

DEMOCRATIC AND POPULAR REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA  
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH  
MENTOURI UNIVERSITY CONSTANTINE  
FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES –DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN  
LANGUAGES

# U.S Foreign Policy Toward Latin America: the Case of President Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy 1933\_1941

---

Dissertation submitted to the Department of Foreign Languages in  
partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of Master in  
American and British Studies

**Presented by :**

*Samira Sahraoui*

**Supervisor :**

*Dr Megherbi Nasr-Eddine*

2009

## **Acknowledgement**

*I am grateful and foremost to my supervisor Mr Megherbi, one of the most elevated teachers know, for his continuing support aand critical assistance from the beginning, even before pen was put to paper. He made this happen just as much I did. I acknowledge my teachers efforts with thanks and appreciation.*

*I am indebted to several people for their help in writing this dissertation including Mr Bedalla Billal, Balhoul Kadour and his wife Salima ,to my friends Chahba, Meriem ,Nesserin, Chany, Aicha, Latifa, Fouad, Achraf, and Anis.*

*I have been blessed with a great family especially my sisters souad ,and Imene so they need to be thanked for their contribution to my thinking and in shaping this dissertation .I also benefited enormously from the critical evaluation of Dr Lahouel Mesbah Dr Yakhelf, and Dr Atamna . I end with hope because that is the only way we can live.*

## **Abstract:**

He was a remarkable figure, the longest serving American presidency this century, the only one to have won four successive general elections. He is the president Franklin D Roosevelt the figure that this study deals with. When Roosevelt took office he established a foreign policy which was made up of both realism and idealism. His foreign policy was associated mainly with the Good Neighbor especially toward Latin America. The study examines the change of US foreign policy under Roosevelt leadership before the out break of the Second World War. I argue that Roosevelt was against the intervention policies sponsored by his predecessors in Latin America. The study deals also with the real motives behind Roosevelt's Good Neighbor which was to keep peace, create conditional laws that treaties can be achieved, and promote social progress and better standards of living throughout the Americans. At last the work shows that Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy was the first stone in the transformation of US foreign policy.

## **Résumé :**

IL existe des hommes qui ont laissé une empreinte remarquable dans l'histoire de la politique. Parmi eux, Franklin Roosevelt sujet de notre recherche, celui qui a su assembler entre la politique réaliste et celle exemplaire tout en l'appliquant sur terrain au cours de ses années de pouvoir durant une phase critique de l'histoire des USA caractérisée par une dégradation économique et une mauvaise qualité de gestion.

Mais ce politicien malgré les critiques et les obstacles a pu sauver l'économie de son pays en ouvrant des marchés multiples vers l'extérieur essentiellement avec les pays limitrophes (Amérique Latine) pour limiter l'inflation.

Notre étude s'est intéressée également sur la méthode pratiquée envers l'Amérique Latine envisagée par Roosevelt et la politique d'ouverture durant ses années de pouvoir rendant aussi justice et dignité à ces peuples ayant souffert de la dictature de USA dirigeants.

Cette, étude, précise clairement que la politique ouverte de Roosevelt envers l'Amérique Latine était la pierre angulaire des relations extérieures des États Unis d'Amérique.

## ملخص

هناك رجال يزدادون تمكنا من النفس و تأثيرا في الواقع السياسي و العالمي من هؤلاء "فرانكلين روزفلت" الذي تمحورت حوله هذه الدراسة حيث اقترن اسمه بالتوفيق في الجمع بين السياسة الواقعية و المثالية ،التي طبقتها على أرض الواقع بعد توليه سدّة الرئاسة في فترة حرجة عانت فيها أمريكا من الركود الاقتصادي و سوء التخطيط اللذين كدا يهويان بها في هوة الانهيار،من هنا كان لزاما على هذا السياسي المحنك الذي واجه الكثير من الانتقادات الأذعة أن يعقد العزم و يمضي قدما نحو ايجاد الحلول الملائمة التي تمثلها جلية في تبادل المنافع بين الولايات المتحدة و جاراتها من جنوب أمريكا من خلال فتح أسواق الجديدة تنفس عن بلده صعداء التكديس والتضخم ، كما ركزت هذه الدراسة على الخطوة الجريئة إتجاه أمريكا اللاتينية حيث تكشف الغطاء عن الدوافع الحقيقية وراء سياسة " حسن الجوار " التي إنتهجها روزفلت والتي ازالته غبار عصور من الإستبداد والتعسف الذي مورس على شعوب هذه الدول من قبل حكام الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية تارة وجيرانها من الأقوياء تارة أخرى .

أخيرا وتماشيا مع ما سبق يظهر هذا البحث بوضوح أن سياسة روزفلت اتجاه أمريكا

اللاتينية شكلت حجر الأساس في جسر التعاملات الخارجية للولايات المتحدة الأمريكية .

## Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	1
<b>Introduction</b> .....	7
<b>Chapter1:</b>	
<b>The Theoretical Approaches that Drive US Foreign Policy</b> .....	11
1.1 Introduction.....	12
1.2 Realism.....	13
1.3 Idealism.....	15
1.4 Liberalism (liberal democratic peace).....	17
1.5 Conclusion.....	20
<b>Chapter2</b>	
<b>The historical back ground of inter-American conflicts (Latin America)</b> .....	22
2.1 Introduction.....	23
2.2 The early relations of us and Latin America.....	24
2.3 The main interventionist doctrine applied on the region of Latin America.....	27
2.4 The legacy of the interventionist doctrine over Latin America.....	34
2.5 Conclusions.....	36
<b>Chapter 3...</b>	
<b>Franklin D.Roosevelt and The Good Neighbor Policy</b> .....	39
1.3 Introduction.....	40

2.3 The ideological undertaking of US policy toward Latin America under F.D.R Leadership.....	41
3.3 The motives and the objectives of Roosevelt's good neighbor policy.....	48
3.4 The problems faced the new policy.....	50
3.5 The new policy and public opinion.....	52
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>57</b>

## **Introduction:**

This research grows out of the course on international conflicts in the Americas. It explores exactly Franklin D. Roosevelt foreign policy in Latin America. Roosevelt policy in the region inspired a debate among scholars, historians, critics and even journalists. They claimed that Roosevelt had little time for foreign affairs because he took office when United States economy was in a sorry state and seemed almost about repair. The purpose of the study is to argue that Roosevelt presidency had witnessed a renewed focus on Washington foreign policy toward Latin America. I try to focus on how F.D.R has traced a new path for US foreign policy, and also to present difficult concepts in clear language with historical examples so the reader could gain a practical understanding of the motivation and the objectives of Roosevelt policy toward Latin America.

The research attempts to show the true nature of diplomatic relations between United States and Latin America from the Monroe Doctrine to Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy. In fact it is not a complete work with all the concepts or history a reader will need. Instead, it is an example of how President Roosevelt was able to transform the American attitude toward Latin America by sponsoring a Good Neighbor Policy. He stirred their conscience with the idea that US should not be an example of force, but an example of peace and freedom as the basis of its constitution. Further more, the central aim of this thesis is to show if this policy really put into practice or it was just an illusion to help for the American National security and economic prosperity.

The research focused practiced simply because United States has a long history with Latin America. The Latin American paradox has always astonished Washington. United by geography with two of the world's most successful nations, blessed with natural resources of every kind, lacking racial, religions or linguistic differences giving rise to serious violence, and by its continuity Latin America could be a continent of peace, stability, and prosperity. But the region remains mired in underdevelopment and political instability. Therefore, the US established itself as big brothers over Latin America to preserve it from any outside dangers. In addition there are a number of questions that central the development of this thesis: how did Roosevelt change the foreign policy in Latin America? And how did he justify the increased involvement in the region? Was Roosevelt's policy in the western hemisphere naïve idealism or crafty calculated? Or was it real or illusion? What was Roosevelt's motivation for undertaking the policy and what did he seek to achieve from it? Are there some common threats that have forced cooperation policy of both sides? Was good neighbor policy a result of circumstance or what Roosevelt intention? All these questions contributed for the build of this work.

