Behind the current Clinton scandal stands the specter of Watergate. That it should be there is understandable. Watergate then is still very much a part of living memory, and living memory is the type of history most relevant to the general public because it is the history with which they are most familiar. Consequently, Watergate has come to exert a powerful influence on the terms of reference by which people understand the Clinton scandal.

Some analogies to Watergate are admittedly quite apt. However, much of the use of Watergate analogies distorts the meaning and significance of the Clinton case. Of greater disappointment to this historian has been the temporal myopia in the search for insight into the Clinton scandal. Watergate was not the first serious attempt to impeach a president. Seldom mentioned in the discussion of the troubles of William Jefferson Clinton is the impeachment of his fellow Southerner, Andrew Johnson. In May 1868, Johnson came closer than any president did in American history to involuntary removal from office. At his trial in the U.S. Senate that spring, he avoided conviction by only one vote. The neglect of the case of Andrew Johnson is unfortunate. Johnson's impeachment provides more insight into the current travails of Bill Clinton than Watergate. However, since the Johnson's impeachment exists outside living memory, it will be necessary to discuss the background of the case at some length.

Andrew Johnson became President of the United States after the assassination of Abraham Lincoln in April 1865. Johnson became President as the Civil War was rapidly coming to a close. Hence, the issue on the mind of the nation as the Tennessean entered the White House was not the conduct of the war, but the status of the postwar South. Johnson, like his predecessor, Abraham Lincoln, favored a lenient peace in which all but the highest-ranking Confederates would be restored to their full rights as U.S. citizens, and normal state government quickly reestablished in the South. Johnson demanded only two substantial concessions before the Southern states regained their full status within the union: that they repudiate Confederate
government debts and ratify the Thirteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which ended slavery. The Southern states quickly acceded, and by the end of 1865, Johnson believed that the process of reconstruction essentially was complete.

However, in his rapid reintegration of the South into the union, Johnson made enemies of an influential faction in the Republican Party, the Radicals. The Radicals believed that Johnson had thrown away a golden opportunity to impose fundamental reforms on Southern society. In particular, the Radicals wanted African Americans to be accorded full citizenship and black men given the right to vote. When Johnson vetoed the Civil Rights bill in early 1866 that provided for the citizenship of African Americans the Radicals began to advocate openly his impeachment. They believed that unless the President could be removed from office, he would be in a position to frustrate their ambitions for interracial government in the South.

[...]

Over time though, Andrew Johnson's character defects played into the hands of his Radical Republican enemies. He was not undermined by an unchecked libido, but by an uncompromising self-righteousness. When Johnson became convinced that he was right and his enemies were wrong nothing could persuade him to accommodate the beliefs of his opponents. The President was especially unyielding on one particular issue. Like virtually all white Southerners in the 1860s, Johnson took for granted that black people were an inferior race and, consequently, he strongly supported white supremacy. Hence, he had vetoed the Civil Rights bill because Johnson believed that the settlement of racial issues in the South should be left to white Southerners, without federal interference. Johnson supported the Black Codes passed by southern legislatures following the war, which severely restricted the activities of African Americans and reduced their status to a state of quasi-slavery. In short, on the issue of white supremacy and the ability of white Southerners to decide alone the nature of Southern society after the war, Johnson would not budge. It was the intransigence of the President about white supremacy that ultimately resulted in his downfall.

So what does the impeachment of President Andrew Johnson have to do with the Clinton scandal? First, it must be admitted that there are considerable differences in both cases. [...] Yet the simple fact is, that despite the overwhelming use of Watergate as the main historical parallel, the Clinton scandal has much more in common with the impeachment of Andrew Johnson. There are the parallels of the two cases thus far.
The parallels in the history of the travails of Andrew Johnson and Bill Clinton are surprisingly strong. For starters, both Clinton and Johnson became the nemesis of extremist ideologues bent on using Congress to remake American society. As previously indicated, Andrew Johnson clashed with the Radical Republicans, who wished to use congressional power to create interracial government in the South. While the Radical's plan may seem appropriate to late twentieth-century Americans, in the 1860s it struck many white Americans as extreme and impractical. Similarly, Bill Clinton has jostled for most of his presidency, but especially since 1994, with the Republican right. Led by Newt Gingrich, these conservative Republicans took control of Congress in early 1995. In their "Contract with America" they proposed a major shift in federal policy, and attacked the legacy of the Democratic Party's Great Society and the New Deal. Gingrich and his supporters wanted to reduce the size and power of the federal government, shifting money and responsibility for many federal functions to the states. They also demanded a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget, and pushed for legislation enacting significant tax cuts, time limits on welfare eligibility, cuts in entitlement programs, the elimination of some cabinet departments and federal agencies created under the Great Society, and a social agenda to satisfy their supporters coming from the Christian right--especially greater restrictions on abortion. More moderate Republicans went along with the conservatives, at least initially, because the latter group had come up with the political vision responsible for finally ousting the Democrats from their control of Congress after forty years.

