Historical Opinions of the Spanish-American War
In 1898, the United States was over 100 years old, and 30 years removed from the Civil War. As American businesses engaged in international trade and European powers expanded their empires into Africa and Asia, many saw a need for the United States to step up to the world stage.

Cuba had been fighting for independence from Spain on and off since 1868, with a renewed effort beginning in 1895. Many Americans saw the war as a parallel to the American Revolution and supported the Cuba Libre ("Free Cuba") movement. President William McKinley hoped for a peaceful end to the revolution and attempted to negotiate with both the Spanish government and Cuban rebel leadership. In the midst of these attempted negotiations, the USS Maine was sent to Havana to protect American interests. On the night of February 15, 1898, the battleship suddenly exploded. Though the cause of the Maine’s explosion was never determined, the possibility that it could have been a Spanish attack was used by some U.S. newspapers to fan the flames of war. In April, after Spain had continually broken promises to change its treatment of the Cuban people, President McKinley declared war against Spain with strong nationwide support.

Political cartoon by F. Victor Gillam, published May 7, 1898 in the magazine Judge. (Historical Society of Pennsylvania Digital History Projects)
Near the conclusion of the war, U.S. Ambassador to the United Kingdom (and later secretary of state) John Hay wrote to his friend Theodore Roosevelt, congratulating him on his victories in Cuba as leader of the “Rough Riders” cavalry regiment. In his letter, Hay stated, “It has been a splendid little war, begun with the highest motives, carried on with magnificent intelligence and spirit, favored by that Fortune which loves the brave.” In many ways, Ambassador Hay’s assessment was sound—the war had lasted only 10 weeks; fewer than 400 Americans were killed in battle (though more than 2,000 died of disease); the Spanish navy had been decimated with barely any damage to American ships; and Cuba was granted independence.

Filipinos had been fighting for independence from Spain since 1896, but unlike Cuba, the Philippines was not granted independence after the Spanish-American War. Instead, the United States purchased the Philippines from Spain for $20 million in December 1898. In February 1899, hostilities between Filipino and American soldiers began, and the Philippines declared war on the United States on June 2, 1899. Brutal fighting continued for three years, and the war ended when the Filipino forces surrendered in April 1902. Casualties were high: more than 4,000 Americans and more than 16,000 Filipino soldiers were killed in battle. Additionally, more than 250,000 Filipino civilians died of famine and disease due to displacement and upheaval. Though a separate conflict, the Philippine-American War was a direct result of the Spanish-American War, and should be considered part of its legacy.

### The Spanish-American War at a Glance

**1898**

- Apr 25: U.S. Congress declares war on Spain
- May 1: American Asiatic Squadron easily defeats Spanish Pacific Squadron at Manila Bay, Philippines
- Jun 10: U.S. Marines land at Guantanamo Bay, beginning the American land invasion of Cuba
- Jun 21: USS Charleston captures Spanish territory Guam on its way to the Philippines
- Jun 24: American forces claim victory at Battle of Las Guasimas, Cuba, despite suffering heavy casualties
- Jul 1: American forces gain strategic footholds in Cuba after victories at Battle of El Caney and Battle of San Juan Hill
- Jul 3: Spanish fleet attempts to escape American blockade of harbor in Santiago de Cuba and is destroyed
- Jul 17: Spanish forces surrender at Santiago de Cuba, which had been under American siege since July 3
- Jul 25: American troops land in Puerto Rico at Guanica and begin successful land campaign
- Aug 12: U.S. and Spain sign Protocol of Peace, agreeing to end hostilities
- Aug 13: Spain surrenders city of Manila, Philippines to U.S. following brief naval bombardment
- Dec 10: U.S. and Spain sign Treaty of Paris, formally ending the Spanish-American War
The stated purpose of President McKinley’s declaration of war was to force Spain to relinquish its claim over Cuba. Yet the Spanish-American War resulted in the American acquisition of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines, establishing the United States as an imperialist power. Some Americans celebrated this outcome, while others criticized it as contrary to the American ideal of self-government. Opinions and interpretations of the Spanish-American War have varied greatly over time. Was it a noble stand for freedom, an unnecessary war, a rightful expansion of American influence, or an unjustifiable land grab?

Read through the primary source excerpts collected here, which represent a variety of historical opinions on the Spanish-American War and American expansionism. Consider how you would have reacted at the time, and how these arguments about the role of the United States as a world power continue today.

