



The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

NEWSLETTER

Volume IV

Number 2

June, 1973

Page

2	Aren't We All Revisionists?
10	Minutes of Meeting, SHAFR Council
14	Results of Questionnaire on a Society-Sponsored Journal
15	Letter from Senator J. W. Fulbright
16	Survey of Manuscript Collections & Documents
24	Publications of Members of SHAFR
26	Personals
27	The Stuart L. Bernath Prize Competition for 1974
28	Announcements

SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

Founded in 1967. Chartered in 1972.

PRESIDENT: Wayne S. Cole, University of Maryland.

VICE-PRESIDENT: Bradford Perkins, University of Michigan.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER: Joseph P. O'Grady, 345 Olney Hall, La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pa. 19141

CHAIRMAN, PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Armin Rappaport, Dep't. of History University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, Calif. 92037.

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

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

MEETINGS: The annual meeting of the Society is held in conjunction with the yearly convocation of the American Historical Association in December. The Society also meets with the Organization of American Historians in April.

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

ROSTER: A complete listing of the members with their addresses and their current research projects is issued once a year to all members. Editor of the *Roster and Research List* is Dr. Warren A. Kimball, Department of History, Rutgers University, Newark, N. J. 07102.

AREN'T WE ALL REVISIONISTS?*

Arthur P. Whitaker

An appropriate reply to the question asked by the title of my remarks today could be, "That depends" For "revisionist" is one of those words -- "liberal" is another -- that mean quite different things in different contexts. Today, to most of us American historians "revisionist" is most likely to suggest the New Left, but to historians of Argentina it connotes a decidedly right-wing view, and still another variation is provided by the Russian historian, Alfred Rieber, who tagged his recent article on Tsar Alexander II "a revisionist view" although its view is not perceptibly either left- or right-wing. On the other hand, both left and right were represented on the same side in the post-World War I controversy over "war guilt". So revisionism is not a monopoly of either the left or the right.

Is it, then, a matter of generations? Probably so, but in what sense? One of our diplomatic historians, George Dangerfield, recently described revisionism as a product of the generation gap, of (in his words) "the absolute necessity for each generation to overthrow its predecessor." The thought has merit, but I find it too constrictive. I should say that historians are revisionists, not because they are young (Henry C. Lea didn't even begin his great revision of the history of the Spanish Inquisition until he was past 40), but because they are historians. This, I understand, is what Benedetto Croce meant when he said that every generation rewrites history for itself; and this saying gives sense to another of Croce's famous apothegms, that all history is contemporary history. For each generation makes history contemporary by changing it to keep up with a constantly changing world.

The rest of my remarks will illustrate the breadth and variety of revisionism with a few examples. All of them are drawn from this Society's special field of interest as I have observed it since 1919, when it became mine, too.

Dean Acheson, now the *bete noire* of New Left revisionists, was always a controversial figure, but as even his worst enemies must admit, his formidable talents, graced by a sparkling wit that was not above punning, made him shine by comparison with all the other secretaries of

*Luncheon address to the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations, April 13, 1973, Palmer House, Chicago, Ill., during the annual conference of the OAH. Dr. Whitaker is professor emeritus in U. S. diplomatic history at the University of Pennsylvania.

state of his generation. Indeed, we may say with confidence that he was as certainly the brightest as his immediate successor was Dulles. Some sense of Acheson's special qualities is conveyed by the account of his trip to Brazil in 1952. Of tropical Belém he could only record that the place has two seasons: in one it rains every day; in the other, all day. But it was different with the booming industrial city of São Paulo (which is Portuguese for St. Paul). There Acheson was honored by being made an honorary citizen in a public ceremony. He writes of it: "In expressing my appreciation of the honor, by happy chance I recalled St. Paul's claim of Roman citizenship before Caesar Augustus and said that henceforth, when called upon to declare myself, I could proudly say in the manner of the great saint whose name the city bore, 'I, too, am a Paulista'." Did this incident inspire President Kennedy's "Ich bin ein Berliner" a decade later? I rather think it did, for Kennedy knew, admired, and often consulted Acheson, who, they tell me, was never backward about coming forward with autobiographical bits.

Paraphrasing Acheson, as he did the apostle, I can say that I, too, am a revisionist . . . in some respects. In *The Spanish American Frontier* and *The Mississippi Question*, two of my early books (which your Executive Secretary suggested I include in this talk), I tried to break out of what was then the conventional pattern of diplomatic history by showing that the frontier was a major factor in Spain's retreat before the advancing United States in their long contest over the navigation and neighborhood of the Mississippi River. I like to think I made my point, but neither book seems to have impressed my fellow historians as strongly as did a by-product of the first book: an arid article examining the question of Godoy's knowledge of the terms of Jay's Treaty.

Leaving a professorship of American history at Cornell for one of Latin American history at the University of Pennsylvania did not end either my interest in the history of American foreign relations or my revisionist urge. At times in the pre-Pearl Harbor decade I even fancied myself playing David to Charles Beard's Goliath. Twice I took issue with his then fashionable capitalist-agrarian thesis, especially as developed in his book *The Idea of National Interest*: first, and broadly, while still at Cornell, in my paper at the Cincinnati meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association in 1935; and later, on a much smaller scale, in the course of my book *The United States and the Independence of Latin America*.

Although I criticized Beard, my admiration for him was great and I did not turn against him in the 1940s as so many others did, mainly because of his views on foreign policy, and more particularly because of what Richard Hofstadter labeled, in a neat paraphrase of Beard himself, Beard's "devil theory of Franklin Roosevelt." Yet, despite my admiration for Beard, I saw no reason why I should not speak up when

I thought he was mistaken. Beard himself was forever setting other historians straight. My effort to render him the same service therefore illustrates in a small way an essential feature of historical revisionism, which I might call its Gertrude Stein feature, namely that revision is revision is revision.

How this process sometimes becomes cyclical if not circular is shown by the historiography of the war of 1846-48 between the United States and Mexico. At the close of the nineteenth century the historical consensus laid the whole burden of war guilt on the Tennessean President, James K. Polk, and the expansionist Southern "slavocracy," as charged at the time by Polk's Whig opponents and other critics. Revision of this account began in 1900 with an article in the *American Historical Review* by Edward Gaylord Bourne -- the same Bourne who, a few years later, was to take the lead in thoroughly revising the history of colonial Spanish America; the book in which he did so is still a classic.

Then, in 1919, the old story was turned completely upside down in a two-volume book, *The War with Mexico*, by 62-year-old Justin Smith, native of New Hampshire and alumnus and former faculty member of Dartmouth College. That seemed an unlikely base for the operation, but it was a stunning success and won him the Pulitzer Prize in 1920 and, in 1923, the Loubat Prize for the best book on American history published in the previous five years. Reviewing it for the *American Historical Review*, Eugene C. Parker of the University of Texas (a more likely base) made a bow to Bourne for pioneering and endorsed Smith's revolutionary conclusions on every important question, including (in Barker's words) "the necessity for an essential justification of the war" and Smith's refutation of the charge that Polk provoked the war in order to grab California. These conclusions, predicted Barker, will be "the ultimate verdict of history." But, he continued, it was doubtful whether the book would carry conviction, for, among other flaws, its style was too imaginative, blending Thomas Carlyle with *The Education of Henry Adams* -- a minor miracle, I should say.