Both Andrew Johnson and Bill Clinton became the archenemy of these political revolutionaries, in part, because of their ability to frustrate them. Clinton undoubtedly proved more skillful politically in blocking the ideologues. He cast himself as the champion of centrists in both parties alienated by Republican and Democratic extremists, the strategy that his political advisor Dick Morris dubbed "triangulation." Following triangulation, Clinton emerged as the clear victor from the government shutdown during the winter of 1995-96, which effectively sapped the "Republican Revolution" of its momentum and put the President on the road to reelection in 1996. Andrew Johnson, of course, proved much less adept in his dealings with Congress, alienating non-Radical Republicans and getting overridden more than any other president in American history. Nonetheless, he continued to obstruct the Radicals through his use of executive power to hamper the implementation of congressional reconstruction in the South.
However, Johnson and Clinton also became archenemies of the ideologues of their time because of their background and reputation. Both men elicited a deep hatred among their enemies almost defying comprehension. Clinton became a lightening rod for the anger of conservative Republicans upset about having lost the White House in 1992. To these hard-liners, Bill Clinton was a draft-dodging, pot-smoking, wife-cheating hypocrite, exuding false empathy, who utterly lacked the requisite character necessary for the oval office. Clinton also had an intelligent, aggressive, and career-oriented spouse, who provided social conservatives with an emotional outlet for their anxiety over the increasingly prominent role of women in American society.

The Radicals of the late 1860s felt that Andrew Johnson, as a Southerner, Democrat, and former slaveholder, was of unfit character to be president in the wake of the Civil War. At a time when Republicans learned they could energize Northern voters by "waving the bloody shirt" (that is, connecting the Democrats to Southern treason), Johnson was a tempting target, especially because of the leniency he had extended to his fellow Southerners and his unbending self-righteousness.

Hence, believing that the president in question was unsuited to be in office and as an effective opponent of their agenda, the drumbeat for impeachment began among the frustrated Republican extremists in both the 1860s and 1990s. There was private talk of impeaching Johnson among the Radicals as early as the autumn of 1865, about half a year into his presidency. This sentiment for impeachment, as has been discussed, broke into the open with Johnson's veto of the Civil Rights bill in early 1866. Likewise, within a year of taking office in January 1993, an "Impeach Clinton" movement began among Republican conservatives. Some very extreme conservatives went even farther. In late 1993, an advertisement appeared in the classified pages of William F. Buckley's National Review, selling bumper stickers stating "Impeach Him Hell - Get a Rope."

More to the point, the zeal to remove an unfit, obstructionist president fueled wide-ranging investigations led by political enemies of both Johnson and Clinton, looking for impeachable offenses. The probes of Bill Clinton, of course, hardly bear repeating. They began with an investigation of the failed Whitewater project, and came to include Clinton's alleged harassment of Paula Jones and Kathleen Willey, alleged improper firings of White House travel office personnel, the alleged misuse of FBI background files, the suspicious death of Vince Foster, alleged violations of campaign finance laws by the 1996 Clinton/Gore reelection operation, and last but not least, the probe into the relationship between Clinton and Monica Lewinsky. There
also developed a cottage industry of investigative activity by conservatives—the so-called "right-wing conspiracy"—that purported to tie Clinton to drug trafficking, and even murder and treason.

Less commonly known are the wide-ranging investigations of Andrew Johnson. Andrew Johnson's arch-nemesis was James M. Ashley, a Radical member of the House of Representatives from Ohio. Using the mantle of the House Judiciary Committee and employing private detectives, Ashley probed Johnson's pardons of high-ranking Confederates, the manner in which President made political appointments, his personal finances, and whether Johnson had had any role in the plot to assassinate Abraham Lincoln. To the disappointment of the Radicals, Ashley's investigations failed to find any hard proof of wrongdoing on Andrew Johnson's part.

Still, in both the 1860s and in the present case, the character defects of the president in question provided their enemies with the ammunition needed to overcome the reluctance of moderates and ignite impeachment proceedings. Clinton, of course, has been undone by his sexual proclivities. His womanizing reputation was well known by the public that elected him, but the unstated assumption seemed to be that the President had promised to be on his best behavior while he was in the White House. Breaking that implied pledge and continuing to deny the affair until faced with physical evidence alienated support even inside his own party. Johnson's fatal flaw, as previously indicated, was his rigid self-righteousness and absolute unwillingness to compromise on a matter of principle. By vetoing Reconstruction legislation in order to protect white supremacy in the South and then using his executive power to obstruct its implementation, Johnson alienated potential allies and increased the power of the Radicals in the Republican Party. As long as he stayed within acceptable bounds of executive power, moderate and conservative Republicans refused to join the Radicals in supporting impeachment. It took Johnson's violation of the Tenure of Office Act to convince the non-Radical Republicans in the House that the President merited removal from office.

