

University at Albany, State University of New York

Scholars Archive

History Honors Program

History

5-2020

Imperial Evolution: Walter Lippmann and the Liberal Roots of American Hegemony

Lukas Moller

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/history_honors



Part of the [History Commons](#)

**Imperial Evolution: Walter Lippmann and the Liberal
Roots of American Hegemony**

An honors thesis presented to the
Department of History,
University at Albany, State University of New York
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for graduation with Honors in History

Lukas Moller

Research Mentor: Ryan Irwin, Ph.D.

Research Advisor: Christopher Pastore, Ph.D.

May, 2020

Abstract

When Walter Lippmann became a founding editor of the *New Republic* in 1914, shortly after the outbreak of World War I, he began to advocate for heightened United States involvement in global affairs. Lippmann argued that the global power vacuum generated by the war presented the ideal opportunity for American values to spread to places like Eastern Europe and South America, the latter under the veil of “Pan-Americanism.” The Pan-American movement would disguise the U.S. as a “big-brother” to the Latin American nations creating a seemingly symbiotic relationship, when realistically it would seize the open markets caused by the war in Europe. Although historians have emphasized Walter Lippmann’s work in drafting the Fourteen Points in 1917 thereby advancing a global embrace of “national self-determination,” little attention has been given to the ways Lippmann maneuvered to advance American interests in the process. Lippmann serves as the lynchpin in the foreign policy transition from aggressive, militaristic assertion of “hard power” under Theodore Roosevelt, to the morally righteous “soft power” approach supported by Woodrow Wilson. Lippmann’s efforts are significant because he had a direct influence on public opinion through his writing in the *New Republic* and on the politicians he advised, including Woodrow Wilson. Drawing on the *New Republic* issues from 1914 through 1918, Lippmann’s personal papers, publications of other *New Republic* contributors, and documents from members of the secretive foreign policy think-tank titled “The Inquiry”, Lippmann’s important role in America’s rise to global power becomes clear. This paper will argue that Walter Lippmann was a crucial ally in supporting the U.S. emergence as a contender for world power by extending democratic ideals in a non-democratic fashion, through both military intervention and economic domination. When Walter Lippmann is viewed as an early advocate for American hegemonic expansion rather than an author or political commentator, it encourages us to think of the foundation of America’s active role in the world beginning during WWI rather than WWII, with one of the most read authors of the 20th century as a strong advocate.

Acknowledgements

There are many people to thank for their help in the process of writing my thesis. First, I would like to thank Dr. Ryan Irwin for his expertise and guidance throughout the past year. I would also like to thank the other Honors students, John Ginder, Hannah Cast, Ankeith Illiparambil, Shouyue Zhang, Chloe Ross, and Nicholas Dorthe for their support and encouragement throughout. Ankeith and Shouyue were particularly helpful with their in-depth review of my thesis. Lastly, I would like to thank Dr. Christopher Pastore for leading the History Honors program and reviewing my thesis progress weekly. I also enjoyed our occasional talks about fishing when we could spare a break from the project. Thank you all for your help.

I will always appreciate the unwavering support of my parents, Mary and Randy, and my brother, Wyatt, to complete any of life's endeavors to the best of my ability.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
The Rise and Fall of Lippmann’s Progressive Imperialism.....	6
“A Disillusioned World”.....	49
Bibliography.....	55

Introduction

“Panic in Brussels. Run on Banks. Collapse of Credit,” wrote Walter Lippmann in his diary on July 29, 1914. His annual European holiday coincidentally placed him only days away from the German invasion of Belgium. Normally a stylistic and witty master of the English language, the frantic staccato of his diary entries at the end of July reflect the panic in the air on the eve of the Great War. Just as his grandfather had fled the aggressive anti-democratic actions of Prussia after the failed Revolution of 1848, Lippmann, sixty-six years later, sought to flee German aggression by crossing the Belgian border into Switzerland. Lippmann’s German blood could jeopardize his safety in Belgium as he noted it was “somewhat dangerous to speak German” on a train heading toward the Swiss border. A young, rotund and well-tailored product of uptown New York City, Lippmann was stuck in the middle of an international crisis. He had been thrust out of his comfort zone with the outbreak of war, and the war would shift his attention from domestic affairs within the U.S. to global affairs surrounding the European war. He never made it to Switzerland, instead crossing the English Channel by boat on the night of July 30, narrowly escaping the Kaiser’s Imperial Army. Only a few days later, on August 4th, Lippmann watched in astonishment from the balcony of the House of Commons as England declared war on Germany. Lippmann described his European escapade in 1914 to Ronald Steel in his authorized biography.¹ Although no inspirational Churchill speech was given like in World War II to spur the 24 year old Lippmann’s interest in the war while in London, he would nevertheless spend the next four years grappling with the U.S. role in the war and in global affairs.

¹ Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century*. (Boston, MA: Little Brown, 1980.)

An anxious Herbert Croly and Walter Weyl awaited Lippmann's return to New York from England to launch the project that would help Lippmann voice his ideas, the progressive magazine *The New Republic*. The magazine blossomed during the publishing renaissance of the early 20th century United States, by catering to the growing middle class through the recruitment of leading liberal political theorists as contributors.² World War I not only served as a turning point for Walter Lippmann by directing his attention to foreign affairs, but acted as a turning point for U.S. foreign affairs as a whole. Lippmann and the *New Republic* had to decide where they believed the U.S. should stand at the dawn of the global age. Would they "talk softly and carry a big stick" like Roosevelt or support a collectivized order of nations with the goal of countering aggression under Wilson? Where Walter Lippmann and the *New Republic* stood is a crucial point in understanding America's rise to global hegemony. Along with America's stance in the world in the early 20th century, the opportunity for heightened global influence for the United States would force Lippmann to develop an opinion regarding American imperialism.

Past studies of diplomatic history during the Wilson Administration have focused heavily on Wilson himself. Wartime diplomacy is the fulcrum on which the historical debate had largely been centered, with varying hypotheses for American involvement in the war that all gravitated around public opinion.³ Arthur Link argued that neutrality for the first three years of the war was

² Carl F. Kaestle and Janice A Radway. *A History of the Book in America: Volume 4: Print in Motion: The Expansion of Publishing and Reading in the United States, 1880-1940.* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2014.), Carl F. Kaestle, *Literacy in the United States: Readers and Reading Since 1880.* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993).

³ For more about Wilsonian diplomacy see: David Steigerwald, "The Reclamation of Woodrow Wilson?" in *Paths to Power: The Historiography of American Foreign Relations to 1941*, ed. Micheal J. Hogan (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000); John Milton Cooper Jr. *The Warrior and the Priest: Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt* (Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985); Arno J. Meyer, *Wilson vs. Lenin: Political Origins of the New Diplomacy* (Cleveland, OH: Meridian Books, 1959); Kendrick Clements, *Woodrow Wilson: World Statesman* (Boston: Twayne, 1987); John Milton Cooper Jr., *Breaking the Hearts of the World: Woodrow Wilson and the Fight for the League of Nations* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Thomas J. Knock, *To End All Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995); Lloyd Ambrosius, *Wilsonianism: Woodrow Wilson and his Legacy in American*

a direct reflection of American public opinion. It was only until it was clear there would be dramatic alterations to the geographic and political landscape of Europe that Wilson coaxed the public into war to ensure a “fair peace”.⁴ Other historians like Robert Ferrell and Georg Schlid argued that Wilson was an opportunist that capitalized on the war when he believed he had the strongest public backing.⁵ One of the leading Wilson historians, Lloyd Ambrosius, removed Wilsonian foreign policy from its national boundaries and placed it on a global scale. He then determined that Wilson’s diplomacy and the diplomacy of other nations were incompatible.⁶ In essence, Wilson was ahead of his time. Other nations and leaders lagged in their adoption of a diplomatic strategy similar to Wilson’s. Lippmann’s role in the formulation of Wilsonian diplomacy, which maintained prevalence throughout the Twentieth Century, then becomes an important perspective in the study of WWI American diplomacy.

The revisionist faction of American diplomatic historians, who have argued that American expansion was for economic gain rather than freedom and democracy, have challenged the tendency to glorify Woodrow Wilson and his policies. Revisionist history of American foreign policy in the early 20th century was spearheaded by the prominent historians William Appleman Williams, George Kennan and Lloyd Gardner beginning in the 1950s.⁷ The revisionist historians criticized Wilsonian liberalism and the exploitation of foreign nations for the benefit of the United States. For evidence of the exploitation, the revisionists highlighted the

Foreign Relations (New York: Macmillian, 2002); Frank Nincovich, *The Wilsonian Century: U.S. Foreign Policy since 1900* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999)

⁴ Arthur S. Link, *Woodrow Wilson: Revolution, War, and Peace* (Arlington Heights, IL: AHM Publishing, 1979)

⁵ Robert H. Ferrell, *Woodrow Wilson and World War I, 1917-1921* (New York: Harper & Row, 1985); Georg Schlid, *Between Ideology and Realpolitik: Woodrow Wilson and the Russian Revolution, 1917-1921* (Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1995)

⁶ Lloyd Ambrosius, *Wilsonian Statecraft: Theory and Practice of Liberal Internationalism during World War I* (Wilmington, DE: SR Books, 1991)

⁷ The influential revisionist works include: William Appleman Williams, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (Cleveland, OH: World Publishing Company, 1959); George Kennan, *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951); Lloyd Gardner *Safe for Democracy: The Anglo-American Responses to Revolution, 1913-1923* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).

increased involvement of the United States in areas of the world such as Latin America.⁸ They interpreted speeches and documents like the Fourteen Points as efforts to increase American involvement for its own benefit rather than as part of a liberal international movement with Wilson as the driving force. But more recently, historians have painted Wilsonian diplomacy in new light. Lippmann falls somewhere in between traditional and revisionist history, by using freedom and democracy to expand American influence for economic gain.

Recent scholarship has continued to focus on Wilson, as seen in Trygve Thronvick's *Power Without Victory*, but has also focused on topics largely on the genesis of American "empire."⁹ While there is little doubt that the United States established an overseas empire in 1898 after the "splendid little war" against Spain, historians like David Immerwahr have proclaimed American imperial interests have evolved throughout history.¹⁰ Above all, recent academic study has centered on the implications of Wilsonian rhetoric and actions by Wilson on previously neglected areas of the world. For example, *The Wilsonian Moment* by Erez Manela focuses on the reactions of Korea, Egypt, China and India to Wilson's call for "self-determination" at the end of the war. Manela began with Wilson's call to end the war and traces the reactions from Korea, Egypt, China and India to his initial wartime statements, like the

⁸ Mark T. Gilderhus, "US-Latin American Relations, 1898-1941: A Historiographic Review" in *A Comparison to American Foreign Relations*, ed. Robert Schulzinger (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2003); Micheal Krenn, *U.S. Policy Toward Economic Nationalism in Latin America, 1917-1929* (Wilmington, DE: SR Books, 1990); Micah Wright, "Unilateral Pan-Americanism: Wilsonianism and the American Occupation of Chiriqui, 1918-1920". *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, no.26 (March 2015): 46-64; David Healy, *Drive to Hegemony: The United States in the Caribbean, 1898-1917* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988); Friedrich Katz, *The Secret War in Mexico: Europe, The United States and the Mexican Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981); Thomas O'Brien, *The Revolutionary Mission: American Enterprise in Latin America, 1900-1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); David Sheinen, *Searching for Authority: Pan Americanism, Diplomacy and Politics in United States-Argentine Relations, 1910-1930* (New Orleans: University Press of the South, 1998); Thomas Schoonover, *The United States in Central America, 1860-1911: Episodes of Social Imperialism and Imperial Rivalry in the World System* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998).

⁹ Trygve Thronvick, *Power Without Victory: Woodrow Wilson and the American Internationalist Experiment* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017)

¹⁰ David Immerwahr, *How to Hide an Empire: A History of the Greater United States* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2019)

“Peace Without Victory” speech in 1917. He then analyzed the fallout of Wilson not delivering his promises during the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 to the four previously listed groups and the Anti-Western movements that ensued.¹¹ Where Wilson was the dominating force of study in the past with outside nations used as evidence for Wilson’s actions, has since created a balance between Wilson and his impact on the world.

Walter Lippmann’s impact on Wilson and the expansion of American influence around the world helped shape America’s emergence from the Great War as the up-and-coming world power. His time with the *New Republic* during the early part of the war provided him with a direct influence on public opinion. The rapid growth of the magazine networked Lippmann with the leading political figures of the 1910s. His web of connected politicians apexed when he caught the attention of President Woodrow Wilson. Wilson kept a close eye on public opinion during the war, therefore also keeping an eye on the new magazine which eventually landed Lippmann a close advisement position with the president. Once Wilson gained the support of Lippmann, the young editorialist became a foundational figure of the Inquiry (WWI foreign policy think-tank,) and that is where his greatest contribution to World War I and Wilson’s presidency was created.

During his time with the *New Republic*, Lippmann and the other editors advocated for heightened American involvement in both the war and in other parts of the world. The war in Europe opened markets in South America, providing the opportunity for a “Pan-American Movement”. An anonymous editorial written by either Lippmann, Walter Weyl or Herbert Croly, stated “Such a Pan-American organization seems to us the substitute for the growth of our

¹¹ Erez Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007)

own imperialism”.¹² Although Pan-Americanism was disguised as a symbiotic relationship between the United States and Latin-American nations, the objective of the organization was for U.S. financial gain. Pan-Americanism is just one example of Walter Lippmann and *The New Republic*'s advocacy for a shift from a Rooseveltian colonial imperialism to a more hegemonic foreign policy approach under Wilson.

