

Name J. K. Toole  
Subject History 342B  
Date April 16, 1957  
Teacher D. Waldrow  
Sending \_\_\_\_\_

#1 is very coherent  
& well organized

A

Good  
paper

# BLUE BOOK

1. racism
2. imperialism
3. imperialism
4. KKK
5. WWI
6. .

BLUE BOOK

Anglo-Saxon  
I think you mean

I'm not sure  
obscure is the word  
it would too apparent

1. Toward the end of the nineteenth century "scientific" Darwinism had developed a somewhat obscure branch optimistically, and a bit rashly, called "Social" Darwinism. Previously, we have traced its effects here in the United States. But it left a taste in the American mind that was a bit more lasting than was to be expected.

With this Social Darwinism in the backs of their minds, men looked around the world and noted the contemporary power and influence of the Anglican man. It appeared, therefore, that he was the fittest, the one destined to survive. From this conception grew a whole line of racists



in England and America. A popular conception became the notion of what we may call the Aryan-Tentonic & Nordic-Anglo <sup>supremacy</sup> supremacy. At first glance, it is fairly obvious that these "supreme" "races" (really nationalities) were those which generally "subdued passion by reason." <sup>they</sup> <sup>thought</sup>

Here in the U.S. the immigration late in the 19th century tended to support such notions, and men like Herbert Baxter Adams and John Fiske found support readily. The large numbers of eastern and southern Europeans entering the U.S. caused a natural reaction against this seeming

<sup>much earlier</sup> <sup>before the 20-1910</sup> <sup>European</sup> <sup>largely vs. the Irish!</sup>  
menace to the Anglo-Saxon nature of the U.S. (note the Know-Nothing political party.) From this there grew an external policy of imperialistic tendencies, particularly <sup>before and</sup> during the administrations of Theodore Roosevelt. Indeed, Teddy Roosevelt had studied under the racist Burgess at Columbia Law School. Because we were essentially a Tentonic nation, it became apparent that our policy externally must require our assuming the will of the leader.

During this period we struck at the closest bulwark of "passionate" humanity: Latin America. Our exploits in the Spanish-American war,



and some of our  
humanitarian  
missionary  
complex too,  
"aid" to revolting Panama,  
capture of the Philippine  
Islands, and annexation of  
Hawaii are traceable to the  
racist mentality. Therefore,  
racism encouraged imperialism.

It was, naturally, a time  
during which we were quite  
close with England, and the  
writings of Josiah Strong  
echoed familiar old British  
attitude of paternalism and  
salvation toward natives  
as an excuse for capturing  
their lands. Strong was also  
anti-Catholic, which is to  
be expected from the relative  
non-Catholicism of the  
Senterian peoples. For good  
measure, he was also anti-  
Mormon.

So, founded on racist  
influence, American imperialism  
moved forward. Europe, at  
the time was also turning  
Colonialism into imperialism, so  
we were, in a sense, in step  
with the times.

Any movement creates a  
corresponding reaction. This  
happened in the case of imperialism  
and racism. Upon entering  
World War I, we discovered that  
Germany had a similarly racist  
point of view. The natural  
reaction against Germany and  
things German led to a  
reappraisal of our own racism  
and tended to negate it. It  
hung on, however, in the  
1920's in the form of such  
unsophisticated and bourgeois

but  
not as  
well  
developed  
as  
later  
under  
Hitler



organizations as the Ku Klux  
Klan and the American  
Legion, & the V. A. R. et al.  
Now, then. —



To this a  
pun?

O.K. I  
see you  
made this  
point on  
the next  
page

In many  
respects  
Americans whose  
pragmatists long  
before James  
popularized  
the term

f. "Philosophy bakes no bread."  
William James read this  
line, used it, and decided  
upon a philosophy that, if  
it didn't bake bread, at  
least got the dough to rise a  
little. As we speak of the  
"Great American" Novel, James  
foreshadowed what might be  
called the "Great American"  
Philosophy.

Sartre once said  
that James'  $\phi$  was not a  
"true"  $\phi$ , but in pragmatic  
terms it most certainly was.  
It was "true" for America,  
"true" in its emphasis upon  
result more than motivating  
principle. James was reacting  
against the rational and  
slightly aesthetic philosophy  
? maybe eastern



but pragmatism was not just  
a reaction. It was a logical  
development out of scientific progress  
being offered in American  
universities. He moved more  
toward the empirical, a reaction  
similar to Turner's reaction  
against the "germ theory" of  
American history. Notable is  
the fact that both James and  
Turner reflected America's new  
emergence as a primary power  
in their "Moose Doctrine"  
philosophy and history.

America, and particularly  
with industrialization, had  
become a nation which judged  
phenomena and trivia by their  
results. James' philosophy  
does the same. Lewis Mumford  
calls this the "pragmatic  
acquiescence", and calls  
pragmatism a "paralysis" and  
a simple result of the

Golden Age.

Do you think the word  
is used?

But what is this pragmatism?  
Its derivation from the Greek  
word for "action" gives a clue.  
It was a movement away  
from old philosophies that  
might have been pleasant  
and edifying, but were  
essentially inactive and  
led to pleasant rationalizing  
without considering the  
results of such rationalizing.  
Although still looking at  
the means, pragmatism  
stressed the ends.

Dewey, a disciple of James,  
labeled his branch of  
pragmatism "instrumentalism",  
and became an important  
influence in America, particu-  
larly in the field of



Streamlined scientific method of both P. + J.

education, creating "Progressive" schools which trained children more usefully than pedantically. Observing the results of certain forms of education, it was decided that certain curricula were not particularly useful.

Although the Commercial schools, etc., had been in existence before Dewey to a slight degree, his philosophy gave them and added impetus as it did other forms of vocational training.

Obviously, the philosophy of James and Dewey is utilitarian and somewhat materialistic. But, was this not the attitude of America.

These two men have been called nihilistic and

positivistic, particularly by Mortimer Adler, whose writings are Thomist in nature and pro-religious in attitude.

Debsam, reflecting Marxist attitudes finds the philosophy reactionary and not observant of the basic class struggles in the U.S. So, we can see that criticism of came from both the religionists and the Marxists.

~~James + J.~~