

The Society for Historians of American  
Foreign Relations

**NEWSLETTER**

---

Volume 16

No. 3

September, 1985

Page

- 1 Important Notices
- 2 A Small Addition to the Battle Story of the  
CDC V. The Historian by Richard E. Welch
- 4 An Antediluvian Note on Access to Official  
Records by Garry Clifford
- 6 Prepared Statement of Richard Curry
- 12 Winston Churchill's First "Iron Curtain"  
Speech by Birdsall Viault
- 15 SHAFR's New Executive Secretary-Treasurer
- 16 Council Meeting Minutes
- 21 Abstracts
- 30 Calendar
- 32 Announcements
- 37 Publications
- 38 Personals
- 39 Bernath Awards
- 43 Holt Fellowship

ISSN 0740-6169



**SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS**  
FOUNDED IN 1967. CHARTERED IN 1972.

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

VICE PRESIDENT: Betty M. Unterberger, History, Texas A & M, College Station, Texas 77843.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER: William Kamman, History, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas 76203. (817) 565-2288.

CHAIRMAN, PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Justus Doenecke, Division of Social Sciences, New College, University of South Florida, Sarasota, Florida 33580.

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

CHAIRMAN, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Thomas M. Leonard, History, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, Florida 33216.

CHAIRMAN, GOVERNMENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE: Milton O. Gustafson, Diplomatic Branch 5E, National Archives, Washington, D.C. 20408.

MEMBERSHIP: Annual dues are \$16.50, payable at the office of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer. Student fees-\$6.00, retired members-8.00, life memberships-\$250.00. If husband and wife are both members the dues for one of them shall be one-half of the regular price. For those wishing only the SHAFR Newsletter the cost is \$10.00. Institutions wishing Diplomatic History should contact Scholarly Resources.

MEETINGS: The Society holds an annual meeting each summer, meets with the American Historical Association in December, and with the Organization of American Historians in April.

PRIZES: The Society administers several awards. Four of them in honor of the late Stuart L. Bernath and financed through the generosity of his parents, Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath of Laguna Hills, California. Another award honors the late W. Stull Holt. The details of each of these awards are given in under the appropriate headings in each issue of the Newsletter.

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



## NOTICES OF IMPORTANCE TO SHAFR MEMBERS

### DIPLOMATIC HISTORY EDITOR SOUGHT

SHAFR seeks a new editor for Diplomatic History. We are looking for an established scholar with substantial publication experience. Candidates must be able to secure firm institutional support. Application deadline is November 1, 1985. The transition from the present editorial staff to the new one should take place on July 1, 1986. Please submit letters of inquiry and vita to Melvyn P. Leffler, Box 6130, Station B, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235.

### SHAFR Call For Papers

The annual SHAFR meeting will be held at Georgetown, June 26-28, 1986. All persons interested in presenting papers or organizing sessions should forward a letter including title and abstract of the paper and the names and university affiliation of perspective participants. Full panels are preferred. Deadline: December 1, 1985. For further information contact:

Justus D. Doenecke  
Divison of Social Sciences  
New College, University of South Florida  
Sarasota, Florida 33580



A SMALL ADDITION TO THE BATTLE STORY OF  
THE CDC V. THE HISTORIAN

by

Richard E. Welch, Jr. (LaFayette College)

In the September, 1984 issue of the Newsletter, Thomas Paterson wrote with cogency and civil anger of "The Present Danger of Thought Control," noting the manner in which the Classification/Declassification Center (CDC) of the Department of State was operating under President Reagan's Executive Order 12356 to delay and obstruct declassification requests filed under the Freedom of Information Act. I should like to offer a modest postscript to his excellent essay.

In the spring of 1980 when doing research in the John F. Kennedy Library, I was informed that a summary history of the Cuban missile crisis had been written by an official in the office of Robert Manning, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, and that it was "still classified." Following a series of unsuccessful letters to the Kennedy Library and Department of State, I requested a "mandatory classification review" under the FOIA in January 1983. In February 1985 I received from Mr. John R. Burke, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Administration, CDC, a heavily censored copy of the document in question, with a cover letter explaining that "the excised and denied material. . .remained protected in the interest of national defense of foreign policy." I was instructed by Mr. Burke, employing the clotted prose of the CDC, that "all non-exempt material in the excised document that is reasonably segregable from the exempt material is released herewith."

The State Department history of the missile crisis was written at the request of National Security Adviser McGeorge Bundy and his author was Frank A. Sieverts. When the 202-page document was forwarded by Assistant Secretary Manning to McGeorge Bundy (22 August 1963), the latter was assured that it was based on State Department records and additional material provided by



the Department of Defense, the White House, and the Central Intelligence Agency, "as well as on personal interviews and private notes." There is no reason to doubt the diligence of Mr. Sieverts although the absence of citations makes it impossible to determine the extent of material provided by sources outside State. In its amputated and sanitized form, it is a document that inspires some interest and considerable frustration.

More concerned with narrative than analysis, Sieverts' account serves primarily as a foretaste of the later administration accounts by Sorensen, Schlesinger, and Robert F. Kennedy. Its interest lies in a few of its details, its indications of State Department division respecting the terms of the Kennedy-Khrushchev settlement, and the inconsistency and irrationality of its many excisions.

Approximately one-fourth of its pages have been treated to a tar-like substance which insures their invulnerability to human or electronic eyes. A majority of these blackened pages concern the CIA and its intelligence gathering endeavors. Most, though not all, references to U-2 surveillance have been excised and the dates of certain U.S. intelligence reports on early rumors of Soviet missile installations have also been deleted, making difficult an assessment of the accusation of Senator Kenneth Keating that the Kennedy administration knew of these installations prior to October 15. An hour-by-hour "scenario of events" for October 22-23 on pp. 86, 86A, 87, and 87A has been deleted as well as the names of certain officials and a chapter on CIA intelligence activity prior to the official origins of the missile crisis.

In those pages that have escaped sanitization, one may discover that at early meetings of Excom, the option of a naval blockade was placed at a higher "magnitude" of force than a "limited, surprise air strike" (pp. 51-52) and trace the semantic evolution of the naval blockade to "a defense quarantine" (p. 59). One can also learn that the decision to reply to Khrushchev's first letter and ignore the more bellicose second



letter was later described as the "Trollope ploy," with reference to "the 19th Century English novelist in whose stories more than one maiden purposely and with foresight interpreted an amorous advance by a would-be swain as a proposal of marriage" (p. 185). Sieverts makes no mention of Robert Kennedy's conversation with Ambassador Dobrynin or of the Attorney General's indication to Dobrynin that President Kennedy might withdraw the Jupiter missiles from Turkey subsequent to a satisfactory conclusion of the Cuban missile crisis, but there is in Sieverts' "epilogue" an element of veiled disappointment with that conclusion and with Castro's continued control in Cuba. One can guess--and with the lack of documentation in a mangled document, it is only a guess--that there was division of opinion within the State Department respecting the dimensions and terms of the U.S. diplomatic victory.

I would not urge the members of SHAFR to spend several years in seeking access to Sieverts' "history," but I would be happy to share my example of CDC bureaucratic timidity with anyone interested.

#### **AN ANTEDILUVIAN NOTE ON ACCESS TO OFFICIAL RECORDS**

by

Garry Clifford (University of Connecticut)

Members of SHAFR who have experienced frustration in recent years over capricious government policy toward access to official documents might find some solace in the following excerpt from the diary of William R. Castle, Jr. As a former Under Secretary of State during the Hoover era and a member of the Republican National Committee in 1939, Castle was rumored to be the next Secretary of State if the Republicans won the White House in 1940. It therefore made sense for an aggrieved historian to complain to Castle about State Department procedures regarding access to records.



