



The Society for Historians of American
Foreign Relations

NEWSLETTER

Volume VIII

Number 4

December, 1977

Page

- 1 L. Ethan Ellis
- 2 Anna K. Nelson, Foreign Policy Records and Papers (III)
- 17 Martin I. Elzy, Researching American Diplomatic History at Johnson Library
- 22 Report on Third National Meeting of SHAFR
- 28 Abstract of Articles
- 31 Personals
- 32 Publications
- 34 SHAFR Announcements
- 36 Other Announcements
- 39 Stuart L. Bernath Awards
- 42 Guidelines for Articles in **Diplomatic History**
- 43 **SHAFR Roster & Research List**
- 44 Bulletin—SHAFR Election

SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

Founded in 1967. Chartered in 1972.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

L. ETHAN ELLIS

by

Robert James Maddox*

L. Ethan Ellis, Voorhees Professor of History Emeritus at Rutgers University, died on October 14, 1977, in Edison, New Jersey. He was 79 at the time of his death. Born in Otisco, New York, he took his bachelor's degree at Syracuse University in 1920, and his master's and doctorate at the University of Chicago in 1924 and 1927, respectively.

Professor Ellis began his teaching career at Emory University, spent a year at Purdue University, then went to Rutgers in 1928 where he served until his retirement in 1963. He was chairman of the history department from 1951 until 1957.

His first book, **Reciprocity, 1911: A Study in Canadian-American Relations**, was published in 1939. His second, **A Short History of American Diplomacy**, appeared in 1951. In his judicious **Frank B. Kellogg and American Foreign Relations, 1925-1929**, 1961, Dr. Ellis characterized Kellogg as a hard-working, mediocre Secretary of State whose most singular feature was his explosive temper. Even after his retirement, Professor Ellis continued his scholarly work. In 1968 he published **Republican Foreign Policy, 1921-1933**, in which he made about as good a case as could be done for the men who shaped our diplomacy during that era. His last book, **40 Million Schoolbooks Can't be Wrong: Myths in American History**, made its appearance in 1975. He was still writing until shortly before his death.

Professor Ellis was an able, dedicated teacher as countless of his students can testify. With graduate students he constantly stressed accuracy and moderation; never use a secondary source when a primary one is obtainable, and never ride your theme too hard. These practices were characteristic of his own published work. His standards were high, yet he urged, in the gentlest possible manner, his students to meet them. He continued teaching long after his formal retirement: at the University of Illinois, Georgetown University, and finally, at Seton Hall University. The present writer used to chide him that if he continued long enough at the latter school he ran the danger of being granted tenure! Professor Ellis was the kindest of men, and will long be remembered by those who knew him.

*Dr. Maddox is a member of the Department of History at Pennsylvania State University, and believes that he "was the last person to complete the Ph. D. under Professor Ellis."

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

Anna K. Nelson

(The following represents the third and concluding instalment of Dr. Nelson's paper. The first part appeared in the June issue of the **Newsletter**, pp. 14-26, and the second portion was in the September number, pp. 13-32)

IV. PERSONAL VS. PRIVATE PAPERS

The series of events surrounding the Nixon tape controversy brought into sharp focus the ambiguities surrounding the distinction of personal papers from public papers. Archivists and historians of every variety have long known that collections of "personal papers" were rich in information and by no means purely "personal". The concern of both groups has been the preservation of these papers, and their collection in some repository for safekeeping. Archivists in fact have carefully avoided definitions of personal papers as opposed to public records, in order to avoid "losing" the valuable papers found in private collections. Senior officials in the State Department who make or implement foreign policy seem to have a particular propensity for keeping large personal collections of papers. Undoubtedly their careful preservation of drafts, working papers, telephone memoranda, letters, and official records reflects the assumption that what they are doing and saying is often crucial to the country. In addition, officials making policy decisions are often particularly eager to collect those records which will justify the perhaps unpopular positions they took during the decision-making process.

Before 1950, there was no legislative act which clearly defined the papers of public officials. Cordell Hull, the last Secretary of State to leave his papers in the Library of Congress, took with him many papers which were official records. Edward R. Stettinius removed all of his files, and left them to the University of Virginia. When they were finally opened, historians in the State Department were appalled to discover the extent to which he had taken official records. Record copies in the James F. Byrnes papers were ultimately returned to the Department and copies substituted.⁴⁷

The State Department is convinced, however, that senior officials from that Department are no longer removing official records. They point to the inhibiting factors of the Federal Records Act of 1950, the Eisenhower Cabinet Paper of 1959 and Secretary Dean Rusk's decision to tighten Department regulations in 1967.⁴⁸ Surely another factor must be that because so many important documents

are classified, officials often find it necessary to leave them in the Department in order to assure proper storage.

In the Historical Office of the State Department, a set of guidelines has been designed to differentiate official from personal papers. In general, they favor designating the personal papers, with all else being official. Personal papers include texts of speeches, calendars, appointment books, newspaper clippings, invitations, menus, etc. Also included is information which would end up in personnel files. Essentially everything else is official. Meanwhile they feel it is as necessary to look at the substance of a paper as its format. Diaries, for example, are regarded by NARS as part of personal papers, but the Historical Office would argue that they are often records of official acts.

The State Department makes a concerted effort to provide incentives for senior officials to leave what are in effect their office files, by providing them incentives. The records managers contact a departing official, offer to assist him in the problem of disposal of his papers, and then offer him certain ideal circumstances to encourage him to cooperate. The papers of senior officials are kept together in one collection. If the official decides to write a book, or needs to refer to his papers for any reason, he is given access to them. The Historical Office can also receive permission to see papers for its compilations. Otherwise the papers of senior officials remain closed. It is the policy of the Department to release information in private papers at the same time material is declassified in conjunction with **FRUS**.

In general the Department policy has been successful in that Secretaries of State Acheson, Rogers, and Rusk have all left their papers in the Department. Their deputies, however, often have not. A quick glance at the catalogue of materials in the Kennedy Library reveals that more than a dozen officials of the State Department during the Kennedy Administration have deposited papers in that library and many of them are listed as official files. It is readily conceded that most of those official papers are copies of records which are also in State files, but no one has actually checked to see if the original document can be found in State. In any case, those senior officials who put papers in the Kennedy Library simply moved out the contents of their file cabinets. There was little attempt to worry about the distinctions recommended by the Historical Office.

There is so little agreement on what constitutes private papers that each individual interviewed had his own definition, or perhaps more prevalently, simply proceeded without a definition. There is agreement on the two edges of the spectrum: family correspondence is personal, while official records with numbers on them belong to the government. Between lies a vast grey area of drafts of position papers, memoranda of telephone conversations or meetings attended, papers concerning the political arena, and copies of everything in the files.

One Secretary of State who had a keen view of his role in

history and the significance of his papers was John Foster Dulles. Those who helped Dulles put his papers in order regard his method as a model. Historians who have dealt with the situation have reservations.⁴⁹ A brief resume of the Dulles procedure is instructive of the problems faced by those who generate and those who use private papers.

Secretary Dulles had a great sense of history and had accumulated a vast collection of personal files even before he reached the State Department. Sometime during 1954-1955, Dulles decided to leave his papers to Princeton with the understanding that Princeton would surround them with complementary collections. He asked his assistant, John W. Hanes, to work on the problem of his papers, and Mr. Hanes estimates that he worked on the issue roughly four years (in conjunction with other duties, of course).

The Dulles papers were divided into four categories: (1) papers from the years previous to those as Secretary of State, (2) non-sensitive papers from his years as Secretary of State, such as speeches or press releases, (3) public documents which surrounded the Dulles career, most of which were classified, (4) papers with a "grey area", and, therefore, to be handled with the utmost care.

The decision was then made to send papers from categories (1) and (2) to Princeton. The third category, public documents which were classified, presented some problems. In theory every public document which came out of the State Department during the Dulles period reflected his work, but that mass of documents was too great to be of any use. It was, therefore, decided to have someone work in the Department files to identify and collect the documents reflecting those major issues on which Dulles had great impact. Allen Dulles suggested historian Philip A. Crowl for this job, and Crowl spent three or four years compiling a microfilm for each group of documents. The project was officially financed by Princeton, but probably through money given by Dulles. Later when Crowl went to work for the State Department, he completed the collection on weekends and evenings, until there were finally 40,000 pages on the microfilm. Category (3) then went to Princeton also.⁵⁰

Papers in category (4) were then placed in the Eisenhower Library, with the understanding that everything under that category would be copied and sent to Princeton (just as the Eisenhower Library would eventually get a copy of the microfilm in the Princeton Library). Those papers were sent to the Eisenhower Library primarily because of the privileges granted under the Presidential Library Act, and because the sensitive papers could be kept under the control of knowledgeable archivists.

Dulles had set forth three definitions of restrictions for the use of his papers. Papers were to be closed (1) to protect national security, (2) so that the private papers would not be used to embarrass living people, and (3) so that no information in the papers could be used in partisan political activity. After the death of the Secretary,

a committee was placed in charge of the papers. This committee monitored access under the general restrictions set by Dulles. Presently, almost all of the papers in the Princeton collection (categories (1) and (2)) are open since they are papers from an earlier period. The microfilm of documents is completely closed and will be opened only when those same documents are opened in the State Department. In order to complement the collection, Princeton has also sponsored an excellent oral history program.

The Dulles papers in the Eisenhower Library are not open and will not be open very soon. No copies of these papers, nor any index of them has yet been made available to Princeton.

These papers, in category (4), illustrate the difficulties which even the most careful of plans can present to the official and the researcher. John W. Hanes describes the Dulles papers as containing certain records that others throw away. The staff kept a record of every telephone call, every person seen, etc. Hanes also remembers that the papers included a certain amount of reflective writing or transcripts of his dictation to secretaries, which reflect his views of the events of the day. In addition, the collection contains papers reflecting advice Dulles gave to Eisenhower on matters other than foreign policy--papers which Dulles considered private. Professor Crowl who looked at the collection several years ago has concluded that the collection is uneven and may not be as valuable to historians as members of the Dulles committee assume. He made no comments on whether the papers were largely private or public. Historians from the State Department who have been allowed to look at the papers for purposes of identification were personally concerned that the papers they would regard as public records were under the control of a private committee.⁵¹ Others have commented that Dulles often deliberately did not mark papers with classification stamps so that he could feel free to remove them.

