

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vii
INTRODUCTION: TINDER.....	1
CHAPTER 1: FANNING THE FLAMES.....	20
CHAPTER 2: SALVATION THROUGH FIRE.....	52
CHAPTER 3: TEMPERING AN ALLIANCE.....	83
CONCLUSION: EMBERS.....	110
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	117

ABSTRACT

The China Lobby was able to construct political and public support for Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist regime, the Guomindang (GMD), using rhetoric and tactics that stymied opposition to its cause following World War II. These methods continued to influence American policies and opinions throughout the Cold War in Asia.

There was no formal organization that proclaimed itself the China Lobby. This makes it difficult to analyze its impact on American policy during the Cold War's formative stages. However, the use of social construction theory provides insight into how an inchoate mass of individuals and interests coalesced to influence U.S. policy. The basic premise of social construction theory is that reality depends on how events are portrayed and received by actors. Therefore, the creation of a social problem is dependent on claimsmakers who communicate and define a subject as a threat to some segment of society. The China Lobby's rhetoric was successful in creating a social problem that received broad attention by policymakers and public support in favor of aiding the GMD.

The China Lobby effectively mobilized American opinion in favor of Chiang Kai-shek's regime during the Chinese Civil War using rhetoric that lauded the Chinese Nationalists while defaming their communist rivals and American critics. This helped lay the foundations for McCarthyism. McCarthyism and the Korean War reinvigorated the China Lobby's campaign to aid the GMD, which the Truman administration was willing to write off in 1950. This aided the China Lobby's efforts to ensure neither the United States nor the United Nations (U.N.) would recognize the newly formed People's Republic of China (PRC). As the Korean War drew to a close a Republican was in the White House and the China Lobby continued its campaign to block the PRC's recognition. The First Taiwan Straits Crisis provided the fodder the China

Lobby needed to block recognition of the PRC in the U.N. and cemented America's alliance with the GMD. The U.S. policy of non-recognition continued until President Richard M. Nixon's historic 1972 trip to China.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the support provided by the staff and faculty of the History Department. Their dedication and professionalism greatly enhanced my experience as a graduate student and provided me with the insight necessary to successfully do history. In particular I would like to thank Dr. Mark Spaulding for organizing a research trip to the National Archives in College Park, Maryland, that greatly enhanced the direction of my thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. David La Vere for providing guidance on how history is done and giving me the opportunity to work as a Teaching Assistant. My thanks also go to Dr. Andrew Clark who was encouraging and understanding as I worked on my thesis while working as his TA.

I am unable to fully express my appreciation for my thesis committee, though I will try, and I will be forever indebted to them for their assistance. Dr. W. Taylor Fain, in addition to whetting my curiosity for foreign relations as an undergraduate, provided me with insight into the field of U.S. foreign relations as well as guidance throughout my time as a graduate student. Dr. Yixin Chen gave me greater understanding of East Asian and Chinese history as well as provided me with the opportunity to further my studies abroad. Dr. Kathleen C. Berkeley, along with her voluminous knowledge of American history, helped me understand how historians analyze other historians' works in addition to admonishing me to "remember the ladies." Dr. John S. Rice has provided me with support since I was an undergraduate and continued to provide me with guidance on sociological theory as I attempted to write history from a sociological perspective. Without all of their erudite counsel my thesis would have been far inferior.

My appreciation also goes to the School of Nursing, which helped me get to this point by providing me with a research assistant position. In particular Dr. Janie Canty-Mitchell was of great assistance by giving a history graduate student with sociological training the chance to assist nursing faculty with their research projects. My work there benefited me when it came time to use numerical data in my own work.

As those we are surrounded by form our experiences and aid our accomplishments I must thank my fellow graduate students. In particular my foreign relations allies Matt Jacobs, Rob Morrison, and Matt Shannon were instrumental in shaping my experience at UNC-Wilmington. Even though we studied different regions, their historical knowledge and ability greatly assisted me in every facet of my time as a graduate student. Their camaraderie pushed me to do more, more quickly, than I would have been able to do otherwise.

Last, and assuredly not least, this thesis would not have been possible without my family. My wife Janira Clark, who let me quit working full time and agreed to live on student incomes while we both continued our educations, and my daughter Sofia Clark who, for all the frustration, really makes everything worthwhile. They both helped to keep me grounded, reminding me that life does exist outside of monographs and, just sometimes, it is all right to take a break from research and writing.

In the end, any errors made in this thesis are no ones responsibility other than my own.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my daughter Sofia Clark. She reminds me that there is more to life than history. I can only hope that my understanding of the past will be of value to her future.

INTRODUCTION: TINDER

On an unusually warm spring day in March 1955 President Dwight D. Eisenhower held a press conference on topics both foreign and domestic.¹ Though reporters pursued questions about a wide assortment of topics, ongoing tensions in the Far East continued to resurface. Charles S. Von Fremd of CBS asked for a clarification of comments made by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles the night before regarding the possible use of nuclear weapons if war broke out again in Asia. Eisenhower's response likely did little to quell anyone's fears. In combat, against military targets, Eisenhower saw "no reason why they [nuclear weapons] shouldn't be used exactly as you would a bullet or anything else."² He went on to say that the only difficulty involved in using these weapons was the possibility of civilians being mixed in with military targets but, save for that lone qualifier, "[he] would say, yes, of course they would be used."³ Though the Second World War in the Pacific had ended in August 1945, shortly after the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the region continued to demand attention in the bipolar world of the Cold War. China's communist revolution was the one factor above all others that made Asia perhaps the most contested arena of the Cold War. However, the reason China and Asia were on the forefront for so many Americans during this early period was because of the efforts of an eclectic group known as the China Lobby. This group's support for Chinese Nationalist Leader Chiang Kai-shek was a key reason why Eisenhower and Dulles were willing to risk nuclear war over a pair of islands that were widely understood to have no strategic purpose other than to demonstrate American willingness to support Chiang's regime in exile.

¹ "Weather Throughout the Nation," *New York Times*, 17 Mar 1955. Hereafter referred to as *NYT*.

² "Transcript of Presidential Press Conference on Foreign and Domestic Affairs," *NYT*, 17 Mar 1955.

³ "Transcript of Presidential Press Conference on Foreign and Domestic Affairs," *NYT*, 17 Mar 1955.

China had excited Americans' imaginations since before the republic's founding. Missionaries looked to the world's most populous country and saw it teeming with souls in need of salvation.⁴ Businessmen and policymakers saw markets overflowing with consumers ready to purchase American goods.⁵ Thus between 1899 and 1900 Secretary of State John Hay issued the Open Door Notes enumerating America's interest in maintaining the United States' right to trade in a nation being carved into spheres of influence by European imperial powers.⁶ The fall of the Qing Dynasty in 1912 led to the collapse of traditional Chinese authority and resulted in a period of warlordism that was largely quelled by the Chinese Nationalist Party, the Guomindang (GMD), in alliance with the Chinese Communist Party (CCP).

During this period the United States helped fight the First World War and endured its first Red Scare that followed Russia's 1917 October Revolution. The GMD-CCP coalition was dissolved in 1927 when Chiang Kai-shek expelled and persecuted the communists, forcing them to flee to the North. The United States backed Chiang's new regime, while Mao Zedong maneuvered for power within the CCP. As Japan continued to expand its empire in Asia, conquering Manchuria and setting up the puppet state of Manchukuo in 1931, it threatened the balance of power in the region. By the time the Sino-Japanese War broke out in 1937, Hitler's and Mussolini's forces were on the rise. War soon broke out in Europe after Germany invaded Poland in 1939. Following Japan's bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941 the wars in Europe and the

⁴ Some works that analyze American missionaries in China are Kenneth S. Latourette, *A History of Christian Missions in China*, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929); Murray A. Rubenstein, *The Origins of the Anglo-American Missionary Enterprise in China*, (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1996); Michael H. Hunt, *The Making of a Special Relationship: The United States and China to 1914*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983).

⁵ A work that looks at early American business interests in China is Jonathan Goldstein, *Philadelphia and the China Trade, 1682-1846: Commercial, Cultural and Attitudinal Effects*, (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1978).

⁶ For an analysis of the importance of the Open Door Notes and their underlying philosophy's impact on U.S. foreign relations see William Appleman Williams, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*, (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1959); for an argument that warns against the over application of Williams's open door thesis see Melvyn P. Leffler, "The Origins of Republican War Debt Policy, 1921-1923: A Case Study in the Applicability of the Open Door Interpretation," *Journal of American History* 59 (Dec. 1972): 585-601.

Pacific were linked as the United States entry into both theatres formalized the Second World War. During the war the United States provided the GMD with aid to keep Japan from conquering all of China and also won recognition from Stalin for Chiang's role as the rightful leader of the nation. With the Allies successful conclusion to World War II, however, the civil war that had began when Chiang purged the communists from the coalition government in 1927 erupted with renewed fervor. This new conflagration was different in the context of the Cold War, which pitted the Soviet Union and the United States in an ideological conflict that would leave no corner of the world untouched.⁷

The postwar period of Sino-American relations has been an important focal point in scholarly study and debate, as it spawned a communist state, two major wars, and three crises in the Taiwan Strait. Initial accounts examined how the United States' involvement in China failed to secure American interests there. The father of modern Chinese studies, John King Fairbank, was one of the first scholars to analyze the role of American policy during this tumultuous period. In *The United States and China*, originally published in 1948 and updated numerous times, Fairbank stressed that the United States needed to understand China as a people and a nation, not just an ideological construct or Soviet puppet.⁸ He stressed that the loss of China came in the American response to Communist China, especially under McCarthyism. The excesses of the Second Red Scare led to the loss of contact with one of the world's oldest and largest civilizations as well as the purge of Sinologists, further increasing an already gaping cultural divide. In *America's Failure in China* Tang Tsou pointed out that pundits and politicians who claimed that America had "lost" China were mistaken, as China had never been America's

⁷ For a thorough analysis of the global reach of the Cold War see Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of our Times*, (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

⁸ John King Fairbank, *The United States and China*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959).

to lose.⁹ He did, however, agree that U.S. policy in China failed as a result of American diplomats and politicians ethnocentrism, which impeded their ability to view other cultures, especially political ones, without comparing them to America. Fairbank and Tsou determined that American ethnocentrism dominated policymaking and adversely affected Sino-American relations. Further analyses of this period and region received renewed focus in the 1970s when Fairbank, speaking as the American Historical Association's new president, delivered a speech, "Assignment for the '70s," in December 1968, one of the most tumultuous years in American and world history.¹⁰

In his address Fairbank stated that the world was coming to a crisis, and China represented a special problem because of its distinct culture and history, which was far removed from the histories of Europe or America. Reiterating a key theme of *The United States and China*, he called for a greater understanding of China and East Asia in American studies. From the work of missionaries to U.S.-China trade relations, all areas needed more in-depth analysis. He also declared "the new field of American-East Asian relations must grow in the 1970's... from the East Asian end."¹¹ Using Vietnam as an example, Fairbank highlighted the importance for Americans to increase their understanding of non-European cultures, especially during the nuclear age. American historians heeded Fairbank's call, addressing the breadth and depth of U.S.-East Asian relations. As documents became available and U.S.-China rapprochement, which began with President Richard M. Nixon's historic 1972 trip, continued through the decade there was a renewed emphasis on understanding Asia in the postwar period.

⁹ Tang Tsou, *America's Failure in China*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963).

¹⁰ John K. Fairbank, "Assignment for the '70s," *American Historical Review*, (Feb., 1969), 861-879; For a work that details the international character of the 1960s, particularly their 1968 climax, see Jeremi Suri, *Power & Protest: Global Revolution and the Rise of Détente*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003).

¹¹ Fairbank, "Assignment for the '70s," 878.

In 1980 Joseph Camilleri wrote a broad overview of Chinese foreign policy.¹² He determined that the PRC went through three phases in its foreign policy from revolution to transition and then post-revolution. He also found that even during its most aggressive revolutionary phase the PRC was essentially cautious in its foreign affairs. Although Camilleri's work fulfilled Fairbanks' call for attempting to understand China it was compromised by his inability to consult Chinese sources. A significant turning point occurred in Beijing in 1986 when a joint American and Chinese conference on Sino-American relations from 1945-1955 took place.¹³ The director of Beijing University's Institute of International Relations Zhang Wenjin opened the conference by acknowledging its significance.¹⁴ It had taken two years of planning in the United States and the PRC, featured young and established scholars, and represented the beginning of a new era in the study of Sino-American relations. With the collapse of the Soviet Union five years later, in 1991, and the continued normalization of relations between the United States and China, scholars obtained access to previously unavailable archives. This rapprochement combined with the emerging trend towards multinational and multiarchival studies, which began in the 1980s, and transformed the field of the history of U.S. foreign relations.

The critical decade following the Second World War continued to be a period of intense scholarly study and debate in this new era. Two themes of America's China policy that developed prior to this period were challenged in the emerging literature. The first one,

¹² Joseph Camilleri, *Chinese Foreign Policy: The Maoist Era and its Aftermath*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1980). An earlier work that did this, but examined a different era, was Michael H. Hunt, *Frontier Defense and the Open Door: Manchuria in Chinese-American Relations, 1895-1911*, (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1973). Hunt argued that both American and Chinese policymakers failed to understand each other as the Qing Dynasty began to collapse by using both American and Chinese sources.

¹³ The presentations given during this conference were gathered and published in Harry Harding and Yuan Ming, eds., *Sino-American Relations, 1945-1955: A Joint Reassessment of a Critical Decade*, (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1989).

¹⁴ Zhang Wenjin, "Foreward," in Harding and Yuan, eds., *Sino American Relations*, xv-xvi.

explained in Allen Mayer's *Cracking the Monolith*, 1986, posited that the United States had understood communism was not monolithic and worked to create a rift between the PRC and USSR that was realized when the Sino-Soviet split climaxed in 1969.¹⁵ The other theme, detailed by Gordon H. Chang's *Friends and Enemies*, 1990, was that U.S. policymakers saw a greater threat from New China than from Soviet Russia and eased tensions with the USSR in an effort to force the PRC to reconcile with the West.¹⁶ Robert Accinelli refuted both of these arguments in 1996.¹⁷ U.S. foreign policy in East Asia had no overarching theme, he argued. It was reactionary and prone to manipulation by American allies. South Korea and Taiwan were successful at garnering U.S. support while America's European allies restrained the United States from pursuing more aggressive policies in the region. There was no grand strategy to force China to split from the Soviet Union or to deal with the West. U.S. policy essentially lurched from episode to episode in an attempt to secure its national security interests, which fluctuated in Asia throughout the Cold War. However, America's policies were not the only ones receiving more critical analyses during this period.

Historians also picked up on Camilleri's efforts to rewrite China back into the story of Sino-American relations in the postwar period. Shu Guang Zhang agreed with Fairbanks and Tang's earlier analyses of American misperceptions, but also highlighted that Chinese policymakers failed to understand America as well.¹⁸ Zhang's work gave agency back to China by stating that there were mutual misunderstandings in the postwar years and that responsibility

¹⁵ David Allen Mayers, *Cracking the Monolith: U.S. Policy against the Sino-Soviet Alliance, 1949-1955*, (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1986).

¹⁶ Gordon H. Chang, *Friends and Enemies: The United States, China, and the Soviet Union, 1948-1972*, (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990).

¹⁷ Robert Accinelli, *Crisis and Commitment: United States Policy toward Taiwan, 1950-1955*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

¹⁸ Shu Guang Zhang, *Deterrence and Strategic Culture: Chinese-American Confrontations, 1949-1958*, (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992).

for strained relations was not solely the fault of U.S. policymakers. Odd Arne Westad challenged the postwar loss of China rhetoric by taking the Chinese Civil War out of American or Russian history and placing it squarely back in China while still acknowledging its international character in *Decisive Encounters*.¹⁹ Chen Jian, in *Mao's China and the Cold War*, 2001, also emphasized China's centrality in the political maneuvering of the Cold War.²⁰ Like the United States and Soviet Union, New China was ideologically driven during this period and had a unique ideology based on revolution and a mentality of victimization resulting from China's exploitation by nineteenth century Western imperialism. All of these historians demonstrated China's role in developing the strained Sino-American relationship of the postwar world as well as the value of multinational and multiarchival studies for understanding historic phenomena.

Fairbank's call to understand China from the Chinese side has become a dominant theme in the field. At the same time the American side has also been receiving renewed attention. In *From Allies to Enemies*, 2007, Simei Qing argued U.S.-China interactions took place between two countries with vastly different backgrounds.²¹ Their unique histories, cultures, peoples, and economies were so radically different that finding common ground was nearly impossible. This gulf was especially apparent in their different interpretations of modernity and morality. Qing draws on social psychology and culture to explain how these two nations were incapable of forming a mutually productive relationship. The results of these differences were mutual misperceptions and counterproductive policies for both sides. Qing drew out and strengthened the arguments posited by Zhang, as well as deepening the theories originally espoused by Fairbanks and Tsou. However, one factor that influenced U.S. policy in Asia during this period

¹⁹ Odd Arne Westad, *Decisive Encounters: The Chinese Civil War, 1946-1950*, (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2003).

²⁰ Chen Jian, *Mao's China and the Cold War*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).

²¹ Simei Qing, *From Allies to Enemies: Visions of Modernity, Identity, and U.S.-China Diplomacy, 1945-1960*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007).

has received limited attention by scholars, though it has been widely acknowledged as a significant factor in Sino-American relations during the critical postwar period: the China Lobby.

Ross Koen wrote the first in depth analysis of the China Lobby in 1960. In *The China Lobby in American Politics*, Koen argued that the lobby profoundly influenced U.S. diplomacy and opinion in favor of Chiang Kai-shek's government.²² By discrediting China specialists who criticized Chiang and directing the rhetoric of America's failure in China the China Lobby was largely successful. Koen's work was actually suppressed by the lobby, however, which got the publisher to destroy 4,000 copies leaving only 800 in circulation. Of those 800, many were actually replaced with a lobby tract titled *The Red China Lobby*.²³ Thus Koen's work had to wait until it was republished in 1974, following U.S.-China rapprochement, to receive wide circulation. Stanley Bachrack wrote the only other published work that examines the China Lobby in *The Committee of One Million*, 1976.²⁴ Bachrack followed the creation of a committee that was originally formed in 1953 to keep the United Nations from recognizing New China and later influenced American policy toward the PRC in general. Other than some works that examine particular members of the China Lobby, such as Robert Herzstein's *Henry R. Luce, Time, and the American Crusade in China*, few other publications have analyzed this pressure group explicitly.²⁵

Although only Koen and Bachrack have directly examined the China Lobby, many works address it, referring to it as either the China bloc or pro-Chiang lobby or using other descriptions as well as its more recognizable moniker. These include the previously mentioned works of

²² Ross Y. Koen, *The China Lobby in American Politics*, (New York: Octagon Books, 1974).

²³ Richard C. Kagan, "Introduction," in Koen, *The China Lobby*, ix.

²⁴ Stanley D. Bachrack, *The Committee of One Million: "China Lobby" Politics, 1953-1971*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976).

²⁵ Robert E. Herzstein, *Henry R. Luce, Time, and the American Crusade in China*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Tsou, Chang, Accinelli, Westad, and seven of the seventeen presentations at the 1986 joint American and Chinese conference in Beijing who acknowledged the lobby's role in America's China policy.²⁶ This is by no means an exhaustive list of works that mention the China Lobby.²⁷ The reason this group of influential individuals, whose members included politicians, businessmen, soldiers, and scholars, has received so little attention is the difficulty of measuring their impact on Sino-American relations without relying on a method outside of traditional historical inquiry. As Warren Cohen pointed out in a review of *The China Lobby*, "there was never a Monolithic 'China Lobby,'" which remains a valid observation.²⁸ Until the Committee for One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations was formed in 1953 there was no single group or organization that formed the China Lobby. This causes difficulties in attempting to analyze its impact on American policy during the Cold War's formative stages. However, the use of social construction theory has the potential to provide insight into how an inchoate mass of individuals and interests coalesced to influence American policy.

²⁶ Rao Geping, "The Kuomintang Government's Policy toward the United States," in eds. Harding and Yuan, *Sino-American Relations*, 51-62; William Stueck, "The Marshall and Wedemeyer Missions: A Quadrilateral Perspective," in *Ibid.*, 96-118; Yuan Ming, "The Failure of Perception: America's China Policy, 1949-50," in *Ibid.*, 143-156; John Lewis Gaddis, "The American 'Wedge' Strategy, 1949-1955," in *Ibid.*, 157-183; Wang Jisi, "The Origins of America's 'Two China' Policy," in *Ibid.*, 198-212; Nancy Bernkopf Tucker, "Cold War Contacts: American and China, 1952-1956," in *Ibid.*, 238-266; Wang Jisi, "An Appraisal of U.S. Policy Toward China, 1945-1955, and its Aftermath," 289-310.

²⁷ Some other works that have addressed the China Lobby are Bruce Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War, Vol. II: Roaring of the Cataract, 1947-1950*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990); David Halberstam, *The Coldest Winter: America and the Korean War*, (New York: Hyperion, 2007); Rosemary Foot, "Redefinitions: The Domestic Context of America's China Policy in the 1960s," in eds. Robert S. Ross and Jiang Changbin, *Re-examining the Cold War: U.S.-China Diplomacy, 1954-1973*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 238-61; Michael Schaller, "Détente and the Strategic Triangle: Or, 'Drinking Your Mao Tai and Having Your Vodka, Too,'" in *Ibid.*, 361-92.

²⁸ Warren I. Cohen, "Who's Afraid of Alfred Kohlberg?," review of *The China Lobby in American Politics* by Ross Y. Koen; *Lost Chance in China: The World II Dispatches of John S. Service*, ed. by Joseph W. Esherick; *The Institute of Pacific Relations: Asian Scholars and American Politics*, by John N. Thomas, *Reviews in American History* 3 (Mar. 1975): 118-123, p. 120.

Broadly defined, social construction theory posits individual reality is dependent on the internalization and reification of socially constructed symbols.²⁹ Peter Berger and Thomas Luckman effectively explain the results of this process in *The Social Construction of Reality*, as “what is ‘real’ to a Tibetan monk may not be ‘real’ to an American businessman.”³⁰ This has particular relevance for studying how and why an issue becomes labeled a social problem, like communist infiltration of the State Department in the postwar period. An objectivist approach to social problem creation rests on an assumption that a problem actually exists. Simply put, society recognizes an issue as a problem and responds to it. Unfortunately an objective analysis of society fails to explain why some issues become regarded as social problems during certain periods and not others. The constructionist approach to social problems, on the other hand, argues that for an issue to become a social problem it has to be brought to the attention of the public. A certain group or segment of society make claims that a particular issue is really a social problem and how others respond to these claims either validates or invalidates that topic as a problem. In order to understand how social problems are created it is necessary to examine the claimsmakers.³¹

Claimsmakers can be divided into two groups, the first being primary claimsmakers. These crusaders attempt to redefine an issue as a societal concern and bring it to the attention of the public, such as the possible domination of China by communists. Whether primary claimsmakers are political insiders or outsiders affects how they attempt to generate public

²⁹ For the foundations of social construction theory see the seminal works by Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons, (New York: Routledge Classics, 2001) and Alfred Shutz, *The Phenomenology of the Social World*, trans. George Walsh and Frederick Lehnert, (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1967).

³⁰ Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckman, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, (New York: Anchor Books, 1966), 3.

³¹ Joel Best, *Threatened Children: Rhetoric and Concern about Child-Victims*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 8-11; Erich Goode and Nachmen Ben-Yahuda, “Moral Panics: Culture, Politics, and Social Construction,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 20 (1994): 149-171, pp. 151-53.

concern over an issue. Insiders, or pressure groups, have greater access to policymakers and experience in creating public awareness for their cause.³² Political leaders are the ultimate insiders and also act as primary claimsmakers, serving an important function in generating public concern for an issue.³³ Outsiders, or interest groups, have to generate public interest in their cause in order to gain access to policymakers. Primary claimsmakers' objective is to influence public policy, and public opinion comprises an important aspect of achieving that influence.³⁴ Therefore, defining the problem is an essential component of the crusaders' message.

Primary claimsmakers attempt to define their topics in noncontroversial terms in order to gain widespread acceptance of an issue as a social problem, also known as a valence issue. A valence issue is a subject that "elicits a single, strong, fairly uniform emotional response and does not have an adversarial quality."³⁵ This can be contrasted with position issues, which have no single strong response and are often highly controversial.³⁶ By defining the problem crusaders try to mitigate conflict, but if conflict arises the parameters for debate that an issue might raise are already set.³⁷ The character of social problems is significantly influenced by contemporary conditions.³⁸ During times of economic recession class issues are more prevalent. In periods of economic prosperity more devotion is given to status issues. Essentially this means in times of plenty people can devote more attention to ideological struggles.³⁹ Class movements are composed of particular groups engaged in the economic system that desire some change in that

³² Best, *Threatened Children*, 13-15.

³³ Daniel Béland, "Insecurity and Politics: A Framework," *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 32 (2007): 317-340, pp. 319.

³⁴ Best, *Threatened Children*, 13.

³⁵ Barbara J. Nelson, *Making an Issue of Child Abuse: Political Agenda Setting for Social Problems*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 27.

³⁶ Nelson, *Making an Issue of Child Abuse*, 27.

³⁷ Best, *Threatened Children*, 26-27.

³⁸ Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, ed. John B. Thompson, trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991), 177, 179.

³⁹ Joseph R. Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement*, (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1963), 17.

system. Status movements, however, can be composed of status communities—Catholics or Protestants, whites or blacks—and status collectives—people who consider themselves to be traditional or modern—who are concerned with the allocation of prestige.⁴⁰ Therefore, when primary claimsmakers propose a topic as a problem by casting it as a valence issue during a period of economic prosperity they are likely to receive widespread support. Thus the call to fight communism, both domestically and in China, found a receptive audience as the American economy expanded following the Second World War. This public support is particularly important for garnering attention for the crusaders' cause, which is where the next group of claimsmakers comes into play.

The media and, to a lesser extent, popular culture serve as the main conduit between crusaders and the larger public. Because the media retranslate an issue before projecting it to an audience they act as secondary claimsmakers. This serves the dual purpose of legitimating an issue for interest groups or providing a larger audience for pressure groups.⁴¹ When crusaders provide valence issues the news media are able to provide coverage while playing the role of the defender of public morality. The media, however, have limited resources and must carefully select stories that will receive the most attention.⁴² The press is more likely to report sensational topics and extreme examples of the issue presented, because more dramatic stories create better news. By typifying the problem the press sets the tone of the public reaction, which becomes a factor in the official response, which then provides the press with more news for the topic.⁴³ The public, though, is only capable of absorbing so much information. This results in competition

⁴⁰ Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade*, 20-21. Gusfield's work is based on Max Weber's concept of class and status groups which can be found in Max Weber, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, trans. and ed. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), 180-195.

⁴¹ Best, *Threatened Children*, 19, 88.

⁴² Best, *Threatened Children*, 88; Nelson, *Making an Issue of Child Abuse*, 52.

⁴³ Nelson, *Making an Issue of Child Abuse*, 71-72; Best, *Threatened Children*, 68-69.

among primary claimsmakers for attention and secondary claimsmakers to maintain interest in an issue.

The arena where issues vie for public attention and official action can be understood as a social problems marketplace.⁴⁴ What this means is “the fates of potential problems are governed not only by their objective natures but by a highly selective process in which they compete with one another for public attention and societal resources.”⁴⁵ Because both the media and crusaders have limited resources to devote to an issue at any given time, and individuals can only devote so much attention to information not directly related to their lives, there is a natural carrying capacity within society for social problems.⁴⁶ Crusaders’ efforts to influence public opinion and policy depend on their ability to craft a message that can penetrate the market. The media’s decision to pick up that message and spread it to their audiences depends on the potential to generate greater consumption for their product. Therefore, crusaders’ rhetoric is an essential aspect of their effort to gain support for their cause.

Rhetoric is a central feature of primary claimsmakers’ campaigns. After an issue has been defined and typified, setting the grounds of debate, crusaders need to construct an argument that makes the issue worthy of sustained attention in the social problems marketplace. Because grounds can be challenged, warrants are essential to claims-making rhetoric.⁴⁷ Warrants, which are usually implicit, “are statements that justify drawing conclusions from the grounds. Disputes about grounds... need not damage conclusions.”⁴⁸ A key in claimsmakers’ rhetoric is the focus on “Folk Devils,” the individual deviant, or conspiracy group, to explain the causes of a social

⁴⁴ Best, *Threatened Children*, 87.

⁴⁵ Stephen Hilgartner and Charles L. Bosk, “The Rise and Fall of Social Problems: A Public Arenas Model,” *Journal of Sociology* 94 (Jul. 1988): 53-78, pp. 57.

⁴⁶ Hilgartner & Bosk, “The Rise and Fall of Social Problems,” 58-61

⁴⁷ Best, *Threatened Children*, 26-32.

⁴⁸ Best, *Threatened Children*, 31.

problem.⁴⁹ For popular culture the need for an antagonist is relatively apparent. For example, in a novel or film it would be exceedingly difficult for the hero to tackle legislative reform in order to quell the perpetuation of socio-economic factors that generate the appeal of communism at home or abroad rather than just taking on a deranged individual or group that can be eliminated. The news media also offer solutions that are distinctly individualistic, but for less obvious reasons. If the media present an issue as being the result of particular social conditions, such as class, race, gender, region, or religion, it becomes controversial, especially if it requires a reallocation of economic resources.⁵⁰ Conversely, a social problem that is ubiquitous in the society and the result of deviant individuals leaves the media free from ideological battles that arise when social conditions are addressed.⁵¹ Using the individual to explain social problems insulates the public from personal responsibility in the issue, allowing them to treat the problem as the result of nameless others.

Statistics that support arguments that a topic is widespread are also an essential factor in the propagation of an issue as a social problem. Numbers and statistics offer concrete evidence to support the rhetoric of claimsmakers and in China numbers are very large compared to Western standards. When a crusader represents a number as a fact it often receives little scrutiny and becomes repeated by the media with little analysis of how that figure was reached.⁵² Claimsmakers are able to get broader support by providing evidence that a problem actually exists. What the public fail to understand and the media choose not to explain is that “all statistics are the products of social processes.”⁵³ How a question is worded, responses gathered

⁴⁹ Goode & Yahuda, “Moral Panics,” 156; Best, *Threatened Children*, 102-106, 112, 180; Gusfield, *Symbolic Crusade*, 74-75, 149.

⁵⁰ Nelson, *Making an Issue of Child Abuse*, 52.

⁵¹ Best, *Threatened Children*, 106-107.

⁵² Best, *Threatened Children*, 46-47; Nelson, *Making an Issue of Child Abuse*, 59.

⁵³ Best, *Threatened Children*, 45.

and then analyzed are all subject to interpretation and manipulation. However, statistics rarely receive scrutiny unless they challenge established economic interests.⁵⁴ By coupling these facts with a valence issue, claimsmakers are able to gather broad-based support for recognition by the public and policymakers that their issue deserves attention.⁵⁵ Social problems are not static, and as challenges occur to the grounds and figures of the crusaders they adjust their warrants and definitions accordingly. Successful campaigns also generate expansions of what constitutes a social problem.

