



The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

NEWSLETTER

Volume VIII

Number 2

June, 1977

Page

1	Salvatore Prisco, Another Approach to Quantification
14	Anna K. Nelson, Foreign Policy Records and Papers
27	Thomas G. Paterson, "Would You Tell Me, Please, Which Way I Ought to Go from Here?"
30	James F. Willis, The Young Sam Bemis in Distress
32	Minutes of SHAFR Council Meeting
35	Roger V. Dingman, Response to Bernath Book Prize
36	Personals
39	Abstracts of Articles and Papers
42	Publications
43	Announcements
45	Bernath Awards
48	Guidelines for Articles in Diplomatic History
49	SHAFR Membership Report
51	SHAFR Roster & Research List
52	SHAFR's Third Annual Conference

SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

Founded in 1967. Chartered in 1972.

PRESIDENT: Raymond A. Esthus, Newcomb College, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

VICE-PRESIDENT: Akira Iriye, Department of History, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637

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

CHAIRMAN, PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Roger R. Trask, Department of History, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33617

CHAIRMAN, MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE: Ralph E. Weber, Department of History, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

CHAIRMAN, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: George C. Herring, Jr., Department of History, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506

MEMBERSHIP: Anyone interested in U. S. diplomatic history is invited to become a member of SHAFR. Annual dues are \$8.50, payable at the office of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer. Fees for retired members and for students are \$5.00 per year, while institutional affiliations are \$30.00. Life memberships are \$125.00

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

PRIZES: The Society administers three awards a year, all of them in honor of the late Stuart L. Bernath and all of them financed through the generosity of his parents, Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath of Beverly Hills, California. The details of each of these awards are given under the appropriate headings in each issue of the **Newsletter**.

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

PUBLICATIONS: The Society sponsors two printed works of a quarterly nature, the **Newsletter**, and **Diplomatic History**, a journal. All members receive these publications.

**ANOTHER APPROACH TO QUANTIFICATION:
DIPLOMATIC ISSUES IN THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, 1896-1900**

by
Salvatore Prisco, III*

Thomas Schoonover's article, "How Have State Department Officials (or Diplomatic Historians) Behaved? A View from the Computer," (SHAFFR Newsletter, Sept., 1976), provides some valuable suggestions on the use of quantitative techniques in researching issues in United States foreign relations. Furthermore, Prof. Schoonover listed three topics of interest which lend themselves to data processing: 1) collective biography, 2) data on trade and navigation, 3) examination of treaties.

I would like to add another topic to this list, i. e., the investigation of popular and professional journals to discover quantitatively which foreign policy issues emerged in different critical periods for public consideration. In this way we will begin to learn more about the climate of public opinion and its relationship to policies actually considered or pursued.

As an example of what I mean, I submit the following analysis of foreign policy issues in the **North American Review** during the critically-expansive period, 1896 to 1900. My hope is to encourage other diplomatic historians to engage in similar research projects.

In investigating the various articles dealing in some way with foreign relations in the **North American Review, 1896-1900**, I have established ten categories, or problem areas, into which these articles may be placed. At the outset, I want to make it clear that these are not categories in the strict sense. Rather, they are a means of approaching the seventy-two varied articles concerning foreign affairs. There is a great deal of inter-relationship between these articles. I will examine each of these categories with an eye toward revealing conflicting opinions. These then are the ten problem areas into which I shall inquire: 1) Trade and foreign relations in the Far East; 2) The Consular Service; 3) Commerce in the Western Hemisphere; 4) Cuba prior to the American declaration of war; 5) Opinions toward expansion and American empire; 6) the Merchant Marine and the growth of the United States Navy; 7) the Canal issue; 8) Militarism and the quest for peace; 9) Foreign missions; 10) the Venezuelan boundary dispute.

Some twenty articles dealt directly with trade and foreign relations in the Far East. Of these, fifteen recognized or argued in favor of commercial expansion in the light of vast economic productivity. John Barrett,¹ American minister to Siam, set the keynote by calling for the United States to "awaken interest in the hunt for the golden fleece of Cathay" and one might add the fleeces of Korea, Japan, and Formosa as well. Barrett was, however, initially careful to warn against the acquisition of territory and

*Dr. Prisco is a member of the Humanities Department at Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, New Jersey.

political involvement. This opinion was modified after the United States assumed control of the Philippines.²

Barrett's pleas for the awakening of America to the opportunity of Asia and the Pacific were echoed time and again by others.³ Of special interest was the article of Charles Denby, Secretary of the United States legation in China, who voiced the cry of "Westward Ho!" to the American frontier in Asia. His problem was to convince American businessmen to invest. With a number of American foreign representatives, it appears to have been a personal crusade of enlistment. In this, they had the cooperation of those governments seeking American dollars. Wu Ting Fang, Chinese minister to the United States, was a noteworthy example.⁴ He called for American investments in order to put Chinese to work, build railroads, improve rivers and harbors, and bring water to cities.

China emerged as the focal point of interest in Asia. A number of articles were concerned with the possibility of her partition.⁵ It is striking to note that the Englishman, Archibald Calquhoun, saw China as a "world necessity." He and others were at great pains to enlist American aid in preserving China. In fact, Mark Dunnell, the American Deputy Consul-General at Shanghai, called for the United States to cooperate with Britain in an "open port" agreement for China. This was seen as the path **most advantageous to the United States.**⁶

Another interesting facet of this topic was the attempt by the Russians to win the United States away from Britain and open trade.⁷ Russia was the prime advocate of the "spheres-of-influence" approach to China. The point of attack against Britain was that through the "open door," Britain could plunder everywhere. Some two months after this article appeared (July, 1899), the United States itself announced adherence to the open door policy.

There were two articles that attacked the extension of Eastern trade outright. One was by Worthington Ford,⁸ chief of the Bureau of Statistics, who feared entangling alliances, and who favored instead a gradual buildup of foreign trade without political and military extension. Another article by Edward Atkinson⁹ attempted to show economic expansion as a pretext for military expansion. He pointed out that only four per cent of American exports went to Asia while most exports went to industrial nations. Atkinson overlooked the possibility that the United States was concerned more with the **expectation** of what its Eastern trade would become, and not with what it actually was at this time.

Also in relation to American trade in the Far East there were three articles calling for reform of the American Consular Service.¹⁰ The national prosperity was made to appear at stake in the need to encourage businessmen to invest through the more effective gathering of market information. It was strongly urged that the active influence of the Government be enlisted. This would develop into an important part of so-called "dollar diplomacy."

Remaining with the theme of expanding American commerce abroad, a number of articles appeared with respect to trade in the Western Hemisphere.¹¹ Most articles were concerned with winning American dollars. Theodore Search pointed out, though, that the United States had keen competition from Britain, Belgium, France, and Germany in South America. This was explained in terms of their close contact with buyers. A great need of the United States to know and understand people, and to obtain their confidence was expressed. Cordell Hull was still trying to effect this objective some thirty-five years later.

Michael Mulhall sought a similar goal in calling for a North American Trade Union of the United States, Mexico, and Canada without political infringement, but certainly commercial domination by the United States would be more satisfactory.

The relationship of Cuba to the United States prior to the declaration of war was another problem that was considered. In essence, all three writers appear to favor annexation by the United States should the situation come to that.¹² In the main, Spanish statesmanship was seen as impotent to solve the Cuban question. American interests there were viewed as historically important. Indeed, Mayo Hazeltine traced American interest in Cuba to John Q. Adams.¹³

The next problem area, that of "Opinions toward Expansion and American Empire" presented the liveliest topic of debate. The articles, however, ran in the proportion of thirteen to four in favor of the assumption of greater American responsibility on the world scene.

Senator John T. Morgan of Alabama was quite strongly in favor of the annexation of Hawaii, Pago Pago, and the Philippines for these were seen as the link to commercial expansion in the Far East.¹⁴ Taking a similar position, Frederic Bancroft saw William H. Seward's policies of expansion as an "infallible guide" to American national welfare.¹⁵

In an extremely perceptive article, Charles Conant counseled free trade as the best means by which a highly industrialized nation could rid itself of most economic surpluses that had accrued due to increased productivity.¹⁶ Conant saw the necessity for Anglo-American cooperation in Asia in the light of both countries' self-interest in the face of Russian competition.¹⁷ Regarding Conant's article, William L. Langer has suggested that it served as a model for John A. Hobson's adept analysis of imperialism.¹⁸

In two articles,¹⁹ Senator William A. Peffer of Kansas expounded on the need for the United States to seize the opportunity for expansion afforded by the Spanish defeat in the light of traditional American expansion on the frontier. The Pacific was seen not as a barrier, but as a new frontier to be conquered.

John Barrett too was pleased to see that the United States was following a policy of expansion in Asia.²⁰ It is interesting to note that Barrett

saw the possibility of having the United States pursue an open door policy at the same time that spheres of influence existed.²¹ Barrett recognized that the United States must insist on free trade even in these areas of quasi-sovereignty. And most important, should China be partitioned, the United States should seek a northern port by purchase or treaty.

Perhaps as an appendage to this possibility, the call went out from Major Louis Seaman for the use of native troops in China and the Philippines to maintain America's overseas empire.²²

In relation to free trade and American possessions, an interesting question was raised by Senator Joseph B. Foraker of Ohio.²³ Might not the American policy of the open door overseas be demanded in turn by a foreign power of American possessions, and indeed from the United States itself? The ruination of the American protective tariff policy was seen as a possibility. This was, of course, part of the problem answered subsequently by the "insular cases."

The classic arguments against American expansion were presented in two articles by Andrew Carnegie.²⁴ Basically, Carnegie doubted the advisability of American involvement socially, economically, politically, and militarily in international power dealings. He viewed the severe economic competition in the Far East as a major threat to peace. Carnegie believed that the United States was **permitted** to take the Philippines without trouble from Germany, France, and Russia because of Britain's position.²⁵

The price for this was that the United States had to adopt the "open door" which secured the trade of the United States possessions for the British. His fear of entangling alliances was his major point of criticism, although he mentioned the cost of empire and its incompatibility with democracy as well. He was not, however, opposed to annexing Cuba for here he saw less chance of a major world clash developing.²⁶

Another criticism of expansion was voiced by G. G. West who saw empire as something not in the American tradition, and also a door through which barbarians might inundate the good American stock.²⁷ A similar racist view was expressed by H. C. Porter.²⁸ He viewed empire as something that would detract from American "greatness."

In essence, this problem revolved around the issue of whether or not the United States was ready to accept major world responsibilities. The answer from those writing here was by far "yes," although one might question their grasp of what these world responsibilities actually meant to American domestic security. Carnegie was perhaps most troubled by this.

Discussions of the need for an enlarged Merchant Marine and United States Navy were quite regularly expressed.²⁹ This was closely related to American commercial expansion. Both naval and non-naval personnel evidenced an awareness of the necessity for preparedness. Charles Cramp called attention to the Japanese naval buildup, and the hitherto supine attitude of the United States.³⁰ The articles of Alfred T. Mahan are also

to be noted.³¹ In general, Sir Walter Raleigh's dictum that "Whosoever commands the sea, commands the trade; whosoever commands the trade of the world, commands the riches of the world and consequently the world itself;" was well appreciated by these writers.

Two articles debated the canal issue and American responsibility. James Whitely called attention to the difficulty of constructing and maintaining such a canal (stressing the purpose of the trade routes) single-handedly.³² Instead he backed the principle of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty (1850) between the United States and Britain to insure the political and military responsibilities of the canal.

In opposition to this stand, Mayo Hazeltine argued that the United States must **now** stand on its own, and take its rightful place among nations.³³ The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, he contended, was outdated and void. Hazeltine especially attacked President Grover Cleveland, and the Democrats, for being so timid in that the president had not pushed for the assumption of American responsibility here.

Another issue that emerged in this period was that of militarism and the quest for peace. Fearing a general growth of militarism, Karl Blind discussed the lack of stability in Turkey and the chance of its dismemberment.³⁴ In answer to problems of this nature, the Hague Conference of 1899 was held to establish the principle of arbitration in international disputes. The articles ran three to one against American ratification of this convention. Noteworthy was the warning of naval personnel against the fear that the United States might be lulled into a false security by this convention.³⁵ Seth Low, delegate to the Convention, made it clear, though, that no one believed arbitration would end war, but that it was a saner approach to world problems.³⁶ The agreement should, therefore, be ratified.