These opinions may or may not be correct. It is difficult to know the contents of a collection which has not even been indexed. What emerges from an examination of the Dulles gift is that Dulles defined all the papers which crossed his desk as public in the sense that he fully intended to leave them in a repository. Simultaneously, he defined all of them as private for purposes of the restrictions and control which he and the committee in charge have exerted. No real decision was made as to distinctions between private and public except for family papers. Recognizing a grey area, the Dulles committee accepted it and never solved the problems surrounding it.

The Dulles method of preservation will eventually serve the field of history well. But the restrictions and control of the papers illustrate all the problems of access which surround those bodies of papers which enter presidential libraries through donor gifts. By giving such careful thought to his papers and leaving them largely in the hands of the man who helped him preserve them, Dulles also managed to exert absolute control over future access to almost every-

thing which concerned him in the Department. If Dulles kept certain papers which others would place in the office files then those public papers are in effect privately controlled. Presently the Dulles committee could refuse to allow the **FRUS** to print certain documents if the only copy available rests in the Dulles papers. Meanwhile, those papers are also outside any FOIA or EO requests. The most recent decision made on eventually opening those papers is that with some exceptions the papers will open when the **FRUS** provides for the declassification of State Department documents for a comparable period.

There seems to be two reasons why policy makers have taken their papers out of the State Department.⁵² One reason is simply that they intend to use them to write memoirs, or narrative histories. The problem of removal for this reason has largely been met by the Department's careful separation and storage of office files and the invitation to the former official to use them when he wishes. Thus Dean Acheson used his papers and sent researchers to use them. George F. Kennan also returned to the State Department to examine papers since he carefully did not remove any copies of the official records.

The second reason for the removal of certain papers from the State Department, including large numbers of copies, is that Secretaries and some senior officials will always be concerned with "protecting" themselves from future exposure or embarrassment. They, therefore, wish to control their papers. Restriction three in the Dulles gift reflects his concern with such embarrassment. One official described his own removal of papers as a basic fear of the repetition of the McCarthy era. Hanging over the new arrivals in his bureau of the State Department was the specter of being faced in congressional committees with documents which were taken from the State Department files, and then withheld from the former senior official. One former policy maker admitted to placing classified documents in the secure vaults of a reputable think tank so that if the next administration tried to embarrass and harass him, he would have copies of the records to prove what really happened.

It is very doubtful that any action taken by the State Department short of criminal prosecution for removal of papers will change this situation. Nor is there a particular need for researchers or archivists to feel concern, because for the most part those individuals who wish to keep their views on record, keep their papers in a safe place. In most instances, because the papers contain a number of copies of classified documents, or national security material requiring care, the papers are placed in a presidential library under a donor's deed of gift.

State Department personnel and archivists in presidential libraries take pride now in the fact that they are not "losing" the papers of important officials. There is, however, some question as to whether there was ever much danger of "losing" papers. The papers

are kept--and what is destroyed can be destroyed before leaving office as well as after. The real issue is the control, ownership, and access to these papers. Presidential libraries are without the papers of Secretaries of State who choose to leave them in the State Department, and the State Department is slightly disapproving of anything which leaves for presidential libraries. If office files leave the State Department they leave the control of the State Department. If they enter presidential libraries, they do so under the control of the donor. If they are kept privately, as for example in the case of W. Averill Harriman, their contents remain largely unknown except to selected researchers.

It is doubtful that any legal definition of private papers vs. public papers can be devised which will serve to benefit the public. Definitions have been attempted, and more will be recommended, but individuals will always make the decisions concerning their own papers and these decisions will largely be made within a political context. Has the official participated in an innovative or controversial foreign policy matter? If so, he will surely save certain memoranda, drafts, and some copies of what went into the files. Did he, as one former official, take notes at NSC meetings? Then his official notes went into State Department files, but the originals--with his asides, scathing comments, and personal notes--went into his own papers. Does the draft of a telegram written for an ambassador but never used by him reflect the views of the foreign service officer who wrote it? Then it will end up in his own files.

Whatever rules are devised then, there are political realities to be considered. It is exemplary that the last two Secretaries of State left their papers in the Department, but there is no guarantee that it will continue to happen. Cabinet secretaries who implement innovative policy, or their assistants and deputies often do not want their papers left to an administration of the opposite party. Their loyalties rest not with the State Department but with the President.

In any case, the questions of control and access present the same problems whether officials remove their papers or leave them in the State Department. For every logical reason, it would seem that historians would support the efforts on the part of the State Department to control the disposition of the papers of senior officials, given the inability to control the definition. Most historians, however, would prefer to see the papers removed from State and put into another repository, preferably a presidential library. Historians would prefer to take their chances with the vagaries of the individual donor than the current policy of the State Department.⁵³ For every closed donor gift in the libraries, there is a group of papers which is open to researchers. Thus while the pattern remains uneven, in libraries there are some papers from the last two or three administrations for use. The researcher can at least ask for classification review of documents in those papers. Papers which are left in the State Department are unavailable to researchers until finding aids and indexes are declassified in conjunction with the **FRUS**. Thus some of the

Acheson papers have just been opened chronologically according to the declassification of State documents.

Another problem with papers left in State is that the Department is not equipped for archival care. Acheson and his researchers may or may not have returned the papers to the proper folder. Certainly there is no guarantee that a Department which (before ADS) handled its own papers so poorly will do better with those of senior officials.

Senior Officials in the White House

There is less confusion about the papers of Presidential Staff Assistants because of a consensus among them that their papers are unquestionably part of presidential papers.⁵⁴ Staff assistants agree that nothing they do in the White House is really personal (aside from family business) and hence there can and should be no division of papers. The question then becomes the broader one of who owns the presidential papers, and again, the real issue is control. All presidential staff assistants interviewed agreed that presidential papers should be left for the public, but they were not in agreement as to whether new legislation assuring this was necessary. One former assistant was convinced that President Nixon was an aberration and that in fact the present system was working well. Others were much more hesitant and sought safeguards without the restrictions of legislation which would seek to define and differentiate between a President's personal and public papers.

In general, those interviewed agreed that not all papers generated in the Executive Office of the President were presidential papers. Some files, which would include the NSC, were institutional files of the Executive Office of the President, and should be treated like other agency files, i.e., retired to NARS. However, all other files, including staff files of national security affairs were presidential papers and should be removed at the end of each administration. The workable compromise for those former White House staff members who were uncomfortable with the present situation was that presidential papers should be treated as a public trust, held and controlled by the President as long as he lived, but then reverting to the control of the United States and NARS. None felt that there could be a workable division of public or private among a President's papers. The nature of the Presidency rendered such a division untenable.

Another point of agreement among those interviewed was that eventual public ownership of presidential papers would not dampen the free exchange of ideas in the White House. Even those who entered the White House with the historian's experience of working with private correspondence and public records, found that the momentum of the events was greater than the participants' concern about future interpretations. Although archivists worry a great deal about the "chilling effect" of early access, the participants seemed uncon-

cerned about the prospects of opening papers at an earlier date. Usually ten years was regarded as a long enough interval of time. Some were uneasy with ten years, but no one interviewed regarded it necessary to keep any presidential papers closed for longer than twenty years. Specifically questioned, they included in the twenty-year rule all national security papers (except for intelligence sources, codes, etc.).

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is clear from this brief account of the situation as it currently exists that officials, archivists, historians and agency personnel each perceive the problem of the preservation and accessibility of records and papers quite differently. Yet certain conclusions can be drawn and from these, recommendations for the Commission's consideration.

In the field of foreign affairs, the preservation of documents is not as great a problem as their accessibility. The only exception might be the records of the State Department prior to 1973 and the inauguration of the ADS.

Accessibility of the records and documents continues to be the most critical and controversial issue. As this study indicates there is extreme disagreement between present officials implementing government policy and former officials who once participated in making national security policy decisions. Disagreement between historians and current official policy is to be expected, but it was surprising that those who were recently in positions of decision-making in the White House and the State Department were so much less concerned over the access to the records than those who are making access decisions under the current review system.

With the important exception of the Nixon tapes, even the questions and controversy surrounding the private papers of public officials concern access to these papers rather than preservation. Although agency historians and archivists are concerned about "losing" papers, it would appear that most officials who participate in making foreign policy are in fact eager to keep their papers. For reasons peculiar to the issues of foreign affairs, the question to be considered then is not how to capture "private" papers before they are destroyed, but how and where to keep them so that the individual official is assured of privacy and the historian is assured of access.

The most serious problem of accessibility is simply the fact that certain records are not now retired and are not planned for retirement to the National Archives. Thus certain crucial records will either never become accessible to the public, or will emerge in disarray after perhaps a hundred years. Unless current practices of accessibility are greatly modified, it will not be possible for historians working in the next twenty-five years to reconstruct the process of foreign policy decision-making in the last twenty-five years.

Based upon these conclusions, the Commission should consider the following recommendations:

- (1) Executive Order 11652 should be modified to provide for complete declassification of national security material after twenty years instead of the present thirty years. No one argues with the fact that it is absolutely necessary to establish a cushion of time between the event and the release of documents concerning that event. The Rostow example illustrates the problems with exposure which comes too early. But none of the senior officials interviewed who had been in policy-making positions disagreed with the opening of documents after twenty years and many thought that ten to fifteen years would be adequate.

Archivists should be able to do the kind of review after twenty years that, under EO 11652, they now provide for material thirty years old. Guidelines should be written as precisely as possible so that archivists would not have to call continually upon the agencies for clarification.

Declassifying after twenty years would greatly diminish the work of the review staffs under the EO and FOIA, and reduce the expense of maintaining these staffs. Obviously ten years of material would automatically be eliminated from the process. In addition, given the conservative approach of most historians to recent history, it can be assumed they would be less anxious to pursue the costly review process for more recent material if they knew that the documents would all be available after twenty years. Archivists, relieved of some of the burden of processing review requests, could process their records in a fashion more conducive to proper research than the current haphazard method which occurs under the review provisions. Meanwhile the public would benefit from the ability of historians to write of the recent past of twenty years ago with enough documentation to avoid the kind of distortion heavily laced with speculation which now develops from using scattered, inadequate source material.