September 19, 1939: "In the afternoon I had a long talk with Professor [Samuel Flagg] Bemis of Yale, the historian. He came to see me because we had in the past discussed the book he was writing about the diplomatic history of our relations with Latin America and he wanted to explain why the project was dropped. He said that he was delighted when an order went out from the Department that the archives were to be opened to qualified scholars writing on any subject connected with American history. He is qualified so he applied and was given permission, although it was under unexpected restrictions. At any rate, he spent a month in Washington at great expense to himself and on his departure left the notes he had taken with the Department for censoring. The necessity of this he admits freely, as the Department must pass on whether one paper or another is secret. He did not hear from them for three months and then wrote to ask whether the notes had been censored and when he could expect their return. After another month he was told that another order was soon to be issued which would make it even easier for the historians and that when this was done he would get back his notes. The second order was so drastic in its restrictions that Bemis said it was clear the Department simply wanted to drop the whole business. Finally he wrote again for his notes but was told that under the circumstances he could not have them back, that the privileges had been curtailed because it was too hard for the Department to decide who was to be admitted and who [was] not. "If we let you in can we refuse Drew Pearson?" was one of their queries--not written I imagine by Sumner Welles, who would probably throw open the archives to Drew. Bemis said he thought it useless to make the obvious retort and just gave up. He said his great mistake was that he had talked freely with the man in [the] Latin America [section] who had been assigned as his mentor, a man who was obviously interested only in seeing to it that the [Roosevelt] Administration was not criticized



and had told him that his great object in writing the book was to try to reconcile the Good Neighbor policy as practiced by this Administration with earlier policy. Bemis says he has worked in the British, French, Italian, and German archives and has never been hindered at every point as he has been here in this Administration. He asked whether the attitude would change if the Republicans got in, but that question I could not answer.<sup>1</sup>

Although Professor Bemis did go on to write The Latin American Policy of the United States (1943), the pitfalls of researching in contemporary government records may have had the beneficial effect of returning Bemis to the era of John Quincy Adams. Plus ca change le meme chose!

<sup>1</sup>Diary of William R. Castle, Jr., Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

**PREPARED STATEMENT OF  
RICHARD CURRY, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY  
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT**

(At the request of Dr. Curry, the SHAFR Newsletter is reprinting the following statement delivered before the Subcommittee on International Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives in May 1984. -- editor)

I would first like to thank the Chairman and the members of the committee for providing me with the opportunity to insert my own views and experiences with the United States Information Agency (USIA) into the record. I am pleased that the Subcommittee has set aside this time to investigate the partisan practices of the United States Information Agency over the past few years.



The issues that have received the most extensive and recent press attention are, as you know, the secret taping of telephone conversations by Mr. Charles Z. Wick and the existence of a USIA blacklist of speakers for the American Participation Program. This blacklisting of prominent public figures and respected scholars clearly establishes the fact that ideological considerations have been a major factor in choosing participants in the APARTS program since 1981.

My purpose here today, however, is to share with you my own experiences with USIA officials and the partisan treatment I received. Between late May and the end of August, 1981, I had the good fortune to serve as a senior Fulbright lecturer in New Zealand. My principal responsibility was to teach two courses on nineteenth century American history at Waikato University which is located in the city of Hamilton. In addition, I was invited to speak on various aspects of American history at five other universities throughout the country.

My difficulties with USIA officials in Australia began with a telephone call I received in New Zealand from Dr. Merton Bland, who was USIA's Cultural Affairs Officer in Canberra. Bland began this conversation by stating, "Professor Curry, I am under intense pressure from Australian academics to bring you to Australia. What is it you do that fits into the 'game plan' of the USIA which is the 'propaganda agency' of the United States government?" I was somewhat startled by this statement, as you might imagine.

After a prolonged discussion Bland requested a cable which not only listed the topics on which I wanted to lecture at Australian universities, but which included in Bland's words, "the points of view you intend to express."

Since I had corresponded with several Australian academics before leaving the United States and had been asked to lecture on topics such as slavery, abolitionism, the American Civil War, and the concept of individualism in American society, I included these



topics in my cable. About a week later I received a return cable from Bland outlining a nine day itinerary for my wife and me in four Australian cities.

Arriving in Canberra, we were entertained by a junior USIA official, whose last name now escapes me, but John was friendly and communicative. Toward the end of the evening, I mentioned to this individual that since his superior, Merton Bland, had expressed reservations about bringing me to Australia, I was somewhat surprised to learn that our itinerary had been revised to include media appearances and newspaper interviews in Tasmania. I proceeded to say in what I thought was a joking fashion that one of my colleagues at the University of Connecticut had said: "When you go overseas, don't create an international incident; but if you do, make it a big one." If I were so inclined, I said, the media interviews provided a great opportunity. I really didn't expect the USIA official to break down in laughter but neither did I expect to strike such a raw nerve. "If you do, you'll never get another Fulbright," he shot back. Taken aback, I informed this person that I had not come to Australia to launch attacks on the Reagan Administration's policies, but to lecture on nineteenth century American history before academic audiences. Nevertheless, I stated that in all probability, I would on occasion, be asked my opinions about contemporary American politics and that I intended to speak freely and responsibly. To do otherwise, I said, would destroy my own personal credibility, bring USIA's credibility into question and insult the intelligence of foreign academics. Privately, the junior USIA official agreed with most of what I had to say but he warned me that the Reagan Administration was extremely sensitive to criticism, and cautioned me in a friendly manner to be extremely careful regarding what I had to say if I wanted ever again to lecture under USIA auspices.

Before leaving Canberra, I was asked to drop by USIA headquarters. There, I was handed copies of speeches on American foreign policy by former Secretary of State Alexander Haig, ex-National Security Advisor



Richard Allen, President Reagan and by the American Ambassador to Australia. I had not read this material and found some of the information useful. What I resented was the suggestion that not only should I read these speeches before reaching Melbourne, but that I should pay close attention to the views expressed.

The final leg of our Australian tour took us from Melbourne to Launceston and Hobart, Tasmania. In Launceston an extremely knowledgeable individual took me aside and said, "They tried to intimidate you in Canberra, didn't they," "Yes," I replied, "they did." "Well," he chuckled, "they didn't succeed, did they?" "No," I replied, "they didn't."

Moving on to Hobart we were met at the airport by a man named George Howatt. Howatt was not a USIA employee but was an American expatriate, so we were informed, who had been asked by USIA to make all necessary local arrangements. In Hobart I did not talk to academic audiences but to business and civic groups. Howatt informed me that a young mens' professional group called APEX wanted to hear my views on what the world could expect from the Reagan Administration. I called the president of the Local APEX chapter to make certain that he understood that I was neither an economist nor a specialist on foreign policy issues. Nevertheless, I stated that as a historian and a reasonably well-informed individual on current affairs, I would be happy to share my knowledge, opinions and projections with them.

That evening, shortly before I began speaking, our local host, George Howatt, brought a taperecorder to the dais. I quietly protested its use without prior consultation and without my permission. Howatt assured me, however, that there was nothing to be concerned about. He simply wanted a record of the "evening's entertainment" for his own use and wouldn't I like to have a copy for my own files? He would mail one to me in New Zealand, he said. He never did despite two subsequent requests on my part that he do so. At the time I could have pressed the issue or



could have simply pulled the plug but I had nothing to hide and the idea of having a copy for personal reference appealed to me. In retrospect, I haven't the vaguest idea who George Howatt is since he was not a USIA employee. Nor do I know specifically why this particular talk--but no other--was singled out for preservation in Howatt's or any one else's files.

After returning to the United States in early September, 1981, I did not write or publish anything about this harassment for several months. Since my previous experiences with USIA had been positive, I felt that my negative encounters may have been isolated. Without incident, I had lectured for the USIA in the Philippines in 1978; taped an interview for the Voice of America in 1973; and the USIA had displayed an American history textbook I had co-authored in one of their world-wide book exhibits.

On February 26, 1982, however, the New York Times published an op-ed article entitled "Reaganizing Scholars." It was written by Fred Warner Neal, a professor of international relations at Claremont Graduate School, who charged that USIA failed to fund his trip to a scholarly conference in Belgrade, Yugoslavia for reasons that appeared to him to be political or ideological in nature. Professor Neal's name, as you know, appeared on the recent USIA blacklist. On March 9, 1982, the New York Times published a reply to Neal by USIA Director, Charles Wick, who argued that USIA's principal mission was to serve as an extension of President Reagan's foreign policy.

