

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations



NEWSLETTER

Volume 21

No. 1

March 1990

Page

- 1 The Department of State and the Robert Lansing
Papers by *David A. Langbart*
- 7 By the Numbers: The Use of Statistics in U.S. Policy
Toward Latin America During the 1950s
by *Michael L. Krenn*
- 17 Summary of the 1989 Annual Meeting by *Robert J.
McMahon*
- 38 Minutes of SHAFR Council Meeting
- 44 A Call for Action by SHAFR Members: Access to
Foreign Relations of the United States Volumes
- 46 Abstracts
- 48 Announcements
- 53 Personals
- 55 Publications
- 58 Calendar
- 59 Awards and Prizes
- 68 A.E.A.R. Newsletter
- 68 A Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations
and Masters Theses by *Marc Gallicchio*
- 77 Correction: Final Pages, Vol. 20, No. 4

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*.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND THE ROBERT LANSING PAPERS

by

David A. Langbart
(National Archives)

The problem of cabinet officials, such as the Secretary of State, taking their official papers with them upon departure from office is usually thought of as a relatively contemporary one. One only need note the controversy over the papers of Henry Kissinger. The reality, however, is that the problem is not new. As a result, documentation on foreign and national security affairs can be found scattered about the country in numerous archives and manuscript collections. One of the earliest twentieth century examples of the removal of official papers involves the files of Secretary of State Robert Lansing. In his case, however, the end result was better than in most cases.

In 1939 the Department of State published a special two volume supplement to the series *Foreign Relations of the United States*. Those special volumes, sub-titled "The Lansing Papers, 1914-1919" contained "an extensive selection from the large body of correspondence of Robert Lansing...secured for the files of the Department of State following Mr. Lansing's death in 1928." The preface stated that the material was not available when the department compiled the *Foreign Relations* volumes for the years 1914 through 1919 and the supplementary volumes on World War I and Russia. Realizing the importance of and public interest in the documents, the department decided to publish them as another supplement to the regular series. Short of explaining that the files had been "secured" for the Department of State after the death of the former secretary of state, the preface sheds no light on exactly how the records ended up with the Department of State.¹ The central files of the Department of State, however, do provide detail on that part of the story.

As early as September 1921, the Department of State expressed concern over materials relating to foreign policy that officials of the Wilson Administration removed upon their departure from office. Department officials expressed particular concern about material on foreign relations taken by President Woodrow Wilson and Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby. The Assistant Secretary, Fred Morris Dearing, wanted to know what had been taken and how the return of the documents might be effected. David A. Salmon, Chief of the Bureau of Indexes and Archives, believed that "polite" and "courteous" requests "might have the desired effect." If that was not the case, he recommended that the Department of State consider proceeding under Section 47 of the Criminal Code.² None of Salmon's suggestions were implemented and the situation remained unchanged.

Strangely, no mention was made of a key group of files, those of Secretary of State Robert Lansing. When Lansing resigned as Secretary of State on February 13, 1920, he took a large amount of material with him, a great deal of which was clearly official in nature. He later used those files in the preparation of his memoirs.³ During the early and mid-1920s, Salmon, as the chief of the Bureau of Indexes and Archives of the Department of State, secured copies of documents from Lansing, on a case-by-case basis, if they were needed for official business. Nothing, however, was done to rectify the problem of a private individual holding official records of use and importance to the government until after Lansing's death.

On January 16, 1929, Secretary of State Frank Kellogg sent Mrs. Robert Lansing a letter explaining the Department of State's "difficulty in locating many telegrams, despatches, aides-memoir, memoranda, letters, etc." during the preparation of the World War supplements to the series *Foreign Relations of the United States*. The secretary attributed the problem to "the fact that many pieces of correspondence of this nature" were sent not to the Department of State for inclusion in the Central Decimal File,

but "directly to Mr. Lansing without record...and incorporated in the files which were removed to his residence" when he resigned. Several times, Kellogg continued, David Salmon, Chief of the Bureau of Indexes and Archives, had obtained copies of documents from the former secretary of state. Once, Lansing stated his intention to return the files to the department intact or to allow Salmon to review the files and remove to the department the official correspondence after the completion of his memoirs. Kellogg now informed Mrs. Lansing that he had heard of the possible relocation of the former secretary's papers to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Before that happened he requested permission for Salmon to "go over them and remove such papers as are official or semi official in character for incorporation in the Archives of the Department." The department would, in return, provide copies to replace the originals.⁴

Mrs. Lansing responded to Kellogg's letter on January 18, just two days later, and stated in no uncertain terms that she had "no intention of turning over the State Department files to the Carnegie Endowment." She planned only to place some of the late secretary's personal papers and manuscripts there "for safe keeping." She further informed Kellogg that one of her nephews, Allen Dulles, would contact the department in an effort to cooperate on the return of official material.⁵

Exactly one week later, Dulles wrote the department that it was Mrs. Lansing's "desire to return to the Department any...papers which properly form a part of the official records." He had reviewed the files and collected the pertinent papers in one filing cabinet that his aunt was ready to turn over to the department. Mrs. Lansing's only requests, Dulles continued, were that the material in the cabinet be indexed, remain segregated from the general files, and be made available to anyone she might designate. Dulles thought that his aunt might eventually select someone to finish Secretary Lansing's unfinished book. Also, Dulles noted, Secretary Lansing indicated before he died that Ray

Stannard Baker would be granted access to the correspondence between Lansing and President Woodrow Wilson. Mrs. Lansing wanted "to be in a position to carry out Mr. Lansing's expressed desire...." Dulles thought that there should be no problems as he had already discussed the situation with Salmon.⁶ Kellogg confirmed the arrangements a few days later in a letter to Dulles.⁷

On January 30, only two weeks after the initial contact with Mrs. Lansing, Dulles informed Salmon that the files were ready for delivery at any time. Contrary to Mrs. Lansing's original request, he also suggested that the papers should be refiled for ease of recall since Secretary Lansing had followed no clear filing plan.⁸

At this point the files of the Department of State fall silent. There are no further significant communications relating to the move of Lansing's files. Soon after, however, Mrs. Lansing transferred the files to the Department of State. For a time they were maintained as a collection, but eventually their contents were indexed and the records interfiled in the Central Decimal File.⁹ Recognition of the importance of that material subsequently led the Department of State to prepare the special supplement *Foreign Relations of the United States: The Lansing Papers, 1914-1919*.

Most of Secretary of State Lansing's remaining papers ended up in the Library of Congress. Mrs. Lansing deposited many of them in 1929 and in 1956, John Foster Dulles, then Secretary of State himself, and other family members placed additional material there. The files in the Library of Congress cover Lansing's entire career and include "General Correspondence," "Desk Diaries," "Private Memoranda," "Scrapbooks," "Notebooks," and other material. Princeton University also maintains a small body of Lansing papers. Those files deal with some of the more important and perhaps controversial subjects encountered by Lansing while in the Department of State. Included is material on Soviet Russian matters, World War I German peace feelers and negotiations, the Lansing-Ishii Agreement, diplomatic appointments and

personnel issues, and Lansing's resignation as Secretary of State. It is curious, given the official nature of some of this material, that it was not transferred to the Department of State in 1929. Princeton University has no specific information on how its small collection came to them.¹⁰ Most likely Allen Dulles held the material back while reviewing the files in 1929 only to send it to Princeton along with his papers.

This incident demonstrates that the problem of high government officials, such as the Secretary of State, taking official papers with them upon departure from government service is not new. In this case, cooperation between the official, the official's family, and his former agency ensured that necessary documentation was available to the agency and also led to the eventual return of the clearly official material. For a considerable period, however, the United States Government was without a complete "official memory" on the subjects covered by Lansing's files and at his mercy when it came to sharing that information. There are countless other examples, both in the more distant past and in recent years, when such cooperation has not been forthcoming. The result has been and continues to be that the official record is much diminished.

NOTES

The opinions expressed are those of the author and do not represent those of any agency of the U.S. Government.

¹*Foreign Relations of the United States: The Lansing Papers, 1914-1919* 2 volumes (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1939), 1:iii.

²Fred Morris Dearing to David A. Salmon, September 23, 1921, David A. Salmon to Fred Morris Dearing, September 24, 1921, Central Decimal File 116/121, Record Group 59, National Archives (hereafter cited as file number, RG 59, NA). Section 47 read: Whoever shall embezzle, steal, or purloin any money, property, records, voucher, or valuable thing whatever, of the moneys, goods, chattels, records, or property of the United States, shall be fined not

more than five thousand dollars, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

- ³See: Robert Lansing. *The Peace Negotiations: A Personal Record*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1921 and *War Memoirs of Robert Lansing*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1935.
- ⁴Secretary of State Frank Kellogg to Mrs. Robert Lansing, January 16, 1929, Central Decimal File 116/174A, RG 59, NA.
- ⁵Mrs. Lansing to Secretary of State Frank Kellogg, January 18, 1929, 116/174B, RG 59, NA.
- ⁶Allen W. Dulles to Secretary of State Frank Kellogg, January 25, 1929, 116/174C, RG 59, NA.
- ⁷Secretary of State Frank Kellogg to Allen W. Dulles, January 29, 1929, 116/174D, RG 59, NA.
- ⁸Allen W. Dulles to David A. Salmon, January 30, 1929, 116/174E, RG 59, NA.
- ⁹These documents are usually easily identifiable for two reasons: first, the file numbers on the documents are typed instead of being handwritten as they are for other World War I era documents and, second, most of the documents have a fractional file number (i.e. 861.00/383-1/2).
- ¹⁰Nancy Bressler to author, November 28, 1988.

BY THE NUMBERS: THE USE OF STATISTICS IN U.S. POLICY TOWARD LATIN AMERICA DURING THE 1950S

by

Michael L. Krenn
(University of Miami)

One of the most enduring impressions of the Vietnam War has been that of a U.S. official, often Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara himself, confidently quoting or displaying an impressive array of statistical information, all of which pointed to the same conclusion—America was winning the war. Whether it was weekly casualty reports, data on the "progress" of democracy in South Vietnam, or intelligence estimates of the capabilities of the enemy, it all seemed to suggest that light was indeed at the end of the tunnel.

Historians analyzing the painful failure of U.S. policy in Vietnam often cite such figures in arguing that the nation's policymakers were able to delude not only the American people but very often themselves into thinking that the United States *was* winning the war. James William Gibson's fascinating study, *The Perfect War: The War We Couldn't Lose and How We Did*, notes that the use of such statistics was a natural result of the tendency of U.S. policymakers to treat the American war effort and machine as a business, with graphs and charts marking its "profits" and "losses" in pursuing the war. At one point, Gibson reprints a "Military Performance Indicator Chart" for an American infantry division in Vietnam. This rather complicated document tried to measure "credits" ("enemy body counts, prisoners of war, and U.S. reenlistments") and "debits" ("accidents, courts-martial, sicknesses, and all kinds of disciplinary problems"). "Credits minus debits," Gibson concludes, "equals the index of efficiency."¹ In another instance of the U.S. fascination with statistics, Gibson examines the Hamlet Evaluation Survey program begun in 1966. In this program, U.S. district

level military advisers were asked to rate the "security" and "development" of the hamlets in their district in eighteen different categories. These reports "were processed by a computer into a composite score. These scores were then ranked according to a system in which numbers signified degrees of security." Following this, a letter grade (A being the best, E the worst) was assigned to the hamlet. Using such a system, the United States was able to claim that just months before the Tet Offensive, 75 percent of the South Vietnamese population was pacified. A few months after the offensive, the numbers again painted a rosy picture, as over 73 percent of all hamlets were "'relatively secure'."²

In light of what actually transpired in Vietnam (and what was transpiring even as those figures were being touted), these statistics seem, at best, incredibly naive. Scholars such as Gibson are quick to point out that the almost blind reliance on these number games contributed in no small way to the ultimate disaster of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Yet, this was not an entirely new phenomenon. Prior to the direct involvement of the United States in Vietnam, the State Department was already using statistical analyses in plotting U.S. policy in Latin America as well as in measuring U.S. "successes" in that region. And while this did not lead to any disasters on the scale of Vietnam, those analyses did contribute to the clouding of U.S. policy toward Latin America by cloaking complex issues in a veneer of "hard statistical data." During some recent research into the State Department records at the National Archives, two documents in particular aptly illustrated this problem.

In April 1952, the State Department's Office of American Republic Affairs (ARA) produced a fascinating document concerning the amount of Point 4 assistance to be given to the nations of Latin America. It consisted of a covering memorandum and three handwritten tables of statistical data, one entitled "Overall Political Importance of the Country to the United States," the second entitled "Need for Point 4 Assistance," and the last "Level of Point 4 Assistance."³ The

memorandum stated that the Point 4 program in any given nation "should depend on two basic factors—first, the overall political importance of the country to the United States and second, the need of the country for development based on its level of development and its population." Based on those assumptions, ARA had ranked nineteen Latin American nations (Argentina was not included) into four groups according to the level of Point 4 assistance that should be given to each. Each group would receive 25% of the total Point 4 aid to be given to Latin America, to be divided up among the nations in that group. Group I contained Mexico and Brazil; Group II was made up of Cuba, Colombia, Uruguay, and Haiti; Group III included Chile, Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru; and Group IV contained Panama, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Paraguay, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Honduras.

