CHiPS

Cameron University Undergraduate Research Journal of Criminal Justice, History, Political Science, and Sociology

CONTENTS

HELEN CHURCHILL CANDEE AND MARGARET BROWN: CHALLENGERS TO THE POLARIZED FEMALE "TYPES" OF THE GILDED AGE AND PROGRESSIVE ERA

Sandi M. Colby

Senior History Major

In the aftermath of the R.M.S. *Titanic* disaster in 1912 there was an outpouring of response from the American public. J. H. McKenzie's *The Titanic Disaster Poem* included the passage, "Oh, may the union of Strauss and wife/Be memorial to all men/ Each for the other gave their life/A life we should commend/Any may all the girls who chance in life/To read this poem through/Emulate the deed of such a wife/As went down in the blue."[1] McKenzie's poem idolized Mrs. Ida Strauss as a heroine for staying on the ship to die with her husband and it made her into a symbol of the ideal Victorian wife, a True Woman. This description of Strauss became a model of womanhood that McKenzie urged young female readers to emulate.

In contrast, Carlo Hurd wrote an account of survivor Edith Rosenbaum that was much more critical. Hurd, a journalist traveling on the rescue ship R.M.S. *Carpathia*, wrote his account shortly after the survivors had been picked up and his observation of Rosenbaum's reaction was unfavorably compared to a male passenger's reaction. His article read,

Those of the refugees who had not lost their lives found subject for distress in the reflection that their money and jewels were at the bottom of the sea. Miss Edith L. Rosenbaum, writer for a fashion trade journal, mourned the loss of trunks containing robes from Paris and Tunis. Several of the late works of Phillip Mocks, a miniature painter, were lost in his baggage, but the artist was not inclined to dwell on his mishap.[2]

Edith Rosenbaum was a single, thirty-three-year-old fashion journalist and buyer. The clothing she "mourned" was part of her livelihood and they had been purchased for clients back in the United States. She was facing a serious financial difficulty over the loss because when she tried to purchase insurance on them she was advised not to spend the money because the *Titanic* was unsinkable.[3] Rosenbaum was a symbol of the New Woman, a woman who did not, and often chose not to, fit the mold of women like Ida Strauss.

Contrasting images like these were part of the polarized nature of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era. The Gilded Age was a period of growing excess and corruption while the Progressive Era focused on fixing those problems. People were talked about in contrasting terms like robber baron or unionist, rural farmer or urban factory worker, and the "soft" man or the virile man. Women, especially middle and upper-class women, were subjected to social constraints as dictated by ideas such as the Doctrine of Separate Spheres. In popular culture, both in 1912 and today, Ida Strauss represents a traditional Victorian lady, a familiar and comfortable version of the True Woman and Ideal Wife. Historian Carroll Smith-Rosenberg defines this character as a woman who was "emotional, dependent, and gentle—a born follower" and who "accepted her biological destiny and gloried in her reproductive sexuality."[4] She was also dedicated to her family and acted as their caretaker and protector.[5] Edith Rosenbaum, on the other hand, represents the character of the New Woman, who Smith-Rosenberg says "constituted a revolutionary demographic and political phenomenon" and who "challenged existing gender relations and the distribution of powers."[6] These were often single, professional women, many of whom were involved in radical reform work and/or had some political power.[7] These descriptions of the two female types common at the turn of the twentieth-century could not have been more contradictory.

In a discussion about women of this period, these simplified female types make it tempting for historians to try and categorize women as *either* True Women *or* New Women. However, few women actually conformed to just one type or the other and many exhibited a fascinating combination of traits from both characterizations. To examine this idea further, the R.M.S. *Titanic* serves as a useful platform and the biographies of two women from her passenger list, Helen Churchill Candee and Margaret Brown, more famously known as the Unsinkable Molly Brown, provide examples of how women defied conventions and blurred the lines between the two versions of Gilded Age and Progressive Era women.

Titanic is a useful platform for this discussion because the ship serves as a more personal representation of the period. Historian Hugh Brewster observes that *Titanic* is often described as a "cross-section of the Gilded Age," that represents a "remarkable convergence of the events, issues, and personalities" of the Edwardian world.[8] One way it is representative is because it was often described in period newspapers and stories with conflicting terminology. Men writing about the ship feminized it and used gendered language to describe *her* in terms of the two female types. Ann E. Larabee says that before the disaster, the ship was described as a maiden who was the perfect "mechanical bride" because she emphasized the "power, virility, heroism and individuality" of her male creators and owners.[9] Descriptions like that, Larabee argues, equated *Titanic* to an obedient wife, a True Woman.[10] After *Titanic* foundered, she was characterized as a "self-destructive, anachronistic female, who was the very image of the New Woman."[11] During *Titanic*'s short life, the ship was first a True Woman, then a New Woman, but never both at the same time.

Such polarized characterizations become more difficult to justify when applied to real women, especially when their individual lives are examined more thoroughly. Women like Helen Churchill Candee and Margaret Brown engaged in many behaviors that defied expectations that would classify them as either a True or New Woman. Traditional and classically Victorian when it suited them, and rebellious and independent when they pleased, these women usually acted in whatever way they thought was best for themselves and their loved ones.

When Helen Churchill Candee boarded the ill-fated R.M.S. *Titanic*

she did so as a first-class passenger and representative of what it meant to be an upper-class woman in America. Beautiful, wealthy, and mother to two adult children, fifty-three-year-old Candee's external appearance classified her as one of *Titanic*'s Gilded Age True Women, but appearances can be deceiving. Candee was, in fact, a divorcee who became a successful and independent woman who was perfectly capable of handling the world on her own. When Candee's husband abandoned the family, she supported their children by writing for publications like *The Woman's Book* and the *Ladies' Home Journal* and her articles covered everything from household tips to important issues such as education and women's suffrage.[12] One of the interesting contradictions in her life was that Candee's work as a professional writer echoed the New Woman ideal, but many of her articles were written for women who fit the True Woman description. One example is her article "A Clever Literary Evening" written for *The Ladies' Home Journal* that reviewed a parlor game played by a wealthy woman and her guests during one of her winter parties.

In 1895, Helen moved to Guthrie, then the capitol of the Oklahoma Territory, which was known for its leniency in granting divorces to women. Her move was prompted by the New York court's earlier denial of her petition for divorce on the grounds of abandonment when her wealthy husband walked away from her and their two children, after fifteen years of marriage. During the time Candee spent in Oklahoma Territory, she wrote several articles about the territory, the land runs, and the people of the area for publications like *Atlantic Weekly* and *Forum* with the intention of promoted interest in and statehood for Oklahoma. She also completed her first instructional book and first novel while living in Oklahoma, both of which contributed to her national recognition as a writer.

