

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

NEWSLETTER

Volume 19

No. 3

September 1988

Page

- 1 Conference of SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Fellows in International Peace and Security by Dorothy V. Jones
- 5 Annotated Bibliography of German Language Dissertations and "Habilitationsschriften" (accepted from 1981-1987) on US Foreign Relations by Thomas Schoonover
- 20 American Constitution and American Presidential Power in Foreign Affairs: A Tentative Commentary by Yang Sheng-mao
- 29 Minutes of SHAFR Council Meeting
- 36 Announcements
- 45 Publications
- 48 Calendar
- 49 Awards and Prizes
- 58 A.E.A.R. Newsletter

ISSN 0740-6169

SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

FOUNDED IN 1967. CHARTERED IN 1972.

PRESIDENT: Lloyd Gardner, History, Rutgers, New Brunswick, NJ 08903.

VICE PRESIDENT: George Herring, History, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER: William Kamman, History, North Texas State University, Denton, TX 76203.

CHAIR, PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Robert McMahon, History, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611.

CHAIR, MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE: Ralph E. Weber, History, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI 53233.

CHAIR, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Roger Dingman, History, University of So. California, Los Angeles 90089.

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

MEMBERSHIP: Annual dues are \$20.00, payable at the office of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer. Student fees - \$7.00, retired members - \$9.00, life memberships - \$250.00. In the case of membership by husband and wife, 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 annual meeting of the Society is held in the summer. The Society also meets with the American Historical Association in December, and with the Organization of American Historians in March or April.

PRIZES: The Society administers several awards. Four of them honor the late Stuart L. Bernath, and are financed through the generosity of his parents, Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath of Laguna Hills, California. Awards also honor Laura and Norman Graebner, the late W. Stull Holt, and Warren Kuehl. Details of each of these awards are to be found under the appropriate headings in each Newsletter.

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

**Conference of SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Fellows
in International Peace and Security**

by

Dorothy V. Jones
(Newberry Library)

New approaches in international peace and security studies were the focus of attention when scholars from sixteen countries and seventeen different disciplines gathered in Cuautla, Mexico, for a conference January 9 through 13. Why should historians of American foreign relations care about a subject that has traditionally been the preserve of political scientists and international relations specialists? Because the field is changing rapidly under the impact of work being done by scholars from different disciplines, including history. And change is exactly the purpose of the international security program being funded by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and administered by the Social Science Research Council. The meeting in Mexico was the second conference of SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Fellows in International Peace and Security, and it included seven fellows whose training and background is in history.

Three of the fellows, Richard Immerman, William O. Walker, and the author of this report, are members of SHAFR, and their work reflects some of the changes taking place in international security studies. Walker plans to examine the place of narcotics control in U.S. security policy, basing his study on a comparison of policies toward Latin America and Southeast Asia. Immerman's focus is on the "new look" in national security under the Eisenhower administration, with particular attention to issues of perception and possible cognitive bias on the part of individuals who participated in the formation of that policy. Jones's work on the problem of ethical issues in international security has led to the discovery of a broadly based code of international ethics which the United States, in an off-again-on-again manner, has helped to create.

The conference was organized according to the kind of presentation being given. Sunday, January 10, the first full day, was devoted to an examination of security issues from the perspective of a Third World country. This was a day of panel discussions in which most of the presentations were made by Mexican scholars. On the following days of the conference, presentations took two different forms. Those fellows who are in the second year of their two-year fellowships gave seminars at which they presented some of the results of their work. More-recently-appointed fellows participated in workshops where they gave a short presentation of their plans for training and research.

A unique feature of the SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Fellowship program is financial support for one year of training in an area outside the fellow's field of concentration. This is followed by one year of support for research and writing on a project in international peace and security studies that utilizes the fellow's newly acquired skills and knowledge as well as those from former training. Fellowships are given at both the pre- and post-doctoral levels.

A look at some of the training and work reported at the conference will serve to illustrate how the program is broadening scholarly approaches to study of the problems of international peace and security. Timothy Brac, a Canadian biologist, studied arms control issues and the technical aspects of biological weapons during his training year in preparation for a detailed study of the ways that changes in biotechnology might affect the attitude of nation-states toward the use of chemical and biological weapons. U.S. attitudes, U.S. leadership in technology, and U.S. willingness to publish scientific reports in the open literature all play a key role here. Donna Gregory, a specialist in English literature, focused during her training year on the evolution of strategic doctrine in the postwar period and is now engaged in a full length analysis of the language of such strategic theorists as Bernard Brodie -- a study with startling implications about the

perceptions and world view of the small community of strategists who have affected U.S. foreign policy.

More familiar to many SHAFR members is the approach of some of the historians who reported on their projects and their preparation for this work. Tami Davis, a Ph.D. candidate in history at Yale, received special training in public policy and organizational theory. She is now working on a study of the origin and development of the theory of strategic bombing and its influence in the U.S. and the United Kingdom during the early Cold War years. SHAFR members Immerman and Walker will train in political psychology and Southeast Asia studies, respectively, while Jones had training in moral philosophy and applied ethics with particular attention to bioethics and public policy. Historian Marc Trachtenberg studied military policy and strategy as a step toward his long-range goal of a history of great power politics and military policy in the nuclear age.

The very names of the six workshops at which more-recently-appointed fellows presented their plans for work are an indication of the broad range of subjects now being brought under the general heading of international peace and security studies. All are or could be of interest to historians of American foreign relations since the United States, despite a determined effort on the part of conference organizers to shift attention from the major powers to other areas of the world (hence the meeting in Mexico), remains a dominant factor in such discussions. Short titles of the working group sessions: Technology and Political Decisions; Ethics, Culture, and Politics; Regional Co-operation, Security, and the Superpowers; Strategic Issues in Peace and Security; Peace and Security in Latin America; and Superpower Policies and Perceptions.

A listing of workshop titles and a description of some of the projects being undertaken by SSRC-MacArthur Fellows only suggests the rich intellectual content of the conference -- and does not even touch on those external aids to thought in January: sunshine,

temperatures in the seventies, flowering bougainvillea on century-old stone walls. The Hotel Hacienda Cocoyoc, where the conference was held, provided settings suitable for exchanges of ideas, and accommodations for all the meetings. Fifty-one fellows attended the conference, which was also attended by officials from the MacArthur Foundation and the Social Science Research Council, and by a number of guest speakers.

A final word for historians who may still be put off by the words "international security," and "strategy," with their suggestion of the Herman Kahn school of thought and all the busy writers from and at the Rand Corporation. It was precisely to enlarge the pool of scholars working on these subjects that the MacArthur Foundation undertook the funding of a program in international peace and security studies. Whatever contribution Kahn, Brodie, et al., might have made, it was only a narrow path in a wide field that is now being explored by other scholars.

For diplomatic historians, who have traditionally been concerned with questions of power and are now also concerned with questions of culture and perception, this should be good news indeed. Even better is the news that many of the SSRC-MacArthur Fellows, whose field of study is not history, are using historical sources in their work. They are using them not just in order to write a brief "historical background" section before they get to the meat of their work. They are using them with a sensitivity that historians do not often credit to those in other disciplines. Without losing their interest in the formulation of the theories that have put many historians off their work, they are demonstrating what seems to this reporter, at any rate, a new awareness of the importance of context for understanding.

One final example may serve to illustrate this point. It comes from the work of a man whose field is not ordinarily associated with history or with questions of international peace and security. The field is medicine. Robert Sprinkle is a physician with broad

medical expertise, including work in the refugee camps of Southeast Asia. His work in the camps made him wonder, as he puts it, why it was that physicians had to go about patching up people who were hurt in other people's wars.

The award of an SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Fellowship enabled him to seek the answers to questions such as this. He is currently a Ph.D. candidate at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public Affairs at Princeton where, in his studies, he is specializing in the human rights and human welfare aspects of foreign policy. He plans to write an analysis of the "realist" approach to international affairs, and then through three case studies examine the ethical standards actually applied by specific States in specific contexts.

And so we are back to context, that sine qua non for understanding, that sine qua non for historical analysis. As Trachtenberg pointed out in his presentation, the whole field of strategic studies, which has dominated discussions of issues in international peace and security, seemed to reach an intellectual dead end in the early 1980s. It is coming alive again, and one of the reasons for this renewed life is the contribution that is being made by historians and by historical analysis to studies of problems in international peace and security.

**Annotated Bibliography of German Language
Dissertations and "Habilitationsschriften"
(accepted from 1981-1987) on U.S. Foreign Relations**
by
Thomas Schoonover¹

While in Germany with a German Academic Exchange Service (Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst -- DAAD) grant in the summer of 1987, I decided to update the annotated bibliography of German dissertations on U.S. foreign relations which the SHAFR Newsletter published in 1982-1983. Working in the university

libraries in Frankfurt and Erlangen-Nuernberg and the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek and J. F. Kennedy Institut in Berlin, I used the standard sources for locating German dissertations [Jahresverzeichnis der deutschen Hochschulschriften (Leipzig, DDR: Boersenverein der Deutschen Buchhaendler (later VEB), 1968---), Deutsche Nationalbibliographie (Leipzig, DDR: VEB, 1949---), and the Deutsche Bibliographie: Hochschulschriften-Verzeichnis (Frankfurt: Buchhaendler-Vereinigung, 1972---)] to locate twenty dissertations from the Federal Republic of Germany and nine from the German Democratic Republic for the years 1981 to 1986. In addition, four dissertations from the period covered by the previous annotated bibliography were brought to my attention.

The German dissertations do not treat only U.S.-German relations. Many analyze U.S. foreign policy formulation, implementation, and public response to or influence on diplomacy. Some treat U.S. relations with countries or regions other than Germany or even Europe. This bibliography is intended as a tool for other scholars, hence the annotations are reduced to very brief summaries or thesis statements which focus on the themes related to U.S. foreign relations, with brief observations on the sources in order to contain the length of this list. For a few dissertations, especially those from the German Democratic Republic (GDR), it was impossible to obtain a copy, so I can offer no more than title, translation, and location where the work was done. The GDR distinguishes between A dissertations and B dissertations. The A form is a normal dissertation; the B form is a second dissertation, normally a longer, more thorough study (roughly equivalent to Federal Republic of Germany *Habilitationsschriften*). There is often a delay of several years or more before copies of GDR dissertations are available outside the socialist bloc. Often German dissertations were published in book form which explains some delay. Some of the dissertations for the mid-1980s not yet in print may be in press. When available, the publication data (merely place, publisher, and date) follows immediately after the dissertation information. Only

in two cases, the dissertations of Angelika Bator and Friedbert Pflueger, was it necessary to supply titles for the published works because the book forms appeared with significantly different titles, although the subject matter was clearly the same. Klaus Schwabe's Habilitationsschrift, translated into English and revised sixteen years later, can best be considered a different work.