This article aims to pinpoint Lippmann's views and thoughts of America on a global scale at the dawn of the American Century. It examines why Lippmann's impact on American diplomacy was a pivotal part of American history during and after World War I. Lippmann inadvertently impacted the course of American foreign policy through his advocacy for: American entry into the war by late 1914, more substantial involvement in the foreign affairs of other nations, and his work in the peace preparations to end the war through his close connections with key political figures like Edward House and Woodrow Wilson. Lippmann joined the Progressive movement in its later stage due to his age and previous political affiliations with the socialist party, so it is important to first understand the people who influenced his early political thinking. His brief association with Roosevelt and subsequent alliance with Wilson coincided with Lippmann's influence on the foreign policy transition between the two. Later, Lippmann's work at the Inquiry did much to expand American influence around the world.

The Rise and Fall of Lippmann's Progressive Imperialism

America's emergence as an industrial powerhouse after the Civil War dramatically altered the economic, social and cultural landscapes of the nation. The Gilded Age in America

¹² “Are We Militarists?” *The New Republic*, (March 20, 1915)

occurred from the 1870s through around 1900, yielded many innovations, and ushered in sweeping changes to American society. Four years of the bloody Civil War ended in 1865 with the North victorious as industrialization triumphed over the agrarian South. In the following two decades, the United States developed industries and wealth at a rate the world had never seen. Public and private investments in railroads and electricity altered the landscape of the United States and the lives of nearly every American.¹³ Rapid urbanization and the concentration of wealth in the upper class outpaced the social mobility of lower classes and as a result the less fortunate urban dwellers were crammed into slums and paid wages that could not sustain even the most frugal lifestyle. The Gilded Age produced slums like the Five Points neighborhood in New York City, arguably the most notorious neighborhood of the Gilded Age. One slum house, dubbed “The Old Brewery” was said to have one murder every night for as long as it provided housing for the poor.¹⁴ The mansions of affluent families like the Vanderbilts showed the bright side of American industrialization but poverty-stricken workers revealed the vulnerabilities of the Gilded Age. The eventual emergence of a growing middle class toward the end of the period led to discontent among middle-class reformers who sought to reconcile the class differences as many believed no human being should be subject to the horrible conditions of extreme poverty.¹⁵

The excesses of the Gilded Age spurred Progressive reform.¹⁶ Muckraking journalism and trust-busting dominated newspapers while the Progressive movement was embraced by the Republican Party. Aside from Grover Cleveland, every president since Andrew Johnson was a Republican. It was not until Woodrow Wilson won the highly contested election of 1912 that a

¹³ Jean Luc Demeulemeester, “U.S. Economic Growth during the Gilded Age”, *Journal of Macroeconomics* 31, (December 2009) 191-199.

¹⁴ Tyler Anbinder, *Five Points: The Nineteenth-Century New York City Neighborhood that invented Tap Dance, Stole Elections and Became the World’s Most Notorious Slum* (New York, NY: Plume, 2002) 54-57.

¹⁵ Arthur S. Link and Richard L. McCormick, *Progressivism* (New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell, 1983) 13-15.

¹⁶ Glenn C. Altschuler and Stuart M. Blumin, *Rude Republic: Americans and their Politics in the Nineteenth Century*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000) 292.

Democrat held the highest office in the nation. Republican Progressivism's pinnacle was when Theodore Roosevelt won the election of 1901. Although Theodore Roosevelt was directly involved in the colonization of the newly conquered people of Puerto Rico and the Philippines, his domestic agenda of expanding the rights of lower- and middle-class Americans appealed to many. Large numbers of progressives including the future editors of the *New Republic* threw their weight behind Roosevelt to accomplish their goals as Roosevelt utilized Progressive legislation like the Sherman Antitrust Act (1890), which sought to dismantle the anti-capitalist monopolies intent on suppressing competition.

Walter Lippmann's embrace of progressivism is best understood through the view of the people who had direct influence on him. Both Croly and Weyl, the other *New Republic* editors, were influential progressives that unlike the younger Lippmann had been riding the wave of the movement since its beginning. Herbert Croly's *Progressive Democracy* published in 1914 was a staple of progressive thought towards the end of the Progressive Era and outlined the thoughts that influenced Lippmann's early career. A stronger role of the federal government in business affairs by promoting competition and the attack on economic abuses and political corruption were staples of the pre-Lippmann Progressive movement. Early issues of the *New Republic* reflect Croly and Weyl's progressive influence on the young Lippmann. For example, in an editorial note from early May 1915, Lippmann claimed that Roosevelt was the "leader of the Progressive movement" due to his support of Progressive legislation during his presidency.¹⁷ In *Progressive Democracy* (1914) Croly characterized progressivism as a reaction to lasting conservatism, the conservatism referred to as the Republican domination of the White House

¹⁷ Walter Lippmann, *Editorial Notes*. (May 5, 1915)

prior to adopting progressive reform since the Civil War. Regarding the Republican party, Croly believed progressivism must “replace the old system effectively.”¹⁸

Replacing the old system could take a variety of forms, from a conservative backlash to radical socialism, or something in between. Croly was aware of this fact by his distinction of progressivism from socialism and populism, other leading ideologies competing for influence in government in the early Twentieth Century. According to Croly, the Republican Party must accept the Progressive movement to hold alternative ideas (like socialism) at bay. This would help the Republican party maintain power.¹⁹ Progressivism was not a “top-down” movement in which the leaders of the parties attempted to impose change on the people, but rather the contrary. In the chapter “The Ideal and the Program” of *Progressive Democracy*, Croly described the Progressive movement as a grassroots, “collective and cooperative action” by the middle class in an effort to change American society.²⁰ For the Progressive movement to achieve success, it would need to be a joint effort by all Americans. Croly summarized the Progressive movement “as not an awakening of public spirit; it’s a rebirth.”²¹ The rebirth of public spirit is in response to the aspects of the Gilded Age that progressives wished to change, particularly the economic disparities between classes that caused millions to live in poverty. The year of *Progressive Democracy*’s publication reflects the shift of the progressive movement from Roosevelt to Wilson, and from the Republican to Democratic party as a result. Much like Lippmann, and perhaps as an example of Croly’s influence on Lippmann, Croly’s support of Roosevelt continued over a year into Wilson’s administration. Croly’s shift may have lagged a bit compared to the wave of progressives that were following Wilson. Croly bestowed the title

¹⁸ Herbert Croly, *Progressive Democracy*. (New York: Macmillian, 1914) 11.

¹⁹ Herbert Croly, *Progressive Democracy*, 315.

²⁰ Herbert Croly, *Progressive Democracy*, 208.

²¹ Herbert Croly, *Progressive Democracy*, 19.

“Father of Progressivism” on Roosevelt even after his 1912 defeat and while the progressive movement was shifting to Wilson.²² Rather than only represent the populated eastern cities like many earlier Progressives, Roosevelt “...mixed with all sorts of Americans in many different parts of the country.”²³ Croly seemed skeptical of Wilson calling him “mysterious” and “conservative” compared to Roosevelt.²⁴ The skepticism would wane into Wilson’s presidency as most progressives gradually backed Wilson as Roosevelt faded into the past.

Herbert Croly was the man who recruited Walter Lippmann and Walter Weyl to serve as co-editors for the *New Republic*. Herbert Croly served as a sort of intermediary between Walter Lippmann and Walter Weyl as the former was more of a radical, free-spirited political thinker fresh out of Harvard with a Bachelor’s degree in philosophy compared to the latter, an economist focused on labor relations in a democracy with a doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania.²⁵ Born in 1873, Walter Weyl was sixteen years older than Lippmann and experienced the Progressive Era through its entirety. Weyl is the lesser-known editor of the *New Republic* but nonetheless became a progressive leader with his publication of *The New Democracy: An Essay on Certain Political and Economic Tendencies in the United States* in 1912, which argued that America was returning to its former democratic greatness due to the Progressive movement. As Croly’s *Progressive Democracy* reflected the Progressive Movement before 1914, Weyl’s *The New Democracy* was a proclamation for progressivism from 1912 forward.

Weyl described the future of democracy in America as having a direct influence from the Progressive Movement in response to the division created by conservatism in American

²² Herbert Croly, *Progressive Democracy*, 6.

²³ Herbert Croly, *Progressive Democracy*, 11.

²⁴ Herbert Croly, *Progressive Democracy*, 189.

²⁵ Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century*, 97.

society.²⁶ Weyl looked back to the creation of the United States in the late eighteenth century as a more idealistic democracy based on individual rights. To Weyl, the issue then was why did the ideal democracy disappear? He deduced that the democratic ideals of post-revolutionary America were lost in the 1830s with the onset of western expansion.²⁷ The idea of Manifest Destiny eclipsed the egalitarian ideals established during the American Revolution. By the early years of the Twentieth Century Weyl felt “The mass of men,-the experimental, inventive, but curiously conservative group of average Americans,-though voting instinctively, is beginning to feel that in essential respects the nation “conceived in liberty” has not borne its expected fruits.”²⁸ The “Average Americans” Weyl spoke of was the same middle class that Croly referenced two years later. Voting was the catalyst for political change in a democracy according to Weyl and other progressives, including Felix Frankfurter. Veering From the course of democracy led to disenchantment among Americans, and Weyl feared Americans could turn to more extreme measures for change such as socialism. To be successful, future progressivism would need to incorporate both societal changes and aspects of conservatism to combat any sudden and radical shifts for the American people.²⁹ The Revenue Act of 1916, which raised the corporate tax rate from one to two percent, is an example of gradual societal change that mixed the conservative idea of a lower corporate tax while slightly adjusting the tax to fit societal needs.

Croly and Weyl served as Lippmann’s early Progressive influences, but other more radical thinkers had a brief impact on the young writer. Rather than follow mainstream

²⁶ Walter Weyl, *The New Democracy: An Essay on Certain Political and Economic Tendencies in the United States*. (New York: Macmillian, 1912) 7.

²⁷ Walter Weyl, *The New Democracy*, 65.

²⁸ Walter Weyl, *The New Democracy*, 4.

²⁹ Walter Weyl, *The New Democracy*, 236.

progressive ideas, these other thinkers flirted with socialism. Prominent socialists and thinkers including H.G. Wells, Upton Sinclair and the British socialist Graham Wallas are examples of people who dabbled with both socialism and progressivism in the early 1900s and impacted Lippmann's early thinking. Lippmann described Graham Wallas as "persuasive" and "brilliant" while he was the leader of the British Fabian Socialists, the group that influenced the young Lippmann to support change through democratic institutions rather than revolutions.³⁰ Lippmann frequently wrote to Wallas and stayed with him during his turbulent episode in late July 1914 when the nations of Europe mobilized for war. Lippmann's experiment with socialism did not last, but it is important to understand the roots of Lippmann's political thought which began with socialism.

Socialism's utopian tease appealed to Lippmann while he was a student at Harvard University. His time with the aforementioned people like Graham Wallas, H.G. Wells and Upton Sinclair undoubtedly influenced his early political thinking, but the idealistic postulation became too unrealistic for Lippmann and he assimilated into the progressive party. Lippmann's drift towards political orthodoxy was the early dawn of his expansive political career and would lead him into contact with other young individuals who themselves became prominent political figures of the twentieth century. A few of the younger men that shaped the political thinking of Lippmann were Felix Frankfurter and Winfred Denison, the former as a Supreme Court Justice and the latter as Assistant Attorney General of the United States. Lippmann's time with people like Frankfurter was spent in a Washington bachelor pad named the House of Truth. His stint with the House of Truth occurred in 1917, but his association with the men of the House began

³⁰ Walter Lippmann. *Letter to Francis Hackett, July 1, 1913*. Letter. From Yale University, *The Walter Lippmann Papers, 1889-1974* Box 14, Folder 35, Reel 138.

years before. Frankfurter dubbed the house the “House of Truth” due to the “lively dinner conversations” about politics and life.³¹

The House of Truth was where Lippmann networked with many important men in Washington to develop his career. Walter Lippmann and his newly-wed wife Faye Alberson moved into the House in late May, 1917.³² With his wife accompanying him, the male-only House received its first female occupant. Lippmann first encountered the young thinkers like Frankfurter and Denison in 1914 during the development stages of the *New Republic* through the progressive leader Herbert Croly. Frankfurter became a contributor to the magazine by writing articles and participating in editorial meetings through the recommendation of Learned Hand, a federal judge who thought highly of Frankfurter.³³ The two developed a volatile relationship that began with friendship in the House of Truth and ended with a bitter feud. Frankfurter was a Harvard Law School graduate who caught the eye of Chief Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Secretary of War Henry Stimson, and President William Howard Taft in his early career.³⁴ In 1939 he was appointed by President Franklin Roosevelt as a Supreme Court Justice. Clearly, Frankfurter was well connected to powerful political figures, as was Lippmann. Lippmann and Frankfurter shared Herbert Croly as a mutual friend, and that is how the two became friends. Also due to Croly, Lippmann and Frankfurter were introduced to Theodore Roosevelt. When Roosevelt decided to challenge Taft for the Republican nomination in 1912 Frankfurter was stuck at a crossroad. Employed by the Taft administration but a firm believer in the words of Roosevelt, Frankfurter ultimately opposed the sitting president. Although Roosevelt was not

³¹ Brad Snyder, *The House of Truth: A Washington Political Salon and the Foundations of American Liberalism*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017) 11.

³² Brad Snyder, *The House of Truth*, 63.

³³ Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century*, 61.

