

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations



NEWSLETTER

Volume 30

No. 3

September 1999

Page

- 1 Philip Mosely and Access to Berlin by *Daniel F. Harrington*
- 9 Religiosity and Success in American Foreign Policy by
Frederick Marks
- 22 *Foreign Relations* in the 21st Century: A Proposal by *Warren
Kimball*, accompanied by a Resolution on Declassification of
Government Documents
- 36 SHAFR Council Minutes
- 41 Announcements
- 44 Publications
- 46 Calendar
- 47 Personals
- 48 Awards, Prizes, and Funds
-

ISSN 0740-6169

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

Founded in 1967

Chartered in 1972

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

VICE PRESIDENT: Robert Schulzinger, History, Colorado, Boulder CO 80309.

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

PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Steven Schwartzberg, P.O. Box 208206, New Haven, CT 06520-8206.

CHAIR, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Douglas Little, History, Clark U., 950 Main St., Worcester, MA 01610

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 (unemployed rate valid for two years). Institutional Subscription Rates for *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 20, 1996 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. For those wishing only to receive the *Newsletter* the cost is \$15.00. 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*.

**-The SHAFR Website can be reached at:
<http://www.ohiou.edu/~shafr/shafr.htm>**

PHILIP MOSELY AND ACCESS TO BERLIN

by

Daniel F. Harrington

HISTORY OFFICE, UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

The good is the enemy of the best, according to a proverb. The best can be the enemy of the good, in the sense that one may reject a suitable solution to a problem by insisting on a better one. Philip E. Mosely is a case in point. Ivy League academic before and after the Second World War, he is best known among diplomatic historians for his work on the European Advisory Commission drawing up plans for the occupation of Germany. Writing of his experiences in *Foreign Affairs* in 1950, he contended he had done all he could to secure freedom of transit for allied forces in postwar Germany.¹ Yet in the spring of 1945 he blocked a US attempt to seek a quadripartite agreement on transit, in large measure because he thought he could achieve a better one.

Mosely wrote his *Foreign Affairs* essay to defend his wartime superior and senior US representative on the EAC, Ambassador John G. Winant, against allegations that Winant was responsible for the Western failure to secure a written guarantee of access to Berlin. Winant's critics maintained he had trusted in Soviet good will,

¹Philip E. Mosely, "The Occupation of Germany: New Light on How the Zones Were Drawn," *Foreign Affairs*, 28:4 (Jul 50): 580-604.

ignoring warnings from the American military and others.² Mosely countered that he and Winant had tried to ensure Western transit, only to be blocked by military officers at every turn. He had drafted a zonal plan late in 1943 that included an overland corridor connecting Berlin with the Western zones, and Winant in May of the following year had urged addition of detailed access provisions to the EAC zonal protocol. The military not only vetoed these proposals, it did its best to eviscerate the EAC.

While no one has found a copy of Mosely's corridor plan or minutes of Winant's May 1944 conversations with the military, Mosely's account stands up well.³ The Pentagon's records make clear its hostility to the EAC, while other files bear out Mosely's version of events.⁴ The military was likely responsible for deleting a paragraph in instructions to Winant, drafted by Mosely's colleague James Riddleberger, that would have made transit to Berlin a

²For such allegations, see Demaree Bess, "Will We Be Pushed Out of Berlin?" *Saturday Evening Post*, 221:4 (31 Jul 48), 92; *FRUS*, 1948, 2: 919; Lucius D. Clay, *Decision in Germany* (Garden City, N.Y., 1950), 15; Albert L. Warner, "Our Secret Deal over Germany," *Saturday Evening Post*, 225:5 (2 Aug 52): 30ff; and Robert D. Murphy, *Diplomat Among Warriors* (Garden City, N.Y., 1964), 231-32.

³Scholars have taken Mosely's essay as a starting point in their examinations of the access issue ever since. See for example William M. Franklin, "Zonal Boundaries and Access to Berlin," *World Politics*, 16:1 (Oct 63): 1-31; Jean Edward Smith, *The Defense of Berlin* (Baltimore, 1963), 20-33; Tony Sharp, *The Wartime Alliance and the Zonal Division of Germany* (London and New York, 1975); and Daniel J. Nelson, *The Wartime Origins of the Berlin Dilemma* (University, Ala., 1978). Nearly thirty years after Mosely wrote it, Robert Slusser summed up the consensus on the essay when he described it as "fundamentally important." Slusser, "The Opening Phase of the Struggle for Germany," *Slavic Review*, 38:3 (Sep 79): 475.³

⁴CCS 334 EAC (12-18-43), RG 218, NA; file CAD 334 EAC (12-18-43), RG 165, NA; 28 Oct - 12 Nov 43 entries, Henry L. Stimson diaries, Sterling Memorial Library, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; *FRUS*, *Conferences at Cairo and Tehran, 1943*, 197-98, 260, 352-54, 416-20; and minutes of the first three Working Security Committee meetings in box 148, Harley A. Notter files, RG 59, NA.