The study points at the presidency of Franklin D Roosevelt from 1933 to 1941 mainly because he was the first United States president who established a good neighbor policy toward the region after harsh decades of intervention. He was the only one who put this word into practice, the only one who could change the crucial image of Latin Americans people toward United States. He was the only president who gave much time to Latin America conflicts and tried at his best to build

democratic regimes in the region molded on those of developed nations. My study focuses on the period from 1933 to 1941 because after 1941 US entered a new era (the Second World War) thereby Latin America was no more US major problem as it was before the beginning of the war. United States policy-makers turned their attention toward Europe and the emergence of the totalitarian regimes both (Fascist and Nazis).

The research strategy is based on a series of data acquired from books. This data is analyzed by using both historical and analytical approaches. The analysis allows the events under consideration to be examined and by looking first at the background to the way in which American foreign policy was made. The first chapter Starts from the basic approaches that build US foreign policy. In addition to that, two techniques are employed: a qualitative analysis to examine the central themes that were developed, and a quantitative analysis of keywords. I take care to focus on critical approaches to make the study possible to judge whether Roosevelt's new policy in Latin America benefit both Washington and Latin America nations, and if it were really applied

The varied original primary sources and secondary one constituted the body of this research. Roosevelt presidency attracted the attention of many historians and critics therefore there was a wide range of books. The place to begin with is Andrew Crawley; Somoza and Roosevelt: Good Neighbor Diplomacy in Nicaragua 1933-1945. Crawley introduced Roosevelt's good neighbor from the beginning till the president's death, he focused in particular on the emergence of dictator leaders in the region.

The study is divided into three chapters. The first chapter examines the theoretical approaches that drive United States foreign policy. It discusses the different principles of Realism , Idealism and liberalism .The chapter identifies some of the keys for understanding the development of US foreign policy .the aim behind that chapter is to give an overview of the basic elements which build United States foreign policy before analyzing the content of Franklin D Roosevelt foreign policy toward Latin America .

The second chapter explores the historical background of United States and Latin American conflicts. In that chapter I seek to show the harsh decades between the Americas throughout the US interventionist policies. The chapter discusses the logical end of US Empire in Latin America by the use of aggression policies. Throughout that chapter I also take care to focus on the failure of intervention in the region and it is time for Washington policy –makers to understand that the old order of US foreign policy in Latin America is over.

The third chapter explores exactly the major themes of the research. The chapter analyses Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy toward Latin America and to what extent was this policy applied. I discuss in that part the motivation and the objectives behind the new policy and how both Latin America and US public embarked this policy. What were the impacts of public opinion on Roosevelt's policy? I also present the problems and struggles faced by the new policy. The last part of the third chapter also leads naturally to share the view that the United States entering a new era, the era which made many Americans proud of their history.

## **Chapter: 1**

### **The Theoretical Approaches that Drive US Foreign Policy**

1.1. Introduction

1.2. Realism

1.3. Idealism

1.4. Liberalism(liberal democratic peace )

1.5. Conclusion

# **The Theoretical Approaches that Drive US Foreign Policy**

## **1.1. INTRODUCTION**

American foreign policy has always been a blend of realism and idealism and international and isolationist tendencies. It looms large in realism which holds only when the American interests are at stake .on the other hand, the earliest US policy – makers embarked on “Ideologism” and constructed a new foreign policy around it. The complexity of idealism and realism traditions in American foreign policy pursued to establish an open relation with other countries; this would allow Americans to trade freely and avoid becoming involved in other nations conflicts, and thus blended moral principles with economic to ensure that no nation attack American territory. However, it is misleading to characterise US foreign policy as one of isolationist nation from its independence US followed a series of wars against Britain, Spain, France, and even Native America.

## 1.2. It REALISM

Realism has multiple meanings. emerged in different ways across the fields of Art, Literature, moral philosophy, and politics. However, realism frequently employed as a term to describe approaches that focus on the sources, modalities, and effects of power. The contemporary intellectual roots of realism can be largely traced back to the ancient world, and especially to the Greek historian Thucydides (1), but there were Americans who viewed international relations from a realist perspective including three important figures whom probably had the greatest impact on American scholarship: “diplomat- historian “E.H. Carr, geographer Nicholas Spykman, and political theorist Hans Morgenthau.

Recent scholarship makes clear that there is no single explanation for the origins of realism. Some scholars claimed that the general principles of realism found in Thucydides’s work “History of the Peloponnesian War” (2). They turned to him for inspiration. Other scholars prefer to trace realism to Renaissance, where other goes back to the politics of early modern Europe. Whatever the origins was all agreed on the same principles of realism

Realist shares at least four central beliefs. First, the assumption that human nature is universal and that among the most important aspects of this universal human nature is a strong desire to dominate. Second, realist believes in collectivism they assume that it is the important principle of social life. That collectivism in the international politics shaped in state which represent the powerful authority. Further more realism is often associated with a simple form of “real politick”; a deeply conservative position that support the stat. But to assure the survival of the stats

realist claimed that they would defend the country's interest by following the rules of diplomacy and war. Moreover, they justify that state behaviour in international politics by the external factors defined the option available to policy-maker. Third, and the most important realist believe that power constitute the essence of international politics, they accept power politics as a natural phenomenon of international life, relied on armies, navies, secret diplomacy and alliances. In addition, realists consider war as the only mean available for changing unwanted political or territorial condition. Fourth, realist assume that the real issues of international politics is interests, who understand the architecture of global balances and contending alliances (Hogan & Thomas G Paterson, 51)

Despite the agreement among realists about the principles above, some historians view the importance of one principle over the other as the historian Rengger assumes that balance of power is the major principle in real he noted : "...balance is likely to be the major ,if not the sole technique of statecraft for promoting order in the international system"(55). On the other hand, we find E.H Carr who claimed in his work "The Twenty Years Crisis 1939" that the most important principle is power because it prevents the national security as well as interest, he argued that any nation defend its interest in the international field and those interest would not be reached by moral principles

The utopian assumption that there is a world interest in peace which is identifiable with the interests of each individual nation helped Politicians and political writers everywhere to evade the Unpalatable fact of a fundamental divergence of interest between Nations desirous of maintaining the status quo and nations

desiring to change it. (85)

In practice realism defined the fundamental formulation of all US foreign policy especially after the Second World War. Many US policy-makers claimed that realism was more needed in those decades because of the changing in the international order and all realism principles benefit to keep US foreign policy on the top of the world policies.

To conclude, US long experience in foreign affairs demonstrated that the objectives which ignored the nation's interest could not long endure. Therefore Washington was fully established realism both in theory and practices in its foreign policy.

### **1.3. IDEALISM**

US foreign policy tore between two main doctrines as have been said above realism was not only the approach that drives US foreign policy, but also idealism. Idealism in American foreign policy appeared in the early days of US Independence; it emerged in the Declaration of Independence which was adopted by the Founding Fathers whom called for "Liberty, rights and property ". Followed this path many Americans rise always the statement of "all people everywhere must be free". In short, idealism is the contrary side of realism.

