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Author’s Response by Klaus Schwabe, Emeritus, Aachen University of Technology

If you are not a native English speaker and are engaged in scholarly work on American history, you are immensely indebted to the H-Diplo Roundtable for helping to overcome the language barrier that still separates historical scholarship outside the English-speaking world from that carried out within its confines. H-Diplo thus contributes considerably to the growth of a truly international history. Personally, I am grateful for having been able to submit the findings of my survey on America’s 20th century foreign policy to a critical review on the part of distinguished colleagues both from the United States and Germany. Needless to say, the favorable comments I find in all of the reviews are a source of a deeply felt gratification for me. Looking at some of my younger German colleagues I also have no reason to share Thomas Schwartz’ doubts as to whether the “understanding” approach in the study of American diplomacy will continue to find followers among German historians.

But my five reviewers will expect me to address their critical observations. They can be divided up into two categories – a majority pointing out to aspects where my text could have been better, and a minority, who want me to have written an altogether different book.

The suggestions for improvements in my account, the first category, are of such a variety that it seems impossible to subordinate them to a number of guiding topics. For that reason I would prefer to deal with them in chronological order. Thomas Schwartz in one of his remarks goes
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back to the 19th century roots of America’s 20th century diplomacy. I can only agree with him as to the need to do so, and was forced to neglect this important aspect by the constraints of space alone. In fact, I think that the somewhat cavalier attitude early American administrations developed in dealing with the sovereign rights of other countries was rooted in America’s diplomacy in Central America and the Pacific in the decades before the Spanish American War. As the case of Nicaragua showed in the mid-fifties, this behavior did not only reflect America’s revolutionary tradition and the rivalry with British claims, but also the overwhelming power the “Yankee” republic enjoyed as compared to its small neighbors in Central America (p.10) 1.

Were these the beginnings of an American imperialism? Günther Bischof takes exception to my book’s inconsistent use of American imperialism as a continuing frame for interpreting the United States as a global actor during all of the 20th century2. My answer to this is that I restricted the use of the term “imperialism” in my account not accidentally, but on purpose. In fact, it is a major point of my interpretation to show that only during the short period following the Spanish-American war did a majority of American official and public opinion advocate an American brand of the kind of imperialism that was then en vogue in Europe. Following the disenchantment triggered by the guerilla war in the Philippines, “informal empire” and “hegemony”3 became the terms that, I believe, most fittingly describe American attempts to exercise influence abroad – both as a program and largely as a practice. In contrast to the school of William A. Williams, I do not equate informal empire with “imperialism” (pp. 40 ff.). It is true that during the first two decades of the 20th century America’s behavior in the Caribbean at times came close to outright imperialism. But even in such cases (like Haiti, p. 47) simple annexation of the occupied areas or their subordination to some American colonial office were never considered. Especially after the election of Woodrow Wilson and certainly during World War One, an anti-Imperialist interpretation of America’s foreign policy gained the upper hand. Henceforth until most recently, the American public and along with it the American administrations cultivated a self-image that Niall Ferguson has aptly described as an “empire in denial”4.

This applies, of course, above all to President Wilson. This most influential tradition-builder of U.S. foreign policy in the 20th century refined, as I try to show, the American anti-


2 I am indebted to Bischof for calling my attention to some most recent interpretations of American imperialism – publications many of which were not yet in print when I wrote the respective chapters.

3 The standard work to which scholars in Germany still refer for defining this term is: Heinrich Triepel, Die Hegemonie. Ein Buch von führenden Staaten, (Stuttgart, 1938).

4 Niall Ferguson, Colossus. The Rise and Fall of the American Empire, (New York, 2004), pp.6, 13ff. As a personal note I may add that knowing the German propaganda slogans sweepingly condemning “American imperialism” in two world wars and remembering them from the end of World War Two, I feel a special obligation as a historian to use this term discriminately.
imperialist stance during the First World War and immediately afterwards. His idealistic plea for a new international order based on cooperation in a League of Nations and on the principle of self-determination was sincere, and some of his occasional deviousness and prevarications notwithstanding, I regret that I apparently created the impression that I dismissed Wilson's foreign policy program merely as “camouflage”, as Christian Hacke believes. Actually, I tried to stress that in my view Wilson was deeply serious in his belief that the United States should become an integral and cooperative part of the new multilateral peacekeeping organization he advocated (pp.55 f., 70 f., 77).