condition of acceptance of the zonal boundaries.⁵ Colonel George A. Lincoln, one of the Army's senior planners, dismissed the zonal lines as "a matter of very little moment from a military point of view," an odd remark from a member of an organization supposedly worried about Western access to Berlin.⁶ Claims by officers after the blockade that they had urged the diplomats to seek transit guarantees and been ignored also seem unlikely in view of a December 1944 memo by the Director of the Army's Civil Affairs Division. Forwarding the zonal protocol Winant had negotiated to Assistant Secretary of War John J. McCloy, Major General John H. Hilldring pointed out that it lacked guarantees of transit across the Soviet zone but added, "I assume we may take it for granted that such facilities will be afforded."⁷

And yet the situation in 1945 was complex. The military began to take an interest in postwar access in February 1945, and the following month Mosely opposed a suggestion that the EAC accept the principle of free transit. The background to this surprising development is well known. The US Joint Chiefs of Staff sent an access proposal to their counterparts in London and Moscow at the end of February. Rather than dwelling on Berlin, they suggested that the occupying powers accept "the general principle of freedom of transit across zones of occupation." Local commanders would settle details. The British accepted the idea on March 9, the Soviets never responded, and the JCS never pressed the issue.⁸

⁵Cf. WS-134, 134a, and 134b, 13-17 Apr 44, "Working Security Documents 121-154" folder, box 149, Notter files, RG 59, NA.

⁶Memo for record, n.d., attached to Hilldring to Dunn, 10 Apr 44, CAD 334 EAC (12-18-43)(1), section 1, RG 165, NA.

⁷Hilldring to McCloy, 9 Dec 44, CAD 014 Germany (7-10-42), section 10, RG 165, NA.

⁸Sharp, *Wartime Alliance*, 109-10; Franklin, "Zonal Boundaries," 26-27; JCS to Deane, WAR 44641, 27 Feb 45, "MR 371-Germany, Zones of Occupation" folder, box 35, Map Room files, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, N.Y.; JCS

The JCS put forward their proposal as an “interim military measure” pending broader agreements on transit which, they commented, “may be expected from the European Advisory Commission.” This remark prompted the planning committee of the US EAC delegation to draft what it thought might serve as such a broader agreement. Its proposal paraphrased the JCS paper. The four governments would accept “the general principle of freedom of transit for the forces of occupation of the four Occupying Powers by air, road, rail and water across all zones of occupation and all zones of quadripartite occupation.” As in the JCS plan, commanders would make specific arrangements. A covering memo by Lieutenant Colonel Graham Hall, who headed the planning committee, noted that two draft EAC directives envisaged freedom of transit.⁹

When Brigadier General Vincent Meyer raised Hall’s paper at a delegation meeting two days later, Mosely implacably opposed. It was superfluous, because the JCS proposal would take care of short-term transit, while the two draft directives on transport would be more suitable for the longer term. If Meyer thought the US should circulate something in the EAC in case Germany suddenly collapsed, Mosely scoffed at Hall’s text as “essentially a paper to be used in an emergency” that “had not yet arisen.” Further, principles were “of little use” without agreement on how to carry them out. Apparently unhappy over the reliance on consultations among commanders, he also complained the paper emphasized zonal powers at a time when opinion in Washington was emphasizing central authority. The best course would be to continue work on the directives, file the planning committee’s paper, and keep it available in case of need. When Mosely remarked that Washington was

1242, 6 Feb 45, CCS 381 (8-20-43), section 11, RG 218, NA, and CCS 786/1, 9 Mar 45, section 10, same file.⁸

⁹Memo, Planning Committee to Joint US Advisers, 21 Mar 45, with attached Draft Agreement, 21 Mar 45, file 519.9744-21, Air Force Historical Research Agency, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.

developing a new policy and freedom of transit might be included, a colonel suggested sending the paper there so it could be included in the deliberations. Mosely relentlessly quashed that idea, too. It would be better to wait for Washington's paper before suggesting revisions. With Meyer out of arguments and Mosely unwilling to budge, the meeting decided to shelve the paper.¹⁰

How can we explain the paradox of a man opposing something he supported? The answer rests on the distinction between the principle of freedom of transit and the planning committee's embodiment of it. Mosely could (and did) reject the latter while endorsing the former. Grounds existed for opposing the committee's draft. It was little more than a paraphrase of the JCS paper and superfluous if the Soviets accepted that document. The same would be true if the EAC approved the directives the US delegation was drafting. Neither would happen, but Mosely could not know that.¹¹

Mosely probably thought any agreement based on this vague staff paper might preclude a more specific accord. He was, as he wrote in 1950, working on such a draft. His paper would have allowed the US commander to choose any two railroads and any two highways. The US could repair railway lines, roads, bridges and signals as it saw fit, as well as maintain gasoline stations, rest areas, and repair patrols along the routes. If any route became

¹⁰Minutes of 61st Meeting of the Joint US Advisers, EAC, 23 Mar 45, folder 3, box 4, Policy Records Retained by Military Adviser to US Delegate, EAC, Records of US Group Control Council, RG 260, NA. Given the parallels between these minutes and Franklin's summary, it seems almost certain that he saw them and, in order not to embarrass Mosely, wrote about them in general terms. See Franklin, "Zonal Boundaries," 27. Mosely had no memory of these events by 1970, writing Daniel Nelson that he did not recall news of the JCS initiative reaching the EAC. Nelson, *Wartime Origins*, 204n18.

