

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

NEWSLETTER

Volume 28

No. 4

December 1997

Page

- 1 The Value of Another Perspective: The *Documents on Canadian External Relations (DCER)* Series, 1947-1954 by *Richard D. Wiggers*
- 21 Women NGO Representatives and UNCLOS III, 1973-1982 by *Ralph B. Levering*
- 37 SHAFR Council Minutes
- 40 Announcements
- 43 Publications
- 46 Calendar
- 47 Personals
- 48 Awards, Prizes and Funds
-

ISSN 0740-6169

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

Founded in 1967

Chartered in 1972

PRESIDENT: Emily Rosenberg, History, Macalaster College, St. Paul MN 55105.

VICE PRESIDENT: Arnold Offner, History, Lafayette College, Easton, PA 18042

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER: Allan Spetter, History, Wright State University, Dayton OH 45435.

PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Chester Pach, History, Ohio University, Athens OH 45701-2979

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Anna Nelson, History, American, Washington, DC 20016.

FINANCE COMMITTEE: Jonathan Utley, 2042 North Fremont St., Chicago IL 60614.

MEMBERSHIP: Annual dues are \$30 for regular members and \$15 for student or unemployed (unemployed rate valid for two years). Institutional Subscription Rates for *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 20, 1996 are \$75 for institutions in North America and \$90 for institutions in the rest of the world. Make checks payable to Blackwell Publishers or use MasterCard, Visa, or American Express. Mail orders, payments, and address changes to: SHAFR Membership Coordinator, Blackwell Publishers, 350 Main St, Malden, MA 02148 or call 1-800-835-6770. For those wishing only to receive the *Newsletter* the cost is \$15.00. Overseas members wishing to receive the *Newsletter* by air mail should remit an additional \$10 per year to the *Newsletter's* office.

MEETINGS: The annual meeting of the Society is held in the summer. The Society also meets with the AHA in January.

PRIZES: The Society administers four awards that honor the late Stuart L. Bernath and two honoring the late Myrna L. Bernath; these are financed through the generosity of the late Dr. Gerald J. Bernath. Awards also honor Laura and Norman Graebner, the late W. Stull Holt, the late Warren Kuehl, the late Armin Rappaport, Robert Ferrell, Lawrence Gelfand, and Arthur Link. Details of each of these awards are to be found in the June and December *Newsletters*.

PUBLICATIONS: The Society sponsors a quarterly *Newsletter*; *Diplomatic History*, a journal; and the occasional *Membership Roster and List of Current Research Projects*.

**The Value of Another Perspective:
The *Documents on Canadian External
Relations (DCER)* Series, 1947-1954¹**

by

Richard Dominic Wiggers

GEORGETOWN

Two years ago, in an earlier issue of this *Newsletter*, Frederic W. Marks III complained about the problem of "Parochialism in American Foreign Relations." In particular, he lamented the ignorance and chauvinism that was often exhibited by Americans of all walks of life in relation to foreign peoples, as well as their cultures, points of view, and rationales for certain policies.² The problem of parochialism within the historical profession was also addressed during recent exchanges on the H-Diplo Internet discussion list,³ and in two

¹The contents of Volumes 13-20, the most recent in the *DCER* series, are summarized in this article. They include the following: 1947, Norman Hillmer and Donald Page (eds), *DCER*, Volume 13 (Ottawa: 1993), 1654 pp.; 1948, Hector Mackenzie (ed), *DCER*, Volume 14 (Ottawa: 1994), 1907 pp.; 1949, Hector Mackenzie (ed), *DCER*, Volume 15 (Ottawa: 1995), 1870 pp.; 1950, Greg Donaghy (ed), *DCER*, Volume 16 (Ottawa: 1996), 1914 pp.; 1951, Greg Donaghy (ed), *DCER*, Volume 17 (Ottawa: 1996), 1898 pp.; 1952, Donald Barry (ed), *DCER*, Volume 18 (Ottawa: 1990), 1625 pp.; 1953, Donald Barry (ed), *DCER*, Volume 19 (Ottawa: 1991) 1665 pp.; 1954, Greg Donaghy (ed), *DCER*, Volume 20 (Ottawa: 1997), 1925 pp.

²Frederic W. Marks III, "Parochialism in American Foreign Relations: An Historical Overview," *Newsletter*, 26:1 (March 1995): 1-19.

³In particular, interested readers should consult the numerous e-mail exchanges about "The State of the Field" that appeared on H-Diplo during October 1997.

articles published during the past year in the American Historical Association (AHA) Newsletter *Perspectives*. One article, by Kyle Longley, challenged scholars to pursue more transnational and comparative approaches in both the analysis and the teaching of American history and foreign policy.⁴

In the most recent issue of *Diplomatic History*, Elizabeth Cobbs Hoffman praised those who have responded positively to these entreaties to resist parochialism and broaden the scope of American scholarship. Many diplomatic historians are already utilizing a new paradigm "that shows the United States as an incredibly powerful participant in a world that is nonetheless not easily malleable to its touch." According to Hoffman, the new generation of scholars is also broadening the breadth and scope of their research because they recognize that this country "was also the recipient of outside influences and a learner, like all nations, in a century fraught with new and terrible experiences." In the article, she encouraged her colleagues to continue to "base their work on multinational sources obtained in the appropriate countries in the appropriate languages." Hoffman also described these new international and comparative approaches and methodologies as an important component of the "New Diplomatic History."⁵

For a host of reasons, Cold War themes have dominated much of the emerging new scholarship. The unexpected collapse of

⁴Kyle Longley, "Internationalizing the Teaching of United States Foreign Relations," *Perspectives*, 34:8 (November 1996): 23-26, 30, 34, and Carl J. Guarneri, "Out of Its Shell: Internationalizing the Teaching of United States History," *Perspectives*, 35:2 (February 1997): 1, 5-8.

⁵Elizabeth Cobbs Hoffman, "Diplomatic History and the Meaning of Life: Toward a Global American History," *Diplomatic History*, 21:4 (Fall 1997), 500-1.

the Soviet Union, the opening of previously inaccessible archives throughout Russia and eastern Europe, and successful public dissemination programs like the Cold War International History Project (CWIHP) have all facilitated this reexamination of topics from a refreshing and insightful multi-archival, multilingual, and international perspective. During the past decade alone, diplomatic historians have utilized these new approaches and materials to reexamine the origins of the Cold War, the Korean conflict, the occupation and division of Germany, and the Cuban Missile Crisis, among others.

The foreign policy record of Great Britain has also proven to be a useful research tool for practitioners of the "New Diplomatic History." On a number of occasions during the past few years, newly released or discovered British archival materials have been showcased in the pages of this *Newsletter*.⁶ During the same period, nearly half a dozen articles addressing various aspects of the Anglo-American relationship and utilizing primary documentation from both countries have also appeared in *Diplomatic History*.⁷

⁶Tor Egil Førland, "Eisenhower, Export Controls, and the Parochialism of Historians of American Foreign Relations," *Newsletter*, 24:4 (December 1993): 4-17; Tor Egil Førland, "Eisenhower, Export Controls, and the Perils of Diplomatic History: A Reply to Spaulding," *Newsletter*, 25:3 (September 1994): 9-22; Robert Mark Spaulding, "Once Again — Eisenhower and Export Controls: A Reply to Tor Førland," *Newsletter*, 25:4 (December 1994): 36-40; Fraser J. Harbutt, "Recently Released Files from British Intelligence Records, 1943-1945," *Newsletter*, 27:1 (March 1996): 27-31; John W. Young, "British Records Available on CD-Rom," *Newsletter*, 27:4 (December 1996): 20-24.

⁷Arthur Combs, "The Path Not Taken: The British Alternative to U.S. Policy in Vietnam, 1954-1956," *Diplomatic History*, 19:1 (Winter 1995): 33-57; William N. Tilchin, "Theodore Roosevelt, Anglo-American Relations, and the Jamaica Incident of 1907," *Diplomatic History*, 19:3

In the British case, the research interest of diplomatic historians has been driven by a host of different factors. Great Britain was one of America's closest wartime and postwar allies, ranking only second behind it in terms of naval and air power when World War II ended, and third in total GNP. These realities alone made London an extremely important actor in the global economy and in the various confrontations that evolved into the Cold War. Historians exploring United States (US) relations with Latin America, the Caribbean, the Middle East, and Asia have similarly recognized that Great Britain continued to play an important economic, strategic, and diplomatic role in those regions until well into the postwar period, making the British perspective an essential component of any comprehensive research plan. The attention that American scholars continue to devote to British documentation and perspectives may also be a byproduct of the fact that the contents of the Public Records Office (PRO) are written in English, making them readily accessible even to those lacking foreign language skills.

Given this list of criteria, why are historians not utilizing Canada's substantial foreign policy record as well? After all, the National Archives of Canada (NAC) are located just across the US border in Ottawa, making them even more accessible — and affordable, an important consideration in these days of diminishing research funds — to the average diplomatic historian than the PRO. Like their British equivalents,

(Summer 1995): 395-405; Laura Belmonte, "Anglo-American Relations and the Dismissal of MacArthur," *Diplomatic History*, 19:4 (Fall 1995): 641-667; Douglas Little, "His Finest Hour?: Eisenhower, Lebanon, and the 1958 Middle East Crisis," *Diplomatic History*, 20:1 (Winter 1996): 27-54; Robert Vitalis, "The 'New Deal' in Egypt: The Rise of Anglo-American Commercial Competition in World War II and the Fall of Neocolonialism," *Diplomatic History*, 20:2 (Spring 1996): 211-239.

Canadian diplomatic records for the postwar era are also written in English for the most part.⁸ Moreover, Canada was an important US ally, especially during World War II and the early stages of the Cold War, an important supplier of raw materials for America's war economy, and an essential forward site for that country's nuclear weapons and air defense systems.

Canada was also a prominent foreign policy actor in its own right. In 1945, it fielded the third largest navy and fourth largest air force in the world, and was second only to the United States as a source of financial credit to war-ravaged Europe. Even Great Britain was a major debtor nation in comparison. All three Atlantic and Anglo-Saxon countries were founding members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the United Nations (UN). Canada was also a partner — although admittedly a junior one — in the wartime Manhattan Project, and in September 1945 it was a defector to Canada, Igor Gouzenko, who first revealed the extent of Soviet espionage activities in the west.

