

# The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations



## NEWSLETTER

---

Volume 20

No. 3

September 1989

### Page

- 1 SHAFR's New Executive Secretary
- 2 What Does a Cultural Attache Really Do? *by Henry Butterfield Ryan*
- 10 Orders From Washington to Dublin: The Mixed Signals Received by Charles Hathaway in 1924 *by Joseph P. O'Grady*
- 17 United States Diplomacy: A Bibliography of Historiographical Works *by Joseph A. Fry*
- 36 Report of the Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation, March 1989
- 43 Minutes of SHAFR Council Meeting
- 45 Obituary
- 48 Announcements
- 56 Publications
- 58 Calendar
- 59 Awards and Prizes
- 67 A.E.A.R. Newsletter
- 67 "Lost Chance" or "Inevitable Hostility?" Two Contending Interpretations of the Late 1940s Chinese-American Relations *by Zhigong Ho*

ISSN 0740-6169

## SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

---

FOUNDED IN 1967. CHARTERED IN 1972.

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

VICE PRESIDENT: Michael Hunt, History, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER: Allan Spetter, History, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435.

CO-CHAIR, PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Wayne Cole, University of Maryland and Mark Gilderhus, Colorado State University.

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

CHAIR, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Arnold Offner, History, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215

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*.

---

## SHAFR'S NEW EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

*The following information is meant to serve the members as an introduction to Allan Spetter who has taken over as the new SHAFR Executive Secretary.*

Born in Brooklyn, N.Y., Spetter moved to Newark, N.J. after high school. He attended the urban campus of Rutgers University in Newark as an undergraduate and the main campus in New Brunswick for graduate work. During his undergraduate and graduate years, he was on staff of the Newark *Star-Ledger*, reporting on civil rights activities and the "war on poverty" in Newark through 1966.

Lloyd Gardner directed his dissertation on the administration of President Benjamin Harrison. He accepted a position in the History Department at Wright State University in Dayton, Ohio in January, 1967, and has remained at Wright State. His wife, Lois, is a teacher of Spanish and English as a second Language. His three children include Stephanie, a junior at Indiana University, Pamela, an entering freshman at Ohio State, and Joshua, entering the fifth grade.

His publications—including *The Presidency of Benjamin Harrison* (University Press of Kansas, 1987, co-author with Homer Socolofsky of Kansas State University)—all deal with the Harrison administration. Most recently, he has concentrated on the historiography of the administration—with an article, "Albert T. Volwiler and the Unfinished Biography of President Benjamin Harrison," in the *Hayes Historical Journal*, Fall, 1988.

His administrative experience includes three years as Assistant Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and five years as chairman of the History Department at Wright State. He has spent much time over the past two months reviewing SHAFR files, and writes the following: "I realize that a wide variety of individuals—including the six who have served before me as Executive Secretary-Treasurer—have devoted a great deal of time and energy to building this organization. I will do my best to carry on the tradition."

## WHAT DOES A CULTURAL ATTACHE REALLY DO?

by  
*Henry Butterfield Ryan*  
(*Johns Hopkins University, SAIS*)

What does a cultural attache do? How many times have I been asked? Yet I have never put together a good, concise answer. Perhaps this will be the exception.

In the American diplomatic service cultural attaches are generally referred to within the ranks as "cultural affairs officers." This was not always the case, and therein lies a small tale I will recount later. First, however, let's talk about what cultural affairs officers hope to do—their most general, perhaps most idealistic, intentions and objectives. They hope to help people in the country to which they are assigned know more about their own country. Everything that they undertake in the line of duty is, or should be, geared to achieve that end. Why? Because they assume, rightly or wrongly, that greater knowledge will lead to sympathetic understanding, reducing the tensions that stem from misapprehension and bias, and creating an atmosphere more conducive to cooperation between their own country and the host country. Cultural officers know that better understanding will not eliminate criticism, but they hope that it will help it to be based on reason rather than prejudice.

Cultural officers work strictly for the good of one country, their own. Still, it is generally assumed, certainly in the American service, that because of the nature of their work, whatever benefits the US probably benefits others as well. If that brings back memories of Engine Charlie Wilson, so be it.

In the ethos of the cultural affairs community, any increase in understanding is considered to be a universal gain.

Obviously then, cultural officers have lofty hopes indeed. Can these be achieved? They do not really know. Evidence is very spotty, but they believe that they are moving in the right direction.

Now, I should say something about methods and organization. American cultural affairs overseas are handled by the US Information Agency (USIA), which works closely with the State Department. The Agency has 204 posts abroad in 127 countries. They are connected to our embassies and consulates, although their headquarters and facilities may be at separate locations. Overseas, USIA is called the US Information Service (USIS). In 25 years with the Agency I only met one person who could tell me convincingly how the whole thing came to have two names. Alas, he has died, and I have forgotten.

A typical USIS post includes a cultural affairs officer (CAO) and an information officer (IO). Each heads a staff, which varies in size from country to country, and each answers to a third officer, the public affairs officer (PAO), who is the head of all USIS operations in any nation. If there are consulates in the country, (in effect, smaller embassies in major cities but not the national capital), each will almost certainly have a branch PAO. He or she will be in charge of local cultural affairs, among other duties, and perhaps will be aided by an American branch cultural affairs officer who in turn will oversee one or more national employees. It is more likely, however, that the PAO will be assisted in the cultural area only by national employees answering to him or her directly.

In order to do their jobs properly, CAOs must keep in touch with some of the most interesting people in their host countries. They should have wide contacts in the academic

community, with both scholars and administrators; in the arts, with artists and cultural managers (e.g., gallery owners, museum staffers, impresarios, festival directors); in the secondary school system, with both teachers and administrators; in the foreign office, with cultural, political, and other officials; in the parliament, with members and staff; and in the media, with cultural, political and other journalists.

Until recently, we had cultural attaches, as I mentioned above, as well as cultural affairs officers. The attaches, who served for limited periods only, were specialists in the affairs of the host country generally or in some important aspect, e.g., history, art, literature. In-house, they were referred to as "super CAOs." They were sent only to the larger countries or those with special diplomatic significance for the US. Cultural affairs officers were subordinate to them. Despite the fact that some of the cultural attaches were extraordinarily good officers, the system was not considered a great success in USIA. In the view of Agency managers, the super-CAOs often were too limited in their interests, they were frequently reluctant to make the full range of contacts needed by the service, they found it hard to adjust to a bureaucratic lifestyle, and they left most of the workload to the CAOs (as indeed they were intended to do) while at the same time keeping the cream of cultural work from careerists. Rightly or wrongly, they came to be regarded as largely ornamental and gradually, quietly were phased out. No one ever said "let there be no more super-CAOs," there just have been none for the better part of a decade. There were two politically appointed CAOs during the Reagan Administration, but that is something different, a reward for political service not an appointment because of expertise. Furthermore, both were purely CAOs; they did not fill the old cultural attache slots.

Cultural affairs appear in their highest and most glamorous relief when, due largely to the efforts of CAOs, great

American art exhibits and famous performing groups travel abroad. For example, USIA regularly assists with our national entries in the Saõ Paulo Biennial and the Venice Biennale. It has also helped send a major show of American Impressionists to Paris, another of works from the collection of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts to China, an exhibit of Western Art from Catlin to O'Keefe to Australia, and a show of 19th century American landscapes to Latin America. Performers and performing groups who have toured in recent years with USIA help have included Dizzie Gillespie, the New York Philharmonic Orchestra, and the Dance Theatre of Harlem. It would be misleading to suggest that USIA "sends" all of these attractions, especially the big shows and groups. More often it chips in, sometimes, as with the show to Australia, only as a minor contributor. Nevertheless, the cultural affairs officers at the receiving locations are nearly always deeply involved in the arrangements.

Far less spectacular projects, but probably more important, are those that permit people abroad to visit the US. Principal among these is one called simply the "International Visitors Program," which brings about 2,600 people a year to the US. It attempts to identify leaders in any field but especially in public affairs, e.g., politics and journalism, well before they reach the top of their careers. It permits them to visit the US, all expenses paid, usually for 30 days to do whatever interests them so long as it relates to their professions. According to the latest count, 99 persons who subsequently became heads of state made these trips. They have included Margaret Thatcher, Jose Sarney, Helmut Schmidt, Indira Gandhi, Anwar Sadat, and many others whose names have become household words. Added to these are 662 who later became cabinet ministers plus thousands of prominent journalists. Heads of all the sections of an embassy staff have a voice in

the selection process for this program, but it is almost always administered by the CAO.

The "Voluntary Visitors Program" is similar. The US Government offers "facilitative assistance" to approximately another 2,500 persons of the type and caliber offered International Visitor grants. For example, it sets up appointments with their counterparts in America, makes hotel reservations and travel arrangements, and provides information about their fields of interest in the US. The government, however does not sponsor or pay for these trips. In special cases some financial assistance may be offered, but not usually, and never in more than very limited amounts.

Two cultural programs administered by USIA are closely linked with the academic community. One is the Fulbright Program; the other, the speakers program.

The Fulbright Program is probably the best known of all USIA's cultural activities. Ironically, however, many Americans, even those who win Fulbright grants, are unaware that the Agency has anything to do with the program because it is advertised and administered in the US mostly by contractors, principally the Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES) and the Institute for International Education (IIE). Fulbright grantees can range from undergraduates to senior scholars and, in fact, can also include non-academicians. The mix varies with each of 102 countries that take part in the program, which is always a two-way exchange. At present about 4,800 Fulbright grants are awarded each year.

Overseas, CAOs are invariably involved with the program in one way or another. Administrative arrangements differ from country to country, but in general the program is either run exclusively by USIA, which usually means the CAO, or by a binational board on which the CAO takes an active part and serves as the chief link to the US Government.



The speakers program, administered by cultural affairs officers or in large posts their deputies, is known and referred to almost universally as the "Ampart" program, "Ampart" being short for "American Participant." In the Carter years, it was believed that public speaking was unacceptably unilateral, whereas "participating" implied a two-way exchange. Because USIA hoped that speakers not only would talk to overseas audiences but also would listen, learn, and subsequently inform Americans, they became "American Participants." From there it was a short, and some would say lamentable, step to "Amparts."

Regardless of the name, the 700 or so Amparts who go abroad each year are invaluable not so much for what they say, brilliant as that sometimes is, but for the bridges they build. They not only demonstrate the quality of American intellectual life, if they are scholars as the majority are, but they often create long-term links between the academies of the US and the countries they visit. Non-academic participants bring similar benefits in whatever field they represent.

The speakers program came under heavy fire in the early 1980s for requiring candidates to pass a political litmus test. Some speakers became irritated, and a few incensed, when asked if they could support Reagan's foreign policy, which was hardly surprising considering that one, for example, was a member of the Minnesota Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party and another specialized in 19th-century America. Several went straight to the press, and gradually stories began appearing about politicization of this USIA activity. Whatever we might think about the press, its pressure kept the program honest. I know because I was the Agency's spokesperson to the US media when the story broke. New guidelines were soon formulated stipulating that only a speaker going out to explain current administration policies needed to agree with

those policies. Otherwise, the speaker's politics did not matter.

It was a good solution, but, alas, not completely adhered to in headquarters. A black list was kept, which later became public, creating an even bigger and more chastening story. I believe that by the time that was over the program was generally sanitized of undue political influence and remains so today.

Cultural affairs officers supervise USIS cultural centers and libraries around the world. In the 1950s and 1960s the libraries often were large lending operations, with a wide selection of American literature and scholarly writing. During the last twenty years, however, they have tended to become much smaller reference collections designed to assist journalists, officials, scholars and others with professional interests in American affairs. Increasingly, the libraries' visible collections are shrinking in importance compared with their electronic links to US databases, and "readers" in the traditional sense have become a small proportion of their clientele. Mostly, their users request information by telephone. Some libraries, in fact, have ceased being open to the public at all, the one in London, for example. Cultural centers are often, but not always, the homes of USIS libraries. They also include English-language schools, art galleries and auditoria. Speakers, exhibits, films, and seminars on various aspects of US life are standard fare. Whenever there is a center, it is the job of the CAO to be sure that it operates efficiently and effectively. In larger countries, there may be centers in several major cities with directors answering to the CAO.

Funding for all official US cultural affairs programs worldwide is small in federal budget terms. In the 1988 fiscal year it equalled \$297 million for speakers, exchanges (Fulbright, International Visitors, and other programs),

overseas cultural centers (including libraries), exhibits, and a program to translate and distribute American books. This year the Pentagon will budget nearly half that amount for military bands alone. Unfortunately, the results of overseas cultural efforts are very difficult to measure. Nevertheless, confident that they are going at least generally in the right direction and trying always for better programs as well as more effective measurements, American cultural affairs officers around the world work pretty much along the lines I have described. Or to put it another way, that, briefly, is what a cultural attache does.

Information for this article is drawn from 25 years experience in the foreign service of USIA (1961-1986), but I have also relied on the Agency's Bureau of Public Liaison and individual agency officers for assistance, especially for current data. Only the figure for military bands comes from elsewhere, i.e., The President's Budget Exhibit 31M of the Operations and Maintenance Budget for each military service.

**ORDERS FROM WASHINGTON TO DUBLIN:  
THE MIXED SIGNALS RECEIVED BY  
CHARLES HATHAWAY IN 1924**

by  
*Joseph P. O'Grady*  
(*LaSalle University*)

Anyone who has worked for the Department of State, or any government agency for that matter, knows that conflicting orders often characterize a day's work and maybe more; but historians, who spend their days in the back corners of archives, seldom find such orders. The long years between the writing of such orders and their transfer to the archives staff, plus the constant pressure to reduce the amount of paper maintained in any office, means that most of such orders seldom make it to the safety that the archives staff represents. That was not the case, however, with the conflicting orders received by Charles Hathaway in 1924. The story of what happened to him may help to explain why sometimes the quality of documents in the archives declines.