¹¹For the fate of the directives, see *FRUS*, 1945, 3: 537-39.

unavailable, the Soviets were to provide an equivalent.¹² Mosely realized such an accord was more likely to win acceptance in Moscow than one allowing Western forces to wander at will in the Soviet zone. That realization, pride of authorship, and the notion that an agreement along these lines would better protect Western interests probably led him to oppose Hall's draft.

The consensus has been that Mosely's draft accord had no effect. When no occasion arose to submit it in the EAC, he gave it and a memo summarizing the background of the access issue to a Colonel Koontz from Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force in mid-May. Daniel Nelson thought this initiative proved a dead end. "There is no way of knowing," he wrote, "whether the memorandum was discussed at SHAEF...and whether it influenced the thinking of the military authorities in subsequent discussions with the Russians. At any rate, the draft agreement was never presented to the Soviet government."¹³

In fact, Mosely's handiwork did influence the military's thinking and it reached the Russians twice in modified form. Further, one can argue judging from a mid-April planning group paper — more a series of questions needing resolution than a definition of needs — discussion of transit and access at SHAEF before V-E Day had not gone beyond generalities.¹⁴ By early June, SHAEF's plans were precise. Major General Floyd L. Parks, appointed commander of the US Berlin garrison, outlined a detailed set of access provisions for discussion with the Soviets. His list echoed Mosely's:

¹²Mosely, "Occupation of Germany," 603.

¹³Nelson, *Wartime Origins*, 125-26. Cf. Sharp, *Wartime Alliance*, 161n54, a more accurate assessment. Jean Edward Smith apparently confused Robert Murphy with Mosely when he claimed the former had passed these detailed recommendations from the US EAC delegation to SHAEF in mid-May 1945. Smith, *Lucius D. Clay: An American Life* (New York, 1990), 268.

¹⁴Scott to SHAEF, 20 Apr 45, Floyd L. Parks papers, US Army Military History Institute, Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

allocation of two highways for entry and later support of the British and American garrisons, "unrestricted movement of British and American motor vehicles on these highways without customs formalities or military police restrictions," rail connections from the two Western zones, and installation and maintenance by British and American forces of phone and telegraph lines along these rail lines and roads.¹⁵ The meeting with Soviet representatives did not take place, but Parks' points were incorporated into briefing papers for use by the SHAEF commander, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, in Berlin June 5. A new paper from Eisenhower's air planners asked for two air corridors connecting Berlin with the Western zones; another applied Parks' principles of unrestricted movement and freedom from customs or police searches to rail traffic, not just highway travel.¹⁶ Marshal Georgi K. Zhukov refused to discuss such matters until Western forces had withdrawn from the Soviet occupation zone, so the SHAEF staff filed the briefing papers.

In mid-June 1945, planners retrieved them for use by General Parks, who was to fly to Berlin to discuss withdrawal from the Russian zone, Western entry into Berlin, and preparations for the Potsdam conference. Lieutenant General Lucius D. Clay, deputy US military governor, instructed him to win Soviet acceptance of a variety of points dealing with access and transit. These amplified Eisenhower's June 5 briefing papers. SHAEF forwarded a copy of this agenda to the US military mission in Moscow for presentation

¹⁵Parks to Barker, 2 Jun 45, "SHAEF/18015/2/GCT 322.01-1/GPS Liaison with the Russians" folder, box 84, SHAEF G-3 Post Hostilities Planning Section Decimal File, 1943-45 (Entry 27), Records of SHAEF, RG 331, NA.

¹⁶SHAEF FWD 23377 to JCS 031830B Jun 45, file 387-1, box 141, SHAEF G-3, Operations 'O' Section Decimal File, 1943-45 (Entry 30), SHAEF Records, RG 331, NA; Jones memo, 3 Jun 45, "SHAEF Post Hostilities" folder, box 2, G-3 Operational Plans, 1943-45 (Entry 23-A), SHAEF Records, RG 331, NA; Clark to Eisenhower, [4] Jun 45, folder 7: "Line of Communication Requirements to Support US Element, Berlin District," Bundle "O," box 2, SHAEF G-3 Records, Subject File 1942-45 (Entry 23), SHAEF Records, RG 331, NA. See also Folder 8: "Proposed Air Routes for USAFIE over Russian Held Territory," loc. cit.

to the Soviets.¹⁷ The Russians would discuss only advance arrangements for Potsdam, so Parks had no occasion to make his case, and once more the access papers were set aside.

The issue reappeared in Clay's well-known meeting with Zhukov on June 29. The day before, at the marshal's request, SHAEF sent the Soviet staff a list of the topics Clay would raise. It included the now-standard US proposals for two railroads, two roads, and airways; access to install and maintain communications lines; freedom from searches; and the right to inspect and repair rail lines and roads.¹⁸ Clay on June 29 won some but not all of what Mosely wanted. Zhukov granted "unrestricted" use of one railway and one autobahn, not two, and he agreed to one 20-mile wide air corridor. Air, road, and rail traffic would conform to routine Soviet police controls but would be free from search or inspections.¹⁹

It was ironic that the last best chance to secure Mosely's aim was left to the US military, which had done so much to thwart him the year before. Adding to the irony, the military's eventual negotiating position almost certainly rested on a paper he had written. More ironic still, Mosely himself had passed up a chance to seek a Soviet commitment to the principle of free transit. Perhaps it would not

¹⁷Clay to Parks, 18 Jun 45, "SHAEF Post-Hostilities" folder, box 2, G-3 Operational Plans (Entry 23-A), SHAEF Records, RG 331, NA; and ETOUSA FWD to Deane S-92155, 21 Jun 45, "SHAEF Message File, Soviet Forces" folder, box 1, SHAEF G-3 TS Incoming and Outgoing Messages, 1944-46 (Entry 24-A), SHAEF Records, RG 331, NA.

