was of a great importance to America. 50 million dollars worth of Cuban Sugar, tobacco and iron industries were owned by the United States. This led the United States to consider the Cuban conflict as a great threat for its investments in the island ("Spanish-American War").

The Cuban rebellion against the Spanish rulers raided and burned villages, sugar plantations and railroad depots. Spain's governmental actions towards these rebels were very harsh. Spanish soldiers were ordered to move thousands of Cuban civilians into prison camps to stop the rebels' supplies. The conditions inside these camps were quite miserable. Spanish authorities made no adequate provision for shelter, food or medical care for these reconcentrados and about 200,000 of them died in these camps of exposure, hunger and disease. Moreover, the Spanish government burned all sugar plantations and cut off supplies in order not to reach the Cuban citizens. As a result of this treatment, millions of Cubans were suffering from diseases and starvation, and a great number of them passed away due to this unbearable situation (O'Callaghan 85).

These conditions were portrayed for the U.S. public by sensational newspapers, namely, Joseph Pulitzer's New York World and William Randolph Hearst's New York Journal. The two newspaper owners also sent teams of reporters to cover the revolt trying to push President McKinley to send troops to Cuba. Few days later, millions of Americans could see, through these two of the largest newspaper chains, how Cubans were badly treated by the Spaniards. This led many Americans to believe that the United States should help the Cubans especially those who had acquire U.S. citizenship and had been arrested by Spanish authority after participating in the rebellion (O'Callaghan 85).

Diplomats at that time also suggested to the president that the United States should buy Cuba from Spain. However, the Spanish responded that they would rather see Cuba sunk in the ocean. In general, popular demand for U.S. intervention to stop the war and to assure Cuban independence gained support in the U.S. congress. Not only due to the American sympathy for the Cuban citizens, but also due to the great American interest in the Cuban land which became more strengthened. As the war went on in Cuba, a number of incidents brought the U.S. near to the edge of intervention. However, it was not until riots took place in Havana in December 1897 that the United States decided to send the battleship called the Maine to that city's harbor. The Maine was sent as precaution for safety of U.S. citizens and property and also to show the American sympathy for the rebels ("Spanish-American War").

On the night of February 15, 1898, a huge explosion shook the city of Havana. The Maine blew up in the harbor and more than 260 of its crew were killed. To this day, the reason why the battleship exploded remains a mystery. However, many Americans believed that the explosion had been caused by an enemy's infernal. This claim was made by the newspaper owner William Randolph Hearst. It was quite believed by Americans that to this man the "enemy" was Spain, and most of them did agree with his claim (O'Callaghan 84).

After this incident, the demand for U.S. intervention became insistent. Americans started calling for war with Spain to help the Cuban people gain independence. In addition to this sympathetic motive, Americans believed that U.S. government and even the American citizens should not forget what happened to the Maine. “Remember the Maine” became a strong battle cry among Americans. In April President McKinley ordered Spain to withdraw from Cuba. Later, and after a few abortive efforts to mediate the dispute, the United States declared war against Spain. In order to prevent the United States from the possibility of annexing Cuba, the Teller Amendment was passed by the congress. The amendment proclaimed that the United States would not annex the island even after victory. Instead they would only help Cubans to gain independence from their Spanish rulers (“Age of Empire”).

The Spanish-American War lasted six weeks. It was fought in two parts, the Philippines and Cuba. The first battle was fought in the Philippines. The American warships sank the Spanish navy that was anchored there. A few weeks later, American soldiers occupied Manila and defeated their Spanish enemies after an abortive resistance. In the following battle in Cuba, the Spanish soldiers were again defeated. In July the Spanish government surrendered and asked Americans for peace. When peace was signed, Spain agreed to free Cuba, and on April 19, 1898 congress declared Cuba independent. It also ceded Guam, Puerto Rico and the Philippines to the United States in the Treaty of Paris on December 10, 1898 (O’Callaghan 86).

At the same time, the United States also annexed Hawaii which later became the 50th State of America. Before that, Hawaii was a group of islands in the middle of the Pacific Ocean that had been independent (O’Callaghan 86). The annexation of Hawaii in 1898 is considered as one of the most notable instances of American imperialism. It paved a way to the United States to gain possession and control over all ports, buildings, harbors, military equipments and public property that belong to the Hawaiian government (“American Imperialism”).

In short, “A splendid little war” that is how the Spanish-American war is viewed through history. The term was used by John Hay, U.S. ambassador to Britain and Theodore Roosevelt’s friend (Richman). It was not a huge war; however, its results lasted forever. It changed the way the Americans viewed their country, their values and the role of the United States in the world. The war with Spain and the policy choices that followed laid the foundation for America’s international leadership in the 20th century. After this war, the United States had become a colonial power, with millions of non-Americans under its rule.

1.1.2. European and American Motives behind Imperialism

During the new imperialism period, between 1880s and the beginning of the Second World War, the European nations were busy taking control of African territories in what was known as “The Scramble for Africa” (“Scramble for Africa”). During this period, the world witnessed an unprecedented pursuit of overseas territorial acquisitions by several European nations such as Britain, France and Italy.

Several motives drove European empires to seek to expand their rule over other countries and territories. First, the economic motives are considered to be the most important ones. European nations wanted to maximize profit. Colonies meant natural resources and raw materials for their factories especially after the Industrial Revolution. Moreover, European empires needed access to markets to buy and sell products. Politically, European powers were competing against each other for supremacy, power, prestige and national pride. They were looking for territories which they can rule and control. Furthermore, they needed strategic lands to guarantee access for their military forces all over the world. Besides, European imperialism had various religious motives behind it. European powers planned to convert new members of their religion through religious people. They wanted to spread Christianity all

over the world. Missionaries from Europe established a great number of churches in colonized lands. They could also spread the imperial nation's language through religious interactions ("Five Motives for Imperialism").

However, for Americans, U.S. imperialism was quite different from the European one. In his article "The New White Man's Burden: U.S. Imperialism Past and Present," Anthony Arnove stated that American imperialism is viewed to be motivated not by greed or power, but by common good. Many Americans believed that the United States had the right, the duty and the responsibility to bring western civilization to backward people. The majority of Americans, in the late 1800s and early 1900s, thought that whites were superior to other races in culture, religion and ability to govern. At that time, the United States was believed to have a special mission to uplift backward people around the world (Foster and McChesney).

The motives that the United States had behind imperialism were different and unique. First, the most important motives were mainly economic. After increasing its manufactured products, the United States needed to find new markets. Americans also wanted more raw materials, natural resources and cheap labor. Moreover, politically, the United States desired to gain power, glory and prestige. It also wanted to exercise military force over nations. Furthermore, religiously, the United States was eager to spread Christianity as well as American values and beliefs ("Reasons for the Growth of American Imperialism"). The other important motive, which is considered as the most notable among the American people, was the American belief in the racial superiority of the Anglo Saxons. Americans strongly believed that it was their duty and responsibility to civilize and uplift the so-called inferior people all over the world. They were eager to spread the Anglo-Saxon civilization and wanted the people around the world to adopt their culture and their ideals ("Motives for American Imperialism").

1.2. Political Ideologies Motivating U.S. Imperialism

Most of the previously mentioned motives were extracted from three major political ideologies which are firmly believed by the majority of Americans. These highly affecting ideologies are American exceptionalism, Manifest Destiny and The White Man's Burden.

1.2.1. American Exceptionalism

First, American imperialism is highly based on American exceptionalism. This latter is a belief central to Americans that America is different, unique and exceptional comparing to other countries due to its specific world mission to spread democracy and liberty. American exceptionalism has always been a firm belief, central to American political culture that America is unique because of its national credo, historical evolution and distinctive political and religious institutions ("American Imperialism"). This term also emphasizes the belief that the United States has an exceptional position among countries. Americans use the term to claim moral superiority for America and Americans. The term is also used to refer to the American concept or dream as an exceptional ideal itself ("American Exceptionalism").

The term was first used by the French diplomat, observer and commentator on the political and cultural character of the early United States, Alexis de Tocqueville, during his first visit to America in 1831. He viewed America to be a unique nation. Tocqueville argues that America is "quite exceptional" in several ways, its puritanical origins, its innate commercial drive and its geographic isolation (Roos).

In support of this concept, Reverend Josiah Strong claimed in his book *Our Country* that Americans were the special Anglo Saxon race, favored by God to serve as the representatives of the purest Christianity and the highest civilization. Moreover, Americans believe that they

are special because they have accepted democracy and personal liberty for the society they formed to live in. The idea of American exceptionalism continued to be a defining characteristic of the country (Melcon).

Through time, the term was lifted from the notion of opportunity to one of obligation. Americans as a people are fated to spread their better way of life far and wide. The westward movement was the physical manifestation of the idea of American exceptionalism. For many Americans, the doctrine of America, which is characterized by freedom, democracy and hard work, has to be spread for all the people around the world (Melcon). America as described in the words of Donald Reagan is “a shining city upon the hill” (Guelzo).

The imprint of the term American exceptionalism lasted for centuries. This term was frequently used by American leaders from the 19th century to the 21st century to emphasize the idea that America is unique and special than the other countries. Ronald Reagan in 1983 said: “I’ve always believed that this land blessed land was set apart in a special way. He continued,” There was some divine plan that placed the two great continents between the oceans to be found by people from every corner of the earth who had a deep love for freedom” (Guelzo). In his presidential bid in 2012, Mitt Romney described America as “exceptional country with a unique destiny and role in the world” (Guelzo).

1.2.2. Manifest Destiny

The Doctrine of Manifest Destiny 1845 is believed to be partly close to American exceptionalism. It was a term used to promote the expansion of the United States beyond its territory. Americans strongly believed in this doctrine that the United States is destined by God to expand its dominion and spread democracy across the entire American continent. This belief widely drove 19th century America to engage in its territorial expansion (“Manifest

Destiny”) .During that century, the concept was used as a justification for American expansion. Later, in the early 20th century, the doctrine was revived to assert that the United States had the right and duty to extend its influence, government and civilization across the Caribbean and the Pacific Ocean (“Ambivalent Empire”).

The phrase “Manifest Destiny” is a phrase that describes a doctrine or belief in the mid1800s that Americans were destined by God to expand their territory across the whole North American continent (“Manifest Destiny”).It is also the doctrine or belief that the expansion of the U.S. throughout the American continents was justified, inevitable and benevolent (Kuchera). Furthermore, this belief is what led the huge territorial expansion of the United States in the late half of the 1800s. According to Eric Foner and John A. Garraty, this “expansion would involve not merely territorial aggrandizement but the progress of liberty and individual economic opportunity as well” (697).