That finishes the summary of the similarities of the Johnson and Clinton cases thus far. I present these remarks in the hope that people will stop talking quite so much about Watergate and little more about Andrew Johnson when looking to understand the Clinton case. While the Johnson and Clinton cases are admittedly apples and oranges, people have been comparing apples and tomatoes (the tomato being Watergate) without really realizing it.
Globalization Proves Disappointing?

By JOSEPH KAHN

The world leaders who have gathered here to discuss how to fight poverty do not always see eye to eye on what works best. But many now agree that the force they once saw as a near panacea – globalization has come up short.

Globalization, or the fast-paced growth of trade and cross-border investment, has done far less to raise the incomes of the world's poorest people than the leaders had hoped, many officials here say. The vast majority of people living in Africa, Latin America, Central Asia and the Middle East are no better off today than they were in 1989, when the fall of the Berlin Wall allowed capitalism to spread worldwide at a rapid rate.

Rather than an unstoppable force for development, globalization now seems more like an economic temptress, promising riches but often not delivering, in the view of many of the leaders at the United Nations conference in this Mexican city, an industrial center.

"The thing about globalization is that if you blink, you miss it entirely," said Trevor Manuel, South Africa's finance minister. "It's not some kind of permanent phenomenon."

When Mr. Manuel and many other officials from around the world talk about economic integration, they tend to focus on why it has proved disappointing? Why rich countries keep many trade barriers in place, why Wall Street is fickle when it comes to investing in emerging markets, why multinationals ignore even some poor countries that follow the right policies.

"You can subject South Africa's policies to the tests of salt water and fresh water economists, and we will pass those tests," Mr. Manuel said, speaking of his country's attempts to create a vibrant capitalist economy. "But that has not translated into a great flow of investment."

The perception that markets have failed to lift all boats fast and high is behind the sudden support for more foreign aid, as is the recent rockiness in the world economy. The threat that terrorists can take advantage of the poorest places as havens also motivates the increase.

President Bush, who will visit Monterrey beginning Thursday, has promised to increase America's foreign aid spending by 50 percent, to $15 billion by 2006,
reversing declines during the so-called decade of globalization. European nations say they will also boost development assistance markedly.

No one predicts a return to the situation that prevailed before 1980, when governments accounted for the bulk of capital flowing from rich countries to poor ones. Foreign aid, at about $50 billion a year, is about a fourth of what companies now invest in developing countries each year, and an even smaller fraction of what developing countries earn from exports.

But even the leaders of industrial nations say their faith in globalization was at least partly misplaced.

President Jacques Chirac of France, speaking to reporters before attending the Monterrey meeting this week, took issue with the slogan "trade not aid," which he said characterized the 1990's view of development. Instead, Mr. Chirac said, industrial countries should spend more on "aid for trade."

"There's no creation of wealth without the necessary infrastructure and that infrastructure demands outside aid," Mr. Chirac said.

Mr. Chirac and Lionel Jospin, the prime minister, who is his rival in forthcoming presidential elections, have detailed competing proposals to tax the profits of globalization to provide aid funds.

One of the few officials who still belittles the role of foreign aid is Treasury Secretary Paul H. O'Neill, who has doubted its effectiveness and extolled the benefits of the market. Speaking in Monterrey today, Mr. O'Neill said all aid doled out last year fell short of what China received in private foreign investment.

"If we are going to have real economic development in the world, most of that will come from capital coming into those countries to create jobs," Mr. O'Neill said. "We are not going to do it with welfare."

Yet Mr. O'Neill's skepticism did not prevent the Bush administration from backing the largest increase in aid in recent history. And some recent studies have found that China is something of an anomaly, one of the only developing countries whose love for the world market has been fully requited.

A World Bank survey released on the eve of the conference shows that after growing furiously through the early 1990's, annual private capital flows to the developing world fell from $300 billion in 1997 to just over half that level last year. Stock and bond markets went into reverse after the 1997 Asian financial crisis, drawing more money out of developing countries than they put in. Corporate foreign investment declined only modestly, but is still below its 1997 peak.
That has left some fallen stars among middle-income countries, like Turkey and Argentina, which are now begging for both private investment and official aid. Those that only tasted the fruits of globalization in the 1990's, like most of Africa and Central Asia, never got a second bite.

Perhaps aside from China, the only country that appears to have benefited unambiguously from the trend toward open markets worldwide is the United States, where a huge inflow of capital has helped allow Americans to spend more than they save, and to import more than they export.

"The trend of globalization is that surplus capital is moving from the periphery countries to the center, which is the United States," said George Soros, the financier and philanthropist who has become a leading critic of globalization.

Mr. Soros came to Monterrey to persuade leaders to back his idea of creating a $27 billion pool that poor countries could use to finance development, especially when private capital flows dry up. He said aid is needed to tame the market.

"The U.S. government view is that markets are always right," Mr. Soros said. "My view is that markets are almost always wrong, and they have to be made right."

1. What are the key points of this article?(20 分)
2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of globalization?(30 分)