¹⁸SHAEF Main to Parks S-93902, 282100B Jun 45, SHAEF/G-5/803, jacket 4, box 22, G-5 Numeric File, 1943-45 (Entry 47), SHAEF Records, RG 331, NA; and Sharp, *Wartime Alliance*, 161.

¹⁹*FRUS, 1945*, 3: 353-61; *ibid.*, Conference of Berlin, 1: 135-37; Clay, *Decision*, 24-27; and "Notes of Meeting at Berlin...", n.d., "Occupation of Germany, 15 Jan 45 - 29 Jun 45" folder, box 45, SHAEF G-3 Subject File, 1942-45 (Entry 23), SHAEF Records, RG 331, NA; and "Record of Meeting with Marshal Zhukov, Berlin, 29 June 1945," 30 Jun 45, FO 1030/294, PRO.

have mattered. Had the EAC accepted Hall's proposal, the details would have been left to local commanders, and transit would have depended on something like the Clay-Zhukov meeting after all. Even so, the Western powers lost an opportunity to obtain transit and access rights in March 1945, and the man responsible was the one whom we have regarded for nearly half a century as the foremost advocate of those rights, Philip Mosely.

RELIGIOSITY AND SUCCESS IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

by
Frederick Marks

So far as I know, no one has ever commented on the link between religiosity and excellence in the conduct of American foreign relations. Yet it can be shown that those presidents and secretaries of state who were most successful in the field of foreign policy were also the most religious. This seemed to me amazing at first sight as I could think of no sage or prophet who ever promised heaven on earth, and I could recall Jesus' description of Satan as "the prince of this world." Piety is simply not a trait normally associated with those who occupy positions of power. Yet the pattern is there; it is inescapable; it is consistent; and it works in reverse: those who appear least religious are also least great.²⁰ More on this in a moment.

In retrospect, I suppose I should not have been all that surprised at my findings given the history of the Jewish kings. David and

¹Edmund Fuller and David Green, in their volume on the religious views of the presidents, list the following as among the least religious: Harrison (William Henry), Taylor, Fillmore, Grant, Arthur, Taft, and Harding.

Solomon, a brace of spiritual giants, were spectacular from a secular standpoint as well. Furthermore, out of roughly thirty-two monarchs who ruled Israel and Judah in the years after Solomon, three were remarkable for their commitment to religious and moral values, and all three were strikingly accomplished in foreign affairs. They are: Asa (c. 913-873), Hezechia (c. 715-687), and Josiah (c. 640-609). Four other sovereigns may be said to have been at least partially committed to the cause of spiritual reform, and again their record in strictly mundane terms is above average. They are: Jehosaphat (c. 873-49), Joash (c. 837-800), Uzziah (c. 800-783), and Jotham (C. 750-42).²¹

Some have held that religion leads to war. But this is not what I found. The twentieth century, least religious by far of all modern epochs, is also the bloodiest, most brutal, and most cruel. Then, too, in biographical terms, I found myself face to face with a recurring linkage between religion and peace. Take, for example, the men responsible for the outbreak of World War II: Neville Chamberlain who looked with abject scorn upon organized religion; Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin, who were of like mind, both of them apostate Christians; and Benito Mussolini, a reprobate. It remained for men of moral fiber and religious conviction — Churchill, Adenauer, De Gaulle, and de Gasperi — to pick up the pieces. Example number two would be Korea. Truman and Acheson, who embroiled America in its first Asian war to rage out of control and lead to repudiation at the polls, were upright but lukewarm on the spiritual front, as compared with those who obtained an honorable peace settlement within months of taking office. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles may well have been the most religiously inspired American twosome on record.

Vietnam presents a similar picture. John Kennedy, who ordered U.S. forces into combat and destabilized the South by conniving in

²¹See 1 Kings and Chronicles in the Bible; also Madeleine I. and J. Lane, eds., *Harper Bible Dictionary* (New York: Harper and Row, 1973).

the overthrow of Diem, and Lyndon Johnson, who escalated the conflict to full-scale war, were less religious than their peacemaking successors, Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger. Despite all the profanity, vulgarity, and duplicity associated with Nixon's Watergate coverup, here was an individual who taught religion as a young lawyer and considered making a career of the ministry. He read the Bible daily during World War II service, went regularly to church during his years out of office, and became the first president to hold Sunday services in the White House.²² The man from Yorba Linda seems never to have lost confidence in the efficacy of prayer, and down to his last day in office, he remained steadfastly loyal to his family. As for Kissinger, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, it's the "swinger" image, affected for a brief interval between marriages, that is most vividly remembered. But here again, there is more to it than meets the eye. It would be hard to find anyone in American diplomatic history as well versed in biblical lore and liturgical practice. As a boy, Kissinger went every morning to the synagogue on his way to school, and there he learned Hebrew, studied scripture, and behaved so well under rabbinical tutelage that he was asked to prepare his younger brother for confirmation. Later in life, though not a practicing Jew, he insisted in his divorce settlement on the religious instruction of his children and served as sponsor for his son's bar mitzvah.²³

The more closely one studies the history of the United States, the more consistent the pattern. The period 1776-1823, known as the "golden age" of American diplomacy, was also a golden age for religion. We have Jefferson's reference to God as the author of human rights in the Declaration of Independence, and a glance at the obverse side of the Great Seal of the United States, printed on

²²Jonathan Aitkin, *Nixon: A Life* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 1993, 1993), 58 (also 46-48).