The annotations are intended to give the thrust of the work, its chief arguments, and main conclusions. Some mention of sources is made when I thought they deserved special attention. The purpose of this supplement, like the original, is to facilitate the access of U.S. scholars to a large body of excellent research on U.S. foreign relations. Although in the period since 1982, Lewis Hanke has edited a five volume work on the study of U.S. history in foreign countries [Lewis Hanke (ed.), Guide to the Study of United States History outside the U.S., 1945-1980 (2 vols.; White Plains, NY: Kraus, 1985)], this and the previous annotated bibliographies remain useful and unique research tools. Dissertations were not treated very extensively in Hanke's multi-volume study of foreign scholarship, teaching, and research on U.S. history.

Abstracts

Basler, Gerhard. "Buendnis- und Rivalitaetsverhaeltnis U.S.A.-Westeuropa." [The alliance and rivalry relationship between the United States and Western Europe.] B dissertation, Berlin, Institute fuer International Politik und Wirtschaft der DDR, 1984.

Bator, Angelika. "Hauptprobleme der Strategie des U.S.A.-Imperialismus in Asien vom Ende des zweiten Weltkrieges bis zur Gegenwart." [The Chief problems of the strategy of U.S. imperialism in Asia from the end of the Second World War until the present.] B dissertation, 2 vols.; Berlin, Humboldt Universitaet, 1982. (U.S.A.-Politik gegen Asien. Strategische Grundzuege nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg. [U.S. policy

in Asia: strategic characteristics after the Second World War.] Berlin, DDR: Militaerverlag, 1986. 256 pp.)

Investigation of the possibilities and limits of the U.S. government's ability to conceive of ways to win Asian allies and to draw them into local wars. The United States intended to fight the wars primarily with foreign forces. The close relationship of these local wars of aggression with U.S. global strategy has been a mark of U.S. Asian policy since 1945. In south Asia the U.S. policy was hindered by the fact that India maintained friendly relations with the Soviet Union and the group of non-allied nations. It must be recognized, however, that the United States is capable of pursuing its objectives with differentiated means and methods. [Sources: printed U.S. public and private materials.]

Borris, Christian. "Die internationale Handels-schiedsgerichtsbarkeit in den U.S.A.: Rechtsgrund-lagen, zwingendes Recht, Anerkennung und Vollstreckung von Schiedsspruechen." [International trade arbitration jurisdiction in the United States: basic law, law of compulsion, recognition, and execution of the arbitration decisions.] Universitaet Koeln, 1986. (Koeln: Heymann, 1987.)

[Law dissertation with an historical dimension.]

Brauch, Hans Guenther. "Struktureller Wandel und Ruestungspolitik der U.S.A. 1940-1950, zur Weltfuehrungsrolle und ihren innenpolitischen Bedingungen." [The Structural change and armaments policy of the United States, 1940-1950, regarding the world leadership role and its domestic political conditions.] Universtaet Heidelberg, 1976.

Braun, Axel. "Ruestungskonversionsbemuehungen in den U.S.A. in den 70iger Jahren." [Armaments conversion efforts in the United States in the 1970s.] Berlin, Freie Universitaet, [1984?]. (Frankfurt a/M: Haag and

Herchen, 1984. 379 pp.)

Among the large armaments enterprises in the aerospace industry, only one has made any effort to convert its military production facilities to civilian uses. The transportation and energy sectors would offer good opportunities for qualified armaments workers in the event of conversion. It would be important, however, to allow ample time for the conversion phase from armaments to civilian production. A conversion law which would incorporate conversion funds and planning commissions is urgently needed. [Sources: private and public group and organizations in the United States; U.S. and U.N.O. publications; periodicals.]

Eckert, Horst. "Die Entwicklung der Aussenwirtschaftsbeziehungen der Volksrepublik China zu den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, 1949-1980, und ihre Bedeutung fuer den grossmachtchauvinistischen Kurs der chinesischen Fuehrung." [The development of foreign economic relations of the People's Republic of China to the United States, 1949-1980, and its significance for the great power chauvinistic course of the Chinese leadership.] 2 vols.; A dissertation, Berlin, Humboldt Universtaet, 1982.

Fiebig-von Hase, Ragnhild. "Lateinamerika als Konflikttherd der deutsch-amerikanischen Beziehungen 1890-1903." [Latin America as crisis center of German-American relations, 1890-1903.] Universtaet Koeln, 1986. (2 vols.; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986. 1196 pp.)

U.S. foreign policy around 1900 focused upon two geographical regions, east Asia and Latin America. Within Latin America, the United States concerned itself with the defense of the Monroe Doctrine and economic expansion. The U.S. economic expansion received a renewed impulse because of the urgency to use foreign trade to alleviate the 1890s depression. The Germans and British supplied the economic competition, only Germany seemed to represent a political-strategic danger to the U.S. position. The German fleet construction program posed no great danger in itself, but the United States had to be concerned about the possibility of Germany allying

with Britain. In that event, Germany's political and economic challenge would assume a new level of seriousness. To North Americans precisely that British-German combination seemed to have occurred during the Venezuela debt-repayment crisis of 1902-1903. [Sources: German and U.S. public and private archives, German, U.S., and Latin American printed materials.]

Finke, Karin. "Die Bedeutung der internationalen Handelsklauseln fuer den Gefahruebergang nach deutschem and U.S.-amerikanischem Recht." [The meaning of the international trade clauses for the implementation of a contract according to West German and U.S. law.] Universtaet Augsburg, 1983. (Frankfurt a/M: Lang, 1984. 237 pp.)

[Law dissertation based on legal sources. Originally in international trade, the contracting parties specified which rights and duties applied to a particular contract. Organizational and technological changes have weakened the traditional procedure. No international trade custom or even trade common law bears the meaning of the international trade clause anymore.]

Frenes, Michal C. de. "Das U.S.-amerikanische Kartellstrafrecht." [U.S. cartel criminal law.] Universtaet Freiburg (Breisgau), [1984?]. (Koeln: Peter Deubner, 1984. 236 pp.)

U.S. law permits local monopoly (for example, in farm cooperatives), but rejects larger combinations. The Webb-Pomerene Act (1918) allows U.S. firms to participate in external monopolies which do not have the effect of limiting competition within the United States. The Sherman Anti-Trust law remains the most important law for anti-monopoly action. The number of prison sentences has increased because of an alteration in the perception of the violations of the Sherman laws from misdemeanours to felonies. [U.S. court reports, law reviews and journals.]

Gerhardt, Gunther. "Das Krisenmanagement der Vereinigten Staaten waehrend der Berliner Blockade (1948/1949)." [Crisis management of the United States during the Berlin blockade (1948-1949).] Universitaet Hamburg, 1983. (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1984. 366 pp.)

The United States perceived the Soviets' Berlin blockade as a provocation which endangered the U.S. position on the European continent. The blockade could only be resolved through the Soviet Union or through the passing of time. The removal of the blockade was interpreted as confirmation of U.S. policy. In both Germany and the United States, the surmounting of this common crisis created a new level of consciousness. [Sources: National Archives, Library of Congress, Pentagon, Center for Military History, Truman Library, U.S. government documents, and memoirs.]

Giessmann, Hans-Joachim. "Zum Stellenwert der militaerischen Gewalt im 'Mehrfrontenkonzept' der aussenpolitischen Strategie des U.S.A.-Imperialismus. Ausdruck der historischen Dialektik von 'Staerke' und 'Schwaechte' des Imperialismus in den 70iger Jahren." [Regarding the value of military force in the multi-front concept of the foreign policy strategy of U.S. imperialism. An expression of the historical dialectic of "power" and "weakness" of the imperialism in the 1970s.] A dissertation, Berlin, Humboldt Universitaet, 1981.

Horn, Ruediger. "Wesen, Erscheinungsformen und Funktionen des Antikommunismus, Amerikanismus und Rassismus in der Ideologie des U.S.A.-Imperialismus von 1917 bis 1929." [Substance, external manifestations, and functions of anti-communism, Americanism, and racism in the ideology of U.S. imperialism from 1917 to 1929.] B dissertation, Universitaet Jena, 1981.

Kabisch, Thomas R. "Deutsches Kapital in den U.S.A. Von der Reichsgruendung bis zur Sequestrierung (1917) und Freigabe." [German capital in the United States

from the foundation of the German Empire until the sequestration (1917) and release of German property.] Universitaet Erlangen-Nuernberg, 1982. (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982. 413 pp.)

Investigation of the economic conditions, proceedings, and occurrences which are linked to investment allows the revealing of the structure and processes which stand behind investment. The United States served some German investors as a spring board for investment in Canada or Latin America. Between 1870 and 1919, German investment shifted away from portfolio toward direct investment. [Sources: N.Y. Public Library, Yale, firm and bank archives and printed records.]

Klose, Roland. "Die Erschliessung des U.S.-Marktes durch Direktinvestitionen mittelstaendischer deutscher Unternehmungen des Investitionsgueterbereichs." [The penetration of the U.S. market through direct investments of mid-sized German enterprises from the investment sector.] Universitaet Wuerzburg, 1983. 307 pp.

A precondition for the realization of investment projects is an effective, organized construction between mother and daughter corporations. Despite the often negative experience which especially large firms have made with their acquisitions in the United States and the consequent negative headlines in the press, the U.S. market will attract many middle class investors in the future. [Sources: interviews, newspapers, and journals.]

Koch, Burkhard. "Der Einfluss neokonservativer Ideologie auf die Auseinandersetzungen um die antisozialistische Konfrontationsstrategie der U.S.A." [The influence of neoconservative ideology on the debates over the anti-socialist confrontation strategy of the United States.] B dissertation, Berlin, Institut fuer internationale Politik und Wirtschaft der DDR, 1985.

Korsten, Josef. "Rechtspopulismus und Neokonservatismus un den heutigen U.S.A." [Rightwing populism

and neoconservatism in the contemporary United States.] Aachen, Rheinisch-Westfaelische Hochschule, 1985. 195 pp.

President Ronald Reagan has conveyed a new self-consciousness to the American people which it had desperately sought after Watergate, Vietnam, Afghanistan, and Iran. He has resurrected U.S. pride and rekindled the feeling of being number one. [Sources: some memoirs and contemporary participant materials; mostly secondary.]

Krakau, Knud. "Missionsbewusstein und Voelkerrechtsdoktrin in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika." [Sense of mission and international law doctrine in the United States of America.] Universitaet Hamburg, 1966. (Frankfurt a/M: Alfred Metzner, 1967. 567 pp.)

