PERSPECTIVES IN AMERICAN STUDIES

A READER BY AMERICAN SCHOLARS IN CHINA

★ 上海外语教育出版社
★ SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS

American Studies Series
by American Studies Center
Shanghai International Studies University

Perspectives In American Studies:

A Reader By American Scholars In China

Edited by:
W. Patrick Strauss
Kenneth Starck
David Yaukey

Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press
Shanghai, China

Perspectives In American Studies:

A Reader by American Scholars in China

Sponsored by
Press & Culture Section of
American Embassy to P. R. C.

美国学纵论

——在华美国学者论文选

〔美〕W.Patrick Strauss
Kenneth Starck 编
David Yaukey

上海外语教育出版社出版发行
(上海外国语学院内)
上海虹口欧阳印刷厂印刷
新华书店上海发行所经销

850×1168 毫米 1/32 14.375 印张 400 千字
1988 年 3 月第 1 版 1988 年 9 月第 2 次印刷
印数： 3,001—4,500 册
(精)ISBN 7-81009-230-8/Z·002 定价： 7.80 元
(平)ISBN 7-81009-324-X/Z·003 定价： 5.80 元

INTRODUCTION

I write this with a great deal of satisfaction, since this book is the outgrowth of two developments which I have witnessed during my time as American Ambassador to China. The first is the maturation of the Fulbright program in China. More than 20 American scholars now come to China each year to teach at China's pre-eminent academic institutions, making the Fulbright program here the largest in the world. The second is the rapid growth in the last few years of American Studies in China. Several universities, in fact, have established American Studies Centers, using American Fulbright scholars and returned Chinese Fulbright scholars as teachers and administrators. So the two dévelopments are mutually reinforcing.

The essays of these 18 American scholars who taught in China in 1986-87 are impressive in their range and insight. All but two were Fulbright scholars. They bring expertise from at least seven different academic disciplines to bear on these essays.

Finally, it seems fitting that this volume was compiled during the period marking the 40th anniversary of the Fulbright Act, because the book helps to accomplish one of the major objectives of the act: the promotion of international understanding. I can only add that I believe it succeeds eminently.

Winston Lord

American Ambassador to P. R. C.

PREFACE

This book is the result of a lecture series sponsored by the American Studies Center, Shanghai International Studies University, given between November 1986 and June 1987 by American scholars teaching in China. All but two were Fulbright scholars, and most traveled from other parts of China to present their papers. Three were not able to come to Shanghai, but their essays are an integral part of the series.

The theme of the lectures is represented by the book's title —— a particular perspective of American Studies in this century. This was presented in terms of the author's academic discipline which included English, history, law, political science, economics, journalism, linguistics, philosophy, and sociology.

A special note of appreciation for the help given by the staff of the American Studies Center at Shanghai International Studies University. Professor Zhang Daiyun, Director, read the entire manuscript and Mr. Wu Gongzhan, Director of Academic Affairs coordinated the series. Messrs. Ji Feng and Ke Yen efficiently handled internal and external arrangements respectively, not easy tasks considering there were fifteen different lecturers to schedule!

Finally, my thanks and gratitude to my collaborators, Kenneth Starck and David Yaukey, who generously helped edit the essays, write headnotes and section introduc-

tions, and put the manuscript in its final form.
July 1987

W. Patrick Strauss
Fulbright Professor 1986-87
American Studies Center
Shanghai International Studies University

CONTENTS

I. AMERICAN POLITICS AND FOREIGN POLICY

Introduction

Contemporary observers of the United States governmental scene are frequently surprised by the twists and turns of the process. But this is nothing new. Both Alexis de Tocqueville, the French nobleman visiting in the late 1820's and Lord James Bryce, the English political scientist a half century later, echoed this in their books. Contemporary ideas are suggested in this section by three historians and a political scientist. However, in their efforts to explain the complexities of American policymaking, they sometimes conclude with more questions than answers.