- (2) All government agencies should plan the orderly transfer of all records to NARS. Intelligence records can be safely deposited there and guidelines established for eventual access--even though such access will no doubt be long delayed. Agencies should also be re-defined to include those which now operate within the Executive Office of the President so that these agencies

would also leave their records in the archives. This requirement to transmit records to NARS in an orderly fashion should certainly extend to NSC records, as it was established by the Staff Secretary, Mrs. Davis, in her court deposition cited above, that the NSC is definitely an agency which now has an institutional file. Of central importance to foreign policy, these records should be declassified in the same manner as State and Defense records. Those who generated NSC records have no qualms about this procedure. Therefore, the insistence by the present NSC staff that their papers are unique should not be simply accepted at face value but should be carefully questioned.

- (3) The declassification of State Department documents must proceed separately and in a manner unrelated to the publication of **FRUS**. Those volumes will always be of great value and will not lose their worth just because the mass of papers were opened to researchers before publication.

For all the reasons noted here **FRUS** is falling farther and farther behind the goals set by the Historical Office several years ago. Tying declassification to these volumes not only closes State Department papers but other papers concerning foreign policy. As noted, DOD deliberately keeps its records closed until State records are open. Furthermore, private collections of papers which are deposited in presidential libraries or even in public repositories often stay closed until they can be released within the context of State declassification. Thus the Acheson papers have remained unavailable, and the Dulles papers at the Eisenhower Library will remain closed for the same reason. It seems essential, therefore, for the State Department to separate declassification from publication in order to hasten accessibility to important papers of twenty years ago.

The State Department should also reassess the role of the Historical Office, allowing it a greater budget, more staff, and more varied responsibility. That office could then add other necessary projects to its current preoccupation with the **FRUS**. It should be offering to the Department and the citizen such things as historical studies of recent events, volumes of current documents, and bibliographical aids. By operating as a preliminary research unit, the Historical Office could also greatly benefit the future researcher by testing the efficacy of the present computerized retrieval system.

- (4) Recommendations for some kind of public ownership of presidential papers should be seriously considered. Presidents or their heirs should not gain absolute and irrevocable control over papers which are not family papers. Access to papers is now often limited under the Presidential Libraries Act because a former President is allowed to perpetuate control of his papers to his heirs through his personal will.

Although institutional files of the Executive Office of the President can easily be separated from presidential papers, there is no agreement on any further differentiation of papers in the White House. Except for family letters, it may be that for historical purposes there are no private papers generated in the White House by the President and his staff. Therefore, emphasis should perhaps be placed upon control and access, rather than upon careful definitions. It seems reasonable to assume the Presidents and their staffs will operate more freely within the White House if it is known that the ex-President will remain in control of the papers which make up the record of the administration. But that control should stop at some point--perhaps at the death of the ex-President or after a certain number of years (twenty years for example) have elapsed. Thus policy should be considered which would give the living ex-President interim control over his papers while assuring that they are nevertheless publicly owned. After all, if historical buildings can be held in trust for the benefit of the nation, so can papers.

Public ownership of presidential papers will automatically eliminate many criticisms of the decisions now made by directors of presidential libraries--decisions often based upon the legal reality that the presidential papers are owned by Presidents who can allow their heirs to continue to influence the disposition of those papers.

- (5) As for the papers of senior officials who make foreign policy, the Defense Department should make a greater effort to encourage its senior officials to deposit their papers in public repositories. There are now few papers available compared to those collected by officials in the State Department. The OSD knows the location of papers of former Secretaries, but these papers are not being processed for access.

The effort of the State Department to keep the records of its officials is commendable. This policy should be encouraged, however, only if State provides the papers with proper archival care, and times the access to those

papers to the recommended twenty years declassification procedure. Otherwise, the public is better served by public officials leaving their records and papers in the presidential library system. At the present time, it seems unnecessary for the State Department to continue what is essentially an archival function, especially since it plans to reduce its paper files through the ADS. It would seem more sensible for the papers of senior officials to go to presidential libraries which are better able to care for them.

From that moment in 1776 when Benjamin Franklin stepped ashore in France to seek aid for the American Revolution, this country has been accumulating records concerning foreign policy decisions. In the Twentieth Century, these decisions have an especially important bearing on the lives of every American. An informed citizenry is the very essence of a representative democracy, yet the nation's memory is at its weakest in the field of foreign policy for the recent past. The Commission should strongly recommend the changes necessary to bring to an end this unfortunate state of affairs.

NOTES

⁴⁷ Interviews with Dougall, Kogan, Aandahl, Slany, Washington.

⁴⁸ Memorandum to the National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials from the Department of State (Washington, D.C., 1976).

⁴⁹ Information on the Dulles papers from interviews with John W. Hanes, formerly Special Assistant to the Secretary of State (Dulles), July 23, 1976; Professor Philip A. Crowl, Naval War College, August 14, 1976; Challenger, Curtis. See also, John E. Wickman, "John Foster Dulles 'Letter of Gift' ", *American Archivist*, Vol. 31, No. 4 (October, 1968), pp. 355-363.

⁵⁰ This decision to store classified material in a private collection caused some concern in the Eisenhower Administration. The Dulles Microfilm was probably responsible for the addition of a paragraph, entitled "Historical Research" which was added to Executive Order No. 10501. See Cabinet Paper, July 27, 1959, included with Memorandum from the State Department to the Commission. Prof. Crowl believes that Dulles originally wanted to collect the microfilm so that he could write his own memoirs when he left the State Department. Crowl does not believe that it will now be very valuable to historians when it is opened.

⁵¹ The very fact that State Department historians wanted to see the paper indicates that they did not believe the papers were purely

“personal”. Looking at papers for purposes of identification means that the historians may just look to see if anything in the papers may be of use. If they find such a document and wish to use it in **FRUS**, then they must go to the committee for permission.

⁵² Removal of papers was discussed in the following interviews: James C. Thomson, Jr., formerly Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs and member of the NSC staff, September 21, 1976; Hilsman, Kennan, Rostow, Nitze, Jacobs, Moss, Halperin.

⁵³ Conclusions drawn here based upon interviews with all the historians listed in the bibliography.

⁵⁴ Interviews with McGeorge Bundy, formerly Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs (Kennedy), September 28, 1976; Elsey, Gray, Goodpaster, Rostow, Halperin, Thomson.

I N T E R V I E W S

* Indicates telephone interview.

Fredrick Aandahl, Historical Office, Department of State.

William Bader, formerly Task Force Leader, Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with respect to Intelligence Activities, United States Senate.

Barton J. Bernstein*, Department of History, Stanford University.

McGeorge Bundy, formerly Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, 1961-1966.

Richard D. Challener, Department of History, Princeton University.

Harry Clark*, Harry S. Truman Library.

Wayne S. Cole, Department of History, University of Maryland.

Charles Corcoran*, Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

Philip A. Crowl, Naval War College.

William Cunliffe, Modern Military Branch, National Archives and Records Service.

George Curtis*, Dwight D. Eisenhower Library.

Jeanne Davis, Staff Secretary, National Security Council.

Robert A. Divine, Department of History, University of Texas.

Robert J. Donovan, Los Angeles **Times**.

Richardson Dougall, formerly with Historical Office, Department of State.

George Elsey, formerly White House staff member, 1947-1953.

William M. Franklin, formerly Director of the Historical Office, Department of State.

John L. Gaddis, Naval War College.

Charles Gellner, Congressional Research Service.

Alfred Goldberg, Historical Office, Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Andrew Goodpaster, formerly Staff Secretary to the President, 1954-1961.

Norman A. Graebner, Department of History, University of Virginia.

Gordon Gray, formerly Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, 1958-1961.

Milton O. Gustafson, Chief, Diplomatic Branch, National Archives and Records Service.

Lawrence Hackman, formerly Assistant Director of the John F. Kennedy Library.

Morton Halperin, formerly senior staff member of the NSC, 1969-1970.

John W. Hanes, formerly Special Assistant to John Foster Dulles, 1953-1957, now chairman of the committee responsible for the Dulles papers.

Roger Hilsman, formerly Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research (1961-1963), and Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs (1963-1964), Department of State.

Joan Howard, formerly an archivist in the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library, and Lyndon B. Johnson Library.

Richard Jacobs, Deputy Assistant Archivist for Presidential Libraries.

George F. Kennan, formerly with the Department of State, 1927-1953, Ambassador to Yugoslavia, 1961-1963, and author.

Arthur D. Kogan, Historical Office, Department of State.

Walter LaFeber, Department of History, Cornell University.

Richard W. Leopold, Department of History, Northwestern University.

Ernest R. May, Department of History, Harvard University.

William Moss, Archivist, John F. Kennedy Library.

Jack Murphy, Staff, National Security Council.

Paul Nitze*, formerly Deputy Secretary of Defense, 1967-1969, and member of the SALT delegation, 1969-1974.

James O'Neill, Deputy Archivist of the United States.

John Pruden, Director, Foreign Affairs Document and Reference Center, Department of State.

Armin H. Rappaport, Department of History, University of California, San Diego.

David A. Rosenberg, Department of History, University of Wisconsin, Green Bay.

Walt W. Rostow, formerly Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, 1966-1969.

Martin J. Sherwin, Department of History, Princeton University.

William Z. Slany, Historical Office, Department of State.

Bromley Smith, formerly member of staff and Executive Secretary of National Security Council, serving in the White House from 1953-1969.

James Thomson, Jr., formerly a member of the staff of the National Security Council, 1964-1966.

David F. Trask, Director, Historical Office, Department of State.

Paul T. Washington, Director, Information Management Section, Executive Secretariat, Department of State.

John E. Wickman, Director, Dwight D. Eisenhower Library.

Theodore A. Wilson, Department of History, University of Kansas.

Robert Wolfe, Modern Military Branch, National Archives and Records Service.

RESEARCHING AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC HISTORY AT THE JOHNSON LIBRARY

by
Martin I. Elzy*

In 1975 a graduate student¹ came to the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library in Austin, Texas, to research Brazilian-United States relations during the Johnson administration. This was very early in the Library's implementation of Executive Order 11652, signed by Richard M. Nixon on March 8, 1972, and further defined by a National Security Council directive on May 17, 1972. The Order provides that upon request by any member of the public, the agency of origin must review for declassification any security-classified document that is ten years old.

At the graduate student's request, copies of Brazilian material in the Johnson Library files were submitted to the agencies of origin for declassification review, and the Library staff and researcher waited for the responses to trickle back. The first time Library staff members suspected there was anything particularly noteworthy in the responses was when Carrollton Press, a company that publishes in microfiche form documents declassified by the federal government, featured a discussion of declassified Brazil items in its publicity newsletter.