³⁴ Brad Snyder, *The House of Truth*, 38.

trained in law as were both Frankfurter and Taft, Frankfurter believed “The Republican party is the party of liberal construction of the Constitution”. Frankfurter was critical of Taft for following the constitution with concrete adherence, leading him to believe he was a poor leader of the Republican party. It would therefore follow logically that Taft would follow the “liberal construction”, but in the eyes of the young lawyer Taft followed “textual worship of the Constitution,” and was unrepresentative of the Republican Party.³⁵ Lippmann on the other hand, was not interested in the constitutional interpretations of the presidential candidates. He was more interested in labor relations and the advancement of Progressive legislation.

Theodore Roosevelt captivated Lippmann from a young age with his theatrical orations and heroic actions at San Juan Hill during the Spanish-American War. First seeing him speak in Saratoga, New York as a child, Lippmann knew he found a man to admire. When Lippmann slowly parted ways with socialism, Roosevelt roped him into the Progressive Movement. Later in life Lippmann referred to himself as “an unqualified hero-worshiper” during the time he supported Roosevelt.³⁶ Roosevelt’s jingoistic rhetoric was overshadowed in the eyes of Lippmann by the domestic progressive agenda of busting trusts and putting the government “back in the hands of the people.”³⁷ Roosevelt’s presidency began in 1901 with the assassination of William McKinley, who only three years before believed God guided him in the decision to annex the Philippines. Roosevelt’s actions in the Spanish American War and his inheritance of the newly acquired overseas territory leaves no surprise that Roosevelt was, as was the case for many powerful leaders at the turn of the twentieth century, an imperialist.

³⁵ Brad Snyder, *The House of Truth*, 594.

³⁶ Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century*, 64.

³⁷ Theodore Roosevelt, “A Charter of Democracy,” 2/21/1912, in *The Works of Theodore Roosevelt*, v. 17, ed. Hermann Hagedorn (New York: C. Scribner’s sons, 1925) 120.

After allowing William Howard Taft to assume his position as the leader of the nation and the Republican Party in 1908, Roosevelt again contended for the highest office in the land in 1912. It was in his decision to run as a third-party candidate that Lippman and the men at the House of Truth as well as the future editors of the *New Republic* all became outspoken supporters of the former Rough Rider. Lippmann developed a personal relationship with Roosevelt after the publication of the young Lippmann's first book, *A Preface to Politics* (1913). Lippmann provided a brief synopsis of the negative treatment of other politicians towards Roosevelt's Bull Moose campaign in 1912. In the chapter "Routinier and Inventor" Lippmann used Roosevelt as an example of "good-and-bad-man theory" which Lippmann claimed as "disastrous" to the political process.³⁸ Much like Herbert Croly in *The Promise of American Life*, Lippmann received Roosevelt's praise by the positive mention of him in a publication.³⁹ In Croly's most well-known work he devoted an entire chapter to Theodore Roosevelt. Lippmann described the treatment of Roosevelt by the U.S. Senate as inequitable compared to the treatment of the other candidates. By acknowledging the unfair treatment and deeming it "detrimental" to the political process, Lippmann elicited an immediate response from the former president.⁴⁰ The first of a series of letters and meetings between the two began in May 1913 and continued for almost two years.

Upon defeat in the 1912 election, Roosevelt embarked on an Amazon hunting trip. In true Roosevelt fashion, he dealt with his defeat by leading a group of men deep into the Brazilian jungle.⁴¹ Emulating other Great Power leaders like George V of the United Kingdom, Roosevelt escaped political life by hunting exotic animals. In the jungle he hunted crocodiles and mapped a

³⁸ Walter Lippmann, *A Preface to Politics* (New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1913) 2-3

³⁹ Herbert Croly, *The Promise of American Life* (New York: The Macmillian Company, 1909)

⁴⁰ Herbert Croly, *The Promise of American Life*, 9.

⁴¹ "Roosevelt's Hunting Trip" *The New York Times*, (Dec 15, 1913)

small tributary of the Amazon River. But in the process, Roosevelt contracted typhoid fever, a potentially lethal illness. But if a bullet could not kill the Bull-Moose, neither could sickness. Roosevelt's time recovering in the jungle coincidentally exposed the former president to the young Lippmann's first book. Instead of searching for his next trophy kill, Roosevelt read Lippmann's *A Preface to Politics*.

The pinnacle of their relationship occurred when Lippmann met his childhood idol. Roosevelt met with Walter Weyl, Herbert Croly, and Lippmann to discuss their views of the Progressive movement in 1914 and the direction of the *New Republic* before its first publication. Lippmann later recalled the meeting as the eldest of the group (Croly) sleeping in a chair as Roosevelt rambled into the night with the captivated Lippmann as his audience.⁴² Roosevelt told stories of his hunting trips, his time in Puerto Rico during the war in 1898 and his opinion of labor relations in 1914. A few days later Lippmann recapped the conversation in a letter he sent to Roosevelt. As an example of the influence Roosevelt held over the magazine, Lippmann relayed the conversation he and Roosevelt had about labor relations to Walter Weyl, who "took up the idea with enthusiasm."⁴³ The enthusiasm is for what Lippmann called "industrial democracy". Industrial Democracy would be an increased involvement of workers in negotiating their terms of employment directly to reign in the control of unions. In the same letter, after Lippmann's conversation with Weyl, the men believed they found a "missing link" in the Progressive movement in the future. Rather than focus on the unionization of workers, as in young democracies they can be "corrupt and faithless", the men thought democracy should be

⁴² Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century*, 109.

⁴³ Walter Lippmann, "Walter Lippmann to Theodore Roosevelt, May 20, 1913." Letter. From Yale University, *The Walter Lippmann Papers, 1889-1974*

the way in which workers were represented.⁴⁴ In 1913 and the earlier half of 1914, Theodore Roosevelt's influence on Walter Lippmann was dominated by domestic affairs rather than foreign, as was the case for many progressives. The outbreak of war on August 1, 1914 in Europe forced Lippmann and the other editors of the *New Republic* to shift their focus from domestic to foreign affairs, as readers expected to read about the war rather than strictly internal topics like labor relations.

Croly, Weyl and Lippmann had limited exposure to foreign affairs prior to the first issue of the magazine published in November 1914. After the bloody First Battle of the Marne in early September 1914 resulting in half a million deaths between the Allied and Central Powers combined, the *New Republic* could not ignore the battle raging across the Atlantic Ocean. Although domestic issues would not be completely overshadowed by the war, Lippmann had no choice but to develop an opinion about the war in Europe and the extent to which he believed the United States should be involved. That is when they turned to their progressive idol for advice. In the first issue of the newspaper on November 7, 1914, an anonymous editorial advocated for "The End of American Isolationism" by joining the war in Europe. Roosevelt called for the United States to prepare for war in August on the grounds that the Navy was ill-equipped for a conflict of such magnitude. The *New Republic* followed suit claiming the war was a "Challenge to the United States to justify its independence."⁴⁵ The "self-complacent isolation" of the United States would hinder its ability to influence global affairs.⁴⁶ At a time when Wilson was calling for Americans to be "impartial in thought as well as in action," the *New Republic* hinted at the future progression of American foreign policy before Wilson and his advisors were leading the

⁴⁴ Walter Lippmann, "Walter Lippmann to Theodore Roosevelt, May 20, 1913." Letter. From Yale University, *The Walter Lippmann Papers, 1889-1974* Box 1, Folder 19.

⁴⁵ "The End of American Isolation" *The New Republic*, (November 7, 1914)

⁴⁶ "The End of American Isolation" *The New Republic*, (November 7, 1914)

drive for peace.⁴⁷ The *New Republic* recognized the opportunity presented to the United States to dominate foreign markets before the European powers could “reconquer and extend their markets.”⁴⁸

Much closer to home, another foreign policy situation was boiling over across the Rio Grande in Mexico. The Mexican Civil War received a great deal of attention from the *New Republic* as an assessment of Woodrow Wilson’s views on foreign policy. The Mexican Civil War captured the imagination of Americans with the obstreperous raids of Pancho Villa on the border towns of the New Mexico border. A true wild-west figure, Pancho Villa and his “band of ragged outlaws” galloped across the U.S.-Mexican border with their guns blazing in March 1916 to raid the small town of Columbus, New Mexico.⁴⁹ The polar opposite of the ragged outlaw, the highly experienced and well respected General John J. Pershing was dispatched by Wilson to track down and reprimand Villa in Mexico. After nine months of chasing Villa through northern Mexico, Pershing returned to the United States empty handed to lead the American Expeditionary Forces in Europe.⁵⁰ Although the climax of U.S. involvement in Mexico was the conflict with Villa, Wilson spent two years prior entangled in the Mexican Revolution. The diplomatic blunder of the Occupation of Veracruz accomplished the goal of eliminating General Victoriano Huerta but did little to provide stability in Mexico. The *New Republic* called the intervention by Wilson a “failure” for its indecisiveness with only “good intentions” to show for.⁵¹ After Wilson’s decision to intervene, The U.S. had an “enormous moral obligation” to produce stability in Mexico. The editors did not advocate for an option to allow Mexico to

⁴⁷ Woodrow Wilson *Message to Congress*, Senate Doc. No. 566 (Washington, D.C.: 1914)

⁴⁸ “The End of American Isolation” *The New Republic*, (November 7, 1914)

⁴⁹ “Editorial Notes” *The New Republic* (March 18, 1916)

⁵⁰ James Hurst, *Pancho Villa and Black Jack Pershing: The Punitive Expedition in Mexico* (Westport, Conn: Praeger, 2008) 156-158.

⁵¹ “Editorial Notes” *The New Republic* (November 28, 1914)

independently decide their new government. The United States would either “compel the Mexicans to police themselves” or come “face to face with the interventionist policy” of outright conquest.⁵² Anticipating Wilsonian sentiment, the *New Republic* advocated for Mexican self-governing, and that is of course only if the people could govern themselves. It is important to note the distinction between self-government and self-determination. Wilson was an advocate for self-governing rather than self-determination, contrary to popular belief. On one hand self-determination would require a hands-off approach by the U.S. government. Self-government on the other hand would still require involvement of an outside force, whether that was the United States or the League of Nations.⁵³ In the case of the Mexican Revolution, the *New Republic* believed the United States should be involved either politically or militarily, the former favorable to the latter. The desire to choose military pressure as a last resort shows the earliest drift of Lippmann from Roosevelt to Wilson. The Rooseveltian action of occupying Vera Cruz had failed, so a political approach to the issue seemed like a more promising option. The establishment of a U.S. backed government in Mexico had an ulterior motive for the *New Republic*. Pressure by the U.S. could, one of Lippmann’s editorials asserted, be “converted into Pan-American pressure, and so cleansed of aggression. There are innumerable possibilities like these which we could profitably discuss.”⁵⁴ The profitability would be the domination of markets for the U.S. as the head of the Pan-American organization, which became a reality as the war in Europe tore the once great nations to shreds. The Pan-American movement will be one of the fundamental building blocks of Lippmann’s shift to the developing Wilsonian foreign policy.

⁵² ⁵² “Editorial Notes” *The New Republic* (November 28, 1914)

⁵³ Trygve Throntveit, “The Fable of the Fourteen Points: Woodrow Wilson and National Self-Determination”, *Diplomatic History*, 35, no. 3, June 2011, 445–481.

⁵⁴ Walter Lippmann, “Blundering into Mexico” *The New Republic* (February 13, 1915)

The Mexican Civil War was one of Lippmann's first commentaries about American foreign policy and helped develop his view of America's position in world affairs.

America's role in the Mexican Revolution and World War One were the foundational pieces in Walter Lippmann's shift from Roosevelt to Wilson. After the outbreak of war, Roosevelt called for a comprehensive overhaul of the United States Navy. After all, the Navy was the "Great Peacekeeper" if a person in the early twentieth century was influenced by Alfred Thayer Mahan., author of *The Influence of Sea Power on History*.⁵⁵ Roosevelt believed the U.S. must prepare for war or be left out of the peacemaking which, without the aid of the U.S. could result in a "reckless" treaty that "cannot be kept."⁵⁶ Like the *New Republic*, Roosevelt recognized the opportunity presented by the war and that the United States should be involved. But it seemed that is all they had in common about foreign affairs in late 1914 and 1915. In contemplating U.S. involvement in war, Roosevelt subscribed to "Big-Stick Diplomacy". The polar opposite of Wilson, Roosevelt believe the peace negotiations by the U.S. would be meaningless if the U.S. lacked a strong military to fall back on if things went awry.⁵⁷ The *New Republic* called for the U.S. to join the war to be a contender in global affairs, so it could compete for foreign markets. In other words, Roosevelt advocated for outright military domination of other nations while the *New Republic* recommended capitalizing on economic opportunities that were masked as mutually beneficial relationships.

The *New Republic* and Roosevelt may have disagreed as to why the United States should join the war, but the disagreement never became personal until two years into the conflict. The Mexican Revolution was the event that led to a permanent split between Roosevelt and

⁵⁵ Theodore Roosevelt, *America and the World War* (New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Son, 1915) 157.

⁵⁶ Theodore Roosevelt, *America and the World War*, 157.

⁵⁷ Theodore Roosevelt, *America and the World War*, 4-7.