An interesting article appeared on foreign missions by an English clergyman that reflected the attitude of Anglo-Saxon supremacy in the period.³⁷ In the light of war threats and upheaval, a call was made to regenerate the world in the Christian, or Western image, as the Roman Empire was regenerated by Christianity. The possible annexation of Hawaii and other areas by Christian powers was seen as a positive good. The author did not seem to realize that it was exactly this attitude that was a contributing factor to the war threats and upheavals in missionary lands.

The final problem area concerned the Venezuelan boundary dispute with articles by both British and American writers. The Englishman, James Bryce, claimed to voice British public opinion of the United States as being "triggerhappy."³⁸ He contended that President Cleveland's ultimatum to the British to settle the affair was unwarranted. He asserted further that all the war talk in the United States was unthinkable. David Wells pointed to a long standing hatred of the United States toward Britain.³⁹ He further argued that wherever Britain had gone, progress and prosperity had ensued. The United States was, in fact, narrow-minded.

In answer to this, Mayo Hazeltine stated that Wells would have liked the United States to acquiesce in Britain's takeover of the disputed area in Venezuela, especially as it pertained to free navigation of the Orinoco River.⁴⁰ It seems that Wells had implied that in general Britain was more welcome in South America than was the United States.

Before this exchange between Wells and Hazeltine appeared, Andrew Carnegie contributed an article, arguing against a rift between Britain and the United States.⁴¹ Carnegie could see no reason for all the noise. Britain was viewed as wrong in the first place, but Cleveland's chiding message was amiss, too. Carnegie saw arbitration as the answer, but he refused to accept peace at any price. The spokesmen for each side appeared to be filled with their own self-importance. Perhaps in this way they reflected the spirit of the age.

In conclusion, commercial and territorial expansion, and severe international competition among the industrial powers of the world were rather clearly reflected in these articles. Of prime importance was the role of the United States in relation to this. In general, most authors who favored an expansion of American activities painted a rosy picture of America's future, and claimed to be ready to accept the responsibilities for this expansion. One might well question whether or not they understood **all** that this responsibility would entail. One can certainly charge that they were very generous with a responsibility that they themselves, for the most part, did not have to assume.

NOTES

¹ John Barrett, "American Interest in Asia," 162 (March, 1896), 257-265.

_____, "The Plain Truth About Asiatic Labor," 163 (Nov., 1896), 620-632.

_____, "America's Duty in China," 171 (Aug., 1900), 145-157.

² John Barrett and Hugh Lusk, "The Problem of the Philippines," 167 (Sept., 1898), 257-277.

³ Thomas Jernigan, "Commercial Trend of China," 165 (July, 1897), 63-69.

Henry Ide, "Our Interest in Samoa," 165 (Aug., 1897), 155-173.

Charles Denby, "America's Opportunity in Asia," 166 (Jan., 1898), 32-39.

Mark Dunnell, "Our Policy in China," 167 (Oct., 1898), 392-409.

Lord Charles Beresford, "China and the Powers," 168 (May, 1899), 530-538.

Sir Charles Dilke, "America and England in the East," 169 (Oct., 1899), 558-563.

⁴ Wu Ting Fang, "Mutual Helpfulness Between China and the United States," 171 (July, 1900), 1-12.

⁵ Archibald Calquhoun, "The Far Eastern Crisis," 167 (Nov., 1898), 513-526.

Demetrius Boulanger, "The Dissolution of China," 168 (March, 1899), 255-268.

_____, "America's Share in the Partition of China, 171 (April, 1900), 171-181.

Gilbert Reid, "The Powers and the Partition of China," 170 (April, 1900), 634-641.

⁶ Dunnell, *op. cit.*, p. 404f.

⁷ Vladimir Holmstrom, "Ex Oriente Lux!" 169 (July, 1899) 6-32.

Archibald Little, "Ex Oriente Lux!, A Reply," 169 (Sept., 1899), 329-348.

⁸ Worthington Ford, "Commercial Superiority of the United States," 166 (Jan., 1898), 75-84.

⁹ Edward Atkinson, "Eastern Commerce: What Is It Worth?" 170 (Feb., 1900), 295-303.

¹⁰ See the three works listed in the bibliography under the heading "Consular Service."

¹¹ See the articles in the bibliography under the heading "Commerce in the Western Hemisphere."

¹² See the articles listed under "Cuba prior to the American Declaration of War," in the bibliography.

¹³ Mayo Hazeltine, "What Shall Be Done About Cuba?" 163 (Dec., 1896), 742.

¹⁴ John T. Morgan, "What Shall Be Done with the Conquered Islands?" 166 (June, 1898), 641-649.

¹⁵Frederic Bancroft, "Seward's Ideas of Territorial Expansion," 167 (July, 1898), 79-89.

¹⁶Charles Conant, "The Economic Basis of Imperialism," 167 (Sept., 1898), 326-340.

¹⁷_____, "Russia As A World Power," 168 (Feb., 1899), 178-190.

¹⁸William L. Langer, "A Critique of Imperialism," **Foreign Affairs**, XIV (Oct., 1935), p. 102f.

¹⁹W. A. Pepper, "A Republic in the Philippines," 168 (March, 1899), 310-320.

_____, "Imperialism: America's Historic Policy," 171 (Aug., 1900), 246-258.

²⁰John Barrett, "The Paramount Power in the Pacific," 169 (July, 1899), 165-179.

²¹*Ibid.*, p. 169f.

²²Louis Seaman, "Native Troops for Our Colonial Possessions," 171 (Dec., 1900), 847-860.

²³J. B. Foraker, "The United States and Puerto Rico," 170 (April, 1900), 464-471.

²⁴Andrew Carnegie, "Distant Possessions-The Parting of the Ways," 167 (Aug., 1898), 239-248.

_____, "Americanism Versus Imperialism," 168 (Jan., 1899), 1-13.

²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 3.

²⁶*Ibid.*, p. 12.

²⁷G. G. West, "Objections to Annexing the Philippines," 168 (Jan., 1899), 112-120.

²⁸H. C. Potter, "National Bigness or Greatness, Which?" 168 (April, 1899), 433-444.

²⁹See the articles in the bibliography under the heading "Merchant Marine and growth of the United States Navy."

³⁰Charles Cramp, "The Coming Sea Power," 165 (Oct., 1897), 444-457.

³¹See bibliography under this heading.

³² James Whitely, "The Diplomacy of the United States in Regard to Central American Canals," 165 (Aug., 1897), 364-378.

³³ Mayo Hazeltine, "The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty," 165 (Oct., 1897), 452-459.

³⁴ Karl Blind, "The Crisis in the East," 162 (Jan., 1896), 84-95.

³⁵ Alfred T. Mahan, "The Peace Conference and the Moral Aspects of War," 169 (Oct., 1899), 433-447.

R. M. Johnson, "In the Clutch of the Harpy Powers," 169 (Oct., 1899), 488-453.

³⁶ Seth Low, "The International Conference of Peace," 169 (Nov., 1899), 625-639.

³⁷ Judson Smith, "Foreign Missions in the Light of Fact," 162 (Jan., 1896), 20-32.

³⁸ James Bryce, "British Feeling on the Venezuelan Question," 162 (Feb., 1896), 145-153.

³⁹ David Wells, "Great Britain and the United States: Their True Relations," 162 (April, 1896), 385-405.

⁴⁰ Mayo Hazeltine, "The United States and Great Britain: A Reply to Mr. David A. Wells," 162 (May, 1896), 594-606.

⁴¹ Andrew Carnegie, "The Venezuelan Question," 162 (Feb., 1896), 129-144.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following articles, seventy-two in number, all appeared in the **North American Review**, 1896-1900. To facilitate matters, I have classified the articles according to the problems of foreign policy to which they address themselves. In this way, one can refer more easily to the problems as they are considered in the paper.

TRADE AND FOREIGN RELATIONS IN THE FAR EAST

Atkinson, Edward. "Eastern Commerce: What Is It Worth?" 170 (Feb., 1900), 295-303.

Barrett, John. "America's Interest in Eastern Asia," 162 (March, 1896), 257-265.

- _____. "The Plain Truth About Asiatic Labor," 163 (November, 1896), 620-632.
- _____. "America's Duty in China," 171 (Aug., 1900), 145-157.
- Beresford, Charles. "China and the Powers," 168 (May, 1899), 530-538.
- Boulanger, Demetrius. "The Dissolution of Chinese Empire," 168 (March, 1899), 255-268.
- _____. "America's Share in the Partition of China," 171 (Aug., 1900), 171-181.
- Calquhoun, Archibald. "The Far Eastern Crisis," 167 (Nov., 1898), 513-526.
- Crispi, F. "China and the Western Powers," 171 (Nov., 1900) 692-703.
- Denby, Charles. "America's Opportunity in Asia," 166 (Jan., 1898), 32-39.
- Dilke, Charles. "America and England in the East," 169 (Oct., 1899), 558-563.
- Dunnell, Mark. "Our Policy in China," 169 (Oct., 1899), 392-409.
- Ford, Worthington. "Commercial Superiority of the United States," 166 (Jan., 1898), 75-84.
- Holmstrom, Vladimir. "Ex Oriente Lux!" A Plea for a Russo-American Understanding," 169 (July, 1899), 6-32.
- Ide, Henry. "Our Interest in Samoa," 165 (Aug., 1897), 155-173.
- Jernigan, Thomas. "Commercial Trend of China," 165 (July, 1897), 63-69.
- Little, Archibald. "Ex Oriente Lux! A Reply," 169 (Sept., 1899), 329-348.
- Porter, Robert. "Is Japanese Competition A Myth," 163 (July, 1896), 144-155.
- Reid, Gilbert. "The Powers and the Partition of China," 170 (April, 1900), 634-641.
- Wu Ting Fang. "Mutual Helpfulness Between China and the United States," 171 (July, 1900), 1-12.

CONSULAR SERVICE

- Jernigan, Thomas. "A Hindrance to Our Foreign Trade," 163 (Oct., 1896), 438-447.

Loomis, Francis. "The Foreign Service of the United States," 169 (Sept., 1899), 349-361.

Warner, Charles. "Our Foreign Trade and Consular Service," 162 (March, 1896), 274-286.

COMMERCE IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Blake, Henry. "Jamaica As A Field for Investment," 162 (March, 1896), 341-346.

Charlton, John. "Canada and the Dingley Tariff," 165 (Oct., 1897), 418-430.

Gosling, Audley. "Central America and Its Resources," 162 (Jan., 1896), 96-102.

Mulhall, Michael. "Thirty Years of American Trade," 164 (March, 1897), 572-581.

Romero, M. "The Philosophy of the Mexican Revolution," 162 (Jan., 1896), 33-47.

Search, Theodore. "Our Trade with South America," 163 (Dec., 1896), 716-724.

CUBA PRIOR TO THE AMERICAN DECLARATION OF WAR

Hazeltine, Mayo. "Possible Complications of the Cuban Question," 162 (April, 1896), 406-413.

_____. "What Shall Be Done About Cuba?" 163 (Dec., 1896), 731-742.

Rubens, Horatio. "The Insurgent Government in Cuba," 166 (March, 1898), 560-569.

Taylor, Hannis. "A Review of the Cuban Question in Its Economic, Political, and Diplomatic Aspects," 165 (Nov., 1897)

OPINIONS TOWARD EXPANSION AND AMERICAN EMPIRE

Bancroft, Frederic. "Seward's Ideas of Territorial Expansion," 167 (July, 1898), 79-89.

Barrett, John. "The Paramount Power of the Pacific," 169 (July, 1899), 165-179.

_____. "The Problem of the Philippines," 167 (Sept., 1898), 257-277

Carnegie, Andrew. "Distant Possessions—The Parting of the Ways," 167 (Aug., 1898), 239-248.

_____. "Americanism Versus Imperialism," 168 (Jan., 1898), 1-13.

Clarke, George. "Imperial Responsibilities, A National Gain," 168 (Feb., 1899), 129-141.

Conant, Charles. "The Economic Basis of Imperialism," 167 (Sept., 1899), 326-340.

_____. "Russia as a World Power," 168 (Feb., 1899), 178-190.

Foraker, J. B., "The United States and Puerto Rico," 170 (April, 1900), 464-471.

