

The Society for Historians of American
Foreign Relations



NEWSLETTER

Volume 16

No. 1

March, 1985

Page

- 1 Present Before and After the Creation by J. Garry Clifford
- 6 The National Archives Microfilm Publications Program by Milton O. Gustafson
- 8 Sources for Understanding the Vietnam Conflict, edited by George Herring
- 30 Minutes of the SHAFR Council Meeting - Chicago
- 39 1985 SHAFR Summer Program
- 45 Publications
- 47 Announcements
- 55 Personals
- 56 Calendar
- 58 Holt Fellowship Program

SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

FOUNDED IN 1967. CHARTERED IN 1972.

PRESIDENT: Warren I. Cohen, History, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 38824.

VICE PRESIDENT: Warren F. Kuehl, History, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio 44325.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER: Marvin R. Zahniser, History, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

CHAIRMAN, PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Roger Dingman, History, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California 90089.

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

CHAIRMAN, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Ronald L. Steel, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1300 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10028.

CHAIRMAN, GOVERNMENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE: Warren F. Kimball, History, Rutgers University at Newark, Newark, New Jersey 07102.

MEMBERSHIP: Annual dues are \$16.50, payable at the office of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer. Student fees are \$6.00, for retired members \$8.00, and institutional memberships are \$30.00. Life memberships are \$250.00. In the case of membership by husband-wife team, dues for one of them shall be one-half of the regular price.

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 per 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 Laguna Hills, California. The details of each of these awards are given in under the appropriate headings of each issue of the Newsletter.

PUBLICATIONS: The Society sponsors two printed works of a quarterly nature, the Newsletter, and Diplomatic History, a journal; a Membership Roster and List of Current Research Projects is published occasionally.

**PRESENT BEFORE AND AFTER THE CREATION:
THE PRIVATE PAPERS OF DEAN ACHESON**

by

J. Garry Clifford (University of Connecticut)

It is quite appropriate that the private papers of Dean Gooderham Acheson are finally open to scholars at the Sterling Library of Yale University, Acheson's alma mater and the repository of the papers of Edward M. House, Henry L. Stimson, and other prominent American statesmen of the 20th century. Samples of Acheson's private correspondence were published in 1980 in a volume entitled Among Friends, and the entire collection of some 70 manuscript boxes was expected to open for research shortly thereafter.¹ Concern about classified materials and candid comments about persons still living caused some delays, however, and the papers only became available last year with certain minimal restrictions: materials still considered classified are closed, and Acheson's correspondence files with Wilmarth Lewis, Archibald MacLeish, and Eugene Rostow will not be available for ten years.

What remains is a rich collection, especially good for the years 1953-1971, the period after Acheson stepped down as Secretary of State. The long, ruminative, sometimes acerbic, often pungent letters that Acheson rarely wrote while in public office appear in abundance in his "private" correspondence, some of the files dating back to college days before World War I where a young Dean Acheson rowed crew under the slightly older Averell Harriman as coach. The personal correspondence consists of 36 boxes filed alphabetically according to correspondent, with each individual's file arranged chronologically therein. One of the largest files is that of Felix Frankfurter, Acheson's mentor at Harvard Law School and lifelong friend. Frankfurter, who may have written more letters than any public figure in this century, unfortunately wrote in an indecipherable scrawl, and more than half of "FF's" hundreds of letters to Acheson from 1919 to the 1960s were not typed. Much of Acheson's correspondence in the 1960s details the arrangements he made for financial and medical care for the ailing Supreme Court Justice in the years before his death. Among the files containing good

correspondence about international affairs before World War II are those of George Rublee and James P. Warburg. To both men Acheson wrote candidly and critically of Franklin Roosevelt's hesitant foreign policy moves, and from Rublee, his favorite law partner, Acheson received first-hand accounts of diplomacy in Mexico under Ambassador Dwight Morrow in the late 1920s and of negotiations with German officials in 1938-39 in a doomed attempt to regularize Jewish emigration from Nazi Germany. The correspondence with Warburg, a fellow interventionist before Pearl Harbor, becomes quite fascinating after 1945 as Warburg bombarded his old friend "Deano" with sharp criticism of American policy toward Germany and exhortations about world federalism. Unfortunately, as with most of Acheson's correspondence for the years 1941-1953, the replies were mostly perfunctory.

Probably the best Acheson materials deal with the last ten years of his life, 1961-1971, in which the mustachioed former Secretary of State served as an active adviser -- one of the so-called "Wise Men" -- to the Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations. It may seem surprising that Acheson, a lifelong Democrat, actually rated Nixon as the most accomplished statesman of the three, the same Nixon who had campaigned so disparagingly in 1952 against "Dean Acheson's cowardly college of communist containment." Acheson's early impression of the Nixon presidency was couched in terms of being "a definite relief from LBJ, not from definable positive virtues, but from the absence of a swinish, bullying boorishness which made his last years unbearable."² His entree into the Nixon White House was eased by a previous friendship with Henry Kissinger, a relationship that began with flattering letters from the refugee professor in the 1950s and blossomed into a mutual admiration that was sustained by similar geopolitical views about the importance of Europe and excessive American involvement in Southeast Asia.³ Kissinger arranged several private meetings with Nixon to consult on such issues as Vietnam, arms negotiations with the Russians, Middle East tensions, and even South Africa and Rhodesia. When Nixon delivered his famous speech on Vietnamization in October 1969 to the "Silent Majority," Acheson had a hand in drafting the peroration.⁴ Although he disapproved of the Cambodian invasion in the spring of 1970, telling friends that Nixon was the only horse he

knew that would run back into a burning barn, Acheson generally supported the President's Vietnam policy because he believed that gradual rather than precipitate withdrawal was a prerequisite toward shoring up the western alliance structure that he had helped to fashion. "He is a curiously appealing person," Acheson wrote after one private talk with Nixon. "Against my better judgment I find myself liking him. He apparently puts up with my outrageously frank talk. The performance does not commend itself, but it is curiously hard to dislike the man. I guess I'm getting senile."⁵ Probably the high point in the relationship came in the spring of 1971 when Acheson and other Cold War luminaries gave public backing to the Nixon administration in repudiating the Mansfield Amendment. The President sent a personal letter saying: "You were among the few present at our meeting in the Cabinet Room Thursday afternoon who could truly claim to have been 'Present at the Creation.' All, however, can now proudly...say that they were 'Present at the Resurrection.'"⁶ Acheson jokingly replied that he was glad not to have been present at the crucifixion, and since he died just a few months later, more than two years before the Watergate crisis and Nixon's resignation, the former Secretary of State did not have a chance to comment on the destruction.

The Acheson papers have excellent documentation of his relations with the Nixon administration, including several detailed memoranda of conversations with Nixon and Kissinger.⁷ There are fewer memoranda detailing Acheson's advisory role with the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, and the correspondence files with such likely Acheson intimates as Paul Nitze and the Bundy brothers are disappointingly thin. Nevertheless, Acheson's attitudes and activities can be traced primarily in correspondence with friends living outside the Maryland-Virginia area codes. Perhaps the most fascinating and candid file dealing with the early 1960s contains long letters to and from Michael Janeway, currently the publisher of the Boston Globe, then the young college age son of Acheson's friend and neighbor, Eliot Janeway. Since Janeway was writing his Harvard senior thesis on John F. Kennedy's foreign policy and enjoyed penning witty and ebullient epistles to "revered leader," Acheson responded similarly. Not only did Acheson spell out his role in and critique of Kennedy's diplomacy, but as the 1960s

came to be dominated by Vietnam, racial unrest, and generational conflict, the continuing correspondence with Janeway shows Acheson struggling valiantly to comprehend the views and emotions of a bright member of the '60s generation.⁸ His own doubts and concerns about Vietnam can be seen most fully in letters to his fellow "wise man", John Cowles, the Minneapolis publisher. Friends abroad also tended to receive fuller, more ruminative letters from Acheson. Robert Menzies of Australia, Howard Beale of New Zealand, Jean Monnet of France, and Anthony Eden of Britain often benefited from Achesonian "tours d'horizon." To Lady Pamela Berry of England went Acheson's pithy review of the laudatory memoirs and biographies of the Kennedy years: "For heartbroken idealists the Kennedy entourage is putting on a show of vulgar commercialism and bad taste the equal of which I have not seen during my lengthening life.... Kennedy and his attendants, like the Pharaohs, are embalmed in exaggeration and encased in gold. I suspect that their fame will be as ephemeral."⁹

It should also be noted that overseas correspondents regularly sent Acheson detailed information about local developments. Scholars of European politics in the 1960s, for example, will be delighted that Acheson received voluminous accounts of Common Market policies and Labour Party activities from, respectively, Robert Schatzel, the U.S. Ambassador to the European Economic Community, and Desmond Donnelly, a hawkish Labour M.P. Similarly, anyone interested in southern Africa will be fascinated by Acheson's correspondence for the years 1967-71 with Sir Roy Welensky, the former Prime Minister of Rhodesia. Initially interested in southern Africa because of NATO and Portugal's colonial problems, Acheson began corresponding with Welensky, whom he never met, because of their mutual friendship with Anthony Eden. Relations with England after Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence in 1965, United Nations sanctions, the proper American policy toward states that practice racial discrimination -- all became the subject of an increasingly absorbing correspondence, as Acheson did much in the last years of his life to moderate American policy toward Rhodesia. Any lingering doubts about the essentially conservative views of the man so inappropriately called the "Red Dean" in the 1950s will be dispelled on reading Acheson's Rhodesia correspondence.¹⁰

In addition to private letters and memoranda, nearly half of the Acheson collection consists of speeches, published writings, and correspondence concerning such activities. Most of it is routine. Historians of the Truman period, however, will find interesting materials in the notes, drafts, and correspondence connected with the writing and publication of Present at the Creation. Not only does one learn such trivia as a suggestion that Acheson consider hiring Athan Theoharis as a research assistant (he eventually hired Henry Kissinger's assistant, Marina Finkelstein), but that Acheson took considerable effort to ask former colleagues and subordinates probing questions about what happened in China in 1946, why MacArthur did what he did in 1950, and the like. There are also reactions to the book, mostly polite puffery, but an occasional candid disagreement by someone who witnessed the creation differently. One senses that Acheson found that writing his memoirs in his mid-seventies gave him a new sense of exhilaration. It kept him active and alive, his ego fully intact. As he reminisced to Lord Avon in the summer of 1969, "If you and I could run the world, Anthony, we could do a much better job than those who fail to run it now. Or so we think!"¹¹

NOTES

¹David S. McLellan and David C. Acheson, Among Friends: Personal Letters of Dean Acheson (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1980).

²Dean Acheson to Pamela Berry, June 24, 1969, Box 3, Dean G. Acheson MSS, Sterling Library, Yale University, New Haven, CT.

³An example of the Kissinger approach: "You might like to know that while in Paris a few weeks ago I spoke with a man who had an appointment with De Gaulle right after you. He told me that De Gaulle said, 'Voila un homme!' and that he went on at some length about how reassured he would be to have somebody he could send on missions like this. This man did not know that I know you. It is, of course, no surprise to your admirers." Kissinger to Acheson, December 14, 1962, Box 18, ibid. Kissinger was referring to

Acheson's meeting with De Gaulle during the Cuban Missile Crisis.

⁴See Acheson to Kissinger, October 29, 1969, Box 18, ibid; and memorandum of conversation with the President, October 27, 1969, Box 68, ibid.

⁵Acheson to J. H. Gould, March 12, 1970, Box 13, ibid.

⁶Nixon to Acheson, May 10, 1971, Box 23, ibid.

⁷The memoranda are in Box 68.

⁸The Acheson-Janeway correspondence is in Box 17, ibid.

⁹Acheson to Pamela Berry, August 1965, Box 3, ibid.