Unfortunately, when historians of a superpower like the United States turn their attention to the foreign policy record of a smaller neighboring power like Canada, the tendency is to pay it little notice, or to merely focus on the study of bilateral issues. Indeed, a relatively large number of recent books have examined Canadian-American relations and demonstrated the immense value to be gained by conducting

⁸Despite Canada's large francophone population, and subsequent efforts to promote bilingualism at the federal level, most inner- and inter-departmental communications generated by Canada's Department of External Affairs during the period covered by the volumes under review here (1947-1954) continued to be conducted in the English language.

comparative research in the archives of both countries.⁹ More Canada-US scholars are also emerging from North American graduate schools each year,¹⁰ and a symposium on bilateral relations is being planned for the 24th Annual

⁹Several years ago, Reginald C. Stuart — author of *United States Expansionism and British North America: 1775-1871* (Chapel Hill: 1988) — wrote a review essay for *Diplomatic History* 18:3 (Summer 1994): 405-14). In that article, Stuart summarized three recent works about the history of Canadian-American diplomacy. The books he selected were J.L. Granatstein and Norman Hillmer, *For Better or For Worse: Canada and the United States to the 1990s* (Toronto: 1990), Robert Bothwell, *Canada and the United States: The Politics of Partnership* (New York: 1992), and Gordon T. Stewart, *The American Response to Canada since 1776* (East Lansing: 1992). More recently, John Herd Thompson and Stephen J. Randall collaborated in the writing of *Canada and the United States: Ambivalent Allies* (Athens: 1994), and Charles F. Doran has co-edited two major collections of essays that also deal with bilateral themes: with Gregory P. Marchildon (eds), *The NAFTA Puzzle: Political Parties and Trade in North America* (Boulder: 1994), and with Alvin Paul Drischler (eds), *A New North America: Cooperation and Enhanced Interdependence* (Westport: 1996). American sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset also continues to utilize Canada as a comparative model for his ongoing work, including *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada* (Toronto: 1989) and his more recent study, *American Exceptionalism: A Double-Edged Sword* (New York: 1996). *American Exceptionalism* was also given a prominent analysis by three reviewers in the *American Historical Review* earlier this year, 102:3 (June 1997): 748-74.

¹⁰According to SHAFR's "U.S. Foreign Affairs Doctoral Dissertations List" (published annually in *Diplomatic History* until 1994, and in the *SHAFR Newsletter* since then), at least four Ph.D. dissertations have been completed each year since 1993 on Canadian-American foreign policy issues, more than half by students attending American universities.

Meeting of SHAFR in June 1998.¹¹ But practitioners of the "New Diplomatic History" may be pleasantly surprised when they discover how immensely valuable a Canadian perspective can actually be in researching a host of other foreign policy topics besides the most obvious one of bilateral relations.

Priscilla Roberts' recent article in *Diplomatic History*, for instance, demonstrated the value of exploring broader regional and global themes.¹² No country was a stronger promoter of Atlanticism during the postwar period than Canada, and none was better placed to play the role of "honest broker" between its giant continental neighbor to the south and its important Commonwealth friend and partner across the Atlantic. Meanwhile, as a smaller power increasingly dependent on US trade and investment, Canada often found common cause with the emerging states of the developing world or championed international organizations like the UN as a counterweight to American continental and global hegemony. Since the study

¹¹SHAFR is planning a major symposium on bilateral relations at the Canadian Embassy when their membership meets in the Washington, D.C. area next June, and there is talk of holding the Annual Meeting in Canada within the next few years. If this happens, SHAFR will simply be joining a trend that seems to be common these days among professional academic organizations based in the US. During 1997, the International Studies Association (ISA) met in Toronto, and the Center for the Study of the Presidency held their Annual Leadership Conference in Ottawa. The American Studies Association (ASA) and the Canadian Association for American Studies (CAAS) also held a joint Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. this year, to be followed by another joint meeting in Toronto in 1999. The Organization of American Historians (OAH) also selected Toronto as host site for their 1999 meeting.

¹²Priscilla Roberts, "The Anglo-American Theme: American Visions of an Atlantic Alliance, 1914-1933," *Diplomatic History*, 21:1 (Summer 1997): 333-64.

of the Cold War and its origins has attracted so much renewed attention from diplomatic historians in recent years, the perspective of a country situated on the front line of the superpower confrontation can also provide valuable insights.

The *Documents on Canadian External Relations (DCER)* Series

At least part of the demand for primary research material for use in compiling the "New Diplomatic History" is addressed in an ongoing series of official volumes entitled *Documents on Canadian External Relations (DCER)*. These publications are produced by the Historical Section of Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (Canadian Government Printing Office, phone: 819-956-4800, fax: 819-994-1495), and are roughly equivalent to the U.S. State Department's *Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS)* series, the published collection of American diplomatic records with which most SHAFR members are much better acquainted.

Thus far, a total of twenty *DCER* volumes have been produced and made available to historians and other researchers around the world. The first volume in the series covers the period 1909-1919, and subsequent ones have dealt with increasingly smaller time frames.¹³ Beginning with Volume 12, each successive release now deals with only a

¹³Previous releases in the *DCER* series have included the following: Volume 1 (1909-1918); Volume 2 (Paris Peace Conference); Volume 3 (1919-1925); Volume 4 (1926-1930); Volume 5 (1931-1935); Volume 6 (1936-1939); Volume 7 (1939-1941, Part 1); Volume 8 (1939-1941, Part 2); Volume 9 (1942-1943); Volume 10 (1944-1945, Part 1); Volume 11 (1944-1945, Part 2); Volume 12 (1946).

single year of Canadian external affairs,¹⁴ and contains as many as 2,000 pages of text and just over 1,000 documents, most published in their entirety. Unfortunately, production of the *DCER* series is lagging significantly behind its State Department counterpart, with Volume 20 (1954) published last month, and only one additional volume expected to be produced in each subsequent year.

Nonetheless, the *DCER* series represents the most important published record available to the diplomatic historian to explain the formulation and implementation of major Canadian foreign policy decisions, and detail the significant international events and trends that affected that country. For US researchers, the materials contained within these volumes also document the efforts made by Canada and other smaller powers to guide or influence — often successfully — American policy decisions, especially during the Cold War era. They also provide a contemporary third party perspective on any number of postwar issues involving the United States and other powers. In some cases the *DCER* volumes even make available important primary materials not contained in the equivalent *FRUS* releases.

Most documents included in the *DCER* volumes originate in the Ottawa archives of the Department of External Affairs (DEA) and the Privy Council Office (PCO, which serves the Canadian Prime Minister and Cabinet). These materials are often supplemented by the records of other important government departments like Defence, Finance, and Trade and Commerce, as well as the personal papers of various Canadian officials and ministers. Recent volumes are also beginning to

¹⁴The term “external affairs” is the Canadian equivalent of what most Americans refer to as “foreign relations.”

follow the *FRUS* example of employing more extensive introductory notes and footnotes to better place the individual documents in their historical context.

While the State Department Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation recently expressed continued concern about the slow progress being made in declassifying materials for inclusion in the *FRUS* volumes,¹⁵ the editors for the *DCER* series face relatively fewer restrictions of that nature. This is partly because their work remains more limited in scope and narrowly focused, with primary reliance on the DEA records. From this perspective at least, Canada was fortunate in that it lacked an equivalent to the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to complicate either its foreign policy, or its subsequent declassification and public disclosure efforts.

The editor assigned to work on each successive volume of the *DCER* series is granted complete freedom of access to relevant departmental records, including materials that would otherwise remain closed to the scrutiny of public researchers. Similar freedom is generally granted to each editor for the selection and declassification of documents intended for inclusion in the published *DCER* volumes. In cases where documents are excluded from the volumes for national security reasons, or because of concerns for information deemed personal in nature according to Canada's Privacy Act, those deletions are indicated in the text and introduction.

***DCER* Volumes 13-20 (1947-1954)**

¹⁵Warren F. Kimball to the Hon. Madeleine K. Albright, June 16, 1997, Report of the State Department Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation (Historical Advisory Committee).

The portion of the series summarized in this article deals with an important phase of Canada's evolution as a state, as well as an eventful phase of its postwar external relations and the origins of the Cold War. At the beginning of this period, the long reign of William Lyon Mackenzie King (Prime Minister of Canada almost continually since 1921) was finally drawing to a close. While his Liberal Party dominated Canada's federal Parliament for at least another decade, foreign policy leadership in Ottawa was subsequently assumed by two individuals.¹⁶ One was Louis St. Laurent, who became Secretary of State for External Affairs in 1946 and Prime Minister in 1948, and then won back-to-back federal elections in 1949 and 1953. The other was his deputy, Lester B. Pearson, who was promoted from Under-Secretary of State to Secretary of State for External Affairs during the same period.

The close partnership that developed between these two men — one a prominent French-Canadian politician; the other an Anglophone foreign service officer — dominated the formulation of Canadian foreign policy for more than a decade. St. Laurent and Pearson differed from the more cautious Mackenzie King most significantly in their determination to have Ottawa pursue a more activist foreign policy and accept new international obligations, particularly through active membership in the UN and NATO.¹⁷ In each

¹⁶The Department of External Affairs also continued to expand during the years of St. Laurent-Pearson stewardship, although its total staff still numbered well below 1,000 stationed both at headquarters in Ottawa, and at approximately 40 missions and consular offices abroad.

¹⁷There was a surprising amount of continuity in the senior staffing of vital overseas posts during this period. Hume Wrong served as Canada's Ambassador in Washington during much of the period from 1946-1953, while Norman Robertson remained High Commissioner in London from

of the eight volumes summarized here, Canada's role as a founding and prominent member of these multilateral bodies, and others like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), is covered extensively.