²³Bruce Mazlish, *Kissinger* (New York: Basic Books, 1976), 31, 221, 253; Marvin and Bernard Kalb, *Kissinger* (Boston: Little Brown, 1974), 10, 146 (on the "swinger" image).

every dollar bill, reveals the eye of the Almighty surveying the building of the American political pyramid. Ben Franklin, who moved to introduce the practice of prayer at the Constitutional Convention, regarded the Bible as the “most faithful of all histories.”²⁴ And John Jay, de facto prime minister of the new nation, was president of the American Bible Society. Small wonder that Alexis de Tocqueville could describe the United States of his time as the most ardently Christian of all great nations.²⁵

And there is more. The peace record of the first four presidents has Washington in first place, John Adams in second, and trailing Adams in third and fourth place, Jefferson and Madison who, like Truman and LBJ, led the country into wars for which it was ill prepared and which failed to attain the objectives for which they were fought. Washington was the most religious of the four, followed by Adams, and after Adams, the Virginians. And so, the pattern holds.

Any list of foreign policy “greats” among the presidents and secretaries of state would have to include Washington, John Quincy Adams, Theodore Roosevelt, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John Foster Dulles, and Ronald Reagan. As “near greats” — I repeat, “near greats” — I’d add Thomas Jefferson, James K. Polk, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Harry Truman (along with Dean Acheson), and Richard Nixon (in concert with Kissinger). Those familiar with the portrait that I draw of FDR in *Wind Over Sand: The Diplomacy of Franklin Roosevelt* will understand my rationale for giving the second Roosevelt a pass, even if they take exception.

²⁴For Franklin’s views on the Bible and his belief in Divine Providence, see his “Address to the United States of America” in *Gentleman’s Magazine* (London), February 1789, vol.59, pt. 1

²⁵America, wrote Tocqueville, is “the place where the Christian religion has kept the greatest power over men’s souls” just as it is “the most enlightened and free” (of the great nations). See Benjamin Hart, *Faith and Freedom* (Dallas: Lewis and Stanley, 1988), 16.

A brief religious profile of each of the “greats” reveals that Washington traveled with a twenty-four page prayer book written out in his own hand, with morning and evening prayers for every day of the week, and when he took command of the Continental armies in 1776, one of the first things he did was to issue an edict outlawing profanity, cursing, and drunkenness while, at the same time, requiring attendance at religious services for rank and file, as well as officers.²⁶ John Quincy Adams, like his father, read the Bible daily. Often, he would attend two services on Sunday, and in his diary, he inveighs against the consequences of indifference to religion.²⁷ Theodore Roosevelt taught religion for seven years, advocated weekly churchgoing, and published a work entitled *Fear God and Take Your Own Part* containing eight references to God on the opening page alone. “Let us care,” he wrote, “for the things of the body, but let us show that we care even more for the things of the soul.”²⁸

Although secularization has made notable gains in the course of the twentieth century, particularly during the twenties, sixties, and seventies, religion has continued to play a prominent part in the lives of American statesmen. Eisenhower, who introduced the practice of cabinet prayer and modified the Pledge of Allegiance to include the phrase “under God,” penned speeches and memoirs that

²⁶*Ibid.*, chapter 5.

²⁷See, for example, *The Diary of John Quincy Adams* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981) — the entries for August 6, 1780, June 17, 1781, July 1, 1781, November 4, 9, 11, and 27, 1785, November 15, 1786, December 7, 14, 21, and 28, 1788 (pp. I: 80, 86, 141, 352, 354, 359, 362, 388, 463-64).

²⁸Frederick W. Marks III, “Morality as a Drive Wheel in the Diplomacy of Theodore Roosevelt,” *Diplomatic History* (Winter 1978), pp. 43-62. See also Theodore Roosevelt *Fear God and Take Your Own Part* (New York: Doran, 1916), 55-58, 139, 165, 170-72, 186, 191, 204, 210, 343 (for Roosevelt’s repeated use of such terms as God, Lord, devil, evil, sin, wicked, and good, not to mention biblical quotes). For the quotation cited in the text, see pp. 57-58. TR advocated weekly churchgoing in an article that appeared in *Ladies’ Home Journal*, October 1917.

are replete with references to the Bible. He and his secretary of state were reared in the fear of the Lord. And Dulles, who has the distinction of being not only the son of a minister but also the father of a priest and who committed to memory practically the entire Gospel of St. John as a boy, was one of the most religious of all secretaries of state.²⁹

