

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations



NEWSLETTER

Volume 29

No. 2

June 1998

Page

- 1 Was Harry Truman a Revisionist on Hiroshima? *by Gar Alperovitz*
- 9 Untapped Resource: Research Records of the United States Information Agency *by Kenneth W. Heger & David A. Langbart*
- 26 "We Can Leave it to the Historians": A Question About the Cuban Missile Crisis for Researchers in the Russian Archives *by Thomas Paterson*
- 28 Announcements
- 33 Letters
- 34 Obituaries
- 38 Personals
- 39 Calendar
- 40 Publications
- 44 Awards, Prizes, and Funds
-

ISSN 0740-6169

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

Founded in 1967

Chartered in 1972

PRESIDENT: Arnold Offner, History, Lafayette College, Easton, PA 18042

VICE PRESIDENT: Walter LaFeber, History, Cornell, Ithaca, NY 14853

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

PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Chester Pach, History, Ohio University, Athens OH 45701-2979

CHAIR, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: David Humphry, Historian's Office U.S. Department of State, Washington DC.

FINANCE COMMITTEE: Robert Schulzinger, History, U. of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309.

MEMBERSHIP: Annual dues are \$30 for regular members and \$15 for student or unemployed. Institutional Subscription Rates for *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 22, 1998 are \$75 for institutions in North America and \$90 for institutions in the rest of the world. Make checks payable to Blackwell Publishers or use MasterCard, Visa, or American Express. Mail orders, payments, and address changes to: SHAFR Membership Coordinator, Blackwell Publishers, 350 Main St, Malden, MA 02148 or call 1-800-835-6770. To receive only the *Newsletter* the cost is \$15.00 % the editor. Overseas members wishing to receive the *Newsletter* by air mail should remit an additional \$10 per year to the *Newsletter's* office.

MEETINGS: The annual meeting of the Society is held in the summer. The Society also meets with the AHA in January.

PRIZES: The Society administers four awards that honor the late Stuart L. Bernath and two honoring the late Myrna L. Bernath; these are financed through the generosity of the late Dr. Gerald J. Bernath. Awards also honor Laura and Norman Graebner, the late W. Stull Holt, the late Warren Kuehl, the late Armin Rappaport, Robert Ferrell, Lawrence Gelfand, and Arthur Link. Details of each of these awards are to be found in the June and December *Newsletters*.

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

WAS HARRY TRUMAN A REVISIONIST ON HIROSHIMA?

by

Gar Alperovitz

NATIONAL CENTER FOR ECONOMIC AND SECURITY ALTERNATIVES

Throughout his life President Harry S Truman maintained he never had doubts about the necessity of his decision to use atomic bombs against the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945.¹ “The atom bomb ‘was no great decision.’... It was merely another powerful weapon in the arsenal of righteousness,” he told Columbia University students in 1959.² On another occasion he stated that he had “no qualms about it whatever”; the Japanese “in their conduct of the war had been vicious and cruel savages....”³

We do know that at least one aspect of the use of the atomic bomb stayed with Truman longer than might be indicated by these and other similar statements. At the time of the bombings Hiroshima and Nagasaki were largely civilian targets. Although there was an army headquarters in Hiroshima, both cities were very low on Air Force bombing priority lists — and achieving maximum psychological shock (rather than destroying the most industrial capacity or directly targeting an important military installation)

¹For a discussion of Truman’s various statements regarding the use of the atomic bomb, see Gar Alperovitz, *The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb and the Architecture of an American Myth* (New York: Knopf, 1995), pp. 513-570; and also, Robert Jay Lifton and Greg Mitchell, *Hiroshima in America: Fifty Years of Denial* (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1995), pp. 174-192.

²Harry S Truman, *Truman Speaks* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), p. 67.

³Truman to Roman Bohnen, December 12, 1946, Atomic Energy, Box 2, PSF, Harry S Truman Library, Independence, MO.

appears clearly to have been the main objective.⁴ The implication of this aspect of the bombings especially seems to have concerned Truman:

On August 10, 1945, the day after the bombing of Nagasaki, Truman told his Cabinet (according to the diary of Commerce Secretary Henry Wallace) that “he had given orders to stop atomic bombing. He said the thought of wiping out another 100,000 people was too horrible. He didn’t like the idea of killing as he said, ‘all those kids.’”⁵ A few months later he wrote, “You know that the most terrible decision a man ever had to make was made by me at Potsdam.... I couldn’t help but think of the necessity of blotting out women, children and noncombatants.”⁶

President Truman clearly continued to worry about the moral issue; similar language appears repeatedly in his private and public statements. During a July 1948 White House meeting to discuss the custody of atomic weapons, for instance, Lewis L. Strauss noted: “The President indicated that he was not going to have ‘some trigger-happy Colonel’ using atomic bombs — that they were not weapons in the ordinary sense, but the liberation of a great natural force which killed women and children and old people indiscriminately.”⁷

A few years later, during the Korean War, the President made

⁴Alperovitz, *The Decision*, pp. 523-524, 528, 533-534.

⁵Henry A. Wallace, *The Price of Vision: The Diary of Henry A. Wallace, 1942-1946*, ed. John M. Blum (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973), p. 474.

⁶Truman, handwritten speech delivered to the Gridiron Dinner, December 15, 1945, Speeches, Longhand Notes File, Box 46, PSF, Harry S Truman Library, Independence, MO. (A typed copy, signed by Truman, is in the same file.)

⁷Lewis L. Strauss, “Memorandum for Files of Lewis L. Strauss,” July 21, 1948, AEC-Memoranda to AEC Commissioners, Strauss Papers, Herbert Hoover Presidential Library, West Branch, IA.

similar remarks at a White House press conference: “He [Truman] said that there has always been active consideration of its [the atomic bomb’s] use. He said that he does not want to see it used. He added that it is a terrible weapon and it should not be used on innocent men, women and children who have nothing to do with this military aggression — that happens when it is used.”⁸ Replying in January 1953 to a letter from Thomas Murray, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, Truman urged: “I rather think you have put a wrong construction on my approach to the use of the Atomic bomb. It is far worse than gas and biological warfare because it affects the civilian population and murders them by the wholesale.”⁹

Up until recently such reflections seemed independent of whether Truman felt his decision to have been the right one. However, there are beginning to be signs that these statements may point in the direction of something different. In my book, *The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb*, I reproduced an account sent to me by our former Ambassador to Poland, the late John A. Gronouski. Gronouski wrote that in 1964 he had gone to Independence, Missouri, to speak at a campaign fundraising dinner for a local member of Congress. His report follows:

After the afternoon tour of the Library I dropped him [Truman] off at his home and agreed to pick him up in time to have a couple of drinks at the Country Club bar....

We stood at the bar and Mr. Truman ordered us each a double shot of Southern Comfort neat. (Not my favorite drink, but when drinking with ex-Presidents you do as.....!) After

⁸UP teletype, “Washington, November 30, [1950],” copy in Atomic Energy File, Box 6, Elmer Davis Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC; see also Eben Ayers’ undated summary of this press conference (beginning “On November 30, 1950,...”) in Atomic Bomb File, Box 4, Ayers Papers, Harry S Truman Library, Independence, MO.

⁹Truman to Thomas E. Murray, January 19, 1953, Atomic Bomb, Box 112, PSF, Harry S Truman Library, Independence, MO.

ordering each of us another of same he began about a ten minute monologue on his decision to drop the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima. He did not ask me whether he did the right thing — he simply was explaining to me and me alone his rationale for deciding to drop the bomb. He did not address the question of the second bomb — I interpreted his explanation as his justification for dropping both bombs.

His reasoning was that with which we are all familiar: he talked about the heavy loss of American (and Japanese) lives that resulted from the storming of the Japanese held Pacific Islands. He added that on the basis of his best information an invasion of Japan could have cost as many as one million American lives and casualties and an untold number of Japanese lives. He said that he regretted the loss of lives at Hiroshima (and Nagasaki, I presumed) but pointed out that the Japanese would have had many more dead and wounded resisting an American invasion and again referred to the saving of American lives. He noted that the best intelligence available to him was of the strong opinion that Japanese morale was high and that dropping a bomb off the coast rather than in a populated area would not have induced the Japanese to surrender. As I say, he went on in this vein for about ten minutes. At no time did he seem defensive nor did he solicit my opinion as to the merits of his decision.

“What fascinated me,” Gronouski emphasized, “... is the fact that he out of the blue brought up the subject in conversation with an almost total stranger (I had been one of dozens who shook hands with him on a previous occasion several years earlier, but otherwise I had no previous contact with him).”

At the time and when I thought about it later I was struck by the fact that this man, who had a reputation of putting out of mind the consequences of tough decisions once he had made them, would spend ten minutes explaining his actions to a virtual stranger almost twenty years after the event. I surmised

that he had been troubled by criticism of his decision all of those years and surmised that the exercise he went through with me was probably one of countless times he had done the same thing with others. However, he gave no indication that he regretted his decision; only that he felt it necessary to point out to me the reasons why, in his mind, it was the right decision.¹⁰

I knew Gronouski personally from the days when I directed U.S. House and Senate legislative work, and also when I was a Special Assistant working at the policy level in the Department of State. He was from Wisconsin, as am I. Ambassador Gronouski was a professional, a cautious man with words — especially written communications that might be directly quoted.

Recently, however, I received a related report on this same event from Carl Leiden, Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the University of Texas at Austin. Leiden was a friend of Gronouski's. (After leaving government Gronouski became the first Dean of the LBJ School of Public Affairs at UT-Austin.) In a letter to me, Leiden (who I do not know personally) offers information which suggests there may well have been more to Truman's expressed concern than the former Ambassador wished to put on paper:

... I had a number of occasions to meet him [Gronouski] and to drink with him. One evening at the end of a long cocktail party the two of us were sitting on a couch nursing the last of bourbons when he told me the story you recount. In your case he was I presume trying to be as accurate as he could be; in my case it was just a late night alcoholic story. But there were differences and in some cases differences of significance. Here is the story that he told me.