Candee's two books, written in 1900 and 1901, provide another glimpse of the mix of female types that made her who she was. *How Women May Earn a Living* was her controversial and best-selling instructional guide for women who needed to work to support themselves.[13] In keeping with the ideas of Progressivism, Candee's book promoted jobs for middle-class women and she encouraged them to pursue careers that allowed them agency and provided them with opportunities to become business owners. Her radical advice for women seems a bit tempered when she primarily promotes "female" work, telling women that "keeping boarders and teaching…seem at first like the most

natural ways of becoming self-supporting," but when she tells readers that strong and intelligent women who train as massage therapists "are worthy to go into private practice or hire herself out," her message balances out.[14] For each career she covered, Candee included important details about necessary training, costs associated, wage expectations, professionalism in the workplace, and the personal drive and commitment that each career will demand of the woman. Candee later heeded her own advice and became an expert on design, antique furniture, and tapestries which earned her a level of prestige as a consultant who helped decorate the White House.[15]

In contrast, Candee's novel, *An Oklahoma Romance*, was a classic love story between two people who moved west—Ruth because her father brought the family out and Paul to get free land and reinvent himself in the wild west. Paul was the dominant masculine character and descriptions of Ruth as a woman who "seemed to typify and embody all the virtues he held highest" paint her as the classic True Woman.[16] Among those attributes were her beauty, a "heart and soul more beautiful than her outward appearance, her frankness, and the 'Mary's halo' he said glowed above her head while she was playing with the Indian children in the area."[17] Despite this glowing endorsement of the True Woman ideal, Candee also gave Ruth a political awareness concerning issues like the "government's way with the Indian," and a self and social awareness regarding her gender, both of which indicate a New Woman leaning underneath Ruth's "proper" exterior.[18] At the end of the story, Paul declares his love for Ruth and she does not respond until he prompts her, at which point she teases him about not having been asked to speak.[19] Even when Candee's writing seems to slant towards one female type or the other she always manages to add some balance.

Later, after making it safely to New York aboard the *Carpathia*, Candee was one of the first survivors to publicly recognize the heroism of the women as well as that of the men. Like most people, Candee spoke of the men as noble heroes whose actions proved their masculinity, but she did not stop with them.[20] In her poetic account of the tragedy, titled "Sealed Orders," Candee describes surviving women as "women of courage [who] had been tricked by noble heroes into saving their own lives," and she includes female victims when she says, "for every life on board, three braver ones had surrendered theirs in God-like selflessness."[21]

While making her own escape, Candee broke her ankle, but still helped row the lifeboat away from the sinking ship instead of helplessly waiting for the male crew to do it. In addition to recognizing the heroism of the women who left the ship, Candee also expresses great admiration for the women who chose to stay with their husbands, particularly Mrs. Ida Strauss, whose refusal to leave was "not the frantic protest of the younger woman, but the firm will of the seasoned soul."[22] It is interesting to note the different ways McKenzie and Candee thought of Strauss' sacrifice—he seemed to view it as the duty of a proper wife, but Candee saw it as the reasoned choice of a woman with agency. Candee saw dignity and heroism in both the choices the women made for themselves and their acceptance of the choices that were made for them, which sometimes blurred the lines between their identities as True or New Women and their actions as the ship went down.

After interest in the *Titanic* disaster waned, Candee went back to her normal life. She released several new books, continued writing essays, and fulfilled her duties in organizations such as the Archeological Society, the American Federation of the Arts, the New York Home for Boys, and the Soldiers and Sailors Club.[23] In March of 1913, Candee, an "active campaigner for women's voting rights" led the Woman's Suffrage Parade in Washington as one of the six equestriennes.[24] Her work for women's suffrage, though, did not mean she disdained men or wanted to be masculine, as anti-suffragists might claim. Candee was vain and she enjoyed being a woman of the wealthy social class that some reformers wanted to change. She is known to have commented that her desire to be respected for her intellect did not mean she planned on going around "dressed like the matron of an asylum."[25] Candee chose to live much her life on her own terms in the style of the New Woman, but she never completely divorced herself from Victorian gender norms or the benefits and privileges that came with being part of the Gilded Age elite.

The "Unsinkable" Margaret Brown is another woman from the *Titanic* who embraced the independent lifestyle of a New Woman without ever completely giving up the luxuries of wealth or the identity of a True Woman. Born in 1867 into a working-class Irish-Catholic family in Hannibal, Missouri, Brown was familiar with the struggle between the classes and for daily survival. As a young girl she set her sights on marrying a wealthy man, but to her disappointment she fell in love with and married

a poor man, Mr. James Joseph Brown.[26] Their status changed several years later, though, when her husband was rewarded with stock in a mine where he had discovered a major gold vein. The Browns were suddenly rich and Margaret embraced everything that came with it. She spent lavishly on clothing and was known for always being ahead of the trends. She socialized with all of the most prominent people of the time and she had large and expensive homes built so she had plenty of room to entertain guests and raise a family.[27] Brown had arrived as a new member of Denver's Gilded Age elite and was an example of the ideal True Woman.[28]

In keeping with Gilded Age practices, Brown was active in clubs and charity work, but her work was often in the vein of progressivism consistent with New Women philosophies. In June of 1905, the *Colorado Republican* ran an article commending her for her efforts to financially support Judge Ben B. Lindsey, founder of the juvenile court movement, with profits from a leased mine.[29] Brown and Lindsey also worked together to end child labor. Brown's support for local miners who were fighting for eight-hour workdays and safer working conditions became an irritation to her mining industrialist husband who often derided her Progressive Era ideals.[30] Their differences ended in a legal separation and Brown lived comfortably on the financial settlement paid for from Mr. Brown's mining income.[31] This arrangement is one of Brown's odd combinations of the female types—she had separated from her husband and basically lived an independent life, but her whole lifestyle was supported by the fortune her husband made off the backs of the miners he employed.

Despite her own harrowing experience on *Titanic*, Brown continued to champion the working class. As soon as all the survivors were safely aboard the rescue ship *Carpathia*, Brown went to work protecting the newly widowed immigrant women. United States policies required immigrants to prove they had already secured employment and housing for when they got there, but since most of the male wage earners were killed in the disaster, there was a strong possibility the surviving family members would be sent back.[32] To prevent that from happening, Brown, with the help of Mrs. William Bucknell and Mrs. George Stone, formed the Titanic Survivor's Committee and in just a few days they raised $15,000.[33] The money they raised ensured that everyone who wanted to stay in America would have the funds to do so.

Two years later, Brown's convictions led her to run for political office, perhaps the most radical of her activist efforts. Supported by local and national suffrage groups, Brown accepted the Progressive and Democratic parties' nomination for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives.[34] In a statement she gave to the press, Brown said, "If I go into this fight I am going to win. There will be no mincing matters—no pink tea policies. It will be a regular man's kind of campaign—stump speaking, spreadeagle [sic] and all."[35] Historian Kristen Iverson credits Brown's roles as a wife, mother, and aunt for preparing her for political work, meaning it was her ability to show both New Woman and True Woman traits that made her a desirable candidate.[36] Unfortunately, the beginning of World War I interrupted Brown's bid for political power because her sister's marriage to a high-ranking German military man required her to step down.

The end of Brown's political career did not mean the end of her work. Both she and Candee continued to live full and exciting lives and kept doing the work that they loved. Brown once described herself as "a daughter of adventure," declaring, "I never know when I may go up in an airplane and come down with a crash, or go motoring and climb a pole, or go off for a walk in the twilight and return all mussed up in an ambulance. That's my arc, as the astrologers would say. It's a good one, too, for a person who had rather make a snap-out than a fade-out life."[37] Missing from her description are limitations based on socially dictated gender norms of the time. Candee was similarly unhampered.

The story of *Titanic* did not end when the ship sank. Instead, it has become part of the discussion about Gilded Age and Progressive Era issues such as wealth distribution, workers' rights, class division, and women's suffrage. One part of the story includes these competing images of the True Woman and New Woman, which were easily applied, in 1912 and today, to describe the ship. Real women, though, defied such simple designations, sometimes intentionally and other times by accident. During the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, Victorian wives and mothers often found it necessary to adopt New Women ideals and strategies to perform their True Women duties as protectors of the family. Helen Churchill Candee became a working woman because it was up to her to support and care for her children when her husband abandoned them. Margaret Brown felt that taking a seat in the government would be a good way to make

changes for people who did not have the power to improve their own lives. Candee and Brown prove that women of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era should not be thought of in terms of being one type of woman or the other, but as a fascinating and effective blend of both.