Like E.H Carr in realism, the president Woodrow Wilson was an important figure in idealism. Many scholars inspired from him the main principles of idealism. He considered as one of the most supporter of that doctrine in US foreign policy. Wilson opposed not all but most of realism principles, he claimed that peace required

the rule of laws and peaceful treaties alone was a morally acceptable burden of diplomacy. (Deconde, 311)

Most idealists agreed with their founding father Wilson. They tended to view that the state should look for individual welfare and the general interests of humanity. Idealist viewed the international system with its accoutrements of conflict and war deeply flawed but they argued that proper leadership and motivation could advanced moralities and politics since the world was not hopelessly corrupt. Wilson among many idealists assumed that for setting international disputes peacefully it would be better to change the quality of national behaviour and international mechanism. And because of the superiority of US institution, was ideally constituted to lead the world toward an improving future this as an obligation to serve the peace and improve the human condition. (Deconde, 314)

Economically speaking idealists opposed the open door policy that sought for foreign markets. They argued that overseas empire violated the best principles of the nations. The president Wilson emphasis mainly on those best principles, he called for equal access to world market as a tool to establish peace.

To sum up despite the fact that those two approaches realism and idealism disagreed in many points, they contribute for the constitution of United States foreign policy. So to understand US foreign policy one should first know the main principles of the two doctrines. However, this doesn't mean that US foreign policy is build up of realism and idealism. Indeed there are other approaches.

## 1.4. LIBERALISM

Like idealism and realism, liberalism is an approach that emerged during the eighteenth and nineteenth century as the historian Rengger wrote: "Liberalism, of course, did not really emerge in anything like its contemporary form until the eighteenth century" (115). Some scholars assumed that there are many similarities between idealism and liberalism, both oppose the use of power as a mean to establish international order. There were many who believe that liberalism, especially economic liberalism, would bring with it a decreasing salience of wars.

As previously mentioned each approach has its own principles and beliefs and so that was liberalism. The liberals would prefer the state to be part of a community of nations instead of power. Under the liberalism rules so much power is less supported, especially military power. Liberals argued that US power should be used for further human welfare. On the other hand, conservatives supported US asserting its imperial prerogative around the world. As realism opposed idealism for most of its principles, conservatives did the same toward liberalism. For the conservative national self-interests enforced by military supremacy, and thus it should be the guiding principle of US foreign policy. (Nye, 45-47)

A claim was made by liberalism in world politics in recent years called "the liberal democratic peace" it is a compound term of liberal states with democratic systems. This new sub approach if we can say proposed that the liberal regimes are qualitatively different from other kinds of regime. As a result, liberal regimes have a certain moral force in international affairs which should be put into influence. The claim proposes that liberal's states do not fight one another, and since it is compound

term, democracies rarely fight one another. It is undoubtedly that democracies have as many conflicts of interests as other kinds of regimes; however they do not see war as a suitable mean to solve problems between the same regimes (democracies). As a result, the liberal democracies are rarely fight each other, therefore they are likely to fight non - democracies nations. (Rengger, 103)

Many of theorists of liberal democratic peace argued that this new claim is rather more or at least better developed than those of the mother origins (liberalism). Liberal democratic peace based on two main factors. The Cultural model and the institutional model.

First, the cultural model scholars assumed that decision makers would try to search for a resolution and that they would expect the other states decision-maker would do the same. As a result, the violent conflicts between democracies are rarely happen. As President Clinton declared in 49<sup>th</sup> session of the US General Assembly, September 25, 1994 "...democracies, after all, are more likely to be stables, less likely to wage war" and he adds "Our effort [Americans] to help build democracies will make us all more secure". (Nye, 49). Thereby the cultural concepts and beliefs help the liberal democracies nations to cooperate with each other. On the other hand, the non-democratic decision- makers would expect to have used against them violent, thus they argued that the distrust among the two sides lead the democracies to adopt undemocratic measures toward non-democratic-regimes.

By contrast to cultural models, the second factor the institutional model assumed that there are many things that prevent violent conflicts between democracies because the democratic political systems associated with the

constitutional checks and balances, the need for large-scale popular support, and for large-scale of military action all reduce the percentage of such decisions to be made. Therefore, the liberal democratic nations rarely go in wars. Whereas non-democracies did not apply all this calculation. In short, both models agreed that the liberal democracies rarely use power to solve conflicts among themselves and piled the blame on non-democratic regimes. As result, the liberal democratic theorists argued that all nations throughout the world should obtain that theory to avoid any war and should establish peace as a world language between nations.

Realism, idealism and liberal all were fully establishes in theory and practice in different ways and at different times and different peaces. One can feel the opposition and even clash between those theories, but still they all benefit for the creation of US foreign policy over time. Realism disagreed totally with idealism over the capacity of human society and international politics. In addition to that realist often heaped the blame on idealists for the moral principles that blinded political leaders to the nation's real interests. On the other hand idealists piled the blame on realists for all US foreign policy disaster. They argued that the over use of power, especially military one, as a principle mean to solve problems led united states to many conflicts overseas.

Moreover, liberalists argued that realist pay insufficient attention to institutions of liberalism, as Nye said "institutions reduce the effect of the anarchy that realist assume" (47). Realist saw the nation's interests as the most important thing even by using force to maintain it whereas liberals' arguments say that trade is important, not because it prevents states from going to war, but because it may lead states to define

their interests in a way that makes war less important to them.

## 1.5. CONCLUSION

Although the contradiction of those theories among each other, they remain overlapped because some times we find realist blended their principles by some of idealism as Carr wrote: "...it is unreal kind of realism which ignore the elements of morality in any world order"(14). Once again we find the idealists founding father Wilson declared "I am going to teach the South American republics to elect good men". And he added "...the United States will be here 200 years and it can continue to shoot men for that little space until they learn to vote and rule themselves" (Smith, 60). Despite the fact that Wilson believed in the importance of international agreements law and order, he used force to establish democratic regimes in Latin American, he argued that he contribute democratic beliefs even by using force as smith wrote: «Wilson intervened forcibly in the severable Republics of Central American"(64). Logically enough both Carr and the President Wilson could not ignore the influence of each theory over the other. Thereby Idealism and Realism are overlapped.

To sum up there is no final point here since debate still rise among scholars. I think that idealism contributed mainly before 1915 followed by realism after 1945 to continue by liberalist in 1960 and 1970. Thus idealism, realism and liberalism were and remain the drivers' approaches of US foreign policy.

## NOTES:

- 1) Thucydides is a member of the Athenian elite who lived during Athens's greatest age where the first principles of realism were put. Thucydides considered as the founding father of realism.
- 2) Peloponnesian war was in the fifth century when two Greek states Athens and Sparta were allied to defeat the Persian Empire. 20 years after Persian Empire had defeated. Athens emerged as a new empire and declared war against its ancient allies (Sparta) and other Peloponnesian neighbours. The war ended by a treaty that promised peace for 30 years.

## **Chapter 2 :**

### **The Historical Background of Inter – American Conflicts (Latin America)**

2.1 Introduction

2.2 The early relations of U.S and Latin America

2.3 The main Interventionist Doctrine Applied on the Region  
of Latin America

2.4 The legacy of the Interventionist Doctrine over Latin America

2.5 Conclusion

## **The Historical Background of Inter-American Conflicts (Latin America)**

### **2.1. INTRODUCTION**

In the history of American foreign relations, some political historians proclaimed that US foreign policy divided into two schools. The nationalist and the progressive. The nationalist stressed the continuities in the Monroe doctrine, they concentrated primarily on state to state relations placed American diplomacy in an international setting whereas the progressive search for change rather than continuing and for intellectual assumption that guided the American policy-maker on the base of political, economical, and regional forces.

The dominant logic of American foreign policy at the early stage of its independence from Britain was dictated by concerns for defense and national security. However, it was surrounded by European colonial power. The American diplomacy was thus confronted with the difficult task of maintaining good relation with all those bitter enemies. US recognize that the dominant way to assure its security was by creating its own sphere of influence. And thus Washington saw Latin America as the appropriate region to apply its influence.