The event related to the elections of 1962 rather than those of 1964 and President Kennedy, not Johnson was the one who

¹⁰John A. Gronouski to Martha Hamilton, October 16, 1985; copy sent by John A. Gronouski to author, October 4, 1989.

pushed Gronouski into going out to Independence. Apparently the candidate for Congress did not meet with Truman's approval and he had refused to endorse him. Kennedy then sent Gronouski out with a personal plea that Truman at least sit on the platform even if he did not formally endorse the man.

According to Gronouski, Truman granted him an interview and finally agreed to sit on the platform, saying that a request from the President should not lightly be disregarded. Gronouski said nothing about a tour of the Library but he did say that he did pick up Truman to take him to the rally. He was early and Truman said that was fine because it would give them time for a drink at his bar (it was not named). In the bar, Truman ordered for them both doubles of Old Grand Dad (not Southern Comfort) and then a second round. After an exchange of pleasantries Gronouski — so he said — asked Truman, not specifically about the bombs, but rather in general whether there were any things that he regretted about his administration.

Truman said instantly, "The bomb of course." He went on to say that he had recurring nightmares about the dropping of the bombs and that he considered that it was the greatest mistake that he had made. But after detailing this, he added, significantly, I think, that of course he could never publicly repudiate his decision at the time. He would simply have to live with it.

There was no reason for Gronouski to tell me this story. He must have told it in one variation or another to dozens of people. We all vary the details of our stories somewhat as we repeat them with the passage of time. But there was no reason for him to be untruthful to me for the story just came out in conversation. I was convinced that he believed it. Like you, I was impressed by it, particularly by three things: (1) Truman's admission without prompting that dropping the bomb was his biggest mistake, (2) His tortured dreams and

nightmares about the bombings, and (3) His insistence that he could not go public with this.¹¹

When I wrote Leiden to thank him for his letter, I also queried him on the accuracy of his memory. He replied that he was confident of his report because he had written up the incident afterwards:

It was always my habit in interviews to take no notes at the interview itself but rather to write up the encounter as soon as possible afterwards. In this case John and I were chatting at a cocktail party as it was winding down and I had nothing to take notes on anyway. However, as was my wont, I did write it up the next morning. I had that original document until recently when I discarded it along with a lot of other records from the years. I am 75. However, before discarding it I reread it; shortly after that I wrote to you. I might also add that I have an excellent memory and when I reread the note that I had made it coincided exactly with my memory down to the brand-name of the bourbon consumed.¹²

This is not the only such report. At the time of the 50th anniversary of the bombings in 1995, Joe O'Donnell, a World War II Marine Corps photographer, reported a similar comment by Truman. In 1950 O'Donnell and a number of other newsmen accompanied Truman to Wake Island to cover his visit with General MacArthur. During a walk with Truman along the beach, O'Donnell turned to the President and said, "Mr. President, I was a photographer at Hiroshima and Nagasaki with the Marine Corps, and I saw lots. I just wondered if you ever had second opinion [sic] about dropping the bombs?" And boy, so sharp, he said, 'Hell, yes! And I've had a lot of misgivings afterwards.' And I was so

¹¹Carl Leiden to Gar Alperovitz, 19 June 1997.

¹²Carl Leiden to Gar Alperovitz, 27 August 1997.

shocked, I was afraid to say, 'What kind of misgivings?' and you can take that for what it's worth. I don't know what he meant."¹³

It is possible that these were simply the occasional and understandable ruminations of a man whose decision cost a conservatively estimated 250,000 lives — and that they do not represent a serious reconsideration. On the other hand, there is now ample evidence that President Truman was more than willing to bend the facts in connection with various aspects of the Hiroshima decision.¹⁴ We also know that it was a very inexperienced Truman who made the decision — and that he was strongly influenced at the time by his then Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes. Truman, of course, subsequently fired Byrnes and came to feel that Byrnes had misled him in general on many matters, and it is possible that his feelings extended to Hiroshima-related issues as well.¹⁵

Moreover, after World War II, with one somewhat "iffy" exception, virtually every major U.S. military leader involved or close to the top leadership was to indicate publicly or privately that he believed the use of the atomic bomb was not necessary. The most well known of these, of course, were the President's Chief of Staff, Admiral William D. Leahy, and General Dwight D. Eisenhower. Among others there are statements by General Henry H. "Hap" Arnold, Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, General Douglas MacArthur,

¹³All Things Considered, National Public Radio, June 28, 1995 (transcript retrieved from the Nexis database). Robert Jay Lifton and Greg Mitchell also interviewed O'Donnell: During the stroll O'Donnell "dared to ask if [Truman] had any 'second thoughts' about the decision to drop the bomb. According to O'Donnell, Truman quickly replied, 'Hell yes!' and then added, somewhat cryptically, 'I've had a lot of misgivings about it, and I inherited a lot more, too.'" Lifton and Mitchell, *Hiroshima in America*, p. 191.

¹⁴See Alperovitz, *The Decision*, pp. 504-570 for a comparison of Truman's various statements about the bomb decision with the historical record.

¹⁵For evidence on Truman's feelings about Byrnes, see Alperovitz, *The Decision*, pp. 196-214, 240, 375-376.

Admiral William F. Halsey, Jr., Major General Curtis E. LeMay, and many lesser supporting staff.¹⁶

It is, of course, hardly surprising that for the most part President Truman stoutly defended his decision in public for the rest of his life. How could he not have? On the other hand, we still do not have all the evidence: The President's daughter Margaret, for instance, has repeatedly refused to respond to inquiries by Barton Bernstein, myself, and others for access to papers related to this and other matters.¹⁷ Historians would be well advised to keep a watchful eye out for further evidence suggesting that the President's personal views may have been rather different from his oft-quoted public statements.

UNTAPPED RESOURCE: RESEARCH RECORDS OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

by
KENNETH W. HEGER
&
DAVID A. LANGBART

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Many considerations go into the formulation of United States foreign policy and the development of the U.S. overseas information program. Among these are an understanding of both foreign and domestic opinion about key events, issues of importance, and the

¹⁶For a review of the many statements by U.S. military leaders, see Alperovitz, *The Decision*, chapters 26-29.

¹⁷See Alperovitz, *The Decision*, pp. 322-323, 558.

actions of other governments. Within the U.S. Government, the United States Information Agency's Office of Research and Media Reaction is one organization responsible for providing such information. As such, the various reports, studies, memoranda, and other records created and maintained by that office are an untapped source of documentation for scholars examining the period of the Cold War. This article describes those records that are presently found in the National Archives.

From the end of World War II until 1953, the Department of State held responsibility for the United States international information program. In 1953, in an effort to reinvigorate the program and separate it from the organization responsible for the formulation of foreign policy, President Dwight Eisenhower created the United States Information Agency (USIA) by the authority of Reorganization Plan No. 8, as approved by Congress. The new agency, which came into existence on August 1, was a combination of the Department's semi-autonomous International Information Administration (IIA), the Department's separate information programs in Germany and Austria as well as the overseas information activities of the Mutual Security Administration (MSA).

During the first two years of its existence, the cobbled-together agency evolved into the basic USIA organization that would exist for almost two decades. Most USIA elements had direct predecessors in IIA and the other organizations out of which USIA was created. The Office of Evaluation was responsible for overall evaluation of research activities relating to the international information program. The media service organizations included units responsible for appraising the effectiveness of their own operations. In addition, the Coordinator of Psychological Intelligence was responsible for providing related intelligence analysis.

In November 1953, the Office of Evaluation and the evaluation units of the media services were combined into the Office of Research and Evaluation. The new office was charged with appraising the

effectiveness of USIA's operations and conducting the research necessary to make such appraisals.

In April 1954, the functions of the Coordinator of Psychological Intelligence were integrated into the Office of Research and Evaluation, resulting in the Office of Research and Intelligence.

The following years saw other administrative changes. In late 1954, the evaluation function was removed from the Office of Intelligence and Research which remained responsible for providing the agency with information necessary to determine policy, to formulate program content, to appraise operations, and to evaluate the results achieved. Actual evaluation of program effectiveness, however, rested with the agency leadership and the units responsible for carrying out specific programs.

By the late 1950s, the conception of the functions of the office changed from "intelligence" to "research and analysis," a shift that was highlighted in the December 1958 change in the name of the office to the Office of Research and Analysis. After this change, there was less attention paid to communist propaganda and more attention devoted to support of the U.S. information output.

In 1966, the Research and Reference Service was merged into the Office of Policy to create the Office of Policy and Research. This was an effort to make the research function more responsive to the needs of the agency's policy makers and planners. The change was a result of recommendations made by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information. The following year, the Commission questioned the wisdom of placing the research function under the USIA policy function, fearing that the close relationship would compromise the objectivity of the resulting research. It indicated a preference for the research function to report to the Director. In 1968, the Commission once again expressed dissatisfaction with USIA's attempts to improve the research function. As a result of the criticism of the advisory commission, the research function was

once again given independent status in 1969 with the creation of the Office of Research and Assessment.

During the reorganization resulting from the creation of the International Communication Agency (USICA) by merger of the USIA with the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs from the Department of State, the research function once again found itself reporting to the agency's leadership through an intermediate level. The newly named Office of Research and Evaluation was now under the Associate Director for Management.

In 1986, an independent Office of Research, reporting directly to the USIA Director and Deputy Director, was established in accordance with the 1986 recommendations of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy. At that time, it was described as being responsible for conducting systematic studies of foreign public opinion and on the evaluation of agency programs in support of the Director as the principal adviser to the President on foreign public opinion. In addition, the office held responsibility for the preparation of analyses of foreign media commentary on issues of importance to the United States as well as studies on Soviet propaganda and disinformation.