The formula for this breakdown was provided in the attached tables. The first, analyzing the importance of the various Latin American nations to the United States, based its conclusions on a number of factors. These included the size of the nation, its location, "subversive pressures," internal political activity, amount of trade, amount of industry, importance of the nation as a source of materials for the United States, and complexity of economic structure, among others. The method used to compute the figures is, unfortunately, not clearly stated. A note at the bottom of the table states that it was "Prepared from Post Rating Scales." What these were is not indicated, although it may be supposed that they were prepared based on political, economic, and social reports from official U.S. diplomatic and commercial representatives in Latin America. In and of themselves, the figures are fascinating.

Figures for "Size" are self-explanatory—Brazil scores a 100 on this count; Costa Rica scores a 6. "Location" obviously reflects more strategic concerns, as Mexico scores a 90, while El Salvador scores 15 (somewhat ironically, in view of recent events). The scores for "Subversive Pressures"

are interesting, but somewhat confusing. Guatemala scored a 65, while Brazil was at the top of the class with a 95. Apparently, the concern over events in Guatemala had not reached the boiling point by 1952. Another group of somewhat surprising figures is found under "Complexity of Economic Structure." As might be expected, nations such as Honduras (18) and Haiti (19) were at the bottom. At the same time, however, Nicaragua (18, the same as Honduras) and Costa Rica (19) are found in their company.

The averaging of the score for the fifteen factors under consideration resulted in Mexico topping the list with a 76. Brazil followed closely with a 73, while at the bottom of the list were El Salvador (25) and Honduras (23). Based on these averages, the nations were then rated on a scale of 100 (with 100 being the most important nation to the U.S., and so on). Mexico, naturally, scored the 100, and the list went on to the bottom—Honduras at 29.9.⁴

The next table provided a statistical analysis of the needs of the individual Latin American nations for Point 4 assistance. This was done by first determining the "Percent of Development" for those nations. The method used was the averaging of the percentages (based on the averages for developed nations) of per capita income, consumption of non-human energy, and number of males in non-agricultural employment. The reciprocal of that figure was then taken as representing the need for economic development. Haiti was deemed most in need (scoring a 25), while Venezuela was found least in need (scoring a 2). This process did not stop there, however. That number was then multiplied by the population of the given nation; this, according to the document, would give a figure for "Population-Need for Point 4." In this manner, Haiti fell from its top position (now behind Brazil and Mexico), while Venezuela moved from the bottom of the list up to fourteenth place among nineteen nations in terms of need for economic development.

Table III put all of this information together in determining the levels of Point 4 assistance that should be

offered to the nations of Latin America. While as lengthy as the preceding tables, the process here was rather simple. The recommended level of Point 4 aid to any particular nation was based on an average of the figure denoting its importance to the United States (Mexico at 100 through Honduras at 29.9) and its figure indicating its "population-need" for Point 4 aid (which, in this table, was also converted to the system wherein the nation with the highest need Brazil—was assigned a 100, with the other nations following in order).⁵ Brazil topped the list with a 96.2 average; Mexico followed with 68.7; and, discounting Argentina, the next closest country was Cuba with 43.6. At the bottom were Honduras at 16.5, with Costa Rica and Nicaragua close at hand, each with 19.5.

Armed with this impressive array of statistics, ARA had made its final determinations for its suggestions as to the disbursement of Point 4 assistance to Latin America. Yet, even a cursory glance at the figures used to make these determinations must raise some eyebrows. In Table II, for example, the multiplying of the need for economic development figure by the particular nation's population gave a nation such as Brazil an overwhelming advantage in this regard. In terms of its actual need for economic development, Brazil was rated at 4.5; ten other nations were judged to be more in need. However, when that figure was multiplied by Brazil's population of 52 million, it zoomed to the top of the list. This was despite the fact that elsewhere in the tables, Brazil was judged to have a relatively high complexity of economic structure, to be the second most industrialized nation in Latin America and to have a moderate per capita income. Haiti, on the other hand, had the highest need for economic development (scoring a 25 that far outdistanced any other Latin American nation). It was judged to have one of the least complex economic structures, was tied with Bolivia for the least amount of industry, was tied with Ecuador for the lowest per capita income in the region, and overall, was the least developed nation in Latin America. Its

population-need for Point 4 aid placed it third behind Brazil and Mexico. In terms of its importance to the United States, however, Haiti fared far worse, finishing thirteenth overall. In the final analysis, therefore, Haiti finished sixth on the list of Point 4 aid to be granted. Other pathetically poor and underdeveloped nations such as Honduras, El Salvador, Paraguay, and the Dominican Republic finished much lower than Haiti, while Brazil, Mexico, Cuba, Colombia, and Uruguay—all nations of much higher economic development status—were the top five nations in terms of Point 4 assistance to be granted.⁶

Other documents in the State Department files provide an example of how officials might have used statistics to chart the degree of success of U.S. policies in Latin America. In May of 1954, Harlan P. Bramble, Acting Chief of the Metals and Mineral Staff, issued a memorandum on the subject of "Review of Dependability Ratings of Countries That Supply Strategic Materials to the United States for Use in Calculating Stockpile Objectives."⁷ According to the memo, these ratings were put together by the State Department in response to Department of Defense requests, and were used to reflect the dependability of various nations in providing strategic materials to the United States during wartime. In preparing the reports, various State Department officers were asked to rate each nation in four categories: (1) "Political Orientation of the Government Toward the United States," (2) "Vulnerability to Sabotage," (3) "Dependability of the Labor Force," and (4) "The Ability of the Economy to Sustain Itself."

The ratings given in each category would "express the degree to which it would be prudent to rely on the full productive capacity of the country's industries being relied [sic] in wartime." In the example of a nation receiving a rating of 70 overall, then, this would mean that the United States "might be willing to consider the chances to be 7 out of 10 that we could get full productive output" from the nation. In arriving at the final rating, the lowest of the four factors

would be used. The reasoning for that decision was not entirely satisfactory, claiming that it was "not desirable...because there may be considerable overlapping" among the categories.

An attached table listed the nations of Latin America to be rated in the four categories. Unfortunately, this had been done for only two nations—El Salvador and Guatemala. It is instructive, nevertheless. El Salvador scored quite well, with a 95 in political orientation toward the United States and 80s in the remaining categories. As directed by Bramble's memorandum, the lowest figure was used as El Salvador's final rating—an 80—which seemed to represent a "passing" grade. Guatemala did not fare as well. It scored highest in the vulnerability to sabotage category (30), had a 20 in the dependability of labor column, and received a 10 for its political orientation toward the United States. This resulted in a score of 10 overall—well below what any respectable professor would classify as passing.

A memorandum attached to the Bramble note, however, brought happier news. Dated 29 July 1954 (just a month after the CIA-directed coup in Guatemala),⁸ it stated that, "The ratings of Guatemala, since the recent change in Government, should be tentatively revised...." Guatemala's political orientation score had leaped to 80 and the dependability of labor (while still suspect) had hopped to 50. Overall, Guatemala now stood at 70 (apparently the decision to use the lowest figure had been changed in the intervening months). It was a low "C" in the traditional grading scale, but it was passing, nonetheless.⁹

It is difficult to ascertain with absolute precision the impact that such statistical studies had on U.S. policy in Latin America during the 1950s. The available data, however, would suggest that these kinds of analyses were gaining in popularity. They differed significantly from previous uses of statistics by the State Department, wherein numbers were usually reserved for trade figures or voting results. Now numbers were used to represent economic, political, and

social realities. Complex and/or vague issues such as "subversive pressures," "percent of and need for economic development," "political orientation," and "dependability" were given concreteness with figures; a certain aura of scientific objectivity overhung their calculation.

As would be the case in Vietnam a decade later, the use of statistics in the U.S. view of Latin America during the 1950s was able to mask or confuse some unpleasant issues. In the example of Point 4 assistance to the nations of that region, the impressive data produced by ARA pointed the way to heavy aid for Brazil, Mexico, and a number of other relatively well developed Latin nations, while many of the most underdeveloped nations found themselves playing catchup. The reliance on this "scientific" approach could well be said to have come back to haunt U.S. policymakers as it is in many of those very nations—Haiti, Honduras, El Salvador—that the United States finds itself confronted with serious problems, many of which arise from the same conditions that the Point 4 program was aimed at eradicating.

In the case of the ratings of El Salvador and Guatemala in 1954, bland but, especially in the case of Guatemala, promising numbers hid some serious questions. The "orientation" and "dependability of labor" in those two nations were not always so pleasantly arrived at. In El Salvador, the military had been the source of governing power since 1945; its rule was often harsh and repressive.¹⁰ The change in the "dependability" of Guatemala's labor came after the 1954 counterrevolution, but at the cost of thousands of jailings and an indeterminate number of executions of labor leaders.¹¹

The impact of what may have been the beginnings of a "statistical revolution" in the field of U.S. diplomacy has not been fully investigated. This brief analysis, however, indicates that many questions need to be answered. In an age dubbed the "Information Generation" by many, we are all aware that the manner in which information is transmitted and used is often as important as the information itself. Just a

few years ago, for example, the quantification craze took the field of history by storm, providing scholars with new ways of looking at the past. In the 1950s, numbers were providing U.S. officials with new ways of looking at the present. It is incumbent upon historians of U.S. foreign relations to find out why those officials were using those methods and what it was that those numbers showed them.

NOTES

- ¹James William Gibson, *The Perfect War: The War We Couldn't Lose and How We Did* (New York, 1988), 115.
- ²Gibson, *The Perfect War*, 305-307, 311-313.
- ³John P. Hoover to Richard F. Cook, 28 April 1952, SD, RG 59, 720.5-MSP/4-2852. The three attached tables were prepared on 1 April 1952, by H. C. Herrick (position unidentified).
- ⁴The mathematics used in determining these figures seems flawed. If Mexico, with an overall average of 76, is stated to be 100, it would be logical to assume that the reciprocal of 76 (1.3157) would then be used to determine the final figures for the other nations as well. Brazil, for example, with an overall average of 73, is listed at 92.3 when the correct figure would be 96.1. For the purposes of this article, however, the figures given in the table will be used as is.
- ⁵In this case, the figures were accurately computed. Brazil, which had a population-need figure of 234, was assigned a 100. The reciprocal of 234 (0.43) was then used to figure the final ratings of the other nations (Mexico, for example, with a population-need figure of 87, was ranked at 37.4).
- ⁶It needs to be noted that these were merely the "suggestions" presented by the ARA. When hearings were held on the actual appropriations, the Technical Cooperation Administration (which oversaw the Point 4 Program) requests agreed with or came close to agreeing with those suggestions in nine out of 19 cases, agreeing to the suggestions for lowering or raising the U.S. contribution to an individual nation in ten of 19 cases. There were, indeed, very wide disagreements in a number of cases. In general, however, the results were much the same. Some of the most underdeveloped nations that were given short shrift by the ARA made it into the top ten in terms of grants—Paraguay, for example, was number 15 on the ARA list, but was in the fifth spot when the appropriations' pitch was made. El Salvador,

the Dominican Republic, Haiti (which actually did worse in the actual appropriations), and Honduras were still near the bottom of the list. For the 1954 fiscal figures, see U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Mutual Security Appropriations for 1954: Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. (GPO, 1953), 421-477.

⁷Harlan P. Bramble, Memorandum, 5 May 1954, SD, RG 59, Box 2, File-Guatemala, 1954 Economic, Records of the Office of Middle American Affairs (Records Relating to El Salvador and Guatemala, 1942-1954).

⁸For the best analysis of the CIA role in the Guatemalan coup, see Richard H. Immerman, *The CIA in Guatemala: The Foreign Policy of Intervention* (Austin, 1982).

⁹John W. Fisher to Jean Mulliken, 29 July 1954, SD, RG 59, Box 2, File-Guatemala, 1954 Economic, Records of the Office of Middle American Affairs (Records Relating to El Salvador and Guatemala, 1942-1954).

¹⁰Ralph Lee Woodward, Jr., *Central America: A Nation Divided* (New York, 1985), 250-51.

¹¹Immerman, *CIA in Guatemala*, 198-200.

SUMMARY OF 1989 ANNUAL MEETING

by

Robert J. McMahon

(University of Florida)

Co-Chair, 1989 SHAFR Program Committee

The fifteenth annual meeting of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations was held at the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, June 14-17, 1989. The meeting was held in conjunction with the American Military Institute and the Conference on Peace Research in History. Approximately 229 people were in attendance at twenty-four different sessions.

A plenary session on the evening of June 14 opened the conference. Entitled "A Consideration of Neil Sheehan's *A Bright Shining Lie: John Paul Vann and America in Vietnam*," it drew a full house of close to 200 people.

The three panelists each began with short statements. Dr. William Hammond of the Army's Center of Military History emphasized the bureaucratic imperatives that led Americans in Vietnam, Vann included, to deceive themselves about the progress being made. Professor Timothy Lomperis of Duke University pointed out that the most important contribution of Sheehan's book was the way it elaborated the middle level of Vietnam operations, the doers who put policy into practice. Dr. Ronald Spector, Director of Naval History, labelled *Bright Shining Lie* perhaps the best of the classic Vietnam books written by journalists and participants, and found its chief contribution in the way it showed how events were actually shaped by people on the scene. Professor Sandra Taylor was unable to make the session because of travel delays. Her written statement, submitted to the session chair, used Vann's voracious sexual appetites as a metaphor for American involvement in Vietnam—"America raped the land and the people," she concluded. A spirited discussion followed the panelists' formal statements.

Three sessions were held on Friday morning, June 15.