Barker, was, of course, mistaken about "the ultimate verdict of history," but in the next three or four decades the previous "verdict" did undergo substantial modification. In 1924 Frederick L. Paxson's *History of the American Frontier*, likewise a Pulitzer Prize winner, hailed Smith's book as a landmark and took most of the sting out of the "slavocracy conspiracy" charge by equating the American frontier's movement into Texas with its movement into his own Wisconsin, thereby, of course, thoroughly decontaminating the Texas phase. And in the next few decades several historians justified, or at least palliated, the expansionism of the 1840s as a defensive reaction against the alleged threat -- especially as voiced by French Foreign Minister Guizot-- that France and England would extend the pernicious balance-of-power

system to the New World as a means of curbing the growth of the United States.

By the 1960s, however, a reaction had set in that brought the revisionist process almost full circle by substantially rehabilitating the nineteenth-century Whig indictment. The rescue operation was captained, not by any youngster, but by my old friend and contemporary, Frederick Merk. He conducted it with great skill and learning in two books, *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History* and *The Monroe Doctrine and American Expansionism*. According to the latter book, the alleged balance-of-power threat from Europe was a mare's-nest, but yet expansionists contrived to make effective use of it as a scare tactic in whipping up enthusiasm for Manifest Destiny; and subsequent historians, including Dexter Perkins, A. K. Weinberg, and Henry Blumenthal, have been taken in by it.

In these and other ways Merk has built up a strong case for his conclusion that: "Seldom has error been relied on so constantly and in such high places in American party battles [as during Polk's administration], and seldom has truth, as confirmed later by historical investigation, formed so large a part of the arguments of the opposition." The opposition referred to was, of course, the Whig Party, and so Merk's meticulous study almost completes the cycle of this particular revisionist process. He rounds it out by virtually ignoring Justin Smith's prize-winning and once epoch-making book and by dismissing it, when he does mention it, as a work "published in a period of high nationalism at the close of the first World War" and "designed for popular consumption."

Extensive revisionism concerning the next major expansionist movement -- the one associated with the Spanish-American War -- began in the 1930s. As I look back, that seems the decade since 1920 most like the 1960s in the strength of the revisionist spirit. But there were differences, of course, and among these was the much greater diversity in the 1930s.

Take, for example, the question of the influence of American business interests on American foreign policy. Then, as now, this was a question of deep concern to historians, but, in contrast to the near-unanimity of revisionist answers to it in the present period, investigations in the 1930s sometimes resulted in revisions that pointed in opposite directions. A case in point is the expansionist movement at the turn of the century. In 1934 Julius Pratt showed that American business interests, far from helping bring on the war with Spain, as previously charged, actually tried to prevent it. On the other hand, only seven years later Charles Campbell, Jr., produced evidence that a group of American exporters to Manchuria -- a group we might call the "Chinese lobby" of its day -- had a hand in developing John Hay's Open Door policy.

To give only one more example of the period's diversity: while Fred Rippy was ripping to pieces the American capitalists in Colombia (South America), Samuel Bemis was waving the flag at Yale and finding the United States' record in Latin America as pure as Ivory soap.

In view of my limited time and the title of these remarks, I must omit much that I would like to say about historians and their works, so that I may move on to the most prominent type of revisionist writings in recent years, namely, those of the New Left variety. Although they do in fact offer variety, most of them, I gather, deal mainly if not only with the twentieth century and revise its history according to the criteria of present-minded activists and at the expense of the United States; though my view may be skewed since it is based only in part on the works of the writers themselves and for the rest on what others have said about them, including articles by Irwin Unger, Thomas J. McCormick, Lawrence Evans, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and Joseph Starobin. From Unger, for instance, I understand that Charles Beard is the New Left's Moses, that William Appleman Williams is a kind of Deputy Moses, and that Walter LaFeber is heir apparent.

Among subjects that have attracted New Left historians, a hot favorite appears to have been the origins of the cold war. Their works have been weighed and found wanting, I am told, in an about-to-be-published book by Robert J. Maddox. I have not read it, but I did not need it to make me skeptical about the way they shift most or all the blame for the cold war from Russian to American shoulders. I am allergic to sackcloth-and-ashes exercises in general, and particularly when I think I detect a holier-than-thou strain peeping through the sackcloth. My predisposition -- prejudice, if you prefer -- has been strengthened, not weakened, by most of the works in this category that I have read. To be sure, Acheson himself admitted, in 1969, in *Present at the Creation*, that it might be true, as charged by what he called "a school of academic criticism," that he had "overreacted to Stalin" in 1950; but that tells us nothing about the origins of the cold war, for by 1950 it had been going on for several years.

My views may yet change, but at present they coincide pretty closely with those stated recently by Robert Ferrell that "there was Russian intransigence after 1945, if not before," and by Robert Divine that the United States' effort to relax after World War II was soon frustrated by "the aggressive expansion of the Soviet Union, combined with a growing fear of communist plans for world domination."

In McCormick's article just referred to -- one written in 1969 for a volume on the state of various fields of American history at that time -- he complained of serious shortcomings in the writings on American diplomatic history in the past quarter century. Major counts in his indictment

range from "increasingly sterile modes" to paucity of new concepts and insights, and neglect of new research methods, particularly quantitative methods.

I find this judgment too severe. Perhaps I have grown soft with the passing years, but it seems to me there is real talent and promise among these younger historians, including some of the New Left as well as the New Center and the New Right. Like all of us, though, they have their faults. In the first group, for instance, the cold-war revisionists have been charged by Starobin with ignoring altogether "the crisis within communism, where [the cold war's] origins lie" and with not yet showing "the scholarship required to explore" "the communist dimension." As for myself, not being competent to pass on that question, I should say that their commonest shortcoming is excessive reliance on economic interpretation, in which they out-Beard Beard himself. Either they still have faith in the fiction of economic man, which economists abandoned long ago, or else they massify him in an economic determinism that I doubt even Marx or Lenin would endorse. In some hands the dismal science produces dismal history.

Some of the recent books are far from dismal, and as examples let us take two of the best. In one, on the origins of the cold war, John L. Gaddis gives what strikes me as a mostly fair and persuasive account, and yet even he loads the dice against the United States at times. In passages on the United Nations conference at San Francisco in 1945, for example, he blames the growing rift with the Soviet Union on members of the American delegation because of, among other things, their "tendency to believe that a conflict between [the two] was inevitable." Blaming the American delegates for the "tendency to believe" is really a bit too much, for before, during, and after the San Francisco conference the Soviet leadership did not merely tend to believe but asserted that such a conflict was inevitable.