Today, the Office of Research and Media Reaction continues the work begun in 1953. The research function conducts surveys and focus groups on attitudes of foreign publics and monitors U.S. public opinion on foreign policy issues. Key issues examined in recent years include those relating to democratization, including trend analyses of political developments; security, including alliances and defense agreements, NATO expansion, Bosnia, and the U.S. troop presence; economics, including trade, investment, and intellectual property rights; and global issues such as drug trafficking, womens' issues, and the environment. The media reaction function prepares analyses of foreign commentary on issues relevant to U.S. foreign policy. These reports provide an assessment of worldwide elite press opinion about issues of concern

to the U.S. and often call attention to both successes and misperceptions of U.S. policies and actions around the world.

The USIA's research records are a veritable treasure trove of information on a wide variety of topics. In a 1955 report, for example, Office of Research staff found that the Iranian views of the United States improved with the removal of the Mossadeq regime and the end of its inflammatory, anti-American rhetoric. The same report also determined that although American monetary grants helped ease relations, the overall Iranian view of these grants was not one of simple gratitude but that the Americans should give more money because the wealthy United States could afford it.¹ In a 1966 opinion poll, the Office found that between June 1965 and April 1966, the percentage of Japanese who viewed American foreign policy as very or somewhat favorable increased from 13 percent to 30 percent, while those viewing American policy as very or somewhat unfavorable decreased from 39 to 30 percent, despite the continuation of the conflict in Vietnam.² From two 1966 research reports, we learn that 83 percent of the Nigerian general population and 70 percent of Nigerian University students held the United States in high esteem and felt that Nigeria and the United States had common interests.³ While they may have been relieved to find that Nigerian students had a favorable view of the United States, America's foreign policy makers were disturbed by the growth of negative stereotypes among Latin American students, and in September 1966 the Office of Research assembled a packet of

¹S-3-55 "Iran" March 31, 1955, NA RG 306, Special Reports 1953-63.

²S-11-66 "Current Japanese Opinion of the U.S. and the Conflict in Vietnam," April 1966, NA RG 306, Special Reports 1964-82.

³R-32-66 "Nigerian Opinion on Selected National and International Issues" February 1966 and R-44-66 "Nigerian University Students Views on National and International Issues" March 1966, NA RG 306, Research Reports 1964-74.

data that U.S. officials could use to combat this trend. The result was a compilation of statistics and other information suggesting how to deal with charges of American economic imperialism, the accusation that the United States was dominated by "Wall Street" elites and opposed to social change, the belief that the United States supported right-wing dictatorships in Latin America, and the contention that American society was racist.⁴

Strategic defense and other military concerns also resulted in the preparation of reports. In April 1979, for example, the Office conducted a study to determine the percentage of Western European populations that supported close military cooperation with the United States. Not surprisingly, the study found the French the least supportive, with only about 30 percent of those polled in favor of close military cooperation. Great Britain had the highest percentage of respondents favoring close participation (80 percent). But, when the analysts examined the data by age group, they found a striking similarity throughout Europe in the percentages of respondents who answered the question in the same way between people 35 to 39 years of age and those 65 to 69.⁵ In the late 1980s, visits of American nuclear warships to their ports became a major issue in Australia and New Zealand, thereby threatening existing strategic defense relations between the United States and its ANZUS partners. Accordingly, the Office of Research conducted numerous polls in those two countries to determine the depth of hostility toward American nuclear warship visits. Two 1986 reports, found a great disparity between the two nations; while a majority of Australians favored permitting both nuclear-powered and nuclear-armed warships to visit Australian ports (61 percent and 55 percent, respectively), a sizeable majority of New Zealanders (62

⁴R-118-66 "Material For Countering Negative Stereotypes about the U.S. Held by Latin American Students" September 1966, NA RG 306, Research Reports 1964-74.

⁵S-34-79 "Age Data Related to West European Opinion" April 1979, NA RG 306, Special Reports 1964-82.

percent) opposed visits of warships that might be carrying nuclear weapons, but opinion split almost evenly (48 percent, each) as to whether to permit nuclear-powered ships to visit the nation's ports.⁶

Domestic issues played a role in USIA activities as well, with the state of race relations in the United States receiving major attention. Tension between black and white Americans in the late 1950s resulted in a communist propaganda offensive directed against the United States. To determine the effect of this propaganda on American foreign policy the USIA undertook several studies.⁷ It found that influential groups throughout the world, especially in crucial Third World areas, had a poor view of race relations in the United States. Realizing that this attitude would affect U.S. foreign policy negatively, in 1961 the Agency produced the first in a series of eight studies designed to provide literate foreigners with information to counter communist assertions.⁸ Written over the next four years, these reports dealt with specific issues, such as desegregation in education and housing, advances in employment among African Americans, and the Nation of Islam. Throughout the 1960s, the USIA supplemented these reports with over sixty studies designed to gauge the effectiveness of American efforts to convince foreigners that race relations in the United States were improving.

⁶R-24-86 "Australian Public Opinion on the U.S. Alliance: 1986" December 1986 and R-2-86 "New Zealand Opinion Divided Over ANZUS and U.S. Ships Visits" February 1986, NA RG 306, Regular and Special Reports, 1983-87.

⁷For example: S-10-57 "The World Looks at Little Rock;" S-18-58 "African Reaction to the Alabama Incidents," NA RG 306, Special Reports 1953-63; PMS-23-58 "Post-Little Rock Opinion on the Treatment of Negroes in America," NA RG 306, Program and Media Studies 1956-62.

⁸S-41-61 "IRI Background Facts: The American Negro." p. I, NA RG 306, Special Reports 1953-63.

Even the Space Race attracted the attention of USIA personnel. Throughout the early 1960s, American policy makers were deeply concerned about world-wide perceptions of American deficiencies in space exploration vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. A 1964 USIA research report undertaken in the wake of the orbiting of a Soviet three-man spacecraft underscored this point, by pointing out that 55 percent of the British population polled saw the USSR as having a clear lead in the Space Race. But, the report's preparers also concluded that the situation was not entirely hopeless and that the U.S. could gain ground with future successes in space.⁹ Future reports proved them right. The next year Astronaut White's twenty minute space walk had a major impact on world opinion, with most respondents claiming that the U.S. had taken a significant leap in the Space Race.¹⁰ World opinion was even more favorable later in 1965 after the successes of Mariner IV and Gemini V. Reports done after these two missions indicated that most press coverage throughout the world characterized the American space program as equal to or superior to its Soviet counterpart.¹¹ The 1969 moonlanding gave the U.S. an overwhelming lead.¹²

The USIA research records form part of National Archives Record Group 306, Records of the United States Information Agency.

⁹R-192-64 "British Assessment of Space Leadership Following the Soviet Orbiting of a Three-Man Spaceship," NA RG 306, Research Reports 1964-82.

¹⁰R-74-65 "World Press Reaction to Gemini IV Space Flight," NA RG 306, Research Reports 1964-82.

¹¹R-93-65 "World Press Reaction to Mariner IV. "; R-125-65 "World Press Reaction to Gemini V Space Flight," NA RG 306, Research Reports 1964-82.

¹²R-10-69 "Effect of the Moon Landing on Opinions in Six Countries," NA RG 306, Research Reports 1964-82.

While many of the records reflect the activities of the Voice of America and worldwide media habits, they also contain evaluations of overseas editorial comment, synopses of communist propaganda, the results of polls surveying foreign attitudes toward American policy, and foreign opinion of world events. Most of the records span the years 1948 through 1973, with several significant series extending through 1993, well beyond the declassified portions of the Department of State's central file (currently declassified through 1969). As such, scholars can use these records to research topics dated later than the availability of other foreign policy records.

As was the case with its organization, the focus of USIA's research records evolved over time. A 1958 description of duties indicates that the Office of Research and Intelligence was responsible for providing USIA with intelligence and research data, reports and estimates for use by headquarters and field elements in making policy and program decisions, and developing documentation, primarily concerning communist activities, for use in the Agency's output. Among a number of specific functions, the Office was to follow and analyze Communist propaganda, estimate and interpret trends in foreign public opinion, and other specialized information to aid USIA in assessing the effectiveness of its programs.

By 1962, the Office's mandate had expanded. It described its work as falling under the following headings: (1) attitude and opinion studies; (2) crisis reporting; (3) communications; (4) target group studies; and (5) communist propaganda activities. Attitude and opinion studies included analyses of regional or national attitudes on significant developments in the international as well as reaction reports to current developments such as nuclear testing and disarmament. Crisis reporting was an offshoot of the reaction reports. That work was of longer duration than ordinary reaction reports and focused on a specific crisis situation such as the Cuban missile crisis. Given the importance of communications to the success of the USIA program, the Office prepared a series of communication fact books covering all major countries of the work to be used as reference works for those officials engaged in

activities related to media and communications facilities throughout the world. The target group studies were a follow-up to the communications studies and helped the USIA reach the right people with the right message. The target studies provided an overall view of the principle population elements with a given country and included separate studies of especially important groups within a country. While not as prominent as earlier, the Office continued to compile information on national and international communist propaganda activities.

The Office's records are divided into two major categories, geographical files and document files. The geographic files consist primarily of working papers of the Office's country and regional research projects and the final reports. Many of these records pertain to media habits and include information on which medium (newspapers, magazines, radio and television) foreigners used and the evaluation of the content of information conveyed in these media. But, the geographic files also document specific topics and events that had a major impact on American foreign policy, such as the Cuban missile crisis, European views of American troop levels in Europe, and President Nixon's November 1969 Vietnam speech. In addition, there are several small miscellaneous series of records.

The Office's "World Surveys" are worthy of special attention. Compiled in February 1964, July 1966, March 1970 and July 1972, the surveys covered a wide range of topics: How foreigners viewed relations with other countries, especially the United States, the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China; views about nuclear power and nuclear weapons; feelings about their domestic political, social and economic issues; opinions of how African Americans were treated in the United States and how that opinion affected the interviewee's view of the United States; and the general view of the value of space exploration and the Space Race. Survey data includes the size of the sample and gives the results in percentages of the sample total. Many survey results were broken down by educational level, age, sex, and political affiliation of the interviewee.