Several months later a former member of the Johnson staff suggested to a Brazilian reporter in Washington that research in the Johnson Library might be worthwhile. The former Johnson staff member was unaware of the Carrollton Press disclosure, as was the Brazilian reporter, who called the Library. We had a pleasant conversation, and she called again a few weeks later to say that a journalist was coming all the way from Brazil for the specific purpose of inspecting the Library's files.

In due course the Brazilian journalist appeared, quietly did some research, and returned to Brazil. From December 18 to 20, 1976, a series of articles appeared in the Rio de Janeiro newspaper, **Jornal do Brasil**, concerning United States knowledge of or involvement in the 1964 Brazilian **coup d'etat** which brought the current military government to power.

Whereas the Carrollton Press announcement was universally ignored as unsolicited advertising, the **Jornal** article created a fire-storm of interest. The **Washington Post** picked up the story in a December 29 article.² A Library staff member was interviewed on a local television news show and the local newspaper carried an article,³ which naturally caught the attention of University of Texas faculty and students. **The Nation** published an article⁴ on the revelations, and the **Washington Post** eventually published a rebuttal by Lincoln Gordon,⁵ who was the United States ambassador to Brazil in 1964.

*Dr. Elzy has been an archivist at the Lyndon B. Johnson Library since 1974. He has specialized in the foreign affairs files of that institution.

The incident had a noteworthy effect on the number of researchers interviewed at the Johnson Library and on their topics. During the three months before the articles appeared in the **Jornal do Brasil**, thirty-three researchers were interviewed at the Library. Only seven were interested in foreign affairs, with two of those specifically citing Brazil. During the three months after the articles appeared, the Library staff interviewed sixty-four researchers, thirty of whom were interested in foreign affairs topics. Seventeen of the thirty cited Brazil as their field of research.

The influx of researchers points up a problem in doing foreign policy research at the Johnson Library, i. e., demand for declassification review greatly exceeds the rate at which the Library staff can process and the security agencies can review material. The usual procedure is for a researcher to cite the folders in which he is interested. The Library staff must then list the security-classified documents in those folders according to agency of origin, copy the documents, and send the copies to Washington to the appropriate agencies. The agencies are besieged by such requests from the Johnson Library, from other Presidential Libraries, and directly from the public. When agency action is taken and the Library is notified, it then informs the researcher of the agency action. All of this may require years for an individual scholar's requests, and the Library will be involved in such activity well into the next century.

Nonetheless, researchers can not overlook the rich foreign policy resources of the Johnson Library. The most valuable single file for historians of American diplomacy is the National Security File, which stretches approximately 300 linear feet. It was the filing cabinet for the President's national security advisors, and contains White House and National Security Council staff memos, State and Defense cables, and Central Intelligence Agency reports. About one-third of the National Security File is a series devoted to Vietnam. Another third is a Country File with from a few pages to several feet of material on each of the nations of the world. A variety of series constitute the remaining third of the National Security File, including an Agency File, Subject File, International Meetings and Travel File, Head of State Correspondence File,⁶ and Speech File.

Another valuable set of material consists of National Security Council histories of twenty important foreign policy crises of the Johnson administration. The White House requested such an effort by the NSC staff near the end of the Johnson administration, and the several linear feet which resulted include narratives and documentary collections concerning the crises, which range from the 1964 Panama demonstrations to the President's speech on Vietnam of March 31, 1968.

The major filing system in the White House during the Johnson administration was the White House Central File, the major component of which is a Subject File of sixty categories. Seven of those are directly related to foreign affairs: Countries, thirty-three feet; Foreign Affairs, twenty-five feet; Immigration-Naturalization, three linear feet; International Organizations, seven linear feet; National Security-Defense, one hundred sixty-two linear feet; Peace, four linear feet; and Trade, ten linear feet.

Other White House Central File categories should also be

consulted. The category dealing with Federal Government-Organizations consists of series devoted to each of the agencies of the federal government. There are series for the National Security Council, State Department, Central Intelligence Agency, and other foreign policy-related agencies. Subject File category, Trips, has a folder or series of folders for each Presidential trip, including those abroad and those within the United States that involved meetings with foreign dignitaries. Yet another White House Central File category, Speeches, includes drafts, preparation memos, and reaction to most of the President's speeches. A parallel file containing similar material is titled Statements of Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House Central File category, Legislation, is further subdivided according to other White House Central File categories. A researcher utilizing any file in the White House Central File would wish to examine the Legislation description to determine whether any material on his topic was filed there. For example, over four inches of material is filed under LE/FO 3-2 concerning economic and military assistance to foreign nations.

Adding to the information on legislation are files titled Reports on Pending Legislation and Reports on Enrolled Legislation. The former were weekly status reports on the President's legislative program from government agencies to the President's congressional liaison staff, which in turn prepared a summary memo for the President before his weekly congressional leadership breakfast. The latter were prepared for the President by the Director of the Legislative Reference Office of the Bureau of the Budget after bills were passed by Congress and the President was considering whether to sign the legislation.

In addition to the sixty-category Subject File, the White House Central File also includes a Name File, which acts mostly as a cross-reference to the Subject File. However, it is useful for biographic studies and also for research on organizations, as material is filed under the names of organizations as well as individuals. There is, for example, one linear inch of material filed under "Foreign" for various organizations with that word in their title.

A researcher who finds any of the White House Central File, Subject File, and Name File categories to be useful will also wish to consult the same categories in the White House Central File, Confidential File. Although much smaller than the White House Central File, the Confidential File duplicates the filing system. It was used for sensitive material that was not to be released as freely to White House personnel as was the White House Central File.

Yet another segment of the White House files for the Johnson administration is the Office Files of the White House Aides. Forty-six aides to the President kept files in their offices which they eventually turned over to the White House filing unit. This material was never integrated into the Subject File, Name File, or Confidential File, but rather was only cross-referenced there. The material is organized according to the aide from which it came. Although a little more difficult to use than the rest of the White House Central File, the Aides File should not be overlooked by diplomatic historians, as it contains folders such as "International Trade-1966" and "Vietnam Weekly Reports (1966)" in the Aides File of Bill Moyers and "A

Chinese March in Moscow" and "Latin America Common Market" in the Richard Goodwin Aides File.

Yet another source of interest is the President's Daily Diary. Researchers should not be deceived by the title, which seems to promise Johnson's most intimate thoughts on the progress of his programs. To the contrary, this useful file was kept by secretaries outside the Oval Office, who listed the President's visitors and telephone contacts. Sometimes the topic of discussion is mentioned and occasionally there are even some details of the conversations. Perhaps the most stunning example of this secretarial practice was achieved at the Presidential luncheon with Soviet leader, Aleksei Kosygin, in Glassboro, New Jersey, on June 23, 1967. The Diary indicates that a secretary took notes of part of the discussion on arms limitation from "the back stairs" after the dining room door was closed.

Researchers can also make use of the Diary Cards, which are an alphabetical name index to the Daily Diary. Of even greater value is the chronologically-arranged President's Appointment File, which includes memos prepared to brief the President for his daily meetings and occasionally minutes of meetings or memos indicating the results of meetings.

Another source of interest to those studying American foreign policy before Lyndon Johnson became President is the Vice-Presidential Security File. The six linear feet of material consists largely of the files of Colonel Howard L. Burris, who served as Air Force Aide to the Vice-President. Burris' responsibilities included national security matters, contacts with the military, and foreign and domestic travel. Of special interest are the handwritten notes, with transcriptions, taken by Johnson during the Cuban missile crisis meetings at the White House. Unfortunately, they are security-classified, and most have recently been exempted from declassification by the National Security Council.

Even earlier in Johnson's career, of course, he served in the House of Representatives from 1937 to 1949 and in the Senate from 1949 to 1961. All of his House papers are open for research, but very few of the Senate papers are available. As might be expected, both collections contain only small amounts of material on foreign affairs.

The Johnson Library is the depository for the Dean Rusk personal papers resulting from his service as Secretary of State from 1961 to 1969. Rusk, unlike other recent State Secretaries, left almost all of his papers in his office as part of the records of the Department of State. Those he carried away were his appointment calendars and itineraries of foreign travels. The two linear feet of material is currently open for research.

The Library also houses the personal papers of at least ten American ambassadors during the Johnson administration, as well as other individuals, such as Clark Clifford, who had a profound influence on American foreign policy during the Johnson presidential administration. None of these collections is available, and it is not anticipated that any will be opened for research soon, as work continues on the papers of Lyndon Johnson.

In 1968 and 1969 sixty-four agencies, bureaus, and offices of the federal government produced histories of their activities during

the Johnson administration. Several are from foreign policy-related agencies, but are unavailable for research due to security classification. These include administrative histories of both the State Department, four linear feet, and Defense Department, twenty-one linear feet.

The Johnson Library is also the depository for the files or the microfilm of files of several federal agencies. Paper holdings include two linear feet from the Central Intelligence Agency, six linear feet from the Department of State, and nineteen linear feet from the United States Information Agency. Microfilm records include two rolls from the Agency for International Development, ninety-seven rolls from the Department of Defense, and 397 rolls from the Foreign Broadcast Information Service. Researchers should beware of optimism concerning this material, however. Very little of it is now open for research, and due to constraints applied by the agencies, very little will be opened in the near future.

Historians often lament the advent of telephones and airplanes, which allow instant communication without a written record. Increasingly, scholars rely on oral history to fill such gaps. Although the Johnson Library's oral history interview with Dean Rusk is closed until January 1, 1990, and the one with Walt Rostow is unavailable until March 22, 1992, interviews with such luminaries as Harold Brown, Cyrus Vance, and Paul Warnke are now open for research, though use of Vance's requires his written permission.

As the foregoing indicates, the Johnson Library has a wide variety of material of interest to the diplomatic historian. This article is in no way definitive; indeed, it is but the first core sample to facilitate decades of excavation by scores of researchers. Because so much of the material is security-classified or otherwise unavailable for research, scholars are entreated to write to the Library before visiting. The staff will seek to provide prompt, helpful responses to all such inquiries.

NOTES

The author wishes to thank his colleagues for their many contributions to this article and for the same efficient service which is provided to all researchers at the Johnson Library.