¹⁰The Welensky correspondence is in Boxes 33 and 34, ibid.

¹¹Acheson to Anthony Eden, July 7, 1969, Box 9, ibid.

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS PROGRAM

By

Milton O. Gustafson (National Archives)

Many librarians and historians have the mistaken notion that the National Archives microfilm publication program is moribund, that the National Archives has microfilmed records of the State Department only through 1929, and that private micropublishers have taken over the job of microfilming records dated later than 1929. None of that is true. I hope this brief note will eliminate some of the confusion.

During the 1970's, the National Archives devoted fewer resources to microfilm publications, but since 1979 there has been an increasing emphasis on preservation, with microfilm publications forming an integral part of the preservation program. Constant reference use damages records. Record series that are heavily used should be microfilmed so that the originals can be withdrawn from use. Having records on microfilm means that the staff does not need to spend time pulling

documents or boxes, making copies of selected items, and then refileing the records. Instead, the microfilm is available for researchers on open shelves in the microfilm reading room. Specific rolls (containing about 1000 pages each) can be purchased for a fee (as of January 1, 1985, \$20), thus eliminating the need for an expensive research trip to Washington, D. C.

The series of State Department records in the National Archives most heavily used by researchers is the central decimal file, a subject file divided into time periods: 1910-29, 1930-39, 1940-44, 1945-49, and 1950-54. For the 1910-29 period, most of the subject files in class 7 (political relations between states) and class 8 (internal affairs of states) were microfilmed before 1974 and are listed in the 1974 Catalog of National Archives Microfilm Publications. Since 1974 many other files of the later time periods have been microfilmed (see the SHAFR Newsletter, December 1981 and June 1984 for lists), and a new "Catalog of Diplomatic Microfilm" is being prepared for publication.

In the past the goal was to delay microfilming until the records had been completely declassified. Records dated through 1929 were declassified in 1960; records dated through 1939 were declassified in 1970; records dated through 1944 were declassified in 1972. Records of the 1945-49 and 1950-54 periods, however, have been reviewed for declassification under new rules; documents are no longer automatically declassified after 30 years, and the files for those time periods contain many documents that have been the ones most heavily used and in most need of microfilming--even without the many withdrawn documents.

The new goal is to microfilm all of the country files in class 8 (internal affairs) through 1949, selected files of the 1950-54 period, and other important files for the period before 1949. This filming will take a long time, and specific priorities, based on available resources, have not yet been determined.

Research interest has stimulated private micropublishers to produce their own microfilm publications of these records. One of these publishers has agreed to provide the National Archives with a positive copy of its microfilm publications of these records. Thus, the microfilm copy can be made

available to researchers in the microfilm reading room and the original records can be retired from use.

The same publisher has produced a list of National Archives microfilm publications of records of the Department of State. A copy can be obtained by writing to the Diplomatic Branch, National Archives, Washington, DC 20408.

**SOURCES FOR UNDERSTANDING THE VIETNAM CONFLICT:
A ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION**

compiled by
George C Herring (University of Kentucky)

On August 2, 1984, twenty years to the day after the first incident in the Gulf of Tonkin, a panel of experts gathered at the SHAFR meeting in Washington to discuss the status of the documentation of the Vietnam War. The panel included scholars with varying interests and specializations related to the war. Three of its members have worked on major Vietnam history projects sponsored by government agencies, and therefore have had access to materials not generally available to other scholars. The charge of the panelists was to discuss for their particular area of expertise what is not available, and, from their experience to highlight sources of particular value or pinpoint major problems relating to Vietnam documentation.

I learned a great deal from the discussion that followed, and I concluded that it would be useful to share the comments of the panelists with the entire SHAFR membership and the scholarly community at large. I therefore asked each of them to submit typescripts of their remarks, and all obliged. What follows then are the remarks of the panelists at the session "Sources for Understanding the Vietnam Conflict: A Roundtable Discussion." Their observations seem to me to have important implications not only for people interested in researching the Vietnam War but also for anyone studying recent American foreign policy.

It should be emphasized that the comments offered by those scholars in the employ of government agencies are their own views and do not represent the views of the agencies to which they are attached.

Sources on the Vietnam War The Communist Side

William J. Duiker
(Pennsylvania State University)

Most early studies dealing with the Vietnam War and written in the United States tended to concentrate on the American role in the conflict, and had little to say about the activities and motivations of the North Vietnamese (officially, Democratic Republic of Vietnam, or DRV) or their supporters in the South. This is understandable, not least because sources for understanding the objectives and the strategy of the DRV and the National Liberation Front (NLF) were relatively scarce. Travel to North Vietnam was difficult and the language barrier intimidating. As a result, little was written outside of official studies on the "communist side" of the Vietnam War.

In the decade that has passed since the fall of Saigon, this situation has begun to change. A number of studies have appeared on the subject, and more will be forthcoming. In part, such studies have become possible because more published studies on the war have appeared in Hanoi. Some are in English; others must be read in Vietnamese. In part, too, a new generation of American scholars has begun to study the Vietnamese revolution and the rise of the Communist Party which guided it to victory.

These are gratifying signs, and through such efforts American diplomatic historians will have the opportunity to gain new insights on the other side of the war. Yet it should be kept in mind that the sources on the communist side are still extremely limited, and are not likely to expand significantly in the near future. Like all communist societies, Hanoi does not make a practice of divulging extensive information about its decision-making process. There is no "thirty year rule," and materials elucidating policy debates within the leadership are rarely issued. Retired officials in Vietnam do not often reveal the inner secrets of the Party and the regime and how they coped with the demands of the war. In sum, scholars will never be in a position to understand Hanoi's role in the war to the degree that exists in the United States. For that reason, researchers must be satisfied with more limited, and

often less reliable sources of information. Listed below are some of the main sources available to scholars in the United States today.

Documentary Sources

The Hanoi regime has issued a small number of documentary studies dealing with the rise of the Communist Party and the course of the war. Unfortunately, most of these studies are in a Vietnamese version only and several are not available in the United States. Some are available in Hanoi, but only for internal use. There is, for example, a multi-volume history of the Vietnamese Communist Party in documents. Unfortunately, it is not available in the United States.

For that reason, scholars have been forced to rely to a considerable degree on captured documents. Many of these originally obtained by American or South Vietnamese military units during sweep operations, and they have been collected and made available to scholars in serial form or in microfilm. The best known are the following:

Catalog of Viet Cong Documents (Cornell University, 1969) (microfilm)

Communist Vietnamese Publications (Library of Congress) (microfilm)

Documents of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam (now at the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago) (microfilm)

Race Documents (currently available at the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago) (microfilm)

Vietnam Documents and Research Notes (published by U.S. mission in Saigon)

Working Paper of North Viet-Nam's Role in the War in South Viet-Nam: Appendix (Department of State, 1968)

There is one additional source of captured documents dealing with the war, a massive set of microfilmed documents known as the CDEC (Combined Documents Exploitation Center) documents. This collection of over 100 microfilm reels was originally compiled by the U.S. military mission in Saigon. Unfortunately a file search system is not currently available for scholars to make use of it.

One relatively useful source of information is the official Vietnamese press. Official statements, and speeches by high Party or government personnel are often published in the press or broadcast over the radio. English language translations are available through the Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and the Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS).

Secondary Sources

Given the paucity of official and documentary sources on the communist role in the war, scholars are forced to rely to an inordinate degree on secondary materials. Fortunately, many materials on the war are now being published in Hanoi. A number of major military figures in the war, such as Van Tien Dung, Hoang Minh Thao, Tran Van Tra, and Vo Nguyen Giap have issued their own memoirs on their role in the conflict. Accounts of the war by low-ranking officers or enlisted men, or civilian cadres connected with the movement, are often published in the newspapers, journals, or in collections in book form. Most are now available through the JPRS in an English translation.

The regime is also in the process of publishing a number of multi-volume official histories of the war. A history of the war in 10 volumes (exact title unknown) is now in preparation. Other series on the history of the People's Army of Vietnam and of the Communist Party are also published or in press. So far, there are no indications that they will be made available in English. A number of shorter studies on various aspects of the war have already been issued through the series Vietnamese Studies or in individual form. One recent publication is the History of the anti-U.S. Resistance War, 1954-1975, translated in 1982 by JPRS. This source is quite useful in providing a rough chronological breakdown of the stages of the war as seen from Hanoi, and it offers a number of insights into the decisions that were made at key stages in the conflict.

Vietnamese historians at the Institute for Historical Research and the Institute for the History of the Communist Party are currently working on a number of issues connected with the war, and their findings are gradually being published in scholarly journals such

as Nghien Cuu Lich Su (Historical Research) or official journals such as Tap Chi Cong San (Communist Review). Some are available in translation through JPRS.

How useful are such sources? It should be kept in mind at the outset that studies dealing with the war published in Vietnam are often for the purpose of stimulating patriotism or confirming as correct the strategy adopted by the Party. There is no "adversary scholarship" in Vietnam today. Yet many of the studies mentioned above do provide insights into the dilemmas faced by the regime, and they often indicate with surprising frankness the degree of controversy that existed in the process of reaching decisions. Within the limitations noted above, material published in Hanoi has been verified by comparison with other sources, and is often quite useful in shedding light on the view from North Vietnam. In a few instances, such as Tran Van Tra's one-volume memoirs, these sources can be surprisingly blunt about problems faced by the regime and military commanders in the South.

As for the captured documents mentioned in this paper, most of the facts contained therein have been verified from other sources. Relatively few documents are available with the imprimatur of the Politburo or the Central Committee. Most consist of directives, diaries, or the decisions of lower-level administrative units. Yet they often reflect decisions taken by higher echelons. In general, they are considered reliable.

Military Records*

Ronald H. Spector (University of Alabama)

In terms of sheer volume, the records relating to the Vietnam War appear to dwarf those of any previous American conflict. The war was the first to be fought in the age of the copying machine and the computer, and the influence of these innovations is reflected in the massive paper trail left by that conflict. The Washington National Records Center in Suitland,

*These comments are adapted from Ronald H. Spector, Researching the Vietnam Experience (Washington: Center of Military History, 1984), pp. 1-5.

Maryland, stores thousands of documents for federal agencies and the armed services. Army documents alone occupy over fifty thousand linear feet, and these are only a portion of the Army's total records! In addition, there are large collections on the Vietnam War at various presidential libraries; at historical offices of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps; at the U.S. Army Military History Institute in Carlisle, Pennsylvania; at the National Archives and Records Service in Washington, D.C.; and at various nongovernment repositories. It is not surprising that one writer has described the Vietnam War as "the most exquisitely documented war in history."¹

There can be no debate about the quantity of documentation. Quality is another matter. If we take exquisite in the usual dictionary meaning of "rare excellence" or "extraordinarily fine," the documentation of the Vietnam War falls sadly short of any such description.

The first difficulty in working with Vietnam records is a practical one. The documents are located at various records centers throughout the United States, and researchers wishing to do a thorough job will be obliged to visit not only different repositories but also different cities in order to obtain the needed sources. For example, a scholar studying the 1962-64 period of the war would have to visit Washington, D.C.; Boston, Massachusetts; and Austin, Texas; just to complete his basic research. Depending on his interests, he also might find it necessary to travel to Montgomery, Alabama; Carlisle, Pennsylvania; or Berkeley, California; as well.

To a large extent, the artificial fragmentation of Vietnam records has been brought about by the proliferation of presidential libraries in widely separated parts of the United States. The armed services also contribute to the problem by locating their extensive archival research centers at isolated sites, such as the Albert F. Simpson Research Center at Maxwell Air Force Base. This trend toward fragmentation probably will be accentuated by the

¹Sterling Slappey, "The Vietnam War Has Been Put on the Shelf," The American Legion 101 (November, 1976):13.

sprouting of Vietnam collections or archives at universities and state historical societies.