Leopold, Thomas. "Das Eurokreditgeschaeft der U.S.-amerikanischen Geschaeftsbanken unter besonderer Beruecksichtigung der Verschuldenkrise der oelimportierenden Entwicklungslaender." [The Euro-credit business of U.S. commercial banks with special consideration of the debt crisis of the oil-importing developing countries.] Universitaet Tuebingen, 1986.

Masyk, Eva-Maria. "Die Aussenpolitik der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika gegeneuber ASEAN [Association of SE Asian Nations] unter der Reagan-Administration." [U.S. foreign policy in regard to ASEAN under the Reagan administration.] Universitaet Muenchen, 1986. (Muenchen: Tuduv, 1986. 505 pp.)

The United States and China found it easier to harmonize their global interests, especially a shared desire to control the Soviet Union, than their regional objectives. The global agreement will probably not suffice to hold the relationship together over a long time period. In the East Asian region, China has always pursued its own aims and goals. Thus to obtain its foreign policy objectives in Asia, the United States must strive for good relations with China, but center its foreign policy upon ties with

ASEAN, Japan, and South Korea. [Sources: U.S. government documents and memoirs.]

Medick, Monika. "Waffenexport und auswaertige Politik der Vereinigten Staaten. Gesellschaftliche Interessen und politische Entscheidungen." [Arms export and U.S. foreign policy. Societies' interests and political decisions.] Universitaet Marburg, [1975?]. (Meisenheim am Glan, W. Germany: Anton Hain, 1976. 233 pp.)

The traditional evaluation of U.S. foreign policy based upon the three traditional positions -- bourgeois liberal, capitalist, or democratic -- is insufficient because none of the three characterizes the U.S. approach well. Although Americans commonly consider foreign policy control by public exposure and Congress to mean democratic control, such supervision does not mean the contents of U.S. foreign policy will coincide with democratic norms. The founding fathers, immersed in the enlightenment, left the decision over war and peace in the hands of Congress under the assumption bourgeoisie society abhorred war because it disturbed economic activity. Since the late nineteenth century, however, the United States has found landing marines or other forms of military intervention cheaper than building economic and political influence. [Sources: extensive use of U.S. government documents, German and U.S. secondary literature.]

Mueller, Erwin. "Ruestungspolitik und Ruestungsdynamik: Fall U.S.A.: zur Analyse der Ruestungsmotive einer Weltmacht und zur Theorie moderner Ruestungsdynamik." [Armament policy and armament dynamic: the U.S. case: a contribution to the analysis of the armament motives of a world power and to the theory of modern armament dynamics.] Universitaet Tuebingen, 1984[?]. (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1985. 378 pp.)

The dimensions of the U.S. power position and its economic tasks converge in a strategy to secure the status quo in certain relevant regions. The armaments

policy aims to secure U.S. access to the greater world economic sphere and also to protect the power relationships which guarantee this position. The United States expects a premier power position within the group of its allies and a deterrence or containment role with regard to the Soviet Union or other antagonists. The United States wishes to demonstrate a capacity for intervention which will help it avoid situations in which it might have to intervene. Since the use of or threat to use military power remains the core of U.S. foreign policy, the U.S. elite finds the military apparatus an indispensable instrument. [Sources: U.S. government documents, memoirs, and periodicals.]

Mueller, Rolf. "Zur Strategie und Taktik des U.S.A.-Imperialismus gegenueber der nationalen Befreiungsbewegung Ende der 60er bis Mitte der 70er Jahre, dargestellt an Beispielen des Nahen und Mittleren Ostens, eine Untersuchung zum Problem der Konterrevolution." [To the strategy and tactics of U.S. imperialism in regard to the national liberation movements from the end of the 1960s to the middle of the 1970s, presented on the examples of the Middle and Far East, an investigation of the problem of counter revolution.] A dissertation, Universitaet Leipzig, 1983.

Munoz, Hector. "Bildungsstrategie und neokolonialistische Politik des U.S.A.-Imperialismus in lateinamerikanischen Laendern." [The education strategy and neocolonial policy of U.S. imperialism in Latin American countries.] A dissertation, Universitaet Jena, 1984.

O'Neal, Michael Steven. "Multinationale Unternehmen unter Staatsaufsicht: Probleme, Konflikte und moegliche Loesungen dargestellt am Beispiel der U.S.A." [Multinational enterprises under state supervision: problems, conflicts, and possible solutions, presented on the U.S. example.] Universitaet Heidelberg, 1979. 129 pp.

U.S. multinationals make themselves a factor in the internal and external politics of the lands in which they operate. Both the United States and host countries try to supervise multinational operations. Bureaucrats in host societies interpret U.S. efforts to control and supervise multinationals as proof of their suspicion that U.S. multinationals are in fact an extension of U.S. government attempts to control the host country. Multinationals need supervision; perhaps this can best be done by international agreement. [Sources: court cases, U.S. government documents.]

Pflueger, Friedbert. "U.S.-Aussenpolitik und Menschenrechte: die Wiederbelebung des amerikanischen Idealismus in den siebziger Jahren." [U.S. foreign policy and human rights: the revival of American idealism in the 1970s.] Universitaet Bonn, 1982. (Die Menschenrechtspolitik der U.S.A.-amerikanische Aussenpolitik zwischen Idealismus und Realismus, 1972-1982. [The human rights policy of the U.S. foreign policy between idealism and realism, 1972-1982.]) (Wien: R. Oldenbourg, 1983. 405 pp.)

The spectacular first hundred day human rights campaign of President James Carter's administration weakened afterwards, but human rights remained an important ingredient of his foreign policy. Carter was no naive idealist. The human rights policy not only served an ideal cause, but also helped to advance U.S. national interests. He was unable, however, to shape his human rights campaign so that it attracted a strong foreign policy consensus in the United States. His policy drew considerable criticism within U.S. society, less from the broad public than from the foreign policy elite. [Sources: periodicals and secondary materials.]

Reichel, Richard E. "Direktinvestitionen deutscher Unternehmungen in den U.S.A." [The direct investments of German enterprises in the United States.] Universitaet Koeln, 1981. (Gelsenkirchen: Mannhold, 1982. 688 pp.)

Efforts of German investors to obtain a long-term, viable market position in the United States cannot be realized alone under consideration of the economic factors of an enterprise, but required an interdisciplinary approach which considered national economic, legal, and tax elements. [Sources: U.S., German and French government and organization documents.]

Schench, Kersten von. "Die Taetigkeit deutscher Wertpapier-Investmentgesellschaften in den U.S.A.: zugleich ein Beitrag zum Anlegerschutz in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und in den U.S.A." [The activity of German stock market investment companies in the United States: a contribution to investor protection in the German Federal Republic and in the United States.] Universtaet Muenster (Westfalen), 1982. (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1982. 204 pp.)

Only since World War II, and especially after the U.S. law (1957) regulating foreign investment firms, have German investors moved to sell their stock to U.S. investors. Once German investment firms reached a certain capital size, they reached out beyond the national border for investment opportunities. The early market targets were inside Europe until the SEC established new procedures in 1975 which made the sale of stocks in the United States attractive. German investment firms have had difficulty, however, completing the SEC procedures to allow full entrance into the U.S. market. [Sources: U.S. and German government documents and court reports, law reviews, and journals.]

Schreiner-Seip, Claudia. "Film- und Informationspolitik als Mittel der nationalen Verteidigung in den U.S.A. 1939-1941. Eine Studie ueber die Umsetzung aussenpolitischer Programme in Filminhalte." [Film and communications policy as a means of national defense in the United States, 1939-1941. A study of the transferral of foreign policy objectives into film content.] Universtaet Koeln, 1984. (Frankfurt a/M: Lang, 1985. 438 pp.)

The U.S. State Department and the CIAA (Committee on Inter-American Affairs) were responsible for the propaganda to secure the western hemisphere in World War II. To this end, the cooperation of the film industry was essential to create a product which attracted and persuaded the audience. The film industry cooperated because it saw economic advantage from the cooperation as the war had shrunk the U.S. film industry's market in Europe. This program promised new markets in Latin America and elsewhere. Congress distrusted the official role in propaganda work, especially in view of the Nazi use of this device. The use of film propaganda began with the work in 1939 to 1941 before the official U.S. entry into World War II. [Sources: National Archives, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Wisconsin Center for Film and Theatre Research, Indiana State Library, Warner Brothers, and the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.]

Schwabe, Klaus. "Die Vereinigten Staaten, die deutsche Friedenspolitik und das Scheitern eines Wilson-Friedens. Deutsch-amerikanische Beziehungen vom Kaiserreich zur Republik 1918/19." [The United States, the German peace policy, and the failure of a Wilson peace. German-American relations from the Empire to the Republic, 1918-19.] Universtaet Freiburg, 1969. [Shortened and updated English language translation: Woodrow Wilson, Revolutionary Germany, and Peacemaking, 1918-1919: Missionary Diplomacy and the Realities of Power (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1985.)]

Spiessdoefer, Peter. "Die Aussenpolitik der U.S.A. gegenueber dem Suedlichen Afrika seit 1969." [U.S. foreign policy toward South Africa since 1969.] Muenchen, Universtaet der Bundeswehr, 1985.

Taubert, Martin. "Die Entwicklung der 'New History': ihre Rolle in der buergerlichen Historiographie der U.S.A. von 1910 bis 1930." [The development of the 'New History': its role in U.S. bourgeois historiography from 1910 to 1930.] A dissertation, Universtaet Jena, 1985.

Welp, Dietrich. "Internationale Zustaendigkeit ueber auswaertige Gesellschaften mit Inlandstoechtern im U.S.-amerikanischen Zivilprozess." [International jurisdiction over foreign enterprises with domestic daughter companies in U.S. civil court proceedings.] Universtaet Bonn, 1982. (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1982. 187 pp.)

[Law dissertation. U.S. courts slowly becoming less prejudiced against the defendant.]

Wey, Klaus-Georg. "Das U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor und Interessenverbaende, 1903-1913." [The U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor and interest groups, 1903-1913.] Universtaet Koeln, 1976. (Frankfurt a/M: Lang, 1976. 237 pp.)

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and H. A. Wheeler were the driving forces behind the establishment of the War Industries Board, which many historians believe was the origin of the interventionist state in the United States. The War Industries Board and the National Recovery Administration were only high points in a difficult and long process of trying to free the political economy from laissez-faire principles. U.S. society has needed a long ideological preparation and a sensitive experimentation with state apparatus in the search for a compromise between economic cyclical stability and social compensation. [Sources: National Archives, records of boards of trade and chambers of commerce, American Federation of Labor archives, Library of Congress, corporate and business publications.]

FOOTNOTES

¹The author could not have compiled this bibliography without the aid of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) which provided financial aid in the summer of 1987. The author thanks his wife, Ebba, for research assistance in locating these dissertations.