1. Names of researchers are not provided by the author in accordance with the provisions of federal privacy legislation.
2. "U. S. Forces Stood Ready to Aid '64 Brazil Coup" by Lewis H. Diuguid.
3. **Austin American-Statesman**, December 29, 1976, "LBJ Papers Declassified: U. S. Was Ready to Aid Brazil Coup."
4. January 15, 1977, "Our Monster in Brazil: It All Began With 'Brother Sam' " by Gayle Hudgens Watson, pp. 51-54.

5. March 8, 1977, "The 1964 Revolution--Made in Brazil."
6. A separate President's Staff File, Head of State Correspondence File combines with the National Security File, Head of State Correspondence File to total over twenty linear feet of material.

**REPORT ON THE THIRD NATIONAL MEETING,
THE SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF
AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS**

(August 4-6, 1977)

(This report was prepared by Roger R. Trask, presently Chief Historian of the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the SHAFR Program Chairman for 1977, in part upon the basis of summaries submitted by session chairpersons)

SHAFR's Third National Meeting began with an evening reception on August 4, 1977, at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville. Local arrangements were made by Norman A. Graebner, Edward R. Stettinius Professor of History at the University. Approximately 120 SHAFR members registered for the conference.

The inaugural session on Friday morning, August 5, with about 100 persons attending, was opened by Raymond A. Esthus of Newcomb College, Tulane University, president of the Society, followed by greetings on behalf of the University from Norman Graebner. There followed a panel discussion on the work of Henry A. Kissinger as National Security Adviser and Secretary of State, 1969-1977, chaired by Robert H. Ferrell of Indiana University. Panelists included Lloyd E. Ambrosius of the University of Nebraska, Akira Iriye of the University of Chicago, Robert Freeman Smith of the University of Toledo, and Robert A. Stookey of the University of Texas. Professor Stookey, a retired foreign service officer, began the presentations by offering his ideas on the Middle East in recent years, especially about former Secretary Kissinger's handling of Middle Eastern problems. To Professor Stookey the most remarkable problem about the Middle East is its utter complexity, and he felt that Kissinger hardly appreciated that fact. Kissinger, he believes, was a first-rate tactician, but the former secretary did not have much idea of how a problem, once opened for resolution, would impinge on countless other difficulties--and how its resolution would then spin into the solutions (or non-solutions) of the other difficulties. Professor Iriye dealt with Kissinger's China policy, and not Vietnam (he preferred for the Vietnam questions to go to the entire panel); and he believed that generally speaking Kissinger did well on China issues. Perhaps the doing of good in this regard was not too difficult a problem, since Kissinger's task as Nixon's guide to relations with China was essentially the reversal of a policy that was not working. But there were

opportunities for error, and Kissinger usually avoided them. The third panelist, Professor Smith, considered Kissinger's Latin America policy, and remarked the fact that the former secretary rather ignored Latin America--until some problem popped up that needed an almost immediate solution. Professor Ambrosius considered the secretary's disarmament policy, and also his effect upon the apparatus of diplomacy, the department in Washington and the foreign service; generally he believed Kissinger drew just fair marks in disarmament policy, and minus marks--or a low mark--in his effect upon the policy apparatus.

After the panelists had given their views, three foreign service experts in the audience made short statements: Jerome Holloway, who had served in Europe and Asia and whose last foreign assignment was as consul general in Kobe, saw Kissinger as admittedly a phenomenon, but probably an unfortunate one, and stirred the audience by stressing the need for psychology in any study of the former secretary; Ambassador Fred L. Hadsel, now head of the Marshall Foundation, believed that Kissinger had little feeling for African problems; Ambassador Robert H. McBride, with much experience in Latin America, thought Kissinger did better in personal relations than in handling technical diplomatic problems, as Kissinger was accustomed to dealing with men in Mexico whom he knew. After these three statements the audience then participated in a rather fast-moving discussion, which ended in a gale of laughter when Professor Smith offered a comment that moved imperceptibly into a hilarious joke about former Secretary Kissinger who became the keeper of the Jerusalem Children's Zoo.

The speaker at the Friday luncheon, attended by about 100 persons, was Lawrence S. Kaplan of Kent State University, who presented an engaging and provocative talk on "Jefferson and 'Other Parts of the World.'" Frank Merli of Queens College, CUNY, presided at the luncheon.

Two sessions were held concurrently on Friday afternoon at 2:15. The program on "Economics and American Diplomacy: A New Look," chaired by Samuel F. Wells, Jr., of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, was attended by forty-five persons. William H. Becker of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, gave a paper on "Business Trade Associations and American Foreign Policy, 1898-1920," in which he pointed out the diversity of membership and purpose between the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Foreign Trade Council. Becker's principal point was the limited degree of assistance which most manufacturing units and trade associations sought from the U. S. government. Melvyn P. Leffler of Vanderbilt University read a paper on "Economics and Republican Diplomacy: Pierre Laval's 1931 Visit and the Reassessment of American Foreign Policy." The discussions preparatory to Laval's visit provided a unique occasion in which the demands of domestic politics were in conflict with the considered judgment of senior American officials in the White House, the Treasury, Commerce, and State Departments about the necessary international economic policy with which to deal with the Depression and to support European stability. Leffler clearly demonstrated that when confronted with

this conflict President Hoover, despite his insistence that the causes of the Depression were international, refused to take international action but stuck with a series of domestic remedies to meet the problem.

Professor Norman Graebner in commenting on these two papers praised them highly and pointed out the limited extent to which the government was expected, and could have been expected, to assist in the expansion of foreign trade. Professor Graebner emphasized that the only way to expand trade was, and remains, to offer better goods at lower prices.

Discussion and questions occupied about twenty minutes at the end of the session. Among issues raised were the role of the Federal Reserve Board, the position of Edward N. Hurley and the efficiency movement, and the differences between pressure for overseas trade expansion following the Depression of 1893 and similar pressures following the Depression of 1929.

Approximately forty people attended the panel on "Anti-Imperialism in the Interwar Period: Two Perspectives," moderated by Charles De Benedetti from the University of Toledo. Richard Salisbury of Western Kentucky University read a paper on "United States Policy in Latin America During the 1920s: An Anti-Imperialist Response." Looking to Costa Rica, Salisbury reviewed the work of Alejandro Alvarado Quiros in opposing the expansion of U. S. influence in Central America in the early 1920s. He particularly emphasized Alvarado's attempts at the 1923 Santiago Conference to strengthen the Pan American Union in the face of Yankee unilateralism. In his commentary, Kenneth J. Grieb from the University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh (whose paper was read in his absence by Thomas Burkman), warned against interpreting Alvarado's anti-Yankee posturings at face value, and suggested that his professed anti-imperialism provided more of a smokescreen for Costa Rican aggrandizement.

In her paper entitled "Washington, the War in Asia, and Anti-Imperialism, 1937-1945," Marlene J. Mayo of the University of Maryland, College Park, found that professional American diplomatists detected no aggrandizement at work in the U. S. approach toward Asia during the period considered. Instead, State Department officials like Stanley K. Hornbeck and George Blakeslee felt that Washington's opposition to Japanese (and even British) ambitions in Asia established the U. S. as a non-imperial if not anti-imperial participant in Far Eastern politics. Indeed, the Department's wartime planners consistently assumed that America would play an active but non-interventionist role in Asia's future. In his critique, George T. Mazuzan from the Office of Presidential Libraries expressed appreciation for the wealth of information that Professor Mayo had presented. But he contended that the material was so plentiful it would be better used in a number of independent articles or even monographs. The time allotted to the panel expired before questions and commentaries from the audience could be raised.

At 4:30 P. M. on Friday, guides from the University of Virginia hosted a delightful tour of the grounds, centering on the historic Rotunda and the nearby pavilions and student rooms, all designed by Thomas Jefferson. Professor and Mrs. Edward Younger of the Univer-

sity of Virginia graciously invited those SHAFR members on the tour into their home, one of the pavilions. A reception in the Garden of the Colonnade Club on the Lawn of the University followed the tour.

At the Friday evening banquet, Betty Miller Unterberger of Texas A & M University presided. The speaker was Ambassador Robert A. Sayre, Inspector General of the United States Foreign Service. Ambassador Sayre spoke about the history of the foreign service and some aspects of his experience in it, which included a tour in the 1960s as ambassador to Panama. In the discussion which followed his presentation, Ambassador Sayre responded to questions about the current negotiations between the United States and Panama for a new canal treaty. The Society is indebted to Ambassador Sayre and the Department of State for their cooperation in the activities of the conference. A reception followed the Ambassador's talk.

Two sessions were held concurrently on Saturday morning, August 6, beginning at 9:30. Richard A. Baker, Historian of the United States Senate, presided over the panel on "Reflections on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee During the 1960s: Aiken, Mansfield, Morse," attended by about thirty persons. This session sought to extend the discussion of the role of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the 1960s beyond the contributions of its chairman, J. William Fulbright. Panelists selected for analysis three Committee members who were less conspicuous, but nonetheless influential. Each speaker stressed that his conclusions were tentative, subject to subsequent alteration with the release of more extensive source material.

Mark A. Stoler of the University of Vermont analyzed George D. Aiken's foreign policy contributions and concluded that they were considerable. Aiken's concern with foreign policy was secondary to his interest in the welfare of Vermont farmers, yet he learned quickly that measures to aid American agriculture were inextricably interwoven with foreign affairs. He concluded that problems of agricultural surplus could only be solved through a federally-directed expansion of foreign markets undertaken in coordination with an internationalist foreign policy. By 1966, Aiken saw continued escalation of the war in Vietnam as destructive of United States's economic well-being. His opposition to the war caused many lawmakers to reexamine privately their views and brought "both respectability and bipartisanship to the anti-war movement at an early date." His influence was also apparent in the 1968 Republican stand on the war, in Nixon's overall foreign policy, and in the 1973 Paris accords.

Jeffrey Safford of Montana State University described Mike Mansfield's behind-the-scenes influence within the committee. Although ostensibly preoccupied with his duties as majority leader, Mansfield remained close to foreign policy developments. In his low-keyed, controlled, and unemotional manner, Mansfield kept strong ties to the White House at a time when Committee Chairman Fulbright had been excluded from President Johnson's inner circle. "Building bridges between congressional and committee factions were the meat of Mansfield's politics." Yet, Mansfield looked back upon his role in the 1960s with deep frustration. He was unable to deter Johnson's

Vietnam commitment and he failed to curb the erosion of congressional foreign policy prerogatives. Mansfield concluded that without presidential cooperation, the Senate foreign relations structure was doomed to impotence.