Of the major themes addressed throughout Volumes 13-20, four in particular reflect Canada's ambivalent diplomatic position during the postwar period:

- First, as a nation acutely conscious of her international status, Canada pursued a role as an "honest broker" between her larger and more powerful Anglo-American allies, and as a "middle power" on the world stage in general;
- Second, Canadian political leaders recognized the reality of growing continental economic and military interdependence, but also manifested a stubborn determination to safeguard their country's sovereignty whenever possible against American global and continental hegemony;
- Third, Canada's concern about the perceived communist threat in Asia and Europe was tempered by repeated fears that American posturing and rhetoric might precipitate an unnecessary and undesired confrontation with either China or the Soviet Union;
- Fourth, the country's sympathetic response to the aspirations of emerging states of the developing world was complicated by Canada's own long-standing ties with European colonial powers that were important both as Cold War allies and economic partners.

meanwhile, the American-born C.D. Howe was Canada's influential Minister of Trade and Commerce throughout this period.

Honest Broker/Middle Power

Throughout Volumes 13-20, numerous Canadian foreign policy documents allude to a concept known as the "North Atlantic Triangle" that was very similar to the "Atlanticist" theme discussed by Priscilla Roberts recently in *Diplomatic History*. This framework of triangular diplomacy was based on traditional Anglo-Saxonism, and was reinforced by the cooperative America-Britain-Canada (ABC) relationships that emerged during World War II. In the postwar period, many Canadian officials saw themselves playing an important diplomatic role at the apex of the "North Atlantic Triangle" by maintaining and strengthening Ottawa's links to both London and Washington. In the words of Canada's representative to London in 1948,

A situation in which our special relationship with the United Kingdom can be identified with our special relationships with other countries in Western Europe and in which the United States will be providing a firm basis, both economically and probably militarily, for this link across the North Atlantic, seems to me such a providential solution for so many of our problems that I feel we should go to great lengths and even incur considerable risks in order to consolidate our good fortune and ensure our proper place in this new partnership. (Volume 14, Document 927)

The UN was another venue where Canada pursued an expanded international role after World War II. In Volume 13 (1947) Canada is shown gaining her first seat on the Security Council, which in turn embroiled that country in the international diplomatic crises in Palestine and Korea. Volumes 18 and 19 (1952-1953) detail the election of Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs, Lester B. Pearson, to the Presidency of the General Assembly. During

1953 he even became the leading candidate for the job of UN Secretary-General, although his nomination was vetoed by the Soviet Union.¹⁸

While Canada often worked with groups of like-minded smaller powers in an effort to influence certain of the more objectionable foreign policy initiatives emanating from Washington, Canadian and American diplomats also cooperated at times to influence international relations for mutual advantage. Both countries were charter members of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) and the GATT, and among other things, their diplomats and trade officials collaborated to force open the restricted markets of postwar Europe to North American imports.

Canada-US Relations

As mentioned earlier, diplomatic historians would most expect bilateral issues to be extensively covered in the *DCER* series. Volume 14 (1948) records the effort to negotiate a comprehensive free trade agreement with the United States during the postwar period, a failed precursor to the 1988 North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). In Volume 16 (1950), extensive attention is devoted to the stationing of US nuclear equipped weapons on Canadian territory for the first time. This was also the year that American aircraft jettisoned and detonated an unarmed atomic bomb over the St. Lawrence Seaway (Volume 16, Document 837), spurring renewed concerns about the command and control of those weapons. The emergence of McCarthyism in

¹⁸Pearson was also destined to play an important mediating role in the 1956 Suez Crisis, for which he won the Nobel Peace Prize the following year. His actions will be covered in a later volume of the *DCER* series.

the US also generated obvious concern from Canadian officials during this period.

Volume 17 (1951) details preparations by both countries for the further integration of continental defense ties, culminating eventually in the creation of the North American Air Defence Command (NORAD) in 1957. Volume 19 (1953) demonstrates the concern that existed among officials in Ottawa over the election of a new Republican administration, as well as growing protectionist sentiments in Washington. During the same period, Ottawa continued to reject repeated invitations to join the Organization of American States (OAS), overtures which it continued to ignore until the 1980s.

Volume 20 (1954), is especially dominated by bilateral issues as Canadian officials continued to balance growing concern for their nation's sovereignty with a firm commitment to continental cooperation. In defense relations, this was exemplified by the continued negotiation of eventual agreements for a Distant Early Warning (DEW) line and joint command over Canadian and American forces stationed on the continent (NORAD). In the economic sphere, Congress finally approved joint Canadian and American funding and control of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1954, but only after a contentious political debate in Washington. At the same time, Ottawa was concerned with an increasing number of protectionist measures being pursued by Congress against imports of Canadian natural gas, hydro-electric power, wheat, dairy products, and other goods.

A series of bilateral meetings involving senior officials from both governments were also initiated during 1950 to share strategic evaluations in times of global crisis. These documents are particularly noteworthy because records of the

1951 and 1954 meetings (which were not declassified in time for publication in the *FRUS* equivalent) offer the foreign policy researcher an intriguing glimpse of the American strategic view at the time, as well as the reception of that view by a smaller ally. The Joint Ministerial Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs — a more permanent bilateral body also created during this period to better coordinate policies between the two countries — provided an additional forum to exchange views on continental and international economic issues, and yet another important source of valuable information for the diplomatic historian.

Cold War:

All eight volumes detail Canadian fears about the looming Cold War, and ambivalence about its own role and attitude *vis a vis* the United States. Because of Ottawa's presumed "special relationship" with Washington, and because Canadian officials were vitally interested in decisions being made there, they often demanded the right to interfere or express opinions in crises when they felt the situation warranted.

This tendency is reflected in a 1947 memorandum written in response to the publication of George Kennan's "X Article" in *Foreign Affairs*. At the time, Canadian officials predicted that "The Pax Britannica of the nineteenth century is to be replaced in the later twentieth century by a Pax Americana," but also noted that

the fact that we are in the same boat with the United States makes it wholly proper for us to tell the United States to stop rocking the boat or driving holes in its bottom... If we play our cards well we can exert an influence at Washington out of all proportion to the relative importance of our strength in war compared with that of the United States. The game is difficult; the issues

will be delicate; but with skill we can play it successfully.
(Volume 13, Document 226)

Sometimes, Canadian diplomatic intervention was unsuccessful. In his memoirs, U. Alexis Johnson noted that Canada's Ambassador in Washington, Hume Wrong, was "particularly acerbic in its criticisms" of American management of the POW issue during the Korean conflict, and constantly "berated" US officials, producing "some of the most vigorous conversations I have ever had with a friendly ambassador."¹⁹

The feeling of having a great deal at stake, but only limited room for maneuver, can also be witnessed during early discussions about NATO in June 1948. At the time, Canada's Ambassador suggested that Ottawa was more prepared than Washington to commit to the defense of western Europe, and provided a surprising assessment of the American official position:

It is still uncertain whether the State Department is fully convinced that a treaty commitment is desirable... I think that Lovett is inclined to be sympathetic but not fully satisfied on the treaty proposal. Bohlen still tends to oppose it, while Kennan appears to be converted. Hickerson is the staunchest advocate. Probably our main concern next week should be to play up all the arguments for a treaty commitment, from our more detached point of view as a North American country and as a smaller Power. (Volume 14, Document 352)

¹⁹U. Alexis Johnson and Jef Olivarius McAllister, *The Right Hand of Power* (Englewood Cliffs: 1984), p. 141.

Canada's ambivalent responses to various Cold War crises can be witnessed throughout the *DCER* series. The documents contained in Volume 14 (1948) demonstrate that Ottawa was unwilling to become actively involved in joint western efforts to break the Berlin blockade. Yet only two years later, Volume 16 (1950) describes the return of Canadian troops to Europe for the first time since the end of World War II in fulfillment of her NATO obligations. Ottawa's ambivalent Cold War stance can also be found in Volumes 16-20 (1950-53), which document Canada's supportive military role in the Korean conflict at the same time as she actively encouraged a negotiated peace there. In Volume 17 (1951) as well, Canada is shown providing only lukewarm support for an American-sponsored resolution to exclude China from the UN.

The North Atlantic Council provided an additional forum for Canadian policy officials to make their views known on a variety of international issues. All of the *DCER* volumes discussed here devote particular attention to the peace settlements in central Europe, and concerns about German rearmament and reunification. North Atlantic Council reports and other documents also detail Canadian efforts to collaborate with other smaller NATO members in attempting to shape America's role in the alliance. Each of the *DCER* volumes also includes reports on NATO ministerial meetings which the counterpart *FRUS* volumes for 1952-4 were not permitted to carry. These are particularly significant for diplomatic historians because within their texts, officials from Ottawa and Washington — as well as government representatives of their European allies — share their varying impressions of the current international situation and the major personalities involved.

Decolonization:

During the postwar period, Canadian diplomats attempted to tread a careful path between loyalty to their traditional European allies and sympathy for their newly independent friends in the developing world, particularly in Asia and Africa. Despite Ottawa's limited direct interest in the developing post-colonial world, diligent foreign policy researchers will find scattered throughout the *DCER* series (particularly in sections devoted to the UN and the Commonwealth) a wealth of material detailing perceived American motives and behavior, and efforts by Canadian officials to forge a consensus on issues of decolonization, development, and Cold War confrontation.

Canada's concern with the sensitivities of the developing world, and its determination to attempt to win them over as western friends within a Cold War context in spite of Washington, can be seen particularly clearly in an October 1950 telegram from Canada's UN delegation reporting on passage of a resolution on Korea:

What I find most worrying is the inability of certain people in Washington to realize that it is not enough to occupy North Korea; that it is more important to remove, if possible, the impression in Asian minds, especially in Indian minds, that the policies and designs of the United States in this whole Korean question are not above suspicion. Apparently in Washington they feel that it is more important not to interfere with the military timetable than to make every possible move to bring fighting to an end in a way which would command the approval of Asian members of the United Nations. I feel that we will have to keep this weakness, as I contrue it, of the United States Government in mind in our consideration of the problem of Canadian association with the relief and rehabilitation work in Korea... (Volume 16, Document 114)

Each volume also explains in different ways the important role played by Canadian diplomats in the fundamental — and often wrenching — redefinition of the Commonwealth during the postwar period. Canadian officials also played a prominent role in the creation and implementation of the Colombo Plan, which provided financial and technical assistance to developing countries in Asia in an effort to maintain economic and political stability in the region and forestall Communist encroachment. Volumes 14 and 15 (1948-1949) are also interesting, because they outline Ottawa's attempts to extricate the Netherlands from the Indonesian conflict.