Lippmann. The controversial involvement of the United States in Mexico elicited different responses among Americans, and Roosevelt believed it was the duty of the U.S. to maintain order for its southern neighbor. Although the *New Republic* indicated the possible exploitation of the Mexican situation by the United States, it was critical of the Wilson Administration's reluctance to take a definitive stance on the issue. The *New Republic* dubbed Wilson's policy on Mexico as "aimless drifting" for Wilson's decision to occupy the city of Vera Cruz and for taking no further steps to become involved and ultimately left the city with little accomplished.⁵⁸ Roosevelt blamed Wilson for numerous problems in Mexico, going as far as blaming him for the drunkenness of a U.S. general in Vera Cruz. The editors of the *New Republic* believed Roosevelt took his criticism too far and blasted him in an early 1915 editorial claiming he was "out of hand" with his comments about the president.⁵⁹ Roosevelt took the criticism personally and so began the decline of the Roosevelt-*New Republic* coalition spearheading the Progressive movement in the mid-1910's.

Lippmann's criticism of Roosevelt was ill-received by the other *New Republic* contributors, especially Herbert Croly. Roosevelt, the "father of progressivism", was the foundational figure of the *New Republic*'s formation. How would they progress without their progressive leader? Although Lippmann grew quite fond of Roosevelt, he viewed Roosevelt's progressivism as "dated" and that "the future is looking towards Wilson."⁶⁰ As the younger, more rebellious editor of the magazine, Lippmann wrote a scathing criticism of Roosevelt while Croly and Weyl were on vacation in April, 1916. In "A Luncheon and a Moral," Lippmann shows his complete departure from Roosevelt in stating "it is the business of Progressives to do

⁵⁸ "Editorial Notes" *The New Republic* (November 28, 1914)

⁵⁹ "Roosevelt on Mexico" *The New Republic* (March 15, 1915)

⁶⁰ Walter Lippmann, "A Luncheon and a Moral" *The New Republic* (April 6, 1916)

something more than to nominate Theodore Roosevelt.”⁶¹ Lippmann even went as far as lambasting the “hero-worshippers” of Roosevelt by writing: “They (Roosevelt followers) are pretty gullible citizens who are so blinded by Mr. Roosevelt’s virtue that they cannot remain openly and good-humoredly critical of him.”⁶² It is important to remember that Lippmann himself claimed he was an “unqualified hero-worshipper” of Roosevelt only two years earlier.

Perhaps the best explanation for Lippmann’s near effortless shift away from Roosevelt was the young editor did not have political loyalty to the Republican party. Lippmann was a progressive, not necessarily a Republican. The Republican party was the medium to which the progressive movement could advance. With the election of Wilson and his progressive platform in 1912, the movement had little choice but to drift towards the newly elected Democratic administration. Although not written by Lippmann, Edgar E. Robinson summarized the state of the Republican Party by mid-1915 in an editorial titled “A Future for the Republican Party.” Robinson claimed that the Republican party had resorted to propaganda for the first time in decades as it was “on the offensive” with a Democrat in the White House.⁶³ In other words, the Republican party was in trouble if it failed to adapt to the changing political landscape in 1915. The split between conservative and liberal Republicans within the party was the reason Wilson was elected, according to Robinson.⁶⁴ Lippmann had been a Republican for only three years during his rendezvous with Roosevelt. Contrary to Croly or Weyl, Lippmann had little invested in the Republican party, allowing him to shift to the Democratic Party.

While Lippmann may have had little trouble in shifting to the Democratic Party, he struggled with forming his foreign policy thoughts. Roosevelt influenced Lippmann’s early

⁶¹ Walter Lippmann, “A Luncheon and a Moral” *The New Republic* (April 6, 1916)

⁶² Walter Lippmann, “A Luncheon and a Moral” *The New Republic* (April 6, 1916)

⁶³ Edgar E. Robinson, “The Future of the Republican Party” *The New Republic* (June 19, 1915)

⁶⁴ Edgar E. Robinson, “The Future of the Republican Party” *The New Republic* (June 19, 1915)

opinion of America's foreign policy situation during the war. But, like their relationship, Roosevelt's influence did not last. Like Roosevelt, *The New Republic* did believe the United States needed to enter the war in 1914 to strengthen its global influence. The magazine criticized Wilson's acts of neutrality and ultimately sided with Roosevelt. But differing thoughts on "aggression" signified the early transition to Wilson's brand of wartime foreign policy. The first issues of the *New Republic* may have hinted at Lippmann beginning to shy away from Roosevelt's foreign policy. The editorial notes of November 21, 1914 asked a series of rhetorical questions about the foreign policy of the U.S. and other nations and their regards to aggression and imperialism. Lippmann began the note by simply stating "What constitutes aggression?"⁶⁵ He then asked if Germany sending a gunboat to Agadir was aggressive. It seems by starting the list with an event fresh on the minds of many people (Agadir Crisis in 1911) as an act of aggression, the acts that follow may not seem as serious. Germany dispatched the gunboat SMS *Panther* to Morocco in response to French military intervention in a Moroccan rebellion. Germany's justification for the gunboat was to protect trade interests, but its goal was to test French and British relations.⁶⁶ Rather than divide the two, the aggressive measure solidified the relationship between the powers. The plan backfired, creating one of many diplomatic blunders of German *Weltpolitik*. The term "gunboat diplomacy" came from the Agadir crisis, so it is safe to say many readers in 1914 would say it was aggressive. Gunboat diplomacy is when one nation pressures another by flexing its military muscles. He then lists other events that occurred like England's actions in the Boer War and France's occupation of Morocco, but among others he sneaked in two very interesting questions. The first was "were we aggressive when we took the

⁶⁵ Walter Lippmann, "Editorial Notes" *The New Republic* (November 21, 1914)

⁶⁶ Norman Rich, *Great Power Diplomacy: 1814-1914*. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1992) 404.

Philippines?” and the other was “is the Monroe Doctrine aggressive?”⁶⁷ While Lippmann provided no answers to the questions, inferences and speculation may provide some insight.

Lippmann was not politically active when the United States won the Spanish-American War and annexed the Philippines. In fact, he was only ten years old. Lippmann therefore was not involved in the U.S. decision to annex the Philippines, and he based his view U.S. control of the territory on second-hand thoughts from Roosevelt. Lippmann believed U.S. control of the islands would be better than that of other powers, such as Germany or England.⁶⁸ His opinion of the Philippine Question, which was that the U.S. should maintain control of the island rather than another power, showed Roosevelt’s influence on his early foreign policy opinion. The Philippines proved to be a financial burden on the United States, which Lippmann acknowledged, but he provided no solution to the financial drain on the nation. Lippmann believed nations would be better off “independent” while the United States controlled their markets. Unlike his thoughts on the Philippines, Lippmann and the Monroe Doctrine are more difficult to pin down. The Monroe Doctrine had deterred Europe from further colonizing the Western Hemisphere for one hundred years. The irony of the early enforcement of the Doctrine was the heavy reliance on the most powerful European nation. The backbone of the Monroe Doctrine was the Royal Navy, acting as a “bouncer” to kick the other European powers out of the hemisphere. If the U.S. could assume control of Latin American markets, England would have little reason to be in the Western Hemisphere. England’s absence from the hemisphere would make the Monroe Doctrine exclusively American. On the surface it seems Lippmann and the *New Republic* viewed the Monroe Doctrine as a symbiotic relationship between the United States

⁶⁷ Walter Lippmann, “Editorial Notes” *The New Republic* (November 21, 1914)

⁶⁸ Walter Lippmann, “Walter Lippmann to Roland G. Usher, September 9, 1914” Letter. From Yale University, *The Walter Lippmann Papers, 1889-1976*. Box 1, Folder 83, Reel 128.

and Latin American nations. Further analysis of *New Republic* issues show there may have been more to the Monroe Doctrine than just mutual benefits from a collation of western hemispheric nations.

By 1916 Lippmann abandoned Roosevelt and his version of American foreign policy. Before the Roosevelt-Lippmann break Lippmann began to shed his “old world” imperial coat and adopt a new form of imperialism. In an anonymous editorial titled “the Higher Imperialism”, the editor described the changed form of imperialism as a response to colonial aggression which was viewed by the *New Republic* editors as a cause of war.⁶⁹ The “Old World Imperialism will die out” and a “pacific super-imperialism” will generate “peace with profits”.⁷⁰ There would be no profits for the United States if it did not establish a “sphere of influence” and foreign markets were dominated by other nations. The “spheres of influence” would not result in the outright colonization of nations. American investments would be protected by military intervention only if independence threatened U.S. market control. In more simplistic terms, the “Higher Imperialism” would be a loose coalition of nations that through “international haggling” and the creation of “machinery for dealing with international disputes” could create a lasting peace.⁷¹ The coalition of nations would eventually emerge as the League of Nations, the brainchild of Woodrow Wilson.

The sphere of influence was already created. The Monroe Doctrine essentially gave an entire hemisphere to the United States while the other powerful nations would vie for the other half of the world. The Monroe Doctrine came to be known as “Pan-Americanism” as it aged into the twentieth century, and it seemed that Pan-Americanism became a central focus of the New

⁶⁹ “Higher Imperialism” *The New Republic* (June 5, 1915)

⁷⁰ “Higher Imperialism” *The New Republic* (June 5, 1915)

⁷¹ “Higher Imperialism” *The New Republic* (June 5, 1915)

Republic by 1915. The term “Pan-Americanism” described the commercial and political cooperation of North and South American nations. South American nations were “skeptical” of the Monroe Doctrine because the opportunity for American domination was always present. The nations were “Pan-American in a lukewarm way” meaning they were inherently tied to the United States due to their geographic location and dependence on the Monroe Doctrine to “protect from European aggression” but they were never completely sold on the idea.⁷² Pan-Americanism was marketed to the Latin American nations as having “immediate, substantial and incontestable” advantages.⁷³ According to the *New Republic*, the Latin American nations had softened up to the Monroe Doctrine due to the U.S. treatment of Puerto Rico and Cuba after the Spanish-American War.⁷⁴ While the nations may have cozied up to the thought of American protection, the European powers still dominated the markets as they had for hundreds of years. The opportunity to shift Latin American markets from Europe to the United States is where Lippmann thought the First World War could lend a hand in the rise of American hegemony.

The Pan-American Movement was just one of many solidarity movements occurring in the early Twentieth Century. Although they shared a similar goal, they all possessed unique characteristics for why they were occurring. For example, the Pan-Islamic movement was centered around Turkey with Islam as the unifying force. In Asia, a Pan-Asian movement was centered around Japan after it proved to be a global contender for power after the Russo-Japanese War in 1906. The difference between the two was that the Pan-Asian movement was backed by an emerging empire and the Pan-Islam movement was a reaction to the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the threat of Western intervention in the affairs of the Islam dominated

⁷² “Editorial Notes” *The New Republic*, (December 12, 1914)

⁷³ “Editorial Notes” *The New Republic*, (December 12, 1914)

⁷⁴ “Editorial Notes” *The New Republic*, (December 12, 1914)

Middle East.⁷⁵ The Wilsonian rhetoric at the end of the war inspired hope with the non-western solidarity movements, but the rejection of the Racial Equality Clause by Wilson and the expanded British and French influence in the Middle East after the war drove the movements to become increasingly Anti-Western and emphasize strong nationalism.⁷⁶ The Racial Equality Clause was a proposed amendment to the League of Nations Covenant by the Japanese that would generate racial equality among all nations participating in the League.⁷⁷ The exclusion of the Japanese in all Peace Conference affairs besides those pertaining to the Far East and the rejection of the Racial Equality Clause by Wilson and the other “Big Three” delegates soured diplomatic relations between the United States and Japan for over two decades.⁷⁸ The Pan-Islam, Pan-Asian and Pan-American movements were a reaction to the downfall of the European Empires which never fully recovered after World War One.

The American hegemonic approach to foreign policy was seen in Lippmann’s advocacy for American involvement in the Mexican revolution. Lippmann followed Wilsonian thoughts before Wilson made them his priority during the war. While contemplating his questions of aggression, Lippmann hinted at the idea that would become the center piece of his work with *The Inquiry*. Lippmann used the almighty buzzword of 1919, “Self-Determination”, as a possible justification for American involvement in the Mexican Revolution.⁷⁹ Lippmann asked “was our refusal to recognize [Victoriano] Huerta an act to further self-determination in Mexico?”⁸⁰ As was the case before, it is merely a rhetorical question. But the fact that Lippmann acknowledged

⁷⁵ Cemil Aydin, *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia: Visions of the World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2007)

⁷⁶ Cemil Aydin, *Beyond Civilization: Pan-Islamism, Pan-Asianism, and the Revolt Against the West*. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2016)

⁷⁷ Naoko Shimazu, *Japan, Race and Equality* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1998)

⁷⁸ Naoko Shimazu, *Japan, Race and Equality* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1998)

⁷⁹ Walter Lippmann, “Editorial Notes” *The New Republic* (November 21, 1914)

⁸⁰ Walter Lippmann, “Editorial Notes” *The New Republic* (November 21, 1914)

“Self-Determination” with the actions in Mexico demonstrates a connection between Pan-Americanism, the idea of “Self-Determination” and ultimately American domination of these markets under the guise of a symbiotic relationship. Wilson justified the Mexican intervention by claiming it advanced “self-determination” for the Mexican people as he believed Huerta seized power without the consent of the Mexican people.⁸¹ The Pan-American idea was marketed to Latin American nations like Mexico and Panama as being more of a burden than a benefit to the United States. The “Pan-Americanism” editorial stated “The United States would be making a greater sacrifice than would her Latin American sisters”, meaning it would not benefit the United States as much as it would the Latin American nations.⁸² But, all was not as it seemed. While Pan-Americanism may have masqueraded as the next step in decolonizing Latin America, it was the first step in American domination of its markets through the exploitation of domestic raw materials and the monopolization of manufactured goods.