As a result of the Neal/Wick exchange, I went public with my own encounters with USIA. Since that time I have been contacted by a number of my colleagues from both the U.S. and abroad who have shared with me their similar experiences. Copies of some of the more compelling letters, articles, and documents, sent to me by other scholars and my own published articles, which were partially based on this correspondence, have been made available to the Subcommittee.



As a result of my own writings, several contradictory attempts have been made by Mr. Wick and USIA functionaries to refute the charges I had made.

Over and over again during my own travels overseas, I was told by foreign academics that what they admired most about the United States was our tradition of civil liberties, our right to speak freely, and our willingness to exchange ideas about domestic and international politics in a free and unfettered manner. I feel that this tradition is now under attack and foreign scholars with whom I have corresponded now view the USIA as little more than a mere propaganda machine. Without question, it is against the long-range interests of American foreign policy to permit USIA policies to become so blatantly partisan.

In my opinion there are related issues involved here. The partisan politics involved in USIA's selection process is simply one aspect of a much larger scenario. It is an important part of a potential Orwellian nightmare which threatens the republican traditions on which our nation was founded. For example, the Reagan Administration's attempts to significantly cut the Fulbright program, to limit the effectiveness of the Freedom of Information Act and the Civil Rights Commission, and to implement National Security Directive 84, demonstrate this pattern.

In sum, my central purpose here today has been to relate as clearly and as forcefully as I can my own personal experiences with USIA officials in Australia in 1981. With the passage of time, it has become increasingly clear that my own experiences are not exceptional and that USIA's partisan political activities constitute but a single strand in a much larger political pattern.

In conclusion, I would simply like to say that I fear for the future of American society, which has so often served as a beacon light for oppressed peoples everywhere. If the reactionary forces currently at work in American society are not checked, we will, in time,



seriously damage the political traditions and Constitutional guarantees which have made the U.S., in relative terms, the most open and free society the world has ever known.

Finally, I want to once again thank the Chairman and the members of this Subcommittee for providing me with the opportunity to address this very important issue.

## WINSTON CHURCHILL'S FIRST "IRON CURTAIN" SPEECH

by

Birdsall S. Viault (Winthrop College)

When did Winston Churchill first use the term "iron curtain" in public? It was not at Fulton, Missouri on March 5, 1946, but instead in a speech to the House of Commons more than six months earlier.

Writing of Churchill's Westminster College speech in his The Cold War as History, Louis J. Halle observed: This speech shocked the public in part because of its direct reference, in such blunt terms, to Russia by name. The one item that appeared to produce the greatest shock of disapproval, however, was the use, here for the first time, of the term 'iron curtain.' In a matter of months, this term would be an accepted part of everyone's vocabulary, for the American mind was now changing fast. . . .

The idea that the former Prime Minister first used the term publicly at Fulton is supported by Bartlett's Familiar Quotations. Bartlett's presents a number of examples of the use of the term "iron curtain" by George Washington, Queen Elizabeth of Belgium, and Joseph Goebbels, among others, and notes that, prior to the Westminster College speech, Churchill had used the term--"not publicly--in a top-secret telegram to President Truman [May 12, 1945]."2



Churchill wrote later of this May 1945 telegram: "Of all the public documents I have written on this issue I would rather be judged by this." He had told the President: "An iron curtain is drawn down upon their front. . . There seems little doubt that the whole of the regions east of the line Luebeck-Trieste-Corfu will soon be completely in their hands."<sup>3</sup>

Neither Churchill nor Bartlett's indicates any public use of the term "iron curtain" by the British leader between this May 12, 1945, telegram and the March 5, 1946, speech.

However, in the intervening period, Churchill did use the term at least once in public. Presenting a final review of the war to the House of Commons on August 16, 1945, following his departure from the prime ministership, Churchill referred to "the iron curtain which at this moment divides us in twain."<sup>4</sup>

The complete paragraph reads:

I am particularly concerned, at this moment, with the reports reaching us of the conditions under which the expulsion and exodus of Germans from the new Poland are being carried out. Between eight and nine million persons dwelt in those regions before the war. The Polish Government say that there are still 1,500,000 of these, not yet expelled, within their new frontiers. Other millions must have taken refuge behind the British and American lines, thus increasing the food stringency in our sector. But enormous numbers are utterly unaccounted for. Where are they gone, and what has been their fate? The same conditions may reproduce themselves in a modified form in the Germans from Czechoslovakia. Sparce and guarded accounts of what has happened and is happening have filtered through, but it is not impossible that tragedy on a prodigious scale is unfolding itself behind the iron curtain which at the moment divides Europe in twain. I should welcome any statement which the Prime Minister



can make which would relieve, or at least inform us upon this very anxious and grievous matter.<sup>5</sup>

In this speech to the House of Commons, Churchill used the term "iron curtain" in relation to the displacement of Germans from Poland and other areas in eastern Europe. This relationship remained in the Fulton speech. In the same paragraph which contained the words "an iron curtain has descended across the Continent," the former Prime Minister noted that "mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a scale grievous and undreamed of are now taking place."<sup>6</sup>

Newsweek reprinted excerpts from Churchill's speech to the House of Commons on August 27, 1945, in an article headed "The Iron Curtain," observing that "the former Prime Minister now felt free to discuss openly one of the most disturbing questions in Europe today: What is happening in Soviet-controlled Eastern Europe."<sup>7</sup> Time included the "iron curtain" statement in its publication of excerpts from the speech but made no particular note of it.<sup>8</sup> In its report of Churchill's speech to the House of Commons, the New York Times described it as "one of the greatest speeches of his long Parliamentary career." The Times quoted the sentence which included the term "iron curtain," but it was not emphasized.<sup>9</sup>

Although Winston Churchill's first "iron curtain" speech received some attention at the time, it has evidently been largely forgotten. Churchill apparently liked the term and found an opportunity to use it again, in a particularly eloquent and memorable fashion, in Fulton, Missouri.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Louis J. Halle, The Cold War as History (New York, 1967), p. 104. Emphasis added.

<sup>2</sup>John Bartlett, Familiar Quotations, ed. by Emily Morison Beck, 15th edition (Boston, 1980), p. 746 fn.



<sup>3</sup>Winston S. Churchill, Triumph and Tragedy (Boston, 1953), p. 573.

<sup>4</sup>Robert Rhodes James, ed., Winston S. Churchill: His Complete Speeches, 1897-1963, VII (New York, 1974), p. 7214.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 7213-7214.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 7290.

<sup>7</sup>"The Iron Curtain," Newsweek, 26 (27 August 1945): 44-45.

<sup>8</sup>"Loyal Opposition," Time, 46 (27 August 1945): 34.

<sup>9</sup>New York Times, 17 August 1945, pp. 1,4.

---

#### SHAFR's New Executive Secretary-Treasurer

---

The new executive secretary-treasurer of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations is a native of Indiana. Born and reared in a small northeastern Indiana town whose chief claim to fame is the house of Gene Stratton Porter and the nearby Limberlost area, he attended the local elementary and secondary school before James B. Conant's The American High School Today influenced Indiana's move toward consolidation in the sputnik era. After graduating from high school he trekked off to Bloomington, in the hills of southern Indiana, where he lived off and on for the next fourteen years. He completed his undergraduate work and Ph.D. at Indiana University. During his Bloomington years he spent two years in the army with service in Korea and three years teaching history and English at Bloomington High School. It was early in his graduate work that he met an undergraduate history major, Nancy Ellen Prichard, in Professor Robert Ferrell's diplomatic history course. Kamman and Prichard were married two years later.



Finishing the doctorate, the Kammans moved to North Texas State University in Denton just north of the Dallas-Fort Worth area. Bill is now chairman of the NTSU history department and Nancy is senior counselor at Denton High School. They are parents of three native Texans -- two who are students at the University of Texas at Austin and one who will be a sophomore in high school.