Finally, in Volume 20 (1954), scholars interested in American policy in Southeast Asia during the postwar period will be intrigued by Canada's expanding diplomatic role. Besides maintaining a close relationship with India, protesting American military aid to Pakistan, and making a significant financial contribution to the Colombo Plan, Canada was also an important participant in the Geneva Conference on Korea, and was designated "western" representative on the three International Commissions erected to supervise the ceasefires in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Throughout the latter process in particular, cooperation with the United States remained close, though deliberately discreet.

Conclusion:

The *DCER* series, which is similar in many ways to the *FRUS* volumes with which most diplomatic historians are much more familiar, is an important source of primary research material. Because it contains a significant portion of the foreign policy record of an important American ally, trade partner, and neighbor, it can provide an essential research tool for the historian of Canadian foreign policy or bilateral relations. But the *DCER* volumes are useful for much more than the

obvious. In a period when diplomatic historians are reassessing the origins of the Cold War, and being urged to avoid parochialism and engage in more international and comparative history, Canada's foreign policy record is certain to be of growing interest to researchers working in a variety of fields and topics. The *Documents on Canadian External Relations* (DCER) series is certain to prove of immense worth to those exploring the origins of NATO or the UN, decolonization and the transformation of the British Commonwealth, and various crises that took place in Asia and postwar Europe during the early phases of the Cold War. Though only a starting point, these volumes are clearly an essential research tool for the scholar engaged in a serious pursuit of the "New Diplomatic History."

WOMEN NGO REPRESENTATIVES AND UNCLOS III, 1973-1982

by
Ralph B. Levering
DAVIDSON COLLEGE

Where can scholars of international relations in the second half of the twentieth century find reasonably large numbers of significant women to study?

This was not a question that interested me greatly when I offered, nearly nine years ago, to work with my mother, Miriam Levering, to write a book on her experiences and those of her colleagues in the so-called Neptune Group of

non-governmental organizations (NGOs)¹ during the Third U.N. Conference on Law of the Sea (UNCLOS III). The conference met sixteen times — normally in sessions lasting from four to seven weeks — between December 1973 and December 1982. But it is now a question that interests me, and one to which I can offer a partial answer. One place to find numerous significant women is in the U.N.-sponsored conferences that have been both a frequent and an often important component of international politics since the 1960's.² More specifically, my mother's and my forthcoming book suggests, scholars should examine the work of women

¹"Neptune Group" is the name that delegates to UNCLOS III gave to representatives of three relatively small lobbying/educational organizations based in Washington: the Ocean Education Project, the United Methodist Law of the Sea Project, and the U.S. Committee for the Oceans. The Neptune Group gained such prestige during UNCLOS III — and Miriam Levering and Lee Kimball were so open to participation by others — that several other NGO representatives and academics considered themselves to be members of the group.

²Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence* 2nd ed. (Glenview: Scott, Foresman, 1989), contains a theoretical and empirical discussion of the change in the international system toward "complex interdependence." The "ocean issue area" is discussed on pages 86-98. Another book that takes a commendably broad view of contemporary international relations is Alan K. Henrikson, ed., *Negotiating World Order: The Artisanry and Architecture of Global Diplomacy* (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1986); see especially T.T.B. Koh, "Negotiating a New World Order for the Sea," 33-45.

in NGOs in these conferences and in the national and transnational politics that accompanied them.³

This research note makes three main points. The first is to demonstrate, through quantitative analysis of references to individuals in the text of our study, that NGOs were the only grouping in which women played substantial roles at UNCLOS III and in the politics surrounding it in the United States.⁴ The second is to describe the work of three American women, all associated with NGOs, who made especially noteworthy contributions and thus do not deserve their current anonymity in scholarly writing on UNCLOS III.⁵

³Ralph B. Levering and Miriam Levering, *Citizen Action for Global Change; The Neptune Group and Law of the Sea* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, forthcoming spring 1998). For a summary of this research, see Ralph B. Levering, "Brokering the Law of the Sea: The Neptune Group," in Jackie G. Smith, Charles Chatfield, and Ron Pagnucco, eds., *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1997). In addition to providing case studies like the one on the Neptune Group, this book offers an excellent introduction to the role of non-governmental actors in contemporary world politics.

⁴At least one European woman who worked as an NGO representative also played a fairly important role in UNCLOS III: Elisabeth Mann-Borgese, who headed the NGO Pacem in Maribus.

⁵Although books on UNCLOS III often include discussions of NGO activities, they normally do not mention the contributions of individuals. This is the case both in the best overview of the conference, Clyde Sanger's *Ordering the Oceans; the Making of the Law of the Sea* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), and in the outstanding book on the seabed mining negotiations, Marcus G. Schmidt's *Common Heritage or Common Burden? The United States Position on the Development of a Regime for Deep Sea-bed Mining in the Law of the Sea Convention* (New

The third is to argue both that gaining a comprehensive understanding of developments in recent international affairs requires moving beyond the current paradigm in historical writings on U.S. foreign relations in the 1970's and 1980's, a paradigm focused disproportionately on Cold War issues and almost entirely on men's participation in the making of U.S. foreign policy, and that careful comparative analysis of women's roles in international conferences would help scholars accomplish this transition.

Many scholars, including historians Joan Hoff and Emily S. Rosenberg and political scientists Nancy E. McGlen and Meredith Reid Sarkees, have observed that, as Hoff put it a decade ago, "women have played, and continue to play, insignificant roles in determining U.S. diplomacy because they were (and are) not present in top policy-making circles."⁶

Although this conclusion may require some modification now that Madeline Albright is serving as secretary of state, it accurately described the gender of high U.S. officials — though not all influences on U.S. foreign policy — when UNCLOS III took place during the 1970s and early 1980s. As

York: Oxford University Press, 1989). It is even true in a book in which the "Quaker/Methodist group" figures prominently in the story: James K. Sebenius, *Negotiating the Law of the Sea* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984).

⁶Joan Hoff-Wilson, "Conclusion: Of Mice and Men," in Edward P. Crapol, ed., *Women and American Foreign Policy: Lobbyists, Critics, and Insiders* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1987), 174; Emily S. Rosenberg, "Gender," *Journal of American History* 77 (June 1990): 116; and Nancy E. McGlen and Meredith Reid Sarkees, *The Status of Women in Foreign Policy* (New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1995), 3-4.

table 1 shows, our book includes 38 U.S. officials who played important roles on law of the sea; all of these officials, mentioned or quoted a total of 196 times, were men.

Table 1

	#Women	#Men	%Women	Ref. to Women	Ref. to Men	% Ref to Women
I. Officials						
1. U.S. officials	0	38	0%	0	196	0%
2. Memb. of Cong	2	29	6.5%	3	68	4.2%
3. Cong. staffers	0	6	0%	0	11	0%
4. Foreign diplomats	0	19	0%	0	74	0%
5. U.N. officials	1	10	9.1%	1	18	5.3%
totals	3	102	2.9%	4	367	1.1%
II. Non-govern. actors						
1. Neptune Group	12	15	44.4%	185	129	58.9%
2. Other NGO reps	8	15	34.8%	20	29	40.8%
3. Mining Ind. reps.	0	11	0%	0	28	0%
4. Academics	1	17	5.6%	1	32	3.0%
5. Other experts	0	6	0%	0	7	0%
6. Journalists	0	6	0%	0	6	0%
Total	21	70	23.1%	206	231	47.1%

Two other categories of officials, congressional staffers and foreign diplomats, also are all male. The number of women

in the final two categories, members of Congress and U.N. officials, is so small that they easily can be named here: Representatives Leonor Sullivan (Dem., Missouri) and Millicent Fenwick (Rep., New Jersey) and U.N. official Gwenda Ward. As noted in the table, women account for only 1.1% of all the references to officials in the book.

In contrast, women account for 47.1% of all the references to non-governmental actors. The percentage is well over 50% when limited to the first two categories (Neptune Group and other NGO representatives); it is brought down several percentage points to 47.1 by the fact that three of the other four categories are all-male, and the fourth, "academics," includes only one female (Professor Ann L. Hollick of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies).

Finally, although more men than women occur in both "Neptune Group" and "other NGO representatives," the people who are mentioned at least five times are more likely to be women. Five Neptune Group women — but only two men — are mentioned five times or more, led by Lee Kimball with 70 references and Miriam Levering with 69. Although the total number of references to other NGO representatives is much smaller, two of their representatives received at least five references, whereas no male representatives received that many. These two women were Anita Yurchyshyn of the Sierra Club (6 references) and Patricia Forkan of the Humane Society of the United States (5 references).⁷ Women thus

⁷The relatively small number of references to Yurchyshyn and Forkan, especially when compared with the much larger number of references to Kimball and Levering, does not imply that Kimball's and Levering's contributions to UNCLOS III were greater to the same degree. The book is primarily about the contributions of members of the Neptune Group, not those of other organizations.

played important roles both in the Neptune Group and in other non-governmental organizations with an interest in UNCLOS III.

The biggest thrill for many members of the Neptune Group, some of whom had worked for nearly eleven years on issues surrounding UNCLOS III, occurred at the signing session for the treaty in Montego Bay, Jamaica, in December 1982. In his presidential address, Tommy T.B. Koh of Singapore praised the group as the NGO representatives who had contributed the most to the conference. Koh did not mention any other NGOs. After discussing eight other "features of the negotiating process...which were productive," Koh offered his ninth point:

I should also acknowledge the role played by the non-governmental organizations, such as the Neptune Group. They provided the Conference with three valuable services. They brought independent experts to meet with delegations, thus enabling us to have an independent source of information on technical issues. They assisted representatives from developing countries to narrow the technical gap between them and their counterparts from developed countries. They also provided us with opportunities to meet, away from the Conference, in a more relaxed atmosphere, to discuss some of the most difficult issues confronted by the Conference.⁸

⁸"Statement by President of Law of Sea Conference at Opening Meeting at Montego Bay Session." United Nations Press Release, 6 December 1982, Miriam Levering files.