A capacity crowd of fifty to sixty managed to finish breakfast in time to attend the session on "Social Science Theory and Diplomatic History." Chaired by Richard H. Immerman of the University of Hawaii, the panel focused on the potential benefits historians of U.S. foreign relations can derive from applying social science theory, as well as the potential problems. Pointing out that historians have yet to develop a theoretical framework for the realist interpretation, Stephen Pelz of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, presented a broad survey of the changes in the international system since 1776 and underscored the effect of these systemic changes on United States policy. Pelz argued that the rules and norms of state behavior are dependent on the global balance of power, and historians must evaluate behavior in accordance with the shifting balances. Such a mid-level analysis, Pelz concluded, can be highly instructive.

William O. Walker III, presently of Cornell University, followed with a paper on decision-making theory and drug control. After introducing his subject by discussing the relevant literature, Walker explained why he was attracted to psychological theories, particularly those stressing motivational biases and conflict resolution. He then demonstrated the explanatory potential of these theories for his own work, presenting case studies concerning U.S. drug control policy toward Mexico and Japan.

The audience was treated to a commentary by Ole Holsti, George V. Allen Professor of International Relations at Duke University and an acknowledged expert in the field. Holsti remarked how pleased he was to attend a SHAFR meeting, adding that taken together the papers reinforced his view that the study of international relations must ultimately be perceived as a function of history, political science, and psychology. Holsti offered a number of cogent suggestions, going so far as to offer Pelz a method to correlate changes in the international system and normative state behavior more rigorously. Immerman's comment emphasized the contrast

between Pelz's and Walker's levels of analysis, and he expressed his reservations with the realist paradigm. He also raised several questions concerning Walker's framework. The general discussion that followed demonstrated that while historians agree that social science theory can be a useful tool of analysis it must be used to supplement and not to supplant careful historical scholarship.

About thirty people attended the session "One Hundred Years of Pan Americanism." The discussants consisted of Lester D. Langley, University of Georgia, Robert Freeman Smith, University of Toledo, and Harold Molineu, Ohio University, with Mark T. Gilderhus, Colorado State University, acting as moderator.

This panel discussion allowed each participant to present a brief position paper and then invited queries and observations from members of the audience. Professor Langley, an historian, drew a distinction between "the United States" and "America," arguing that the latter characteristically displayed more generosity in dealings with Latin America than the former. Professor Smith, also an historian, examined the mystique of Pan Americanism and suggested that it often had an insubstantial effect on the conduct of actual policy. Professor Molineu, a political scientist, looked at the political machineries of Pan Americanism and concluded that actual attainments, though not inconsequential, often ran behind expectations.

The audience responded enthusiastically with an assortment of questions and comments, often focused on current concerns in relations with Latin America, and an energetic discussion followed.

The third morning session, on "Psychological Warfare as a Policy instrument," drew about fifty or sixty people to hear papers presented by Neal H. Petersen (retired State Department historian and consultant), John Prados (author) and Peter Kornbluh (National Security Archives researcher). The chair and commentator was Christopher Simpson (author).

The three papers presented a roughly chronological overview of U.S. use of psychological warfare since 1941, plus some commentary. Petersen focused on the World War II role of Allen Dulles in Bern, Switzerland, stressing Dulles' early commitment to psychological warfare as an important tool in U.S. international relations. Prados followed with an examination of the cold war-era Psychological Strategy Board, a large scale effort to coordinate U.S. programs in the field. Prados traced how the PSB ultimately came unraveled due to bureaucratic infighting in the government. Kornbluh examined the Reagan-era Office of Public Diplomacy at the State Department, a largely unknown aspect of the Iran-Contra affair in which psychological warfare techniques were used inside the United States to encourage support for administration policy in Central America. Simpson's commentary offered some definitions of the term "psychological warfare," and a critique of the papers.

A lively discussion period followed, much of which focused on various aspects of the question of where (and whether) a distinction should be drawn between hard-ball "psychological warfare" operations on the one hand and more conventional government "public information" activities on the other.

The American Military Institute hosted its annual luncheon at noon. The diners were treated to a lecture and slide show by Ronald H. Spector of the Naval Historical Center focusing on his recent trip to the Soviet Union.

A packed house of close to 200 gathered at 1:15 p.m. to hear a session entitled "The Cuban Missile Crisis Revisited." James A. Nathan of the University of Delaware presided over a session that included papers by Raymond Garthoff of the Brookings Institution on the Soviet perspective on the missile crisis and Philip Brenner of American University on the Cuban perspective on the crisis. Both papers relied heavily on recent documentation as well as new information made available during a series of recent conferences in the United States and the Soviet Union. A third paper by Lawrence

Chang of the National Security Archives highlighted the new documentation and the fresh light that has been shed on the crisis by that documentation.

Raymond Garthoff discussed the perceptions of Soviets and reviewed the fragility of the Soviet decisional processes at a time of great tension. Garthoff argued that the danger the participants perceived was real enough but probably overstated. Nonetheless, Garthoff contended that the crisis did drive home the point that nuclear weapons represented an immense danger and in this sense the crisis was an opportunity and a turning point in the cold war. Lawrence Chang concluded that the crisis was a disturbing concatenation of near misses and miscues. Chang discussed the new revelations regarding U.S. invasion plans and covert activities, including "Mongoose teams" operating at the height of the crisis, that shed additional light on the limits of "crisis management." Philip Brenner's presentation focused on Cuba's perception of the crisis, the neglected story of Castro's reasoning for perhaps reluctantly accepting the missiles (largely because of well founded fears of invasion) and for his disappointment at the fashion in which the negotiation for their removal unfolded.

Former Secretary of the Treasury and Executive Committee member C. Douglas Dillon provided a participant's perspective on the U.S.-Soviet confrontation, focusing on the lessons that have been and should be drawn from that potentially fateful encounter. In his comment, journalist and author Scott Armstrong, now with the National Security Archives, offered his own set of lessons along with a sharp critique of Kennedy's actions.

A wide-ranging discussion ensued, with the questioning of the panelists interrupted only by the approach of another set of sessions at 3:30 p.m.

Four sessions ran concurrently in the late afternoon. In a session chaired by Gary Ostrower and jointly sponsored by the Society for the Study of Internationalism and the Council on Peace Research in History, Martin Dubin (Northern

Illinois University) and Joseph Baratta (executive secretary of the SSI) addressed the subject of twentieth century internationalism. Dubin offered a challenging account of internationalist activity between the wars. He argued that historians of the interwar years have not only underestimated the amount of contact between the U.S. and the League of Nations, but that extensive intergovernmental contact between American bureaus and interest groups dramatically, though quietly, altered the shape of U.S. policy as it related to the rest of the world. Baratta's paper focused on internationalism since 1945 and provided a stimulating critique of the efforts (and failures) to implement internationalist policy. He ended with an eloquent plea for commitment to a rational brand of international cooperation. William C. Widenor (University of Illinois) and Richard C. Laurence (Michigan State University) offered comments that helped to focus on the difficult task of defining internationalism.

A lively discussion ensued, most of the fifteen to twenty participants addressing the more contemporary focus of Baratta rather than the more technical issues covered by Dubin. If there was any consensus, it was that Dubin is correct to argue that the real focus of internationalism must be more than narrowly political, and that forecasts of the "twilight of internationalism" are not merely premature but incorrect.

A session entitled, "Beyond the Cold War?" attracted an audience of thirty-five to forty. Since Michael Cox of the Queen's University (Belfast) was unable to attend, chairman Patrick J. Hearden of Purdue University read his paper, "Beyond Containment: Beyond the Cold War." Cox's provocative arguments about the contemporary world scene were followed by Sterling J. Kernek's (Western Illinois University) equally provocative speculations about the "long peace" paradigm. The two papers, along with the sometimes sharp criticisms of the commentators, David S. Painter of Georgetown University and Ralph B. Levering of Davidson

College, sparked a spirited debate among the panelists and between the panelists and the audience.

Kenneth J. Hagan of the U.S. Naval Academy chaired a session on the American Military Abroad. Jack Shulimson of the Marine Corps Historical Center delivered a paper entitled "Daniel Pratt Mannix and the Marine China Connection, 1881-1885." The paper explored the advisory role played by a little known military officer who attempted to help the Chinese navy to modernize. The paper is part of a larger study of the function of marine and naval officers as diplomats and advisors at the end of the last century, and as such it raised questions about the nature of American isolation in the heyday of European imperialism. Harold Langley of the Smithsonian Institution delivered the second paper, "Charles C. Tevis: Service Under Many Flags." Unlike Mannix, who remained close to the Marine Corps through out his life, Tevis was a soldier-of-fortune seeking fame and wealth as a mercenary. The contrast between the two types of personality offered Frederick Drake of Brock University the opportunity to raise questions about motives and personality in the military service. Kenneth Hagan focused on Mannix in his comments because Mannix had also served as an aide to Commodore Robert W. Shufeldt in his cruise around the world on the *U.S.S. Ticonderoga*, 1878-1880. The session was lightly attended, but the discussion afterward led to a significant exchange of ideas and some post-conference scholarly interaction with at least one panelist and one member of the audience.

The final late afternoon session attracted forty-five people to listen to two papers that shed "New Light on the Vietnam War." Gregory James Pemberton of the Australian War Memorial began with "The Rules of the Game: Western Political Strategies and the Vietnam Revolution." His talk dealt with the way international legal concepts were used by both sides in the war for political purposes. Among the issues of contention were definitions of aggression and the juridical status of the two Vietnams. Pemberton concluded that

international law is incapable of providing a framework for understanding the war.

Michael Lutzker of New York University offered a counterfactual paper, "How the United States Withdrew from Vietnam in 1965: The Search for an Alternative Past." He contended that as Johnson contemplated the bombing decision in the winter of 1964-65, he and his aides could have made a good case for deescalation and withdrawal from Vietnam before the Americanization of the war. They were not happy about the disarray in Saigon and not at all confident that American power would turn the tide on the battlefield. Moreover, Lutzker believes that such a policy could have been sold to the American population with minimal political costs to the Democrats.

David Anderson of Indianapolis University concentrated most of his attention as discussant on Lutzker's paper which he thought proposed an implausible scenario. Melvin Small of Wayne State University, who also chaired the session, agreed with Anderson. Although he admired Lutzker's effort, he questioned whether Johnson ever seriously doubted the wisdom of his middle-of-the-road approach during the period in question. For the most part, the audience tended to accept the post-hoc logic of Lutzker's position but rejected the notion that withdrawal was a likely outcome of the deliberations that took place in December-January 1964-65.

SHAFR hosted a dinner on the evening of June 15. Journalist and author Wallace Terry, whose acclaimed oral history of the Vietnam War, *Bloods*, was familiar to many in the audience, made the after-dinner address. Drawing on his own experiences in covering the civil rights movement and the Vietnam War, he provided a stimulating and evocative talk that covered a range of personal and historical reflections on the Vietnam War era and its continued meaning for America.

In one of four sessions held on the morning of June 16, a crowd of about seventy-five gathered to hear papers that focused on changing attitudes and policies in the United

States and the Soviet Union. Ole R. Holsti (Duke University) presented the results of polls conducted with American opinion leaders on U.S.-Soviet relations. He concluded that those questioned expressed views that seemed independent of the rhetoric and policies of the administration in power. Gilbert H. McArthur (William and Mary) reviewed recent events in the Soviet Union and argued that a "conceptual revolution" had occurred in the thinking of Soviet leaders.

Commenting on the papers, Robert D. Schulzinger (University of Colorado) praised both authors but focused his remarks on Holsti's findings. He suggested that the surveys provided valuable information and raised intriguing questions that have enhanced and over time will further increase our understanding of American attitudes toward the Soviet Union. The other commentator, S. Neil MacFarlane (University of Virginia), also commended the authors of both papers. He focused his discussion on McArthur's arguments, reminding his listeners that it was too soon to make any authoritative judgments on what is happening in the Soviet Union and suggesting that McArthur's conclusions might be premature. The audience responded to the panelists' presentations with a vigorous exchange of opinions about and personal experiences with *glasnost*.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, the National Historical Publications Commission gave moral support and later grant funds for the publication of the papers of the nineteenth century's "great triumvirate" of Clay, Calhoun, and Webster. Now, decades later, scholars are reaping the harvest through the availability of these papers in modern documentary editions. A panel entitled, "A Closer Look at the Actions of 'The Great Triumvirate,'" chaired by Mary A. Giunta, Acting Director of the Publications Program, National Historical Publications and Records Commission, reexamined the diplomatic careers of the three.

Norman Graebner read a paper prepared by Michael Birkner, Millersville University (who was unable to attend). His paper, entitled "David F. Porter, the Foxardo Affair and

Henry Clay: A Diplomatic Perspective," explored Spain's sensitivity on the issue of its sovereignty over its island possessions in the Caribbean. That sensitivity increased after the punitive action of Captain David Porter at Foxardo, Puerto Rico, when he led a party of 200 seamen and marines ashore and, among other acts, extracted a public apology from local Spanish officials. This paper explored the diplomatic response on the part of Spain and the United States and the resolution of the incident.

The second panelist was Clyde Wilson, Editor of the Papers of John C. Calhoun at the University of South Carolina. The title of his paper was "Beyond Texas and Oregon: John C. Calhoun's Role in the Global Expansion of the United States Presence." Professor Wilson's paper explored through the use of consular records, the papers of John C. Calhoun, and other sources the expansion of the American consular establishment during the mid-1840s. Focusing on Calhoun's participation in this process, the paper discussed United States consular activities in Australia, China, Hawaii, the Dominican Republic, and Cuba.

The third panelist was Professor Kenneth Stevens of Texas Christian University. His paper, "The Treaty of Amity and Commerce of 1850 between the United States and Switzerland," dealt with the anti-semitic provision of the treaty which aroused protests from American Jews. In the face of a well organized protest campaign, not only was the treaty returned for renegotiation, but the incident led to a joint international diplomatic effort on the part of the United States, Britain, and France to change anti-semitic laws in Switzerland.