## 2.2. US EARLY RELATIONS TOWARD LATIN AMERICA

In the 1840 American foreign policy was impelled by the notion of what became known as 'manifest destiny'. The term denoted the belief that the whole of the new world was destined by God to be owned and run by the people of the US. Although territorial expansion was eventually, there were many who believed that Latin America one day became part of the United States. From this concept US started its foreign policy toward Latin America.

From the early times Western Hemisphere people believed that they were unique. Both North and South "people of the Americas believed in a common destiny, a body of political ideas, the rule of law, and cooperation among themselves" (Deconde, 83). It is truly that there were a difference between the Americans and their cousin in the form of government, beliefs, and behavior. However the North America colonists mainly came from the countries of western and northern Europe, they regarded themselves a very different from the people of Latin America in terms of race, culture, and history. The North American inherited and shared the traditional attitudes of Great Britain, their country of origin whereas the Latin Americas were a mixture of Spanish, Portugal and France. They showed dislike and distrust of the Anglo-Saxon settlers in the North American colonies .therefore US Latin American conflicts dated back to the colonial era.

When US get its independence from Great Britain, Washington search to extent its territory .contrary to fashionable European ideas that true republic should be limited in its geographic area. And as the President James Madison argued that republican government would best survive in large rather than small area. This meant

that Washington sought to continue their country of origin (Britain); the imperialist policy to win a new territory. Right from the beginning of its national history, the United States therefore, chose to become an active participant in the long standing battle among the great European powers to acquire territory with the aim of gaining political, commercial and military influence in the Western Hemisphere.

The newly independent states increased its contacts with the Spanish – American colonies and especially Latin American because they were the closest market in geographical terms. In addition the American desire to trade overseas was to spread its liberal commercial ideas such as free market trade. However, it was not an easy task for the Americans to establish a free trade where existed a Spanish empire which sought to prevent foreigners from trading with its colonies.

The European empire tried to contain their colonies in Latin America from any goad influence. But the increasing contact with the newly independent states over trade created the feeling of national independence. Thereby in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century following the model of the US and French revolution, most of Latin American achieved its independence.

The out break of wars for independence from 1808 onwards bough Latin American affairs to the notice of us people. Therefore Washington tried to make a diplomatic and commercial contact with neighboring countries in the western hemisphere. However, it was nothing in comparison with the contacts of the old world.

In fact Washington refused to help the Latin Americans to get their independence from Spain because it feared that European powers might be provoked into helping Spain, but US did not remain completely detached from the events. It was the first outside power to accord official diplomatic recognition with Latin American states. Moreover, US sent its minister to represent their interests in the region. This meant that Washington believed in total independence of the hemisphere nations. In short, US wanted to gain special advantages in the new states.

US proclaimed a neutral policy. It benefited a lot from that policy. US situation was not really stable at that time. It had neither military nor naval forces to defend the coastline against external attack, nor complete economic reason to go to war. Therefore US took the opportunity to build its domestic affairs and planned for its future foreign policy while the great powers were fighting among themselves. Washington benefited a lot from that policy, for example, Spain relaxed its policy and opened colonial ports which gave us the chance to increase its commercial with the western hemisphere. On the other hand, the great powers were in financial malaise so they either sell their colonies or borrow some money. US took this opportunity when France wanted to sell the Louisiana territory to finance the war and also Florida from Spain.

When US finished from building its internal elements, it recognized that its interest much up with Latin American, Washington established "the Monroe doctrine" fearing that Britain might exploit Spain's weakness and put its hand on the region once again. US proclaimed that any fighting in the region distrusts its national

security.

In short, the end of American neutral policy was the beginning of interventionism under the policy of “the Monroe doctrine” “dollar diplomacy” and “the big stick”.

### **2.3. THE MAIN INTERVENTIONIST DOCTRINE APPLIED ON THE REGION OF LATIN AMERICA**

While the American attitude toward Europe , the Middle East , and Asia was that the United states should to the equal of the European powers , the policy in the Western hemisphere was to keep the United States on top. The US preserved its influence under cover through direct investment , its control of the Panama Canal, the sanctification of the Monroe Doctrine , and , when necessary the direct intervention of troops.

It is misleading to characterize Monroe doctrine as the first step in U.S foreign policy toward Latin America. There was an old intervention before Monroe doctrine. In 1813, the president Jefferson sent troops to the south pacific ( Marquess Island) . Jackson sent troops to Sumatra even during the civilian president Lincoln sent troops to Panama. By 1900, the U.S had established a military presence in the south pacific sufficient for any international treat and also to protect the American commercial interest in Latin America.

Monroe Doctrine was a policy sponsored by the president Monroe in 1823.

In a message to congress he set four principles. First the Western Hemisphere was no longer open for colonization; the American related their destiny with those of Western Hemisphere and any threat to those nations means the threat for US safety. They argued that it is was unfair that after a long fight against British Empire and the lost of so much blood , money and man to establish this monarchy , European power extent their empire in Western hemisphere which means the ignorance of U.S sovereignty . Second, the US would not tolerate a great power to establish their sphere of influence in Latin American accept theirs under the cry of ( America for Americans ) . US policy -makers believed that the independence of those nations from Spain and later Portugural was in the interest of American national security. Third, US would refrain from participation in European wars and would not disturb existing colonies in the Western Hemisphere. Fourth, the political system of the American was different from those of Europe. Latin America had joined the US in rejecting the monarchical political system of Europe, therefore, the region belong to the new world.

The impact of the Monroe Doctrine was mixed. It was successful to the extent that the continental powers did not immediately attempt to revive the Spanish empire and Latin America was prevented from being a British protectorate. The Doctrine was also successful in keeping France, Spain, and other powers out of the region. And in

the US refusal Britain hope for making a joint statement regarding the Western Hemisphere. Britain supported the Doctrine because the presence of Spain in the region threat its holding in the Atlantic as well as the balance of power in Europe. While US considered any joint as an intervention in the internal affairs of the Americas. Thus three principles would because the basis of American policy no interposition, non-colonization and no interference. On the other hand, the doctrine was a failure from the stand point that the Latin American nations resented the Big Brother behaviour of the US. And also Britain would remain the dominant trade power in Latin America.

Whatever the interventionist doctrine succeeded or failed US real objective behind Monroe policy was not territorial, it was based on commercial and political considerations. Further more US primary concerns were geo-strategic that related to national security. US spoke on behalf the new government of Latin America and stood against the European power was an equally clear that U.S consider the region as its own sphere of influence. Equally important, the policy helped US to win a new market to supply its goods. As a result, Monroe Doctrine permitted the involvement and assistance of the US in Hemisphere affairs.

The second policy followed the Monroe Doctrine was known as the Roosevelt Corollary Policy. This policy employed under the presidency of Theodore Roosevelt. From the beginning of his presidency, T.R was deeply in favour of the U.S

intervention in the internal and external affairs of Caribbean nations. It was under his leadership that little agreement was singing with the American intervention. First Venezuela was the opening problem that faced the new president. It was when Venezuela failed to pay back its foreign debt then Britain and German governments decided forcibly to collect it. British and German started bombing Venezuela ports. Then Venezuela called for US intervention. Although US was successful in this instance, it establish some condition including American control the size of the nation budget. The rate of taxation, indeed the access to the funds collected. These conditions were rejected by the Latin American nations. And thus T.R established another sever policy called the" big stick".