Miriam Levering was one of the two people without whose efforts this tribute almost certainly would not have been made. With her husband, Sam Levering, and with other world federalists and Quakers, Miriam founded the first Neptune Group organization, the U.S. Committee for the Oceans, early in 1972. Headed by Sam, the U.S. Committee led a broader NGO effort throughout the 1970's to prevent the passage in Congress of unilateral U.S. deep seabed mining legislation that, in the Leverings' view, would severely damage the negotiations at UNCLOS III. In January 1973 Miriam founded the Ocean Education Project (OEP), an organization that sought to educate the American people (including members of the administration and Congress) to support what one scholar aptly has called the "new regime for the oceans"⁹ that was likely to emerge from UNCLOS III.

Levering was the primary catalyst/encourager of the NGO effort both in Washington and at UNCLOS III. She brought four major strengths to her work. First, she was an inspiring motivator and hence an effective builder of networks of people who were willing to advance what she and they defined as a common cause. Because of her charismatic personality and networking skills, the national organization of United Methodist women plus the denomination's U.N. office enthusiastically joined the crusade for ocean law. Specifically, she inspired leaders of United Methodist women to establish the United Methodist Law of the Sea Project (UMLSP) early in 1975. She also successfully encouraged dozens of young people and several older people, often working for little or no pay, to devote their summers or to take time off from college or graduate school to assist Lee Kimball and herself in their

⁹Guilio Pontecorvo, ed., *The New Order of the Oceans* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986).

joint efforts. And partly because of Levering's personality and ability to make friends, the Neptune Group quickly became most delegates' favorite NGO working at the conference.

Second, Levering was an able fund raiser. In addition to larger total contributions from wealthy individuals and foundations, she raised perhaps \$10,000 to \$15,000 each year from 1973 through 1982 from individuals and from local churches (prompted by individuals within them) who gave to OEP because they trusted that the Leverings would put the money to good use.

Third, Levering was a prolific, engaging writer. In the newspaper published at the conference that gave the group its name (Neptune) and in many other publications, she worked hard to make the stories and editorials entertaining as well as instructive. Many of the scores of letters she wrote each month, largely to financial backers and to other NGO representatives, also were written with verve and individuality.

Fourth and perhaps most important, Levering had good political instincts. She learned in the early years of the conference that, if delegates and U.N. officials wanted anything from NGOs, it was assistance and not advice. Thus, in contrast with many other NGO representatives working at UNCLOS (a couple of whom many delegates strongly disliked), Levering and those who worked with her carefully avoided the temptation to urge the delegates to accept their vision of what the treaty should include. Instead, they focused on doing research on difficult issues — research that was often reported in Neptune and then was incorporated in modified form into the negotiating text — and on setting up seminars with outside experts who helped the delegates move toward achieving consensus on a treaty. They also met

frequently with individual delegates, offering suggestions on how to move the negotiations forward and conveying confidential messages from one key negotiator to another. In these and other ways, they served as catalysts and honest brokers in ways that delegates on different sides of particular issues genuinely appreciated.

The other person who helped inspire Koh's tribute to the Neptune Group was Lee Kimball, who headed the pro-UNCLOS work of the Methodist project both in Washington and at the conference. A full generation younger than the Leverings and equally committed to the success of UNCLOS III, Kimball was taking courses for her M.A. in international relations when the conference began. She was highly analytic and had, she recalled, a "secular, at times cynical style" that helped her establish effective personal relationships with some of the more hard-nosed delegates and mining company representatives.¹⁰ More personally reserved and more businesslike than Miriam Levering, Kimball emphasized what she had learned from her about cultivating personal relationships in a 1980 letter:

It is tough to forget my first meeting with Miriam, which took place at an evening sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment's Project Dialogue in 1973. You came up to me afterward and said something about how much I knew about Law of the Sea, "and so pretty too!" That was my first exposure to your highly effective technique which I later learned to adapt under your tutelage — leading with

¹⁰Lee Kimball to Ralph Levering, 4 January 1995, Ralph Levering files.

a compliment, rendering the personal touch and thus laying the groundwork for sustained future contact.¹¹

Kimball quickly developed a detailed knowledge of the substantive issues in the negotiations, especially those related to deep seabed mining. She also worked extremely hard: editing Neptune and establishing close relationships with negotiators at the conference, lobbying Congress and the administration, setting up seminars for delegates and U.N. officials, speaking to United Methodist groups across the United States, and completing scholarly articles between sessions, she often worked eighteen hours a day on law of the sea.

Kimball's analytical abilities, her growing interpersonal skills, her unsurpassed knowledge of the negotiations, and her hard work paid off. By the late 1970's she had become the star of the Neptune Group's work at UNCLOS III. Edward Miles, a professor at the University of Washington who attended many sessions of the conference, noted her "extraordinary access" to delegates; Arthur Paterson, a Neptune Group colleague, recalled her skill in "helping to identify a problem and bringing in outside experts"; and Koh described Kimball as "quietly competent," "a solid pro," "very hard working," and "very tactful and discreet."¹² Eleanor Smith, a Neptune Group intern who worked with Kimball at conference sessions in 1980 and 1981, remembered her as "an extremely quick thinker, able to cut through the

¹¹Lee Kimball to Miriam Levering, 18 November 1980, Miriam Levering files.

¹²Interviews with Edward Miles, 26 January 1990; with Arthur Paterson, 3 October 1989; and with Tommy Koh, 11 April 1990.

muddle to the heart of an issue.... She's also savvy. She knows the pulse of a situation, and who should be contacted to get a particular thing done." Smith elaborated on Kimball's contribution to the conference:

Lee was respected at the conference as being one of the few who really understood the implications of the treaty process, the policy issues that had to be decided, and the technical aspects. And that is no small feat, given the nature of this conference. She was regularly sought out by most delegates. The impression was that she was the pivotal person to see if you wanted an answer.¹³

A third American woman who made important contributions to UNCLOS III was Anita Yurchyshyn, the Sierra Club's leading expert on law of the sea who successfully worked for changes in the negotiating text that provided greater protections for the ocean environment. Whereas Levering might best be characterized as a catalyst/encourager and Kimball as an expert/honest broker, Yurchyshyn played the more traditional NGO role of advocate/expert.

Yurchyshyn's achievements were even more remarkable because of her need to juggle child-care responsibilities for young children back home in Boston with her husband, who also had to travel in his career. She talked about the difficulties in a 1990 interview:

I was never able to spend an entire six weeks [at the sessions of UNCLOS III]. Anya was born in 1977; it was difficult to leave her and Alexandra. But once I was on the [U.S.] delegation, I did go to Geneva for two to three weeks at a time, and George often had to rearrange his

¹³Interview with Eleanor Smith, 5 October 1989.

travel schedule. We always made sure that one parent was here.¹⁴

Before and during her time on the U.S. delegation in the late 1970's, Yurchyshyn served on the environmental subcommittee of the State Department's Public Advisory Committee on Law of the Sea. Encouraged by the head of the delegation, Elliot Richardson, himself a lover of nature who believed that support from environmentalists would be essential to get the treaty ratified, Yurchyshyn and other members of the subcommittee repeatedly made suggestions to Richardson and other U.S. negotiators to strengthen the protection of the ocean environment in the negotiating text.

Led by Yurchyshyn and Forkan, the environmentalists' greatest achievements at UNCLOS III were in elaborating the requirements for environmental regulations for deep seabed mining and in strengthening article 65 of the treaty, which sought to protect marine mammals. In Washington, Yurchyshyn, Forkan, and other environmentalists (notably Jim Barnes of the Center for Law and Social Policy) helped to ensure that the U.S. seabed mining legislation incorporated numerous provisions to protect the marine environment.

In addition to Richardson's support, the keys to the environmentalists' success were thorough knowledge of the negotiating texts and dogged determination to succeed. Yurchyshyn recalled an encounter with an unfriendly U.S. official that occurred on the day she became a member of the U.S. delegation:

He asks me out to lunch, my first day. I thought, what a nice, collegial thing to do. And then, without any

¹⁴Interview with Anita Yurchyshyn, 2 April 1990.

niceties or small talk, he leaned across the table from me and said, "Look, honey, you don't expect the United States government to spend its negotiating capital on your paltry environmental amendments, do you?"¹⁵

Judging correctly that she had Richardson's support, Yurchyshyn did not let this hostile comment intimidate her. Nor did she lose heart when Soviet delegates refused for more than two sessions to support a provision requiring the environmental monitoring of seabed mining. She recalled what happened after the Russians agreed, at the last minute, to accept it:

We finally resolved our differences [with the Russians], and then had to get it once again onto Engo's desk [Paul Engo of Cameroon was the head of the negotiating committee dealing with this issue]. And the door was closed. He said, "It's too late, it's too late, go away." And I remembered knocking and I wouldn't go away. And I said, "Chairman Engo, this is Anita. I've got good news." And he said, "It's too late." And I kept knocking and saying, "But you must listen." And he finally got it in.¹⁶

In a meeting of the Public Advisory Committee on 18 May 1979, Richardson cited the environmentalists' contributions at the recently concluded session in Geneva as "an outstanding example of the kind of help that we have received so consistently from members of this Committee...."¹⁷ The more detailed comments of the main U.S. negotiator on deep

¹⁵*Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ Transcript of meeting of Public Advisory Committee, 18 May 1979, p. 67; Sam Levering files.

seabed mining, George Aldrich, provide one of the best summaries of what NGO representatives, at their best, are able to accomplish in international negotiations:

the progress we made on the environmental protection of seabeds this time is owed entirely to the initiative taken by the members of the Advisory Committee who attended, representing the Environmental Subcommittee, and not simply in taking the initiative to force us to look at these problems, but in talking to the Secretariat, in lobbying other delegations and, in a very real way, in gently twisting people's arms, particularly at the very end of the session. We found that it took a lot of time and effort by Anita Yurchyshyn, who went around to see Paul Engo and the Soviets and everybody else, and I think it is a good example of what we can do in a cooperative way....¹⁸

In *Since Vietnam: The United States in World Affairs, 1973-1995*, H.W. Brands, one of diplomatic history's bright young stars, rightly emphasizes the "complexity of [international] life in the late twentieth century."¹⁹ Like many other scholars of recent U.S. foreign relations, however, Brands makes not a single reference in the book (at least not one that I have located) to an important arena in which that complexity was played out: the numerous U.N.-sponsored conferences that, among other things, often found delegates from the U.S. and other developed countries arguing with each other and with delegates from developing countries over such highly important issues as protection of the environment,

¹⁸*Ibid.*

¹⁹New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996, p. xi. The word "complexity" also appears twice in the book's penultimate paragraph (p. 171).

law of the sea, the establishment of international standards for the treatment of women, and the transfer of wealth from the minority of affluent nations to the majority of relatively poor ones.