As an ideological concept, Manifest Destiny is a historical progress in the United States in the 19th century .This was a great period in which it helped the United States to expand westward across North America. This expansion opened the gate for Americans and offered for them self-innovation, self-sufficiency, economic income and freedom. Americans themselves, believed in having a mission to fulfill which is expansion as well as spreading their traditions and knowledge (Boucheфра and Belhadj 3).

The term Manifest Destiny was first used by John O’Sullivan in the New York Democratic Review in 1845. It was written in favor of the United States annexation of Texas, which is an area that the United States considered as independent and under no colonial rules. Furthermore, O’Sullivan coined the term Manifest Destiny to insist on the idea that Americans were destined, by God, to govern North America and to occupy the whole continent from Atlantic to Pacific(Daniel).

1.2.3. The White Man's Burden

In addition to the previously mentioned ideologies supporting U.S. imperialism, another important concept that is firmly believed by the Americans is the term “The White Man's Burden.” This ideology is viewed to have a stronger imprint on the history of U.S. imperialism than any other ideologies believed by the Anglo-Saxon race.

Kipling's the White Man's Burden has had a lasting effect on U.S. past and present imperialism. Its imprint and sentiments are as relevant today in 21st U.S. imperialism as they were in the late 19th and early 20th centuries when the poem was first written in the aftermath of the Spanish-American war (Foster and McChesney). Since the time Kipling wrote his poem, the term The White Man's Burden became a strong belief in the Americans' minds. Kipling affected the minds of the Americans and made them view imperialism as a heavy “burden” they should take up and they are responsible for civilizing backward people. The term is believed by historians to be a euphemism for American imperialism (Arnove).

1.3. Background of “The White Man's Burden”

In 1899, the British novelist and poet Rudyard Kipling wrote a poem entitled “The White Man's Burden: The United States and the Philippine Islands.” In this poem, Kipling urged the United States to take up the burden of empire as had Britain and other European nations. The term “The White Man's Burden” does not refer only to Kipling's literary work, rather, it became more known as an ideology that is firmly believed by the Americans. The concept of the White Man's Burden insists that the United States has the right to develop and civilize the undeveloped people.

Kipling's "The White Man's Burden," was first published in McClure's Magazine in February 1899. In this Work, Kipling urged the United States, with special reference to the Philippines, to join the European nations in taking the racial responsibilities of empire. Kipling shaped the minds of the Americans and made them believe that imperialism is a good endeavor the United States should have (Foster and McChesney).

After being first used by Kipling in his poem, the phrase was widely used to justify U.S. imperialism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The term refers to "the alleged duty of the white peoples to manage the affairs of the less developed non white peoples." As defined in Merriam Webster dictionary.

According to the Collins English Dictionary, the term is defined as "the supposed duty of the white race to bring education and western culture to the non white inhabitants of their colonies." Besides, Oxford Dictionary has a distinctive definition for the term. It is defined "a phrase that was used in the 19th century to express the idea that the European countries has a duty to run the countries and organizations of peoples in other parts of the world with less money, education or technology than the Europe... ."

When the poem was written, the debate over the ratification of the Treaty of Paris was still raging, and the anti-imperialist movement in the United States was denouncing the plan to annex the Philippines (Foster and McChesney). After publishing the poem, Opponents to anti-imperialists supported Kipling's call for imperialism. They justified U.S. imperial behavior, particularly the proposed annexation, helping the poem gain additional support among American intellectuals and politicians. Few days later, the debate over the United States being an imperial power was brought to an end, and the Treaty of Paris was finally ratified by the U.S. Senate in February 06, 1899. The treaty officially ended the Spanish-American war and brought the Philippines, Guam, Puerto Rico and Cuba under U.S. control (Longley). Through

its contribution in convincing the U.S. government to ratify the Treaty of Paris, Kipling's poem had a considerable role in paving the way to the United States to become an imperial power.

A number of powerful American figures including President McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt welcomed Kipling's call for the United States to take up the burden of empire. It was reported that after Roosevelt read the poem he copied the poem and sent it to his friend Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, commenting that it was "rather poor poetry, but good sense from the expansion point of view" ("White Man's Burden"). The racialized notion of the White Man's Burden from then on became a euphemism for imperialism ("White Man's Burden").

1.4. The Imprint of "The White Man's Burden" on American Imperialism

The imprint of Kipling's *The White Man's Burden* is highly apparent on past and present U.S. imperialism. Indeed, a number of proponents of past and present U.S. imperial behavior have drawn connection with Kipling's poem. It is believed that the United States has taken up some kind of global burden just as Kipling urged. Moreover, the sentiments of Kipling's poem are relevant in 21st century U.S. imperialism as they were in that of the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Foster and McChesney). Besides, the effect that Kipling had on the history of American imperialism was a lasting one. U.S. administrations through centuries believed that the United States should shoulder the white man's burden and take the responsibility of civilizing the non-white and less developed people around the world. The United States has considered itself responsible for spreading civilization, promoting democracy and protecting human rights.

In the late 1890s, President William McKinley strongly welcomed Kipling's call for taking up the burden of empire. The sentiments of the British poet Rudyard Kipling are quite visible

in McKinley's administration. The president is reported to have said that "God Almighty" had ordered him to make the Philippine a U.S. colony. As quoted by Anthony Arnove, in an interview in 1999, President McKinley recounted:

I went down on my knees and prayed to Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night...it came to me this way-I don't know how it was, but it came...that we could not leave the Filipinos to themselves-they were unfit for self-government- and they would soon have anarchy and misrule over there worse than Spain was; and...that there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and to uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellow-men for whom Christ also died. And then I went to bed, and went to sleep, and slept soundly.

Like the administration of President McKinley over a century before it, President George W. Bush's administration was an apparent manifestation of Kipling's ideas. The language the Bush administration has used to justify U.S. invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan is quite similar to the language used by McKinley over a century before when justifying U.S. imperialism in the Philippines. In a graduation speech at West Point in June 2002, President Bush said:" America has no empire to extend or utopia to establish. We wish for others what we wish for ourselves." In November 2002, he returned to his claim that the United States has" no territorial ambitions. We don't seek an empire. Our nation is committed to freedom, for ourselves and for others"(Arnove).

The parallels between McKinley administration and Bush's are very clear and visible and they both carry out the concepts of Kipling's poem. The rhetoric used by U.S. government in the late 19th and early 20th centuries is quite similar to the arguments used for justifying the American invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan in the 21st century. Bush explicitly made the

connection between the two occupations in a speech to the Philippines congress on October 18, 2003. He said to the assembly:” Together our soldiers liberated the Philippines from colonial rule”(Arrove).

Conclusion

This chapter investigated the background of U.S Imperialism. First, it explored the early roots of American imperialism, and how America abandoned the policy of isolation and emerged for the first time as an imperial power. Furthermore, this chapter showed how the late 19th century was a period of imperial expansion, not only for the United States but also for other European powers. However, for the majority of Americans, U.S. imperialism was different in its roots, motives and policies. According to them, what really encouraged U.S. to leave the policy of isolation is the feeling of duty to uplift backward people around the world. Besides, this chapter stated three main American political ideologies that are considered as motivating factors for U.S. imperial behavior in the late 19th century. These ideologies are American Exceptionalism, Manifest Destiny and The White Man’s Burden. The three ideologies played an important role in shaping the American mind as being unique and exceptional among countries as well as justifying the American expansion in the late 1800s. However, Kipling’s the White Man’s Burden, the last and most important motive mentioned in this chapter, is believed by historians to have a lasting imprint on U.S. imperialism. The United States is viewed to have taken the burden of empire just as Kipling urged. Indeed, as mentioned in this chapter, the sentiments of Kipling are apparently noticed in American past imperialism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as well as in present imperialism in the 21st century.

CHAPTER TWO: U.S. IMPERIALISM IN THE LATE 19TH
AND EARLY 20TH CENTURIES

Introduction

By the late 19th century, the United States abandoned the policy of isolation and emerged for the first time as a world power. During 1890s, the world witnessed the age of American imperialism which saw the expansion of the United States' economic, political, and cultural influence beyond its borders. The Spanish-American War fought in 1898 opened the gate for America to enter the 20th century as an imperial power. After its victory in the war, the United States gained control of the former Spanish colonies Cuba, Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines. After becoming an imperial power, the United States was described by its people as a force for democracy and civilization. Americans believed that it is their duty to uplift and civilize backward people around the world. This chapter discusses U.S. imperialism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. It examines the American imperial behavior during this period with special emphasis on U.S. imperialism in the Philippines. This chapter also investigates the imprint of Kipling's *The White Man's Burden* on U.S. imperialism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries taking U.S. imperialism in the Philippines as a case study. At the end, this chapter uncovers how U.S. imperialism in the Philippines is covered by a civilizing mission.

2.1. U.S. Imperialism in the Late 19th and Early 20th Centuries

After its victory in the Spanish-American war in 1898, the United States took the role of an imperialist nation. The war transformed the United States from a continental power to a world empire with colonial possessions in the Caribbean and Pacific. The Spanish colonies Cuba, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Philippines became under American control. The United States had been expanding its territory from the time the first settlers arrived at the first British Colonies. However, having overseas possessions was a new experience for the nation

(“Ambivalent Empire”). The United States was eager to have overseas colonies as had various European nations.

By the late nineteenth century, the world witnessed the United States switch to imperialist behavior. The shift from isolationism to interventionism and then to imperialism was led by strong political, cultural, religious and economic motives as well. The new American imperialism that appeared in the late nineteenth century was different and special comparing to European imperialism in terms of these motives and also in terms the American roots of this imperial behavior.

After the Spanish-American war, the United States was exercising influence over islands in the Caribbean Sea and in the Pacific. These islands were under Spanish control for centuries. Cuba, Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippine were all of a great importance for Spain. After its defeat in the war, Spain was forced to cede these long-standing colonies to the United States opening the gate for Americans to take the role of imperial power in these islands.

2.1.1. U.S. Imperialism in Cuba

The American imperial behavior in Cuba is one of the considerable instances of the U.S special story with imperialism and interventionism. In April 1898, Congress passed the Teller Amendment which proclaimed that the United States would not exercise permanent control over Cuba. Instead, it would only help the Cubans gain independence and leave the government and control over the island to its people once they become independent (“Teller and Platt Amendments”).