The big stick policy most notably in the use of force against Colombia. Washington sponsored a local revolution in Colombia, when it refused the US permission to construct a canal from the Atlantic to the pacific on its territory. The war ended with the creation of the states of Panama and from the state it derives the Panama Canal. The Panama crisis dated back to 1898, during the Spanish American war. It was clear to all that such a water-way could serve as vital military as well as commercial functions while the war. As a result, the war ended with U.S victory Puerto Rico became under its control and won a protectorate over Cuba. And thus Washington appetite for the canal was opened even more. In 1903 T.R sponsored an

uprising which ended with a separation from Colombia. Moreover, the policy extended its limits to Cuba it occupied the area from 1906 to 1909 were signed the Platt Amendment (1) followed by the dispatch of mariners to Nicaragua in 1909. In Mexico also US intervened and withdrew its president "Porfirio Diaz" from power in 1908 and in Haiti mainly all the Latin America nations

Theodore Roosevelt justified his intervention by the fact that the wrongdoing of those newly independent nations required intervention of more civilized and experienced nation (U.S). He announced in his annual message on 6 December 1904. If a nation shows that it knows how to act with reasonable efficiency and decency in social and political matters. If it keeps order and pay its obligation it need fear no interference from the united states "Combene , 136) . He added that not only wrongdoing but also foreign debt he declared:

U.S would oblige the western hemisphere nations to pay  
Its debts back to the foreign government and it may use  
force to do that at the same time U.S could go to war with  
any foreign nation if any of those nation occupied a space  
of any territory in order to enforce the payment of its  
obligation (138)

Throughout all this intervention in Latin America, both internal and external affairs proved that U.S foreign policy was much alike those of old world nations. The

European justified their colonisation in terms of white man's burden and U.S consider Latin America to be so far in favour to Anglo- Saxon. Theodore Roosevelt claimed that all U.S intervention in western hemisphere was not for its own interests, at the contrary it was only to maintain peace, stability and order in the Americas. T.R declared "all that this country desires is to see the neighbouring countries stable, orderly, and prosperous" (Mc Keeven, 325). However, there was a paradox patterns in T.R attitude. How a nation could establish order by evoking a local revolution and intervened in the external relations of other nations especially by using armed forces.

In fact, T.R real motives was commercial interests than territorial because the American economy depended more than ever on overseas markets, the fact that led the U.S to adopt an open door policies and emphasized on free market trade in order to supply its goods as the historian Garrison wrote "Money, not land has always been at the core of American imperial designs (80). Indeed T.R search for a total influence, economic, political and even spiritual upon the western hemisphere this throughout all the available means. In addition the Roosevelt corollary and policy was not a logical or legal derivation of the Monroe doctrine as he claimed.

Followed Theodore Roosevelt's path his successor William Howard Taft, is often associated with "Dollar Diplomacy" the new policy involved two goal: the encouragement of American foreign trade, investments and loans, to protect such

investments in Latin America, the establishment of what amounted to financial protectorates in nations. Taft administration claimed that America provide Dollar throughout legal banks to help this nation limited itself , but in return the Americans who administrate the “ local banks therefore U.S had the right , they argued, to sent troops to protect them .

Woodrow Wilson, who denounced intervention, practised it more than either of his predecessors. During his presidency, United States troops occupied Santo Domingo, Haiti, Cuba, and Nicaragua. Under the terms of the Platt Amendment to the Cuban constitution. The U.S was authorized to intervene to protect financial solvency and political stability. The island was occupied from 1898 to 1902, 1906 to 1909, in 1912, and from 1917 to 1922. Haiti became a protectorate in 1915 and was occupied from 1915 to 1934. Santo Domingo's protectorate status began in 1905 and lasted until 1924, when the Marines were withdrawn and the 1907 treaty was supersede. Between 1916 and 1924 the country was actually run by American forces Nicaragua was under American control from 1912 to 1925 and from 1926 to 1933. After all this intervention Wilson tried to avoid further involvement by accepting an offer from Argentina, Brazil, and Chile to mediate the differences between the United States and Mexico. (Smith, Tony, 60).

## 2.4. THE LEGACY OF THE INTERVENTIONIST DOCTRINE OVER LATIN AMERICA

From Monroe doctrine to Coolidge administration US stated that it reserved the right to intervene in the internal affairs of the Latin American nations in order to insure the peace and stability of the region. The intervention took several forms. The most common means of intervention was the use of military force to suppress rebellion or to maintain order. But there was other ways as well. That method was the protectorate, an arrangement in which a large power assumed administrative duties in a small nation when local official were unable to maintain order to the satisfaction of the more powerful country. However, the legacy of this interventionist doctrine failed to bear fruit.

US intervention in Latin America blended between supporter and opponent. Through the 19<sup>th</sup> century American satisfied their territorial ambitions by policies occupying the continental United States. But even this progressed some American dreamed of an extended overseas empire in Central American, Pacific and Latin American. The main objective was that the United States possessed. A vast expanse of productive territory at home and had no need for overseas possessions. Major objection was the expense of own overseas empire, especially the maintenance of a large navy and the staffing of colonial governments. In fact, some critics raised the same objection to extended foreign trade the country, they claimed, need a large navy to protect shipping and a large diplomatic corps to maintain with foreign

Idealists also opposed those policies sponsored by the American leader toward Latin America. They opposed the conquest of foreign lands. They argued that

traditionally US had acquired foreign territory by purchase or by annexation treaties. It would be a violation of American ideals.

Understandably US domination of Latin American created special reaction. Latin Americans themselves complained that the United States has become the new Rome. They claimed that those actions were barely disguised intervention and perhaps more subtle and generous than that of the European, but imperialist intervention nonetheless. Moreover US doctrine failed to prevent the region. European countries violated the Monroe doctrine on many occasions. Further more US intervention earned the nation hatred from the Latin American.

Thanks to Taft policy dollar diplomacy. European increased their financial influences in Latin American when US American banks extending interest loans to Latin American. In addition to that Wilson failed to promote constitutional democracy in the region and to put down US waster hemisphere disputes, it is commonly that Wilson and his various agents never understand the complexities of the situation confronting then in the region. Democracy in Latin American was only an option or an aspiration as the historian Leslie wrote Even though democratic institution are still fragile and often besieged in much of Latin American, they have been and will continue to be, a permanent option.

In fact their were who supported US intervention including business and labors group. They argued that US under policies enjoyed budge benefit from the Latin American. The increased rate of investment in the region had a great impact on the notion's economy. They assumed that Latin American was an important course of raw materials and one of the main markets for American export. Others noticed that

Latin American nations benefited a lot from US intervention. As such, US protect the region many times from overseas empires. And thanks to T.R policies aided the economic development of those nations, condition were improved roads were built; the banks were set in order.

In short, all this policies sponsored power as its main tool to prevent US national interest in the region. They intervene in most of Latin American nation. Despite the fact that Western Hemisphere nations get their independence from Spanish, French and Portugal, the US throughout this interventionist policies establish a new colonial era.

## **2.5. CONCLUSION**

To sum up, United States emerged as one of the powerful nation on earth at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This new-found status was explained by worldwide economic and territorial expansion. Several factors influenced this expansion one was a desire to secure overseas markets for the country's industrial and agricultural products. Another was Manifest Destiny; the belief that the United States was God's chosen country and, as such, destined to dominate world affairs. The third factor was a reform impulse. Americans had always been great believers in improving society. They looked upon reform as a duty that applied to the improvement of foreign people as well as of those at home. A final influence on expansion was domestic politic. Americas found their new status as a world power to be a source of national pride as a result; national leaders received widespread support for an aggressive foreign policy.

Since Latin America occupied a central place in US foreign policy. Washington policy- makers applied an aggressive policy under different names. They contributed the idea of protection and order to justify their intervention. In short, just as Wilson was not able to bring stability to the region through democracy, so Theodore Roosevelt and Taft were unable to bring stability through dictatorships.