Professor Norman Graebner of the University of Virginia offered an evaluation of documentary editions as sources for history as well as a critique of the papers presented. The session was attended by approximately 27 people who engaged in an extended question and answer period following presentation of the papers.

A third morning panel focused on the formative years of the U.S.-Latin American relationship (1823-1850). Unforeseen difficulties prohibited Lawrence Clayton of the University of Alabama from being able to chair this session. Ray Shurbutt of Georgia Southern College filled in as session chair. The first paper, "Personalities in Conflict: United States-Chilean Diplomacy," presented by Professor Shurbutt, utilized extensive primary sources to emphasize how the personalities and demeanor of early U.S. envoys to Santiago often proved more influential than "official" government policy in determining United States-Chilean relations. Most of these early agents were political appointees with little or no experience in diplomacy, and unfortunately they made scant effort to understand or relate to their Chilean counterparts. Then, too, their isolation from Washington and lack of regular correspondence (instructions, personal mail, answers to specific questions) certainly exasperated their attempts to follow their initial instructions.

The second paper, "Initiating United States Relations with Argentina," presented by Paul B. Goodwin of the University of Connecticut, exhibited many similarities with Shurbutt's paper. Goodwin found that while some of the U.S. envoys to the La Plata seemed better equipped to carry out successful missions in Buenos Aires, their too personal characteristics often interfered with diplomacy. Special emphasis was given to the complexities evolving from problems over legal ownership of the Falkland Islands.

Commenting on the two papers was John Soder of George Mason University. Professor Soder stated that he was especially pleased that both presenters had dwelt upon events and envoys scarcely mentioned in published sources, thereby introducing new data to the overall study of U.S.-Latin American relations. Questions from the small but highly-interested audience gave substantiation to Soder's comment that such new information would lead to additional research and new interpretations on U.S.-Latin American diplomacy.

A final morning session was devoted to the availability and utility of legislative records for diplomatic historians. Rodney A. Ross, Charles Edward Schmael, and Robert W. Coren, each with the National Archives, dealt respectively with unpublished records of the House Foreign Affairs committee, other House committees relating to foreign affairs, and Senate committees relating to foreign affairs. Duane Tananbaum of Lehman College complimented the presenters for providing valuable information about important sources that are rarely tapped by diplomatic historians. David R. Kepley of the National Archives chaired the panel.

All three paper givers collaborated on the recent National Archives publications, *Guide to the Records of the United States House of Representatives at the National Archives, 1789-1969* and *Guide to the Records of the United States Senate at the National Archives, 1789-1969*. Copies of the Guide are free and available upon request from the Center for Legislative Archives, National Archives, Washington, DC 20408.

At noon five SHAFR members who had had the opportunity to travel to Indochina within the past few years shared their experiences and reflections in a workshop entitled, "Five Historians in Search of Indochina." Participating in this fascinating panel were William Brinker (Tennessee Technological University), Edward P. Crapol (William and Mary), Jonathan Goldstein (West Georgia College), Jeffrey P. Kimball (Miami University, Ohio), and Sandra C. Taylor (University of Utah).

In one of three early afternoon panels, Judith Ewell presided over and participated in a lively session entitled, "Reagan and Central America: An Early Assessment." Thomas M. Leonard of the University of North Florida, Randall B. Woods of the University of Arkansas, and Mark T. Gilderhus of Colorado State University all lent their expertise to this venture into contemporary history. The panelists' brief remarks inspired a remarkable diversity of

comments and observations from the audience at this well-attended session.

A session on "Eisenhower and His Allies," chaired by Frederick Marks, was attended by sixty persons. Professor H. W. Brands of Texas A&M University argued that one of the reasons for American intervention in Iran was Nasser's earlier rejection of a Middle East defense organization. The second paper, given by Daniel Greene of the University of Texas, dealt with Vietnam in 1954-55, specifically how Washington got in and Paris got out with a maximum of face-saving in light of inter-allied differences over Diem. Professor Brian Duchin of Williams College delivered the third paper which focused on the formation of the Western European Union in 1953 after the demise of the EDC with special reference to Dulles' threat of "agonizing reappraisal."

Professor Burton Kaufman of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, who served as commentator, noted that if there was any one theme tying the three papers together it was the commanding role played by Dulles in American foreign policy, hence a reversal of the stereotypical portrait of Dulles as less important, less restrained, and less sophisticated than Ike. Questions and comments from the audience brought the session to a lively conclusion.

The session, "Public Health Issues and Diplomacy," consisting of two papers on the issues of AIDS and malaria and their impact on foreign policy, was attended by about twenty people. The malaria paper, by James Edward Miller of the State Department, dealt with the manner in which the Rockefeller Foundation, solicited by the Italian government, attempted to eradicate malaria on the island of Sardinia in 1946-48, and the effect that this project had on the relationship of the United States government to Italy. Since neither the Foundation, the Italian government, nor UNRRA wished to have Sardinia fall victim to a separatist movement, it was important that the eradication effort succeed. Despite the opposition of the Communists and the difficulties of the task, the attack on malaria was successful in the cities,

although not in remote areas of the island. The successes of this non-governmental program showed how such efforts could serve humanitarian needs and also promote the interest of American foreign policy.

Geoff Smith of Queen's University (Ontario) compared the ostracism of AIDS sufferers, particularly during the Reagan years, with the discrimination suffered by women and homosexuals in American society and government, especially the way in which the latter were linked to communism during the early Cold War years. He discussed the way in which the government seemed to have a sexual obsession in its linking of homosexuality with sickness and ipso facto, communism, itself a disease.

Comments were offered by Mark Stoler of the University of Vermont and Sandra Taylor of the University of Utah. Both noted their ignorance of the medical aspects of these problems and praised the high quality of the papers. Stoler questioned the lack of a conclusion to Miller's paper, asking, "So what?" He would have more information on the other actors in the drama and the effect of the project on U.S.-Italian relations, on the Marshall Plan, and on the Rockefeller Foundation and other such transnational actors. What is their relationship to American foreign policy? Taylor noted the difference between this "good" type of diplomacy and "bad" diplomacy, as practiced by the CIA on the Italian mainland, and wished this comparison had been brought out.

Comments on the Smith paper were more heated. Stoler noted his provocative conclusions, and questioned Smith's linking communism, homosexuality, and the liberation of women to the "historic, global ethnocentrism" of the US and consumer capitalism as a cause of sexual and gender liberation and as an ideology that made critics of "normalcy" into enemies of the state. AIDS was not, Stoler claimed, really the topic of the paper, and he called for clarification of the degree to which sexual illness is a metaphor for politics and ideology. Stoler concluded by asking if this could be the cause, not simply the rationalization for, the breakdown

between private and public life and subsequent attacks on homosexuality as a threat to society.

Taylor also singled out the topic of AIDS for criticism. Noting that not all AIDS victims are gay, and no link has been made between non-gay sufferers and communism, she questioned the linkage of the three in the paper. She also questioned the inclusion of discrimination against "liberated" women and its parallel with homosexuality.

Four late afternoon sessions completed a very busy day for presenters and audience alike. Approximately twenty-five people attended a session entitled, "Perceptions and Reality in American Foreign Policy Toward China, 1914-50." John Rossi of the University of South Carolina at Aiken delivered a paper on the structure of U.S. trade with and investments in China and Japan during the 1920s. He stressed the fact that most American investments in China were made directly in the manufacturing sector which had a high rate of return. In contrast, Japanese law and custom confined foreign investments largely to bond and equity investments. These yielded lower rates of return and mitigated foreign influence on the Japanese economy.

T. Christopher Jesperson of Rutgers University contributed a paper on the role of Henry Luce in shaping the popular American image of Nationalist China during the 1930s and 1940s. He stressed how Luce's religious background and belief distorted his own perception of Chinese events and how these idiosyncratic notions were reflected in *Time* magazine.

Comments were provided by the session chair, Michael Schaller of the University of Arizona, and by Robert Schulzinger of the University of Colorado. Both stressed Rossi's need to analyze more specifically the regions within China where American investments flourished. Regarding the Luce paper, the commentators noted that Luce was a genius at "mass marketing" middle brow ideas on any number of subjects, and that in analyzing his China outlook his talents as a popularizer needed to be studied more carefully.

About thirty people attended a session which featured papers focusing on very different aspects of the Korean War. In "NSC 68 and the Korean War: Western Threat Perception and Cold War Policymaking," Beatrice Heuser of the Foundation for Science and Politics in West Germany analyzed Western rearmament during the early 1950s in the context of intelligence reports on Soviet intentions and military strength. While conceding that definitive conclusions must await the opening of Soviet archives, Dr. Heuser argued that, "given the situation of Yugoslavia in 1950/1951, and perhaps some other parts of the world, the Western defence programme...may well have been the appropriate answer to international developments." In "The Truman Administration and the South Korean Political Crisis of 1952: Democracy's Failure," Edward C. Keefer of the U.S. State Department examined the American response to South Korean President Syngman Rhee's campaign during the spring and summer of 1952 to force the Republic of Korea's National Assembly to amend the constitution so as to provide for direct election of the president, a ploy designed to insure his reelection. Dr. Keefer argued that due largely to partisan political factors at home and the advice of military officials on the scene, the Truman administration refused to intervene to force a compromise solution which would have preserved the legislature as a "viable political institution."

Commentators Roger Dingman (University of Southern California) and William Stueck (University of Georgia) complimented both the principals for well-researched, well-executed presentations. Regarding Heuser's theme, Dingman pointed to the inadequacy of available documentation on Soviet strength and intentions while Stueck emphasized the importance of continuing the scholarly debate on the matter. Both commentators questioned Keefer's emphasis on domestic politics by Western standards. A lively discussion followed the formal presentations, with most questions and comments centering on Soviet intentions and the military balance in Europe during the early 1950s.

Michael J. Hogan chaired a panel on "Western Europe and the Early Cold War." The session, which drew an audience of twenty-five people, featured papers by Wilson D. Miscamble of the University of Notre Dame, Jill Edwards of the University of Reading, and Seth Fain of the University of Texas. In his paper, "Acheson, Kennan, and the Division of Germany," Miscamble described the debate in the State Department that was prompted by George Kennan's efforts to develop a plan for the reunification of Germany. This debate, according to Miscamble, shows that America's German policy and the thinking of Secretary of State Dean Acheson were far more fluid in late 1948 and early 1949 than is usually assumed. The paper by Jill Edwards, "Roger Makins—'Mr. Atom': The Modus Vivendi, A Study in Anglo-U.S. Rivalry, 1945-1947," focused on another key personality of the early Cold War. Edwards examined the influence of Undersecretary of State Roger Makins on British diplomacy, especially British policy toward atomic energy, and reached the conclusion that Makins and other officials played a more important role, Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin a less important role, that is commonly believed. Seth Fein's paper, "Anglo-American Relations and the 1954 German Rearmament Crisis," argued that Secretary of State Dulles took his cues from President Eisenhower and that Anglo-American differences over the EDC eventually gave way to joint support for West Germany's rearmament within the framework of NATO.

Thomas Schwartz of Harvard University and Hans-Jurgen Schroeder of the University of Giessen provided the commentaries. Both generally lauded the papers while calling for additional analysis of particular points. Much of the discussion centered on Jill Edwards' attempt to deemphasize the central importance of Ernest Bevin in shaping the foreign policy of the British Labour Government, with both the commentators and the audience arguing that she had overstated her case.

A final late afternoon session, chaired by Justus D. Doenecke (New College, University of South Florida), considered "New Approaches to Diplomatic History." At least thirty people were in attendance. The first paper was by Jules R. Benjamin (University of Pittsburgh) and covered "The Changing Belief Systems of United States Expansionism." Benjamin outlined such traditionalist interpretations as Thomas A. Bailey's and then called for new analytical structures that incorporate the revisionism of the 1960s. The second paper, offered by Michael Dunne (University of Sussex), was entitled "Mapping the Past: Structures of Explanation in Twentieth Century American Foreign Relations." He used the cartography analogy in his call for a new approach to diplomatic history. Commentary was supplied by Emily S. Rosenberg (Macalester College) and Roger R. Trask (U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.). Both commentators applauded the papers for their fresh and innovative approaches but raised questions of definition and method. The discussion was a most lively one, with both authors responding to critics and the members of the audience at times responding to one another.

The annual meeting closed with three Saturday morning sessions (June 17).

One of them provided a forum for new work on the theme of decolonization. The chair, Michael Hunt (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), opened the session with brief comments on some key themes in the field that these papers would touch on.

John Coski (a William and Mary Ph.D. currently employed by a museum in Richmond) offered an account of the evolution of the American understanding of trusteeship (summarizing the main argument from his doctoral dissertation). This was followed by a case study, the United States and French North Africa (1946-56), from several sections of Egya Sangmuah's dissertation (subsequently defended successfully at the University of Toronto). The final paper by Cary Fraser of the University of Geneva (now doing

his work in the United States) applied a broadly cast world systems argument to account for U.S. decolonization policy between 1945 and 1964.

Gary Hess (Bowling Green State University) offered a set of thoughtful comments on the papers highlighting key sets of questions (American attitudes toward colonization, the impact of American policy, and the global context conditioning American action). The audience, consisting of about thirty to forty people, responded with a lively session that went beyond the normal time to adjourn. The questions raised and comments offered came from a broad sampling of the audience and were for the most part addressed to Coski and Sangmuah. The abstractions of the provocative Fraser paper proved harder for the audience to engage.