Although the United States was supposed to keep its promise when the amendment was passed, what happened was completely the opposite. The United States did not annex Cuba; however, it did exercise a significant control and intervention in Cuban affairs (“Age of Empire”). This control over the island was widely justified by Americans. The New York Times claimed that Americans are supposed to gain permanent possession of Cuba if the Cubans are proved to be incapable of self-government (Kinzer).

When American troops left the island in 1902, Cuba gained its independence which was a nominal one. The United States continued her intervention and control over the island. American economic and political influence remained effective until 1959, when the government was overthrown from power by Fidel Castro in which he established a Marxist regime together with close ties to the Soviet Union (“Ambivalent Empire”).

2.1.2. U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico

Puerto Rico was one of Spain’s principal possessions in the Caribbean. In December 1898, the Treaty of Paris ended the Spanish-American War and approved the cession of Puerto Rico to the United States. After gaining control over the island, the U.S. government made efforts to Americanize this new possession. In 1917 the United States granted Puerto Ricans full American citizenship and the island was officially a U.S. territory. The United States exercised control over Puerto Rico’s politics and economy. However, in the 1930s, a nationalist movement led by the Popular Democratic Party was widely supported across the island and U.S. assimilation was effectively opposed (History.com Editors).

Afterwards, in 1948, Puerto Ricans were given the right to elect their own governor. Four years later, a new Puerto Rican constitution was approved by the U.S. Congress making the island a U.S. commonwealth, with granting American citizenship to its people (History.com

Editors). After becoming self-governing, Puerto Rico remained closely connected to the United States and the two governments kept having considerable economic and political relationships (“US Imperialism in Puerto Rico”).

2.1.3. U.S. Imperialism in Guam

The western Pacific island of Guam is considered as a strategic link between the United States and Asia. It made trade and connection to Asia and Eastern countries more easily accessible and strategic (Ajootian). The island lying 6,000 miles from California was considered as a great benefit for Americans. In 1898 during the beginning of the Spanish-American War, The United States planned to annex the Philippines. Later, after taking the Philippines, the United States needed to take Guam to secure its larger territory because the two islands are only 1,500 miles apart (Little).

The island of Guam became an official U.S. territory under the Treaty of Paris in April 1898. Guamanians, as called by U.S. government became American citizens. However, unlike citizens of the fifty states of America, they did not have full political rights. They were not able to vote for president. Moreover, Guam’s 162,000 people had no voting representatives in Congress (Little). Guam was of a significant importance for Americans. It was viewed by the United States as a strategic military stronghold. Around 7,000 American military soldiers and officers are stationed at Guam (Ajootian).

2.1.4. U.S. Imperialism in Hawaii

U.S. involvement in the Pacific area was not limited to these former Spanish possessions. Hawaii, which was an independent nation, had also been under American imperial control.

The 1890s witnessed the beginning of a new relationship with the Hawaiian Islands. American interest in Hawaii dates back to the 1820s, the United States' contact with Hawaii had been through missionaries and casual traders. After 1865 Americans acquired a true involvement in Hawaii as a result of sugar trade. The United States began to develop their interest in the islands' resources ("Ambivalent Empire").

Hawaii was led by a hereditary monarch and was a strategically located group of islands. Americans wanted to gain control and influence over it. The American-Hawaiian relations had a significant change when Congress approved the McKinley Tariff which raised import rates on foreign sugar. This had a negative impact on Hawaiian planters leading to a serious depression in the islands. Sugar planters believed that if the United States annexed Hawaii, the depression would disappear. However, Queen Liliuokalani argued that the root of these problems was foreign interference. In 1893 sugar planters in Hawaii wanted to overthrow their queen and Queen Liliuokalani was forced to surrender. The American president Grover Cleveland was an anti-imperialist, and was against the annexation of the islands. He aimed to restore the queen to the throne, but the American public strongly welcomed the annexation ("Hawaiian Annexation").

Hawaii was finally annexed by Cleveland's successor President William McKinley in July 1898. After the annexation of Hawaii, the United States gained access to all ports buildings, harbors and public property that belonged to the Hawaiian government. America exercised its imperial behavior since it had the permission to rule the islands after Queen Liliuokalani left the throne. Hawaiians lost most of their voting rights and abilities to hold higher political positions. Besides, they lost their culture and faith as a result of U.S. forceful attempts to Christianize and Americanize them. Hawaii remained a U.S. territory until 1959, when it gained its independence and was granted statehood as the fiftieth state of America (Taufa'asau).

2.2. U.S. Imperialism in the Philippines

After its defeat in the Spanish-American war, Spain was forced to relinquish its essential long-standing territorial possession of the Philippines to the new world imperial power. The former Spanish colony was considered as one of the most strategically located islands in the Far East. It became of a great importance to America and Americans more than any other colonial possessions which the United States gained control of in the aftermath of the Spanish-American War.

The Philippines became a Spanish property in 1521 by Ferdinand Magellan, a Portuguese explorer sailing for Spain. He was the one who named the islands after King Philip the second of Spain. However, Filipino people were always thinking about liberation from Spain. They refused the Spanish culture that was imposed on them and started rebelling. Although the rebels did not win complete independence, it angered the Spanish government who was not able to end the rebellions. Instead, it acted in a brutal way. Spain's brutality against Filipinos was rapidly portrayed to the U.S. public in which Americans sympathized with them and resulted in the growing of popular demand for U.S. intervention in the Philippines ("History of the Philippines").

This event coincided with the American intervention in Cuba, Puerto Rico, Guam and Hawaii. It opened the gate for Americans to exercise control over this essential territory and become an imperial power. As a result of the American victory, Spain was forced to cede its long-standing colony of the Philippines to the United States in the Treaty of Paris on December 10, 1898 for the sum of twenty million dollars together with Guam and Puerto Rico ("History of the Philippines"). By the years following the Spanish-American war 1898, U.S. imperialism exercised its political, economic and military influence over Spain's former colony the Philippines. The United States presented itself as a savior of the Filipinos from the

long-standing Spanish misrule, promising to lead the islands in democracy and liberty (Lewis).

Meanwhile, the decision made by U.S. policy makers to annex the Philippines had a number of motives behind it. First, the United States sought to gain commercial opportunities in Asia due to the large territory and the strategic geographical location of the islands. In addition, Americans also had religious motives behind the annexation of the Philippines. They wanted to spread Christianity all over the islands. Furthermore, Americans claimed that the Filipinos were incapable of self-rule and that they need American guidance. Besides, the United States had the fear that if it did not take control of the islands, another power such as Germany or Japan might do so (“The Philippine-American War”).

However, Filipino nationalists led by Emilio Aguinaldo refused the control that the United States imposed on the islands. For them, the new American control was quite similar to that of the Spaniards. The two imperial powers were imposing political, economic, cultural and military control on Filipino people. Few days later, fighting was launched between American troops and the Filipino nationalists who sought independence rather than a change in the colonial rulers (“The Philippine-American War”).

2.3. The Philippine-American War

On February 4, 1899, two days before the ratification of the Treaty of Paris that had transferred the Philippines sovereignty from Spain to the United States, fighting broke out between Filipino nationalists and American military forces. A three years lasting war caused the death of over 4, 200 American soldiers and about 20,000 Filipino combatants. After the Spanish-American War, Filipino revolutionaries took control over a big part of the Philippines. Most important was the capital of Manila which was the American base of

operation. The war was under the leadership of Filipino nationalists headed by Emilio Aguinaldo who were working for establishing the independence of the Philippines. American intentions to impose its colonial control over islands became clear. Clashes began between the two sides from April 1899 and lasted for two years. Filipinos fought against the United States for their freedom in a war which became known as the Philippine revolutionary war for independence (“The Philippine-American War”).

At the very beginning of the war and starting from February till November 1899, fighting led by Aguinaldo and his nationalist followers against the better-trained and equipped American troops was always won by Americans. The Filipino revolutionaries were unable to find outside support for their cause. However, things changed when the Filipinos shifted to the Guerrilla style warfare that began from November 1899 and lasted even after the spring of 1902 (“The Philippine-American War”).

The war was decisive and brutal to both sides. The United States burned villages, implemented civilian reconstruction policies and tortured suspected Guerrillas. Filipino combatants, on the other side, responded by capturing American soldiers, torturing them as well as terrorizing civilians who cooperated with American forces. At the meantime, the colonial government that was established under the rule of the American president William Howard Taft was working to implement plans for the economical development, introduce social reforms and permit a significant degree of self-government. These reforms worked perfectly for the side of American military behavior and helped the United States to win the war (“The Philippine-American war”).

Lastly, in 1907, the Philippines convened its first elected assembly, and gained its eventual independence in 1916 in the Jones Act. In 1935, the Philippines became a U.S. commonwealth. However, the U.S. did not grant independence to the Philippines until 1946 after nearly half of a century of territorial control (“The Philippine-American War”).

2.4. The Imprint of Kipling's "The White Man's Burden" on U.S. Imperialism in the Philippines

In February 1899, the British poet Rudyard Kipling wrote his poem "The White Man's Burden: The United States and the Philippine Islands." In this poem, Kipling urged the United States, with special reference to the Philippines, to join Britain in taking the responsibilities of empire. He wrote the poem to help persuade the anti-imperialist Americans to accept the territorial annexation of the Philippine islands to the United States.

The role that Kipling's poem played in convincing the United States to shoulder the burden of empire in the Philippines was a significant one. Kipling effectively, and in a very short time, ended the debate over the ratification of the Treaty of Paris which lasted for two months. Indeed, due to the eminent effect of Kipling's call among the American government and people, the treaty was finally ratified and Spain ceded its former principal territorial possession of the Philippines to the new world power the United States.

The impact that Kipling's poem had on the American story with imperialism did not end when the United States took the Philippines as a territorial possession. However, it remained significantly effective after this important incident that is viewed as a considerable landmark in the American history. Kipling's sentiments were highly reflected in the way Americans, including the U.S. public, historians, influential figures and politicians as well, viewed the American imperial behavior in the Philippine islands. According to the majority of Americans, the United States had taken the burden of empire just as Kipling urged (Foster and McChesney). In 1899 President McKinley claimed that God ordered him to take the Filipinos to uplift and civilize them (Arnove).