Records vary greatly in terms of their usefulness and accessibility to researchers. Those in the presidential libraries are probably the best organized and indexed. However, large sections of these records are closed to researchers because of security classification, donor restrictions, or processing problems. In addition, some presidential library staffs have shown a tendency to rearrange and reorganize files continually, making precise citation and location more difficult.

The records of the armed services are generally more accessible from the point of view of classification, but each of the four services maintains entirely different systems of records and recordkeeping for the Vietnam War period. The Navy, for example, continues to use a unique records system, one that has remained virtually unchanged since World War II. By contrast, the Army and Air Force have updated their records systems continuously. During the Vietnam War, new filing and reference systems superseded those used by agencies and commands at the beginning of the conflict. All of the armed services made a considerable effort to record the history of their activities in regard to Vietnam. However, each service had (and has) a different system of historical reporting. Thus, the Army's Operations Report/Lessons Learned has relatively little in common with the Marine Corps' Command Chronology or the Navy's annual command historical report.

The services also manage and control their records differently. In the Army the ultimate custodian of records is the adjutant general, whereas the chief of naval history and the director of Marine Corps history and museums possess broad authority over their services' historical records and recordkeeping. The Army has followed a policy of retiring many of its recent records to the National Archives. In contrast, a comparatively small proportion of the post-1950 records of the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps have been so retired. It should be added that the transfer of post-World War II records to the National Archives has not necessarily proven a means of making them more accessible.

Although the immense volume of records has created the impression that the Vietnam War is extensively documented, the records are in fact extremely uneven. During the early years of the war, unit commanders, overworked and understaffed, often neglected or ignored Army requirements concerning the preparation and preservation of reports and records. Records managers, both civilian and military, were few and far between and often lacked the necessary training. Lt. Gen. William R. Peers' Army Board of Inquiry that investigated the My Lai massacre found so many deficiencies in the Army's recordkeeping system that it added an annex to its report to discuss them. The board discovered that many of the permanent record files of Army units "contained documents which were not necessarily of a permanent nature while documents which should have been retained, such as reports of investigations, were missing. Daily staff journals were found to be poorly prepared and incomplete in most cases." The Peers board also commented on the "tendency among units to destroy records rather than to retire them" and reported that the files that were retired were "poorly selected, poorly organized and, in some cases, inaccurately identified."²

Much of the extensive Army documentation is actually an outgrowth of the Army's belated recognition that its records management system in Vietnam had broken down during the first few years of the conflict. As the failures of Army units and commands to preserve basic records came to light, word went out from Washington enjoining records managers from destroying any records that related to Vietnam. The result was the rapid accumulation of masses of trivial and ephemeral material, such as traffic violations, financial statements, and cargo manifests. These documents happily cohabit the same boxes and shelves with important message files and operations plans. In general, the story of the war at the field level--that is, in Vietnam itself--is well documented for the 1970-73 period, while the earlier years, as suggested above, are rather poorly documented. At the

²U.S. Department of the Army, Report of the Department of the Army Review of the Preliminary Investigations Into the My Lai Incident, 14 March 1970 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974), vol. 1, The Report of the Investigation, pp. B-1 and B-2.

Washington level the opposite is true. The Kennedy-Johnson period is fairly well documented, but little is available for the Nixon years because of restrictions imposed on Nixon presidential materials at the time of Watergate.

Whatever their quality or quantity, portions of the existing records are virtually inaccessible to researchers because the finding aids, inventories, or indexes have been lost or are unusable. An example are the records of the Combined Documents Exploitation Center, the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, which translated and analyzed captured enemy documents. Thousands of these documents were microfilmed and filed in random order on thousand-foot reels. An elaborate machine-readable index provided access to the documents. Unfortunately, the computer system able to "read" the index has long since become obsolete. A somewhat similar problem occurs in the use of records relating to combat operations, such as situation reports and intelligence summaries. These require the use of maps and grid systems then in use in Vietnam, and such maps are often unavailable or incomplete.

Documentation of the Vietnam War is also extremely one-sided. At the conclusion of World War II, American historians had available to them masses of captured enemy documents from which they were able to reconstruct the decisionmaking process of the German, Italian, and, to a lesser extent, the Japanese governments. Former high-ranking officers of those nations were available for questioning and often were utilized as research assistants in the preparation of the official Army and Navy histories. Nothing remotely similar exists for Vietnam. Although large numbers of captured Communist documents are available, the overwhelming majority are of a routine and low-level nature. In addition, the Communists' obsession with propaganda exhortations and ideological correctness in all their writings renders much of this material difficult to interpret and of suspect reliability. This holds true especially for accounts of events written some time after the events had occurred. Although these accounts usually contain valuable information, they must be used with caution because their authors may have felt it necessary to rework the facts to fit the current party line. The South Vietnamese government's perspective is almost as

poorly documented as that of its opponents. Few South Vietnamese government documents survived the fall of Saigon in 1975.

Like most military and bureaucratic records, Vietnam documents primarily reflect the perspectives of the leaders, rather than the led. In the area of military records, for example, most of the reports were prepared under the direction of and reflect the views of unit commanders. Few reports reflect the perceptions of individual soldiers, or squad or platoon leaders. Military records were always thus. In the case of the Vietnam War, however, this "leadership bias" of the records presents a special problem because most combat actions involved units of platoon- or company-size, or smaller. Yet the written accounts of these small unit engagements are prepared by a higher headquarters that usually was not itself involved in the action.

Finally, it is almost superfluous to observe that many Vietnam records--especially periodic, recurring documents involving quantitative reporting, such as enemy casualties ("body counts")--are highly suspect. Although it is impossible to prove that the men who prepared these reports deliberately "cooked the books" in any specific instance, it is equally impossible to ignore the widespread and numerous assertions by former soldiers and bureaucrats that reports were "adjusted" to reflect progress; to protect reputations, or to satisfy superiors. Researchers should bear in mind that the documentation of U.S. operations in Vietnam was prepared, for the most part, by career military and civilian officials who were under strong pressure to demonstrate positive results and whose organizations valued team work, a positive attitude, and energetic performance more than disinterested pursuit of truth.

Executive and Congressional Documents

William C. Gibbons (Congressional Research Service)

In our study for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee¹ we have made extensive use of published and unpublished documentary materials from the executive and legislative branches, as well as conducting 130 oral history interviews with key figures from the two branches. Our most useful source of information about

attitudes and actions in both the Executive and Congress has been the presidential libraries. Fortunately, a good deal of material has been made available through 1965. Unfortunately, material for later years is apparently going to take longer to process, due to its volume as well as staff shortages.

There are conspicuous gaps: The NSC has not opened the records of the NSC Operations Board or the Planning Board during the Eisenhower Administration, and is acting very slowly on mandatory review requests under the Freedom of Information Act, even for that early period. The Kennedy Library has not processed the papers of McGeorge Bundy, and the Kennedy family has not opened the papers of Robert Kennedy; the Johnson Library has not opened the papers of W. W. Rostow or Bill Moyers.

Congressional records are also available only in part. The Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees are publishing the proceedings of their closed meetings, with those of Foreign Relations available through 1961 and Foreign Affairs through 1955. Still unavailable, however, are executive sessions of other relevant committees, as well as most other committee records. In the House, access to committee records is generally barred for 50 years. In the Senate, committees are urged to make records available after 20 years, but compliance has been spotty. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has taken the lead by opening most of its files after 12 years.

The State Department and Presidential Libraries

Louis J. Smith
(Office of the Historian, Department of State)

For those interested in the evolution of Vietnam policy, beyond the documentation opened through 1954, there is good news and bad news. The good news is that the State Department has decided to accelerate the publication of the Vietnam volumes in the Foreign Relations series. The bad news is that it will probably be a long time before scholars gain access to the files on which those volumes will be based.

The decision to accelerate the publication of the Vietnam volumes is, in part, a response to strong,

continuing public interest in the subject. It is also a reflection of the window of opportunity which Vietnam represents in an otherwise gloomy clearance picture. While it is becoming increasingly difficult to steer Foreign Relations volumes through the clearance process, the files relating to the Vietnam conflict are seen by clearance officials in the State Department, and elsewhere in the government, as largely desensitized material dealing with a closed chapter in American history. As such, much of the remaining classified documentation can be released through the Foreign Relations series. On the understanding that Vietnam volumes will receive priority treatment in the clearance process, the Historian's Office has established a team of six historians, under General Editor John P. Glennon, to accelerate publication as far as possible through the Vietnam conflict. Scholars can, therefore, expect to see, within the next few years, the publication of the following Foreign Relations volumes dealing with Vietnam:

1. Foreign Relations, 1955-1957, Vietnam -- This volume is almost through the clearance process and should be published within a year.
2. Foreign Relations, 1958-1960, Vietnam -- This volume is well into the clearance process and should be published within two years.
3. Foreign Relations, 1961-1963, Vietnam -- Compilation of three volumes covering the Kennedy administration has been completed. These volumes are entering the clearance process, and should be published, if accorded priority treatment, within three years.
4. Foreign Relations, 1964-1965, Vietnam -- Research is underway on two or three volumes covering the first two years of the Johnson administration. Publication of these volumes is anticipated within four or five years.

Beyond 1965, prospects for compiling accelerated volumes are murky, at best. The Johnson Library is completing the processing of Vietnam-related documentation through 1965, but faces an unprocessed mountain of material generated after the introduction of American combat forces in 1965. Because of

budgetary constraints, the library has only a small and shrinking number of hands to use in chipping away at that mountain.

The processing problem lies behind the gloomy projection that scholars should not expect to see the opening of official files on Vietnam, or any other topic, beyond 1954 for some years to come. The processing staff at the National Archives has been drastically reduced. The 1950-1954 record block of State Department documentation is being processed and made available largely because of a supplementary grant from the State Department. I understand that State Department funding may dry up after the processing is complete through 1954. That would mean that, unless the Archives budget is unexpectedly expanded to hire additional processors, the 1955-1959 and 1960-1963 record blocks would be processed very slowly. The processing situation at the Kennedy Library is similar to that at the Johnson Library. Processing of foreign policy files has been limited to a few prominent issues, such as Vietnam, Laos, Cuba and Africa. Even those files are not completely processed, and processing is proceeding at a very slow pace in both libraries because of limited staff. All of this is to emphasize a problem of which most of the profession is relatively unaware, a problem which threatens to limit research on foreign policy issues to materials released through the FOIA channel, or through official publications, such as the Foreign Relations series.

The processing problem which has developed in the past few years is, of course, overlaid on a clearance problem which is becoming steadily worse in a tougher climate of official opinion on clearance matters. The clearance problem reflects a fundamental change in releaseable material. This more conservative outlook governs clearance. The processing problem, on the other hand, is equally serious, but more tractable. Even under tougher clearance guidelines, the government would be prepared to release the vast majority of documents generated thirty years ago, if they can be processed and prepared for release. It may be necessary for interested scholars, inside and outside of government, to consider what measures may be necessary to generate funding for the largely mechanical but necessary function of processing

retired files at the Presidential libraries and the National Archives.

In light of the time which may elapse before government archives are opened beyond 1954, the team compiling the Vietnam volumes for 1955-1965 has made an effort to be as comprehensive as possible in researching the compilations. In addition to the extensive files, both open and classified, bearing on Vietnam in the Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson libraries, we have mined the files of the State Department, the NSC, the JCS, and CIA as appears in the files available to us. It should be noted, for those scholars who have worked through the materials in the open files at the Kennedy and Johnson libraries, that what they have seen is the tip of the iceberg. Much of the best documentation bearing on the development of policy remains in the classified files. Hopefully, much of this material will be released with the publication of the Vietnam volumes in the Foreign Relations series.