A case in point is Bailey's essay. He inaugurated the lecture series and begins here, looking at the development of American foreign policy at the time the United States achieved world power status. What caused the change from America's looking inward to looking outward in a period of less than twenty years? He argues that a confluence of ideas and events by the beginning of the twentieth century thrust the United States onto the world stage. However, he questions whether it was because of the development of the American economy, America's politics and politicians, certain psychological factors, intellectual and cultural currents, naval and military growth, or some combination of these. The author suggests that a close analysis of these factors leads not to answers but to more questions.

Strauss is also interested in American foreign policy, but he discusses it as an important power of the president. His emphasis is on the institution of the presidency, and how seven strong and determined presidents enlarged their presidential role due in a large part to actions taken in foreign policy. A much larger group who have served in the office, he concludes, have been mediocre or poorer, but the office has become so strong that it has survived them. Not only that, but the executive branch now overshadows the legislative and the judicial branches in importance, thus upsetting the checks and balances that the Constitution embodied.

Closely related is Silver's essay on Franklin D. Roosevelt, who served in the presidency longer than any of the thirty-nine who have held the office. Here was one of the ablest men to have held the presidency. The author painstakingly follows his career and suggests a combination of talents, not the least of which was his political acumen. Professor Silver also expands on a recurrent theme of the two previous essays, which is the relationship of domestic to foreign policies. Few would disagree with his conclusion that Roosevelt was one of the major political forces in the twentieth century.

Finally, Yoder looks at America's role during the founding of Israel and the aftermath. He finds that the United States, granted the best of intentions, has been perceived as being blatantly pro-Israel, to its detriment in dealing with Arab states. Further, he finds the role of the United Nations in the area was much more important and vital than has been acknowledged by western scholars and politicians. The effectiveness, he says, was in direct proportion to the support given by the United States. Yoder cites the infinitesimally small amount necessary to support United Nations special agencies as compared to the United States defense budget. He concludes that instead of the attempted use of power by the United States which has had little lasting success, more effort should be made through cooperation and support of the United Nations in the area.

In summary the essays in this section have suggested some of the complexities involved in the making of American foreign policy. So too are the men responsible for making the policies complicated. While they make decisions based upon world events, they perhaps base those determinations as much on the domestic situation and politics.

J. Albert Bailey *has been Fulbright professor at Zhongshan University, Guangzhou during 1986-87. He is a diplomatic historian who received his B. A. from Notre Dame University, South Bend, Indiana, the M. A. from Fordham University in New York City, and the Ph. D. from Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. in 1969. His permanent home is the University of Michigan, Dearborn where he is professor of history.*

Professor Bailey has traveled and lectured in several places throughout China. He has also been conducting research on Sino-American relations during World War II. He says that he has "enjoyed teaching American Diplomatic History to graduate and undergraduate students at Zhongshan University". This must be true because he was reappointed for 1987-88 as a Fulbright professor at the same university.

Expansion Outward: Factors Underlying American Foreign Policy at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

by

J. Albert Bailey

Introduction:

The United States in 1900: A nation in the process of founding and consolidating a "new empire" recently acquired in the Spanish-American War. At the same time, a nation proclaiming an "Open Door" to safeguard its already acquired privileges in Asia, privileges shared with other European and Asian nations, largely at the expense of China.

Seen from the perspective of the present, this enthusiastically aggressive American foreign policy appears as a natural prelude to other foreign policy adventures of the coming 20th century: the First and Second World Wars, the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, and NATO, conflicts in Korea and in Vietnam.

Yet, in 1900, this new empire, recently approved in the Peace of Paris ending the Spanish-American War, was truly a "new" concept. For the fitst time in its history the United States had acquired territories, to be sure not to be called "colonies", in areas beyond its continental limits whose populations comprised peoples of different cultures, languages, and historical traditions. Despite doubts raised in the great "national debate" over imperialism, the Senate had narrowly approved the pact with Spain bringing the Philippines, Guam, and Puerto Rico into union with the United States. In a separate but related action, the Kingdom of Hawaii had been formally annexed shortly before. Cuba, the original object of interest in declaring war, was not part of the American extension of sovereignty thanks to the Teller Amendment. But American influence over the affairs of that island would be clearly confirmed in months to come.