The geographic files, which include records created in Department of State predecessor offices, consist of approximately 170 linear feet of records and are divided into three chronological segments, 1948-51, 1951-64 and 1964-73. The first two segments are arranged alphabetically by country and thereunder chronologically. The third segment is divided into five regions: Africa, Eastern Europe and Multi-Area Studies; East Asia and Australia; Latin America; Western Europe and Canada; and the Near East, South Asia and North Africa. Each regional group is in turn arranged by country.

Covering the years 1953-1987 and 1990-93, the document files consist of a virtually complete set of all of the Office of Research's reports, research memoranda, briefing papers and media analyses, and contain a wealth of information. The documents' format is conducive to research; documents are usually short, presenting information in a concise fashion and often contain easy-to-read graphs and charts. The data included in these documents is frequently a synthesis of data found in the geographic files, compiled in a concise version for dissemination to American foreign policy makers. Researchers can find national and multinational polls, collections and analyses of communist propaganda and of foreign editorials about American policy, reactions to traveling American cultural exhibits and information about media habits overseas.

The document files are especially useful for finding good, short appraisals of flashpoint issues, such as the Cuban missile crisis and the Berlin crisis of 1961-62. In addition, there are studies conducted over several years that pertain to longer-term issues affecting American foreign policy, for example the Vietnam Conflict, race relations in the United States, and Arab-Israeli relations. Finally, the Office prepared reports, studies and briefings for American officials prior to the visits of foreign dignitaries to the United States, before American officials (most notably the Secretary of State and the President) went abroad, and in preparation for international summits. The Appendix at the end of this article lists

the Research "R" Reports for the year 1962 and serves as an example of the number and scope of the document files.

The document files (approximately 130 linear feet of records) consist of several series that represent the different kinds of documents that the Office produced. The major series are: Research ("R") Reports, Special ("S") Reports, Research Memoranda, Foreign Media Analyses, and Briefing Papers. Each series is arranged numerically. The major document series have a numerical filing number, whereby the first report of the year was assigned the number one, the next report number two, and so forth; the next year the numbering sequence began with number one again. Consequently, researchers should be certain to note the date of the report, as well as its number.

Finally, the Office of Research's records contain several small miscellaneous series, two of which are worthy of special attention. Although there are very few administrative records for the Office, there is a small series (seven linear feet) that fits into this category. Entitled the "General Records of the Office of Research and Intelligence" and covering the years 1955-59, this series is arranged by subject and thereunder chronologically. The records document early USIA activities and include subjects such as radio broadcasting, the effectiveness of USIA programs and communist propaganda.

The second series of noteworthy miscellaneous records is entitled "Foreign Service Despatches". These records cover the years 1954-65 and consist of despatches from USIS representatives overseas to USIA headquarters in Washington, DC, including evaluations and assessment reports of USIA programs, annual country plans, inspection reports and reports of meetings of regional USIS officers, and provide excellent overviews of American cultural foreign policy efforts in specific countries. The despatches generally state the USIA's general objectives in each country and discuss the projects local Agency representatives intended to implement, such as educational exchange efforts, film and publication programs, and

exhibits. The records' volume is approximately two linear feet and they are arranged in broad geographic areas: Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe and Canada, and Latin America.

The Archives II Reference Branch of the National Archives at College Park has extensive finding aids to assist researchers using the records of the Office of Research. That office has compiled a check list of each series within this collection, that includes the series title, the date span, the volume and the stack location. There are box lists for the series within the geographic files to help researchers identify pertinent boxes. For the series comprising the documents files, there are detailed file title lists containing the titles of every Research Report, Special Report, Research Memorandum, Foreign Media Analysis and other document series. These finding aids are available in the consultation room of the Archives II Reference Branch (Room 2600), as well as the finding aids room of the research complex (Room 2000).

APPENDIX

RESEARCH "R" REPORTS OF THE USIA'S OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND MEDIA REACTION, 1962

- R-1 -- The Soviet People View America
- R-2 -- Venezuela: A Communications Fact Book
- R-3 -- Soviet Attitudes Toward the Voice of America
- R-4 -- A Communications Fact Book: Philippines
- R-5 -- The Daily Newspapers and Periodicals of India
- R-6 -- A Communications Fact Book: Malaya-Singapore
- R-7 -- Developments in Communist Bloc International Broadcasting, 1961
- R-8 -- The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland: A Communications Fact Book
- R-9 -- The Role and Trend of Public Opinion in Western Europe, 1961
- R-10 -- The Role and Trend of Public Opinion in Latin American, 1961
- R-11 -- The Role and Trend of Public Opinion in the Far East, 1961
- R-12 -- The Role and Trend of Public Opinion in Africa, 1961
- R-13 -- The Role and Trend of Public Opinion in the Arab States, 1961
- R-14 -- The Role and Trend of Public Opinion in South Asia, 1961

- R-15 -- The Role and Trend of Public Opinion in the Middle East-Aegean Area, 1961
- R-16 -- Dominican Republic: A Communications Fact Book
- R-17 -- Communications Fact Book: Taiwan
- R-18 -- Worldwide Distribution of Radio Receiver Sets
- R-19 -- Soviet-Satellite Propaganda in 1961: A Year-End Review
- R-20 -- Free World Media Treatment of First US Orbital Flight
- R-21 -- Reaction to the Presidential Announcement on Nuclear Testing
- R-22 -- Communist Propaganda Activities in South Asia, 1961
- R-23 -- Communist Propaganda Activities in the Far East, 1961
- R-24 -- Communist Propaganda Activities in Western Europe, 1961
- R-25 -- "Medicine, USA" in Moscow: The First Week
- R-26 -- Attitudes and Opinions in Taiwan
- R-27 -- The Communist Bloc in International Film Festivals of 1961
- R-28 -- The Republics of Senegal and Mauritania: Communications Fact Books
- R-29 -- "Medicine, USA" in Moscow: The Second Week
- R-30 -- The Yugoslav Transistor Contest
- R-31 -- The Empire of Ethiopia: A Communications Fact Book
- R-32 -- A Communications Fact Book: Burma
- R-33 -- Overseas Television Developments in 1961
- R-34 -- The French Daily Press: A Descriptive Listing
- R-35 -- Communist Propaganda Activities in the Middle East-Aegean Area, 1961
- R-36 -- Soviet Economic Aid to the Satellite Nations Since 1956
- R-37 -- Notes on the French Film Industry
- R-38 -- Preliminary Worldwide Reaction to US Nuclear Tests
- R-39 -- National Hopes and Fears of Parliamentarians in Three Developing Countries
- R-40 -- Portugal: A Communications Fact Book
- R-41 -- Chinese Communist Propaganda, 1961
- R-42 -- Soviet Views of American Broadcasting
- R-43 -- Soviet Book Publishing in Free World Languages, 1961
- R-44 -- Japan's Improving Image in Southeast Asia
- R-45 -- "Medicine, USA" in Kiev: The First Week
- R-46 -- Italy: A Communications Fact Book
- R-47 -- Communist Propaganda Activities in Africa, 1961
- R-48 -- Worldwide Reaction to the US Despatch of Troops to Thailand
- R-49 -- Communist Propaganda Activities in Israel and the Arab States, 1961
- R-50 -- A Communications Fact Book: Cambodia
- R-51 -- "Medicine, USA" in Kiev: The Second Report
- R-52 -- An Annotated Listening of the African Press
- R-53 -- Notes on the Czechoslovak Film Industry
- R-54 -- Selected African Youth Movements: A Directory
- R-55 -- "The Passing Show": Political Satire in Chinese Communist Propaganda

- R-56 -- Spain: A Communications Fact Book
- R-57 -- Calendar of Significant Dates: US and Latin America — July
- R-58 -- The USIA: A Selected Bibliography, May 1962
- R-59 -- Communist Propaganda Activities in Latin America, 1961
- R-60 -- Tuskegee Institute: A Successful Experiment in Self-Help
- R-61 -- Regulated Spanish Press Suppresses and Distorts News About Current Labor Unrest
- R-62 -- Algeria: A Communications Fact Book
- R-63 -- Some Lettish Views on Soviet Society
- R-64 -- Press Control in South Korea
- R-65 -- Stephen Foster: A Biographical Sketch
- R-66 -- Fidel Castro Praises Soviet Youth, Criticizes Peace Corps
- R-67 -- The United Kingdom: A Communications Fact Book
- R-68 -- President John F. Kennedy's Current Statements, May 1962
- R-69 -- Selected African Labor Movements: A Directory
- R-70 -- Far East Participation in the Helsinki World Youth Festival
- R-71 -- Calendar of Significant Dates: US & Latin America, August
- R-72 -- Post-Wall Significance of RIAs and Other Radio Stations Reported by East German Escapees
- R-73 -- President John F. Kennedy's Current Statements, June 1962. With Index January-June 1962
- R-74 -- Reaction to Geneva Agreement on Laos
- R-75 -- Europe at the Crossroads of Integration
- R-76 -- Attitudes, Communications and Communist Propaganda: Fractures in Insurgency in Southeast Asia
- R-77 -- Notes on the Italian Film Industry
- R-78 -- Mexican Aspirations and Expectations: Indications from a Survey of National Urban Opinion
- R-79 -- Listening to Western Broadcasts in Poland, 1960
- R-80 -- Chronological Listing of Reports Issued Between January 1960 and June 1962, Western European Branch
- R-81 -- Notes on the Spanish Film Industry
- R-82 -- Moscow Emphasizes the Role of the "Proletariat" in Arab Countries
- R-83 -- President John F. Kennedy's Current Statement, July 1962
- R-84 -- Calendar of Significant Dates: US & Latin America, September
- R-85 -- The Impact of Telstar Upon the British Public
- R-86 -- World Reaction to Soviet Resumption of Testing
- R-87 -- Developments in Communist Bloc International Broadcasting in the First Half of 1962: A Statistical Report
- R-88 -- Shoddy Construction Hobbles the Soviet Housing Effort: A Satirical View
- R-89 -- Japanese Attitudes Toward the EEC
- R-90 -- IRS Background Facts: The Negro American, Part IV. Emancipation Proclamations September 23, 1862, and January 1, 1963