Another well attended session focused on "Austria, Yugoslavia, and the Early Cold War." Forrest C. Pogue, retired director of the George C. Marshall Library, presided.

Dr. Oliver Rathkolb of the University of Vienna and Guenter Bischof, who is completing his doctorate in history at Harvard University, drew on their experience as native Austrians and their advanced research to analyze the early phases of the cold war in Austria with particular reference to the development of U.S. policy.

Rathkolb showed how an initial postwar sympathy or neutrality toward the Soviet government changed to fear in Austria as a result of brutal actions by Soviet forces in that country. A pro-American sentiment increased as the United States strongly opposed Soviet claims that "German assets" in Austria subject to reparations demands should include former Austrian property that had been seized by the Germans before the war and as American aid under the Marshall Plan began to flow.

Bischof stressed some of these same points, noting also that the percentage of the Communist vote in the elections in late 1945 had been much less than that polled in Czechoslovakia. He emphasized the strong fear of the Soviet Union that followed in Austria after the communist coup in

Prague. The effect in Austria and the West was to dampen the move for an immediate Austrian treaty that would require the withdrawal of western as well as Soviet forces.

Professor Lorraine Lees of Old Dominion University carefully outlined the development of U.S. policy toward Tito in Yugoslavia. She showed how both the Truman and Eisenhower administration defended aid to a dissident Communist regime even to the point of offering military aid for a time and then of defending to the American Congress Yugoslav insistence on keeping some ties with Moscow and on maintaining a communist regime.

Professor Russell Buhite of the University of Oklahoma and Professor George V. Strong of William and Mary were the commentators. They both complimented the presenters while suggesting the need for additional information and clarification. Professor Buhite raised a number of pointed questions. He wondered to what degree Dulles' defense of aid to communist Yugoslavia represented an aberration. He questioned the use of the word "realism" as applied to policies of the Truman and Eisenhower administrations and wondered to what degree the policy of the Eisenhower administration was marked by an appreciation of "the vulnerability of empires." Dr. Buhite wondered to what degree Soviet caution was based on talk of preventive war by the United States, a suggestion that his own research has indicated may have had some effect.

Professor Strong in commenting on the three papers found Bischof and Rothkolb somewhat more skeptical than Lees about U.S. motives in aiding Yugoslavia and Austria. Tito's move for independence seemed more a policy of opportunism than a quest for freedom. The United States seemed moved more by a desire to weaken the Soviet Union than a desire to spread the cause of freedom. In conclusion, he wondered if the 1955 treaty settlement in which Austria won freedom from occupying armies by accepting a neutral status might afford a model for other central European

countires seeking to avoid the consequences of continuing strife between the superpowers.

A final session dealt with a topic of interest to all who teach and write about American diplomatic history: how is that history being taught in the secondary schools? F. Kevin Simon of Sayre School in Lexington, Kentucky, presided over a panel that included Dorothy Desmond of Trinity Episcopal School in Richmond, Virginia, Michael Miller of Episcopal High School in Alexandria, Virginia, and Kathryn Prinz of Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School in Bethesda, Maryland. An audience of about one dozen people was treated to a lively and informative series of presentations that stressed the diversity of the problems faced by secondary school teachers and the wide variety of approaches being utilized by them. In the incisive and wide-ranging discussion session that followed more than a few members of the audience praised the presenters for their remarkable energy and commitment while bemoaning the fact that exceptional teachers of history in the schools were all too often the exception rather than the rule. Several also urged SHAFR to continue this long overdue dialogue with secondary school teachers.

A special word of thanks is due to the program committee members who gave so generously of their time and expertise in helping to make the summer meeting a successful one. Thomas M. Leonard, Mark T. Gilderhus, Sandra C. Taylor, and Edward P. Crapol each played a significant role in shaping the program—a task made more difficult by the record number of paper and panel proposals that we received. As co-chairman, Ed Crapol deserves the appreciation of all for opening up his beautiful campus for our meeting and for attending with cheerfulness and efficiency to the myriad details associated with local arrangements. He may be ribbed for a long time to come about the spartan conditions of the William and Mary dorms, but that, as they say, is another story... Thanks to all.

MINUTES OF THE SHAFR COUNCIL MEETING

27 December 1989

San Francisco Hilton, San Francisco, CA

George Herring, presiding

The meeting opened at 8 p.m. Council members present were George Herring, Michael Hunt, Jerald Combs, John Gimbel, Waldo Heinrichs, Thomas Paterson, and Allan Spetter. Others present were Gerald Bernath, M.D., William Brinker, Richard Burns, Mark Gilderhus, Michael Hogan, Richard Hopper, Warren Kimball, Page Miller, Anna Nelson, Thomas Schoonover, Mark Stoler, William Walker, and Thomas Zoumaras.

1. Page Putnam Miller, director of the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, spoke to the Council on two major issues: the agreement between the National Archives and the Philip Morris Companies Inc. to promote the Bill of Rights; access to the Foreign Relations of the United States volumes.

After a lengthy discussion, Council asked incoming president Michael Hunt to write to Don Wilson, United States Archivist, to express SHAFR's concern about the agreement with Philip Morris.

On the issue of the FRUS volumes, Council unanimously approved the following resolution to be forwarded to William Slany, Historian in the Bureau of Public Affairs in the Department of State, and to the Government Printing Office:

Whereas the purpose of the Federal Repository System is to make the public record available to the American citizenry;

Whereas the FRUS series is the official record of the nation's foreign policy;

Whereas the GPO curtailed dissemination of bound copies of the FRUS volumes to the FRS system;

Whereas the reliance upon microfiche impedes the ability of readers to employ the FRUS series as a multi-year reference and research tool;

SHAFR calls upon the GPO to: 1) immediately resume publication of an adequate number of bound volumes of the FRUS series for dissemination to the FRS libraries; 2) retroactively print the 23 volumes which have not been made available.

2. Anna Nelson spoke to Council as chair of the *ad hoc* Committee on Access to Documents. In response to her comments, president George Herring proposed creation of a new standing Committee on Documentation. Council unanimously approved the following proposal:

*DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A
COMMITTEE ON DOCUMENTATION*

The Committee on Documentation shall consist of one person designated by Council to chair the committee plus three members appointed by the president for a term of three years. For the purpose of establishing and maintaining a regular rotation of membership on the committee the president may appoint members for a term of one and two years. The vice-president of SHAFR will also be a member of the committee.

The committee shall work with the National Coordinating Committee and other groups to promote access to documentation on the history of U.S. foreign relations. It shall also keep the membership of SHAFR informed on matters relating to access to documents.

3. Gerald Bernath, M.D., spoke to Council about the possibility of creating a new Bernath award to honor the memory of his late wife. Council authorized incoming president Michael Hunt to work closely with Dr. Bernath to formulate plans for an appropriate award.

4. Mark Gilderhus, co-chair of the 1990 summer conference, informed Council of progress on finalizing the program.

5. Gilderhus, of Colorado State University, and Mark Stoler, of the University of Vermont, presented proposals for possibly hosting the 1991 summer conference.

6. Allan Spetter reported for Stephen Rabe, chair of the Bernath Dissertation Award Committee. David McFadden, a graduate student at the University of California, Berkeley, received the award for 1989.

7. Richard Burns reported to Council that the index to *Diplomatic History* will appear in Vol. 14, No. 4.

Burns informed Council that he intended to apply for an NEH grant to support the effort to prepare a supplement to the *Guide to American Foreign Relations Since 1700*. Council voted to provide necessary funding for work on the grant proposal.

8. Michael Hogan recommended—and Council approved the appointment of David Anderson, Robert Hathaway, and Robert Schulzinger to the editorial board of *Diplomatic History*. Hogan distributed his annual report as editor of *Diplomatic History*.

9. Warren Kimball reported to Council that the first Link Prize for Historical Editing might be presented in 1990-1991.

10. William Brinker reported to Council that the next *Newsletter* would be mailed in January.

11. Allan Spetter reported the results of the 1989 elections: Michael Hunt will succeed to the presidency; Gary Hess was elected to the vice presidency; Stephen Rabe and Robert Schulzinger were elected to three-year terms on Council (serving through 1992); and Sandra Taylor was elected to the Nominating Committee.

Spetter distributed copies of the 1989 financial report for the operating account and a proposed budget for 1990. Council approved the report and the budget.

The meeting adjourned at 11 p.m.

Allan Spetter

PROPOSED SHAFR BUDGET FOR 1990

SHAFR's anticipated revenue sources for 1990 are as follows:

Membership dues from 900 regular members	\$18,000
Membership dues from 200 student members	2,700
Membership dues from 100 institutional, retired and unemployment members	900
Interest on Regular and Money Market checking accounts	1,200
Sales of Guides and Mailing Labels	1,000
	\$23,800

SHAFR's anticipated expenditures for 1990 are as follows:

<i>Diplomatic History</i> (Scholarly Resources)	\$12,000
Copy editor for <i>Diplomatic History</i>	2,500
General operating (postage, stationery, supplies, telephone, xeroxing, secretary-treasurer expenses)	2,500
Contribution to National Coordinating Committee	2,000
Convention expenses (AHA, OAH)	1,000
Susan Shah (to manage endowment accounts, pay expenses)	1,000
Tax preparation	400
Printing labels	300
	\$21,700

FINANCIAL REPORT FOR SHAFR

December 16, 1988 to December 15, 1989

Carryover from 1988:

Checking Account	\$545.59
Money Market Account	29,155.56
	\$29,701.15

Receipts:

AHA Luncheon, 1988	\$238.00
AHA Luncheon, 1989	1,120.00
Bernath Awards, Expenses Reimbursement	3,777.99
Bernath Trust Reimbursement	1,900.00
Dues	18,283.00
Endowment Contributions	570.05

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

Graebner Award Reimbursement	1,000.00
Guides Sold	900.00
Holt Award Reimbursement	1,500.00
Interest	1,422.98
Kuehl Award Reimbursement	1,000.00
Mailing Labels Sold	375.00
Miscellaneous	77.36
Student Members Reimbursement	1,495.00
Summer 1989 Conference	3,361.43
	<hr/>
	\$66,721.96

Disbursements:

AHA, 1988	\$952.17
AHA, 1989	25.00
Bernath Awards, Expenses	3,761.99
Bernath Trust	1,900.00
Bond	375.00
CPA	110.00
<i>Diplomatic History</i> , Copy Editor	2,500.00
Endowment	3,501.05
Holt Award, Expenses	1,650.00
Index, <i>Diplomatic History</i>	500.00
Kuehl Award	1,000.00
Life Membership	250.00
Miscellaneous (including returned checks)	136.45
Moving Expenses	533.26
National Coordinating Committee	2,000.00
Newsletter Expenses	255.00
Operating Expenses	2,266.05
OAH, 1989	206.68
Scholarly Resources (<i>Diplomatic History</i>)	11,845.00
Susan Shah, Expenses	819.59
Summer Conference, 1989	500.00

Cash on Hand:

Checking Account, Citizens Federal	7,081.14
Money Market Account, Citizens Federal	24,553.58

\$66,721.96

REPORT OF THE ARTHUR S. LINK
PRIZE COMMITTEE

(Mary Giunta, George Herring, Warren F. Kimball)

As of 27 December 1989, thirty-one contributors have given \$3,550 to the Arthur S. Link Prize fund. My goal is \$5,000. Since the prize would be awarded no more often than every three years, that would be enough to fund out of the interest the prize of \$500 plus expenses to the meeting at which the prize is presented. (Assuming 8% interest, that would generate \$1,200 every three years. Even the current \$3,550 would generate \$852 at 8% over three years—almost enough.) To date I have not received any contributions in response to the recent notice published in the latest *SHAFR Newsletter* or the announcement in the *OAH Newsletter* of the intention to create such a prize.

Even while I will continue to solicit contributions (as well as your suggestions on ploys to use), I would ask the SHAFR Council to approve the establishment of the prize and the awarding of the initial prize at the American Historical Association meeting in December 1990. That would necessitate an advance from SHAFR funds, but assuming continued success in fund-raising (a reasonable assumption, I believe), the Link fund could pay back SHAFR within a reasonable number of cycles of the prize.

I would suggest that the SHAFR Executive Director have the authority to determine the maximum of allowable expenses for the winner. In the event of multiple editor/authors, we should set a policy. I would recommend that we pay expenses for one person until the fund can afford more.

Warren F. Kimball

A CALL FOR ACTION BY SHAFR MEMBERS
ACCESS TO *FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES*
VOLUMES

ISSUE

Since 1986 volumes of the *Foreign Relations of the United States* have not been placed in Federal Depository Libraries.

BACKGROUND

Since 1861 the Department of State has published *Foreign Relations of the United States*, the official records of American diplomacy. The State Department's Historical Office prepares the volumes in this documentary series by including, subject to necessary security considerations, all documents needed to give a comprehensive record of the major foreign policy decisions of the United States. The Historical Office currently is trying to adhere to the thirty year time line established by President Reagan with the volumes presenting as complete and open a record as possible. This highly respected and prestigious documentary series now includes well over 300 volumes. For students and scholars of diplomatic history, international relations, and public policy, the *Foreign Relations* series has provided an accurate and objective documentation of critical events and has served as an invaluable research tool. These volumes, printed by the Government Printing Office, have in the past been easily accessible through the 1400 Federal Depository Libraries spread across the country which make government documents easily available to the public. The program is a cooperative one—Congress appropriates money for the Government Printing Office to reproduce extra copies of publications for the depository libraries and libraries contribute space, staff, and equipment to house and service

the collection. Many of the 1400 Federal Depository Libraries are part of university libraries.