American imperialists liked to use the term "The White Man's Burden" to justify and encourage President McKinley's empire establishment in the Philippines (Ferguson 301).

They believed that what drove them to turn the Philippines into an American colony are not their interests; however, it is their responsibility and their “burden” to civilize and uplift the Filipinos. According to Stanley Karnow, Kipling wrote his poem as an exhortation to Americans to spread the blessing of their civilization in the Philippine islands (20).

Moreover, American imperialists always emphasized notions of civilization and uplift that Kipling called for in his poem. They viewed U.S. colonial conquest in the Philippines as a burden shouldered by soldiers, missionaries, doctors exactly as Kipling recommended (Capozzola 33). Besides, U.S. imperialism in the Philippines is considered as benevolent. The term “Benevolent Assimilation” is often used to describe the American imperial behavior in the Philippine islands. McKinley proclaimed that the United States did not come to the Philippines as an invader; instead, it came as a friend to help the Filipinos (Choy 1).

2.5. How U.S. Imperialism in the Philippines is Covered by Civilizing Mission

U.S. imperialism in the Philippines has been widely justified by its people including historians, writers, influential figures and governors as well. They claimed that the U.S. motives behind the American imperial behavior in the Philippines were not about economic, political or military interests, but what drove U.S. to take the islands is the feeling of duty and responsibility to civilize and uplift the Filipinos. Americans had long claimed that the mission that the United States had in the Philippines is a precious instance of the American benevolent assimilation (Linn 20). However, the American claim of benevolence is not that easy to believe. The American imperial experience in the Philippines proved that it was just covered by what is known among Americans as civilizing mission.

American eyes had been always focused on Filipinos who were trying to get their independence. Hence, for this imperial power, expansion had significant commercial

advantages. Yet, Filipinos were never informed of the real American intentions behind staying in the islands. This was apparent in the message of the Philippines leader Emilio Aguinaldo who stated that divine providence was about to bring independence to their country (“U.S. War Crimes in the Philippines”).

Aguinaldo argued that Americans come to their territory not for mercenary motives as he believed but in fact, they come for the sake of humanity and as a savior of so many persecuted people. Besides, Aguinaldo and his fellows had a big confidence in America as he called it the “cradle of liberty” to their people. However, the clash happened when Filipinos discovered that they liberated themselves from the Spanish rule. They realized that the United States never entered the Philippines with the intention of granting freedom to its people. Moreover, President McKinley explicitly denied the American intention for giving up the Philippines after the war with Spain had ended (“U.S. War Crimes in the Philippines”).

The evil reality about the American intention is not as what Filipinos believed at the beginning, nor what Americans tried to show to the world. In fact, Filipinos were seen by Americans as Dean Worcester, an American colonial official, claimed in his memoirs that Filipinos were treacherous, arrogant, stupid and vindictive. He also viewed Filipino civilians as incapable of recognizing obligation. That is, Americans cannot take the risk of treating them as equals simply because they believe that they cannot even understand it (“The Brutality of the Philippine-American War”).

For Americans, Filipino people seemed unable to be aware of the meaning of justice and good faith. That is why, they must be taught obedience and be obliged to follow what Americans do and believe even if they do not comprehend the practices of civilization. Following such belief, American actions in the Philippines were very aggressive. General Otis, a leader of the American Army in the Philippines, acted brutally against Filipinos

regardless of the government orders to avoid any military conflict. Hence, General Otis refused and did very little to prevent the break out of the Philippine-American war. Another instance of the American atrocities against Filipinos is in what the correspondent of the "Philadelphia Ledger" wrote. He narrated that "American soldiers have pumped salt water into men to make them talk." They also shot prisoners even without a hint of evidence ("The Brutality of the Philippine-American War").

In his book, John Marriott claimed that the United States is believed to have "failed to effect the cultural transformation that the civilizing mission had promised for the native population." He continued: "American capitalists who looked to the Philippines to profit were to be disappointed; there was no El Dorado to be found in the islands. Ultimately," Marriott continued, "the civilizing mission was undone" (526).

The civilizing mission in the Philippines was central in American culture at the 1904 St Louis World's Fair that the American Republican Party politician, Paul Kramer argues emerged out of colonial institutions. He claimed that the apparent display of this civilizing mission is the U.S. occupation in the Philippines. Kramer argued that the United States intended, through this mission, to convey hegemonic messages about race and U.S. superiority, this was in fact demonstrating the imperial mission in the Philippine islands as a story from pathos to progress (Marriott 526).

Americans had always believed that the Philippines was in need of the United States. The American imperialists believed that the Philippines would be better under U.S. control than they would have under Filipino control. According to Senator Albert J. Beveridge, the Filipinos needed Americans to rule them. Occupation, annexation and even being a U.S. possession were all good for the Filipinos. He added that the Filipinos were in fact incapable

of ruling themselves. They were in an urgent need of American guidance after centuries of the Spanish tyrannous rule (Carandang 19).

It is widely believed that U.S. mission in the Philippine islands is merely spreading civilization. However, little is known that the U.S. actual mission was imperial led mainly by economic motives. The American occupation in the Philippines meant wealth, new markets as well as new resources. The success of America's economics was mainly thanks to its territorial expansion, political and economic hegemony over territories and markets (Carandang 15, 18). The geographic location of the Philippines in the Far East drove the United States to view the islands as a great territorial possession providing a significant commercial success. The islands lied directly in the middle of the trade destinations of the major economic powers China, Japan and Indonesia. The U.S. journalist and diplomat, John Barrett, emphasized the significant importance of the Philippine islands. He viewed the islands as a promise of the American economic growth thanks to its geographic location, wealth, resources as well as its population (Beaman 13).

Although the American commanders who were sent to the Philippines were often reminded that their U.S. army had not only a military but a civilizing mission, the real motives of the American government were about its economic, political and military interests (Linn 20). As quoted in Niall Ferguson's book *Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire*, the head of U.S. anti-imperialist league Mark Twain at first welcomed the U.S. liberation of the Philippines from Spanish rule commenting in a letter sent to his friend in 1898 saying that "it is a worthy thing to fight for one's freedom." However when he read the Treaty of Paris he stated that U.S. intention was not "to free but to subjugate the people of the Philippines... and so I am an anti-imperialist" (50).

The United States thought of Filipinos as savages in need of the American colonial rule to uplift and civilize them. However, the Americans themselves proved that they are the ones who committed savages acts. The Philippine-American war ended 100,000 Filipinos' lives (Choy 2). Furthermore, The United States had made a significant gap between its imperialist promise of civilizing mission and its performance. Indeed, according to the historian Clifford Kuhn, the American imperialism in the Philippines proved that American promises are false ones. He stated: "..., the Philippines epitomizes an American foreign policy based on dubious premises and false promises." He added: "American troops committed atrocities, attacked civilians, and destroyed their crops and villages" (qtd. in Arnove).

The historian Sidney Lens claimed that Americans have been told that the United States has always tried to avoid war when it was forced to use its military power. In addition, they have been convinced that its intervention was rarely led by motives of gain and glory. However, the real motives, as they were told, were all about granting freedom, providing the right for self-determination and ending aggression. Moreover, the United States is then described to them as anti-imperialist nation. However, the historian proved that this claim is totally wrong. Lens argued that "American policy has been motivated not by lofty regard for the needs of other peoples but by America's own desire for land, commerce, markets, spheres of influence, investments....The primary focus has not been moral, but imperial" (qtd. in Arnove).

Although the United States had granted the Philippines independence, the U.S. economic benefit remained even after the Philippines became independent. It is believed that the American decision to grant the Philippines their independence was actually motivated by their own self-interests. The United States economy did benefit from granting Filipinos their freedom. Independence meant to the Philippines "a phased imposition of American tariffs on Philippine products." It was very hard to the Philippine economy to remain dependent on the

American market to buy more than three-quarters of Philippine exports (Ferguson 51 - 52). All in all, taking such instances about American actions against innocent people in their countries may push the human mind to question the inherited belief about America as a force for civilization as well as a defender for humanity.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed American imperialism in the late 19th century and early 20th century and how America shifted from the policy of isolation to become an imperial power exercising control over Spain's former colonies Cuba, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Philippines. After winning the war against Spain, the United States became known to the world as an imperial power. Americans believe themselves to be the chosen people by God having the duty to uplift and civilize backward people all over the world. They were described as a force for democracy and civilization. Another important point that was mentioned in this chapter is the American imperial behavior during that period. The chapter took the Philippines as a case study. It focused on how it was annexed from Spain, what was the Filipinos' reaction about the change in the colonial rulers and how was the United States treating Filipinos who rejected its control and aimed for a real independence. This chapter also tackled the imprint of Kipling's the White Man's Burden on U.S. imperialism in the late 19th century and early 20th centuries. The last point discussed in this chapter is pinpointing how U.S. imperialism in the Philippines is covered by a civilizing mission. Indeed, for hundreds of years the United States showed to the world that it is the world savior and a force for civilization supporting its claim by the notion of Manifest Destiny and Kipling's the White Man's Burden. However, as an imperial power, its deeds in the Philippine islands confirmed otherwise. The American occupation in the Philippine islands was not benevolent as Americans described it. The

United States did exercise its political, economic and military influence against Filipino people.

CHAPTER THREE: U.S. IMPERIALISM IN THE EARLY 21ST
CENTURY

Introduction

By the dawn of the twenty-first century, the world witnessed the emergence of the United States for the first time as the sole imperial power. The roots of this unprecedented emergence date back to the end of the Cold War which marked the fall of the Soviet Union and the emergence of the United States as the only superpower in the world. After this significant victory, the American government desired to impose its dominance across the world and establish a U.S.-oriented new world order. Eventually, by the beginning of the twenty-first century, a huge event shocked the world. A series of terrorist attacks targeted the United States on September 11, 2001. In response to the attacks, the United States launched a global war on terror. The Bush administration ordered for an invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq claiming that its objectives are to end terrorist threats and promote freedom and democracy to people all over the world. The U.S. current invasion of the Middle East region after the September 11 attacks has been and is still attempted to be justified. Americans claim that the United States after this incident should shoulder the white man's burden across the region and protect its people from the threat of terrorism. They also claimed that U.S. invasion in the Middle East countries aims mainly to spread democracy and defend human rights around the world. This chapter attempts to discuss U.S. imperialism in the early twenty-first century. It first examines the background and the roots of U.S. imperial behavior in this period. Then, the chapter investigates the September 11 attacks and its aftermath with the American response to the incident through invading Afghanistan and Iraq in what is known as the "war on terror". At the end, the chapter examines the imprint of Kipling's *The White Man's Burden* and demonstrates how the American imperial behavior this time is just covered by promoting democracy and defending human rights.