The preoccupation of the European Great Powers presented the ideal situation for American economic gain, according to the Lippmann and the other *New Republic* contributors. The “Pan-American Union has painted in glowing colors the business opportunities to be found in South and Central America”, showing that the United States was not seeking outright cultural and social domination like that which aligned with the thinking of Theodore Roosevelt. The United States could respect the idea of “self-determination” for a nation while capitalizing on its markets, a characteristic developed under Wilson.⁸³ In true imperial fashion, the *New Republic* believed in regard to Latin America, “we must now sell our manufactured goods abroad and import raw products for our own consumption.”⁸⁴ The extraction of raw materials from the Latin

⁸¹ John Milton Cooper Jr, *The Warrior and the Priest*, 39-48.

⁸² “Pan-Americanism” *The New Republic* (December 19, 1914)

⁸³ “Pan-American Finance” *The New Republic*, (May 22, 1915)

⁸⁴ “Pan-American Finance” *The New Republic* (May 22, 1915)

American nations, manufacturing them into finished goods and selling them back to the nations in which they came for a profit was at the heart of what Lippmann and the other editors were advocating for. The mastermind behind the *New Republic's* embrace of the Pan-American movement was Ronald G. Usher, a professor of history at Washington University. Although Usher had received little attention for his work on foreign affairs, his publication *Pan-Americanism: A Forecast of the Inevitable Clash Between the United States and Europe's Victor* in 1915 may have influenced Lippmann during his time at the *New Republic*.⁸⁵ Usher argued that the United States must become more involved in global affairs as the war in Europe revealed many opportunities for economic advancement.⁸⁶ An adequate summary of what Lippmann and the other editors believed regarding the "Higher Imperialism" came in an interview with "Professor Munsterberg" who said "it is the time to begin the sacred work which could alone could bring us the blessed age of our vision, The United States of the World."⁸⁷ The "sacred work" the professor referenced was precisely what Lippmann believed, for the United States to capitalize on the foreign markets as Europe was tearing itself apart. Lippmann may not have called for a "United States of the World" as "Professor Munsterberg" had, but they both recognized the economic opportunities presented by the war.

By the summer of 1915 it was clear Roosevelt's ideas had aged for the worse. Lippmann severed his ties with the former president and set his sights on Wilson. The Lippmann-Wilson relationship seemed inevitable by the similarity in ideas between the two, and Wilson gave increased attention to public opinion as the war continued. By the summer of 1915 the ideas of the two converged and Lippmann became a very early advocate for what Wilson would

⁸⁵ Roland G. Usher, *Pan-Americanism; a forecast of the inevitable clash between the United States and Europe's victor* (New York: Century Co, 1915)

⁸⁶ Roland G. Usher, *Pan-Americanism*, 15-38.

⁸⁷ Walter Lippmann, "A League of Peace" *The New Republic* (June 26, 1915)

accomplish in his second term. When analyzing a conference in Pennsylvania aimed at peace, Lippmann commended the sensible thinking of the delegates for avoiding utopian rhetoric like outlawing war.⁸⁸ The founders of the Kellogg-Briand Pact may have found Lippmann's advice a decade in the future to be useful. The Kellogg-Briand Pact was created in 1927 and effectively outlawed war. As crazy as that may sound due to the deadliest conflict in human history breaking out twelve years later, Frank Kellogg and Aristide Briand created the pact in attempt to save lives of soldiers.⁸⁹ Lippmann claimed that "a league of nations that should give power to international law" was the way to avoid another large-scale conflict like WWI.⁹⁰ This was, of course, the same League of Nations that we would see in 1919. Lippmann's justification for a conglomerate of nations was based on the success of the United States federal government. The United States was once a "league of foreign states" until after the Civil War when the country truly unified. Like the United States, the League of Nations would consist of individual states, working independent of their own agendas, under the auspices of a federal government⁹¹

Lippmann's choice of the United States as the model for the league was due to the territorial size and the "internal peace" of the nation compared to the nations of Europe at the time.⁹² The Pan-American union was based on a similar platform as the proposed league, but with the U.S. as the powerful entity. The Pan-American Union would be composed of American nations, but the United States would have the "final say" in making decisions. Pan-Americanism was framed as an "American International Concert" with the United States as larger entity with the smaller

⁸⁸ Walter Lippmann, "A League of Peace" *The New Republic* (June 26, 1915)

⁸⁹ Sally Marks, *The Illusion of Peace* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003) 87.

⁹⁰ Walter Lippmann, "A League of Peace" *The New Republic* (June 26, 1915)

⁹¹ Walter Lippmann, "A League of Peace" *The New Republic* (June 26, 1915)

⁹² "Editorial Notes" *The New Republic* (April 3, 1915)

nations under its “mutually beneficial” umbrella, or so the United States wanted the smaller nations to believe.⁹³

It was in 1916 that Lippmann seized the opportunity to meet the sitting president and make an informed decision about who he would support in the 1916 election. When he met the sixty year old president in the summer of 1916 he made the outright conversion to Wilson when he “showed (me) the inside of his mind” rather than answer the questions Lippmann prepared.⁹⁴ The clear parallel in thought over the irrational and dated Roosevelt foreign policy of “saber-rattling” and the gradual drift out of neutrality as neutrality became increasingly difficult as the war dragged on influenced Lippmann’s admiration for the president in 1916. Lippmann supported American entry into the war, and by 1916 Wilson was preparing for just that. Lippmann became an early convert from Roosevelt’s Republican Progressivism to that of the Democratic party, which proved to be a challenge for him at the *New Republic*. Croly, Weyl and Frankfurter, among others, were still on the Republican side of the Progressive fence. The Republican party nominated Charles Evan Hughes to challenge Wilson in the upcoming election, and Wilson needed all the support he could get. That is where Lippmann became a valued supporter of Wilson, by converting his friends and the *New Republic* to the emerging Wilsonian Progressivism.⁹⁵

The United States entry into the European war on April 6, 1917 was the moment in which Lippmann’s earlier ideas of American foreign policy came to fruition. Woodrow Wilson’s “Peace Without Victory” speech only a few months before showed Wilson’s desire for peace, and that the emerging Great Power was now willing to intervene. In the part of peace-making,

⁹³ “Pan-Americanism” *The New Republic* (December 19, 1914)

⁹⁴ Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century*, 78.

⁹⁵ Ronald Steel, “Electing a War President” in *Walter Lippmann and the American Century*. (Boston, MA: Little Brown, 1980.)

Wilson believed “it is inconceivable that the people of the United States should play no part in that great enterprise.”⁹⁶ The decision to be involved in the war was a drawn-out affair spanning almost three years. As the war dragged on and the United States continued to fund the Entente Powers it became increasingly difficult to remain neutral. Although Wilson wished to broker peace to make it “virtually impossible for any such catastrophe (to) ever overwhelm us again”, he also recognized the opportunity at hand.⁹⁷ The catastrophe he noted can be interpreted as a reflection to the treatment of the Confederate South by the Union North after the Civil War which, as a Southerner from Virginia, continued to haunt and influence his thinking well into the Twentieth Century.⁹⁸ It was clear by 1917 that the powers involved were nowhere near as supplied and powerful as in 1914, and a fluctuation of morale both in the trenches and at the home fronts showed the fragility of the situation. Wilson believed that placing guilt on one party or the other would only lead to further conflict down the road. In hindsight, it seems Wilson may have caught a glimpse of what was to come with interwar period tensions and ultimately WWII. If a “Peace without Victory” was brokered by Wilson in early 1917 it would leave the European powers with dignity and strength and hopefully no further turmoil would result.⁹⁹ The occasion gave the United States the chance to become the “pre-eminent” power and it could rise out of the global conflict as a contender for international power. But, the call for peace by Wilson went unanswered, and the activation of unrestricted submarine warfare by Germany finally pushed Wilson to approach the Senate on April 2, 1917 to declare war on the Central Powers.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ Woodrow Wilson, “State of the Union Address, January 22, 1917” in *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson* v. 40, ed. Arthur S. Link (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966-1994) 378.

⁹⁷ Woodrow Wilson, “State of the Union Address, January 22, 1917,” 379.

⁹⁸ Adam Tooze, *The Deluge: The Great War and the Remaking of the Global Order 1916-1931* (London: Penguin Books, 2014) 12-14.

⁹⁹ Arthur S. Link, *Woodrow Wilson*, 16-18.

¹⁰⁰ Arthur S. Link, *Woodrow Wilson*, 24.

Lippmann became an advocate for the United States entering the war in Europe under the guidance of Wilson as it became a calculated and strategic move, contrary to the reactionary aggression which Roosevelt advocated for three years prior. Entering the war was the easy part. Creating peace after an entire continent was torn to shreds was more difficult. The first gestures towards peace occurred in December, 1916. Germany proposed a compromised peace with the Allies as a diplomatic maneuver to retain power in Central Europe. While it seemed to be just one of the many diplomatic maneuvers taken by the Central Powers during the war, it proved to be a catalyst in Lippmann's rise to presidential advisement and influence. After hearing it straight from the president that either the Allied Powers would have to accept German supremacy of the continent (France would never accept such terms) or unrestricted submarine warfare would force the United States into the war, Lippmann wrote an editorial titled "Peace Without Victory".¹⁰¹

In the "Peace Without Victory" editorial, Lippmann called for the rejection of the German peace plan, which would have allowed Germany to retain its newly acquired territory in Flanders and in the East. Lippmann called for its rejection due to German expansion without "annexing a foot of territory" through the domination of its allies, namely the weaker Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empire, effectively making them satellite states of their more powerful ally. Essentially, Lippmann was advising against establishing what he wished for in the Western Hemisphere, an American hegemony over Latin America. German hegemony would tip the European balance of power heavily towards the German Empire and the British Empire would no longer be a competitor. Lippmann feared the German Empire would expand through the Balkans and into the Middle East and nearby states like Romania would come under German

¹⁰¹ Walter Lippmann, "Peace Without Victory" *The New Republic* (December 23, 1916)

influence. A “loss of prestige” for the Allied Powers was conditional on the acceptance of the “Peace Without Victory” which England could in no way accept.¹⁰² A little over a year later Germany would annex a massive portion of Western Russia from the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk with the new Soviet Union, which would only have tightened the grasp Germany held on Central and Eastern Europe if the December call for peace was accepted.

At first glance it may seem that Lippmann borrowed the famous phrase from Wilson. Actually, the editorial was written one month before Wilson gave the speech to Congress. Why then, did Wilson use the phrase if it was not original? Perhaps it was because of the increased attention Wilson was giving to Lippmann and the *New Republic*. Lippmann believed the “world expected” the United States to “share the responsibility of peace.”¹⁰³ While that sounds like typical Wilsonian rhetoric towards the end of the war, the League of Nations proposed by Lippmann would place the America as the “pre-eminent” world power and markets, particularly Latin American markets, could provide outlets for United States manufactured goods and a reciprocal return of raw materials to support the emerging global industrial powerhouse.

Lippmann’s increased participation in Wilson’s preparation for war and peace also brought him into contact with Edward House, the Texas progressive who became Wilson’s right-hand-man while president. Lippmann became a frequent visitor to Edward House when he stayed in Washington with his friends at the House of Truth. Lippmann’s rise to political influence landed him a stint with the Secretary of War, Newton Baker that lasted around six months. The transition to bureaucracy marked his leave of absence from the *New Republic* while he gave his complete attention to the global war. His time with the War Department came to an end when House approached him about a new project being created by Wilson. The project began without

¹⁰² Walter Lippmann, “Peace Without Victory” *The New Republic* (December 23, 1916)

¹⁰³ Walter Lippmann, “Peace Without Victory” *The New Republic* (December 23, 1916)

a name, or personnel, or an area to meet. It began as an idea. An idea that would become the first think-tank created by the United States government comprised of non-government scholars tasked at solving the problem of peace after the war.

The project would be known as “The Inquiry”. Wilson asked House to create an organization to provide information for the impending peace conference when the war came to a close, one composed of historians, philosophers, geographers and professors, among others.¹⁰⁴ While the Inquiry itself is secondary to the study of Walter Lippmann’s influence on American foreign policy during World War I, it is nonetheless important to first understand the platform from which Lippmann asserted influence on policy at the end of the war. After all, the peace conference was the medium through which America advanced its global ambitions. The Inquiry was a secretive organization that flew under the radar of the media spotlight to gather information for the peace conference. Notable scholars from the Inquiry included the geographer Isaiah Bowman, historian James T. Shotwell, international law scholar David Hunter Miller and of course, Walter Lippmann.¹⁰⁵ Wilson himself advised House to put Lippmann on the Inquiry.¹⁰⁶ Lippmann’s connections with both the *New Republic* and the president made him a prime candidate for work in the organization, but did not give him a clear position to fill. Lippmann was not a foreign policy “scholar,” and he held no previous position in foreign affairs. He voiced his opinion on the war in Europe in his editorials but held no formal training or experience in the field. What Lippmann did have experience in was making connections and being at the “right place and right time.” So, Lippmann set about recruiting people to join the

¹⁰⁴ Edward House, “Edward House to H.C. Wallas, Oct 14, 1917” in *The Intimate Papers of Edward M. House* ed. Charles Seymour (Ann Harbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2005)

¹⁰⁵ Lawrence E. Gelfand, *The Inquiry: American Preparations for Peace, 1917-1919*. (New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1963) 22.