Charles Hathaway served in the American Consulate in Cork, Ireland during World War I and his ability to describe the political events there with remarkable clarity convinced his superiors in the State Department to move him to Dublin in time for the Department to receive his reports on the remarkable events of the Irish Civil War in 1922 and 1923. That war developed over a disagreement between two Irish factions with respect to the Treaty of December 6, 1921 in which England granted Ireland Dominion Home Rule. The Irish would be in complete control of their internal affairs as the Irish Free State, but would remain a member of the British Empire and somewhat subject to the King. One faction under the leadership of Eamon De Valera, the anti-treaty wing of the

Irish Republican Army (I.R.A.), resisted attempts to create the Irish Free State under the Treaty terms in the spring of 1922 and full scale civil war erupted in late June. It would last almost a full year.<sup>1</sup>

Hathaway's reporting of these events and what followed gained him the confidence of his superiors in Washington and, at the same time, he was able to develop close relations with the leading personalities of the new Irish Free State Government.<sup>2</sup> That latter success gave him access to the information that made his reports to Washington so acceptable. He was in a position that foreign service officers dream about and he had the ability to put all of what he heard and saw on the written page in a manner that kept his superiors well aware of what was happening. He could research a problem, analyze the evidence and produce a dispatch that described not only what had actually happened with logical clarity, but what it meant.

Then in the late fall of 1923 he ran into some difficulties with his staff. Sickness suddenly reduced it just as routine work, in particular, the issuing of visas, increased. The sudden freedom from England had not changed Ireland's economy and many citizens could neither find jobs nor hope for the future. The movement out of the country, especially to the United States which was experiencing a booming economy, only grew and with it Hathaway's workload. The result was that he had to delay his political reporting which had earned him his advancement in the service.

He filed his last report for 1923 on November 21. Because of these staff problems he was unable to submit his first report of 1924 until March 24, but it was a long one.<sup>3</sup> The eighteen page effort covered the events of December, January, February, and March during which the British people went to the polls in a general election. As a result a Labour party government emerged in January 1924 for the first time.

But the better portion of his March dispatch (16 of 18 pages) covered what he clearly considered the major event for Ireland during those months, the attempted mutiny by some army officers on March 6. On that day two officers had sent an ultimatum to President William Cosgrave. They would resort to the use of force if changes were not made in Army policy and the government did not become more aggressive in its use of the powers conferred by the 1921 Anglo-Irish Treaty to gain the ultimate freedom for Ireland, a republic. The events that followed the announcement of that ultimatum produced, at the time and ever since, a very confused picture of who had the real power in Dublin in March 1924. A recent full scale, book length study of those events has not clarified all the questions that haunt that month, but Hathaway in his March dispatch painted a clear picture of a confused and divided Irish Free State Army, a divided Executive Council (the Irish Cabinet), a similarly divided Dail (the lower, but politically controlling, House of the Irish Parliament) and a likewise split in the pro-treaty political party that controlled the Dail and the Executive that was subject to it.<sup>4</sup> Even today some sixty-four years later Hathaway's eighteenth page account remains the clearest short statement of what had happened and what it meant for the immediate future of the Cosgrave government.

When that dispatch reached the Department, the staff on the Western European Desk realized that they had received a very logical and believable explanation of a very complex series of events and they heaped high praise upon Hathaway for the report's comprehensiveness. As that report moved through the Department, it led to a letter of commendation to Hathaway for his "full exposition of the situation." That same letter informed him that his views were "of value to the Department," words foreign service officers, or anyone, always like to read.<sup>5</sup>

In that same letter, however, Hathaway received additional instructions.

The Department would, however, prefer if, in the future, you would report on political matters at more frequent intervals, confining your reports to three or four pages at the most, but endeavoring to send some information on the political situation at least once a fortnight.<sup>6</sup>

That request troubled him because he knew he had gotten those kind words in the first half of the letter by doing exactly the opposite of what was asked in the second half of the letter. His concern only grew when he learned later in early May that the Department had examined his March 24 report "with interest and appreciation, and because of its comprehensiveness and analytical character a rating of excellent has been given it."<sup>7</sup> After reading that second letter, he had some doubts about his ability to earn that rating again. If he followed his latest instructions, the Department would not receive the comprehensive statements that it obviously rewarded.

Hathaway finally put those thoughts into a private letter on August 12 to William R. Castle, Jr., the Chief of the Division of Western European Affairs. He admitted that he had been "a little puzzled by the instructions of April 18 and of May 9" that referred to his March 24 dispatch. He did "not see how it could have been materially shortened if the situation was to be thoroughly analyzed.... Moreover, if I had attempted to deal with it piece-meal I should not have been able to justify the rating given by the instructions of May 9." He also explained that he appreciated the desirability of brevity in his reports and that he should have sent his reports more often, but his lack of subordinate officers precluded that. He had worked on the assumption that he would send a connected series of dispatches that reviewed the situation in a comprehensive manner every three to five weeks and a separate series on

special situations as they arose. If he had sent four page accounts every two weeks, he felt he would never be able to describe events in a comprehensive fashion and would, in effect, provide information in the nature of "news reports with only incidental comment." All that caused him to be somewhat uncertain as to what he should do and he wanted some indication from Castle as to how he could best serve the needs of the Department.<sup>8</sup>

Castle replied almost immediately: on September 4 he wrote to Hathaway and explained that most diplomatic missions sent either weekly or bi-weekly political reports. Because of the Department's concern for information about events in the British Empire (which he had written to Hathaway on a number of occasions), they felt that a similar practice could be useful "for the consulates, Dublin and Ottawa particularly." For that reason he would like Hathaway to submit "concise weekly political reports which would keep us up-to-date with what is going on in Ireland," but then added, "I should be very sorry, however, if those reports interfered with an occasional more comprehensive report." If he intended those words to give directions to Hathaway, which is difficult to believe, his next sentence only added to Hathaway's confusion. "I am inclined to think, however, that if you put the weekly reports together they would make up something very much like the report of March 24." Then he explained the basic thinking behind the demand for short three to four page weekly reports. The Department needed "bits of information from time to time" for the Department's "confidential political monthly statement."<sup>9</sup>

That last statement clarified all the previous contradictions. The orders for short bi-weekly reports eventually rested upon the Department's need to publish a monthly summary of events around the world. Those with military experience would recognize such a publication as an intelligence



summary. For those in the business world it is the company's monthly newsletter. For anyone who has read such summaries or newsletters, it is not necessary to explain the usefulness of such publications. Written to cover the entire globe, or the entire company, they produce information that may be readily available from regular news sources and those are often more timely. Such publications in reality provide tidbits of information that one may find interesting, but seldom does anyone find any in-depth analysis of what happened somewhere in the world, or in the company.

That 1924 request from the State Department may have helped to produce a useful publication, but that was done at the expense of the detailed, comprehensive reporting that the U.S. Government needed in order to develop adequate policies in response to fundamental changes that were taking place in the British Empire. A search of the files for the fall of 1924 indicated that Hathaway sent the requires bi-weekly reports, but the ones I have read do not read as well as his March 24 dispatch, nor do they contain the kind of reflective analysis of that report. Possibly someone found it easier to publish a newsletter in 1924 because of those bi-weekly reports, but the policy makers missed Hathaway's comprehensive dispatches. So does the historian in 1989 who regrets that Hathaway was not able to continue to send eighteen page efforts. One can only hope that future decision makers in the Department of State will not ask the people in the field to sacrifice depth of understanding for "bits of information," but that would require such decision makers to put long term needs ahead of short term needs. There is little real possibility of that happening.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup>Calton Younger, *Ireland's Civil War* (London: Muller, 1970). The full story can be found here.
- <sup>2</sup>William R. Castle, Jr. to Secretary of State, August 15, 1923, 84/d.00/615, Record of the Department of State relating to Internal Affairs of Great Britain, 1901-1929, Microfilm edition, Roll 220 M580. In this letter the Chief of the Division of Western European Affairs explained that Timothy Smiddy, the Irish representative in Washington, called at the Department to discuss a few minor issues and in the course of the conversation Smiddy expressed "the greatest admiration for Mr. Hathaway, Consul in Dublin" and indicated that he "had the complete confidence and respect of all the officials of the Free State Government."
- <sup>3</sup>Hathaway to Secretary of State, March 24, 1924, Post Records, Dublin, Record Group 84. Department of State, National Archives. Hereafter referred to as Post Records, Dublin. These letters survived because they were filed in Dublin. I could not find them in the Central File of the Department in Washington.
- <sup>4</sup>Maryann Gialanella Valuilis, *Almost a Rebellion: The Irish Army Meeting of 1924*. (Cork: Tower Books, 1985).
- <sup>5</sup>Herbert C. Hengstler to Hathaway, April 18, 1924, Post Records, Dublin.
- <sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*
- <sup>7</sup>Hengstler to Hathaway, May 9, 1924, Post Records, Dublin.
- <sup>8</sup>Hathaway to Castle, August 12, 1924, Post Records, Dublin.
- <sup>9</sup>Castle to Hathaway, September 4, 1924, Post Records, Dublin.

## UNITED STATES DIPLOMACY: A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HISTORIOGRAPHICAL WORKS

by  
*Joseph A. Fry*  
(*University of Nevada, Las Vegas*)

I began compiling this bibliography several years ago for a class on the historiography of United States diplomatic history. I first offered the course in the University of Nevada, Las Vegas M. A. program in Spring 1985 and then again in Spring 1988. While revising and updating the entries for the latter class, it occurred to me that this compilation might be of interest and perhaps of use to other students of American diplomacy. With those possibilities in mind, I examined a number of additional journals, added categories (beyond my lecture/discussion scheme for the class), and solicited suggestions from Richard D. Burns, Jerald A. Combs, and George C. Herring. Although all three graciously provided me with helpful advice and leads, and Michael Green, one of my students in the 1988 class, helped me check citations, I feel certain other materials might have been included. Therefore, consider this bibliography a starting point. If readers notice omissions, please send the relevant information to me and/or William Brinker for inclusion in a subsequent number of the *Newsletter*.

Also, while noting starting points, let me add just a word on the four works that provide the most comprehensive overview. First, the *SHAFR Guide to American Foreign Relations since 1700*, edited by Richard Dean Burns, is indispensable. The introductions to each of the forty chapters provide crisp, succinct historiographical overviews, and the

annotations locate the works in relevant, on-going historiographical debates. Second, Jerald A. Combs (*American Diplomatic History: Two Centuries of Changing Interpretations*) skillfully traces the evolution of U. S. diplomatic historiography from the American Revolution through the Vietnam War. In so doing, he not only dissects conflicting arguments, but also analyzes the historical circumstances that influenced previous students of American diplomacy. Third, in editing *American Foreign Relations: A Historiographical Review*, Gerald K. Haines and J. Samuel Walker have collected the most recent, comprehensive set of historiographical articles. These perceptive essays treat the United States chronologically from the Revolution through the origins of the Cold War and also examine twentieth century U. S. diplomacy with Asia, "Black Africa," the Middle East, and Latin America. Finally, *New Frontiers in American-East Asian Relations: Essays Presented to Dorothy Borg*, edited by Warren I. Cohen, is truly a model set of historiographical articles and provides broad chronological and geographical coverage.

### *The State of the Art*

- Ball, Desmond J. "The Blind Men and the Elephant: A Critique of Bureaucratic Politics Theory." *Australian Outlook* 28 (1974): 71-92.
- Campbell, A. E., Tadashi Aruga, and N. Gordon Levin. "The Wisconsin School of Diplomatic History." *Reviews in American History* 2 (1974): 586-605. (Each author has a separately titled review essay included under the above title: Campbell, "The Primacy of Foreign Policy"; Aruga, "The Ambiguity of the American Empire: A Japanese View"; and Levin, "The Open Door Thesis Reconsidered.")
- Cohen, Warren I. "The History of American-East Asian Relations: Cutting Edge of the Historical Profession." *Diplomatic History* 9 (1985): 101-112.
- Combs, Jerald A. "Norman Graebner and the Realist View of American Diplomatic History." *Diplomatic History* 11 (1987): 251-64.

- Craig, Gordon. "The Historian and the Study of International Relations." *American Historical Review* 88 (1983): 1-11.
- Evans, Laurence. "The Dangers of Diplomatic History." In *The State of American History*, edited by Herbert J. Bass, 142-56. Chicago, 1970.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. "The Corporatist Synthesis: A Skeptical View." *Diplomatic History* 10 (1986): 357-62.
- Gelfand, Lawrence E. "American Foreign Policy and Public Opinion: Some Concerns for Scholars." *Reviews in American History* 5 (1977): 418-25.
- Hess, Gary R. "After the Tumult: The Wisconsin Schools' Tribute to William Appleman Williams." *Diplomatic History* 12 (1988): 483-99.
- Hogan, Michael J. "Corporatism: A Positive Appraisal." *Diplomatic History* 10 (1986): 363-72.
- Hoff-Wilson, Joan. "The Future of American Diplomatic History." *Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations (SHAFR) Newsletter* 16:2 (1985): 10-22.
- Holsti, Ole R. "Models of International Relations and Foreign Policy." *Diplomatic History* 13 (1989): 15-43.
- Iriye, Akira. "Culture and Power: International Relations as Intercultural Relations." *Diplomatic History* 3 (1979): 115-28.
- Kimball, Jeffrey P. "The Influence of Ideology on Interpretive Disagreement: A Report on a Survey of Diplomatic, Military and Peace Historians on the Causes of 20th Century U. S. Wars." *History Teacher* 17 (1983/84): 355-84.
- "Realism, Diplomatic History, and American Foreign Policy: A Conversation with Norman A. Graebner." *SHAFR Newsletter* 18:2 (1987): 11-19.
- Krueger, Thomas. A. "The Social Origins of Recent American Foreign Policy." *Journal of Social History* 7 (1973): 93-101.
- LaFeber, Walter. "'Ah, If We Had Studied It More Carefully': The Fortunes of American Diplomatic History." *Prologue* 11 (1979): 121-31.
- Leopold, Richard W. "The History of United States Foreign Policy: Past, Present, Future." In *The Future of History*, edited by Charles F. Delzell, 231-46. Nashville, 1977.
- Levering, Ralph. "The Importance of the History of American Foreign Relations." *Organization of American Historians Newsletter* 12:2 (1984): 20-22.