- R-91 -- World Reaction to Vostok III and IV
- R-92 -- The Broadcasting Industry in Communist China
- R-93 -- Selective Guide to Scholarly Literature, Jan-March 1962
- R-94 -- Selected Quotations from Khrushchev's Statements on the Agricultural Situation in the USSR and on Overtaking the US in Agricultural Production
- R-95 -- Television in Communist China
- R-96 -- Calendar of Significant Dates: US & Latin America, October
- R-97 -- Reaction to the Federation of Malaysia
- R-98 -- Fact Book on Latin America, 1961
- R-99 -- NO REPORT IN FILE
- R-100 - Voice of America Listening in Communist China
- R-101 - Two Soviet Approaches in Reporting on Neutralist Countries, India
- R-102 - Book Publishing in Latin America
- R-103 - Soviet Views on Communist Tasks in Latin America
- R-104 - How Peking's Neighbors View Communist China: Far East Editorial Opinion During the First Half of 1962
- R-105 - Attitudes Toward the European Common Market in Britain and in Three Member Nations
- R-106 - President John F. Kennedy Current Statements, August 1962
- R-107 - Nigeria: A Communications Fact Book
- R-108 - Chronology of Significant Soviet Propaganda Moves Relating to the Resumption of Nuclear Weapons Testing by the USSR and the United States
- R-109 - Media Comment on the Mississippi Crisis (US Race Relations)
- R-110 - French Attitudes Toward De Gaulle on the Eve of the Referendum
- R-111 - Calendar of Significant Dates: US & Latin America, November
- R-112 - Racial Prejudice mars the American Image
- R-113 - The Morale of the East European Professional
- R-114 - President John F. Kennedy Current Statements. September
- R-115 - Soviet Distortion of Sekou Toure's Article in "Foreign Affairs"
- R-116 - Cyprus: A Communications Fact Book
- R-117 - Soviet Heavy Industry and Machine Building
- R-118 - Overseas Reaction to Pres. Kennedy's Cuban Announcement
- R-119 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-120 - The Impact of President Kennedy's Visit to Mexico
- R-121 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-122 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-123 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-124 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-125 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-126 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-127 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-128 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation

- R-129 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-130 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-131 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-132 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-133 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-134 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-135 - The Republic of Togo: A Communications Fact Book
- R-136 - Student Reaction in Bogota to the Mississippi Crisis
- R-137 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-138 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-139 - Response to the VOA Japanese Service Transistor Contest
- R-140 - Voice of America Vietnamese Transistor Contest
- R-141 - Peking Propaganda on the Sino-Indian Border Affair
- R-142 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-143 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-144 - Editorial vs. News Coverage of the Meredith Case
- R-145 - President John F. Kennedy Current Statements. October
- R-146 - Preliminary World Reactions to the Sino-Indian Conflict
- R-147 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-148 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-149 - Poland Revisited
- R-150 - Greece: A Communications Fact Book
- R-151 - Far East Reaction to the Sino-Indian Conflict
- R-152 - The Impact of American Commercial Television in Japan
- R-153 - Calendar of Significant Dates: US & Latin American. Dec
- R-154 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-155 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-156 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-157 - One Month Summary of Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-158 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-159 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-160 - Far East Reaction to the Sino-Indian Border Dispute
- R-161 - Brazilian Public Opinion on Fidel Castro and the US Naval Quarantine of Cuba
- R-162 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-163 - The Impact of American Commercial Television in Western Europe
- R-164 - IRS Background Facts: The Negro American. Part V, Housing
- R-165 - Black Muslims or the Nation of Islam
- R-166 - The Impact of American Commercial Movies in Western Europe
- R-167 - An Assessment of Free World Reactions to the Cuban Situation
- R-168 - World Reaction to the Sino-Indian Conflict
- R-169 - New Delhi Reactions to the Mississippi Desegregation Crisis
- R-170 - Trends in Japanese Public Opinion Toward the US & the USSR
- R-171 - Selective Guide to Scholarly Literature: April-June 1962

- R-172 - Overseas Reaction to the Cuban Situation
- R-173 - World Reaction to the Sino-Indian Conflict
- R-174 - Communist Exploitation of American Racial Incidents: Moscow Lets
US News Items and Pix Tell Its Story Abroad
- R-175 - Chronology of Cuban Events, 1961
- R-176 - Calendar of Significant Dates: US & Latin America, January
- R-177 - World Reaction to the Sino-Indian Conflict
- R-178 - Japanese Attitudes Toward Communist China
- R-179 - President John F. Kennedy Current Statements, Nov 1962
- R-180 - West European Impressions of America from Five Cultural Products
- R-181 - Reported Reasons for Flight of Post-Wall Escapees from East Germany

**“WE CAN LEAVE IT TO THE HISTORIANS”:
A QUESTION ABOUT THE CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS
FOR RESEARCHERS IN THE RUSSIAN ARCHIVES**

by
Thomas G. Paterson
CONNECTICUT

The State Department's Walt W. Rostow wrote the following letter to President John F. Kennedy after the Cuban missile crisis. According to Rostow, the Ambassador from Turkey to the United States, Bulent Usakligil, told him that Nikita Khrushchev's misreading of American politics in the early 1960s influenced the Soviet leader. That is, Khrushchev, in 1962, might have believed that he could get away with the installation of the missiles in Cuba because of an anticipated "disarray" in the American government during another electoral season, in this case the fall congressional elections.

Do the Russian archives contain any documents that speak to this interpretation of Khrushchev's thinking?

Rostow's letter is located in Box 65, Staff Memoranda — Rostow, President's Office File, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston, MA

The Jerry Wadsworth mentioned in the letter is James J. Wadsworth, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, 1960-1961, who served in an "Acting" capacity before receiving full appointment.

The last paragraph refers to Cuba's release of the Bay of Pigs prisoners, December 23-24, 1962, in exchange for food and medicine. On the day of Rostow's letter, Kennedy welcomed the brigade prisoners at a rally in Miami's Orange Bowl.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Counselor and Chairman
Policy Planning Council
Washington

December 29, 1962

Dear Mr. President:

The Ambassador from Turkey presented an interpretation of Khrushchev's behavior in the Cuban crisis that might interest you; namely, that Khrushchev didn't know the difference in U.S. behavior between a Presidential and a Congressional election year.

He observed Khrushchev closely in New York in the fall of 1960 when he represented Turkey at the U.N. General Assembly. He noted then the impact on Khrushchev of seeing the U.S. rudderless during the election campaign, without even Lodge in attendance. He recalled that Jerry Wadsworth was moved into the breach. Khrushchev disported himself freely in that atmosphere. He is convinced that Khrushchev thought the same disarray would prevail during the election campaign of 1962.

We can leave it to the historians to check it out.

May I add a word. I remember with admiration the depth of your concern for the Cubans on the beach at the worst of the April 1961 affair, the night of the Congressional reception, when there was occasion for many other things to be on your mind. And I know that personal concern never left you. Their return now is thus doubly gratifying.

A Happy New Year.

Faithfully yours,
W.W. Rostow

The President
Washington, D.C.

Announcements

Intelligence Study Newsletter

Michael Wala (Erlangen) reports that the *Newsletter*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Winter), of the International Intelligence History Study Group is now available in a WWW version:

<http://intelligence-history.wiso.uni-erlangen.de>

Call for Papers

The 65th annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association will meet November 3-6, 1999, in fort Worth, Texas. Deadline for proposals is October 1, 1998. Send five copies of proposals, including a brief summary of the proposed paper(s) and a *cv* of each presenter to:

For European Sessions - Katherine Kennedy, History, Agnes Scott College, 141 East College Ave., Decatur GA 30030

For Latin American Sessions - Andrew Boeger, History, North Carolina A&T University, Gibbs Hall, Greensboro NC 27411

All other Sessions - Charles Joyner, SHA Program Committee, History, Coastal Carolina University, Conway SC 29526

Call for Papers

The ICBH (Institute of Contemporary British History) of London, England will hold its summer 1998 conference on the theme of "Anglo-American Relations in the 20th Century". The conference will be held from 6-10 July 1998 and interested parties may view news and paper guidelines for this conference at our conference site at: <http://ihr.sas.ac.uk/icbh/angloam>

For any further details and information about paper proposals, the ICBH may be directly contacted at: icbh@sas.ac.uk

The Institute of Contemporary British History's Home Page may be viewed at: <http://ihr.sas.ac.uk/icbh>

Travel Grant Opportunity

The Horace Samuel & Marion Galbraith Merrill Travel Grants in Twentieth-Century American Political History were inaugurated in 1998 to promote access of young scholars to the Washington, DC, region's rich primary source collections in late nineteenth- and twentieth-century American political history. The grants also provide the opportunity for scholars to interview former and current public figures residing in the metropolitan Washington area. The program offers stipends to underwrite travel and lodging expenses for the Organization of American Historians who are working toward completion of a dissertation or first book.

Please send four complete copies of application materials by January 8, 1999 to the Organization of American Historians, 112 North

Bryan Street, Bloomington, IN 47408-4199, attention Horace Samuel & Marion Galbraith Merrill Travel Grants in Twentieth-Century American Political History.

- Amounts: Grants range from \$500 to \$3,000 and are awarded to individuals on a competitive basis.
- Application requirements: There is no standard application form. The complete application should not exceed ten pages.
- Cover sheet: Include name, address, phone numbers, social security number, institutional affiliation when appropriate, project title, a project abstract not to exceed one hundred words, and total amount requested.
- Project description: In one thousand words or less, describe the projects goals, methods, and intended results.
- Vita: Submit a standard resume of academic experience and achievements.
- Budget: Indicate how the requested funds will be spent and the extent of matching funds available.
- References: Graduate students must include two letters of reference from people familiar with their academic work.
- Selection process: A committee of three judges will consider the significance of the research project; the project's design, plan of work, and dissemination; its contribution to American political history; its relationship to current scholarship; and appropriateness of the budget request.