3.1. Background of U.S. Imperialism in the Early 21st Century

In the aftermath of the Cold War, the world faced a new age of imperialism. This age was completely different from the age of imperialism that emerged in the late nineteenth century and lasted till the Second World War. During the late nineteenth century, various world powers were competing against each other for establishing the largest empire on earth. After the fall of the Soviet Union in the aftermath of the Cold War, the United States emerged as the sole superpower. During this period, the nation had no competitors. Its military, economic and cultural influence was unchallenged. The American intention then became mainly to expand their influence all over the world. Americans wanted to spread their ideals, values and policy among the maximum number of people on earth.

The United States aimed to impose its dominance and ensure the protection of its interests all over the world. The American government wanted to establish a US-oriented new world order. During this time, the American eyes were focused on the Middle East. The end of the Cold War established this region as a significant area of American interest. The United States recognized the importance of maintaining military, political and economic presence in the region for U.S. benefit. The U.S. need to protect its position in the world drove it to extend its presence in central Asia. Academics claimed that when the United States became the only world power with special capacities of managing international justice in the post Cold War Era, the notion of Global Security was established to enable the nation to act internationally for its own interests (“Post 9/11 US Foreign Policy”).

The Gulf War is viewed to be the first time the United States was able to practice its role as the world police and extend its military influence. The war allowed the United States to establish its focus on protecting its interests in the Gulf region (“Post 9/11 US Foreign Policy”). The American ambition was to establish a group of US-dominated nations. The

American hegemony in this area would grant the United States tribute in the oil concessions, control of oil distribution and the continuance of U.S. as medium for international trade (“Iraq: The Debacle of US Imperialism”).

The United States did impose some kind of dominance in the Middle East area in the years following the Gulf War. However, it was not until the dawn of the twenty-first century that the scales overturned. In September 2001, a huge incident shocked the world. The United States witnessed the destruction of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. The September 11 attacks significantly impacted the nature of U.S. foreign policy. After this event, the United States imperial behavior obtained new shape. The American urge to play the role of the international police became more insistent. The American ambition to have significant dominance in the Middle East finally became justified and covered by U.S. inherited feeling of responsibility and duty to protect human rights.

3.2. 9/11 Attacks and its Aftermath

Tuesday, September 11, 2001, dawned temperate and nearly cloudless in the eastern United States. Millions of innocent men and women were killed in a suicide attack in two towers of the World Trade Centre in New York City, the Pentagon near Washington D. C. as well as the field in Shanksvill, Pennsylvania (“September 11 Attacks”). A total of 2,977 people died in a terrorist attack carried out by al-Qaeda. This latter is an international Islamist extremist terrorist group. It was founded in the late 1980s by Osama bin Laden. The aim of this network is to overthrow governments in the Middle East and in every country in the Muslim world which do not enforce religion in the ruling of the country. U.S. support for such country was the biggest obstacle. That is why the attacks of 9/11 were organized and millions of people lost their lives (“9/11 FA Qs”).

The attack was allegedly orchestrated by al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden together with nineteen other members. Fifteen of them were from Saudi Arabia, two were from the United Arab Emirates, one was from Lebanon and the last one was from Egypt (“September 11terror Attack Fast Facts”). This extremist group hijacked four U. S. commercial airplanes. At the beginning, two of the planes crashed into the north and south of the World Trade Center (WTC) complex. The WTC contained seven buildings. On September 11, 2001, the whole centre was destroyed. As a result, 2,753 people were killed when the terrorist group hijacked the two planes belonging to American airlines flight 11was supposed to be traveling from Boston to Los Angles at 8:46a.m. The second plane belonged to the United States airlines flight as well. It was programmed to fly at 9:03a.m. to the same direction as the first one. The victims of this terrorist attack ranged in age from two to 85years (“September 11Terror Attacks Fast Facts”).

Few minutes later, and exactly at 9:45 a.m. a third plane belonging to American airlines flight 77 traveling from Dulles, Virginia to Los Angles was crashed into the west side of the Pentagon near Washington D.C. This collision that was caused by the Boeing 757 led to the collapse of half of the building which was near the U.S. department of defense. The crashing of this plane caused the death of about 125 military personnel and a number of other civilians plus 64 other people aboard the airliner (“September 11 Attacks”). Meanwhile, the fourth plane crashed near Shanksvill, Pennsylvania. Nearly at 10:03 a.m., 40 passengers and crew members who were on the United States airlines flight 93 traveling from Newark, new jersey to San Francisco passed away(“September 11Terror Attack Fast Facts”).

As a response, President George W. Bush declared that this terrorist attacks could shake America’s biggest buildings, but they cannot shake the foundation of America. He added that these acts smashed steel but they cannot impact the steel of American resolve (“September 11Attack”). He also declared that the American government will not make distinction

between terrorists who committed these acts and the ones who helped them. American's efforts to capture Osama bin Laden who was the leader of this terrorist attack did not stop till May 2, 2001, when he was finally tracked down and killed by U.S. forces ("September 11 Attacks").

3.3. U.S. Imperialism in the Early 21st Century

After the September 11 attacks, the United States emerged as the sole imperial power in the world stage. It became the only nation that can be thought of as a global empire (Hoglund). President George W. Bush immediately declared a "War on Terror." The U.S. imperial behavior during this time was totally justified. American actions were believed to be fairly responding to the threat of terrorism ("Post 9/11 US Foreign Policy"). The American motives behind imperialism this time turned from spreading Anglo-Saxon civilization to defending human rights and spreading democracy. The American task then became to shoulder the white man's burden across the Middle East and protect the people there from terrorism (Foster and McChesney).

3.3.1. U.S. Imperialism in Afghanistan

In response to the September 11 attacks, the United States ordered an invasion of Afghanistan. President George W. Bush's public aim was to dismantle al-Qaeda and expel the Taliban from Afghanistan. Bush ordered the Taliban leader Mohammed Omar to deliver to the United States all the leaders of al-Qaeda who were hiding in the Afghan land. His main aim, in fact, was to drive the Taliban to hand over Osama bin Laden and to expel al-Qaeda. The Taliban however, refused to extradite him and other al-Qaeda members unless they are

given evidence of his involvement in the 9/11 attacks. The United States rejected the request and started implementing a plan for declaring a war against the country (Witte).

Before the American invasion in late 2001, Afghanistan had been in war for decades. In December 1979, Soviet forces moved into the Afghan lands. The Soviet invasion led to a national rebellion across the country. The rebellion was led by Islamist fighters who gained extensive secret support from Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and some of other foreign volunteers. After a decade of resistance against the invasion, the Soviet forces finally departed from the Afghan lands. However, civil war reigned across the country with the Islamist fighters fighting first to expel the Soviet-backed government and later fighting turned between Afghans themselves. In 1996 the Taliban captured Kabul and appointed an Islamic law. In the same year, al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden was welcomed to Afghanistan after being expelled from Sudan. He established his organization there. By the summer of 2001, with al-Qaeda's support, the Taliban won control of over 90 percent of Afghanistan (Witte).

After the 9/11 attacks, The United States declared a war on terror. Afghanistan became the first battleground of this global war on terror. The regime change became the goal of the United States. American government prepared a military plan for invading the Afghan lands. The plan relied mainly on secret support of CIA, US and British Special Forces and US airpower. The plan was also provided with significant support by the Northern Alliance which was in opposition to the Taliban (Dobbins et al 90). Later, the CIA team and the Special Forces planned for the air campaign which began on October 7, 2001 attacking Taliban targets. This campaign was the public beginning of Operation Enduring freedom. In late October, the Northern Alliance started to overtake the Taliban's former towns. The forces were working with the United States, but they disobeyed U.S. orders and marched into the city of Kabul. The Taliban then withdrew without fight, and on December 6, U.S. forces and its allies marked the end of the Taliban as a ruling power in the Afghan lands (Witte).

After the ouster of the Taliban and al-Qaeda, the American focus shifted to reconstruction and nation building efforts in Afghanistan. Eventually, a new Afghan administration was installed. The United States had no official responsibility to rule the country. However, it was given significant permission to rule by a growing government to carry out military operations across the country. The U.S. military continued to focus on hunting the remnants of al-Qaeda and the Taliban. The public objectives of the Bush administration behind the invasion of Afghanistan were to destroy al-Qaeda, remove the ruling Taliban regime and rebuilding the nation through humanitarian aid (Dobbins 90, 96).

US-led military invasion of Afghanistan which begun in 2001 and lasted for nearly 16 years became the United States longest war (King). The U.S. intervention in the Afghan lands was widely claimed to be a merely nation- building effort. It aimed to avert the humanitarian disaster in the country. The United States also provided economic assistance to Afghanistan amounted to some 500 million dollars. After the end of the Taliban regime in the country, the concept of nation-building became of a great focus in the Bush administration. The Bush plan was claimed to provide humanitarian aid for the Afghan people. The plan aimed to ensure proper management, implementation and oversight by agencies responsible for Afghan assistance programs. In addition, the American humanitarian aid in Afghanistan aimed to reduce death rates among Afghans, make food more accessible and ensure that aid reached those for whom it was intended (Dobbins et al 98, 99).

During the successor administration of President Barack Obama, U.S military presence in Afghanistan increased. It reached the peak of 100,000 troops (King). President Obama stated his commitment to advancing democratic values. In his 2013 State of the Union, Obama stated that "in the Middle East, we will stand with citizens as they demand their universal rights, and support stable transitions to democracy" (Sedaca and Bouchet 3). The Obama administration continued the mission that Bush started before. Obama carried out hunting

terrorism and ending the remnants of al-Qaida and the Taliban. U.S. forces during Obama regime achieved some development with the primary goal of the war which was mainly approaching al-Qaida leaders. On May 2, 2011, U.S. forces captured Osama bin Laden in Abbottabad, Pakistan and killed him. Later, On June 22, Obama announced a timetable for the departure of U.S. forces from Afghanistan. He declared that the number of U.S. troops is to be reduced gradually in the following years preparing for the complete U.S. withdrawal from the Afghan lands by the end of 2014 (Witte).