**American Constitution and American Presidential
Power in Foreign Affairs: A Tentative Commentary**

by

Yang Sheng-mao

(Professor of History, Institute of American
History, Nankai University, Tianjin)

(This paper was read at the First Sino-U.S. American Studies Workshop held on Oct. 24-31, 1987 in Beijing, China.)

History is like a river. It flows forever and ever remains fresh. I do believe in relativity and disclaim any connection with relativism because a historian cannot grasp the eternal truth of history at once in terms of space and time, but can arrive at it step by step. That's the reason why I use the word "tentative" in the title of this paper. Besides, I will draw on many sagacious suggestions and criticisms in this workshop from my colleagues and friends to enrich or revise my interpretations. In this sense what I am presenting here is really "tentative."

History is changing; so is the American Constitution. With a sense of change and development in view, I think we may perceive the meaning of the American Constitution in relation to foreign affairs. And we may discern better the relationship between the Constitution and the Presidential power in foreign affairs, if we could recognize that the interpretations of the Constitution are subject to the implementation of U.S. foreign policy.

Expansion is a distinct phenomenon of American history. The disposition to serve the purpose of expansion chiefly characterizes the American foreign policy. It is no wonder that American foreign policy hinges on expansion, politically, economically, and culturally. Thus, the interpretation of the Constitution in the interest of expansion is, I think, the key to looking into the relationship between the Constitution and the Presidential power in foreign affairs.

In correspondence with the development of expansion in American history, there are, I believe, three stages of the development of American foreign policy: (1) the continentalism stage (1774-1897); (2) the overseas expansion stage (1898-1945); (3) the global hegemony stage (1946-present). For the sake of symbolization, these three stages could be demonstrated in terms of three wants: first, I want to stay alone, to be an isolationist, and to mind my own business; next, I want to join your gang and to share with you whatever we can lay our hands on; and then, I just want to ally with my allies and my allies' allies and to "commit" myself to global hegemony. The relationship between the American Constitution and American Presidential power in foreign policy can be traced through such rough divisions.

When we dissect the above-mentioned relationship in the first stage, naturally we would first examine the background against which the Constitution was framed in 1787.

Apparently the Founding Fathers of the United States at Philadelphia paid relatively less attention to foreign affairs than to domestic ones. In the seven Articles of the Constitution, there are only a few hundred words about foreign affairs. The subsequent amendments have no mention of foreign affairs at all.

The main reasons why the American Founding Fathers paid less attention to foreign affairs are:

(1) They wanted a strong government, but not so strong that the government might regress to monarchy. They wanted a centralized government, but not too centralized to sacrifice the bourgeois democracy, about which some of them, though, entertained some misgivings. So it was on these crucial domestic issues that they were at variance. But as far as foreign affairs were concerned, there existed relatively less discrepancy, to say nothing of factions. Factions came to the American political arena only well after the Constitution was written.

(2) The main and colossal task of the Philadelphia conventioneers was to establish an internally strong central government to replace the loosely-constituted Confederation government, which had proved to be a threat to the propertied class as well as to the nation. At that time, the United States had no urgent foreign involvements. What's more, America actually endeavoured to keep away from foreign entanglements because the primary diplomatic objective of the young republic was to maintain and to solidify its newly-won independence and because it had not only no military power strong enough to wrestle with European nations but no immediate needs to serve.

The American Constitution bestowed solely on the federal government powers in relation to foreign affairs, which were distributed among the three branches of the federal government, with the executive and legislative having more instantaneous power. A looseness and unevenness left a gap for executive policy-makers to edge in. This demonstrates the pragmatic side of the framers' thought. They were inclined to let deeds interpret words. In this way, the executive power waxes gradually at the expense of the legislative as far as foreign affairs are concerned. Gradual as it is, the tendency is ever strong.

Although in Article I Section 8 the "necessary and proper" clause has loomed large in Congressional power, the respective powers of Congress and the President as regarding foreign affairs are in effect not so clear as to domestic affairs. Besides, as Professor Henry S. Commager maintained, Article II of the American Constitution "was the most debated and the least satisfactory part of the new Constitution."¹ There exists a kind of ambiguity and evasion in meaning.

The "executive power" clause is flexible and gives the President a large grant of power including administration of foreign affairs, especially when a President or a Justice wants to put a loose construction on the executive power.

The "take care" clause gives the President various means including the constitutional power to negotiate executive agreements. The Rush-Bagot Agreement of 1817, the first international executive agreement of America, was approved by the Senate a year later, but since then the President has constructed many thousands of international agreements without seeking the Senate's consent.² In this way, the President actually gained the unilateral initiative of treaty-making power.

The "necessary and expedient" clause authorizes the President to determine or influence what measures the Congress ought to take in foreign affairs.

Above all, the "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy" clause lays the foundation for the growth of Presidential war power. Congress has the power to declare war; nevertheless, the power of prosecuting war is wholly vested in the President's hand. The President has not only the power to meet invasion but the means to impose war on the nation. The traditional argument that the President is limited to taking defensive but not offensive actions has lost its meaning today.

As Commander in Chief, the President's power in the field of foreign affairs naturally grew stronger as time went on and usually the Executive circumvented the Legislative by executive orders and with various means of manipulations and evasions, and under the excuses of "national emergency," "national security," "vital interests," and "top secrecy."

By 1983 American troops had been dispatched beyond the borders of the U.S. on about 150 occasions, among which, however, Congress formally declared war only five times -- in 1812, 1847, 1898, 1917, and 1941 -- to say nothing of the many wars against Indians within the U.S.³

The first major post-1783 war against the French was waged by John Adams without formal Congressional consent. Thomas Jefferson followed this precedent in

his war against the Barbary States. Jefferson and later James Madison, like Alexander Hamilton, accepted a broad construction of the constitutional power "for the common defense." President James K. Polk first sent troops to the disputed territory between Mexico and the U.S., then told Congress in May 1846 that "Mexico has passed the boundary of the U.S., and shed American blood upon the American soil." Later Representative Abraham Lincoln still introduced "Spot Resolutions" to make protests, although Congress had been forced or coaxed to declare war on Mexico. Then the Presidential war power was still in its infancy.

If in the period of continentalism the character of unchecked Presidential war power was not yet fully manifested, the period of overseas expansion presented a more glaring picture. The more expansive a nation becomes, the faster the legislative is put at a disadvantage in handling foreign affairs, even though it holds the leash of appropriation.

On the eve of thrusting into overseas markets and raw material regions, cries of expansionists burst out. Alfred Thayer Mahan in 1897 complained in an essay about the "constitutional lion in the path" of expansion.⁴ Mahan wanted to remove or circumvent the "lion." Even Woodrow Wilson, in his Constitutional Government in the U.S., agreed that government was modified by its environment and "is accountable to Darwin, not to Newton."⁵ In 1890 the Supreme Court in the case of In Re Neagle held that the President's duty was not confined "to the enforcement of the acts of Congress or of treaties of the U.S. according to their express terms," and it also included "rights, duties, and obligations growing out of the Constitution itself, our international relations, and all the protection implied by the nature of the government under the Constitution."⁶ In Re Neagle was the first court decision which accepted the theory of inherent Presidential power in international affairs. This, I believe, can be construed as an attempt to remove the "lion" which Alfred Mahan complained about seven years later. Here the image of the so-called imperial Presidency began to emerge.

In comparison with continentalism, overseas expansion is truly a "Great Aberration," as S.F. Bemis pointed out, but the "Great Aberration" is a logical product of Manifest Destiny, which was the North Star for continental expansionists.

Under various excuses and pretensions, mostly under those of protecting "American property and life," the U.S. Presidents sent troops abroad on their own initiative as Commander in Chief. During the period of overseas expansion, there were about 21 instances of this kind. For instance, in 1900 William McKinley sent 5,000 soldiers to China, and in 1903 Theodore Roosevelt landed marines in Columbia. He boasted in 1911 that "I took the Canal Zone and let Congress debate." In 1904 American marines landed at three cities of the Dominican Republic, and in 1916 at San Domingo. In 1907 American marines meddled in the Honduras-Nicaraguan war, and in 1910 and 1912 landed in Nicaragua again. In 1914 American marines landed at Haiti's Port au Prince, and the next year again in Haiti. In 1918 Wilson sent 15,000 soldiers to invade Soviet Russia and fought against Russians at Murmansk, Vladivostok, and Archangel. In 1920 American troops landed in Guatemala. In 1926 President Coolidge sent 2,000 soldiers to Nicaragua. On the eve of World War II the Presidential power in international affairs was further enhanced. In 1936 in U.S. vs. Belmont the Supreme Court judged that an executive agreement was equivalent to a treaty; in U.S. vs. Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation the Supreme Court explicitly separated the domestic policies under the Constitution from the diplomatic policies under the very same Constitution. In this sense the U.S. created "two Presidencies," one foreign, one domestic. Presidential powers in the foreign policy arena clearly overwhelmed those in the domestic domain.⁷ In 1941, in the face of the Nazi menace, President F.D. Roosevelt dispatched troops to Greenland after Nazi Germany invaded Denmark, although Congress had not wished to send troops outside the Western Hemisphere. In the same year Roosevelt sent troops to Iceland, and once again violated Congress' prohibition. After the fall of the Netherlands, he ordered American troops to

occupy the Netherlands Guiana, and meanwhile sent the American navy to escort arms-convoys to England and the Soviet Union. I'm just remarking on the Constitutional side of these events, although I personally side with Roosevelt's actions on these particular occasions.

Since the end of World War II the U.S. has invariably pursued a course of global hegemony, so the President's war power soars even more swiftly. More frequently the President sent troops abroad to anticipate or initiate war actions, without securing Congress' formal approval. For instance, in 1948 Truman sent American marines to Nanking and Shanghai, and in 1950 he sent troops to Korea; in 1957 President Dwight D. Eisenhower sent marines to Indonesia, and in 1958 to Venezuelan home waters, to Beirut, and to Indonesia again. In 1961 when Congress consented to send troops to Vietnam, twelve thousand American soldiers were already there. At first, sixteen military advisers were sent to Vietnam by the U.S. and later in 1968 the number of armed forces mounted to more than 500,000 men. In 1962 President John Kennedy ordered the blockade of Cuba. In 1965 President Lyndon B. Johnson sent 4,500 soldiers to the Dominican Republic, and in 1967 he sent the Sixth Fleet to Syrian home waters and military advisers to the Congo. In 1970 President Richard M. Nixon sent 1,500 marines to Lebanon. In 1975 President Gerald R. Ford ordered marines and planes to rescue the American merchant ship the Mayaguez off the coast of Cambodia. In 1980 President James E. Carter ordered paratroopers to rescue the American hostages in Iran. In 1981 Ronald Reagan ordered planes from the aircraft carrier the Nimitz to shoot down Lybian jets in the Gulf of Sidra in the Mediterranean. In 1983 he sent combat troops into Grenada and in 1986 he sent planes to bombard Lybia. Recently he sent a fleet to the Strait of Hormuz.