- McCormick, Thomas J. "The State of American Diplomatic History." In *The State of American History*, edited by Herbert J. Bass, 119-41. Chicago, 1970.
- . "Drift or Mastery? A Corporatist Synthesis for American Diplomatic History." In Stanley I. Kutler and Stanley N. Katz, eds., *Reviews in American History* 10 (1982): 318-30.
- Maier, Charles S. "Marking Time: The Historiography of International Relations." In *The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States*, edited by Michael Kammen, 355-87. Ithaca, 1980.
- Hunt, Michael, Akira Iriye, Walter F. LaFeber, and Melvyn P. Leffler. "Responses to Charles S. Maier, 'Marking Time: The Historiography of International Relations.'" *Diplomatic History* 5 (1981): 354-82.
- May, Ernest R. "The Decline of Diplomatic History." In *American History: Retrospect and Prospect*, edited by George Athan Billias and Gerald N. Grob, 399-430. New York, 1971.
- . "Writing Contemporary International History." *Diplomatic History* 8 (1984): 103-114.
- Morton, Louis. "The Cold War and American Scholarship." In *The Historian and the Diplomat: The Role of History and Historians in American Foreign Policy*, edited by Francis L. Loewenheim, 123-69. New York, 1967.
- Neu, Charles E. "The Changing Interpretive Structure of American Foreign Policy." In *Twentieth-Century American Foreign Policy*, edited by John Braeman, Robert H. Bremner, and David Brody, 1-57. Columbus, OH, 1971.
- Noble, David W. *The End of American History*. Minneapolis, 1985. (Chapter 6 treating William A. Williams)
- Patterson, David S. "What's Wrong (and Right) with American Diplomatic History? A Diagnosis and Prescription." *SHAFR Newsletter* 9:3 (1978): 1-14.
- Perkins, Bradford. "'The Tragedy of American Diplomacy': Twenty-Five Years After." *Reviews in American History* 12 (1984): 1-18.
- Rose, Lisle A. "The Trenches and the Towers: Differing Perspectives on the Writing and Making of American Diplomatic History." *Pacific Historical Review* 55 (1986): 97-101.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. *The Cycles of American History*. Boston, 1986. (Chapter 7, "America and Empire")

- Singer, J. David. "The Behavioral Approach to Diplomatic History." In *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy*, edited by Alexander DeConde, I, 66-77. 3 vols. New York, 1978.
- Small, Melvin. "The Applicability of Quantitative International Politics to Diplomatic History." *Historian* 38 (1976): 281-304.
- Terrell, Ian R. *The Absent Marx: Class Analysis and Liberal History in Twentieth Century America*. Westport, CT, 1986. (Chapter 5 on the New Left)
- Thompson, J. A. "William Appleman Williams and the 'American Empire.'" *Journal of American Studies* 7 (1973): 91-104.
- Williams, William A. "Confessions of an Intransigent Revisionist." *Studies on the Left* 3 (1973): 87-98.
- Wittner, Lawrence S. "Pursuing the 'National Interest': The Illusion of Realism." *Reviews in American History* 13 (1985): 282-87.

### Overviews

- Borg, Dorothy, comp. *Historians and American Far Eastern Foreign Policy*. New York, 1966.
- Burns, Richard Dean, ed. *Guide to American Foreign Relations since 1700*. Santa Barbara, 1983.
- Combs, Jerald A. *American Diplomatic History: Two Centuries of Changing Interpretations*. Berkeley, 1983.
- Cohen, Warren I., ed. *New Frontiers in American-East Asian Relations: Essays Presented to Dorothy Borg*. New York, 1983.
- DeConde, Alexander. *American Diplomatic History in Transformation*. Washington, 1976.
- Dennis, Donnie Lee. "A History of American Diplomatic History." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, 1971.
- Haines, Gerald K. and J. Samuel Walker, eds. *American Foreign Relations: A Historiographical Review*. Westport, CT, 1981.
- Loewenheim, Francis L., ed. *The Historian and the Diplomat: The Role of History and Historians in American Foreign Policy*. New York, 1967.
- May, Ernest R. and James C. Thompson, Jr., eds. *American-East Asian Relations: A Survey*. Cambridge, MA, 1972.
- Sellen, Robert W. and Thomas A. Bryson, eds. *American Diplomatic History: Issues and Methods*. Carrollton, GA, 1974. (West Georgia College Studies in the Social Sciences, No. 13.)
- Trask, David F. "Writings in American Foreign Relations: 1957 to the Present." In *Twentieth-Century American Foreign Policy*, edited by

John Braeman, Robert H. Bremner, and David Brody, 55-118.  
Columbus, OH, 1971.

### *The Revolution*

- Archdeacon, Thomas J. "American Historians and the American Revolution: A Bicentennial Overview." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 63 (1980): 278-98.
- Dull, Jonathan R. *A Diplomatic History of the American Revolution*. New Haven, 1985. (Annotated bibliography, 175-218)
- Greene, Jack P. "Changing Interpretations of Early American Politics." In *The Reinterpretation of Early American History*, edited by Ray Allen Billington, 151-77. San Marino, CA, 1966.
- . "Revolution, Confederation, and Constitution, 1763-1787." In *The Reinterpretation of American History and Culture*, edited by William H. Cartwright and Richard L. Watson, Jr., 259-95. Washington, 1973.
- Horsman, Reginald. *The Diplomacy of the New Republic, 1776-1815*. Arlington Heights, IL, 1985. (Bibliographical Essay)
- Kaplan, Lawrence S. "Founding Fathers on the Founding Fathers: Reflections on Three Generations of American Dipomatic Historians." *SHAFR Newsletter* 6:4 (1975): 1-8.
- Middlekauff, Robert L. "The American Continental Colonies in the Empire." In *The Historiography of the British Empire-Commonwealth: Trends, Interpretations and Resources*, edited by Robin W. Winks, 23-45. Durham, NC, 1966.
- Perkins, Bradford. "Bemis Regit!" *Reviews in American History* 14 (1986): 195-99.

### *1790s*

- Kaplan, Lawrence S. *Entangling Alliances with None: American Foreign Policy in the Age of Jefferson*. Kent, OH, 1987. ("Recent Historiographical Trends," 194-99)
- Markowitz, Arthur. "Washington's Farewell and the Historians: A Critical Review." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 44 (1970): 173-91.



### War of 1812

- Egan, Clifford L. "The Origins of the War of 1812: Three Decades of Historical Writing." *Military Affairs* 38 (1974): 72-75.
- Goodman, Warren F. "The Origins of the War of 1812: A Survey of Changing Interpretations." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 28 (1941-42): 171-86.
- Perkins, Bradford. *The Causes of the War of 1812: National Honor or National Interest?* New York, 1962. (Introduction)

### 1840s: Manifest Destiny and the Mexican War

- Gilbert, Arthur N. "The American Indian and United States Diplomatic History." *History Teacher* 8 (1974/75): 229-41.
- Graebner, Norman A. "How Wars Begin: The Mexican War." In *Proceedings of the Citadel Conference on War and Diplomacy*, edited by David H. White and John W. Gordon, 15-25. Charleston, SC, 1979.
- , ed. *Manifest Destiny*. Indianapolis, 1968. (Introduction and Bibliographical Essay)
- Harstad, Peter T. and Richard W. Resh. "The Causes of the Mexican War: A Note on Changing Interpretations." *Arizona and the West* 6 (1964): 289-302.
- Horn, James J. "Trends in Historical Interpretation: James K. Polk." *North Carolina Historical Review* 42 (1965): 454-64.
- Sheehan, Bernard W. "Indian-White Relations in Early America: A Review Essay." *William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd ser., 26 (1969): 267-86.

### Civil War

- Cresap, Berrar. "Frank L. Owsley and King Cotton Diplomacy." *Alabama Review* 26 (1973): 235-51.
- Crook, D. P. *Diplomacy During the American Civil War*. New York, 1975. (Suggestions for Further Reading)
- Ferris, Norman B. "Diplomacy." In *Civil War Books: A Critical Bibliography*, edited by A. Nevins, J. Robertson, Jr., and B. Wiley, I, 241-78. 3 vols. Baton Rouge, 1967.

### *Late Nineteenth Century*

- Ambrosius, Lloyd. "Turner's Frontier Thesis and the Modern American Empire: A Review Essay." *Civil War History* 17 (1971): 332-39.
- Beisner, Robert L. *From the Old Diplomacy to the New, 1865-1900*. Arlington Heights, IL, 1986.
- Calhoun, Charles W. "Benjamin Harrison, Centennial President." *Indiana Magazine of History* 84 (1988): 134-60.
- Dulles, Foster Rhea. "The New World Power: 1865-1917." In *Interpreting and Teaching American History*, edited by William H. Cartwright and Richard L. Watson, Jr., 215-30. Washington, 1961.
- Field, James A., Jr. "American Imperialism: The Worst Chapter in Almost any Book," (with comments by Walter F. LaFeber and Robert L. Beisner). *American Historical Review* 83 (1978): 644-83.
- Fry, Joseph A. "William McKinley and the Coming of the Spanish-American War: A Study of the Besmirching and Redemption of an Historical Image." *Diplomatic History* 3 (1979): 77-97.
- Gould, Lewis L. "Chocolate Eclair or Mandarin Manipulator? William McKinley, the Spanish-American War, and the Philippines: A Review Essay." *Ohio History* 94 (1985): 182-87.
- Holbo, Paul S. "Perspectives on American Foreign Policy, 1890-1916: Expansion and World Power." *Social Studies* 58 (1967): 246-56.
- May, Ernest R. "Emergence to World Power." In *The Reconstruction of American History*, edited by John Higham, 180-96. New York, 1962.
- . *American Imperialism: A Speculative Essay*. New York, 1968.
- Smith, Daniel M. "Rise to Great World Power, 1865-1918." In *The Reinterpretation of American History and Culture*, edited by William H. Cartwright and Richard L. Watson, Jr., 443-64. Washington, 1973.

### *Progressivism and Imperialism*

- Grantham, Dewey W., Jr. "Theodore Roosevelt in American Historical Writing, 1945-1960." *Mid-America* 43 (1961): 3-35.
- Hitchman, James H. "The Platt Amendment Revisited: A Bibliographic Survey." *Americas* 23 (1967): 343-69.
- Israel, Jerry. *Progressivism and the Open Door: America and China, 1905-1921*. Pittsburgh, 1971. ("A Summary of the Literature as Prelude," xi-xxiv)

Siracusa, Joseph M. "Progressivism, Imperialism, and the Leuchtenberg Thesis, 1952-1974." *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 20 (1974): 312-25.

### *Woodrow Wilson and World War I*

Accenelli, Robert D. "Link's Case for Wilson the Diplomatist." *Reviews in American History* 9 (1981): 285-94.

Ambrosius, Lloyd E. "The Orthodoxy of Revisionism: Woodrow Wilson and the New Left." *Diplomatic History* 1 (1977): 199-214.

Binkley, Robert C. "Ten Years of Peace Conference History." *Journal of Modern History* 1 (1929): 607-629.

Birdsall, Paul. "The Second Decade of Peace Conference History." *Journal of Modern History* 11 (1939): 362-78.

Cohen, Warren I. *The American Revisionists: The Lessons of Intervention in World War I*. Chicago, 1967.

Hill, Thomas M. and William H. Barclay. "Interests, Ideals and American Intervention in World War I: An Historiographical Appraisal." *International Review of History and Political Science* 14 (1977): 1-24.

Leopold, Richard W. "The Problem of American Intervention, 1917: An Historical Retrospect." *World Politics* 2 (1950): 405-425.

May, Ernest R. *American Intervention: 1917 and 1941*. Washington, 1960.

Moore, James R. "Woodrow Wilson and Post-Armistice Diplomacy: Some French Views." *Reviews in American History* 2 (1974): 207-13.

Porto, Victor John. "Woodrow Wilson, the War, and the Interpretations; 1917-1970." *Social Studies* 63 (1972): 22-31.

Seltzer, Alan L. "Woodrow Wilson as 'Corporate Liberal': Toward a Reconsideration of Left Revisionist Historiography." *Western Political Quarterly* 30 (1977): 183-212.

Smith, Daniel M. "National Interest and American Intervention, 1917: An Historiographical Appraisal." *Journal of American History* 52 (1965): 5-24.

Watson, Richard L., Jr. "Woodrow Wilson and his Interpreters, 1947-1957." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 44 (1957): 207-236.

Wells, Samuel F. "New Perspectives of Wilsonian Diplomacy: The Secular Evangelism of American Political Economy: A Review Essay." *Perspectives in American History* 6 (1972): 389-419.

*Interwar Years*

- Adler, Selig. "Hoover's Foreign Policy and the New Left." In *The Hoover Presidency: A Reappraisal*, edited by Martin L. Fausold and George T. Mazuzan, 153-63. Albany, 1974.
- Braeman, John. "American Foreign Policy in the Age of Normalcy: Three Historiographical Traditions." *Amerika studien/American Studies* 26 (2 November 1981): 125-58.
- . "Power and Diplomacy: The 1920s Reappraised." *Review of Politics* 44 (1982): 342-69.
- . "The New Left and American Foreign Policy during the Age of Normalcy: A Re-examination." *Business History Review* 57 (1983): 73-104.
- Cole, Wayne S. "The United States in World Affairs, 1929-1941." In *Interpreting and Teaching American History*, edited by William H. Cartwright and Richard L. Watson, Jr., 282-95. Washington, 1961.
- DeConde, Alexander. "Herbert Hoover and Foreign Policy: A Retrospective Assessment." IN *Herbert Hoover Reassessment*, 313-34. Washington, 1981.
- Doenecke, Justus D. "The Anti-Interventionist Tradition: Leadership and Perceptions." *Literature of Liberty* 4 (1981): 7-67.
- . *The Literature of Isolationism: A Guide to Non-Interventionist Scholarship, 1930-1972*. Colorado Springs, 1972.
- . "The Literature of Isolationism, 1972-1983: A Bibliographic Guide." *Journal of Libertarian Studies* 7 (1983): 157-84.
- Ferrell, Robert H. "Foreign Policy, 1929-1941." In *The Reinterpretation of American History and Culture*, edited by William H. Cartwright and Richard L. Watson, Jr., 509-524. Washington, 1973.
- McCoy, Donald R. "Trends in Viewing Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower." *Midwest Quarterly* 20 (1978): 117-36.