3.3.2. U.S. Imperialism in Iraq

In 2003, the American government decided to wage a war against Iraq as they thought of it to be having weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Saddam Hussein's government was immediately perceived as a threat to the world especially after what happened in the United States on September 11, 2001. From that day onward, America decided to declare "war on terrorism." According to the United States, there was a strong linkage between the Iraqi president Saddam Hussein and international terrorism. Americans believed that it is the United States's duty to put an end to it, and this can be done only through force (Danju et al 683). For this reason the United Nations (UN) was asked to investigate the truth of the claims that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction especially after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the Gulf War. On March 20, 2003, President George W. Bush declared war on Iraq and ordered the U.S. forces led by General Tommy Frank to invade Iraq. This operation was labeled "operation Iraqi Freedom." In fact, the United State was not alone in this war, other countries allied with it including France, the United Kingdom and Australia ("Iraq War").

Leading the war, the United States used fast moving troops to quickly invade Iraq which was called "Shock and Awe." Few weeks later, the Iraqi capital Baghdad was under the

United State's control. Later, in that year Saddam Hussein was captured and put on trial by the new Iraqi government and was executed in 2006. However the coalition forces continued the occupation of Iraq. The official end of the Iraq war was on December 18, 2011("Iraq War").

3.4. The Imprint of Kipling's "The White Man's Burden" on U.S. Imperialism in Afghanistan

The American invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan in the early twenty-first century is viewed by Americans as a benevolent hegemony. This led historians to question whether there are no similarities between the new imperialism of the early twenty-first century and the imperialism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Foster and McChesney). In the late nineteenth century, the United States believed that it was her duty and responsibility to protect people from the tyrannous colonial rule and to spread civilization all over the world. After more than a century, the American government also claimed that it is their duty to protect the world, particularly the Middle East, from dictatorial regimes and to promote democracy and human rights all over the world.

Indeed, the United States is claimed by its people to have shouldered the burden of empire across the Middle East just as Kipling urged more than hundred years ago. It is not clear if President George W. Bush was a reader of Kipling; however, Kipling's sentiments are as relevant today as they were when the poem was first written in the aftermath of the Spanish-American war in 1898 (Foster and Machesney).

After the September 11 attacks, the United States launched a war on terror. Their public aim was to protect people from the threat of terrorism, promote democracy and freedom, and

defend human rights all over the world. The Bush administration claimed that it had no imperial ambitions behind the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan (Arno).

American government ensured that the removal of the Taliban and the capture of Osama bin Laden and other members of al-Qaeda were its primary objectives. The military insisted that it had no intention to occupy the Afghan lands. Rumsfeld said: "we're not invading; we're not going to stay." Furthermore, the CIA director, George Tenet confirmed: " we are not invading...we are not occupying" (Keane 57). Besides, Americans claimed that promoting democratic institutions, processes and values has long been the U.S. foreign policy primary principle.

The Bush administration ensured that their mission in Afghanistan is merely nation-building. For more than twenty years, the United States has made the democracy assistance a principal mission. American government claimed that it devoted approximately \$2, 5 billion a year to this assistance with about half of it directed at Afghanistan and Iraq (Carothers 4). Through this process, the United States would provide humanitarian aid for Afghan people and build a functioning economy and free society. The aim of U.S. commitment in the nation was to assure that Afghanistan becomes a stable and democratic state. For the American government, establishing security in Afghanistan was its biggest challenge. The Bush administration attempted to assist democratically elected governments (Melia 3).

In addition, the American government believed that one of the main objectives of the United States assistance for Afghanistan is to support Afghan women's organizations. They claimed that Afghan Women were totally deprived of their rights. Moreover, the committee recommended \$2,000,000 for the Afghan Independent Human Rights commission and for other Afghan human rights organizations (Melia 3).

The American assistance for Afghanistan is mainly managed by three main organizations the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Development of State and the National Endowment for Democracy (NED). Through these organizations, the American government made efforts to support democratic institutions in Afghanistan. According to American government, U.S. democracy aid is only a small element of huge devoted efforts to democracy-related assistance which emanate from many governments, international organizations and private foundations (Carothers 4).

3.5. How U.S. Imperialism in Afghanistan is Covered by Democracy Promotion

By the dawn of the twenty-first century, the United States emerged as the world democracy promoter. Since the September 11 attacks, the Bush administration made the promotion of democracy in the Middle East a primary objective of U.S. foreign policy. The Middle East region has been made by Bush as the front line of his Freedom Agenda reflecting the strong connections it drew between the war on terror and democracy promotion (Carothers 4). President Bush asserted that the lack of democracy in the Middle East region created a breeding ground for terrorism (Lawson and Epstein 6).

Democracy promotion is in general viewed to be an American foreign policy and a belief in the superiority of the American system of governance. Some historians and influential figures argue that the U.S. government used democracy promotion as a pretext for its intervention in other countries such as Afghanistan and Iraq. For instance, in his use of the notion of democracy promotion, President George W. Bush always linked this concept with other goals and projects which first serve his administration and the American foreign policy like what happened in the American military intervention in Afghanistan and Iraq. Therefore,

it became notable that during Bush presidency, democracy promotion served nothing but the American politics (Mitchell 132).

The American government, for several years, ensured that U.S. war in Afghanistan is merely fought in the name of democracy. However, anyone who studied the U.S. imperial behavior from the late nineteenth century to the early twenty-first century would see how the burden turned from civilizing mission to democracy Promotion and how this burden is only a cover for U.S. imperial mission in the Middle East area particularly in Afghanistan. Indeed, Post 9/11 American actions were merely a demonstration of U.S. continuation of previous imperialist ambitions ("Post 9/11 U.S. Foreign Policy"). The U.S. invasion of Afghanistan was in fact a war for domination on the pretext of the September 11 attacks. After these attacks, the United States engaged in a series of wars labeled as the "Global War on Terror" ("Afghanistan: A Decade of War and the Decline of US Imperialism").

Europe's foreign policy elites believed that the Bush's statement about democracy promotion and human rights is a new "virulent" form of U.S. imperialism. Iranian officials as well asserted that Bush's rhetoric about democracy covers an ulterior U.S. motive of seizing oil in the Gulf region. Besides, after seeing the American brutal acts in Afghanistan, a number of critics of U.S. being the world police ensured that the United States should abandon its ideological mission of promoting democracy (McFaul 147, 148).

The U.S.-led war against the people of Afghanistan on the pretext of 9/11 attacks was a devastating one. For more than ten years, the people of Afghanistan have been living under the brutal U.S. occupation. Due to the war, Afghanistan witnessed an extensive destruction. Tens of thousands of Afghans lost their lives at the hands of the American imperialist occupation forces ("Afghanistan: A Decade of War and the Decline of US Imperialism"). U.S. imperialist forces conducted series of terrorist activities against innocent Afghans and

Islamist soldiers as well. Moreover, the number of Afghan civilians killed by the United States is in fact more than those who lost their lives in the criminal World Trade Center attack. The U.S. war increased the suffering of hundreds of thousands of refugees and exposed millions to the threat of starvation (“U.S. out of Afghanistan”).

Afghanistan has long been viewed by U.S. imperialist powers as a buffer zone for their intention to dominate Central Asia. Indeed, the American invasion of Afghanistan was in fact driven by U.S. need to stabilize Central Asia and the Gulf region. This need demanded the Bush administration to exercise its dominance against the Afghan lands to keep hold on local forces and the region's oil production (“U.S. out of Afghanistan”). Furthermore, the U.S. government intended to transfer Afghanistan into an American sphere of influence in Central Asia. American imperialists knew that the vast majority of oil and natural gas in the world is located in large parts of the Middle East, Central Asia and the entire Caspian Region. Besides, they were aware that Afghanistan itself is located on or very close to vital trade routes between the Middle East and Asia, Central Asia and China, and Pakistan and India (Beacham). To gain this significant profit, U.S. forces invaded Afghanistan on the pretext of removing dictatorial regimes and nation-building efforts.

The Bush administration sought to follow its imperial ambitions, mainly protecting its oil interests in Middle East and Central Asia. The reason why the United States selected Afghanistan was notably due to the American efforts to secure the regions in possession of oil (“Post 9/ 11 U.S. Foreign Policy”). U.S. imperialists exercised domination on the extraction of oil and other minerals in Afghanistan. They also forced producers to turn into cash crops, making rich areas much poorer. The United States needed to strengthen its exploitation making the military intervention an obligation (“U.S. out of Afghanistan”).

According to Andrew Bacevich, the notion of nation-building is controversial and ambitious. Some scholars argue that the use of this notion in Afghanistan and other places is merely an ideological veil for U.S. imperial ambitions. Indeed, despite the American claim that their mission in Afghanistan is merely nation-building efforts seeking to provide humanitarian aid for Afghan people, after more than a decade of U.S. intervention of the country, Afghan people were still suffering from a severe humanitarian disaster. By 2008, a quarter of Afghans still did not have access to clean water. More than six million people were still in need of food aid. Moreover, approximately 50 percent of Afghan children were still suffering from malnourishment (Keane 2, 3).

The Bush administration's "war on terror", whose first battleground was Afghanistan, was even more broadened to become an "axis of evil" consisting of several other places including Iraq, Iran and North Korea. These actions were widely believed as a cover driving the United States to pursue its special commercial interests aiming to enforce American prestige, power and influence in the Middle East. According to the American government, these objectives would be achieved only through shouldering the burden of nation-building efforts in Afghanistan first and then invading Iraq on the pretext of accusing President Saddam Hussein of having weapons of mass destruction (Keane 5).

After the September 11 attacks, the world was seeing that the Bush administration goals were not to conquer but to liberate. However, after more than a decade of U.S. intervention in Afghanistan, it became notable that the real motives behind U.S. actions in the country were actually to invade. In his book *The Search for Arab Democracy: Discourses and Counter-Discourses*, Larbi Sadiki argues "perhaps the most negative aspect of the American promotion of democracy and human rights lies in its veiled imperialist motivation" (qtd. in Markakis 46).

The Bush administration has for several years trampled the rule of law in its so called “war on terror”. The large number of abuses of Afghan and Iraqi detainees and prisoners, the secret prisoners of the CIA team and the unauthorized domestic eavesdropping have been a devastating threat to the U.S. status as the promoter of democracy and human rights in the world (Carothers 14- 15). The evidences that prove the United States imperialist behavior in Afghanistan and in other countries in the Middle East became notable. However, nothing more reveals the U.S. claim of being the world police and the anti-terrorist champion than its political, military and financial support for the terrorist regime of Israel against millions of innocent people (“U.S. out of Afghanistan”).