Crusaders seeking access to the social problems market place will often use established topics to make their cases. By relying on a topic that is already recognized by the public and validated by the media new claims are able to get more attention than if they had to initiate a new campaign. This is especially true if the original problem created institutional structures that specialize in dealing with that topic, such as the House Un-American Activities Committee.⁵⁶ In certain extreme situations this expansion can result in moral panics, in which the media, policymakers, and public respond disproportionately to the problem.⁵⁷ More often, however, politicians will adopt the social problem to campaign against allowing them to pass legislation that may not receive public support otherwise.⁵⁸ This helps elevate the original problem and leads to collective insecurity in a society that politicians can continue to use to their advantage.⁵⁹ Becoming an institutionalized concern that receives widespread recognition and results in attention by policymakers and the public, a social problem becomes a semi-permanent or

⁵⁴ Best, *Threatened Children*, 63.

⁵⁵ Hilgartner & Bosk, "The Rise and Fall of Social Problems," 61-62.

⁵⁶ Best, *Threatened Children*, 80; Hilgartner & Bosk, "The Rise and Fall of Social Problems," 66.

⁵⁷ Goode & Yahuda, "Moral Panics," 156.

⁵⁸ Béland, "Insecurity and Politics," 330.

⁵⁹ Béland, "Insecurity and Politics," 320.

permanent aspect of society. When examined within this paradigm the China Lobby becomes a tangible entity in the history of Sino-American relations.

The China Lobby was a group of primary claimsmakers who wanted to obtain greater aid for Chiang Kai-shek's regime. They used communism in Asia and American foreign policy to pursue this agenda. The lobby was a pressure group that had access to the levers of government, and included prominent members of the U.S. Congress. It used established systems, like the House Un-American Activities Committee, and officials to broadcast their message to the public. During the Second Red Scare that developed after the Second World War ended in 1945 and lasted until 1960 few Americans were willing to defend the rights of communists, making the lobby's chosen message a valence issue. The postwar period was also marked by economic expansion allowing Americans to devote their attention to status issues. Communists, then, served as folk devils in the insecurity spawned by the nuclear age. The media questioned few of the assertions coming from politicians and the threat of communism saturated the news. An examination of U.S.-China relations during this period highlights how the China Lobby was able to influence American foreign policy during the Cold War's formative stages.

The China Lobby's original objective was to increase U.S. aid for the GMD, first during the Second Sino-Japanese War, which became part of the Pacific War, and then the Chinese Civil War. To obtain this aid, pro-Chiang crusaders defined the issue as more than choosing sides in a civil war, but as part of America's struggle against international communism. By directing the public discourse to a narrowly defined topic of being either pro-Nationalist or pro-communist, the GMD crusaders found an effective argument. As the Cold War began to develop, a Second Red Scare began to sweep through America providing the crusaders' rhetoric with plausibility. As the rhetoric became more credible, claimsmakers began to disseminate their

statements more widely. The basis of their argument was that communists and fellow travelers had infiltrated the State Department. Using this to bludgeon the current administration, Republicans picked up this line of attack to use against their Democratic rivals, who had been in power since President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's first election in 1932. These messages became particularly powerful after the Chinese Communist Party's defeat of the GMD in 1949. Originally formed by pro-Chiang crusaders, the China Lobby crafted a message that resonated with the public and appealed to the minority party in the U.S. government. The culmination of their rhetoric came with the drafting of NSC-68, which codified some of the China Lobby's key arguments.

Senator Joseph McCarthy's (R-Wis.) sensational claims against the State Department were drawn directly from the China Lobby and resulted in one of the most repressive eras in U.S. history. As McCarthy's attacks buffeted the State Department with help from prominent China lobbyists, the Truman administration declared its intent to wash its hands of the situation in China. Fortunately for the China Lobby the outbreak of the Korean War a few short months after McCarthy appeared on the scene reenergized their faltering campaign. In January of 1950 Truman announced what was essentially a hands-off policy towards China. But with the outbreak of the Korean War and the entry of the PRC's People's Liberation Army (PLA) on the side of North Korea, Chiang's regime became a necessary tool in U.S. policy in the Far East. The stationing of the Seventh Fleet off the coast of Taiwan before the PLA crossed the Yalu River indicated the GMD's increased relevance for American aims in Asia. Some of the key goals of the lobby during this period were the continued support of the United States for the GMD as well as keeping the PRC from obtaining recognition in the United Nations, which would hobble the Nationalists' claim as the legitimate government of China. China Lobby crusaders were also able

to fend off an investigation into their activities, by employing the rhetoric used with such efficacy against the State Department to assault those few politicians and individuals who called for an investigation of the lobby's influence and motives.

The China Lobby continued its attack on the State Department for its failure in China, and in 1953 Dwight D. Eisenhower became the first Republican president since Herbert Hoover left office. Though Eisenhower and his Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, took actions to placate the China Lobby and a public that was growing increasingly bellicose toward the PRC, they did not drastically alter the Truman administration's policies in China. The crusaders' goals remained non-recognition of the PRC in the United States and U.N. However, with the successful conclusion of an armistice in Korea, the China Lobby's goal of keeping the PRC out of the United Nations was endangered. Many of America's allies favored recognition of the government that controlled the Chinese mainland, making continued non-recognition more difficult. Fortunately, for Chiang and his supporters, in 1954 the PRC began shelling the Nationalist held isle of Jinmen, precipitating a crisis in the Taiwan Strait. The China Lobby, keeping pressure on the administration, was able to obtain a formal defense treaty between the United States and Taiwan. They also continued their anti-communist rhetoric to convince Americans of the depravity of the PRC and bolstered the opinion that the GMD was a legitimate recipient of U.S. support. Washington's formal entanglement with Taipei destroyed Sino-American relations until President Richard M. Nixon's historic trip to China in 1972 signaled a shift in American policy. The China Lobby, however, would continue its campaign of non-recognition while fighting any possibility of the United States recognizing two Chinas throughout this era.

Eisenhower's threat of nuclear war against the PRC on that spring day in 1955 was not issued out of a lack of concern for human life. It was the response of an astute politician who realized that the American public needed a show of force in the face of the communist threat in East Asia that they feared was a threat to the American way of life. However, what the public failed to grasp was that this threat had been exaggerated and broadcast by a disparate group of pro-Chiang crusaders. The media and popular culture spread this message until it was regarded as an established fact. Politicians and policymakers were then able to influence, or were influenced by, public demands for action. By analyzing the China Lobby's role during this period it is possible to discern how domestic politics influenced foreign policy and how international affairs shaped domestic concerns at the height of the Cold War.

CHAPTER 1: FANNING THE FLAMES

World War II was over. The May 1945 Allied victory in Europe was followed three months later with the successful conclusion of the war in the Pacific, and America began to adjust to its new leadership role in a changed world. The world was not going to return to the pre-war status quo. Former European colonies began seeking their independence and their former masters lacked the resources to retain them. The tenuous alliance between the Allies also began to degenerate quickly, as the Soviet Union's and United States' ideological differences came to the fore without the threat of an external aggressor. Americans were focused on Europe as the USSR began to establish friendly buffer states against any future encroachment. However, the developing Cold War would not be waged in Europe alone. Its battles would take place in the Far East, pitting Western liberal-capitalism against revolutionary-communism. China, in particular, would become both a battleground and symbol of this postwar conflict.

On 26 November 1945, a few short months after the Allied victory over Japan in the Pacific theater, General Patrick Hurley resigned his post as U.S. ambassador to China. The following day he released the text of his resignation letter to the media. The resignation was, in and of itself, nothing particularly special. Hurley originally talked about resigning because of poor health after returning to the states from China, but had agreed to stay on after talking to Secretary of State James F. Byrnes.¹ The turnabout was a surprise, particularly as his announcement came a few hours after speaking with President Harry S. Truman about the need to return to China.² More disconcerting, however, Hurley took aim at the State Department. He charged that “a considerable section of our State Department is endeavoring to support

¹ Bertram D. Hulen, “Action is a Surprise,” *NYT*, 28 Nov. 1945.

² Harry S. Truman, *Memoirs by Harry S. Truman, Vol. II: Years of Trial and Hope*, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1956), 65-66.

communism generally as well as specifically in China,” and “there is a third world war in the making.”³ This was neither the first nor the last attack on the State Department during the critical postwar period, but it was the first involving a high-level administration official. His vociferous claims of malfeasance and sabotage of U.S. foreign policy suddenly propelled the claims of a small coterie of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek crusaders into the forefront of American political debate.

The initial pro-Chiang claimsmakers’ campaign began well before Hurley’s resignation. However, the necessity of that support became more pronounced as VJ-Day freed up both the GMD and its rivals, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) led by Mao Zedong, to once again vie for control of China. The GMD-CCP conflict had been officially suspended prior to the Marco Polo Bridge incident on 7 July 1937, which precipitated the Pacific War and, arguably, the Second World War.⁴ Although both sides claimed to be fully engaged in repelling the Japanese invaders, neither was willing to commit all of its resources to that endeavor. Chiang and Mao’s reluctance to engage in all out war with the Japanese was compounded by U.S. assistance following America’s entry into the war in 1941. In 1942 Generalissimo Chiang stated “no political party and no political activity can aid the war of resistance [China’s war against Japan during World War II] or promote the revival of the nation if they differ... from the Kuomintang.”⁵ By 1946, the Chinese Civil War had resumed in earnest, and the GMD needed U.S. support. Claimsmakers after the Second World War pursued two different methods to propagate that message. The first expounded on the accomplishments of the GMD and

³ “Resignation of Patrick Hurley,” (26 Nov. 1945), Entry 399, Box 1, Folder 030.003 Hurley Mission, 1945-46: Records of the Office of Chinese Affairs, Subject File 1944-47, Record Group 59, National Archives at College Park, Maryland. Hereafter referred to as CA, SF 1944-47, RG 59, NACP.

⁴ *The China White Paper*, originally published as Department of State, *U.S. Relations with China with Special Reference to the Period of 1944-1949*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press: 1967), 44-45.

⁵ Chiang Kai-shek, *China’s Destiny and Chinese Economic Theory*, with notes and commentary by Phillip Jaffe, (New York: Roy Publishers, 1947), 140.

Generalissimo Chiang while defending them from charges of malfeasance. The second sought to discredit the CCP and the U.S. State Department, which opposed aiding Chiang's regime without stipulations. During this early stage of the debate on America's role in China, the lobby's message was refined and the parameters of future debate set.

The China Lobby was an eclectic mixture of American individuals and organizations, as well as Nationalist Chinese spokesmen, who wanted to garner support for the GMD. Among its initial members were media moguls such as Henry R. Luce, the founder of *Time*, *Life*, *Fortune*, and *Sports Illustrated*, whose commitment to Chiang Kai-shek was derived from an anti-communist Christian zeal and a childhood spent in China with missionary parents.⁶ There were also businessmen like Alfred Kohlberg, popularly known as the head of the China Lobby, whose support for Chiang came from both his staunch anti-communism and a business made on importing Chinese textiles to the United States.⁷ In addition to these individuals there were organizations such as the American China Policy Association (ACPA). Among the ACPA's members were Kohlberg and Clair Boothe Luce, wife of Henry Luce and a representative to the U.S. Congress from Connecticut from 1943-1947, who served as the association's president the year she left congress.⁸ Claire Booth Luce was not the only politician who acted on behalf of Chiang Kai-shek's regime, however.

Senator William F. Knowland (R-Calif.) was one of the GMD's staunchest allies and, as a West Coast politician, was more concerned with the Pacific Rim than politicians from the East Coast. Knowland defended the GMD because he believed it was the only entity capable of

⁶ Herzstein, *Henry R. Luce*, 1, 21.

⁷ Joseph Keely, *The China Lobby Man: The Story of Alfred Kohlberg*, (New Rochelle, N.Y.:Arlington House, 1969), 21-25. This account is strongly biased in favor of Kohlberg, as is evidenced by the Author's opening in the foreword, "I was privileged to know Alfred Kohlberg and many others mentioned in this book who tried to prevent the disastrous events that have succeeded one another since World War II... but their voices were drowned out by strident shouts from the left." (p. ix). However, it does provide a good background for Kohlberg and his opinions.

⁸ Koen, *The China Lobby*, 51.

halting communism in Asia.⁹ Representative Walter H. Judd (R-Minn) was another pro-Chiang politician who had spent nearly ten years as a medical missionary in China prior to his political career and was also an avowed anti-communist.¹⁰ Support for Chiang's regime was not limited to a select few members of Congress, however. Republicans adopted China Lobby rhetoric as a tool to use against the Truman administration. The emergence of the Second Red Scare as a theme in American society also led some conservative Democrats, such as Patrick McCarran (D-Nev.), to adopt China Lobby rhetoric to demonstrate their anti-communist credentials. The U.S. Congress became an echo chamber for the accusations of the original China Lobby claimsmakers, becoming the lobby's most powerful pressure group.

The common cause among Chiang Kai-shek's supporters was anti-communism. It was this threat more than an affinity for China that would draw in a larger segment of pro-Chiang supporters who became the China Lobby's primary claimsmakers. Though these claimsmakers came from varied segments of American society and rarely worked in concert, their impact was cumulative and their combined pressure became capable of influencing both foreign and domestic U.S. policy in the postwar period. Therefore, the China Lobby refers to individuals and organizations that supported the GMD in China for myriad reasons with an overarching theme of anti-communism. Though their efforts were not orchestrated, the various actors who made up the China Lobby would repeat and reiterate arguments made by each other to create unrehearsed themes supporting the GMD, defaming the CCP, and attacking individuals and organizations critical of Chiang's regime in China. The China Lobby, then, serves as a moniker that refers to individuals and organizations that worked to further the cause of the Nationalists for ideological

⁹ Gayle B. Montgomery and James W. Johnson, *One Step from the White House: The Rise and Fall of Senator William F. Knowland*, (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1998), 75-76.

¹⁰ "Walter H. Judd, 95, Missionary to China and U.S. Representative," *NYT*, 15 Feb. 1994.

reasons that often obscured economic and national security interests in China. A key aspect of this effort to obtain assistance for the GMD was introducing the American public to a particular version of China.

The Chinese Nationalists faced a problem during the post-World War II era. Unlike European countries ravaged by nearly six years of warfare, China was much less well known to Americans who were asked to help rebuild these war-torn lands. Few in America had extensive experience or knowledge of the land and millennia old culture of China. Much of their information had been shaped by contradictory interpretations of Chinese society. The first interpretation was a paternalistic image of a people awaiting the redemptive powers of American religiosity and economy. The second interpretation was derived from American fears and racism that had resulted in the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, which was in effect until 1943.¹¹ Thus one of the lobby's goals was to reintroduce Americans to a particular version of China: one that emphasized Chiang Kai-shek and the Guomindang's bravery and democratic patriotism, their responsible stewardship of China and the harmful repercussions that would result from not aiding them. The pro-Chiang crusaders used the public's lack of familiarity to continue earlier efforts to construct a China that was not only palatable to Americans, but also commendable for its similar mores when juxtaposed against America's own. However, this initial argument lauding the GMD met with staunch opposition forcing the China Lobby to defend its claims and diminished the message's effectiveness.

¹¹ T. Christopher Jespersen, *American Images of China, 1931-1949*, (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996), 1-3. This work offers an excellent analysis of the early efforts of pro-Chiang crusaders efforts to garner support for the GMD.

Chiang proclaimed on New Years Eve, 1945, that by the end of the year China would have a constitution.¹² This provided the GMD with an apparent devotion to democratic ideals which claimsmakers were able to point to as proof that Chiang was the best hope for representative government in China. Furthermore the Nationalists were lauded for having “steadfastly refused to become an ally of Japanese aggression in a racial war against the West and became instead the spearhead of freedom against Japan.”¹³ By not destroying the communists after the Marco Polo Bridge incident, “Chiang Kai-shek, instead of being a heathen, barbarian, warlord, was a Christian.”¹⁴ Chiang was presented as a war hero who continued to carry the torch of freedom and democracy in China despite the enormous hardships faced by the Chinese people after nearly a decade of world war followed by civil war.¹⁵ Chiang’s wife Soong Meiling, better known in the United States as Madame Chiang Kai-shek, often served as an emissary for the Generalissimo and downplayed the animosity between the Nationalists and Communists shortly after VJ-Day.

Madame Chiang was an important figure in Sino-American relations during this period. Born into a wealthy Chinese family, Soong Meiling was sent to the United States to study. While there she made connections with other women and came to identify herself as more American than Chinese. Her 1927 marriage to Chiang Kai-shek propelled her into world affairs. In many ways, Madame Chiang exhibited the qualities Americans wanted to see in their Chinese allies. A

¹² “Chiang Pledges Democratic China While Enemy is Being Driven Out,” *NYT*, 1 Jan. 1945.

¹³ “Manchurian Manifesto,” (15 May 1946), Entry 399A, Box 12, Folder Top Secret, 1946, 320.2049, Sino-Soviet Relations: Records of the Office of Chinese Affairs, Top Secret Subject File, 1945-50, Record Group 59, National Archive, College Park, Maryland. Hereafter referred to as CA, TSSF 1945-50, RG 59, NACP.

¹⁴ Congress, House, Rep. Walter H. Judd of Minnesota speaking on Chiang Kai-shek, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., *Congressional Record* 91, (15 Mar. 1945), 2301-2302. Hereafter referred to as 79-1, *CR* 91.

¹⁵ Congress, Senate, Senator Knowland of California Speaking on American Policy in China, 81st Cong., 1st Sess., *Congressional Record* 95, (3 May 1949): 5484-85. Hereafter referred to as 81-1, *CR* 95; Congress, Senate, Senator Vandenberg of Mich. Speaking on Aid to China, 80th Cong., 2nd Sess., *Congressional Record* 94, (30 Mar. 1948): 3667. Hereafter referred to as 80-2, *CR* 94.

well-educated Christian woman who was also Chinese, Madame Chiang was simultaneously exotic and familiar. It was partially because her popularity in the United States that the Chinese exclusion laws were repealed in 1943. Madame Chiang continued her efforts on behalf of her husband's government after the outbreak of Chinese Civil War.¹⁶ In an effort to cultivate the GMD's image of devotion to democracy she referred to the CCP as merely one of many parties that would coexist in the Chinese government.¹⁷ However this picture was challenged by counter charges of a government riddled with corruption and unable to offer real solutions to China's postwar problems.

General Albert C. Wedemeyer, the commander of U.S. forces in China at the end of the Second World War, was sent back on a diplomatic mission to the region in 1947. At the end of his mission to China, Wedemeyer concluded "in China today I find apathy and lethargy in many quarters. Instead of seeking solutions of problems presented, considerable time and effort are spent blaming outside influences and seeking outside assistance."¹⁸ In order for China to recover it needed "inspirational leadership and moral and spiritual resurgence which can only come from within China."¹⁹ Wedemeyer was neither the first person nor the lone voice in this interpretation of the state of affairs in China after twenty years of GMD control. His public pronouncement of the GMD's inept management of the Chinese government did as much as Hurley's statement two years earlier, only with the opposite effect.

¹⁶ Several works that examines Soong Meiling's role as an unofficial GMD ambassador and how she influenced American perceptions of China are Karen J. Leong, *The China Mystique: Pearl S. Buck, Anna May Wong, Mayling Soong, and the Transformation of American Orientalism*, (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2005): Ch. 4. Jespersen, *American Images of China*, Ch. 5. For a detailed biography see Laura Tyson Li, *Madame Chiang Kai-shek: China's Eternal First Lady*, (New York: Grove Press, 2006).

¹⁷ Nancy MacLennan, "Mme. Chiang Opens Peace Campaign," *NYT*, 15 Aug. 1945.

¹⁸ "Wedemeyer's Statement," *NYT*, 25 Aug. 1947.

¹⁹ "Wedemeyer's Statement," *NYT*, 25 Aug. 1947.

Privately many in the Truman administration, including Acheson and Truman, had few illusions about either the GMD's efficacy or its democratic nature.²⁰ The Nationalist government in China had begun excluding reporters deemed overtly critical of their regime in 1945.²¹ General of the Army George C. Marshall, who advocated the economic recovery plan in Europe that bears his name, was dispatched to China following Hurley's resignation. Marshall called for a ban on the export of arms to the GMD during his mission because "the spread of hostilities at this time was due chiefly to [Nationalist] Government campaigns to occupy certain cities and areas controlled by the Chinese Communists."²² Marshall noted, "in specific areas, such as Manchuria and Formosa [Taiwan], National Government rule has seriously alienated the local populace. The rule has been one of exploitation and corruption without regard for the welfare of the people... In both areas the local people privately express a preference for Japanese rule."²³ As the Chinese Civil War progressed the GMD continued to suffer from maladministration and corruption. U.S. supplies sent to the Nationalists ended up in the hands of the CCP's Peoples Liberation Army (PLA) as a result of the GMD army's "desertion, surrender, and loss of stockpiles."²⁴ Overall, Nationalist soldiers lost the will to fight and suffered from inept leadership, with many military commanders' appointments based on their loyalty to Chiang

²⁰ A couple of key works that examine the GMD's malfeasance are Suzanne Pepper, *Civil War in China: The Political Struggle, 1945-1949*, (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1999): pt. 1; Westad, *Decisive Encounters*.

²¹ "The Acting Secretary of State to the Ambassador in China (Hurley)," (2 Aug. 1945), in Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers, 1945, Vol. VII: The Far East, China* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1969): 1477-78. Hereafter referred to as *FRUS 1945*, 7. For the full details of these particular incidents of GMD censorship see "Objections of the United States to the Chinese Government's Exclusion of Certain American Press Correspondents," *FRUS 1945*, 7: 1476-82.

²² "Why Did the U.S. Government Impose a Ban on the Export of Munitions to China in 1946 and 1947?," (1948), Box 14, Folder Top Secret (1948) #2P, Taiwan: CA, TSSF 1945-50, RG 59, NACP.

²³ "Memorandum Presented to General Wedemeyer at Nanking," (23 Aug. 1947), pg. 4, Box 58D, Folder 1: Central Decimal File 1945-49, Record Group 59, National Archives, College Park, Maryland. Hereafter referred to as CDF 1945-49, RG 59, NACP.

²⁴ "Statement of Hon. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State," (18 Mar. 1949), in U.S. Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, *Economic Assistance to China and Korea: 1949-50*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1974), 52. Hereafter referred to as *Economic Assistance*.

rather than on their military acumen.²⁵ This private knowledge, however, was not as damaging to the pro-Chiang claimsmakers as the public proclamations against GMD maladministration and corruption.

Many vocal critics of the GMD were in the same arena as its defenders: the chambers of the U.S. Congress. Senator Glen H. Taylor (D-Idaho) cited the Nationalists' brutal suppression of the native Taiwanese after the GMD fled the mainland and its oppression of Chinese on the mainland as the cause of the CCP's popularity.²⁶ He stated that support for communism in China came from "a spirit of solidarity and camaraderie which I believe would accrue to any party or organization which would oppose the unbearable oppression of the reactionary Chinese Government of Chiang Kai-shek."²⁷ Chiang was labeled a fascist and compared to Adolf Hitler for his authoritarianism.²⁸ Senator Wayne L. Morse (R-Ore.), a liberal Republican and critic of Chiang's regime, charged that materiel sent to the Nationalists since VJ-Day was either rotting unused or had been resold in the United States through a GMD company, a charge confirmed a year later during Director of the Joint Military Advisory Group to the Republic of China Major General David G. Barr's statement to the House Committee on International Relations.²⁹ Some

²⁵ "Statement of Maj. Gen. David G. Barr, Director of the Joint Military Advisory Group to the Republic of China," (6 Apr. 1949), in U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on International Relations, *Volume VII, United States Policy in the Far East, Part I*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1976), 508. Hereafter referred to as *Far East, 7-1*;

"Memorandum from the Office of Chinese Affairs (Sprouse) to the Secretary of State on the Situation in the Far East," (27 July 1948), Box 13, Folder Top Secret (1948) 350.002, Internal Situation: CA, TSSF, RG 59, NACP.

²⁶ Congress, Senate, Sen. Taylor speaking on Aide to Greece and Turkey, 80th Cong., 1st Sess., *Congressional Record* 93, (31 Mar. 1947), 2873. Hereafter referred to as 80-1, *CR* 93; Congress, Senate, Sen. Taylor speaking on Aide to Greece and Turkey, 80-1, *CR* 93, (18 Apr. 1947), 3702.

²⁷ Congress, Senate, Sen. Taylor speaking on Aide to Greece and Turkey, 80-1, *CR* 93, (18 Apr. 1947), 3702.

²⁸ Congress, House, Congressman Vito Marcantonio of New York speaking on the Third Supplemental Appropriations Act, 80-1, *CR* 93, (19 Dec. 1947), 11757; Congress, Senate, Sen. Morse speaking on Aid to China, 80-2, *CR* 94, (30 Mar. 1948), 3671.

²⁹ Congress, Senate, Sen. Morse speaking on Aid to China, 80-2, *CR* 94, (30 Mar. 1948): 3670; "Statement of Maj. Gen. David G. Barr, Director of the Joint Military Advisory Group to the Republic of China," (6 Apr. 1949), *Far East, 7-1*: 525. Senator Morse, who would continue to be critical of the GMD and the China Lobby, was reelected to the Senate as a Republican in 1950, however in 1952 he became an Independent in protest of President Dwight D. Eisenhower's selection of Richard M. Nixon as his running mate. In 1955 Morse switched his affiliation to the

prominent Chinese citizens, such as Madame Sun Yat-sen, widow of the “Father of Modern China,” stated that the only way for the GMD to regain the support of the people was to enact drastic reforms, which included removing many of its top officials.³⁰ State Department officials, such as Wedemeyer, and some sinologists, including John King Fairbank, agreed and emphasized the need for reform in the GMD.³¹ They stopped short of calling for the removal of the Generalissimo because, paradoxically, he was seen as “both the key to the situation in China and the possible stumbling block to reforms which might prevent the eventual collapse of the Nationalist Government authority.”³² Maintaining its postwar efforts to quell negative reports coming out of China, the GMD continued restricting access for reporters deemed unfriendly to the government, though this backfired when the journalists published articles on the censorship they faced from a supposedly democratic government.³³ The pro-Chiang crusaders, however, were not going to allow the tarnishing of the Nationalists to stand unopposed.

The GMD’s champions dismissed Wedemeyer’s statement as “the pontifical attitude of the denizen of an ivory tower,” and railed that his knowledge of China was lacking because he had not spent enough time there.³⁴ The lobby continued to refute the notion that the Nationalists’ position was dire, which would continue even as late as 1949 when the majority of the GMD had

Democratic Party at the urging of Senator Lyndon B. Johnson and remained in the Senate until 1969 during which he voted against the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and was an outspoken critic of the Vietnam War.

³⁰ “Mme. Sun Asks Ban on Our Aid to China,” *NYT*, 23 July 1946; “Memorandum of a Conversation between Tan and Vincent,” (9 Sept. 1946), pg. 3, Entry 399A, Box 12, Folder Top Secret (1945-1946) 361.13, Chiang Kai-shek (and Mme. Chiang): CA, TSSF 1945-1950, RG 59, NACP.

³¹ “Memorandum Presented to General Wedemeyer at Nanking,” (23 Aug. 1947), pg. 4, Box 58D, Folder 1: CDF 1945-49, RG 59, NACP; 2; “Wedemeyer Statement,” *NYT*, 25 Aug. 1947; John King Fairbank “Our China Policy,” *NYT*, 9 May 1948.

³² “Memorandum Presented to General Wedemeyer at Nanking,” (23 Aug. 1947), pg. 2, Box 58D, Folder 1: CDF 1945-49, RG 59, NACP.

³³ Henry R. Lieberman, “The Correspondent Versus the News in China,” *NYT*, 5 Dec. 1948.

³⁴ “Telegram from Shanghai (Davis) to Secretary of State,” (2 Sept. 1947), Box 58D, Folder 1: CDF 1945-49, RG 59, NACP; “Telegram from Shanghai (Davis) to Secretary of State,” (6 Sept. 1947), pg. 2, Box 58D, Folder 1: CDF 1945-49, RG 59, NACP.

fled to Taiwan. Chiang's advocates drew a parallel between the American founding fathers and the GMD's position vis-à-vis the CCP. Senator Knowland proclaimed on the Senate floor:

“I have no doubt whatever that some of the practical men who lived in other countries at the time of our own war of independence, as they looked at Valley Forge and the condition of General Washington and his troops in that very dark winter of American history, might have written off our cause as hopeless. But men of courage and determination can sometimes turn the scales even though the situation may look dark and hopeless.”³⁵

He repeated this analogy on the floor several months later in an attempt to garner military aid for Chiang's faltering regime.³⁶ Perhaps the most amazing thing about this claim was that Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the Guomindang had been in power for over two decades, which implied that a fair level of autocracy existed within the GMD. This was another fact with which the China Lobby's claimsmakers had to contend with in directing the debate over America's China policy.

Even though there was overwhelming evidence of the GMD's mismanagement of American aid as well as its rule of China and Chiang's anti-democratic tendencies, the China Lobby continued the rhetoric of the Nationalist government's efficacy. Sen. Arthur H. Vandenberg (R-Mich.) claimed that it was impossible to track whether or not American aid had reached the Chinese people, but insofar as that aid had perpetuated the GMD regime it was for the benefit of China.³⁷ China's ambassador to the United States, V.K. Wellington Koo, proclaimed, “For one corrupt official... there are ninety-nine honest ones who desire to make the fullest and most effective use of American aid.”³⁸ In response to the charges of Chiang's authoritarianism Representative Judd declared that all countries restricted their people's

³⁵ Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland speaking on Investigation of Foreign Policy in the Far East, 81-1, *CR* 95, (21 Apr. 1949), 4863.

³⁶ Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland speaking on Military Assistance to Foreign Nations-Amendment Relating to Aid for China, 81-1, *CR* 95, (4 Aug. 1949), 10738.

³⁷ Congress, Senate, Sen. Vandenberg speaking on Aid to China, 80-2, *CR* 94, (30 Mar. 1948), 3668.

³⁸ W.H. Lawrence “Mme. Chiang in Washington; Reception for Her is Modest,” *NYT*, 2 Dec. 1948.

freedoms during war and requests for the GMD to be more democratic was “an absurd counsel of perfection.”³⁹ The press was criticized for its “sloppy, scandal-catching, nagging journalism,” which damaged the GMD government and Sino-American relations.⁴⁰ Unfortunately for the pro-Chiang claimsmakers time spent debating the state of the Nationalist government in China did not benefit their objective of aiding the Generalissimo’s beleaguered regime.

The Guomindang’s ability to run the government was a position issue. Supporters and critics of the GMD were able to take sides that were often quite contentious backed up by opposing evidence. Furthermore, as evidence of the authoritarianism and maladministration of the GMD continued to surface, proponents of the Nationalists as democratic and efficient faced the prospect of becoming not merely ineffectual but irrelevant in the social problems marketplace. However, the pro-Chiang claimsmakers were not limited to expounding on the GMD’s virtues. One of Chiang’s tactics during this period was to state that the Nationalists would pursue the assistance of fascists and reactionaries if they were unable to count on U.S. support.⁴¹ Another tactic was to insinuate that if American aid began to diminish, the GMD would be forced to turn to the USSR for assistance.⁴² Neither of these threats appeared convincing because the GMD’s enemy during this period was the CCP, which were much more likely to receive Soviet support, and they were already arguably a fascist state. Furthermore, these claims did little to provide Americans with warrants supporting the conclusion that the GMD deserved U.S. aid. What gave the Nationalist government its greatest appeal in the United States was that its enemy was a communist party. General Marshall felt that Americans would be

³⁹ Congress, House, Rep. Judd Speaking on the Situation in Asia, 79-1, *CR* 91, (15 Mar. 1945), 2301-2302.