*World War II*

- Cole, Wayne S. "American Entry into World War II: A Historiographical Appraisal." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 43 (1957): 595-617.
- Coox, Alvin D. "Repulsing the Pearl Harbor Revisionists: The State of Present Literature on the Debacle." *Military Affairs* 50 (1986): 29-31.

- Divine, Robert, ed. *Causes and Consequences of World War II*. Chicago, 1969.
- Doenecke, Justus D. "Beyond Polemics: An Historiographical Re-Appraisal of American Entry into World War II." *History Teacher* 12 (1978/79): 217-33.
- Ferrell, Robert H. "Pearl Harbor and the Revisionists." *Historian* 17 (1955): 215-33.
- Leonard, Thomas M. "The United States and World War II: Conflicting Views of Diplomacy." *Towson State Journal of International Affairs* 7 (1972): 25-30.
- Leopold, Richard W. "Historiographical Reflections." In *Pearl Harbor as History: Japanese-American Relations, 1931-1941*, edited by Dorothy Borg and Shumpei Okamoto, 1-24. New York, 1973.
- Morton, Louis. "1937-1941." In *American-East Asian Relations: A Survey*, edited by Ernest R. May and James C. Thompson, 260-90. Cambridge, MA, 1972.
- . "Pearl Harbor in Perspective: A Bibliographical Survey." *Proceedings of the United States Naval Institute* 81 (1955): 461-68.
- Robertson, Esmonde M., comp. *Origins of the Second World War: Historical Interpretations*. London, 1971.
- Takeshi, Matsuda. "The Coming of the Pacific War: Japanese Perspectives." *Reviews in American History* 14 (1986): 629-52.
- Williams, William A. "Reflections on the Historiography of American Entry into World War II." *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 57 (1956): 274-79.

### *Origins of the Cold War*

#### **Books**

- Compton, James V., ed. *America and the Origins of the Cold War*. Boston, 1972.
- Maddox, Robert James. *The New Left and the Origins of the Cold War*. Princeton, 1973.
- Siracusa, Joseph M. *New Left Diplomatic Histories and Historians: The American Revisionists*. Port Washington, NY, 1973.
- Tucker, Robert W. *The Radical Left and American Foreign Policy*. Baltimore, 1971.
- Watt, Donald Cameron. "Britain and the Historiography of the Yalta Conference and the Cold War." *Diplomatic History* 13 (1989): 67-98.

Articles

- Cashman, Greg and Arthur N. Gilbert. "Some Analytical Approaches to the Cold War Debate." *History Teacher* 10 (1976/77): 263-80.
- Combs, Jerald A. "Cold War Historiography: An Alternative to John Gaddis's Post-Revisionism." *SHAFR Newsletter* 15:2 (1984): 9-19.
- Crapol, Edward. "Some Reflections on the Historiography of the Cold War." *History Teacher* 20 (1986/87): 251-62.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. "The Emerging Post-Revisionist Synthesis on the Origins of the Cold War." *Diplomatic History* 7 (1983): 171-204 (with responses from Lloyd C. Gardner, Lawrence S. Kaplan, Warren F. Kimball, and Bruce R. Kuniholm)
- Graebner, Norman A. "Cold War Origins and Continuing Debate." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 13 (1969): 123-32.
- Hammond, Thomas T. "'Atomic Diplomacy' Revisited." *Orbis* 19 (1976): 1403-1428.
- Hoffman, Stanley. "Revisionism Revisited." In *Reflections on the Cold War: A Quarter Century of American Foreign Policy*, edited by Lynn H. Miller and Ronald W. Pruessen, 3-26. Philadelphia, 1974.
- Kaplan, Lawrence. "The Cold War and European Revisionism." *Diplomatic History* 11 (1987): 143-56.
- Kennedy, Thomas L. "Shifting Perspectives on the Origins of the Cold War." *Towson State Journal of International Affairs* 4 (1970): 121-28.
- Kimball, Warren F. "The Cold War Warmed Over." *American Historical Review* 79 (1974): 1119-36.
- Leffler, Melvyn P., Burton I. Kaufman, and Bradford Perkins. "The United States and the Near East." *Reviews in American History* 9 (1981): 124-43. (Each author has a separately-titled review essay included under the above title: Leffler, "From Cold War to Cold War in the Near East"; Kaufman, "Oil, Security, and America's Involvement in the Mideast in the 1940s"; and Perkins, "Reluctant Midwife: America and the Birth of Israel.")
- Leigh, Michael. "Is there a Revisionist Thesis on the Origins of the Cold War?" *Political Science Quarterly* 89 (1974): 101-116.
- MacDonald, William W. "The Revisionist Cold War Historians." *Midwest Quarterly* 11 (1969): 37-49.
- Maddox, Robert J. "The Rise and Fall of Cold War Revisionism." *Historian* 46 (1984): 416-28.
- Maier, Charles S. "Revisionism and the Interpretation of Cold War Origins." *Perspectives in American History* 4 (1970): 313-47.

- Melanson, Richard A. "Revisionism Subdued? Robert James Maddox and the Origins of the Cold War." *Political Science Reviewer* 7 (1977): 229-71.
- Patterson, David S. "Recent Literature on Cold War Origins: An Essay Review." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 55 (1972): 320-29.
- Richardson, R. L. "Cold War Revisionism: A Critique." *World Politics* 24 (1972): 579-612.
- Schulzinger, Robert D. "Moderation in Pursuit of Truth is No Virtue; Extremism in Defense of Moderation is a Vice." *American Quarterly* 27 (1975): 222-36.
- Sellen, Robert W. "Origins of the Cold War: An Historiographical Survey." *West Georgia Studies in the Social Sciences* 9 (1970): 57-98.
- Shapiro, Edward S. "Responsibility for the Cold War: A Bibliographical Review." *Intercollegiate Review* 12 (1976-1977): 113-20.
- Smith, Daniel. "The New Left and the Cold War." *Denver Quarterly* 4 (1970): 78-88.
- Smith, Gaddis. "The United States in World Affairs Since 1945." In *The Reinterpretation of American History and Culture*, edited by William H. Cartwright and Richard L. Watson, Jr., 543-54. Washington, 1973.
- Stromberg, Roland N., Barton J. Bernstein, and Thomas A. Krueger. "The Continuing Cold War: A Symposium." *Reviews in American History* 1 (1973): 445-69. (Each author has a separately-titled review essay included under the above title: Stromberg, "The Kolkos and the Cold War"; Bernstein, "Cold War Orthodoxy Restated"; and Krueger, "New Left Revisionists and their Critics.")
- Trister, Toby. "Traditionalists, Revisionists, and the Cold War." In *Caging the Bear: Containment and the Cold War*, edited by Charles Gati, 211-22. New York, 1974.
- Ulam, Adam B. "On Modern History: Rereading the Cold War." *Interplay* 2 (1969): 51-57.

### *China, Occupation of Japan, and Korean War*

- Cohen, Warren I. "Cold Wars and Shell Games: The Truman Administration and East Asia." *Reviews in American History* 11 (1983): 430-36.
- . "New Light on the China Tangle." *Reviews in American History* 1 (1973): 291-97.

- . "Who's Afraid of Alfred Kohlberg?" *Reviews in American History* 2 (1974): 118-23.
- Dingman, Roger. "Lost Chance in China." *Reviews in American History* 9 (1981): 252-59.
- Dower, John W. "Occupied Japan as History and Occupation History as Politics." *Journal of Asian Studies* 34 (1975): 485-504.
- Iriye, Akira. "Contemporary History as History: American Expansion into the Pacific since 1941." *Pacific Historical Review* 53 (1984): 191-212.
- Leopold, Richard W. "The Korean War: The Historian's Task." In *The Korean War: A Twenty-five Year Perspective*, edited by Francis H. Heller, 209-224. Lawrence, KA, 1977.
- McMahon, Robert J. "The Cold War in Asia: Toward a New Synthesis?" *Diplomatic History* 12 (1988): 307-327.
- Park, Hong-Kyu. "American Involvement in the Korean War." *History Teacher* 16 (1982/83): 259-63.
- Stueck, William. "The United States and Korea." *Reviews in American History* 14 (1986): 455-60.
- West, Philip. "Interpreting the Korean War." *American Historical Review* 94 (1989): 90-96.

### Truman

- Cohen, Warren I. "Harry Truman, China, and the Cold War in Asia." *Reviews in American History* 6 (1978): 46-55.
- Ferrell, Robert H. "Truman Foreign Policy: A Traditionalist View." In *The Truman Period as a Research Field: A Reappraisal 1972*, edited by Richard S. Kirkendall, 11-45. Columbia, MO, 1974.
- Gardner, Lloyd C. "Truman Era Foreign Policy: Recent Historical Trends." In *Ibid.*, 47-74.
- Griffith, Robert. "Harry S. Truman and the Burden of Modernity." *Reviews in American History* 9 (1981): 286-306.
- . "Truman and the Historians: The Reconstruction of Postwar American History." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 59 (1975): 20-50.
- Smith, Geoffrey. "'Harry, We Hardly Know You': Revisionism, Politics and Diplomacy, 1945-1954." *American Political Science Review* 70 (1976): 560-82.
- Williams, Robert J. "Harry S. Truman and the American Presidency." *Journal of American Studies* 13 (1979): 393-408.



*Eisenhower*

- Bernstein, Barton J. "Foreign Policy in the Eisenhower Administration." *Foreign Service Journal* 50 (1973): 17-20.
- DeSantis, Vincent P. "Eisenhower Revisionism." *Review of Politics* 38 (1976): 190-207.
- McMahon, Robert J. "Eisenhower and Third World Nationalism: A Critique of the Revisionists." *Political Science Quarterly* 101 (1986): 453-73.
- Reichard, Gary W. "Eisenhower as President: The Changing View." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 77 (1978): 265-81.
- Rey, J. A. "Revolution and Liberation: A Review of Recent Literature on the Guatemalan Situation." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 38 (1958): 239-55.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. "The Ike Age Revisited." *Reviews in American History* 11 (1983): 1-11.

*Kennedy and Johnson*

- Beck, Kent M. "The Kennedy Image: Politics, Camelot, and Vietnam." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 58 (1974): 45-53.
- Brune, Lester. *The Missile Crisis of October 1962: A Review of Issues and References*. Claremont, CA, 1985.
- Conkin, Paul K. "The Johnson Years: An Essay Review." *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 56 (1972): 59-64.
- Ferguson, Yale H. "The Dominican Intervention of 1965: Recent Interpretations." *International Organization* 27 (1973): 517-48.
- LaFeber, Walter. "Kennedy, Johnson and the Revisionists." *Foreign Service Journal* 50 (1973): 31-33, 39.
- Nathan, James A. "The Missile Crisis: His Finest Hour Now." *World Politics* 27 (1975): 256-81.
- Van De Mark, Brian. "Kennedy the Diplomatist." *SHAFR Newsletter* 15:3 (1984): 21-34.

*Vietnam*

- Braestrup, Peter. "Vietnam as History." *Wilson Quarterly* 2 (1978): 178-87.
- Butterfield, Fox. "The New Vietnam Scholarship." *New York Times Magazine* (February 13, 1983): 26-35, 45-61.

- Dunn, Joe P. "In Search of Lessons: The Development of a Vietnam Historiography." *Parameters, Journal of the U.S. Army War College* 9 (1979): 28-40.
- Herring, George C. "The 'Vietnam Syndrome' and American Foreign Policy." *Virginia Quarterly Review* 57 (1981): 594-612.
- . "American Strategy in Vietnam: The Postwar Debate." *Military Affairs* 46 (1982): 57-63.
- . "Vietnam Remembered." *Journal of American History* 73 (1986): 152-64.
- . "America and Vietnam: The Debate Continues." *American Historical Review* 92 (1987): 350-62.
- Hess, Gary R. "The Military Perspective on Strategy in Vietnam: Harry Summers' *On Strategy* and Bruce Palmer's *The 25-Year War*." *Diplomatic History* 10 (1986): 91-106.
- Kattenburg, Paul M. "Reflections on Vietnam: Of Revisionism and Lessons Yet to be Learned." *Parameters, Journal of the U.S. Army War College* 14 (1984): 42-50.
- Lovett, Christopher C. "'We Held the Day in the Palm of Our Hand': A Review of Recent Sources on the War in Vietnam." *Military Affairs* 51 (1987): 67-72.
- Pels, Stephen. "Alibi Alley: Vietnam as History." *Reviews in American History* 8 (1980): 139-43.
- Taylor, Sandra C. "Reporting History: Journalists and the Vietnam War." *Reviews in American History* 13 (1985): 451-61.
- . "Teaching the Vietnam War." *History Teacher* 15 (1981/82): 57-66.
- Young, Marilyn B. "Revisionists Revised: The Case of Vietnam." *SHAFR Newsletter* 10 (1979): 1-10.

### *United States and Latin America*

- Abrams, Richard M. "United States Intervention Abroad: The First Quarter Century." *American Historical Review* 79 (1974): 72-102.
- Anderson, Thomas P. "Intervention in the Caribbean Basin: 'A Search for Stability.'" *Latin American Research Review* 19:2 (1984): 208-213.
- Connell-Smith, Gordon. "Latin America in the Foreign Relations of the United States." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 8 (1976): 137-50.
- Dominquez, Jorge I. "Consensus and Divergence: The State of the Literature on Inter-American Relations in the 1970s." *Latin American Research Review* 13:1 (1978): 87-126.