My other example is David Green's *The Containment of Latin America* (an odd title), which is about the Good Neighbor policy under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. Foremost among this well-written book's merits is its firm foundation in manuscript sources. Yet, almost certainly because economic blinders obstructed his view, the author missed evidence offered by more obvious sources, such as the memoirs of Cordell Hull and Henry L. Stimson, that Roosevelt added greatly to the military component of our foreign policy in ways as various as consulting the chiefs of staff about it to the exclusion of his secretaries of State and War, and as insisting that, when he gave an after-dinner address, he should be introduced, not as President of the United States, but as commander-in-chief of its armed forces. In retrospect, all this made it look as if Franklin D. Roosevelt were rehearsing for Richard Nixon. If the military component of F.D.R.'s foreign policy was mixed with an

economic component, as seems not at all impossible, then it would appear that a study of that period should have given us a preview of what, several years later, President Eisenhower's farewell address was to call the military-industrial complex; but that, too Green's book passes over in silence.

McCormick's pithy article deserves more discussion than time permits, but it suggests two points that I think need to be stated. One is that I agree with Lawrence Evans, writing in the same volume, on the primacy of political relations in diplomatic history. Whether we call the field diplomatic history or the history of foreign relations or by some other name, the subject matter falls in the field of international relations and hence is necessarily and primarily political, though by no means exclusively so. My second comment is that to McCormick's list of lacunae and neglects should be added the history of ideas, particularly political ideas. Their importance in the history of international relations from the age of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment to that of communism, fascism, and Hans Kohn's "global nationalism" should be obvious. Yet diplomatic historians, like some other historians we could mention, often take little or no account of them. That, I think, is a grievous mistake. And tell me not in mournful numbers that what matters is not the ideas but their economic origin, for that would take us on to an inquiry into the ultimate cause of things -- an inquiry I would rather leave to theologians and metaphysical philosophers.

Some time ago, Williams noted the influence of "corporatists" in our foreign relations. McCormick, calling them "cosmopolitans," describes them as the true "system-makers" in both our foreign and domestic affairs. As examples of system-makers he mentions the Council on Foreign Relations, the Council on Economic Development, the think tanks, and the major foundations. The underlying idea is good and could be quite useful if refined. A refinement I suggest, having been a member of the Council on Foreign Relations for many years and, as a research fellow, having written a book for it on Spain and our air and naval bases there, is that one needs to know *which* of its members are system-makers. For by no means all of them are -- a good many are powerless academics like myself -- and the Council never takes a corporate position on questions of public policy. It does seem, however, that the Council has, somehow and in varying degrees, helped to shape foreign policy ever since Elihu Root and other bigwigs founded it a little more than a half-century ago. So diplomatic historians would do well to keep the Council's role and roll-call in mind.

The explanation of its influence is that, like all the other politically significant organizations that have grown up in the twentieth century, this Council owes its leverage mainly to those of its members who are

big bankers, foundation heads, or corporation lawyers; to the corporations those lawyers represent; and to members who have other means of access to policy-makers. A case in point is another council, the Council for Latin America, whose membership includes 85 per cent of all U.S. companies doing business in Latin America, among them DuPont, Standard Oil of New Jersey, and the Chase Manhattan Bank. In a study of the melancholy history of the Alliance for Progress, Jerome Levinson and Juan de Onís rank the Council for Latin America first among the "business interests" which, they say, "took precedence over U.S. national interests" during most of the life of the alliance, thereby contributing to its failure. However, they also report contributing factors of a different, non-economic kind, principally the "over-ambitious idealism of (the alliance's) development goals" and "the pointless obsessiveness of the (United States') concern for security."

Corporate influence on our foreign policy has, as Williams pointed out, developed mainly since the turn of the century. Of still more recent origin is that already-mentioned and much-discussed variant of it, the military-industrial complex. Gabriel Kolko has given the discussion a new turn (new to me, at least) by arguing at length and persuasively that our armed forces have been and are only the instruments or agents -- the gunmen, some might say -- of the new imperialism of greedy and aggressive American corporations. If he is right, perhaps we should scrap the phrase "military-industrial complex" and speak instead of "militant industrialists." If reports are correct, that term would fit I.T. and T. like a glove because of its efforts to prevent the President-elect of Chile, Salvador Allende, who was head of a socialist-communist party, from taking office. In this instance the corporation failed to sway Washington, not to mention Santiago de Chile.

Despite failures of this kind, it may well be that, as Richard Barnet maintains in his recent book, *Roots of War*, "the owners and the managers of big business" constitute "the single most important external influence" on policy making in Washington. Of no less interest to this Society of historians are Barnet's further findings that the process of making policy is highly insulated as well as highly concentrated in the Executive Department and that its policy makers have "an extraordinary free hand." If, as I believe, he is right, then it follows that the presidential pattern of American history, which has lost favor with our domestic historians, is still as valid as ever for the history of our foreign relations.

A good many of the observations and findings I have made or quoted were made with reference to recent history. Are they then useful only for the current scene or, at most, for the twentieth century? I think not. As I consider them from the vantage point [if I may be permitted a bare-faced euphemism] of more than 50 years' experience, it appears to me

they can also be useful in dealing with our country's history in earlier times; provided, of course, changing times and circumstances are taken into account. Quantification, for example, will be difficult if not impossible much of the time, but this would not cause me to sorrow as one having no hope. Again, although corporations were rudimentary or non-existent in our first half-century, there were signs of a rough equivalent even then, as I noted briefly in my early books and as Mira Wilkins had demonstrated in great detail in her recent book on multinational enterprise and American business abroad from the colonial era to 1914.

At any rate, with precautions that I hope will be adequate, I am going to try my hand at making the transfer before long. That will be when I return, after a long absence, to the austere Republican era stretching from the Thomas Jefferson whose passion for peace did not deter him from blasting the Barbary pirates, through ever-thoughtful James Madison and once-rash James Monroe, to the John Quincy Adams who countered the clamor for support of the independence movements in Latin America and Greece with a warning against what he called "the inevitable tendency of a direct interference in foreign wars, even wars for freedom, to change the very foundations of our own government from *liberty to power.*"

Minutes of Meeting, SHAFR Council

Private Dining Room #6, The Palmer House, Chicago

April 11, 1973, 8:00-10:30 P. M.

Members present: Wayne S. Cole, president, Bradford Perkins, Robert Divine, John De Novo, Dorothy Borg, Robert Ferrell, Richard W. Leopold, Armin Rappaport, Lawrence Gelfand, Samuel Wells, Leon E. Boothe, Nolan Fowler, Warren A. Kimball, Joseph P. O'Grady,

The president called the group to order and asked the Council to approve the minutes of its December, 1972 meeting as published in the March issue of the *Newsletter*. Professor Gelfand moved that the first sentence in the bottom paragraph on page 19 of the *Newsletter* be changed to read, "Dr. Lawrence Gelfand, Chairman of the Bibliographical Planning Committee which has been seeking ways and means of compiling a new guide to the history of American Foreign Relations, which can replace the

Guide to the Diplomatic History of the United States (S.F. Bemis and G.G. Griffin, 1935)." The Council accepted the change, approved the minutes, and, on the motion of Professor Perkins, agreed that henceforth the minutes should be circulated to members of Council prior to publication for any additions, deletions, or corrections.