Beyond government archives, we have searched a number of valuable private collections and have conducted an extensive series of oral history interviews, based on our research, to fill in and amplify the record. I include a copy of the list of collections used. We have interviewed a number of government officials important in the development of Vietnam policy during the Eisenhower administration, and have either interviewed, or will soon interview, most such officials from the Kennedy administration. The one notable exception is Robert McNamara, who apparently still does not like to say the word Vietnam. These interviews are being processed and procedures are being developed to incorporate them with the documentation on which they are based. We hope that these interviews will, in time, enrich the study of Vietnam policy.

Collections Consulted

1. J. Lawton Collins Papers - currently at the National Archives, will go to Abeline. The Vietnam file, which has Collins' reports, staff notes, and correspondence, is largely declassified. Collins was the Special Representative in Vietnam, Nov. 1954-May 1955.

2. Lt. Gen. Samuel T. Williams Papers - one part at the National Records Center at Suitland, and another at the Hoover Institution at Stanford. General Williams was Chief of MAAG in Vietnam Nov. 1956-Aug 1960.
3. Edward G. Lansdale Papers - also split between Suitland and the Hoover Institution. In each case, the collection at Suitland appears to be richer. General Lansdale was Deputy Assistant for Special Operations in Defense after 1955.
4. Admiral Arthur W. Radford Papers - at the Naval History Center, of use for 1955-1957.
5. Admiral Arleigh Burke Papers - also at the Naval History Center, valuable for Admiral Burke's period as CNO, which ran through 1961.
6. Mike Mansfield Papers - at the University of Montana. Permission from Mansfield needed to use the confidential file - easy to obtain.
7. Files of the Michigan State University Group - at Michigan State University Archives. Project ran from 1955-1962. Connected with CIA until 1960. Archive also has the papers of Wesley Fishel and John Hannah who were involved in the project.

Kennedy Period

1. Gen. Maxwell Taylor Papers - at the National Defense University - very rich, to date little used. General Taylor was initially Kennedy's military adviser, and then Chief of Staff during the Kennedy administration.
2. Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer Papers - also at the National Defense University. Of value for his correspondence with Lt. Gen. Lionel C. McGarr, and for his handwritten notes on NSC and JCS meetings, which are in some cases the only records available.
3. W. Averell Harriman Papers - in Harriman's possession, soon to be transferred to Columbia University. Valuable in particular for records of telephone conversations. Harriman was key in the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State for

Far Eastern Affairs and then Undersecretary of State under Kennedy.

4. Chester Bowles Papers - at Yale contain bits and pieces of use.

5. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. Papers - at the Massachusetts Historical Society contain almost nothing of value.

Within Agency Files and Presidential Libraries

Roger Hilsman Papers - in Kennedy Library

James Thomson Papers - Kennedy Library

Robert Kennedy Papers - closed by donor restriction

Robert McNamara Files - in Department of Defense

Dean Rusk Files - State Department

U. Alexis Johnson Files - State Department

George Ball Files - State Department

William Bundy Files - State Department

McGeorge Bundy Papers - Johnson Library

Walt Rostow Papers - Johnson Library

**Interviews as a Source for the History of American
Involvement in the Vietnam War**

Melvin Small (Wayne State University)

What follows are observations concerning my experiences interviewing Vietnam-era politicians written from the perspective of a novice who has been both fascinated and frustrated by the process. Although much of what I have to say is well known to those who have employed this research tool, I thought that others contemplating interviewing might profit from my remarks.

I am trying to determine how the antiwar movement affected policy-making from 1965 through 1971. This

is a fuzzy subject that involves identifying the perceptions of the decision makers and then suggesting how those perceptions may have affected their actions during crucial turning points in this period.¹ I am concerned not only with what happened during important meetings but also with why certain policies were adopted. Written documents, when available, are best for the what but are often obscure on the why. Of course, few people can say with certainty and credibility why they did what they did yesterday, let alone twenty years ago. Thus, the ultimate fuzziness of the subject.

I began with a candidate list of 40 subjects for interviews. Within a month after sending my letter, prospectus and resume, I was astonished when about 30 figures in both administrations consented to talk to me.² A few of them have subsequently proven so difficult to pin down to a specific time and place that one wonders whether they had any intention in following through with an interview in the first place.

Some who were not responsive initially became more forthcoming after I asked Michigan Senator Carl Levin's aides to prod them a bit.³ Such a ploy works well with Washington and New York lawyers who do business with the government. On the other hand, to be fair to my reluctant subjects, interviewing Johnson and Nixon people is becoming something of a cottage industry that often interrupts the schedules of busy executives who are no longer public servants. When I expressed concern to one prominent lawyer about how much money I was "costing" him, given his very high dollar-per-minute billing, he made me feel better by pointing out that someone in the corporate world would end up paying for our time together.

The more people I interviewed the more my candidate list expanded as I was frequently told, "you must see so and so." It is difficult to know where to stop once the interviewing process is launched, especially when you turn up people of significance who have remained in historical obscurity.⁴

Many of the key people are still relatively young, especially presidential and National Security Council aides. It is true, however, that potential interviewers should move with dispatch to see some of

the more important figures. As I was being ushered out of Clark Clifford's office, he commented, "I bet you didn't think people could be this old."⁵

As might have been expected, the Johnson people have been more accessible and eager, on the average, than the Nixon people. Many more former Johnson officials than Nixon officials now work in Washington and New York, a reflection, perhaps, of the sunbelt orientation of the Republican party, as well as the way some of them left office.

It should be noted that most of those interviewed are still loyal to their former employers from the Oval Office and the relatively few who are not tend to be disparaged by the rest. I was warned by officials of both administrations not to believe all that I was told by the handful of their former colleagues who have been openly critical of Johnson or Nixon.

I was also struck by how insulated many of those to whom I spoke had been from one another. When I asked officials at the assistant or deputy secretary level about White House policy making, many reported that they rarely knew what was going on there. As for Congress, and Senator J. William Fulbright in particular, he claimed that most of his colleagues knew very little about activities at the other end of the Mall.⁶ In many cases, those in the White House, even at relatively low levels of the bureaucracy, seemed to be more knowledgeable about national security affairs than their colleagues in State, Defense, and Congress. Although there was much inter-departmental contact and coordination and mounds of paper flowed continuously from department to department, when it came to significant influences on Johnson and Nixon, White House staffers seemed to be the most valuable sources.

Many on that staff, as well as others, admonished me not to rely too much on printed documentation for establishing what factors went into policy making. I was most interested in the public opinion variable, a variable that documents available in the Johnson Library and The Pentagon Papers relegate to the miscellaneous category, if it appears at all. Thus, I asked McGeorge Bundy, for example, why he did not deal very much in his printed policy analyses with public reactions when he and the president contemplated

escalation in January of 1965. Bundy, now a member of our guild at New York University, responded that I was mistaken; opinion was a key variable that came up almost every time he and the president talked about the bombing decision. Its minor status in his papers, according to Bundy, does not mean that it was not important to Johnson and his advisors. Dean Rusk suggested much the same, pointing out that few complete minutes were taken at the Tuesday lunches and that the participants in that very small group rarely leaked information.⁷

If anything, such admonitions offer another justification for supplementing written materials with interviews. Naturally, this will only work for a decade or so as many of the main characters soon begin to die or their memories fade. Then they may leave us with more of their papers which they now claim tell only part of the story.

One major area of disappointment was the difficulty I had obtaining responses to conceptual questions. When I moved away from people, places, and meetings, and asked about the relationship between opinion and dissent, or where they thought opinion came from, or how the issue was handled by the White House staff, I often drew a blank. In some cases, I was told that my questions were intriguing but that they had never given them much thought.

When I did get them to reflect on opinion, dissent, and policy, my subjects often responded in ways that did violence to the neat models of opinion formation and transmission of the social scientists. For example, if Lyndon Johnson thought that Walter Lippmann created public opinion in the spring of 1965, then Lippmann did at least in terms of how Johnson responded to "public opinion."⁸

While I was occasionally distressed with the inability of my subjects to answer my questions and exasperated about their vague memories of major historical events, I was frequently impressed with the discretion of the diplomats. After talking to them, I emerged with a new respect for their precise language -- even body language -- as I tried unsuccessfully to pry loose some sensational revelation. Further, I discovered that several of the more quotable things that I was told so spontaneously had been presented in speeches

twenty years earlier. In addition, some of my historical scoops vanished when my subjects shared them with several million viewers of the PBS Vietnam television history. Not surprisingly, the lower one went in the hierarchy, the more indiscreet the answers. Unfortunately, the honest historian must ask him or herself, what did the lesser staffers really know about the Tuesday lunches or the comments of Nixon to Kissinger in the Oval Office?

Are the interviews worth it in a cost-benefit sense? The process has been expensive and time-consuming. Without a generous grant from the American Council of Learned Societies, I doubt whether I could have afforded the travel and phone bills that mounted, especially when one considers the relative paucity of material obtained per person hour of labor. That is, I am certain that I ended up with many fewer useable notecards of material per hour through the interview process than through traditional archival research.⁹

On the other hand, despite the material and sometimes psychological costs, interviewing presents a challenging and rarely uninteresting research experience. More important, given some of the things that I think that I have discovered through the process, I am convinced that it is an essential activity, especially for the period between the deaths of the main figures and the opening of the relevant archives. Undoubtedly, the reviewers will have the last word about the value of the interviews I have conducted.

NOTES

¹Some tentative results of my early research can be seen in "The Impact of the Antiwar Movement on Lyndon Johnson, 1965-1968: A Preliminary Report," Peace and Change, X, (Spring 1984), 1-22.

²Among the refusals were several who never responded to multiple queries (John Mitchell, Spiro Agnew, Nguyen Cao Ky), one venerable diplomat who would talk about anything except Vietnam, so painful was the experience for him, and a former White House aide who had no time for such activities since he was working around the clock for Christ.

³Similarly, I was successful in obtaining a rare interview with a Vietnamese diplomat in New York, in part, because of the intervention of a friend who holds a prominent office in the United Nations.

⁴For example, Daniel Z. Henkin who was an assistant secretary of defense for public affairs, told me about Harry Zubkoff in the Pentagon who has provided a vital news clipping service, Current News, to thousands of officials since 1963. Interview with Henkin, February 9, 1984, Washington, D. C.; Interview with Zubkoff, August 3, 1984, Washington, D. C.

⁵Interview with Clifford, February 8, 1984, Washington, D. C.

⁶Interview with Fulbright, February 7, 1984, Washington, D. C.

⁷Interview with Bundy, March 9, 1984, New York; Interview with Rusk, February 23, 1984, Athens, Georgia.

⁸For further thoughts on this issue, see my "Public Opinion on Foreign Policy: The View from the Johnson and Nixon White Houses," Politica (Arhus, Denmark), (1984, No. 2), 184-200.

⁹In most cases, and especially as I became more proficient and focussed, an hour was more than enough for an interview with 35-45 minutes usually sufficient.

Concluding Remarks

George Herring

The preceding discussion has made no pretense of being all-inclusive, and it is obvious that many important sources have not been mentioned. Indeed, as the remarks of the panelists make clear, sources for studying the Vietnam War are growing daily and will continue to grow much faster than scholars can learn about them and study them. I spent an enormously profitable week this past summer studying the manuscript collections and oral history interviews at the U.S. Army Military History Institute, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania. Although much of the manuscript materials remain classified, the documents now available provide invaluable insights into the

views of senior army officers on the war. I have also stumbled almost by accident on little gems in unexpected places. To give one example, the James J. Kilpatrick Papers at the University of Virginia Library contain a file of correspondence from readers in response to a Kilpatrick column of February 1975 advocating additional aid for South Vietnam. The letters, many from avowed Kilpatrick fans, provide a rare look at grass roots opinion at a critical stage in the war. They also dispel the pervasive and potentially dangerous myth that it was primarily liberals who wanted to wash their hands of South Vietnam and sold a loyal ally down the river. One can only assume that there are many more such gems scattered across the country.