- Glasgow, Roy Arthur. "The Birth of an American Empire." *Latin American Research Review* 22:1 (1987): 241-47.
- Green, David. "Language, Values, and Policy Perspectives in Inter-American Research." *Latin American Research Review* 10:3 (1975): 177-90.
- Grindle, Merilee. "Armed Intervention and U.S.-Latin American Relations." *Latin American Research Review* 14:1 (1981): 207-17.
- . "Black Gold in Mexico and U.S.-Mexican Relations." *Latin American Research Review* 18:2 (1983): 230-39.
- Heinrichs, Waldo. "The Panama Canal in History, Policy, and Caricature." *Latin American Research Review* 17:2 (1982): 247-61.
- Langley, Lester D. "Fire Down Below: A Review Essay on the Central American Crisis." *Diplomatic History* 9 (1985): 161-67.
- Lowenthal, Abraham F. "United States Policy Toward Latin America: 'Liberal,' 'Radical,' and 'Bureaucratic' Perspectives." *Latin American Research Review* 8:3 (1973): 3-25.
- Pletcher, David M. "United States Relations with Latin America: Neighborliness and Exploitation." *American Historical Review* 82 (1977): 39-59.
- Rabe, Stephen G. "Historic Patterns of Intervention." *Latin American Research Review* 23:2 (1988): 206-213.
- Schulzinger, Robert D. "Colossus at Work." *Reviews in American History* 12 (1984): 589-94.
- Smith, Robert Freeman. "The United States and the Caribbean-Central American Region: Empire, System, or Legitimate Sphere of Influence." *Reviews in American History* 12 (1984): 443-48.
- Trask, David F. "Gunboats in the Caribbean Danger Zone." *Latin American Research Review* 13:3 (1978): 246-49.
- Trask, Roger R. "Inter-American Relations." In *Latin American Scholarship Since World War II*, edited by Roberto Esquenazi-Mayo and Michael C. Meyer, 203-221. Lincoln, NE, 1971.
- Wehre, Stephen. "Central America and the United States in the 1980s: Recent Descriptions and Prescriptions." *Latin American Research Review* 21:3 (1986): 179-205.

### *Peace History*

- DeBenedetti, Charles. "Peace History, in the American Manner." *History Teacher* 18 (1984/85): 75-110.
- Howlett, Charles F. and Glen Zeitzer. *The American Peace Movement: History and Historiography*. Washington, 1985.

- Wittner, Lawrence S. "Peace Movements and Foreign Policy: The Challenge to Diplomatic Historians." *Diplomatic History* 11 (1987): 355-70.
- Zeitzer, Glen. "A Peace for All: Recent Trends in American Peace History." *American Studies International* 19 (1981): 49-57.

*Miscellaneous*

- Borg, Dorothy. "Two Historians of the Far Eastern Policy of the United States: Tyler Dennett and A. Whitney Griswold." In *Pearl Harbor as History: Japanese-American Relations, 1931-1941*, edited by Dorothy Borg and Shumpei Okamoto, 551-73. New York, 1973.
- Buckingham, Peter H. *America Sees Red: Anti-Communism in America, 1890s to 1980s*. Claremont, CA, 1987.
- Hess, Gary R. "Global Expansion and Regional Balances: The Emerging Scholarship in United States Relations with India and Pakistan." *Pacific Historical Review* 56 (1987): 259-94.
- Jervis, Robert. "Intelligence and Foreign Policy: A Review Essay." *International Security* 11 (1986-87): 141-61.
- Kennedy, Thomas C. *Charles A. Beard and American Foreign Policy*. Gainesville, 1975.
- Keto, C. Tsehloane. *American-South African Relations, 1784-1980: Review and Select Bibliography*. Athens, OH, 1985.
- Kuehl, Warren F. "Webs of Common Interests Revisited: Nationalism, Internationalism, and Historians of American Foreign Relations." *Diplomatic History* 10 (1986): 107-120.
- Kuniholm, Bruce R. and Michael Rubner. *The Palestinian Problem & United States Policy*. Claremont, CA, 1985.
- Langley, Lester D. "The Diplomatic Historians: Bailey and Bemis." *History Teacher* 6 (1972/73): 51-70.
- Leopold, Richard W. "The Mississippi Valley and American Foreign Policy, 1890-1941: An Assessment and an Appeal." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 37 (1951): 625-42.
- L'Estrange, Michael. "History Without Some of the Facts: Interpretations of Australian-United States Relations Since 1949." *SHAFR Newsletter* 19:4 (1988): 14-32.
- Miscamble, Wilson D. "Catholics and American Foreign Policy from McKinley to McCarthy: A Historiographical Survey." *Diplomatic History* 4 (1980): 223-40.
- Plischke, Elmer. "American Diplomats as Authors." *SHAFR Newsletter* 15:3 (1984): 1-20.

- Walker, J. Samuel. "Writing the History of Nuclear Energy: The State of the Art." *Diplomatic History* 9 (1985): 377-83.
- Waller, Douglas C., James T. Bruce, III, and Douglas M. Cook. *The Strategic Defense Initiative: Progress and Challenge*. Claremont, CA, 1987.
- Wilkins, Mira. "Multinational Corporations." *Latin American Research Review* 17:2 (1982): 185-98.
- Yres-Henri, Nouailhat. "Franco-American Relations: French Perspectives." *Reviews in American History* 14 (1986): 653-68.
- Zingg, Paul J. "America and North Africa: A Case Study in United States-Third World Relations." *History Teacher* 12 (1978/79): 253-70.
- 
- 

## ***SPECIAL NOTICE***

SHAFR has arrangements with ABC-CLIO Inc. to make the *Guide to American Foreign Relations Since 1700* available to its membership for \$30. Orders must be made through the SHAFR office which will forward them to ABC-CLIO. Make checks for \$30 payable to SHAFR and send them to:

SHAFR, Department of History  
Box 13735  
University of North Texas  
Denton, Texas 76203

If you know persons who are not members of SHAFR who would like a copy of the *Guide* for \$30, encourage them to join the Society.

---

---

## REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HISTORICAL DIPLOMATIC DOCUMENTATION MARCH 1989

The Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation met in Washington on December 8 and 9, 1988. Present throughout were Professors Warren I. Cohen, Blanche Wiesen Cook, Robert Dallek, Michael H. Hunt, and Bradford Perkins. They elected Professor Cohen chairman. Professor Michel Oksenberg joined the meeting on the 9th.

As always, Dr. William Z. Slany, The Historian, and his staff performed magnificently in arranging and hosting the meeting. The principal issues discussed were the scope, content, and format of the *Foreign Relations* series for the years after 1960, procedures for prepublication reviewing of *Foreign Relations* volumes by outside experts, problems of the presidential libraries, and the role of the Committee. It was the most constructive meeting in years and we are grateful to the Department, especially to the CDC participants, for abandoning the adversarial posture which has hampered recent efforts. We remain concerned about the future of the *Foreign Relations* series, the further setbacks to the publication schedule, the refractoriness of the financial problems faced by the Department in general and the Historical Office in particular, difficulties with declassification in the presidential libraries, and divergent interpretations of the Committee's role. In addition, anxiety reemerged about the preservation of the historical record.

### *Foreign Relations Series*

Our principal concern is the future of the *Foreign Relations* series. The enormous increase in the size of the documentary record in the post-World War II era accelerates in the 1960s.

Even if there were no other problems, the volume of material confronted by the Historical Office would require changes in the basic shape of the series. Financial pressures which preclude significant expansion of the series intensify the problem. The Department's Historian has outlined what he perceives to be his options. Further informed by our discussion, the Historian's Office is preparing a list of the proposed volumes for the 1961-1963 triennium showing the subjects and topics it intends to document. Upon receipt of that list, the Committee should be able to offer definitive advice on the several questions involved (what issues should be covered in printed volumes and which relegated to microfiche, bibliographic references, narrative/synopses, etc).

Related to the substance of the volumes is Committee uneasiness about how well the series will represent the reality of American foreign relations when the bulk of covert operations, an increasingly important part of our activities, is omitted. On several occasions, experts from within the government have acknowledged that covert activities were the most important activities conducted in a given country at a given time and that their omission distorted the record significantly. At minimum, it would appear essential to provide a disclaimer in the published volume indicating that operations beyond the purview of the Department of State were involved. Since most such operations are known, although not officially acknowledged, to do less would approach fraud—and subvert the credibility of the series.

We are also profoundly troubled by the failure of the series to meet President Reagan's goal of "1960 by 1990." We understand that much of the problem rests with demands on the National Security Council declassifiers preoccupied with the "Iran-Contra" mess, but note that this fits a disturbing pattern in which "emergencies" forever interrupt the work of

the Historical Office at State. As a result, a twenty year rule eroded into a twenty-five year rule, then into a thirty year rule—and now we will fail to meet even that. It becomes extremely difficult to persuade anyone of the seriousness with which we view our shared effort to produce a timely record.

Given the transcendent importance of the credibility of the volumes, we are very pleased by the success of the experiment with pre-publication review. We urge the Department to institute such reviews as standard procedure and suggest that the outside authority be brought into the process at an earlier stage.

### *Presidential Libraries*

An unexpected obstacle to the work of the Historian's office and to that of scholars, journalists, and others interested in American foreign relations in the 1960s has been the failure of the presidential libraries to process materials at a reasonable pace. For the first time in its existence, the Historian's Office is unable to proceed with its work—not because material is being withheld as sensitive, but because enormous masses of documents sit unsorted in boxes at the Kennedy and Johnson libraries. The department cannot rectify this problem alone, but if the secretary's concerns were added to those of others addressing John Fawcett, head of the Presidential Libraries system, and to Don Wilson, the National Archivist, there might be more rapid progress toward resolving this problem.

### *Role of the Advisory Committee*

This Committee was created to serve a dual purpose: to advise relevant officers of the Department on the professional problems that affect the work of historians within and without the Department; to maintain the credibility of the Department



and its historical work with the learned societies and, ultimately, the public.

Toward those ends, the work of the Committee has focused on the preparation of the volumes of the *Foreign Relations* series. For many years, the Committee reviewed the material omitted from these volumes, heard the explanations for omission, and assured the learned societies and the interested public of the reliability of the published product. Similarly, the Committee was informed of records policy, what was kept, what was made available to scholars, what was not—and why not. It was not a perfect system, not everyone was happy about how it worked, but it did work. The *Foreign Relations* series won and maintained a superb reputation at home and abroad. Even in a country like China, government officials and scholars have been willing to revise their estimates of American intent based on the record presented in the *Foreign Relations* series and supplementary documents available in the National Archives and presidential libraries.

During the last decade, the traditional practice of interaction between the Committee and the Department changed radically, to the point where it seemed to become an adversary procedure, destructive of mutual trust, damaging to the credibility of the *Foreign Relations* series, the Department, and the nation. The critical change derived from decisions by the Department to deny Committee members an opportunity to see what was being withheld from the published documents and the guidelines for making material available in the archives. In brief, the Committee was denied access to precisely that information which was essential if it was to advise the Historical Office, the learned societies, and the outside world that the published volume was indeed a full and honest account of American foreign policy, that the material available in the archives provided an honest representation of

the record. The Committee was asked to become a rubber stamp—and it refused.

1987 and 1988 were tense years between the Committee and some elements in the Department. There were threats to abolish the Committee, but wiser heads prevailed. In the course of last year, compromises were painfully wrought with the help of Assistant Secretary Charles Redman and Deputy Assistant Secretary George High. At the December 1988 meeting a tentative agreement was reached which may provide a workable accommodation between the Committee's *need to know* what is excluded from the published record and the Department's reluctance to return to the traditional practice of presenting the deletions. Nothing short of a return to traditional practice is likely to restore full trust and credibility but the Committee is prepared to try. For 1989, our working assumption is that CDC will continue to provide its detailed and helpful briefings on specific volumes of our choosing, with the Department reserving the right to substitute in the unlikely event of a case of extraordinary sensitivity; further, that the unclassified record of deletions for each volume will be made available to the Committee.

The one remaining issue, tabled in December 1988, is the matter of "guidelines" to the National Archives, prepared after each volume has been reviewed by CDC. The Committee wishes to go on record as reiterating its understanding that its historic role has never been restricted to the *Foreign Relations* series; that the learned societies of which the members are elected representatives will not accept so narrow an interpretation of its role. Should the Secretary ever have the opportunity to examine the guidelines at issue, he might be astonished at the absurdity of risking the credibility of the Department, the mutual trust that must exist between the Committee and the Department, over documents which would

hardly create a stir if published on the front page of the *Washington Post*.

In the last year, some members of the Department were troubled by what they considered the monolithic nature of the Committee, as evidenced by its unanimity in face of the restrictions proposed. Suggestions have been made about enlarging the Committee with which the current members concur. We would recommend following the suggestions offered by a number of our predecessors: that the Department include members designated by the chairs of the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs committees. Congressional participation would help legislators understand the difficulties involved in providing full access to historical records, and, not least, the value of and the justification for expenditure on the *Foreign Relations* series and other efforts of the Historical Office.

### *Preservation of Records*

The problems of electronic storage of documents require careful study. It would be valuable to know what documents are preserved on paper and what is kept on computer tapes and disks. What is routinely destroyed? Do the various agencies involved have different policies on record management? Perhaps most important is information on the estimated life of electronically stored data.

The nightmare that confronts us all is the knowledge that important documents, likely candidates for inclusion in the *Foreign Relations* series, are on disks that will disintegrate years before the documents are scheduled for declassification. Such a loss would be devastating to the series and to the archival collections on which our recreation of the foreign policy past depends.

Finally, I am pleased to repeat that in the last year, strenuous efforts on the part of the Department's Bureau of

Public Affairs, its Historical Office, and the new leadership of the Classification/Declassification Center, have offered the promise of relieving the credibility crisis. We are delighted that the Department is once again appreciating the seriousness with which we address our responsibilities and is prepared to give us the information we require to meet those responsibilities. We look forward to an even more productive 1989.

Warren I. Cohen

## SHAFR COUNCIL MEETING

16 June 1989

*College of William and Mary*  
*GEORGE HERRING* presiding

The meeting opened at 8:15 a.m. Council members present were George Herring, Michael Hunt, Gary Hess, Rosemary Foot, J. Samuel Walker and Allan Spetter. Others present were Edward Crapol, Robert McMahon, Daniel Helmstadter, Richard Burns, Michael Hogan, William Kammen, David Anderson and H. Eugene Bovis.

1. Dr. H. Eugene Bovis, Director of Classification and Declassification for the State Department, explained a major reorganization which added Freedom of Information matters to his jurisdiction. He emphasized that the Secretary of State had made a commitment to Freedom of Information and \$1.5 million had been provided to work on the existing backlog. Bovis described how his office had reviewed 400,000 pages of material in 23 working days, releasing 84% of the material.

Bovis predicted that State Department decimal files through 1959 would be available in early 1990. He explained that work on those files is based on demand for particular files. Bovis made it clear that he did not believe release of the decimal files should be tied to publication of the Foreign Relations series.

