

Doris S. Patterson

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

NEWSLETTER

Volume VI

Number 4

December, 1975

Page

1	Lawrence S. Kaplan, Founding Fathers
8	Personals
9	Queries
10	Publications by Members of SHAFR
12	Better to be Safe than Sorry!
12	Announcements
14	Abstracts of Articles and Papers
18	Special Financial Report
19	Stuart L. Bernath Prize Competition
20	Increase in Bernath Memorial Fund; Bulletins

SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

Founded in 1967. Chartered in 1972.

PRESIDENT: Armin H. Rappaport, Department of History, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92037.

VICE PRESIDENT: Robert A. Divine, Department of History, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712.

JOINT EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER: Lawrence S. Kaplan, Department of History, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44240, and Warren F. Kuehl, Department of History, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio 44325.

CHAIRMAN, PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Thomas Paterson, Department of History, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut 06268.

CHAIRMAN, MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE: Leon E. Boothe, College of Arts and Sciences, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia 22030.

CHAIRMAN, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Lawrence Gelfand, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52240.

MEMBERSHIP: Anyone interested in U.S. diplomatic history is invited to become a member. Annual dues are \$5.00, payable at the office of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer. Membership fees for retired members and for students are \$3.00 per year, while institutional affiliations are \$10.00. Life memberships are \$75.00.

MEETINGS: The annual meeting of the Society is held in August. The Society also meets with the American Historical Association in December, and with the Organization of American Historians in April.

PRIZE: The Stuart L. Bernath Prize of \$500.00 is awarded each year at the spring meeting of the Society to that person whose first or second book in U. S. diplomatic history is adjudged the best for the previous year.

ROSTER: A complete listing of the members with addresses and their current research projects is issued in even years to all members. (A supplemental list is mailed in odd years). Editor of the **Roster & Research List** is Warren F. Kimball, Department of History, Rutgers University (Newark), Newark, New Jersey 07102.

Founding Fathers on the Founding Fathers:
 Reflections on Three Generations of
 American Diplomatic Historians

by

Lawrence S. Kaplan*

There was once a time when diplomatic history was a young and virile branch of American history. While that time is not distant chronologically--scarcely half a century--the subject in recent years has shown signs of arteriosclerosis. Although the diagnosis may not be accurate, it is widely held within the profession. Even the fact that the founding fathers of the field lived long lives, or indeed are still living, is an occasion for reproach on the part of critics. What may have been youth in the 1920s is undeniably age in the 1970s, and was even so in the 1950s and 1960s.

Such excitement as the pioneer diplomatic historians, Samuel F. Bemis and Thomas A. Bailey, Julius W. Pratt and Dexter Perkins, Richard W. Van Alstyne and Arthur P. Whitaker yielded from their studies had implications outside the historical profession. Woodrow Wilson had been a historian as well as a president of the United States, and was a bearer of a world outlook that made American diplomacy important. Theodore Roosevelt, president before him, was also a historian as well as a strenuous actor on the world stage. And before him Henry Adams, sometime public figure, had made his history of the United States during the administrations of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison an exercise in diplomatic history. Even Frederick Jackson Turner, perhaps the most renowned American historian in the first quarter of the twentieth century, had a share in the beginnings of diplomatic history. Among his many contributions were essays in Franco-American diplomacy concerning the Mississippi Valley.¹

The rise of diplomatic history coincided with an awareness of America as a world power, as a maker and shaker in an arena larger than the American continent. The seminal years in the education of the first professional generation of historians ranged from the Spanish-American War to the First World War when the power of the United States manifested itself in Latin America, in the Far East, and ultimately in Europe itself. It was a success story that called for explanation. Bemis' explorations in the Federalist era, Pratt's in the origins of the War of 1812, and Perkins' authoritative studies of the Monroe Doctrine were all testaments to a pride in American values and American strength which were exhibited in a successful foreign policy in the early national years.² Their objectives were the sources of American power, and they were achieved to the satisfaction of the seekers.

*Professor Kaplan is a member of the Department of History at Kent State University, and Joint Executive Secretary-Treasurer of SHAFR.

Disillusionment with the League of Nations and the fall of Wilson as a culture figure had a particular negative impact upon historians: Never again would historians occupy quite the seats of prominence they had occupied when Theodore Roosevelt or Woodrow Wilson was president; lawyers, economists, and political scientists would take their place from the academic community in the next two generations. But diplomatic history did not suffer diminution of status as a consequence of Versailles. Historians were leaders in both the defense of, and in the assault upon, Wilson. Despite the rise of neo-isolationism in the interbella period the continued vigor of diplomatic historians may have stemmed from the self-confidence of the historians themselves in their assumptions about what was good for America. Their lessons were drawn from the foreign policy of the post-Revolutionary period. If Wilson went astray it was because he had failed to adhere to the advice of the Founding Fathers. Statesmen had failed to extract an American advantage from Europe's distress, as Bemis had identified in Pinckney's Treaty in 1795. They lost sight of the meaning of the two hemispheres which Perkins had set forth in the Monroe Doctrine.

But if diplomatic history as a discipline blossomed in this age of disillusionment it was also because its practitioners were impeccable scholars. They went beyond Henry Adams in multiarchival research, uncovering in the archives of England, France, and Spain a fuller record than had been known before and analyzing it with wit and learning. While the results of their labors proved to be flattering to Americans, they made no attempt to alter or to shy away from the materials they discovered. Whether they asked the appropriate questions of their materials is another matter. Most of their findings remain definitive conclusions, no matter what glosses subsequent generations may place on them. The decades from Bemis' *Jay's Treaty* (1923) to his first volume on John Quincy Adams (1949) constituted a golden age for diplomatic historians.