**List of Excerpts**

- *The Influence of Sea Power Upon History: 1660-1783*
  Alfred T. Mahan, book published in 1890

- *Manifest Destiny*
  Carl Schurz, article published in 1893

- *Speech to the U.S. Senate*
  Senator Redfield Proctor, delivered March 17, 1898

- *The March of the Flag*
  Albert Beveridge, speech delivered September 16, 1898

- *The Conquest of the United States by Spain*
  William Graham Sumner, speech delivered January 16, 1899

- *The Paralyzing Influence of Imperialism*
  William Jennings Bryan, speech delivered in July 1900

*American troops cheering the Spanish surrender at Santiago de Cuba, July 17, 1898. (LoC/James Burton)*

*1898 photo of caskets of Spanish-American War dead ready for burial at Arlington National Cemetery. (LoC)*
Excerpt:

**THE INFLUENCE OF SEA POWER UPON HISTORY: 1660-1783**

Alfred T. Mahan

Alfred T. Mahan was a United States naval officer and historian. In *The Influence of Sea Power Upon History: 1660-1783*, Mahan described factors needed to support sea power and the role sea power had played in wars during the 17th and 18th centuries. The book was published in 1890 while Mahan was president of the U.S. Naval War College, and the naval strategies it describes were adopted by many different countries.

Colonies attached to the mother-country afford, therefore, the surest means of supporting abroad the sea power of a country. In peace, the influence of the government should be felt in promoting by all means a warmth of attachment and a unity of interest which will make the welfare of one the welfare of all, and the quarrel of one the quarrel of all; and in war, or rather for war, by inducing such measures of organization and defence as shall be felt by all to be a fair distribution of a burden of which each reaps the benefit.

Such colonies the United States has not and is not likely to have. As regards purely military naval stations, the feeling of her people was probably accurately expressed by an historian of the English navy a hundred years ago, speaking then of Gibraltar and Port Mahon. "Military governments," said he, "agree so little with the industry of a trading people, and are in themselves so repugnant to the genius of the British people, that I do not wonder that men of good sense and of all parties have inclined to give up these, as Tangiers was given up." [CONTINUED]
Having therefore no foreign establishments, either colonial or military, the ships of war of the United States, in war, will be like land birds, unable to fly far from their own shores. To provide resting-places for them, where they can coal and repair, would be one of the first duties of a government proposing to itself the development of the power of the nation at sea....

The question is eminently one in which the influence of the government should make itself felt, to build up for the nation a navy which, if not capable of reaching distant countries, shall at least be able to keep clear the chief approaches to its own. The eyes of the country have for a quarter of a century been turned from the sea; the results of such a policy and of its opposite will be shown in the instance of France and of England. Without asserting a narrow parallelism between the case of the United States and either of these, it may safely be said that it is essential to the welfare of the whole country that the conditions of trade and commerce should remain, as far as possible, unaffected by an external war. In order to do this, the enemy must be kept not only out of our ports, but far away from our coasts.
Carl Schurz was a German immigrant who had a lifelong career in politics and journalism. After fighting for democratic reforms in his native Germany, he served as a general in the U.S. Army from 1862 to 1865, Republican senator from Missouri from 1869 to 1875, and secretary of the interior from 1877 to 1881. He also worked as the editor of the New York Evening Post and The Nation in the 1880s. The following excerpt is from an article published in Harper’s Magazine in October 1893.

Whenever there is a project on foot to annex foreign territory to this republic the cry of manifest destiny is raised to produce the impression that all opposition to such a project is a struggle against fate.... The new manifest destiny precept means, in point of principle, not merely the incorporation in the United States of territory contiguous to our borders, but rather the acquisition of such territory, far and near, as may be useful in enlarging our commercial advantages, and in securing to our navy facilities desirable for the operations of a great naval power....

The advocates of the annexation policy advance some arguments which require but a passing notice. They say that unless we take a certain country offered to us—Hawaii, for instance—some other power will take it, and that, having refused ourselves, we cannot object. This is absurd.

We are told that unless we take charge of a certain country it will be ill-governed and get into internal trouble. This is certainly no inducement. This republic cannot take charge of all countries that are badly governed. On the contrary, a country apt to get into internal trouble would be no desirable addition to our national household.

We are told that the people of a certain country wish to join us, and it would be wrong to repel them. But the question whether a stranger is to be admitted as a member of our family it is our right and our duty to decide according to our own view of the family interest.