Victor Dahl of Portland State University outlined the basis of Wayne L. Morse's acerbic criticism of American involvement in Vietnam. Dahl contended that although Mansfield and Aiken were ideologically distant from Morse, they ultimately subscribed "to the main outlines of his anti-war stance." Although a majority of Morse's constituents in 1968 favored withdrawal from Vietnam, he was defeated for reelection in part because of the "animosities engendered by a veteran gladiator who had relentlessly attacked any and all who had ever disagreed with him."

A discussion of the special problems associated with researching senators of the modern era followed the formal presentations. The panelists agreed, in response to a question from the audience, that a study of the Committee in the 1950s would have posed fewer source material problems, but each believed that the time had come to begin an examination of the Vietnam era. There was additional discussion of the role of the Committee's staff in shaping attitudes of members.

The chairman of the session on "Sino-American Relations in Three Critical Decades: the 1880s, the 1920s, and the 1930s" was Leon E. Boothe of George Mason University. About fifty-five persons attended. Victoria M. Siu of George Mason University read a paper entitled "Sino-American Relations, 1882-1885: The Mission of John Russell Young." Young was Minister to the Imperial Court of Ch'ing China, 1882-1885. Though his mission was peaceful in the tradition of American Open Door diplomats at the turn of the century, Young could not avoid the disagreements between Europeans, ambitious for spheres of influence, and Chinese, desirous of maintaining territorial integrity and even suzerainty over their tributary states. The American minister sought to arbitrate the Sino-French controversy of 1880-1885, a cold war over Annam and Tongking which escalated to international dimensions, and to promote peace regarding the potentially explosive Sino-Japanese conflicts over Korea in 1882 and 1884. On the Chinese domestic scene, Minister Young and other American representatives advanced their country's commercial interests, but without territorial ambitions and sometimes independently of British leadership.

A closer examination of Young and his colleagues demonstrates 1) that the neglect of the 1880s by historians leads to a failure to recognize the decade's importance in relation to subsequent years which include both the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895) and the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905) and 2) that, in particular, Young's frustrating ministry, contrary to Britten Dean's views in a recent article, in fact represented at times the good intentions and positive accomplishments generally accorded American policy by Tyler Dennett.

"Thomas M. Millard: An American Journalist in Shanghai, 1910-1929," was the topic of a paper by Thomas Buckley from the University of Tulsa. Millard became a war correspondent at the turn of the century. His work took him to China, where he helped found several newspapers, trained a generation of young journalists, wrote

numerous books, and later became an adviser to the Chinese Nationalist government. During his years as a writer, Millard became a promoter of close Chinese-American relations. He believed that because of the Open Door the United States had a special responsibility for the future of China. He constantly promoted this idea with Presidents, Secretaries of State, Congressmen, and the American public. He was certainly one of the best known writers on China from 1916 to 1929; for a short period in the 1920s he was the main correspondent of **The New York Times**. He was not an objective reporter, but worked his strong pro-Chinese, anti-Japanese views into almost everything he wrote. He believed that the Japanese were the great villains of Eastern Asia and that they must be stopped from taking over Manchuria and China itself. His ideas were not only expressed in his writings but in his personal contacts with influential leaders of the American government, in particular William H. Taft. To argue that a man who helped found the leading American paper in China, whose actual words were used by American leaders in their speeches, and whose writings were read by thousands of Americans, had no influence on American policy, is to ignore the obvious.

Susan Bradshaw of Marian College read a paper on "Sino-American Relations, 1931-1933: Frank Ross McCoy." In December, 1931, after initially declining to support the sending of a League of Nations Commission to Manchuria, Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson reversed himself and selected his old friend, Major General Frank Ross McCoy, to be the U. S. member of the Commission. Having spent more than thirty years observing Far Eastern affairs, and having served on international commissions of inquiry and arbitration, McCoy was eminently qualified for the challenging position. Stimson, increasingly concerned because of Japanese advances on Shanghai in early 1932, issued the nonrecognition doctrine, stating that the United States would not recognize any territorial aggrandizement acquired contrary to the Nine Power Pact or the Kellogg-Briand Pact. In taking this advanced position of warning to Japan, Stimson hoped that the investigation which McCoy would help conduct might prove Stimson's views correct--that the Manchurian incident was precipitated by the Japanese, and that the creation of Manchukuo stemmed from Japanese activity and was not a native independent movement.

Department of State documents heretofore unused reveal McCoy's significant role on the Commission. He actively participated in several months of intense "on-the-spot" investigations, and was a thorough critic of the report. He also mediated disputes between his British and French colleagues which at times threatened to lead to a minority report. McCoy, not only a fine soldier but also a distinguished statesman, used his powers of persuasion and negotiation to produce the unanimous Lytton Report which substantiated Stimson's non-recognition doctrine.

Comments on the papers were provided by Edward Younger of the University of Virginia and Jules Davids of Georgetown University. Most of the remarks from the audience were complimentary and provided the basis for a useful and exhilarating dialogue.

The final event of the conference was luncheon at noon on

Saturday, August 6, with about ninety persons present. Roger R. Trask, Chairman of the SHAFR Program Committee, presided. Robert H. McBride, a retired foreign service officer whose last post was as ambassador to Mexico (1969-1974), was the speaker. Ambassador McBride, who served from 1974 to 1977 as Diplomat in Residence at the University of Virginia, spoke about his impressions of the foreign service and his experiences in it during a career that lasted from 1941 to 1974. At the conclusion of the discussion which followed Ambassador McBride's talk, President Esthus made announcements and then adjourned the Third National Meeting of the Society.

The consensus of those attending the conference appeared to be that it was a stimulating program in an excellent setting. Norman Graebner was a gracious host, and the local arrangements he made for the conference--housing, meeting rooms, meals, the University tour, and especially the receptions--were grand indeed. Although the SHAFR Council has not established the national meeting as an annual affair, there was almost unanimous agreement that a Fourth National Meeting should be held if possible during the summer of 1978. President Esthus indicated that such a gathering was indeed under consideration.

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES PUBLISHED BY MEMBERS OF SHAFR

Glen St. J. Barclay (U of Queensland), "Australia Looks to America: The Wartime Relationship, 1939-1942," **Pacific Historical Review**, XLVI, 2 (May, 1977), 251-271. Australian Prime Minister John Curtin's assertion after the fall of Hong Kong in December, 1941, that "Australia looks to America," has been singularly misrepresented ever since. Australia did indeed look to America for help, but it also looked to Russia and it in no sense looked away from Britain. Moreover, Australian confidence in the willingness of the United States to provide help was based on a complete misunderstanding of American strategic priorities. Curtin's discovery in mid-1942 that the Americans were as committed as the British to making their major military effort against Germany, while making holding operations only in the Pacific, led to a mood of disenchantment, forcefully expressed in private papers and documents now available for examination in Canberra and Wellington.

Frederick B. Hoyt (Illinois State U), "The Golden Age of Missions: American Protestants on the Eve of the Chinese Revolution of the 1920s," **Selected Papers in Asian Studies**, 2 (1977), 140-152.

By the eve of the Chinese Revolution of the 1920s, American Protestants had become the closest counterparts in the Open Door Empire to the scholar-gentry of traditional China; they embodied many of the same attributes and performed many of the same functions. Like their predecessors, the missionaries possessed the chief qualification for privilege in China, that is, education. Power and glory accrued to men in the Kingdom of God as it had in the Middle Kingdom

of the scholar-gentry. In China, the erection of a temple to the Lord created a single reference point of one God that unified the missionaries as the concept of one Middle Kingdom sustained the scholar-gentry. While missionaries could not slide into the official bureaucracy, not many Chinese scholars had made that transition either, and exclusion still left the Protestants with a host of vocations comparable to those of the traditional elite. This was particularly true in educating Chinese and in mediating between man and the harsh environment, as the scholar-gentry had done. Furthermore, the missionary life-style conspicuously resembled that of the traditional elite. The mission compound itself emulated the house on the hill owned by the scholar-gentry, and once the envy of the neighborhood. The mission home became a "museum of things American," a show-room, as it were, for the Montgomery Ward catalogues so common in the mission compound. The process of duplicating the habits of the scholar-gentry reached its apogee in the watering spots to which missionaries repaired for recreation and fellowship, especially the "Newport of China missionaries," the Kuling Estate. Education and wealth conferred deference on the status of the Protestants, as it had upon the scholar-gentry. Indeed, missionaries were so comfortable in China that they sometimes forgot that they were sojourners, where their welcome, as that of the barbarians throughout the centuries, depended upon Chinese consent. The anti-foreign emphasis of the Chinese Revolution in the 1920s would make the earlier part of that decade, in retrospect, a veritable golden age of missions.

Frederick B. Hoyt (Illinois State U), "The Summer of '30: American Policy and Chinese Communism," **Pacific Historical Review**, XLVI, 2 (May, 1977), 229-249. Although the United States was the first Western power to recognize the new Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek in 1928, American diplomats over the next decade privately voiced serious reservations about the abilities of the Generalissimo and the party, the Kuomintang, which he led. Notwithstanding these reservations, disappointment never resulted in estrangement, in part because support for Chiang and the Nationalists was the reverse side of American attitudes toward Chiang's only domestic alternative, the Chinese Communist Party. This article surveys the summer of 1930, when the Chinese Communists appeared in major urban areas for the only time between 1927 and 1937. Forced to protect their nationals at Kanchow (Kiangsi), Changsha, Wuhan, and along the Yangtze River, American diplomats defined attitudes and policies toward both rival factions that would outlast the crisis of 1930 itself. By the fall of 1930, American government officials were arguing that the Communists were "organized brigands" who were the "enemies of mankind," and consequently authorized the use of the American military for protecting life and property against the Communists. The Communist threat to American interests in China, in short, submerged the misgivings of American diplomats concerning Chiang's regime.

Arnold A. Offner (Boston U), "Appeasement Revisited: The United States, Great Britain, and Germany, 1933-1940," **Journal of American History**, LXIV, 2 (September, 1977), 373-393. America's war with Germany resulted from political rather than economic conflict. Throughout the 1930s the United States maintained strong trade and economic relations with Germany, and leading American diplomats sought to achieve political appeasement through economic appeasement.

Peace efforts culminated in 1940 with Sumner Welles' mission to Europe which sought reconstituted Polish and Czech states, trade outlets for Germany, resolution of the Russo-Finnish war, and diplomatic and trade concessions for Italy in order to balance Germany in Europe and achieve security in the Mediterranean.