⁴⁰ Lieberman, “Criticism of China Condemned Again,” *NYT*, 11 Oct. 1947; Benjamin Welles, “Chiang Castigates some U.S. Reports on China as Unfair,” *NYT*, 28 July 1947.

⁴¹ “Letter From Bayne to Penfield,” (7 Oct. 1946), Entry 399A, Box 1, Folder Bayne: CA, SF 1944-47, RG 59, NACP.

⁴² “Sun Fo Suggests Closer Soviet Tie,” *NYT*, 17 Sept. 1947. For more information on how countries played the United States and Soviet Union against one another for their own benefit see Westad, *The Global Cold War*.

more compelled by GMD malfeasance than the ideology of the CCP in the ongoing media campaign during his mission to China.⁴³ Here Marshall underestimated Americans' ingrained suspicion of communism. The China Lobby used the CCP's ideology to great advantage during the Chinese Civil War. After all, though Chiang's government was corrupt, mismanaged, and authoritarian, it was "fighting for the United States and all other anti-Communist countries as well as itself."⁴⁴ The rhetoric of an anti-communist government defending itself from aggressive communism appealed to the American people who were called on to support the GMD much more than did arguments about its governance of China.

Americans' distrust of communism did not begin after the Second World War. Even after the war broke out in the European theater, Americans worried that communists' activities needed more scrutiny than Nazis' activities in the country by more than two to one.⁴⁵ The hard reality of the nascent Cold War was that the two allies who had the capability of rebuilding and offering assistance to the rest of the world were diametrically opposed, with capitalist America and communist Russia vying for power and security throughout the world. This was combined with the uncertainties that faced capitalism following the success of totalitarian regimes and the economic depression of the 1930s.⁴⁶ In order to play on American fears of communism, the China Lobby spared no effort in demonstrating that the Chinese communists were far worse than their Nationalist counterparts. The CCP was also stripped of its agency by the crusaders'

⁴³ "Minutes of Meeting Between General Marshall and Dr. Wei Tao-ming at No. 5 Ning Hai Road, Nanking, December 9, 1946, 5 p.m.," in Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States 1946, Vol. X: The Far East: China*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1972).

⁴⁴ Bertam D. Hulen, "China Requesting 3 Billion in U.S. Aid," *NYT*, 5 Dec. 1948.

⁴⁵ "Dies Committee," (5 Jan. 1940), in George H. Gallup, *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion, 1935-1971*, (in three parts), (New York: Random House, 1972), 199. Hereafter referred to as *Gallup*.

⁴⁶ John Lewis Gaddis offers a succinct account of these ideological chasms between the United States and the USSR in *The Cold War: A New History*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2005) Ch. 1; another excellent account of this period can be found in Melvyn P. Leffler *The Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1953*, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1994): Ch. 2.

arguments that it worked to advance the Soviet Union and that if Chiang lost to the communists all of Asia and even Europe would fall under the sway of international communism. With the power of this rhetoric, the China Lobby was able to combine American's limited knowledge of China and its people with the fear of communism to construct an image that significantly influenced American perceptions of the Chinese Civil War.

Pro-Chiang claimsmakers had a much easier time convincing the public of the depravity and insincerity of the CCP than they did of the honor and integrity of the GMD. Chiang charged that the economic plight of China was the direct result of the communists and they were intentionally sabotaging any possibility of reconciliation.⁴⁷ It is interesting to note that Marshall had considered terminating his mediation trip to China on the grounds that the GMD were using it as a cover for active military campaigns against the CCP in 1946.⁴⁸ Though there were different opinions concerning which side was more to blame for the civil war, most Americans had a difficult time supporting any government that espoused communism. They believed that “it is not an economic movement. It is social, political, and philosophical. Yes, it is even a religion—a pagan religion that defies the state and denies God.”⁴⁹ Some in the United States, like the journalist Edgar Snow in *Red Star Over China*, attempted to point out that the CCP was more democratic than the GMD.⁵⁰ It was at the very least the lesser of two evils and their popular support in China over the GMD lent credence to these claims.⁵¹ However, American public sentiment was not receptive to the idea of communism being the lesser of any evil. The GMD

⁴⁷ Benjamin Welles, “Chiang Castigates Some U.S. Reports on China as Unfair,” *NYT*, 28 July 1947.

⁴⁸ “Why did the U.S. Government Impose a Ban on the Export of Munitions to China in 1946 and 1947?,” (No Date), Entry 399A, Box 14, Folder Top Secret (1948) #2P, Taiwan: CA, TSSF 1945-50, RG 59, NACP.

⁴⁹ Congress, Senate, Sen. Hugh A. Butler Speaking on American Policy by the Chinese Communists, 81-1, *CR* 95, (24 June 1949), 8328.

⁵⁰ Edgar Snow, *Red Star Over China*, (New York: Grove Press, 1938).

⁵¹ “Memorandum Presented to General Wedemeyer at Nanking,” “23 Aug. 1947,” pg. 3, Box 58D, Folder 1: CDF 1945-49, RG 59, NACP.

also cultivated these images. Its diplomats argued that the CCP was a totalitarian organization, bent on enslaving mankind and reducing the Chinese people to serfdom.⁵² The Chinese communists were also portrayed by Nationalist representatives as placing their party loyalties over the good of their country.⁵³ This rhetoric found traction in a public that was beginning to fear its World War II ally in Russia and already feared its ideology.

President Harry S. Truman stated the aims of American foreign policy in a Navy Day address on 27 October 1945. Two key points were that the United States would not interfere in the internal politics of another sovereign state and that it would refuse to recognize any government that was imposed on one state by another.⁵⁴ Therefore, unable to attack a traditional American policy with roots dating back to the Monroe Doctrine, the China Lobby had to demonstrate that the CCP was not acting on behalf of China. By March 1945 Representative Judd stated that all communists worked to advance Soviet Russia and “the Chinese Communists are first Communist and second Chinese, just as we know that American Communists are first Communist and second American.”⁵⁵ When the Truman administration advocated a coalition government between the GMD and CCP as a mechanism to prevent reigniting China’s Civil War, it was denounced because “a coalition government, if successful, will result... in making China a satellite of Russia.”⁵⁶ The belief in monolithic communism was a powerful tool that China Lobby claimsmakers expounded. Chiang claimed that World War III had already started

⁵² Felix Belair, “Key Chinese Body Calls on Congress for Greater Help,” *NYT*, 15 Dec. 1948; Tillman Durdin, “External Threats Cited by Chiang,” *NYT*, 1 Jan. 1948.

⁵³ “Chinese Reds Minimized,” *NYT*, (15 Feb. 1945); Walter W. Ruch, “Communists Hit by Chinese Envoy,” *NYT*, 10 Jan. 1947.

⁵⁴ “Text of Presidents Navy Day Speech in Central Park on the Aims of U.S. Foreign Policy,” *NYT*, 28 Oct. 1945: especially points 4 and 6.

⁵⁵ Congress, House, Rep. Judd speaking on the Situation in Asia, 79-1, *CR* 91, (15 Mar. 1945), 2298.

⁵⁶ “Memorandum of a Conversation between Tan and Vincent,” (9 Sept. 1946), pg. 1-2, Entry 399A, Box 12, Folder Top Secret (1945-1946) 361.13, Chiang Kai-shek (and Mme. Chiang): CA, TSSF 1945-50, RG 59, NACP; “U.S. Urged to Stop Aid to China Reds,” *NYT*, 26 July 1946.

as a result of the Soviet Union's direct involvement in the CCP-GMD conflict, and other Nationalist leaders stated that the Chinese communists had no sense of nationalism.⁵⁷ These claims might not have garnered much popular support from Americans. However, the heightening of Cold War tensions in Europe and the constant repetition of this as fact by pro-Chiang crusaders, both in and out of the U.S. government, helped the theory of Kremlin-led monolithic communism to gain traction. By defining detractors as supporting the Soviet Union and typifying them as communist sympathizers, China Lobby claimsmakers were able to narrow the field of debate. Politicians, entrepreneurs, military officers and the press all spoke up to assert the USSR's central role in the Chinese Civil War.⁵⁸

The Truman administration realized early on that Americans were predisposed to mistrust anything associated with communism. A memorandum from the U.S. embassy in China highlighted "the profound suspicion and hostility in the United States to the tag 'Communist'... prejudices the American public against the Chinese Communists."⁵⁹ Wedemeyer found evidence that the GMD was planting evidence to implicate the USSR in aiding the CCP in an effort to make the Chinese Civil War an international event.⁶⁰ While the Communists did receive limited support from the USSR, the Nationalists received an equal amount of support from the United States. This should have caused a rational actor to ponder who was fostering international

⁵⁷ "Chiang Urges West to Resist Russians," *NYT*, 10 Oct. 1949.

⁵⁸ "Final Report of Yen-an Observation Group," (15 Apr. 1946), Entry 399A, Box 12, Folder Top Secret (1945) 320.2049, Sino-Soviet Relations: CA, TSSF 1945-1950, RG 59, NACP; Alfred Kohlberg, "Letters to the Times: Our Allies the Kuomintang," *NYT*, 2 Sep. 1946; Bertram D. Hulen, "U.S. Accelerating Arms Aid to China," *NYT*, 13 Nov. 1948; "Observations of Ambassador Stewart on China Political Scene," (8 July 1948), Entry 399A, Box 13, Folder Top Secret (1948) 350.002, Internal Situation: CA, TSSF 1945-1950, RG 59, NACP; Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland Speaking on the Situation in China and the Far East, 81-1, *CR* 95, (29 June 1949), 8600.

⁵⁹ "Memorandum by the Second Secretary of Embassy in (China)," (4 Jan. 1945), *FRUS* 1945, 7: 157.

⁶⁰ "General Wedemeyer to the Secretary of State," (8 Aug. 1947), in Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States 1947, Vol. VII: The Far East: China*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO 1972): 713.

tensions in China, but the intensifying Cold War led both the United States and the Soviet Union to become entangled in China's internal affairs.⁶¹ After all, the crusaders claimed:

“Whatever may have been the acts of commission and omission attributable to the Nationalist Government in the past, it is a cardinal fact today that China is strenuously fighting the Communist aggression which is aided and abetted by an oligarchy of international communism abroad and by the Communists throughout the World.”⁶²

However, the claimsmakers still needed to provide a reason why this conflict in the Far East was relevant to the safety of Americans entrenched on the other side of the world. To abrogate this problem the China Lobby provided a doomsday scenario that played on American fears and distrust of communism.

By adopting a tactic that would later become known as the Domino Theory, China Lobby claimsmakers argued, in the words of Governor Thomas E. Dewey shortly before his failed bid for the presidency, “If China falls [to communism], we may reasonably assume that all Asia is gone and Western Europe and the America's will stand alone—very much alone in a hostile world.”⁶³ This was an argument Chiang had proposed in 1942 and it was suddenly propelled into the public arena for the American people to consider.⁶⁴ A letter from the Executive Yuan, the GMD's Legislative council, went even further proclaiming that “if China should unfortunately be conquered, the Far East would be sovietized and so would Asia and Europe. Even the Americas might not be secure.”⁶⁵ A striking example of this was Madame Chiang Kai-shek's claim, in an address aired on ABC, that “if communism prevails in China, you, my friends, will ultimately also be suffering.... If China falls, all of Asia goes.”⁶⁶ Coming from the second most

⁶¹ For more on this topic see Chen, *Mao's China and the Cold War*, Ch. 1.

⁶² “Text of Koo's Statement on China,” *NYT*, 8 Aug. 1949.

⁶³ Congress, House, Governor Thomas E. Dewey Address to Columbia Law School read in Extension of Remarks by Rep. W. Sterling Cole on Aid to China, 80-1, *CR* 93, (24 Nov. 1947), A4453.

⁶⁴ Chiang, *China's Destiny*, 234.

⁶⁵ Felix Belair Jr., “Key Chinese Body Calls on Congress for Greater Help,” *NYT*, 15 Dec. 1948.

⁶⁶ “Mme. Chiang Cites U.S. Stake in Clash,” *NYT*, 22 Nov. 1948.

admired woman in America, it was a powerful message that appealed to Americans' distrust of communism in general and the Soviet Union in particular.⁶⁷ This provided an effective warrant to the conclusion that communist domination of China was a concern for all Americans.

Whether or not this was a legitimate concern received very little attention in the public arena. A 1949 State Department call for recommendations on the Far East from scholars received nineteen responses, of which only one proclaimed that if the CCP won in its struggle with the GMD the entire region would turn to communism. That one scholar was William C. Bullitt, whose work was lauded in the *China Monthly: The Truth About China*, a primary mouthpiece for the China Lobby's claimsmakers.⁶⁸ In May 1949, Secretary of State Dean Acheson testified to Senate Foreign Relations Committee that he "doubted very much whether China is a great strategic springboard for the Communists. It may turn out to be a strategic morass."⁶⁹ In that and other hearings in the House and Senate in 1949 the State Department's director for Far Eastern Affairs W. Walton Butterworth and General Barr refuted the theory of the CCP as puppets of, or receiving significant assistance from, the USSR.⁷⁰ It should be pointed out that the Joint Chiefs of Staff along with Barr felt the CCP were Soviet-style communists, but Barr felt that any attempt to make the Chinese subservient to Moscow would be short lived.⁷¹ Though the evidence did not support the theory of China's role as anchor of Asia and the world, or of the CCP being

⁶⁷ "Most Admired Woman," (26 Dec. 1948), *Gallup*, 775.

⁶⁸ "Nineteen Statements from Far East Specialists: Summary of Recommendations," (30 Sept. 1949), pg. 2, Entry 399A, Box 14, Folder Top Secret (1949) 030.002, Ambassador Jessup's Trip: CA, TSSF 1945-50, RG 59, NACP; "The Bullitt's Report on China," *The China Monthly: The Truth About China* VII, (Nov. 1947): 368-69; Koen, *The China Lobby*: 48-50.

⁶⁹ "Statement of Hon. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State," (18 Mar. 1949), *Economic Assistance*, 30.

⁷⁰ "Statement of Hon. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State," (18 Mar. 1949), *Economic Assistance*, 33; "Statement of Maj. Gen. David G. Barr, Director, Joint U.S. Military Advisory Group to the Republic of China," (22 Mar. 1949), *Economic Assistance*: 77-78; "Statement of Maj. Gen. David G. Barr, Director, Joint U.S. Military Advisory Group to the Republic of China," (6 Apr. 1949), *Far East*, 7-1: 516.

⁷¹ "Memorandum of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee," (9 June 1947), *FRUS 1947*, 7: 840; "Statement of Maj. Gen. David G. Barr, Director, Joint U.S. Military Advisory Group to the Republic of China," (22 Mar. 1949), *Economic Assistance*: 77-78.

Soviet puppets, these arguments were picked up and repeated by secondary claimsmakers with little scrutiny until they were widely accepted as facts. This established the typification of the GMD's detractors as pro-communist and legitimized the warrant that China's conversion to communism would threaten the United States and the world.

By 1948 79 percent of Americans had heard of the Chinese Civil War and 57 percent of this group believed the fighting in China was a threat to world peace and 65 percent believed the CCP took its orders from Moscow.⁷² The chambers of the U.S. Congress reverberated with the threat of Communist dominion in Asia and the papers reported what was being said, providing the rhetoric with mass distribution and legitimacy.⁷³ As the CCP forces approached victory over the GMD in 1949, the *New York Times* ran an editorial which concluded "we believe that if the masses of the Chinese could understand the whole situation they would not see as friends the new barbarians who have once more rolled down from the North."⁷⁴ This demonstrated how the crusaders' strategy of defaming communism became a major factor in discussions of the Chinese Civil War. It also demonstrates that the conclusions advocated by the China Lobby had become accepted. There was no denying that the Chinese communists carried out atrocities and the chairman of the CCP, Mao Zedong, could in no way be called a humanitarian. However, it is significant that Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, who was as ruthless if not as efficient as Mao, was treated as a paradigm of democratic ideals, while Mao and the CCP were vilified. One of the primary reasons for the vilification of the Chinese communists was the charge of loyalty to party

⁷² "China," (15 Dec. 1948), *Gallup*, 773. The numbers reported in the Gallup poll are 45 percent and 51 percent respectively, however that is of the total population, as they use those percents along with the other percentage of responses to add up to the 79 percent who had heard or read about the Chinese Civil War.

⁷³ Congress, House, Rep. Robert L.F. Sikes of Florida Speaking on Aid for China, 80-2, *CR* 94, (27 Feb. 1948), 1872; Ho Ying-chen "Democracy in China," *NYT*, 2 May 1948; Congress, Senate, Sen. William E. Jenner of Indiana Speaking on the Spreading Threat of Communism in the Far East, 81-1, *CR* 95, (18 May 1949), 6390.

⁷⁴ "China's Oldest Enemy," *NYT*, 13 Aug. 1949.

over country, which was picked up by American claimsmakers and intimately linked to the burgeoning American fear of everything Soviet.

The China Lobby's use of Americans' fear of communism to discredit the CCP was an effective tool. In the postwar period communists had become even more feared by the American public as the Cold War became entrenched in their everyday lives. The assault on communists by the China Lobby was a valence issue. Where the merits of GMD rule were openly debatable, defending the merits of communism was likely to find an actor under investigation or brought up on charges. The House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) had been in operation since 1938 and the majority of its investigations surrounded communism and charges of communist infiltration in American institutions. By 1947 it was investigating alleged Communist activity in Hollywood, demonstrating to the American public that even the movies could be a refuge for Soviet subversives in the United States.⁷⁵ During this period 61 percent of Americans favored forbidding membership in the Communist Party altogether and 82 percent of the public, including 78 percent of union members, felt it was appropriate for labor union officers to swear oaths that they were not Communists before taking a case to the National Labor Relations Board.⁷⁶ Many Americans began to support Representative Judd's conclusion that "the basic issue is whether China is to be free and on the side of the United States, or whether it is to be taken over by the Communists and enslaved as a Russian satellite—against us".⁷⁷ By 1948, 55 percent of Americans approved "giving the Chiang Kai-shek (Nationalist) government more military supplies, goods, and money," compared to 32 percent who disapproved.⁷⁸ As the

⁷⁵ For an excellent overview of some of the key cases and events surrounding HUAC see Eric Bentley, ed., *Thirty Years of Treason: Excerpts from the Hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities 1938-1968*, (New York: Thunder Head Press, 2002).

⁷⁶ "Communist Party," (19 Apr. 1947), *Gallup*, 640; "Non-Communist Oaths," (18 Feb. 1949), *Gallup*, 791.

⁷⁷ Congress, House, Rep. Judd speaking on Aid to Chiang Kai-shek, 80-1, *CR* 93, (19 Dec. 1947), 11761.

⁷⁸ "Aid to Nationalist China," (28 Apr. 1948), *Gallup*, 728-29.

Chinese Civil War continued, and the precarious position of the Nationalists became apparent, Americans wanted to know why China appeared to be drifting into the Soviet orbit. The China Lobby was ready to provide an answer.

When Ambassador Hurley resigned his post, he provided the China Lobby with one of its most effective tools. That tool was Hurley's charge that his original directive from President Franklin Delano Roosevelt to prevent the collapse of the GMD during the war with Japan, as well as to enhance U.S.-GMD relations, were stymied because "American policy did not have the support of all the career men in the State Department. The professional foreign service men sided with the Chinese Communist armed party."⁷⁹ Though there was speculation surrounding Hurley's resignation, along with its public salvo against the State Department, what stood out was the fodder it provided for the China Lobby's claimsmakers.⁸⁰ Along with Hurley's statement, the arrest of two State Department employees and a lieutenant in the Office of Naval Intelligence by the Federal Bureau of Investigations in July 1945 during the *Amerasia* affair made it appear that communists had infiltrated the U.S. government.⁸¹

Amerasia was a journal of Asian affairs that came under investigation when some of its articles appeared to draw on classified government reports. An investigation by the FBI led to the arrest of six people. One of whom was John S. Service, a Foreign Service Officer and China Hand, who had also been reproached by Hurley for his criticism of the GMD while he was stationed in China. Service, however, was not indicted. Of the two other government employees who were indicted, one had all charges dropped and the other paid a \$500 fine for possessing government documents. Of the three civilians arrested only one was indicted and was also

⁷⁹ "Resignation of Patrick Hurley," (26 Nov. 1945), pg. 2; Entry 399, Box 1, Folder 030.003 Hurley Mission, 1945-46: CA, SF 1944-47, RG 59, NACP.

⁸⁰ For an analysis of possible motives surrounding Hurley's resignation as well as its reception by the China Lobby see Koen, *The China Lobby*: 66-72.

⁸¹ Frederick R. Barkly, "FBI Seizes 6 as Spies, Two in State Department," *NYT*, 7 June 1945.

released with only a fine. A special House Judiciary committee determined the worst offense was a general lack of standardized classifications of sensitive documents and that the information purportedly leaked to foreign governments was already well known by the public and not damaging in any way to American interests.⁸² Regardless of these findings, the insinuation of foreign infiltration in the U.S. government was bolstered by Hurley's charges against the State Department coming so soon after the *Amerasia* affair.

Using Hurley's claim that there were communist sympathizers in the State Department and the *Amerasia* affair, pro-Chiang crusaders instigated a moral panic in the United States. The China Lobby played to American fears of a hostile Soviet Union with agents in the United States, creating communist "'folk devils'... [which were] deviant stereotypes identifying the enemy, source of the threat, selfish, evil wrongdoers who are responsible for the trouble," and aligning any who opposed assisting Chiang Kai-shek as being either communist or a communist sympathizer.⁸³ The success of China Lobby claimsmakers' assertion that communists had infiltrated the government came from their determination to insist that America was responsible for what happened in China. The message also appealed to Republicans looking for an issue to use against their Democratic rivals who had been in control of both the U.S. Congress and presidency since 1933. The final result was the vilification of the State Department, which was against unconditionally aiding the GMD. The rhetoric's culmination came in August 1949 when the Truman administration published a volume of documents on U.S.-China relations to defend its record of support for the GMD from these attacks. By then, the fear that had been aroused in

⁸² C.P. Trussell, "Surprising Lack of Care Found in Guarding Washington Files," *NYT*, 25 Oct. 1946. For an analysis of the *Amerasia* affair and its importance in postwar America see Harvey Klehr and Ronald Radosh, *The Amerasia Spy Case: Prelude to McCarthyism*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

⁸³ Goode and Ben-Yahuda, "Moral Panics," 156.

the American public of folk devils precluded rational debate and produced one of the most repressive eras in American history.

GMD officials and pro-Chiang crusaders had assailed America's China policy since the secret provisions of the 1945 Yalta agreement granting concessions to the USSR became public. At the Yalta conference, primarily organized to determine Europe's postwar reorganization, Roosevelt agreed to recognize Soviet interests in Manchuria and an independent Mongolia in order to secure the USSR's entry into the Pacific theater following the conclusion of the war in Europe. Ambassador Koo stated in 1946, "The raid on Manchuria began with Yalta,... and someday the moral responsibility of the United States must be assumed in this connection."⁸⁴ This responsibility was expounded upon after it became apparent that the GMD was in danger of losing the civil war to the CCP. Chiang claimed that the erosion of the GMD's previously superior military position was a result of the USSR's non-observance of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Alliance, which he claimed his government had signed at the behest of the United States.⁸⁵ Republicans, including Governor Dewey and Senator Knowland, picked up this argument and accused Truman and his administration of having "a 'do-nothing policy'" in China which ran counter to the China policy originally enunciated by John Hay in his Open Door Notes of 1899-1900.⁸⁶ Other representatives went so far as to proclaim, "The Chinese Communist conquest of Asia was not made possible in China. It was engineered right here in Washington, by

⁸⁴ "Letter from Bayne to Penfield," (19 Sept. 1946), Entry 399, Box 1 Folder Bayne: CA, SF 1944-47, RG 59, NACP.

⁸⁵ "Letter to Truman from Chiang via Koo," (9 Nov. 1948), Entry 399A, Box 13, Folder Top Secret (1948) 361.13, Chiang Kai-shek: CA, TSSF 1945-50, RG 59, NACP.

⁸⁶ Congress, House, Speech by Gov. Thomas Dewey read in Extension of Remarks by Rep. W. Sterling Cole of New York on Aid to China, 80-1, CR 93, (24 Nov. 1947), A4453; "Bridges Condemns Acheson on China," *NYT*, 16 Apr. 1949; Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland speaking on Investigation of Foreign Policy in the Far East, 81-1, CR 95, (21 Apr 1949), 4862-63.

the top policy makers of this Government.”⁸⁷ Because of this useful and succinct attack line against the entrenched party in power, the China Lobby’s message was picked up by politicians who expanded the debate outside of the smaller circles of China experts and into the living rooms of America.

Chiang and his supporters understood the importance of electoral politics to the policies of the United States. In 1947, a Nanjing newspaper ran an editorial noting that the upcoming U.S. elections meant no definite or new China policy was likely to occur in the United States.⁸⁸ U.S. politics were of significant importance to the GMD and the China Lobby. The Republicans had been successful in reclaiming both chambers of Congress in 1946, and it appeared that the White House would be theirs too after 1948. To the astonishment of everyone, particularly the *Chicago Tribune*, Democrats not only held onto the White House they also reclaimed both the Senate and the House. This news disappointed Chiang Kai-shek, who supported a plank in the Republican Party’s platform accusing Truman of neglecting China. However, it was even more disappointing for Dewey and the Republicans.⁸⁹ Following this unexpected defeat in 1948, the Republicans adopted an even harsher stance towards their Democratic counterparts. Sharpening their calls for aid to the beleaguered GMD, Republicans became the dominant claimsmakers for the China Lobby. Before 1948 they offered a stark contrast to Democratic policy in Asia, which Democrats saw as merely a political ploy. By 1950 the Republican attacks assumed their most vitriolic form in the hands of the junior Republican senator from Wisconsin, Joseph R.

⁸⁷ Congress, Senate, Sen. William E. Jenner of Indiana speaking on the Spreading Threat of Communism in the Far East, 81-1, CR 95, (18 May 1949), 6391.

⁸⁸ “Telegram from Nanking (Stuart) to Secretary of State,” (3 Sept. 1947), Box 58D, Folder 1: CDF 1945-49, RG 59, NACP.

⁸⁹ Henry R. Lieberman, “Truman Vote Disappoints Nanking; Hope for Full Support from Dewey Gone,” *NYT*, 4 Nov. 1948.

McCarthy.⁹⁰ McCarthy did not create the line of rhetoric he pursued, he just did it in such a sensational fashion that it could not be ignored, and the results of the election of 1950 showed that the public was listening. Nearly all of the Democrats who defended Secretary Acheson and the Department of State from the accusations that were leveled by their Republican opponents lost their bids for reelection.⁹¹ Though the primary purpose of the Republicans pro-Chiang stance was partisan, it had real and significant repercussions, and began to be picked up by some Democrats. Political leaders are a necessary component in creating collective insecurity, and the sensational claims against the State Department exacerbated American anxieties already heightened in the Nuclear Age.⁹²

The attacks made on the State Department were not merely assaults on policy. The Republicans adopted an Asia first strategy and based their claims on rhetoric originally disseminated by the China Lobby. By aligning themselves with the pro-Chiang movement they perpetuated and augmented earlier accusations of communist infiltration of the American government, expanding the rhetoric to fit their political agenda. As early as 1946, critics of the Chiang regime were dubbed either soft on communism or communists. An example of this was when Madame Sun Yat-sen spoke out against further aid for the GMD and was denounced as being a communist by the China Lobby. Prominent among her detractors was Alfred Kohlberg.⁹³ Madame Sun may have been aligned with the communists, but this was not common knowledge

⁹⁰ Congress, House, Rep. Fred E. Busby of Illinois Speaking on Republican Policy in Asia, 80-2, *CR* 94, (6 Aug. 1948), 10111; Congress, Senate, Sen. Thomas T. Connally of Texas Speaking on the Situation in the Far East, 81-1, *CR* 95, (9 Sept. 1949), 12759.

⁹¹ William S. White, "Political Stake High in M'Carthy Inquiry," *NYT*, 16 Apr. 1950; Arthur Krock, "In the Nation," *NYT*, 9 Nov. 1950.

⁹² Béland, "Insecurity and Politics," 319.

⁹³ "Mme. Sun Asks Ban on Our Aid to China," *NYT*, 23 July 1946; "U.S. Urged to Stop Aid to China Reds," 25 July 1946; Alfred Kohlberg, "Letters to the Times: Our Ally the Kuomintang," *NYT*, 2 Sep. 1946.

during the period.⁹⁴ The issue here is that she was denounced not because she was suspected of communism, but because she spoke out against aid for the GMD. The China Lobby also set precedents that would be exemplified by McCarthy.

In 1944 Kohlberg began a campaign against the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR). The organization was a Wilsonian nongovernment organization created in 1925 to analyze relations within and between countries of the Pacific Rim and published some articles critical of the GMD. Kohlberg called for a resolution to have the IPR inspected by an outside organization, which the institute denied by 1,163 to 66. Kohlberg then proclaimed that he had an unnamed witness who would testify, rather than provide evidence, that the IPR was a communist front and that many of its members were communists.⁹⁵ Once these tactics reached the level of national politics, even before McCarthy made them famous, rational debate on communism's appeal in the world was untenable in the United States.

Without independent information on China, much of the American public's knowledge regarding China was culled from the China Lobby's rhetoric. A poll conducted in 1950 of "720 'intelligent, well informed Americans,'" found that the participants "frankly and somewhat unhappily admit they didn't have the necessary information on which to base judgments" of America's China policy.⁹⁶ Many of those polled thought it was the fault of the State Department that they were ill informed, but the China Lobby had helped create that gap.⁹⁷ When politicians became more vociferous of the pro-Chiang line, the rhetoric became more credible.

Representative Edward E. Cox (D-Ga.) proclaimed that "it is my feeling and it is my conviction

⁹⁴ Jung Chang and Jan Halliday, *Mao: The Unknown Story*, (New York: Anchor Books, 2005): 132.

⁹⁵ "Pacific Institute Upholds its Staff," *NYT*, 23 Apr. 1947. An interesting part of this case was, when the institute Kohlberg's request was denied, he stated he would resign his membership in the organization, but had already been dropped for not paying his dues.

⁹⁶ "U.S. China Policy Called Confusing," *NYT*, 30 Mar. 1950.