2. George Herring reported for Anna Nelson, chair of the ad hoc Committee on Access to Documents. The committee has been exerting pressure to resolve problems in the presidential libraries. Future plans include a conference on classification/declassification. SHAFR will apply to the Knight Foundation for a \$30,000 grant to support such a conference. Herring asked Council to approve a resolution creating a standing committee on Research and Documentation. The resolution was approved.

3. A lengthy discussion about the proposed indexing of Diplomatic History led Council to authorize Richard Burns and Daniel Helmstadter to proceed to prepare an author/title index at a maximum cost of \$1,000. Such an index might be included in an issue of Diplomatic History. Burns and Helmstadter will report on how much more it would cost to prepare a topical index.

4. David Anderson, editor of the Roster and Research List, reported that a revised version would be ready before the end of 1989.

5. Council discussed the SHAFR summer conference of 1991. Dates and location will be decided as quickly as possible.

6. Council extended thanks for a job well done to Edward Crapol and Robert McMahon, co-chairs of the program committee for the 1989 summer conference.

7. Council noted the passing of Mrs. Myrna Bernath. Gary Hess, chair of the Finance Committee, reported that the committee continues to work closely with Mrs. Susan Shah on management of the endowment funds.

8. George Herring reported on the discovery of 192 original reels of material on John Foster Dulles at the Princeton University Library. The State Department has copies of the reels. The material has not been declassified.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

## OBITUARY

Richard Edwin Welch Jr., prominent SHAFR member, died in June after suffering a sudden stroke. He was 65 and had recently retired from Lafayette College.

Born June 16, 1924, in Newburyport, he was a son of the late Richard E. and Helen P. Hale Welch.

He attended Dartmouth College for one year before enlisting in the Army during World War II. He was promoted to lieutenant in the amphibious combat force stationed in the Philippines. He later graduated from Dartmouth in 1949 and obtained his doctorate in American history from Harvard University in 1952.

After serving on the faculties of Colgate University and Virginia Military Institute, he became the Charles A. Dana professor of history at Lafayette College. The recipient of numerous teaching prizes, he taught at Lafayette for 31 years.

Among his many publications were: *Theodore Sedgwick, Federalist: A Political Portrait*; *George Frisbie Hoar: a Half-Breed Republican*; *Imperialists Versus Anti-Imperialists: The Debate Over Expansionism in the 1890s*; *Response to Imperialism: The United States and the Philippine-American War*; *Response to Revolution: The United States and the Cuban Revolution, 1959 to 1961*; and most recently *The Presidencies of Grover Cleveland*.




---



---

**SPECIAL SHAFR DISCOUNT**


---



---

**AMERICAN-RUSSIAN ECONOMIC RELATIONS, 1770s-1990s** James K. Libbey

Libbey has succeeded in summarizing the basic economic activities in the long commercial relationship between the United States and Russia.

"It strikes me that we don't have anything like it."

*Lloyd Gardner, Rutgers University.*

"I think it is very good—informative, balanced, thoughtful...."

*Raymond L Garthoff, Brookings Institution.*

1989 \$21.95 cloth [ISBN 0-941690-35-0], \$12.95 paper [ISBN 0-941690-36-9], \$8.95 text **SHAFR Discount \$7.00**

**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) \$8.75 text **SHAFR Discount \$7.00**

**STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE: Progress and Challenge.** D. Waller, J. Bruce III & D. Cook

This critical survey draws from more than 60 top scientists, engineers, managers, and experts deeply involved with, and supportive of, SDI research. It includes discussion of SDI's relationship to arms control, of the Soviet Union's antagonism to SDI, and of the politics of SDI funding. The expanded reference chapter contains nearly 500 citations on the SDI program.

184 pages (1987) \$19.95 cloth [ISBN 0-941690-24-5] \$11.95 pbk [ISBN 0-941690-25-3]. **SHAFR Discount \$7.00**

---



---

Offer expires December 15, 1989



**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) \$7.95 text **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)\$ 7.95 text **SHAFR Discount \$6.00**

<b>Libbey. <i>Economics</i></b>	discount \$7.00	_____
<b>Buckingham. <i>America Sees Red</i></b>	discount \$7.00	_____
<b>Waller et al. <i>SDI...</i></b>	discount \$7.00	_____
<b>Esthus. <i>Theodore Roosevelt</i></b>	discount \$6.00	_____
<b>Brune. <i>Missle Crisis</i></b>	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**

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### *SHAFR NEWS*

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations will hold its 16th annual conference at the University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, on August 2,3, & 4, 1990. The program committee welcomes the submission of proposals for panels and papers. The deadline for proposals is December 1, 1989. Please send a one-page abstract along with a vita to Mark T. Gilderhus, Department of History, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523.

### *NEW DOCUMENTARY EDITING PRIZE*

10 July 1989

Dear SHAFR Colleagues:

If you read the small print in the Council minutes of a few meetings ago, you may recall that SHAFR has approved a proposal to establish a prize for analytical, scholarly editing of documents. I have been in touch with Arthur Link to ask if he would permit us to name the prize after him, and he has agreed; enthusiastically I should add.

As the description in the following Prize Criteria indicates, this award is designed to encourage just the kind of project that Arthur has devoted so much of his life to accomplishing, though we can hardly expect to see many others of that size and breadth. It is that combination of editor and scholar that we hope to both memorialize and encourage. Equally important, the prize will signify our affection and appreciation for a scholar who is also a thoroughly decent human being.

But prizes, even modest ones like this, require money. Our estimate is that an endowment of about four thousand dollars, properly invested, would be sufficient, since the prize

will not be awarded more than once every three years. I write to ask you all, some as friends of Arthur Link, others as admirers of his work, to contribute to this prize fund. We have reached about half our goal, but need your help in order to establish a prize worthy of the name. Perhaps the best endorsement I can offer is that made by Arthur himself, who has written me that he would like to contribute to the prize fund once it is clear that it will come about.

I hope you will find it possible to contribute, and I thank you in advance for whatever you are able to do to help. I would also ask you either to pass on this letter to others who might be interested in contributing or send their names to me so that I can contact them.

Checks should be made out to "SHAFR-Link Fund" and sent to me at the Dept. of History, Rutgers Univ., Newark, NJ, 07102. All contributions will be acknowledged publicly unless specified to the contrary.

### *SHAFR PRIZE FOR DOCUMENTARY EDITING*

*PURPOSE.* The prize will recognize and encourage analytical scholarly editing of documents, in appropriate published form, relevant to the history of American foreign relations, policy, and diplomacy. By "analytical" we mean the inclusion (in headnotes, footnotes, essays, etc.) of both appropriate historical background needed to establish the context of the documents, and interpretive historical commentaries based on scholarly research.

*CRITERIA.* To be selected for the award, the collection, which must have been published in some form, must, taken in its entirety, meet all or most of the following criteria:

a) makes more available an historically important collection of documents relevant to the history of American foreign affairs;

b) makes a significant contribution to an understanding of American foreign relations;

c) significantly expands, updates, or changes our knowledge of American foreign relations;

d) provides historical context for the documents based upon research in both the sources and relevant secondary materials;

e) conforms in editorial methodology to standards of modern day documentary editions (e.g. standards *Foreign Relations of the United States* series);

f) offers an interpretive historical analysis, not by selectivity of documentation, but in an appropriate but separate commentary;

g) the format would normally have documents and analysis together, but that would not exclude separate presentation so long as they were essentially one project.

**ELIGIBILITY.** The competition is open to the editor/author(s) of any collection of documents published after 1984 that is devoted primarily to sources relating to the history of American foreign relations, policy, and/or diplomacy; and that incorporates sufficient historical analysis and interpretation of those documents to constitute a contribution to knowledge and scholarship.

**PROCEDURES.** The prize winner shall be selected by a three member committee appointed by the President of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. Nominations may be made by any person or publisher. Recommendations for nominations may be requested from the Association for Documentary Editing and any other similar professional organization.

**FREQUENCY.** The prize shall be awarded whenever the committee determines there is a qualified entry, but no more frequently than once every three years.

*PRIZE.* To be determined by the amount of monies available in excess of capital, but \$500 plus travel expenses to the professional meeting where it is presented is the current goal.

### *BRADLEY SEMINAR IN WEST AND EAST GERMANY*

Sessions are held in English language on German politics, history and international relations. Designed principally for undergraduate college teachers. Sessions in East Berlin and Weimar scheduled for June 8-18; sessions in West Berlin and Bonn for June 18-27, 1990. Seminars presented by German university faculty, political leaders and foreign office experts.

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

Because of deadlines for East German visas, invitations to attend are sent before November 1, 1989. For applications and information contact:

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

### *VOLKSWAGEN GRANTS*

The Volkswagen Foundation has given the German Historical Institute a grant for two related programs. One program will introduce American historians to archives in the Federal Republic and in West-Berlin. The other will allow American historians to familiarize themselves with German archives and libraries, and to learn German script at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbuttel. Both programs will begin in the summer of 1990 and are funded for three years. Details will be announced in a future issue of the Bulletin of the German Historical Institute.

### *U.S.-GERMAN CONFERENCE*

American Policy Towards Germany, 1949-1955. Sponsored by the History Department, University of Marburg and the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C. Conveners: Jeffery M. Diefendorf (University of New Hampshire, Durham) and Hermann Josef Rupieper (University of Marburg). Marburg, September 26-28, 1989.

### *WORLD WAR II CONFERENCE*

The American University of Paris will host an International Conference on the occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Opening of the Second World War. The conference will take place in Paris, September 26-30, 1989 at 60, Blvd de Latour-Maubourg, 75007 Paris, France.

### *ARCHIVIST SIGNS JOINT US-USSR AGREEMENT AND RETURNS IMPERIAL RECORDS*

On April 18 Dr. Don W. Wilson, the Archivist of the United States and Dr. Fedor M. Vaganov, Chief of the Main Archival Administration of the USSR Council of Ministers, signed a joint agreement on archival cooperation for 1989-90. Among other projects, the signed protocol includes the first agreement on cooperation in genealogical research between the two countries.

The Archivist also returned to the Soviet government the first of two 400 boxes of the original files of the Imperial Russian Consulates in North America. These archives, which were created from about 1862 to 1922, are the records of the Imperial Russian Consulates in New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Honolulu, Philadelphia, Portland (Oregon), and Seattle, as well as the Canadian cities of Montreal and Vancouver.

## SHAFR NEWSLETTER BACK ISSUES

We have recently received several requests at the *SHAFR Newsletter* for back issues that we are no longer able to supply. We no longer have extra copies of these issues: June 1988, March 1988, March 1987, September 1986, December 1985, June 1985, March 1985, and March 1975. All other issues back to December 1969 (Vol I, No 1) are available in very limited quantities.

## CONFERENCE ON THE VIETNAM ANTIWAR MOVEMENT IN AMERICA:

### CALL FOR PAPERS

On the weekend of May 3-6, 1990, the University of Toledo and the Council on Peace Research in History are sponsoring a conference on the Vietnam Antiwar Movement in America. The conference will commemorate the posthumous publication of Charles DeBenedetti's history of the movement as completed by Charles Chatfield, *Ordeal for a Nation: The Antiwar Movement and America, 1955-1975*. For further details, contact Professor William D. Hoover, The University of Toledo, Local Arrangements Chairman. Paper proposals should be sent by September 1, 1989 to:

Professor Mel Small  
816 Mackenzie  
Dept. of History  
Wayne State University  
Detroit, Michigan 48202

THEODORE ROOSEVELT . . .

CALL FOR PAPERS

Hofstra University will sponsor a conference entitled "Theodore Roosevelt and the Birth of Modern America," April 19-21, 1990. The conference will deal with the life, career, and presidency of Theodore Roosevelt, The Progressive Era, Roosevelt's family and contemporaries and other topics. A prospectus should be sent by September 15, 1989, completed papers in duplicate due November 1, 1989 with a one-page abstract. Send to:

Laura J. Tringone  
Conference Coordinator  
Hofstra Cultural Center  
Hofstra University  
Hempstead, LI, NY 11550  
Phone (516)560-5041

NATIONAL REGISTRY FOR THE  
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HISTORY

The National Registry for the Bibliography of History, sponsored by the Association for the Bibliography of History, solicits listings of bibliographical projects in progress, in any field of history, by historians/bibliographers in the United States and Canada. This project is designed to reduce possible duplication of projects, and to serve as a medium of information concerning work now in progress. The listing is published each year in *American History: A Bibliographical Review* (Meckler & Co.) and is also circulated to interested publishers from time to time. For information and registration forms, write:

Prof. Thomas T. Helde, Director  
National Registry for  
the Bibliography of History  
Dept. of History



Georgetown University  
Washington, DC 20057

*THE 1989 GILBERT CHINARD PRIZE*

The Gilbert Chinard awards are made jointly by the Society for French Historical Studies and the Institut Francais de Washington for distinguished scholarly books or manuscripts in the history of relations between France and North, Central and South America published by Canadian or American authors during 1989. Historical studies in any area or period are acceptable. The Gilbert Chinard Prize of \$1,000 is awarded annually for a book or manuscript in page-proof. The Institut Francais de Washington funds the Prize and a committee of the Society for French Historical Studies determines the winners. The winners will be announced at the annual conference of the Society for French Historical Studies in the spring of 1990. Deadline for the 1989 award is December 15, and four copies of each entry should be sent to:

Prof. John McV. Haight, Jr.  
Chairman, Chinard Prize Committee  
Dept. of History  
Lehigh University  
Maginnes Hall #9  
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015

*SEMINAR ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TEACHING  
FACULTY*

The Consortium for the Study of Intelligence (CSI) will sponsor the fifth faculty seminar on teaching about intelligence from Monday, July 9 through Thursday, July 19, 1990, at Bowdoin College, in Brunswick, Maine.

Applicants are invited from faculty of all ranks who are currently teaching in the following fields: political science—

including world politics, international relations, and national security; military and diplomatic history; sociology and economics as it relates to national security areas; and constitutional and international law.

The objectives of the seminar are (1) to deepen substantive knowledge of the elements of intelligence collection, analysis, counterintelligence, and covert action; (2) to expand and improve the teaching of intelligence-related concerns; and (3) to promote professional contacts among scholars in the field.