In 1986 the Public Printer announced that due to budgetary restraints, a large portion of the material previously sent to depository libraries in a paper format would now be available only in microfiche. The Public Printer asked the Depository Library Council, composed of Presidential appointees, to decide which publications should be printed in a microfiche format. The Council included the volumes of the *Foreign Relations of the United States* among their recommendations for microfiche. Thus the Public Printer ordered a reduction of paper volumes and contracted for the preparation of microfiche volumes. Since this decision, 23 volumes have been printed in paper and are available for sale from the Government Printing Office. Due to a contract backlog, however, only two of the 23 volumes have been prepared in microfiche and placed in the depository libraries.

ACTION NEEDED

Letters to the Public Printer and to the Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Printing: to express concern that the recent volumes of the *Foreign Relations* series are not available in Federal Depository Libraries; to request attention to this problem; and to recommend that future volumes be printed in paper format for the depository libraries.

ADDRESSES

Mr. Joseph Jenifer, Public Printer
Government Printing Office
North Capitol and H St.
Washington, DC 20401

Senator Wendell H. Ford, Chairman
Joint Committee on Printing
Hart Building, Room 818
U.S. Senate
Washington, DC 20510-8004

ABSTRACTS

Alan K. Henrikson (Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University), "The Southern Mind in American Diplomacy," *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs* 13, no. 2 (Summer 1989): 375-87.

Has the South been a major source of the content and character of American foreign policy? This essay, commenting on Thomas J. Schoenbaum, *Waging Peace and War: Dean Rusk in the Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson Years* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988), examines this question in light of the personal history and public career of Dean Rusk. It finds in Rusk's Southern experience and heritage three elements—associated respectively with Woodrow Wilson, George C. Marshall, and Lyndon B. Johnson, dominant Southerners who influenced Rusk—that will last, despite partial defeat during the Vietnam war: a Wilsonian commitment to international law and organization, a Marshallian commitment to military service and institutional order, and a Johnsonian commitment to racial equality and socio-economic development. Secretary Rusk's statesmanship, "coded" by his strong Southern formation, contrasts with a political tradition (articulated by George Kennan and Henry Kissinger) that is governed by a changeable concept of "national interest." Rusk's views have been powerfully challenged but, somewhat like the idealization of the Old South, will survive; his Southern-shaped values have given American foreign policy some of its continuity and constancy.

Thomas C. Kennedy (University of Wyoming), "Sibling Stewards of a Commercial Empire: The Innerarity Brothers in the Floridas," in the *Florida Historical Quarterly*, vol. 67, (January, 1989), 259-89.

The article evaluates the role and influence of the Scotch-born James and John Innerarity in the economic, diplomatic,

and Indian affairs of the southeastern Spanish borderlands in the early nineteenth century. In their late teens the brothers became apprentice clerks in the British trading firm of their uncle, William Panton (Panton, Leslie and Company), becoming full partners a decade after their uncle's death in 1801, and after the firm was reorganized as John Forbes and Company. Discussed and analyzed are the many turbulent and momentous events impacting upon the firm's trade, debt, and land dealings with Indian tribes, plus the brothers' relations with Spanish, British, and American authorities in the region. These events included the Louisiana Purchase, the War of 1812, a Creek War, Andrew Jackson's invasion of the Floridas, and the cession of the Floridas to the United States. The article concludes that, while the Innerarity brothers could not prevent the ultimate decline of the company's fortunes by the 1820s, through perseverance, intelligence, and adroit dealings with friend and foe alike, they were able to uphold successfully the company's interests for some two decades after their uncle's death.

SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

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:

Allan Spetter
Department of History
Wright State University
Dayton, OH 45435

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

UPDATING THE SHAFR GUIDE

Richard Dean Burns

The SHAFR Council, meeting at the AHA in San Francisco, endorsed my suggestion that we ask the National Endowment of the Humanities for funds to update the SHAFR Guide. I'm exploring (with ABC-CLIO) the prospects for publishing either a new, revised edition of the Guide or a Supplement to it; and that in either event we establish an online SHAFR bibliographical database.

Professor Peter Buckingham at Linnville College, Oregon, has agreed to serve as Associate Editor of the new edition. He and I will be able to design an updating procedure, especially if we are able to create an online computerized database.

The support of the SHAFR membership is necessary if our new endeavor is to be successful—would you drop me a note on the following points?

- (1) Have you found the Guide useful? In what way?
- (2) How might we improve the next version?

We will require volunteers to serve as editors, contributors, and reviewers (to supplement those of the initial group who wish to continue) for the new edition. Grant funds will not be sufficient to pay SHAFR members for their contributions; however, all royalties from the sale of the Guide will go to a designated SHAFR fund and will be used in future updating activities. Please contact me:

Richard Dean Burns
Department of History
California State Univ., Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA 90032

EISENHOWER CENTENARY LECTURE SERIES

The University of New Orleans—Metropolitan College announces the Eisenhower Centenary Lecture Series for Spring Semester, 1990, sponsored by the Eisenhower Center for Leadership Studies. For information contact:

Eisenhower Center for Leadership Studies
University of New Orleans
Metropolitan College
Lakefront Campus
New Orleans, LA 70148

*UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
FOREIGN POLICY SEMINAR*

In the fall semester, seminar participants discussed the work of two historians. On October 6 Professor Douglas Little of Clark University spoke on "The CIA and Syria, 1946-1958," part of his book-length study of United States relations with the Middle East after the Second World War. On December 1 Professor Diane Kunz of Yale University investigated "The Economic Diplomacy of the Suez Crisis," the topic of her forthcoming book with the University of North Carolina Press.

In spring semester 1990, two speakers are scheduled. On March 9 Professor Louis A. Perez, Jr., of the University of South Florida will address Cuban-American relations in the twentieth century. On April 30 Professor George Herring of the University of Kentucky will discuss aspects of the history of the Vietnam War.

The seminars are open to all, although instructors and graduate students in the New England area who work in diplomatic history, foreign policy analysis, international relations, and area studies are the primary participants. Summaries of the sessions are prepared and distributed.

For more information, contact:

Professor Thomas G. Paterson
Department of History
241 Glenbrook Road
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT 06269-2103

OSS CONFERENCE

As part of a World War II commemoration, the National Archives is planning the first major research conference on the role of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) to be held in July 1991. The conference date marks the 50th anniversary of the appointment of William J. Donovan as Coordinator of Information; this office was the predecessor of the OSS. The conference is expected to attract former OSS agents and historians from around the world.

EARLY CIA HISTORY TURNED OVER TO NATIONAL ARCHIVES

On Tuesday, November 14, Judge William H. Webster, Director of Central Intelligence, presented Dr. Don W. Wilson, Archivist of the United States, with the first CIA document to be declassified and transferred to the National Archives for release to the public under the Agency's Historical Review Program. During the visit to the National Archives, Judge Webster presented Dr. Wilson with the declassified version of the CIA history entitled, "The Central Intelligence Agency: An Instrument of Government, to 1950." The 1500-page document was written in 1951-1953 by Dr. Arthur B. Darling, the CIA's first Chief Historian.

CALL FOR PAPERS: THE EISENHOWER LEGACY

Gettysburg College will host an international symposium to celebrate the centennial of President Eisenhower's birth on October 11-13, 1990. The symposium will focus on the legacy of the Eisenhower years in successive administrations. We are currently seeking papers for the panels in the following areas: White House structure, nuclear strategies, civil rights, containment, foreign policy, United Nations, economic policy, domestic policy, elections, press relations, federalism, leadership, bureaucracy, executive-legislative relations. Panel chairs include the following SHAFR members: Robert Divine, Robert Ferrell, Anna Nelson, and Stephen G. Rabe. For more information, contact:

Dr. Shirley Anne Warshaw
Director, Eisenhower Symposium
Gettysburg College
Gettysburg, PA 17325

AUTHORS SOUGHT

For a bio-bibliographical volume on the most significant international statesmen of the modern Western world, to be published by Greenwood Press, Dr. Frank W. Thackeray and Dr. John E. Findling are seeking authors willing to write essays on one or another of some fifty to sixty subjects. Those interested should send a letter stating qualifications and a brief resume to:

Dr. Frank W. Thackeray
c/o Division of Social Sciences
Indiana University Southeast
4201 Grantline Road
New Albany, Indiana 47150

VIETNAM, 1964-1973: AN AMERICAN DILEMMA

The Fourteenth Military History Symposium, "Vietnam, 1964-1973: An American Dilemma," will be held on October 17-19, 1990. The symposium will clarify the United States' approach to limited conflict by illuminating the contradictions of America's active military involvement in Vietnam. For information, please write or telephone:

Attn: Capt. Scott Elder
HQ USAFA/DFH
USAF Academy, CO 80840-5701
Commercial: (719)472-3230
Autovon: 259-3230

AUTHOR'S QUERY

ZACHARIAS—Did you know him? Writer/researcher gathering information for a biography of the late Rear Admiral Ellis Mark Zacharias, USN (Ret.); 1890-1961. I am looking for sources of information about, personal recollections of, or correspondence to/from Rear Adm. Zacharias that will describe the man and his career. I am particularly interested in RAdm. Zacharias' career in Japan as a Japanese language student in the 1920s; about his work for the Office of Naval Intelligence, off-and-on from 1938 to 1945; and about his command of the naval ships *USS Salt Lake City* from 1940 to 1942 and *USS New Mexico* from 1943 to 1945. All letters will be answered. Please contact:

J. Wandres
624 Randall Way
Matawan, NJ 07747-1962

ENDOWMENT CONTRIBUTORS

The following individuals have made contributions to the SHAFR endowment:

Wayne Cole	George Constantinides
Martin Cramer	Calvin Davis
Vincent DeSantis	John Gaddis
Lawrence Gelfand	Fred Harrington
David Hirst	Jules Karlin
Linda Killen	Steven Lee
Richard Leopold	W. Bruce Leslie
Richard Luther	J. Kenneth McDonald
Delber McKee	Edward McKinley
L. Fletcher Prouty	Clifford Reutter
Howard Romanek	Jed Snyder
William Stueck	Guy Swanson
J.A. Thompson	

LIFE MEMBERS

Helen Anderson, H. Eugene Bovis, Martin Elzy, Hideki Kan, Shinichi Kitaoka, and Bruce Kuniholm have become life members of SHAFR.

PERSONALS

Robert Ferrell (Indiana University) participated in a panel discussion "Defining a Public Role for Former Presidents" at the Hoover Library, October 18-19.

David F. Healy (University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee) has been named a Fulbright Scholar for 1989-1990. He will spend the academic year in the USSR.

Walter L. Hixson has taken a tenure track position at the University of Akron.

Akira Iriye has joined the faculty at Harvard University.

Lawrence Kaplan (Kent State University) gave the keynote address at a conference to mark the 40th anniversary of the founding of NATO. The meeting was held at the Truman Library in Independence on September 21 and 22.

Charles Maier (Harvard University) participated in a conference in Philadelphia last April marking the Fortieth Anniversary of the drafting of West Germany's Basic Law (Grundgesetz) and in an October colloquium at Cambridge entitled "1949-1989: The Federal Republic as History."

Roger Trask (General Accounting Office) participated in a panel discussion on the use and importance of institutional history at the first of a series of seminars focusing on the structure and evolution of the major civilian and military agencies. The seminar was held on October 13 at the National Archives.

Michael Wala (University of Erlangen) participated in a September conference on "American Policy Toward Germany, 1949-1955" at Marburg, Germany.

Ted Wilson (University of Kansas) has a two year Senior Research Professorship at the Center of Military History. Ted is residing in Alexandria, VA.

Thomas Zoumaras has taken a position at Northeast Missouri State University. Tom has been awarded the first Theodore Sorensen fellowship by the Kennedy Library to undertake a biography of Douglas Dillon.

Stephen Schuker (Brandeis University) and Sally Marks (Rhode Island College) participated in the June 14-17 research conference on "Genoa/Rapallo and the Reconstruction of Europe, 1922."

Ernest May (Harvard), David Alan Rosenberg (Naval War College), and John Lewis Gaddis (Ohio University) participated in the NHP Study and Review Conference, July 5-8 at the Aspen Institute's Wye Plantation in Maryland. David Rosenberg is also directing work on a NHP research project concentrating on Berlin. NHP is publishing a newsletter titled *Nuclear History*.