⁹⁷ "U.S. China Policy Called Confusing," *NYT*, 30 Mar. 1950.

that had our China policy been dictated by Stalin it would not have possibly been more to the advantage of Russia.”⁹⁸ Senator Styles Bridges (R-N.H.) accused Secretary of State Acheson of sabotaging GMD efforts to keep China free.⁹⁹ Representative Judd claimed to have a secret report showing that the CCP’s victory in China could have been averted. Adopting tactics pioneered by Kohlberg, Judd “did not specify the authorship of the report nor the circumstances surrounding its drafting,” setting the ground work for McCarthy’s more outrageous claims to follow.¹⁰⁰ It was not a select minority of individuals who attacked the State Department as diatribes by politicians abounded. Typical rhetoric included Representative Robert Hale’s (R-Maine) claim that the State Department “has in the past been permeated with Reds and leftists. If it is not still so permeated, there seem to be plenty of people left with no fixed convictions against communism and are quite gullible about Communist propaganda.”¹⁰¹ These accusations were compounded by comments such as Senator Joseph H. Ball’s (R-Minn.) statement that “there were far too many Communists and fellow-travelers in that agency from the beginning,” in reference to the State Department’s Information Service.¹⁰² Attacks were not directed only at the Department of State in totum as charges were also brought against specific employees.

Charging specific members in the State Department provided the public with names and faces to accompany the folk devils being created. The first organization to claim certain State Department officials favored communism in China was the GMD, which expressed dissatisfaction in 1945 about the inclusion of Dean Acheson and John S. Service as part of a

⁹⁸ Congress, House, Rep. Cox of Georgia Remarks in House Relative to United States White Paper on China, 81-1, *CR* 95, (8 Aug. 1949): 11015.

⁹⁹ “Bridges Condemns Acheson on China,” *NYT*, 16 Apr. 1949.

¹⁰⁰ Harold B. Hinton, “Secret War Report on China Suppressed, Judd Charges,” *NYT*, 21 Aug. 1949.

¹⁰¹ Congress, House, Rep. Hale Speaking on Chinese Policy, 81-2, *CR* 95, (7 Mar. 1949), 1952.

¹⁰² Congress, Senate, Sen. Ball Remarks in Senate relative to State Department, 80-2, *CR* 94, (16 Jan. 1948), 270.

Political Advisory Board for General Douglass MacArthur.¹⁰³ In addition to Service other prominent “China Hands,” including the one time Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs John Carter Vincent, were maligned by the China Lobby to discredit them and their criticism of Chiang Kai-shek’s government.¹⁰⁴ Another individual singled out for attack by the China Lobby was Owen Lattimore, a scholar of East Asia who was an editor for the IPR’s *Pacific Affairs* in the 1930s and served as an advisor to Chiang Kai-shek during the Second World War. Like many China Hands in the postwar period Lattimore, while a professor at Johns Hopkins University, was critical of the GMD. Because of this Kohlberg singled him out in a 1945 article published in *The China Monthly* that claimed Lattimore was attempting “to lock China into the Communist world System.”¹⁰⁵ In 1950 Lattimore was the focus of a much more public and far reaching attack by McCarthy who claimed Lattimore “was a Communist, ‘the top soviet agent’ in the United States and the ‘architect’ of a Far Eastern policy that had ‘betrayed’ Nationalist China to the Communists.”¹⁰⁶ McCarthy’s repetition of Kohlberg’s charges reached a much broader audience because of the legitimacy provided by his position as a Senator. Also McCarthy’s reiteration came shortly after the sensationalism of Alger Hiss’s trial, during which Hiss was accused and cleared of espionage for the Soviet Union in 1948 and was retried in 1950 and found, after one mistrial, guilty of perjury. This created a much more receptive audience for the charges as well.¹⁰⁷ The Truman administration attempted to quell the China Lobby’s main

¹⁰³ “The Ambassador in China (Hurley) to the Secretary of State,” (20 Sept. 1945), *FRUS 1945*, 7: 565-66.

¹⁰⁴ For a remarkably thorough and well written work on the ordeals of John Carter Vincent see Gary May, *China Scapegoat: The Diplomatic Ordeal of John Carter Vincent*, (Washington D.C.: New Republic Books, 1979).

¹⁰⁵ Alfred Kohlberg, “Owen Lattimore: ‘Expert’s Expert,’” *The China Monthly* 6, (Oct. 1945), 26.

¹⁰⁶ William S. White, “Lattimore Denies he was Ever a Red; Tydings Clears Him,” *NYT*, 7 Apr. 1950. For an in depth examination of Owen Lattimore’s trials and tribulations during this period see Robert P. Newman, *Owen Lattimore and the “Loss” of China*, (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1992).

¹⁰⁷ An exhaustive book that examines the Alger Hiss case and finds that he was ultimately guilty of perjury, though is unable to prove Hiss was guilty of espionage, is Allen Weinstein, *Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978).

claim, that the United States had not provided Chiang with adequate support after the Pacific War, as the accusations reached a near deafening cacophony.

In August 1949, the State Department released *U.S. Relations with China with Special Reference to the Period of 1944-1949*, also later dubbed the *China White Paper*. Though it was meant to be a defense of the administration's China policy, it also heralded the success of the China Lobby's campaign. The goal of the *China White Paper* was to demonstrate that "the reasons for the failures of the Chinese National Government... do not stem from any inadequacy of American aid."¹⁰⁸ The GMD's embassy was wary that the publication of the *China White Paper* would damage Sino-American relations during a critical juncture for the Chinese Nationalists, but their fear proved to be unfounded as the China Lobby's claimsmakers went into action.¹⁰⁹ Even before the *China White Paper* was published the China Lobby set out to refute the claims it enumerated. Referring to a presentation before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which found 90 percent of American aid had been seized by the CCP, Senator Knowland claimed "that statement cannot be supported by the record, in fact is not correct. and [*sic*] can be demonstrated as not being correct on the basis of the State Department's own figures."¹¹⁰ Describing it "as 'a 1,054-page whitewash of a wishful, do-nothing policy which has succeeded only in placing Asia in danger of Soviet conquest,'" the *China White Paper's* claims were refuted and the administration was charged with cherry picking the evidence provided by both Republicans, including Knowland and Judd, and some conservative Democrats, such as

¹⁰⁸ Dean Acheson, "Letter of Transmittal," (July 30 1949), *White Paper*, xiv.

¹⁰⁹ Harold B. Hinton, "Chinese Urge U.S. Halt White Paper," *NYT*, 24 July 1949.

¹¹⁰ Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland Speaking on Economic Aid to the Republic of Korea, 81-1, *CR* 95, (5 July 1949), 8822.

Senator Pat McCarran (D-Nev.).¹¹¹ Mao and the CCP also attacked the document, from the opposite perspective by stating, “That despite the [GMD] regime’s corruption and lack of popular support the United States would ‘make use of this tool’ so long as it had any soldiers or agents left in China.”¹¹² A poll conducted in September found that the *White Paper* had done little to enhance the public’s opinion of the administration’s China policy. Of those who were familiar with the publication, 26 percent approved of U.S. policy and 53 percent disapproved.¹¹³ Thus, the Truman administration’s attempt to unequivocally explicate its program in China failed to weaken the China Lobby’s rhetoric.

By February 1950, when McCarthy made his fantastic announcement that he had a list of Communists currently employed by the State Department, the world was no longer the safe haven it had been after the victorious conclusion of the Second World War in 1945.¹¹⁴ By 1949 the Soviet Union had successfully tested its first atomic weapon and the Chinese Communist Party had won its revolution against the Nationalists. With the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, communism appeared to be on the march and the China Lobby appeared prophetic. The United States was openly engaged in a Cold War with the USSR, and despite the economic prosperity of the period the world seemed to be a much more dangerous place. These developments were not alone in providing credibility for McCarthy’s charges of communist infiltration of the State Department. For years, particularly following VJ-Day in 1945, a loose-knit organization had set out to influence American policy towards China. In doing so they

¹¹¹ Harold B. Hinton, “4 Senators Issue Call for China Aid,” *NYT*, 22 Aug. 1949; William J. Goodwin, “China’s Nationalist Army,” *NYT*, 12 Aug. 1949. Harold B. Hinton, “Secret War Report on China Suppressed, Judd Charges,” *NYT*, 21 Aug. 1949.

¹¹² Walter Sullivan, “China White Paper Draws Red Retort,” *NYT*, 14 Aug. 1949.

¹¹³ “China,” (19 Sept. 1949), *Gallup*, 852.

¹¹⁴ Joseph McCarthy, “Speech at Wheeling West Virginia, February 9, 1950,” in Ellen Schrecker, *The Age of McCarthyism: A Brief History with Documents*, (New York: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2002), 238-241; “McCarthy Insists Truman Oust Reds,” *NYT*, 12 Feb. 1950.

popularized many of the theories and methods that became the signatures of McCarthyism and influenced U.S. policy toward China as well as America's overall foreign and domestic policies throughout much of the Cold War.

The unequivocal support provided for the Guomindang simply because they were not communists, regardless of their corruption and cruelty, was played out time and again as the United States backed regimes based on their opposition to communism. Because most Americans are essentially parochial, they rely on others for information about the larger world. The China Lobby used this factor to portray Chiang as someone comparable to America's founding fathers, someone who deserved U.S. aid. McCarthy, using the rhetoric provided by the China Lobby, cast those who questioned the veracity of these claims or challenged them and their proponents outright as being either "Reds, [or] their minions the egg-sucking phony liberals who... clutter American thinking with their simple-minded arguments."¹¹⁵ American aid was not solely to help these governments, but also to shore them up against supposed Soviet aggression and communism in general. The China Lobby's original claims that China was the lynchpin to communist control of all Asia became a foundation of U.S. foreign policy during the Cold War. The administration adopted what became known as the Domino Theory in NSC 68, drafted in 1950, which made the military containment of communism a key objective of the United States.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ "McCarthy Labels Marshall Unfit," *NYT*, 21 Apr. 1950.

¹¹⁶ A copy of NSC 68 can be found in Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950 Vol. I: National Security Affairs; Foreign Economic Policy*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1977): 234-292. Hereafter referred to as *FRUS 1950, I*. For a brief treatment of the supposed particular susceptibility of Asians to Soviet ideology see pages 246-47.

Rep. Hugh De Lacy (D-Wash.), quoting Marquis Childs, commented in 1946 “the easiest way to dispose of your opponent is to yell Communist.”¹¹⁷ This view was proven only too true once McCarthyism reared its head in American society. Loyalty hearings, neighbors suspicious of neighbors and ruined lives marked the panic that swept through the populace. These events, which did not occur in a vacuum, were not the natural manifestations of public anxiety. They were, in part, the result of the China Lobby’s efforts to arouse public support for the GMD and the minority party in the U.S. Congress. However, China Lobby claimsmakers’ efforts did not end after Chiang Kai-shek’s government was forced to seek refuge on Taiwan. There was a new issue to be dealt with in China. The problem of recognition by the United States and the United Nations of either the Republic of China as the sole representative of the Chinese people or of the newly formed People’s Republic of China that controlled the mainland would become a major factor in Sino-American relations. The China problem and McCarthyism would continue to batter the Truman administration during what many contemporaries viewed as the beginning of the Third World War, the Korean War.

¹¹⁷ Congress, House, Rep. De Lacy speaking on America’s Responsibility for Civil War in China, 79th Cong., 2nd Sess., *Congressional Record* 92, (26 July 1946), 10224.

CHAPTER 2: SALVATION THROUGH FIRE

By 1950 Mao Zedong's People's Republic of China (PRC) was in control of China. Chiang Kai-shek's Republic of China could only claim Taiwan, the Pescadores, Hainan, and some of the offshore islands in the Taiwan Strait. By May, the PRC had taken Hainan as well. It appeared that the Chinese Civil War was progressing quickly and would result in the Guomintang's (GMD) ultimate collapse. Though the China Lobby had been able to mobilize public support for Chiang's government its efforts seemed to have been for naught. President Harry S. Truman and his administration were unwilling to devote extensive aid or military support to the Guomintang for an island that, technically, remained Japanese territory.¹ By January 1950 the administration's stance towards the conflict in China was acknowledged as one where "we wash our hands of Formosa [Taiwan]."² This position was highlighted when Dean Acheson, in a speech to the National Press Club on 12 January, conspicuously left Korea and Taiwan outside the U.S.'s Defensive Perimeter in Asia.³ However, the United States still recognized the GMD as the legitimate government of China. Thus the China Lobby had a new objective. Although support for Chiang's regime had not prevented its military defeat, the crusaders had a new goal: preventing the United States acknowledgement of the newly established government on the Chinese mainland.

As early as 1947 the problem of a communist controlled China was addressed in a Joint Chiefs of Staff memorandum. The core of the problem was China's position as a permanent member of the United Nations (U.N.) Security Council. The last thing the United States wanted

¹ James Reston, "Truman Decision Against Occupying Formosa Reported," *NYT*, 1 Jan. 1950.

² "Mr. Truman on Formosa," *NYT*, 6 Jan. 1950.

³ Walter H. Wagoner, "Four Areas Listed," *NYT*, 13 Jan. 1950. For a thorough analysis of the Truman administration's national security strategy throughout its tenure as well as this period see Melvyn P. Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War*, (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1992).

was “removing from the Security Council a Chinese government friendly to the United States and replacing it with one under the control of the USSR.”⁴ Late in 1949 Senator Knowland declared on the Senate floor that the United States was not bound to recognize “either de facto or de jure, another government merely because it has overrun by force of arms a major area of a legal government which is still functioning.”⁵ The majority of Americans agreed with Knowland; 55 percent of those familiar with China’s civil war felt the United States should not recognize the newly formed PRC.⁶ However, the administration did not think the situation was as dire as the press coverage indicated and was entertaining the possibility that PRC representation was only a matter of time.⁷ All that changed when, on 25 June 1950, North Korea invaded South Korea. Japan had taken control of Korea in 1910 and ruled the country until its defeat in the Second World War. Korea was then partitioned into Soviet and American spheres of influence along the 38th parallel which, as one historian has pointed out, was “a line on a map, nothing more.”⁸ The outbreak of the Korean War was intricately linked to the overall antagonisms of the Cold War, as once the United States and USSR set up friendly regimes in 1945 the possibility of Korean reunification became remote.⁹

Within the United States, the Korean War had ramifications that went beyond the actual conduct of the war itself. In addition to providing fuel for McCarthyism, the war reinvigorated the China Lobby as the United States and the U.N. attempted to turn back the Democratic

⁴ “Memorandum from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee,” (9 June 1947), *FRUS 1947*, 7: 841.

⁵ Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland speaking on Recognition of Soviet Regime in China, 81-1, *CR 95* (11 Oct. 1949), 14180.

⁶ “China,” (7 Jan. 1950), *Gallup*, 880-81. This number is derived from 42 percent opposed to recognition of 76 percent who stated they were aware of the civil war in China.

⁷ “Memorandum of the Counselor (Kennan) to the Secretary of State,” (6 Jan. 1950), *FRUS 1950*, 1: 132; “U.S. Path is Eased on U.N. China Shift,” *NYT*, 6 Jan. 1950.

⁸ William Stueck, *Rethinking the Korean War: A New Diplomatic and Strategic History*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002): 12. A detailed account of how the 38th parallel became the boundary between North and South Korea can be found on pages 11-15.

⁹ For a thorough analysis of the factors leading up the Korean War see Cummings, *Origins of the Korean War*.

People's Republic of Korea. These latent effects became more pronounced after the PRC entered the war against the American-led U.N. forces in October 1950. During this period the China Lobby also successfully fended off investigation and attack by the Truman administration and its allies in the Congress. During this second phase, 1950-1952, the China Lobby had many advantages over its initial phase during the Chinese Civil War. Not only were the Pro-Chiang crusaders more adept at crafting their messages for public consumption, but also the parameters of debate over American policy in China had been established. As the Second Red Scare swept across the American landscape and U.S. troops fought a communist enemy in a foreign land, the debate over China became not one of whether to support Chiang's regime on Taiwan, but of how much support his regime should be given.

In 1950 the two favorite mottos of Americans were "do unto others as you would have them do unto you" followed by "live and let live."¹⁰ Ironically, at the same time nearly half the population familiar with Senator Joseph McCarthy's attacks against the State Department felt he was doing more good than harm.¹¹ Dean Acheson would later recall "McCarthy's Wheeling speech was not a brilliant maiden effort in the traditional parliamentary or senatorial style. It was the rambling, ill-prepared result of his slovenly, lazy, and undisciplined habits."¹² While McCarthy's skills as an orator were questionable, his ability to tap into a reservoir of fear in American society was unrivaled. This was by no means solely the work of McCarthy, though this age of repression and hysteria would bear his name. McCarthy took the initial claims of the China Lobby against the State Department, which had been validated through their reiteration by politicians and the press and expanded them into an assault that would reach the highest echelons

¹⁰ "Favorite Motto," (8 July 1950), *Gallup*, 924.

¹¹ "Joseph McCarthy," (21 May 1950), *Gallup*, 912. Thirty-nine percent of 84 percent familiar with the subject felt McCarthy was doing good, 29 percent felt he was doing harm.

¹² Acheson, *Present at the Creation*, 362.

of government.¹³ In addition to the ad hominem attacks on the State Department, McCarthy also attacked individuals previously identified by pro-Chiang crusaders with all of the authority provided by his position in the U.S. Senate. McCarthy became a willing propagator of China Lobby rhetoric in his crusade against domestic communism, which was facilitated by Alfred Kohlberg who continued to be one of the China Lobby's most vociferous members. These attacks would spill over into the U.S. Congress, heightening internal tensions and solidifying the anti-communist sentiments of the country as the Cold War turned hot.

Four days before McCarthy delivered his speech in Wheeling, West Virginia, he interrupted a harangue by Senator William Knowland on the floor of the Senate. Among other things, Knowland proclaimed "it is my firm belief that, despite the Far Eastern Division, despite the Secretary of State and the President, the Republic of China continues to have the good will and prayers of the American people in the struggle against communism."¹⁴ McCarthy interrupted to discuss the State Department, John Service in particular, and whether its China policy indicated its communist predilections. Knowland's response demonstrated the continuity of the China Lobby's rhetoric; he had Hurley's resignation printed in the *Congressional Record* stating, "I think the letter speaks for itself."¹⁵ McCarthy's charges were not cut from whole cloth, they were merely more public and direct than the original attacks China Lobby claimsmakers had made about the government. Communists had been primary targets of pro-Chiang claimsmakers for years because they were effective folk devils for Americans and the GMD's primary political rivals in China. Chiang had placed his government's troubles at the feet of the Chinese

¹³ For a detailed analysis of how domain expansion progresses through the three stages of initial claim-validation-expansion see Best, *Threatened Children*, 79-84.

¹⁴ Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland speaking on American Policy in the Far East, 81-2, *CR* 95, (5 Jan. 1950): 81.

¹⁵ Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland speaking on American Policy in the Far East, 81-2, *CR* 95, (5 Jan. 1950): 86.

Communist Party as far back as 1927 after he expelled them from his coalition government.¹⁶ In addition to partisan attacks against the Truman administration, McCarthy pursued the China Lobby line against the State Department.¹⁷ McCarthy's general attacks on the State Department were quickly honed into attacks on "the Far Eastern Division and the Voice of America," which he claimed "were 'almost completely controlled and dominated by individuals who are more loyal to the ideals and designs of communism than to those of the free, God-fearing half of the world.'"¹⁸ However, McCarthy's greatest contribution to the pro-Chiang crusaders was his assault on individuals who had long been critical of the Generalissimo's government.

In 1945 Owen Lattimore countered Alfred Kohlberg's original assertion that he was a communist sympathizer in an article printed in *The China Monthly*. In addition to citing a multitude of errors in Kohlberg's original article, Lattimore stated emphatically "what I believe in, and what my whole record shows I believe in, is the spread of democracy, not the spread of communism."¹⁹ In his response, Kohlberg acknowledged Lattimore's corrections and leveled additional accusations. Citing the dust jacket of Lattimore's *Solution in Asia*, Kohlberg asserted that Lattimore had supported the USSR and wanted to know "When did you change your mind and why?"²⁰ If Kohlberg had taken the time to read the collection of essays Lattimore had presented, however, he would have found that Lattimore did believe Asians desired democracy but he favored working with the Soviet Union—an ally at the time of the book's publication—rather than against it.²¹ This method of assault by insinuation and misrepresentation became a hallmark of McCarthy's demagoguery in the Senate. Kohlberg's previous attacks on Lattimore

¹⁶ Chiang, *China's Destiny*, 120-21.

¹⁷ "McCarthy Insists Truman Ousts Reds," *NYT*, 12 Feb. 1950.

¹⁸ William S. White, "Assails Lattimore," *NYT*, 31 Mar. 1950.

¹⁹ Owen Lattimore, "Reply to Mr. Kohlberg," *The China Monthly* 6 (Dec. 1945): 15-17, pp. 17.

²⁰ Alfred Kohlberg, "A Reply to a Reply," *The China Monthly* 7 (Mar. 1946): 104.

²¹ Owen Lattimore, *Solution in Asia*, (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1945).

made him an appealing target as a folk devil once McCarthy was given access to the Senate's investigative mechanisms.

McCarthy's first public mention of Lattimore was as one of four government employees whose loyalty he questioned on 13 March 1950 before a committee led by Senator Millard E. Tydings (D-Md.), formed specifically to investigate McCarthy's Wheeling charges. Tydings and the other members of the subcommittee decided they would allow McCarthy to provide information as he saw fit, which gave him "a blank check."²² Thus the Tydings committee's effect was to provide McCarthy with legitimacy and exposure that would reverberate throughout the United States. It was during these hearings that McCarthy tied together the pro-Chiang claimsmakers' rhetoric with the Red Scare sweeping through the United States.²³ In the first round of accusations Lattimore was not even a primary target.²⁴ However, less than two weeks later McCarthy claimed Lattimore was the top Soviet agent in the United States.²⁵ During Lattimore's hearing McCarthy refused to divulge any information to the committee and claimed that a review of Lattimore's record would prove that he was guilty of treason. After members of the committee lambasted McCarthy for making a sham of the hearing by cherry picking evidence McCarthy replied "the traitors,... will cause many men not to have a chance,... Crocodile tears are being shed for traitorous individuals, but forgotten are 400,000,000 people [the Chinese] who have been sold into slavery by these people."²⁶ After Lattimore's testimony and a review of his record, compiled by Federal Bureau of Investigations Director J. Edgar Hoover, Tydings and the

²² "S. RES. 231—Continued," (27 Feb. 1950), in U.S. Senate, *Executive Sessions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Vol. II: Eighty-First Congress, First and Second Sessions, 1949-1950*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1976), 232.

²³ Dean Acheson, *Present at the Creation: My Years at the State Department*, (New York: Norton, 1969), 363.

²⁴ William S. White, "McCarthy Accuses Point Four Official," *NYT*, 14 Mar. 1950.

²⁵ Jay Wale, "Lattimore Named 'Top Soviet Spy' Cited by M'Carthy," *NYT*, 27 Mar. 1950.

²⁶ William S. White, "Assails Lattimore," *NYT*, 31 Mar. 1950. Brackets in original.

committee cleared Lattimore of any wrongdoing.²⁷ McCarthy's response to the ruling was to question the integrity of the proceedings, claiming "either Tydings hasn't seen the files or he is lying. There is no other alternative."²⁸ McCarthy earlier had said his case would fall or stand on his accusation of Lattimore and now he needed a new method of convincing the committee.²⁹ Lacking any hard evidence McCarthy produced Louis F. Budenz, a former communist, to prove that Lattimore was a communist agent.

Budenz, who had never met Lattimore, made a sensational witness. Along with references to the conspiratorial nature of communism in the United States, he referenced Alger Hiss, the *Amerasia* affair, and the Institute of Pacific Relations. Though it came to light that Budenz denied Lattimore was a Communist in 1949 to a *Collier's* magazine editor, Budenz now claimed he only said that because "he had felt that the editor was asking him 'peculiar questions' that might open him to libel action. Every ex-Communist knew... that the Communists were out to 'bleed' them with libel suits."³⁰ Budenz's testimony also revealed that he and Alfred Kohlberg had recently discussed Lattimore's case. Furthermore, Budenz admitted to only a cursory reading of one of Lattimore's eleven works on Asia.³¹ Lattimore, following Budenz's fantastic accusations, obtained a copy of Budenz's *This is My Story* published in 1945 and found "big chunks of it reappeared in his testimony."³² Essentially, Budenz had never met Lattimore, denied he was a communist a year earlier, discussed the case with Kohlberg, and never devoted attention to Lattimore's prolific writings. However, Budenz's world of communist conspiracy needed no hard evidence. After the cross-examination had revealed these defects in Budenz's

²⁷ Owen Lattimore, *Ordeal by Slander*, (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1950): 107.

²⁸ William S. White, "Lattimore Denies he was Ever a Red; Tydings Clears Him," *NYT*, 7 Apr. 1950.

²⁹ Joseph McCarthy, *McCarthyism, The Fight For America: Documented Answers to Questions Asked by Friend and Foe*, (New York: Devin-Adair Company, 1952), 20.

³⁰ William S. White, "Testifying before Senators in Washington," *NYT*, 21 Apr. 1950.

³¹ William S. White, "Testifying before Senators in Washington," *NYT*, 21 Apr. 1950.

³² Lattimore, *Ordeal by Slander*, 122. Lattimore's recollection of Budenz's testimony can be found on pp. 117-125.

testimony Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper (R-Iowa) queried ““Have you ever met Stalin?’ ‘No,’ ... [Budenz responded] ‘You believe Stalin, however, to be a Communist?’” which was met by laughter in the galley.³³ Although Lattimore and all others investigated by the Tydings committee were cleared following its conclusion in July 1950, the decision fell along party lines with Republicans claiming the committee had not been thorough enough in its investigations.³⁴ Lattimore’s “trial” was not over as he would once again defend himself before a Senate investigative committee that would include Senator Knowland early in 1952.³⁵ Lattimore was not the only sinologist critical of the GMD to come under fire from McCarthy and the conclusion of the Tydings committee did not end the senator’s crusade.

State Department officials such as John Carter Vincent, John S. Service, O. Edmund Clubb, and Phillip C. Jessup came under renewed scrutiny as a result of McCarthy’s allegations.³⁶ However, the most ambitious of McCarthy’s accusations was against former General of the Army, former Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall. Claimsmakers had long blamed the GMD’s demise on Marshall for his role in attempting to broker a peace in China. Marshall’s failure was originally attributed to ignorance with claimsmakers stating Marshall “went on his mission to China ignorant of the fixed, long-standing purpose of Moscow to force China into a satellite status, and only discovered shortly before he left China a year later how he had been used to serve Soviet ends.”³⁷ In the Senate it was insinuated that, after his mission to China, Marshall “finding Chiang Kai-shek too strong to be broken and too wise to be fooled, ... came home nursing an angry hostility to the

³³ William S. White, “Testifying before Senators in Washington,” *NYT*, 21 Apr. 1950.

³⁴ “The M’Carthy Charges,” *NYT*, 18 Jul. 1950.

³⁵ William S. White, “Lattimore Calls Senators’ Inquiry on China Stacked,” *NYT*, 27 Feb. 1952.

³⁶ “McCarthy is Accused,” *NYT*, 26 May 1950; Harold B. Hinton, “Vincent Loyalty Case Opens; 1,139 Ordered Re-Examined,” *NYT*, 17 Dec. 1951.

³⁷ William R. Johnson, “The United States Sells China Down the Amur,” *The China Monthly* 7 (Dec. 1947), 415.

generalissimo.”³⁸ The GMD had long held the view that Marshall was “the chief stumbling block to vigorous all-out support of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.”³⁹ McCarthy, though studiously avoiding outright accusations, was willing to go on an all-out offensive. In press conferences, speeches delivered in the Senate, a book, and a magazine, McCarthy set out to undermine one of America’s most celebrated heroes.⁴⁰ Emblematic of McCarthy’s attack was a declaration that the only way to understand Marshall’s farewell address from China was “if it is read as a propaganda document in behalf of Communist world objectives.”⁴¹

McCarthy’s attacks on China Hands such as Lattimore and Service as well as diplomats like Marshall were not new. However these assaults were broadcast to a much larger audience and emboldened other politicians to go on the offensive against suspected communists. Many of the people targeted had originally been identified by the China Lobby and included Secretary of State Dean Acheson.⁴² Communists continued to be safe political targets, after all. Ninety percent of the public favored removing communists working in important industries during times of war and 67 percent favored passing a bill that would force communists to register with the Justice Department. More telling, however, were American opinions of what to do with American communists if the United States were to go to war with the USSR. Forty percent favored interning or imprisoning American communists, 28 percent favored exiling them—13 percent of those wanted them sent to Russia—and 13 percent favored their execution. Only one

³⁸ Congress, House, Sen. Edward E. Cox of Georgia speaking on Help Europe and China Too, 80-2, *CR* 94, (8 Mar. 1948), 2332.

³⁹ Henry R. Lieberman, “Truman Vote Disappoints Nanjing; Hope for Full Aid from Dewey Gone,” *NYT*, 4 Nov. 1948.

⁴⁰ “McCarthy Labels Marshall Unfit,” *NYT*, 21 Apr. 1950; Congress, Senate, Sen. Joseph McCarthy, “America’s Retreat From Victory; The Story of General George C. Marshall,” (14 Jun. 1951), in Joseph McCarthy, *Major Speeches and Debates of Senator Joe McCarthy: Delivered in the United States Senate 1950-1951: Unabridged Reprint from the Congressional Record*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO 1951); Joseph McCarthy, *America’s Retreat from Victory: The Story of George Catlett Marshall*, (New York: Devin-Adair, 1951); McCarthy, *McCarthyism*.

⁴¹ McCarthy, *America’s Retreat from Victory*, 128. Marshall’s statement can be found in “Personal Statement of the Personal Representative of the President (Marshall), January 7, 1947,” *White Paper*, 686-89.

⁴² Acheson, *Present at the Creation*, 364-65.

percent declared that the government should do nothing as everyone was entitled to freedom of thought.⁴³ Simply put, no one was going to come out and make a strong case for the rights and liberties of communists during this era. Communism continued to be a valence issue in 1950s America.

Rising American incomes during the postwar period enhanced the efficacy of McCarthy's crusade against domestic communists. This also assisted China Lobby claimsmakers as they continued to discredit critics of Chiang Kai-shek's regime. The Second World War had helped end the Great Depression in the United States and the U.S. economy continued to improve after the war's end. Although there were several contractions, overall Americans' disposable income—income after taxes—increased during this period. From 1945 to 1950 Americans' disposable income increased by two percent and from 1950 to 1952 it increased another three percent. In total, from 1945 to 1952, the increase was four percent.⁴⁴ However, from 1940, before the Second World War, to 1952 American's disposable income increased by 37 percent.⁴⁵ This allowed Americans to focus their attention on status issues, such as communist subversion, because economic concerns were ameliorated by rising incomes in the postwar United States. Therefore, McCarthy's use of China Lobby rhetoric was aided by the increased economic stability of Americans when compared to the prewar period.

⁴³ "American Communists," (21 Aug. 1950), *Gallup*, 933-34.

⁴⁴ These percentages were obtained using the formula (current amount – past amount)/past amount = percent change. For other economic data the same formula is used unless otherwise stated. In 1996 dollars, the Disposable Personal Income of Americans in 1945 was 7,729; in 1950 it was 7,863; in 1952 it was 8,071. U.S. Census Bureau, "Selected Per Capita Income and Product Items in Current and Real (1996) Dollars: 1929-2002," available from U.S. Census Bureau, "The 2009 Statistical Abstract: Historical Statistics," at http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/hist_stats.html. Data retrieved 30 Apr. 2009. Hereafter referred to as "2009 Statistical Abstract."