Schwartz argues that during the League fight in 1919 many of Wilson’s Republican adversaries were in fact as much “multilateralists” as the president himself. In a sense this is true, as people like Lodge advocated a continuing alliance among the victors. Still, the senator was not prepared as Wilson was to enlarge and ultimately globalize this alliance, and he insisted more than Wilson did that this all-powerful victors’ alliance not infringe on America’s sovereign right to take diplomatic decisions in accordance with its own interests. So, Wilson rightly condemned Lodge and his supporters as advocates of “imperialism” (p. 74). In a way, Lodge anticipated what I called “cooperative imperialism” in interpreting Franklin D. Roosevelt’s war diplomacy.

On the other hand, I fully agree with Schwartz as far as the more structural problem he raises – the problem regarding the legitimacy of decisions taken by and in the name of a global organization in opposition to the express wishes of a nationally elected and thus politically representative body of a given member country. Does the intent of a democratically elected national representation not enjoy a higher degree of legitimacy than a chance majority decision of the UN Security Council of which some members may lack any democratic legitimacy? George H. Bush ignored this dilemma in the statement Schwartz quotes, and it is indeed this dilemma which explains and excuses the negative attitude the American public adopted with regard to the United Nations at times during the seventies and afterwards (p. 387 f.). But does this unpleasant reality detract from the indispensable obligation of every country to engage in multilateral cooperation, and does it obliterate the need for each government to seek the approval of such cooperative policies on the part of its national constituency?

Wilson’s successors encountered the same basic problem: To what extent can the United States, being face to face with the ugly realities of international life, afford to remain faithful to its democratic mission? Georg Schild seems to give a special twist to this dilemma by stating that Franklin Roosevelt’s realism came to naught – apparently once he had to cope with Stalin’s pretensions. Then, after the war, he states, American basic beliefs proved incompatible with Stalin’s diplomatic agenda. Schild thus perceives a difference between Roosevelt and his successors. I would not want to deny that, as compared with Wilson, Roosevelt was more of a realist and had a clearer notion of the primary responsibility of the great powers for peacekeeping; but I would qualify this by adding that it was not only Roosevelt, the realist, but also Roosevelt, the idealist (or the ideologue), who clashed with Stalin. After all, it was Roosevelt who at Yalta endorsed the declaration on a liberated
Europe. As a pure realist he should not have harbored any illusion that Stalin would ever take this idealist program serious. My point is that because Roosevelt proved to be serious in his idealist convictions by demanding western style democracies also in the areas of Europe liberated by the Red Army, he himself was the first to stumble into what was later called the Cold War (p.149).

It remains an open question whether or not the following course of the Cold War was more or less predetermined, as Hacke suggests. I tend to agree with him as far as the German question was concerned. Differently from Donal O'Sullivan I would argue that it was not so much the demise of Germany's and Japan's traditional military power that led to the Soviet-American antagonism, but the continuing economic and demographic potential of the two countries. In hindsight it seems indeed doubtful whether the United States and the Soviet Union had any chance of reaching an agreement on the future of their former major enemies – at any event as soon as each side began to regard the other as a rival in Europe and the Far East and became aware of Germany's (and Japan's) potential as an ally either with the West or the East. In this restricted sense the Cold War was pre-determined.

