

CONTROL/US OFFICIALS ONLY

CLASSIFICATION **RESTRICTED**

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
INFORMATION FROM  
FOREIGN DOCUMENTS OR RADIO BROADCASTS

REPORT

CD NO.

STAT

COUNTRY China  
SUBJECT Political - Foreign relations  
HOW PUBLISHED Weekly magazine  
WHERE PUBLISHED Nan-ching  
DATE PUBLISHED 7 Aug 1948  
LANGUAGE Chinese

DATE OF INFORMATION 1948

DATE DIST. *2 June 1949*

NO. OF PAGES 2

SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT NO.

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF ESPIONAGE ACT 18 U. S. C. 2381 AND 2385. ITS TRANSMISSION OR THE REVELATION OF ITS CONTENTS IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW. REPRODUCTION OF THIS FORM IS PROHIBITED.

THIS IS UNEVALUATED INFORMATION

SOURCE Ta-hsueh P'ing-lun (University Review), Vol I, No 5, 1948.

[The University Review is apparently an independent weekly periodical, first issue of which appeared in July 1948. After reviewing 30 issues FDB makes the following analysis: Contributors to this review appear to be liberal non-party or Kuomintang adherents who, previously content to keep still under conservative Kuomintang rule were beginning in 1948 to become increasingly discontented with the ineptness and corruption of the ruling clique. Though they are not Communists they are leaning further left as Communist victories continue.]

AMERICA'S STUPID DIPLOMACY

Chiang Meng-yin (Ueda 10082, 2275,3044)

The saying "A weak nation has no diplomacy" is really not very apt. On the contrary, rich and powerful nations, although having incessant diplomatic activity are in fact still "without diplomacy." Because their foreign policy is stupid and their skill poor, even if they are busy with details all day long and do not hesitate on expense, their labor and money is wasted; it contributes nothing to their own basic advantage or the world's true welfare.

Nations which follow stupid diplomacy are numerous in history and in the world today, but none can compare with the US. Since 1783, when she accomplished her independence from Britain, this young nation with superior location and abundant resources should have been outstanding in international affairs. Signally blessed by Heaven, it should have been a commanding figure. In fact it has not been so. The reason is that US diplomacy has always been stupid and weak.

When I say this, Americans will perhaps retort that I have been deceived by anti-American agitation and am slandering a friend and ally. Nevertheless, there are plenty of instances to back up my assertion.

One instance is Wilson's obstinate determination in 1919 to go to Paris, where, despite his high ideals and great prestige, he made bad mistakes and his fine ideas were scuttled.

- 1 -

CONTROL/US OFFICIALS ONLY

CLASSIFICATION **RESTRICTED**

STATE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NAVY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NRRB																	
ARMY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AIR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FBI																	

**RESTRICTED**

STAT

Franklin Roosevelt, despite his fine intelligence, often blundered in diplomacy. Witness the exports to Japan when war clouds were gathering, and the peace talks in Washington just before Pearl Harbor, and even worse, Yalta.

Since Roosevelt's death, US diplomacy has been even more stupid. Note the policy of aiding Japan, "nourishing a tiger to plague oneself." Because when Japanese once get weapons in their hands they will no longer meekly salute MacArthur. But, when Chinese of all classes opposed US support of Japan, it evoked a stupid statement from the erstwhile university president, Ambassador Stuart: "If this continues, it can invite unfortunate results"; and again, "You gentlemen must be ready to accept the results of your actions." To make such statements to the people of a country to which one is accredited as ambassador is bad grace and undignified. To his surprise there was unanimous opposition and remonstrance, and the old gentleman kept quiet after that.

From the above instances it may be seen that US diplomacy, both in policy and technique has been doltish; it was so in the past, it is so now. Considering the high quality and cultural advancement of the US people, why is her diplomacy like this? Basically the formation and execution of US foreign policy has mainly been controlled by three types of persons: merchants, militarists, and missionaries. Merchants think only of gain, so they want the open door and are willing to give economic aid abroad. Militarists are imbued with fondness for war, so they seize bases everywhere and do not object to training enemies. Missionaries feign love and justice, but outwardly pray for men's peace and prosperity; they are in fact advance agents of imperialism. But such acrobatic performances, while they may be self-hypnotizing, cannot hoodwink the whole world. The result is that when the outward form is unmasked, the true stupidity becomes apparent.

America is indeed a highly civilized nation but has nothing to offer in the field of diplomacy. President Wilson was famed for his "abundant idealism," but in fact he had no original ideas. All his projects were copied from others. For example, the concept of a League of Nations arose in the Middle Ages; the slogan "self-determination of peoples" was originated by the Russian Communists; the system of "mandate government" was born in the fact of Britain teaching her colonies to become self-governing dominions. Still less worth mentioning are those, including Roosevelt, who have come after Wilson. Therefore to consider US diplomacy as stupid is both "natural and necessary."

- E H P -

- 2 -

**RESTRICTED**