The panelists have highlighted the major problems that confront the researcher of the Vietnam conflict. The war generated enormous volumes of paper, more than any single scholar could ever begin to read, much less master. I do not envy the brave (or foolish) person who, fifty or sixty years from now, attempts to write a synthesis of the war and base it even in part on archival material and manuscripts. All panelists agree, however, that despite their volume, the Vietnam documents are one-sided, spotty, and uneven, with huge gaps in critical places. Professor Small's appeal for oral history is therefore well taken, and while numerous official and unofficial programs are already underway, the case can certainly be made for more.

The most immediate and pressing problem, of course, is declassification. Precious little material is now available for the period after 1965, and there is every indication that this problem will not be relieved in the near future. None of the panelists addressed themselves specifically and in depth to the peculiar problems of the Nixon era, but, obviously, the roadblocks are especially formidable there. As Thomas G. Paterson and others have pointed out, moreover, the trends in declassification over the past five years have been highly unfavorable. I can recall when I began research on World War II around 1962 how struck I was by the limited volume of material available despite the years that had passed since 1945. Yet within ten years this had dramatically changed. By contrast, when I started serious research on Vietnam just two years after the war had ended I was impressed with how much was available. For a

variety of reasons, the pace of Vietnam declassification has not been maintained, and, as many of the panelists make clear, the prospects for the immediate future are gloomy. Even to hold the line will require redoubled and more systematic efforts on the part of individual historians and the various historical associations.

**Minutes of the SHAFR Council Meeting
Chicago, Illinois—December 27, 1984
Hyatt Regency Hotel - Warren I. Cohen presiding**

Present were Council members: Kuehl, Smith, Gelfand, Cohen and Zahniser. Also present were Mr. Weber, Mr. Helmstadter, Mr. Leffler, Mr. Brinker, Mr. Buckley, Mr. Slany, and Mr. Kamman.

Mr. Cohen called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. He called first on Mr. Kuehl, who suggested the desirability of SHAFR having official representation on the Department of State's Advisory Committee on Historical Documentation. At present, Mr. Kuehl and Mr. Gaddis are sitting with the Committee but not as representative of SHAFR. Following discussion, it was resolved to ask that SHAFR have two permanent representatives on the Committee. Mr. Kuehl will make the request on behalf of SHAFR.

Mr. Buckley next reported that he has completed a Revised Research and Roster List. He expects that he will receive authorization from his university's administration to proceed with publication sometime in January.

Council then considered whether SHAFR should lend its support to the development of a Foreign Service History Center at George Washington University. Mr. Victor Wolf, Jr., Co-Director of the Center, wrote Mr. Kuehl late in November that the purpose of the Center will be "to develop collections and programs exploiting the perceptions of retired American career foreign affairs professionals" and to collect supporting papers and correspondence as well. Council members indicated they thought the concept behind the Center was worthwhile, and asked Mr. Kuehl to keep in contact with Mr. Wolf to determine how SHAFR might

best relate to the Center. No official endorsement of the Center seemed in order at this time.

Mr. Cohen raised the question of where the SHAFR summer meeting, 1986, will be held. Officials of Northern Kentucky University have issued an invitation to SHAFR. It was pointed out that Council agreed several years ago that three out of four meetings should be held on the East Coast, as near as possible to Washington, D. C. Since the 1985 meeting will be held on the West Coast, should we not attempt to return in 1986 to the Washington, D. C. area? Following discussion, it was decided that the President and Vice-President be given the power to determine the site for 1986. NKU will be advised that their invitation is still under consideration.

It was reported to Council that plans are moving ahead to prepare a revised (not an updated) edition of the Guide to American Foreign Relations Since 1700. Richard Dean Burns and Kinley Brauer have submitted a proposal for support to the National Endowment for the Humanities. Mr. Gelfand expressed concern that the present Guide had not been reviewed in widely-circulated scholarly publications.

Mr Cohen reported for Mr. Dingman, Chair of the Program Committee, that twenty-four proposals have been submitted for the SHAFR conference in June 1985. In addition to the several planned sessions on Pacific-East Asian and Latin American relations, there will be two sessions on teaching diplomatic history. In response to a question raised by Mr. Dingman, it was determined that SHAFR sessions and activities will be integrated with the printed program of the Pacific Coast Branch of the AHA, with which SHAFR is jointly holding its meetings.

Mr. Slany informed Council that SHAFR's proposal to the Department of State to provide internships for younger historians, a proposal made some three years ago, has now cleared the management section of the Department. The Department believes several questions yet remain to be answered, some of which relate to the functions of the internees and some to the possible financial support that SHAFR is willing to provide the program. Mr. Slany counseled patience since the proposed arrangement are new ones to the Department of

State, and since broad consultation and agreement are necessary before the Department can proceed.

In asking Mr. Brinker for a report on the Newsletter, Mr. Cohen asked if a reply had been made to the writer of a letter, published on p. 37 of the Vol. 15 #4 issue, in which questions were raised concerning the access rights of foreign scholars under the Freedom of Information Act. No reply has been made. Mr. Cohen will pursue the matter with Page Putnam Miller, Director of the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History.

Mr. Zahniser next reported in his role as Executive Secretary-Treasurer. His report follows:

SHAFR has had a very fine year. Our encouragement of scholarly activities has expanded once again, this time through the newly established Holt Fellowship Fund and the Bernath Dissertation Support Fund. Also, SHAFR is now a regular financial supporter of the National Coordinating Committee, and active in its deliberations. Our Bernath Prizes are actively sought by our best younger scholars. The Society's reputation--and membership--is now international in scope. Our membership this year exceeded one thousand, a measure of the Society's growing reputation and the quality of its publications, prizes, and numerous scholarly endeavors.

Financially, the recent dues increase has brought our income and expenditures into approximate balance. The marvelous financial management of our two recent summer conferences (by Harold Langley and Peter Hill) made it possible recently to transfer \$2,500.00 into our General Endowment Account. As usual, Warren Kuehl and members of the Finance Committee have handled our endowment funds with great skill. Finally, we are constantly reminded that through the generosity of Dr. and Mrs. Gerald Bernath, the Society is able to encourage research and scholarship in many ways that otherwise would be beyond our means.

Financial Report for SHAFR 1984
(Dec. 16, 1983 to Dec. 15, 1984)

Carryover from 1983		
Checking Account	\$ 9,248.65	
Vanguard Money Market Fund	1,067.02	<u>\$10,315.67</u>
Receipts		
Dues	\$14,940.26	
Bernath Living Trust	1,900.00	
Bernath Prizes & Expenses	3,699.40	
Sale of SHAFR Mailing List	425.00	
Endowment & Graebner Fund	438.00	
Misc. Refunds (incl. Summer Conferences, 1983-84)	9,409.80	
Net Interest & Dividends	998.43	\$31,811.39
TOTAL FUNDS		<u>\$42,127.06</u>

Disbursements		
Scholarly Resources	\$ 8,133.44	
Bernath Living Trust	1,900.00	
Bernath Prizes & Expenses	3,744.52	
General Operating	1,883.56	
Convention Expenses	1,638.77	
Brochures & Programs	647.00	
Contribution to NCC	500.00	
Professional fees	75.00	
Transfer of Endowment Funds	487.50	
Membership Fees	20.00	\$19,029.79
FUNDS AVAILABLE		<u>\$23,097.27</u>

Cash on hand		
Operating	\$14,234.86	
Vanguard MM Fund	8,862.41	<u>\$23,097.27</u>

Proposed SHAFR Budget for 1985

Our anticipated revenue sources for 1985 are as follows:

Membership dues for 728 regular members	\$12,012.00
Membership dues for 160 student members	2,000.00
Membership dues for 55 retired & unemployed members	440.00
Interest on checking account & money market funds	900.00
Sale of membership list	300.00
TOTAL	\$15,652.00

Our anticipated expenditures for 1985 are as follows:

<u>Diplomatic History</u> (Scholarly Resources)	\$ 8,500.00
<u>General Operating</u> (postage, stationery, supplies, committees, transfer to North Texas State costs, Secretary-Treasurer expense)	4,000.00
Convention Expense	2,000.00
National Coordinating Committee	750.00
Tax Consultant	200.00
Transfer to General Endowment	2,500.00
TOTAL	14,950.00

Council accepted the Report and adopted the proposed budget for 1985. Mr Zahniser next presented the following resolution to Council for adoption:

Council instructs that as of May 1, 1985, the offically authorized signatures on the Society's account (983023609-0) with the Vanguard Group shall be William Kamman, incoming Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the Society, and Warren F. Kuehl. Only one signature on each check is required.

The resolution was approved by voice vote. Mr. Zahniser then announced that Betty Unterberger has been elected Vice President of SHAFR, Melvyn Leffler and Martin Sherwin were elected to three-year terms on the Council (1985-1987), and that Garry Clifford was elected to a three-year term on the Nominations Committee (1985-1987).

Last, Mr. Zahniser presented preliminary information on costs of liability insurance for all officers and committee members appointed to act on behalf of SHAFR. Full information will be provided at the OAH meetings, following reception of a second bid to insure SHAFR.

On behalf of the Finance Committee, Mr. Kuehl presented the following Report:

Report of Finance Committee, December 1984

The committee created to oversee SHAFR's funds supervises the Stuart L. Bernath Accounts, including the Book Award, the Speaker/Article Award, and the Supplementary Fund. It also administers the SHAFR Endowment and prize accounts for the W. Stull Holt and the Norman and Laura Graebner Award. This makes a total of six separate accounts.

The SHAFR Endowment fund is especially noteworthy. It includes life memberships, accumulations, and gifts. Additional gifts and interest left to accumulate will enable SHAFR to pursue its many projects

SHAFR TRUST, PRIZE, AND ENDOWMENT PORTFOLIO
December 15, 1984

Bonds and notes are listed at face value

Stuart L. Bernath Book Award		
Federal Notes	\$10,000.00	
Bank Account	372.12	<u>\$10,372.12</u>
Stuart L. Bernath Article/Speaker Award		
Federal Notes	6,000.00	
Bank Account	426.06	<u>6,426.067</u>
Stuart L. Bernath Supplementary Account		
Federal Notes	\$47,000.00	
Corporate Bonds	10,000.00	
Vanguard Accounts 11/30	1,253.51	
Bank Account	2,042.54	<u>60,296.05</u>
Bernath Charitable Remainder Annuity		
Corporate Bonds	20,000.00	<u>20,000.00</u>
SHAFR Endowment		
Corporate Bonds	4,000.00	
Federal Notes	8,000.00	
Bank Account	2,975.44	<u>14,975.44</u>
Holt Fellowship		
Federal Notes	13,000.00	
Mich Telephone Bond	2,000.00	
Bank Account	1,435.63	<u>16,435.63</u>

Graebner Prize		
Federal Notes	3,000.00	
Bank Account	1,755.48	<u>4,755.48</u>
1982 TOTAL	\$ 89,618.30	
1983 TOTAL	119,721.64	
1984 TOTAL	<u>133,260.78</u>	

Finance Committee, Gary Hess, Lawrence Kaplan, Paul Varg, Warren Kuehl

Mr. Kuehl noted that the General Endowment Account is growing nicely, and that four members of SHAFR have assigned future book royalties to this account. He also indicated that renewed attempts are underway to enlarge the Norman and Laura Graebner Fund.

