

The Development and Enlightenment of Sino-US Educational Exchange in the Period of World War II from the Perspective of Diplomatic Relations

Bojun Zou¹, Dan Li^{2*}

1. Institute of Vocational and Technical Education, Jilin Agricultural University, Changchun, China

2. Liaoning Anshan Xinyuan High School, Anshan, China

*Co-first Author

Abstract—In the background of World War II, the US declared war on Japan and Sino-US formed a temporary alliance. Therefore, the two sides carried out a series of educational exchanges and cooperation including joint training, scholars visit; however, on the racial principle of educational sovereignty with the existence or abrogation of China Educational Exchange Fund, both still contradicted. Looking back to the development process of Sino-US educational communication, it has always been affected by the diplomatic relationship. National interest becomes the starting point along with footholds. The actions, that the bilateral is committed to building an equal as well as mutually beneficial mechanism on education, contributes to achieving the greatest common divisor of mutual cultural interests.

Index Terms—educational exchange, Sino-US relationship, state interest

I. THE DIPLOMATIC FEATURES AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE STRATEGY OF SINO-US IN THE PERIOD OF WORLD WAR II

A. the formation of Sino-US special relationship during World War II

Since Japan launched the full-scale invasion to China, the Nanjing National Government declared self-defense war, and issued the *Declaration of the Protection for Territorial Sovereignty and Administrative Integrity*. In the winter of 1941, Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, and soon the Pacific War broke out. The United States changed her attitudes, which shifted from silently compromising into actively joining with a temporary alliance with China.

In fact, the U.S. policy was still twofold-one was a common goal to fight against Japan, and the other was a consideration of establishing an international organization, for making China act as a leading power with the same status parallel with the U.S., Britain and the Soviet Union. There was no doubt that China made tremendous contributions to defeating fascism on the Eastern battlefield, and won actual appraisal from her allies [1-2].

In the later time of Anti-Japanese War, a New Testament, was concluded by China, the United States and Britain, which aimed to abolish imperialist

extra-territoriality in China. *Declaration of Universal Security* was jointly issued, by China, the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union, at the Cairo Conference where some new post-war world order was discussed. Thus, China and the United States had been a more than ten-year special diplomatic relationship.

B. the strategy of Sino-US cultural exchange

As far as the United States is concerned, a strategy of cultural exchange, had been already conceived before. In 1941, the United States decided to set up the *China Project*, by which handled the relations among the three subjects, as well as took over the responsibility for the U.S. Department of Cultural Relations. After the Pearl Harbor incident, the United States stepped up its cultural assistance to China. Just then, the President appropriated 150,000 U.S. dollars as development fund in culture and education. Grammon, then director of *China Project* said, the primary objective of cultural assistance was to boost Chinese morale, followed by supporting China in various ways, comprising science, technology, education and industry, in order to encourage China to make more greater efforts to fighting Japan [3].

As far as China is concerned, heated discussions on wartime educational policies were widely raised, by politicians standing for different parties of the Nanjing National Government. In the end, the guideline, in which wartime was supposed to be ready for peacetime, was resulted, and therefore, several educational exchanges were promoted as usual to train advanced talents. Actually, a number of overseas students and scholars to the United States, had already applied the American educational thoughts to the home reform [4].

On the other hand, the struggle for educational autonomy, still continued. There were lots of disputes, represented by the the existence or abolition of the China Exchange Foundation. In general, the mutual communication showed to be a relatively positive trend [5].

II. SINO-US MUTUAL BENEFICIAL COOPERATION IN THE PERIOD OF WORLD WAR II

A. Cooperation to train talents

The mutual barometer, was reflected by the cultivation of international students, to some extent. After the Pacific War, the United States was involved into a full-scale war, and based on the temporary alliance, boosted numbers of receiving dispatched Chinese students.

The Chinese Government also removed the the the Restriction of Studying Abroad, which was promulgated in 1938. Instead, China implemented a more loose regulations. Since 1943, owing to own-expense and public funds, a total of 1200 personnel touring the United States, were sent by year.

The side of the U.S. expressed frankness to China, sufficient support and humanitarian aid was rendered. The United States State Department, coordinated relevant administrative sections and non-governmental organizations, allocated special funds to support the necessities for tuition, scientific research and living expense, and provided additional subsistence allowances to Chinese students in need.

In order to speed up post-war construction, the Government sent overseas groups, engaged in industrial technology; and strengthened the control of awareness and ideology. On the contrary, the United States consistently maintained academic freedom. Weighing again, the National Government addressed an informal statement on complying with the traditions, customs and academic freedom, which were accustomed in foreign countries [6].

B. bilateral interview by experts and scholars

On one hand, Chinese experts, professors, scholars and representatives were invited to visit the United States. In 1942, six Chinese universities including the Central University and the Southwest Associated University were repeatedly invited to send representatives who was represented by well-known patriotic scholars such as Wu Jingchao and Yan Yangchu, to interview the United States for one year, proposed by the U.S. State Department. According to the mutual consultation, a total of nearly 30 Chinese educators and artists were asked to actualize the on-the-spot investigation and deliver speeches, before the founding of the People's Republic of China [7].

On the other hand, the U.S. State Department funded and made representatives tour around China, which were related to humanities such as American history, western philosophy, western literature, sociology and art studies, as well as promoted Sino-US academic exchanges in Southwest China.

III. CULTURAL CONTRADICTIONS OF SINO-US EDUCATIONAL DOMINION IN THE PERIOD OF WORLD WAR II

A. relevant background of mutual cultural contradictions

There is a proverb saying, *there is no permanent friends, but permanent interests*. As for the dominance of education, the given conflicts and controversies seemingly never ceased for a minute. In the wartime, the United States declared to immediately repeal its prerogatives in representative of excepting sovereignty,

and voluntarily gave up the relevant rights and profits in the *Xinchou Treaty* [8].