Despite the frequent intensity of the arguments, several of these conferences, notably UNCLOS III and the subsequent negotiations on deep seabed mining in the early 1990's that secured the Clinton administration's acceptance of the treaty, produced agreements that are widely recognized as international law. Yet most scholars — and in particular most diplomatic historians — have shown little or no interest in these developments.²⁰

Similarly, many diplomatic historians and political scientists have shown little if any interest in studying the role of the NGO representatives (including many women) who have sought, often effectively as well as persistently, to influence the making of foreign policy in Washington and other capitals, to lobby international conferences and U.N. agencies to achieve desired results, and to provide often-welcome expertise to international conferences and agencies.²¹ Until more scholars develop this interest, and until the Cold War competition is in fact seen as one of several important phenomena in international relations during the second half of this century, a good portion of the interesting, consequential

²⁰One important exception is Mark H. Lytle, "An Environmental Approach to Diplomatic History." *Diplomatic History* 20:2 (Spring 1996): 279-300. See especially pages 298-99.

²¹One useful book, albeit overly present-minded, is Thomas Princen and Matthias Finger, *Environmental NGOs in World Politics; Linking the Local and the Global* (New York: Routledge, 1994).

history of our times will remain largely unknown and little taught.

MINUTES OF SHAFR COUNCIL MEETING

21 June 1997, Georgetown University

1. President Emily Rosenberg called the meeting to order.
2. Allan Spetter reported the winners of the Myrna Bernath Fellowships - Deborah Kisatsky and Mary Elise Sarotte.
3. Emily Rosenberg reported on the problems with the Ferrell award. Brad Perkins has taken over as chair of the committee.
4. Emily Rosenberg reported that the Holt award has gone to Max Friedman.
5. There was discussion of the problem of committee work, like that of the Ferrell award, not being done. Emily suggested that a letter go out to each committee chair, asking that the chair create a permanent file with instructions for the incoming committee chair. The new committee chairs should receive a file with information and the relevant due dates.
6. Allan Spetter reported Ann Jones' news from Blackwell that institutional subscriptions have been going up at about 10% per year.
7. There was discussion of the problem of people who do not meet their obligations to panel sessions. Geoff Smith

suggested that when the SHAFR conference program goes out, it should include notice that people not meeting the deadline must contact the chair of the session, and that people must provide a substitute if they cannot attend. Bill Brands suggested including telephone numbers and e-mail addresses for all participants on panels so that they can communicate more effectively. Chester Pach moved and Brands seconded that the above instructions and admonitions be included with the notice that panels have been accepted. The motion carried unanimously.

8. A formal resolution thanking the local arrangements and the program committee passed unanimously.

9. Keith Olson and San Walker reported on the 1998 conference, to be held 18-20 June at the University of Maryland Conference Center, with some sessions also at Archives II. There was discussion of the imperative need to have relatively inexpensive housing that is close to the conference center.

10. Emily Rosenberg said that because of the growing size of the annual conferences, SHAFR needs to consider the possibility of moving the conference to a hotel. In January 1998, when the Council will have a final report on the 1997 meeting, the Council will discuss the issues involved in possibly moving to a hotel.

11. In January 1998, the Council will also discuss the issue of how many papers to have at sessions.

12. Emily Rosenberg reported on the SHAFR-sponsored sessions at the upcoming AHA and OAH: a roundtable chaired by Arnie Offner on Nazi gold at the AHA and a

roundtable chaired by Mike Hogan on new work in diplomatic history at the OAH.

13. Emily Rosenberg proposed a resolution, which carried unanimously, that in the future the president and the vice-president of SHAFR organize general interest roundtables at the AHA and OAH conventions.

14. There was extensive discussion of the issue of moving the Presidential address from the AHA to the SHAFR annual meeting. Offner suggested that making such a move would further distance diplomatic history from the overall discipline of history. However, the Council has in a previous year passed a resolution to move the presidential address to the SHAFR meeting. Emily asked Arnie Offner to bring to the January 1998 meeting a proposal regarding when the presidential address should be given.

15. Dave Anderson moved that Arnie Offner be given the option to deliver his presidential address at the AHA if he so desires. The motion was seconded and passed.

16. Jonathan Utley reported on the SHAFR endowment.

a. SHAFR will unitize its endowment accounts, which will allow each specific endowment to reflect its growth in excess of the award amount.

b. The endowment committee needs to know how long *DH* will stay at its present location with its present subsidy from OSU in order to guide investment strategy.

c. Current dues provide ample operating revenues but will not be sufficient if *DH* requires additional direct support if it should leave OSU. The amount of a dues increase could be reduced by endowment income and income from a new publication contract. SHAFR needs to negotiate a profit-sharing agreement with Blackwell.

17. Emily Rosenberg reported that there has been a request to raise prizes, particularly of the Holt award. Emily asked Jonathan Utley to review the amount of money that goes to each of the prizes and to recommend in January whether the amounts need to be raised. Allan Spetter spoke to the necessity of increases. Arnie Offner suggested helping to defray the costs of the person delivering the Bernath lecture.

18. Chester Pach suggested a proposal for a SHAFR home page. It was moved, seconded, and passed unanimously that a home page be created.

19. The Council then discussed the proposal for the new SHAFR guide and authorized President Rosenberg to conduct negotiations with ABC-Clio and a prospective general editor.

20. Allan Spetter reported and Council confirmed that the 1999 summer conference will be at Princeton.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

SHAFR Call for Papers

SHAFR invites submissions for its Twenty-fourth annual Conference to be held in College Park, MD, June 18-20, 1998. Proposals from historians and scholars in related disciplines dealing with the broadest range of topics in international history and foreign policy. Preference will be given to proposals for complete panels and roundtables.

Send proposals — including a one-page abstract for each paper, a current one-page c.v. for each participant, and current mailing and e-mail addresses for each participant —

to: Chester Pach, SHAFR Program Committee Chair
Contemporary History Institute
Ohio University
Athens, OH 45701

SHAFR Bibliography Project

The SHAFR council is pleased to announce a new project that aims to provide an ongoing service to historians of U.S. foreign relations.

Robert L. Beisner of American University has agreed to make a five-year commitment as editor in charge of a new SHAFR Bibliography Project. The project, first, will result in a new two-volume, updated, and revised version of the *SHAFR Guide* that was published in 1983. The new *Guide*, to be published by ABC-Clío, will be approximately 1800 pages and contain between 12,000 and 13,000 annotated entries. The target date for completion is 2000. The project, next, will establish a system for creating and maintaining a continually updated, online addendum to the printed *Guide*. This addendum, which will be available on the Internet, will contain additional bibliographical entries, not listed in the *Guide*, and biennial updates as new scholarship comes out.

The 12-member Advisory Board for the SHAFR Bibliography Project will help guide Professor Beisner in matters of policy and design. They are Kinley J. Brauer, Richard Dean Burns, Diane S. Clemens, John Lewis Gaddis, Michael H. Hunt, Diane B. Kunz, Walter LaFeber, Thomas J. Noer, Thomas G. Paterson, Stephen G. Rabe, Emily S. Rosenberg, and Betty

Miller Unterberger. Probably more than fifty other historians will join the project as contributing editors. Kurt Hanson, a doctoral student at American University, will assist the project by handling technical issues.

SHAFR Travel Grant for Minority Students

SHAFR has allocated \$2,000 to fund the travel of minority graduate students to its 1998 June meeting. The maximum allowable grant is \$500. Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanic Americans who are U.S. citizens or nationals and who are enrolled full time in an accredited graduate program in history are eligible to apply. A letter of application detailing reasons for desiring to attend the meeting and estimated expenses should be accompanied by a letter of nomination from a faculty advisor. The deadline for receiving applications is March 31, 1998. For more information contact Arnold H. Taylor, Department of History, Howard University, Washington, D.C. 20059.

Tel: (202)806-9330

Fax: (202)806-4471

E-mail: ataylor@fac.howard.edu

Call for Papers

A workshop on The Evolution of Diplomacy is planned for the conference on "The 350th Anniversary of the Peace of Westphalia," Münster, Germany, July 16-19, 1998. The workshop will consist of 9 sessions over 3 days, organized by Raymond Cohen, Jan Melissen, and Sasson Sofer.

A number of questions arising include: Are there elements of diplomatic methods which have remained fixed and definitive over the course of history? Have functions of diplomacy

changed? how and why do diplomatic regimes evolve? Are they always functional in terms of the practical requirements of the larger international systems they are supposed to serve? Why and how does diplomacy break down? Are the representatives of states the only practitioners of diplomacy?

We envisage the workshop being organized around three themes.

Westphalia in comparative Perspective

Westphalia: The Foundations of Modern Diplomacy
contemporary Diplomacy: The Heritage of Westphalia," —
examining the salient features of the diplomatic regime
that has evolved since the Second World War.

For further information contact: Jan Melissen, Centre for the
Study of Diplomacy, Attenborough Building, Leicester
University, Leicester LE1 7RH, UK

PUBLICATIONS

Stephen E. Ambrose (New Orleans), *Citizen Soldiers: The U.S. Army from the Normandy Beaches to the Bulge to the Surrender of Germany, June 7, 1944 to May 7, 1945*. Simon & Schuster, 1997. ISBN 0-684-81525-7, \$27.50.