American history is replete with instances of "undeclared wars," from the war with France, 1799-1800, to the bombardments at the Persian Gulf in 1987. During the post-World War II years, America waged, in

terms of death toll, two gigantic wars: the Korean War and the Vietnam War. Until the Vietnam War, "America's longest war," Congress showed no sign of opposition to "undeclared wars" because Congress was reluctant to interfere with the Commander-in-Chief's affairs in time of crisis. Presidents appealed to Congress for support mostly after military actions were taken on the ground of national security or national emergency. The War Powers Act of 1973 is one of the first major laws which specifies the situations where the President can develop armed forces abroad. The Act also requires the President to report to Congress any military action within forty-eight hours and limits the involvement to sixty days unless Congress gives further consent. "Some Congressmen protested that the Act conferred upon the President a more direct power to commit American troops to war than he had had before;"⁸ nevertheless, no President has given it very serious thought.

Congress and the President often take complementary actions to achieve a collective goal. This concert may be best exemplified by the notorious Platt Amendment and the Taiwan Relations Act. After the President has taken military actions, Congress is inclined to commit itself to reinforcing the President's position. For instance, Congress ratified an amendment on October 20, 1987, to uphold President Reagan's destruction of Iranian oil platforms one day before.

In conclusion, the Constitution is made of dead letters, but human beings infuse life into them. In Federalist 8 Hamilton penned, "Safety from external dangers is the most powerful director of national conduct. Even the most ardent love of liberty will, after a time, give way to its dictates," but today the scope of "external danger" has extended to encompass the whole globe. This outstretches the American Founding Fathers' imagination. Human progress is a reflection of the growth of society, politically, economically, and culturally. With the progress of human beings goes the interpretation of political constitutions. We should admit that in an age of

instantaneous gigantic nuclear war it is crucially important, although very hard due to various conditions, to harness the ever-growing Presidential war power. The globe is shrinking with the advancement of weapons technology. Security actually demands interdependence and compromise. Like individuals, states need to meet their opponents halfway, if both sides truly treasure coexistence. "Security" is, in fact, an emotional, plausible, persuasive, and perhaps provocative word.

In an age of push-button warfare, I am convinced that the American people have the wisdom to anticipate the hazard of a growing imperial Presidency, which stems from an age-long series of interpretations and implementations of the American Constitution. Definitely I am not a pessimist in this respect. Nor am I an exaggerator. Michael H. Hunt in the preface of his book on ideology and U.S. foreign policy says: "If my efforts here make Americans a bit more self-conscious about their own thinking on international affairs and to that extent more cautious and wise in their use of power, then I shall have partially fulfilled that obligation."⁹ Professor Hunt's remark deserves the American people's patient and sober deliberation. Nowadays, the role of world-policeman is too heavy financially, too harmful politically, and too costly mentally to bear.

ENDNOTES

¹Henry S. Commager, The Defeat of America: Presidential Power and the National Character, New York, 1974, p. 127.

²Louis Henkin, Foreign Affairs and the Constitution, New York, 1972, p. 420.

³Thomas R. Dye and L.H. Zeigler, American Politics in the Media Age, Walesworth, 1983, p. 321.

⁴Walter Lafeber, "The 'Lion in the Path:' The U.S. Emergence as a World Power," Political Science Quarterly, No. 5 (1986), p. 707.

⁵Quoted from Walter Lefeber's The Constitution and U.S. Foreign Policy: An Interpretation (manuscript), 1986, p. 19.

⁶A.M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Imperial Presidency, Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1973, p. 82.

⁷Aaron Wildavsky, "The Two Presidencies," in The Presidency, ed. by Aaron Wildavsky, Boston, 1969, p. 231.

⁸George Herring, America's Longest War, New York, 1986, p. 262.

⁹Michael H. Hunt, Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy, Yale University Press, 1987, p. xiv.

MINUTES

SHAFR Council Meeting

June 11, 1988

American University

Lloyd Gardner, presiding

President Lloyd Gardner called the meeting to order at 7:50 a.m. Other persons included Vice President George Herring and Council members Richard Burns, Gerald Combs, John Gimbel, Gary Hess, Waldo Heinrichs, Betty Unterberger, Theodore Wilson, and William Kamman. Also present were: David Anderson, Terry Anderson Robert Beisner, Kinley Bauer, William Brinker, Warren Cohen, Calvin Davis, Thomas Garwin, Daniel Helmstadter, Michael Hogan, Robert McMahon, Frederick Marks, Richard Parker, and Nancy Tucker.

1. Richard Parker, president of The Association for Diplomatic Studies, presented a brief description of the Association and its programs. The Association wants to augment the facilities and holdings of the Foreign Service Institute to make it a leading research center in foreign affairs and diplomatic history. The Association has begun development of an oral history program and plans to develop a special

collection of reference works, memoirs, and books on diplomacy.

2. On March 2, 1988, Lloyd Gardner requested an Ad Hoc Committee on SHAFR Financial Arrangements made up of Gary Hess, Michael Hogan, Lawrence Kaplan, William Walker, and Marvin Zahniser (chairman) to study the administration of SHAFR endowment accounts. Gary Hess was present to report the committee's recommendations.

The committee's first recommendation was that SHAFR employ the services either of the Huntington Trust Company (Columbus, Ohio) or the First National Bank of Ohio (Akron) to manage the Society's endowment accounts. Each institution presented written proposals. After discussion Council accepted the proposal of the First National Bank of Ohio.

The committee's second recommendation was that Council approve an investment policy as follows:

INVESTMENT POLICY STATEMENT OF SHAFR COUNCIL

1. Income from endowment funds is to be used as a dependable resource for ongoing SHAFR programs and awards. Two chief concerns in investing SHAFR monies are to preserve principal and to provide for some growth of principal on a longterm basis.
2. The Finance Committee of SHAFR is instructed not to invest or to permit investment of SHAFR funds in ways likely to violate the conscience of its members.
3. In keeping with sound financial practice, the endowment funds shall be invested in a variety of instruments so that in a severe financial crisis the safety of our funds will be reasonably assured.
4. A primary goal of our investments program is to invest SHAFR monies in such a manner that persons contemplating gifts to these funds will have complete confidence that their gifts shall be carefully administered for the continuing work of SHAFR.

5. The following investment vehicles are viewed as having minimal risk and shall be considered as appropriate parts of SHAFR's investment portfolio:

CERTIFICATES OF DEPOSIT in banks that are members of FDIC. No account shall be permitted to exceed the amount insured by the FDIC.

SHORT TERM AND LONG TERM INVESTMENT GRADE BONDS, both government and corporate, rated no less than AA.

MUTUAL FUNDS which invest primarily in U.S. Government and other very secure financial instruments carrying the "full faith and credit" of mutual fund accounts, shall be placed only in funds that have a minimum of five years of investment experience, that have a commendable rating within their common community of funds, and that are preferred; load funds are to be bought only if there is a compelling reason to do so.

EQUITY INCOME AND GROWTH-AND INCOME INVESTMENTS. In order to provide for some modest growth in its capital base, SHAFR recommends that a portion of its funds, but no more than 30%, be invested in equity-income or growth-and-income mutual funds that have a minimum of five years of investment experience and that have a commendable rating within their common community of funds. No load funds are preferred; load funds are to be bought only if there is compelling reason to do so. The Finance Committee or investment adviser to SHAFR may wish to pursue the stated objective in ways other than through investing in mutual funds such as through purchasing individual equity issues. The particular mutual funds or equity issues selected to achieve the objective of modest capital growth must have the concurrence of the Finance Committee.

MONEY MARKET FUNDS, either government or bank issue, for short-term investments or to assist in making timely transfers within the portfolio.

If fundamental changes in investment policy are recommended by the Finance Committee, or by an investment advisor, before implementation such

recommendation must first be brought to the SHAFR Council for approval.

Any bank or advisor to be used to invest SHAFR's endowment or other accounts must be approved by SHAFR's Council.

In the discussion it was noted that the committee was recommending more diversified investment; there would be more reliance on equity income and growth-and-income investments but such investing would be limited. Dr. and Mrs. Bernath and others will be consulted on this issue.

The committee's third recommendation was that Council empower the selected trust company to gather SHAFR's financial records, establish accounts in the name of SHAFR, and act as SHAFR's endowment manager in keeping with the usual practices of the trust company and in light of SHAFR's endowments investment policy guidelines. The trust company should consult SHAFR's Finance Committee at least twice a year.

In discussion it was noted that Warren Kuehl had managed to keep all endowment accounts separate, not only on the books but also in maintaining separate investments supporting each account. To maintain such separate investments would entail heavy management fees. Economy of management indicates that all the endowment monies shoud be handled en bloc. Of course the accounts and all the activity (new money, investment increments, and payouts) in the accounts will be kept separate.

Council accepted the third recommendation and supported consolidation of the accounts. Dr. and Mrs. Bernath and others will be consulted on the question.

The Committee's forth recommendation was that Council place the executive secretary-treasurer on the Finance Committee ex officio. This recommendation was made so that the secretary-treasurer will be better informed on financial policy and be in a better

position to take action if the Finance Committee chair is indisposed.

The committee's final recommendation was that Council designate that the Finance Committee shall be headed by a chairperson and that Council promptly fill that position. The designated chair would replace the person designated to administer endowment accounts. The committee anticipates that the administrative functions performed by Warren Kuehl in this position will be shifted to the management of the bank, and it seems appropriate to redefine the "administrator" position.

Council approved making the executive secretary treasurer an ex officio member of the Finance Committee and appointing a chairperson to head the Finance Committee. Council instructed the executive secretary-treasurer to poll the membership on these changes in the by-laws.

Pending membership approval of the proposed by-law changes Council appointed Gary Hess to serve as chair of the Finance Committee.

3. Lloyd Gardner expressed concern about the future of the Foreign Relations series. He noted problems with the Classification/Declassification center, budget, and publication. Gardner appointed a committee consisting of Anna Nelson chairperson, Warren Cohen, Michael Hunt, Robert McMahon, and Bradford Perkins to inform SHAFR about these problems and recommend action that might be taken to solve them.

4. Lloyd Gardner recommended and Council approved that, beginning in 1989, SHAFR contribute \$2000 to the National Coordinating Committee for the Advancement of History.

5. Calvin Davis, retiring chairperson of the Bernath Book Prize Committee, recommended the following guidelines for the Bernath Book Prize.

I. The prize is to be awarded to a first monograph by a young scholar. The book must be a history of international relation. Biographies of statesmen and diplomats are included under this term and are eligible. General surveys, autobiographies, editions of essays and documents, and works which are primarily representative of social science disciplines other than history are not eligible.