The dilemma for United States policy in Latin America from Monroe Doctrine to Coolidge is that it has no success story to guide its promotion of stable, pro American governments there. Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson and Coolidge expressed a willingness to work with whatever regimes emerged so long as they were friendly to American interests. But unfortunately they failed.

## NOTES:

1) Platt amendment: a treaty of relation signed at Havana, May 22, 1903. The treaty had give US the right to intervene in Cuban affairs.

2) Open Door Policy: in 1899, secretary of state may issue the open door note, which committed. The US to support of equal rights in the China trade . All the great powers except Russia expressed approval. .

## **Chapter: 3**

### **Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Good Neighbor Policy**

3.1. Introduction

3.2. The Intellectual and Ideological undertaking of US Foreign Under F.D.R

3.3. The Motives and the Objectives of Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy.

3.4. The Problems faced the New Policy.

3.5. The New Policy and Public Opinion.

3.6. Conclusion

## **Franklin D Roosevelt and the Good Neighbor Policy**

### **3.1. INTRODUCTION**

Before 1930's United States adopted an undemocratic measures toward Latin America. United States policy-makers set out a vision of a global order in which Washington continued to offer leadership over Latin America. And thus between 1898 - 1933 the United States occupied Cuba Nicaragua, the Dominion Republic and Haiti, established military basis in Panama, and sent troops into Mexico and Panama. Therefore, Latin American governments have treated US concerns and actions with considerable defense .

At the beginning of the twentieth century the United States began to reap the failure of the political, economical, and military intervention in Latin America. The growing pressure in the region was the root of us abandonment of the interventionist policy and it embarked on a new era in the US- Latin American relations.

The 1930's had witnessed a renewed focus on US foreign policy toward Latin America. Washington's policy-makers re-evaluated the American policy in the region, which ever since the Monroe doctrine of 1823 had been seen as an American sphere

of influence. American forces were withdrawn from Cuba, Haiti, and Nicaragua

mainly from most of western hemisphere nations. All this happened under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

### **3.2 THE INTELLECTUAL AND IDEOLOGICAL UNDERSTANDING OF US FOREIGN POLICY UNDER F.D.R**

**« The beating of that generous heart which was always stirred to anger and to action by the spectacle of aggression and oppression by the strong against the weak. It is indeed a loss, a bitter loss to humanity, that those heart beats are stilled forever ».**

**Winston Churchill recalled in the death**

**of Franklin D. Roosevelt. 1945**

In 1933, the new president Franklin D. Roosevelt presented an entirely image. He brought an air of confidence and optimism. At the age of 39, he was paralyzed by an attack of polio. Despite this handicap he continued his rising political career. He was strong and as Alsop wrote : "F.D.R was strong, he never failed to put a smiling despite his illness, he tried cure after cure, he refused to believe that polio paralyzed him for year on end he acknowledged that it could be permanent".(95)

The challenges facing Roosevelt at the beginning of his presidency were the domestic struggles, he aware that there were new enormous responsibilities to shoulder, both in relation to the United States itself and in relation to the world. As

such, Roosevelt introduced some new strategies that had not received much attention before. At home he promised a “new deal” and abroad, he promised to be “Good Neighbor” originally intended for the entire world, but in application it comes to apply toward Latin America.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt determined to improve relations with the nations of South America; he knew that intervention in the internal and external affairs of those nations created aggressions. Therefore Roosevelt adopted a policy rebuilding American-hemisphere relations committing it to a long term “Good Neighbor Policy”. Actually it was not a new direction since president Hoover had started a policy of cooperation with the Latin American countries. So far as Latin American countries were concerned, their government was pleased by his abandonment of Theodore Roosevelt’s intervention. However, Hoover’s administration retaining the same informal control over the affairs of Latin American nations.

Roosevelt’s “Good Neighbor Policy” represented an attempt to distance the US from earlier interventionist policies, such as the Theodore Corollary and military interventions in the region during the 1910 and 1920. The Good Neighbor Policy acquired a new and fresh name as a result of section taken from Roosevelt’s inaugural address of 4 March 1933” in the field of world policy. I would dedicate this nation to the policy of the Good Neighbor-the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and because he does so, respects the rights of others. “and in December he stated the definite policy of the united states from now on is one opposed to armed intervention”(Cambone,212). Consequently, it was Roosevelt and not Hoover who

has been popularly regarded as the origination of what became known as the “Good Neighbor Policy”).

The ideological beliefs of F.D.R have persuaded the US to adopt a truly isolationist position toward the border conflicts. He seeking to avoid engagement in war by the fact that the health of the American economy was about repair. Roosevelt searched to secure the American interests by bringing to end the era of US sending the marines and to replace it with a policy based on sharing responsibility. In the early months of his presidency he announced a new century of the Americas, that would spread the ideology of liberty and economic growth to all corners of the hemisphere, he wanted to carry on his founding fathers mission, to be an example of democracy and freedom as the historian garrison noticed “the founding fathers intended the us to be the greatest of nations destined to be an inspiration to all other nations and a beacon of freedom to the rest of the world” (62).

Roosevelt tried to build democratic ideals in America as well as abroad. The policy based on Wilsonian idealism, it was the strengthening of the processes of constitutional democratic governments, “that the people in those countries would insist upon the preservation of peace. Roosevelt understood that using force against hemisphere nations lead to more conflicts. Therefore, he establish free trade as the fundamental principle of his foreign policy

The first foreign policy crisis faced Roosevelt in his first few months in the presidency was the Island of Cuba. Cuba was a protectorate of the United States under Platt Amendment had the right to intervene; as it had several times in the past. More than a few administrations had taken action in Cuban problems from the days

of Williams's MC Kinsley and Roosevelt's was one of them. Cuba was in civil and economic disorder resulting mainly from the collapse in the world price of sugar and the decline of sugar exports to the US. The Cuban president Machado was overthrown in a military coup in August 1933, when revolution erupted in the era the president under the Platt amendment sent a small number of warships to patrol Cuban water, however, he refused to take any action despite the legal right he had. In addition, on September 6, 1933 at the height of excitement Roosevelt took an action of which he was later exceedingly proud. He called in the representatives from Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Mexico to assure them that the purpose of the warships in the region was to rescue Americas, he was not planning intervention since he hoped that those nations would solve their own domestic problems. Thereby Roosevelt wanted to apply his good neighbor policy toward Cuba and Latin America in general.

The evidence was needed in the Good Neighbor Policy to be successful and Roosevelt provided them in January 1934 when he announced with regard to Latin American affairs: "the definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention" (Gombone, 210). Roosevelt's words followed by actions he signed new treaties with Cuba in May 1934 abrogating the Platt amendment. Its first article said: "the treaty of relations which was concluded between the two contracting parties on May 22, 1903 shall cease to be in force, and it is abrogated from the date on which the present treaty goes into effect". (Gombone, 221). Throughout the new treaty US did no longer intervene in Cuban affairs though it still remained its possession on naval bases it was indicated in the third article of the treaty "...so long as the United States of America shall not abandon the said naval station of Guantanamo or the two governments shall not agree to a modification of its present

limits". (Gombone,221). This meant that Roosevelt wanted to balance the interest among the two governments no more intervention, on the other hand, the remaining of "Naval Station" to preserve US National Security.

Roosevelt followed his abrogation of the aggressive treaties. He established a series of treaties whose intention was to provide an international mechanism for the peaceful resolution of disputes with the western hemisphere. For example, a new treaty was signed with Panama in 1936 that abrogated the existing American legal right of intervention and increased annual payments to that country arising from the operation of the canal from \$ 250,000 to 430,000. As in Cuba remained "naval station" in Panama also Washington did not eliminate the right to defend the canal in emergencies. As have been said Roosevelt put us interests in the region as equal as the good relation with the western hemisphere nations and he wanted to avoid military intervention in Latin America to keep us prestige in the region as Garrison noticed "the world must remember that military power is the beginning and the end of empire"(20).