A discussion next followed on the need to find a suitable person to serve as Archivist of the United States and to lead the newly created National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). Mr. Kuehl commented that no search committee has yet been appointed, a matter of concern. The National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History is urging concerned historical organizations to press on the White House the appointment of a search committee, that the appointment be a non-political one, and that the appointee have the following qualifications:

1. A commitment to preserving government records, an understanding of archival concerns and an appreciation of the role of historical research in documenting our government's policies, programs, and actions.
2. The ability to administer a large organization.
3. The stature and presence to work effectively with other heads of executive branch agencies, as well as members of the legislative branch.
4. An understanding of governmental and budgetary procedures so that he/she can use the administrative and statutory authority of the position to the fullest extent.
5. A commitment to adapting NARA to the new information environment and a willingness to use

modern information technology for the benefit both of records/archives administration and of research.

6. The capacity to assert a leadership role for the National Archives among federal records managers, archivists, historians, genealogists, and related constituencies.

Mr. Kuehl was deputized to support these qualifications for the new archivist through contact with appropriate government and historical organizations.

Mr. Hogan, chair of the Bernath Article Prize Committee, reported through Mr. Cohen that five articles have been nominated thus far for the Prize.

Mr. Leffler, chair of the Bernath Book Prize Committee, indicated that eight books have been submitted for consideration. He hopes that many more books will be submitted and asked those present to urge presses to nominate appropriate books. Mr. Zahniser will send out a reminder to the presses concerning the Book Prize.

Mr. Smith, chair of the Bernath Dissertation Support Fund, reported that eight applications have been received. Since none of the applications were yet complete, he asked Council for discretion in extending the deadline for receipt of materials. The discretion was granted. The awards will be announced no later than the OAH meetings.

Mr. Gelfand, chair of the W. Stull Holt Prize, stated that the Fund has now grown to \$16,000. He hoped that the amount of the Award can soon be raised from \$1,500.00 to \$2,000.00. This year all applicants must submit their materials by April 1 since it is the Committee's hope to announce the award at the SHAFR summer meetings in June.

SHAFR's membership, Mr. Weber reported, exceeded one thousand in 1984. This figure represents a new high. He was congratulated for his efforts, and those of his committee, by Mr. Cohen.

Last, Mr. Kuehl asked whether it would not be wise for SHAFR to have representation on the joint AHA-OAH Committee on selection of an Archivist. Mr. Kuehl

will contact Mr. Gammon of the AHA, if absent Council members indicate it seems wise to seek representation on the Committee. In response to a question, Mr. Cohen indicated that if SHAFR were to appoint a representative, all expenses associated with the activity would be deferred from resources outside SHAFR.

There being no further business, Mr. Cohen adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

STUDENT BONERS

From Terry Anderson (Texas A&M):

"At the Geneva Congerence the country of Vietnam was divided at the 17th parallel, and that resulted in North and South Korea."

Professor Anderson assures us that this was not an "Aggie joke."

SHAFR 1985 PROGRAM COMMITTEE REPORT

The Program Committee has completed its work for our 1985 annual meeting. Its task was not an easy one, for more than one hundred fine proposals were received. The Committee has arranged the program as is printed below.

SHAFR members should receive the full joint SHAFR/Pacific Coast Branch, American Historical Association/American Military Institute/Conference on Peace Research in History Program late in April. The program will include complete information about transportation, housing, conference social events, and registration procedures.

Roger Dingman, Chairman---SHAFR 1985 Program Committee

**SHAFR 1985 PROGRAM
STANFORD UNIVERSITY JUNE 25-28, 1985**

WOMEN IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY (SHAFR)

- CHAIR: Joan Hoff-Wilson, Indiana University
LYDIA MARIA CHILD: ABOLITIONIST CRITIC OF AMERICAN
FOREIGN POLICY
Edward Crapol, William and Mary College
INVISIBLE PROMOTIONS: ELEANOR LANSING DULLES
Lynn Dunn, University of Utah
BARELY IN THE INNER CIRCLE: JEANE KIRKPATRICK
Judith Ewell, William and Mary College
COMMENT: Roderick Nash, University of California,
Santa Barbara
Barton Bernstein, Stanford University

SECURITY IN THE PACIFIC (SHAFR)

- CHAIR: D. Clayton James, Mississippi State University
ALASKA'S CHANGING STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE, 1934-1984
Jonathan Nielson, University of Alaska
STRATEGIC NECESSITY OR NAVAL EXTRAVAGANCE? BRITAIN'S
DEFENSE OF HONG KONG AND SINGAPORE, 1945-1949
Malcolm Murfett, University of Singapore
THE IDEA OF A PACIFIC PACT
David W. Mabon, Department of State
COMMENT: Edward A. Olsen, U.S. Naval Postgraduate
School
Ramon Myers, Hoover Institution

WORK IN PROGRESS (SHAFR)

- CHAIR: Warren Kuehl, University of Akron
ORIGINS OF THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM
Richard D. Byrne, University of Iowa
ARMS CONTROL IN THE EISENHOWER ERA: THE VERIFICATION
ISSUE
Charles A. Appleby, Johns Hopkins University
ANGLO-AMERICAN RIVALRY IN THE MIDDLE EAST: THE
BURAIMI OIL CIRCUS, 1952-1957
Tore T. Petersen, University of Minnesota
COMMENT: The Audience

PERSPECTIVES ON NINETEENTH CENTURY DIPLOMACY (SHAFR)

CHAIR: Kinley M. Brauer, University of Minnesota
THE CONFEDERACY'S CHINESE NAVY

Frank J. Merli, Queens College, C.U.N.Y.

COMPETITIVE IMPERIALISM IN LATIN AMERICA

Thomas Schoonover, University of Southwestern
Louisiana

CATALYST FOR THE NEW DIPLOMACY: THE CHILEAN MENACE,
1879-1892

Stephen D. Brown, University of Wisconsin

COMMENT: Joseph Frye, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Jerald Combs, San Francisco State University

IMAGE-MAKERS IN AMERICAN-EAST ASIAN RELATIONS (SHAFR)

CHAIR: Michael Schaller, University of Arizona

THE ROLE OF THE DIPLOMATIC HISTORIAN: KIYOSAWA
KIYOSHI

Kitaoka Shunichi, Rikkyo University

THE ROLE OF THE PUBLISHER: HENRY R. LUCE

Patricia Niels, United States International
University

THE ROLE OF THE NOVELIST: PEARL BUCK

Sandra Hawley, University of Houston - Downtown

COMMENT: David Axeen, Occidental College

Frank Ninkovich, St. John's University

EISENHOWER AS FOREIGN POLICY DECISION-MAKER (SHAFR)

CHAIR: Norman Graebner, University of Virginia

ENDING THE KOREAN WAR

Edward C. Keefer, Department of State

REASSURING ISRAEL

Isaac Alteras, Queens College, C.U.N.Y.

NEGOTIATING THE US-REPUBLIC OF CHINA MUTUAL DEFENSE
TREATY

Harriet D. Schwar, Department of State

COMMENT: Jim F. Heath, Portland State University

James Matray, New Mexico State University

AMERICA AND SOUTHEAST ASIA (SHAFR)

CHAIR: Damidar SarDesai, UCLA

A MILITARY EXPERIMENT: MACARTHUR, QUEZON, AND THE
PHILIPPINE ARMY, 1935-1941

Ricardo Jose, University of the Philippines

THE UNITED STATES AND MALAYSIA

Pamela Sodhy, National University of Malaysia

TRUMAN, QUIRINO AND THE DILEMMAS OF DEPENDENCY

Richard E. Welch, Jr., Lafayette College

COMMENT: Gary R. Hess, Bowling Green State University

David DuFault, San Diego State University

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT AND AMERICAN INTERVENTION IN WORLD WAR II (SHAFR)

CHAIR: Wayne S. Cole, University of Maryland

ROOSEVELT AND THE SUMMER OF 1940

J. Garry Clifford, University of Connecticut

ROOSEVELT'S INTERVENTION IN THE BATTLE OF THE
ATLANTIC, 1941

Waldo Heinrichs, Temple University

ROOSEVELTIAN LEADERSHIP AND THE COMING OF THE PACIFIC
WAR

Jonathan Utley, University of Tennessee

COMMENT: Frederick W. Marks, Forest Hills, New York

Asada Sadao, Doshisha University

ANGLO-AMERICAN RELATIONS AT MID-CENTURY (SHAFR)

CHAIR: Paul Holbo, University of Oregon

HARMONY IN WAR: THE VOICE OF AMERICA, 1941-1945

Holly C. Shulman, Golden Jubilee Commission on
Telecommunications

COOPERATION IN KOREA, 1945-1948

J. Y. Ra, Kyung Hee University

RIVALRY IN THE MIDDLE EAST: IRAN, 1947-1951

James F. Goode, University of Georgia

CONVERGENT INTERESTS? MALCOLM MACDONALD AND THE
AMERICANS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA, 1948-1955

Constance M. Turnbull, University of Hong Kong

COMMENT: Peter Buzanski, San Jose State University

Roger Adelson, Arizona State University

**THE IMPACT OF AMERICAN OCCUPATIONS IN ASIA
AND THE PACIFIC (SHAFR)**

CHAIR: Theodore Wilson, University of Kansas
MISSIONARIES IN LUZON, 1898-1916
Kenton J. Clymer, University of Texas, El Paso
SOLDIERS AND SAILORS ON TONGA, 1942-1945
Charles J. Weeks, Southern Technical Institute

UNDERSTANDING THE OCCUPIERS: JAPANESE INTELLECTUALS
AND THE UNITED STATES, 1945-1952
Igarashi Takeshi, University of Tokyo
COMMENT: James Boutilier, Royal Roads Military
College
George Knowles, Stanford University

**AMERICAN DIPLOMACY: PERSPECTIVES FROM ABROAD
(SHAFR)**

CHAIR: Raymond G. O'Connor, University of Miami
AUSTRALIA: Joseph M. Siracusa, University of
Queensland
CANADA: Geoffrey Smith, Queen's University
REPUBLIC OF CHINA: Chen Chi, National Chung Hsing
University
JAPAN: Aruga Tadashi, Hitotsubashi University
PHILIPPINES: Bonifacio Salamanca, University of the
Philippines
COMMENT: Sandra Taylor, University of Utah

**INTELLIGENCE AND COVERT OPERATIONS IN
LATIN AMERICA (SHAFR)**

CHAIR: Richard Immerman, University of Hawaii
AMERICAN INTELLIGENCE AND COVERT OPERATIONS IN MEXICO,
1900-1950
Dirk Raat, State University of New York, Fredonia
EISENHOWER AND THE OVERTHROW OF RAFAEL TRUJILLO
Stephen G. Rabe, University of Texas, Dallas
COMMENT: Friederich Katz, University of Chicago
Thomas M. Leonard, University of North Florida

REAPPRAISALS OF MAHAN (AMI)

- CHAIR: Paul Ryan, Hoover Institution
A MODICUM OF INFLUENCE: ANGLO-AMERICAN RELATIONS,
1899-1909
Richard W. Turk, Allegheny College
NEGATIVE INFLUENCE: THE PROTECTION OF SHIPPING IN
WARTIME
Chick Bowling, San Diego, California
COMMENT: John Hattendorf, U. S. Naval War College
Jack Shulimson, Marine Corps Historical Center

PRISONERS OF WAR AND INTERNEES IN TWO WORLD WARS (AMI)

- CHAIR: Stanley Falk, Alexandria, Virginia
GERMAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN JAPAN, 1914-1920
Ursula Moessner, Saratoga, California
INTERNEED AMERICANS IN BERLIN, 1941-1942
Charles Burdick, San Jose State University
COMMENT: Stanley Falk, Alexandria, Virginia
Frederick Kiley, National Defense University

PEACE MOVEMENTS IN EUROPEAN HISTORY (CPRH)