The coming of the Second World War did not check the outpouring of studies in diplomatic history. Many of the leading diplomatic historians may have been isolationists in the 1930s, but few had difficulty in adjusting to the challenge of Nazi and Japanese ambitions to the United States after Pearl Harbor. The increased authority of the United States in world affairs revealed for them another side of the wisdom of the founding fathers. Dexter Perkins eloquently reminded his readers of the peculiar American virtues in diplomacy and of the civilizing mission they might perform in mitigating the evils of the balance of power and in promoting the rule of international law.³ This book, a staple of the United States Information Service, developed from lectures at the University of Uppsala, enlightening Europeans on the American approach to foreign policy. Bemis in the later editions of his influential textbook and in a combative piece for the *Virginia Quarterly Review* accepted the challenge of the isolationists after the war and employed his erudition to align George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and James Monroe with the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty.⁴ Curtis P. Nettels seemed to have been a minority voice among historians of early America in pleading against the passage of the treaty on the grounds that Washington would have disapproved it.⁵

The second generation of scholars came into its professional maturity in the wake of that war. Many of them were former students of Bemis and Bailey who identified realism with what later would be known as the "consensus" interpretation of the American past. While the third generation of critics preferred to equate this approach to an Eisenhower fuzziness or to unseemly fears of McCarthyism, the postwar scholars drew their picture of history from the optimism of World War II when the prospect of a Pax Americana was an exciting challenge to diplomatic historians. They followed the paths of the founding fathers and went beyond them in many ways. Their exploitation of multiarchival research was more thorough; their understanding of the interplay of domestic and foreign affairs, of the psychological dimensions involved, of the roles of public opinion and elite groups was more sophisticated than that of their predecessors.

The studies of Alexander DeConde concerning Franco-American relations in the Federalist era and of Bradford Perkins in his trilogy on Anglo-American relations from 1795 to the Monroe Doctrine were noteworthy for their ability to relate diplomacy to the larger political scene.⁶ Insights and techniques from other disciplines became part of the scholarly baggage of diplomatic historians. In examining causes of the War of 1812 the idea of national honor and the need to preserve the Republican party were the materials of intellectual history and even of psychohistory in the writings of Norman K. Risjord and Roger H. Brown.⁷ Historians have also made full use of biographical information generated by the support of the National Historical Publications Commission after World War II. Princeton's Jefferson papers, Columbia's Hamilton, Chicago's and Virginia's Madison, Yale's and the American Philosophical Society's Franklin, and Harvard's Adams Family inspired not only reevaluations of those major figures but also new views of lesser diplomatists. George Dangerfield's Livingston is a model of excellence in biography.⁸

What has been particularly striking about their work has been their acceptance of the ideological framework of the founders. Although the former are more sensitive to nuances of behavior and have admirably filled many hiatuses in information, the main lines remain unchanged. America emerged in the writings of the second professional generation of diplomatic historians much as it had been in the first: namely, a special breed of nation, fighting for its survival in a hostile world and succeeding because of a combination of inherent moral virtues, a particular racial composition, the special circumstances of geography, and the good fortune of rivalries among the larger powers of Europe. Scholars who have attempted to fit American diplomatic history into a different frame, such as Seymour M. Lipset and Robert R. Palmer, usually were drawn from a different discipline or from another field of history.⁹ Richard B. Morris' valiant try to recast the post-revolutionary experience in the model of a contemporary emerging nation lacked credibility.¹⁰

There has been considerable harmony between historians of the early national period with such political scientists as Hans J. Morgenthau whose search for realism matched theirs.¹¹ To express American virtues in terms of the sterile moralistic pieties in the manner of the older generation, was embarrassing to a nation caught up in the leadership of an imperfect world. The postwar historians discovered that the diplomatists

from Washington to Monroe fitted the spirit of the 1950s better than did the makers of foreign policy from Jackson to Wilson; the Founding Fathers were realists who knew the limits of morality in politics as well as the limits of their own power. Hence, the arguments among historians were often over who was the greater realist: Hamilton or Jefferson, Madison or Monroe, Franklin or Jay. Dumas Malone and Albert H. Bowman celebrated Jefferson's essential wisdom in foreign policy while Gilbert L. Lycan and Helene J. Looze were joyful combatants on behalf of Hamilton!² Lawrence S. Kaplan was less concerned with Hamilton's judgment than in Jefferson's errors in his relations with France.³ Gerald Stourzh's study of Hamilton, perhaps the most discerning of all recent examinations of Hamilton, found qualities which most often others had missed!⁴ The debate over Revolutionary diplomacy continued as Richard Morris elevated John Jay to first rank, and Cecil B. Currey exposed Benjamin Franklin as a realist in a different tradition: he would triumph personally in the Revolution whichever side won!⁵

Thomas J. McCormick claims that too many historians have become obsessed with a "metaphysical" "realism-idealism" which has created an artificial and sterile polarity!⁶ It has diverted the diplomatic historian, he asserts, from developing comparative analyses of contemporary societies, and from looking for new frames for understanding foreign relations. Yet it is worth observing that the revisionists of the 1960s, the so-called New Left, have shied away from the early national period. Although McCormick may be correct in his charges about the realist-idealist debate and about the parochialism of diplomatic historians, the New Left has not distinguished itself for any reevaluations of the diplomacy of the early period. The record of revisionist historiography is meager compared with its contribution to the understanding of the Open Cold War.