We are told that we need coaling stations in different parts of the world for our navy, also if it be a small one, and that the rich resources of the countries within our reach should be open to American capital and enterprise. There is little doubt that we can secure by amicable negotiation sites for coaling stations which will serve us as well as if we possessed the countries in which they are situated. [CONTINUED]
[CONTINUED] In the same manner we can obtain from and within them all sorts of commercial advantages. We can own plantations and business houses in the Hawaiian Islands. In the American tropics we can build and control railroads; we can purchase mines, and have them worked for our benefit; we can keep up commercial establishments in their towns—in fact, we are now doing many of these things and all this without taking those countries into our national household on an equal footing with the States of our Union, without exposing our political institutions to the deteriorating influence of their participation in our government, without assuming any responsibilities for them which would oblige us to forego the inestimable privilege of being secure in our possessions without large and burdensome armaments. Surely the advantages we might gain by incorporating the countries themselves in the Union appear utterly valueless compared with the price this republic would have to pay for them.

*Political cartoon by Clifford Berryman, published in the Washington Post on June 26, 1898. Titled “Uncle Sam’s Temptation,” it shows Uncle Sam being served a bowl of anti-annexation broth, while the English John Bull tempts him with conquest and foreign aggression. (NARA)*
Senator Redfield Proctor served as governor of Vermont (1878-1880), secretary of war (1889-1891) and as a Republican senator (1891-1908). He visited Cuba in March 1898 to observe conditions during the revolution, and upon his return to Washington, D.C. delivered a speech to the U.S. Senate describing what he witnessed. This speech is often cited as a turning point in public and Congressional opinion on the United States’ need to declare war on Spain.

It is not within the narrow limits of my vocabulary to portray it. I went to Cuba with a strong conviction that the picture had been overdrawn; that a few cases of starvation and suffering had inspired and stimulated the press correspondents, and that they had given free play to a strong, natural and highly cultivated imagination.

I could not believe that out of a population of one million six hundred thousand, 200,000 had died within these Spanish forts, practically prison walls, within a few months past, from actual starvation and disease caused by insufficient and improper food.

My inquiries were entirely outside of sensational sources. They were made by our medical officers, of our consuls, of city alcaldes, of relief committees, of leading merchants and bankers, physicians and lawyers. Several of my informants were Spanish born, but every time came the answer that the case had not been overstated. [CONTINUED]

Cuban Reconcentrados

In response to the Cuban Revolution, Spanish General Valeriano Weyler ordered rural Cuban families to move into concentration camps in fortified towns. By 1898, one third of Cuba’s population had been forced into these camps. Housing was inadequate and mostly uninhabitable, food was scarce and disease rampant. Over 100,000 Cubans died as a result of the reconcentration policy.
[CONTINUED] What I saw I cannot tell so that others can see it. It must be seen with one's own eyes to be realized....

I have endeavored to state in not intemperate mood what I saw and heard, and to make no argument thereon, but leave everyone to draw his own conclusions. To me the strongest appeal is not the barbarity practiced by Weyler nor the loss of the Maine, if our worst fears should prove true, terrible as are both of these incidents, but the spectacle of a million and a half of people, the entire native population of Cuba, struggling for freedom and deliverance from the worst misgovernment of which I ever had knowledge. But whether our action ought to be influenced by any one or all these things, and, if so, how far, is another question.

Political cartoon by Louis Dalrymple published in the magazine Puck on May 11, 1898, captioned “The duty of the hour – to save her not only from Spain, but from a worse fate.” A woman representing Cuba is caught between a frying pan of Spanish misrule and the fire of anarchy. (LoC)
Albert Beveridge was a Republican senator from Indiana, serving from 1899 to 1911. The following excerpt comes from a campaign speech that he delivered on September 16, 1898. It reflects the arguments made by many American imperialists in support of the annexation of the Philippines.

Therefore, in this campaign, the question is larger than a party question. It is an American question. It is a world question. Shall the American people continue their march toward the commercial supremacy of the world? Shall free institutions broaden their blessed reign as the children of liberty wax in strength, until the empire of our principles is established over the hearts of all mankind?....

Hawaii is ours; Porto Rico is to be ours; at the prayer of her people Cuba finally will be ours; in the islands of the East, even to the gates of Asia, coaling stations are to be ours at the very least; the flag of a liberal government is to float over the Philippines, and may it be the banner that Taylor unfurled in Texas and Fremont carried to the coast.