⁴⁵ In 1996 dollars, the Disposable Personal Income of Americans in 1940 was 5,912, in 1952 it was 8,071. U.S. Census Bureau, "2009 Statistical Abstract," data retrieved 30 Apr. 2009.

Although McCarthyism was a phenomenon in its own right, the senator's momentum was derived from the rhetoric of pro-Chiang claimsmakers.⁴⁶ As McCarthy continued his attacks on communist infiltration of the government he expanded the original arguments making them even more sensational, which benefited the China Lobby in several important ways. First, McCarthy's sensational accusations succeeded in removing GMD critics, such as Service, and causing those officials left in the State Department to self-censor their reporting. McCarthy's accusations also gained high levels of attention from the media and policymakers allowing the claimsmakers' arguments to reach a larger segment of the public. Republicans attacking the Truman administration as well as Democrats afraid of appearing soft on communism made useful pegs for the media on communist subversion. This exacerbated fears of Soviet espionage, which was already an identified social problem.⁴⁷ Furthermore, examples of communist espionage were dramatic and universal, as in Budenz's testimony that "in the Communist world, a Communist agent may be shielded by special indulgences and dispensations permitting him to attack Communist ideas and the Party line. Thus, he warned, anything anti-Communist in either my [Lattimore] writings or my actions ought to be taken as proof of my being in fact a Communist!"⁴⁸ This tautological argument meant that anyone could be a communist agent, even if they were stridently anti-communist. The lack of evidence, rather than refuting claims of rampant communist infiltration of the government, was used as proof of the strength of

⁴⁶ A few good analyses of McCarthyism are David Cauter, *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge Under Truman and Eisenhower*, (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1978); Robert Griffith, *The Politics of Fear: Joseph R. McCarthy and the Senate*, (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987); and M.J. Heale, *McCarthy's Americans: Red Scare Politics in State and Nation, 1935-1965*, (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 1998). For a comparison of Kohlberg and McCarthy's accusations against the Institute of Pacific Relations and its personnel can be found in Koen, *China Lobby*, 221-229.

⁴⁷ Best, *Threatened Children*, 95-96.

⁴⁸ Lattimore, *Ordeal by Slander*, 121. Three additional aspects of this tautological argument can be found on pp. 121-122 and in William S. White, "Lattimore Derides Budenz as 'Gossip,'" *NYT*, 22 Apr. 1950.

communist conspiracies.⁴⁹ With no way of knowing who might be working for the Soviet Union, no one was safe or free from attack.⁵⁰ Thus the threat of communist infiltration was spread from the State Department to all of America, creating a moral panic. This meant that anyone who did not offer all-out support of Chiang Kai-shek's regime against the communist PRC could be labeled as "eager and willing to turn China over to Stalin," even if some paid "lip service, at least, to the cause of Nationalist China."⁵¹ As beneficial as McCarthy's assault on the State Department was, it also coincided with the Soviet-authorized North Korean invasion of American allied South Korea in June 1950. The congruence of McCarthyism and the Korean War, especially after the PRC's entry in October 1950, served to reinforce the China Lobby's calls for non-recognition of the PRC in any form.

McCarthy was successful in promoting the domestic agenda of the China Lobby. However, the fate of the Nationalist Government on Taiwan was still in a tenuous position in the early months of 1950. Once the outcome of the Chinese Civil War became apparent in 1949, pro-Chiang claimsmakers began looking for legal loopholes to secure Taiwan for the remnants of the GMD, including not turning Taiwan over to China after the Japanese Peace Treaty was finalized.⁵² The theory underlying the latter strategy was that then Taiwan would not be the rightful territory of China, allowing U.S. forces to be stationed there without becoming participants in a civil war. During this period the American public familiar with the Chinese Civil War opposed recognizing the PRC more than two to one and the majority favored

⁴⁹ Best, *Threatened Children*, 83.

⁵⁰ Hilgertner and Bosk, "The Rise and Fall of Social Problems," 61; Best, *Threatened Children*, 98.

⁵¹ "Judd Sees China Sacrificed by U.S.," *NYT*, 10 Oct. 1951.

⁵² "Statement of Maj. Gen. David G. Barr, Director, Joint U.S. Military Advisory Group to the Republic of China," (22 Mar. 1949), *Economic Assistance*, 62-63; Acheson, *Present at the Creation*, 350.

discontinuing trade if the CCP took over the whole of China.⁵³ The difficulty was the continued existence of the Nationalist regime once the PLA was able to put together a naval force capable of crossing the Taiwan Strait.

China Lobby claimsmakers began criticizing the Truman administration's hands-off policy regarding China shortly after its articulation. Following the public revelation of this policy towards the GMD on Taiwan, Acheson attempted to forestall pro-Chiang crusaders' criticisms by explaining the necessity of such a policy in a private meeting with Senators Knowland and Alexander H. Smith (R-N.J.). Two concerns Acheson highlighted were the danger of inadvertently supporting communist propaganda that the United States was an imperial power and that Taiwan was outside of America's security parameter.⁵⁴ However, Knowland and Smith disagreed with Acheson there and on the Senate floor.⁵⁵ Knowland not only supported continued aid to the GMD, but also wanted to have the U.S. Navy "out there and serving notice that we will not permit carnage and destruction on the island of Formosa [Taiwan]."⁵⁶ Knowland posited that this was necessary with the island's status pending the Japanese Peace Treaty. Knowland admitted that the conflict in China was a civil war although he continued the rhetoric that the communists constituted a puppet regime under Moscow control.⁵⁷ This line was backed by Smith's declaration that "this Communist-Chinese movement originated in Moscow some twenty years ago... [its] leadership today are Moscow trained agents, directed now from Moscow,

⁵³ "China," (28 Nov. 1949), *Gallup*, 868-69. These figures are derived from 42 percent opposed to recognition of the PRC versus 20 percent favoring recognition and 33 percent who favored discontinuing trade versus 29 percent desiring continued trade of 79 percent familiar with the civil war. Fourteen percent had no opinion for either recognition or trade.

⁵⁴ "Memorandum of Conversation, by the Secretary of State," (5 Jan. 1950), in Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States 1950, Vol. VI: East Asia and the Pacific*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO 1976): 259-261. Hereafter referred to as *FRUS 1950, 6*.

⁵⁵ "Memorandum of Conversation, by the Secretary of State," (5 Jan. 1950), *FRUS 1950, 6*: 260-63.

⁵⁶ Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland speaking on American Policy in the Far East, 81st Cong., 2nd Sess., *Congressional Record* 96, (5 Jan. 1950), 82, 98. Hereafter referred to as 81-2, *CR* 96.

⁵⁷ Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland speaking on American Policy in the Far East, 81-2, *CR* 96, 87-88.

supplied by Moscow.”⁵⁸ Opponents, such as Senate Majority Leader Scott W. Lucas (D-Ill.), argued that placing U.S. naval forces between the warring factions in China would indicate, “we will become a participant in the civil war now raging in China” and if that were to happen “we should prepare for world war III.”⁵⁹ Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Senator Thomas T. Connally (D-Tex.), and other Democratic leaders, continued to place the onus of the GMD’s failure on Chiang stating “I will tell the Congress who abandoned China. Chiang Kai-shek abandoned her.”⁶⁰ While Americans continued to support non-recognition of the PRC, the public was not willing to provide all out assistance for Taipei. Forty-two percent of Americans who were reasonably well informed about the situation in Taiwan preferred the administration’s hands-off approach to China, 20 percent supported using the military to defend it, and 29 percent favored providing financial and materiel aid to the Nationalist regime.⁶¹ The outbreak of the Korean War on 25 June 1950, radically altered the faltering foreign policy objectives of the China Lobby.

Working as a consultant to the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles prepared a memorandum concerning Asia in mid-May 1950. Dulles declared the only way to prevent the deterioration of U.S. influence in Asia and reassure America’s allies was “if at some doubtful point we quickly take a dramatic and strong stand that shows our confidence and resolution.”⁶² North Korea’s invasion of South Korea provided an ideal opportunity to prove America’s resolve to the world. The United States quickly dispatched troops to the area and secured the authority of

⁵⁸ Congress, Senate, Sen. Smith speaking on American Policy in the Far East, 81-2, *CR* 96, (5 Jan. 1950), 85.

⁵⁹ Congress, Senate, Sen. Lucas speaking on American Policy in the Far East, 81-2, *CR* 96, (5 Jan. 1950), 98.

⁶⁰ Congress, Senate, Sen. Connally speaking on Struggles in China, 81-2, *CR* 96, (9 Jan. 1950), 98.

⁶¹ “Formosa,” (3 Feb. 1950), *Gallup*, 887. These numbers are derived from 49 percent of respondents who were reasonably well informed, of which 21 percent favored a hands-off policy, 10 percent favored using armed forces, and 14 percent favored providing financial and materiel assistance. Four percent had no opinion.

⁶² “Memorandum by John Foster Dulles,” (18 May 1950), Entry 399A, Box 17, Folder Top Secret (1950) 306.001, US Policy Toward China: CA, TSSF 1945-50, RG 59, NACP:

the United Nations to use force. Truman's decision to position U.S. naval forces in the Taiwan Strait indicated a dramatic shift from the hands-off policy towards the GMD advocated earlier in the year. The Korean War, which had been progressing well for U.N. forces, faltered after the PRC became involved. Dispatching the Chinese People's Volunteers into Korea to bolster North Korean forces, the PRC quickly pushed the American-led offensive back across the 38th parallel. For the China Lobby's claimsmakers this reversal signaled a boon for their campaign. Crusaders were able to make use of the Korean War itself to bolster their earlier claims of communist machinations, especially after China became involved. It also reinvigorated claimsmakers' arguments of the importance of the Nationalist regime on Taiwan to U.S. global strategy. Even more significant though, the PRC's entry into the conflict provided the China Lobby with a new tool to use against recognizing China's communist government both in the United States and the United Nations.

Claimsmakers' arguments that communists everywhere, including the Chinese Communist Party, were tools of the Soviet Union seemed to be validated by the conflict in Korea. George F. Kennan, the father of containment and author of the Long Telegram and *Foreign Affairs* "X" article, stated "the Russians now intended to exploit the Asiatic satellites against us [the United States]," in order to bolster the USSR's position in Europe.⁶³ State Department officials declared, on the first day of South Korea's invasion, their intention to hold the Soviet Union responsible for North Korea's actions.⁶⁴ This sentiment was echoed in the halls of Congress. Senator Homer Ferguson (R-Mich.) proclaimed "under the Communist crusade, Russia is the mother of Communists everywhere," and Representative John D. Lodge (R-Conn.)

⁶³ "Memorandum of National Security Council Consultants' Meeting, Thursday, June 29, 1950, 2 p.m.," *FRUS 1950, I*: 329.

⁶⁴ "Washington Holds Russia to Account," *NYT*, 25 June 1950.

put it succinctly stating, “the Korean War is but the outward manifestation of Communist determination to achieve world domination.”⁶⁵ Americans overwhelmingly agreed that the Soviet Union was behind the PRC’s decision to enter the war. Eighty-one percent of the public believed that China entered the war on orders from the USSR and only five percent disagreed with that interpretation.⁶⁶ Senator Pat McCarran (D-Nev.) demonstrated the narrowed field of debate concerning communism by lambasting the Truman administration’s hands-off policy as a:

“bankrupt one.... The dust has settled on the boys whose bodies are buried in Korea. Surely no one in possession of the facts believes that the Communist movement—and the Communist government—in China is anything but a stooge and tool of the Kremlin, a puppet playing its part in carrying out the politburo’s imperialistic design for world domination.”⁶⁷

Though the outbreak of hostilities in Korea was effective in proving the earlier rhetoric of Soviet domination of China it was even more beneficial for China Lobby claimsmakers by renewing the significance of the GMD and Taiwan.

Less than a month after fighting broke out in Korea 57 percent of Americans believed that they were in World War III; an assumption that held true throughout 1950.⁶⁸ Truman’s goal during this period was to keep the war from expanding beyond the Korean peninsula.⁶⁹ The prospect of another world war during the nuclear age was a truly frightening possibility.

Americans overwhelmingly felt their communities would be attacked with atomic bombs in the event of nuclear war.⁷⁰ The majority of Americans, however, had no compunction about using

⁶⁵ Congress, Senate, Sen. Ferguson speaking on Significance of Korean Hostilities—Not a Local Matter, but an Incident of U.S.S.R. Strategy,” 81-2, *CR* 96, (13 July 1950), 10062; Congress, House, Rep. Lodge speaking on Defense Production Act of 1950, 81-2, *CR* 96, (1 Aug. 1950), 11518.

⁶⁶ “Korea,” (30 Dec. 1950), *Gallup*, 955.

⁶⁷ Congress, Senate, Sen. McCarran speaking on Military Assistance to the Republic of China, 82nd Cong., 1st Sess, *Congressional Record* 97, (16 Jan. 1951), 332. Hereafter referred to as 82-1, *CR* 97.

⁶⁸ “World War III,” (19 Aug. 1950), *Gallup*, 933; “World War III,” (6 Dec. 1950), *Gallup*, 951.

⁶⁹ Truman, *Memoirs*, 345.

⁷⁰ “Atom Bombs,” (2 Dec. 1950), *Gallup*, 950. Americans living in urban centers felt there was a 71 percent chance they would be attacked, members of mid-sized communities felt there was a 51 percent chance of being targeted and even in the smallest communities people felt there was a 44 percent chance of being the target of an atomic strike.

atomic weapons and felt if the United States went to war with the PRC that atomic weapons should be used.⁷¹ Americans were deeply concerned about the possibility of getting into a war with China whose principle ally, the USSR, also had atomic weapons. Most Americans agreed that the Truman administration was correct in limiting the war below the 38th parallel in Korea and attempting to broker a peace agreement with the PRC.⁷² The China Lobby, however, pursued the opportunity presented by the Korean War to garner support for returning Chiang Kai-shek and the GMD to the Chinese mainland.

On 27 July 1950 Truman announced that U.S. air and naval forces would begin assisting South Korean forces to repel the North Korean invasion. He also ordered the Seventh Fleet to the Taiwan Strait to prevent a communist invasion of the last refuge of the Nationalists.⁷³ The Truman administration issued the order in an effort to contain the fighting to the Korean peninsula and defend the Nationalists from an invasion by the PRC.⁷⁴ This order also halted any assaults on the mainland by the GMD.⁷⁵ China Lobby claimsmakers used that provision to attack Truman for his “order to the Navy to guard Red China against sea or air attack by the forces of free China.”⁷⁶ However, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur became the greatest opponent of fighting a limited war in Korea. In August 1950 MacArthur released a statement suggesting

These numbers are derived from responses by Community Size: 100,000 and over, Good Chance 41 percent, Fair Chance 30 percent; 10,000-100,000, Good Chance 25 percent, Fair Chance 26 percent; Under 10,000, Good Chance 16 percent, Fair Chance 28 percent.

⁷¹ “Korea,” (4 Dec. 1950), *Gallup*, 950. Forty-five percent of respondents felt that the United States should use the atom bomb, 7 percent said only as a last resort and only 38 percent were opposed to its use. Ten percent had no opinion.

⁷² “Korea,” (5 Mar. 1951), *Gallup*, 969.

⁷³ Anthony Leviero, “Bid Made to Russia,” *NYT*, 28 June 1950.

⁷⁴ Truman, *Memoirs*, 351; Congress, Senate, Sen. Robert S. Kerr speaking on the Replacement of General MacArthur, 82-1, *CR* 97, (11 Apr. 1951), 3643.

⁷⁵ Truman, *Memoirs*, 334.

⁷⁶ “Testimony of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, Accompanied by Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney,” (3 May 1951), in U.S. Senate, Committee on Armed Services and Committee on Foreign Relations, *Military Situation in the Far East*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1951), 56. Hereafter referred to as *Military Situation*.

that the United States would hold on to Taiwan for use as an “unsinkable aircraft carrier.”⁷⁷ Although the tone of the statement seemed to follow stated U.S. objectives, it also appeared to call for aggressive actions against the PRC from Taiwan.⁷⁸ Pro-Chiang claimsmakers and MacArthur became even more outspoken against the PRC after the Chinese People’s Volunteers entry into the Korean War believing that “if allowed to use my full military might... I [MacArthur] could not only save Korea, but also inflict such a massive blow upon Red China’s capacity to wage aggressive war that it would remove her as a further threat to Asia for generations to come.”⁷⁹ Representative Robert Hale (R-Maine) backed this claim saying, “if General MacArthur were given a free hand in Asia, Chiang Kai-shek’s army could go to work, and the Chinese Communist Tyranny of Mao Tze-tung might be overthrown.”⁸⁰ In December MacArthur called for using GMD troops in Korea, a move he had originally rejected, convinced that the Korean War had become a war against the PRC.⁸¹

In response to MacArthur’s persistent criticisms of the Truman administration’s strategy in Korea, which continued to leak to the press, Truman felt compelled to relieve him of command on 11 April 1951.⁸² MacArthur’s positions had already given the China Lobby another effective tool in attacking the administration and with his dismissal they obtained yet another.⁸³ China Lobby claimsmakers bludgeoned the administration because:

“Mao Tse-tung in Peking [Beijing] and Josef Stalin in Moscow must have received great satisfaction at the action taken by the President of the United States in removing Gen.

⁷⁷ “Texts of Controversial MacArthur Message and Truman’s Formosa Statement,” *NYT*, 29 Aug. 1950.

⁷⁸ Truman, *Memoirs*, 354.

⁷⁹ Douglas MacArthur, *Reminiscences*, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963), 378; Congress, Senate, Sen. Harry P. Cain (R) of Washington speaking on The New War in Korea, 81-2, *CR* 96, (28 Nov. 1950), 15940.

⁸⁰ Congress, House, Rep. Hale speaking on MacArthur’s Accomplishments in Asia, 82-1, *CR* 97 (9 Apr. 1951), 3541.

⁸¹ Truman, *Memoirs*, 384-85.

⁸² Truman, *Memoirs*, 447-50.

⁸³ Truman, *Memoirs*, 429-30.

Douglas MacArthur from his position. General MacArthur was a rock of Gibraltar against the further spread of Communism in the East.”⁸⁴

The dismissal of MacArthur also met with disapproval from the American public and added to the popularity of the China Lobby’s message, which was not limited to intensifying the war in Korea.⁸⁵ The pro-Chiang crusaders’ included bolstering the GMD’s position on Taiwan as a bulwark against communism and future springboard for invading the Chinese mainland.

Before the outbreak of the Korean War, representatives of the GMD tried to convince U.S. officials that a large anti-Communist force was waiting to join any offensive made by Chiang’s government to retake the mainland.⁸⁶ These claims received little attention until after MacArthur’s dismissal. The original claim that the Seventh Fleet was defending the PRC from Chiang’s military was expanded to include “preventing its forces on Formosa [Taiwan] from aiding their revolting comrades on the mainland.”⁸⁷ MacArthur publicly proclaimed “there were 1,500,000 anti-Communist guerrillas inside China ready to rise against the Red regime as soon as they ‘receive any degree of encouragement or any hope of success.’”⁸⁸ The fighting ability of Nationalist troops was lauded, however the number of reported troops available to carry out this invasion of China fluctuated between 500,000 and 700,000.⁸⁹ Chiang himself insinuated that millions in China awaited emancipation from Communist rule and the Legislative Yuan of the

⁸⁴ Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland speaking on Replacement of General MacArthur, 82-1, *CR* 97, (11 Apr. 1951), 3623.

⁸⁵ “General MacArthur’s Dismissal,” (3 May 1951), *Gallup*, 981. Sixty-six percent disapproved of MacArthur’s dismissal, 25 percent approved and 9 percent had no opinion.

⁸⁶ “Memorandum of Conversation by Under Secretary of State (Webb),” (3 Apr. 1950), Box 4195, Folder 1, Central Decimal Files, China 1950-54, Record Group 59, National Archives, College Park, Maryland. Hereafter referred to as CDF, China 1950-54, RG 59, NACP.

⁸⁷ Congress, House, Rep. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., of Pennsylvania speaking on The Situation in Asia, 82-1, *CR* 97 (19 Mar. 1951), 2620.

⁸⁸ “1,500,000 Anti-Reds Wait in China, Says MacArthur,” *NYT*, 6 May 1951.

⁸⁹ Congress, Senate, Sen. John C. Stennis of Mississippi speaking on American Military Policy in the Far East, 82nd Cong, 2nd Sess., *Congressional Record* 98, (2 July 1952), 573. Hereafter referred to as 82-2, *CR* 98; MacArthur, *Reminiscences*, 376; Congress, House, Rep. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., of Pennsylvania speaking on The Situation in Asia, 82-1, *CR* 97 (19 Mar. 1951), 2620; Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland speaking on Emergency Relief to Yugoslavia, 81-2, *CR* 97, (11 Dec. 1950), 16397; “1,500,000 Anti-Reds Wait in China, Says MacArthur,” *NYT*, 6 May 1951.

Republic of China stated there were hundreds of millions waiting to be freed by the GMD from their island refuge.⁹⁰ If the United States failed to help the GMD exploit this anti-Communist movement, the crusaders warned, American Far Eastern policy would be lost.⁹¹ Even more significantly “if we should concede these areas to be lost forever from humanity, then we free the hand of the Soviet planners to give their full attention to winning more victories in South America and in Africa; to give their full time to fomenting revolution in the Near East, to the conquest of India and of Southeast Asia.”⁹² Using numbers to bolster their claims allowed pro-Chiang crusaders to construct the perception that the GMD could easily reclaim all of China with the overwhelming support of the people. These numbers, moreover, were rarely challenged by secondary claimsmakers who reported the numbers stated with little, if any, critical analysis. China Lobby claimsmakers also continued to use this domino theory rhetoric to bolster Chiang’s efforts to return to the mainland. Although a U.S. backed return of Chiang Kai-shek to the mainland would have been the ultimate coup de grâce, the China Lobby also used the Korean War for the more mundane task of ensuring the GMD continued to receive support from the United States.

China Lobby claimsmakers continued to use rhetoric that had been effective prior to the outbreak of hostilities on the Korean peninsula. Senator Ferguson claimed the United States defense of Taiwan amounted to “the drawing of a line to contain communism,” which was “well

⁹⁰ “Chinese News Service Article,” (21 June 1951), C-0012, Reel 22: Records of the Office of Chinese Affairs, 1945-1955 (on Microfilm), National Archives, College Park Maryland, pp. 281. Hereafter referred to as CA 1945-1955 (MF), NACP; “Message to the House of Representatives from the Legislative Yuan,” (5 Sept. 1951), C-0012, Reel 22: CA 1945-1955 (MF), NACP, pp. 346.

⁹¹ Congress, Senate, Sen. H. Alexander Smith (R) of New Jersey speaking on Report of Far Eastern Policy, 82-2, *CR* 98, (29 Jan. 1952), 573.

⁹² “Dewey Voices Hope for Revolt in China,” *NYT*, 10 Oct. 1952.

received in the United States and free nations abroad.”⁹³ Senator McCarran claimed that Chiang was the only possible leader of an anti-Communist Chinese government.⁹⁴ Knowland drew parallels between the United States and GMD claiming that “in Formosa there is freedom of the press, there is freedom of religion for every church of type and character.”⁹⁵ By 1951 the Truman administration publicly announced that the Generalissimo would begin receiving more materiel and moral support from the United States, which led some critics to observe that the administration agreed with “MacArthur on at least one important point, that Formosa [Taiwan] must be saved from falling into the hands of the Chinese Reds.”⁹⁶ The American public supported an increase of aid to Chiang’s regime. Though Chiang had received tepid support from Americans prior to the Korean War, shortly after it began 48 percent favored aiding the GMD.⁹⁷ Six months later 54 percent favored sending aid to the Generalissimo’s regime on Taiwan.⁹⁸ Though this was a modest gain for the China Lobby’s cause, the issue of recognition by either the United States or U.N. of the PRC remained a key concern. The Korean War, however, also became the crusaders’ most useful rhetorical device in keeping Beijing out.

The China Lobby had little fear the United States would recognize the new government in China. In June 1950 Americans familiar with the situation in China were against the United States establishing diplomatic ties with the PRC by more than two to one.⁹⁹ The real debate was taking place at Lake Success, New York. Although the China Lobby had been able to

⁹³ Congress, Senate, Sen. Ferguson speaking on Significance of Korean Hostilities—Not a Local Matter but an Incident in U.S.S.R. Strategy, 81-2, *CR* 96, (13 July 1950), 10063.

⁹⁴ Congress, Senate, Sen. McCarran speaking on The Asiatic Problem, 81-2, *CR* 96, (14 Aug. 1950), 12421.

⁹⁵ Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland speaking on Emergency Relief Assistance to Yugoslavia, 81-2, *CR* 96, (11 Dec. 1950), 16397.

⁹⁶ Henry R. Lieberman, “Formosa Expects More U.S. Support,” *NYT*, 23 Jan. 1951; Congress, House, Kenneth B. Keating (R) of New York speaking on Soundness of MacArthur’s Recommendations, 82-1, *CR* 97, (7 May 1951), 5008.

⁹⁷ “Military Aid for Formosa,” (12 Aug. 1950), *Gallup*, 932.

⁹⁸ “Chinese Nationalists,” (29 Jan. 1951), *Gallup*, 962.

⁹⁹ “China,” (2 June 1950), *Gallup*, 915. The number familiar with the situation was 65 percent, of which 16 percent favored recognition and 40 percent were opposed, 9 percent had no opinion.

successfully mobilize Americans against recognizing the newly formed government in China other countries, including Britain and the newly established state of India, recognized Mao Zedong's government. Most observers felt that "the unseating of the Nationalist delegation was only a question of time."¹⁰⁰ Even after the outbreak of the Korean War the United States was hard pressed to keep the PRC out of the U.N. In September the Indian delegation offered a resolution calling for Mao's China to be offered a seat in the General Assembly while the Russian delegation offered a resolution to eject the Nationalists. Acheson's only available argument to refute these resolutions was that the Nationalist government had been present in the U.N. since its founding, essentially arguing that tradition should be the basis of rejecting the offered resolutions.¹⁰¹ With the entry of the People's Volunteer Army into the Korean War, however, pro-Chiang claimsmakers obtained the necessary leverage to bar the PRC from the United Nations.

On 1 February 1951 the United Nations condemned the PRC for aggression in Korea. In this instance the secondary claimsmakers were in the forefront against allowing Mao's China into the U.N. The *New York Times* ran a series of editorials condemning the possibility of appeasing the new government in China.¹⁰² Senator John C. Stennis (D-Miss.), giving a preview of later tactics adopted by pro-Chiang crusaders claimed, "we cannot under any circumstances permit Red China to become a member of the United Nations. If she does, under whatever guise, it means that we can no longer participate as a member."¹⁰³ Early in 1952 Senator William E. Jenner (R-Ind.) also attacked the State Department for its "double talk" concerning the

¹⁰⁰ "Growing Issue," *NYT*, 15 Jan. 1950.

¹⁰¹ "Text of Speeches in U.N. Assembly on Seating of China," *NYT*, 20 Sep. 1950.

¹⁰² "'Appeasement' in Korea," *NYT*, 2 May 1951; "No Reward for Aggression," *NYT*, 9 May 1951, "Our Changing China Policy," *NYT*, 19 May 1951;

¹⁰³ Congress, Senate, Sen. Stennis speaking on Prohibition Against Admission of Red China to Membership in the United Nations, 82-1, *CR* 97 (2 July 1951), 7557.

Nationalist government.¹⁰⁴ In many ways the lobby had little need to persuade Americans against the admission of the PRC to the U.N. In July 1950, 58 percent of Americans were against giving the PRC the GMD's seat on the U.N. Security Council.¹⁰⁵ In December, with the Chinese People's Volunteers successes in Korea, the public wavered with 57 percent of Americans willing to let New China take the Nationalists' seat on the Security Council in return for a ceasefire.¹⁰⁶ By September of 1951 Americans had resumed their original opposition, with 60 percent disapproving of giving the PRC a seat, and 35 percent not willing to go along even if a majority in the U.N. voted for it.¹⁰⁷ Thus the China Lobby had little need to generate opposition in the American public. However the claimsmakers were not being lax as the Truman administration drew to a close. The coterie of pro-Nationalist advocates had another issue with which to contend. That issue was the very existence of the China Lobby and what its existence entailed for the United States. This offered both an opportunity and potential liability for the pro-Chiang crusaders.

The first instance of the China Lobby being named publically happened during Lattimore's trial by Senator McCarthy. During his testimony Lattimore stated McCarthy was a "willing tool' of an 'implacable' pro-Nationalist China lobby which was seeking by intimidation to silence all in the United States including the State Department itself, who were opposed to further aid to the Chiang Kai-shek regime."¹⁰⁸ This sparked a debate in the United States as to what significance, if any, this held for the American people. The *New York Times* ran an article on the China Lobby stating that "rather than being a tight and tangible conspiracy of possible sinister intent, it is, more accurately, a loose conglomeration of persons and organizations which

¹⁰⁴ Congress, Senate, Sen. Jenner speaking on The Japanese Peace Treaty, 82-2, *CR* 98 (20 Feb. 1952), 1180.

¹⁰⁵ "Communist China," (10 July 1950), *Gallup*, 924-25.

¹⁰⁶ "The UN and Communist China," (29 Dec. 1950), *Gallup*, 955.

¹⁰⁷ "Communist China—Admission to UN," (24 Sept. 1951), *Gallup*, 1011-12.

¹⁰⁸ William S. White, "Lattimore Denies he was Ever a Red; Tydings Clears Him," *NYT*, 7 Apr. 1950.

for various reasons are interested in China.”¹⁰⁹ Although there was some interest in examining the activities of the China Lobby, it was not until the MacArthur hearings that the topic gained political traction when Senator Wayne Morse (R-Ore.) called for an investigation of the China Lobby in June 1951.¹¹⁰ This began a formal period of data gathering on the activities of the China Lobby by the Truman administration as well as increased public interest in what it entailed.¹¹¹ As a result of the investigations by the State Department, members of the media, and Senator Morse evidence regarding the activities of pro-Nationalists in the United States came to light.

One of the areas of the investigation examined how the China Lobby influenced policy. The State Department found evidence of Jo Duvall, who worked as a publicist for United China Relief and now worked for the American Bureau of Medical Aid for China, authoring news articles critical of administration policies that were subsequently read into the *Congressional Record*.¹¹² This suggested that Duvall had been receiving payment to attack Truman administration policies while attempting to gain aid for the GMD. Stories also surfaced of periodicals carrying news pieces critical of the GMD being bought and destroyed and of other stories being suppressed as a result of the power of the lobby.¹¹³ Evidence that academics were also being affected by the claimsmakers began to surface as well. Incidents involving David Rowe, an author and academic, who supplied McCarthy with information on Far Eastern specialists and threatened organizations he felt were sympathetic towards the PRC with “the

¹⁰⁹ Cabell Phillips, “Is There a China Lobby? Inquiry Raises Question,” *NYT*, 30 Apr. 1950.

¹¹⁰ “Testimony of Hon. Dean G. Acheson, Secretary of State, Accompanied by Adrian S. Fisher, Legal Advisor—Resumed,” (7 June 1951), *Military Situation*, 2116.