PUBLICATIONS

- Scott L. Bills (Stephen F. Austin State Univ.), *Empire and Cold War: The Roots of U.S.-Third World Antagonism, 1945-7*. St. Martin's Press, 1990. ISBN 0-312-03641-8, \$35.00
- Gordon H. Chang (Oakland, CA), *Friends and Enemies: The United States, China, and the Soviet Union, 1948-1972*. Stanford Univ. Press, 1990. ISBN 0-8047-1565-3, \$25.00
- Edward W. Chester (Univ. of Texas—Arlington), *The Scope and Variety of U.S. Diplomatic History, Volumes 1 & 2*. Prentice Hall, 1990. Vol. 1: ISBN 0-13-796624-5; Vol. II: ISBN 0-13-796632-6
- Richard H. Collin (Univ. of New Orleans), *Theodore Roosevelt's Caribbean: The Panama Canal, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Latin American Context*. Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1990. ISBN 0-8071-1507-X, \$45.00
- Charles DeBenedetti (with assistance of Charles Chatfield), *An American Ordeal*. Syracuse Univ. Press, 1990. Cloth: ISBN 0-8156-0244-8, \$49.50; paper: ISBN 0-8156-0245-6, \$16.95
- Robert A. Divine (Univ. of Texas), ed., *The Johnson Years, Volume Two: Vietnam, the Environment, and Science*. Univ. Press of Kansas, 1987. Now in paper: ISBN 0-7006-0327-1, \$9.95
- Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana Univ.), ed., *Monterrey is Ours: The Mexican War Letters of Lt. Dana, 1845-1847*. Univ. Press of Kentucky, 1990. ISBN 0-8131-1703-8, \$29.00
- John Gimbel (Humboldt State Univ.), *Science, Technology, and Reparations: Exploitation and Plunder in Postwar Germany*. Stanford Univ. Press, 1990. ISBN 0-8047-1761-3, \$35.00
- Walter LaFeber (Cornell Univ.), *The American Age: United States Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad Since 1750*. Norton, 1989. Now in paper: ISBN 0-3939-5611-3, \$18.95
- James K. Libbey (St. Augustine, FL), *American-Russian Economic Relations, 1770s-1990s*. Regina Books, 1989. Cloth: ISBN 0-941690-35-0, \$21.95; paper: ISBN 0-941690-36-9, \$12.95
- Timothy P. Maga (Univ. of Maryland), *John F. Kennedy and the New Pacific Community, 1961-3*. St. Martin's Press, 1990. ISBN 0-312-03639-6, \$35.00
- Anders Stephenson (New York, NY), *Kennan and the Art of Foreign Policy*. Harvard Univ. Press, 1989. ISBN 0-6745-0265-5, \$35.00

Regina



Books

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

220 pages (1987) \$21.95 cloth [ISBN 0-941690-23-7] \$12.95 pbk [ISBN 0-941690-22-9] \$8.75 text **SHAFR Discount \$7.00**

**EMPIRE ON THE PACIFIC: A Study in American
Continental Expansion** Norman A. Graebner.

Graebner contends that Texas, California, and Oregon were acquired so that eastern merchants could gain control of the harbors at San Diego, San Francisco, and Puget Sound—and thereby increase their lucrative trade with the Far East.

LCCN 82-22680. Reprint ed. with updated bibliography. 278 pages. (1983) \$16.95 cloth [ISBN 0-87436-033-1], \$8.75 text **SHAFR Discount \$7.00**

Offer expires June 15, 1990

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**

Libbey. <i>Economics</i>	discount \$7.00	_____
Buckingham. <i>America Sees Red</i>	discount \$7.00	_____
Graebner <i>Empire on Pacific...</i>	discount \$7.00	_____
Esthus. <i>Theodore Roosevelt</i>	discount \$6.00	_____
Brune. <i>Missile Crisis</i>	discount \$6.00	_____

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

sub-total _____

postage (\$1 per title) _____

TOTAL _____

Ship to:

Name: _____

Address _____

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

CALENDAR

1990

- March 22-25 The 83rd meeting of the Organization of American Historians will take place in Washington, DC with headquarters at the Washington Hilton and Towers.
- April 1 Applications for the H. Stull Holt dissertation fellowship are due.
- May 1 Deadline, materials for the June *Newsletter*.
- August 1-4 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 1 Deadline, materials for the September *Newsletter*.
- November 1 Deadline, materials for the December *Newsletter*.
- November 1-15 Annual election for SHAFR officers.
- November 1 Applications for Bernath dissertation fund awards are due.
- December 27-30 The 105th annual meeting of the AHA will be held in New York. The deadline for submissions has passed.

1991

- January 1 Membership fees in all categories are due, payable at the national office of SHAFR.
- January 15 Deadline for the 1990 Bernath article award.

- January 15 Deadline for submissions for 1991 Summer SHAFR panels and proposals.
- January 20 Deadline for the 1990 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.

The 1991 OAH will meet in Louisville, April 11-14. The program chairman is Armstead L. Robinson, Carter G. Woodson Institute for Afro-American and African Studies, 1312 Jefferson Park Ave., University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903. Deadline for proposals is 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 1991 to the chairperson of the committee: William O. Walker III, 180 Uris Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853.

The award of \$300.00 will be presented at the SHAFR luncheon at the annual meeting of the OAH in 1991 in Louisville.

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 FUND

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, 1990.

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) |
| 1990 | David McFadden (UC-Berkeley) |

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, 1991 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.

Prior winners:

1986 Kurt Schultz (Ohio State University)

1987 David W. McFadden (University of California, Berkeley)

1988 Mary Ann Heiss (Ohio State University)

THE NORMAN AND LAURA GRAEBNER AWARD

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

Conditions of the Award:

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

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

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

- (a) provides a brief biography of the candidate, including educational background, academic or other positions held and awards and honors received;
- (b) lists the candidate's major scholarly works and discusses the nature of his or her contribution to the study of diplomatic history and international affairs;
- (c) describes the candidate's teaching career, listing 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 1989 and 1990. Deadline for submissions is February 1, 1991. One copy of each submission should be sent directly to each member of the selection committee.

David Patterson
9011 Montgomery Ave.
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

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

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

Prior winners:

1987 Harold Josephson (University of North Carolina at Charlotte)
1989 Melvin Small (Wayne State University)

ARTHUR LINK 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. *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.



AMERICAN-EAST ASIAN RELATIONS NEWSLETTER

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS AND MASTERS THESES

*Compiled by
Marc Gallicchio*

[Ed. note. The following bibliography is divided into three sections: (1) doctoral dissertations in progress; (2) completed doctoral dissertations; (3) masters theses, both completed and in progress. If the work cited is in progress, the reader may find the following abbreviations help: WIP = Work in progress; ADC = Anticipated Date of Completion; ADP = Anticipated Date of Publication.]

Doctoral Dissertations Completed Between 1987-1989

ASIA

- Ismail, Bukhovy bin, Ph.D. (Journ). Analysis of international news coverage of 24 Asian nations by the United States Newspapers. Ohio Univ., 1988. 193pp. DA8827433.
- Park, Ki-June, Ph.D. (PS). American foreign policy toward East Asia (China, Korea, and Japan) 1945-1949. Univ. of Kansas, 1988. 260pp. DA8903147.
- Rossi, John Paul, Ph.D. (His). "Purely a question of business." The American search for order in East Asia, 1917-1928. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey-New Brunswick, 1988. 411pp. DA8903446.

CHINA AND CHINESE-AMERICANS

- Chang, Michael S.H., Ph.D. (Soc). From marginality to bimodality: Immigration, education, and occupational change of

- Chinese-Americans, 1940-1980. Stanford Univ., 1988. 177pp. DA8826114.
- DeSmither, Carol Marie, Ph.D. (Soc). From calling to career: Work and professional identity among American women missionaries to China, 1900-1950. Univ. of Oregon, 1987. 204pp. DA8808675.
- Dsang, Lincoln Ling-Gao, Ph.D. (Soc). An adaptation of American social welfare methods to west China. Drew Univ., 1933. 206pp. DA8823883.
- Hackett, Beatrice Nied, Ph.D. (Anthro). Family, ethnicity, and power: Chinese Cambodian refugees in the Washington metropolitan area. The American Univ., 1988, 280pp. DA8820660.
- Hickey, Dennis Van Vranken, Ph.D. (PS). United States-Republic of China relations: An exploration of ambiguity in U.S. foreign policy and a retrospective evaluation of decision-making models. The Univ. of Texas at Austin, 1988. 351pp. DA8816472.
- Lasater, Martin Lee, Ph.D. (His). U.S. policy towards China's reunification, the Reagan Years: 1980-1986. The George Washington Univ., 1988. 329pp. DA8809228.
- Lee, Handel Yu-Yung, Ph.D. (Rel). The adaptation of American rural church administration to the rural church in China. Drew Univ., 1933. 163pp. DA8823878.
- Li, Tszesun, Ed.D. (Journ). A comparative study of reciprocal coverage of the People's Republic of China in the "Washington Post" and the United States in the "People's Daily" in 1986. A case study of foreign news within the context of the debate of the new world information order. Oklahoma State Univ., 1988. 202pp.
- Ma, Chen-Lung Ringo, Ph.D. (Sp. Comm.). Reaction to conflict in Chinese/U.S.A. interrelationships: The nature of discontented responses. Univ. of Florida, 1987. 140pp. DA8809666.
- Shaw, Chonghal Petey, Ph.D. (His). The role of the U.S. in Chinese civil conflicts 1944-1949. Saint Louis Univ., 1987. 556pp. DA8805265.
- Song, Huey-Long, Ph.D. (Soc). No white feathered crows: Chinese immigrants' and Vietnamese refugees' adaptation to American legal institutions. Univ. of California, Irvine, 1988. 349pp. DA8827999.

- Sun, You-Li, Ph.D. (His). *Diplomacy of illusion: China's quest for anti-Japanese alliances, 1931-1941*. Univ. of Chicago, 1988. No DA#.
- Syrdal, Rolf Arthur, Ph.D. (Rel). *American Lutheran mission work in China*. Drew Univ., 1942. 553pp. DA8823915.
- Wang, Richard Yuping, Ph.D. (His). *The Joint Chiefs of Staff and United States Policy on China, 1945-1949*. Mississippi State University, 1988. 243pp. DA8808899.
- Zhou, Nan, Ph.D. (Bus Adm). *China's open door policy: Development of international business in Fujian Province, 1979-1985*. Univ. of Utah, 1987. 322pp. DA8802171.

JAPAN AND JAPANESE-AMERICANS

- Azrak, Paul F., Ph.D. (Econ). *Protectionist pressure and dumping in the U.S.: The case of Japan*. Fordham Univ., 1988. 150pp. DA8818452.
- Brower, Charles F., IV, Ph.D. (His). *The Joint Chiefs of Staff and national policy American strategy and the war with Japan, 1943-1945*. The University of Pennsylvania, 1987. DA8804885.
- Bruno, Nicholas John, Ph.D. (His). *Major Daniel C. Imboden and press reform in occupied Japan, 1945-1952*. Univ. of Maryland, College Park, 1988. 403pp. DA8818365.
- Fujita, Fumiko, Ph.D. (His). *"Boys be ambitious": American pioneers on the Japanese frontier, 1871-1888*. City Univ. of New York, 1988. 482pp. DA8820864.
- Gregory, Sadie Raines, Ph.D. (Econ). *The economic effects of Japanese voluntary export restraints on the United States automobile industry*. Howard Univ., 1988. 200pp. DA8824258.
- Hirano, Kyoko, Ph.D. (Cinema). *Japanese cinema under the American occupation: 1945-1952*. New York Univ., 1988. 438pp. DA8812633.
- Johnson, Malia Sedgewick, Ed.D. (Ed). *Margaret Sanger and the birth control movement in Japan, 1921-1955*. Univ. of Hawaii, 1987. 202pp. DA8812141.
- Kawaharda, Dennis, Ph.D. (Lit). *The rhetoric of identity in Japanese American writings, 1948-1988*. Univ. of Washington, 1988. DA8826398.

- Mason, Mark Evan, Ph.D. (His). United States direct investment in Japan: Studies in government policy and corporate strategy. Harvard Univ., 1988. 539pp. DA8901684.
- Muro, Mariko, Ph.D. (His). Acquiring the American way of learning: The cultural and intellectual assimilation of Japanese children into an American elementary school. Stanford Univ., 1988. 430pp. DA8906716.
- Nester, William Raymond, III, Ph.D. (PS). The new hegemon: Japanese economic predominance in East Asia. Univ. of California, Santa Barbara, 1987. 506pp. DA8803874. Compares U.S. "liberal" hegemony to Japan's "neo-mercantilist" hegemony.
- Shearer, Susan Biddle, Ph.D. (PS). The domestic economics and international politics of postwar U.S. trade policy, 1945-1980, case study: Japan. Univ. of Notre Dame, 1988. 345pp. DA8819900.
- Tamamoto, Masaru, Ph.D. (His). Unwanted Peace: Japanese intellectual thought in American occupied Japan, 1948-1952. The Johns Hopkins Univ., 1988. 288pp. DA8819119.
- Van de Velde, James Richard, Ph.D. (PS). Japan's emergence into western security doctrine: U.S.-Japan defense cooperation, 1976-1986. Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy (Tufts Univ.), 1988. 462pp. DA8822308.
- Zhao, John Quansheng, Ph.D. (PS). Japanese Politics and policies towards China with comparisons to American politics. Univ. of California, Berkeley, 1987. 272pp. DA8814130.

KOREA AND KOREAN-AMERICANS

- Cheong, Sung-Hwa, Ph.D. (His). Japanese-South Korean relations under American occupation, 1945-1952: The politics of anti-Japanese sentiment in Korea and the failure of diplomacy. The Univ. of Iowa, 1988. 326pp. DA8815070.
- Kang, Jeong-Koo, Ph.D. (Soc). Rethinking South Korea land reform: Focusing on U.S. occupation as a struggle against history. The University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1988. 575pp. DA8813139.
- Lee, Hye-Kyung, Ph.D. (Soc). Socioeconomic attainment of recent Korean and Filipino immigrant men and women in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, 1980. University of California, Los Angeles, 1988. 341pp. DA8803981.

Sohn, Kyung Soo, Ph.D. (Ed). American influences on secondary school teacher training in Korea: 1945-1962. University of Southern California, 1988. No DA#.

PHILIPPINES AND PHILIPPINE-AMERICANS

Kessler, Richard John, Jr., Ph.D. (PS). Development diplomacy: The making of Philippine foreign policy under Ferdinand E. Marcos. Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy (Tufts Univ.), 1986. 476pp. DA8805642.

Platt, Donald L., Ph.D. (His). A sovereignty of sorts: Filipino-American relations during the Truman administration, 1945-1951. The Univ. of Toledo, 1988. 330pp. DA8906601.