This lacuna is all the more surprising considering the labors of William Appleman Williams, an inspirational figure to the New Left!⁷ To him diplomacy was the handmaiden of a coherent expansionist search for markets. In an important article in the *William and Mary Quarterly* in 1958 Williams claimed that all the Founding Fathers shared an interest in replacing British mercantilism with American, and that Madison deserves more credit than Hamilton in promoting American industry; Hamilton, in this view was tied too much to Britain. Whatever the merits of the argument, his disciples have failed to develop it for the Federalist or Jeffersonian periods. Indeed, the only major contributors to the theme of American imperialism, although from a non-Marxist perspective, are veterans of another generation: Arthur B. Darling who dwelled on the power struggle over the Mississippi Valley between Europe and America, and Richard W. Alstyne who observed the continuities in American expansionism.¹⁸

By sifting through the heap of publications on foreign affairs which piles up annually, one can find some evidence in the historiography of the diplomacy of the new nation of all the currents flowing today, from character studies to local history, from comparative analysis to quantitative methods. A modest beginning has been made in the use of quantitative techniques. Mary Ryan has examined party formation in the Federalist period with implications for partisan roles in the foreign policy debate during the quasi-war with France!⁹ Ronald L. Hatzenbuehler has employed cluster bloc analysis scaling and an index of cohesion in the study of roll calls relating to foreign policy in the House of Representatives during

the first session of the Twelfth Congress.²⁰ Even the less likely area of state history has yielded some insights into foreign affairs. Such studies as Richard R. Beeman's on Virginia in the 1790s and Victor A. Sapiro's on Pennsylvania in 1812 have the merit of looking beyond the national level to find the local roots of foreign policy.²¹ But they are all marginal in their impact.

Surprisingly, the Progressive school of interpretation is missing from the list for the most part, despite the temptations of a Hamilton-Jefferson dualism. Indeed, if it appears at all it is largely a pale reflection of that conflict. Hamilton's Anglophilism or Jefferson's Francophilism are essentially character defects which may damage the national interest but are not basically part of the agrarian-industrial class struggle characterizing most of the Progressive approach. Charles E. Neu places Julius Pratt and Arthur Whitaker into the Progressive mold, considering the primacy they gave to the Western agrarian as opposed to the Eastern merchant in the shaping of American foreign policy.²² Yet, diplomacy does not emerge as a class activity since the objectives of foreign policies mesh. Indeed, foreign affairs has a flattening effect on all differences as East and West, Federalist and Jeffersonian, all seem to seek an isolationist America independent of political connections to the Old World but prepared to profit from both its political difficulties and economic needs. Small wonder then that the consensus history predominates.

Given the relative immunity of diplomatic history to the prevailing schools of this century it is understandable that the first generations of national history still bear the stamp of the Founding Fathers, and in the case of Henry Adams a Founding Grandfather, of the profession. Not only must a scholar begin his study of the Revolution with the work of Edward S. Corwin and Samuel Flagg Bemis, but he can never discard their contributions.²³ The judgments of Bemis and Whitaker on the diplomacy of the Confederal and Federalist periods vis-a-vis Great Britain and Spain remain standards.²⁴ And no one can approach Jeffersonian foreign policy or the War of 1812 without stepping into the long shadow of Henry Adams whose nine-volume history was completed before the turn of the twentieth century.²⁵ Even the major statements on Western influence upon the War of 1812, such as those of Pratt and George R. Taylor, date back to the first third of the twentieth century.²⁶ As for the Monroe Doctrine, Dexter Perkins' identification with the subject has not dimmed with the passage of time. Rather, it has been brightened by his own exegetical reviews of the Doctrine.²⁷ While the great Progressive historians--Charles A. Beard, Frederick Jackson Turner, and Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr.--may be treated with respect by students of economic, Western, and social history, respectively, they are victims of a generation gap. They do not speak to subsequent generations in the way their contemporaries in diplomatic history address their children and grandchildren.

¹ In addition to his editing of "Correspondence of the French Ministers to the United States, 1791-1797", **American Historical Association, Annual Report**, 1903 (Washington, D.C., 1904), Turner published several articles on the West in French diplomacy drawn from the above documents. See, for example, "The Origin of Genet's Projected Attack on Louisiana and the Floridas", **American Historical Review**, III (July, 1898), 650-671 and "The Policy of France toward the Mississippi Valley in the Period of Washington and Adams", **American Historical Review**, X (January, 1905), 249-279.

² Samuel Flagg Bemis, **Pinckney's Treaty: A Study of America's Advantage from Europe's Distress, 1783-1800** (Baltimore, 1926); Dexter Perkins, **The Monroe Doctrine, 1823-1826** (Cambridge, Mass., 1927); Julius W. Pratt, **Expansionists of 1812** (New York, 1925).

³ Dexter Perkins, **The American Approach to Foreign Policy** (Cambridge, 1952).

⁴ Samuel Flagg Bemis "The Shifting Strategy of American Defense and Diplomacy", **Virginia Quarterly Review**, XXIV (Summer, 1948), 321-335.

⁵ Nettels' testimony, **Hearings**, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 81st Congress, first session, Part 2, 1107.

⁶ Alexander DeConde, **Entangling Alliance: Politics & Diplomacy under George Washington** (Durham N.C., 1959) and **The Quasi-War: The Politics and Diplomacy of the Undeclared War with France, 1797-1801** (New York, 1966); Bradford Perkins, **The First Rapprochement: England and the United States, 1795-1805** (Philadelphia, 1955), **Prologue to War: England and the United States, 1805-1812** (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1961) and **Castlereagh and Adams: England and the United States, 1812-1823** (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1964.)

⁷ Norman K. Risjord, "1812: Conservatives, War Hawks, and the Nation's Honor," **William and Mary Quarterly**, XVIII (April, 1961), pp. 196-210; Roger H. Brown, **The Republic in Peril: 1812** (New York, 1964).

⁸ George Dangerfield, **Chancellor Robert R. Livingston of New York, 1746-1813** (New York, 1960).

⁹ Seymour Martin Lipset, **The First New Nation: The United States in Historical and Comparative Perspective** (New York, 1963); Robert R. Palmer, **The Age of the Democratic Revolution** (2 vols., Princeton, 1959-64).