American appeasement and the Welles mission aggrieved the British and French, while Hitler scoffed, and the Russians probably remained deeply suspicious. From the spring of 1940, however, the Roosevelt administration determined that the regime in Berlin had to be vanquished, although whether a defeated Germany would be kept whole or divided, agrarianized or industrialized, remained unresolved and underlay much of the diplomacy of World War II and the Cold War.

Noel H. Pugach (U of New Mexico), "American Friendship for China and the Shantung Question at the Washington Conference," **Journal of American History**, LXIV, 1 (June, 1977), 67-86. The settlement of the Shantung question at the Washington Conference demonstrated that, within the constraints of America's overall objectives in East Asia, American friendship for China helped to shape official United States policy. At critical stages in the negotiations, the "friends" of China in the State Department, who understood that Sino-American amity was rooted in self-interest as well as idealism, influenced Secretary of State Hughes to adopt pro-Chinese policies and helped China win much better terms than most observers had expected in the summer of 1921. Above all, they educated Hughes on the necessity of transferring control of the Shantung Railway from Japan to China.

Richard E. Welch Jr. (Lafayette College), "New Deal Diplomacy and Its Revisionists," **Reviews in American History**, V, 3 (September, 1977), 410-417. Following an evaluation of a recent collection of essays on New Deal foreign policy (**Watershed of Empire**), this essay weighed the successive waves of scholarly criticism directed against the diplomacy of Franklin D. Roosevelt: the early attacks of Harry E. Barnes and C. C. Tansill; the censures of the "Realist school"; the criticisms of those who fault the political strategy and inconsistent internationalism of the New Deal; the revisionists who analyze New Deal diplomacy from the standpoint of its economic instruments and ambitions. The author notes the contributions of Lloyd C. Gardner and Robert Freeman Smith but sees a need to synthesize the interpretations of the political and economic historians and place the economic diplomacy of the New

Deal more firmly in the context of American political history and contemporary international politics.

PERSONALS

Joan Hoff Wilson, formerly of Sacramento State U, a fellow the past year at Radcliffe Institute, and presently at Arizona State U, played a prominent role at the Conference on the History of Women, College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minnesota, October 21-23, as she chaired one session and presented a paper, "Hidden Riches: Colonial Legal Records and Women," at another.

Noel Pugach (New Mexico) has been elevated to the rank of associate professor.

The George C. Marshall Foundation recently received a grant from the NHPRC to support the editing of General Marshall's papers. It is estimated that the project will entail ten years of work and will result in the publication of six volumes. Assistant editor of this undertaking will be Larry I. Bland who was most recently a teaching fellow at the U of Illinois (Urbana). Serving as members of the advisory committee for this project are three additional members of SHAFR: Forrest C. Pogue, biographer of Marshall and director of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Institute for Historical Research at the Smithsonian; Richardson Dougall, formerly deputy director of the Historical Office, Department of State; and Maurice Matloff, chief of military history in the Center of Military History.

David H. Culbert (Louisiana State), currently a fellow at the National Humanities Institute (Yale), has been made chairman of a recently-established sub-group of the OAH, called the Committee on Radio, Film, and Television Media.

At the recent annual convention of the SHA, held in Atlanta, SHAFR members did not hide their "lights under a bushel." Presiding at sessions were Alonso L. Hamby (Ohio U), Robert L. Beisner (American U), and Robert F. Smith (Toledo). Edward Chester (U of Texas-Arlington) and David E. Kyvig (Akron) read papers, while Raymond A. Esthus (Tulane and president of SHAFR) and Lester D. Langley (Georgia) served as commentators. Then there was the all-star meeting where the chairman, Paul A. Varg (Michigan State);

readers of papers, Frederick B. Hoyt (Illinois State U), Sandra C. Taylor (Utah), and Linda M. Papageorge (Georgia State U); and the critics, Jerry Israel (Illinois Wesleyan) and Howard Kushner (Concordia U, Montreal), were all members of SHAFR.

Betty M. Unterberger (Texas A & M) was a recent appointee to the Advisory Committee of the **Foreign Relations** series.

**PUBLICATIONS IN U. S. DIPLOMACY
BY MEMBERS OF SHAFR**

John Chay (Pembroke State U), editor, **The Problems and Prospects of American-East Asian Relations**. 1977. Westview Press. \$18.50. Three members of SHAFR, Akira Iriye, Norman A. Graebner, and Chay, have essays in this compilation.

James W. Cortada (private industry), editor, **A Bibliographic Guide to Spanish Diplomatic History, 1460-1977**. 1977. Greenwood Press. \$25.00. At least 50 pages of the book deal with Spain's relations with the United States, and those of Latin America with Spain regarding the USA.

Robert J. Donovan (LA Times, Washington, DC), **Conflict and Crisis: The Presidency of Harry S. Truman, 1941-1948**. 1977. W. W. Norton & Co. \$12.95. Given front page status by New York Times Book Review, October 16, in a quite favorable appraisal by the noted biographer, Joseph P. Lash.

John K. Fairbank (Harvard), editor, **Our China Prospects**. 1977. American Philosophical Society, Pb. \$5.00. Two of the essays are by SHAFR members---Fairbank and Akira Iriye.

Norman A. Graebner (Virginia and ex-president of SHAFR), compiler, **American Diplomatic History Before 1900**. 1977. AHM Cl. \$10.95; pb. \$6.95. In series, Goldentree Bibliographies in American History.

Akira Iriye (Chicago and v-p of SHAFR), **From Nationalism to Internationalism: U. S. Foreign Policy before 1917**. 1977. Routledge & Kegan Paul. \$14.00.

Howard Jones (Alabama), **To the Webster-Ashburton Treaty; A Study in Anglo-American Relations, 1783-1843**. 1977. North Carolina. \$15.95.

Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State and Joint Executive Sec'y-Tr's'r, SHAFR), editor, **The American Revolution and "A Candid World."** 1977. Kent State U Press. \$10.50.

Martin V. Melosi (Texas A & M), **The Shadow of Pearl Harbor: Political Controversy over the Surprise Attack, 1941-1946**. 1977. Texas A & M U Press. \$10.00.

Yonosuke Nagai and Akira Iriye (Chicago), editors, **The Origins of the Cold War in Asia**. 1977. Columbia U Press. \$20.00. Reviewed in **Perspective**, November, 1977.

Thoman G. Paterson (Connecticut), J. Garry Clifford (Connecticut), and Kenneth J. Hagan (U. S. Naval Academy), **American Foreign Policy; A History**. 1977. D. C. Heath and Co. \$12.95.

OTHER MATERIALS

Will wonders never cease! J. Barton Bernstein and Robert H. Ferrell have joined hands for the nonce to inform the SHAFR membership that the James V. Forrestal Diaries are now available upon microfilm. The price for the three reels is \$30.42, and they may be obtained by writing to John C. Broderick, Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress, Washington, DC 20540.

A guide to French archives containing documentary source materials on American history has been published in Paris by France Expansion and is available in the U. S. through Clearwater Publishing Co., Inc., 75 Rockefeller Plaza, N. Y., N. Y. 10019. Titled **Guide des Sources de l'Histoire des Etats-Unis dans les Archives Fran-**

çaises, the 390-page paperback is priced at \$35.00.

The book covers all documents of the various French archival depositories, from the age of discovery to 1815 for all of North America, and up to 1940 for the United States itself. For each archive the book provides a general description of the collection and the nature of each series of documents, including period and regions covered. An inventory of existing reference tools, printed and manuscript, is included for each archive, as is a checklist of microform copies of materials available at the Library of Congress. Practical information for researchers is also given, such as addresses, hours, restrictions; etc. In addition to the book, Clearwater can also supply research work and paper or microform copies of documents from most of the archives discussed in the book.

SHAFR ANNOUNCEMENTS

As is customary, SHAFR will be meeting in conjunction with the annual convocation of the AHA, scheduled for December 28-30 in Dallas. Headquarters for the convention will be the Fairmont Hotel, Ross Avenue and Akard Street.

The SHAFR Council will convene in the Vista Room of the Fairmont, 8:00 P. M., Tuesday, December 27. Two SHAFR meetings will be held the next day: (a) the editorial board of **Diplomatic History** will get together at 4:00 P. M. in the Prairie Room of the Sheraton Hotel, and (b) the SHAFR reception will be held in the Executive Room of the Fairmont, 5:00-7:00 P. M. The SHAFR luncheon is scheduled for the Cafe D'Or, Sheraton Hotel, Thursday, December 29, at 12:15 P. M. Presiding at this affair will be vice president, Akira Iriye (Chicago). The presidential address of Raymond A. Esthus (Tulane) is titled "Isolationism and World Power." A short business session, in charge of president Esthus, will conclude this meeting.

This is the "on" year for SHAFR at the AHA, and members have not been backward about seizing the opportunities. This has been true even in the planning for the convention. Marlene J. Mayo (Maryland) and Forrest C. Pogue (Smithsonian Institution) were members of the Program Committee, while Mary V. Kuebel (Southern Methodist) was on the Committee for Local Arrangements.

There will be one all-SHAFR session at the convention, "The American Response to Third World Modernization in Indonesia and Liberia, 1945-50," with George C. Herring, Jr. (Kentucky) presiding, Gary R. Hess (Bowling Green) and Thomas M. Campbell, Jr. (Florida State) reading papers, and Warren F. Kimball (Rutgers-Newark) along with Herring acting as commentators. Three Colloquia for Senior Scholars will be a feature of the convention, and Richard W. Leopold (Northwestern and ex-president of SHAFR) will head the one titled "Historical Research and the Federal Government." Seven sessions will be devoted to summaries of dissertations by recent doctoral candidates. One of the seven, "History of American Foreign Relations," will be in charge of Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana and former

president of SHAFR) who will also offer comments upon the papers in his section.

In rounding out the SHAFR presence at the convention, Samuel F. Wells, Jr. (Woodrow Wilson International Center) and Theodore A. Wilson (Kansas) will chair a couple of sessions; John A. De Novo (Wisconsin-Madison), Charles L. De Benedetti (Toledo), Frederick B. Hoyt (Illinois State U), Stephen John Kneeshaw (School of the Ozarks), and Patricia Dawson Ward (Baylor) will read papers; and Paolo E. Coletta (U. S. Naval Academy), Norman A. Graebner (Virginia and ex-president of SHAFR), Charles E. Neu (Brown), Stanley L. Falk (Office of Air Force History), Daniel Yergin (Harvard Business School), and Samuel F. Wells, Jr., will be commentators.