The Opposition tells us that we ought not to govern a people without their consent. I answer, The rule of liberty that all just government derives its authority from the consent of the governed, applies only to those who are capable of self-government. We govern the Indians without their consent, we govern our territories without their consent, we govern our children without their consent. How do they know what our government would be without their consent? Would not the people of the Philippines prefer the just, humane, civilizing government of this Republic to the savage, bloody rule of pillage and extortion from which we have rescued them?

And, regardless of this formula of words made only for enlightened, self-governing people, do we owe no duty to the world? Shall we turn these peoples back to the reeking hands from which we have taken them? Shall we abandon them, with Germany, England, Japan, hungering for them? Shall we save them from those nations, to give them a self-rule of tragedy?

They ask us how we shall govern these new possessions. I answer: Out of local conditions and the necessities of the case methods of government will grow. If England can govern foreign lands, so can America. If Germany can govern foreign lands, so can America. If they can supervise protectorates, so can America. [CONTINUED]
[CONTINUED] Why is it more difficult to administer Hawaii than New Mexico or California? Both had a savage and an alien population: both were more remote from the seat of government when they came under our dominion than the Philippines are today.

Will you say by your vote that American ability to govern has decayed, that a century’s experience in self-rule has failed of a result? Will you affirm by your vote that you are an infidel to American power and practical sense? Or will you say that ours is the blood of government; ours the heart of dominion; ours the brain and genius of administration? Will you remember that we do but what our fathers did — we but pitch the tents of liberty farther westward, farther southward—we only continue the march of the flag?

A racially insensitive political cartoon by Louis Dalrymple published in the magazine Puck on January, 25, 1899.

Uncle Sam scolds children representing the Philippines, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and Cuba, saying to his new Civilization class, “Now, children, you’ve got to learn these lessons whether you want to or not! But just take a look at the class ahead of you, and remember that, in a little while, you will feel as glad to be here as they are!”

Children in the back of the classroom represent California, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and Alaska. The blackboard reads: “The consent of the governed is a good thing in theory, but very rare in fact. England has governed her colonies whether they consented or not. By not waiting for their consent she has greatly advanced the world’s civilization. The U.S. must govern its new territories with or without their consent until they can govern themselves.” (LoC)
William Graham Sumner was a social scientist and professor who taught at Yale University in New Haven, Connecticut from 1872 to 1909. The following excerpt comes from a speech he delivered at Yale on January 16, 1899.

During the last year the public has been familiarized with descriptions of Spain and of Spanish methods of doing things until the name of Spain has become a symbol for a certain well-defined set of notions and policies. On the other hand, the name of the United States has always been, for all of us, a symbol for a state of things, a set of ideas and traditions, a group of views about social and political affairs.

Spain was the first, for a long time the greatest, of the modern imperialistic states. The United States, by its historical origin, its traditions, and its principles, is the chief representative of the revolt and reaction against that kind of a state. I intend to show that, by the line of action now proposed to us, which we call expansion and imperialism, we are throwing away some of the most important elements of the American symbol and are adopting some of the most important elements of the Spanish symbol.

We have beaten Spain in a military conflict, but we are submitting to be conquered by her on the field of ideas and policies. Expansionism and imperialism are nothing but the old philosophies of national prosperity which have brought Spain to where she now is. Those philosophies appeal to national vanity and national cupidity. They are seductive, especially upon the first view and the most superficial judgment, and therefore it cannot be denied that they are very strong for popular effect. They are delusions, and they will lead us to ruin unless we are hardheaded enough to resist them....

Justice and law were to reign in the midst of simplicity, and a government which had little to do was to offer little field for ambition. In a society where industry, frugality, and prudence were honored, it was believed that the vices of wealth would never flourish. [CONTINUED]
[CONTINUED] We know that these beliefs, hopes, and intentions have been only partially fulfilled. We know that, as time has gone on and we have grown numerous and rich, some of these things have proved impossible ideals, incompatible with a large and flourishing society, but it is by virtue of this conception of a commonwealth that the United States has stood for something unique and grand in the history of mankind and that its people have been happy. It is by virtue of these ideals that we have been "isolated," isolated in a position which the other nations of the earth have observed in silent envy; and yet there are people who are boasting of their patriotism, because they say that we have taken our place now amongst the nations of the earth by virtue of this war. My patriotism is of the kind which is outraged by the notion that the United States never was a great nation until in a petty three months' campaign it knocked to pieces a poor, decrepit, bankrupt old state like Spain. To hold such an opinion as that is to abandon all American standards, to put shame and scorn on all that our ancestors tried to build up here, and to go over to the standards of which Spain is a representative.