¹⁰ Richard B. Morris, **The Emerging Nations and the American Revolution** (New York, 1970).

¹¹ See, for example, Hans J. Morgenthau, **In Defense of the National Interest: A Critical Examination of American Foreign Policy** (New York, 1951).

¹²Dumas Malone, **Jefferson and His Time** (5 vols., 1948-1974); Albert Hall Bowman, "Jefferson, Hamilton and American Foreign Policy," **Political Science Quarterly**, LXXI (March, 1956), 18-41; Gilbert L. Lycan, **Alexander Hamilton and American Foreign Policy: A Design for Greatness** (Norman, 1970); Helene Johnson Looze, **Alexander Hamilton and the British Orientation of American Foreign Policy** (The Hague, 1969).

¹³Lawrence S. Kaplan, **Jefferson and France: An Essay on Politics and Political Ideas** (New Haven, 1967).

¹⁴Gerald Stourzh, **Alexander Hamilton and the Idea of Republican Government** (Stanford, 1970).

¹⁵Richard B. Morris, **The Peacemakers: The Great Powers and American Independence** (New York, 1965); Cecil B. Currey, **Code Number 72: Ben Franklin, Patriot or Spy?** (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972).

¹⁶Thomas J. McCormick, "The State of American Diplomatic History", in Herbert J. Bass, ed., **The State of American History** (Chicago, 1970), 119.

¹⁷William A. Williams, "The Age of Mercantilism: An Interpretation of the American Political Economy, 1763-1828," **William and Mary Quarterly**, Third Series, XV (October, 1958), 419-437.

¹⁸Arthur B. Darling, **Our Rising Empire, 1763-1803** (New Haven, 1940). Richard W. Van Alstyne, **The Rising American Empire** (Oxford, 1960).

¹⁹See Mary Ryan, "Party Formation in the United States Congress, 1789-1796, A Quantitative Analysis," **William and Mary Quarterly**, Third Series, XXVII (October, 1971), 523-542.

²⁰Ronald L. Hatzenbuehler, "Party Unity and the Decision for War in the House of Representatives in 1812," **William and Mary Quarterly**, Third Series, XXIX (July, 1972), 367-390.

²¹Richard R. Beeman, **The Old Dominion and the New Nation, 1788-1801** (Lexington, Ky., 1972); Victor A. Sapio **Pennsylvania and the War of 1812** (Lexington, Ky., 1970).

²²Charles E. Neu, "The Changing Interpretive Structure of American Foreign Policy", in John Braeman et al, eds., **Twentieth-Century American Foreign Policy** (Columbus, 1971), p. 10.

²³Edward S. Corwin, **French Policy and the American Alliance of 1778** (Princeton, 1916); Samuel Flagg Bemis, **The Diplomacy of the American Revolution** (New York, 1935).

²⁴Bemis, **Jay's Treaty and Pinckney's Treaty: A Study of America's Advantage from Europe's Distress, 1783-1800** (Baltimore, 1926); Arthur P. Whitaker, **The Spanish-American Frontier; The Westward Movement and the Spanish Retreat in the Mississippi Valley** (Boston and New York, 1927) and **The Mississippi Question, 1795-1803** (New York, 1934).

²⁵ Henry Adams, **History of the United States during the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison** (9 vols., New York, 1889-91).

²⁶ Julius W. Pratt, **Expansionists of 1812** (New York, 1925); George R. Taylor, "Agrarian Discontent in the Mississippi Valley Preceding the War of 1812" **The Journal of Political Economy**, XXXIX (August, 1931), 486-505.

²⁷ Dexter Perkins, **The Monroe Doctrine, 1823-1826** (Cambridge, 1927), and **Hands Off: A History of the Monroe Doctrine** (Boston, 1941).

PERSONALS

Forrest C. Pogue, former Executive Director of the Marshall Foundation and biographer of Gen. George C. Marshall, was awarded an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters by his alma mater, Clark University, in May of this year.

* * * * *

Two members of SHAFR, Richard C. Lukas (Tennessee Technological U) and Thomas G. Paterson (U of Connecticut), were recent recipients of grants from the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute for postdoctoral research in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, N. Y.

* * * * *

Norman A. Graebner (U of Virginia and former president of SHAFR) has been appointed to a 14-member Advisor Council, created this past spring by the George C. Marshall Foundation's Board of Trustees. The task of this body will be to work intimately with the Foundation's Executive Director, Fred L. Hadsel, in broadening existing programs and devising new ones.

* * * * *

Robert J. Maddox (Pennsylvania State U) and David A. Rosenberg (U of Chicago) have received grants-in-aid from the Harry S. Truman Library Institute for National and International Affairs for research during the academic year 1975-76.

* * * * *

The Gilbert Chinard Prize, given jointly by the Society for French Historical Studies and the Institut francais de Washington for a distinguished scholarly work in Franco-American history, was awarded for 1974 to Albert H. Bowman (U of Tennessee at Chattanooga) for his book, **The Struggle for Neutrality: Franco-American Diplomacy in the Federalist Era** (1974, Knoxville: U of Tennessee Press, \$13.50).

* * * * *

The doctoral dissertation of Gary May (U of Delaware), titled **The China Service of John Carter Vincent, 1924-1953**, was awarded the Allan Nevins Prize for the "best written dissertation in American history submitted for the Ph. D. in 1974."

* * * * *

The Gilbert Chinard Incentive Award for 1974 was made to Melvin P. Leffler (Vanderbilt U) for his manuscript, "The Struggle for Stability: American Policy toward France, 1921-1933."

* * * * *

David L. Wilson (Southern Illinois U) has been selected as a NHPRC Fellow in Advanced Editing of Documentary Sources for 1975-76. His project will be the Ulysses S. Grant Papers, a work with which he has been identified the past few years.