End Notes

[1] J.H. McKenzie, *The Titanic Disaster Poem*, 1912, excerpt in Steven Biel, ed., *Titanica: The Disaster of the Century in Poetry, Song, and Prose* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1998), 29.

[2] George Behe, *Voices from the Carpathia: Rescuing RMS Titanic* (Gloucestershire, UK: The History Press, 2015), 73.

[3] Andrew Wilson, *Shadow of the Titanic: The Extraordinary Stories of Those Who Survived*, First Atria Paperback ed. (New York: Atria Paperback, 2013), 21-2.

[4] Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, *Disorderly Conduct*, 239. As opposed to a recreational sexuality.

[5] Ibid., 199.

[6] Ibid., 245.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Hugh Brewster, *Gilded Lives, Fatal Voyage: The Titanic's First-Class Passengers and their World* (NY: Broadway Paperbacks, 2012), 3.

[9] Ann E. Larabee, "The American Hero and His Mechanical Bride," *American Studies* 31, no. 1 (Spring 190), 5, 6.

[10] Quoted in Larabee, "The American Hero and His Mechanical Bride," 6.

[11] Ibid., 6, 7.

[12] Randy Bryan Bigham, "Life's Décor: A Biography of Helen Churchill Candee," *Encyclopedia-Titanica*.org, 23 December 2005, accessed 5 November 2017.

[13] Randy Bryan Bigham, "Life's Décor."

[14] Helen Churchill Candee, *How Women May Earn a Living* (NY: The Macmillan Company, 1900), 14, 92.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Candee, *An Oklahoma Romance*, 89.

[17] Candee, *An Oklahoma Romance*, 63, 66.

[18] Helen Churchill Candee, *An Oklahoma Romance* (New York: The Century Co., 1901), 64.

[19] Candee, *An Oklahoma Romance*, 328.

[20] Bigham, "Life's Décor."

[21] Helen Churchill Candee, "Sealed Orders," first published in Collier's Weekly, 4 May 1912, found on *Encyclopedia-Titaninca*.org, accessed 5 November 2017.

[22] Candee, "Sealed Orders."

[23] Bigham, "Life's Decor."

[24] Brewster, *Gilded Lives, Fatal Voyage,* 112.

[25] Bigham, "Life's Decor."

[26] Kristen Iverson, *Molly Brown: Unraveling the Myth (Boulder: Johnson Books, 1999)*, 90.

[27] Ken and Lisa Marks, *Molly Brown from Hannibal, Missouri: Her Life in the Gilded Age* (Charleston, SC: The History Press, 2013), 68-71.

[28] Iverson, *Molly Brown*, 107.

[29] "Mine Dividends for Waifs," *Colorado Republican*, 15 June 1905, "Molly Brown: Suffragist, Socialite and Adventurer," *Colorado Virtual Library,* Colorado State Library, Accessed 4 November 2017.

[30] Ibid., 68.

[31] Iverson, *Molly Brown*, 167.

[32] Marks, *Molly Brown from Hannibal, Missouri*, 48.

[33] Logan Marshall, *The Sinking of the Titanic: 1912 Survivor Accounts*, 10th Printing, Abridged and ed. by Bruce M. Caplan (Bellevue, WA: Seattle Miracle Press, Inc., 2003)*,* 133.

[34] Iverson, *Molly Brown*, 203.

[35] Quoted in Iverson, *Molly Brown*, 204-5.

[36] Iverson, *Molly Brown,* 205-6.

[37] Quoted in Iverson, *Molly Brown*, 236.

THE DIVERGENT NATURE OF THE AMERICAN SOUL: REPUBLICAN IMPERIALISM

Christopher Ellwanger
Senior History Major

In 1865, the United States had no territories or land possessions outside of the continental U.S. By 1900, the U.S. controlled Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Philippines, Wake Island, Samoa, and talks over the Panama Canal zone had already begun. This brief period of time, when the US actively practiced imperialism, was an experiment for the American people. This marked a departure from many of the cornerstone ideals upon which the country was founded. It also set a new standard of public opinion on American foreign policy for years to come after coming face to face with its inequities.

America's stance on foreign affairs in the early 19th century largely embodied isolationism- albeit selective isolationism. In 1821, during his address to the US House of Representatives, then Secretary of State John Quincy Adams said that America "goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own."[1] This mindset took hold during a time when the country had huge expanses of what its leaders and many of its citizens perceived as open land to settle, whose bounty

and resources would inevitably fall to them in a competition with Native American peoples. However, the closure of the frontiers triggered a change in America. The need for greater resources put the frontier man into competition with Native Americans. The frontier where this seemingly non-imperial struggle unfolded also produced one of the central ideals in the great American mythos. Anchoring this mindset was the belief that frontier living sharpened people in a manner that other countries lacked. It made them self reliant, tough as nails, and industrious. Frontier life honed new immigrants into real Americans who could serve useful purposes in their new homeland. Of course, this ignored the frequent reliance of the self-reliant on slave labor. Still, when Frederick Jackson Turner deemed the frontier closed based on 1890 census data, it was a blow to many peoples' ideas of what America was.[2] No longer could people push further out into the west and simply take land to relieve population pressures. A new era of high population density living, factory working, and the ills that accompany these lifestyles, loomed on the horizon.

America has always been high-minded when it comes to its central motivations. Autocracies can rule in whatever way they see fit and what motivates the ruler becomes what motivates the citizens. Old world governments, such as Britain's, were set up with the nobility in mind, and the systems, governmental and legal, were developed in part for the nobility's purposes. The U.S., by contrast, has generally always known a more citizen-based style of government. This was manifested in a belief that political systems should represent the interests and will of all the governed. The country viewed itself as above the old world corruption typical of landed elites. What this translated to in practice was that, to the average American in the 1890s, America was at its heart good and would never exploit other people for gain because that ran counter to the ideals for which the country stood- the reality that the country was founded on the exploitation of African slaves, the systematic decimation of the Native Americans, and the use of an underpaid foreign workforce, notwithstanding.

The colony game, which was usually about resources, both economic, like sugar colonies in the Caribbean, and strategic, such as rubber in the Congo Free State, was at odds with the citizen- centered, frontier mythos of the U.S.. This type of colonialism is predicated upon the notion that the land is solely for the exploitation of the resource for the sake of the colonial master. The well- being of native populations did not factor

into this equation at all. Proponents of colonization may have paid some lip service to the tenets of paternalistic care and enrichment of the native people, but this could be as little as a small aside within a larger framework about the riches of the islands.[3] This attitude may have worked effectively for the Europeans, but to some Americans, this kind of colonialism proved intolerable. The only acceptable way for America to take colonies, and for this contingent to be comfortable with that fact, would be if the citizens believed this was actually doing something positive for the people of the colonies themselves, reflecting American ethnocentrism and paternalism.

While some Americans opposed to imperialism were motivated by humanitarian interests, for others, business interests took precedence. According to Christopher Lasch, strict anti-imperialists believed that the expansion of the United States should be limited to North America, along the lines of manifest destiny, not all around the world.[4] Limiting U.S. conquests to North America was their way of staying true to U.S. support for self- governance and self- determination. Consequently, many who believed that overseas imperialism was against the very tenets of democracy became members of the American Anti- Imperialist League. This group, formed on June 15, 1898, believed that another nation should not be annexed without that nation's consent. The American Anti-Imperialist League was originally formed to fight against the annexation of the Philippines. Some very prominent members of American society professed these beliefs and were members of the league including captain of industry Andrew Carnegie, President Grover Cleveland, union leader Samuel Gompers, and literary legend Mark Twain. Thus, America was polarized and imperialism could only occur effectively if both halves of the American mind were reconciled.