*The deadline for application is February 15, 1990.* It is anticipated that approximately 25 applicants will be selected. Final notification will be given by mid-March 1990. CSI will pay round trip travel, room and board at the seminar.

*For further information and application forms, contact:* Dr. Roy Godson, Consortium for the Study of Intelligence, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue, NW, Suite 601, Washington, DC 20036. Telephone: (202) 429-0129.

## PUBLICATIONS

Michael A. Barnhart (SUNY Stony Brook), *Japan Prepares for Total War: The Search for Economic Security, 1919-1941*. Cornell Univ. Press, 1987. Now in paper, ISBN 0-8014-9529-6, \$9.95.

Vincent P. DeSantis (Univ. of Notre Dame), *The Shaping of Modern America: 1877-1920*. Forum Press, 1989. ISBN 0-8827-3136-x, \$14.95.

Susan Gubar and Joan Hoff-Wilson (Indiana), eds., *For Adult Users Only: The Dilemma of Violent Pornography*. Indiana Univ. Press, 1989. Cloth: ISBN 0-253-32365-7, \$39.95; paper: ISBN 0-253-20508-5, \$14.95

Gregg Herken (Cal Tech), *The Winning Weapon: The Atomic Bomb in the Cold War, 1945-1950*. Princeton Univ. Press, 1988. Now in paper: ISBN 0-691-02286-0, \$12.50

- Trumbull Higgins (New York, NY), *The Perfect Failure: Kennedy, Eisenhower, and the CIA at the Bay of Pigs*. Norton, 1987. Now in paper: ISBN 0-393-30563-5, \$7.95
- Akira Iriye (Chicago) and Warren I. Cohen (Michigan State), eds., *The United States and Japan in the Postwar World*. Univ. Press of Kentucky, 1989. ISBN 0-8131-1652-x, \$27.00
- Osamu Ishii (Hiroshima University), *Reisen to Nichibei-Kankei: Partnership no Keisei [The Cold War and Japan-U.S. Relations: The Formation of a Partnership]*. Tokyo: The Japan Times, 1989.
- Walter LaFeber (Cornell), *The American Age: United States Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad Since 1750*. Norton, 1989. ISBN 0-393-02629-9, \$25.00.
- Lester D. Langley (Georgia), *America and the Americas*. Univ. of Georgia Press, 1989. Cloth: ISBN 0-820-31103-0, \$30.00; paper: ISBN 0-820-31104-9, \$15.00
- Richard A. Melanson (Kenyon) and David Mayers, eds., *Reevaluating Eisenhower: American Foreign Policy in the Fifties*. Univ. of Illinois Press, 1987. Now in paper, ISBN 0-252-06067-9, \$10.95.
- David Reynolds (Cambridge University, England), co-author with David Dimbleby, *An Ocean Apart: The Relationship between Britain and America in the Twentieth Century*. Random House, 1988. Cloth: ISBN 0-394-56968-7, \$24.95. Vintage Books, 1989. Now in paper: ISBN 0-679-72190-8, \$8.95.
- Alfred Dick Sander (Purdue University Calumet), *A Staff for the President: The Executive Office, 1921-1952*. Greenwood Press, 1989. ISBN 0-313-26526-7, \$49.95.
- Michael Schaller (Oxford University), *Douglas MacArthur: The Far Eastern General*. Oxford Univ. Press, 1989. ISBN 0-195-03886x, \$22.50.
- Mark Stoler (Vermont), *George C. Marshall: Soldier-Statesman of the American Century*. Twayne Publishers, 1989. Cloth: ISBN 0-8057-7768-7, \$24.95; paper: ISBN 0-8057-7785-7, \$10.95

## CALENDAR

1989

- November 1      Deadline, materials for the December *Newsletter*.
- November 1      Applications for Bernath dissertation fund awards are due.
- November 1-15    Annual election for SHAFR officers.
- December 27-30    The 104th annual meeting of the AHA will be held in San Francisco. The deadline for proposals has passed.

1990

- January 1        Membership fees in all categories are due, payable at the national office of SHAFR.
- January 15        Deadline for the 1989 Bernath article award.
- January 20        Deadline for the 1989 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.
- March 22-25      The 83rd meeting of the Organization of American Historians will take place in Washington, DC with headquarters at the Washington Hilton.
- April 1            Applications for the H. Stull Holt dissertation fellowship are due.
- May 1             Deadline, materials for the June *Newsletter*.

June 9-12            The 16th SHAFR Summer Conference at the University of Maryland. The program chair is Mark T. Gilderhus, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523.

August                The 16th SHAFR Summer Conference at the University of Maryland. The co-chairs are Wayne Cole and Mark Gilderhus.

In 1990 the AHA will meet in New York. The program chair is Ronald Walters, The Johns Hopkins University.

The 1991 OAH will meet in Louisville, April 11-14, and the program chairman is Armstead L. Robinson, Carter G. Woodson Institute for Afro-American and African Studies, 1312 Jefferson Park Avenue, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903. Deadline for proposals of February 1, 1990.

(The AHA will meet in Chicago in 1991. The OAH will meet in Chicago in 1992 and in Anaheim in 1993.)

## AWARDS AND PRIZES

### *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: Douglas Little, Dept. of History, Clark University, Worcester, MA 01610.

Books may be sent at any time during 1989, but should not arrive later than January 20, 1990.

The award of \$2,000.00 will be announced at the March 1990 luncheon of the Society of Historians of American Foreign Relations held in conjunction with the Organization of American Historians in Washington.

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)
1989	Stephen G. Rabe (Texas-Dallas)

*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, 1990. Nominations should be sent to: Emily Rosenberg, Department of History, MacAlester College, St. Paul, MN 55105.

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 William Stueck (Georgia)
- 1987 Nancy Bernkopf Tucker (Colgate)
- 1988 William O. Walker III (Ohio Wesleyan)
- 1989 Stephen G. Rabe (Texas at Dallas)
- 1990 Richard Immerman (Hawaii)

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 1989. 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 1990* to the chairperson of the committee, who for 1990 is: William O. Walker III, Department of History, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, OH 43015.

The award of \$300.00 will be presented at the SHAFR luncheon at the annual meeting of the OAH in March, 1990, in Washington.

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)
- 1989 Robert J. McMahon (Florida)

#### THE STUART L. BERNATH DISSERTATION PRIZE

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

Requirements include:

1. The dissertation must deal with some aspect of American foreign relations.
2. Awards are given to help defray costs involved in:
  - (a) consulting original manuscripts that have just become available or obtaining photocopies from such sources,
  - (b) typing, printing, and/or reproducing copies of the dissertation,
  - (c) abstracting the dissertation.
3. Most of the research and writing of the dissertation must be completed at the time application is made. Awards are *not* intended to pay for time to write.



4. Applications must include:
  - (a) A one page curriculum vitae of the applicant, a table of contents for the dissertation, and a substantial synopsis *or* a completed chapter of the dissertation,
  - (b) a paragraph regarding the original sources that have been consulted,
  - (c) a statement regarding the projected date of completion,
  - (d) an explanation of why the money is needed and how, specifically, it will be used, and
  - (e) a letter from the applicant's supervising professor commenting upon the appropriateness of the applicant's request. (This should be sent separately.)
5. One or more awards may be given. Generally awards will not exceed \$500.
6. The successful applicant must file a brief report on how the funds were spent not later than eight months following the presentation of the award (i.e., normally by the following September). In addition, when the dissertation is finished, the awardee should submit to the committee a copy of the abstract sent to University Microfilms (University of Michigan).

Applications should be sent to Dr. Stephen G. Rabe, Humanities Division, Box 830688, University of Texas, Dallas, Richardson, Texas 75083-0688. The deadline is November 1, 1989.

Previous winners:

- |      |  |
|------|--|
| 1985 | Jon Nielson (UC-Santa Barbara)   |
| 1986 | Valdina 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)   |
| 1989 | Thomas Zeiler (Massachusetts-Amherst) & Russel Van Wyk (North Carolina-Chapel Hill)                                      |

#### *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, 1990 to: Frank Costigliola, Dept. of History, Univ. of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881.

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

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 has been awarded since 1986 to a distinguished scholar of diplomatic and international affairs. It is expected that this scholar is 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 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 winners:

1986 Dorothy Borg (Columbia)

1988 Alexander DeConde (University of California at Santa Barbara)

#### *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.

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

Harold Josephson  
Department of History  
U. of N. Carolina/Charlotte  
Charlotte, NC 2822

Ralph Levering  
P.O. Box 1178  
Davidson, NC 28036

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



# AMERICAN-EAST ASIAN RELATIONS NEWSLETTER

In order to introduce American audiences to the type of research interests and work in which young Chinese historians are engaged, this and forthcoming issues of the *A.E.A.R. Newsletter* will reprint bibliographical essays from *Chinese Historian*.

## REVIEW ARTICLE

### "LOST CHANCE" OR "INEVITABLE HOSTILITY?" TWO CONTENDING INTERPRETATIONS OF THE LATE 1940S CHINESE-AMERICAN RELATIONS

by  
*Zhigong Ho*  
(*University of Houston*)

Relations between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) from the end of World War II to the outbreak of the Korean War have continuously attracted scholarly attention. Because of the influence of the Cold War, dominant historical scholarship between 1950 and the early 1970s focused on such questions as why America's China policy failed or how China was lost to the Soviet-backed Communists. To these scholars, the Chinese-American confrontation in Korea was only naturally inevitable.<sup>1</sup>

However, starting from the early 1970s, many students of Sino-American relations abandoned the "lost China" paradigm and began to argue for a "lost chance" thesis. This new thesis suggests that if the U.S. decision-makers had seized some opportunities between 1945 and 1949 to develop working relations with the CCP, the clash of the two sides in Korea

could have been avoided. Although there are still scholars who do not accept the "lost chance" thesis and still believe that the Chinese-American hostility in Korea was inevitable, their perspectives and sources used are quite different from before. In this essay, I will discuss both the "lost chance" and the "inevitable hostility" literatures and give my own assessment of these two theses.

The shift in the American historiographical treatment of CCP-American relations occurred for a number of reasons. The Sino-Soviet split in the 1960s called into question the assumption firmly held in the 1950s and the early 1960s that the Communist world was a monolithic one. America's experience in Vietnam led many historians to cast doubts on the feasibility and advisability of containment. Also, Nixon's trip to China and the rapprochement between China and America reminded scholars of the CCP leadership's warm attitude toward America in 1945. More importantly, in newly declassified diplomatic documents some historians found apparently revealing evidence to suggest that both the CCP and Washington were strongly interested in improving their relations even as late as 1949 and early 1950. It is under these circumstances that new interpretations have been stimulated and debated.

According to some scholars, America lost a chance to establish better relations with the CCP during the period from 1944 to 1946. Two young foreign service officers, John S. Service and John P. Davies, suggested to the State Department in the closing months of WWII that the CCP could be weaned away from Moscow. In 1945, Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai told Franklin D. Roosevelt that they were willing to come to Washington to discuss the CCP-USA relations. Nevertheless, the American government turned a deaf ear to Service and Davies, and neglected Mao and Zhou's request.

Two studies discuss the advisability of America's decisions. Joseph Esherick edited Service's despatches and entitled it "Lost Chance in China." In his introduction to the book, Esherick argues that the final years of war when Service put forward his proposals were "perhaps the last hope for friendly U.S. relations with the Chinese Communists."<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, Barbara Tuchman criticizes America's decision to turn down Mao's request. In "If Mao Had Come to Washington: An Essay in Alternative," Tuchman emphatically suggests that if ill-feeling and antagonism between the CCP and the USA had been cleared away by Mao's visit to Washington, "there might have been no Korean War," and even, "we might not have come to Vietnam."<sup>3</sup>

Comparatively speaking, two other "opportunities" of 1949 have attracted more attention and debate than the ones in the mid-1940s. The reason for this is that the relationship between the CCP and USA had become much more critical in 1949 as the CCP was gaining national power and the Korean War was only one year away.

One "opportunity" was the so-called Zhou-Keon demarche. In a telegram to the Secretary of State, Edmund Clubb, U.S. Consul General in Beijing, reported that Zhou Enlai on May 31, 1949 passed along a message to American diplomats through Michael Keon, an Australian journalist working in China for the United Press. In the message, Zhou said he wanted to improve relations between the CCP and USA and desired to seek economic aid from America. Zhou admitted that there were differences within the CCP leadership concerning policies toward the Soviet Union and that he himself did not agree with the Soviet attitude toward the United States. Zhou preferred the whole thing to be confidential, saying that he would disavow any connection with it if leaked.<sup>4</sup> But when the State Department tried to send their reply based on Harry Truman's instruction of not "any

softening toward the Communists," the Chinese contact cut off the conversation by refusing to accept the American response.