The President then asked for the Executive Secretary-Treasurer's Report. The Secretary announced that Professor Fowler, the editor of the *Newsletter* will maintain the mailing list in the future, and that the latter would appreciate receiving any changes in addresses as soon as possible. Professor O'Grady also reported that he has not been able to hire any additional secretarial assistance, since the amount of dues received as of April 10th was less than last year's. A number of retired members have dropped their memberships, while the general economic situation has probably slowed the payment of dues from others. (As of April 25th, 206 members have paid their dues and 225 have not).

When the Executive Secretary-Treasurer finished his report, the president offered the floor to Professor Rappaport, who presented the Program Committee's report. A session arranged by Professor Kenneth J. Hagan of Kansas State University on naval diplomacy will be held in conjunction with the AHA in December. No meeting of the PCBAHA will be held in August of 1973 because the AHA will meet in San Francisco, but the Committee has arranged a joint session with the SHA in November. This program will commemorate the 150th Anniversary of the Monroe Doctrine. Professor Rappaport also announced that he would invite Professor W. Stull Holt to address the Society at the 1974 luncheon session at the OAH meeting in Denver. He then raised the issues of a separate national meeting and the need to coordinate the regional meetings. After some lengthy discussion, the Council agreed that regional meetings are helpful and should be encouraged, but that the organizers must coordinate their work with the Program Committee Chairman. The Council also looked favorably upon the idea of a separate meeting of the Society, to be held in Washington, D.C., during August, either in 1975 or 1976. An attempt will be made, by having one of the local campuses host this event, to keep expenses down. The plan for this meeting is to have a program of four sessions, two luncheons, and one dinner. The Council also voiced its approval of a session on the day before the OAH meeting, preferably at night. The Executive Secretary-Treasurer was asked to contact the appropriate officials of the OAH to see if they would object to such a meeting.

Professor Cole next invited the Chairman of the Nominating Committee, Professor Wells, to speak. The latter reported that his Committee had developed a slate of nominees and asked the Council if he should disclose the names before the individuals involved had had an opportunity to accept or reject the nominations. Council unanimously agreed that he should not announce the names on the principle that the Committee reports

directly to the membership and not to the Council. The Committee Chairman should send directly to the Executive Secretary-Treasurer only that information necessary to prepare the ballot for voting upon the nominees.

Professor Boothe, Chairman of the Membership Committee, stated that he had written to the Membership Committee and had received a 50% reply. He emphasized the need for personal contacts and indicated that he would do what he could to interest people in allied fields to join the Society.

Professor Bradford Perkins, reporting as Chairman of the Bernath Prize Committee, announced that some twenty books had been submitted for the 1973 competition with the deadline (May 31st) still some six weeks away. He indicated that he would keep all five copies of each book until he received all entries and then distribute them. He then opened a discussion concerning the possibility of closing the gap between the publication date and the announcement of the award. If the Committee asked for submission of books as they were published, the Committee could close the competition on December 31st of the year of each work's publication and could then announce the award at the OAH luncheon the following April. The Council agreed to this change but asked the Executive Secretary-Treasurer to communicate this information to Dr. and Mrs. Bernath. If they agree, an announcement could be sent to the publishers immediately.

The president next yielded the floor to Professor Gelfand, who spoke at some length concerning the Bibliographical Guide and Retrieval System for the History of American Foreign Relations. He indicated that tentative budgets had been prepared with the assistance of staff personnel at the University of Iowa and stated that the campaign to collect the necessary funds would commence as soon as he received definite assurances from his institution concerning the level of assistance it would offer. He hoped to receive this information before the end of the spring semester. The Council members expressed their appreciation to Professor Gelfand for the work he has done and the contagious enthusiasm that he has exhibited with regard to this project. All were impressed with the sheer magnitude of the effort.

Professor Kimball explained some of the problems of the *Roster and Research List*, and asked if he might publish only a supplement this year as he expected few changes to be made before September. Council unanimously approved this request.

Professor Cole then asked the Executive Secretary-Treasurer to discuss some old items of business. Professor O'Grady requested that Council table the State Department Internship Program as it now appeared the Historical Office in the Department had sufficient funds (with White House endorsement) to expedite the publication of the Foreign Relations series.

The Secretary then discussed the Congressional letter campaign, claimed that it may have helped in the effort to speed the Foreign Relations series, and proceeded to read a letter from Senator William J. Fulbright concerning publication of Executive Hearings of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. (See page 15). Finally, the Secretary announced the results of the poll on the question of a Society-sponsored journal. (See page 14). On this point he felt that the responses were somewhat long and the result of some soul-searching on the part of those who answered. For that reason he did not feel fully qualified to summarize the results and asked if it would not be best if each member of Council reviewed the material before the final decision. Council accepted this advice and also agreed with the Secretary concerning the procedures to be followed if the Council decided to sponsor such a journal. The Secretary would make an announcement, inviting institutions to submit proposals outlining the support they could give such an effort in conformity with specific guidelines established by Council. Council would then review these proposals and accept the best offer.

The President announced that Professor Jerald A. Combs had agreed to handle local arrangements for SHAFR at the AHA meeting in San Francisco. He warmly thanked the committee and project chairmen who had reported at the Council meeting, emphasizing that the decentralization their active contributions represented added constructively to the strength and vitality of the Society as its operations grew larger and more complex.

Professor Cole next moved to the question of a new Executive Secretary-Treasurer. At that point the non-elected Council members left the meeting. After a lengthy discussion, Professor O'Grady agreed to write a job description and an estimation of the institutional support necessary to guarantee a proper functioning of the Office. Council also agreed that individual members could submit to the President suggestions of persons they felt were qualified for the Office. President Cole will then contact these individuals to see if they would be willing to apply for the position.

With these conclusions reached, the President asked for a motion to adjourn. It was offered and carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph P. O'Grady

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE ON A SOCIETY-SPONSORED JOURNAL

- 1) Do you feel there is a need for another journal in American history?
Explain your reasoning.

YES - 121

NO - 34

? - 8

- 2) Should the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations sponsor such a journal? Give your reasons for your answer.

YES - 123

NO - 28

? - 12

- 3) Would you consider submitting your articles to such a Society-sponsored journal?

YES - 151

NO - 5

? - 7

- 4) It is estimated that the sponsorship of a journal would force dues to a minimum of \$15.00 per year (\$10.00 for students). Would you continue as a member if the dues reached \$15.00?