Historian's Office Web Page

The Department of State announces a new home page prepared by the Department's Office of the Historian featuring basic information on the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series, the official documentary record of U.S. foreign policy compiled in the Historian's Office, and the texts of press releases and summaries of recently released volumes. The full texts of some *FRUS* volumes can also be accessed from this site. The new page also presents

complete editions of the Office of the Historian's other publications.

The site also contains Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on the history of the State Department and the Foreign Service and descriptive information on the Advisory committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation. A Timeline of brief narrative essays on major events in U.S. diplomatic history is currently under development.

The complete address of the Office of the Historian's web site is:
http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/history/index.html

Cold War Conference

The Los Alamos Historical Society, the Union Institute, and the University of New Mexico/Los Alamos, are sponsoring "The Cold War and Its Implications: Locally, Nationally and Internationally" at the University of New Mexico, Los Alamos, August 9-12, 1998.

Contact Fran DiMarco, conference manager at: 888-809-3898; FAX 888-455-9539

Inter-American Relations Conference

Arizona State University will host the third Bi-Annual Conference on Inter-American Relations, February 11-12, 1999, at Tempe, Arizona. The program committee invites papers and entire panels (in English or Spanish). The committee defines Inter-American relations as including all relationships at all levels (political, non-governmental, economic, individual, cultural) between the various nations of the western hemisphere. They especially encourage people from Latin America, Canada, and Europe to participate.

Send proposals to: Kyle Longley, Department of History, Arizona State University, Box 872501, Tempe, Arizona 85287 (Fax: 602 835 0310).

E-mail: Longley@asuvm.inre.asu.edu [Longley prefers "snail mail" submission due to the differences in e-mail programs and the difficulties sometimes created. Nevertheless, feel free to contact him via e-mail.]

Call for Papers

The Department of African and African American Studies Penn State is organizing an interdisciplinary conference on "African American and the Age of American Expansion, 1898-1999." The conference is scheduled for March 26-28, 1999, at the University Park campus in University Park, PA 16802. Papers are solicited which will explore (1) the role and impact of African Americans in the process of American expansion initiated by the Spanish American War; (2) the internationalization of the politics of race and its impact upon both American domestic politics and foreign policy; and (3) the contribution of African Americans to shaping the activities of the African Diaspora. Participation is open to scholars in both the humanities and the social sciences.

Proposals for papers should be submitted to: Cary Fraser, Department of African and African American Studies, The Pennsylvania State University, 236 Grange Building, University Park, PA 16802 (Phone 814-863-4243; FAX 814-863-4837). The closing date for submissions is September 1, 1998.

Letters

Dear editor,

I want to record my dismay over Professor Doron Ben-Atar's comments on William A. Williams in the article "Rethinking the Franklin Mission" (*Diplomatic History*, Winter 1998). The nasty tone of, and the distortions in, Ben-Atar's remarks suggest an effort to score points and prove "political correctness." Nevertheless, his essay shows, without acknowledging or apparently even understanding it, that Williams has indirectly or directly influenced his own thinking.

Aside from ignoring the 200 pages that Williams devoted to early U.S. history in *The Contours of American History* (1961), Professor Ben-Atar distorts the argument that Williams presented in his *William and Mary Quarterly* essay on "The Age of Mercantilism..." (1958). By quoting selectively from two sentences on p.426 of that article, Ben-Atar suggests that Williams' concept of early American empire was simply trade based, but it was more complicated than that. While Williams held that "commercial empire" was an object of the Founders, on the same page of the *WMQ* article he argued that James Madison "provided the theoretical basis for an American mercantilism combining commercial and territorial expansion with political democracy." Indeed, in one of the sentences that Ben-Atar quoted, Williams referred to both "commercial" and "continental empire." Whatever one may think of Williams' arguments, they should be represented accurately.

In between the selective quotes, Professor Ben-Atar throws in the word "bad" to suggest that it included anti-imperial polemics. But whatever Williams thought about empire in 1958, his *WMQ* article was far from polemical in content. To suggest otherwise is misleading.

Ironically, Professor Ben-Atar's analysis of Franklin is Williamsesque in its implications and phraseology. On p. 110, he characterizes Franklin's goal as the creation of an "integrative, self-sufficient North American economy." On the next page, he has Franklin basing "American Identity" on a "balanced neo-mercantilist political-economy." Compare those statements with what Williams wrote in the *WMQ* article: "mercantilists were essentially nationalists who strove for self-sufficiency though increased domestic production and a favorable balance (and terms) of trade." Moreover, "mercantilists constantly labored to build a tightly organized and protected national market and to increase their share of the world market. The key points in their program were integration at home and expansion abroad."

Despite the interesting parallels between what Williams wrote in 1958 and what Ben-Atar thinks today, the latter is more interested in discrediting Williams than in acknowledging, much less exploring, similarities. One can find faults in the writings of William A. Williams, but his extraordinary methodological and analytical contributions deserve better than Professor Ben-Atar's snide remarks.

Sincerely,

William Burr
The National Security Archive

Obituary

Jules Davids, the respected and popular professor of U.S. diplomatic history in the School of Foreign Service and the Graduate School of Georgetown University, died after a long illness on 6 December 1996. He had spent his entire active and productive life at Georgetown. After graduating from Brooklyn College, he came as a student to the University, earning the degree of Master

of Science in Foreign Service in 1945, and receiving his Ph.D. from the Graduate School two years later with a dissertation on U.S.-Mexican relations. He had already joined the faculty of the School of Foreign Service (in 1946), and for the next forty years he taught what became a famous undergraduate survey course in U.S. diplomatic history, as well as electives, and courses in the Graduate School. Illness forced his retirement in the spring of 1986, at the age of 65.

The four decades of Jules' professional life were filled with activity and achievements. He merged his dynamic teaching with professional obligations and extensive research and publication into a career whose contributions were often not fully recognized because of his own low-key approach to his work. His accomplishments were quietly attained, and even his colleagues only imperfectly realized how active his life had been.

By the early 1950s he was beginning to achieve recognition as a teacher of diplomatic history. In 1954, Jacqueline Kennedy, newly arrived in Washington, enrolled as a special student in Jules' survey course - one of the few women to be admitted to the then theoretically coed, but overwhelmingly male, School of Foreign Service. She was impressed by his lectures, and it was no accident that Senator Kennedy turned to Jules for aid in preparing what would become his Pulitzer Prize winning *Profiles in Courage*. Jules made significant contributions in content, organization, style, and preliminary drafting, but was himself the soul of silence about his role. It was only after I had known him for a number of years that he even made a glancing reference to that work.

Slowly, in the months after I arrived at Georgetown in 1958 to teach European diplomatic history, we came to know each other and to work together in a warm professional friendship for close to thirty years. To my pleasure, I had been assigned an office next door to his, but some time elapsed before we actually met. In those days, faculty tended to dash to their classes, and leave swiftly after they were over. Moreover, a good many classes were held at night,

which made contact with one's colleagues even more difficult. As the Fall of 1958 progressed and I worked busily in my office on my new preparations, I became aware of a regular phenomenon: every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday at invariably 11:13, I would hear the rush of hasty footsteps in the hall, a key turned the lock next door, then a half minute of silence, followed by the bang of the door and retreating footsteps. As I ultimately found out, the sounds were of Jules Davids arriving to meet his now famous survey course at precisely 11:15. Ultimately, I *did* meet the owner of the footsteps, and as the semesters went by, we became better acquainted. At this time, Jules was completing the remarkable work of contemporary history, *America and the World of Our Time*, which Random House published in 1960. It was very favorably received - the *New York Times* cited it as one of the best books of the year on American foreign affairs - and it went through two later editions, in 1962 and 1975.

One had the feeling that Jules made every minute count. He was always on the go with his varied projects, but at the same time he was a constructive and encouraging teacher. I never saw him harshly criticize or take to task a student, but he effectively made the delinquent scholar fully conscious of his or her shortcomings. In the classroom, his impact upon students was impressive. Quiet and gentle though he was in professional contact, he became alive on the podium. Forceful, dynamic, fully engaged in his topic, he was no dry-as-dust diplomatic historian. He earned the respect and admiration of generations of students, among whom was the campus leader of the sixties, Bill Clinton. In 1979 Jules was chosen as "best teacher of the year" in the School of Foreign Service. Three years later the University awarded him its outstanding service medal. He is remembered annually at commencement time through the award of a silver medal in his name to that year's highest ranking graduate in U.S. diplomatic history.

From its earliest days, SHAFR was one of Jules' most committed interests. Actively involved in its organization in the later sixties, Jules then was instrumental in negotiations for the publication of its

journal, *Diplomatic History*, by Scholarly Resources. Also, he arranged for the first of SHAFR's annual conferences, held at Georgetown in August 1975. He then edited a volume of papers selected from the conference proceedings to be published by Arno Press in 1976. It was typical of his modest approach to his active life that amidst our by then frequent contacts in meetings, dissertation consultations, and oral examinations, the only mention Jules ever made of the conference (I was not then a member of SHAFR) was the quick comment: "By the way, Tom, we're having a little meeting of the diplomatic historians here in August."

Similarly, only gradually did I learn of his big project for the seventies: the compilation of a three-part series (53 volumes in all) of documents, in transcription and facsimile, concerning American relations with China from 1843 to 1904. We never really knew of the magnitude of this project until the volumes began to appear, for Jules spoke of it only briefly and hastily while hurrying after class to the National Archives to supervise the team of graduate students who helped to produce this impressive collection which stands as a special monument to his professional activity.