Kamman's research interest is twentieth-century U.S. diplomacy, particularly U.S.-Latin American relations. Among his publications are A Search for Stability: United States Diplomacy Toward Nicaragua, 1925-1933 and contributions to Alexander DeConde's Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy and Theodore Wilson's and Frank Merli's Makers of American Diplomacy.

---

**MINUTES OF THE JUNE 26, 1985 SHAFR COUNCIL MEETING  
Stanford University**

---

The SHAFR Council met at 7:45 a.m. in the Otero Room of Wilbur Hall on Wednesday, June 26, 1985. President Warren Kuehl presided. Council members present were Vice President Betty Unterberger, Geoffrey Smith, and William Kamman. Also attending were William Brinker, Alexander DeConde, Roger Dingman, Ronald Schaffer, and Thomas Schoonover.

1. Mr. Ronald Schaffer of California State University, Northridge, made a brief presentation to Council on securing libel protection for historians. He expressed concern over the potential problem of litigation for libel which scholars face when they publish. Mr. Schaffer recommended four courses of action.

A. That we request our professional associations to arrange for group coverage which specifically



provides for libel, includes all defense costs, and offers a minimum of \$1,000,000 coverage for each instance. The AHA's insurance administrator has said that his company would be quite willing to pursue this matter with our officers.

B. That our organizations meet with publishers to develop a more equitable Author's Warranty clause and better protection for authors. Representatives of our organizations could request the publishers to pay the insurance premium - something that certain publishers have already begun to do - or at least to attach authors to their own insurance policies at a reasonable cost. We might also arrange to have the publishers' legal specialists as a matter of routine review manuscripts that might be subject to legal action.

C. That we take part as amici curiae in cases involving the law of libel, particularly those respecting public figures.

D. That we hold an informal meeting sometime during this convention to begin (or continue) steps needed to resolve this problem as rapidly as possible, apprise our colleagues of our actions, and confer again at the December AHA convention to assess what has been done.

Council agreed to consider Mr. Schaffer's proposals.

2. Warren Kuehl informed Council that the W. Stull Holt Award Committee had selected Peter Coogan of the University of North Carolina as winner of the W. Stull Holt Award. Formal announcement will be made at the PCB/SHAFR dinner on June 28, 1985.

3. Mr. Kuehl noted the need for specific written guidelines for use by the Graebner Prize Committee. The committee is formulating guidelines for presentation to Council.

4. Warren Kuehl noted that the nominating committee to select SHAFR's nominees to the Department of



State's Advisory Committee on Historical Documentation had not yet reported. Roger Dingman suggested that membership on the State Department committee should be broadened to represent more geographic areas of the nation. Discussion followed on problems of the number and length of meetings and the need to minimize costs.

5. William Kamman reported that Thomas Buckley desired to resign as editor of the Roster and Research List. Mr. Buckley has finished work on the new edition except for several pages to cover the most recent additions. He has had difficulty in finding funding to cover printing and postage costs. Buckley noted that the project had become expensive and time consuming. He questioned whether a two-year schedule was realistic because less than ten percent of the citations are changed every two years. In the following discussion it was suggested that departments might join to share costs of printing and have SHAFR handle mailing or have SHAFR assume all costs. Another possibility was to reduce costs by publishing supplements only. It was suggested that the information be placed on disks and have it disseminated through the Newsletter. Council authorized Mr. Kuehl and Mr. Kamman to handle the problem.

6. Warren Kuehl announced that the 1986 SHAFR summer conference would be held at Georgetown University in Washington. Dates for the conference are June 26-28, 1986. Georgetown was the site for SHAFR's first summer conference.

7. Council passed the following resolution of gratitude for the Program Committee:

"Recognizing both the importance and extent of its work, Council wishes to express fullest appreciation to the program committee consisting of Sandra Taylor, Richard Immerman, Ron Spector, and especially the chairperson, Roger Dingman, for its efforts and the efficiency in which it conducted its work."



8. Mr Kuehl announced the following SHAFR committee assignments for 1985 in accord with committee revisions of April, 1985.

Bernath Book Prize

W. Patrick Strauss (C) '86  
Stephen Pelz '87  
Calvin Davis '88

Bernath Lecture

Russell Buhite (C) '86  
Ronald Nurse '87  
Dorothy V. Jones '88

Bernath Article Prize

Harold Josephson (C) '86  
James Fetzer '87  
Sally Marks '88

Bernath Dissertation  
Award

Geoffrey Smith (C) '86  
Dennis Bozyk '87  
Keith Nelson '88

Graebner Prize

Richard D. Burns (C) '86  
Charles DeBenedetti '88  
Edward Bennett '90

Holt Prize

Lawrence Gelfand '86  
Bernard Burke (C) '87  
Michael Hogan '8

Government Relations

Milton Gustafson (C) '90  
Anna Nelson '89  
Marlene Mayo '88  
Harold Langley '87

Program

Thomas Helde (Co-C)  
Justus Doenecke (Co-C)  
Sheri Wells  
Thoms McCormick  
Howard Jones

Finance

(Rotation every two years)

Marvin Zahniser '89  
Lawrence S. Kaplan '87  
Joseph O'Grady '91

9. In discussing ways for increasing membership, it was suggested that new members receive a reduced price for the Guide. Warren Kuehl is in touch with ABC-Clío to determine what price might be offered.

10. Mr. Kuehl reported that no money was now available for a revised Guide. Contact has been made with the NEH on this matter.

11. Council discussed indexing Diplomatic History. Council authorized Warren Kuehl to examine alternatives and negotiate for SHAFR. Alternatives



included finding a publisher who would consolidate several journals in need of indexing into one project and seeking funding from the NEH.

12. A search committee consisting of Melvyn Leffler, chairman, Michael Hogan, Martin Sherwin, Warren Cohen, George Herring, and Robert Seager is seeking a new editor for Diplomatic History.

13. Warren Kuehl presented Council copies of the minutes of the Government Relations Committee's meeting on June 19, 1985. The committee requested Mr. Kuehl to discuss selection of a new Archivist of the United States. There followed a wide-ranging discussion of what position SHAFR should take. Should SHAFR oppose specific persons or generally oppose individuals (unnamed) who do not meet the standards? Other questions raised were: Is opposition essentially political? What have been the standards for the Archivist? Is there now an opportunity to set standards because the Archives has recently become independent? Should the organization oppose specific persons or leave that to individual members of the organization? Mr. Kuehl will consider the information presented and submit a letter on the issue.

Another part of the Government Relations Committee report dealt with declassification and release of State Department records. Council instructed Mr. Kuehl to support the 25-year rule and to work for legislation mandating the 25-year rule as a maximum. The 1986 SHAFR summer meeting at Georgetown University will hopefully have a plenary session on the subject of declassification and release of State Department records.

14. William Kamman reported that the SHAFR move from Ohio State University to North Texas was practically complete. He noted that Marvin Zahniser and his staff had planned the move carefully in advance, and it was through their efforts that the switch was completed so efficiently.

William Kamman



---

## ABSTRACTS

---

Frederick W. Marks III, "Facade and Failure: The Hull-Nomura Talks of 1941," Presidential Studies Quarterly, XV (Winter 1985); also published in R. Gordon Hoxie, ed., The Presidency and National Security Policy (Center for the Study of the Presidency Proceedings: Volume V, Number 1, 1984). For many years, scholarly treatment of the Hull-Nomura talks has traced their breakdown to one of three causes: either the allegedly amateurish performance of two Maryknoll missionaries; the supposed inadequacy of Admiral Nomura as an ambassador; or apparent intransigence on the part of Tokyo. In point of fact, the talks prove to have been a grand facade for Roosevelt's unwillingness to consider any form of meaningful compromise. FDR's methods, at their best, frustrated the normal process of communication. At their worst, they violated common canons of courtesy, not to mention fair dealing. So devious was he on occasion, and so successful in concealing the true nature of the Hull-Nomura exchange, that individuals on each side of the bargaining table have ever since been saddled with a burden of blame which is in no way theirs.