For those in support of American imperialism, the reasons spanned the political spectrum. A common core belief was that "non-western" people were childlike and needed help from others who knew what was best for them. President McKinley explained that "We hold the Philippines for the Filipinos."[5] If America was just a placeholder for a ruler that would come from amongst the Filipinos themselves, though, then how long that replacement would take was a question in many people's minds. William Howard Taft stated, "Our little brown brothers would need fifty or one hundred years of close supervision to develop anything resem-

bling Anglo-Saxon political principles and skill."[6] Of course, Taft's conception of development would allow the time for American companies to strip all the resources of the country.

U.S. Protestants of the time also thought of non-Western peoples as in need of U.S. civilization. They believed that colonization would expand the boundaries of Christianity and American style of republicanism. In actuality, most of the possessions that the U.S. acquired were previously Spanish colonies and therefore already Christianized. As a result, the Protestant/Catholic contest for dominance played a motivating role in "civilizing" the Philippines. Indiana Senator Albert Beveridge went so far as to say that the Philippines under Spanish rule had been "Put through a process of three hundred years of superstition in religion."[7] An undercurrent of racism was tied up in this jingoism; just as the idea of social Darwinism was prevalent at the time, the conviction that the white race was the governing race prevailed. There was a definite component of racism among the most ardent people of this era. Albert Beveridge, in an address to the Senate, illustrated the point where God and race intersected:

> "It is elemental. It is racial. God has not been preparing the English- speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-contemplation and self-admiration. No! He has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns. He has given us the spirit of progress to overwhelm the forces of reaction throughout the earth. He has made us adept in government that we may administer government among savage and senile peoples. . . This is the divine mission of America, and it holds for us all the profit, all the glory, all the happiness possible to man."[8]

Even Theodore Roosevelt was quoted to the effect that, "All the great masterful races have been fighting races."[9] Of course, America was a masterful race and needed to fight to stay preeminent, but the age of sail was over and the age of steam had more stringent requirements if the U.S. wanted to transform itself from a regional power to something greater.

Another factor contributing to this wave of imperialism was how the major world powers viewed U.S. military power, specifically its power at sea. In the 1890s, the U.S. had a small standing army and the states had militias. The navy was small and could not project power very far beyond

the mainland. This was partly due to the lack of coaling stations and naval bases around the world. The major powers in Europe, by contrast, had been in the colonization game for centuries and had all manner of imperial possessions around the world. This allowed them to effectively deploy their forces and added to their foreign trade opportunities. It was a point of pride for the European states to have such a dominating presence over supposedly less- advanced nations. Additionally, these empires illustrated that states lacking this type of land possession could not compete with those that did, either militarily or economically. Alfred Thayer Mahan was a British naval master who believed that strong navies were tantamount to a nation's success. Mahan opined that "The history of sea power is largely...a narrative of contests between nations, of mutual rivalries,[and] of violence frequently culminating in war."[10] In short, if a state wanted to be respected, a strong navy was a must and a navy required bases.

These days the word "chauvinism" conjures up the stereotypical image of an opinionated man arguing that women are already equal; however, that is actually the third definition of the word, according to Merriam-Webster. The first definition is "excessive or blind patriotism" and that attitude was a key characteristic of America in the 1890s.[11] There was a feeling that America was a great power and should start acting like one. The Monroe Doctrine of 1823 was an early attempt at becoming a great power, but it was undercut by America's complete inability to back up its threats in the slightest. The situation remained much the same into the late 1890s. The U.S. had no overseas colonies as a regional power. It is not surprising that America was swept up in a patriotic fever and a desire to prove herself a great power equal to all in Europe. The *New York Post* went so far as to argue that "Anti- imperialism is only another name for old-fashioned Americanism."[12] Opposing imperialism was an antiquated concept, accepted during the age of sail, but not of steam.

Interestingly, gender roles helped fuel imperialism in the 1890s. Shifts in gender roles emerged as more women went to work, while work became less labor intensive. Workforce management jobs were becoming more common and the growth of leisure and the good life were having an effect on the populous.[13] The fear of men losing their masculine edge from a multitude of changes in society as well as the workplace culminated in the new concept of the "soft man." This alarm caused apprehension at all levels of society. The fears resulted in a wide array of new products and

services to reinvigorate the soft man. In addition, the idea emerged that war offered an invigorating activity and one in which the great powers often engaged. Hawkish politicians like Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge romanticized the idea of going to war. In 1897, Roosevelt used the fear of the soft man in his address to the Naval War College, "If we forget that in the last resort we can only secure peace by being ready and willing to fight for it, we may someday have bitter cause to realize that a rich nation which is slothful, timid, or unwieldy is an easy prey for any people which still retains those most valuable of all qualities, the soldierly virtues."[14] Roosevelt personified the pro-war sentiment in his advocacy of the societal benefits of war.

Naturally at the base of all these excuses for expansion was the basest of them all, avarice. The islands of the Philippines were thick with natural, exploitable resources that the U.S. was eager to obtain. Once again Henry Cabot Lodge showed his true motivations during a speech at the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments after the Philippines became possessions of the U.S.:

> "They possess certain qualities other than natural beauty and romantic charm, which to many minds are more enticing…fertile in the gifts of soil and climate… untold mineral resources…great areas of forest and of plain fit for the support and prosperity of civilized man. In a word they have a very great material value, largely undeveloped."[15]

This is the most common reason wars happen during any time in history, and the 1890s were no exception.

Although germane to the subject of imperialism, the events of the Spanish-American War are an altogether different subject. Suffice it to say, 1898 marked America's debut on the global field of battle. At this point, the U.S. had a stellar navy, but the U.S. Army lacked organization and readiness. Logistics were a nightmare and with the exception of a few units, the whole thing was not well led. In part, the Spanish-American War occurred to show the world that the U.S. belonged in the great power club. In one of his first acts, President McKinley asked Congress for a fifty- million dollar war appropriation, well over a billion dollars today. It was a show of force that stunned the old world because it demonstrated just how far the American economic engine had come. The second stop was the Battle at

Manila on May 1, 1898, during which Admiral Dewey sank the entire Spanish Pacific fleet in a morning.[16] In American history this is known as the "splendid little war." It won renown, showcased American military power and gallantry, but it also had an unintended result. The war ended with the Treaty of Paris in 1899 which stipulated that Spain would give up all of its colonies in the Pacific and Caribbean to the United States in exchange for twenty million dollars.[17] Overnight, the U.S. bought into the colony game and all of the problems that accompany it.

According to Louis J. Halle, "History is full of incidents in which nations have competed for possession of liabilities that look like assets."[18] This fits the U.S. acquisition of the Philippines perfectly. Spain had been dumping men, arms, and money into the Philippines since the Filipino revolution began in 1896. It was part of why Spain was so weak during the war with the U.S. The fact that the Filipinos were not interested in being governed by yet another foreign power was immediately clear. The revolutionary government that was already established had been combating Spanish forces and more or less had the support of the people. Predictably, when the U.S. force came to the island to begin governing, they met violent resistance. The Filipino armed forces could not defeat the United States in open combat and the war on the islands quickly devolved into the use of guerilla tactics, with revolutionaries being squelched by U.S. forces.