In the eighties, Jules became absorbed in what would have been the crown of his career: a political biography of Averill Harriman for the years after 1945. Every spare minute that he could find he spent in files at the Harriman residence in Georgetown. Tantalizingly, Jules would pass on interesting bits of information from the archives while on the run from class to his car to get to the Harrimans, and, incidentally, often spend frustrating minutes searching for a place to park. We looked forward to seeing the product of his work, which would have been an important contribution to the history of American post-war foreign affairs. But in the Spring of 1986 the onset of Alzheimer's disease made it necessary for him to retire and abandon the Harriman project.

SHAFR's annual conference for 1986 was scheduled for June at Georgetown, just a month after Jules' retirement. It was my privilege to succeed him as local arrangements chair. Although

Jules did not come to the opening address and evening reception the next day he attended sessions and met with friends and colleagues. It was a special and moving pleasure to see him circulating in the halls and enjoying a day of spirited visits with members of the organization to which he had contributed so much.

Thomas Helde
Georgetown University (emeritus)

PERSONALS

Columbia University has awarded Walter LaFeber, SHAFR's vice president, the Bancroft Award for his recent book, *The Clash: U.S.-Japanese Relations Throughout History* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1997).

Carol Anderson (Missouri) and W. Taylor Fain III (Virginia) have received a 1997 Abilene Travel Grant from the Eisenhower Library.

W Taylor Fain III (Virginia), Richard Filipink, Jr. (SUNY), and Andrew Johns (Santa Barbara) have received grants from the Lyndon B. Johnson Foundation for research at the Johnson Library.

Kyle Longley (Arizona State) has been awarded the A.B. Thomas book prize by the Southeastern Council on Latin American Studies for his book, *The Sparrow and Hawk: Costa Rica and the United States during the Rise of Jose Figueres*.

Jeffrey Nadaner (Yale) and Lise Namikas (USC) have been awarded 1997 Abba Schwartz Fellowships for dissertation research.

Lawrence Wittner (State University of New York, Albany) has received an NEH 1998 summer stipend for research on volume 3 of his trilogy, *The Struggle Against the Bomb*.

CALENDAR

1998

- August 1 Deadline, materials for the September *Newsletter*.
- November 1 Deadline, materials for December *Newsletter*.
- November 1-15 Annual election for SHAFR officers.
- November 1 Applications for Bernath dissertation fund awards are due.
- November 15 Deadline for SHAFR summer conference proposals.
- November 15 Deadline for Myrna F. Bernath research fellowship proposals.

1999

- January 1 Membership fees in all categories are due, payable at Blackwell Publishers, 350 Main St., Malden MA 02148.
- January 7-10 The 113th annual meeting of the AHA will take place in Washington.
- January 15 Deadline for the Bernath Article Award.
- February 1 Submissions due for Warren Kuehl Award, deadline for the Bernath Book Award, deadline for March *Newsletter*, and deadline for Ferrell Book Prize.
- February 15 Deadline for the Bernath lecture prize.
- March 1 Deadline for Graebner Prize nominations.
- April 1 Applications for the W. Stull Holt dissertation fellowship are due.
- April 22-25 The 92nd meeting of the OAH will take place at the Sheraton Centre Toronto.
- May 1 Deadline, materials for the June *Newsletter*.
- June 24-27 SHAFR's 24th annual conference will meet at Princeton.

Future OAH meetings will be at the Adam's Mark St. Louis, March 30-April 2, 2000.

PUBLICATIONS

Robert Dallek (UCLA), *Lyndon B. Johnson, 1960-1973: Vice President and President, volume 2*. Oxford, 1998. ISBN 0-19-505465-2, \$30.00.

Alex Danchev (Keele), *On Specialness: Essays in Anglo-American Relations*. Macmillan/ St. Martin's, 1998. ISBN 0-333-69997-1 (Macmillan), 0-312-17647-3 (St. Martin's).

Robert H. Ferrell (emeritus - Indiana), *The Presidency of Calvin Coolidge*. University Press of Kansas, 1998. ISBN 0-70060892-3, \$29.95.

Lloyd C. Gardner (Rutgers) and Ted Gittinger, eds., *Vietnam: The Early Decisions*. Univ of Texas, 1997. ISBN 0-292-72800, \$35.00.

INFORMED SOURCES

DOCUMENTS OF SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS. Edited by Harold J. Goldberg
New. Volume 3. Diplomatic Relations, Economic Relations, Propaganda, International Affairs, Neutrality, 1933-1941. 170 documents.

A comprehensive documentary survey of the relations between the superpowers of the twentieth century. Twelve volumes when complete. Introductions, headnotes, annotation, subject, name, place, institution indexes. About 450 pages each. In English.

Volumes 1-3 (1917-1941) in print. 467 documents in 958 pages.

\$77 each by subscription / \$97 each non-subscription

See for yourself! Visit AIP's web site for contents, introductions, prefaces, sample documents.

Please forward this along with your order request to your librarian.

ACADEMIC INTERNATIONAL PRESS • PO Box 1111 • Gulf Breeze FL 32562-1111 • USA
850-932-5479 (fax) • aipress@aol.com (email) • www.pcola.gulf.net/~bevon (web site)

Mary Giunta (National Historical Publications and Records Commission), *Documents of the emerging nation: U.S. Foreign Relations, 1775-1780*/ Scholarly Resources, 1998. Cloth: ISBN 0-8420-2663-0, \$55.00; paper: ISBN 0-8420-2664-9, \$19.95

Gary Hess (Bowling Green State), *Vietnam and the United States*. Twayne, 1998. Revised paper edition: ISBN 0-8057-1676-9, \$18.00.

Michael H. Hunt (North Carolina), *The Genesis of Chinese Communist Foreign Policy*. Columbia, 1998. New in paper. ISBN 0-231-10311-5, \$18.50.

Charles S. Maier (Harvard) *Dissolution: The Crisis of Communism and the End of East Germany*. Princeton U., 1997. ISBN 0-691-07879-3, \$29.95.

Joseph A. Maiolo (London School of Economics and Political Science), *The Royal Navy and Nazi Germany, 1933-39: A Study in Appeasement and the Origins of the Second World War*. St. Martin's, 1977. ISBN 0-333-72007-5.

Gary B. Ostrower (Alfred), *The United States and the United Nations*. Twayne, 1998. ISBN 0-8057-7937-x, \$29.95.

Galen Roger Perras, *Franklin Roosevelt and the Origins of the Canadian-American Security Alliance, 1933-1945: Necessary, but Not Necessary Enough*. Greenwood Publishing, 1998. ISBN 0-275-95500-1, \$57.95.

William Weeks (San Diego State), *Building the Continental Empire*. Ivan R. Dee, 1998. New in paper. ISBN 1-56663-136-x, \$9.85.

Donald R. Whitnah (Northern Iowa), *U.S. Department of Transportation: A Reference History*. Greenwood, 1998. ISBN 0-313-28340-0, \$75.00.

SHAFR MEMBER DISCOUNT

The Cuban-Caribbean Missile Crisis of October 1962. Lester H. Brune. (1996) 160pp. \$12.95 paper SHAFR Price (pap) \$8.00

America and the Indochina Wars, 1945-1990: A Bibliographical Guide. Lester H. Brune & Richard Dean Burns, eds (1992) 352pp. \$39.95 SHAFR Price (cloth) \$13.00

Empire on the Pacific: A Study in American Continental Expansion. Norman A. Graebner. (1983) 278pp. \$14.95 paper SHAFR Price (paper) \$9.00

Theodore Roosevelt and the Inter-National Rivalries. Raymond Esthus. (1982) 165pp \$12.95 SHAFR Price (paper) \$8.00

Panama, the Canal and the United States. Thomas M. Leonard. 144pp. \$10.95 paper SHAFR Price (paper) \$6.00

Siracusa. <i>In the Dark House</i> ,,	\$ 9.00	—
Ruddy. <i>Charting an Independent Course</i> ,,	\$ 8.00	—
Tritle. <i>Balkan Currents</i> ,,	\$13.00	—
Siracusa. <i>America's/Australia</i> ,,	\$ 7.00	—
Brune. <i>Cuban-Caribbean Missile Crisis</i>	\$ 8.00	—
Brune. <i>Amer. & the Indochina Wars</i> ,,	\$13.00	—
Graebner. <i>Empire on Pacific</i> ...	\$ 9.00	—
Esthus. <i>Theodore Roosevelt</i>	\$ 8.00	—
Leonard. <i>Panama, the Canal</i>	\$ 6.00	—

Offer limited to *individuals* only. All paperback orders must be prepaid (a personal check is fine).

sub-total _____

(\$2.00 1st bk, \$1.00 add'l bks) postage _____

TOTAL _____

Ship to:

Name: _____

Address _____

Send to: Regina Books, Box 280, Claremont, CA 91711

Telephone (909) 624-8466 FAX (909) 626-1345

Regina



Books

SHAFR MEMBER DISCOUNT

INTO THE DARK HOUSE: American Diplomacy & the Ideological Origins of the Cold War. Joseph M.

Siracusa. (1998) 288pp.

The purpose of this book is twofold: it seeks to delineate some of the ideas, beliefs and assumptions from Franklin D. Roosevelt's shift in Soviet policy in the autumn of 1944 to the resumption of the Korean armistice talks in late 1951; and it seeks to provide students of the early Cold War period with some of the major historical documents that have been the bases of historical interpretations during the past fifty years.

Cloth \$36.95, Paper \$17.95.

SHAFR Price (paper) \$9.00

CHARTING AN INDEPENDENT COURSE: Finland's Place in the Cold War and in U.S.

Foreign Policy. T. Michael Ruddy. (1998) 228pp

The essays in this volume give equal weight to Finland and the Finnish situation as well as the Cold War and the role of the United States. The goal is to shed new light on Finland's place in the Cold War and in American foreign policy.

Cloth \$32.95, Paper \$14.95

SHAFR Price (paper) \$8.00

BALKAN CURRENTS: Studies in the History, Culture & Society of a Divided Land. Lawrence A. Tritle.

(1998)160pp

The essays in this volume give equal weight to Finland and the Finnish situation as well as the Cold War and the role of the United States. The goal is to shed new light on Finland's place in the Cold War and in American foreign policy.