¹⁰⁶ Edward M. House, “The Diary of Edward House” in *The Intimate Papers of Edward M. House* ed. Charles Seymour (Ann Harbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2005) 397.

organization when it began. The issue with recruitment was an overall lack of professionals in the specific fields of study needed, like Eastern European and African history or international law. Due to the “famine of men” in these fields, the Inquiry was forced to “create its own experts” for Russia, the Balkans and Turkey.¹⁰⁷ It seems fabricating experts would produce unreliable results, but Lippmann relied on “sheer genius” for the “practically unexplored” realms of Eastern Europe and the Middle East.¹⁰⁸ Examples of the “inexperienced experts” included Dana C. Munro, the European Medieval historian who was the head of Middle Eastern research (an odd combination) and the geologist Nevin Fenneman who was assigned to research African questions. In the early days of the group Lippmann received the second highest salary, trailing only James Shotwell and earning more than the leader of the group Sydney Mezes who ranked fourth.¹⁰⁹ Lippmann was officially given the title Secretary of Research when the terms of the organization were solidified and he created an outline of priorities for the group consisting of 11 main points.¹¹⁰ The points serve as an early precursor to the Fourteen Points with a mention of “freedom of the seas” (V) and “economic, racial and physical maps for territory from the Baltic Sea to the Persia Gulf... including Alsace-Lorraine and Poland.” (II)¹¹¹ The final and perhaps most interesting point was “the relation of the Monroe Doctrine to the Settlement”.¹¹² Again the Monroe Doctrine seeped into Lippmann’s thoughts as he shaped the U.S. role in global affairs at the beginning of the twentieth century. The peace settlement was centered around Europe, as that

¹⁰⁷ Walter Lippmann, “Walter Lippmann to Newton Baker, May 16, 1918”, Letter. From Yale University, *The Papers of Walter Lippmann, 1889-1976* Box 22, Folder 14, Reel 144 .

¹⁰⁸ Walter Lippmann, “Walter Lippmann to Newton Baker, May 16, 1918”, Letter. From Yale University, *The Papers of Walter Lippmann, 1889-1976* Box 22, Folder 14, Reel 144.

¹⁰⁹ David Hunter Miller, “Inquiry Account Book” in *The Papers of David Hunter Miller, 1875-1961* Library of Congress, Accessed March 24, 2020, <https://lccn.loc.gov/20016226>.

¹¹⁰ Walter Lippmann, “Walter Lippmann to Sydney Mezes” Letter. From Yale University, *The Papers of Walter Lippmann, 1889-1976* Box 17, Folder 8, Reel 156.

¹¹¹ Lawrence E. Gelfand, *The Inquiry*, 87.

¹¹² Lawrence E. Gelfand, *The Inquiry*, 88.

was where the greatest changes would take place. The Monroe Doctrine was specific to the Western Hemisphere where no major territorial alterations would occur, so it may seem odd that the relation of Monroe Doctrine to the European settlement is explicitly stated so early in the peace preparation. The continued emphasis placed on the Monroe Doctrine from the beginning of the war through the beginning of the peace conference show Lippmann's desire for the United States to rise from the depths of the global conflict as the dominate economic power on Earth.

The fact that Latin America received such attention by the Inquiry is interesting because after all, the war was on the other side of the world. A possible explanation for the attention given to Latin America is the convergence of various interests by Inquiry researches, including Isaiah Bowman, Bailey Willis (Chief of Latin American Division) and Lippmann. The allocated budget for Latin American studies began at thirty thousand dollars and only grew when Bowman assumed the role of Secretary of Research in 1918.¹¹³ To put the amount into perspective, international law was given eleven thousand dollars and regional research was given around twenty eight thousand dollars.¹¹⁴ The peace conference relied heavily on international law with the formation of the League of Nations, so it was surprising it received less than a third of the funding. An advocate for Latin American funding, Isaiah Bowman was the director of the American Geographical Society which was used by the Inquiry as a private space "free from the public eye" to quietly gather knowledge for the president when the New York Public Library could no longer hold the growing organization.¹¹⁵ The important role of geography to determine

¹¹³ David Hunter Miller, "Inquiry Account Book," Accessed March 24, 2020, <https://lccn.loc.gov/20016226>.

¹¹⁴ David Hunter Miller, "Inquiry Account Book," Accessed March 24, 2020, <https://lccn.loc.gov/20016226>.

¹¹⁵ Edward M. House, "The Diary of Edward House" 54.

the boundaries of the new European states, and the AGS resources available including large scale maps and data made it an ideal location for the scholars to meet.¹¹⁶

When the logistical details of creating the organization were hammered out after months of preparation, the Executive Committee wasted no time in gathering information for the president. The Executive Committee consisted of Mezes, Miller, and Lippmann, and by the end of 1916 the group wrote a staple of WWI diplomatic charters. Out of the three, Lippmann was the chief author of the Fourteen Points draft, which was the formulation of Inquiry research in its early months.¹¹⁷ Woodrow Wilson's speech was given on January 8, 1918 to assert the terms by which a post-war peace would be established. The Fourteen Points became famous as an early piece of decolonization policy that could create both a lasting peace and a pseudo "Peace Without Victory." The points, though, were not created overnight. It took months of data analysis including the study of ethnic boundaries in the crumbling empires of Austro-Hungary, Turkey (Ottoman) and Germany by leading scholars at the Inquiry to make educated suggestions for the president. Like the earlier pieces written by Lippmann including those about Pan-Americanism and American entry in the war, the call to end the war on the terms of the Fourteen Points was Lippmann's and in turn Wilson's way of positioning the United States as a leading global power.

Lippmann viewed his work on the Fourteen Points as "putting words in the mouth of the president."¹¹⁸ Wilson did not take his exact words from the early draft, named "The Present Situation: War Aims and the Peace Terms it Suggests," but he weighed the advice heavily in his

¹¹⁶ Neil Smith, *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalism* (Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2004) 113.

¹¹⁷ Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century*, 122.

¹¹⁸ Walter Lippmann, "Letter to Isaiah Bowman, December 2, 1917" Letter. From Yale University, *The Papers of Walter Lippmann, 1889-1976* Box 3, Folder 11, Reel 138b.

final draft of the Fourteen Points. The Executive Committee viewed the United States as the king of the chess board of peace, with the “Poles, Czechs, South Slavs, and Bulgaria” as the pawns for limiting German influence in Middle Europe. If those groups were to become either satellites of Germany or outright absorbed into the empire, Germany would become the “Master of the Continent.”¹¹⁹ Due to Germany’s geographic position and possible military dominance of its weaker neighbors, the “MettleEuropa” dream of German Chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg was not out of the question. MettleEuropa was a part of Bethmann-Hollweg’s plan for German European hegemony named the “Septemberprogramm”. In effect, the groups surrounding Germany, listed by the Executive Committee, would be absorbed by the German Empire and the empire could gain strength. The strength would then lead to the eventual domination of Belgium and France, which could be reduced to vassal states.¹²⁰ Lippmann’s effort to try to prevent German hegemony in Europe was a direct reflection of his “Peace Without Victory” editorial written a year earlier, when he advocated against German continental hegemony.¹²¹ The irony of course was that while Lippmann worked to control the power of Germany, he hypocritically supported policies that would expand American influence on a global scale. Perhaps his advocacy for German power limitations would create a power vacuum in Eastern Europe that the United States could fill. Overall, the goal of peace for the United States would be the “Disestablishment of a Prussian Middle Europe” which took the form of the latter nine points of the Fourteen Points Address.¹²²

¹¹⁹ Walter Lippmann, David Hunter Miller and Sydney Mezes, “The Present Situation: War Aims and the Peace Terms it Suggests” In *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson* ed. Arthur S. Link, v. 45 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984) 460.

¹²⁰ Theobald von Bethmann Hollweg, *Reflections on the World War* (Los Angeles, CA: University of California Libraries, 1920)

¹²¹ Walter Lippmann, “Peace Without Victory” *The New Republic* (December 23, 1916)

¹²² Walter Lippmann, David Hunter Miller and Sydney Mezes, “The Present Situation,” 460.

It was no surprise that the first suggestion made by the Executive Committee would coincide with Lippmann's progressive views in the late 1910's. In an effort to curb Prussian Militarism, the Executive Committee suggested to "increase democratization of Germany".¹²³ Increased democratization would consist of power delegated to elected representatives to control the army and navy, and increase ministerial and foreign policy control which would put the power into the hands of the people rather than the Prussian elite. In addition to pushing a democratic movement on the German people, the Inquiry suggested the "control of the two military terminals of Berlin-Baghdad (to) remain in the hands of an administration friendly to the western nations".¹²⁴ The ill-defined phrase "friendly to the western nations" could mean a variety of things. On one hand it meant that Germany and Turkey would not ally against the soon-to-be victorious western powers. On the other hand, the term "friendly" meant an administration that would kowtow to the demands of the Allied Powers. If Lippmann's goal of making the United States the "pre-eminent" power after the war was completed, an administration friendly to the Allied Powers would be an administration ultimately subject to the United States. If the latter is to be inferred by the stated objective, it would be a similar situation to the American occupation of Veracruz and the overthrow of the Huerta administration; What seemed like the promotion of "self-determination" on the surface was really the Pan-American movement implemented by the United States on a global scale.

The demobilization of German militarism required a fine balance between German industrialization and economic opportunity, and the possibility of discontent among the German civilian working class and military if the government demobilized and industrialized too

¹²³ Walter Lippmann, David Hunter Miller and Sydney Mezes, "The Present Situation," 460.

¹²⁴ Walter Lippmann, David Hunter Miller and Sydney Mezes, "The Present Situation," 462.

quickly.¹²⁵ When assessing the assets of the United States to enforce the nations war aims, he was quick to note that the economic well-being of post-war Germany was in the hands of the United States. In the first section of the memorandum titled “Assets”, Lippmann clearly stated that the “commercial control of the outer world....lies in our hands.”¹²⁶ Lippmann believed the asset most valuable for coaxing Germany into abiding by the terms of peace was the “possibility of German exclusion both from the sources of raw materials and the richer markets”.¹²⁷ Due to the radical shifts in European demographics at the end of the war through the dissolution of multiple empires, it was unclear what exactly those markets would be. A possibility of course would be Latin America, which was abundant in both raw materials and rich markets due to European preoccupation with the war. Lippmann recognized that “Germany’s exclusion from Central and South America” was a bargaining chip to influence German cooperation.¹²⁸ What the Executive Committee offered Germany was an ultimatum. Either Germany cooperates with Allied demands and democratizes, or it will be excluded from “freedom of intercourse”, namely new markets and raw materials to catalyze industrial growth.¹²⁹ Before the Allied victory, Germany ruled over the Shantung and German South-West Africa which provided the raw materials to manufacture for sale in the western markets. The Allied powers stripped Germany of their colonial possessions upon defeat and controlled the nation’s access to foreign markets.¹³⁰

Rather than offer mere suggestions, the final section of the memorandum provided concrete peace terms for the president to consider. Many of the terms were nearly identical to the finalized Fourteen Points but with further alterations to language. There was one exception to the

¹²⁵ Walter Lippmann, David Hunter Miller and Sydney Mezes, “The Present Situation,” 460.

¹²⁶ Walter Lippmann, David Hunter Miller and Sydney Mezes, “The Present Situation,” 462.

¹²⁷ Walter Lippmann, David Hunter Miller and Sydney Mezes, “The Present Situation,” 461-463.

¹²⁸ Walter Lippmann, David Hunter Miller and Sydney Mezes, “The Present Situation,” 462.

¹²⁹ Walter Lippmann, David Hunter Miller and Sydney Mezes, “The Present Situation,” 460.

¹³⁰ Margaret Macmillan, *Paris 1919* (New York, NY: Random House, 2003) 187.

parallels between the memorandum and the speech, being the Alsace-Lorraine question. Lippmann and Mezes stated, “The wrong done in 1871 must be undone” due to the fact that Germany “proclaimed these provinces are foreign territory.”¹³¹ David Hunter Miller dissented after the document was produced and stated that Germany should still be able to capitalize on the industry of the region even though it would once again be in French hands.¹³² Wilson ultimately never sided with either Miller or Lippmann and ambiguously stated that the “wrong done to France in 1871 must be undone, (borrowing the phrase from the Inquiry) and should be righted...in the interests of all.”¹³³ Wilson blended the ideas of Lippmann and Miller by advocating for the restoration of the territory to France, but included Germany through the phrase “all,” which could allow for German economic interests in the area. Since Lippmann was trying to limit German economic domination of Europe in fear it could compete with American hegemony, it makes sense that he would advise against German influence in an economically important area.

Woodrow Wilson’s statement of U.S. war aims was given to a joint session of Congress on January 8, 1918. The Fourteen Points speech was given only after the memorandum was completed on December 22, 1917 and an expanded copy with explanations of the research was given to House on January 2, 1918.¹³⁴ Wilson then edited the draft to fit his liking and added the first five points of the draft, which did not directly reflect Inquiry research but echoed topics that were supported by Inquiry personnel. The topics included freedom of the seas (Point II) unless “closed by international action for the enforcement of international covenants” and the “free,

¹³¹ Margaret Macmillan, *Paris 1919*, 469.

¹³² David Hunter Miller, “Mr. Miller’s Memorandum” in *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson* ed. Arthur S. Link, v. 45 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984) 473.

¹³³ Woodrow Wilson, “An Address to a Joint Session of Congress, January 8, 1918” in *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson* ed. Arthur S. Link, v. 45 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984) 537.