Political cartoon by Clifford Berryman published in the Washington Post on September 14, 1899. Captioned “Uncle Sam – ‘Too late, my boys. I’ve already expanded,” it shows Uncle Sam resting after having eaten a three-course meal of Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Philippines. Anti-expansionists, led by William Jennings Bryan and Senator George Hoar, are disappointed at having arrived too late. (NARA)
The Paralyzing Influence of Imperialism
William Jennings Bryan

William Jennings Bryan was a prominent Democratic politician and orator from Nebraska who served in the House of Representatives and as secretary of state, and ran for president three times. He is buried at Arlington National Cemetery in Section 4, Grave 3121. The following excerpt is from a speech that he delivered at the Democratic National Convention in July 1900.

Those who would have this nation enter upon a career of empire must consider not only the effect of imperialism on the Filipinos but they must also calculate its effects upon our own nation. We cannot repudiate the principle of self-government in the Philippines without weakening that principle here....

The principal arguments, however, advanced by those who enter upon a defense of imperialism are:

First, that we must improve the present opportunity to become a world power and enter into international politics. Second, that our commercial interests in the Philippine Islands and in the Orient make it necessary for us to hold the islands permanently. Third, that the spread of the Christian religion will be facilitated by a colonial policy. Fourth, that there is no honorable retreat from the position which the nation has taken....

It is sufficient answer to the first argument to say that for more than a century this nation has been a world power. For ten decades it has been the most potent influence in the world. Not only has it been a world power but it has done more to affect the policies of the human race than all the other nations of the world combined. Because our Declaration of Independence was promulgated, others have been promulgated. Because the patriots of 1776 fought for liberty, others have fought for it. Because our Constitution was adopted, other constitutions have been adopted....

[The commercial argument] is based upon the theory that war can be rightly waged for pecuniary advantage and that it is profitable to purchase trade by force and violence....

To me it seems that neither the obtaining nor retaining of any trade, howsoever valuable, is an object for which men may justly spill each other's blood; that the true and sure means of extending and securing commerce are the goodness and cheapness of commodities, and that the profits of no trade can ever be equal to the expense of compelling it and holding it by fleets and armies.... [CONTINUED]
[CONTINUED] The religious argument varies in positiveness from a passive belief that Providence delivered the Filipinos into our hands for their good and our glory to the exultation of the minister who said that we ought to "thrash the natives (Filipinos) until they understand who we are," and that "every bullet sent, every cannon shot, and every flag waved means righteousness."

We cannot approve of this doctrine in one place unless we are willing to apply it everywhere. If there is poison in the blood of the hand, it will ultimately reach the heart. It is equally true that forcible Christianity, if planted under the American flag in the far-away Orient, will sooner or later be transplanted upon American soil....

The argument made by some that it was unfortunate for the nation that it had anything to do with the Philippine Islands, but that the naval victory at Manila made the permanent acquisition of those islands necessary, is also unsound.

We won a naval victory at Santiago, but that did not compel us to hold Cuba....

The fact that the American flag floats over Manila does not compel us to exercise perpetual sovereignty over the islands; the American flag waves over Havana today, but the President has promised to haul it down when the flag of the Cuban republic is ready to rise in its place. Better a thousand times that our flag in the Orient give way to a flag representing the idea of self-government than that the flag of this republic should become the flag of an empire.

*Political cartoon by Clifford Berryman, published in the Washington Post on February 4, 1899. It shows Emilio Aguinaldo, leader of the Philippine independence movement, attempting to remove Uncle Sam’s boot from the Philippines. (NARA)*
Though the era of imperialism is over, debate continues about the United States’ role as a world power. Some advocate for military support of other democracies; others emphasize the importance of protecting American business interests; and some prefer that the United States limit its engagement in foreign affairs. Whenever you discuss your thoughts on foreign policy with family, friends and neighbors, you are participating in a conversation that began in the early days of this country and will continue for generations to come.

Political cartoon by Udo J. Keppler, published in the magazine Puck on July 13, 1898, showing an American sailor leaning on a cannon with the ruins of the Spanish fleet in the background. (LoC)
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