Further more, the president faced one of the major diplomatic crises in Mexico during 1938. The Mexican president Lázaro Cárdenas declared that his nation would take away the Anglo-Dutch and American oil companies. Roosevelt accepted the Mexican decision to the protests of the American oil companies.

He considered the action as natural right to the Mexican government and US would respect it. Roosevelt knew that any action led to the distraction of his good neighbor policy and thereby it opens new conflicts with Latin America where he was

deeply occupied with the domestic affairs. In addition, there was an anxiety that the dispute would encourage the advance of fascist influence in Mexico and also throughout the whole region.

Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy toward Latin America did make something of a turning point in US and western hemisphere. The president attempted not only to devote his energies on political relations but also on economic. Roosevelt established strong bonds of commerce and cultural exchange with Latin America. His good neighbor policy promoted an economic integration within the hemisphere that was designed to increase trade and helped the American economy to recover from the Great Depression.

Roosevelt backs the political acts up with the economic one. The congress act (R.T.A.A) (1). In fact, the act had a little support in Latin America because their economies offered raw materials that were not major competitions of American goods, further more; those nations were also in the depths of economic depression. On the other hand, the countries adopting the (R.T.A.A) became economically depend over the us market for their export growth. In short, both sides benefited for example the American exports to Cuba. Tripled during 1933 to 1938 and Cuban exports to us almost doubled in value from \$57million in 1933 to \$108million in 1938.

Another mean to extend trade with Latin America nations were put in February 1934. It was the Export Import Bank (E.I.B). This new element was created to provide foreign countries with dollar credit for the purchase of imports from United States.

It gave also loans, the United States was given the rights to naval base at Guantanamo bay an the South Coast of Cuba

To sum up Roosevelt Policy was founded upon values of capitalism, liberal democracy and the renunciation of aggression as an instrument of foreign policy. The president made a strong stand in favor of neutrality in international politics, he believed that adherence to such neutrality placed the United States upon superior moral ground as Dallek wrote:” Roosevelt was not only an architect of victory in world war 2 but also a leader of peace during the thirties “(529). Logically enough, therefore, Roosevelt emphasizes was upon strengthening American power through restoring its economic comptureness. This in turn involved both domestic policy, such as brining the budget deficit under control, and foreign policy, such as formation of free-trade Lonnie in the western hemisphere and replacing the closed imperial economic zone.

Roosevelt’s Good Neighbor Policy toward Latin America did make something of a turning point in U.S and western hemisphere relation. Thought, the American foreign policy based on a continental vision which supported the idea of the intervention in western hemisphere to assure a national security, the president Franklin D. Roosevelt stand against this intervention “as Roosevelt was peaceful leader man, pointed to American efforts to limit armaments and the aggressors” he also carry the Wilson’s aim to make the world safe for democracy he said “we must be the great arsenal of democracy” in short, Roosevelt’s good neighbor policy was the first positive initiative to reestablish the cooperation that Bolivar(2) had envisioned for the Americas.

### **3-3 THE MOTIVES AND THE OBJECTIVES OF ROOSEVELT'S GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY.**

For Franklin D. Roosevelt, the good neighbor policy was more than political device, it was one of his achievements in which he took the most pride. The extent of the American power overseas was not Roosevelt's major attempt, he was motivated by the need to avoid a costly, perhaps suicidal, war with any western hemisphere nation because of the United States economic collapse as the historian Garrison wrote "his greatness lay in his ability to balance the Jacksonian impulse to protect with the Wilsonian commitment to build. Thus he won the war as well as winning the peace" (174).

The president was motivated by a mixture of realism and idealism; he believed that the US must maintain a world order to shape it in ways that favor American economic interests and political values. In the early 1930s Roosevelt attempted to explore the possibilities for peace in Latin America on terms compatible with American interests, he tried to demonstrate Latin American nations as the president declared "I tell the American people solemnly that the US will never survive as a happy and fertile oasis of liberty surrounded by a cruel desert of dictatorship" (Smith, 124). The broad objectives of Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy in Latin America was to prevent a collective security. The president was motivated by the fear of fascism during the late 1930's.

He declared in the Argentine conference 1936: "We in the Americas should stand shoulder to shoulder in our determination that others, who might seek to

commit acts of aggression against us, will find a hemisphere wholly prepared to consult together for our mutual safety each one of us has learned the glories of independence. Let each one of us learn the glories of inter-dependence". (Rofe 16).

The president F.D.R established a model program of International Economic and cultural cooperation toward Latin America to force the totalitarian powers to keep distance from the hemisphere. In order to strength his policy's goals, the president requested a special Pan-American Conference to be held in Buenos Aires in December 1936. The conference flourished the Good Neighborliness and further the distance between the European powers and Latin America. The conference ended with the Latin American governments agreement over the US proposal that they should be prepared to hold meetings to consultation in the event of a threat to peace either from outside or inside the hemisphere: Roosevelt stressed the importance of cooperation with Latin American nations to counter the threat of fascism.

The first Pan- American Conference open the appetite for other conferences. The second was held in 1938 held at Lima, years after another was held at Panama City. The two conferences discuss the European conflicts. Both US and Latin American nations declared neutrality. Therefore, the war unified more the Americas and strengthens the good neighbor policy.

By the heat of the war in Europe. The Americas held the Havana conference. The conference presented the success of r policy that had contributed to the distinct improvement in inter-American relations. As a result to that conference Latin American countries joined US in organizing resistance against the Fascist threat

posed by German and Italy both before and during the Second World War.

To conclude, the Good Neighbor Policy main objective from 1933 to 1941 was to build a continental security motivated by the containment of Fascist and Nazis. In short, Roosevelt established his policy because he feared the Nazis to place pressure on Latin America both economically (3) and covertly (4).thereby his focus shifted to the protection of the western hemisphere nations.

### **3.4. THE PROBLEMS FACED THE NEW POLICY**

In fact Roosevelt 's Good Neighbor Policy did much to improve relations with Latin America, the president assigned Secretary of state Cordell Hull to carry out his vision of this policy, which was to improve the ties between those countries and the US to ensure non-hostile neighbors South of its borders. However, some problems embodied in the practice of Good Neighbor Policy.

Despite his popularity Roosevelt was certainly not short of critics. Some believed that Roosevelt was too idealist and his foreign policy have been always described as a naïve or unrealistic as the historian Dallek wrote:

His suggestions for preserving peace during the thirties  
Were less the product of an idealized view of world affairs  
That of a continuing desire of encourage leaders and people  
Every where to work against war and, especially to sign  
aggressor motives that the United States was in different to  
their plans(530).

Roosevelt tried to establish a Good Neighbor Policy in Latin America

.however, this policy as some critics claimed help for the emergence of dictatorship, and he failed to spread out the democratic ideals. there were about 10 coup in the period from 1933-36. They argued that while Roosevelt sponsored this New Policy of non-intervention with armed forces showed a willingness to accept, if not actively support the rise to power of leaders with military background or dictators such as Fulgencio, and Rofael Tryillo in the Dominion Republic (Crawley. 38)

Further more, the isolation were against Roosevelt New Policy. They claimed that he directed his efforts to increase hemisphere armed strength under the name of continental security and also he failed in rebuilding Latin American society in the image of the American Dream of rich neighborliness.

The major problem faced the New Policy was that it failed to protect the hemisphere from Nazis influence. Brazil established a commercial trade with German. Hitler's administration sought to bay Brazilian agricultural goods in exchange for industrial products including arms that were wanted by the Brazilian military. As a result, Brazil doubled its exports to German and German became the bigger market for Brazilian Cotton and Cacao.