Also, in line with equality and two-way benefits, a Sino-US new postwar treaty was signed again. However, the negotiations failed to provide a substantive solution to any specific issues, concerning the renunciation of Gengzi's claims by the China Educational Exchange Fund.

B. mutual attitudes to mutual cultural contradictions

From aspects of China, the Nanjing Government was divided into two factions on the above issue: the *conservative* headed by the then Economic Minister Wen Wenhao, and the *activist* represented by the then Minister of Education Chen Lifu. Based on the mutual diplomatic relations, the *conservatives* hoped to enhance their powers involving US affairs, which depended on dialogues on this platform. In order to safeguard its existing vested interests, the *activists* desired to make the pretext full use of to expand their jurisdiction of education authorities [9].

Just as Aitcheson, then Director of the Far Eastern, said that the attitude toward existence or abrogate of the China Educational Exchange Fund was ambiguous. According to the new Sino-US agreement, the relevant rights and interests of the Gengzi reparation should be repealed, along with the unequal treaties. The new testament could not affect the relationship originated the fund. Taking the important role of the wartime allied relations into account, there was no choice but clarify its supportive attitude toward the fund in some informal occasions.

Bilateral negotiations on existence or abrogate of the fund were stalled. With the flexible adjustment in ways of personnel, the Nanjing Temporary Government revised relevant articles, increased the number of Chinese board of directors and other effective measures, to control over the fund. By 1948, the influence of the China Educational Exchange Fund on the fields of science and education had a mere nominal existence [10].

IV. THE ENLIGHTENMENT AND CONCLUSION TO NATIONAL INTERESTS FROM FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF SINO-US EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

Reviewing each periodical progress of educational exchanges between China and the United States, of which both are subject to the mutual diplomatic relations and furthermore neither of the starting-ending point has always been the supreme national interest. The United States opened the door to cultural colonialism with the covert manner of spreading religion and setting up schools.

Whatever it is missionary schools, open-door policy or returning Gengzi reparation, the essential intention of opponent side is bound to defend a vested interest in a comprehensive ways, and scheme a blueprint, by means of invasion of cultural values. On the another, due to the the righteous actions in seizing educational sovereignty during periods of Modern Times, cultural invasion to China processed by the U.S., was indeed remarkably

restricted [11].

Stimulated by the demands of anti-Japan, China and the United States formed a short-time alliance. Not only did the United States attempt to utilize China to ease its combat pressure in the Asia Pacific region, but also hoped to employ the strategic superiority of China as a big power, to maintain its global leadership. As a result, the bilateral honeymoon period witnessed a short-term. However, on account of the failure of aiding anti-communist strategy, investments in education owned by the U.S. were compelled to be repealed. *The one-side* orientation toward the Socialist Camp in representative of the Soviet Union, led to a long-term closed bilateral education exchange, which was not changed, until the formal diplomatic relations set up. Since then, not only did setbacks suffer, but also it picked up a warming trend. From a board respect, the overall remained relatively optimistic.

Both China and the United States are committed to building an exchange mechanism of humanity, on a basis of based equality and mutual benefits, which is beneficial to political, economic, cultural and social development. With the help of this platform, the United States is able to realize the utmost profits of cultural diplomacy, and promote the spread of the concept of democratic values across China, which indirectly affects the progress of democracy and laws in China, for achieving the common goal of economic along with ideological interests [12].

As China's overall national powers steadily increases, in the decisive battle to build a well-off society, more investments in cultural diplomacy are advantageous. It is conducive to absorbing the advanced experience, promoting the dissemination of Chinese culture and outstanding ideas, and meanwhile plays a constructive role in maintaining regional stability and harmony.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. A. Stoler, *Allies and Adversaries: The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Grand Alliance, and US Strategy in World War II*, UNC Press Books, 2003.
- [2] B. Buzan, "Sino-Japanese and Sino-US Relations in China's Peaceful Rise". *World Economics and Politics*, vol. 7, 2006, p.002.
- [3] Y. Deng, "Chinese Relations with Japan: Implications for Asia-Pacific Regionalism," *Pacific Affairs*, 1997, 70(3), pp.373-391.
- [4] H. Wang, "Multilateralism in Chinese foreign policy: the limits of socialization". *Asian Survey*, vol. 40, No. 3, 2000, pp. 475-491.
- [5] M. Li, "Rising from within: China's search for a multilateral world and its implications for Sino-US relations," *Global Governance*, vol. 17, No. 3, 2010, pp. 331-351.
- [6] D. Shambaugh, "Sino-American strategic relations: from partners to competitors". *Survival*, vol. 42, No. 1, 2000, pp. 97-115.
- [7] K. Möller, "Diplomatic relations and mutual strategic perceptions: China and the European Union," *The China Quarterly*, 2002, pp.10-32.
- [8] G. H. Chang, *Friends and Enemies: The United States, China, and the Soviet Union, 1948-1972*, Stanford University Press, 1990.
- [9] W. Lafeber, *The great transition: American-Soviet relations and the end of the Cold War by Raymond L. Garthoff*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1994, 1(1), pp. 32-57.
- [10] J. Wang, Z. Lin, "Chinese perceptions in the post-cold war era: three images of the United States," *Asian Survey*, vol. 32, No. 10, 1992, pp. 902-917.
- [11] X. Lin, S. J. Miller, "Negotiation approaches: direct and indirect effect of national culture," *International Marketing Review*, 2003, 020(3), pp. 286-303.
- [12] T. K. Chang, *The press and China policy: The illusion of Sino-American relations, 1950-1984*, Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1993.