YES - 129

NO - 17

? - 17

- 5) Do you have any suggestions for alternative funding?

NO

Professor Joseph P. O'Grady
345 Olney Hall
La Salle College
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19141
March 27, 1973

Dear Professor O'Grady:

Mr. Robert Blum of our staff has told me of your interest in the Foreign Relations Committee's series of historical publications of hearings held in executive session.

I understand he has sent you a copy of the first volume of this series, *The Legislative Origins of the Truman Doctrine*. In the near future we hope to publish a volume entitled *Foreign Relief Aid: 1947* which will include the Foreign Relations Committee's executive session discussion of H. J. Res. 153 (Relief to Countries Devastated by War) and S. 1774 (European Interim Aid). This volume will be followed by one on *The Marshall Plan and Aid to China: 1948* which will include all of the Committee's executive hearings on the legislation combined in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. Following this we hope to publish a volume of hearings relating to *The Vandenberg Resolution and NATO* and a volume entitled *Reviews of the World Situation: 1949-1950* which will include briefings the Secretaries of State and Defense and other Administration officials gave the Foreign Relations Committee in executive session in those years. These volumes are in various states of preparation and should be published within the next few months. Others focusing on foreign aid legislation of 1949 and 1950 are in the planning stage and, we hope, will be published in the not too distant future. In fact, we hope to make this a continuing series.

I would appreciate your conveying this information to your colleagues at the April meeting in Chicago of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. The Committee is publishing its heretofore classified executive session hearings because they are an important part of the history of our foreign relations. I feel that it is important for our country to understand better the early period of its involvement in the Cold War and to understand particularly the role Congress played in that involvement. I am sure that you and other scholars attending the meeting in Chicago will help us obtain that understanding.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. Fulbright
Chairman, Committee on
Foreign Relations, United
States Senate

A SURVEY OF MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS AND DOCUMENTS RELATING TO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND EUROPE, 1945-50

Ronald D. Landa*

Due in large part to the furor over the publication of the Pentagon Papers, the question of access to primary material on recent American foreign policy--for many years a bone of contention between scholars and the federal government--has demanded new attention. For evidence one need only glance at the topics of sessions at recent meetings of the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians. Interspersed among the more traditional presentations were sessions on "The Opening of the Documents: A Panel Discussion," "Access to Government Documents: Current Developments," a workshop on "Archivists and Diplomatic Historians," and a luncheon meeting on "New Relationships Between the Historian and the Archivist: The Joint AHA-OAH-SAA Committee on Historians and Archives."

One obvious result of the renewed interest in accessibility of government records has been a growing camaraderie among historians and archivists. Behind the spirit of cooperation is the recognition that the problems of research in post-World War II American foreign policy are beyond the ingenuity of any individual working alone. In the first place, the volume of material is staggering, because of the greater role played by the military in foreign affairs; the creation of new agencies, like the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency; the establishment of the United Nations and multilateral treaty organizations; a keener interest by Congress and the American public in foreign affairs; and finally the general outward thrust of American policy which brought the United States into closer and more sustained contact with more nations. Secondly, restrictions governing access to this abundant storehouse of material have gradually been relaxed. Action taken by executive order to speed the publication of the *Foreign Relations* series has advanced the open period for research in the State Department's files; and the military service branches, following the State Department's recent example, have lifted some of their rules regarding submission of notes taken from military records.

These developments, plus the continuing acquisition of manuscript collections by private depositories, have opened tremendous opportunities for the researcher if he can but keep abreast of the material as it becomes available. This is no easy task. The most recent volume of the standard guide to manuscript collections in the United States, *The National Union Catalogue of Manuscript Collections*, unfortunately was published in 1971 and covers accessions only through 1970. A more up-to-date reference is the *Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress*, which lists in its October issue each year all acquisitions of manuscript collections by the Library

*Professor of history at College Misericordia, Dallas, Pennsylvania.

of Congress during the previous year and features descriptive essays on the most significant collections. Furthermore, in order to stay current with the opening of government documents it is necessary to consult regularly *Prologue: The Journal of the National Archives*. On occasion, too, publications of scholarly organizations, like the American Historical Association's *Newsletter*, note acquisitions of manuscript collections and documents; but these references are sometimes incomplete or tardy and depend upon the depository for reporting the information, which does not always occur.

The purpose of this essay, then, is to help the scholar interested in American relations with Europe in the years immediately after World War II to locate pertinent primary material. Certainly a number of the papers and documents mentioned here relate to other geographical areas and other periods of time as well. But to include material bearing specifically on Asian, African, or Latin American affairs, or to cite collections at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library concerning the closing phases of the war in Europe in 1945 would make this paper more cumbersome than it already is. This essay makes no claim to comprehensiveness. Whatever breadth it does have derives mainly from information generously provided by archivists, librarians, and other historians.

PRESIDENT, WHITE HOUSE STAFF, AND CABINET

The finest depository of material relating to the Executive Branch is quite naturally the Harry S. Truman Library in Independence, Missouri. The bulk of the material in the White House Files, divided into the Official File and the President's Personal File, is routine; but occasionally there are important memoranda or correspondence providing insights on policy-making. In the near future the Truman Library expects to receive material kept in the possession of the late President until his death. This would presumably include Truman's diary, a few excerpts of which were printed in William Hillman's *Mr. President* in 1952.

Of greater value in some respects than the now available papers of Truman himself are the papers of Clark M. Clifford, Special Counsel to the President, 1946-50, and of George Elsey, Clifford's assistant from 1946 to 1949 and administrative assistant to the President, 1949-51. Both men figured prominently in the preparation of Truman's speeches on foreign policy; and Elsey, a historian by training, took meticulous notes of the conversations and deliberations involved in the drafting of these addresses. There is also very limited material on foreign affairs in the papers of Presidential Assistant, Charles S. Murphy, and the Secretary to the President, 1945-53, Matthew J. Connelly. An extremely useful source at the Library of Congress is the diary of Admiral William D. Leahy, Truman's Chief of Staff. His diary notations are brief, but reveal much about high level attitudes in the Truman administration.

The Truman Library also has the records of several special committees appointed by Truman, including the President's Committee on Foreign Aid, 1947-48, and the President's Air Policy Commission, 1947-48. Some good information on foreign policy may also be gleaned from the papers of James E. Webb, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, 1946-49.

The most useful collections of papers of cabinet members at the Truman Library are those of John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, 1947-53 and Secretary of Agriculture, Clinton P. Anderson. Other papers of cabinet members are scattered throughout the country. The papers of Henry A. Wallace, who served as Secretary of Commerce, 1945-46, are at the University of Iowa. Their value for his tenure as Secretary of Commerce is slight, although a few interesting items are there concerning his presidential campaign of 1948, especially the correspondence with Curtis MacDougall respecting his book, *Gideon's Army*. The much-used diaries at Yale University of Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War from 1940 through late 1945, have overshadowed some significant but neglected portions of his correspondence. Another neglected source is the extensive collection of papers at Princeton University of James V. Forrestal, Secretary of Defense until 1949. The papers of Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, 1945-47, at the Library of Congress contain little of interest.