* * * * *

Dr. Forrest C. Pogue, director of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Institute for Historical Research at the Smithsonian, was the featured speaker at the first colloquium of the academic year, sponsored by the Department of History, U of Tennessee. Dr. Pogue particularly stressed his use of oral history--its benefits and its pitfalls--in doing his multi-volumed biography of Gen. George C. Marshall.

* * * * *

QUERIES

Professor Ralph E. Weber of the History Department at Marquette University is preparing a manuscript for publication as a book entitled **Secret Codes and Ciphers, 1776-1851**. The volume will contain more than sixty different codes and ciphers used by American presidents and diplomats during this period. Several codes have not been found and Professor Weber would be grateful for any information on the location of the codes employed by:

Thomas Jefferson to David Humphreys, American Minister Resident in Portugal in 1791, in which "994" was the symbol for **the**.

Thomas Pinckney, Minister Plenipotentiary in Great Britain, 1792-1796, and by Robert Livingston to Rufus King in 1802, in which "663" was the symbol for **the**.

Rufus King, Minister Plenipotentiary in Great Britain, 1796-1803, in which **the** was "769".

Thomas Jefferson to William Short in 1790, and to John Jay in 1787 and 1789, in which **the** was "224."

John Armstrong, Minister Plenipotentiary in France, 1804-1810, in which **the** was "972."

Thomas Jefferson to William Carmichael in Spain between 1787-1789, in which **the** was "1196."

George Erving, Charge d'Affaires ad interim in Spain, 1805-1810, in which **the** was "1651."

Anthony Morris in Spain 1814-1816, in which **the** was "285."

Thomas T. Barlow, Charge d'Affaires ad interim in France, 1812-1813, in which **the** was "1700."

Anyone with information should write to Professor Weber, Department of History, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53233.

PUBLICATIONS IN U. S. DIPLOMACY BY MEMBERS OF SHAFR

Irvine H. Anderson, Jr. (U of Cincinnati), **The Standard-Vacuum Oil Company and United States East Asian Policy, 1933-1941**. 1975. Princeton U. Press. \$12.50.

* * * * *

Thomas A. Bailey (professor emeritus, Stanford U, and first president of SHAFR) and Captain Paul B. Ryan (USN, retired), **The Lusitania Disaster: An Episode in Modern Warfare and Diplomacy**. 1975. The Free Press. \$10.95. Reviewed in New York **Times**, October 12, 1975. Subject of an article by E. M. Halliday in December issue of **American Heritage**, "Who Sank the **Lusitania?**" pp. 33-35, 96.

* * * * *

Thomas A. Bryson (West Georgia College), **American Diplomacy in the Middle East**. 1975. Forum Press. 16pp. \$0.75. Number FA 067 in the series, **Forums in History**.

* * * * *

Kenton J. Clymer (U of Texas at El Paso), **John Hay: The Gentleman as Diplomat**. 1975. U of Michigan Press. \$15.00.

* * * * *

Keith L. Nelson (U of California, Irvine), **Victors Divided: America and the Allies in Germany, 1918-1923**. 1975. \$20.00.

* * * * *

Milton Plesur's (SUNY at Buffalo) **America's Outward Thurst: Approaches to Foreign Affairs** which was published in a clothbound edition at \$12.50 by the Northern Illinois U Press in 1971 is now available in a paperback edition for \$3.00 at the same press.

* * * * *

Martin J. Sherwin (Princeton), **A World Destroyed: The Atomic Bomb and the Grand Alliance**. 1975. Alfred A. Knopf. \$10.00.

* * * * *

Joan Hoff Wilson (California State U, Sacramento), **Herbert Hoover: Forgotten Progressive**. 1975. Little, Brown and Co., Inc. Pb. \$3.95. Favorably reviewed in *New York Times*, August 17, 1975, and in *Choice*, September, 1975.

ADDITIONAL PUBLICATIONS BY MEMBERS OF SHAFR

Stanley L. Falk (Office of Air Force History), **Seventy Days to Singapore**. 1975. G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$8.95.

* * * * *

Jules A. Karlin (U of Montana), **Joseph M. Dixon of Montana: Part II, Governor Versus the Anaconda, 1917-1934**. 1975. U of Montana Press. \$7.95.

* * * * *

John A. Moses (U of Queensland, Australia), **The Politics of Illusion: The Fischer Controversy in German Historiography**. 1975. London: George Prior Associated Publishers. 3.75 pounds. New York: Barnes & Noble. \$12.50. Reviewed in *London Times*, September 14.

IT'S BETTER TO BE SAFE THAN SORRY!

The editor of the **Newsletter** does not possess the power of clairvoyance! So, if you are going to change addresses, let the editorial office of the **Newsletter** (Box 5146, Tennessee Tech, Cookeville, Tennessee 38501) know about it at least one month before the mailing of the next issue. Then you will be happy--and so will the editor!

Copies of the **Newsletter** which are returned to the editorial office because of faulty addresses will be forwarded only upon the payment of a fee of 50¢.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The annual meeting of the AHA is scheduled for Atlanta, December 28-30, with headquarters at the Marriott Motor Hotel, Courtland and Cain Streets, Atlanta, Ga. 30303. The Council of SHAFR will meet in Room 12 Oaks of the Marriott, 8:15 P. M., December 27. The Society luncheon will be held at noon, Sunday, December 28, in the Midnight Sun Restaurant, 235 Peachtree Street, N. E., in Peachtree Center. Armin Rappaport will deliver his presidential address, "A New American Foreign Policy," at the luncheon, and a short business session will follow. Later that same day (5:00-7:00) a reception will be held in the Tudor Room of the Hyatt Regency Hotel, 265 Peachtree Street.