-----"The Origin of FDR's Promise to Support Britain Militarily in the Far East--A New Look," Pacific Historical Review, LIII (November 1984). This article endeavors to show that Roosevelt's guarantee to Britain came not in late 1941, as generally assumed, but during the fall of 1940, just prior to Churchill's reopening of the Burma Road. The guarantee is viewed as one of a series of similar, though less binding, promises made to European statesmen on and off for several years.

Justus D. Doenecke (New College, University of South Florida), "The Literature of Isolationism, 1972-1983: A Bibliographical Guide," Journal of Libertarian Studies, VII (Spring 1983), 157-184. This article,



based upon a paper originally written for a seminar sponsored by the World Without War Council, updates the author's The Literature of Isolationism: A Guide to Non-Interventionist Scholarship, 1930-1972 (1972). It describes the great outpouring of research on anti-interventionism since 1972, covering several hundred books, articles, and doctoral theses. Research on pacifism is included.

Robert Frazier (University of Nottingham), "Did Britain Start the Cold War? Bevin and the Truman Doctrine," Historical Journal, XXVII-3 (September 1984), 715-727. This article is an examination of British motives for the sudden announcement of the withdrawal of financial aid from Greece in February 1947, the proximate cause of the Truman Doctrine. After consideration of Francis Williams' view that Bevin was engaged in a plot to force the United States back into the international arena, of the specific financial problems facing Britain in early 1947, and of possible left-wing pressure on Bevin to end support to a reactionary government, it is concluded that the withdrawal was the result of a lengthy process of policy determination not directly influenced by any of these factors. Rather, the problem of what to do about Greece was a matter of relatively low priority; the effect of the decision on American policy was unanticipated by either Bevin or Dalton.

-----,"The Bevin-Marshall Dispute of August-November 1947 concerning the withdrawal of British Troops from Greece." A paper read at the Conference on the Greek Civil War 1945-1949, University of Copenhagen, 30 August 1984. On 30 July 1947, the United States government was shocked to learn that Britain intended to withdraw its combat troops from Greece immediately. Marshall's response was a strong protest which led to an acrimonious interchange with Bevin, characterised by unreasonable attitudes on both sides until Bevin gave way. Bevin's stubborn insistence on withdrawal cannot be understood in terms of the convertibility crisis or fear of left-wing critics; it seems explicable only as an attempt to use the issue as a



lever to gain financial aid for Britain from the United States. Marshall's arguments for retention of the troops display a lack of confidence in British intentions and poor understanding of the factors involved in the Greek civil war. Above all, the incident suggests that Bevin had little regard for the problems of Greece.

Melvin Small (Wayne State University), "The Impact of the Antiwar Movement on Lyndon Johnson, 1965-1968: A Preliminary Report," Peace and Change, X (Spring 1984), 1-22. Based on interviews and material in the LBJ Library, this is a survey of how the Johnson administration reacted to antiwar protestors and dissenters in the academic and intellectual world. Mass protests took a psychological and physiological toll on the Johnson policy makers. The defection of the democratic left, especially in the journals and among the opinion makers, was even more troublesome. The largest demonstration of the era, the March on the Pentagon in October of 1967, shattered the nerves of many in the inner circle. Although it is difficult to establish a direct link between opinion after Tet and the earlier activities of the antiwar movement, the article suggests one.

----, "Public Opinion on Foreign Policy: The View from the Johnson and Nixon White Houses," Politica (Arhus, Denmark), XVI, 2 (1984), 184-200. This article attempts to determine how opinion on foreign policy came to the oval offices during the Vietnam War. The ways in which opinions in the media, polls, mails, Congress, and among friends and family were interpreted by Nixon and Johnson are analyzed. At bottom, both presidents used highly intuitive means to evaluate opinion, often responding to perceived opinion in fashions that do violence to the neat social-scientific models of the opinion flow in a democratic policy.

Joseph M. Siracusa (University of Queensland, Australia), "Nuclear Diplomacy, the Arms Race and Arms



Control," Australian Journal of Politics and History, 29 (1983), 308-17. This essay suggests that despite the growth and apparent influence of the anti-nuclear movement in the United States, little is publicly known of the historical obstacles that lay across the path of the resolution of nuclear arms control. The evidence indicates that the key to the problem lies in the nature of the rivalry that has animated Soviet-American relations since the waning days of World War II.

-----, "Australian-American Relations, 1983: Constraints and Opportunities." Dyason House Papers: Australian Institute of International Affairs, Melbourne, 10 (1983), 3-9. Basically an historical survey of what has come to be known as a "special relationship," this paper examines the perceptions Australians and Americans have had of each other in the twentieth century and the extent to which they have shaped national security considerations. At present, the analysis concludes, Australian and American foreign policies tend both to complement and parallel each other, each adding in its own way to a more positive and constructive post-Vietnam foreign policy outlook.

-----, "The Historical Influence of the United States on Australian Strategic Thinking," Australian Outlook, 38 (December 1984), 153-58. Originally delivered at the Conference, "American Influences on Australian Defense," held at the Australian Studies Center, Pennsylvania State University, in June 1984, this paper traces the impact of the United States on Australian threat assessment since the Second World War.

-----, "The Domino Theory Revisited: Reagan and Central America," World Review, 23 (August 1984), 71-82. Originally delivered at the Queensland branch of the Australian Institute of International Affairs on 22 August 1984, this essay compares and contrasts the Reagan Administrations' policies in Central America with earlier policies in Vietnam. The conclusion is that the Administration will have a difficult time



proving El Salvador is a 'textbook case' of indirect armed aggression directed by international communism.

-----, "In Search of the Australian Character," World Review, 23 (October 1984), 21-30. A documentary note preceded by an introduction, this is a transparently honest and less than rapturous analysis of the Australian psyche in the 1960s, at least as exhibited in Melbourne, by a former United States Consul General, F. Hopkins.

Hopkins, a scion of the Hopkins' dynasty of Baltimore and a very traditional United States Foreign Service officer, set out to discern and analyze what he regarded as the basic elements of the Australian character and national psychology, based on the patterns of life which had grown up in Australia over the years, as well as the expression of these elements in political and foreign policy attitudes.

Jonathan Goldstein (West Georgia College), "An Interdisciplinary Experiment in Teaching the American-Indochina War." This abstracts a paper read at the annual meeting of the Southeast Conference, Association for Asian Studies, Durham, No. Carolina, January 19, 1985. In 1984 West Georgia College offered a pilot course on the American-Indochina War taught by professors of political science, sociology, and East Asian, American, and French history. While a consensus had to be reached among the instructors on the selection of an overall text, and Stanley Karnow's Vietnam: A History was chosen as the lowest common denominator, each professor had the leeway to include lectures, movies, handouts, and exam questions reflective of his personal political or disciplinary viewpoint.

Student and faculty-peer evaluations suggest that the course succeeded in giving each student an appreciation for the complexity of America's longest war, a cataclysmic event whose aftershocks may reverberate in American society into the twenty-first century. The interaction among the faculty brought on



by an interdisciplinary approach was a source of personal pleasure and learning for the teaching team. But were arguments resolved, or were students simply faced with different partisans re-arguing old issues with no resolution? Faculty agreed on a single issue as being objectively true; the undeniability of human suffering and material loss caused at least partially by United States involvement in Indochina.

A lack of substantial mechanisms to test student learning may have derived from this larger failure to agree on scholarly objectives. Each instructor created and corrected exam questions pertaining only to his specific presentations and assignments. There was no consensus among instructors on either the choice of questions or how they should be graded.

Nor was provision made for students to write research papers or even to summarize at home the visual materials experienced in class. Such summaries would have helped clarify values after controversial movies. But which instructor would have approved project topics and graded both projects and summaries?

If the course is offered again, mechanisms should be improved for testing student learning and for student value clarification.