II. Books will be judged primarily in regards to their contributions to scholarship. Winning books should have interpretative and analytical qualities of high levels. They should demonstrate mastery of primary material and relevant secondary works, and they should be examples of careful organization and distinguished writing.

III. The prize should be divided only when two superior books are so evenly matched that any other decision seems unsatisfactory to the committee.

IV. The committee will not award the prize if there is no book in the competition which meets the standards of excellence established for the prize.

Council approved the proposed guidelines. They will be in effect for awarding the prize in 1990 (books published in 1989).

6. Terry Anderson, chairperson of the Holt Prize Committee, reported that Mary Ann Heiss of Ohio State University was the Holt Prize winner for 1988, Anderson recommended that major professors review their students' applications more thoroughly, that unsuccessful applicants reapply, and that applicants submit a 6-10 page double-spaced statement of purpose.

7. Robert McMahon, co-chairperson of the 1989 program committee reported that the SHAFR summer meeting would be at the College of William and Mary in mid-June, 1989. There will be no particular theme. His committee is considering a session for high school teachers patterned after similar programs at the

annual meetings of the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians.

8. David Anderson, editor of the SHAFR Roster and Research List, noted that a new and complete roster would be published in 1989.

9. Council unanimously approved a resolution expressing appreciation to the 1988 program committee and especially to co-chairpersons Nancy B. Tucker and Robert Beisner for the excellent summer program and arrangements. Council also expressed gratitude to Betty T. Bennett, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at American University, for supporting the SHAFR reception on Thursday evening and to the Committee on American-East Asian Relations for hosting the Friday evening reception.

10. Daniel Helmstadter and Richard Dean Burns discussed the project for indexing Diplomatic History. They noted the cost could vary from \$4000 to \$10,000. Given the expense, they asked if Council really wanted a cumulative index. In the discussion it was suggested that SHAFR could begin an index on an annual basis. Council decided to postpone a decision until the December meeting.

11. Thomas Garvin, American Coordinator of the Nuclear History Program, described the program to Council. He noted its efforts to collect, preserve, and make available evidence; to develop scholarly analyses; and to increase historical knowledge of a new generation of experts, in part to encourage young scholars to conduct original research into nuclear history. Garwin noted the program's wish to develop contacts with all scholars active in the study of the history of the nuclear age as well as participants in the history under examination.

12. William Kamman presented to Council a list of SHAFR portfolio holdings as of June 1, 1988. They were listed by account and each was described by certificate number and account number. Kamman requested Council to pass a resolution naming

individuals to validate annual signature and address verification. Council appointed Gary Hess and Lawrence Kaplan to perform these tasks.

13. Kamman distributed to Council a letter from Robert Ricketts, CPA, concerning SHAFR's status as a tax exempt organization and the amount of SHAFR's income from gross investment income.

Council adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

SEARCH FOR SHAFR EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER

Lloyd C. Gardner, president of SHAFR, has appointed a search committee to find an executive secretary-treasurer whose term will commence on June 1, 1989. Professors George Herring, Thomas Paterson, Betty Unterberger, together with Mr. Gardner, constitute the committee. Nominations and inquiries may be addressed to Professor Lloyd C. Gardner, Department of History, Rutgers University, CN 50509, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903. Application deadline is October 1, 1988.

SHAFR'S CALL FOR PAPERS

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations will hold its 15th annual conference at the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, June 14-17, 1989. Program co-chairs Robert J. McMahon and Edward P. Crapol urge you to submit proposals for panels and papers. Fully assembled sessions are preferred but individual submissions are also encouraged. The committee encourages volunteers for chairing and/or commenting on panels. The deadline for proposals is December 1, 1988. Please send a one-page abstract along with a vita to Robert J. McMahon,

Department of History, University of Florida,
Gainesville, FL 32611

**OCEANIC HISTORY
CALL FOR PAPERS**

The North American Society for Oceanic History and the Society for the History of Discoveries will hold their annual meeting jointly in San Francisco, California, June 8-10, 1989. Co sponsor of this meeting will be the National Maritime Museum. Proposals for papers or sessions should be sent to Sanford H. Bederman, Department of Geography, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA., 30303; or William N. Still, Jr., Department of History, East Carolina University, Greenville, N.C., 27858-4353.

NORTH TEXAS MILITARY HISTORY SEMINAR

The sixth annual Military History Seminar will be held on Saturday, September 10, 1988, on the campus of the University of North Texas, Denton, Texas. This seminar will concentrate on the generalship of Dwight D. Eisenhower. Dr. Stephen Ambrose, Professor of History at the University of New Orleans, will speak on "Eisenhower as Supreme Commander" and General H.S. Hansell, Jr., USAF (ret), will speak on the serving officer's view of Eisenhower and other senior officers of World War II. Regional AMI and SHAFR members are welcome. A nominal fee will be charged for lunch and administrative expenses. For more information, please contact Kristen Staples, 817/565-2903.

**SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL
CALL FOR PAPERS**

The Southwestern Historical Association will meet in conjunction with the Southwestern Social Science Association in Little Rock, Arkansas, March 29-April 1, 1989. Papers or sessions in U.S. History, European and Asian History, and Latin and African History are encouraged. Prizes of \$100 will be awarded in each of the three categories. Send proposals to Lowell L. Blaisdell, Department of History, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409 by October 1, 1988.

**ASIAN STUDIES/HONG KONG
CALL FOR PAPERS**

The American Studies Association of Hong Kong and the Centre of Asian Studies of the University of Hong Kong are planning an international conference on all aspects of Sino-American relations since 1900.

Proposals for papers or complete panels are welcome. The conference organizers particularly encourage papers which utilize Chinese-language sources. Send a one-page summary and brief c.v. by October 31, 1988 to Priscilla Roberts, History Dept., University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

**WORLD WAR/1939
CALL FOR PAPERS**

Siena College will hold its annual multidisciplinary conference on the 50th anniversary of World War II on June 1-2, 1989. The focus for the meeting will be 1939 but papers dealing with broader issues of earlier years are welcome. For information, contact Thomas O. Kelly, Department of History, Siena College, Loudonville, NY 12211. (No deadline mentioned.)

AMI CALL FOR PAPERS

The Virginia Military Institute's Department of History and Politics will host the annual meeting of the American Military Institute on April 14-15, 1989 in Lexington, VA. The conference theme is "Military Education and Thought." Papers that treat the establishment of formal military education, the creation of academies and service schools, or the formulation and institutionalization of military doctrine through military education are invited. Papers may focus on any nation or period of history. Please send proposals before October 31, 1988 to: AMI Conference Coordinator, Department of History and Politics, VMI, Lexington, VA 24450.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT FOREIGN POLICY SEMINAR

The University of Connecticut Foreign Policy Seminar met three times during the last academic year. On October 23, 1987, Charles E. Neu (Brown University) spoke on "The Search for Colonel Edward M. House." His talk and the seminar discussion focused on the Wilson adviser's life and on the problems a scholar faces in writing a biography of an elusive man like House, who set traps for historians by spinning myths about his past. On February 19, 1988, Thomas G. Paterson (University of Connecticut) presented preliminary findings from his study of the United States response to the Cuban Revolution. His paper on "Kennedy's Fixation with Cuba: The Bay of Pigs, Missle Crisis, and Covert War Against Castro" was also based upon a study to be published in late 1988. On April 8, 1988, the State Department's Country Director for China, Richard L. Williams, spoke on "Sino-American Relations: Past, Present, and Future."

Future seminars will include Irwin F. Gellman (Newport Beach, CA) on "Personalities and Foreign Policy, 1933-1945" (October 7, 1988), Frank Costigliola (University of Rhode Island) on "The United States and Western Europe in the 1960s" (December 2, 1988), Louis L. Gerson (University of Connecticut) on "The Allied Governments, the Polish Government-in-Exile, and the Holocaust in Poland" (February 3, 1989), and Mark A. Stoler (University of Vermont) on "The Armed Forces, United States Foreign Policy, and Strategic Planning, 1933-1945."

If you would like to have your name put on the mailing list for future seminars and seminar summaries, please contact Professor Thomas G. Paterson, Foreign Policy Seminar Coordinator, Department of History, 241 Glenbrook Road, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06268.

THE JOHN CARTER BROWN FELLOWSHIP

The John Carter Brown Library will award approximately fifteen Research Fellowships for the year June 1, 1989-May 30, 1990. Fellowships are of two types.

SHORT-TERM FELLOWSHIPS

The regular John Carter Brown Library Fellowships are available for periods of two to four months and carry a stipend of \$800.00 per month. These Fellowships are open to Americans and to foreign nationals who are engaged in pre- or post-doctoral, or independent, research.

LONG-TERM FELLOWSHIPS

The Library will also receive applications for long-term Fellowships funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities. These NEH Fellowships are for either six-months (with a stipend of \$13,750) or twelve months (with a stipend of \$27,500). Applicants for NEH Fellowships must be American citizens or have been resident in the United States for the three years immediately preceding the term of the Fellowship. Graduate students are not eligible for NEH Fellowships.

Application forms may be obtained from the Director, John Carter Brown Library, Box 1894, Providence, RI 02912. Applications should be postmarked no later than January 15, 1989. Announcements of awards will be made before March 15, 1989.

SEMINAR FOR COLLEGE FACULTY IN BERLIN - JUNE 1989

Sessions are held in English language on German politics, history and international relations. Designed principally for undergraduate college teachers. Sessions in East and West Germany scheduled for June 9-28, 1989: Pre-Seminar sessions in Erfurt, Dresden, Weimar; Seminars in East Berlin and Potsdam, West Berlin and Bonn. Seminars presented by German

university faculty, political leaders and foreign office experts.

Participants' principal cost is travel to and from Berlin. American faculty are assigned as session commentators.

Because of deadlines for East German visas, invitations are sent by November 1, 1988. For information contact:

Lester H. Brune
History Department
Bradley University
Peoria, IL 61625

NAVAL HISTORY SYMPOSIUM CALL FOR PAPERS

The History Department of the United States Naval Academy will sponsor its ninth Naval History Symposium in 1989. Tentative dates for the symposium are 18-20 October. The Symposium welcomes papers on all topics relating to naval and maritime history. Proposals should be sent to Associate Professor William R. Roberts, History Department, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD 21402-5044. The deadline for proposals is 1 February 1988.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES FUNDS STUDY OF ELECTRONIC RECORDS

The Archivist of the United States, Dr. Don W. Wilson, has announced that a study of the effects of electronic recordkeeping on the historical record of the Federal government is underway. The survey and analysis will be conducted by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) under a \$195,000 year-long contract.