Stephen E. Ambrose and Douglas G. Brinkley, *Rise to Globalism: American Foreign Policy Since 1938*. New Eighth Revised Edition. Penguin Putnam, 1997. ISBN 0-14-026831-6, \$14.95.

Michael R. Beschloss (Annenberg Foundation), *Taking Charge: The Johnson White House Tapes, 1963-1964*. Simon & Schuster, 1997. ISBN 0-684-80407-7, \$30.00.

Robert Bowie and Richard H. Immerman (Temple), *Waging Peace: Eisenhower's Strategy for National Security*. Oxford, 1997. ISBN 0-19-506264-7, \$49.95.

Jacques M. Downs (Kennebunkport, ME), *The Golden Ghetto: The American Commercial Community at Canton and the Shaping of American China Policy, 1784-1844*. Lehigh University Press, 1997. ISBN 0-934223-35-1, \$69.50.

John Dumbrell (Keele, UK), *The Making of US Foreign Policy*. St. Martin's, 1997. Cloth: ISBN 0-7190-4821-4, \$79.95; Paper: ISBN 0-7190-4822-2, \$29.95.

Robert H. Ferrell (emeritus - Indiana) ed., *Off the Record: The Private Papers of Harry S. Truman*. Missouri, 1997. ISBN 0-8262-1119-4, \$19.95.

Mary Ann Heiss (Kent State), *Empire and Nationhood: The United States, Great Britain, and Iranian Oil, 1950-1954*. Columbia, 1997. Cloth: ISBN 0-231-10818-4, \$49.50; paper, ISBN 0-231-10819-2, \$19.50.

Walter Hixson (Akron), *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture and the Cold War, 1945-1961*. St. Martins, 1998. New in paperback. ISBN 0-213-17680-5, \$17.95.

Michael H. Hunt (North Carolina), *Lyndon Johnson's War: America's Cold War Crusade in Vietnam, 1945-1968*. Hill & Wang, 1997. New in paper: ISBN 0-8090-1604-4, \$11.00.

Ernest R. May and Philip D. Zelikow (both of Harvard), *The Kennedy Tapes: Inside the White House During the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Harvard, 1997. ISBN 0-674-17926-9, \$35.00.

Rafael Medoff (SUNY - Purchase C), *Zionism and the Arabs: an American Jewish Dilemma, 1898-1948*. Greenwood, 1997. ISBN 0-275-95824-8, \$55.00.

Cathal J. Nolan (Boston U) ed., *Notable U.S. Ambassadors Since 1775: A Biographical Dictionary*. Greenwood, 1997. ISBN 0-313-29195-0, \$95.00.

David m. Pletcher (emeritus - Indiana), *The Diplomacy of Trade and Investment*. Missouri, 1997. ISBN 0-8262-1127-5, \$44.95.

Noel H. Pugach (New Mexico), *"Same Bed, Different Dreams": A History of the Chinese American Bank of Commerce, 1919-1937*. Centre of Asian Studies, University of Hong Kong, 1997. ISBN 962-8269-06-2, \$20.70.

Michael Schaller (Arizona), *Altered States: The United States and Japan Since Occupation*. Oxford, 1997. ISBN 0-19-506916-1, \$30.00.

Robert D. Schulzinger (Colorado), *U.S. Diplomacy Since World War I, (Fourth Edition)*. Oxford, 1997. New in paper, ISBN 0-19-510631-8, \$21.95.

William Stueck (Georgia), *The Korean War: An International History*. Princeton, 1995. Paper, ISBN 0-691-01624-0, \$18.95.

Roger Trask (Locust Grove, VA) and Alfred Goldberg (Arlington, VA), *The Department of Defense, 1947-1997: Organization and Leaders*. Washington: Historical Office, Office of the Secretary of Defense, 1997. ISBN 0-16-049163-0, \$31.00.

Randall B. Woods (Arkansas), *J. William Fulbright, Vietnam, and the Search for a Cold War Foreign Policy*. Cambridge, 1997. ISBN 0-521-62059-7, \$54.95.

CALENDAR

1998

- January 1 Membership fees in all categories are due, payable at Blackwell Publishers, 350 Main St., Malden MA 02148.
- January 8-11 The 112th annual meeting of the AHA will take place in Seattle.
- January 15 Deadline for the Bernath Article Award.
- February 1 Submissions due for Warren Kuehl Award, deadline for the Bernath Book Award, deadline for March *Newsletter*, and deadline for Ferrell Book Prize.
- February 15 Deadline for the Bernath lecture prize.
- March 1 Deadline for Graebner Prize nominations.
- April 1 Applications for the W. Stull Holt dissertation fellowship are due.
- April 2-5 The 91st meeting of the OAH will take place in Indianapolis.
- May 1 Deadline, materials for the June *Newsletter*.
- June 18-20 SHAFR's 23rd annual conference will meet at the University of Maryland. Keith Olson, and J. Samuel Walker co-chairs, local arrangements; Chester Pach, program chair.
- August 1 Deadline, materials for the September *Newsletter*.
- November 1 Deadline, materials for December *Newsletter*.
- November 1-15 Annual election for SHAFR officers.
- November 1 Applications for Bernath dissertation fund awards are due.
- November 15 Deadline for SHAFR summer conference proposals.
- November 15 Deadline for Myrna F. Bernath research fellowship proposals.

Future OAH meetings will be in Toronto (Sheraton Centre) in 1999 and in St. Louis, March 30-April 2, 2000.

Future AHA meetings will be in Washington, D.C., Jan. 7-10, 1999, Chicago, Jan. 6-9, 2000, and Boston, Jan. 4-7. Submissions of panels and workshops for the Washington meeting must be submitted by February 13, 1998, Contact: John Voll, 1999 AHA Program Committee Chair, Dept. of History, Georgetown Univ., 37th and O Sts., NW, Washington, DC 20057.

PERSONALS

George C. Herring (Kentucky) will be the keynote speaker at the Florida Conference of Historians at Daytona, Fl., March 12-14, 1998.

Gary Hess (Bowling Green) has received the University's Distinguished Faculty Service Award for 1997. (In 1988 Hess won the Olscamp Research Award, the only faculty member to win both.)

Bradford Perkins retired from the active faculty at Michigan in May, 1997. The Regents have named him Professor Emeritus of History.

Nicholas E. Sarantakes (Texas A&M-Commerce) received research grants from the Johnson Presidential Library and the Texas A&M-Commerce Research Foundation.

Tom Schoonover (Southwestern Louisiana) lectured at St. Antony's College, Oxford and at the University of Erlangen Nürnberg before teaching a summer course at Cornell. He

also put in the finishing touches on a book on Germany and Central America scheduled for publication.

William Walker has joined the department at Florida International University as Professor of History and International Relations.

AWARDS, PRIZES, AND FUNDS

THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL PRIZES

The Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Lectureship, the Memorial Book Competition, and the Memorial Lecture Prize were established in 1976, 1972, and 1976, respectively, through the generosity of Dr. Gerald J. and Myrna F. Bernath, in memory of their son, and are administered by special committees of SHAFR.

The Stuart L. Bernath Book Prize

DESCRIPTION: This is a competition for a book dealing with any aspect of the history of American foreign relations. The purpose of the award is to recognize and encourage distinguished research and writing by scholars of American foreign relations.

ELIGIBILITY: The prize is to be awarded for a first book. The book must be a history of international relations. Biographies of statesmen and diplomats are included. General surveys, autobiographies, editions of essays and documents, and works which are representative of social science disciplines other than history are *not* eligible.

PROCEDURES: Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. A nominating letter explaining why the book deserves consideration must accompany each entry in the competition. Books will be judged primarily in regard to their contribution to scholarship. Winning books should have interpretative and analytical qualities of high levels. They should demonstrate mastery of primary material and relevant secondary works, and they should be examples of careful organization and distinguished writing. Five (5) copies of each book must be

submitted with the nomination and should be sent to: Tom Borstelmann, Department of History, McGraw Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca NY 14853.

Books may be sent at any time during 1997, but should not arrive later than February 1, 1998.

The prize will be divided only when two superior books are so evenly matched that any other decision seems unsatisfactory to the committee. The committee will not award the prize if there is no book in the competition which meets the standards of excellence established for the prize. The 1996 award of \$2,000.00 will be announced at the annual luncheon of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations held in conjunction with the Organization of American Historians' annual meeting in Spring, 1998.

RECENT WINNERS:

1992 Thomas Schwartz
1993 Elizabeth Cobbs
1994 Tim Borstelmann

1995 James Hershberg
Reinhold Wagnleitner
1996 Robert Buzzanco

The Stuart L. Bernath Lecture Prize

DESCRIPTION: The Bernath Lecture Prize seeks to recognize and encourage excellence in teaching and research in the field of foreign relations by younger scholars. Prize-winners normally deliver their lecture at the SHAFR luncheon at the annual meeting of the OAH. The lecture is to be comparable in style and scope to the yearly SHAFR presidential address and is to address broad issues of concern to students of American foreign policy, not the lecturer's specific research interests. The award is \$500, with publication of the lecture in *Diplomatic History*.

ELIGIBILITY: The prize is open to any person under forty-one years of age whose scholarly achievements represent excellence in teaching and research. Nominations may be made by any member of SHAFR or any other member of any established history, political science, or journalism department or organization.

PROCEDURES: Nominations, in the form of a short letter and *curriculum vita*, should be sent directly to the Chair of the Bernath Lecture Committee. The nominating letter requires evidence of excellence in teaching and research and must reach the Committee no later than 15 February 1998. The Chairperson of the Committee is: Robert Messer, Department of History, University of Illinois, Chicago IL 60680.

RECENT WINNERS:

1992 H.W. Brands
1993 Larry Berman
1994 Diane Kunz

1995 Thomas Schwartz
1996 Douglas Brinkley

The Stuart L. Bernath Scholarly Article Prize

The purpose of the prize is to recognize and to encourage distinguished research and writing by young scholars in the field of diplomatic relations.