¹¹¹ Anthony Leviero, “Lobbying Inquiry Sought by Morse,” *NYT*, 6 July 1951.

¹¹² “Memorandum,” (12 June 1951), C-0012, Reel 22: CA 1945-1955 (MF), NACP, pp. 688.

¹¹³ “Expose Reports Burned,” *NYT*, 5 Apr 1952; “Letter to Jessup from Kan Chieh-hou,” (8 Nov. 1952), Box 4203, Folder 1: CDF, China 1950-54, RG 59, NACP.

attention of ‘the Hill’” exemplified this facet of the investigation.¹¹⁴ Of more concern for investigators, however, was evidence that pro-Chiang crusaders were “using ‘methods to intimidate persons like me [Lattimore] and even officials of the United States Government from expressing views contrary to their own.’”¹¹⁵ In a conversation with Chiang Mon-lin, a GMD official, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs Dean Rusk made reference to Nationalist efforts to bypass the State Department on issues regarding Taiwan, which Chiang Mon-lin confirmed was a problem.¹¹⁶ There was also an occasion in which the Chinese Minister to Panama told a State Department official that he was “corresponding with Senator [George W.] Malone [(R-Nev)]... in the hope that he can supply him with ammunition to use against the State Department” to obtain more aid for the GMD.¹¹⁷ Senator Morse also uncovered a series of cables sent from Nationalist diplomats in the United States to Taiwan between 1949 and 1950 that, among other things, made statements such as “in order to avoid direct conflict with the administration we should not have a head-on collision with that man [Acheson]. So, we suggest it would be better not to attack him openly.”¹¹⁸ Another cable reported a conversation with William C. Bullitt that noted, “the general situation toward us is turning to the direction which is favorable to us. We must be patient, but we must not miss our chance—such as a fight in U.N. as well as propaganda and other activities in this country.”¹¹⁹ Though there was a significant body

¹¹⁴ “Memorandum of Conversation by Clubb,” (11 Apr. 1951), C-0012, Reel 22: CA 1945-1955 (MF) NACP, pp. 693; “Memorandum of Conversation by Clubb,” (15 May 1951), C-0012, Reel 22: CA 1945-1955 (MF) NACP, pp. 687. Source of quote.

¹¹⁵ William S. White, “Lattimore Denies he was Ever a Red; Tydings Clears Him,” *NYT*, 7 Apr. 1950.

¹¹⁶ “Memorandum of Conversation by Sprouse,” (26 Apr. 1950), Box 4195, Folder 1: CDF, China 1950-54, RG 59, NACP.

¹¹⁷ “Memorandum by R.Z. Smith,” (4 June 1951), C-0012, Reel 22: CA 1945-1955 (MF), NACP, pp. 128

¹¹⁸ Congress, Senate, Sen. Morse speaking on Investigation of Alleged Activities of Foreign Governments to Influence American Foreign Policy, 82-2, *CR* 98, (10 Apr. 1952), 3970.

¹¹⁹ Congress, Senate, Sen. Morse speaking on Investigation of Alleged Activities of Foreign Governments to Influence American Foreign Policy, 82-2, *CR* 98, (10 Apr. 1952), 3972.

of evidence demonstrating Nationalist efforts to influence U.S. policy, much more attention was devoted to finding a money trail linking the activities of pro-Chiang crusaders to the GMD.

Lattimore was the first to highlight Nationalist efforts to entice U.S. citizens with money in 1950. Lattimore furnished a letter he received from a GMD official on behalf of the Generalissimo offering him a gift of “the sum of \$5,000.00” in whatever form he wished during his interrogation by McCarthy.¹²⁰ At the time of Morse’s original call for an investigation there were suspicions that Nationalists had cornered the soybean market and then sold the stock just before the outbreak of the Korean War, which implicated that the GMD knew of the war beforehand but this line of inquiry did not result in any actionable information.¹²¹ There also were charges of graft by the Nationalists leveled by some of their own officials in the United States.¹²² Though these charges excited the public and aroused U.S. policymakers over the alleged activities of Chinese Nationalists, in the words of one State Department official, “they would not be of direct assistance in showing whether the funds found their way into the possession of individuals who might use them as part of the ‘China Lobby.’”¹²³ Though the official was referring to the \$125 million China Aid Program, it was applicable to the various facets of the China Lobby. As an editorial in the *New York Times* pointed out “an American citizen has a legal and moral right to influence legislation if he can.”¹²⁴ Thus if opponents were unable to prove illegal conduct had occurred they had little chance of stopping pro-Chiang crusaders. The investigation of the China Lobby, moreover, actually became a vehicle for its claimsmakers to assail the administration and critics of Chiang Kai-shek’s regime.

¹²⁰ Lattimore, *Ordeal by Slander*, 170.

¹²¹ Anthony Leviero, “Lobbying Inquiry Sought by Morse,” *NYT*, 5 July 1951.

¹²² Anthony Leviero, “Ouster of General Revives Scrutiny of Graft in China,” *NYT*, 31 Aug. 1951; “China Aide Widens Charges of Graft,” *NYT*, 12 Sept. 1951.

¹²³ “Memorandum of Conversation by Cardozo,” (3 July 1951), C-0012, Reel 22: CA 1945-1955 (MF), NACP, pp. 681.

¹²⁴ “The ‘China Lobby,’” *NYT*, 11 June 1951.

Claimsmakers did refute some of the accusations that arose from the investigation. Often their main defense was that they were not part of any lobby. Philadelphia manufacturer and head of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China Frederick C. McKee denied being affiliated with any lobby and stated “this committee has never received any money whatsoever... from the Nationalist Government of China,” and “I have never... been in the employ of any foreign government.”¹²⁵ The cables between GMD officials that Morse had read into the *Congressional Record* were the result of an attempt “to mislead you [Morse] regarding the authorship of these cabled reports.”¹²⁶ However, defending the objectives of the China Lobby claimsmakers and attacking their opponents were more effective means of stymieing the investigation.

Pro-Chiang crusaders’ defense was easy to assemble in the climate fostered by McCarthyism and the Korean War. The head of the GMD’s delegation to the U.N., T. F. Tsiang, pointed out that none of the China Lobby claimsmakers “had asked for nor received a cent of Chinese Nationalist money for their advocacy of its cause,” but “were motivated by anti-Communist zeal alone.”¹²⁷ Representative Arthur L. Miller (R-Neb.) declared that the State Department wanted an investigation because “the China Lobby has opposed Communists.”¹²⁸ With America in the throes of an anti-communist moral panic fostered by McCarthy’s sensational attacks on the State Department pro-Chiang crusaders had little to fear from these investigations. Morse was even careful in his original call to investigate the China Lobby to state his “favor of a complete disclosure and exposé of Communist activities in the United States,”

¹²⁵ “Manufacturer Denies Link to China Lobby,” *New York Tribune*, 13 June 1951, read into the *Congressional Record* by Sen. Morse in extension of remarks on The China Lobby, 82-1, *CR* 97, (13 June 1951), A3521.

¹²⁶ Congress, Senate, Sen. Morse speaking on Investigation of Alleged Activities of Foreign Governments to Influence American Foreign Policy, 82-1, *CR* 98, (16 Apr, 1952), 4017.

¹²⁷ Robert C. Doty, “Tsiang Denies Nationalists Support a ‘China Lobby’ or U.S. Spokesman,” *NYT*, 11 June 1951.

¹²⁸ Congress, House, Rep. Miller speaking on The China Lobby, 82-1, *CR* 97 (13 June 1951), 6504.

and continued to defend his call based on his resolution “that all lobbies should be investigated and not limited to the so-called China lobby.”¹²⁹ Thus the GMD’s enemies’ ideology once again became a rallying point for the China Lobby’s claimsmakers. More significantly, however, pro-Chiang claimsmakers were able to go on the offensive against their critics using the well-established rhetoric of Communist machinations.

In 1949 the New York Communist Party sent out a letter with a program of action for its members, which Knowland had read into the *Congressional Record* in 1950. First on the list of objectives was for members to “demand a congressional investigation... of the Chinese lobby in Washington.”¹³⁰ The similarity between the New York Communist Party’s and Lattimore’s description of the pro-Chiang crusaders become a primary tool in the campaign against those who questioned China Lobby activities.¹³¹ Senator Ralph Owen Brewster (R-Maine) referred to Lattimore’s testimony that Kohlberg was a prominent member of the China Lobby with the counterclaim “that, when compared with what the left wing could do in flooding the market with pro-Chinese Communist material, Mr. Kohlberg is but a babe in the woods.”¹³² Knowland reread the Communist Program for Action into the record after Morse’s call to investigate the China Lobby, stating that any investigation needed to examine communist lobbying as well as any “groups that may have been active in the interest of preserving China as a non-Communist and free republic.”¹³³ The president of the American China Policy Association declared the State

¹²⁹ “Testimony of Hon. Dean G. Acheson, Secretary of State, Accompanied by Adrian S. Fisher, Legal Advisor—Resumed,” (7 June 1951), *Military Situation*, 2116; Congress, Senate, Sen. Morse speaking on Investigation of Alleged Activities of Foreign Governments to Influence American Foreign Policy, 82-1, *CR* 97, (6 July 1951), 7709.

¹³⁰ “Program for Action on China Policy as Suggested by the Action Conference on China Policy, New York City, January 29, 1949,” read into the *Congressional Record* by Sen. Knowland speaking on Cooperation in the Formulation of Foreign Policy, 81-2, *CR* 96, (13 Apr. 1950), 5157.

¹³¹ “M’Kee Denies Link to a ‘China Lobby,’” *NYT*, 14 June 1951.

¹³² Congress, Senate, Sen. Brewster speaking on A Guidebook to 10 Years of Secrecy in Our China Policy, 82-1, *CR* 97, (5 June 1951), 6146.

¹³³ Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland speaking on Investigation of Alleged Activities of Foreign Governments to Influence American Foreign Policy, 82-1, *CR* 97, (6 July 1951), 7711-12.

Department's investigation "would be just plain silly if they were not also viciously aimed at discrediting a fine group of patriotic Americans who have foiled his [Acheson's] frightful plan."¹³⁴ In addition to these counter claims, pro-Chiang crusaders challenged the administration to have a full investigation of lobbies influencing U.S. China policy, claiming that there would be far more evidence of communist influence than Nationalist. Kohlberg stated, "I know where the China Lobby is—straight in the State Department."¹³⁵ Turning the tables on the investigators, China Lobby claimsmakers were able to continue propagating their message while simultaneously blunting efforts to curtail their influence on U.S. foreign policy.

By the time the Korean War ended in 1953 the United States had undergone another dramatic political shift. The China Lobby's assaults on the Truman administration were one factor that helped usher in a sweeping victory for Republicans in the 1952 elections. For the first time since President Herbert C. Hoover left office in 1933 the United States had a Republican in the White House, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Adopting the China Lobby's rhetoric and embracing McCarthyism, Republicans also took control of both chambers of Congress. Thus pro-Chiang claimsmakers had reason to be optimistic as the party that had aligned itself with their cause took the reigns of government. However, as the Korean War drew to a close there remained the possibility that the PRC would be admitted to the U.N., and the Nationalists on Taiwan remained in a precarious position without explicit U.S. support. So while Republicans adjusted to their new role as the party in power, China Lobby claimsmakers continued to propagate their message of aiding Chiang Kai-shek's regime. The PRC's shelling of Jinmen in September 1954 was a

¹³⁴ "China Group Sees Inquiry as Bluff," *NYT*, 10 June 1951.

¹³⁵ "China Group Sees Inquiry as Bluff," *NYT*, 10 June 1951; Congress, House, Representative Fred E. Busbey of Illinois speaking on China Lobby, 82-1, *CR* 97, (19 July 1951), 8497.

boon for claimsmakers who once again were able to expound on the expansionist aims of a global communist movement.

The China Lobby had been saved by world events in 1950. McCarthy's meteoric rise reinvigorated their claims that the State Department was soft on communism and removed sinologists critical of Chiang Kai-shek's governance. It also influenced how people perceived communist activities in the United States, heightening fears that Communists were actively working to sabotage Americans' way of life, leading to a moral panic under McCarthyism. The Korean War seemed to prove the China Lobby's earlier domino theory rhetoric, as aggressive communism appeared to be on the march in Asia. Knowland clarified the danger of a communist Asia stating:

“while I do not doubt the Soviet desire to tie Germany and the industrial Ruhr into the Communist orbit, I believe that is secondary on their timetable for Communist control of the more than a billion people of Asia, ... China, to be sure, was the key, but it was and is only a step in the chain reaction and not a final target.”¹³⁶

This increased the importance of the GMD's exiled regime on Taiwan, as it could serve as both a bastion against communism and a possible springboard for reclaiming mainland China from the CCP. The Truman administration's hands-off policy quickly crumbled in light of the events in Korea and McCarthy's assaults on the State Department. When critics of providing unquestioned aid for the GMD began calling for an investigation of the China Lobby they were unable to garner public support because of these domestic and foreign phenomena. Attempts to ascertain the nature of pro-Chiang claimsmakers backfired and were used to continue the assault on the Truman administration. The investigation only increased the plausibility of the China Lobby's rhetoric in the social problems marketplace. The time and space in periodicals and Congress

¹³⁶ Congress, Senate, Knowland speaking on Treaty of Peace with Japan, 82-2, *CR* 98, (18 Mar. 1952), 2450.

devoted to trying to find material determinants for an ideologically motivated organization aided the lobby's cause.

The Eisenhower administration would not be insulated from the China Lobby's assaults when it replaced the beleaguered Truman administration. As the Korean War drew to a close and the French effort in Indochina was noticeably failing, pro-Chiang claimsmakers lambasted decisions to have high-level meetings between American and communist Chinese diplomats. With the very real prospect of the PRC gaining entrance into the U.N. following the Korean War, the China Lobby would demonstrate its nonpartisan nature in attempting to force Eisenhower's and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles's hands in Asia. In September 1954, when the PRC began shelling an offshore island in the Taiwan Strait, the world once again braced for disaster.

CHAPTER 3: TEMPERING AN ALLIANCE

When Eisenhower entered the White House in 1953 the China Lobby had reason to be optimistic. The 1952 election reestablished the Republican Party and had been won in part by using McCarthyism, the Korean War, and China's Communist Revolution.¹ As the minority party, Republicans had adopted the China Lobby's rhetoric as a tool to use against the Democratic majority. As the Korean War drew to a close the pro-Chiang crusaders had no fear that the United States would recognize Mao Zedong's government in China as recognition of the PRC had been effectively stymied by McCarthy's attacks on the State Department and the outbreak of the Korean War. Support for the GMD had become entrenched in American politics.² However, the possibility of the PRC's recognition in the United Nations (U.N.) would be a significant setback for the Nationalists on Taiwan and their allies in the United States. The China Lobby saw an opportunity to solidify the U.S.-Taiwan relationship with Republican control of government as well as to block U.N. recognition of the PRC. Thus the China Lobby claimsmakers continued their campaign with renewed fervor and focus as Eisenhower's administration began.

Negotiations for an armistice to the Korean War began in July 1951, but crawled on for two years as neither side could come to terms on the agenda, let alone the line of demarcation or repatriation of prisoners.³ The conclusion of hostilities was on the horizon when Eisenhower became president, and China Lobby claimsmakers such as Democratic Whip John W. McCormack (D-Mass.) felt "there is going to be a determined effort made by some nations to get

¹ "G.O.P. Victory Analyzed," *NYT*, 12 Nov. 1952.

² "U.S. Aid to Formosa Put Above Politics," *NYT*, 5 Nov. 1952.

³ For a detailed analysis of the U.S.-China negotiations to end the Korean War see Yafeng Xia, *Negotiating with the Enemy: U.S.-China Talks during the Cold War, 1949-1972*, (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2006), ch. 3.

Red China into the United Nations.”⁴ By 1953 Senator Joseph McCarthy’s popularity began to wane, with 41 percent of Americans sharing the opinion that he was hurting U.S. relations with its allies.⁵ The China Lobby needed new tactics to continue its agenda during a time of peace. Peace would be short lived after 3 September 1954, when the PRC began shelling the offshore island of Jinmen, known as Quemoy to contemporary Americans.⁶ The China Lobby was able to use this new conflict to prohibit the PRC’s admission to the U.N. as well as to strengthen American ties to Chiang Kai-shek’s island regime.

To pursue these objectives China Lobby crusaders made use of new networks they helped create since their initial campaign during the Chinese Civil War. They also were able to take advantage of the new positions of some of their prominent claimsmakers in the Republican-led Congress. Americans were already convinced of the perfidy of allowing the PRC into the U.N. The pro-Chiang crusaders, however, launched a new offensive that was not only against the PRC, but against the U.N. In order to ensure Americans continued their unwillingness to recognize the PRC in a time of peace China Lobby claimsmakers also renewed their attacks on Mao’s China. The increased tensions that arose in the Taiwan Strait presented the crusaders with a new opportunity: the possibility of a formal alliance between the United States and Taiwan. The groundwork laid during the Chinese Civil War had been reinforced by McCarthy and the Korean War and by the time the Quemoy-Matsu Crisis broke out claimsmakers were provided with the final tool to bind Washington and Taipei as the Cold War continued in Asia.

⁴ Congress, House, Rep. John W. McCormack speaking on Admission of Communist China to the United Nations, 83rd Cong., 1st Sess., *Congressional Record* 99 (30 July 1953), 10579. Hereafter referred to as 83-1, CR 99.

⁵ “Joseph McCarthy,” (22 Jan. 1953), *Gallup*, 1204-05.

⁶ A work that analyzes not only Jinmen’s role during the Cold War but also the effects of the Cold War on its inhabitants see, Michael Szonyi, *Cold War Island: Quemoy on the Frontline*, (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

As the Korean War wound down, McCarthy had reached the limits of his demagoguery. By 1954 Americans disapproved of his methods and his colleagues in the Senate were willing to halt the excesses of his attempt to purge Communists from the government.⁷ The Republican led government also wanted to change the perception of the State Department as inept. Representative Frances P. Bolton (R-Ohio) admonished another Republican representative for comments made before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the State Department's malfeasance since Franklin Delano Roosevelt first occupied the White House. He stated "we Republicans are hoping the 20 years are over."⁸ As McCarthy's charges grew more fantastic he continued to dominate the news media, especially as he leveled charges of communist infiltration of the U.S. Army. This control of the social problems marketplace became detrimental to the goals of the China Lobby as well as to Eisenhower's administration. McCarthy's shift from attacking the State Department to the Defense Department detracted from the China Lobby's efforts to ensure the United States continued to recognize the GMD as the legitimate rulers of China. It also affected their efforts to keep the PRC out of the U.N. "as the controversy over the Geneva conference as the opening wedge to the recognition of Red China is reduced to a murmur."⁹ Essentially the social problems marketplace's carrying capacity was filled by McCarthy's sensational charges following the Korean War's conclusion. Though McCarthy had outlived his utility to the China Lobby, he had achieved significant gains for both pro-Chiang crusaders and Republicans before his 1954 censure. Diplomats in the State Department were still being harried for harboring views critical of Chiang's regime, and three-fourths of the American

⁷ "Joseph McCarthy," (16 Jan. 1954), *Gallup*, 1203; Dwight D. Eisenhower, *Mandate for Change, 1953-1956*, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1963), 326.

⁸ "Hon. Kit Clardy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan," (9 July 1954) in U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Foreign Affairs, *Selected Executive Session Hearings of the Committee, Vol. 18: U.S. Policy in the Far East, Part 2*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1980), 363. Hereafter referred to as *Far East, 18-2*.

⁹ Anne O'Hare McCormick, "Abroad," *NYT*, 27 Feb. 1954.

public remained convinced communist subverts were in the U.S. government, though the majority felt there were fewer under Eisenhower than there had been under Truman.¹⁰ With the decline of McCarthy's stature, though not McCarthyism, pro-Chiang claimsmakers sought other means to pursue their agenda.

China Lobby claimsmakers were wary of a settlement in Korea that would lead to recognition of Mao's China by either the United States or the U.N. Senator William E. Jenner (R-Ind.) warned that "recognition of an invader is achieved by getting the commentators to 'condition' the public to words embodying the change, as Pavlov used to condition his captive dogs to new associations."¹¹ However, the China Lobby had long relied on public education campaigns to arouse the American people in support of Chiang's regime and on 31 July 1953 a new campaign began when American University Professor Count Nicolas de Rochefort testified before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs headed by Representative Walter Judd (R-Minn.). Rochefort gave members of the subcommittee a plan of action to be used against admitting the PRC to the U.N. First on his agenda was the creation of a national committee for "stirring... the American public opinion" against the PRC and "its nucleus should be formed of Members of the Congress."¹² In addition to this core group Rochefort advocated getting religious denominations, legal and academic associations, labor organizations, members of the media, and private citizens support. This grand organization's goal would be to educate

¹⁰ "Case of the Honest Diplomat," (15 Nov. 1954), *Singapore Times*, in C-0012, Reel 34: CA 1945-1955 (MF), NACP, pp. 1107; "Communists in Government," (15 Feb. 1954), *Gallup*, 1213. The proportion cited above is derived from 74 percent of respondents saying Yes to communists being in the government, 59 percent felt there were fewer communists under Eisenhower than there were under Truman. The number of Americans believing there were communists in government remained stable throughout this period as, by 1955, 73 percent of respondents continued to respond yes to the question, see "Communists in Government," (28 Jan. 1955), *Gallup*, 1306.

¹¹ Congress, Senate, Sen. Jenner speaking on Consolidated General Appropriation Act, 83-1, CR 99, (26 May 1953), 5555.

¹² "Statement of Count Nicolas de Rochefort, Professional Lecturer in Political Science, American University," *Far East*, 18-2, (31 July 1953), 316.

the American public and the world on the “legal, moral, and phlegmatic arguments” against admitting the People’s Republic of China to the U.N.¹³ This neither represented a new tactic for pro-Chiang crusaders nor a new set of objectives, what it did represent was the formal articulation to transform the previously inchoate mass of China Lobby claimsmakers under the auspices of one organization. The Committee for One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations (“the Committee” or “the Committee of One Million”) was founded shortly thereafter.¹⁴ The original petition to President Eisenhower in the name of the Committee featured over 200 distinguished signatories that included legislators, generals, labor leaders, former President Hoover and former Secretary of State Marshall.¹⁵ Though the China Lobby now had an umbrella organization, there was little discernable change in its claimsmakers’ tactics as they continued to attack U.S. recognition of the PRC in any form, putting the Eisenhower administration on the defensive.

Claimsmakers continued to perceive a concerted threat that “advocates of Red China recognition keep... trying to weaken the opposition [to its recognition] by ‘brainwashing’ the public mind, hoping to wear down the opponents until further resistance may appear futile.”¹⁶ Thus any action taken by the administration that offered a semblance of dealing with the government on the Chinese mainland opened them up to attack. The Korean War armistice talks were derided, but the administration’s decision to participate in negotiations to end the First Indochina War at Geneva where the PRC would have representatives came under heavy

¹³ “Statement of Count Nicolas de Rochefort, Professional Lecturer in Political Science, American University,” *Far East*, 18-2, (31 July 1953), 316-17.

¹⁴ For a more thorough analysis of the founding of this organization see Bachrack, *The Committee of One Million*, Ch. 3. For a caveat on his inability to obtain de Rochefort’s testimony before the House subcommittee see pp. 55-58.

¹⁵ “Notables Urge U.S. Bar Peiping in U.N.,” *NYT*, 23 Oct. 1953. For a complete list of the original signatories see Bachrack, *The Committee of One Million*, 62-69.

¹⁶ Congress, House, Rep. Robert C. Byrd (D) of West Virginia speaking on Let us Read the Handwriting on the Wall, 83rd Cong., 2nd sess., *Congressional Record* 100, (18 Mar. 1954), 3576. Hereafter referred to as 83-2, *CR* 100.

criticism.¹⁷ The administration's continued non-recognition of the PRC was not questioned, but the PRC's involvement at all was "a form of 'recognition' never before accorded to the rebel state."¹⁸ This unwillingness to have any dealings at all with the PRC placed Eisenhower and Dulles in a delicate position. The Geneva Conference was organized at the behest of France, which was losing the war to maintain control over its former colonial possession. Dulles attempted to defuse criticisms by emphatically stating the "United States would in no case recognize Communist China,"¹⁹ however this did little to assuage the fears of the congress or the vociferous China Lobby, many of whom continued to be the same people.¹⁹ Dulles continued to make the case that the United States would not recognize the PRC, insisting that it would in no way benefit the American people, but the pro-Chiang crusaders continued to fear the possibility of any semblance of recognition.²⁰ In order to support its ally the administration had to defend not only its participation at the conference against accusations that it was bolstering New China in the negotiations but also participating in what was described as "a peace of defeat" for the West.²¹ The possibility of PRC recognition in the United Nations, however, was the issue on which the China Lobby concentrated its efforts.

Before the Korean armistice was reached the U.S. Congress was already working to stymie any efforts to obtain recognition for the PRC in the United Nations. One of its first efforts was to deny American financial support to the U.N. if it recognized the government in Beijing.

¹⁷ A few notable works on the First Indochina War are: Lloyd C. Gardner, *Approaching Vietnam: From World War II through Dienbienphu*, (New York: W. W. Norton, 1988); Mark Atwood Lawrence, *Assuming the Burden: Europe and the American Commitment to War in Vietnam*, (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2005); Kathryn C. Statler, *Replacing France: The Origins of American Intervention in Vietnam*, (Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucky, 2007).

¹⁸ James Reston, "Now Dulles Faces Fire," *NYT*, 24 Feb. 1954.

¹⁹ "Dulles Rules out any Recognition of Peiping Regime," *NYT*, 24 Feb. 1954; Congress, House, Rep. John W. McCormack of Massachusetts speaking on Red China and the United Nations, 83-1, *CR* 100, (3 Mar. 1954), 2598-99.

²⁰ "Text of Address by Secretary Dulles on United States Policy in the Far East," *NYT*, 30 Mar. 1954;

²¹ Hanson W. Baldwin, "The Big Question Now: What Defense for Asia?," *NYT*, 25 June 1954.

Though Eisenhower was able to block this initial effort to strong-arm the international community, many more efforts followed.²² By July 1954, as the Geneva Conference drew to a close, Senator William Knowland (R-Calif.) announced the creation of a bipartisan bloc in the Senate that was once again attempting to cut off appropriations to the U.N. if the PRC won recognition.²³ Some members of Congress even advocated that the United States abandon the U.N. if Beijing obtained recognition. Members of Congress who opposed that position, however, had to open with their dedication to non-recognition and references such as they stood “second to no Member of the Senate in... [their] opposition to the admission of Red China in the United Nations,” and further reference their membership in the Committee to validate their anti-recognition credentials.²⁴ This narrowed field of debate was the result of the China Lobby claimsmakers’ past efforts, which meant that by this period only “the loud talk of a few left wingers and Communists,” were perceived to support the admission of the PRC into the U.N.²⁵ The China Lobby claimsmakers’ efforts to define the issue of GMD support had been successful at restricting criticism of Chiang’s regime to the fringes of American political discourse.

By the time of the First Taiwan Straits Crisis even the U.N. was open to attack as “communism and not capitalism is the present theme of the United Nations.”²⁶ The Pro-Chiang crusaders’ influence did not stop with the U.S. Congress, however, as a multitude of organizations also attacked the U.N. Among others the American Legion, the Jersey Marine

²² Eisenhower, *Mandate for Change, 1953-1956*, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1963), 214-215; Congress, Senate, Sen. McClellan of Arkansas speaking on Red China and the United Nations, 83-1, *CR* 99, (10 June 1953), 6329.

²³ Clayton Knowles, “Knowland Forms Anti-Peiping Bloc,” *NYT*, 6 July 1954.

²⁴ Congress, Senate, Sen. Guy M. Gillette of Iowa speaking on Communist China and the United Nations, 83-2, *CR* 100, (8 July 1954), 9996; Congress, Senate, Sen. Ralph E. Flanders of Vermont speaking on The Chinese Problem, 83-2, *CR* 100, (9 July 1954), 10141.

²⁵ Congress, House, Rep. Charles J. Kersten of Wisconsin extension of remarks on Americans United in Opposition to Seating of Red China in the U.N., 83-2, *CR* 100, (9 Aug. 1954), 13849.

²⁶ Congress, House, Rep. Usher L. Burdick of North Dakota extension of remarks on Are We Going To Stand Firm for the Principles on Which this Government was Founded?, 84th Cong., 1st Sess., *Congressional Record* 101, (2 Feb. 1955), 1096. Hereafter referred to as 84-1, *CR* 101.

League, Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Reformed Church, and Daughters of the American Revolution came out in support of non-recognition for the PRC in the U.N. and some called for withdrawal from the world body.²⁷ An organization called the Christian Nationalist Crusade distributed pamphlets proclaiming "that it was a 'sensational fact' that the 'Russian Arms Banner bears shocking similarity to the United Nations flag,'" insinuating the U.N.'s alliance with the Soviet Union.²⁸ Thus the organizations' critiques tended to follow closely with those of the more influential China Lobby claimsmakers. Though attacking the U.N. had become acceptable, anti-recognition claimsmakers were driven by China Lobby rhetoric about what recognition of the PRC would mean for an organization established to foster peace.

Many of the arguments against allowing the new regime in China into the U.N. continued to stem from that organization's 1 February 1951 ruling that China was an aggressor in the Korean War. China Lobby claimsmakers echoed Judd's assertion that "it would be plain hypocrisy to admit, under the guise of a peace-loving nation, dedicated to the high principles and objectives of the U.N., the Communist regime in China which brazenly went to war with the U.N. itself."²⁹ Amidst claims that the Chinese people were allowed to select any government they might desire, "opposition [to U.N. admission] is firm and strong against any government which continues to be the equivalent of an international brigand."³⁰ China Lobby claimsmakers made the case that admission of the PRC to the U.N., in the words of Representative Charles J.

²⁷ "Statement of David Watley, 7400 Arden, Bethesda, MD.," *Far East 18-2*, 368-369 (The American Legion's resolution was read into the proceedings by Rep. Judd); "Stand on China Backed," *NYT*, 4 July 1954; "Women's Unit Bids U.S. Quit the U.N.," *NYT*, 7 Feb. 1954; "D.A.R. Scores U.N. for 'Interfering,'" *NYT*, 21 Apr. 1955; "Reformed Church Backs U.N.," *NYT*, 8 June 1955.

²⁸ "Women's Unit Bids U.S. Quit the U.N.," *NYT*, 7 Feb. 1954.

²⁹ Congress, House, Rep. Judd speaking on Report Opposing Communist China to U.N., 83-1, *CR* 99 (21 July 1953), 9405; "Peiping and the U.N.," *NYT*, 16 Sept. 1953; "Red China and the U.N.," *NYT*, 20 Mar 1954; Congress, House, Rep. Jacob J. Javits (R) of New York speaking on Opposition to the Communist Chinese Regime's Admission to United Nations, 83-2, *CR* 100, (8 July 1954), 10117.

³⁰ Congress, House, Rep. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., (D) of New Jersey speaking on Our Foreign Policy, 84-1, *CR* 101, (12 July 1955), 10336; "Peiping in U.N. Opposed," *NYT*, 5 Feb 1955.