Expansion was hardly a concept unique to this period of American history. From the earliest years of settlement, American colonists and nationalists had expanded: to the Piedmont and Western New England farms, across the Appalachians and into the Ohio River Valley. Then, in the 19th century, across the Mississippi River into the newly acquired Louisiana Territory, into the Floridas shortly after and, under the years of President James Polk in the 1840's, it became our "Manifest Destiny" to obtain the remainder of the continent westward to the Pacific. The Oregon Country in the Northwest, and the areas of Texas and of the Mexican Cession came to the union due to the agreements and conflicts of that decade.

Yet the new century begun in 1900 was to see expansion "outward". Why this new departure from previous American reluctance to expand in this direction? The focus of this paper is to examine the factors underlying this phenomenon and, in so doing, present some of the historiographical views put forward to explain or justify the movement.

What did cause American foreign policy to change from the precedents of its first century and a quarter to the Twentieth century pattern so familiar to us —— for better or for worse?

The great mid-century conflict, the Civil War, was the touchstone of American history. It marked an end to the question of secession but also settled the fateful linking of the issue of slavery and expansion which had plagued the nation in the 1840's and 1850's. Lee's surrender at Appomattox began an era of industrial development in America, financed greatly by British investment, and unique in its tolerance for laissez-faire capitalism. In an atmosphere in which the "robber barons", Rockefeller, Carnegie, and J. P. Morgan prospered, the nation's leaders and heroes were to be found not on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington but on Wall Street in New York.

Large numbers of immigrants poured into Atlantic, and some Pacific, ports of the rapidly growing nation. Furnishing the "muscle" for the railroads and steel mills, these new Americans, arriving now from Southern and Eastern Europe as well as traditional immigrant sources, would contribute to a population growth which saw Americans more than double in numbers in the thirty-five years from the Civil War to 1900. Opportunities for the immigrants were offered; so were slum housing in the urban tenements, long hours and low wages in the factories, and anti-labor union actions by the private armies sent by the captains of industry of the day.

No wonder that, thus preoccupied, Americans thought not of foreign exploits but of domestic development. And if the Industrial Age betrayed the promises emblazoned in

Emma Lazarus' verses on the statue dominating New York harbor, there was always the West! The West, the "Great American Frontier" still beckoned. The land, much of it still hardly touched by settlers, lay waiting. Only nomadic Indian tribes barred the way to this goal. And to remove this barrier, the U.S. Army, shrunk from its Civil War numbers but reveling in the tradition of "Custer on the plains", with bugle call and cavalry charge, galloped to open Indian lands —— and closed Indian cultural existence. Encouraged by the Homestead Act of Lincoln's administration and subsequent legislation, settlers filled the "great American desert" in the years of the latter 19th century. Great strikes of precious metals —— gold, silver, and copper, drew prospectors and settlers to the West. Cattle and sheep raising, then homesteading, increased the population. Grains from America's "new Eden" flowed back to the East —— and on to foreign markets across the Atlantic.

With the building of the great railroad routes of the 1870's and 1880's the incorporation of the West into the new industrial nation was complete. From New York to San Francisco, the country was now unified in factory and farm. The West was gone. At least, Frederick Jackson Turner's frontier had vanished as the last Indian territory, Oklahoma, was opened to settlement in 1889. Was it true as Professor Turner intimated in his epic thesis, published just four years later, that the "new frontier" now lay *beyond* the continental limits of the United States? Were the events of the 1890's a natural progression from the "closing of the frontier" in the West?

Or, had expansion never really ceased —— at least in