Last, but not least, Ronald Reagan. Not a persistent churchgoer and inclined on occasion to be skeptical of organized religion, he was far from irreligious. There are no less than seven references to God and religion in the first fifty-seven pages of his *Autobiography*; and more than once, when asked whom he admired most, he would reply: "The Man from Galilee." Jesus, he insisted, was either what he claimed to be, namely God, or he was the world's greatest liar. And would a liar, Reagan wanted to know, have had the impact on humanity that Jesus had — and continues to have? Would a charlatan go to the cross for the sake of a lie? Such reasoning may sound a bit heavy coming from a happy-go-lucky-actor-turned-politician. But it jibes with Reagan's brand of spirituality. During his acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention, he set aside a minute for silent prayer. As president, he was observed praying in the Oval Office. And so revolted was he by the practice of abortion that he wrote a book on the subject.³⁰

Turning to the "near greats" of American diplomatic history, Thomas Jefferson believed in an afterlife with rewards and punishments, and he described himself as a Christian "sincerely attached" to the "doctrines" of Jesus. He also collected bibles, instituted a school of theology at the University of Virginia, and wrote extensively on the subject of religion: forty-six pages on "The Philosophy of Jesus" and 164 pages on "The Life and Morals

²⁹Frederick W. Marks III, *Power and Peace: The Diplomacy of John Foster Dulles* (Westport, CT - Praeger, 1993), 4, 24-25, 19-25, 221 (nn. 16-17).

³⁰Dinesh D'Souza, *Ronald Reagan* (New York: Free Press, 1997), 212-14; Ronald Reagan, *An American Life* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1990).

of Jesus of Nazareth.” While not belonging to any one church, he made donations to various denominations and often attended services.³¹ James K. Polk of 54° 40’ fame was a strict sabbatarian and faithful churchgoer who wound up becoming a Methodist, and before he passed away, he vowed that “If God grants me length of days and health, I will give a history of the selfish and corrupt considerations which influence the course of public men.”³² Why he is loved!

Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson need no introduction. The man from Illinois has been billed as our most theological president. He read the Bible in the White House just as he read it as a boy, and beyond this, he escorted Mrs. Lincoln to church whenever he could.³³ Wilson, son of a Presbyterian minister, promoted daily Bible reading and practiced what he preached. It is said that every night of his life from adolescence on, he would kneel for prayer. Never one to doubt his creed, he persevered in the faith, attended church as president, and called for days of prayer and thanksgiving.³⁴

Leapfrogging to Harry Truman, we find someone who was again steeped in religion as a child. By the age of twelve, he’d read the Bible twice through and memorized the Sermon on the Mount. Although less religious as an adult, he nevertheless found time as

³¹Merrill Peterson, *Thomas Jefferson and the New Nation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), 957-60; Hart, *Faith and Freedom*, 352 (also 14, 283-84, 351).

³²See the *Dictionary of American Biography*.

³³Benjamin Thomas, *Abraham Lincoln* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1952), 478.

³⁴Arthur Walworth, *Woodrow Wilson* (2 vols. Baltimore: Penguin, 1965), 1:13, 205-206, 285n., 417; II: 373; Stephen Carter, *The Culture of Disbelief* (New York: Anchor, 1944), 100.

president to pray and meditate on Scripture.³⁵ Secretary of State Dean Acheson, son of the Episcopal bishop of Connecticut, shared with Truman a deep-seated aversion to the breaking of matrimonial vows, and he was not out of character signing a letter to one of his secretaries with the words, "God bless you."³⁶ Truman and Acheson are, I suspect, the least religious of all those whose names appear on my roster of "near greats," and, as history would have it, they are the only ones to involve the nation in a devastating military debacle. And so, once again, the pattern holds.

Old time religion and traditional morality are so out of fashion today that historians, uncomfortable dealing with them, have made claims that are little short of ludicrous from a professional standpoint. John Milton Cooper, in *The Warrior and the Priest*, theorizes, without a leg to stand on, that Theodore Roosevelt "may have been a skeptic about the existence of God."³⁷

James Flexner dismisses Washington as a deist and is studious in avoiding any reference to the general's piety, churchgoing, and belief in divine providence. In like vein, Cold War scholar Louis Halle paints the Founding Fathers as "basically agnostic." Then there is Thomas Bailey. In his justly celebrated textbook, he ridicules McKinley's claim to have gotten down on his knees and

³⁵David McCullough, *Truman* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992), 41-55, 60, 86, 185, 890; Alonzo Hamby, *Man of the People* (New York: Oxford, 1995), 21, 474; Robert Ferrell, ed., *Dear Bess* (New York: Norton, 1983), 502, 504-505, 522 (Truman to his wife, October 2, 1943, March 28, 1944, and July 29, 1945).

³⁶David Acheson, *Acheson Country* (New York: Norton, 1993), 199; McCullough, *Truman*, 185; Dean Acheson, *Among Friends* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1980) 79 (Acheson to Jeffrey Kitchen, July 13, 1953).