Although American forces viewed themselves as benefactors helping the country, they engaged in the barbarous tactics that were all too frequently-employed during imperial wars. To the Americans at home basking in the glow of their alternative liberation of the Philippines, their soldiers were unlike others. They would never engage in barbaric behavior such as the water cure torture that was described by Corporal Daniel J. Evans in front of a Senate committee. This involved Filipino prisoners being forced to drink water to the point of bursting, at which point they were punched in the stomach repeatedly until they vomited all the water up. Evans claimed that two non-American scouts and one American soldier had carried out the torture, but it occurred in the presence of at least fifty U.S. soldiers.[19]

Once reports of the terrible happenings filtered their way back stateside, the papers picked up the stories and ran with them. The tales of

cruelty took on a life of their own in 1902. On January 30, 1902, the *Delaware Gazette and State Journal* published an article called "Water Cure in the Philippines."[20] It gives multiple accounts of soldiers employing the torture for a variety of reasons but chiefly to extract confessions out of the native population. Torture was not the only action in which American forces were engaged that damaged the country's image on the home front. Colonel Tony Waller was court-martialed for ordering the deaths of 11 natives in 1902. It was later discovered that Waller was following the orders of his commander, Brigadier General Jacob "Hell Roaring Jake" Smith. The story was picked up by the papers at home. On May 1, 1902 , residence of Honolulu woke to find *The Independent* had published an article titled "Kill everything Above Ten." It reported that Waller stated in his court martial that Smith told him, to "kill and burn" and that the more he killed the happier the general would be.[21] Smith ordered that all males on the island of Samar old enough to hold a weapon be killed on the spot. When Waller asked the general for a clarification on what age that would be, he responded, "Everything over ten years."[22] Smith said he wanted to "Make Samar a howling wilderness."[23] General Smith was also brought to trial for his ordering the murder of fourth- grade children. An argument could be made that these sorts of actions were possible solutions to deal with Filipino guerilla warfare and that the Spanish had also done what U.S. forces were doing. But in fact, the treatment of the natives in Cuba was one the reasons the U.S. declared war against Spain in the first place. When stories like these started to creep back home, the split personalities of America began to revolt against each other.

The *Indianapolis Journal* published an article titled "Military Criticized" on April 11, 1902. Among multiple stories covered in the article, it contained testimony from General MacArthur during a Senate hearing on the burning of villages in 1899. Senator Thomas Patterson of Colorado was questioning the general on matters in the Philippines. The article states, "Senator Patterson asked if the killing of twenty Filipinos to one American was not 'simply slaughter.' 'No,' replied MacArthur. 'Not when your adversary stands up and fights you.' ' Then under these conditions, with such disparity of casualties, the Filipinos stood up and fraught, are they not the bravest people that ever went to war?' asked Senator Patterson."[24] The public became increasingly aware of the fact that the motivation of spreading the light of democracy to the Philippines at the end of a bayonet

ran counter to the ideals of self-governance and self-determination upon which they thought America was built. Supporters of the war took a different view. In 1900, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge commented on the insurrection:

> "Our opponents put forward as their chief objection that we have robbed these people of their liberty, and have taken them and hold them in defiance of the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence in regard to the consent of the governed. As to liberty, they have never had it, and have none now, except when we give it to them protected by the flag and armies of the United States. The taking of the Philippines does not violate the principles of the Declaration of Independence, but will spread them among a people who have never known liberty. . . We could not have robbed them of it, for they had none to lose."[25]

But Filipinos had never known liberty because they had been under Spanish rule since 1521 when Ferdinand Magellan claimed the island for Spain. Now, in their eyes, they were simply trading one colonial master for another. Wayne Bert points out that "Subduing the Filipinos was the unanticipated and more difficult second act of intervention, 'that the U.S. "had never foreseen nor prepared,' for it."[26] President Theodore Roosevelt tried to end the war with the pen by declaring it over on July 4, 1902, and granting amnesty to all insurgents. The fight for self-governance continued until the Philippine Independence Act was enacted by Congress in March of 1934, which still included many pro-US provisions.[27]

The arguments from Beveridge and Lodge mentioned above are significant because they reveal the attitude of American policymakers circa 1900 regarding peoples whom they saw as members of so-called non-white races. These men did not see equals in the Filipinos, but lessers. Beveridge specifically names the English-speaking "races" as better in all facets than all others and viewed exploitation of such peoples as divine providence. Lodge showcased another important theme that is key to understanding the period-cognitive dissonance. In this case, America convinced itself that the Filipinos were incapable of self-governance as an excuse to take control of the islands. Many Americans were very troubled by these actions and the cognitive dissonance it created, as America was practicing imperialism, not for the good of the Filipino people, but for its

own self-interest. Americans have demonstrated this characteristic often, from our founding forward. The U.S. was based on the exploitation and/or decimation of other people in the name of "bettering" them or bettering the U.S. In the 1890s, for example, "better" for the Native Americans resulted in an effort to strip away their culture and re-educate their youth to assimilate into American culture. "Better" for African Americans in the 1890s was the doctrine of "separate, but equal" and Jim Crow, following 200 years of slavery. "Better" for the Philippines meant existing as a territory of the United States to be used as a strategic military port and harvested for foreign gain.

No one wants to think himself a villain, but when one's actions are villainous, justifications have to be manufactured to carry on with acts. "Better" only exists because acknowledgement of the exploitation for its own sake would cause a burden that would crush all but the most ruthless. Duality on the subject of exploitation is, of course, not just limited to the U.S. It is a common thread that runs through the whole story of humanity, because duality on all subjects is at the core of human nature.

End Notes

[1] John Q. Adams, "Warning Against the Search for "Monsters to Destroy," 1821."Accessed October 29, 2017. https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/jqadams.htm.

[2] Sean Dennis Cashman, *America in the Gilded Age: From the Death of Lincoln to the Rise of Theodore Roosevelt* (New York: New York University Press, 1994), 282-284.

[3] U.S. Senate, General Session, Congressional Record. 56th Cong., 1st Sess., (January 9, 1900), 704-712.

[4] Christopher Lasch, *American Imperialism & Anti- Imperialism: Problem Studies in American History.* Edited by Thomas G. Paterson (New York City: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1973.), 112.

[5] Wayne Bert, *American Military Intervention in Unconventional War: From the Philippines to Iraq* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 70.

[6]Stuart Creighton Miller, *Benevolent Assimilation: The American Conquest of the Philippines* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), 134.

[7] U.S. Senate, Congressional Record. 56th, 704-712.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Theodore Roosevelt, "Naval War College Address June, 2 1897." Accessed October 15, 2017 <http://www.theodoreroosevelt.com/images/research/speeches/tr1898.pdf>.

[10] Alfred Thayer Mahan, *The Influence of Sea Power Upon History, 1660-1805* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1890), 1-5.

[11] "Chauvinism." Merriam-Webster. Accessed October 29, 2017. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/chauvinism>.

[12] Susan A.Brewer. *Why America Fights: Patriotism and War Propaganda from The Philippines to Iraq* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 38.

[13] Theodore Roosevelt, "True Americanism." Teaching American History. Accessed October 09, 2017 <http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/document/true-americanism-the-forum-magazine/>.

[14] Roosevelt, "Naval War College Address June, 2 1897."

[15] Henry Cabot Lodge, *Address of the Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge Member of the American Delegation at the fourth plenary session of the Conference on the Limitation of Armament. December 10, 1921.* (Washington: Govt. Print. Off., 1921.), 4-6.

[16] Marshall Everett, *History of the Philippines and the Life and Achievements of Admiral George Dewey: also containing The Life and Exploits of Brig.-Gen. Fred Funston, and The Life and Adventures of Aguinaldo including Thrilling Tales of Bravery -- Exciting Personal Experiences-- as told by the Boys at The Front to which Is Added a Complete History of The War in The Philippine Islands and The History of American Expansion* (Chicago, IL: J.S. Ziegler, 1899.), 52-54, 63-65.