Some portions of the Fred M. Vinson papers at the University of Kentucky dealing with his tenure as Secretary of the Treasury, 1945-47, have recently been opened to researchers. They contain much material of the Export-Import Bank operations and the British Loan. The papers of one of the principal architects of American policy toward Europe in this period, W. Averell Harriman, remain in his personal possession. He has opened his papers only to a few scholars on request. Harriman was ambassador to the Soviet Union, 1943-46; to Great Britain, 1946; Secretary of Commerce, 1946-48; and U. S. Representative to Europe under the Economic Cooperation Act, 1948-50.

STATE DEPARTMENT

The basic sources for the diplomacy of this period, of course, are the State Department Records at the National Archives, soon to be opened through 1947. The Decimal File for 1945-49 and many of the Lot Files are in the Archives Building; but the Post Files, other Lot Files, and the Decimal File after 1949 are located at the State Department and must be examined at its Records Services Division. The Post Files and Lot Files frequently contain important material overlooked by scholars who concentrate their efforts on the Decimal File.

Of the four Secretaries of State during this period, the papers of two are currently available: those of Edward M. Stettinius at the University of Virginia and of James F. Byrnes at Clemson University. Both contain

some items not found in memoirs, the *Foreign Relations* volumes, or in the Decimal File. The George C. Marshall Library in Lexington, Virginia, has material from Marshall's personal files and some xeroxed official files, but this is not presently open to scholars. Like the remainder of Truman's own papers, the papers of Dean G. Acheson have been willed to the U. S. Government and will eventually wind up at the Truman Library.

The manuscript collections of American diplomats are surprisingly numerous, but of mixed quality. Many have complied with the State Department's wishes that they turn over to the government at the time of retirement any official papers in their possession. Hence, their private collections are often devoid of anything of substance on foreign policy. In a few cases, however, diplomats compensated for the paucity of official material by writing detailed descriptions of foreign conditions and their own attitudes in their private correspondence.

One such collection of papers is that at the Library of Congress of Laurence A. Steinhardt, ambassador to Czechoslovakia, 1945-48. Although some items are missing from his letterbooks--most notably for the months after the Communist coup in February, 1948--Steinhardt's lengthy correspondence with friends in the State Department's Division of Central European Affairs provides a valuable supplement to his official dispatches to Washington. Some of the papers of Joseph E. Jacobs, his successor in Prague in 1948-49, are at the Hoover Institution; but they focus primarily on Jacobs' service in Korea prior to going to Czechoslovakia. Another good collection is that of Lewis W. Douglas, ambassador to Great Britain, 1947-50, at the University of Arizona.

Other less valuable ambassadorial papers include those of Arthur Bliss Lane, ambassador to Poland, 1944-47, at Yale University; of Jefferson Caffery, ambassador to France, 1944-49, at the University of Southwestern Louisiana; of Henry F. Grady, ambassador to Greece, 1948-50, at the Truman Library; and of George V. Allen, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, 1948-49 and ambassador to Yugoslavia, 1949-53, at Duke University. The papers of Lincoln MacVeagh, ambassador to Greece, 1944-48, are in the possession of John O. Iatrides of Southern Connecticut State College, who is writing a book about MacVeagh's career.

Most of the papers of George F. Kennan, Counsellor of Embassy in the Soviet Union, 1944-46, head of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff, 1947-49, and Counsellor to the Department, 1949-50, at Princeton University are closed; but the open material, including memoranda and unpublished speeches, is quite valuable and still untapped. Now that his memoirs are published, the papers of another key figure, Charles E. Bohlen, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, 1944-47, Counsellor to the Department of State, 1947-49, and minister at Paris, 1949-50, will be deposited at the Library of Congress.

Important collections of State Department officials serving in Washington include the papers of Will L. Clayton, Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs, 1946-47, and Joseph M. Jones of the Office of Public Affairs, who helped draft the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan speeches, both at the Truman Library; of Leo Pasvolsky of the Office of Special Political Affairs, 1945-46, and Herbert Feis, Special Assistant to the Secretary of War, 1944-46, and member of the Policy Planning Staff, 1950-51, at the Library of Congress; and Clair Wilcox of the Office of International Trade Policy, 1945-48, at the University of Pennsylvania.

The papers of Warren R. Austin, the American representative at the United Nations, 1946-50, at the University of Vermont are more substantial for his previous years in the Senate than for his U. N. services. The papers of other members of the American U. N. delegation, Philip C. Jessup and Herschel V. Johnson, are at the Library of Congress and the University of North Carolina, respectively. Included in the papers of UNRRA Director Herbert H. Lehman at Columbia University are the papers of Marshall MacDuffie regarding the UNRRA Mission to the Ukraine and the papers of Richard B. Scandrett, Jr., on the UNRRA Mission to Byelorussia.

Finally, a most profitable collection for this period is that of John Foster Dulles at Princeton University. Dulles attended most of the major international conferences as the unofficial Republican Party member of the American delegation, and his notebooks of official records and his own memoranda and correspondence regarding some of these conferences are a gold mine of information. Also quite revealing of certain aspects of American policy toward Europe, for example, the formation of NATO, are the reminiscences of State Department officials in the Dulles Oral History Project.

MILITARY

Despite some centralization of military records, a bewildering variety of materials, only a few of which are listed here, are housed in a number of depositories.

In February, 1973, the records of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Modern Military Branch of the National Archives for the years 1946-48 were added to the records of 1945 already opened to researchers. These include records concerning European occupation policies, postwar military base requirements, minutes of the meetings of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee, restitution and reparations policies, and geographically-organized subject files pertaining to Europe. In addition, the Modern Military Branch holds the papers of Avery Johnstone, head of the American Decartelization Branch in Germany until his resignation in 1948. Also relating to the German occupation are the papers of Major General

Walter J. Muller, who commanded the American forces in Bavaria, at the Hoover Institution. The Hoover Institution and several other major libraries have a number of mimeographed documents, sometimes on microfilm, on the occupation of Austria: the Allied Commission for Austria, the minutes of meetings of the Allied Council, the unofficial minutes taken by the U. S. delegation whenever possible, and the Executive Committee minutes. General Frank Howley, who headed the American forces in Berlin, has deposited his papers at New York University.

The Archives Branch of the U. S. Aerospace Studies Institute at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, has a vast quantity of material for the years 1943-65, including records on the European Theater of Operation. The papers of Carl Spaatz, Commanding General of the Army Air Force in Europe, 1946-47, and Chief of Staff of the Air Force, 1947-48 are at the Library of Congress, as are the papers of Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff, 1948-53; of Muir Stephen Fairchild, Air Force Vice Chief of Staff, 1948-50; and of two influential retired Air Force officers, H. H. Arnold and Ira C. Eaker, including Eaker's diary through 1947.