But this does not mean that the Korean or the Vietnam wars, or other conflicts, were equally inevitable. In the Korean case Stalin was under no constraints to authorize the North Korean invasion of the South, nor was there any unavoidable constraint for the United States to get entangled in Indochina once France had lost control of its former colonies (pp. 218, 310 ff.). Hacke also raises the intriguing question whether the historian can perceive common traits in linking American Wilson-style and Cold War liberalism with later neoconservative ideas regarding America's role in the world. Obviously, some "neo-cons" established such links, so that the problem boils down to the question whether these neo-conservatives in claiming to carry on Wilson's legacy do justice to the former president's aspirations or not. My own impression is that the neoconservative democratic missionary ideal is in fact Wilsonian, including the acceptance of military means in order to defend and enhance that mission. The point where Wilson and his neo-conservative imitators clearly diverge is the all-important issue as to what diplomatic and military instruments to resort to in serving the missionary ideal. In this respect there is a major difference between Wilson's the multilateralist and his basically anti-militarist stance on the one hand and the position of his neo-conservative would-be disciples on the other (pp. 484 ff., 489). Above all, American presidents from Truman to Reagan avoided a direct military clash with the Soviet Union, because they rightly feared that such confrontation would escalate to an uncontrollable nuclear war. Instead, they carefully managed the political confrontations that flared up, like Truman at the time of the Berlin blockade, or like Kennedy in response to the building of the Berlin wall and to the Cuban missile crisis.5

5 Schwartz notes that I disagree from John Gaddis in seeing a strong link between the Berlin and the Cuban crisis. To what extent the two crises were linked from the Soviet point of view is a question addressed to the Soviet side, which is not my major concern, although I took note of the fact that Soviet diplomacy hardly ever mentioned Berlin during the Cuban missile crisis. My own argument is based on the American record (tapes) which shows that the Berlin issue was always present in the minds of the responsible officials of the Kennedy administration (pp. 283, 288).
All this seems to apply to the last Cold Warrior, President Reagan, as well. I agree with Hacke that there is hardly any American president whose foreign policy is more difficult to assess than Reagan. Personally, I vividly recall the devastatingly poor reputation he had in Germany during the first phase of his administration – an estimate I personally shared in those early days. Seen from hindsight, however, there can be no doubt that without Reagan's success in both intimidating and ultimately winning over the Soviet leadership to his concept of détente there would not have come about the big sea change in Europe of 1989/1990. Despite his public braggadocio Reagan won these successes without risking a direct military confrontation with the USSR. On the debit side I see his nonchalance in conniving at terrorist activities and his unstoppable liking for public simplification. But what looked intellectually revolting turned into an asset whenever Reagan had to deal with the American public. I think that both his admirers and his detractors agree on the outstanding talent this former actor and great communicator displayed in this respect.

Thus Reagan is prominent in my analysis because I attempt to bring in the domestic aspects of America's foreign policy. Here American public opinion looms large. Contrary to Schild's assertion, I did not want to convey the conclusion that the American public generally tended to opt for the extremes ("isolationism" versus "domination"). In my view, the American public does not seem at all continuously to be wedded to any particular set of foreign policy priorities. What counts in the public eye in the United States is the moral and traditional justification on which specific foreign policy decisions are based – an observation that goes a long way in explaining the ideological underpinnings of America’s diplomacy.

When I started writing my book, George W. Bush had yet to be elected and only science-fiction movies foreshadowed what was to happen on 9/11. As I continued, I treated the various phases of America's foreign policy rather as results of foregoing developments than as an anticipation of what followed. This explains the inadequacies of the two final chapters of my book – inadequacies which Hacke justly points out. To an extent, these shortcomings have something to do with the difference between a political scientist, who has professionally to be present minded, and the historian who feels obliged to judge historical developments on their own merit. Thus, I discussed the Clinton administration under the aspect of the process of winding up the cold war and its relics. It is obvious that this alone cannot be today's perspective.

This brings me to the kind of comments that suggest that I should have written a different book. I am especially grateful for this criticism as it offers the opportunity for me to submit in somewhat more detail what the lack of space forced me to touch on only briefly in my introduction. My critics thus give me the chance to explain the selection I made from the record and the methodical lines I tried to adhere to in my account. Not unlike some of my German reviewers, some of my critics in this roundtable regret that I have neglected certain topical areas that they feel should have been included in my account like intelligence affairs, economics, the more or less recent "turns" in historiography like the
linguistic, the gender and the cultural turn. Generally, they miss references to revisionist interpretations, and they think that my treatment of my topic is somewhat conventional, if not “arch-traditionalist”, as Bischof puts it. Before going into details, let me say that I find this criticism well founded on its terms. But I also trust that I had good reasons for deciding to write the book the way I did.