[17] "A Treaty of Peace Between the United States and Spain", U.S. Congress, 55th Cong., 3rd sess., Senate Doc. No. 62, Part 1." Avalon Project. Accessed December 04, 2017. http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/sp1898.asp.

[18] Bert, *American Military Intervention,* 70

[19] Stuart Creighton Miller, *Benevolent Assimilation,* 215-225

[20] "Delaware Gazette and State Journal. (Wilmington, Del.) 1883-1902, January 30, 1902, Page 4,Image 4." Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers. Accessed February 10, 2018. <https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn88053046/1902-01-30/ed-1/seq-4 >.

[21] "The Independent. (Honolulu, H.I.) 1895-1905, May 01, 1902, Image 5." Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers. Accessed February 10, 2018. <https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85047097/1902- 05-01/ed-1/seq-5/>.

[22]Ibid.

[23] Ibid.

[24] "The Indianapolis journal. (Indianapolis [Ind.]) 1867-1904, April 11, 1902, Page 4, Image 4." Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers. Accessed February 10, 2018. <https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn82015679/1902-04-11/ed-1/seq-4/>.

[25] Henry Cabot lodge. "The Retention of the Philippine Islands." Accessed February 10, 2018. <https://books.google.com/books?id=zfTvp-KkfUYC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>, 8.

[26] Bert, *American Military Intervention*, 70.

[27] Millard E. Tydings and John McDuffie, "Philippine Independence Act." Legis Works. Accessed December 3, 2017.< http://www.legisworks.org/congress/73/publaw-127.pdf>.

THE POLITICS AND ECONOMICS OF EUROPEAN WELFARE STATES

Luis Jaquez
Junior Political Science Major

Introduction

Government, its role, and its administrative responsibilities have evolved over centuries of experimentation and modernization. The role of the state has evolved with society and some have bred reliance on the administrative state and governmental oversight, affecting the perception of the duties that states should legislate and perform on the individual level. Precedent, expectations of security, and reliance on social stability have slowly extended the jurisdictions of legislatures into the personal lives of their citizenry. This has led to numerous debates over the duties of government, causing questions to arise as to where it should act and what should be considered a natural right worthy of protection and insurance. The conflict between ensuring a good or service as a right, instead of ensuring the open opportunity to obtain it through competition, directly reflects the ideas found in the contest between individual versus collective good. This conflict has long proposed the question of how are these opposing factors to be balanced in an environment dictated by good governance (World Development Report 1997, 25).

These opposing factors underpin the discussion regarding gov-

ernmental powers and reflect the development of globalism, modern economies, and industrial advances in technology. They have been met with various levels of acceptance, with those states that are more collectivist being more favorable to governmental regulation of the social sphere, while more individualistic states shy away from infringing on individual choice. These differences are most notable between the United States and Western Europe. For example, the citizenry of many European states tends to be more accepting of government's intervention in society and the economy. They view the government as a mediator between the people and corporate interests whereas those in the United States are typically more individualistic and skeptical of its interference.

European mediation occurs through outside actors petitioning for and stimulating the demand of intergovernmental cooperation, legitimating a combination of influences that propagate bureaucracy, state power, and state responsibility (Raadschedlers 2003, 379). This propagation gives way to an ever-expanding framework of governmental intervention. Numerous arguments are made for and against this intervention especially as extensiveness and qualification for social welfare protection is considered. This paper will assess the real world operation of social safety nets with reference to the following research question: how do economic and market regulations within a state affect the implementation of a social welfare net and its extensiveness (World Development Report 1997, 27)?

When discussing social policy, one must first understand the intent of social legislation and how it evolves. This is seen in how a country protects its people from poverty and economic busts. These protections provide context as to what qualifies as a priority in welfare policy, creating an invaluable picture of how states supersede economic and political consequences to achieve societal circumstances that the unregulated market cannot provide on its own. Each of these characteristics will be utilized to answer the proposed research question and test the hypothesis that countries with a more business friendly, less restrictive market will be more likely to foster the development of extensive social welfare policy. Testing will occur through the European policy scopes of the United Kingdom, Germany, and Denmark (University of Pittsburg 2000, Basic Concepts and Definitions).

Literature Review

To begin testing the proposed hypothesis, conceptualizations of what a business friendly environment and of what a social welfare net consist of must first be established. According to Jon Lieber's (2014) "What Makes a City Business Friendly?" a business friendly environment will accomplish the following: create a licensing, permitting, and regulatory atmosphere that protects businesses and consumers but is easy to comply with, establish tax laws that are easy to understand and easy to comply with, and offer training and networking programs that help young professionals succeed and build their human capital. These factors spark entrepreneurship, position businesses on a platform where they can endure challenging economic periods, and create positive governmental incomes that can be manipulated toward social causes. Business friendly environments also create a network of cooperation that allows individuals to continue to invest in their skills to improve their human capital and become more marketable (Lieber 2014).

In assessing the meaning of a social welfare state, the University of Pittsburg (2000) has established a database of European Union welfare states, utilizing various perspectives taken from economists and comparative theorists. This database references T.H. Marshall's (2000) *Social Policy* to describe welfare states as any state that takes on the explicit role of providing funding to protect its citizens from poverty. These states tend to create monetary endowments to invest in their populace's human capital to promote better economic conditions and an innovative business environment. Social welfare policy attempts to supersede the limitations of capitalist and socialist economies to establish a market based mixed economy to protect individuals from the harsher realities of the market and governmental interference. The University makes note of the European welfare state's specific interests in modifying market outcomes to compensate for what they believe to be market failures. It adds that involvement in areas such as poverty relief, subsidization of housing, retirement benefits, educational funding, and funding for health care are all indicative of the institutions of social welfare nets in Europe (University of Pittsburg 2000,).

Still, despite these conceptualizations, the welfare state is difficult to place into general terms due to the various approaches had at imple-

menting welfare regimes around the world and the numerous theories that relate to their development. The University of Pittsburgh's (2000) "How to Conceptualize the Welfare State" argues that the shift away from policies primarily concerned with law and order, the military, and the preservation of rank and social class to policies focused on redistributing wealth to promote well-being are the main factors of social welfare. It theorizes that this shift occurs in response to industrialization and the evolution of modern market economies (University of Pittsburg 2000).

Sheri Berman (1999) adds to this narrative explaining that the intent of social policy in Europe is to tame capitalism, not to hamper it or hope for its demise. She argues that welfare states do not worship at the altars of free markets. Instead, they advocate for liberal ideas while maintaining strong criticisms of their destructive powers. The usage of trade unions to protect laborers is a noted linchpin of social policy in Europe. Berman argues that mixed economies are aware of capitalism's ability to create state wealth and stability, but also of its abilities to create wealth inequalities, strong political factions, and exploitive business practices. Thus, welfare states maintain strong state oversight, regulation, and enforcement to prevent these aspects and protect their citizens. Put shortly, mixed economies, and the social welfare nets they promote, are observed to be real middle paths between laissez-faire liberalism and coercive governmental control. These paths utilize political primacy to manipulate and control markets to achieve favorable socioeconomic goals and reign in wasteful materialism (Berman 1999, 12).

The public's response to the harsher aspects of a pure market economy and government intervention to rectify these issues further complicates conceptualization as these aspects are polarized by political ideology. Still, for the purposes of comparison, the following conceptualization of welfare states and their social policy institutions will be utilized. Social welfare nets are those policies with the primary intent of redistributing wealth amongst the citizenry to insulate vulnerable individuals from poverty. They also attempt to circumvent harsher aspects of the economic laws of supply and demand to promote social well-being and thwart the exploitive capacities of liberalism and authoritarianism (University of Pittsburg 2000).