Cloth \$21.95

SHAFR Price (cloth) \$13.00

AMERICA'S AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIA'S

AMERICA. Joseph M. Siracusa & Yeong-Han Cheong (1997) 160pp

"Australia's relations with the United States could never be other than paradoxical." This well received account traces the twists and turns in the relationship, concentrating on the period from the 1940s to the present.

\$21.95 cloth, \$12.95 pap

SHAFR Price (paper) \$7.00

AWARDS, PRIZES, AND FUNDS

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. Gerald J. and Myrna F. Bernath, in memory of their son, and are administered by special committees of SHAFR.

The Stuart L. Bernath Book Prize

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

ELIGIBILITY: The prize is to be awarded for a first book. The book must be a history of international relations. Biographies of statesmen and diplomats are included. General surveys, autobiographies, editions of essays and documents, and works which are representative of social science disciplines other than history are *not* eligible.

PROCEDURES: Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. A nominating letter explaining why the book deserves consideration must accompany each entry in the competition. Books will be judged primarily in regard to their contribution to scholarship. Winning books should have interpretative and analytical qualities of high levels. They should demonstrate mastery of primary material and relevant secondary works, and they should be examples of careful organization and distinguished writing. Five (5) copies of each book must be submitted with the nomination and should be sent to: David Wilson, Department of History, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale IL 62901-4519.

Books may be sent at any time during 1998, but should not arrive later than February 1, 1999.

The prize will be divided only when two superior books are so evenly matched that any other decision seems unsatisfactory to the committee. The committee will not award the prize if there is no book in the competition which meets the standards of excellence established for the prize. The 1998 award of \$2,000.00 will be announced at the annual luncheon of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations held in conjunction with the Organization of American Historians' annual meeting in Spring, 1999.

RECENT WINNERS:

1993 Elizabeth Cobbs	1996 Robert Buzzanco
1994 Tim Borstelmann	1997 Carolyn Eisenberg
1995 James Hershberg Reinhold Wagnleitner	1998 Penny Von Eschen

The Stuart L. Bernath Lecture Prize

DESCRIPTION: The Bernath Lecture Prize seeks to recognize and encourage excellence in teaching and research in the field of foreign relations by younger scholars. Prize-winners normally deliver their lecture at the SHAFR luncheon at the annual meeting of the OAH. The lecture is to be comparable in style and scope to the yearly SHAFR presidential address and is to address broad issues of concern to students of American foreign policy, not the lecturer's specific research interests. The award is \$500, with publication of the lecture in *Diplomatic History*.

ELIGIBILITY: The prize is open to any person under forty-one years of age whose scholarly achievements represent excellence in teaching and research. Nominations may be made by any member of SHAFR or any other member of any established history, political science, or journalism department or organization.

PROCEDURES: Nominations, in the form of a short letter and *curriculum vita*, should be sent directly to the Chair of the Bernath Lecture Committee. The nominating letter requires evidence of excellence in teaching and research and must reach the Committee no later than 15 February 1999. The Chairperson of the Committee is: Elizabeth Cobbs Hoffman, History, University of San Diego, 5998 Alcalá Park, San Diego, CA 92110.

RECENT WINNERS:

1993 Larry Berman	1996 Douglas Brinkley
1994 Diane Kunz	1997 Elizabeth Cobbs
1995 Thomas Schwartz	1998 Robert Buzzanco

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 or essay appearing in a scholarly journal or edited book, on any topic in United States foreign relations that

is published during 1998. The prize is open to any person within ten years of receipt of the Ph D. The article or essay must be among the first six publications by the author. 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 nominations shall be submitted by the author or by any member of SHAFR by January 15, 1999. Three (3) copies of the article shall be submitted to the chairperson of the committee: Gordon Chang, Department of History, Stanford University, Stanford CA, 94305. The award is given at the SHAFR luncheon held in conjunction with the OAH annual meeting.

RECENT WINNERS:

1993 Daniel P. O'C. Greene

1996 David Fitzsimons

1994 Frederick Logevall

1997 Robert Vitalis

1995 Heike Bungert

1998 Nancy Bernhard

The Stuart L. Bernath Dissertation Grant

This grant has been established to help doctoral students who are members of SHAFR defray some of the expenses encountered in the writing of their dissertations.

Requirements are as follows:

1. The dissertation must deal with some aspect of United States foreign relations.
2. Awards are given to help defray costs for dissertation research.
3. Applicants must have satisfactorily completed all other requirements for the doctoral degree.
4. Applications must include:
 - (a) a one-page curriculum vitae of the applicant and a dissertation prospectus;
 - (b) a paragraph regarding the sources to be consulted and their value to the study;
 - (c) an explanation of why the money is needed and how, specifically, it will be used; and
 - (d) 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 \$1000.

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).

Applications should be sent to: Frederick W. Marks III, 112-2072 Drive, Forest Hills, NY 11375. The deadline is November 1, 1998.

RECENT WINNERS:

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1992 Shannon Smith | 1995 Amy L.S. Staples |
| 1993 R. Tyler Priest | Christian Ostermann |
| Christian Ostermann | 1996 David Fitzsimons |
| 1994 Delia Pergande | |

The Myrna F. Bernath Book and Fellowship Awards

A prize award of \$2,500.00 to be offered every two years (apply in odd-numbered years) for the best book by a woman in the areas of United States foreign relations, transnational history, international history, peace studies, cultural interchange, and defense or strategic studies. Books published in 1996 and 1997 will be considered in 1998. Submission deadline is November 15, 1999. Five copies of each book (or page proofs) must accompany a letter of application. Contact: Christine White, History Dept., Penn State University, University Park, PA 16802-5500.

PREVIOUS WINNERS

- 1991 Diane Kunz and Betty Unterberger
1996 Nancy Bernkopf Tucker

An award of \$2500 (apply in even-numbered years), to research the study of foreign relations among women scholars. The grants are intended for women at U.S. universities as well as for women abroad who wish to do research in the United States. Preference will be given to graduate students and newly finished Ph.D's. The subject-matter *should be historically based* and concern American foreign relations or aspects of international history, as broadly conceived. Work on purely domestic topics will not be considered. Applications should include a letter of intent and three copies of a detailed research proposal of no more than 2000 words. Send applications to: Christine White, Department of History, Penn State, University Park, PA 16802-5500. Submission deadline is November 15, 1998.

RECENT WINNERS:

1992 Shannon Smith
1994 Regina Gramer
Jaelyn Stanke
Christine Skwiot

1997 Deborah Kisatsky
Mary Elise Savotte

THE W. STULL HOLT DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP

The Society of Historians for American Foreign Relations is pleased to invite applications from qualified doctoral candidates whose dissertations are in the field of the history of American foreign relations. This fellowship 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 1998, 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 from the director of the applicant's dissertation, are required.

Applications and supporting papers should be sent before April 1, 1999 to: Keith Nelson, History Dept., University of California, Irvine, CA 92715.

The Holt Memorial Fellowship carries an award of \$1,500.00. Announcement of the recipient of the Holt Memorial Fellowship will be made at the Society's annual summer meeting. 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.

RECENT WINNERS:

1991 Kyle Longley
1992 Robert Brigham
1993 Darlene Rivas

1994 Christian Ostermann
1995 John Dwyer
1996 Max Friedman

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 career, lists any teaching honors and awards, and comments 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: Chester Pach, History Department, Ohio University, Athens OH 45701.
The deadline for nominations is March 1, 1999.

RECENT WINNERS:

1986 Dorothy Borg	1992 Bradford Perkins
1988 Alexander DeConde	1994 Wayne Cole
1990 Richard W. Leopold	1996 Walter LaFeber

THE 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 1997 and 1998. Deadline for submissions is February 1, 1999. Current Chairperson: David F. Schmitz, Department of History, Whitman College, Walla Walla WA 99362.

PREVIOUS WINNERS:

1987 Harold Josephson

1993 Thomas Knock

1988 Melvin Small

1995 Lawrence S. Witner

1991 Charles DeBenedetti and
Charles Chatfield

**ARTHUR LINK PRIZE
FOR DOCUMENTARY EDITING**

The inaugural Arthur S. Link Prize For Documentary Editing was awarded at the American Historical Association meeting in December 1991. The prize will be offered hereafter whenever appropriate but no more often than every three years. Eligibility is defined by the following excerpt from the prize rules.

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" is meant 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. 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. Nominations may be made by any person or publisher. The award is \$500 plus travel expenses to the professional meeting where the prize is presented. For all rules and details contact the committee chair. One copy of each entry should be sent directly to each member of the committee. Current Chairperson: Mary Giunta, NHPRC - Room 300, National Archives, Washington DC 20408.

PREVIOUS WINNERS 1991 Justus Doenecke
1996 John C.A. Stagg

THE LAWRENCE GELFAND - ARMIN RAPPAPORT FUND

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations established this fund in to honor Lawrence Gelfand, former SHAFR president and Armin Rappaport, founding editor of *Diplomatic History*. The fund will support the professional work of the journal's editorial office. It was initiated by Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Paterson, who donated earnings from their book, *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, and by the authors of essays in this book, who waived fees. Further donations are invited from authors, SHAFR members, and friends. Please send contributions in any amount to Professor Allan Spetter, SHAFR Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Department of History, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435.

ROBERT H. FERRELL BOOK PRIZE

This is competition for a book, published in 1998, which is a history of American Foreign Relations, broadly defined, and includes biographies of statesmen and diplomats. General surveys, autobiographies, or editions of essays and documents are not eligible. The prize of \$1,000 is to be awarded as a senior book award; that is, any book beyond the first monograph by the author. The deadline for submission of books is February 1, 1999.

Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of SHAFR. Current chairperson: Thomas Noer, Carthage College, Kenosha WI 53140-5438

PREVIOUS WINNERS:

1992 David Anderson and Diane Kunz	1996 Norman Saul
1994 Mel Leffler	1997 Robert Schulzinger
1995 John L. Harper	