Ralph B. Levering (Earlham College), "The News Management Issue and John F. Kennedy's Foreign Policy:" a paper presented at the JFK Conference at Hofstra University on March 30, 1985. Based largely on letters, memoranda, and oral history interviews from the Kennedy Library, the paper focuses on techniques Kennedy and his staff used to combat Republican criticisms of his foreign policies, especially those relating to Berlin in 1961 and Cuba in 1962 and 1963. It details Kennedy's use of columnists to help him prepare his University of North Carolina address in fall 1961, and his use of favored reporters to get the administration's version of the Cuban missile crisis into the New York Times and into mass-circulation magazines like Look and Saturday Evening Post. It



also discusses Defense Department efforts in early 1963 to blunt Republican claims that the Soviets were hiding missiles in caves in Cuba rather than removing them from the island as promised. It concludes that, while Kennedy was the first president to make effective use of television, the public relations and news management efforts of more recent presidents have been much larger and more sophisticated.

David Reynolds (Cambridge), "GI and Tommy in Wartime Britain: The Army 'Inter-Attachment' Scheme of 1943-44." Journal of Strategic Studies, 7:4 (December 1984), 406-22. In 1943 relations were strained between the GIs based in Britain and British troops. following precedents from North Africa, the two army commands mounted a program of "inter-attachment," placing groups of a dozen GIs in comparable British units and vice versa. The program proved a great success in fostering good relations, and the reports about it provide insights into the contrasting methods of the two armies. Compared with similar exchanges in World War I, 1939-40, NATO, and the Korean War, this one was unusual in that it involved mostly enlisted men and was intended to promote Anglo-American amity rather than specific technical training.

-----,"Churchill and the British 'Decision' to Fight On in 1940: Right Policy, Wrong Reasons," in Richard Langhorne, ed., Diplomacy and Intelligence in the Second World War: Essays in Honour of F.H. Hinsley (Cambridge University Press, 1985, 147-167. Contrary to popular mythology it was not a foregone conclusion that Britain fought on after Dunkirk. Senior politicians favoured sounding out Hitler's terms, and Churchill himself was less resolute in private than his "victory at all costs" rhetoric suggested. But publicly he and his colleagues kept hope alive by insisting that if Britain could get through 1940 all would be well. Their confidence was founded on two fundamental assumptions: that the German economy was on the verge of collapse and that the USA was about to enter the war. Both assumptions proved erroneous. The best argument - of which British intelligence was



ignorant until well into 1941 - was that Hitler would turn east against Russia. Had he not done so, the course of the war might have been very different.

-----,"The Origins of the Cold War: The European Dimension, 1944-1951," The Historical Journal, 28:2 (June 1985), 497-515. Review article including books by Alexander, Anderson, Bullock, Grosser, Hammond, Ireland and Taubman. This emphasises the role of European factors in determining the shape of U.S. Cold War policy, especially the continuing "German problem," the strengths and weaknesses of Britain, and the aspirations of France. Recent work suggests, similarly, that indigenous influences affected Soviet policy in parts of Eastern Europe, albeit to a lesser extent. On both sides of the "Iron Curtain" the Europeans were not completely passive victims of superpower politics. There was more to the early Cold War than what Sen. Fulbright called "two big dogs chewing on a bone."

Lester H. Brune (Bradley), "The First Day of the Cuban Missile Crisis, October 16, 1962," a paper presented at the JFK Conference at Hofstra, March 1985. This paper analyzed the Transcripts of the two recorded meetings of Kennedy's advisors on the day after U-2 photographs disclosed Soviet missile bases under construction in Cuba. The transcripts were released by the Kennedy Library in October 1983. While scholars may find a variety of interesting details in the transcripts, three insights which are of special interest are the evaluation of the informal discussions used by Kennedy's advisors; the group's evaluation of Soviet motives as being either for strategic nuclear advantages or diplomatic trade-offs in Berlin or Turkey; and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara's role in suggesting a naval blockade as the response preferable to an unannounced massive air attack against Cuba.



Included below is an abstract of a foreign relations/diplomatic dissertation. In the future the Newsletter will include such abstracts on a space available basis.

Thomas Schwartz, "From Occupation to Alliance: John J. McCloy and the Allied High Commission in the Federal Republic of Germany, 1949 - 1952." (This work was completed at Harvard under the supervision of Ernest May.)

The rapid transformation of American policy towards Germany remains one of the most important and controversial developments in postwar international relations. Much of the previous work on this subject focused exclusively on the Cold War, and interpreted developments in American-German relations through this prism of East-West tensions. With the use of recently released documents from four countries - the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Federal Republic of Germany - and extensive interviewing with government, business, and political leaders from this period, this thesis examines the importance of the German question within the postwar history of the Western alliance. Using the vantage point of the American High Commissioner, John J. McCloy, the dissertation explores the inter-Allied and intra-governmental decisions through which the United States sought to "integrate" Western Germany into a larger Atlantic and European framework. Both officially and unofficially, McCloy played a critical role in promoting two of the earliest proposals for European integration, the successful European Coal and Steel Community and the ill-fated European Defense Community. Through such organizational structures, American leaders like McCloy sought not only to contain Soviet expansionism. They also hoped to provide the basis for long-term political stability and economic growth in Western Europe, and guarantee the security of the region against any future disruption by a nationalist and autarchic Germany. At the same time McCloy's strategy rested on the premise that the American commitment to Europe was temporary in nature, and that it was vital that greater European



unity be achieved before the withdrawal of American forces. Finally the thesis concludes that the "special relationship" established between Washington and Bonn, more similar in this period to a federal-state relationship than a traditional alliance, played a critical role in restoring the legitimacy of German democracy, encouraging rapid economic expansion, and providing for the Federal Republic's military security.

---

### CALENDAR

---

- November 1                      Deadline, materials for the December Newsletter.
- November 1-15                  Annual election for SHAFR officers.
- November 13-16                The 51st annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association will be held in Houston. The Shamrock Hilton will be the headquarters hotel.
- December 1                      Deadline, nominations for the Bernath Disseration Support Awards.
- December 27-30                The 100th annual meeting of the AHA will be held in New York. The headquarters hotel is to be the Mariott Marquis on Times Square. (The deadline for proposals has passed.)
- January 1                        Membership fees in all categories are due, payable at the national office of SHAFR.
- January 20                        Deadlines for the 1985 Bernath article award and the Bernath book award.



- February 1            Deadline, materials for the March Newsletter.
- March 1                Nominations for the Bernath lecture prize are due.
- April 1                Applications for the W. Stull Holt Dissertation Fellowship are due.
- April 9 - 12            The 79th annual meeting of the OAH will be held in New York with headquarters at the New York Penta Hotel.
- May 1                  Deadline, materials for the June Newsletter.
- June 25-28             The 12th annual conference of SHAFR will be held at Georgetown University. Program co-chairs are Thomas Helde (Georgetown) and Justus Doenecke (New College, University of South Florida). See page 1 for more information.
- August 1               Deadline, materials for the September Newsletter.

(The 1986 AHA will meet in Chicago at the Hyatt Regency, Margaret C. Jacob, Graduate Center, City University of New York, is the program chair for the meeting.)

(The 1987 OAH will meet in Philadelphia, April 2-5. The program co-chairs are:

Drew Gilpin Faust, American Civilization, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104  
and

Ronald Walters, Department of History, the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, 21218.

The deadline for submissions in March 15, 1986.)



---

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

---

### SHAFR ROSTER NEWS UPDATE NEEDED

The SHAFR Roster will be issued soon. Because some projects may have been completed and new ones started, please send immediately your name and any studies completed in the past two years. Also, send any new ones started in the same period. These should go to Susan Shah, History Department, The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325.

We want the Roster to be as current and accurate as possible, so please respond.