The intelligence aspect raised by O'Sullivan is relatively easy to address. Whenever I found out that intelligence reporting and/or covert action had an immediate impact on decision making in Washington I referred to it. As a few examples I mention the Zimmermann telegram of 1917, “magic” for World War Two, the American intervention in Iran to oust Mossadegh, the coup in Guatemala (1954), the prehistory of the Bay of Pigs invasion, the Iran-Contra Affair and the support for Solidarnosh (pp. 57, 120ff., 246ff., 247, 278 ff., 402 ff.). I did not mention the penetration by Soviet intelligence of American society during the forties as I cannot see that this “penetration”, if it really was one and Alger Hiss notwithstanding, influenced the basic direction of the American policy vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. If I had decided differently and had fully entered the vast field of American espionage no end of my account would have come into sight, as questions of intelligence and espionage, often raising military technicalities, have to be analyzed in detail and still tend to become elusive in some cases.

The other aspects that Bischof in particular finds inadequately represented, if not totally ignored, touch on questions of methodology. As Bischof not incorrectly observed, my book to an extent can be compared with an American textbook. The reason why I opted for this format lay in what the German language book market has to offer on American history. There is, of course, an impressive amount of research going on dealing with numerous special aspects of American history and in part related to American foreign policy. The German market is also flooded by numerous more or less essayistic assessments of America's role in the world in the 20th century – in many instances friendly disposed, in others and especially after the beginning of the present Iraqi war derogatory and slanted. But there did not exist a full-length treatment of that subject as a whole. This being so, I regarded it as my first assignment simply to “put the record straight”, i.e., to provide a reliable factual basis as a prerequisite for any informed and politically unbiased discussion. In this endeavor a good dose of positivism was indispensable.

In this connection, Bischof mentions Leopold von Ranke as a high priest of positivism. In this, I am afraid, he is wrong. To Ranke the substance of history was “das Realgeistige” (i.e. a combination of the material with the spiritual). History to him was an art and only partly

---

6 One notable exception is the survey by Stephan Bierling which covers American foreign policy from 1917 to the present and adopts a detached position similar to my view [Stephan Bierling, *Geschichte der amerikanischen Außenpolitik. Von 1917 bis zur Gegenwart*, 271 pp., (München, 2003)].

7 Leopold von Ranke, *Das politische Gespräch und andere Schriftchen zur Wissenschaftslehre*, (Halle, 1925), p.22.
a science ("Wissenschaft")\(^8\). In this sense, I never could be content with a fact-mongering presentation of my subject. The real historian’s craft is to find context and meaning and on this basis to establish a focus, a “conceptual core”, as Marc Trachtenberg puts it, for his narrative\(^9\).

For my book I focused on what to me appeared to be the primary motive of America’s foreign policy in the 20\(^{th}\) century – the effort to prevent the world from sinking into violence and international anarchy (a term coined before 1914) and instead to create structures and devices that promised a globally peaceful change. Seen from that perspective, American national interest and global welfare seemed to coincide. This approach is of course in no way original; numerous colleagues shared it thus forming a sort of mainstream consensus. There was enough room for relative originality on my part whenever I took up the crucial question as to how and to what extent America managed to come to grips with this self sought assignment. By selecting a widely accepted analytical basis, I also felt I would facilitate a meaningful discussion of both the achievements the United States could claim and the missed opportunities and failures in dealing with the outside world it had to concede. This main-stream approach, I hoped, would finally help me avoid a number of pitfalls waiting for a non-American – and particularly a German – historian, who writes on America’s diplomacy. Such pitfalls are: (1) an encyclopedic and indiscriminate enumeration of America’s ubiquitous involvements in all parts of the world; (2) seeing America’s world policies in the light of the German-American relationship, certainly a key factor in 20\(^{th}\) century American foreign relations, but only a segment of a broader picture\(^{10}\); (3) the application of the standards of traditional European diplomacy to the American example, instead of focusing on the Washington perspective; (4) a fixation on the present time as the sole yardstick for historical judgment, certainly a violation of the traditional principle that historiography in assessing events of the past always and primarily take account of the perspective of that particular past.