ELIGIBILITY: Prize competition is open to any article or essay appearing in a scholarly journal or edited book, on any topic in United States foreign relations that is published during 1997. The author must not be over 40 years of age, or, if more than 40 years of age, must be within ten years of receiving the Ph.D. at the time of acceptance for publication. The article or essay must be among the first six publications by the author. Previous winners of the Stuart L. Bernath Book Award are excluded.

PROCEDURES: All articles appearing in *Diplomatic History* shall be automatically considered without nomination. Other nominations shall be submitted by the author or by any member of SHAFR by January 15, 1998. Three (3) copies of the article shall be submitted to the chairperson of the committee: Nick Cullather, History, Indiana University, Bloomington IN 47405. The award is given at the SHAFR luncheon held in conjunction with the OAH annual meeting.

RECENT WINNERS:

1992 Marc Gallicchio
1993 Daniel P. O'C. Greene
1994 Frederick Logevall

1995 Heike Bungert
1996 David Fitzsimons
1997 Robert Vitalis

The Stuart L. Bernath Dissertation Grant

This grant has been established to help doctoral students who are members of SHAFR defray some of the expenses encountered in the writing of their dissertations.

Requirements are as follows:

1. The dissertation must deal with some aspect of United States foreign relations.
2. Awards are given to help defray costs for dissertation research.

3. Applicants must have satisfactorily completed all other requirements for the doctoral degree.
4. Applications must include:
 - (a) a one-page curriculum vitae of the applicant and a dissertation prospectus;
 - (b) a paragraph regarding the sources to be consulted and their value to the study;
 - (c) an explanation of why the money is needed and how, specifically, it will be used; and
 - (d) a letter from the applicant's supervising professor commenting upon the appropriateness of the applicant's request. (This should be sent separately.)
5. One or more awards may be given. Generally awards will not exceed \$1000.
6. The successful applicant must file a brief report on how the funds were spent

not later than eight months following the presentation of the award (i.e., normally by the following September).

Applications should be sent to: Brian VanDeMark, 12 Franklin St., Annapolis, MD 21401. The deadline is November 1, 1998.

RECENT WINNERS:

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1992 Shannon Smith | 1995 Amy L.S. Staples |
| 1993 R. Tyler Priest | Christian Ostermann |
| Christian Ostermann | 1996 David Fitzsimons |
| 1994 Delia Pergande | |

The Myrna F. Bernath Book Prize

A prize award of \$2,500.00 to be offered every two years (apply in odd-numbered years) for the best book by a woman in the areas of United States foreign relations, transnational history, international history, peace studies, cultural interchange, and defense or strategic studies. Books published in 1998 and 1999 will be considered in 1999. Submission deadline is December 1, 1999. Five copies of each book (or page proofs) must accompany a letter of application. Contact: Christine White, Penn State, Dept of History, University Park PA 16802-5500.

PREVIOUS WINNERS

- 1991 Diane Kunz and Betty Unterberger
1996 Nancy B. Tucker

The Myrna F. Bernath Research Fellowship

An award of \$2500 (apply in even-numbered years), to research the study of foreign relations among women scholars. The grants are intended for women at U.S. universities as well as for women abroad who wish to do research in the United States. Preference will be given to graduate students and newly finished Ph.D's. The subject-matter *should be historically based* and concern American foreign relations or aspects of international history, as broadly conceived. Work on purely domestic topics will not be considered. Applications should include a letter of intent and three copies of a detailed research proposal of no more than 2000 words. Send applications to: Christine White, Penn State, Dept of History, University Park, PA 16802-5500. Submission deadline is November 15, 1998.

RECENT WINNERS:

- 1992 Shannon Smith
1994 Regina Gramer
 Jacklyn Stanke
 Christine Skwiot
1997 Deborah Kisatsky
 Mary Elise Savotte

THE W. STULL HOLT DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP

The Society of Historians for American Foreign Relations is pleased to invite applications from qualified doctoral candidates whose dissertations are in the field of the history of American foreign relations. This fellowship is intended to help defray costs of travel, preferably foreign travel, necessary to the pursuit of research on a significant dissertation project. Qualified applicants will have satisfactorily completed comprehensive doctoral examinations before April 1998, leaving only the dissertation as the sole, remaining requirement for the doctoral degree.

Applicants should include a prospectus of the dissertation, indicating work already completed as well as contemplated research. The prospectus should describe the dissertation project as fully as possible, indicating the scope, method, and chief source materials. The applicant should indicate how the fellowship, if awarded, would be used. An academic transcript showing all graduate work taken to date should accompany the application and prospectus of the dissertation. In addition, three letters from graduate teachers familiar with the work of the applicant, including one from the director of the applicant's dissertation, are required.

Applications and supporting papers should be sent before April 1, 1998 to: Keith Nelson, Department of History, University of California, Irvine CA 92717.

The Holt Memorial Fellowship carries an award of \$1,500.00. Announcement of the recipient of the Holt Memorial Fellowship will be made at the Society's annual summer meeting. At the end of the fellowship year the recipient of the fellowship will be required to report to the Committee relating how the fellowship was used.

RECENT WINNERS:

1990 Katherine A.S. Siegel

1993 Darlene Rivas

1991 Kyle Longley

1994 Christian Ostermann

1992 Robert Brigham

1995 John Dwyer

1996 Max Friedman

THE NORMAN AND LAURA GRAEBNER AWARD

The Graebner Award is to be awarded every other year at SHAFR's summer conference to a senior historian of United States foreign relations whose achievements have contributed most significantly to the fuller understanding of American diplomatic history.

CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD: The Graebner prize will be awarded, beginning in 1986, to a distinguished scholar of diplomatic and international affairs. It is expected that this scholar would be 60 years of age or older. The recipient's career must demonstrate excellence in scholarship, teaching, and/or service to the profession. Although the prize is not restricted to academic historians, the recipient must have distinguished himself or herself through the study of international affairs from a historical perspective.

Applicants, or individuals nominating a candidate, are requested to submit three (3) copies of a letter which:

- (a) provides a brief biography, including educational background, academic or other positions held and awards and honors received;
- (b) lists the candidate's major scholarly works and discusses the nature of his or her contribution to the study of diplomatic history and international affairs;
- (c) describes the candidate's career, lists any teaching honors and awards, and comments on the candidate's classroom skills; and
- (d) details the candidate's services to the historical profession, listing specific organizations and offices, and discussing particular activities.

Chairman: Chester Pach, History Department, Ohio University, Athens OH 45701
The deadline for nominations is March 1, 1998.

RECENT WINNERS:

1986 Dorothy Borg
1988 Alexander DeConde
1990 Richard W. Leopold

1992 Bradford Perkins
1994 Wayne Cole
1996 Walter LaFeber

THE WARREN F. KUEHL AWARD

The Society will award the Warren F. Kuehl Prize to the author or authors of an outstanding book dealing with the history of internationalism and/or the history of peace movements. The subject may include biographies of prominent internationalists or peace leaders. Also eligible are works on American foreign relations that examine United States diplomacy from a world perspective and which are in accord with Kuehl's 1985 presidential address to SHAFR. That address

voiced an "appeal for scholarly breadth, for a wider perspective on how foreign relations of the United States fits into the global picture."

The award will be made every other year at the SHAFR summer conference. The next award will be for books published in 1997 and 1998. Deadline for submissions is February 1, 1999. Current Chairperson: David Schmitz, Whitman College, Dept of History, Walla Walla WA 99362

PREVIOUS WINNERS:

1987 Harold Josephson
1988 Melvin Small
1991 Charles DeBenedetti and
Charles Chatfield

1993 Thomas Knock
1995 Lawrence S. Witner

**ARTHUR LINK PRIZE
FOR DOCUMENTARY EDITING**

The inaugural Arthur S. Link Prize For Documentary Editing was awarded at the American Historical Association meeting in December 1991. The prize will be offered hereafter whenever appropriate but no more often than every three years. Eligibility is defined by the following excerpt from the prize rules.

The prize will recognize and encourage analytical scholarly editing of documents, in appropriate published form, relevant to the history of American foreign relations, policy, and diplomacy. By "analytical" is meant the inclusion (in

headnotes, footnotes, essays, etc.) of both appropriate historical background needed to establish the context of the documents, and interpretive historical commentaries based on scholarly research. The competition is open to the editor/author(s) of any collection of documents published after 1984 that is devoted primarily to sources relating to the history of American foreign relations, policy, and/or diplomacy; and that incorporates sufficient historical analysis and interpretation of those documents to constitute a contribution to knowledge and scholarship. Nominations may be made by any person or publisher. The award is \$500 plus travel expenses to the professional meeting where the prize is presented. For all rules and details contact the committee chair. One copy of each entry should be sent directly to each member of the committee. Current Chairperson: Mary Giunta, NHPRC-Room 300, National Archives, Washington DC 20408

PREVIOUS WINNERS 1991 Justus Doenecke
 1996 John C.A. Staggs

THE LAWRENCE GELFAND - ARMIN RAPPAPORT FUND

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations established this fund in to honor Lawrence Gelfand, former SHAFR president and Armin Rappaport, founding editor of *Diplomatic History*. The fund will support the professional work of the journal's editorial office. It was initiated by Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Paterson, who donated earnings from their book, *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, and by the authors of essays in this book, who waived fees. Further donations are invited from authors, SHAFR members, and friends. Please send contributions in any amount to Professor Allan Spetter, SHAFR Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Department of History, Wright State University, Dayton OH 45435.

ROBERT H. FERRELL BOOK PRIZE

This is competition for a book, published in 1997, which is a history of American Foreign Relations, broadly defined, and includes biographies of statesmen and diplomats. General surveys, autobiographies, or editions of essays and documents are not eligible. The prize of \$1,000 is to be awarded as a senior book award; that is, any book beyond the first monograph by the author. The deadline for submission of books is January 1, 1998.

Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of SHAFR. Current chairperson: Brad Perkins, Dept of History, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI 48109-1003; copies should also be sent to: Thomas Noer, Dept of History, Cathage College, Kenosha WI 53140
K.C. Johnson, Dept of History, Williams College, Williamstown MA 01267

PREVIOUS WINNERS:

1992 David Anderson and Diane Kunz
1994 Melvyn Leffler
1995 John L. Harper