These concepts of business friendly environments and social wel-

fare nets relate to the United Kingdom in that it is a unitary state that has gone and continues to undergo a massive reconstruction of its social welfare policies due to difficulty in maintaining and balancing a mixed economy. Nicole Faher (2000) observes that the country's welfare policies began to take shape after World War II. After implementing welfare policies, the United Kingdom began to experience various critical economic problems. These problems, along with the partisan politics led by Margret Thatcher and the Conservative Party, shaped the face of the economic and social welfare debate. The five major welfare benefits in the country include personal social services, housing, health care, education and cash benefits. These benefits can be classified as means- tested, non-contributory, or national insurance. The National Health Service is by far the most popular aspect of the United Kingdom's welfare net, and it is taxpayer funded and nationalized. Still, the nation faces the critical problems of an aging population and high unemployment rates which are aspects that has led the United Kingdom to cut taxes to simulate the economy and promote innovation and investment. While this fiscal policy has been successful in accomplishing its goal, it has caused those social welfare institutions dependent on taxes to undergo crisis, leading to the need for further welfare net reconstruction (Faher 2000).

Some economists and social policy theorists took these aspects of crisis and the restructuring of the social welfare net as a complete policy failure, while those like Wincott (2011) argues that those failures commonly attached to the concepts of welfare theory are misunderstood and misattributed. This thesis was constructed utilizing evidence from law and societal reforms and comparing them to social retellings of historical events. Wincott refutes welfare critics, like Alan Wolfe, with the argument that various aspects of social welfare policy and sociology went completely unaffected during economic recession. This gives grounds to the prospect that policy failure occurred because of partisanship not an inherent economic downfall related to social welfare policy (Wincott 2011, 342).

The market economy of the United Kingdom is extremely business friendly. It maintains a well-developed and stable financial sector with relatively liberal policies with regards to the labor force. The financial consolidation, started by Prime Minister Margret Thatcher in the 1980s, caused the country to experience steady economic growth and to become the fifth largest economy in the world, despite still maintaining a relatively high

deficit. The United Kingdom also maintains an effective rule of law and an open trading environment. The corporate tax rate is one of the lowest in the world at 20% and it maintains one of the most deregulated global economies. Regulations and taxes are transparent and the process to start a business is relatively straightforward. The United Kingdom also maintains some price controls and other consumer protection regulations. Its social welfare net suffers as the country does not work very closely with trade unions and businesses to translate the demand for skilled labor into human capital. It has a population of 64.9 million and a GDP of $2.7 trillion that it utilizes to keep its economic and governmental engines firing efficiently (Heritage Organization 2017).

Business friendliness and social welfare nets have long been part of Germany's history as a welfare state, but its pertinence with social welfare policy is very complicated, inconsistent, and evolving given the country's change of governments in the twentieth century and the political tensions it faced after World War II and during the Cold War. Alexander Burdumy (2013) examined the usage and eventual failure of the welfare state in early German history. His research focused on the failure of the initial implementation of the welfare state in the German Democratic Republic and established the cause of the failure to be politically driven nature. The original implementation of the social welfare net in Germany did not only allow for provisions of aid to the sick and elderly, it also allowed for the subsidization of public opinion through misappropriation of funds (Burdumy 2013, 873). This led Burdumy to the conclusion that Germany's planned economy and its fiscal instability caused the failure of its early welfare state by pursuing the overall goal of maintaining political power. Failure occurred at the cost of the reputation of social welfare policy in Europe (Burdumy 2013).

Germany's current social welfare policy takes a more middle of the road approach according to Patricia Dinsmore (2000). She describes the welfare system as being an integrated part of Germany's market economy that is commonly used in methods akin to economic governance. Economic and social welfare policy serves a dual mandate in the country, enhancing employment opportunities by removing excess labor from the market through its creation of early retirement schemes and long university programs. These policies also place greater influence on social security transfer payments, rather than providing public service goods. Germany

practices neo- liberalism which is important in constraining the extreme egalitarian aspects of its social welfare policies. Despite of its economic restructuring, it is still plagued by problems in reunifying East Germany with West Germany, the aging population, and Germany's unstable unemployment rates. These aspects continue to stress the economy and the social welfare net. Unlike the United Kingdom though, its governing coalitions, currently led by Chancellor Angela Merkel, tend to remain dedicated to the maintenance of an expansive and fair social environment (Dinsmore 2000).

Despite Germany's internal economic challenges and the various outside challenges it faces regarding monetary policy from the European Union, it is currently one of the world's most powerful and dynamic economies. Business and investment freedom along with entrepreneurial spirit is strong and growing within the country, prompted by an openness to global trade and strong protections on intellectual and physical property rights. Although Germany's economy still faces various conflicts in recovering from the economic crisis of 2008. It is currently plagued by questions and tension regarding the ongoing migrant crisis, but it is dealing with this crisis by cooperating with businesses and trade unions to establish a skilled labor force and jobs for migrants and its citizens. These policies have faced difficulty as Germany already maintains a population of 81.4 million people. Still, it continues to be the most powerful economy within the European Union with a GDP of $3.8 trillion (Heritage Organization 2017).

Denmark's social welfare net is the most extensive in relation to its business environment and is driven by its citizenry, according to Schou (1912). Schou emphasizes the people's cultural cooperation and focuses upon collective good that he hypothesizes developed from the country's beginnings in industrialized agriculture. He also attributes some of its social policy success to the country's relatively small size which allows it the ability to readily and efficiently mobilize its government to embark on political and economic action that promotes public good (Shou 1912, 51). Denmark's official government website (2017) details that the Danish welfare system, which operates on the Scandinavian Model, has as its basic intent that every citizen be guaranteed the equal right to social security and services like health care and education, free of charge (Denmark.Gov 2017).

The country guarantees free and easy access to higher education because of the highly competitive market of the globalized world. This benefits the country's expanded industrial horizons which now includes various business and research institutions who work together to create an innovative learning environment. Denmark also practices the economic and political philosophy of flexicurity, which combines the principles of security, flexibility, and active labor market policy through its guaranteed unemployment benefits package and active collaboration with trade unions. This ensures a productive and fair labor environment that establishes a strong social welfare net. These principles come at a tradeoff, though, as Denmark maintains no federally mandated minimum wage. (Denmark.Gov 2017).

Denmark's expansive social welfare spending is counterbalanced by its mixed economic practices of having a deregulated, transparent, and straightforward business environment. This counterbalance, in combination with innovated active labor ideals and higher human capital allowed by its spending on education, is conducive to supporting the social welfare net it maintains. Still, these factors do not completely offset the costs of social policy spending, thus Denmark makes its citizenry shoulder one of the highest income and sales tax rates in the world. Although, it maintains one of the lowest corporate tax brackets at 23.5%, it uses these low tax brackets to create a market economy that is conducive to business development, social networking, and trade. This allows Denmark to reach a GDP of $258.7 billion with a population of only 5.6 million (Heritage Organization 2017).

Methodology

The rules regarding the operation of a country's economy are an extremely significant aspect of governance that relates to how the entrepreneurial spirit, market landscape, and workforce responds to political and financial conflict. This, in concert with public opinion, determines the level of benefit and satisfaction that a country's citizenry receives from its government. Member states of the European Union are thought to provide more satisfactory welfare nets, leading to the following questions: why do these institutions develop so similarly amongst European states, and which nation provides the most extensive welfare packages (Raadschedlers 2003, 379)?