* * * * *

The 30th International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa (formerly called International Congress of Orientalists) will be held in Mexico City, August 3-8, 1976. The topics to be considered at the meeting will include the history, sociology, economics, philosophy, art, literature, anthropology, and contemporary problems of Asia and North Africa. The program will be divided into sections, seminars, colloquia, and conferences. The sections will be arranged according to these geocultural areas: West Asia and North Africa, Central and Northern Asia, South Asia, Southeast Asia, and East Asia (a. China; b. Japan and Korea). The official languages of the Congress will be English, Spanish, and French. Papers shall not exceed twenty minutes, and the deadline for the submission of titles and authors is January 1, 1976. Summaries of not more than 200 words must be submitted to the Secretary General before April 1. Registration and inquiries should be addressed to: Secretary General, 30th International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa, El Colegio de Mexico, Guanajuato 125, Mexico 7, D. F., MEXICO.

* * * * *

The Department of History at Kent State U, with financial assistance from the George Gund Foundation and the Ohio American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, is sponsoring a conference on May 14-15, 1976, titled "America and 'a Candid World': The Revolution in an International Perspective." There will be three sessions with a total of nine papers and six commentaries. Additionally, there will be speakers at a banquet and a luncheon. The emphasis of the meetings will, obviously, be upon the diplomacy of the Revolutionary period. Detailed information respecting the conference may be obtained from either Dr. Wm. H. Kenney or Dr. Lawrence S. Kaplan, Kent State U, Kent, Ohio 44240.

* * * * *

Paris Research Associates, founded in 1971, offers an array of services to individuals outside France who desire information from French sources and who find it inconvenient for one reason or another to do the research themselves. Among the services which the firm offers are the following: providing background information in any area; locating photographs, historical drawings, or other pictorial material, and arranging for reproduction; collecting, synthesizing or analyzing press reports, books, and official publications; gathering statistical data; conducting personal interviews; translating material upon any subject; locating, photocopying, or microfilming specific documents; compiling bibliographies or printed and/or archival sources; seeking out letters, administrative reports, **procès verbaux**, genealogical records, etc. in archives and libraries; supplying or verifying references for texts and footnotes; tracking down private papers; locating rare books; contacting French experts in a given field. Those interested should write or call Paris Research Associates, 181 East 73rd St., N. Y., N. Y. 10021; phone: 1 (212) 288-9564.

* * * * *

During this coming Bicentennial year, the Department of History at The University of Connecticut expects to appoint up to four Roger Sherman Scholars. The number of awards will depend upon the qualifications of the applicants and budgetary constraints. Sherman Scholars must indicate an intention to pursue the doctorate in any field of history. Awards will consist of a \$2500 predoctoral fellowship and a one semester's teaching assistantship for a total of approximately \$4500. The exact amount will depend upon the applicant's progress toward the degree and his or her teaching experience. Sherman Scholars will be selected on the basis of potential for outstanding teaching and research careers, the quality of their prior academic record, GRE aptitude and history scores, recommendations, a written personal statement, and previously completed research papers or other analytical writing which may be submitted with the application.

To secure application blanks for admission and financial aid and the Bulletin of the Graduate School, write to the Graduate Admissions Office, Box U 6A, The University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut, 06268. Awards cannot be made until all application material for both

admission and financial aid have been received. Applicants should note on their financial aid forms that they are specifically interested in being considered for appointment as a Sherman Scholar. However, all applicants for financial assistance will be considered for the Sherman Scholarships. Other financial assistance may be offered to those not selected. All material should be sent by March 1, 1976, but preferably earlier, to the Chairman, Graduate Admissions Committee, Department of History, The University of Connecticut, Box U 103, Storrs, Connecticut 06268. For further information about the graduate program in history, request the prospectus from the same address.

* * * * *

Members of SHAFR will cut quite a swath at the AHA convention in Atlanta, December 28-30. It is doubtful that any other organization with a membership approximating that of SHAFR (c. 600) will have participants in as many programs--eight. Six members will be chairing sessions: Warren F. Kuehl (U of Akron), Russell F. Weigley (Temple), Robert L. Beisner (American U), Stanley L. Falk (Department of the Air Force), Louis Morton (Dartmouth), and Philip A. Crowl (Naval War College). Seven will be reading papers or participating in panels: David S. Patterson (Rice), Robert Dingman (Southern California), Michael H. Hunt (Yale), Norman A. Graebner (Virginia), Richard S. Kirkendall (Indiana), Forrest C. Pogue (the Smithsonian), and James W. Moore (the Citadel). Two, Stephen E. Pelz (U of Massachusetts-Amherst) and Raymond O'Connor (U of Miami), will be commentators.

* * * * *

Warren F. Kuehl, Director of the Center for Peace Studies at the University of Akron, Akron, Ohio 44325, has announced a broad publishing program on peace and internationalism to be undertaken by Clearwater Publishing Company, Inc., 50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10020. Dr. Kuehl is General Editor of the project and will be assisted by an editorial board consisting of Professor Charles Chatfield of Wittenberg University, Dr. J. van Hall, Director of the Library of the Peace Palace at the Hague, Dr. John W. Chambers of Barnard College, and several other scholars.

One major activity of the program will be reproducing on microfiche manuscript collections, rare documents, and major periodicals, including some of the most important published over the past 200 years. Collections of lesser-known and short-lived publications devoted to conscription, pacifism, and internationalism will also be available. Index volumes will be published for each microfiche collection. All microfiche titles and indexes will be available individually.

The program also includes plans for the publication of a series of print editions of registers and catalogs to manuscript collections on peace and internationalism. The first publications to be offered will be a selected microfiche edition of the card catalog of the Library of the Peace Palace at The Hague and the Annual Reports of the Lake Mohonk Conferences on International Arbitration (1895-1916).

Finally, a series of monographs presenting contemporary issues and historical analyses will be published in book form. The program, which is already under way, will proceed by degrees as long as worthwhile projects can be developed.