Hazeltine, Mayo. "What Is to Be Done in Cuba?" 167 (Sept., 1898), 318-325.

Morgan, John. "What Shall We Do with the Conquered Islands?" 166 (June, 1898), 641-649.

Peffer, W. A. "A Republic in the Philippines," 168 (March, 1899), 310-320.

_____. "Imperialism, America's Historic Policy," 171 (Aug., 1900).

Potter, H. C. "National Bigness or Greatness, Which?" 168 (April, 1899), 433-444.

Taylor, Hannis. "Pending Problems," 167 (Nov., 1898), 609-624.

Seaman, Louis. "Native Troops for Our Colonial Possessions," 171 (Dec., 1900), 847-860.

West, G. G. "Objections to Annexing the Philippines," 168 (Jan., 1899), 112-120.

MERCHANT MARINE AND GROWTH OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Butler, Charles. "Freedom from Capture of Private Property at Sea," 168 (Jan., 1899), 54-61.

Cramp, Charles. "The Coming Sea Power," 165 (Oct., 1897) 444-451.

Mahan, Alfred T. "Effects of Asiatic Conditions upon International Policies," 171 (Nov., 1900), 609-626.

_____. "The Engineer in Naval Warfare," 163 (Dec., 1896), 641-666.

Melville, P. W. "Our Future on the Pacific—What We Have There to Hold and Win," 166 (March, 1898), 281-296.

Nixon, Lewis. "The Commercial Value of the Shipyard," 165 (Nov., 1897), 527-539.

Payne, Sereno. "Our Merchant Marine," 168 (Feb., 1899), 240-247.

Smith, Alex. "Our Neglected Shipping," 163 (Oct., 1896), 470-478.

_____. "The Export Bounty Proposition," 165 (Aug., 1897), 223-231.

THE CANAL ISSUE

Hazeltine, Mayo. "The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty," 165 (Oct., 1897), 452-459.

Whitely, James. "The Diplomacy of the United States in Regard to Central American Canals," 165 (Aug., 1897), 364-378.

MILITARISM AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

Blind, Karl. "The Crisis in the East," 162 (Jan., 1896), 84-95.

Johnson, R. M. "In The Clutch of the Harpy Powers," 169 (Oct., 1899), 448-453.

Low, Seth. "The International Conference of Peace," 169 (Nov., 1899), 625-639.

Mahan, Alfred T. "The Peace Conference and the Moral Aspect of War," 169 (Oct., 1899), 433-447.

Taylor, H. C. "The Study of War" 162 (Feb., 1896), 181-189.

FOREIGN MISSIONS

Smith, Judson. "Foreign Missions in the Light of Fact," 162 (Jan., 1896), 20-32.

VENEZUELAN BOUNDARY DISPUTE

Bryce, James. "British Feeling on the Venezuelan Question," 162 (Feb., 1896), 145-153.

Carnegie, Andrew. "The Venezuelan Question," 162 (Feb., 1896), 129-144.

Doane, William. "Follies and Horrors of War," 162 (Feb., 1896), 190-194.

Hazeltine, Mayo. "The United States and Great Britain: A Reply to Mr. David A. Wells," 162 (May, 1896), 594-606.

Wells, David. "Great Britain and the United States: Their True Relations,"
162 (April, 1896), 385-405.

**FOREIGN POLICY RECORDS AND PAPERS:
A CASE STUDY OF THE PRESERVATION
AND
ACCESSIBILITY OF ONE GROUP OF DOCUMENTS**

Anna K. Nelson

PREFACE

This paper was prepared while the author, an Associate Professorial Lecturer in History at George Washington University, was a Research Associate with the Public Documents Commission. It was sent to the Commissioners in January of this year. The Commission completed its work in April and submitted its final report to the President and Congress at that time. Copies of the report will be available from the Government Printing Office.

The second and third instalments of this paper will appear in the September and December numbers of the **Newsletter**.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. INTRODUCTION
- II. PRESERVATION OF RECORDS
 - A. State Department
 - B. Defense Department
 - C. National Security Files
- III. ACCESS TO RECORDS
 - A. State Department
 - B. Official History as an Aid to Access
 - C. Access to Papers and Records in Presidential Libraries

IV. PERSONAL vs. PUBLIC PAPERS

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I.

INTRODUCTION

Nations, like individuals, depend in part upon memory in order to be able to function rationally in the present. Historians are to a degree responsible for what stands out in a nation's memory; they supply experience longer than one generation's life-span, and broader than that of any group of individuals.

Lloyd C. Gardner¹

The National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials was established by members of the Congress who genuinely believe that a nation's memory is not only important to the present and future, as noted by Professor Gardner, but that such memory depends upon preserving the public record and providing access to it.

The emergence of the United States as a world power in the Twentieth Century and the heavy responsibilities inherent in that role which the country has experienced since 1945, have made the study of the history of American foreign relations particularly important to those who believe that the "lessons of the past" can provide understanding for the present. Yet for reasons peculiar to the policy-making process, papers and documents concerning foreign policy are often the most controversial and the least accessible.

This study began with the assumption that records and papers concerning the making of foreign policy share certain characteristics with all government records, while exhibiting some special characteristics inherent in the process of protecting the national security interests of the United States. A second assumption was that although historians of foreign relations in the early decades of the century could rely almost exclusively on State Department records and the papers of its senior officials, historians interested in the period after World War II would have to rely just

as heavily on records and papers from the White House and even certain papers from the Defense Department. In addition, historians would face the additional problems of a vast escalation in the sheer amount of material being generated by all those concerned with the policy-making process. The question which this study seeks to answer is: Can historians of foreign relations now write, or be able to write in the future, about the recent past of the last twenty to thirty years? The answer to this question can help indicate to the Commission the recommendations for changes which should be considered so that the nation's memory will remain intact.

Rather than rely on printed reports of the situation as it should be, this study relied heavily upon interviews or conversations with more than fifty people who have either used the documents and papers in question, produced them, or both. Thus an attempt has been made to assess the situation as it really exists for those people who are the most concerned.

In order to limit the scope of what could have been a limitless study, the information in this paper concentrates first on the preservation of records in the State Department, followed by a section on the availability of those records. After an examination of the special problems presented by the papers of senior officials in the agencies and the White House, the study concludes with a summary and recommendations.

II.

PRESERVATION OF RECORDS

State Department Records

Research on American foreign relations invariably begins with the records of the Department of State, not necessarily with the documents in the archives, but rather in a library with the pertinent volume of **Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS)**.² These volumes, which have been published since 1861, are compilations of the most important policy-making documents in the State Department records. Before the State Department records are made available for research, trained professional historians from the Department's Historical Office comb each and every box and file to determine which records and papers are the most valuable to completing the record of the Department's actions. After the publication of these records in **FRUS**, the State Department declassifies and sends to the National Archives and Records Service (NARS) the records and papers which have been used in the just-published volume or volumes. The last **FRUS** volumes published were for the year 1949. Thus State Department material through 1949 is now at NARS—with some important exceptions to be noted later.

Each document in **FRUS** is marked by an identifying number, to aid the researcher who seeks the original source. Most of the records from the State Department which reflect the decision-making process are in a group designated as Record Group 59, although there are eleven other record groups which include records of the Department.³ After 1910 the records of the Department which comprised the central file were filed by the Department according to a comprehensive subject filing system called the decimal file. But of equal interest to the researcher are the files which remain outside the central file system of the Department. Most of these valuable files are various office files. These lot files, as they are called, often contain inter-office memoranda, working papers, drafts, and correspondence which supplement and even explain the material in the central files.

Unfortunately, the preservation and retrieval of State Department records is not the smooth operation that official descriptions of the records would indicate. The retrieval of records has been a persistent problem to members of the Department, career diplomats, historians in the Historical Office, and countless researchers. Part of the problem simply stemmed from the fact that with the Second World War, the number of records relating to foreign policy escalated beyond the wildest imaginations of those who originally established the filing systems. A second problem developed from the failure of the Department to recognize the first problem. During the depression years the Department was able to hire bright young people to care for the files, and paper was filed properly. However, just as the number of documents began to multiply, prosperity tempted the knowledgeable clerks to better paying jobs. Those who remained began the process of putting one country's records in another country's files. Thus the entire system of the central files simply broke down sometime in the 1940s. The result was a "nightmare of disorder and inefficiency amounting to almost total inaccessibility."⁴

As a result of this disorder in the central files, career diplomats, desk officers, and others in the Department hesitated to place papers which were important to them into the central file system. Instead they simply kept them in their offices. These collections, the lot files, were then retired as one collection of records, although they included a countless array of records and papers on a variety of issues. The foreign service officer often kept what he believed were duplicates, but so much was lost in the central file that often the lot files became the only source of important information. Hours and hours are spent, first by members of the Historical Office and then some years later by researchers, laboriously going through these disorganized files.

In addition to the confusion over the lot files, records in the State Department not only get lost but are sometimes destroyed in a totally irrational manner. Researchers have often complained that documents printed in the **FRUS** are sometimes missing from the archives. One his-

torian recently doing research in the area of Latin American relations during World War II was struck by the number of inexplicable gaps in the records. Another found that just prior to a recent visit to the Department, "records of the Eastern and Southern European Division were destroyed". Historians in the Historical Office can relate many stories such as the one concerning a Freedom of Information request for documents on the Italian elections in the early 1950's. There was evidence that the information had been carefully preserved at one time in one of the lot files, only to be destroyed by someone who had run out of storage space. The historians in the Historical Office blame this situation on inefficiency, neglect, and disregard by the Department. Frustrated researchers tend to see either a deliberate destruction of records which certain people did not want left in the files or suspect that the relevant documents they seek now rest in inaccessible private collections.⁵

In 1973, the State Department began using a new automated document system (ADS) for its central file. This system has satisfactorily solved the problem of immediate retrieval for recent or current records in the department.⁶ Operated by the Foreign Affairs Document and Reference Center (FADRC), it is an unusually effective system which took ten years to develop in order that the special needs of the Department could be met. The system is so well designed that high speed search and retrieval is now possible for any document which has entered the State Department since 1973. Every piece of correspondence which enters the Department and even special reports of long-term interest are now captured on this system. Retrieval is gained first by referring to indexes and then through the use of terminals connected to the computer.

The indexes compiled by FADRC are of course crucial to the success of the system. Many of the documents which enter the system are indexed automatically because they are marked by a TAGS code (Traffic Analysis by Geography and Subject). The remaining documents are indexed by personnel with college degrees and trained by FADRC.

In addition to this computerized central file system, another computer is at work in the State Department Executive Secretariat.⁷ Papers generated by the Executive Secretariat are of particular interest to historians. Essentially the Secretariat handles information which reaches the Secretary of State and his principal deputies. Any brief perusal of **FRUS** by a casual observer would illustrate the importance of documents which come from the Executive Secretariat (S/S). The record managers of the system in the Executive Secretariat (the SADI system) describe it as designed to keep track of the flow of documents which operate within the Secretariat. Documents which enter the "seventh floor" of the State Department, enter the SADI system and stay there until the Secretariat is completely through with them. Then they are placed in the ADS system and indexed.

The record managers who designed and implemented the ADS system in

FADRC and those in charge of the SADI system are justifiably proud of their accomplishment, considering the disarray of State Department records in the thirty or forty years which preceded their system. They insist that the central file is now complete and hence the problem of retrieval is solved not only for State employees but for future researchers.

Unfortunately there is simply no way of knowing whether the record managers are correct in their assumptions. Do they now have in the computer all that the historian will need to know from the public record? Except for a few Freedom of Information requests, and some brief attempts on the part of individual historians in the Historical Office, no one has yet attempted to use the computer record for historical research.