Webb, Katherine Watkins, Ph.D. (PS). Are overseas bases worth the bucks? An approach to assessing operational value and application to the Philippines. The Rand Graduate Institute, 1988. 334pp. DA8826991.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

Sybrandy, Unchalee, Ed.D. (Ed). Characteristics of Southeast Asia presented in children's realistic fiction published in the United States between 1960 and 1980. Temple University, 1987. 380pp. DA8803846.

THAILAND

Tipayamahing, Patchara Khumkhilai, Ph.D. (Ed). The treatment of Thailand in selected American world history and world geography high school textbooks. Kent State University, 1987. 156pp. DA8807237.

Narasuj, Wongduen, DA (His). Siamese-American relations in the nineteenth century. Illinois State University, 1988. 164pp. DA8818718.

VIETNAM AND VIETNAMESE-AMERICANS

Ball, Moya Ann, Ph.D. (Sp Comm). A descriptive and interpretive analysis of the small group communication of Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and their key advisers concerning the decisions from January 1961 to July 1965 to expand the

- Vietnam War. Univ. of Minnesota, 1988. 537pp. DA8815797.
- Bartz, Michael Omar, Ph.D. (Lit). United States cultural movements as reflected in the fiction, journals, and oral histories of the Vietnam War. Saint Louis Univ., 1987. 479pp. DA8805240.
- Christie, Norton Bradley, Ph.D. (Lit). Another war and postmodern memory: Remembering Vietnam. Duke Univ., 1988. 267pp. DA8822010.
- DiLeo, David Lewis, Ph.D. (His). Rethinking containment: The origins and meaning of George Ball's Vietnam dissent. Univ. of California, Irvine, 1988. 400pp. DA8820207.
- Fenn, Jeffrey William, Ph.D. (Theater). Culture under stress: American drama and the Vietnam War. The Univ. of British Columbia, Canada. No DA#.
- Furniss, David West, Ph.D. (AS). Making sense of the war: Vietnam and American prose. Univ. of Minnesota, 1988. 174pp. DA8820477.
- Hein, Jeremy, Ph.D. (His). States and Political Migrants: The Incorporation of Indochinese Refugees in France and the United States of America. Northwestern University, 1989.
- Howell, Richard Lee, Ph.D. (AS). Harvard University and the Indochina War: From the takeover of University Hall in the spring of 1969 through the aftermath of the invasion of Cambodia and the Kent State killings in the spring of 1970. Michigan State of Univ., 1988. 338pp. DA8814860.
- Hunt, Robert Vernon, Jr., Ph.D. (His). Colorado and the Vietnam War, 1964-1974: A study in the politics of polarization. Univ. of Colorado, 1987. 487pp. DA880823.
- Khong, Yuen Foong, Ph.D. (PS). From rotten apples to falling dominos to Munich: The problem of reasoning by analogy about Vietnam. Harvard Univ., 1987. 293pp. DA8806098.
- Martin, Andrew Victor, Ph.D. (AS). Critical approaches to American cultural studies: The Vietnam War in history, literature, and film. Univ. of Iowa, 1987. 217pp. DA8810170.
- Nash, Jesse William, Ph.D. (Anthro). Vietnamese values: Confucian, Catholic, American. Tulane Univ., 1987. DA8811318.

- Nordell, John Robert, Jr., Ph.D. (His). *Dien Bien Phu and Bermuda: Setting the stage for the military and diplomatic climax to the French Indo-China war, November 20-December 9, 1953.* The Pennsylvania State Univ., 1988. 772pp. DA8826798.
- Olson, Gregory Allen, Ph.D. (Sp Comm). *Mike Mansfield's ethos in the evolution of United States policy in Indochina.* Univ. of Minnesota, 1988. 772pp. DA8905844.
- Parker, Fred Charles, IV, Ph.D. (His). *Strategic history of the Vietnam War, 1965-1968.* Georgetown Univ., 1987. 293pp. DA8816334.
- Pratt, Andrew LeRoy, Ph.D. (Rel). *Religious faith and civil religion: Evangelical responses to the Vietnam War, 1964-1973.* The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988. 518pp. DA8818528.
- Van De Mark, Brian, Ph.D. (His). *Lyndon Johnson and the escalation of the Vietnam War, 1964-1965.* Univ. of California, Los Angeles, 1988. 487pp. DA8826029.

Doctoral Dissertations in Progress

- Xiaolan Bao (New York University), "Women Workers in New York's Chinatown, 1948-1988." New York University, History Department. Dissertation director: Marilyn B. Young. ADC, Spring/Summer 1990.
- Ena Chao (Institute of American Culture, Academia Sinica, Republic of China), "The Congressional China Bloc and the United States China Policy." University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, History Department. ADC, December 1989.
- Kaiyi Chen (Temple University), "Chinese-American Relations at the Time of the Geneva Conference." Temple University, History Department. Dissertation director: Waldo Heinrichs.
- Michael Gillen (New York University), "U.S.-Vietnam: Policy and Dissent, 1945-1954." New York University, History Department. Dissertation director: Marilyn B. Young. ADC, Spring 1990.
- Jyoti Grewal (SUNY, Stony Brook), "Woodrow Wilson and America's Diplomacy toward Japan." SUNY, Stony Brook, History

Department. Dissertation director: Michael Barnhart. ADC, Fall 1990.

Xiao-bing Li (Carnegie-Mellon University), "Understanding Chinese Intention of Bombing Quemoy: Eisenhower and U.S. Information Processing Problems During the 1954-55 Offshore Islands Crisis." Carnegie-Mellon University, History Department. ADC, April 1990.

Qiusha Ma (Case Western Reserve University), "The Activities of American Foundations in China During the First Half of the Twentieth Century." Case Western Reserve University History Department. ADC, May 1992.

Shirley Sui Ling Tam (Case Western Reserve University), "Chinese Christian Churches and the Chinese Community in Los Angeles, 1900-1970." Case Western Reserve University, History Department. ADC, May 1992.

Jeffery C. Livingston (University of Toledo), "Ohio Congressman John M. Vorys: A Republican Conservative Nationalist and Twentieth Century American Foreign Policy." University of Toledo, History Department. ADC, Summer 1989.

Barney J. Rickman III (University of Connecticut), "The Japan Connection: The Ideology of American Cooperation with Japan, 1922-1952." University of Connecticut, History Department. ADC, May 1990.

Renqiu Yu (New York University), "To Save China; To Save Ourselves: A History of the China Hand Laundry Association." New York University, History Department. Dissertation director: Marilyn B. Young. ADC, Fall 1989/Spring 1990.

Master's Theses: Completed & In-Progress

Zhitian Luo (University of New Mexico), "The Response of State Department Officials to the Chinese Nationalist Revolution, 1927-1929." University of New Mexico, History Department. ADC, summer 1989.

M. Teresa Peebles (University of Alabama), "United States-Japanese Relations during the Siberian Expedition." University of Alabama, History Department. ADC, August 1989.

Shirley Sui Ling Tam (Case Western Reserve University), "Police Round-up of Chinese in Cleveland in 1925: A Case Study of a Racist Measure and the Chinese Response." Case Western Reserve University, History Department. Completed, May 1988.

Yanming Xiao (University of Hawaii, Manoa), "Sino-American Relations from Confrontation to Reconciliation: An Analysis of Misperceptions and Ideologies." University of Hawaii at Manoa, History Department. Completed, August 1988.

CORRECTION

The endnotes for Zhai Qiang's essay, "Recent Chinese Writings on 1945-1955 Sino-US Relations," in our December 1989 issue were inadvertently truncated. Following are those notes in their entirety.

NOTES

- ¹For a survey of recent Western writings on the early Cold War American-East Asian relations, see Robert McMahon, "The Cold War in Asia: Toward a New Synthesis?" *Diplomatic History* (Summer, 1988), pp. 307-327.
- ²For a brief review of the pre-1976 Chinese historiography on Sino-American relations, see Luo Jungqu and Jiang Xiangze, "Research in Sino-American Relations in the People's Republic of China", Warren Cohen, ed., *New Frontiers in American-East Asian Relations* (New York, 1983), pp. 1-16.
- ³Zi Zhongyun, *Mei Guo Dui Hua Zheng Ce De Yuan Qi He Fa Zhan, 1945-1950 (The Origin and Evolution of American Policy Toward China, 1945-1950)*, (Cong Qing, 1987), pp. 323-357; Zhai Qiang, "Yuan Wai Yuan Hua Gi Tuan He Du Lu Men Dui Hua Zheng Ce, 1947-1949" ("The China Lobby and Truman's Policy Toward China, 1947-1949") *Shi Jie Li Shi (World History)* (No. 5, 1986), pp. 37-45
- ⁴Yuan Ming, "Xin Zhong Kuo Cheng Li Qian Hou De Mei Kuo Dui Hua Zheng Ce Guan" ("The US Policy Conception of China Around the Founding of the PRC"), *Li Shi Yan Jiu (History Studies)*, (No. 3, 1987), pp. 24-33.
- ⁵Wang Jisi, "1945-1955 Lun Mei Kuo Dui Hua Zheng Ce Ji Qi Hou Guo" ("An Appraisal of US Policy Toward China 1945-1955 and Its Aftermath") *Mei Kuo Yan Jiu (American Studies)*, (No. 1, 1987), pp. 40-68.
- ⁶Wang Jianwei, "Xin Zhong Kuo Cheng Li Qian Hou Mei Huo Dui Hua Zheng Ce Pou Xi" ("An Analysis of America's China Policy Around the Founding of the PRC"), *Shi Jie Li Shi (World History)*, (No. 11, 1986).
- ⁷Shi Yinhong, "Jue Ding Du Lu Men Zheng Fu Dui Xin Zhing Kuo De Zheng Ce De Ji Ge Ji Ben Guan Nian" ("Certain Basic Principles in the Truman Administration's Policy toward the PRC"), *Nangjing*

Daxue Xuebao (The Journal of the Nanjing University), (No. 2, 1988), pp. 45-54.

⁸Zi Zhongyun, op. cit. p. 387.

⁹He Di, "Zhong Kuo Gong Chan Dong Dui Mei Zheng Ce De Yan Bian" ("The Evolution of the CCP's Policy Toward the U.S.: 1945-1949"), *Li Shi Yan Jiu (History Studies)*, (No. 3, 1987), pp. 15-23.

¹⁰Shi Yinhong and Jiang Yun, "Jian Kuo Qian Hou Mei Kuo Dui Xi Zang De Tu Mou" ("The American Designs on Tibet Around the Founding of the PRC"), *Xi Zang Yan Jiu (Tibetan Studies)*, (No. 1, 1987), pp. 41-49.

¹¹Zi Zhongyun, "Li Shi De Kao Yan: Xin Zhong Kuo Dan Sheng Qian Hou Mei Kuo De Dui Tan Zheng Ce" ("The Test of History: The US Policy Toward Taiwan Around the Founding of the PRC"), *Guoji Wenti Yanjiu (Journal of International Studies)*, (No. 3, 1982), pp. 34-42; Wang Jisi, "Lun Mei Kuo 'Liang Ge Zhong Kuo' Zheng Ce de Qi Yuan" ("The Origins of America's 'Two China' Policy"), *Shi Jie Li Shi (World History)*, (No. 3, 1987), pp. 33-43.

¹²Zhai Qiang, "Lun Mei Kuo Dui Zhong Su De 'Qie Zi Zhan Lue', 1948-1954" ("American 'Wedge' Strategy Toward Sino-Soviet Relations, 1948-1954") *Nanjing Daxue Xuebao (The Journal of Nanjing University)*, (No. 2, 1988), pp. 55-62.

¹³He Di, op. cit.

¹⁴Shi Yinhong, "Du Lu Men Dui Xin Zhong Kuo De Zheng Ce: Cong Di Shi Dao Zhan Zheng De Li Shi Hui Gu" ("From Hostility to War: A Historical Review of the Truman Administration's Policy Toward the PRC") (Ph.D. dissertation, Nanjing University, 1987), pp. 72-76.

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

SPONSOR: Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.

EDITOR: William J. Brinker, Department of History. **EDITORIAL ASSISTANT:** Brent W. York.

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

DEADLINES: All material should be sent to the editor four weeks prior to publication date.

ADDRESS CHANGES: Changes of address should be sent to:
the Executive Secretary-Treasurer: Executive Secretary-Treasurer:
Allan Spetter, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435.

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

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

FORMER PRESIDENTS OF SHAFR

- 1968 Thomas A. Bailey (Stanford)
 - 1969 Alexander DeConde (California-Santa Barbara)
 - 1970 Richard W. Leopold (Northwestern)
 - 1971 Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana)
 - 1972 Norman A. Graebner (Virginia)
 - 1973 Wayne S. Cole (Maryland)
 - 1974 Bradford Perkins (Michigan)
 - 1975 Armin H. Rappaport (California-San Diego)
 - 1976 Robert A. Divine (Texas)
 - 1977 Raymond A. Esthus (Tulane)
 - 1978 Akira Iriye (Chicago)
 - 1979 Paul A. Varg (Michigan State)
 - 1980 David M. Pletcher (Indiana)
 - 1981 Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State)
 - 1982 Lawrence E. Gelfand (Iowa)
 - 1983 Ernest R. May (Harvard)
 - 1984 Warren I. Cohen (Michigan State)
 - 1985 Warren F. Kuehl (Akron)
 - 1986 Betty Unterberger (Texas A&M)
 - 1987 Thomas G. Paterson (Connecticut)
 - 1988 Lloyd Gardner (Rutgers)
-