Beyond such practical considerations, I am convinced that the topical emphasis of my narrative led straight to the major issues of international relations in the 20\(^{th}\) century and America’s contribution to them. More than anything else, the course of 20th century was determined by two World Wars and a Cold War, the latter together with its attendant proxy wars. Caging the bestial proclivities of man and thus opening ways for human decency to

---


\(^{10}\) This is the reason why I largely excluded the certainly impressive recent German scholarship on German-American relations. The publications to which Bischof calls the reader’s attention mostly belong to this category. In addition, most of them deal with the effects of American cultural penetration in Germany. To my understanding, this is primarily German history. At any rate, to extend my analysis to this field would have forced me to attempt the same in other contexts like Japan, Eastern Europe or Latin America. Obviously, this would have been impossible for lack of space. It would also have diverted my analysis from its focus, which is the Washington perspective.
assert itself was the major issue – an issue gaining in urgency under the impact of nuclear armaments. Hard and soft power, security, the political and military balance, legitimacy and human responsibility were therefore the problems that seemed most relevant; personal decisions, most of the times from the top down, counted no less than anonymous structures. Compared with these questions of life and death other problems like international trade, gender, social and cultural trends were certainly contributory, but in the last analysis much less instrumental in determining the course of international relations and the United States’ role in them.

To be sure even this synthesizing as well as selective approach created agonies in the process of identifying which publication should be regarded as relevant, and omitting what appeared only as marginal. There is no way for a single author to consider all the thousands of titles in English, but also in German and French, related to the subject. What helped in groping one’s way in that maze was one’s own pre-knowledge and besides what I would call an “instinct” for novel revelations based on new evidence. In such cases it did not matter to what extent such findings could be regarded as “revisionist” or not – in the last analysis a continuous process of self-revision starting from one’s own premises and pre-knowledge went on.

Given the limited space available for footnotes, I had to accept that it was impossible to refer to, let alone discuss at length the historiography dealing with my subject. Had I tried this, cuts at other places in the manuscript would have been unavoidable. Unfortunately, none of my critical reviewers so far has had palpable propositions to make that would have unburdened my text of some possibly less relevant passages. I still welcome suggestions! There would have been another drawback had I tried to incorporate some debates among expert historians into my manuscript: Such discussions would have diverted the average German reader’s attention from the thrust of my argument. By implication I did refer to some controversies like the one surrounding William A. Williams; but discovering such references required an extremely careful reading of my footnotes11.

The question remains to what extent the focus of my narrative had to lead to the exclusion of the potentially relevant areas that my critics found missing. I will deal with them one by one starting with the economic aspect. Clinton’s famous dictum: “It’s the economy, stupid” has accompanied me during all my life beginning with my years as a high school student in the Soviet zone of occupation in Germany. At the university level I was confronted with the same battle cry, this time coming from American historical revisionism of people like Charles Beard or Harry E. Barnes and then prominently espoused by William A. Williams. I read Williams’s *Tragedy of American Diplomacy* as the result of an insider’s tip (it was H.U. Wehler). Then I discussed the relevance of economic factors for America’s foreign policy at length with my students as an academic teacher. The conclusion at which I arrived was that economics – in the American case as an example the commitment to the Open Door – is a

---

powerful factor influencing America’s foreign relations, but that it still would be
reductionist to assign to a given economic interest – like the American espousal of free
trade – an overarching function in explaining America’s role in international affairs. In this
sense, the occasional neglect of economic factors in my text is not accidental. I do not
believe, to offer an absurd example, that in 1940-41 Roosevelt turned America into an
“arsenal of democracy” in order to boost the American steel production. The Marshall Plan,
to offer another example of the limit of the economic paradigm, was politically motivated,
although it was an economic measure.

On the other hand, I did try to deal with economic conditions whenever the evidence
convinced me of their impact on the general course of American foreign relations. To quote
only a few examples, I stressed Wilson’s concern about American prosperity when I
discussed his neutrality policies (pp. 48f.). My account of the twenties represents a sort of
indictment against the then prevailing American foreign policy, which largely relied on
economic means alone to promote America’s national interests (p.89). I mention the
economic background of the American interventions in Iran of 1953. Last but not least, I
devote a whole subchapter to the end of America’s financial hegemony beginning in 1965
(pp. 373ff.). I admit, though, that I could have treated the problem of international access to
raw material more prominently.