However, it seems probable that the next generation of historians will still face certain problems of both preservation and accessibility. They will just be new problems. It is still unclear whether the record managers on the "seventh floor" are in fact capturing all the information of importance to the researcher. The computer system has been devised by those interested in the efficient conduct of policy. The historian is interested in the reconstruction of the decision-making. Therefore, he is as interested in inter-office records, records not on the computer, as those which enter and leave the Department. The historian is also interested in the comments and notations which are often attached to documents—comments which will now be removed before the document enters the computer. Therefore, even though the computerized central file will largely eliminate the problems generated by the massive lot files, the archivists "will still find it necessary to accession office files of permanent value."⁸

There are some other problems that need to be solved before the ADS system transfers its microfilm for use in NARS. Fortunately these problems are now being discussed by the record managers in FADRC, the historians in the Historical Office and the archivists in the Diplomatic Branch of the archives. One such problem concerns the indexes. Currently the indexes for the ADS are being designed for immediate retrieval by State Department personnel. As yet no one knows if they will also be adequate to the needs of the researcher. Some informal indexes on the "seventh floor" are actually being destroyed at the end of their usefulness to SADI, although they could be very useful to future researchers.⁹

Another problem for researchers is that one very important research technique—the scanning of documents relating to a specific subject will no longer be possible. The researcher will approach the records with his indexes and will simply have to call for the documents indicated by them.

The technical problems that follow this retrieval will probably be more easily handled. Some system will have to be devised for removing classified records as the researcher will need to use rolls of film which contain both classified and unclassified documents. He may also find that the indexes indicate a need for fifty documents from fifty separate rolls of microfilm. Obviously it will be necessary for the archives to provide the

researcher with electronic microfilm reader-printers for this kind of research. All research will grind to a halt if the computerized records have to be retrieved through the laborious system of hand-cranked microfilm readers now available in NARS.

Defense Department Records

Historians interested in the interrelationship between foreign policy and strategy must also do research in the records of the Department of Defense (DOD). DOD is not one agency but a collection of agencies and its records reflect all the advantages and disadvantages of such a conglomerate. Each service, Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, has its own record-keeping section and its own historical office. In addition there is a historical office and separate records for the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS), and the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD). There are also separate collections of intelligence records.¹⁰

All of the divisions of the Defense Department, including the Army and Navy intelligence divisions, routinely retire their records to NARS. Archivists point out that this indicates the military's sense of public responsibility as well as its belief in civilian control. But the JCS have only recently come around to the view that they deal in public records. They still interpret official records very "tightly", omitting from their files certain memoranda and material that other agencies would leave for the public records. The Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), like the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), does not retire its records to NARS.

Record keeping in DOD is generally of very high quality. Archivists in the Modern Military Branch of NARS believe that the Army may have the best record-keeping system in the entire government. This was confirmed by at least one other government historian, who added the information that this was probably due to a combination of an adequate budget and the "clout" of Army regulations. Another government historian noted that within DOD the most complete set of records in any office would probably be found in the JCS. Perhaps this is true because they tend to guard jealously their records from outsiders.

Yet, in spite of their completeness, DOD records are very difficult for the researcher to use. There is no central file and no subject file. This has led one historian to characterize Defense records as a "wonderland". Fortunately historians of foreign policy are usually interested in records of the smaller organizations within DOD, those concerning the Joint Chiefs, the Secretary's Office and the intelligence agencies. Here the problems are those of access which will be discussed later.

Archivists in NARS desire the routine retirement of records from every agency and argue that they are not only equipped to keep secrets, but

could become personally liable for prosecution if they were revealed. Thus they have urged the DIA, the CIA and the National Security Agency (NSA) to accept the idea of the public responsibility to leave their records in NARS. NSA, for example, has declined to turn over to the archives records it has in its possession which date from World War I. Realistically, the archivists judge that it would take a "ukase" from Congress to pry records loose from intelligence groups, even though the records could easily remain closed for as long as the agency felt necessary. Until every agency leaves its records to NARS there is simply no way of knowing what is thrown out.

National Security Files

No matter how complete and accessible, agency files are inadequate for understanding the course of foreign policy decision-making after World War II. With the expansion of presidential power, researchers have begun relying ever more heavily upon records and papers generated by the Executive Office of the President. Here, in councils, committees, subgroups, or just staff meetings, policy was discussed and determined by a small group of individuals and their staffs. Those historians, therefore, who wish to write the complete history of decision-making now need to refer to the national security files left by each presidential administration. Along with the final position papers and documents, they must search these for memoranda, drafts, summaries, minutes, and personal recollections.

Discussing security files in the post-war era means examining a period in which researchers have had very little access to source material. Because the State Department has declassified its records before 1949, most of the other agency records for that period are also open. Very little material on national security has, however, been released from the post-1949 period so that the extent of the material which has been collected is largely unknown. Before conclusions can be drawn concerning national security files from the Executive Office of the President it is useful to consider what has happened to the files of the last thirty years.

One part of the National Security Act of 1947 created the National Security Council (NSC), an Executive Secretary and an NSC staff. President Eisenhower then added a Special Assistant for National Security Affairs to oversee the work of the Executive Secretary and the staff. This organizational structure has remained in place even as presidential use of the structure has varied.¹¹

Both Truman and Eisenhower made full use of the formal Council structure. Eisenhower's Special Assistant, Robert Cutler, regarded his staff as a professional one whose purpose was that of policy-planning. This NSC staff was to go beyond the day-to-day reaction to foreign policy problems and instead to plan in an orderly fashion. Other members of the staff, such

as Andrew Goodpaster, were then in charge of the operational end and coordinating the NSC planning function with the operational functions.

During the Kennedy Administration, the structure remained but the system was dismantled. The Special Assistant used the NSC umbrella but within it made a personal staff for President Kennedy. This pattern continued under the Johnson Administration, and although President Nixon planned to return to the Eisenhower model, his Special Assistant in fact soon came to dominate the scene in decision-making.

These changes have had an effect on the record-keeping processes. During the Eisenhower Administration, a "permanent library of documents" relating to policy-planning was placed in the NSC files. During the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations, the document file diminished and the important files were staff files, particularly the files kept by Special Assistants McGeorge Bundy and Walt W. Rostow. Thus, two sets of national security files have emerged from the past four or five administrations, and will probably continue to emerge in future administrations: an NSC institutional file, and the national security staff files of presidential advisors.¹²

All agencies which are members of the NSC—State, Defense, CIA, etc.—have copies of NSC "numbered documents." These documents are the final position papers of the Council which were circulated to every member. The State Department has used these in **FRUS**, some of these have been "leaked" (especially the famous NSC/68), and others have been obtained through the Freedom of Information Act. In addition, these numbered documents can often be found in the presidential libraries.¹³

When the Truman Library received its final collection of Truman papers in January 1975 they included not only the number one copy of the NSC numbered documents of that administration, but minutes of the NSC meetings. However, the Truman Library staff files contain very few action memos, drafts, and other such memoranda. The Truman Administration had a very small staff compared to those of the last three administrations. These men were very security conscious and were cautioned by President Truman against keeping any papers relating to security matters in their own files. Thus they returned all such papers to the files of the NSC. Historians and political scientists have generally assumed that because Truman did not use the Council as much as his successors, there were simply no other records. This position may have to be modified. There may be a considerable body of material for the Truman Administration locked in the files of the NSC.¹⁴

The Eisenhower Administration institutionalized the NSC. The staff was enlarged and an orderly file system of country and regional files developed. The Eisenhower Administration also left office in a very orderly manner leaving the NSC files in what had become in effect an institutional file.¹⁵

The Eisenhower Library now has three groups of national security files.

One group consists of the large collection of documents which went into the security area at Fort Ritchie, Maryland, at the end of the Eisenhower Administration and only reached the library in the mid-1960's. This material is highly classified and has not yet been processed. (There are, however, container lists for the material.) A second group of national security files came to the library through the papers of staff assistants to the Council and the President. The papers of Gordon Gray and Andrew Goodpaster, for example, contain many such papers. The third group of papers came to the library in 1969. These were included in the files which Mr. Eisenhower kept with him at Gettysburg particularly in the "Whitman File," a file maintained by Eisenhower's personal secretary, Ann Whitman. Although President Eisenhower had made clear to his staff that he did not approve of individuals keeping summaries and notes, his Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, Robert Cutler, arranged for Everett Gleason to make a summary of all the NSC meetings. These summaries were left in the Whitman file, and are just now being processed by the library. The library intends to remove these Gleason summaries from the general file, placing each one in a file folder which will then be identified to the researcher by date only. All this material is closed and can only be seen by researchers going through the review process.¹⁶

After the Kennedy Administration took office and national security affairs were in the hands of the President's personal staff, the official or institutional NSC file grew thinner. There is very little documentation for that period in the NSC files. The vast national security files from the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations are in the presidential libraries, an estimated 330,000 pages in the Kennedy Library alone. They came through staff files—the Bundy file in the Kennedy Library, for example—although they are so vast they are arranged by country, region and subject as well as under the names of staff members. The Kennedy Library has described its files rather precisely in its guide to the materials in the Library.¹⁷ The Johnson Library has not yet published a guide yet presumably will do the same. The material in both libraries is filed in a similar manner since both administrations used the same filing manual. The primary difference between the filing systems was that Johnson had no private secretary—no Evelyn Lincoln—making separate files. Johnson, instead, actually used the central file of the White House.¹⁸

The Nixon Administration in 1969 revived the NSC as a functioning body. In an affidavit filed in the case of **Nixon v. The Administrator of General Services**, Mrs. Jeanne Davis, Staff Secretary of the NSC, described in some detail the record-keeping procedure of the Council during the Nixon Administration. She noted that there were two separate security files, The institutional files

contain all National Security Study Memoranda and Decision Memoranda and all reports and recommendations prepared for the Council. These files also include minutes of NSC sub-group meetings, briefing papers, and material related to NSC organizations.

In addition to these files there are non-institutional files maintained by NSC staff. She described these as materials used to brief the President, records of negotiations with foreign governments, correspondence with foreign heads of state, etc. These papers, regarded as presidential papers, are filed separately and will leave the White House with the President. Evidently, this system was continued during the Ford Administration.¹⁹

The NSC keeps its current records in the Old Executive Office Building and its backlog of institutional records in the CIA depository in Warrenton, Virginia. Although the NSC will be thirty years old next year (1977), the NSC staff does not plan to retire its records to NARS. To do so, they state, would require a review of every document, and there is no budget for such an undertaking. In addition, the NSC staff concedes that it strongly believes that security files such as theirs are unique and some at least should probably never be opened—or at least not for fifty to one hundred years.²⁰

Unless this position changes in the future, historians will clearly profit by administrations which file their national security documents outside the institutional NSC file. Although all national security documents are closed to researchers, at least the historians knows the extent of the documentation in the Kennedy-Johnson period, because the bulk of the record exists in presidential libraries. The researcher still does not know the extent of the national security material left by the Truman or Eisenhower administrations.

NOTES

¹U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, **U. S. Government Information Policies and Practices - Security Classification Problems Involving Subsection (b) (1) of the Freedom of Information Act, (Part 7)**. Hearings before a sub-committee of the House Committee on Government Operations, 92nd Congress, 2nd Sess., 1972, p. 2657.

²Unless otherwise noted information on the State Department Historical Office comes from the following interviews: Richardson Dougall, former Deputy Director of the Historical Office, June 21, 1976; William Slany, formerly Editor of the Foreign Relations Series and now Director of the Multi-Lateral and Western Group, June 24, 1976; Arthur Kogan, Advisor on Records Policy, June 28, 1976 and Frederick Aandahl, formerly Acting Director of the Historical Office and now Associate Historian, June 28, 1976.

³A complete description of State Department records in NARS may be found in the National Archives and Records Service, General Services

Administration, **Preliminary Inventory of the General Records of the Department of State** (Washington, 1963). Also, see Milton O. Gustafson, ed., **The National Archives and Foreign Relations Research** (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1974), pp. 3-8.

⁴Foy D. Kohler, "Reflections of a Professional Diplomat," Gustafson, ed., p. 282; interview with Dougall. A recent example of the historian's frustration can be found in Brian L. Villa, "The U. S. Army, Unconditional Surrender, and the Potsdam Proclamation," **The Journal of American History**, Vol. LXIII, No. 1 (June, 1976) pp. 66-92. Here in footnote 4, p. 68, he writes, "For an example of State Department files at their worst see 740.00119 (Potsdam) 7-2345. . . , a loose unbound file containing over 100 documents from sundry and miscellaneous sources, currently (1973) in no particular order."

⁵Confidential conversations with historians in the State Department Historical Office; Comments made by Michael Grow concerning research for his dissertation, "The Good Neighbor Policy; United States Economic Expansion and Great Power Rivalry in Paraguay" (unpublished dissertation, George Washington University, 1976); letter to the author from Hugh de Santis, Chicago, August 22, 1976; interview with Armin Rappaport, Professor of History, UC/San Diego, June 30, 1976.