The NAPA staff will collect data on the electronic recordkeeping practices of Federal agencies through questionnaires and interviews. A questionnaire will

be mailed to approximately 1,000 key officials in Federal departments and agencies and a series of interviews with records and information managers in 19 agencies will be conducted. The agencies include the Justice, Defense, and State Departments as well as the U. S. House of Representatives and U. S. Senate.

The data will then be analyzed and presented to a panel of 15 experts who will make recommendations to the Archivist.

The final report is scheduled to be completed by December 20.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES' PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY BOARD

The Archivist of the United States, Dr. Don W. Wilson, announced today the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Presidential Libraries. The eight Presidential libraries around the nation are operated and maintained by the National Archives.

The committee will be a standing advisory group with no fixed duration; each member will serve renewable three-year terms. The committee will be composed of nine members initially, each providing a perspective on the development of Presidential libraries.

For further press information, please call Jill Brett, Public Affairs Officer of the National Archives at (202) 523-3099.

THE JOHN F. KENNEDY LIBRARY ANNOUNCES RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP

The John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library announced today the establishment of the Marjorie Kovler Research Fellowship to provide financial assistance to scholars undertaking research at the Library.

Applications for the Kovler Fellowship will be reviewed by the Kennedy Library Academic Advisory

Committee. Selection of Kovler Fellows will be made by the Board of Directors of the John F. Kennedy Library Foundation after receiving recommendations from the Advisory Committee.

Further information about the fellowship may be secured by writing to: The Director, John F. Kennedy Library, Columbia Point, Boston, MA 02125

**LEGISLATIVE UPDATE FROM PAGE PUTNAM MILLER
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
FOR THE PROMOTION OF HISTORY**

ACCESS TO RECORDS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. On June 15 the Subcommittee on Rules of the House held a hearing to consider H. Res. 419, which would amend the Rules of the House to make noncurrent House records available to scholars after 30 years. Currently House records are closed for 50 years. Four witnesses presented testimony: three of the four supported the adoption of a 20 year rule, which has been the practice in the Senate for almost a decade. Only the Clerk of the House supported the 30 year rule. Immediately following the hearing the committee voted unanimously, without any discussion, to recommend a 30 year rule. The fact that there are 52 members of the House who have served for over 20 years and who may prefer for their earlier views not to be scrutinized seemed to have been the underlying reason for the unanimous support by the Subcommittee on the 30 year rule.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT HEARING. Senator Patrick Leahy (D-VT) has scheduled for August 2 a hearing for the Senate Subcommittee on Technology and the Law of the Judiciary Committee to consider the administration of the FOIA. For scholars one of the most disturbing issues is a fee waiver provision adopted in 1986. To qualify for a fee waiver, educational or scientific researchers must prove that a request "is being made under the auspices of a qualifying institution." Individual historians initiate their own research projects. Generally academic institutions have no

role in a historian's selection of topics, research, or conclusions. The requirement that scholars make their requests on behalf of the university reflects a lack of understanding of much historical research. The NCC is currently working with Senator Leahy's staff to ensure that the concerns of historians are heard.

FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES. Since 1861 the Department of State has published the official records of American diplomacy in a respected documentary series, The Foreign Relations of the United States. For many years volumes in the series were published 20 years after the historical events. Now there is little hope for meeting a thirty year target. The NCC is working with leaders in the historical community to draw Congressional attention to the problems currently facing this series. Concerns focus not only on the delays but also on the problems in the declassification process and on the appropriate role of the Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION. There are two major pieces of news to report on the NHPRC. The first is that the reauthorization for the grants program has been passed by the Congress and is now awaiting the President's signature. The second is that Frank Burke, who for the past 13 years has served as the Executive Director of the NHPRC, will be leaving in September. A national search is now underway for a new Executive Director and the deadline for applications is September 15.

The NHPRC reauthorization legislation establishes funding ceilings for the NHPRC grants for the next five years at \$6 million for FY'89, \$8 million for FY'90 and \$10 million for FY'91, '92 and '93.

PUBLICATIONS

Joseph P. Baratta (Cambridge, MA), Strengthening the United Nations: A Bibliography on U.N. Reform and World Federalism. Greenwood Press, 1987. ISBN 0-313-25840-6. \$45.00

Thomas H. Buckley (Tulsa) and Edwin B. Strong, American Foreign and National Security Policies, 1914-1945. U. of Tennessee, 1988. Cloth: ISBN 0-87049-539-9, \$24.95. Paper: ISBN 0-87049-540-2, \$12.95

Henry Butterfield Ryan (John Hopkins University, School of Advanced International Studies), The Vision of Angol-America: The US-UK Alliance and the Emerging Cold War, 1943-1946. Cambridge University Press, 1987. ISBN 0-521-32928-0. \$34.50

Howard Jones (Univ. of Alabama), The Course of American Diplomacy: From the Revolution to the Present. 2nd ed. Dorsey Press, 1988. Cloth, one vol.: ISBN 0-256-06088-6, \$35.00. Paper, two vols.: Volume I, ISBN 0-256-06218-8, \$16.00; Volume II, ISBN 0-256-06219-6, \$22.00

Frederick W. Marks, III (Forest Hills, N.Y.), Wind over Sand: The Diplomacy of Franklin Roosevelt. University of Georgia Press, 1988. \$29.95

David Reynolds (Cambridge University), co-author, An Ocean Apart: The Relationship between Britain and America in the Twentieth Century. Random House, 1988. ISBN 0-394-56968-7. \$24.95

Robert Seager, II (Univ. of Kentucky), and Melba Porter Hay, eds., The Papers of Henry Clay, Volume 9: The Whig Leader, January 1, 1837 -- December 31, 1843. Univ. Press of Kentucky, 1988. \$50.00

Jesse Stiller (Fort Bliss, Texas), George S. Messersmith, Diplomat of Democracy. U. of North Carolina Press, 1987. ISBN 0-8078-1721-X. \$35.00

SPECIAL SHAFR DISCOUNT

AMERICA SEES RED: Anti-Communism in America, 1890s to 1980s. A Guide to Issues & References.

Peter H. Buckingham.

"I was greatly impressed by the thoroughness of the author's survey of issues, especially in the post-World War II period."

—Professor Robert Griffith, University of Massachusetts at Amherst

240 pages (1987) text \$8.75

SHAFR Discount \$7.00

THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE: Progress and Challenge. A Review of Issues and References.

Douglas C. Waller, James T. Bruce III and Douglas M. Cook.

This critical survey is drawn from two congressional studies and has been supplemented with a discussion of SDI's relationship to arms control, of the Soviet Union's antagonism to SDI, and of the politics of SDI funding. The text is amplified by a dozen illustrations, charts and tables. The expanded reference chapter contains nearly 500 citation to the SDI program and related issues.

184 pages (1987) text \$7.75

SHAFR Discount \$6.00

ARMS CONTROL, DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, 1987: An Annual Bibliography

Richard Dean Burns, Editor-in-Chief

Sponsored by the Center for the Study of Armament and Disarmament, California State University, Los Angeles and the Arms Control Association, Washington, D.C.

Each annual bibliography will identify and classify some 1,500 to 2,500 reference works, books and monographs, documents, articles, and dissertations on arms control, disarmament, and international security.

(1988) ca. 200pp. cloth \$25.95

SHAFR Discount \$12.00

Offer expires December 31, 1988

Individuals only, please

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AND THE INTERNATIONAL RIVALRIES. Raymond R. Esthus. The story of Roosevelt's role as a pragmatic diplomat, employing secret diplomacy to placate rivalries without involving his country in commitments abroad. This account deals both with TR's involvement in European and East Asian controversies. Bibliography, index.

165 pages. (1971, 1982) text \$7.95, SHAFR Discount \$6.00

U.S. DIPLOMATS IN EUROPE, 1919-1941. Kenneth Paul Jones, ed. "...the essays are lucidly written and coherently organized...a fine introduction to the diplomacy of the era as well as to some of the most recent scholarship..." — *American Historical Review*

240 pages (1983) text \$7.95, SHAFR Discount \$6.00

THE MISSILE CRISIS OF OCTOBER 1962: A Review of Issues and References. Lester Brune.

"Brune skillfully...scrutinizes the origins of the major issues and analyses the reaction and response of Washington and Moscow, relating them to domestic politics and international affairs....Highly recommended as a brief, analytical review of the crisis situation."

—*Choice* (April 1986)

165 pages (1985) text \$ 7.95, SHAFR Discount \$6.00

Buckingham. <i>America Sees Red</i>	discount	\$7.00	_____
Waller et al. <i>SDI</i>	discount	\$6.00	_____
Burns <i>Arms Control...</i>	discount	\$12.00	_____
Esthus. <i>Theodore Roosevelt</i>	discount	\$6.00	_____
Jones. <i>U.S. Diplomats</i>	discount	\$6.00	_____
Brune. <i>Missle Crisis</i>	discount	\$6.00	_____

Offer limited to *individuals* only. All orders must be pre-paid (a personal check is fine): Regina Books will pay the postage of orders of 3 or more books. California orders, please add 6% sales tax.

sub-total _____

postage (\$1 per title) _____

TOTAL _____

Ship to: Name: _____
Address _____ _____ _____

Send to: Regina Books, Box 280, Claremont, Ca. 91711

CALENDAR

- November 1 Deadline, materials for the December Newsletter.
- November 1-15 Annual election for SHAFR officers.
- November 1 Applications for Bernath dissertation fund awards are due.
- December 27-30 The 103rd annual meeting of the AHA will be held in Cincinnati. The deadline for proposals has passed.
- January 1, 1989 Membership fees in all categories are due, payable at the national office of SHAFR.
- January 15 Deadline for the 1988 Bernath article award.
- January 20 Deadline for the 1988 Bernath book award.
- February 1 Deadline, materials for the March Newsletter.
- February 1 Submissions for Warren Kuehl Award are due.
- March 1 Nominations for the Bernath lecture prize are due.
- April 1 Applications for the H. Stull Holt dissertation fellowship are due.
- April 6-9 The 82nd meeting of the OAH will be held in St. Louis, MO, at Adam's Mark Hotel.
- May 1 Deadline, materials for the June

Newsletter.

June 9-12

The 15th SHAFR Summer Conference at the College of William and Mary. The program chair is Robert McMahon, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611.

August 1

Deadline, materials for the September Newsletter.

In 1989 the AHA will meet in San Francisco; the program chairman is Timothy N. Tackett, Dept. of History, Catholic University, Washington, D.C. 20064.

The 1990 OAH will meet in Washington, D.C., March 22-25 and the program chairman is August Meier, Department of History, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44242.

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 which is a history of international relations, which is meant to include biographies of statesmen and diplomats. General surveys, autobiographies, editions of essays and documents, and works which are representative of social science disciplines other than history are not eligible. The prize is to be awarded to a first monograph by a young scholar.