The committee, set up in December, 1976, consisting of Norman A. Graebner, chairman, Wayne S. Cole, Robert A. Divine, Lloyd C. Gardner, and David Pletcher, and charged with the responsibility of advising and overseeing the project to revise S. F. Bemis and G. G. Griffin's **Guide to the Diplomatic History of the United States** (1921) recently announced its choice of Richard D. Burns as editor of the compilation. The SHAFR Council unanimously approved this selection.

Dr. Burns is the Director of the Center for the Study of Armament and Disarmament and Professor of History at California State University, Los Angeles. He has edited a series of book-length WAR/PEACE BIBLIOGRAPHIES for ABC-Clio Press, of which five volumes have appeared, and the sixth is in press. He has been involved in the compilation of two of these and, additionally, has supervised the assembly of sixteen pamphlet-length bibliographies in a POLITICAL ISSUES SERIES prepared by his Center. He has directed a four-year team study (1964-68) for the U. S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has been chairman of his history department, and has written or edited several other books and articles.

Dr. Burns will work closely with Norman Graebner's advisory committee in developing a format for the project and in selecting editors for the various sections of the compilation. He will have a sabbatical in the academic year 1978-79 and will be able to devote full time then to the undertaking so that early---and considerable---progress can be expected.

Leon E. Boothe, speaking upon behalf of George Mason University, has extended an invitation to SHAFR to hold its fourth summer conference upon the campus of that school, August 3-5, 1978. That institution's nearness to Washington, D. C.---fifteen minutes away---will be a big plus in its favor with many people.

Dr. Boothe has made preliminary housing arrangements which are comparable to the reasonable and comfortable ones experienced by SHAFR members and friends in Charlottesville last summer. Single rooms will be \$10.00, doubles \$13.00, and family units (two-bedroom apartments) \$19.00. With receptions, luncheons, and dinners, the

package prices (depending upon accommodations) will be about the same as those at Charlottesville---\$35.00 to \$40.00. Families can be accommodated with the option of remaining through the night of August 5.

Betty Miller Unterberger, SHAFR Program Chairwoman for 1978, is interested in receiving proposals for papers, panels, or sessions to be presented at this conference. Send them to her at the Department of History, Texas A & M University, College Station Texas 77843, not later than January 30.

From Warren F. Kimball, editor of the SHAFR **Roster & Research List**, comes a couple of reminders: "Over 400 members have not submitted a correction to their current research listing since 1974. The membership of SHAFR is far too large now to permit the editor to keep up with changes on his own, and if the List of Current Research is to be of real value, members must make a better effort to keep it up to date. The next complete revision of the **R & R List** will come out in the fall of 1978, so please update your current research listing before then. A form for entering that data as well as any address change is provided in the back of this **Newsletter**."

Dr. Kimball is also chairman of the Stuart L. Bernath Book Prize Committee for 1977, but he is disappointed because of the few entries to date for this prize. He urges SHAFR members to nominate their own or others' books which have been published in 1977 if they meet the proper criteria. (See the rules for this competition which are published in every edition, including this one, of the **Newsletter**). Dr. Kimball points out that authors do not have to be members of SHAFR, nor do they have to be professional academics.

OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS

Until recently scholars who wished to work in the Archives of Russian Foreign Policy, which houses Russian diplomatic documents over the period 1721 to 1917, have been hampered because of an absence of published regulations and guidelines concerning access. This past summer, though, the director of the archives, Mr. Victor Mazaev, presented a team of American scholars in Moscow with a typed copy of "Regulations Governing the Work of Foreign Researchers in the Reading-Room of the Archives of Russian Foreign Policy of the Historical-Diplomatic Administration of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs." These regulations have now been translated and a copy may be obtained by writing to the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Smithsonian Institution Building, Washington, DC 20560, or to the Diplomatic Branch, National Archives and Records Service, Washington, DC 20408.

"Going to the Source: An Introduction to Research in Archives" will be offered Jan. 16-19 at the National Archives in Washington, D.C. The lecture and laboratory course fits the needs of the general researcher, historian, social scientist, university instructor, or graduate student. Librarians who work with researchers using primary sources will also find the four-day workshop useful.

Lecturers and panelists will focus on the resources of the National Archives and how to locate them, with emphasis on tracking a problem through the records. Other sessions will deal with problems of access to archives and manuscript collections. Printed aids available for locating records will be discussed.

A panel of archivists will simulate a search through National Archives records. Other staff will comment on audiovisual and cartographic holdings in the Archives. Workshop sessions will provide direct experience with documents, microfilm and finding aids. The schedule provides time for independent research.

Including all materials, the cost of the course is \$50. Enrollment is limited to 25 persons. For more information, write to Elsie Freivogel, Education Division, National Archives and Records Service, Washington, D.C. 20408, or call 202-523-3298.

David F. Trask, a longtime member of SHAFR and presently head of the Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D. C. 20520, writes that his bureau has recently published a 27-page pamphlet, titled "Major Publications of the Department of State: An Annotated Bibliography," which may be obtained by writing to the above address. The office has also prepared (and continues working upon) materials/publications in six topical areas (e. g., "Security, Arms Control, and Disarmament Affairs") and five world geographical regions (e. g., "Africa"). One may be placed upon the mailing list to receive materials in one or more of these fields of diplomatic interest by completing a card, to be secured from the above office, and returning it to the same.

The Smithsonian Institute has prepared a traveling exhibit, titled "A Cartoon History of United States Foreign Policy, 1776-1976." (It's based upon a paperback of the same title, done by the editors of the Foreign Policy Association, published by William Morrow and Co., Inc., and retailing for \$3.95). The depictions are all of a contemporary nature, illustrating various viewpoints concerning American foreign affairs, and are taken almost entirely from the sketches of noted cartoonists as they appeared in leading U. S. newspapers.

There are 54 pieces (panels) in the exhibit, and it requires 190 running feet for showing. The booking periods are for four weeks, and the rental fee is \$350.00. Departments, schools, communities, or other organizations interested in booking the exhibit should write to Larry Rosenblatt, Traveling Exhibit Service, Smithsonian Institute, Washington, DC 20560.

The Early National Historical Society will hold an organizational meeting at the convention of the Organization of American Historians in New York in April, 1978. The group will meet at 4:30 P. M. on Thursday, April 13, in the New York Room of the New York Statler Hilton Hotel.

The group welcomes historians of any topical area---political, economic, social, intellectual, cultural, diplomatic, demographic, military, etc.---which falls within the general chronological period of about 1789-1828.

After formally organizing, the group expects to put out a newsletter devoted to recent developments in the early national period of United States history, including book reviews, lists of new articles and dissertations, and notes on work in progress.

Persons desiring further information should contact James H. Broussard, Room 413, 140 North Senate Ave., Indianapolis, IN 46204.

Bergen Community College (Paramus, N. J.) is currently producing a 54-program television series which will be broadcast nationally by CBS, May-September, 1978. This series, titled "Paradox of Power: U. S. Foreign Policy," will also be offered for credit at a number of two-year and four-year colleges throughout the nation, via the Media Instructional Association, which is based at Bergen Community College.

Guest-scholars who have agreed to participate in the series include those from both the halls of academe and the non-academic realm. Noted among the distinguished participants are three members of SHAFR: Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. (Graduate Center, CCNY), Henry Graff (Columbia), and Richard S. Kirkendall (Executive Secretary, OAH). Among the groups which have been acting as consultants for the series are these: OAH, Department of State, Center for the Study of the Presidency, Eastern Community College Social Science Association, New York **Times**, and the Foreign Policy Association. The latter will create original print materials to accompany the series.

This series has been hailed as "the most far-reaching exploration of foreign affairs ever undertaken by television", and it is anticipated that "it will reach an estimated audience of one million, plus an academic audience in those colleges where it will be offered for credit."

Institutions or individuals interested in the series, and especially those wishing an outline and synopsis thereof, should communicate with Dr. Philip C. Dolce, Coordinator, Public Media Programming, Bergen Community College, 400 Paramus Road, Paramus, N. J. 07652. Telephone: (201) 447-1500.

THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL BOOK COMPETITION FOR 1978

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

CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD

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

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

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

PREVIOUS WINNERS

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

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

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

CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD

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

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

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

AWARD WINNER

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

**THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL LECTURE
IN AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC HISTORY**

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

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

PROCEDURES: The Bernath Lectureship Committee is now soliciting nominations for the 1980 Lecture from members of the Society. Nominations, in the form of a short letter and curriculum vitae, if available, should reach the Committee not later than December 1, 1978. The Chairman of the Committee, and the person to whom nominations should be sent, is Dr. Jonathan Utley, Department of History, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37916.

HONORARIUM: \$300.00 with publication of the lecture assured in the Society's **Newsletter** or its journal, **Diplomatic History**.

AWARD WINNERS

1977 Joan Hoff Wilson (Fellow, Radcliffe Institute)

1978 David S. Patterson (Colgate)

GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO **DIPLOMATIC HISTORY**

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

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

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

All manuscripts should be submitted to: Dr. Armin H. Rappaport, Editor, **Diplomatic History**, Department of History, U of California--San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093.

 SHAFR ROSTER AND RESEARCH LIST

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

 Name: _____ Title: _____

Address _____

State: _____ Zip Code _____ Institutional Affiliation

(if different from address) _____

General area of research interest: _____

_____ Key word _____

Current research project(s): _____

_____ Key word(s) _____

If this is pre-doctoral work, check here _____

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

BULLETIN

In the recently-concluded election for officials of SHAFR, Paul A. Varg (Michigan State) was chosen as vice president. Betty M. Unterberger (Texas A & M) and Warren F. Kimball (Rutgers-Newark) were elected to the Council, and Milton O. Gustafson (National Archives) became a member of the Nominations Committee. Akira Iriye (Chicago), currently the vice president, will assume the duties of the presidency at the conclusion of the SHAFR-AHA convention in Dallas, Texas, in late December.

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

SPONSOR: Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.

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

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

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

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

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

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

FORMER PRESIDENTS OF SHAFR

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

Box 5146
TENNESSEE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED
EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage Paid
Permit No. 101
Cookeville, Tenn.
38501