⁶Interview with John Pruden, Director, Foreign Affairs Document and Reference Center, Department of State June 25, 1976; Milton O. Gustafson, "Archival Implications of State Department Recordkeeping," **Prologue**, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Spring, 1975), pp. 36-38.

⁷Interview with Paul M. Washington, Director, Information Management Section, Department of State, July 8, 1976.

⁸Gustafson, "Archival Implications of State Department Recordkeeping," p. 38.

⁹Interview with David Trask, Director, Historical Office, Department of State, July 9, 1976; interviews with Pruden, Washington.

¹⁰Unless otherwise noted information on Defense records came from interviews with the following: Alfred Goldberg, Chief Historian, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, July 16, 1976; Robert Wolfe, Branch Chief, and William Cunliffe, Archivist, Modern Military Branch, NARS, July 21, 1976; Jonathan Grossman, Historian, U. S. Dept. of Labor, July 22, 1976; Ernest R. May, Professor of History, Harvard University, September 15, 1976.

¹¹Stanley L. Falk, "The National Security Council Under Truman,

Eisenhower, and Kennedy", **Political Science Quarterly**, Vol. 79 (September, 1964), pp. 403-434; David K. Hall, "The 'Custodian-Manager' of the Policymaking Process", **Commission on the Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy** (Washington, June, 1975), 2:100-119.

¹²Interviews with Bromley Smith, member of NSC staff from Eisenhower administration through Johnson administration, July 20, 1976; Gordon Gray, formerly Special Assistant to the President (Eisenhower) for National Security Affairs, July 30, 1976; William Moss, Archivist, Kennedy Library, August 3, 1976; Mrs. Jeanne Davis, Staff Secretary, NSC, August 6, 1976; Andrew Goodpaster,, formerly Staff Secretary to the President (Eisenhower), August 26, 1976.

¹³Interview with John L. Gaddis, Professor of History, Naval War College, August 14, 1976; telephone interview with Harry Clark, Truman Library, August 24; interview with Moss.

¹⁴Interview with George M. Elsey, Administrative Assistant to the President (Truman), September 3, 1976; interviews with Clark and Davis.

¹⁵John Eisenhower, however, removed all of the papers with his father's signature. Therefore, some of the records in the NSC files for that period are copies. Interview with Jack Murphy, NSC Staff, August 6, 1976.

¹⁶Eisenhower also insisted that only one record be kept of the "special group" meetings. These records were filed by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Information on the Eisenhower period from interviews with George Curtis, Archivist, Eisenhower Library, August 6, 1976; Richard A. Jacobs, Deputy Assistant Archivist for Presidential Libraries, July 14, and September 12; Smith, Goodpaster, and Gray.

¹⁷NARS, **Historical Materials in the John F. Kennedy Library**, (Waltham, Massachusetts, January, 1975).

¹⁸Telephone interview with Charles Corcoran, Assistant Director, Johnson Library, August 10, 1976.

¹⁹"Deposition of Jeanne W. Davis", July 30, 1975, **Richard M. Nixon v. Administration of General Services et. al.** (Civil Action 74-1852, United States District Court for the District of Columbia),

²⁰Interview with Davis and Murphy.

'WOULD YOU TELL ME, PLEASE, WHICH WAY I OUGHT
TO GO FROM HERE?' or RESEARCH IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

by

Thomas G. Paterson*

Alice, she of Wonderland, presented this question, not to the staffs of the Diplomatic Branch, National Archives, or the Historical Office of the Department of State, but to the Cheshire Cat. Still, should Alice ever decide to undertake serious research in U. S. diplomacy for the post-1945 period, she would find her query quite appropriate. My recent participation on a State Department "open house" panel, a long research venture in several Washington, D. C. area depositories, conversations with helpful archivists, and chats with young scholars in dazed pursuit of relevant sources, have convinced me that the answers to our Alice-like questions are inadequate or confused, sometimes downright obfuscatory, and frequently frustrating.

The explanation for this unhappy state of affairs lies not only in the unfortunate practice of tying the release of State Department materials to the publication of the **Foreign Relations** volumes. It lies not only in the disorder of the documents we are permitted to read. It lies not only in the fact that many documents have been lost or destroyed. It lies, then, not simply in the problem of accessibility to incomplete materials, but also in the difficulty of gaining **access to information about diplomatic sources**. Where are they? Are they open to researchers? Why are so many documents withdrawn? Is there an index? Is the index itself classified? Who holds responsibility for declassifying materials? And on and on.

The problem of locating sources begins at once upon entering the office of the Diplomatic Branch of the National Archives. Even veterans of research will recall their first timid steps past secretaries/guards who have slight interest in diplomatic history and seemingly little patience with those who profess acquaintance with the subject. You are directed to a staff member, who will, upon learning the title of your project, suggest applicable collections. This person is very helpful, yet immediately you sense that you are largely dependent upon this person. Lists are not produced for you unless you ask for them. Yet you often do not know what to ask for. Doubt creeps in. Could the assistant at the Diplomatic Branch have forgotten to mention a relevant collection? You ask if there might be other materials. The very vagueness of the question engenders the expected response: "I think so." You remember that someone had mentioned that "lot" files contained a variety of materials not necessarily reflected in the "lot" file title. You learn, through questioning, that a "lot" file list does exist. When handed the list, you learn that it is incomplete and under revision. Could you see the box list for the International Trade Files, or the George McGhee Files, or the SWNCC Files? Of course, but they, the box lists, are in stack area 5-E.

* *Professor Paterson is a member of the Department of History at the University of Connecticut, and is also a constituent of the SHAFR Council.

Should you have had the good fortune to have heard from other scholars about specific collections, as I did, you may ask for these particular items. I inquired about the Charles E. Bohlen Records (Lot 74D-379), which I understood to be housed in the National Archives. They were there, came the reply, but they remained in the legal custody of the Department of State and had not been prepared for research in large part because they contained classified materials. In short, they were closed. With the help of the Diplomatic Branch, I filed a Freedom of Information Act request and, after I left Washington, the Bohlen materials were opened to research. This problem of gaining access to the Bohlen files was aggravated by my understanding that some scholars had researched the files when they were in the Historical Office of the State Department. But since the research facilities of that office were closed in the summer of 1976, because of inadequate staffing and apparent interference with the work of the editors of the **Foreign Relations** volumes, the Bohlen documents among many others were closed. I felt trapped by bureaucratic decisions. The Bohlen files were indeed opened, but one wonders how many other collections are stalled in limbo.

What is encouraging, however, is that a spirit of "openness" seems to prevail with the leadership of both the Historical Office and the Diplomatic Branch. As active scholars themselves, they know well the frustrations of research. They are sensitive to the difficulties. I hope the following suggestions will encourage them in their quest for improvements. It would seem that something like the following is necessary unless the historian and archivist are continually to work at cross purposes. There is one characteristic of this relationship, however, that we cannot dodge. That is, the relationship is inherently an adversary one. Scholars want what the Diplomatic Branch and the Historical Office have and are sometimes reluctant to give up. If certain documents promise to tell the scholar a great deal, the latter may file numerous Freedom of Information Act requests for declassification, increasing the staffs' work load immensely. Scholars feel awkward in causing such burdens and perhaps in inviting a quiet declaration of **persona non grata** which may impede future research. Tension will always exist. Such is the basic nature of the relationship. But the following recommendations should facilitate the work of both and reduce the sale of aspirin in the city of Washington. Then, too, we could offer poor Alice some happy advice about the routes to scholarly havens.

Recommendations:

(1) To avoid the scholar's problem of not knowing what exists and not knowing which questions to ask, the Diplomatic Branch should create a central "Resource Room" in its offices. That room should contain, on open shelves for browsing, **every** index, checklist, box list, guide, or folder which in any way describes the holdings of the Branch. We should not have to run to 5-E from 6-E to obtain a box list from overworked records keepers who sometimes reveal irritation with the intrusion into their domain. We should not have to travel to another part of the building to find and use the index for the Research and Analysis reports (O. S. S. and State Department). All guides should be centrally located in one room where scholars can

stumble across unexpected research gems. After our own search through the lists we will be better able to formulate questions for the staff, one of whom should always be available in the room. Most of the Presidential libraries make such lists available in this manner. These lists and indices should be kept up-to-date. This "Resource Room" should also contain general lists of materials in other branches of the National Archives which hold materials of importance for the diplomatic historian. The Modern Military Branch, for example, has opened for research several National Security Council numbered papers, Joint Chiefs of Staff Records, and a handful of Central Intelligence Agency reports. Although it is the responsibility of the scholar to chase down these materials, the Diplomatic Branch could provide a useful service by providing research tips. This matter will become increasingly important as topics in the 1950s and 1960s are researched. The most important sources on the Cuban Missile Crisis or the CIA-operation in Guatemala it seems, do not reside in the Department of State and will thus not be located in the Diplomatic Branch later.

(2) The Historical Office of the State Department should designate one person as a "liaison" officer to handle questions from scholars. The telephone and office numbers of that individual should be published in this **Newsletter** and prominently displayed in places diplomatic historians frequent (within reason, of course). The Historical Office should open indices to researchers. Without the indices we certainly cannot identify the materials we wish to see. Let's be frank. Such openness will invite numerous Freedom of Information Act requests. From my point of view as a researcher I must ask for information about collections yet classified. I cannot easily function in my research unless I have such information. The records keeper-archivist, surely, gasps at such a prospect. The conflict will continue unless materials are opened more rapidly than now and particularly if accessibility remains tied to the publication rate of the **Foreign Relations** series. It seems reasonable to suggest that a twenty-year or less rule be in order. That would open sources through 1957. (If the publication of the **Foreign Relations** volumes lags behind the opening of documents, it does not appear that anything will be sacrificed). Then, too, the Historical Office should make available an "openings" book. Finally, this "liaison" officer will eliminate the necessity of tapping "contacts" in the Historical Office for information. By definition the latter becomes privileged and gives one scholar a certain advantage over another. All hint of privilege should be ended; doctoral students and full professors should receive the same information and the same courtesies.

(3) The Historical Office and the Diplomatic Branch, it seems to this outsider, could cooperate more effectively. The latter resists taking materials which are only partially declassified and the State Department, for whatever reason, insists on sending such materials. A better arrangement is clearly needed so that various files, and valuable research, are not tangled in the bureaucratic tussle. The two offices should share indices and lists and assist the confused researcher through the maze. Perhaps, too, the Advisory Committee on the **Foreign Relations of the United States** should meet more often and hold joint sessions with representatives of the

Diplomatic Branch and Historical Office. All of us would profit from a speedier opening of historical records and publishing of diplomatic papers. All concerned should consider re-creating the research room at the Historical Office; or, at least, immediately re-opening those sources which were once open and studied by scholars, but which fell victim to the closing in 1976. In summation, let's reach for rewarding answers to Alice's question.

The Young Sam Bemis in Distress

James F. Willis, editor
Southern Arkansas University

(The following letter of Samuel Flagg Bemis supplements his memoirs published in two parts in the **Newsletter** last fall. Those reminiscences focused upon his happy and rewarding years as a graduate student at Harvard. Success at Harvard did not, however, bring immediate professional advancement, and Bemis spent several poorly-paid years in small colleges out West. While a fledgling professor at Colorado College in November, 1919, he wrote a plea to Dean Charles H. Haskins of Harvard requesting help in finding a better position. His letter strikingly illustrates the fact that economic ills in the history profession are not altogether new. Learning that this great scholar had once encountered hardships similar to those of many young historians of today gave me encouragement when I found his letter in the Haskins papers at Princeton four years ago while doing doctoral research and facing an uncertain future. Bemis's example of perseverance in overcoming adversity and remaining in the profession should serve, I believe, as an inspiration to all aspiring historians).

PERSONAL

COLORADO COLLEGE
Colorado Springs
Colorado

1924 North Tejon Street
Colorado Springs, Colorado
8 November 1919

Dear Dean Haskins;-

I am taking advantage of the suggestion contained in your recent letter that you would be glad to assist me toward getting a better position.