Kersten (R-Wis.), “would be a complete prostitution of the whole organization.”³¹ Furthermore, Knowland warned, it “would make almost inevitable World War III.”³² This was another issue that the China Lobby claimsmakers pressed, defending calls for the United States to abandon the U.N. if Beijing was recognized because “it would destroy the United Nations.”³³ Arguing that they were attempting to save the U.N. from the corrupting influence of the new Chinese government allowed China Lobby claimsmakers to assert that they were taking the high ground. Although there was also the fear that “if they [the PRC] are admitted [to the U.N.], the ball game is over. That’s it. They [the communists] have won.”³⁴ The American public, for the most part, agreed with the anti-recognition crusaders.

Before the Korean armistice was finalized, American opposition to admitting the PRC into the United Nations was hardened by China Lobby claimsmakers’ rhetoric, McCarthyism, the Korean War and the First Indochina War. Additionally, from 1952 to 1955 Americans’ disposable personal incomes rose seven percent, to an overall increase in disposable income of 12 percent since 1945.³⁵ This allowed Americans to continue to focus on the status challenge of admitting the PRC into the U.N. during this period. Sixty percent of Americans opposed admitting the PRC into the U.N. early in July 1953, by September that figure had increased to 68 percent.³⁶ Following the Geneva Conference in July 1954 American opposition to admitting

³¹ “Statement of Count Nicolas de Rochefort, Professional Lecturer in Political Science, American University,” *Far East*, 18-2, (31 July 1953), 325.

³² “Knowland Warns of Asian ‘Munich,’” *NYT*, 23 Feb. 1954.

³³ “Hon. Kit Clardy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan,” (9 July 1954), *Far East*, 18-2, pp. 344, 351; Congress, House, Rep. Kit Clardy (R) of Michigan speaking on Admission of Red China to U.N., 83-2, *CR* 100, (6 July 1954), 9830; Morris Kaplan, “Lions Hear Plea to Bar Red China,” *NYT*, 9 July 1954.

³⁴ “Hon. Kit Clardy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan,” (9 July 1954), *Far East*, 18-2, pp. 345.

³⁵ In 1996 dollars, the Disposable Personal Income of Americans in 1952 was 8,071; in 1955 it was 8,675; in 1945 it was 7,729. U.S. Census Bureau, “2009 Statistical Abstract,” data retrieved 30 Apr. 2009.

³⁶ “Communist China—Admission to the United Nations,” (6 July 1953), *Gallup*, 1153; “Communist China—Admission to the United Nations,” (11 Sept. 1953), *Gallup*, 1169.

Beijing into the U.N. had grown to 78 percent.³⁷ A year later, after the First Taiwan Straits Crisis, public opposition had dropped, but remained significant at 67 percent.³⁸ However, shortly after the Korean War 52 percent of the British public approved admitting the PRC into the U.N.³⁹ This demonstrated the difficulty faced by claimsmakers in ensuring America's allies would not support the inclusion of Mao's China in the world body. Thus the tactic of threatening American funds and withdrawal became a tool to force American allies to follow American will. The American people, though, never supported withdrawal from the U.N. Following the Korean War only 19 percent approved of that tactic, after the Geneva Conference 25 percent supported withdrawal, and following the Taiwan Straits Crisis support dropped back down to 17 percent.⁴⁰ The threat of withdrawing from the U.N. for not following American public opinion did not stand up to American mores of fair play. Furthermore, the idea of abandoning the postwar organization established to maintain peace was untenable in the atmosphere of anxiety spawned by the Cold War.⁴¹ Following the Geneva Conference 76 percent of Americans continued to approve of the United Nations. Therefore, the anti-recognition and pro-Chiang crusaders overstepped the accepted boundaries when they advocated the United States abandon the world body.⁴² This was a failed effort to expand on the original anti-communist rhetoric by implicating the U.N. represented a facet of expansionary communism. However, attacking the PRC remained not only a viable endeavor, it met with the approval of majority America. The China Lobby

³⁷ "Communist China—Admission to the United Nations," (26 July 1954), *Gallup*, 1254-55. Opposition remained steady through August 1954, with 79 percent opposed to U.N. recognition, "Communist China—Admission to the United Nations," (9 Aug. 1954), *Gallup*, 1259.

³⁸ "Communist China—Admission to the United Nations," (4 June 1955), *Gallup*, 1337-38.

³⁹ "Communist China-Admission to the United Nations," (5 Aug. 1953), *Gallup*, 1160.

⁴⁰ "Communist China—Admission to the United Nations," (6 July 1953), *Gallup*, 1153-54; "Communist China—Admission to the United Nations," (9 Aug. 1954), *Gallup*, 1259; "Communist China—Admission to the United Nations," (4 June 1955), *Gallup*, 1338.

⁴¹ A work that examines how Cold War anxiety affected the American public is Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*, (New York: Basic Books, 1998).

⁴² "United Nations," (11 Aug. 1954), *Gallup*, 1259.

claimsmakers once again set out to construct an image of the new regime in China as one that was loathsome to the American people and the Western world.

Pro-Chiang crusaders' vilification of the PRC following the Korean War differed from their earlier efforts. During the Chinese Civil War the goal behind the rhetoric was to obtain materiel, moral, and monetary support of Chiang Kai-shek's regime. The new goal was to lend credence to the claims that the admission of the PRC to the U.N. would be harmful to the interests of the Western world. Although the goals were different, the rhetoric remained similar. References of monolithic communism suffused the arguments, as did the inherent fear of "the other" presented by people who were culturally and politically different from the propagators of these arguments. However, as the intended audience of the new accusations was international as well as domestic, there were distinct differences from the earlier calls rejecting the PRC solely for its ideology. Monolithic communism was tempered by citing acts of communist aggression and, while the Chinese communists' agency was often attributed to Moscow, claimsmakers identified Mao and the CCP as having a distinct position in the communist world. Leveling accusations of atrocities by the PRC became a major vehicle of the crusaders drive to keep Beijing out of the U.N. The campaign to discredit Mao's government in China also had undertones of ethnocentric prejudice against Asians, which meshed with fears of desegregation raised in American domestic culture. The U.N.'s 1951 ruling that the PRC was an aggressor in the Korean War, though, provided the dominant theme in this reinvigorated campaign against the communist regime in China.

Monolithic communism remained a specter in American political and social thought and many contemporary Americans agreed, as a *New York Times* article's title proclaimed, "Asia's

Wars are Linked in Communist Strategy.”⁴³ The perceived goal of that strategy, moreover, was nothing less than world domination in “a war of ideas.”⁴⁴ McCarthyism factored into the perception of a communist global strategy led by the Kremlin. The former governor of Taiwan, K. C. Wu, testified before a house subcommittee as an expert on communist espionage as well as a representative of the Nationalist regime. Wu’s claims of communist conspiracy linked domestic fears of communism to a worldwide Soviet plot to rule the world.⁴⁵ One example of this link was Hong Kong, which Wu contended the communists left under British control in order to drive a wedge between Britain and the United States.⁴⁶ Madame Chiang Kai-shek, who continued to rank as one of American’s most admired women throughout this period, also asserted that the Soviet Union’s imperialism would not stop in Asia but would end at the door of the United States.⁴⁷ The perception of Soviet imperialism was cast as “not only in the aggressive search for territory and raw materials, but also for the souls and minds of mankind.”⁴⁸ The theory that Beijing was subservient to Moscow continued to be a significant factor China Lobby claimsmakers cited to deny the PRC membership in the U.N.⁴⁹ However, Mao’s China began to emerge as a threat to the United States in its own right in both crusaders’ accusations and policymakers’ perceptions.

⁴³ Tillman Durdin, “Asia’s Wars are Linked in Communist Strategy,” *NYT*, 25 Jan. 1953.

⁴⁴ “Statement of K. C. Wu, Former Governor of Formosa,” (24 July 1953), *Far East 18-2*, pp. 266; Congress, Senate, Sen. H. Alexander Smith (R) of New Jersey speaking on Mutual Security Act of 1951, 83-1, *CR 99*, (29 June 1953), 7568, quoted text.

⁴⁵ “Statement of K. C. Wu, Former Governor of Formosa,” (24 July 1953), *Far East 18-2*, pp. 255-84. A few of Wu’s more telling explanations of Communist espionage activities can be found on pp. 280-81.

⁴⁶ “Statement of K. C. Wu, Former Governor of Formosa,” (24 July 1953), *Far East 18-2*, pp. 267-68.

⁴⁷ “Most Admired Woman,” (6 Jan. 1954), *Gallup*, 1200; “Most Admired Woman,” (2 Jan 1955), *Gallup*, 1299-1300; Madame Chiang Kai-shek, “Communism’s Route to America Lies through China,” *American Legion Magazine*, Aug. 1953, read into *Congressional Record* by Rep. Melvin Price of Illinois extension of remarks on Communism’s Route to America Lies through China, 83-1, *CR 99*, (31 July 1953), A4911.

⁴⁸ Congress, House, Rep. Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia speaking on Secretary of State Dulles, 83-2, *CR 100*, (31 Mar. 1954), 4271.

⁴⁹ Congress, Senate, Sen. H. Alexander Smith of New Jersey speaking on Mutual Security Act of 1951, 83-1, *CR 99*, (29 June 1953), 7569; “Koo Cautions U.S. on Geneva Parley,” *NYT*, 3 Apr. 1954; Frank L. Meleney, “Dealing with Red China,” *NYT*, 18 July 1954.

Following the Korean War China began to be viewed by American policymakers and citizens as a communist state distinct from the Soviet Union. A *New York Times* editorial referred to the PRC and the USSR as “two rival imperial powers” as early as November 1953.⁵⁰ A National Security Council policy statement concurred stating, “Communist power and influence in Asia, . . . derives primarily from Communist China” shortly before the PRC began shelling Jinmen in 1954.⁵¹ Following the outbreak of hostilities in the Taiwan Strait the PRC was widely characterized as independent from the Soviet Union. Senator Walter F. George (D-Ga.) went so far as to declare Mao, after the death of Joseph Stalin, as “the ablest single Communist in a commanding position on the earth today, and I do not except the Kremlin.”⁵² Rather than having a conciliatory effect on U.S.-China relations China’s autonomy actually deepened antagonisms. This was because in the Soviet Union the United States was dealing with “a new generation” of communists, whereas in China it was dealing with “the first generations of Communists. These are the very men who have turned a nation of individualists into a nation of slaves.”⁵³ The PRC’s newly established agency in the communist system was not used to drive a wedge between it and the Soviet Union, as many Sinologists had advocated prior to the Korean War. The debate had been quashed by China Lobby rhetoric to the point that it was politically untenable for anyone to suggest such a course without being branded as either an appeaser or a communist. Instead the PRC’s autonomy became a liability that was exploited in charges that the PRC was actively engaged in committing atrocities against its people and the world.

⁵⁰ “Double Satellite,” *NYT*, 28 Nov. 1953.

⁵¹ “Draft Statement of Policy Prepared by the NSC Planning Board,” (4 Aug. 1954), in Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1952-1954. Vol. XIV, China and Japan (in two parts), Part 1*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1985), 516. Hereafter referred to as *FRUS 1952-1954, 14-1*.

⁵² Congress, Senate, Sen. George speaking on Authorization for Use of Armed Forces to Protect the Security of Formosa, 84-1, *CR* 101, (27 Jan. 1955), 819.

⁵³ Congress, Senate, Ralph E. Flanders of Vermont speaking on Bomb the Chinese People with Wheat, 84-1, *CR* 101, (28 July 1955), 11766.

One of the arguments against admitting China to the U.N. concerned how it treated its people. Many of the classical lines about its being unrepresentative continued to be put forth, but China Lobby claimsmakers took that argument a step further, arguing that China was a country of “400 million slaves.”⁵⁴ Other crusaders, including Senator Pat McCarran (D-Nev.) who claimed Premier Zhou Enlai was a servant of Mao, insinuated that Mao was not a head of state so much as a slave master.⁵⁵ This rhetoric was picked up by the Eisenhower administration’s representatives at the U.N. as a tactic to deny recognition of the PRC. On 23 April 1954 U.S. spokesman Preston Hotchkis, citing selected news clippings and noncooperation for investigations, claimed that the PRC used a slave-labor system. C. L. Hsia, the GMD’s representative to the U.N., claimed there were 24 million slaves on the Chinese mainland bolstering Hotchkis’s claims.⁵⁶ The numbers presented to the U.N. fluctuated, but always remained high. In February 1955 U.S. delegates estimated that there were between 8 million and 18 million enslaved Chinese.⁵⁷ This was another effective use of numbers to prove the depravity of Mao’s China without submitting evidence. The debate became not whether or not the PRC used slave labor, but to what extent it was used. Even Senator Wayne Morse (I-Ore.) and other opponents of the bellicose rhetoric were careful to point out that the PRC’s leaders had “no appreciation of human life, human values, or human dignity.”⁵⁸ However, the China Lobby claimsmakers maintained that the PRC’s nefarious activities did not stop with the exploitation of China’s citizens. The new regime in China was a threat to the entire civilized world.

⁵⁴ Congress, Senate, Sen. William E. Jenner of Indiana speaking on Consolidated General Appropriation Act, 83-1, *CR* 99, (26 May 1953), 5556.

⁵⁵ “Recognition of Red China,” *NYT*, 25 Nov. 1953; Congress, Senate, Sen. McCarran speaking on Thoughts and Suggestions on the Crisis in the Far East, 83-2, *CR* 100, (28 June 1954), 9045.

⁵⁶ “Red Slave Camps Attacked by U.S.,” *NYT*, 24 Apr. 1954.

⁵⁷ “U.S. Says Red China has Slave System,” *NYT*, 16 Feb. 1955.

⁵⁸ Congress, Senate, Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon speaking on The Formosa Treaty, 84-1, *CR* 101, (4 Feb. 1955), 1190.

One of the threats that crusaders attributed to China was its treatment of foreigners within its borders. China Lobby claimsmakers appealed to American Christian mores—especially significant during Eisenhower’s presidency—claiming, “never since the Boxer days have so many crimes been committed against foreign missionaries.”⁵⁹ Representative Louis C. Rabaut (D-Mich.) verified this was an important issue because “in the field of foreign affairs the problem haunting us today is unquestionably godless communism.”⁶⁰ The PRC was also charged with abusing American prisoners of war, which demonstrated its lack of respect for human dignity as well as international law.⁶¹ In addition to these alleged abuses of missionaries and prisoners the case was made that “its [the PRC’s] hands are stained with blood... the blood of good American boys,” for its entry into the Korean War.⁶² U.S. delegates to the U.N. claimed assaults on Western air and naval transport vessels by the PRC had continued unabated since 1950 in order to demonstrate the new regime was committed to using violence as a tool to achieve its objectives.⁶³ However, claimsmakers had a much more nefarious plot to attribute to Beijing.

United States representatives at the U.N. gave the nineteenth-century Opium Wars in China an intriguing corollary towards the end of the Korean War. Unlike the earlier efforts of British traders to open up China’s markets by introducing opium manufactured in British India, China was now charged with being the largest cultivator and exporter of poppy derivatives to the West. An editorial in the *New York Times* cited China’s discussed the diabolical nature of the PRC’s use of narcotics as a revenue stream for aggression stating, “after all, when teenage

⁵⁹ “Judging Red China,” *NYT*, 9 Aug. 1953.

⁶⁰ Congress, House, Rep. Rabaut extension of remarks on Communism and the Admission of Red China to the United Nations, 83-2, *CR* 100, (20 Aug. 1954), 15685.

⁶¹ “Moscow and Red China,” *NYT*, 7 Nov. 1953.

⁶² Congress, House, Rep. Charles A. Wolverton of New Jersey speaking on Red China has No Right to Membership in the United Nations, 83-2, *CR* 100, (15 July 1954), 10659.

⁶³ A. M. Rosenthal, “39 ‘Warlike’ Acts Laid to Red China: U.S. Lists Charges,” *NYT*, 20 Sep. 1954.

addicts in New York are helping pay for the shells that kill American boys in Korea Peiping [Beijing] may well congratulate itself.”⁶⁴ Opium offered more than just the opportunity for illicit economic gains, however, as “the Communists expect to use narcotic addiction as a weapon against the societies in which it can get a foothold.”⁶⁵ By 1954 Federal Narcotics Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger charged that China had shipped “800 tons of opium, heroin, and morphine, valued at \$60,000,000,” in the last year which “was 20 per cent short of... [what] the Government officials had planned.”⁶⁶ Interestingly, Anslinger provided these numbers without access to any evidence other than a drug seizure in San Francisco and fantastic charges of communist dope smuggling in Asia, which were reminiscent of McCarthy’s fantastic charges of domestic communist espionage. Once again numbers and statistics were employed as a method to provide grounds that the PRC was unfit for inclusion in the U.N. These accusations, all made before the U.N. and echoed by secondary claimsmakers, were repeated throughout this period as justification for denying the PRC any position in the world body.⁶⁷ This also spurred various accusations and comparisons to America’s Prohibition-era drug traffickers with the PRC becoming “the blood-stained gangster regime of Red China.”⁶⁸

The China Lobby claimsmakers’ tactics of defamation during this period were not significantly different from their earlier efforts. Many claims attacked the nature of communism as a monolithic subversive movement. A significant portion of the other charges surrounded the corrupt nature of the PRC government and its leaders. There were several minor variations that created significant differences, though. The ascension of the PRC as a communist state in its own

⁶⁴ “Secret Weapon—Opium,” *NYT*, 2 Jan 1953.

⁶⁵ “Secret Weapon—Opium,” *NYT*, 2 Jan 1953.

⁶⁶ “U.S. Charges China Spurs Drug Habit,” *NYT*, 5 May 1954.

⁶⁷ “Peiping’s Narcotics Trade,” *NYT*, 15 May 1954; “Peiping Narcotics Cited as U.N. Bar,” *NYT*, 1 Aug. 1955.

⁶⁸ Congress, Senate, Sen. William E. Jenner of Indiana speaking on United States Conference with Red China, 84-1, *CR* 101, (29 July 1955), 12042.

right allowed China Lobby claimsmakers to argue for more direct measures of halting the spread of Chinese communism. This newfound position within the worldwide communist body also allowed detractors to directly attack the PRC government as a threat in its own right as tensions with the Soviet Union seemed to be stabilizing. The most profound change, however, was where these claims originated. During the Chinese Civil War the claims had come primarily from Republican members of the U.S. Congress. By the Korean War the claims came from both sides of the aisle and during this period the charges began coming from the executive branch of the U.S. government as well. These shifts would lead to a radical alteration of U.S. China policy after the PRC began shelling Jinmen and the China Lobby sought to cement an alliance between Taipei and Washington.

In 1950, prior to the Korean War, Dulles advocated that the United States make a stand on Taiwan. Though he acknowledged it would entail the risk of war with the PRC, he felt that a stand on Taiwan was necessary to ensure America's worldwide prestige.⁶⁹ In 1954 Secretary of State Dulles got the opportunity to make that stand. Beijing's decision to precipitate an attack on the offshore islands also had to be considered in light of Washington's "New Look" strategic policy. Nearly a year before, U.S. policymakers had anticipated a new strategy of containment that relied on the ability "to inflict massive retaliatory damages by offensive striking power."⁷⁰ Dulles made a public announcement of this new strategy to the Council on Foreign Relations on 12 January 1954. In addition to explaining the principle of atomic retribution in response to

⁶⁹ "Memorandum by John Foster Dulles," (18 May 1950), Entry 399A, Box 17, Folder Top Secret (1950) 306.001, US Policy Toward China: CA, TSSF 1945-50, RG 59, NACP.

⁷⁰ "Draft Statement of Policy Proposed by the National Security Council," (Sep. 30, 1953), in Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States 1952-1954, Volume II: National Security Affairs, Part I*, (Washington D.C.: GPO, 1984), 494, hereafter referred to as *FRUS 1952-54 II*. For a more detailed analysis of Eisenhower's Strategy see John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar National Security Policy*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), Ch. 5-6; Robert R. Bowie and Richard H. Immerman, *Waging Peace: How Eisenhower Shaped an Enduring Cold War Strategy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

aggression, Dulles touted the economic benefits of the new plan. It called for a reduction in military manpower in favor of nuclear striking capabilities. Though couched in euphemisms, the message itself was clear. The term “Massive Atomic Retaliation” appeared in the *New York Times* and a reporter stressed that Dulles’ statements “told Moscow and Peiping [Beijing]... that in the event of another proxy or bushfire war in Korea, Indo-China, Iran or anywhere else, the United States might retaliate instantly with atomic weapons against the USSR or Red China.”⁷¹

The PRC was intentionally testing America’s resolve to protect Chiang Kai-shek’s government. In July of 1954, the Chinese Communist Party’s ambassador to the Soviet Union sent a message to Premier Zhou Enlai detailing a plan to drive a wedge between America and the Nationalists on Taiwan, which was viewed as the primary conflict between China and the United States. The propaganda of liberation in the Taiwan Strait was also to further the PRC’s domestic programs. Getting the people to unite in a struggle against the United States did this. It also served the purpose of enhancing the People’s Liberation Army’s (PLA’s) maritime capabilities. The communiqué clearly stated that direct engagement with U.S. forces was to be avoided except in response to a direct attack on Chinese troops.⁷²

For the China Lobby, the Quemoy-Matsu Crisis represented a potential catalyst for a U.S.-GMD alliance in Asia.⁷³ Securing a permanent alliance would ensure Chiang’s regime

⁷¹ “Text of Dulles’ Statement on Foreign Policy of Eisenhower Administration” *NYT*, 13 Jan. 1954; James Reston “Washington ‘Massive Atomic Retaliation’ and the Constitution,” *NYT*, 17 Jan. 1954.

⁷² “Telegram, CCP Central Committee to Zhou Enlai, Concerning Policies and Measures in the Struggle against the United States and Jiang Jieshi after the Geneva Conference,” (27 Jul.1954), available from Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars, “Cold War International History Project,” at http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=topics.home&topic_id=1409. Data retrieved 21 Mar. 2009. For more detailed accounts of CCP interpretations of this incident see Chen *Mao’s China and the Cold War*: 167-170; Gordon H. Chang and He Di. “The Absence of War in the U.S.-China Confrontation over Quemoy and Matsu in 1954-1955: Contingency, Luck, Deterrence,” *American Historical Review* 98 (December 1993): 1500-1524; Shu, *Deterrence and Strategic Culture*, 189-224.

⁷³ A few works that analyze the importance of the Quemoy-Matsu Crisis are H. W., Brands, Jr. “Testing Massive Retaliation: Credibility and Crisis Management in the Taiwan Strait,” *International Security* 12 (1988): 124-151; and

would maintain an important position in U.S. planning and aid. It would also strengthen American commitment to the non-recognition of the PRC at home and in the U.N. In order to achieve this end, the China Lobby claimsmakers intensified their ongoing campaign to assert the importance of Taiwan for U.S. strategy in the Far East. Once again the GMD was lauded for its governance and now claimsmakers also asserted America was obligated to aid Chiang's Nationalist government. Crusaders espoused the importance of not only Taiwan but the offshore islands as well for American interests in the region. Before the First Taiwan Straits Crisis was over, China Lobby claimsmakers would achieve their goal of an alliance. Moreover, their vociferous support for Chiang and antagonism towards the PRC would continue unabated.

Even before the Korean armistice was formalized, pro-Chiang crusaders began warning the Eisenhower administration that any dealings with the PRC would amount to appeasement and the abandonment of one of America's greatest allies.⁷⁴ Eisenhower lauded Chiang Kai-shek's leadership and Americans applauded the GMD's "heroic resistance to the international gangsters now torturing and enslaving the helpless Chinese."⁷⁵ China Lobby claimsmakers argued that the United States' obligation to the GMD stemmed both from it being non-communist as well as its role in World War II.⁷⁶ However, the main reason the United States was obligated to the GMD was related to the trope that "Chiang Kai-shek didn't lose the mainland, ... we gave it away."⁷⁷ That fallacy was the overriding factor behind Eisenhower's and Dulles's

Leonard H. D. Gordon, "United States Opposition to Use of Forces in the Taiwan Strait," *Journal of American History* 72 (December 1985): 637-660.

⁷⁴ "Any Peace in Asia is Appeasing, Dr. Poling Tells Anti-Red Group," *NYT*, 23 May 1953.

⁷⁵ Eisenhower, *Mandate for Change*, 462; "Against Recognition of Red China," *NYT*, 10 Nov. 1953.

⁷⁶ Congress, House, Rep. W.J. Bryan Dorn of South Carolina speaking on Universal Military Training and Service Act, 83-1, *CR* 99, (11 June 1953), 6442.

⁷⁷ "Statement of Maj. Gen. William A. Worton, USMC (Retired)," (2 Mar. 1955), *Far East*, 18-2, 428.

private and public statements against appeasing the PRC through any form of recognition.⁷⁸ Even though the Truman administration and others had correctly attributed the loss of China to Chiang, the China Lobby's campaign to refute any charges of malfeasance by the GMD had proved effective in altering the perception of the public as well as policymakers. Therefore the Eisenhower administration had to defend Taiwan from the mainland or risk having the ultimate defeat of the Nationalists attributed to it. Defending Taiwan from the mainland, however, meant the China Lobby had to change its campaign for the return of the GMD to China's mainland.

Before the PRC's renewed efforts to reclaim Taiwan and the offshore islands pro-Chiang crusaders had continued their campaign to return the GMD to the mainland. One of Eisenhower's first moves as president was to modify the Seventh Fleet's orders, allowing the Nationalists to make forays against the mainland in order to increase pressure on the PRC.⁷⁹ The American public greeted this change with overwhelming support as 65 percent approved having the Nationalists make more raids on the mainland and only 14 percent disapproved of unleashing Chiang.⁸⁰ Claimsmakers continued their rhetoric that the Chinese on the mainland merely awaited the arrival of the well-trained Nationalist forces to revolt against Mao's government.⁸¹ The most vocal advocates for the return to the mainland were representatives of the Nationalist government. Former Governor Wu claimed that, with modest support from the United States, "I guarantee within 6 months' time we [the GMD] could stage the attack [on the mainland]... in 1½ year's time after the invasion, we could possibly reach Peking [Beijing]."⁸² Madame Chiang supported this proposition by restating the claim that there were millions of Chinese waiting for

⁷⁸ "Memorandum of Conversation, by the Secretary of State," (24 Mar. 1954), *FRUS 1952-1954, 14-1*: 396-97.

⁷⁹ "Memorandum by John Foster Dulles to General Dwight D. Eisenhower," (2 Jan. 1953), *FRUS 1952-1954, 14-1*: 125; Hanson. W. Baldwin, "Formosa Move Big Step to put Heat on China," *NYT*, 1 Feb. 1953.

⁸⁰ "China," (9 Feb. 1953), *Gallup*, 1119.

⁸¹ "Any Peace in Asia is Appeasing, Dr. Poling Tells Anti-Red Group," *NYT*, 23 May 1953; Congress, Senate, Sen. Everett Dirksen of Illinois speaking on Mutual Security Act of 1951, as Amended, 83-1, *CR* 99, (30 June 1953).

⁸² "Statement of K. C. Wu, Former Governor of Formosa," (24 July 1953), *Far East 18-2*: 272.

the return of the Nationalists to the mainland as the “flame of revolt smolders intensely; we must not allow it to die out” and “in patriotic Chinese hands... even your most rudimentary land and air weapons can be victoriously effective.”⁸³ Chiang Kai-shek also continued to expound on these views to American officials who visited him in Taipei.⁸⁴ As 1954 began GMD officials continued to express confidence that they would be able to return to the mainland with only a modicum of U.S. assistance.⁸⁵ The PRC’s shelling of Jinmen called the GMD’s bluff, however. As it became apparent that the GMD position on Taiwan was tenuous at best, the debate was not whether or not the United States should defend this regime in exile, but whether or not to defend the offshore islands it controlled in the strait.

Eisenhower and the Joint Chiefs of Staff all agreed on two facts concerning the offshore islands in the Taiwan Strait. First, they were not militarily necessary to the defense of Taiwan. Second, the Nationalists could not hold them without American support. Despite those two conclusions they determined that losing these islands would be a blow to the GMD troops’ moral.⁸⁶ With the exception of a few vocal claimsmakers like Senator Knowland who called for a blockade of the Chinese mainland, there was little attention devoted to the Far East during the midterm election cycle.⁸⁷ However the next session of a once again Democratic-controlled congress was nearly unanimous on one issue: the defense of Taiwan. On 27 January 1955 President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate Walter F. George (D-Ga.) stated “there is no question by any member of Congress... that the United States should protect Formosa [Taiwan] and... the

⁸³ Madame Chiang Kai-shek, “Communism’s Route to America Lies through China,” *American Legion Magazine*, Aug. 1953, read into *Congressional Record* by Rep. Melvin Price (D) of Illinois extension of remarks on Communism’s Route to America Lies through China, 83-1, *CR* 99, (31 July 1953), A4912-13.

⁸⁴ “The Ambassador to the Republic of China (Rankin) to the Department of State,” (30 Nov. 1953), *FRUS 1952-1954, 14-1*: 335-36.

⁸⁵ “Chiang Spurs China Toward ’54 Freedom,” *NYT*, 1 Jan. 1954; “Koo Urges Liberation,” *NYT*, 4 Feb. 1954.

⁸⁶ Eisenhower, *Mandate for Change*, 463.

⁸⁷ James Reston, “President vs. Senator,” *NYT*, 17 Nov. 1954.

Pescadores,... If anyone has a contrary view, I have not heard it expressed.”⁸⁸ Even Senator Morse, long critical of the Nationalist government, declared that the United States had “the right to protect Formosa [Taiwan].”⁸⁹ The only caveat was the offshore islands. Throughout the First Taiwan Straits Crisis politicians continued to support, in the words of Senator Herbert H. Lehman, “policy [that] consists of the determination to defend Formosa and the Pescadores,” however, “defending the Quemoy [Jinmen] Island group, Matsu [Mazu] Island group and the Tachen [Dachen] Island group, right off the mainland of China, I am not for that.”⁹⁰ There was almost no opposition to the possibility of going to war with the PRC to defend the GMD on Taiwan.⁹¹

There were, of course, advocates for defending the offshore islands other than Senator Knowland and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.⁹² Forty-two percent of Americans familiar with the situation in the Taiwan Strait supported the U.S. defense of Jinmen and the Mazus compared to 27 percent who were against it, demonstrating that the public firmly supported an aggressive defense of the GMD.⁹³ Essentially, the only opposition to the use of American forces to defend the GMD was over the offshore islands that were within shelling distance of land-based artillery. Just five years earlier Taiwan was considered unnecessary to U.S. defense, now the debate did not even touch on its defense, but on islands that were much closer to the mainland of China than

⁸⁸ Congress, Senate, Sen. George speaking on Authorization for Use of Armed Forces to Protect the Security of Formosa, 84-1, *CR* 101, (27 Jan. 1955), 820.

⁸⁹ Congress, Senate, Sen. Morse speaking on Authorization for Use of Armed Forces to Protect the Security of Formosa, 84-1, *CR* 101, (27 Jan. 1955), 848.