Due to the geographic importance of the Afghan lands, the United States liked to stay there forever, but they realized that Afghan people will never stop struggling to gain their independence. Instead, the American government attempted to negotiate an end to the war on terms that would protect the American imperialist interests in the country (Beacham).

Conclusion

This last chapter tackled U.S. imperialism in the early twenty-first century. It first discussed the United States being the world superpower and how the system of the world changed to follow American values in the aftermath of the Cold War. Furthermore, it investigated the terrorist attacks that targeted the United States on September 11, 2001 and its impact on the American state and society. These attacks that were organized by an Islamist extremist group called al-Qaeda shook the American stability. This extremist group destroyed the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. This bloody attack led to a big change in the world. As a response to it, President George W. Bush launched a global “war on terror” and invaded Afghanistan and Iraq. After years of intervention, the United States could oust the Taliban

from power in Afghanistan and executed the Iraqi president Saddam Hussein after accusing him of having weapons of mass destruction. Besides, this chapter, through exploring U.S. actions in Afghanistan and even in Iraq, showed that 9/11 attacks was just a pretext to enable the United States to pursue its political, military and economic interests. Another important point discussed in this chapter is the imprint of Kipling's *The White Man's Burden* on U.S. imperialism in the twenty-first century. The chapter showed how Americans claimed that they have just shouldered the burden as Kipling urged. The Bush and even the Obama administration insisted that their mission in the Middle East is not to conquer but to liberate. This chapter also investigated the relationship between past U.S. imperialism of the late nineteenth century and the new imperialism of the twenty-first century. At the end the chapter showed how the white man's "burden" turned from civilizing mission to democracy promotion and how the American imperial behavior in Afghanistan is just covered by promoting democracy and human rights. Therefore, the United States, along its history, has justified its wars and invasions against innocent people. Americans always pursued their interests on the pretext of protecting people from unjust governments. The U.S. brutal acts revealed its veiled imperial ambitions in all of its interventions and wars which are claimed to be launched solely in the name of democracy and human rights.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

This study was an endeavor to explore the imprint of Kipling's *The White Man's Burden* on past and present U.S. imperialism. It also aimed to investigate the linkages between the new U.S. imperialism of the twenty-first century and the imperialism of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The present study, therefore, aimed to show how the white man's "burden" turned from civilizing mission to democracy promotion, and how these moral missions are used by Americans to veil their imperial ambitions.

Today, and after more than a century since the introduction of Kipling's poem entitled "The White Man's Burden," U.S. actions still reflect the sentiments carried in this poem. Indeed, by the early twenty-first century, the United States claimed that it had taken the burden of empire just as Kipling urged. Anyone who sees U.S. public motives behind its invasions in the aftermath of 9/11 attacks would clearly notice that the United States is representing itself as a benevolent power whose mission is to liberate, promote democracy and defend human rights. Americans believe that it is their duty to be the world protector which is not new to their values. According to them, they have just carried out the mission that their fathers started in the aftermath of the Spanish-American war responding to Kipling's call for imperialism.

The current U.S. invasions in the Middle East starting after the September 11 attacks have drawn a number of similarities and historical linkages to the past U.S. imperialism which emerged in the Aftermath of the Spanish-American War. Indeed, the language used by the Bush administration to justify its invasion of the Middle East countries is quite similar to the rhetoric utilized by President McKinley to justify the American intervention in the former Spanish colonies after its victory in the war. American motives behind its invasions in its both past and present imperial experiences are claimed to be merely moral and humanitarian.

The history of U.S. imperialism itself clearly reveals that the white man's "burden" turned from spreading civilization to promoting democracy. In the past, Americans believed that they are found to fulfill a holy mission which is spreading the blessing of their Anglo-Saxon civilization among "backward" people. Today, starting from the dawn of the twenty-first century, Americans claim that the world is no longer in need of civilization. Instead, it needs the promotion of democracy and defending human rights.

It is undeniable that this burden is just used by Americans as a veil to pursue their imperial ambitions. Indeed, U.S. actions in the Philippines and the other former Spanish colonies revealed the real American imperial behaviors. The real U.S. motives, in fact, were not moral. On the contrary, they served Americans' political, military and economic interests. Although, the United States claimed that its mission in the Philippine islands was to civilize, Christianize and educate the Filipinos, its tyrannous practices against innocent people showed the contrary. The U.S. government committed a huge number of inhumane acts against the Filipinos which were of a greater brutality than that of the Spaniards.

After more than a century, the United States emerged again as a benevolent power and a world protector. It claimed that this time its duty is to spread democracy and defend human rights in the Middle East; the reality, however, shows otherwise. The U.S. real mission in the Middle East particularly in Afghanistan was imperial. Afghanistan meant wealth, prestige and military dominance. Moreover, the U.S. government killed many innocent people, destroyed houses and exploited the country's natural resources. Afghanistan did not witness any of the American promises of democracy and liberty. Instead, it witnessed its worst economic, military and political states in its history.

After a deep study of the history of U.S. imperialism from the late nineteenth century till the early twenty-first century, many facts have been revealed about U.S. real intentions

behind its intervention in other countries. The United States was and is still seeking economic, military and political dominance. The current U.S. invasions have various similarities to its past versions both in terms of motives and even practices. Today, the American government is still playing the role of the world protector to cover its imperial ambitions. Although, the world nowadays has perceived the real intentions of the United States since its first establishment, it is still incapable of deterring the nation from imposing its dominance due to the American unrivaled power and hegemony.

WORKS CITED

E-books:

Capozzola, Christopher. *Photography & Power in the Colonial Philippines I*, WPS Office, np,nd,33.

Carandang, Joven J.C. .*White Man's Burden? The Party Politics of American Imperialism in the Philippines 1900-1920*, WPS Office, np, 2007,15,18,19.

Carothers, Thomas. *Revitalizing Democracy Assistance: The Challenge of USAID*, WPS Office, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2009,4.

Carothers, Thomas. *Democracy Promotion: During and after Bush*, WPS Office, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace,2007,14,15.

Choy,Catherine Ceniza. *Imperialism in the Philippines*, summarized by Timothy Doran , WPS Office, np,nd,1,2.

Danju, Ipek et al.*The Reasons behind U.S. Invasion of Iraq*, WPS Office, Elsevier, 2013,683.

Dobbins, James et al. *After the War: Nation-Building from FDR to George W. Bush*, WPS Office, RAND Corporation, 2008,90,96,98,99.

Ferguson, Niall. *Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire*, WPS Office, np, nd,50,51,52,301.

Foner, Eric and John A. Garraty.*The Reader's Companion to American History*, Houghton Mifflin Company,1991 ,697.

GoogleBooks,books.google.dz/books?id=tZeHAgAAQBAJ&pg=PT720&lpg=PT720&dq=territorial+aggrandizement+foner++garraty&source=bl&ots=OPeD139xq9&sig=ACfU3U2q1TGN0S4MjmTMoSsrpWpICogQ-Q&hl=ar&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjgIG73-

_qAhUMzoUKHT0tDokQ6AEwAnoECAsQAQ#v=onepage&q=territorial%20aggrandizement%20fonder%20%20garraty&f=false

Karnow, Stanley. *In Our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines*, WPS Office, New York, Foreign Policy Association, 1989,20.

Keane, Conor. *U.S. Nation-Building in Afghanistan*, WPS Office, Routledge, 2016, 2,3,5,57.

Lawson, Marian L. and Susan B. Epstein. *Democracy Promotion: An Objective of U.S. Foreign Assistance*, WPS Office, Congressional Research Service, 2019,6.

Linn, Brian McAllister. *The U.S. Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902*, UNC Press, 2000, 20. Books Google, books.google.dz/books?id=-5WOrmt_VxcC&pg=PA20&lpg=PA20&dq=us+civilizing+mission+in+the+Philippines&source=bl&ots=607UBaBGLK&sig=ACfU3U1679nujSowWE-SAfs9sTJI3YCN7w&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjCidf6kvfpAhUjrXEKHesyCvsQ6AEwEHoECAMQAQ#v=onepage&q=us civilizing mission in the Philippines&f=false

Markakis, Dionysius. *US Democracy Promotion in the Middle East: The Pursuit of Hegemony*, WPS Office, np, 2012,46.

Marriott, John. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Modern Imperial Histories*, edited by Philippa Levine, Routledge, 2016, 526, Book Google, books.google.dz/books?id=GgDPCwAAQBAJ&pg=PA526&lpg=PA526&dq=us+civilizing+mission+in+the+Philippines&source=bl&ots=Us-Ee1Ldj4&sig=ACfU3U0ccCB19wWzUVAJptjx6NFmTuXMaQ&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjCidf6kvfpAhUjrXEKHesyCvsQ6AEwD3oECAEQAAQ#v=onepage&q=us civilizing mission in the Philippines&f=false

McFaul, Michael. Democracy Promotion as a World Value, WPS Office, The Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2004, 147, 148.

Melia, Thomas O. *The Democracy Bureaucracy: The Infrastructure of American Democracy Promotion*, WPS Office, n.p, 2005,3.

Mitchell, Lincoln A. *The Democracy Promotion Paradox*, Brookings Institution Press. 2016,132. *Google Books*,
https://books.google.dz/books?id=S9OACwAAQBAJ&pg=PA132&lpg=PA132&dq=democracy+promotion+in+Afghanistan+true+or+false&source=bl&ots=Wk8UffC_Ar&sig=ACfU3U1kKizEBBPQyxYLSYJZsQKFgxQE4A&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwix5ICsq7qAhVDwKQKHYYAaCdwQ6AEwCXoECAYQAQ#v=onepage&q=democracy%20promotion%20in%20Afghanistan%20true%20or%20false&f=false

O'Callaghan, Bryn. *An Illustrated History of the USA*, WPS Office, Longman,1990,84, 85,86.

Sedaca, Nicole Bibbins and Nicolas Bouchet. *Holding Steady? US Democracy Promotion in a Changing World*, WPS Office, Chatham House, 2014,3.