³⁷John Milton Cooper, *The Warrior and the Priest* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), 88; Thomas Flexner, *George Washington: The Forge of Experience* (Boston: Little Brown, 1965), 245; Louis Halle, *Civilization and Foreign Policy* (New York: Harper, 1952), 22.

prayed for guidance governing the Philippines.³⁸ Did Professor Bailey know, when he wrote as he did, that the home in which McKinley grew to manhood was otherworldly in the extreme? That the president's mother dreamt of his becoming a bishop? And that if anyone believed in the power of prayer, it was he? As an adult, McKinley served as trustee of his church, and when fatally wounded by an assassin's bullet, his response was quintessentially Christian: "Don't let them hurt him," he murmured (referring to his would-be murderer). Minutes later, on the operating table for intrusive and possibly lethal surgery, he prayed, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done." According to biographer Charles Olcott, the man who waged the "Splendid Little War" against Spain and came out of it a hero was "deeply religious."³⁹

This is not, you will understand, a matter of personalities. Thomas Bailey was a distinguished historian for whom I have the utmost respect, and I should say the same of Cooper and Flexner. The crux of the issue is what becomes of scholarly detachment, not to say plain horse sense, when it comes to matters of religion and morality. Regarding the first Roosevelt, one of the nation's capital moralizers, Eugene Trani remarks: "He deemed every war in which Americans fought to be just." This despite the fact that in TR's well-advertised view, the Mexican War was unjust, the spirit of Manifest Destiny piratical, and the indiscriminate massacre of American Indians deplorable.⁴⁰

Nothing illustrates the point better than some material that I chanced to run across on Winston Churchill. One author has Churchill

³⁸Thomas Bailey, *A Diplomatic History of the American People*, 9th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1974), 474: "It is possible that McKinley heard the voice of the people rather than the voice of God, for his statement [on prayer] has most of the earmarks of imperialism."

³⁹Charles Olcott, *The Life of William McKinley* (2 vols. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916), I:11-12; II: 316, 318, 368-71.

⁴⁰Marks, "Morality."

rejecting the immortality of the soul, while another pegs him as an atheist.⁴¹ This seemed to me so utterly farfetched when I saw it, even though it bore the imprint of Scribner in one case and Simon and Schuster in the other, that I made a beeline for the primary sources. It didn't take long to find an essay written by Churchill in his mid-fifties in which he speaks of life hereafter, affirms his belief in miracles, and defends the reliability of the Bible.⁴² Further inquiry led me to speeches and maxims well sprinkled with words such as "good" and "evil," "God," "the devil," and "hell." That Churchill believed in free will, the sacred and binding nature of marriage between man and woman, and moral judgment on the part of the historian is beyond doubt.⁴³

As most of us would accord Churchill a place among the world's "greats," we are afforded yet another indication of the viability of our hypothesis. And one can go further. Strong values are

⁴¹For denials of Churchill's religiosity, see John Pearson, *The Private Lives of Winston Churchill* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991), 417; and Maurice Ashley, *Churchill As Historian* (New York: Scribner's 1968), 18.

⁴²Winston Churchill, *Amid These Storms* (New York: Scribner, 1932), 280 (re: his "hope of immortality"), 288 and 291-92 (re: miracles and hell), 293 (re: reliability of the Bible).

⁴³Ashley, *Churchill As Historian*, 18-20. For WSC's belief in an afterlife, see Churchill, *Amid These Storms*, 182, 258; Pearson, *Churchill*, 398; A. J. P. Taylor et al., *Churchill Revised* (New York: Dial, 1969), 268; Robert Blake and William Roger Louis, eds., *Churchill* (New York: Norton, 1993), 515. For WSC's belief in Divine Providence, see Taylor et al., *Churchill Revised*, 251; Blake and Louis, eds., *Churchill*, 517; Winston S. Churchill, *Maxims and Reflections* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1947), 72, 107. For WSC's belief in God: Pearson, *Churchill*, 152-53; Taylor et al., *Churchill*, 263; Churchill, *Maxims*, 71, 107, 171; Churchill, *Amid These Storms*, 171, 213, 261. For WSC's confidence in the Bible, see Churchill, *Maxims*, 99, 170 (references to the Old and New Testaments). For his belief in Christian ethics and civilization in contrast to "barbarism," see Churchill, *Maxims*, 104, 125; Churchill, *Amid These Storms*, 277. For his belief in "right" and "wrong," see his *Maxims*, 168. And for his belief in prayer and simple faith in God, as well as in free will, see his *Maxims*, 63, 168, 172.

characteristic of virtually *all* of the world's greatest rulers: from Caesar Augustus and Charlemagne to Otto the Great of Germany and Louis IX of France, from Isabella of Spain and Elizabeth I of England to Maria Teresa of Austria, not to mention Hammurabi, Ramses II, Saladin, and Suleiman the Magnificent. Applying the pattern to other areas of culture, one can name Beethoven, Bach, Haydn and Mozart in music — all highly devout; in literature: Dante and Shakespeare, Milton and Bunyan; in painting: Michelangelo, Leonardo, Rembrandt and Rubens; in science: Roger Bacon and Sir Isaac Newton, Louis Pasteur and Madame Curie. In architecture, one thinks of the Parthenon, a temple dedicated to the virgin goddess Athena; then of the gothic cathedrals, erected by people of surpassing faith; also of the Taj Mahal, built by a mogul of strong Islamic persuasion and unassailable rectitude. The Taj, a working mosque, is covered with inscriptions from the Koran.⁴⁴