I like my present place here, and my work in connection with it, very

much, I want to stay in the college teaching profession and continue on with writing and research, but I am alarmed lest I be forced out of it by sheer lack of being able to make both ends meet on my present salary. This year I am receiving a total (with bonus) of \$1975 as associate professor. My wife and I are living very modestly indeed in a four room apartment, and eating, and entertaining, in the kitchen. We have figured that we are just making both ends meet, without a cent to spare, and actually nothing in the way of recreation or amusement. At this rate, and with all husbanding of our resources, it is impossible to raise a family or to live in self-respecting circumstances. To buy a pair of shoes is a serious possibility to be closely figured over and is the subject of a family conference of no mean importance. I need not dwell on this; it is doubtless very familiar to you; but the fact remains that this is the condition, not only with me but with many other college instructors; and that unless something happens to improve my lot, I shall have to hunt for some chance to get into business and leave work which I think I am best fitted for, and in which I think I am most valuable and serviceable to society. I can make money in business. I would rather leave the teaching profession, under present circumstances, than to join an irresponsible radical movement to apply in a vicious way the principle of collective bargaining, as at present operated, to education in American colleges.

This is more or less of a selfish letter, because I want to be able to afford to stay in the work I now pursue. There are a number of things I want to do in it which are worthwhile. For example, recently I was told that efforts were being made to secure a place for me on the program of A. H. A. this Christmas, to read a paper I have just written. It would be a good thing for me to be there personally, but I cannot possibly afford to go (nor will the college pay my expenses). I have a volume nearly completed, which I hope soon to submit to the Harvard Historical Series (on the advice of Professor Channing), but as it is now I cannot even afford to pay express on volumes for reference borrowed from other libraries, which I need to finish it. After that is finished I want to spend a lot of time writing a real diplomatic history of the United States, but I cannot do so unless I continue teaching for a number of years.

Here at Colorado College I am successful. I can honestly say that I am as successful as anyone on this faculty, and I have better qualifications than most of them. I would not say any such thing, except for the exceptional candor of this letter. They want me to stay here. I am persuaded [sic] they would be willing to raise my salary five or six hundred dollars to keep me. This would enable me to get along. When it is badly need[ed] the money can always be found. At present the opinion is that I may care to stay here on account of my health. So I do, but my health is so recovered that I could if necessary reside in any part of the West (west of the Mississippi), especially in such places as the Dakotas, Minnesota, or good parts of the East. If I could get a good offer from a college or university in such a locality, the administration here would meet it, I think, to keep me. If they did not, I would go. I [If] neither happen[s], I must get out of teaching soon. My purpose in writing you this letter is to scare up

such an offer. I want it, because I want to go on with what I have planned.

I hope you will pardon the length of this letter, and the personal circumstances related. I know you realize the situation is a serious one, not for me alone, but for college education everywhere. If things continue, the college faculties will be filled up with a crowd of little meek men, who are there because they cannot fit in anywhere else. If you can do anything for me I shall be very grateful.

You mentioned that although there was a considerable demand for men in European History, there did not seem to be in U. S. history. I prefer the latter, but I have handled work in modern European history here, and was chairman [sic] of the War Aims work in the S. A. T. C. What I want is a combination of American History and contemporary international relations.

Respectfully yours,

Samuel F. Bemis

Dean Charles H. Haskins
Harvard University

MINUTES OF SHAFR COUNCIL MEETING

President Raymond Esthus called the Council to order at 8:15 P. M. in the Whitehall Suite of the Marriott Hotel in Atlanta, April 6, 1977. Present were Council members Akira Iriye, Joseph O'Grady, Tom Paterson, and Armin Rappaport, plus Nolan Fowler, Waldo Heinrichs, Roger Trask, Samuel Wells and Warren F. Kuehl.

Warren Kuehl noted that memberships in SHAFR were rising steadily, and he predicted that a total of 700 would be reached by the end of the year. He stated also that a \$20,000 bond had recently been received from Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, the income of which is to be used to help defray the costs of the Stuart L. Bernath awards. Raymond Esthus then disclosed the names of the most recent winners of Bernath Awards. The Committee for the Stuart L. Bernath Book Prize (John L. Gaddis, Chairman, Warren F. Kimball, Ronald Steel) selected Roger V. Dingman of the University of Southern California for his study, **Power in the Pacific: The Origins of Naval Arms Limitations, 1914-1922**. (University of Chicago Press). The Article Award Committee (Martin Sherwin, Chairman, Robert Beisner, Charles Neu) chose John C. A. Stagg of the University of Auckland, New Zealand, for his essay, "James Madison and the 'Malcontents': The Political Origins of the War of 1812," which appeared in the **William and Mary Quarterly** in October, 1976.

Sam Wells reported that his committee would meet during the current

OAH convention to decide upon a nominee for the Bernath lectureship of 1978. Ray Esthus explained that all committee appointments for the Bernath prizes rotate in April of each year with new members and chairpersons taking charge at that time.

In the absence of the chairman of the Membership Committee, Warren Kuehl distributed a compilation which showed the geographical distribution of the members. (See p. 49 of **Newsletter**). A discussion of whether special attention should be given to recruiting State Department personnel as members led to the conclusion that they should be reached through the usual channels.

Nolan Fowler stated that each issue of the **Newsletter** now exceeded in number of pages and copies the maximums which had been specified in the original contract, and Council observed that SHAFR members were pleased with the bargain. A Committee chaired by Joe O'Grady and including Nolan Fowler is to be formed to consider a new editor for the **Newsletter** when Dr. Fowler retires. A job description is to be prepared with the Committee responsible for advertising the post and reporting to Council its recommendations for a successor.

Armin Rappaport, editor of **Diplomatic History**, disclosed that the second issue of the journal was out and that the third number was virtually prepared for publication. A steady flow of essays was being received now, he said, with a good balance between those from elder and younger scholars. He remarked that in response to the problem of accepting essays on non-U. S. diplomatic history he had polled the Editorial Board and that it had reaffirmed the intent that the journal be purely U. S. in focus. A discussion ensued over the problem of foreign-language essays and translations with several suggestions being offered by Council members. The Council firmly rejected the idea of carrying articles in the journal which had been published elsewhere.

In the absence of a formal report by the Committee on the new guide to American foreign relations, Council decided that no action could be taken on the editorship selection. The president mentioned that proposals respecting the position had already been received from two parties, but the Council decided that additional publicity should be given the project, to the end that there be a large pool of qualified applicants from which to make the final choice. The Committee was instructed to supply the **Newsletter** with a proper notice regarding the editorship, and inviting preliminary expressions of interest not later than August 1.

Roger Trask, Chairman of Program Committee, announced that the program for the SHAFR summer conference was complete except for one dinner speaker. Copies were circulated amid expressions of pleasure regarding the topics and participants, and commendations to the chairman and the committee for its work. A brochure giving all details of the conference is

to be mailed in May. On the question of whether the Program Committee should supply the names of speakers and their topics to the planners of meetings at regional historical organizations, the Council felt that this could be a burdensome task. Furthermore, members can be notified through the **Newsletter** of such opportunities and submit proposals on their own.

Warren Kuehl stated that 75 approvals have been received to date concerning changes in the By-Laws, all of them favorable.

The subject of the **Roster & Research List** stimulated discussion because Rutgers University at Newark can no longer absorb the mailing costs. While Council agreed at its December meeting to defray expenses for the 1976 **Roster** it was felt it would be burdensome for SHAFR to continue to do this. Joe O'Grady volunteered that if Warren Kimball agreed, he would be willing to distribute the 1976 **Roster** from La Salle College and thus save SHAFR that expense. Council decided that a full review of the **Roster** situation should take place at its August meeting. (Note: The **List** was mailed from Rutgers to members in mid-May).

Waldo Heinrichs gave a resume' of his efforts to find a solution to the State Department's decision to discontinue the publication of the Biographical Register and Foreign Service List. The Council had submitted to the Department its resolution which was passed at the December meeting and had received a non-committal response. Council decided to name Heinrichs and Samuel Wells as SHAFR's representatives in pursuing discussions with the Department concerning this problem. It was deemed important to push first for a continuation of the past policy but if this was not feasible then to insist that at the least the compilations should be continued with their release at the end of a ten-year period. The Secretariat was instructed to respond in writing to the State Department, expressing SHAFR's continuing interest and concern.

Under the heading of new business, Warren Kuehl announced that plans have been made for a SHAFR reception at the AHA Pacific Coast Branch meeting at Flagstaff, Arizona, in August, with Peter M. Buzanski, Gerald E. Wheeler, and David J. Alvarez in charge of local arrangements.

The Council formally voted to set a new dues rate for unemployed members at \$5.00 per year. A discussion of the feasibility of establishing a special committee to consider monetary grants which could be utilized for SHAFR projects ended in a decision to delay consideration. Likewise the question of a job-registry was explored with a consensus that the **Newsletter** provides the opportunity for members and institutions to post notices of needs and openings.

The subject of compiling a list of reviewers for the volumes in the **Foreign Relations** Series which could be provided to review editors of historical journals was debated with the decision that it would be unwise

for SHAFR to become involved in such an undertaking. The question of establishing a financial advisory committee for SHAFR led to a consensus that a need exists to advise the Society and the Secretariat on the proper investments of funds, and the President agreed to consider this subject with perhaps former presidents being asked to serve upon such a committee.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

At the business meeting following the luncheon on April 8, President Esthus commented upon the decisions and plans related to the bibliography project. The Bernath Book prize was given by John L. Gaddis to John F. Robinson of the University of Chicago Press in the absence of the award winner, Roger V. Dingman, who was in Japan. Martin Sherwin announced that John C. A. Stagg (U of Auckland) was the winner of the Bernath article prize, and Samuel Wells disclosed that the 1978 Bernath Speaker would be David S. Patterson of Colgate University. Roger Trask spoke about the summer meeting and distributed typed copies of the program.

The following resolution, introduced by Robert H. Ferrell, was adopted unanimously: "The Society desires to express its intense interest in the continuation of the advisory committee on the **Foreign Relations** series of the Department of State. For a generation this committee of historians, political scientists, and international lawyers has advised the Department on publication of **Foreign Relations**, the most distinguished documentary series issued annually by any of the major governments of the world. The Society's membership believes that the work of the committee is essential to the scholarly distinction of the series."

Response of Bernath Book Prize Winner

Roger V. Dingman

April 8, 1977

As I write these words, three sorts of emotions come over me. The first is regret. I am very sorry not to be present in Atlanta with you today. But a long standing prior commitment puts me in Tokyo. Perhaps that is in a way appropriate, for it was in Japan many years ago that I turned down the path that eventually led to the writing of this book.

Secondly, I want to express the deep sense of gratitude I feel toward all who contributed to making the events of this moment a reality. My thanks go very sincerely to those directly responsible for **Power in the Pacific's** receiving the Bernath Award--the members of the SHAFR Prize Committee, and the Bernath family. But they also extend to the many, many people who helped me along the way--teachers, friends, librarians, archivists, and publisher's staff. I want in particular to mention three of

special importance: Ernest May, under whose guidance this book began as a doctoral dissertation; my wife, Linda Story Dingman, without whose moral support the book would never have become a reality; and lastly, John Robinson--my voice for today, and also one of the most cooperative and efficient editors one could hope to have!

Finally, I feel a sense of encouragement which I would like to share with you. One incident in the production of the book prompts that feeling. Several years ago, before the manuscript was in final form, I sent it to a publisher other than the University of Chicago Press. After a short while it was returned along with a letter of a single sentence. The letter read:

"The only way we could publish this book is if you could prove that every battleship afloat in 1921 was a bordello run by the Mafia." I felt utterly devastated. But after a bit my feelings of devastation turned to those of determination. I had to prove that witty editor wrong, no matter how many times I rewrote the manuscript. I did rewrite it, and the manuscript eventually became **Power in the Pacific**.

I tell this story now not to prove that editor wrong, but rather to remind us of an important truth. A book, be it one's first or one's tenth, is not easily born. Perhaps we historians will write better books if we put in them not just the facts we find but also something of the human feelings--the disappointments as well as the delights--we experience in producing them.

Thank you very much.

PERSONALS

Warren I. Cohen (Michigan State) has a grant from the Ford Foundation in order to gather materials for a biography of Dean Rusk in the series, **American Secretaries of States and Their Diplomacy**, edited by Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana and former president of SHAFR). "Ports of call" for him in his research in recent months have included the Oral History Collection at Columbia U, the National Archives, and the presidential libraries, Kennedy, Truman, L. B. Johnson.