### AUTHORS SOUGHT

The Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Georgetown University is seeking scholars and practitioners of international affairs and diplomacy to cooperate in a program of publication. The Institute would be able to assist with expenses and pay a modest honorarium for work performed. The Institute's monographs are normally manuscripts of approximately 200 double-spaced pages. Under an arrangement being pioneered this year, the Institute is prepared to work with Ph.D. candidates who may find in a subject of Institute interest the basis for a thesis.

The following are some of the subjects for which writers are currently being sought.

- Conduct of Public Diplomacy
- The Law of the Sea Negotiations
- The Protecting Power
- Agriculture and Diplomacy
- Diplomacy in Africa
- Diplomacy in Latin America
- Health and Diplomacy
- The Cords Project



Economic Tools and Diplomatic Objectives  
Intelligence and Diplomacy  
Changing Patterns of International Protocol

Those scholars and writers who may be interested in pursuing these opportunities should address a brief summary of the subject they may wish to undertake to the Honorable David D. Newsom, Director, Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20057.

**CONFERENCE ON LBJ AT HOFSTRA**

On April 10 - 12, 1986 Hofstra University, Hempsted, New York, will host the Fifth Annual Presidential Conference. The 1986 meeting is to be "An Interdisciplinary Conference: A Retrospective on Lyndon Baines Johnson, 36th President of the United States." For information contact:

Natalie Datlof & Alexej Ugrinsky  
Conference Coordinators  
Hofstra University Cultural Center (HUCC)  
Hofstra University  
Hempstead, NY 11550  
(516) 560-5669, 5670

Deadline for completed papers, November 1, 1985.

**BERKSHIRE CONFERENCE FOR WOMEN HISTORIANS**

The 7th Berkshire Conference on the History of Women will be held on June 19-21, 1987, at Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA. The theme for this conference will be "Beyond the Public/Private Dichotomy: Reassessing Women's Place in History. The Program committee suggests submission of proposals for complete sessions involving two papers, one commentator and one moderator. For information on non-U.S. topics contact Dorothy Helly, Women's Studies Program, Hunter College, 695 Park Ave., New York, N.Y., 10021 and for U.S. topics contact Susan Reverby, Women's Studies Program, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA., 02181.



## SENATOR JACOB JAVITS COLLECTION INAUGURAL CONFERENCE

A conference to commemorate the opening of the Senator Jacob Javits Collection of the Senator's private papers will be held October 24-26, 1985, at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. The theme of the conference is "Congress and United States Foreign Policy: The Javits Years, 1946-1980." Papers will be offered on topics including congressional-executive relations in the conduct of foreign policy, Congress' role in constraining the use of force and in arms limitation, and the War Powers Resolution. Past and present members of the United States Senate will present comments and addresses.

For information please contact:

Ann P. Forkin, Director of Conferences and Special Events, 328 Administration, SUNY-Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY 11794-0604.

### BERLIN SEMINAR

The 1986 Berlin Seminar for college faculty teaching foreign policy, international studies, and European history will be held from June 11 to 25. The schedule is:

June 11-16 - East Berlin and Potsdam

June 16-22 - West Berlin, Europäische Akademie

June 22-25 - Bonn and Cologne

Seminar sessions are with university faculty, political leaders, and foreign office experts of the DDR and GDR. The participant's principal expense is travel to and from Berlin. Faculty interested in the seminar for 1986 or for future years should write to:

Lester H. Brune  
Department of History  
Bradley University  
Peoria, Illinois 61625



## SOUTHEASTERN CONFERENCE, ASSOCIATION FOR ASIAN STUDIES

To be held January 17-18, 1986, at North Carolina State University, Raleigh, the conference will include sessions dealing with Japan, China, and Southeast Asia which might be of interest to SHAFR members. The presidential address will be given by Frank H. Golay. His topic, "A Legacy of American Imperialism." For information please contact:

Jonathan Goldstein  
History Department  
West Georgia College  
Carrollton, GA 30118

### VIETNAM PROJECT

The Project on the Vietnam Generation is a private, nonprofit organization housed in the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of American History in Washington, D.C. It was established in January, 1985 to foster scholarship on how the events of the 1960s and early 70s -- among them the Vietnam war, civil rights, Peace Corps, women's movement, the beginning of the environmental movement, assassinations of national leaders, and Watergate -- affect the actions and attitudes of the generation of 60 million men and women who came of age during those tumultuous years.

The project wishes to help scholars who are interested in this subject area, by making their work and needs known.

The organization is conducting a comprehensive survey of courses that include units on or focus on Vietnam era events that are currently being offered or are scheduled to part be of the curriculum of a college, university or high school during the 1985-86 academic year.

If you have been or are currently involved in a course (or contemplating teaching one) on any of the events mentioned above or on the "1960s", please contact:



Ms. Sandie Fauriol, Executive Director  
The Project on the Vietnam Generation  
Room A 1040  
National Museum of American History  
Smithsonian Institution  
Washington, D.C. 20560  
(202) 357-4258

### **SPECIAL ADVANCED RESEARCH GRANT**

The US Army Military History Institute announces a special \$750.00 Advanced Research Grant in support of specific bibliographic and publication projects at the Institute. Each year USAMHI plans to announce the subject for a special bibliography. This award will be considered separately from the established Advanced Research Grant program which MHI also administers. The subject for the 1986 special bibliography is to prepare, for publication, a bibliography of USAMHI's holdings on the U.S. Army's divisions during World War II.

MHI seeks a candidate skilled in the humanities, preferably with training in military history, with research credentials, and the ability to prepare a bibliography for publication. Materials to be incorporated into the bibliography include manuscript, print, photographic, film, and combat art. For applications and further information, candidates interested in this grant are encouraged to write:

Assistant Director for Historical Services  
U.S. Army Military History Institute  
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013-5008

The deadline for the submission of applications is 1 June 1986, and results will be announced by 1 July 1986.



---

## PUBLICATIONS

---

Lester H. Brune (Bradley University), Chronological History of United States Foreign Relations: 1776 to January 20, 1981, 2 Volumes. Garland Publishing. 1985. Cloth ISBN 0-8240-9056-X, \$150.

Norman A. Graebner (University of Virginia), Foundations of American Foreign Policy: A Realist Appraisal from Franklin to McKinley. Scholarly Resources. 1985. Cloth ISBN 0-8420-2244-9, \$30.00. Paper ISBN 0-8420-2245-3, \$11.95.

Edward M. Bennett (Washington State University), Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Search for Security: American-Soviet Relations, 1933-1939. Scholarly Resources. 1985. Cloth ISBN 0-8420-2246-5, \$30.00. Paper ISBN 0-8420-2247-3, \$9.95.

Roger R. Trask (Historical Office, Office of the Secretary of Defense), The Secretaries of Defense: A Brief History, 1947-1985. Washington: Historical Office of the Secretary of Defense. 1985. Paperback.

Thomas J. Noer (Carthage College), Cold War and Black Liberation: The United States and White Rule in Africa, 1948-1968. University of Missouri Press. 1985. ISBN 0-8262-0458-9, \$26.00.

Helene Christol and Serge Ricard (Universite de Provence), Hyphenated Diplomacy: European Immigration and U.S. Foreign Policy, 1914-1984. GRENA (Group de Recherche et d'Etudes Nord-Americaines). 1985.

Michael H. Hunt (University of North Carolina), The Making of a Special Relationship: The United States and China to 1914. Columbia University Press. Now in paperback. ISBN 0-231-05517-1, \$12.50.

Melvin Small (Wayne State University) with J. David Singer, co-editors, International War: An Anthology. Homewood, Dorsey. 1985. \$12.95.



---

## PERSONALS

---

Thomas G. Paterson (University of Connecticut) has been appointed to the Editorial Board of the OAH.

Donald A. Ritchie (Historical Office-U.S. Senate) has been elected to a term on the Nominating Board of the OAH.

Warren F. Kimball (Rutgers) has received the prize for the most outstanding book in the social and behavioral sciences in the Ninth Annual Professional and Scholarly Book Awards sponsored by the Association of American Publishers. Kimball's prize is for Churchill and Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence. Congratulations!!!.