- CHAIR: Roger Paxton, University of Utah
MEDIAEVAL PEACE MOVEMENTS: A HISTORIOGRAPHICAL
REVIEW
Udo Heyn, California State, Los Angeles
THE PEACE MOVEMENT IN INTER-WAR EUROPE: A REAPPRAISAL
Harold Bauman, University of Utah
COMMENT: Carroll Gillmore, University of Utah
John S. Conway, University of British Columbia

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON THE VIETNAM WAR (SHAFR)

- CHAIR: Ronald Spector, University of Alabama
FATEFUL MISUNDERSTANDING: LYNDON JOHNSON AND
EISENHOWER'S ADVICE ON VIETNAM
William B. Pickett, Rose-Hulman Institute
DECISION ON VIETNAM: SENDING GROUND COMBAT TROOPS,
1964-1965
Vincent Demma, U.S. Army Center for Military
History
A WAR FOR NOTHING: ATTITUDES AND IDEOLOGIES OF
AMERICANS IN VIETNAM
Christian Appy, Harvard University
COMMENT: Samuel Popkin, U C San Diego
Stephen Vlastos, University of Iowa

THE JAPANESE PEACE SETTLEMENT OF 1951 (SHAFR)

CHAIR: Hosoya Chihiro, International University of
Japan

THE JAPANESE PERSPECTIVE

Watanabe Akio, University of Tokyo

THE AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE

Miyazato Seigen, International University of
Japan

COMMENT: Peter Duus, Stanford University

Howard Schoneberger, University of Maine

RECENT SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS (SHAFR/CPRH)

CHAIR: Betty Miller Unterberger, Texas A&M University
NIXON, BREZHNEV, AND DETENTE

Keith Nelson, University of California, Irvine

THE KAL 007 AFFAIR

Alexander Dallin, Stanford University

COMMENT: Coit Blacker, Stanford University

Diane Clemens, University of California, Berkeley

THE ETHICS AND POLITICS OF THE NEW WARFARE (SHAFR/CPRH)

CHAIR: David Rosenberg, National Defense University
STRATEGIC BOMBING IN WORLD WAR II: THE HUMANITARIAN
ISSUE

Ronald Schaffer, California State University,
Northridge

SENDING NUCLEAR WEAPONS TO EUROPE, 1954-1961

Gary Tocchett, United States Military Academy

COMMENT: Conrad Crane, United States Military
Academy

David Hollaway, Stanford University

DOLLARS AND DIPLOMACY (SHAFR)

CHAIR: Wilton B. Fowler, University of Washington
AMERICAN FINANCIAL ADVISING IN LATIN AMERICA BEFORE
BRETTON WOODS

Emily S. Rosenberg, Macalester College

HERBERT HOOVER AND THE BAWDWIN MINE IN BURMA

Ronald Renard, Payap University, Thailand

AMERICAN LOANS AND BUSINESS INTERESTS IN INTERWAR
YUGOSLAVIA

Linda Killen, Radford University

COMMENT: Noel Pugach, University of New Mexico

Paul Drake, U C San Diego

THE POLITICS AND DIPLOMACY OF HUNGER (SHAFR)

- CHAIR: Richard Dean Burns, California State University, Los Angeles
FAMINE RELIEF IN CHINA, 1928-1930
Arline Golkin, Whittier College
FOOD FOR WAR: INDOCHINA AND CENTRAL AMERICA
Marc J. Cohen, The Washington Center
COMMENT: Jane M. Porter, Department of Agriculture
Franz Schurman, University of California, Berkeley

PUBLICATIONS

Sam Walker (U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission) and George Mazuzan (Washington D.C.), Controlling the Atom: The Beginnings of Nuclear Regulation, 1946-1962. University of California Press. \$28.95. ISBN 0520051823

Kenneth J. Hagan (U.S. Naval Academy) ed., In Peace and War: Interpretations of American Naval History, 1775-1984; A Second Edition. Greenwood. 1984. Cloth ISBN 0-313-24583-5 \$29.95. Paper ISBN 0-313-24581-9 \$13.95.

Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana University), Woodrow Wilson and World War I: 1917-1921. New American Nation Series. Harper and Row. 1985. ISBN 0-06-011229-8 \$17.95.

Suzanne Wilson Barnett and John K. Fairbank (Harvard) eds., Christianity in China: Early Protestant Missionary Writings. Harvard University Press. \$20.00. ISBN 0674128818.

Jonathan G. Utley (University of Tennessee), Going To War With Japan, 1937-1941. University of Tennessee Press. \$19.95. ISBN 0870494457.

Montague Kern, Patricia W. Levering, and Ralph B. Levering (Earlham College), The Kennedy Crises: The Press, the Presidency, and Foreign Policy. University of North Carolina Press. Now in paper \$9.95. ISBN 0807815691.

Ernest R. May (Harvard University) ed., Knowing One's Enemies: Intelligence Assessment Before the Two World Wars. Princeton University Press. \$29.50.

Sandra C. Taylor (University of Utah), Advocate of Understanding: Sidney Gulick and the Search for Peace with Japan. Kent State University Press. \$25.00. ISBN 0873383079.

Gaddis Smith (Yale University), Morality, Reason, and Power: American Diplomacy in the Carter Years. Hill and Wang. \$16.95.

Thomas J. Noer (Carthage College), Cold War and Black Liberation: The United States and White Rule in Africa, 1948-1968. University of Missouri Press. \$24.50. ISBN 0826204589.

Ronald H. Spector (University of Alabama), Advice and Support: The Early Years of the U.S. Army in Vietnam, 1941-1960. The Free Press. Paper \$10.95. ISBN 0029303702. (paper:V.1)

Ronald H. Spector (University of Alabama), Eagle Against the Sun: The American War with Japan. The Free Press. \$24.95. ISBN 0-02-930360-5.

Robert D. Schulzinger (University of Colorado), The Wise Men of Foreign Affairs: The History of the Council on Foreign Relations. Columbia University Press. \$27.50. ISBN 0231055285.

Olav Riste (University of Tromso) ed., European and Atlantic Defence 1947-1953. Columbia University Press. \$39.00. ISBN 0-231-06168-4.

Dorothy V. Jones (Northwestern University), Splendid Encounters: The Thought and Conduct of Diplomacy. University of Chicago Press. Now in paper. \$10.00. ISBN 0943056055.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

**1983 Report of the Advisory Committee
on
Historical Diplomatic Documentation**

(The 1983 Report took the form of a letter from Professor Ernest R. May to the Honorable George Shultz, Secretary of State.)

21 December 1983

Dear Mr. Secretary:

In other countries and here at home as well, the history of American foreign policy after World War II is poorly understood. The Department is partly to blame, for it has withheld from serious scholars the sources necessary for writing fair and comprehensive histories. The interests of scholars have been confused with the interests of journalists and others seeking sensitive information about current issues. As a result, more and more of the history consists merely of remembered headlines, for scholars cannot see the documents which would enable them to correct the record. For practical purposes, this generalization applies at present to the whole period since about 1950. Our collective national interests will be served if you take some modest steps to improve conditions for scholarly research.

Specifically, we recommend the following:

1) You should establish immediately a policy of opening for scholarly research almost all Department records twenty-five years old or older. If instituted in 1984, that would make possible immediate research on most of the Eisenhower years. Materials for the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations would become available between the mid-1980s and the mid-1990s, those for the Nixon, Ford, and Carter Administrations during the subsequent decade. Serious research on the Reagan Administration could commence in about the year 2006. Apart from specifying categories of records to be exempted, such as personnel files and documents potentially compromising intelligence sources and methods, you should set up a procedure for identifying

and withholding materials which might for special reasons need to be protected for more than twenty-five years; but the presumption should be in favor of opening the records. The requirements for making exceptions should be exacting.

2) You should lead an effort to make such a policy government-wide, for the records which permit full reconstruction of the history of American foreign policy are not exclusively products or property of the Department of State.

3) To facilitate research in newly opened materials, to help identify records which might need special handling, and to accelerate the process of correcting the record, you should charge the Historian of the Department to continue producing the comprehensive and immensely valuable Foreign Relations series, to get into print and public circulation as rapidly as possible his already edited volumes for the early and mid-1950s, to commence publication of volumes for the late 1950s and early 1960s, and to institute as new supplements several-volume documentary collections on important or much-discussed topics such as the Vietnam War, Soviet-American relations, NATO affairs, or relations with the American Republics. The Foreign Relations volumes per se should continue to be reflective of the whole record, with any necessary omissions specifically identified so that the international scholarly community can retain confidence in the integrity of the series. The new supplements, on the other hand, would in their nature be selective and partial. They would not be expected to provide a basis for genuine scholarship, but they could permit teaching on the history of American foreign policy and foreign relations to be based on some authentic documents other than those that came to light when the particular issue or relationship happened to be front page news.

4) You should enlarge this Advisory Committee to include members designated by the chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs committees. In seeing that the historical record is fully studied and understood, participation in the Advisory Committee would help members of the former understand more fully the difficulties involved in providing full access to historical records, the extent to which contemporary reportage and

investigation can provide only a partial picture of reality, and, not least, the value of, and justification for expenditure on, the Foreign Relations series and other documentary publications of the Historical Office.

We should add that these recommendations do not intend or imply criticism either of the Historical Office or of the Classification/Declassification Center. We cannot praise too highly the work which the Office has done in the past, the current state of cooperation between the Office and the Center, and the high quality of the leadership in both. Our recommendations to you have the objective of enabling the Office and the Center to continue to work effectively in conditions which increase the pressures upon them by at least one order of magnitude. The Foreign Relations series and the program of support for declassification by National Archives personnel are largely responsible for our being able to say that the period 1945-1950 is coming to be understood as history. But the Foreign Relations series for 1950 became complete in 1981. With the series for 1951 still incomplete and files for the first half of the 1950s only very selectively open for research, it seems clear to us that the existing system could produce results comparable to those of the past only if, and perhaps not even if, the Office and the Center were given massive new resources. We therefore believe that a more practical course of action is that outlined in our recommendations.

Though current international problems necessarily preoccupy you, you are well aware that intelligent public and congressional understanding of history is a precondition for sound and effective national policies. If you feel any hesitancy about acting on our recommendations, we would welcome an opportunity to see you and to explain why we feel so strongly that these are the steps most likely to bring about the desired result.

Dr. Ernest R. May
John F. Kennedy School of
Government
Harvard University

The following committee members were co-signatories of this letter.

Dr. John Gaddis
Department of History
Ohio University

Dr. Ole R. Holsti
Department of Political
Science
Duke University

Dr. Carol S. Gruber
Department of History
William Paterson College

Dr. Richard N. Rosecrance
Center for International
Studies
Cornell University

Dr. Seymour J. Rubin
Executive Vice President
and Executive Director
The American Society of
International Law

Dr. Gaddis Smith
Department of History
Yale University

STORIA NORDAMERICANA
A NEW ITALIAN JOURNAL OF AMERICAN HISTORY

(The following is a note from the editor, Tiziano Bonazzi of the University of Bologna).

American history is a quite recent acquisition to Italian scholarship. It was only after World War II that historians in this country devoted themselves to extensive investigation in the field of American history, and it was only in the sixties that it began to be taught in some Italian universities. CISNA (Comitato Italiano di Storia Nordamericana), the historical association representing the specialists of American history among Italian historians, is even more recent since it was founded at the beginning of the Seventies.

Interest for American history has grown impressively in the last decade and though it has remained a minor specialization in the field of Italian historical studies, it is now taught in the universities and the members of CISNA are now fifty.

The next step is to establish scientific contacts with other specialists in the field, especially on the European continent, therefore, CISNA has founded Storia Nordamericana in the hope of making accessible

at an international level the research that is being carried out by Italian Scholars.

Subscription rate for 1984 (1,2): Europe L. 42.000, other countries L. 55.000 (surface mail postage included); advance payment required.