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 books should be sent directly to: Walter LaFeber, History Department, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853.

Books may be sent at any time during 1988, but should not arrive later than January 20, 1989.

The award of \$2,000.00 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, 1989, in St. Louis.

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-Chapel Hill)
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	Michael H. Hunt (North Carolina-Chapel Hill)
1985	David Wyman (Massachusetts-Amherst)
1986	Thomas J. Noer (Carthage College)
1987	Fraser J. Harbutt (Emory)
	James Edward Miller (Department of State)
1988	Michael Hogan (Ohio State)

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, 1989. Nominations should be sent to: Clayton Koppes, Department of History, Oberlin College, Oberlin, OH 44074.

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)
1986	Nancy Bernkopf Tucker (Colgate)
1987	William O. Walker III (Ohio Wesleyan)
1988	Stephen G. Rabe (Texas at Dallas)

The Stuart L. Bernath Scholarly Article Prize

The purpose of the 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 United States foreign relations that is published during 1988. The author must not be over 40 years of age, or within 10 years after receiving the Ph.D., at the time of publication. Previous winners of the Stuart L. Bernath Book Award are excluded.

Procedures: All articles appearing in Diplomatic History shall be automatically considered without nomination. Other articles may be nominated by the author or by any member of SHAFR or by the editor of any journal publishing articles in American diplomatic history. Three (3) copies of the article shall be submitted by 15 January 1989 to the chairperson of the committee, who for 1989 is: Gaddis Smith, P.O. Box 1504A, Yale Station, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520.

The award of \$300.00 will be presented at the SHAFR luncheon at the annual meeting of the OAH in April, 1989, in St. Louis.

Previous winners:

1977	John C.A. Stagg (U of Auckland, N.Z.)
1978	Michael H. Hunt (Yale)
1979	Brian L. Villa (Ottawa)
1980	James I. Matray (New Mexico State) David A. Rosenberg (Chicago)
1981	Douglas Little (Clark)
1982	Fred Pollock (Cedar Knolls, NJ)
1983	Chester Pach (Texas Tech)
1985	Melvyn Leffler (Vanderbilt)
1986	Duane Tananbaum (Ohio State)
1987	David McLean (R.M.I.H.E., Australia)
1988	Dennis Merrill (Missouri-Kansas 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. Deadline for receipt of applications is November 1.
6. The application should include an itemized listing of how the money is to be used; an abstract and a description of the significance of the study; and a projected date of completion.
7. The applicant's supervisor must include a brief statement certifying the accuracy of the applicant's request and report of completion.
8. When the dissertation is finished the recipient must send to the chairman of the committee a copy of the abstract sent to University Microfilms (University of Michigan).
9. 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 Harriet Schwar, Office of the Historian, Department of State, Washington, DC 20520.

Previous winners:

- 1985 Jon Nielson (UC-Santa Barbara)
1986 Valdinia C. Winn (Kansas) & Walter L. Hixon (Colorado)

- 1987 Janet M. Manson (Washington State), Thomas M. Gaskin (Washington), W. Michael Weis (Ohio State) & Michael Wala (Hamburg)
1988 Elizabeth Cobbs (Stanford) & Madhu Bhalla (Queen's, Ontario)
-

THE W. STULL HOLT DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP

The Holt Dissertation Fellowship was established as a memorial to W. Stull Holt, one of that generation of historians which established diplomatic history as a respected field for historical research and teaching.

The award will be \$1,500.00.

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 to help defray costs of travel, preferably foreign travel, necessary to the pursuit of research on a significant dissertation project. Qualified applicants will have satisfactorily completed comprehensive doctoral examinations before April 1989, leaving only the dissertation as the sole, remaining requirement for the doctoral degree.

Applicants should include a prospectus of the dissertation, indicating work already completed as well as contemplated research. The prospectus 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. An academic transcript showing all graduate work taken to date should accompany the application and prospectus of the dissertation. In addition, three letters from graduate teachers familiar with the work of the applicant, including one letter from the director of the dissertation, are required.

At the end of the fellowship year the recipient of the fellowship will be required to report to the Committee relating how the fellowship was used.

Applications and supporting papers should be sent before April 1, 1989 to: Wayne S. Cole, Department of History, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

Announcement of the recipient of the Holt Memorial Fellowship will be made at the Society's annual summer meeting.

Prior winners:

- 1986 Kurt Schultz (Ohio State University)
 - 1987 David W. McFadden (University of California, Berkeley)
 - 1988 Mary Ann Heiss (Ohio State University)
-

THE NORMAN AND LAURA GRAEBNER AWARD

The Graebner Award is to be awarded every other year at SHAFR's summer conference to a senior historian of United States foreign relations whose achievements have contributed most significantly to the fuller understanding of American diplomatic history.

Conditions of the Award:

The Graebner prize will be awarded, beginning in 1986, to a distinguished scholar of diplomatic and international affairs. It is expected that this scholar would be 60 years of age or older.

The recipient's career must demonstrate excellence in scholarship, teaching, and/or service to the profession. Although the prize is not restricted to academic historians, the recipient must have distinguished himself or herself through the study of international affairs from a historical perspective.

Applicants, or individuals nominating a candidate, are requested to submit three (3) copies of a letter which:

- (a) provides a brief biography of the candidate, including educational background, academic or other positions held and awards and honors received;
- (b) lists the candidate's major scholarly works and discusses the nature of his or her contribution to the study of diplomatic history and international affairs;
- (c) describes the candidate's teaching career, listing any teaching honors and awards and commenting on the candidate's classroom skills; and
- (d) details the candidate's services to the historical profession, listing specific organizations and offices, and discussing particular activities.

Chairman of the committee: Lloyd Ambrosius, Dept. of History, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588.

Prior winner: Dorothy Borg (Columbia)

WARREN F. KUEHL AWARD

The Society will award the Warren F. Kuehl Prize to the author or authors of an outstanding book dealing with the history of internationalism and/or the history of peace movements. The subject may include biographies of prominent internationalists or peace leaders. Also eligible are works on American foreign relations that examine United States diplomacy from a world perspective and which are in accord with Kuehl's 1985 presidential address to SHAFR. That address voiced an "appeal for scholarly breadth, for a wider perspective on how foreign relations of the United States fits into the global picture."

The award will be made every other year at the SHAFR summer conference. The next award will be for books published in 1987 and 1988. Deadline for submissions is February 1, 1989. One copy of each submission should be sent directly to each member of the selection committee.

David Patterson
9011 Montgomery Ave.
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Robert Accinelli
Dept. of History
University of Toronto
Toronto M5S 1A1
Canada

Harold Josephson
UNCC St. - History
U. of N. Carolina/Charlotte
Charlotte, NC 28223

1987 winner: Harold Josephson (University of North Carolina at Charlotte)

(After a short lapse the A.E.A.R. Newsletter is resuming publication. The most recent issue was included in the March 1987 issue of the SHAFR Newsletter.



AMERICAN-EAST ASIAN RELATIONS NEWSLETTER

SEPTEMBER 1988

Research in Progress

Ron Lilley (Northern Virginia Community College)

From time to time the A.E.A.R. Newsletter has published a list of research in progress. The following is at best a partial listing, and the editor would be very happy to hear from those who did not receive his letter. If you have a project in progress on A.E.A.R., the Pacific Rim, and the Indian Ocean, the editors would like to hear from you. Here's the data I would like to collect and publish on this topic: (a) your name; (b) institutional affiliation; (c) subject matter of work in progress; (d) anticipated date of completion.

American-Chinese Relations

1. Michael Hunt, Department of History, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. "Chinese Communists' Images of U.S."
2. Charles R. Lilley, Northern Virginia Community College, Woodbridge Campus, "Nationalism in the Bicultural Social Worlds of Tsiang T'ing-fu." ADC: 1990.
3. Noel H. Pugach, Department of History, University of New Mexico. "A History of the Chinese American Bank of Commerce, 1919-1929" and "A Study of the China Arms Embargo during the 1920's." ADC: nd.

4. Arthur Waldron, Department of History, Princeton University. "The Warlord Period: A Re-evaluation of the Diplomacy of the 1920's;" "A Study of J.V.A. MacMurray;" and "Higher Education in China before 1949." ADC: nd.

American-Japanese Relations

1. Osamu Ishii, faculty of law, Hiroshima University. "U.S. Policy towards Japan in the 1950's." ADC: 1989.

American-Korean Relations

1. Wayne Patterson, Department of History, St. Norbert College. "The Korean Frontier in America: Immigration to Hawaii, 1896-1910." ADC: Fall 1988, University of Hawaii Press.

South Asia

1. Robert J. McMahon, Department of History, University of Virginia. "U.S. Relations with India and Pakistan, 1947-1965." ADC: 1990.

The Vietnam War and Southeast Asia

1. Peter Edwards, Australian War Memorial, GPO Box 345, Canberra, Act 2601, Australia. "Official History of Australia's Involvement in the Malayan Emergency and the Vietnam War." ADC: early and mid-1990's.
2. L. Fletcher Prouty, USAF, ret. "The Vietnam War." ADC: nd.
3. Ronald H. Spector, University of Alabama. "After Tet: An Account of the Bloodiest Year of the Vietnam War." [Author explains that his is a "study of the interplay between events in Vietnam and their impact on perception and decisions in Saigon and Washington from President Johnson's Speech of March 31, 1968 to Hamburger Hill in May of 1969.] ADC: 1991.

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

SPONSOR: Tennessee Technological University,
Cookeville, Tennessee.

EDITOR: William J. Brinker, Department of History.

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT: Brent W. York.

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

DEADLINES: All material should be sent to the editor
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 subjects,
bibliographical or historiographical
essays, essays of a "how-to-do-it" nature, information
about foreign depositories, biographies,
autobiographies of "elder statesmen" in the
field, jokes, etc.

FORMER PRESIDENTS OF SHAFR

1968	Thomas A. Bailey (Stanford)
1969	Alexander DeConde (California-Santa Barbara)
1970	Richard W. Leopold (Northwestern)
1971	Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana)
1972	Norman A. Graebner (Virginia)
1973	Wayne S. Cole (Maryland)
1974	Bradford Perkins (Michigan)
1975	Armin H. Rappaport (California-San Diego)
1976	Robert A. Divine (Texas)
1977	Raymond A. Esthus (Tulane)
1978	Akira Iriye (Chicago)
1979	Paul A. Varg (Michigan State)
1980	David M. Pletcher (Indiana)
1981	Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State)
1982	Lawrence E. Gelfand (Iowa)
1983	Ernest R. May (Harvard)
1984	Warren I. Cohen (Michigan State)
1985	Warren F. Kuehl (Akron)
1986	Betty Unterberger (Texas A&M)
1987	Thomas G. Paterson (Connecticut)