⁹⁰ Congress, Senate, Sen. Lehman speaking on Authorization for Use of Armed Forces to Protect the Security of Formosa, 84-1, *CR* 101, (28 Jan. 1955), 926; Congress, Senate, Sen. Estes Kefauver of Tennessee speaking on Policy with Respect to Formosa, 84-1, *CR* 101, (30 Mar. 1955), 4043; Congress, Senate, Sen. Lehman speaking on The Islands of Quemoy and Matsu, 84-1, *CR* 101, (1 Apr. 1955), 4199.

⁹¹ Congress, Senate, William Langer of North Dakota speaking on Opposing Formosa Resolution, 84-1, *CR* 101, (28 Jan. 1955), 942.

⁹² Congress, House, Rep. James P. Richards of South Carolina speaking on Foreign Affairs, 84-1, *CR* 101, (23 Feb. 1955), 1963.

⁹³ “Formosa,” (27 Mar. 1955), *Gallup*, 1320-21. Of 77 percent familiar with the issue, 32 percent favored defending Jinmen and the Matsus, 21 percent did not.

to Taiwan. The range of acceptable debate no longer considered whether or not the United States should be supporting one side in what was, ostensibly, still a civil war. The China Lobby's claimsmakers had successfully shifted American support solidly behind Chiang's regime, however the *coupe de grâce* came with the formalization of the U.S.-Taiwan relationship.

Ambassador Koo had raised the possibility of a mutual security pact early in the Eisenhower administration. Coming before the Korean armistice, Dulles contended that a mutual security agreement between the United States and GMD was unlikely, especially because of the continued civil war in China.⁹⁴ However calls for a mutual defense treaty continued to come from both the Nationalists and the pro-Chiang crusaders, even though regional governments, particularly India, felt such a maneuver would be an unnecessary provocation in Asia.⁹⁵ Just two days before the outbreak of the First Taiwan Straits Crisis the State Department favored the eventual creation of a U.S.-GMD mutual protection pact, "but would prefer to delay decision as to timing because of the complexities of the offshore island problem."⁹⁶ The offshore island problem, however, became much more pronounced with the PRC's assault on Jinmen. Though the administration had been wary of an alliance with a nation split between two rival regimes, it began the process of cementing its ties with Generalissimo Chiang's government on Taiwan.⁹⁷ The efficacy of the China Lobby's rhetoric on Taiwan's importance was such that the possibility of leaving the GMD to fend for itself was no longer an option, and on 2 December 1954 the

⁹⁴ "Memorandum of Conversation, by the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs (Allison)," (19 Mar. 1953), *FRUS 1952-1954, 14-1*: 158.

⁹⁵ "The Ambassador in the Republic of China (Rankin) to the Department of State," (18 Nov. 1953), *FRUS 1952-1954, 14-1*: 333; "Memorandum by the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs (Jernegan) to the Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs (Robertson)," (27 Aug. 1954), *FRUS 1952-1954, 14-1*: 551.

⁹⁶ "Memorandum by the Acting Secretary of State to the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs," (1 Sept. 1954), *FRUS 1952-1954, 14-1*: 555.

⁹⁷ "Memorandum by the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs (Robertson) to the Secretary of State," (7 Oct. 1954), *FRUS 1952-1954, 14-1*: 706-707; "The Acting Secretary of State to the Embassy in the Republic of China," (14 Oct. 1954), *FRUS 1952-1954 14-1*: 761.

United States and the Republic of China agreed to a mutual defense treaty. The United States had entered into an entangling alliance with the Republic of China. China Lobby claimsmakers, however, were still not sated as the Eisenhower administration moved to bring the First Taiwan Straits Crisis to an end.

Some China Lobby claimsmakers assailed the treaty itself for being, in Representative Judd's words, "a treaty that would imprison Formosa under us."⁹⁸ Far more troubling for pro-Chiang crusaders, however, was the administration's decision to approach the PRC to obtain a cease-fire in the strait. Although the China Lobby was successful in cementing an alliance between the United States and Taiwan their work was not done as they fought the possible recognition of two Chinas.⁹⁹ In February Knowland blocked a resolution to have the U.N. broker an end to hostilities in the strait, a move Chiang had objected to earlier.¹⁰⁰ Following the administration's decision to work outside the U.N. Knowland released a statement lambasting the White House's decision to meet with the PRC because "they don't need a conference to bring about a cease-fire. All they need to do is stop shooting."¹⁰¹ Dulles attempted to stave off further attacks on the administration by meeting with some of the more vociferous pro-Chiang Senators, including Knowland, to explain the decision.¹⁰² Knowland's response was to read his statement into the *Congressional Record* the next day, demonstrating his continued resistance to any action that provided the PRC with a modicum of recognition. The Committee of One Million also became involved, issuing a statement in support of a peaceful solution of a ceasefire, but also urging "that Communist China be required to live up to past agreements before any new

⁹⁸ "Statement of Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff," (24 Jan. 1955), *Far East* 18-2: 411.

⁹⁹ Russell Baker, "Asian Issue Left to Others by U.S.," *NYT*, 29 Jan. 1955.

¹⁰⁰ "Senators Defer Formosa Action," *NYT*, 2 Feb. 1955; Eisenhower, *Mandate for Change*, 464-65.

¹⁰¹ Congress, Senate, Sen. Knowland speaking on Statement by Senator Knowland on Proposal for Negotiations With Communist China, 84-1, *CR* 101, (28 Apr. 1955), 5205.

¹⁰² "Memorandum of a Conversation, Washington, April 27, 1955, 6 p.m.," in Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957: Vol. 2, China*, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1986), 526-27.

agreements were made with it.”¹⁰³ In response to claims “that there is ample evidence of a plan to rig de facto recognition of Red China now, and ultimately to obtain de jure recognition,” Eisenhower assured the American public and pro-Chiang crusaders that at any meeting with the PRC, where the GMD were absent, the United States would not discuss any issues pertaining to the GMD.¹⁰⁴ Thus the China Lobby continued its campaign against recognition in any form for the new government in China.

The China Lobby’s influence on Sino-American relations continued throughout much of the Cold War. Though tensions abated in the strait for a while, they flared up again in 1958 during the Second Taiwan Straits Crisis. At home the excesses of McCarthyism, which had not abated following McCarthy’s 1954 censure, were beginning to be challenged by a weary public. Sino-American relations were further strained during the Vietnam War in which the PRC provided materiel and military support to Ho Chi Minh’s Vietcong in their fight against the U.S. military and Ngo Dinh Diem’s regime. Even as the Vietnam War continued to intensify in Southeast Asia, the Soviet Union and China became involved in border skirmishes as the Sino-Soviet rift came to light. In 1964 China became a nuclear power, despite the Soviet Union’s decision to withdraw technical support as the Sino-Soviet rift developed.¹⁰⁵ During this period Mao also plunged China into the Cultural Revolution, which would disrupt not only the government but also the lives of millions of Chinese. The United States was also suffering from internal strife as Americans began to protest the war in Vietnam. Throughout all of this, U.S. pressure kept the PRC out of the U.N. until 1971, after which President Richard M. Nixon, who

¹⁰³ “Unit Here Warns on Peiping Parley,” *NYT*, 18 May 1955.

¹⁰⁴ Congress, House, Rep. Thomas J. Dodd (D) of Connecticut extension of remarks on Meeting with Red China to Discuss Formosa and Asia, 84-1, *CR* 101, (26 July 1955), 11601; Congress, House, Rep. Robert Hale (R) of Maine speaking on Chinese Communist Situation, 84-1, *CR* 101, (26 July 1955), 11523; “Eisenhower Bars Asia Summit Talk,” *NYT*, 4 Aug. 1955.

¹⁰⁵ For a full analysis of China’s path to becoming a nuclear power see John Wilson Lewis and Xue Litai, *China Builds the Bomb*, (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1988).

had been Vice President under Eisenhower, made his historic trip to China. Nixon served an important role in the normalization of U.S. China relations. As a Cold Warrior in the 1950s he had been sympathetic to the pro-Chiang crusaders. However, with the continuing conflict in Southeast Asia and the opportunities presented by the Sino-Soviet rift Nixon began the process of Sino-American rapprochement with his 1972 trip to meet Mao Zedong in China. The China Lobby, however, continued its campaign of nonrecognition throughout this transformative era under the auspices of the Committee of One Million.

China Lobby claimsmakers had begun this period in a position to significantly influence U.S. policy in the Far East. The Republicans had regained control of the U.S. government, partially by adopting the China Lobby's earlier rhetoric, which McCarthy exemplified. Pro-Chiang crusaders managed to keep the United States and the U.N. from recognizing the PRC following the Korean armistice. This had been accomplished by a new round of campaigning to demonstrate the evils of not only communism, but of the Chinese communists. Although the PRC received an elevated status within supposedly monolithic communism, the agency granted it was used as justification for its unsuitability for membership in the U.N. When the PRC began its shelling of Jinmen, the China Lobby was able to go back into action against Mao's government. Significantly, the conclusion of a mutual defense treaty between the United States and Taiwan meant that America was now bound together with the GMD in Asia. However, following this accomplishment the China Lobby continued its campaign against communist China, ensuring that the United States would continue to recognize only one China, whose government was in Taipei.

The China Lobby was an effective pressure group. For nearly three decades its message dominated American perceptions of Asia. It would not be until the United States fought to a

standstill in Vietnam, in addition to the domestic turmoil of the Sixties, that its message began to lose efficacy. In 1972 President Richard Nixon was compelled by domestic and international pressures to repair the Sino-American relationship leading to his trip to China, which had undergone its own significant inner turmoil. The Sino-Soviet rift, apparent to the West since 1959, demonstrated that the PRC and Soviet Union could be used against each other, and U.S. allies wanted to once again have access to Chinese markets. The ongoing struggle in Vietnam also weakened the United States' ability to continue neglecting the desires of its allies. Essentially, the China Lobby's opposition to the recognition of the PRC by the United States or the U.N. was only overcome after nearly 10 years of another war in Asia resulting in the loss of approximately 60,000 additional American lives as well as the lives of millions of Vietnamese, Laotians, and Cambodians.

CONCLUSION: EMBERS

Nixon's trip to China in 1972 received more public attention than any other event in the previous 37 years.¹ His historic trip to the Chinese mainland occurred only a few months after the United Nations recognized the People's Republic of China, expelling Chiang Kai-shek's Republic of China. Though the PRC had effectively won recognition by the world as the sole legitimate Chinese government, the China Lobby continued trying to win aid and support for the Guomindang on Taiwan. Two days after the PRC's victory in the U.N., the Committee of One Million declared it would continue its fight. Walter H. Judd, now the Committee's chairman, declared the admission of the PRC was "an ominous blow to international justice and a cynical affront to human decency."² In the lead up to Nixon's trip, China Lobby claimsmakers continued to laud the GMD as a "dedicated force holding high the torch of freedom," and the Generalissimo, who would remain president until his death in 1975, proclaimed "any appeasing actions by foreign countries in order to seek a balance of power with such an evil entity cannot possibly serve the cause of world peace."³ Americans, however, disagreed.

The U.S. public was optimistic that Nixon's trip would improve world peace by nearly three to one.⁴ With the conclusion of the Vietnam War a year later, American optimism appeared validated. However, even after U.N. recognition and Nixon's trip, Americans viewed the PRC less favorably than they did the USSR, and the United States did not extend the PRC full

¹ "American Image of China," (12 Mar. 1972), in George H. Gallup, *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1972-1977* (in two parts), (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1978), 20. Hereafter referred to as *Gallup 1972-1977*. Ninety-eight percent of the public was aware of Nixon's trip; a note details the significance of that percentage. For a detailed analysis of Nixon's trip to China see Margaret MacMillan, *Nixon and Mao: The Week that changed the World*, (New York: Random House, 2007).

² "China Lobby Says it Will Still Fight," *NYT*, 27 Oct. 1971.

³ "Buckley, in Taipei, Hails Nationalist Fortitude," *NYT*, 24 Jan, 1972; "Chiang Assails Peking," *NYT*, 21 Feb. 1972.

⁴ "President Nixon," (9 Mar. 1972), *Gallup 1972-1977*: 20. This number is derived from respondents stating what the efficacy of Nixon's trip would do for improving world peace, 18 percent said very, 50 percent said fairly, 24 percent said not at all and 8 percent had no opinion.

diplomatic recognition until 1979.⁵ This perception and reluctance to grant official recognition was not solely a result of pro-Chiang crusaders' influence, but they could claim a fair portion for their three-decades long campaign for the GMD against the Chinese Communist Party. Though the China Lobby ultimately failed to deny the PRC recognition in either the United States or the U.N., it had profoundly influenced American perceptions and policy during the early years of the Cold War.

The China Lobby took shape during the Second Sino-Japanese War and advocated aiding the Chinese against Japanese aggression. After Japan attacked Pearl Harbor their claims took on more relevance as the United States entered the Second World War. It was after the war, however, that the inchoate mass of claimsmakers that made up the China Lobby turned their attention to aiding the GMD against the CCP as the Chinese Civil War was resumed. Pro-Chiang crusaders pursued several different paths to generate American support for the Generalissimo's government. Their first tactic was to construct an image of the Nationalists that would appeal to an American public largely ignorant of China. Claimsmakers' attempt to construct a particular image of the Nationalists, however met with opposition. The military and political efficacy of the GMD was a position issue, which resulted in clashes between pro-Chiang crusaders and their opponents. The China Lobby claimsmakers' other avenue for garnering support proved to be much more effective as they tied the ideology of the GMD's enemy to the nascent Cold War. Arguing that the Chinese communists were beholden to the Soviet Union the China Lobby found a valence issue that galvanized support for the GMD. The State Department, however, resisted the China Lobby's rhetoric and came under fire for being communist sympathizers and was

⁵ "Rating of Foreign Countries," (30 June 1972), *Gallup 1972-1977*: 39-40. For Russia the responses were 40 percent favorable to 54 percent unfavorable. For Communist China the responses were 23 percent favorable to 71 percent unfavorable. Nationalist China, on the other hand, had 53 percent favorable to 38 percent unfavorable.

lambasted for helping the CCP against Chiang's government. In 1949 the PRC was founded and the Nationalists were forced onto the offshore islands and Taiwan, and the Truman administration attempted to defend its record in China. The publication of the *China White Paper*, however, failed to generate support and was roundly attacked by China Lobby claimsmakers. By early 1950 Truman and Acheson were ready to wash their hands of the China problem. In June that perception was radically altered by the accusations of Senator Joseph McCarthy and North Korea's invasion of South Korea.

McCarthy's Wheeling, West Virginia, speech in February propelled the relatively unknown junior Senator from Wisconsin into the national spotlight. His ascension, however, was predicated on the rhetoric of China Lobby claimsmakers. McCarthy's attacks began with the State Department and sinologists previously targeted by pro-Chiang crusaders, such as Owen Lattimore. This benefited the China Lobby by removing diplomats critical of the GMD and censoring those who remained for fear of being labeled as either communists or communist sympathizers. As McCarthy and the Red Scare that bore his name aided the China Lobby's domestic agenda, the outbreak of the Korean War helped them realize that agenda more fully. Truman's order placing the Seventh Fleet in the Taiwan Strait ensured the GMD would not be invaded by the PRC whose troops were preparing to finish the Chinese Civil War. The China Lobby's Domino Theory rhetoric appeared validated, especially as the Chinese People's Volunteers entered the Korean peninsula forcing American-led U.N. forces back South of the 38th parallel. China Lobby claimsmakers argued that the Nationalist regime on Taiwan was more necessary than ever to serve as a rallying point for anti-Communist Chinese on the mainland as well as a location to block further PRC expansion. More importantly, however, the U.N.'s designation of the PRC as an aggressor in 1951 provided the China Lobby with its most

persuasive argument against recognizing the new regime in China. McCarthyism and the Korean War also insulated the China Lobby from internal criticism. The call for an investigation of foreign lobbies in the United States was raised during the MacArthur hearings. The administration, congress, and media began examining the activities of pro-Chiang organizations, but investigators' emphases on economic factors were unable to prove links between the GMD and their advocates. China Lobby claimsmakers, on the other hand, were able to use the investigation to their own benefit. Claiming that their efforts were against communists, crusaders were able to refocus attention away from themselves and back on those who questioned the GMD as soft on communism. As the Truman administration left the White House, the China Lobby continued its campaign to assist the GMD.

In 1953 the Republican Party resumed control of the White House and the U.S. Congress, in part by exploiting the China Lobby's rhetoric. As the Korean War drew to a close the China Lobby refocused its energies on keeping the PRC out of the U.N. Many of the pro-Chiang members of congress formed the Committee for One Million Against the Admission of Red China to the United Nations, which served as an umbrella organization for the disparate members of the China Lobby. Even negotiations with the PRC over Korea and Indochina were attacked as appeasement for fear that any meeting was a form of recognition for the new regime. In order to deny the PRC's admission to the U.N. pro-Chiang crusaders began to attack the world body itself, threatening the withdrawal of U.S. assistance or even representation if New China were admitted, though the American public did not support this tactic. China Lobby claimsmakers also began attacking the new government in China to demonstrate its unsuitability for the U.N. Monolithic communism continued to be an important target of the rhetoric, but China was also given an elevated spot in arguments about the communist world in order to

demonstrate that the PRC was, in and of itself, a threat to the United States and the world. Some of the new claims against the PRC were that it was a slave state and was using narcotics as a way of achieving its world objectives. Once the PRC began shelling the offshore island of Jinmen in 1954, however, the China Lobby was given the opportunity to cement the U.S.-Taiwan relationship by securing a mutual defense treaty. Even after the United States was formally tied to the GMD, though, the China Lobby continued its campaign against the recognition of the PRC maintaining that there was only one China and its legitimate government was in Taipei. This continued to be official U.S. policy toward China until after Nixon's trip in 1972.

The China Lobby profoundly influenced U.S. policy, foreign and domestic, in favor of the GMD in the postwar era. China Lobby claimsmakers benefited from a congruence of social, political, economic, and international forces in their campaign. The Second Red Scare made its cause against the CCP into a valence issue that became unquestioned following ten years of conflict in Asia. The Republican Party adopted many of the China Lobby's criticisms of the Truman administration in their election campaigns, legitimizing and spreading its rhetoric. The increased affluence of Americans in the postwar period allowed them to devote more attention to status issues, even as anxieties arising from communism and atomic war made them more susceptible to fear mongering. Finally, the nascent Cold War pitted American capitalism against Soviet communism, splitting the world into rival camps that were easily classified by their ideological predilections. Even as Americans focused their attention on Europe in the postwar period, Asia continued to garner worldwide attention as failing empires and Western-backed governments collapsed before nationalistic movements. The inchoate mass of organizations, individuals, and policy makers that made up the China Lobby were able to successfully use these conditions and events to align the United States with Chiang Kai-shek's ousted government on

Taiwan. By controlling the debate, pro-Chiang crusaders made supporting the GMD the only viable option in China, and the purge of sinologists critical of the GMD from the government exacerbated the lack of any alternative policy in the Far East. The United States' opposition to the PRC was solidified in this period by a pressure group that became a fixture in American politics throughout the Cold War in Asia. Nixon was only able to make the trip to China because of his credentials as an anti-communist Cold Warrior. The veil successfully placed between the United States and the PRC by the China Lobby could only be lifted by Nixon, whose career was made at the China Lobby's apogee during the tumultuous postwar period.

The ability of foreign interest groups to influence U.S. policy in their favor raises questions about the ability for a democracy to function in the face of undemocratic measures. Eisenhower famously warned of the military-industrial complex in his 1960 farewell address. However, another farewell address that is no less well known among scholars of U.S. foreign relations is George Washington's in 1796. A significant portion of Washington's address warned the United States to avoid the entangling alliances practiced by the European powers of the period. As a part of that warning, though, Washington also admonished his countrymen:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.⁶

In the postwar world the United States was no longer able to shut itself off from other nations, and internationalization has only continued since that period. However, it would serve U.S.

⁶ George Washington, "Farewell Address" (1796), available from Yale Law School, "Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy," at <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/>. Data retrieved 15 Feb. 2009.

policymakers and citizens well to heed the advice of their first president. The China Lobby proved Washington's prescience, validating the dangers advocates of foreign governments can exert at home.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Department of State, Record Group 59, National Archives II, College Park, Maryland
Central Decimal File, 1945-49.

Central Decimal Files, China 1950-54.

Records of the Office of Chinese Affairs, 1945-1955 (on Microfilm), C-0012.

Records of the Office of Chinese Affairs, Subject File 1944-47.

Records of the Office of Chinese Affairs, Top Secret Subject File, 1945-50.

U.S. Government Publications

Congressional Record 91 – *Congressional Record* 101

Department of State. *Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers, 1945, Vol. VII: The Far East, China*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1969.

_____. *Foreign Relations of the United States 1946, Vol. X: The Far East: China*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1972.

_____. *Foreign Relations of the United States 1947, Vol. VII: The Far East: China*. Washington, D.C.: GPO 1972.

_____. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950, Vol. I: National Security Affairs; Foreign Economic Policy*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1977.

_____. *Foreign Relations of the United States 1950, Vol. VI: East Asia and the Pacific*. Washington, D.C.: GPO 1976.

_____. *Foreign Relations of the United States 1952-1954, Volume II: National Security Affairs, Part 1*. Washington D.C.: GPO, 1984.

_____. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1952-1954. Vol. XIV, China and Japan (in two parts), Part 1*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1985.

_____. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957: Vol. 2, China*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1986.

The China White Paper, originally published as Department of State, *U.S. Relations with China with Special Reference to the Period of 1944-1949*. Stanford: Stanford University Press: 1967.

U.S. Census Bureau, "The 2009 Statistical Abstract: Historical Statistics." Available at http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/hist_stats.html.

U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on International Relations. *Volume VII, United States Policy in the Far East, Part I*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1976.

_____, Committee on Foreign Affairs. *Selected Executive Session Hearings of the Committee, Vol. XVIII: U.S. Policy in the Far East, Part 2*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1980.

U.S. Senate, Committee on Armed Services and Committee on Foreign Relations. *Military Situation in the Far East, (5 volumes)*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1951.

_____, Committee on Foreign Relations. *Economic Assistance to China and Korea: 1949-50*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1974.

_____. *Executive Sessions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Vol. II: Eighty-First Congress, First and Second Sessions, 1949-1950*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1976.

Periodicals

The China Monthly: The Truth About China

New York Times

Memoirs/Books/Miscellaneous

Acheson, Dean. *Present at the Creation: My Years at the State Department*. New York: Norton, 1969.

Chiang Kai-shek. *China's Destiny and Chinese Economic Theory*, with notes and commentary by Phillip Jaffe. New York: Roy Publishers, 1947.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. *Mandate for Change, 1953-1956*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1963.

Gallup, George H. *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion, 1935-1971 (in three parts)*. New York: Random House, 1972.

_____. *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion, 1972-1977 (in two parts)*. Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1978.

- Lattimore, Owen. *Ordeal by Slander*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1950.
- _____. *Solution in Asia*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1945.
- MacArthur, Douglas. *Reminiscences*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.
- McCarthy, Joseph. *America's Retreat from Victory: The Story of George Catlett Marshall*. New York: Devin-Adair, 1951.
- _____. *Major Speeches and Debates of Senator Joe McCarthy: Delivered in the United States Senate 1950-1951: Unabridged Reprint from the Congressional Record*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1951.
- _____. *McCarthyism, The Fight For America: Documented Answers to Questions Asked by Friend and Foe*. New York: Devin-Adair Company, 1952.
- Schrecker, Ellen. *The Age of McCarthyism: A Brief History with Documents*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2002.
- Snow, Edgar. *Red Star Over China*. New York: Grove Press, 1938.
- Truman, Harry S. *Memoirs by Harry S. Truman, Vol. II: Years of Trial and Hope*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1956.
- Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. "Cold War International History Project." Available at http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=topics.home&topic_id=1409.
- Yale Law School. "Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy." Available at <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/>.

Secondary Sources

Books/Monographs

- Accinelli, Robert. *Crisis and Commitment: United States Policy toward Taiwan, 1950-1955*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Bachrack, Stanley D. *The Committee of One Million: "China Lobby" Politics, 1953-1971*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.
- Bentley, Eric, ed. *Thirty Years of Treason: Excerpts from the Hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities 1938-1968*. New York: Thunder Head Press, 2002.
- Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckman, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books, 1966.

- Best, Joel. *Threatened Children: Rhetoric and Concern about Child-Victims*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited by John B. Thompson, translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Bowie, Robert R. and Richard H. Immerman. *Waging Peace: How Eisenhower Shaped an Enduring Cold War Strategy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Camilleri, Joseph. *Chinese Foreign Policy: The Maoist Era and its Aftermath*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1980.
- Caute, David. *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge Under Truman and Eisenhower*. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1978.
- Chang, Gordon H. *Friends and Enemies: The United States, China, and the Soviet Union, 1948-1972*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Chen Jian. *Mao's China and the Cold War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Cumings, Bruce. *The Origins of the Korean War, Vol. II: Roaring of the Cataract, 1947-1950*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Fairbank, John King. *The United States and China*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar National Security Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- _____. *The Cold War: A New History*. New York: Penguin Books, 2005.
- Gardner, Lloyd C. *Approaching Vietnam: From World War II through Dienbienphu*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1988.
- Goldstein, Jonathan. *Philadelphia and the China Trade, 1682-1846: Commercial, Cultural and Attitudinal Effects*. University Park, Pa.; Pennsylvania State University Press, 1978.
- Griffith, Robert. *The Politics of Fear: Joseph R. McCarthy and the Senate*. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.
- Gusfield, Joseph R. *Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1963.

- Halberstam, David. *The Coldest Winter: America and the Korean War*. New York: Hyperion, 2007.
- Harding, Harry and Yuan Ming, eds., *Sino-American Relations, 1945-1955: A Joint Reassessment of a Critical Decade*. Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1989.
- Heale, M.J. *McCarthy's Americans: Red Scare Politics in State and Nation, 1935-1965*. Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 1998.
- Herzstein, Robert E. *Henry R. Luce, Time, and the American Crusade in China*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Hunt, Michael H. *Frontier Defense and the Open Door: Manchuria in Chinese-American Relations, 1895-1911*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1973.
- _____. *The Making of a Special Relationship: The United States and China to 1914*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Jespersen, T. Christopher. *American Images of China, 1931-1949*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Jung Chang and Jan Halliday. *Mao: The Unknown Story*. New York: Anchor Books, 2005.
- Keely, Joseph. *The China Lobby Man: The Story of Alfred Kohlberg*. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1969.
- Klehr, Harvey and Ronald Radosh. *The Amerasia Spy Case: Prelude to McCarthyism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Koen, Ross Y. *The China Lobby in American Politics*. New York: Octagon Books, 1974.
- Latourette, Kenneth S. *A History of Christian Missions in China*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929.
- Lawrence, Mark Atwood. *Assuming the Burden: Europe and the American Commitment to War in Vietnam*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2005.
- Leffler, Melvyn P. *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1953*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1994.
- Leong, Karen J. *The China Mystique: Pearl S. Buck, Anna May Wong, Mayling Soong, and the Transformation of American Orientalism*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2005.

- Lewis, John Wilson and Xue Litai. *China Builds the Bomb*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1988.
- MacMillan, Margaret. *Nixon and Mao: The Week that changed the World*. New York: Random House, 2007.
- May, Elaine Tyler. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. New York: Basic Books, 1998.
- May, Gary. *China Scapegoat: The Diplomatic Ordeal of John Carter Vincent*. Washington D.C.: New Republic Books, 1979.
- Mayers, David Allen. *Cracking the Monolith: U.S. Policy against the Sino-Soviet Alliance, 1949-1955*. Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1986.
- Montgomery, Gayle B., and James W. Johnson. *One Step from the White House: The Rise and Fall of Senator William F. Knowland*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1998.
- Nelson, Barbara J. *Making an Issue of Child Abuse: Political Agenda Setting for Social Problems*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Newman, Robert P. *Owen Lattimore and the "Loss" of China*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1992.
- Pepper, Suzanne. *Civil War in China: The Political Struggle, 1945-1949*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1999.
- Qing, Simei. *From Allies to Enemies: Visions of Modernity, Identity, and U.S.-China Diplomacy, 1945-1960*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Ross, Robert S. and Jiang Changbin, eds. *Re-examining the Cold War: U.S.-China Diplomacy, 1954-1973*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Rubenstein, Murray A. *The Origins of the Anglo-American Missionary Enterprise in China*. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 1996.
- Shutz, Alfred. *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. Translated by George Walsh and Frederick Lehnert. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1967.
- Statler, Kathryn C. *Replacing France: The Origins of American Intervention in Vietnam*. Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucky, 2007.
- Stueck, William. *Rethinking the Korean War: A New Diplomatic and Strategic History*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002.

- Suri, Jeremi. *Power & Protest: Global Revolution and the Rise of Détente*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Szonyi, Michael. *Cold War Island: Quemoy on the Frontline*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Tyson Li, Laura. *Madame Chiang Kai-shek: China's Eternal First Lady*. New York: Grove Press, 2006.
- Tsou, Tang. *America's Failure in China*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Weber, Max. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Translated and edited by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- _____. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Routledge Classics, 2001.
- Weinstein, Allen. *Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.
- Westad, Odd Arne. *Decisive Encounters: The Chinese Civil War, 1946-1950*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2003.
- _____. *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of our Times*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Williams, William Appleman. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1959.
- Yafeng Xia. *Negotiating with the Enemy: U.S.-China Talks during the Cold War, 1949-1972*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2006.
- Zhang, Shu Guang. *Deterrence and Strategic Culture: Chinese-American Confrontations, 1949-1958*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Articles

- Béland, Daniel. "Insecurity and Politics: A Framework." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 32 (Summer 2007): 317-340.
- Brands, Jr., H. W. "Testing Massive Retaliation: Credibility and Crisis Management in the Taiwan Strait." *International Security* 12 (Spr. 1988): 124-151.
- Cohen, Warren I. "Who's Afraid of Alfred Kohlberg?," Review of *The China Lobby in American Politics* by Ross Y. Koen; *Lost Chance in China: The World War II Dispatches of John S. Service*, ed. by Joseph W. Esherick; *The Institute of Pacific Relations: Asian*

- Scholars and American Politics*, by John N. Thomas. *Reviews in American History* 3 (Mar. 1975): 118-123.
- Chang, Gordon H. and He Di. "The Absence of War in the U.S.-China Confrontation over Quemoy and Matsu in 1954-1955: Contingency, Luck, Deterrence." *American Historical Review* 98 (December 1993): 1500-1524.
- Leffler, Melvyn P. "The Origins of Republican War Debt Policy, 1921-1923: A Case Study in the Applicability of the Open Door Interpretation." *Journal of American History* 59 (Dec. 1972): 585-601.
- Fairbank, John King. "Assignment for the '70s." *American Historical Review* (Feb., 1969): 861-879.
- Gordon, Leonard H. D. "United States Opposition to Use of Forces in the Taiwan Strait," *Journal of American History* 72 (December 1985): 637-660.
- Goode, Erich and Nachmen Ben-Yahuda. "Moral Panics: Culture, Politics, and Social Construction." *Annual Review of Sociology* 20 (1994): 149-171.
- Hilgartner, Stephen and Charles L. Bosk. "The Rise and Fall of Social Problems: A Public Arenas Model." *Journal of Sociology* 94 (Jul. 1988): 53-78.