My critics furthermore miss an extensive use of the gender paradigm in my book. Again,
this omission is not accidental, because in my understanding of international relations
gender-related questions may additionally illustrate, but never really explain the motives
of diplomatic decision makers. It seems indicative to me that the journal Diplomatic History
contains only a few gender related contributions.

Bischof also regrets my neglecting the “linguistic turn”. Once more, this omission did not
occur by chance. For the historian the “linguistic turn” raises a fundamental question of
methodology. In line with medieval “Pyrrhonism” this post-modern school denies the
existence of an objective reality independent of human perception and expression.
Objectivity as a guiding principle of historical research and interpretation is, therefore,
discarded. I cannot see how this methodology can give room for any successful historical
inquiry, as it blurs the principle of causation and suspends what the German historian
Kosellek called the “veto power” of the sources, i.e. the historian’s obligation to be prepared

---

12 For an exception, see p.33.

13 Recently I discovered Helen Laville, “‘Our Country Endangered by Underwear’: Fashion, Femininity,
and the Seduction Narrative in Ninotchka and Silks Stockings”, in Diplomatic History 30, 4, Sept. 2006,
pp.623ff.

14 For the following I rely on Trachtenberg, The Craft of International History, pp.10 ff.; Melvyn P. Leffler,
“New Approaches, Old Interpretations, and Perspective Reconfigurations”, in: Diplomatic History 19,2, 1995,
pp.453ff, 459f.
to correct – revise, if you will – a given interpretation of a past event in the light of new evidence, be it factual or archival. The linguistic turn may have been good for linguistics; for the historian, especially of foreign relations, it leads to a dead-end street. Personally, I have a particular aversion to it, as one of its patron saints, Friedrich Nietzsche and his concept of what is history, were exploited by Nazi historians who wanted to create a useful past that could be put into the service of the Nazi ideology and its fight against “bourgeois objectivity”\textsuperscript{15}.

In seeing limits in the usefulness of the just mentioned paradigms I have to agree with Bischof that I did not write the book he had hoped for. There is one area, though, that Bischof mentioned and that seems to me to be promising, as long as the traditional standards of historical research are upheld, and that is the cultural approach. As a student of a history of another country not using your own native language you are immediately struck by differences in culture. The wars of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century accentuated such differences by raising the question of national identity. Culture also forms mentalities and in this respect comes close to the good old history of ideas. In this sense it may be capable of offering clues to the understanding of individual foreign policy decisions of long term significance. On the other hand, the present debate between the Western and Islamic influenced cultures has underlined the importance of culture as a mass phenomenon\textsuperscript{16}. America as a more and more globally present great power had continuously to cope with such cultural differences, not least during the Cold War. In concluding my book, I called the readers’ attention to nation-building as a central concern of America’s foreign policy in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century (p. 487). This American objective combined political, military, as well as cultural challenges, and thus assigns an outstanding role to the inquiry into cultural factors.

The inclusion of the cultural factor into diplomatic history should also create an awareness of cultural differences, as soon international relations are under discussion, and fend off national parochialism, whatever “turn” may serve as paradigm\textsuperscript{17}. What ultimately is needed, and what I intended to contribute with my book, is an international history based on an international pluralistic perspective. Only by absorbing a multicultural perspective, the scholar of international relations is able to form a judgment that avoids national reductionism. This implies the knowledge of foreign languages, multiarchival research, and, if possible, a personal exposure to cultures that are not one’s own. In this respect the book by Toshi Hassegawa, Racing the Enemy: Stalin, Truman, and the Surrender of Japan (2005) which was discussed at an H-Diplo roundtable possesses an exemplary quality.

\textsuperscript{15} For that see Klaus Schwabe, ed., Gerhard Ritter. Ein politischer Historiker in seinen Briefen, Boppard 1984, pp.73f.308f.; also Trachtenberg, The Craft of International History, p.10ff.


\textsuperscript{17} Michael H. Hunt, “The Long Crisis in U.S. Diplomatic History”, in Diplomatic History 16.1, 1992,130ff.