Also at the Library of Congress are the papers of Ernest J. King, Commander-in-Chief of the United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations in World War II and a member of the American delegation at Yalta. These contain a little correspondence on postwar problems such as international control of atomic weapons and matters relating to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The papers of the Army Chief of Staff, 1948-49, Omar N. Bradley, are at the Army Military History Research Collection at the Carlisle Military Barracks, Carlisle, Pa. The preponderance of this collection deals with Bradley's World War II career and his service with the Veteran's Administration following the war, but there are some items for 1948-49 as well.

CONGRESS

The curse of researchers in the papers of Senators and Congressmen is constituent mail. As a general rule, Congressional manuscript collections contain much material, but little in the way of revealing information on foreign policy.

Of the legislators who had some part in shaping foreign policy a rather large number have left their papers in widely-scattered depositories. This includes both chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Thomas T. Connally and Arthur H. Vandenberg. Although the Vandenberg Papers at the William Clements Library of the University of Michigan have been used frequently, they contain little of value beyond what was published in *The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg*. Moreover, the Connally Papers are practically worthless. On the other hand, some helpful information can be found in the papers of H. Alexander Smith at Princeton

University, especially in his handwritten diary and in memoranda from his visit to Europe in the fall, 1947. There also is a little information in the Alexander Wiley Papers at the Wisconsin State Historical Society and the somewhat skimpy manuscript collection at the Library of Congress of James O'Brien McMahon, who also served as Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

Collections of papers of Foreign Relations Committee members of marginal value, partially because their tenure was too brief, are those of Alben W. Barkley at the University of Kentucky, of Arthur Capper at the Kansas State Historical Society, and of H. Styles Bridges, in the possession of James J. Kiepper, New England College, Henniker, New Hampshire. Of no value whatsoever are the papers at Georgetown University of Robert F. Wagner, who was ill in his closing years on the committee and did not participate in its business.

On the Senate Armed Services Committee, which was until 1947 divided into the Military Affairs and Naval Affairs Committee, in addition to Bridges, there are the papers of C. Estes Kefauver at the University of Tennessee, of Leverett Saltonstall at the Massachusetts Historical Society, Burnet R. Maybank at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Harley M. Kilgore at the University of West Virginia, Harry S. Byrd at the University of Virginia, and Joseph C. O'Mahoney at the University of Wyoming. The Lyndon B. Johnson Papers at the Johnson Library dealing with his years on the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate have not yet been organized and opened for research.

Members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee who have deposited their papers include Helen Gahagan Douglas at the University of Oklahoma, John M. Vorys at the Ohio Historical Society, and Karl E. Mundt at General Beadle State College, Madison, South Dakota. The papers of John Taber, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee who temporarily blocked approval of Marshall Plan funds in 1948, are at Cornell University.

Perhaps of greater value than the various Congressional manuscript collections are the records of executive sessions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee now open at the National Archives.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL

One of the best sources of material outside the government consists of papers of newspapermen who maintained close links with policymakers. The Library of Congress holds several outstanding collections of this nature: the papers of Eric Sevareid, of Joseph and Stewart Alsop, of Edgar Ansel Mowrer, of Elmer H. Davis, and the recently-acquired papers of publisher and editor, Henry R. Luce. In addition, the Syracuse University Library has the papers of Fulton Lewis. An especially valuable

collection of the Truman Library is that of *Time* correspondent Frank McNaughton, a confidant of Vanderberg and others on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. McNaughton frequently included the substance of conversations with these men in his reports to the New York office of *Time*, but he carefully stipulated that they were not for publication or for attribution.

The papers of Bernard M. Baruch at Princeton University have some usefulness. Although he corresponded and privately conferred with top officials in the Truman administration and was quite outspoken in presenting his views, government leaders were more reticent in expressing themselves to Baruch. In short, one learns more about Baruch's thoughts than about those of his correspondents'. At the Library of Congress are the papers of the former ambassador to the Soviet Union, Joseph E. Davies, who served in 1946-47 as vice-chairman of the President's Committee to Study Universal Military Training.

EUROPEAN

Put simply, there is a scarcity of available European material. The Communist countries have kept their archives for this period tightly closed to scholars and there are no equivalents of Western private manuscript collections. In non-Communist Europe, the situation is little better, where 30-year or 50-year rules for opening archival collections are rather rigidly adhered to. The only major exception is the British government's decision to open its World War II records.

But there do exist some private papers of Western European figures and even those of a few Eastern Europeans who migrated to the United States. The London School of Economics and Political Science has the papers of Hugh J. N. Dalton, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and of Sir Charles Webster, who attended the San Francisco Conference in 1945. A few papers of Clement R. Attlee are in University College, Oxford, and Churchill College, Cambridge. Most significantly, the British Library of Political and Economic Science at the London School of Economics and Political Science has undertaken a project to locate the papers of persons and institutions active in British public affairs between 1900 and 1951. When the project is completed in 1975 a comprehensive reference guide for scholars and students hopefully will be published. It is estimated that 5,000 individuals and institutions fall within the scope of the project. These would include members of Parliament, junior ministers, prominent members of the House of Lords, heads of diplomatic missions, military officials, various civil servants, trade association and trade union officials, religious leaders, newspaper owners, editors, and journalists, business men, political parties, societies, and pressure groups.

The Hoover Institution has the papers of Jan Ciechanowski, the

Polish ambassador to the United States, 1941-45, but at present they are closed to scholars. The papers of Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, the Prime Minister of Poland, 1945-47, and Juráj Slavík, the Czechoslovakian ambassador to the United States, 1945-48, are in the hands of their respective families in the United States, but as yet these families have been reluctant to make them available to scholars. Edward Rozek used the Mikolajczyk papers in writing his *Allied Wartime Diplomacy: A Pattern in Poland*, published in 1958; but no one has made use of them since. And according to Professor Alexander De Conde, the papers of Italian Prime Minister Alcide de Gasperi are located in widely separated depositories in Italy.

For all practical purposes this period represents the frontier of serious research in the area of American foreign relations, which is one reason certainly for its attraction to doctoral candidates and scholars. With a few exceptions its drawbacks do not concern the existence, nor even the availability, of sufficient material, but rather the problem of identifying and locating what is available. By providing a regular medium for scholars and archivists to share their knowledge of current acquisitions of manuscript collections and the opening of certain documents, the SHAFR *Newsletter* not only can be of great assistance to historians working on specialized topics, but it also may help to hasten the writing of the first thorough, comprehensive history of American relations with Europe in the early post-World War II years.

Publications by Members of SHAFR

One of the elder statesmen in U.S. diplomatic history, Dr. Thomas A. Bailey, lets no grass grow under his feet. Professor emeritus at Stanford, he has just completed a revision and updating of his popular documentary, *The American Spirit* (2 vols.; D.C. Heath and Co.). Almost simultaneously with this publication has come the Doctor's latest opus, *Probing America's Past; A Critical Examination of Major Myths and Misconceptions* (2 vols.; also by D.C. Heath and Co.).