¹³⁴ Edward M. House, “The Diary of Edward House,” 421.

open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of territorial claims” (Point V), or the clause famously associated with self-determination.¹³⁵ Freedom of the seas was a direct response to the restricted trade the United States experienced while it was a neutral country. The naval blockade of the Royal Navy restricted American trade with Germany, and as a neutral nation the United States had the right to trade with either side in the war.¹³⁶ Lippmann wrote about the stifling of American trade in the war in early 1915. He claimed that England was equally as threatening to neutral involvement in the war as Germany, shown through the rejection of England to allow Germany to import food and raw materials for the benefit of the civil population.¹³⁷ England practiced “unregulated capture at sea of suspicious vessels” which had never sat well with Americans, branching back to the War of 1812.¹³⁸ Lippmann believed that England’s violation of international law by controlling Trans-Atlantic trade negatively impacted American economic growth. While England and America became allies in the war, the growing American Navy would eventually compete with the island nation for global hegemony.

Wilson’s affinity with the League of Nations, shown through his insistence of a signed covenant early in the peace negotiations in France, was directly influenced by the Inquiry. A staple of Wilson’s presidency was the formation of the League of Nations. The formation of the League is always credited to Wilson, and rightfully so, but Lippmann’s work in the early days of the League has been overshadowed by his later career. The League of Nations, as a reaction to the German attempt at “world domination,” would be a collection of nations for “common protection” and to “solve international disputes.”¹³⁹ Another aspect of the League would be “the

¹³⁵ Woodrow Wilson, “Transcript of Shorthand Draft” in *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson* ed. Arthur S. Link, v. 45 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984) 516.

¹³⁶ Adam Tooze, *The Deluge*, 14-18.

¹³⁷ Walter Lippmann, David Hunter Miller and Sydney Mezes, “The Present Situation” 476.

¹³⁸ Walter Lippmann, David Hunter Miller and Sydney Mezes, “The Present Situation” 476.

¹³⁹ Walter Lippmann, David Hunter Miller and Sydney Mezes, “The Present Situation” 472.

attainment of a joint economic prosperity”.¹⁴⁰ Without an explanation by the members of the Executive Committee it was difficult to pin down just what the Inquiry meant by the phrase. It could have meant that all nations in the League would support economic policies that would benefit all nations rather than just their own. But it could have also been an economic opportunity for the United States in disguise. The early *New Republic* articles by Lippmann and his colleagues about Pan-Americanism link to the fourteenth point. Lippmann was the chief author of this draft, and there was a possibility of what is essentially an expanded Pan-American Movement masked as the final point. But in this case the unifying entity was the League rather than geographic location of the Western Hemisphere. “Joint economic prosperity” sounds quite familiar to the symbiotic relationship marketed to the Latin American nations from 1914 through 1916. The establishment of the League of Nations presented the United States with the opportunity to inconspicuously influence global affairs for national gain. The League, much like the Pan-American movement, was advertised to the world as a mutually beneficial relationship. But, both organizations had strong undercurrents of American economic exploitation aimed at expanding American influence to new parts of the globe. Without concrete evidence there is no clear answer as to the intentions of the statement. Based on Lippmann’s thoughts only two years prior, a disguised symbiotic relationship was a possibility for the final point. Wilson ultimately cut the phrase from his final draft of the Fourteen Points and replaced it with the guarantee of “political independence and territorial integrity.”¹⁴¹

Advocating for the League of Nations and actually creating it were two completely different things. Lippmann was the Secretary of Research of the Inquiry, but much of the

¹⁴⁰ Walter Lippmann, David Hunter Miller and Sydney Mezes, “The Present Situation” 472.

¹⁴¹ Woodrow Wilson, “Final Draft of the Fourteen Points Address” in *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson* ed. Arthur S. Link, v. 45 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984) 519.

research had been completed and research was sidelined in lieu of the concrete League formulation as the armistice approached.¹⁴² Those trained in law, like David Hunter Miller, assumed a stronger role in the Inquiry by late spring of 1918 to establish the guidelines for an accepted covenant at the upcoming peace conference. Lippmann was not trained in law, and found the Inquiry became increasingly boring compared to the early research and formulation of the Fourteen Points. As the focus of the Inquiry shifted from thought formulation to procedural development, Lippmann began searching for his next endeavor.

A loss of interest may not have been the only factor that drove Lippmann away from the Inquiry. Actually, it was probably only a secondary reason for Lippmann's departure. Walter Lippmann was raised in a Jewish family and began his career when Anti-Semitism was rampant around the world. The Inquiry was infiltrated by Anti-Semitism through Edward House and Isaiah Bowman, the latter of which conspired against Lippmann with the help of House to hijack the position of Secretary of Research. Anti-Semitism plagued the career of Bowman who quite frankly came to hate Lippmann while the two worked together.¹⁴³ Bowman was the leader of the American Geographical Society where the Inquiry was stationed. He was also an up-and-coming geographer that would wield great influence throughout the first half of the twentieth century. While at the Inquiry, Bowman became in an increasingly aggressive egomaniac that took control of the Inquiry by sabotaging the relationship of the Executive Committee members. Bowman summarized his Machiavelli rise to Inquiry domination in a note written at the end of 1918. Lippmann expressed to Bowman his discontent with Mezes as the leader of the group, calling the geologist "lazy" and "controlling." The young geographer concurred with Lippmann's

¹⁴² Lawrence E. Gelfand, *The Inquiry*, 83.

¹⁴³ Neil Smith, "Silence and Refusal: Refugees, Race, and Economic Development" in *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalism* (Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2004)

assessment of Mezes.¹⁴⁴ That was until he turned his back on Lippmann by framing him as a threat to the organization in a meeting with House. Bowman blamed the “extreme disorganization” of the Inquiry in spring 1918 on Lippmann and suggested he himself should become the Executive Officer of the Inquiry.¹⁴⁵ As Executive Officer, Bowman would not only assume Lippmann’s role of Secretary of Research, but he would also control the organizations funding, hiring and firing.¹⁴⁶ Bowman also won over the support of David Hunter Miller to kick Lippmann off the Executive Committee and out the Inquiry for good. Miller even went so far as saying that he never met anyone that didn’t “hate to work with Lippmann.”¹⁴⁷ Once House learned of Bowman’s true feelings towards Lippmann, he let the geographer in on a little secret.

House said to Bowman that the only reason Lippmann became a member of the Inquiry was because the Wilson Administration had to “cooperate with the extreme liberals of the country” and that Lippmann fit the mold of a pushover that could work on more personal matters like Inquiry hiring with House.¹⁴⁸ It was never the plan for Lippmann to fill such a crucial role as the Secretary of Research. House later recalls his revulsion for Lippmann due to his Jewish faith, but conceded that he was at least “one of the quiet Jews.”¹⁴⁹ Lippmann was aware of the crumbling foundation of the Inquiry when it became clear Bowman had betrayed him to commandeer the role of Executive Officer, which was the man responsible for “men, money and plans.”¹⁵⁰ In hindsight, it seems that House, Miller, and Bowman may have underestimated the

¹⁴⁴ Walter Lippmann, “Letter to Isaiah Bowman. February 13, 1918” Letter. From Yale University, *The Papers of Walter Lippmann, 1889-1976* Box 3, Folder 11, Reel 142.

¹⁴⁵ Isaiah Bowman, *Notes on the Inquiry, November 30, 1918* in *The Inquiry: American Preparations for Peace, 1917-1919*. (New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1963) 350.

¹⁴⁶ Isaiah Bowman, *Notes on the Inquiry, November 30, 1918*, 350.

¹⁴⁷ Isaiah Bowman, *Notes on the Inquiry, November 30, 1918*, 350.

¹⁴⁸ Isaiah Bowman, *Notes on the Inquiry, November 30, 1918*, 351.

¹⁴⁹ Edward M. House, “The Diary of Edward House,” 463.

¹⁵⁰ Isaiah Bowman, *Notes on the Inquiry, November 30, 1918*, 350.

ability of the young Lippmann until he became a crucial figure in the drafting of the Fourteen Points.

Lippmann's departure from the Inquiry sent him back across the Atlantic. While he was in Belgium during the outbreak of the war in August 1914, he later traveled to neighboring France in 1918 after his time at the Inquiry to see the colossal conflict conclude. The second time it was with the United States Expeditionary Forces in the Military Information Branch. As we will see, Lippmann's relatively uneventful time as an Army Captain in France (a seemingly interesting position in 1918) had a lasting impact on his views of government and media control through propaganda. Lippmann spent a month in London as an unofficial liaison for the Inquiry by discussing United States war aims with its ally. House granted Lippmann permission to speak on behalf of the Inquiry, and surprisingly gave him free reign of what to tell the British.¹⁵¹ Lippmann then relocated to France where the propaganda leaflets of Wilson's speeches were created and distributed.

Lippmann's office in France was by no means the New York Public Library or the American Geographical Society. Lippmann's unpleasant time in France was spent in half of a room with cold, propaganda poster covered walls and uncomfortable furniture stacked with Woodrow Wilson speeches and other propaganda leaflets from France and England.¹⁵² The goal of Lippmann's propaganda was to differentiate between United States and European Allied propaganda, but the outcome was propaganda typical of the other Allies. Like England and France, the Military Information Branch focused on the treatment of German prisoners of war as better than the treatment of German soldiers by their own government. Although Lippmann found the work less than exhilarating, it was nonetheless deemed successful by Allied leaders

¹⁵¹ Edward House Edward M. House, "The Diary of Edward House," 479.

¹⁵² Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century*, 147.

based on the number of pamphlets found on captured German soldiers.¹⁵³ Lippmann may have escaped his downfall in the Inquiry by fleeing to France, but he encountered a similar type of issue like the one he encountered in New York. The content of his work became dull, like the post-Fourteen Points Inquiry work, and people within the organization were plotting against him. This time it was George Creel. Creel spent his time before the war as a journalist and became the head of American Propaganda in Europe during the war. During his time as a journalist, Creel and Lippmann bickered in 1915 over a civil liberties issue that led Creel to hold a grudge.¹⁵⁴ Lippmann worked independent of Creel in his propaganda organization, which Creel wished to avoid at all costs. Creel went all the way to the top and appealed to Wilson for help in controlling Lippmann. A few months before Lippmann departed to Europe, George Creel was plotting against him. Wilson valued the advice of Creel which set Lippmann at a disadvantage. Creel wrote Wilson saying “ I myself a somewhat in doubt as to the best attitude to adopt to Lippmann and his associates.”¹⁵⁵ His associates were the “extreme liberals” that forced House to place Lippmann on the Inquiry when it was created. Wilson responded to Creel by agreeing his “attitude towards what Lippmann and others have suggested is entirely correct.”¹⁵⁶ So, when Lippmann was in Europe, Creel was able to suppress the young propagandists work through the end of the war by absorbing the Military Information Branch into his Committee of Public Information in the fall of 1918.

On November 11, 1918 hostilities ceased between the Allied and Central Powers based on the Fourteen Points. The very work that Lippmann spent months creating before he left for

¹⁵³ Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century*, 150.

¹⁵⁴ Walter Lippmann, “Paul Kellogg Muckraked” *The New Republic* (February 22, 1915)

¹⁵⁵ George Creel, “Letter to Woodrow Wilson, November 28, 1918” in *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson* ed. Arthur S. Link, v. 45 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984) 153.

¹⁵⁶ Woodrow Wilson, “Letter to George Creel, November 30, 1918” in *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson* ed. Arthur S. Link, v. 45 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984) 162.

France was used for the armistice that effectively ended a world war. Propaganda became irrelevant when the fighting ended, and Lippmann began planning for the peace conference. His “old friends” at the Inquiry would be joining him in France along with hundreds of other advisors, reporters and government entities.¹⁵⁷ Lippmann hoped his departure from the Inquiry was only temporary and his colleagues would welcome him back with open arms. By late 1918 Bowman had assumed leadership of the Inquiry and he would ultimately have the final say for Lippmann joining the group in Paris. After the *George Washington* arrived in France in December 1918 with the Inquiry on board, Lippmann anxiously awaited to join his colleagues from his hole-in-the-wall propaganda office. The call to join the group never came and Lippmann watched as Wilson paraded through the streets of Paris as the savior of the European people. Lippmann eventually swallowed his pride and asked Bowman to rejoin the Inquiry. Bowman’s resentment for Lippmann failed to subside and he sent Lippmann packing.¹⁵⁸ Lippmann’s conflict with Creel weakened his relationship with Wilson, and Bowman’s control of the Inquiry left Lippmann in Paris without a job. What seemed to be a time of great opportunity at the beginning of a peace settlement turned out to be a time of exclusion and isolation for the young Lippmann. So, while the euphoria of Wilson’s arrival swept through Europe, Lippmann boarded a ship bound for New York before the conference even began.

“A Disillusioned World”

Walter Lippmann’s expansive career peaked in the late 1950’s and early 1960’s with two Pulitzer Prize awards in journalism, one in 1958 and the other in 1962. His contributions to neo-liberal political theory during the same period has captured a majority of scholarly attention,

¹⁵⁷ Margaret Macmillan, *Paris 1919*, 9-10.

¹⁵⁸ Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century*, 142.

leaving little attention to the dawn of his career around World War I. Walter Lippmann's time as editor of the *New Republic* during the war gave him direct contact with the public. The United States role in the war was heavily influenced by public opinion, the area in which Lippmann would have the greatest influence in the early years of the war. The fact that Lippmann, at the astonishingly young age of 25, had such a profound influence on an entire nation's involvement in a global war makes him a key figure in crafting American foreign policy during WWI. The fusion of progressive political theory and economic domination of independent, sovereign nations by Lippmann created the framework for what can be referred to as "progressive imperialism". Lippmann's shift from the Roosevelt "big stick diplomacy" and outright colonial domination to "progressive imperialism" under Wilson swayed the opinion of many progressives to support U.S. entry in the war. The shift makes him a crucial figure in understanding not only the course of American foreign policy after the war but in understanding the shift of the entire global order on the eve of implosion for the previously Euro-Centric world, opening the door for the American Century.