* * * * *

Richard Turk (Allegheny), aided by a grant, is currently working upon a volume in the Historical Monograph Series, sponsored by the Naval War College, which will deal with the correspondence between Alfred T. Mahan and Theodore Roosevelt.

* * * * *

Charles De Benedetti (Toledo) had a N. E. H. summer stipend last year to aid him in research upon the subject of the anti-war movement in America, 1961-1975.

* * * * *

Fred H. Harrington (Wisconsin), in India for the past six years upon a grant from the Ford Foundation, will return to his teaching post at Wisconsin in the fall.

* * * * *

Richard C. Lukas (Tennessee Tech) was recently the recipient of a grant from the Kosciuszko Foundation of New York City for the purpose of doing work in London and Warsaw this summer on a book dealing with United States-Polish relations during World War II.

* * * * *

Robert Seager II (Baltimore) will join the staff at the U of Kentucky this fall as professor of history and co-editor of the Henry Clay papers.

* * * * *

George C. Herring (Kentucky) is on leave this year with the support of a fellowship from the National Endowment for the Humanities. He was a guest lecturer at the Naval War College last October.

* * * * *

Thomas G. Paterson (Connecticut) was a member of the 1977 OAH Program Committee and helped to make sure that the recently-concluded annual meeting in Atlanta would have its share of sessions devoted to U. S. diplomatic history.

* * * * *

After a considerable stay in the United States, Chi Chen has resumed his professorship in American diplomatic history at the National Chung Hsing University in Taiwan. He is also serving as a research fellow of international relations at the Institute of International Relations, Republic of China.

* * * * *

W. Dirk Raat (SUNY at Fredonia) spent four months doing research in Mexico during the latter part of 1976.

* * * * *

David M. Pletcher (Indiana) has a review article in the February 1977 issue of the **American Historical Review**, titled "United States Relations with Latin America: Neighborliness and Exploitation," pages 39-59. Nine books are covered in the article.

* * * * *

On April 2 Lawrence S. Kaplan (Joint Executive Sec'y-Tr's'r of SHAFR) read a paper before the British Association for American Studies at St. Catherine's College, Oxford University, upon the topic, "The U. S. Military Aid Program and the Development of NATO."

* * * * *

J. K. Sweeney (South Dakota State U) and his wife have been selected as Danforth Associates for a six year term, beginning June of this year.

* * * * *

Glen St. J. Barclay (U of Queensland) was the author of an article, "Writings on Australian Nationalism, 1970-1976," which appeared in the **Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism**, III (1976), 51-61.

* * * * *

During the academic year 1977-78 Kendrick A. Clements (South Carolina) will be a Fulbright-Hays lecturer in American and U. S. diplomatic history at the National Taiwan University, Tamkang College, and at the Academia Sinica in Taipei, Taiwan.

* * * * *

Gerald E. Wheeler (San Jose State and former editor of SHAFR **Newsletter**) was recently appointed to the position of Dean of the School of Social Sciences at San Jose State. He had been the Acting Dean since last summer. Prior to his deanship, he was Chairman of the Department of History at the same institution.

* * * * *

Among those scholars who recently received grants as an aid to research activities at the Harry S. Truman Library Institute, Independence, Mo., was Bruce Kuklick (Pennsylvania).

* * * * *

During the last year twenty persons were awarded grants by the Lyndon Baines Johnson Foundation in order to do research at the Johnson Library, Austin, Texas. Among that number were two members of SHAFR: Kenneth S. Chern (U of Hong Kong) who was working upon the topic, "Mutual Images of America and China, 1961-1968," and Gary B. Ostrower (Alfred U) with the topic, "The United States, the United Nations, and Vietnam, 1964-68."

* * * * *

Roger Dingman (Southern California and 1977 winner of the Bernath Book Prize) will be a visiting professor at the Naval War College, Newport, R. I., the coming academic year.

* * * * *

Samuel F. Wells, Jr. (North Carolina) has held a fellowship at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, D. C., during the past academic year for the purpose of work upon a prospective book, **Escalation of the Cold War: the Impact of Korea, 1950-1954.**

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

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

Richard A. Baker (U. S. Senate Historical Office), "The Senate Historical Office: Why, What, and For Whom?" Paper read at annual meeting of Organization of American Historians, April, 1977, in Atlanta. This paper called upon historians to pay greater attention to Congress' policy-making role and suggested that the recently-created Senate Historical Office might make this formidable task less difficult. The office seeks to facilitate access to primary source material created by Senators and committees since 1789, and to serve as a clearing house for Senate-related research activity. Guided by the example of the Foreign Relations Committee, the office is encouraging other committees to open and print accounts of pre-

viously closed hearings, transcripts, and other restricted papers of the early postwar period. The office will intercede, on behalf of researchers with committees to identify records and recommend access where possible. The office has available for distribution an extensive bibliography and a catalogue of locations of the papers of members who have left the Senate since 1947.

* * * * *

Glen St. J. Barclay (U of Queensland), "The Future of Australian-American Relations," **Australian Outlook**, 30 (1976), 459-473. The ANZUS Pact has been revered by successive Australian Governments as the keystone of Australian relations with the United States, ever since its inception in 1951. The record shows, however, that the rare occasions on which anything like effective consultations between Washington and Canberra have in fact taken place, have occurred quite outside the ANZUS framework, as a result of necessarily transient personal accords between the leaders of the two countries. If the Australians wish to enhance the importance of the Alliance, it would thus seem expedient for them to enhance their own value as an ally to the United States. At a time when the Royal Australian Navy is outgunned by every other fleet in the Pacific, apart from those of Singapore and New Zealand, this consideration assumes some urgency.

* * * * *

John M. Carroll (Lamar University), "The New Left, the Cold War, and the Use of Historical Evidence," **Research Studies**, 45 (March, 1977), 53-59. During the last ten years diplomatic historians have given more attention to the origins of the Cold War than to practically any other subject. This article reviews the controversy between Traditional and New Left historians concerning the onset of the Soviet-American conflict. It focuses on the charges by Robert J. Maddox, Oscar Handlin, and others that New Left scholars have distorted and falsified historical evidence in arguing their position. Traditionalists have charged that New Left historians are undermining historical scholarship by misusing historical data. The article also examines the counter-attack by New Left scholars and analyzes the dimensions of the problem in the proper use of historical evidence.

* * * * *

Kendrick A. Clements (South Carolina), "'A Kindness to Carranza': William Jennings Bryan, International Harvester, and Intervention in Yucatan," **Nebraska History**, LVII (winter, 1976), 479-490. This article argued that although President Wilson and Secretary Bryan were not especially sympathetic to the plight of American businessmen caught in the Mexican Revolution, and although the experience of intervention at Veracruz in 1914 made them cautious about further involvement, pressure from certain economic interests brought them again to the brink of intrusion in the

spring of 1915. The pressure was brought by American farmers and manufacturers of farm equipment who feared that a blockade of Yucatan ports by Constitutionalist forces would cut off the supply of sisal fiber needed for the making of binder twine. This industry was dominated by an old enemy of Bryan, International Harvester, but the Secretary of State agreed, nevertheless, with President Wilson that force should be used, if necessary, to re-open Yucatan's ports and get the sisal. Fortunately, however, the Constitutionalists discontinued their blockade before a conflict took place.

* * * * *

Kendrick A. Clements (South Carolina), "Woodrow Wilson and Revolution: The Mexican Experience, 1913-1914," Paper delivered at the Citadel Conference on War and Diplomacy, Charleston, S. C., March 11, 1977. The paper contended that President Wilson's attitude toward revolution, as demonstrated in the first year of his Mexican policy, was more complicated than is usually realized, and that his policy was more flexible than he is usually given credit for. By the beginning of 1914 he had abandoned his original insistence upon constitutionalism in Mexico and had accepted the necessity of a radical, violent revolution leading to basic reforms, including re-distribution of land and limitations upon foreign investors. Well aware that such a revolution posed great risks for Americans and other foreigners, Wilson, nevertheless, insisted upon the right of the Mexicans to run their own affairs. The showy events of Wilson's intervention in Mexico should not blind one to his basic sympathy with Revolution, and to the rather remarkable degree of restraint which he usually demonstrated after his first, bungling year.

In the course of an exam a student informed Professor Salvatore Prisco, III (Stevens Institute of Technology) that as a consequence of the outrages of the Barbary pirates a well-known slogan resulted: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for **The Tribune.**"

PUBLICATIONS IN U. S. DIPLOMACY BY MEMBERS OF SHAFR

Thomas A. Bryson (West Georgia College), **American Diplomatic Relations with the Middle East, 1784-1975; a Survey.** 1977. The Scarecrow Press, Inc. \$17.50.

* * * * *

Thomas H. Etzold (Naval War College), **The Conduct of American Foreign Relations; the Other Side of Diplomacy.** 1977. New Viewpoints --Division of Franklin Watts. Cl. \$10.00; pb. \$5.95.

* * * * *

Norman A. Graebner (Virginia and former president of SHAFR), ed., **Nationalism and Communism in Asia; the American Response.** 1976. D. C. Heath & Co. Pb. \$3.50. Problems in American Civilization Series.

* * * * *

David Healy (U of Wisconsin--Milwaukee), **Gunboat Diplomacy in the Wilson Era: The U. S. Navy in Haiti, 1915-1916.** 1976. U of Wisconsin Press. \$15.00. Reviewed in **Journal of American History**, March, 1977.

* * * * *

Delber L. McKee (Westminster College), **Chinese Exclusion Versus the Open Door Policy, 1900-1906; Clashes over China Policy in the Roosevelt Era.** 1976. Wayne State U Press. \$17.95.

* * * * *

Harold F. Peterson (Professor emeritus, SUNY at Buffalo), **Diplomat of the Americas: A Biography of William I. Buchanan (1852-1909).** 1977. SUNY Press, Albany, N. Y. \$40.00.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS BY MEMBERS OF SHAFR

Norman A. Graebner (Virginia and former president of SHAFR), ed., **Freedom in America; a 200-Year Perspective.** 1977. Pa. State U. Press. \$12.50.

* * * * *

James E. Hewes, Jr. (Center of Military History, U. S. Army, Washington, D. C.), **From Root to McNamara: Army Organization and Administration, 1900-1963**. 1975. Sup't of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. \$11.45. This work is one of the Special Studies Series being done by the Center of Military History.

SHAFR ANNOUNCEMENTS

Applications are being accepted for the editorship of the projected bibliographic guide to the history of American foreign relations. (See the **Newsletter** of December, 1976, pp. 26-27, for details respecting this undertaking). Applicants with bibliographical experience are particularly desired. The editorship will require support from the editor's institution, including released time and secretarial assistance. It is anticipated that some financial grants, possibly by the NEH, will also be available. Each applicant should, if possible, include a statement from his/her institution, indicating the amount and type of help that the school will provide. Please send applications by August 1 to Dr. Norman A. Graebner (chairman of the advisory board for the guide), Corcoran Department of History, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903.

* * * * *

The Pacific Coast Branch of the AHA will hold its annual meeting at Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, August 11, 12, and 13. Professors Gerald E. Wheeler and Peter Buzanski of San Jose State will be in charge of a reception (cash bar) for members of SHAFR and friends at this convention. It will be held on Friday, August 12, 4:30-6:30 P. M., with the place unknown at press time. Those interested should check at the Registration Desk for the location.

OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Department of History at The Citadel has established an Oral History Program in War and Society. Interviews conducted to date have

focused primarily on World War II, and include tapes of General Mark Clark, General Sir John Hackett and others. For further information, please contact John W. Gordon, Department of History, The Citadel, Charleston, S. C. 29409.

* * * * *

The MacArthur Memorial, Norfolk, Virginia, will sponsor the third symposium of a series (begun in November, 1975), on the Occupation of Japan, April 13-15, 1978, to be titled "The Occupation of Japan: Economic Policy and Reform."

Anyone interested in participating, especially in presenting a paper or in presiding over a session, is invited to contact: Director, MacArthur Memorial, 198 Bank Street, Norfolk, Virginia 23510. Phone: 1-804-441-2256.