The other "opportunity" was American Ambassador John Stuart's abortive trip to meet Mao and Zhou in Peking. Before appointed as Ambassador, Stuart, a seasoned missionary, served as president of Yenching University in Beijing. In mid-1949, during his talks with Huang Hua, the CCP director of Alien Affairs at Nanjing, they worked out a plan for Stuart to visit Beijing. However, Secretary of State Dean Acheson on July 1, 1949, with the decision coming from the highest level, informed the American Ambassador that "under no circumstances" was he to go to Beijing.<sup>5</sup>

The first treatment of Zhou-Keon demarche was by Robert Blum in 1978. In his article, "The Peiping Cable: A Drama of 1949," Blum tells a story of "how a potential chance to keep China unaligned in the cold war, and thus perhaps change the course of postwar history in Asia, came and went without anyone except in a small circle of insiders knowing about it." Blum notes that the year of 1949 was not only a disaster for American policy in the Far East, but also was a year when "a chance was lost for avoiding that quarter-century of mutual fear and enmity." As for the reason of Zhou's refusal to accept American reply, Blum suggests that if Clubb had been permitted to forward the reply orally, the message might have gotten through. Moreover, Blum thinks that the fact that a spy in Zhou's office had leaked the substance of Zhou-Keon demarche to the other faction of the CCP might have contributed to Zhou's decision of disconnecting the whole business.<sup>6</sup>

The invitation of Stuart to visit Beijing in 1949 was first revealed in Seymour Topping's memoirs, "Journey between Two Chinas" (1972). Topping was aware of the invitation as early as 1949 when he was in Nanjing as an Associated Press



correspondent. The American Ambassador, Topping recalled, thought he could have improved relations between Beijing and Washington, and laid the foundation for the establishment of normal diplomatic ties when the Communist government was formally proclaimed. Although Topping realized it was not easy for Stuart or the Truman Administration to influence the CCP, he believes that there might not have been a Korean War or two decades of hostility if Americans had continued to talk to the CCP.<sup>7</sup>

Looking at CCP-Soviet relations, Donald Zagoria was very critical of Truman's decision to block Stuart's Beijing trip. He thinks the U.S. should have exploited Mao's long-standing suspicions of Stalin and catered to China's national interest and expressions of desire for American support. If the American government had done the right things, Zagoria argues, the Sino-Soviet split would have erupted much earlier, and thus, there would not have been two wars in Asia. However, "shortsighted American policy in 1949, dictated by a combination of internal American politics and gross American ignorance about the relationship within the Communist world, forced Peking into Moscow's embrace."<sup>8</sup>

There are also historians who believe that within the Truman Administration there were strong forces favoring accommodation with the CCP in 1949 and early 1950. Warren Cohen in his essay, "Acheson, His Advisors, and China, 1949-1950," has found ample evidence to suggest that the State Department was preparing for recognition of the PRC, despite the opposition of Congress, Pentagon and anti-Communist China Lobby. But Cohen notes that Truman, not confident enough to ignore Congress and the public, overruled Acheson, and thus prevented steps that might have led to early normalization of Chinese-American relations.<sup>9</sup>

Nancy Tucker agrees with Cohen that Acheson and the State Department were willing to come to an accommodation

with the CCP. She even sees flexibility in Truman over the recognition issue. In *Patterns in the Dust: Chinese-American Relations and the Recognition Controversy, 1949-1950*, Tucker examines the attitudes and policies of the CCP and USA toward each other, and concludes that neither side had set up unbridged chasms before the outbreak of the Korean War. Although it is not Tucker's intention to support the "lost chance" thesis, she does emphasize that the sudden outbreak of the war in Korea stopped the PRC-USA accommodation process.<sup>10</sup>

The arguments of the "lost chance" thesis have a common base: the CCP foreign policy was flexible and China could be weaned over from aligning with the Soviet Union. These historians thus have a common vision: the hostility between China and the U.S. was not inevitable. It is by questioning the validity of the base of "lost chance" thesis that opponents put forward their counterargument. After all, contend these opponents, if the CCP proved to be strongly ideology-oriented and the Sino-Soviet block was monolithic, there was no "chance" for America to lose, and therefore, the Chinese-American confrontation in Korea was inevitable. Hereby comes the "inevitable hostility" thesis.

Emphasizing the effect of ideology on the CCP's attitudes toward the U.S. as well as the Soviet Union, Steven Goldstein discusses the ideological restraints of both the U.S. and CCP. To Goldstein, Mao saw the CCP's place at Stalin's side in the Cold War. Also, the CCP had reasons to hate the Americans since the latter provided huge aid to the CCP's enemy in the Chinese civil war and still supported the Nationalist government even after the Communist victory in China was overwhelming.<sup>11</sup>

Okabe Tatsumi shares Goldstein's viewpoint. In his "The Cold War in China," Okabe contends that the CCP's ideological attachment to the Soviet Union precluded any

serious considerations by the former to turn to the U.S. It is Okabe's belief that the U.S. simply could do nothing to change the CCP's pro-Soviet policy in 1949.<sup>12</sup>

Steven Levine also believes that the Chinese alliance with the Soviet Union could not be avoided because of America's hostility toward the CCP in the post WWII years. Yet, Levine concedes that the alliance with the Soviet Union did not necessarily prevent the CCP from seeking contact with the U.S.<sup>13</sup>

In his "Missed Opportunities? American Policy and the Chinese Communists, 1949," Russell Buhite directly assaults the "lost chance" thesis. Buhite sees an enormous influence of the Soviet Union on the CCP's foreign policy. After examining both "lost chance" cases of 1949, the Zhou-Keon demarche and the invitation of Stuart to Beijing, Buhite finds that in both incidents the Soviet Union pressed the CCP to retreat. Zhou cut off connections with the U.S. because of Soviet pressure and Mao made the "leaning to one side," the Soviet Union, pronouncement before Washington's reply concerning Stuart's visit. Buhite therefore concludes that "Mao would become another Tito but the United States could not make him one."<sup>14</sup>

Devoted exclusively to Stuart's proposed Beijing trip, Yuming Shaw has done an interesting study, "John Leighton Stuart and US-Chinese Communist Rapprochement in 1949: Was There Another 'Lost Chance in China'?" Shaw's research reveals that "when the Peking trip was being considered, Stuart undertook another mission which probably produced results similar to those that have come about from a meeting between himself and Communist leaders." According to Shaw, the exchange of views between Stuart and the CCP leaders had already been done through a proxy Chen Minshu, an influential Chinese, who brought back to Stuart discouraging news from Mao and Zhou about CCP-USA

relations. Shaw points out emphatically that the CCP's leaning to the Soviet Union decision was "a complete commitment," and "Stuart's efforts made in 1949 for a Sino-American rapprochement never had any chance for success and, in the final analysis, were only exercises in futility."<sup>15</sup>

Thus, two arguments, the "lost chance" and "inevitable hostility" remain widely divided. If the proponents of the "lost chance" thesis stress the opportunities and flexibilities, their opponents emphasize the restraints and obstacles. While the former blame American policies of being rigid and shortsighted, the latter try to reveal the CCP's firm commitment to the Soviet Union. It is clear that each side of the argument has its strong points and both theses have contributed to a better understanding of the early Cold War Sino-American relations.

Yet, some problems in the debate of the "lost chance" and "inevitable hostility" remain. One is that these two arguments are generally seen as mutually exclusive. Actually, to argue against the "lost chance" thesis should not automatically lead to an "inevitable hostility" argument, because whether America had lost chances in the late 1940s or not, the two countries could still avoid confrontation if both sides were willing to act with restraint. The confrontation in Korea was also shaped by other factors, some of which appeared only in 1950.

The other problem is more serious. When discussing the two "opportunities" of 1949, many have generally tended to ask questions relating to their possible outcomes, such as: What if Washington responded differently? Why did the CCP change their attitudes? Yet, few have looked at these two cases sufficiently enough to clarify some mystery and confusion. It is my contention that further light can be shed to the debate if one examines the two cases themselves, instead of their possible outcomes only, more carefully. Of course, in this

historiographical essay, I am only able to point out the problem rather than to solve it.

For the case of the Zhou-Keon demarche, a researcher might become perplexed if he does a careful textual examination of the related documents and has had broader background information in mind. Why, he might ask himself, did Zhou choose a go-between like Keon to send such an important message to American officials, as Keon not only did not have close ties with the CCP but also received criticism from the latter not long ago for his "distorted" reporting of the CCP affairs? Why, besides Keon himself, was there no other single source or evidence to vindicate that Keon did meet Zhou or Zhou's aides? Moreover, does it not seem odd for Zhou to make such a blunt overture since Zhou had long been proven as the shrewdest and most cautious statesman and diplomat among the CCP leadership? Also, if Zhou had ever made this overture at all, he would not have told the Americans, through a reporter, of the CCP's internal strifes or differences, if any, because the topic was too sensitive and circumstances were not appropriate.

Most importantly, there was no need for Zhou to seek another channel to communicate with the Americans, and especially no need for a go-between to exist, since Huang Hua had been meeting the American Ambassador during the same period of time. Evidence shows that Huang Hua was purposefully sent by Zhou to meet Stuart in April 1949 in Nanjing, and Huang and Stuart had kept in close touch with each other until the latter's return to Washington in August.<sup>16</sup> Zhou and Stuart were friends; Huang was one of Zhou's most trusted aides; and Stuart was Huang's former teacher in Yenching University. Thus, it was extremely unreasonable for Zhou to create a new channel to pass such a sensitive message through such an unreliable go-between. On the other hand, Huang Hua, Li Shenzhi, Pu Shan, and others who

worked with Zhou or in the CCP's foreign affairs agencies in the late 1940s all said that they did not have any knowledge of the Zhou-Keon demarche and that they did not think Keon's story was true.<sup>17</sup> Seen from these lights, I would like to suggest that before further evidence upholds the authenticity of the Zhou-Keon demarche, historians should not take this case seriously.

There is also something to say about the other "opportunity"—Stuart's abortive trip to Beijing. Quite a number of scholars participating in the debate support the "lost chance" thesis by suggesting that because Mao and Zhou were eager to improve relations with the U.S., they invited Stuart to visit Beijing. Again, this is the result of a misreading of the sources, for the idea of Stuart's Beijing trip was not from the CCP.

Both Stuart's telegrams to the State Department and his unpublished diary have clearly shown that the proposal of Stuart's trip to Beijing came from the American Embassy in China. It was Philip Fugh, Stuart's personal secretary and life-long friend, who first approached Huang Hua and discussed the possibility of Stuart's Beijing trip, without the Ambassador's instruction, according to Stuart. Several weeks later, Huang Hua replied that the CCP leadership in Beijing had concurred about the trip.<sup>18</sup>

Actually, Stuart played a key role in creating this "opportunity." He not only intentionally stayed in Nanjing, with permission from Dean Acheson, so as to meet the CCP officials, but also instructed Philip Fugh to discuss the possibility of a Beijing trip with Huang Hua.<sup>19</sup> Perhaps it is sufficient to say that Stuart himself acquired an invitation from the CCP to visit Beijing.

Moreover, Huang Hua pointed out that the discussion of future Sino-American relations was not the CCP's major concern when they accepted Stuart's Beijing trip proposal. To

Huang, the immediate improvement of Chinese-American relations was out of the question—one main reason being that the U.S. still supported the anti-Communist resistance forces in southern China and still recognized the Nationalist government. The CCP's main intention to accept Stuart in Beijing, Huang Hua said, was to give the public an impression that the U.S. might abandon the Nationalist government soon. In doing so, the CCP hoped, the morale of the resistance forces in southern China could be further crushed.<sup>20</sup> Therefore, some of the evidence and assumptions upon which the "lost chance" thesis is based are questionable.

It is clear to students of Sino-American relations of the late 1940s that one crucial task is to better understand the CCP's changing attitudes and policies toward other countries. In achieving this goal, lack of reliable sources constitutes a major obstacle. Scholars from both the U.S. and PRC have long been waiting for the Chinese government to declassify its diplomatic documents and open its archives. Only then can some mysteries such as the Zhou-Keon demarche be brought to light, and will the debate between "lost chance" and "inevitable hostility" be discussed more fully.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Tang Tsou, *America's Failure in China, 1941-1950* (Chicago, 1963); Anthony Kubek, *How the Far East Was Lost* (Chicago, 1963).

<sup>2</sup>Joseph W. Esherick, ed., *Lost Chance in China: The World War II Despatches of John S. Service* (New York, 1974), xiii.

<sup>3</sup>Barbara W. Tuchman, "If Mao Had Come to Washington: An Essay in Alternative," *Foreign Affairs* 51, No. 1, (Oct. 1972).

<sup>4</sup>*Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS)* (Washington, D.C., 1978), 1949, VIII, 357-360.

<sup>5</sup>*FRUS* 1949, VIII, 769.

<sup>6</sup>Robert M. Blum, "The Peiping Cable: A Drama of 1949," in *The New York Times* August 13, 1978.

- <sup>7</sup>Seymour Topping, *Journey Between Two Chinas* (New York, 1972), 89-90.
- <sup>8</sup>Donald Zagoria, "Choices in the Postwar World (2): Containment and China," in Charles Gati, ed., *Caging the Bear: Containment and the Cold War* (New York, 1974).
- <sup>9</sup>Warren I. Cohen, "Acheson, His Advisers, and China, 1949-1950," in Dorothy Borg and Waldo Heinrichs, eds., *Uncertain Years: Chinese-American Relations, 1947-1950* (New York, 1980).
- <sup>10</sup>Nancy B. Tucker, *Patterns in the Dust: Chinese-American Relations and the Recognition Controversy, 1949-1950* (New York, 1983).
- <sup>11</sup>Steven M. Goldstein, "Chinese Communist Policy toward the United States: Opportunities and Constraints, 1944-1950" in Borg and Heinrichs, *Uncertain Years*.
- <sup>12</sup>Okabe Tatsumi, "The Cold War in China," in Yonosuke Nagai and Akira Iriye, eds., *The Origins of the Cold War in Asia* (New York, 1977).
- <sup>13</sup>Steven Levine, "Notes on Soviet Policy in China and Chinese Communist Perceptions, 1945-1950," in Borg and Heinrichs, *Uncertain Years*.
- <sup>14</sup>Russell D. Buhite, "Missed Opportunities? American Policy and the Chinese Communists, 1949," in *Mid-America* 61, No. 3 (Oct. 1979).
- <sup>15</sup>Yuming Shaw, "John Leighton Stuart and US-Chinese Communist Rapprochement in 1949: Was There Another 'Lost Chance in China'?" in *The China Quarterly* (March 1982).
- <sup>16</sup>John Leighton Stuart's Diary (unpublished), 1949; *FRUS* 1949, VIII; This author's interview with Huang Hua, Feb. 5, 1985, Beijing.
- <sup>17</sup>Warren I. Cohen, "Conversations with Chinese Friends: Zhou Enlai's Associates Reflect on Chinese-American Relations in the 1940s and the Korea War," in *Diplomatic History* 11 (Summer, 1987); This author's interview with Huang Hua.
- <sup>18</sup>*FRUS* 1949, VIII, 766-769; Stuart's Diary, May-July, 1949.
- <sup>19</sup>This author's interview with Philip Fugh, August 16, 1986, Washington D.C.; Zhigong Ho, "John Leighton Stuart as American Ambassador, 1946-1949," (unpublished M.A. thesis, Graduate School, the Chinese Academy of Social Science, Beijing, 1985).
- <sup>20</sup>This author's interview with Huang Hua; Zhigong Ho, "American Foreign Policy toward China, 1945-1949: An Assessment," in *Jin Dai Shi Yan Jiu* (Journal of Modern History), 25, No. 1, (Jan. 1985, Beijing).