Correspondence concerning contributions and all editorial matters should be addressed to the Editor: c/o Dipartimento di Politica Istituzioni Storia, Strade Maggiore 45, 40127, Bologna, Italy.

All communications concerning subscriptions should be addressed to the publisher: Rosenberg & Sellier Editori in Torino, via Andrea Doria 14, tel. 011/532150.

VIDEO TAPES AND TRANSCRIPTS

International Studies Notes, XI (fall, 1984), is devoted to discussions of four secretaries of state at a conference in Atlanta, December 16-17, 1983. There is an excellent summary by William O. Chittick and a verbatim record of one of the discussions. Everyone teaching and writing about U.S. foreign relations will find some points of interest regarding policies and process.

Two, 45-minute video tapes and transcripts are available from the Southern Center for International Studies, P.O. Box 9767, Atlanta, GA 30319 (404/261-5763).

SUMMER NEH SEMINAR

The U.S.-China Relationship in Historical and Global Perspective is the focus of a National Endowment for the Humanities seminar for college teachers that Michael H. Hunt is directing at Columbia University in the summer of 1985. Those interested in the opportunities for research and collegial interchange are encouraged to write for a full seminar description, housing and stipend information, and terms of eligibility--all available from the Summer Session Office, 418 Lewisohn Hall, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027. Applications are due by 1 April 1985.

NCC NEWS

A recent distribution from the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History (the desk of Page Putnam Miller) includes the following excerpts which may be of interest to SHAFR members.

Freedom of Information Act. Restrictive amendments to FOIA passed the Senate in the last Congress, but made little progress in the House. A similar piece of legislation will undoubtedly be introduced in the 99th Congress. Historians were successful in the Senate in securing a fee waiver statement which exempts scholarly researchers from the new fees. Hopefully the 1985 version of the bill will also contain that item. While it is our hope that this legislation will not become law, if it does we want to have done all we could to make it as bearable as possible.

Executive Order on Classification. On August 1, 1982, a new Executive Order on classification went into effect. E.O. 12356 gives government officials greater authority to invoke national security and to thereby classify increasing amounts of government information. The 1983 report of the Information Security Oversight Office documents the decline in review and declassification. NCC will continue to monitor these developments and bring them to the attention of appropriate Congressional committees.

The Copyright Act of 1976. Although no action is expected on this issue, the NCC is monitoring the Copyright Act because recommendations that would be detrimental to the pursuit of historical research were included in the Register of Copyright's 1983 Report. The issue involved concerns archivists supplying photocopies of unpublished materials to historians for research.

United States Institute of Peace. On October 19 the President signed into law legislation to establish an Institute of Peace. The measure specifies that 25% of the Institute's budget will be earmarked for academic research grants. The critical step that is currently pending is the President's selection of nominees to the Board of Directors. All appointments to the Board must be made within 90 days of January 20, 1985. The viability and effectiveness of the Institute depends

on constituent attentiveness to the President's nominations and the Senate's evaluation of them in the confirmation process.

GPO PUBLICATIONS

The Government Printing Office has announced publication of three studies which may be of interest to SHAFR members.

Essays on Strategy addresses issues and choices confronting Western strategists. "Operation Barbarossa" examines basic military strategy and delineates certain characteristics of the Soviet soldier by reviewing Germany's 1941 invasion of Russia. The four remaining essays examine chemical weapons, "Deep Attack" in defense of Central Europe, NATO and Persian Gulf security, and Indian Ocean security. These essays emphasize the value of intelligent and open debate on national security issues.

(Essays on Strategy. 1984. Paper \$4.00. Order from:
Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office
Dept. SSMC
Washington, D.C. 20402)

Defense Planning for the 1990s focuses on South and East Asia, showing the growing interest in these regions and such problems as Indo-Pakistani tensions, nuclear proliferation, and improved Sino-American relations. A striking example of new perspective is the possibility of normalizing relations with Vietnam—a subject which could not have been discussed seriously in 1974.

(Defense Planning for the 1990s. 1984. Paper \$8.50).

The Soviet Armed Forces: A History of Their Organization Development. Many works have been written about the Soviet Army and Navy, their history, and their combat records. The history of the Soviet Armed Forces began with the formation of the world's first socialist workers' and peasants' state. A resolution adopted by the Central Committee on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution contains the following passage: "The entire course of the campaign against

internal counterrevolution and foreign interventionists showed that a revolution can consolidate its victory openly if it knows how to defend itself." This book points out the most important problems involve equipment, organizational structure, manning, command and control, logistic support, and more.

(The Soviet Armed Forces. 1978. Reprint 1984. Paper \$14.00).

7TH NAVAL ACADEMY SYMPOSIUM

The History Department of the United States Naval Academy will sponsor its seventh Naval History Symposium on September 26-27, 1985. The Symposium is seeking papers on all topics relating to naval and maritime history. Proposals should be sent to Associate Professor Kenneth J. Hagan, History Department, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD 21402. (The deadline for proposals is April 1, 1985).

ASIAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION SOUTHEAST CONFERENCE

The Annual Meeting of the Southeast Conference, Association for Asian Studies, will be held January 17 and 18, 1986 at North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina. Individual and panel proposals, especially on China, would be welcomed by the program chairperson, Professor Jonathan Goldstein, History Department, West Georgia College, Carrollton, GA 30118; TEL: (404) 834-1345. As of 1/22/85 there are already a number of proposals submitted on Japan, South, and Southeast Asia.

SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE HISTORICAL SERIES, Volume 13, part 2.

The closed-door testimony of three newspaper correspondents, Henry Raymont, Tad Szulc and Max Frankel, regarding their observations and personal experiences in connection with the Bay of Pigs invasion, provide an unusual feature of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's recently released volume 13, part 2 (June-December 1961), of its "Historical Series." Other subjects covered in these hearings include Iran, Vietnam, the Alliance for Progress, the

establishment of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and President Kennedy's meeting with Soviet Premier Khrushchev in Vienna.

Copies of this volume, and past volumes in the series still in stock, are available at no charge to those who write to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D.C. 20510, or call (202) 224-4651.

PERSONALS

Wayne Patterson (St. Norbert College) has been awarded a SSRC grant to do research on the immigration of Koreans to the United States at the turn of the century. He will carry out this research at the University of Hawaii during the spring and summer of 1985.

Randall B. Woods (University of Arkansas) has been appointed John A. Cooper, Sr. Professor of Diplomacy, an endowed chair controlled jointly by the Department of History and the Fulbright Institute for International Affairs. (Cooper was a pioneer developer of retirement villages in Arkansas.)

Thomas M. Leonard (University of North Florida) has been awarded a Fulbright for 1984-85. He will spend the year in Argentina.

Ronald Schlundt, a 1982-83 Fulbrighter to Japan, presented a paper entitled "Civil Rights as an Issue in Executive-Congressional Relations During the Early Years of the Reagan Administration" before a conference of the German Association of American Studies. The conference was held in Frankfurt, West Germany on November 9 and 10, 1984.

Joseph Siracusa (University of Queensland) plans a study leave at the Fletcher School for the academic year 1985-1986.

Stephen G. Rabe (University of Texas at Dallas) was awarded a National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowship for Independent Study and Research for 1985-1986. Rabe is working on a study of the Latin American policy of the Eisenhower administration.

Richard Lukas (Tennessee Tech) will chair the Membership Committee of the European Section of the SHA for 1984-1985.

Eliot Rosen and David Schmitz (Rutgers) have received grants from the Hoover Presidential Library Association.

CALENDAR

April 18-21 The 78th annual meeting of the OAH will be held in Minneapolis with the headquarters at the Hyatt Regency and Holiday Inn Hotels.

The schedule of SHAFR functions:

April 18, 8-11 p.m., Council Meeting in the Hyatt Regency Hotel, Regency Room

April 19, 5-7 p.m., Cash Bar Reception, Holiday Inn Downtown, Satellite 6

April 20, 12-2 p.m., Luncheon

Hyatt Regency, Nicollett Ballroom A-1

The luncheon address, "MacArthur's Japan: The View From Washington," will be given by Michael Schaller

May 1 Deadline, materials for the June Newsletter.

June 26-28 The 11th annual conference of SHAFR will be held at Stanford University. See program on pages .

August 1 Deadline, materials for the September Newsletter.

November 1 Deadline, materials for the December Newsletter.

November 1-15 Annual election for SHAFR officers.

November 13-16 The 51st annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association will be held in Houston. The Shamrock Hilton will be the headquarters hotel.

November 20 Deadline, nominations for the Bernath Disseration Support Awards.

December 27-30 The 100th annual meeting of the AHA will be held in New York. The headquarters hotel is yet to be announced. The deadline for proposals has passed.

(The AHA has announced Margaret C. Jacob, Graduate Center, City University of New York to be the program chair for the 1986 annual meeting.)

**THE SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN
RELATIONS INVITES APPLICATIONS FOR THE W. STULL HOLT
DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP TO BE AWARDED IN JUNE, 1985.**

The Award will be \$1500.00.

Applicants must be candidates for the degree, Doctor of Philosophy, whose dissertation projects are directly concerned with the history of United States foreign relations. The award is intended for the defraying of travel and living expenses connected with the research and/or the writing of the dissertation.

To be qualified, applicants must be candidates in good standing at a doctoral granting graduate school who will have satisfactorily completed all requirements for the doctoral degree (including the general or comprehensive examinations) except for the dissertation before April, 1985.

There is no special application form. Applicants must submit a complete academic transcript of graduate work to date. A prospectus of the dissertation must accompany the application. This should describe the dissertation project as fully as possible, indicating the scope, method, and chief source materials. The applicant should indicate how the fellowship, if awarded, would be used.

Three letters from graduate teachers familiar with the work of the applicant, including one letter from the director of the dissertation, should be submitted to the committee.

Deadline for filing applications and supporting letters for this year's award will be: April 1, 1985.

Applications should be addressed to the Chairperson of this year's W. Stull Holt Fellowship Committee:

Lawrence E. Gelfand
Department of History
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

SPONSOR: Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.

EDITOR: William J. Brinker, Department of History, Tennessee Tech.

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS: Renea Griffith and Scott Hickman, Tennessee Tech.

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 hands of the editor no later than four weeks prior to publication date.

ADDRESS CHANGES: Changes of address should be sent to the Executive Secretary-Treasurer: Marvin R. Zahniser, Dept. of History, Ohio State U., Columbus, Ohio 43210.

BACK ISSUES: Copies of back numbers of the Newsletter may be obtained from the editorial office upon payment of a charge of \$1.00 per copy: for members living abroad, \$2.00.

MATERIALS DESIRED: Personals, announcements, abstracts of scholarly papers and articles delivered--or published--upon diplomatic subjects, bibliographical or historiographical essays, essays of a "how-to-do-it" nature, information about foreign depositories, biographies, autobiographies of "elder statesmen" in the field, jokes, etc.

FORMER PRESIDENTS OF SHAFR

- | | |
|------|--|
| 1968 | Thomas A. Bailey (Stanford) |
| 1969 | Alexander DeConde (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 (California-San Diego) |
| 1976 | Robert A. Divine (Texas) |
| 1977 | Raymond A. Esthus (Tulane) |
| 1978 | Akira Iriye (Chicago) |
| 1979 | Paul A. Varg (Michigan State) |
| 1980 | David M. Pletcher (Indiana) |
| 1981 | Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State) |
| 1982 | Lawrence E. Gelfand (Iowa) |
| 1983 | Ernest R. May (Harvard) |

Box 5154
TENNESSEE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
Cookeville, Tennessee 38505

NON PROFIT
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
COOKEVILLE, TENN.
PERMIT NO. 101

ROBERT D SCHULZINGER
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY CB 234
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
BOULDER, CO 80309