Stone, Oliver and Peter Kuznick. *The Untold History of the United States*, Secret History,2012, XV, *Google Books*,
[https://books.google.dz/books?id=hZlFAQAAQBAJ&pg=PA15&lpg=PA15&dq=from+the+time+the+first+settlers+arrived+at+Virginia+from+England+the+untold+history+of+the+United+States&source=bl&ots=BJshbMPZdG&sig=ACfU3U1KCVIeHJeNMyl2LM9LtG4kWKhAxA&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi82YyohfjqAhUP8xQKHTuvB_kQ6AEwC3oECAIQAQ#v=onepage&q=from the time the first settlers arrived at Virginia from England the untold history of the United States&f=false](https://books.google.dz/books?id=hZlFAQAAQBAJ&pg=PA15&lpg=PA15&dq=from+the+time+the+first+settlers+arrived+at+Virginia+from+England+the+untold+history+of+the+United+States&source=bl&ots=BJshbMPZdG&sig=ACfU3U1KCVIeHJeNMyl2LM9LtG4kWKhAxA&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi82YyohfjqAhUP8xQKHTuvB_kQ6AEwC3oECAIQAQ#v=onepage&q=from+the+time+the+first+settlers+arrived+at+Virginia+from+England+the+untold+history+of+the+United+States&f=false)

Theses:

Beaman, Allan T. *American Economic Imperialism and the Spanish-American War Era* , WPS Office, vol. number, Education and Human Development Master's Theses, 2013, 13.

Boucheфра, Abdelkarim and KhaledBelhadj. *Manifest Destiny as a justification for the American Expansion*.np, 2017, 3, www.google.dz/url?q=http://dspace.univ-tlemcen.dz/bitstream/112/11414/1/belhadj-boucharfa.pdf&sa=U&ved=2ahUKEwiFh5Kk4djpAhVPzoUKHbWvAyAQFjAAegQIABAB&usg=AOvVaw0fn8fN8GLbPGIZcZJacrHv

Website Articles:

"Afghanistan: A Decade of War and the Decline of US Imperialism." *Lalkar*.np, 2011, www.lalkar.org/article/526/afghanistan-a-decade-of-war-and-the-decline-of-us-imperialism&hl=en-DZ

Ajootian, Mithril. "US Imperialism in Guam." *Arcgis* . 6 Nov. 2019, storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/daf3261b3c8b47c9bb4fdcd7030efb5b&hl=en-DZ

"Ambivalent Empire." *Country Studies*.np, nd, country-studies.com/united-states/history-ambivalent-empire.html&hl=en-DZ

"American Exceptionalism." *New World Encyclopedia*.np, nd, www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/American_exceptionalism&hl=en-DZ

"American Imperialism." *lumen Learning*.np,nd,courses.lumenlearning.com/boundless-ushistory/chapter/american-imperialism/&hl=en-DZ

"American Imperialism." *Global Security*.np,nd,www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/usa/history/08-09.htm&hl=en-DZ

Arnove, Anthony. "The New White Man's Burden: U.S. imperialism past and present." *Third World Traveler*.np, June 2006, www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Imperialism_Neocolonialism/New%2520WhiteMansBurden.html&hl=en-DZ

Beacham, John. "Afghanistan and the Struggle against Imperialism." *Liberation School*.np, 17 Oct. 2012, liberationschool.org/afghanistan-and-the-struggle-against-imperialism/&hl=en-DZ

Daniel, Catherine. "Manifest Destiny: Creating an American Identity." *Teaching History*.np, nd, teachinghistory.org/history-content/ask-a-historian/25502&hl=en-DZ

"Definition of White Man's Burden." *Collins Dictionary*.np, nd,www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/white-mans-burden

"Definition of White Man's Burden." *Merriam-Webster*.np, nd www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/white%2520man%2527s%2520burden&hl=en-DZ

Foster, John Bellamy, and Robert W. McChesney. "Kipling, the White Man's Burden, and U.S. Imperialism." *Monthly Review*.np, 1 Nov. 2003, historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5478/&hl=en-DZ

Guelzo, Allen C. "What's Exceptional About American Exceptionalism." *City Journal*.np, 2019, www.city-journal.org/american-exceptionalism&hl=en-DZ

"Hawaiian Annexation." *US History*. U.S. History Online Textbook, 9 Jun. 2020,
www.ushistory.org/us/44b.asp&hl=en-DZ

"History of the Philippines." *Csub.np*, nd,
www.csub.edu/pacificrim/countryprospectus/history.htm#:~:text=The%20Philippines%20were%20claimed%20in,were%20then%20called%20Las%20Felipinas

History.Com Editors. "September 11 Attacks." *History*. A&E Television Networks, 17 Feb. 2010, www.history.com/topics/21st-century/9-11-attacks

History.com Editors. "U.S. forces invade Puerto Rico." *History*. A&E Television Networks, February 9, 2010, www.history.com/this-day-in-history/puerto-rico-invaded

Höglund, Johan. "Taking up the White Man's Burden? American Empire and the Question of History." *Openedition*. European Journal of American Studies, 2007,
journals.openedition.org/ejas/1542&hl=en-DZ

"Iraq: The Debacle of US imperialism." *Leftcom.np*, nd, 16 Feb. 2007,
www.leftcom.org/en/articles/2007-02-16/iraq-the-debacle-of-us-imperialism&hl=en-DZ

"Iraq War." *Ducksters.np*, nd,
www.ducksters.com/history/us_1900s/iraq_war.php#:~:text=The%20U.S.%20began%20to%20worry,developing%20weapons%20of%20mass%20destruction

Kinzer, Stephen. "US Imperialism in Cuba." *Libcom.np*, nd, libcom.org/history/us-imperialism-cuba-1898-1901&hl=en-DZ

Kuchera, Carolyn. "ManifestDestiny." *Oxford Bibliographies*. np, 28 Jun. 2016, www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199827251/obo-9780199827251-0024.xml

Lewis, Carl. "Philippine Election and US Imperialism." *Workers*. np, 27 Mai. 2016, www.workers.org/2016/05/25574/&hl=en-DZ

Little, Becky. "How the United States Ended up with Guam." *History*. A&E Television Networks, 9 Aug. 2017, www.history.com/news/how-the-united-states-ended-up-with-guam&hl=en-DZ

King, Laura. "No Nation-Building in Afghanistan? Easier Said than Done, Experts Say." *Los Angeles Times*. np, 22 Aug. 2017, www.latimes.com/nation/la-fg-afghanistan-nation-building-20170822-story.html&hl=en-DZ

Longley, Robert. "Treaty of Paris 1898: The End of the Spanish- American War." *Thought Co*. np, 29 Jul. 2019, <https://www.thoughtco.com/treaty-of-paris-1898-4692529>

Maier, Charles S. "Empire without End: Imperial Achievement and Ideologies." *Foreign Affairs*. np, Jul/Aug 2010, www.foreignaffairs.com/reviews/review-essay/2010-07-01/empire-without-end&hl=en-DZ

"Manifest Destiny." *Dictionary*. np, nd, www.dictionary.com/browse/manifest-destiny&hl=en-DZ

"Manifest Destiny." *History*. np, 5 Apr. 2010, www.history.com/topics/westward-expansion/manifest-destiny&hl=en-DZ

Melcon, Margot. "American Exceptionalism." *Marin Theatre*. np, nd, www.marintheatre.org/productions/the-way-west/from-possibility-to-entitlement&hl=en-DZ

"Motives for Imperialism." *Bishop Amat*. np, nd, www.bishopamat.org/apps/video/watch.jsp?v=47531

"Post 9/11 US Foreign Policy: Continuation of Imperialist Ambitions." *E- International Relations*. np, 14 Aug. 2012, www.e-ir.info/2012/08/14/post-911-us-foreign-policy-continuation-of-new-imperialist-ambitions/&hl=en-DZ

"Reasons for the Growth of American Imperialism." *Prezi*. np, 11 Dec. 2014, prezi.com/nnyskxbawvuo/reasons-for-the-growth-of-american-imperialism

Richman, Michael. "A Splendid Little War Built America's Empire." *Washington Post*. np, 8 Apr. 1898, www.washingtonpost.com/archive/1998/04/08/a-splendid-little-war-built-americas-empire/0cc1f34f-cfdd-4e93-9c1a-85893e25ebdc/&hl=en-DZ

Roos, Dave. "Origins of the Term American Exceptionalism." *How Stuff Works*. np, nd, people.howstuffworks.com/american-exceptionalism4.htm&hl=en-DZ

"Scramble for Africa." *New World Encyclopedia*. np, nd, www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Scramble_for_Africa&grqid=9A6quE70&s=1&hl=en-DZ

"September 11 Terror Attacks Fast Facts." *CNN*. np, 27 Jul. 2013, edition.cnn.com/2013/07/27/us/september-11-anniversary-fast-facts/index.html

"Spanish American War." *Britannica*. np, 14 Apr. 2020, www.britannica.com/event/Spanish-American-War&hl=en-DZ

Taufa' asau, Malia. "American Imperialism with Hawaii." *Arcgis*. np, 18 Nov. 2019, storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/de6b1a09b13a44eba9d087fd04559096&hl=en-DZ

"Teller and Platt Amendment." *Loc*. np, nd, loc.gov/rr/hispanic/1898/teller.html&hl=en-DZ

"The White Man's Burden." *Oxford Learner's Dictionaries* .np, nd,
www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/the-white-man-s-burden&hl=en-DZ

"The White Man's Burden: Kipling's Hymn to U.S. Imperialism." *History Matters*.
np,nd,historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5478/&hl=en-DZ

"The Age of Empire: The Spanish American War." *Khan Academy*.np, nd,
www.khanacademy.org/humanities/us-history/rise-to-world-power/age-of-empire/a/the-spanish-american-war&hl=en-DZ

"The Philippine-American War, 1899- 1902." *State*.np, nd,
history.state.gov/milestones/1899-1913/war&hl=en-DZ

"US Imperialism in Puerto Rico." *Sites*.np, nd,
sites.google.com/site/usimperialisminpuertorico/

"U.S. out of Afghanistan! Defeat Imperialism! Re-Creat the Fourth
International." *Marxists*.np, nd,
www.marxists.org/history/etol/newspape/socialistvoice/Afghanistan200112.html&hl=en-DZ

Witte, Griff. "Afghanistan War 2001-2014." *Britannica*.np, nd ,
www.britannica.com/event/Afghanistan-War

Witte, Griff. "The Obama Surge." *Britannica*.np, nd,
www.britannica.com/event/Afghanistan-War/The-Obama-surge&hl=en-DZ

"9/11 FAQs." *9/11 Memorial*.np, nd, <https://www.911memorial.org/911-faqs>