In fact, Roosevelt authority under the new treaties was limited, so he could not intervene once again to over throw those governments, especially that he called for Good Neighbor. Moreover , those leaders would prove to be most cooperative in assisting the United States to defeat the Axis Powers in the Second World War and later to support policies of anti-communism during the Cold War. Therefore ,it was not Roosevelt mistake for the emergence of such leaders and as Nye argued: "Roosevelt was not naïve in all aspects of his policy" (120). In addition, under

Roosevelt leadership US had devoted considerable attention to fight the flow of Marijuana and Heroin from Mexico and other Latin American nations (Carpenter,21).

### **3.5. THE NEW POLICY AND PUBLIC OPINION**

It is generally agreed that Public Opinion is much less influential in the making of foreign policy than it is in domestic policy. From the perspective of most members of the public, foreign policy is figuratively and literally distant from their every day lives. Unlike the core domestic issues of employment, the cost of living and education, for example, most foreign policy issues makes little impact upon the consciousness of the average American. Therefore, the president is the main beneficiary of this public lack of concern. This frequently results that public accepts whatever policy decisions the presidents makes

The president Roosevelt was employed two strategies to fulfill his Good Neighbor Policy. The first was the use of personal diplomacy and the second was the American Public Opinion. FDR's term was a time of vast change for the American people, the nation's culture and the government. Those changes caused some Americans to love FDR and some Americans to hate him. Whether people agreed or disagreed with him, his words and actions gave strength to the American people when they need it. The strength that FDR gave to US people during his first terms as president continued throughout his presidency. Thereby the American people trusted their president and followed him in both domestic and foreign policies as rife noticed the views of the American people were a continual concern for Roosevelt in his policy making.

Roosevelt strategy was not only to win support at home, but also abroad. He tried to create a good atmosphere to put his good neighbor policy in practice without any struggles. Roosevelt was skillfully study the cues of the hemispheric people, he was the first president who made several tours to the region in fact, the Latin American people were apprehensive over the win of Roosevelt because that surname firmly associated with the aggressive policy of big stick sponsored by his cousin the old Roosevelt. However F.D.R was unlike his causer, he announced publicly that he desired to act sympathetically toward Latin American nations.

Roosevelt supporters in Latin American increased especially when he revised the policy of armed intervention associated with the Roosevelt corollary and dollar diplomacy. In addition, Roosevelt emerged as a hero in the Mexican crisis, he ruled out the use of military force and did not allow Great Britain to take an aggressive action to Mexico when its oil supplies were affected. Thus Latin American people touted Roosevelt good neighbor policy (Kennedy, 391).

In December 1936 President Roosevelt flew to Latin America to attend a Pan American conference. Crowds lining the streets on his arrival. It was the first time that an American president welcomed by the western hemisphere people; this proved Franklin Roosevelt could change Latin American mind to word. Latin America, he regarded also the welcoming as a real application of his good neighbor policy.

### **3.6 CONCLUSION**

To sum up great strides had been made to improve relations between the United States and Latin America. The president Franklin Roosevelt understood that

improving US Latin American relation be only solved by cooperative action, supported by citizens and done in the community of nations. There is no more positive proof of the change and the application of good neighbor policy than the friendly and admiration for Franklin D Roosevelt throughout Latin American. He is still one of the heroes of the hemisphere.

## NOTES:

- 1) (R.T.A.A) pressed by Cordell hull secretary of state, that act would cut American tariffs in response to similar cuts the other nations of the world.
- 2) In 1826 Simon Bolivar, the liberator of South American convened a hemispheric conference to begin. The process of building a sense of community among. The new by independent nations of the Americas.
- 3) Economically by threaten to cut off their export to Europe.
- 4) Covertly though the use of agents in those countries with large German immigrant population.

## **Conclusion:**

As Roosevelt wished, there remains a larger significance to the Good Neighbor. At a time when he was circumscribed in his actions, he was able to establish a prototype in the hemisphere of the International Order that he wished extended to the world. In the years since his death, the collective security machinery, trade and economic aid programs and cultural arrangements with all their blemishes and strengths have indeed join together large parts of the world. This is as Roosevelt had hoped. At September 1943, in reporting to Congress on the progress of the war he declared “ the Policy of the Good Neighbor has shown such success in the hemisphere of the Americas that its extension to the whole world seems to be the logical next step” (Samuel,405-406). In short Roosevelt left behind not simply a record of victory in four presidential elections, but also a transformation in the inter-American relations. Roosevelt tried to change Marty note that” US policy toward Latin America is cyclical”(184).

## Bibliography

Allport, Alan. *Great American President: Franklin D Roosevelt*. Philadelphia: Chelsea House, 2004.

Alsop, Joseph. *A Century Remembrance: FDR*. London: Thomas and Hudson Limited, 1982.

Bethell, Leslie, Ed. *The Cambridge History of Latin America: Latin America since 1930; Economy, Society, and Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Carpenter, Galen Ted. *Bad Neighbor Policy: Washington's Futile War on Drugs in Latin America*. New York: Polgrave Mac Milan, 2003.

Carr E, H. *The Twenty Years Crisis 1919-1939*. Hong Kong: The Mac Milan Press LTD, 1984.

Casey, Steven. *Cautious Crusade: Franklin D. Roosevelt, American Public Opinion, and the War against Nazi Germany*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Crawley, Andrew. *Somoza and Roosevelt: Good Neighbor Diplomacy in Nicaragua, 1933-1945*. United States of America: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Deconde, Alexander, Richard Dean Burus, and Fredrik Logevall. Ed. "Pan-Americanism" *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy* .2<sup>nd</sup> ed.

Divine, R A. *Roosevelt and World War 2*. Baltimore: The John Hophins Press, 1969.

Edkins, Jenny, and Nick Vanghan Williams,Eds. *Critical Theorists and International Relation*. United States of America: Rutledge, 2009.

Gaddis, John Lewis. *The Long Peace: Inquiries into The History of The Cold War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Gambone, Michael D. *Documents of American Diplomacy from the American Revolution to the Present*. United States of America: Green Wood, 2002.

Garrison, Jim. *America as Empire: Global Leader or Rogue Power*. San Francisco: Berrett Kochled, 2004.

Hogan, Michael j , and Thomas G Daterson, eds. *Explaining the history of American foreign policy*. USA: Combridge University Press, 2004.

Kennedy, David, M. *Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1929-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Martz, John P. *United States Policy in Latin America: A Decade of Crisis and Challenge*. United States of America: University of Nebraska Press, 1995.

MC Keever, Robert, and Philip Davies. *Politics USA*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2006.

Nye, Jr, Joseph S. *Understanding International Conflicts: an Introduction to Theory and History*. United States: Priscilla Mc Geehon.

Rengger, Jn. *International Relation, Political Theory and the Problem of Order: Beyond International Relation Theory*. USA: Toylor and Francise Libery, 2005.

Robert, Dalleck. *Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy , 1932-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Rofe, Simon J. *Franklin Roosevelt's Foreign Policy and The Welles Mission*. New York: Palgrave Mac Millen, 2007.

Smith, Joseph. *The United States and Latin America: A History of American Diplomacy, 1776-2000*. *International Relations and History Series*. New York: Taylor & Francis Rutledge, 2005.

Smith, Tony. *America's Mission: The United States and The World Divid Struggle for Democracy in the Twentieth Century*. United Kingdom: Princeton University, 1994.

Taneway, Michael. *The Fall of the House of Roosevelt: Brokers of Ideas and Power from Franklin D. Roosevelt to LBJ*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.

Wilson, Robert A, Ed. *Power and the Presidency*. United States of America: Public Affairs TH, 1999.