* * * * *

The United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate Doc. No. 94-265, dated August 30, 1976, is a 74-page account commemorating the 160th anniversary of the Committee (1816-1976). It is designed not as history but rather "addresses itself to the questions most frequently asked about the Committee and the ways it goes about its business." Nevertheless, SHAFR members will find in it valuable historical information, plus a roster of all persons who served, including dates. This is arranged both alphabetically and by sessions of Congress where party affiliation and the state they represented are noted. A third appendix lists the chairmen and their tenure. A two and one half page bibliography is included. Congress authorized the printing of 7,500 copies, "for the use of that Committee."

* * * * *

A new project in U. S. military and diplomatic history has been instituted at the Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars in the nation's capital under the title of the International Security Studies Program. Headed by Samuel F. Wells, Jr. (North Carolina) the project envisages the establishing of fellowships, the holding of conferences, and the inviting of guest scholars--all for the purpose of examining American security policy since 1945. The goal of the program, will be to have scholars from all the Social Sciences at work upon topics which will be based upon archival records in the Washington, D. C. area for the period 1945-1960.

Persons interested in receiving scholarships should apply to Dr. Samuel F. Wells, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Smithsonian Institution Building, Washington, D. C. 20560, prior to October 1. Dr. Wells's telephone number is 1-202-381-6397.

THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL LECTURE IN AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC HISTORY

The Stuart L. Bernath Annual Memorial Lectureship was established in 1976 through the generosity of Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, Beverly Hills, California, and is administered by SHAFR. The Bernath Lectures will be the feature at the luncheons of the Society, held during the conventions of the OAH in April of each year.

DESCRIPTION AND ELIGIBILITY: The lectures will be comparable in style and scope to the yearly SHAFR presidential address delivered at the American Historical Association, but will be restricted to younger scholars with excellent reputations for teaching and research. Each lecturer will concern himself not specifically with his own research interests, but with broad issues of concern to students of American foreign relations.

PROCEDURES: The Bernath Lectureship Committee is now soliciting nominations for the 1979 Lecture from members of the Society. (The name of the 1977 recipient of the Lectureship is given below. The 1978 award winner will be announced in the near future). Nominations, in the form of a short letter and curriculum vitae, if available, should reach the Committee not later than December 1, 1977. The Chairman of the Committee, and the person to whom nominations should be sent, is Dr. Samuel F. Wells, Jr., Department of History, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514.

HONORARIUM: \$300.00 with publication of the lecture assured in the Society's **Newsletter**.

AWARD WINNER

1977 Joan Hoff Wilson (Fellow, Radcliffe Institute)

**THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL PRIZE FOR THE BEST
SCHOLARLY ARTICLE IN U. S. DIPLOMATIC HISTORY DURING 1977**

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations announces that the 1978 competition for the best published article on any aspect of American foreign relations is open. The purpose of the award is to recognize and to encourage distinguished research and writing by young scholars in the field of U. S. diplomatic affairs.

CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD

ELIGIBILITY: Prize competition is open to the author of any article upon any topic in American foreign relations that is published during 1977. The article must be among the author's first seven (7) which have seen publication.

PROCEDURES: Articles shall be submitted by the author or by any member of SHAFR. Five (5) copies of each article (preferably reprints) should be sent to the chairman of the Stuart L. Bernath Article Prize Committee by January 15, 1978. The Chairman of that Committee for 1977 is Dr. Robert L. Beisner, Department of History, American University, Washington, D. C. 20016.

AMOUNT OF AWARD: \$200.00. If two (2) or more authors are considered winners, the prize will be shared. The name of the successful writer(s) will be announced, along with the name of the victor in the Bernath book prize competition, during the luncheon for members of SHAFR, to be held at the annual OAH convention, meeting in April, 1978, at New York City.

AWARD WINNER

1977 John C. A. Stagg (U of Auckland, N. Z.)

THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL BOOK COMPETITION FOR 1978

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations announces that the 1978 competition for the Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Prize upon a book dealing with any aspect of American foreign affairs is open. The purpose of the award is to recognize and to encourage distinguished research and writing of a lengthy nature by young scholars in the field of U. S. diplomacy.

CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD

ELIGIBILITY: The prize competition is open to any book on any aspect of American foreign relations that is published during 1977. It must be the author's first or second book.

PROCEDURES: Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of SHAFR. Five (5) copies of each book must be submitted with the nomination. The books should be sent to: Dr. Warren F. Kimball, Chairman, Stuart L. Bernath Book Prize Committee, Department of History, Rutgers University (Newark), Newark, New Jersey 07102. The works must be received not later than February 1, 1978.

AMOUNT OF AWARD: \$500.00. If two (2) or more writers are deemed winners, the amount will be shared. The award will be announced at the luncheon for members of SHAFR, held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the OAH which will be April, 1978, in New York City.

PREVIOUS WINNERS

1972	Joan Hoff Wilson (Sacramento) Kenneth E. Shewmaker (Dartmouth)
1973	John L. Gaddis (Ohio U)
1974	Michael H. Hunt (Yale)
1975	Frank D. McCann, Jr. (New Hampshire) Stephen E. Pelz (U of Massachusetts-Amherst)
1976	Martin J. Sherwin (Princeton)
1977	Roger V. Dingman (Southern California)

GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO **DIPLOMATIC HISTORY**

Diplomatic History is a new quarterly journal, sponsored by SHAFR and published by Scholarly Resources, Inc., which is devoted to scholarly articles in the field of American diplomatic history broadly conceived. The journal will include contributions that deal not only with the foreign policy of the United States but with the extensive foreign relations of the American nation--cultural, economic, and intellectual. Priority will be given to articles that make a significant scholarly contribution either by presenting new evidence and exploiting new sources or by offering new interpretations and perspectives. Preference will be given to manuscripts that illuminate broad themes in the American diplomatic experience, but articles that deal intensively with specific historical events are welcomed if they cast light on more central issues.

The journal is not designed to reflect any single ideological viewpoint. Articles by those who consider themselves traditionalists, revisionists, realists, moralists or generalists will receive an equally impartial reading. The sole objective is to further scholarly discourse among diplomatic historians and to provide them with a new outlet for their research and writing.

All manuscripts should be submitted in duplicate, with the author's name, affiliation and address on a separate cover page. Each manuscript should be typed in a double-spaced fashion on standard size paper, and the notes should be typed separately, in sequence, at the end of the manuscript. All the notes should follow the style set forth in **A Manual of Style**, published by the University of Chicago Press, 12th Edition.

All manuscripts should be submitted to:

Dr. Armin Rappaport
Editor, **Diplomatic History**
Department of History
U of California (San Diego)
La Jolla, California 92093

SHAFFR MEMBERSHIP REPORT, March 31, 1977

Total Membership - 618

Alabama	3	.49%	Montana	5	.81%
Alaska	0		Nebraska	3	.49%
Arkansas	4	.65%	Nevada	0	
Arizona	3	.49%	New Hampshire	5	.81%
California	46	7.44%	New Jersey	13	2.10%
Colorado	8	1.29%	New Mexico	3	.49%
Connecticut	13	2.10%	New York	54	8.74%
Delaware	3	.49%	North Carolina	15	2.43%
Dist. of Col.	42	6.80%	North Dakota	1	.16%
Florida	9	1.46%	Ohio	36	5.83%
Georgia	8	1.30%	Oklahoma	7	1.13%
Hawaii	2	.32%	Oregon	5	.81%
Idaho	2	.32%	Pennsylvania	40	6.47%
Illinois	20	3.24%	Rhode Island	8	1.29%
Indiana	18	2.91%	South Carolina	4	.65%
Iowa	7	1.13%	South Dakota	1	.16%
Kansas	7	1.13%	Tennessee	12	1.94%
Kentucky	6	.97%	Texas	25	4.05%
Louisiana	3	.49%	Utah	2	.32%
Maine	1	.16%	Vermont	3	.49%
Maryland	26	4.21%	Virginia	39	6.31%
Massachusetts	19	3.07%	Washington	12	1.94%
Michigan	7	1.13%	West Virginia	3	.49%
Minnesota	3	.49%	Wisconsin	17	2.75%
Mississippi	5	.81%	Wyoming	1	.16%
Missouri	7	1.13%	Non-U.S.	32	5.18%

EAST

Connecticut	13
Delaware	3
Dist. of Col.	42
Maine	1
Maryland	26
Massachusetts	19
New Hampshire	5
New Jersey	13
New York	54
Pennsylvania	40
Rhode Island	8
Vermont	3
West Virginia	<u>3</u>
Total	230
% of U.S. Total	39.25
% of Total	37.22

MIDWEST

Illinois	20
Indiana	18
Iowa	7
Kansas	7
Michigan	7
Minnesota	3
Missouri	7
Nebraska	3
North Dakota	1
Ohio	36
South Dakota	1
Wisconsin	<u>17</u>
Total	127
% of U.S. Total	21.67
% of Total	20.55

SOUTH

Alabama	3
Arkansas	4
Florida	9
Georgia	8
Kentucky	6
Louisiana	3
Mississippi	5
North Carolina	15
Oklahoma	7
South Carolina	4
Tennessee	12
Texas	25
Virginia	<u>39</u>
Total	140
% of U.S. Total	23.89
% of Total	22.65

WEST

Alaska	0
Arizona	3
California	46
Colorado	8
Hawaii	2
Idaho	2
Montana	5
Nevada	0
New Mexico	3
Oregon	5
Utah	2
Washington	12
Wyoming	<u>1</u>
Total	89
% of U.S. Total	15.19
% of Total	14.40

NON-U.S.

Australia	5
Canada	13
England	4
Germany	3
Italy	1
Japan	5
Scotland	<u>1</u>
Total	32
% of Total	5.18

WOMEN

Female Membership	53
% of Total	8.57
Total U.S.	586
Total Non-US	<u>32</u>
TOTAL MEMBERSHIP	618

 SHAFR ROSTER AND RESEARCH LIST

Please use this form to register your general and current research interests as well as your address. This **List** is stored upon computer tapes so that information may be quickly retrieved. In order for the system to work, though, two things are necessary from the members: (a) simple, concise, obvious titles should be used in describing projects; (b) a key word should be specified for each project. It would be quite helpful if members would send revised information to the editor whenever new data is available, since it will be much easier to keep the files up to date and avoid a rush in the fall. If a form is not available, a short memo will suffice. Changes which pertain only to addresses should be sent to the Executive Secretary, and he will pass them on to the editors of the **List** and the **Newsletter**. Unless new data is submitted, previously listed research projects will be repeated.

 Name: _____ Title: _____

Address _____

 State: _____ Zip Code _____ Institutional Affiliation
 (if different from address) _____

General area of research interest: _____

_____ Key word _____

Current research project(s): _____

_____ Key word(s) _____

If this is pre-doctoral work, check here _____

Mail to: Dr. W. F. Kimball, editor
 SHAFR R & R List
 Department of History
 Rutgers University, Newark
 Newark, New Jersey 07102

Draw a Circle around These Dates!

August 4-6, 1977

The Third National Conference of SHAFR

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

Expenses (Rooms, Meals, Registration Fee) Held to a Minimum!

One Reception, a Tour of Historic Sites, Two Luncheons, One Dinner

**Ten Papers, Four Commentaries, Three Luncheon-Dinner Addresses--
Utilizing Noted Figures from the Halls of Academe and the U. S. Govern-
ment**

Combine Scholarship with Pleasure!

Don't Miss It!

For Details Write National Office of SHAFR

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

SPONSOR: Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.

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

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

DEADLINES: All material must be in the office of the editor not later than four (4) weeks prior to the date of publication.

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

BACK ISSUES: Copies of all back numbers of the **Newsletter** are available and may be obtained from the editorial office upon the payment of a service charge of 50¢ per number. If the purchaser lives abroad, the charge is 75¢ per number.

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

FORMER PRESIDENTS OF SHAFR

1968	Thomas A. Bailey (Stanford)
1969	Alexander De Conde (U of California - Santa Barbara)
1970	Richard W. Leopold (Northwestern)
1971	Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana)
1972	Norman A. Graebner (Virginia)
1973	Wayne S. Cole (Maryland)
1974	Bradford Perkins (Michigan)
1975	Armin H. Rappaport (U of California - San Diego)
1976	Robert A. Divine (Texas)

Box 5146

TENNESSEE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

Bulk Rate

U.S. Postage Paid

Permit No. 101

Cookeville, Tenn.

38501