Robert M. Hathaway (History Staff, CIA) was recently selected as a Congressional Fellow for 1985-86. (The Congressional Fellowship Program, sponsored by the American Political Science Association, sends federal agency executives to Capitol Hill for a year to work as professional staff assistants to U.S. senators and representatives.)

Hathaway was also named a Foreign Affairs Fellow and will participate in a special two-month seminar at Johns Hopkins' School of Advanced International Studies prior to assuming his new duties on Capitol Hill.

J.B. Donnelly (Washington and Jefferson College) has been appointed Professor of History on the Linn Foundation and chairman of the department.

Andrew J. Rotter (Saint Mary's College, Moraga, CA) spent the 1984-85 academic year in India researching U.S.-India relations for the period 1947-1964.

Stephen A. Schuker (Brandeis) and Akira Iriye (Chicago) have been awarded research assistance by the American Council of Learned Societies for projects on "the Rhineland and the security of the West" and "a



comparative study of the changing ideas of war and peace in the 1930s" respectively.

Ronald Schlundt, listed in the March Newsletter as having been a Fulbright scholar in Japan is a faculty member at the University of Maryland--European Division.

---

### THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL PRIZES

---

The Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Lectureship, the Memorial Book Competition, and the Memorial Lecture Prize, were established in 1976, 1972, and 1976 respectively, through the generosity of Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, Laguna Hills, California, in honor of their late son, and are administered by special committees of SHAFR.

#### **The Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Book Competition**

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

Eligibility: The prize competition is open to any book on any aspect of American foreign relations, published during 1985. 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 the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. Five (5) copies of each book must be submitted with the nomination. The book should be sent directly to: W. Pat Straus, Department of History, Oakland University, Rochester, MI 48063.

Books may be sent at any time during 1985, but should not arrive later than January 20, 1986.



The award of \$1500.00 will be announced at the annual luncheon of the Society of Historians of American Foreign Relations held in conjunction with the Organization of American Historians, in April, 1986, in New York City.

**Previous Winners:**

- 1972 Joan Hoff Wilson (Sacramento)  
Kenneth E. Shewmaker (Dartmouth)
- 1973 John L. Gaddis (Ohio U)
- 1974 Michael H. Hunt (Yale)
- 1975 Frank D. McCann, Jr. (New Hampshire)  
Stephen E. Pelz (Massachusetts-Amherst)
- 1976 Martin J. Sherwin (Princeton)
- 1977 Roger V. Dingman (Southern California)
- 1978 James R. Leutze (North Carolina)
- 1979 Phillip J. Baram (Program Manager, Boston)
- 1980 Michael Schaller (Arizona)
- 1981 Bruce R. Kuniholm (Duke)  
Hugh DeSantis (Department of State)
- 1982 David Reynolds (Cambridge)
- 1983 Richard Immerman (Hawaii)
- 1984 David Wyman (Massachusetts-Amherst)

**The Stuart L. Bernath Lecture Prize**

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

Procedures: The Bernath Lecture Committee is soliciting nominations for the lecture from members of the Society. Nominations, in the form of a short letter and curriculum vita, if available, should reach the Committee no later than March 1, 1986. The



chairman of the committee to whom nominations should be sent is: Russell Buhite, Department of History, University of Oklahoma, Normal, Oklahoma 73069.

The award is \$500.00, with publication in Diplomatic History.

#### Previous Winners

- 1977 Joan Hoff Wilson (Fellow, Radcliffe Institute)
- 1978 David S. Patterson (Colgate)
- 1979 Marilyn B. Young (Michigan)
- 1980 John L. Gaddis (Ohio U)
- 1981 Burton Spivak (Bates College)
- 1982 Charles DeBenedetti (Toledo)
- 1983 Melvyn P. Leffler (Vanderbilt)
- 1984 Michael J. Hogan (Miami)
- 1985 Michael Schaller (Arizona)

#### **The Stuart L. Bernath Scholarly Article Prize**

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

Eligibility: Prize competition is open to any article on any topic in American foreign relations that is published during 1985. The author must be under 35 years of age, or within 5 years after receiving the Ph.D., at the time of publication. Previous winners of the Stuart L. Bernath Book Award are excluded.

Procedures: Nominations shall be submitted by the author or by any member of SHAFR by January 20, 1986. It will be helpful if the person making the nomination can supply at least one copy and if possible five (5) copies. The chairperson of the committee is: Harold Josephson, Department of History, University of North Carolina-Charlotte, Charlotte, No. Carolina 28223.



The award of \$300.00 will be presented at the SHAFR luncheon at the annual meeting of the OAH in April, 1986, in New York City.

### **The Stuart L. Bernath Dissertation Fund**

This fund has been established through the generosity of Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath in honor of their late son to help doctoral students defray some of the expenses encountered in the concluding phases of writing their dissertations.

Requirements include:

1. The dissertation must cover some aspect of American foreign relations.
2. An award will help defray:
  - (a) last-minute costs to consult a collection of original materials that has just become available or to obtain photocopies from such sources
  - (b) typing and/or reproducing copies of the manuscript
  - (c) abstracting costs.
3. The award committee presumes that most research and writing of the dissertation has been completed. Awards are not intended for general research or for time to write.
4. Applicants must be members of SHAFR.
5. A report on how the funds were used must be filed by the successful applicant(s) not later than six (6) months following presentation of each award.
6. The applicant's supervisor must include a brief statement certifying the accuracy of the applicant's request and report of completion.
7. Generally an award will not exceed \$500.00, and a minimum of three awards each year will be made. More awards are possible if the amounts requested are less.

Nominations, with supporting documentation should be sent to Geoffrey S. Smith, Bernath Dissertation Fund Chair, Department of History, Queen's University,



Kingston, Ontario, Canada, K7L 3N6. The deadline for applications is December 1, 1985.

1985 award winner - Jon Nielson (UC-Santa Barbara).

---

**THE SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS INVITES APPLICATIONS FOR THE W. STULL HOLT DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP TO BE AWARDED IN JUNE, 1986.**

---

The award will be \$1500.00.

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

To be qualified, applicants must be candidates in good standing at a doctoral granting graduate school who will have satisfactorily completed all requirements for the doctoral degree (including the general or comprehensive examinations) except for the dissertation before April, 1986.

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

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

Deadline for filing applications and supporting letters for this year's award will be April 1, 1986.



Applications should be addressed to the Chairperson of this year's W. Stull Holt Fellowship Committee: Lawrence E. Gelfand, Department of History, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242.

1985 winner Peter Coogan (North Carolina)



## THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

SPONSOR: Tennessee Technological University,  
Cookeville, Tennessee.

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

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT: Greg Gormley, Tennessee Tech.

ISSUES: The Newsletter is published on the 1st of  
March, June, September and December.

DEADLINES: All material must be in the hands of the  
editor no later than four weeks prior to  
publication date.

ADDRESS CHANGES: Changes of address should be sent to  
the Executive Secretary-Treasurer: William  
Kamman, North Texas State University, Denton,  
Texas 76203.

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

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

### FORMER PRESIDENTS OF SHAFR

- 1968 Thomas A. Bailey (Stanford)
- 1969 Alexander DeConde (California-Santa Barbara)
- 1970 Richard W. Leopold (Northwestern)
- 1971 Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana)
- 1972 Norman A. Graebner (Virginia)
- 1973 Wayne S. Cole (Maryland)
- 1974 Bradford Perkins (Michigan)
- 1975 Armin H. Rappaport (California-San Diego)
- 1976 Robert A. Divine (Texas)
- 1977 Raymond A. Esthus (Tulane)
- 1978 Akira Iriye (Chicago)
- 1979 Paul A. Varg (Michigan State)
- 1980 David M. Pletcher (Indiana)
- 1981 Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State)
- 1982 Lawrence E. Gelfand (Iowa)
- 1983 Ernest R. May (Harvard)
- 1984 Warren I. Cohen (Michigan State)



Box 5154  
TENNESSEE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY  
Cookeville, Tennessee 38505

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