To answer these questions, this research focuses on the economic and political data of the United Kingdom, Germany, and Denmark, comparing them through the most similar-systems (MSS) design of political analysis. The most similar-systems design was utilized because of these countries' position within the European Union, their similar business and governmental practices, and their similar economic and trade practices. The main focus of this research is how these European governments' relate to their economy and business sectors and how they have influenced their social welfare policy. This analysis was conducted using data regarding economic regulation, tax policy, and training environments taken from the Heritage Index of Economic Freedom (Heritage Organization 2017).

These comparisons were done to address the prior stated hypothesis that countries with a more business friendly, less restrictive market will be more conducive to the development of a social welfare net and be likely to maintain a more extensive social welfare policy. The independent variable in this study is how a country treats its market and the dependent variable is how the treatment of the market affects the country's social policy perspectives. The general economic and social welfare policy development data for each of these states were taken from various scholarly articles and compared for their cultural, political, and public opinion similarities. Each of these aspects were taken into consideration within the contexts of social welfare policies and the historical and political stressors that framed their creation.

The analysis was conducted utilizing the factors outlined within the conceptualizations of a business friendly environment and a social welfare net. These countries were compared by the tax burdens they place upon their citizenry and their businesses. They were also compared utilizing their respective Economic Freedom rankings to indicate how streamlined and easy to comply with tax codes and other regulations were within these countries' respective markets. Those maintaining lower corporate tax rates and higher Economic Freedom rankings were deemed more business friendly. Those countries that cooperated more closely with trade unions and business institutions to invest in the human capital of their citizenry were given a higher ranking in the expansiveness of their social welfare nets and overall business friendliness. This occurred because the social welfare benefits packages like health care, unemployment protections, and access to higher education that each country provides were rel-

atively similar, except for how each country worked to collaborate trade unions, business institutions, and higher education.

Once the research was conducted, it became apparent that avoiding conceptual stretching was going be necessary, but difficult to accomplish. This was due to the welfare state and a social welfare policy varying greatly in their applications to the United Kingdom, Germany, and Denmark. Also, the concepts surrounding the economic, social, and political decisions regarding these policies were all molded differently by each country's varying historical backgrounds and economic priorities.

Table 1: Social Welfare Net Versus Business Environment

	Corporate Tax	Personal Tax	Economic Freedom Rank	Human Invest	Net Extensive
U.K.	20%	45%	4th	Good	Good
Germany	15.8%	47.5%	14th	Better	Better
Denmark	23.5%	56%	12th	Best	Best

This research shows that those countries with the most extensive social welfare nets did have very business friendly mixed economies. It also showed that Denmark and Germany, having the most extensive social welfare nets, maintained the following characteristics: corporate tax rates ranging from 15%-24% to promote business innovation, personal income taxes ranging from 47%-56% to pay for the costs of maintaining an extensive social welfare net, and close cooperation with business institutions and trade unions to attempt to achieve full employment and invest in the human capital of their citizenry. These governments were also found to intervene more often into the market, placing their Economic Freedom rankings at the 12th and 14th in the world. The United Kingdom, while it maintains a strong social welfare benefits package, tended to stay out of the market, placing its Economic Freedom ranking as the 4th in the world and establishing it as more business friendly policy wise at the cost of its

social welfare net expansiveness and its overall business friendliness in that it lacks cooperation with trade unions and business institutions.

Denmark was also found to maintain no federally mandated minimum wage because of the country's trade union and business relationships that helped to create employment opportunities and achieve a living wage without creating a detrimental labor price floor that would lend itself to the labor rationing of low skilled employment. This establishes Denmark's social welfare net as the most extensive out of the countries observed in this research. Germany's collaboration with trade unions and business institutions establishes it as the second most extensive in this research because of its unemployment packages and other welfare aspects being out classed by Denmark. These relationships also showed that the United Kingdom, Germany, and Denmark each struggle with rising personal tax rates and unemployment rates due to the extensiveness of their welfare nets infringing upon the market, their raising of the human capital required to obtain employment, and their making anything less than full employment economically unsustainable which pushes them to recoup social welfare net costs from their citizenry.

Conclusion

When analyzed, the data demonstrated a complicated relationship with the hypothesis. Each of these countries were observed to be extremely business friendly. Despite this, the United Kingdom maintains a higher economic freedom ranking than Germany and Denmark. Still, Germany and Denmark worked more closely with their business institutions and trade unions increasing their business friendliness and their social welfare net expansiveness. Thus, the data supported the hypothesis that the most business friendly European states were more likely to implement and maintain more extensive social welfare nets. These findings also point to other possible independent variables like the political, cultural, and historical origins of these countries as being factors that could be significant in influencing social welfare policy. This leaves room for improvement within the results. The data used here also exists in indexes that could be utilized to develop a more thorough quantitative analysis that utilizes statistical tools, like linear regression analysis, to expand on the observed relationships.

The historical development of each of these countries had major impacts on their political parties, governmental values, and the economic stances related to their social welfare policy, but an in-depth examination of these relationships for each country is best left to an individual case study due to the immense amount of information that exists regarding these issues. Partisan politics was a prominent feature in the formation of these welfare states, causing general instability in balancing business values with collective social good. Still, the liberal market landscapes of each of these European states have created a relatively deregulated trading environment, furthered by competitive corporate tax policies. These values support a mixed economy, providing the finances needed to sustain their individual welfare nets.

Balancing social welfare policy against economic pressures has also resulted in the insulation of various goods and services, such as health care, from the natural recourse of supply and demand. This has resulted in welfare nets becoming more expensive, growing budget deficits, and the creation of wage price floors in Germany and the United Kingdom. Each of these factors threaten the labor markets and economies of their implementation and cause governmental instability and social tensions for the United Kingdom, Germany, and Denmark, who struggle with unemployment and growing national debts due to their social policies. Still, these social welfare nets continue and these countries thrive as stable social democratic institutions.

Works Cited

Berman, Sheri. 1999. "Understanding Social Democracy." New York: Columbia University. <http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~ces/conferences/left/left_papers/berman.pdf> March 14, 2018.

Burdumy, Alexander.2013. "Reconsidering the Role of the Welfare State Within the German Democratic Republic's Political System." *Journal of Contemporary History*. 48 (4). pp. 872-889.

Denmark. Dk.2017. "Society." *The Official Website of Denmark*. April 25, 2017.

Dinsmore, Patricia. 2000. "Germany." *Country Case Studies and Links.* University of Pittsburg. <http://www.pitt.edu/~heinisch/ca_germ.html> April 25, 2017.

Faher, Nicole. 2000. "United Kingdom." Country Case Studies and Links. University of Pittsburg. <http://www.pitt.edu/~heinisch/ca_brit.html > April 25, 2017.

Heritage Organization. 2017. *Index of Economic Freedom: United Kingdom, Germany, Denmark.<https://www.heritage.org/index/ranking>*April 25, 2017.

Lieber, Jon. 2014. "What Makes a City Business Friendly?" *National League of Cities*. <https://citiesspeak.org/2014/07/11/what-makes-a-city-business-

friendly/> March 22, 2018.

Raadschelders, Jos. 2003. *Government a Public Administrators Perspective*. Routledge. pp. 1- 379. *The Taylor and Francis Group*. (Accessed April 25, 2017)

Schou, P. 1912. "Social Denmark." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics.* 27(1). pp. 50-66.

World Development Report.1997. "The Evolving Role of the State." *Rethinking The State a Framework*. pp. 1-28. April 25, 2017.

University of Pittsburg. 2000. *European Welfare States: Information and Resources.* <http://www.pitt.edu/~heinisch/eusocial.html> April 25, 2017.

Wincott, Danial. 2011. "Images of Welfare in Law and Society: The British Welfare State in Comparative Perspective." *Journal of Law and Society*. (38)3. pp. 343-375.