Interested scholars are invited to submit suggestions, proposals, or manuscripts.

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES PUBLISHED, OR SCHOLARLY PAPERS
DELIVERED, BY MEMBERS OF SHAFR

(Please limit abstracts to a total of fifteen (15) lines of **Newsletter** space. The overriding problem of space, plus the wish to accommodate as many contributors as possible, makes this restriction necessary. Don't send lengthy summaries to the editor with the request that he cut as he sees fit. Go over abstracts carefully before mailing. If words are omitted, or statements are vague, the editor in attempting to make needed changes may do violence to the meaning of the article or paper. Do not send abstracts until a paper has actually been delivered, or an article has actually appeared in print. For abstracts of articles, please supply the date, the volume, the number within the volume, and the pages. Double space all abstracts).

* * * * *

Stuart Anderson (Claremont Graduate School), "British Threats and the Settlement of the Oregon Boundary Dispute," **Pacific Northwest Quarterly**, LXVI,3 (October 1975), 153-160. The threats of the Peel Ministry to use military force during the Oregon boundary negotiations in 1846 played an important, though subsidiary role in the final settlement of the question. President James K. Polk, after the rejection of his initial compromise offer by the British Minister, Sir Richard Pakenham, resorted to a strategy of bluff. He would not give the British a clue as to what terms he might now find acceptable, and he refused to reveal to the British his willingness to submit a new compromise offer to the Senate for its prior advice. By keeping his adversaries in the dark as to his true intentions, Polk hoped to force them to take the initiative in offering a compromise. During the first months of 1846, however, British naval preparations and threats from the London government forced Polk to reveal to the British his terms for compromise and his intention to submit any acceptable new British offer to the Senate. The threats thus facilitated the final settlement.

* * * * *

G. St. J. Barclay (U of Queensland, Australia), "Singapore Strategy: The Role of the United States in Imperial Defense," **Military Affairs**, XXXIX (1975), 54-58. This article deals with the abandonment of Admiral Jellicoe's original proposal to base a huge Far Eastern fleet at Singapore in favor of a deliberately-imprecise undertaking to send a major fleet there in the event of Japanese aggression. In fact, the British were unable by 1935 at the latest to detach a sufficiently large force from home waters to deter the Japanese without imperiling their own defense. Their efforts were, accordingly, directed towards trying to persuade the United States to accept responsibility for the defense of the Eastern Empire in the event of Britain's being involved in a European war.

* * * * *

G. St. J. Barclay (U of Queensland, Australia), "Problems in Australian Foreign Policy, July-December, 1974," **Australian Journal of Politics and History**, XXX, 1 (1975), 1-10. This article analyzes the implications of the peculiarly ambiguous policy of the Whitlam Labor Government in Australia towards the United States, and discusses the particular problems of an international posture which assigns top priority to the maintenance of an alliance with the United States, while at the same time consistently opposing United States policy on almost all diplomatic and defense issues which have arisen since 1972. The paper also alludes to the legal implications of the confrontation between the Federal Labor Government, and the non-Labor Governments in four of the six states of the Australian Federation.

* * * * *

Hong-Kyu Park (Wiley College, Marshall, Texas), "The Korean War Revisited: A Survey of Historical Writings," **World Affairs**, CXXXVII, 4 (Spring, 1975), 336-344. Based on the author's earlier work as well as further research, this article deals with historical writings available in English on the Korean Conflict and the U. S. involvement in it. Pointing to the need for further investigation, the article concludes that the prospects for additional studies and for a definitive overall history of the war "are dim until the U. S. government releases its papers to researchers and until reliable information becomes available about what went on inside Moscow, Peking, and Pyongyang during the war."

* * * * *

Noel H. Pugach, (U of New Mexico), "American Shipping Promoters and the Shipping Crisis of 1914-1916: The Pacific & Eastern Steamship Company", **The American Neptune**, XXXV (July, 1975), 166-182." To cope with the shipping crisis in the Pacific, 1914-1916, (high rates, a shortage of tonnage, and the growing predominance of the Japanese), American and Chinese diplomats and businessmen attempted to organize a viable Sino-American shipping company. The result was the formation of the Pacific & Eastern Steamship Company in 1915. However, the American partners were unable to fulfill their obligations, that is, to raise one-half of the capital and to obtain the ships. Thus, in spite of the support of the Wilson administration, the project collapsed, to the detriment of American economic influence in China. To a great extent, this was due to the fact that, given the unwillingness of large and solid firms to participate, the field was left to speculators, concession-seeking promoters and inexperienced investors. This incident sheds additional light on the failure of American business to increase its stake in China. It also suggests that diplomatic historians who are studying American economic expansion should consider the impact of smaller firms and get-rich-quick speculators as well as the major industrial and financial concerns.

* * * * *

Richard C. Lukas (Tennessee Technological U), "The Big Three and the Warsaw Uprising," **Military Affairs**, XXXIX, 3 (October, 1975), 129-134. The writer considers American, British, and Russian responses to the Warsaw Uprising of 1944, and points out that Great Britain and the United States tried to assist the beleaguered Poles. Russia, however, refused to do so until Polish defeat was a certainty. In contrast to some revisionist accounts, the writer claims that political, not military, factors were responsible for the Russian behavior at the Vistula.

* * * * *

J. Samuel Walker (National Archives), "Henry A. Wallace and the Cold War." A paper delivered at the April 1975 meeting of the OAH in Boston. This paper described briefly Wallace's views on foreign affairs, and then traced his rift with the Truman administration over America's policy towards the Soviet Union. It attempted to explain why Wallace rejected the Cold War consensus that nearly all Americans endorsed by late 1947, and why his efforts to challenge the assumptions underlying the foreign policy of the United States failed so completely. The paper contended that despite some conspicuous flaws in Wallace's position, he offered perceptive criticisms of America's Cold War policies and at the very least deserved an open-minded hearing from his contemporaries.