Lippman was by no means a pioneer of the Progressive movement, and the movement is what directly influenced his views of America in a more global sense. In other words, he was a product of the progressive movement. His work in the *New Republic* was directly influenced by Herbert Croly and Walter Weyl, among others, and the two editors introduced Lippmann to the "father of the progressive movement", Theodore Roosevelt.¹⁵⁹ Lippmann turned to the former president for advice when the Great War broke out in late 1914. Alongside Roosevelt, but not to the extent of immediate mobilization of the armed forces, The *New Republic* advocated for entry into the war. But Roosevelt's knee-jerk rejection of war was so the United States could gather up on

¹⁵⁹ Herbert Croly, *Progressive Democracy*, 6.

the spoils of the conflict. The *New Republic* disagreed with that approach. Roosevelt's outlandish accusations of Wilson's incompetence in the Mexican Civil War also led Lippmann to drift into the Wilson Administration. The support of the Pan-American movement by the *New Republic* for new economic markets showed a characteristic shift from Roosevelt's outright colonial domination to Wilson's coercive sovereignty for economic benefit. Lippmann assimilated into the Wilson Administration and subsequently caught the eye of Edward House. His connection to House landed him the position of Secretary of Research for the Inquiry, where he would have his greatest influence during the war. The climax of Lippmann's work in the Inquiry was the drafting of the Fourteen Points, whereby he advanced the establishment of sovereign nations based on "self-government" from the ashes of the Central Powers. The immediate global response to the Fourteen Points based on the culmination of Lippmann and the Inquiry's work along with Wilsonian ideals of democracy seemed to have ushered in a new wave of anti-colonial sentiment.

An interesting paradox of Lippmann's work during the war was that while he was attempting to tear down the old empires of Europe by sparking a global movement of independence, he was building the foundation of America's twentieth-century empire. The Fourteen Points were accepted by the Central Powers as the basis for the armistice to cease hostilities on November 11, 1918. After decades, and in some cases centuries, it seemed to many colonies that their break from the chains of imperialism became reality with Wilson's rhetoric heading into the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. The expanded democratic ideals of self-government struck a chord with future leaders like Ho Chi Minh, Mahatma Gandhi and Lala Lajpat Rai, among many others. Lala Rai traveled around the United States and used it as the model for modernizing an increasingly independent India. The American ideals of progressive

democracy led Rai to believe that India could gain independence through educational reforms to achieve a gradual release from their colonial binds to the British Empire.¹⁶⁰ After catching word of Wilson's speeches during the war, including the "Peace Without Victory" speech and the Fourteen Points Address, Rai claimed America was the "freest of all countries" and used the Wilsonian progressive platform to inspire Indian reformers to gain independence through gradual reforms rather than revolution.¹⁶¹ Rai became an important figure in the rise of both the Indian National Congress and Mahatma Gandhi in post-war India. During the peace conference it became clear to many nationalist Indian leaders that Wilson was not as powerful nor as committed to the self-determination movement as previously thought and their faith in the once anti-colonial leader waned,¹⁶²

Ho Chi Minh was a young kitchen assistant at the Ritz hotel during the peace conference and a native to French Indochina in Southeast Asia, the jewel of the French Empire. The young nationalist believed Wilson would help Southeast Asia gain independence from French colonial rule. So, while in Paris, the young Minh wrote a petition to the president outlining his support for Wilson's advocacy for decolonization and his hope for the establishment of an independent Vietnam.¹⁶³ The vessel to which Minh gained independence from French rule did not matter, and eventually communism seemed the strongest option to achieve his goal when his call to Wilson went unanswered. In more simplistic terms, Wilson's influence at the peace conference presented him with the opportunity to generate positive relations with Vietnam five decades before the Vietnam War. Rebuffed by Wilson, Minh then turned to Vladimir Lenin, the communist leader

¹⁶⁰ Lala Lajpat Rai, "On Education" April. 1919, in Lajpat Rai, *Selected Documents of Lala Lajpat Rai, 1906-1928*, ed. Ravindra Kumar (New Delhi: Anmol, 1992) 104-109.

¹⁶¹ Erez Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment*, 87.

¹⁶² Erez Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment*, 97.

¹⁶³ Margaret Macmillan, *Paris 1919*, 57.

of the new communist state in Russia. He later claimed while reflecting on his gravitation to Communism in the early 1920s that “Patriotism, not yet Communism, led me to have confidence in Lenin.”¹⁶⁴ Minh did not have the same in confidence in Wilson. Communism was the route that would end at his goal of independence when Wilsonian democracy failed him. The initial work of Lippmann in the Inquiry inadvertently influenced Minh’s appeal to Wilson in the nascent stage of Vietnam-American relations that erupted in the Second Indochina War half of a century later. Minh’s eventual critique of both American democracy and the Paris Peace Conference’s outcome found an unlikely common ground with Lippmann.

The young army captain returned home from Europe in December 1919 disillusioned by the work he had completed. It became clear to Lippmann that the conference would be dominated by Great Power diplomacy of the Council of Three rather than control of the empires in a collectivized effort by multiple nations. The League of Nations was created at the insistence of Wilson at the conference before peace negotiations began. Ironically, the United States did not join the League due to its failure to receive congressional approval after the conference. Lippmann returned to the *New Republic* after the war and voiced his critical opinion of Wilson in two issues of the magazine in May, 1919. In the eyes of Lippmann and the other editors, the peace after the war was a complete failure. With the dismantling of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the suppression of German power, the door was left wide open for the imperial powers of Japan, Britain and France to secure territory either “outright or by mandate,” both of which would only “entangle the United States... if the treaty (was) accepted.”¹⁶⁵ The wave of Wilsonian rhetoric before the conference was characterized by Lippmann as Wilson’s “days of

¹⁶⁴ Ho Chi Minh, “The Path Which Led Me to Leninism” in *Ho Chi Minh on Revolution: Selected Writings, 1920-1966* ed. Bernard B. Fall (New York, NY: New American Library, 1967) 24.

¹⁶⁵ Walter Lippmann, *Europe Proposes* (May 17, 1919)

glory” and ultimately the president was a failure for allowing the settlement to be dominated by the “spirit of traditional diplomacy of Europe.”¹⁶⁶ The disillusionment of the Paris Peace Conference was more than just Lippmann’s immediate reaction to the “failure”. In *Public Opinion* (1922), Lippmann had yet to come to terms with the peace conference outcome. Lippmann critiqued democratic governments for their efforts to influence individual behavior to prevent societal cohesion. He used the example of French propaganda during the war to boost morale at the cost of individualism.¹⁶⁷ He was also critical of the media, as he witnessed during the war that “news and truth are not the same thing”.¹⁶⁸ He claimed that the press had become “an organ of direct democracy,” which paradoxically undermined the very roots of democracy by shading the truth.¹⁶⁹ Through Lippmann’s analysis, it was clear he was disappointed with progressivism and democracy, the very ideals he held dear throughout much of the previous decade. To round out Lippmann’s critique of democratic governments, he directly attacked the “Big Three” of the Paris Peace Conference. He believed the men had become the “incarnation of human hope” until they became “merely negotiators and administrators for a disillusioned world” when the conference concluded.¹⁷⁰ The disillusioned world was that in which Lippmann was living, and based on America’s role in global affairs during the twentieth century, there may have been some truth to the young journalist’s words.

¹⁶⁶ Walter Lippmann, *Europe Proposes* (May 17, 1919)

¹⁶⁷ Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion*, 11

¹⁶⁸ Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion*, 230.

¹⁶⁹ Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion*, 233.

¹⁷⁰ Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion*, 10.

Bibliography

Ambrosius, Lloyd. *Wilsonian Statecraft: Theory and Practice of Liberal Internationalism during World War I*. Wilmington: SR Books, 1991.

Ambrosius, Lloyd. *Wilsonianism: Woodrow Wilson and his Legacy in American Foreign Relations*. New York: Macmillian, 2002.

Aydin, Cemil. *The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia: Visions of the World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Bethmann Hollweg, Theobald von. *Reflections on the World War*. Los Angeles: University of California Libraries, 1920.

Clements, Kendrick. *Woodrow Wilson: World Statesman*. Boston, MA: Twayne, 1987.

Cooper, John Milton Jr. *The Warrior and the Priest: Woodrow Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1985.

Cooper, John Milton Jr. *Breaking the Hearts of the World: Woodrow Wilson and the Fight for the League of Nations*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Croly, Herbert. *Progressive Democracy*. New York: Macmillian, 1914.

Croly, Herbert. *The Promise of American Life*. New York: The Macmillian Company, 1909.

Demeulemeester, Jean Luc. "U.S. Economic Growth during the Gilded Age". *Journal of Macroeconomics* 31. December, 2009.

Gelfand, Lawrence E. *The Inquiry: American Preparations for Peace, 1917-1919*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Healy, David. *Drive to Hegemony: The United States in the Caribbean, 1989-1917*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.

House, Edward. Correspondence, 1914-1919. *The Intimate Papers of Edward M. House*. ed. Charles Seymour. Ann Harbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005.

House, Edward. Diary, 1916-1919. *The Intimate Papers of Edward M. House*. ed. Charles Seymour Ann Harbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005.

Hurst, James. *Pancho Villa and Black Jack Pershing: The Punitive Expedition in Mexico*. Westport: Praeger, 2008.

Immerwahr, David. *How to Hide an Empire: A History of the Greater United States*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2019.

- Kennan, George. *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Knock, Thomas J. *To End All Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order*. New York: Princeton University Press, 1995
- Link, Arthur S. and Richard L. McCormick. *Progressivism*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 1983
- Link, Arthur S. *Woodrow Wilson: Revolution, War, and Peace*. Arlington Heights: AHM Publishing, 1979.
- Lippmann, Walter. *A Preface to Politics*. New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1913
- Lippmann, Walter. *Drift and Mastery*. New York: H. Holt and Company, 1914
- Lippmann, Walter. *Public Opinion*. New York: Macmillan, 1922
- Lippmann, Walter. *The Political Scene: An Essay on the Victory of 1918*. New York: H. Holt and Company, 1919.
- Lippmann, Walter. *The Stakes of Diplomacy*. New York: H. Holt and Company, 1915.
- Lippmann, Walter. Correspondence, 1906-1930. *The Walter Lippmann Papers, 1889-1974*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Library
- Lippmann, Walter. Diary, 1914-1921. *The Walter Lippmann Papers, 1889-1974*. New Haven: Yale University Library
- Lippmann, Walter, David Hunter Miller, Sydney Mezes. "The Present Situation: War Aims and the Peace Terms it Suggests" In *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. ed. Arthur S. Link. v. 44, 45, 46. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984
- Macmillan, Margaret. *Paris 1919*. New York: Random House, 2003
- Manela, Erez. *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007
- Marks, Sally. *The Illusion of Peace: International Relations in Europe, 1918-1933*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2003.
- Miller, David Hunter. "Inquiry Account Book" in *The Papers of David Hunter Miller, 1875-1961*. Library of Congress.
- Miller, David Hunter. "Mr. Miller's Memorandum" in *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. ed. Arthur S. Link, v. 45. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984
- Minh, Ho Chi. "The Path Which Led Me to Leninism" in *Ho Chi Minh on Revolution: Selected Writings, 1920-1966*. ed. Bernard B. Fall. New York: New American Library, 1967

The New Republic. Volume 1, Issue 1-- Volume 25, Issue 317. New York: November 14, 1914-- December 29, 1920.

O'Brien, Thomas. *The Revolutionary Mission: American Enterprise in Latin America, 1900-1945*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Rai, Lala Lajpat. "On Education" April, 1919, in Lajpat Rai, *Selected Documents of Lala Lajpat Rai, 1906-1928*. ed. Ravindra Kumar. New Delhi: Anmol, 1992.

Rich, Norman. *Great Power Diplomacy, 1814-1914*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1992

Roosevelt, Theodore. "A Charter of Democracy," 2/21/1912. *The Works of Theodore Roosevelt*. V. 16 & 17 Columbus: P.F. Collier & Son, 1926.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *America and the World War*. New York: Charles Scribner's Son, 1915.

Schoonover, Thomas. *The United States in Central America, 1860-1911: Episodes of Social Imperialism and Imperial Rivalry in the World System*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.

Smith, Neil. *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalism*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004

Steel, Ronald. *Walter Lippmann and the American Century*. Boston: Little Brown, 1980.

Snyder, Brad. *The House of Truth: A Washington Political Salon and the Foundations of American Liberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Thronveit, Trygve. "The Fable of the Fourteen Points: Woodrow Wilson and National Self-Determination". *Diplomatic History*, 35, no. 3. June, 2011

Thronveit, Trygve. *Power Without Victory: Woodrow Wilson and the American Internationalist Experiment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017.

Tooze, Adam. *The Deluge: The Great War and the Remaking of the Global Order 1916-1931*. London: Penguin Books, 2014.

Usher, Roland G. *Pan-Americanism; a Forecast of the Inevitable Clash between the United States and Europe's Victor*. New York: Century Co, 1915.

Usher, Roland G. *Pan-Germanism*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1915

Wilson, Woodrow. *Message to Congress*. Senate Doc. No. 566. Washington, D.C.: 1914

Wilson, Woodrow. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. V. 44, 45, 46, 47. ed. Arthur Link. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Weyl, Walter. *The End of the War*. New York: Macmillan, 1918

Weyl, Walter. *The New Democracy: An Essay on Certain Political and Economic Tendencies in the United States*. New York: Macmillan, 1912.

Williams, Appleman William. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1959.