* * * * *

Two members of SHAFR have edited volumes in the series, Crowell Problem Studies in American History. Prof. Thomas G. Paterson, U of Connecticut, was responsible for *American Imperialism & Anti-Imperialism*, while Prof. Gary R. Hess, Bowling Green State U (Ohio), directed the

work, *America & Russia: From Cold War Confrontation to Coexistence*. Paperbacks, each retails at \$2.95.

Another recent editorial project by Prof. Paterson is *Containment and the Cold War; American Foreign Policy since 1945*. This work, a paperback, is one in the Addison-Wesley Publishing Company's SERIES IN HISTORY.

* * * * *

Prof. David F. Trask, chairman of the History Department at SUNY (Stony Brook), has recently authored *Captains and Cabinets; Anglo-American Naval Relations, 1917-1918*. Published by the U of Missouri Press, the work retails at \$12.00. It is reviewed in the April number of *History*.

* * * * *

First volume in the new American Presidency series, sponsored by the University Press of Kansas, is *The Presidency of William Howard Taft*. Written by Dr. Paolo E. Coletta, professor of history at the U.S. Naval Academy, the work is listed at \$10.00.

* * * * *

Prof. Justus D. Doenecke, New College, Sarasota, Fla., is the author of a recent bibliographical work titled *The Literature of Isolationism: A Guide to Non-Interventionist Scholarship, 1930-1972*. The manual was favorably reviewed in the April, 1973 number of *History*. A paperback, it is available from Ralph Myles, Publisher, Colorado Springs, for \$1.85.

* * * * *

Prof. John De Novo, U of Wisconsin and member of the SHAFR Council, is the general editor of a recent publication, *The Gilded Age and After: Selected Readings in American History*. It can be secured from C. Scribner's Sons for \$6.95. It was reviewed in the April, 1973 number of *History*.

PERSONALS

Dr. Forrest M. Pogue, Director of the George C. Marshall Research Library, VMI, Lexington, Va., has recently been installed as the president of the American Military Institute.

* * * * *

Dr. Gerald E. Wheeler, former editor of the *SHAFR Newsletter*, has been reappointed to a four-year term as chairman of the History Department at San Jose State, California.

* * * * *

Dr. James C. Tillapaugh, presently instructor in history at Northwestern University, has been appointed to the post of assistant professor of history at the University of Texas of the Permian Basin.

* * * * *

Dr. Richard C. Lukas, professor of history at Tennessee Technological U, has been appointed to the editorial board of *The Journal of Army Aviation History*.

* * * * *

David H. Corcoran has become the Executive Director of the Pearl S. Buck Birthplace Foundation, Inc., Hillsboro, W. Va. The Foundation publishes a newsletter titled *The Pearl S. Buck Birthplace Report*. Director Corcoran states that future issues will contain much information on Chinese-American relations. Members of SHAFR may receive a free copy of the first issue by writing to Pearl S. Buck Birthplace Foundation, Box 126, Hillsboro, W. Va. 24946.

* * * * *

Recent appointments to committees of the American Historical Association include Prof. Richard S. Kirkendall (U of Missouri) to Committee on Committees, and Professor Ernest May (Harvard), Norman A. Graebner (Virginia), Alexander DeConde (U of California at Santa Barbara), Richard W. Leopold (Northwestern), and Dorothy Borg (Columbia) to the Committee on American-East Asian Relations with Prof. May serving as chairman.

THE STUART L. BERNATH PRIZE COMPETITION FOR 1974

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations announces the opening of the 1974 competition for the Stuart L. Bernath Prize on a book dealing with any aspect of American foreign relations. (The 1973 competition closed on May 31 with the prize winner to be announced at the annual luncheon of SHAFR, held in conjunction with the AHR in December, 1973). The purpose of the award is to recognize and to encourage distinguished research and writing by young scholars in the field of America's foreign relations.

CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD

ELIGIBILITY: The prize competition is open to any book on any aspect of American foreign relations that was published during 1973. 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. Robert Beisner, Chairman, Stuart L. Bernath Prize Committee, Department of History, American University, Washington, D. C. 20016. The volumes must be received by December 31, 1973.

AMOUNT: \$500.00. If two (2) or more works are deemed winners, as in 1972, 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 in April, 1974, at Denver, Colo.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Council of the Society approved at its meeting in Chicago in April, the idea of a two-day conference to take place in August of 1975 or in 1976, in Washington, D. C. The tentative plan is to have four sessions (one each on Friday morning, Friday afternoon, Saturday morning and Saturday afternoon), two luncheons (Friday and Saturday) and one dinner (Friday). The Program Committee earnestly solicits suggestions from the membership for sessions and for luncheon and dinner speakers.

-----Dr. Armin Rappaport, Program Chairman of SHAFR, Department of History, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92037

* * * * *

The editor of the *Newsletter* wishes to publish in the September number synopses of articles upon U. S. diplomatic affairs which members of the Society have authored over the last year, as well as summaries of scholarly papers which members have delivered at learned meetings over the same period. The summaries must not exceed twelve (12) lines of the *Newsletter*. The term "last year" will include anything actually published or delivered after June, 1972. If space does not warrant publication of all abstracts in September, the remainder will be carried in the December issue. Do not send abstracts which have appeared, or will appear, in another publication such as *America: History and Life*.

SHAFR ROSTER & RESEARCH LIST

Please use this form to register your general and current research interests as well as your current address. The complete Roster & Research List will be revised and issued on Dec. 15 of even years. (Supplemental lists will be published in uneven years). In addition to an alphabetical membership roster, names will be grouped according to the subject matter of their current research (or according to their area of general research interest if no specific research project is listed), so please use descriptive titles in registering a project. Unless new data is submitted, previously listed research projects will be repeated in each issue. Submit the form at any time during the year, but before July 15 to be included in that year's listing.

Name: _____ Title: _____

Address: _____

_____ State: _____ Zip: _____

General area of research interest: _____

_____ Code Word: _____

Current research project: _____

Code Word: _____ EST. COMPL. DATE: _____

Check here _____ if this is pre-doctoral research.

Mail to: W. F. Kimball, Editor, SHAFR Roster
 Department of History, Rutgers University
 175 University Avenue
 Newark, New Jersey 07102

SHAFR NEWSLETTER

SPONSOR: Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.

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

ISSUES: March, June, September, and December. All members receive the publication.

DEADLINES: All material must be in the hands of the editor not later than the 1st of the month preceding each issue.

MATERIAL DESIRED: Personals (promotions, transfers, obituaries, awards), announcements, synopses of scholarly papers delivered 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 articles and book reviews are unacceptable.

Box 5146
TENNESSEE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

BLK. RT.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID

Cookeville, Tenn.
PERMIT NO. 101