* * * * *

J. Samuel Walker (National Archives), "Henry A. Wallace as Agrarian Isolationist, 1921-1930," **Agricultural History**, XLIX, 3 (July, 1975), 532-548. This article traces Henry A. Wallace's views on foreign affairs during his career as a farm editor in Iowa. It argues that during the 1920s he took an isolationist position consistent with his agrarian background in his quest to find solutions for the agricultural depression. Even after he abandoned his isolationism and became an outspoken internationalist in the early 1930s his ideas upon foreign affairs continued to reflect attitudes and biases that stemmed from his agrarian roots. They provide the basis for understanding his later positions upon issues of foreign policy.

Special Financial Report upon
 First Annual Conference of SHAFR,
 Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.,
 (August 15-16, 1975)

Income: (Registration fees and food)	\$2229.95
Expenditures:	
Luncheons and Dinners	2378.49
Incidental Expenses	192.00
Printing of Programs	230.83
Refunds	46.80
	2848.12
Total Expenses	2848.12
Total Income	2229.95
Expenditures over Income	618.17
Assumed by Georgetown University School of Foreign Service	340.54
Expenses to SHAFR	\$277.63

We are highly indebted to Georgetown University for its generous support of the Conference and the willingness of the School of Foreign Service to assume general expenses in addition to providing the use of its facilities.

November 30, 1975.

Warren F. Kuehl
 Joint Executive
 Secretary-Treasurer

THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL PRIZE COMPETITION FOR 1976

Preamble of Agreement between SHAFR and
Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath
October 24, 1974

Whereas Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath desire to establish a permanent memorial to their late, beloved son, Historian Dr. Stuart Loren Bernath, who died on July 3, 1970, they do hereby enter into a contract with S.H.A.F.R. to perpetuate the previously-established annual prize award for the best published book on any aspect of American foreign relations. The purpose of the award shall be to encourage and promote the study of American foreign relations. Only the first or second book of an author is eligible. Such studies need not be traditional. Books may be expressions of original thinking and may be innovative in interpretation. They may be based on journalistic or entirely new, contemporary and independent source materials, as well as usual archival historical documents. Works based on authoritative sources such as personal interviews with people directly associated with recent or contemporary events shall be considered qualified for entrance into the contest. Authors may be non-academic and do not have to be a member of any society. Books by foreign writers may be entered into the contest, providing they are published in English.

CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD

ELIGIBILITY: The prize competition is open to any book on any aspect of American foreign relations that is published during 1975. It must be the author's first or second book.

PROCEDURES: Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of SHAFR. Five (5) copies of each book must be submitted with the nomination. The books should be sent to: Dr. Ernest R. May, Chairman, Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Prize Committee, Department of History, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02178. The works must be received not later than December 31, 1975.

AMOUNT OF AWARD: \$500.00. If two (2) or more works are deemed winners, the amount will be shared. The award will be announced at the luncheon for members of SHAFR, held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the OAH which will be April, 1976, at St. Louis, Missouri.

STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL FUND INCREASED

Through the generosity of Gerald and Myrna Bernath, SHAFR has received a gift of \$6,000 in United States bonds carrying an interest rate of 8¼ per cent. The income will be used to perpetuate the ideals of scholarship and teaching so ably represented by their son, Stuart.

SHAFR's Council is studying suggestions for the use of this income which will be separate from the Stuart L. Bernath Prize. A special committee, consisting of John L. Gaddis (Ohio U), chairman, Geoffrey S. Smith (Queen's U, Canada), Michael H. Hunt (Yale), and Frank D. McCann, Jr. (U of New Hampshire), has been appointed by President Armin Rappaport, and charged with the specific task of making recommendations to the Council.

BULLETIN

In the recently-concluded election for officials of SHAFR, Raymond Esthus (Tulane) was chosen as vice president, Thomas Paterson (U of Connecticut) was elected to the Council, and Warren I. Cohen (Michigan State) was made a member of the Nominations Committee. The present vice president, Robert A. Divine (U of Texas), will assume the duties of the presidency at the conclusion of the AHA meeting at Atlanta in December.

BULLETIN

The Ohio Program in the Humanities, a state-based chapter of the National Endowment for the Humanities, has made available the sum of \$7,790.00 as an aid towards financing the second national convention of SHAFR. The convention will be held upon the campus of Ohio State U, Columbus, Ohio, August 13-14, 1976, with "Bicentennial Foreign Policy Symposium: 'Lessons of the Past' for American Diplomacy" as the theme for the meeting.

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

SPONSOR: Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.

EDITOR: Nolan Fowler, Department of History, Tennessee Tech, Cookeville, Tennessee 38501.

ISSUES: The **Newsletter** is published on the 15th of March, June, and September, and on the 1st of December. All members receive the publication.

DEADLINES: All material must be in the office of the editor not later than six (6) weeks prior to the publication date.

ADDRESS CHANGES: Notification of address changes should be in the office of the editor at least one month prior to the date of publication. Copies of the **Newsletter** which are returned because of faulty addresses will be forwarded only upon the payment of a fee of 50¢.

BACK ISSUES: Copies of all back numbers of the **Newsletter** are available and may be obtained from the editorial office upon the payment of a service charge of 35¢ per number. If the purchaser lives abroad, the charge is 50¢ per number.

MATERIALS DESIRED: Personals (promotions, transfers, obituaries, honors, awards), announcements, abstracts of scholarly papers and articles delivered—or published—upon diplomatic subjects, bibliographical or historiographical essays dealing with diplomatic topics, lists of accessions of diplomatic materials to libraries, essays of a "how-to-do-it" nature respecting diplomatic materials in various depositories. Because of space limitations, "straight" articles and book reviews are unacceptable.