What, then, are we to conclude? Is churchgoing to be regarded as some kind of magic talisman? Hardly. There have always been men who were good but unchurched, just as there have been churchmen who were anything but good. Taken seriously, however, the religion that brings people to church also builds character and, in so doing, ensures against blackmail. It is a training ground for literacy and meditation, among the hallmarks of inspired leadership. It acts, in the third instance, as a spur to prudent risk-taking since its followers are securely anchored in the hope of eternal life. Fourthly, it makes for credibility, something indispensable for the diplomat. The spiritual man is apt to be a balanced man as well, for while religion fosters idealism, it also instills a wholesome distrust of human nature, inclining its adherents to a respectable defense posture. At the same time, it militates against parochialism inasmuch as priests, rabbis, and ministers operate across national boundaries. Finally, if one hearkens to the

⁴⁴Taking Mozart, for example, see Wallace's translation of his letters from the German — *The Letters of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, 1769-1791*, 2 vols — 1:107, 160-61, 209, 212-14, 273; II: 60, 145, 222 (dated February 2, July 3, and December 26, 1778; July 25, and December 15, 1781; and August 17, 1782).

voice of the prophet, it puts one in touch with the source of all creativity, offering an “in” with the Almighty, who hears the prayers of his faithful and acts upon them.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. rejects out of hand the notion that we are a “chosen people” entrusted with a “sacred mission,” and one may be tempted at times to agree with him.⁴⁵ Hubris and chauvinism worm their way into the psyche of any nation that is at once successful in economic terms and militarily powerful, and they are surely to be resisted. It would be less than responsible, however, to underestimate the power of ideas, including, and most especially, religious ideas. It is a good thing that diplomatic historians have been taking such pains of late to broaden the scope of their inquiry and to weigh the influence of a myriad of cultural determinants, even if the concept is not exactly new. Sixty years ago, Albert K. Weinberg published a milestone work, *Manifest Destiny* (1935), in which he highlighted religion as an element in the makeup of imperialist oratory. A couple of decades later, James McNall Burns devoted a full chapter of his magnum opus, *The American Idea of Mission*, to religious thought and imagery. It was around this time, too, that Henry R. Luce, the impressionable son of missionary parents and multimillionaire owner of *Time*, *Life*, and *Fortune*, based an appeal for greater American involvement overseas on Jesus’ parable of the Good Samaritan.⁴⁶

Clearly, there is much to be said on the subject of religion and American foreign policy, some of it profound, some of it less so. As an aside, I should add that Edward Everett, the renowned orator and classics scholar who took England by storm as American minister and served ably as secretary of state under Millard Fillmore, was an ordained minister, while Henry Clay, the Great Pacificator and secretary of state under John Quincy Adams, was

⁴⁵Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., “Starting a Third Century” (*Wall Street Journal*, December 29, 1976).

⁴⁶Henry R. Luce, “The American Century,” *Life*, February 17, 1946, p.65.

the son of a clergyman. Of greater moment, and closer to the present, sentiment has been building on Capitol Hill for a more vigorous defense of the rights of Christians faced with religious persecution abroad. It is not without irony that this comes at a time when one must reckon with the long-term effect of America's record-breaking export of pornography, coupled with the enormous pressure being brought to bear by the Department of State on Third World countries for abortion, sterilization, and contraception, all of it under the rubric of "population control," yet no less offensive on this account to the religious sensibilities of a large portion of the world's people. Not long ago, George Kennan sympathized with Soviet revulsion at the "decadence" and "lurid quality" of American life, and Khomeini of Iran could speak of Uncle Sam as "the great Satan."⁴⁷ Neither Kennan nor Khomeini would have any reason to revise their estimate of American culture were they with us today, for ours is an age when enemies of the United States can build their case and commit acts of terrorism in the name of a higher morality. De Tocqueville's tribute to American virtue seems far removed.

By way of summation, I would simply reiterate my belief that there is room in our field for a more sophisticated and insightful handling of matters religious and moral. Too often, such topics have been avoided, minimized, or misconstrued on the basis of glib generalization. Although no one can discern the shape of the future, one thing seems clear. Religious enthusiasm is on the rise in the countries of the former Soviet Union, in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The number of Catholics in Africa alone has risen from 100,000 at the turn of the century to 100,000,000 today, and vocations to the priesthood are booming. Even in the United States, Christian traditionalists regularly outperform their mainline competitors in the winning of converts. Islam, too, is on the move. Indeed, if current demographic trends continue and the mosques rising across France, Spain, Germany, and Italy continue to make

⁴⁷For Kennan, see George F. Kennan, *The Nuclear Delusion* (New York: Pantheon, 1962), 98.

their appearance in places such as New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and elsewhere, American politics, along with the politics of western Europe, will be dramatically reconstituted. And so, for this reason, along with others, it seems safe to say that spiritual considerations will remain a significant factor in the orientation of American policy makers, as well as in the making of American foreign policy.

*FOREIGN RELATIONS IN THE 21st
CENTURY: A PROPOSAL*

02 June 1999

From: Warren F. Kimball
To: Historical Advisory Committee (Dept. of State)
Subj: 2nd PRELIMINARY REPORT

With the modern *Foreign Relations* series approaching the 21st Century, this is an appropriate time to ask if the series is meeting its mission and purpose. In a recent report to the Historical Advisory Committee, the Historian of the State Department, William Slany, posed a challenge:

The evolving needs of American scholars and the government itself require a new goal and mission for the *Foreign Relations* series and the historians of the Department of State. The ongoing historical discourse over the meaning of the Cold War and the significance of U.S. commitments, and the evidence the record provides for understanding this nation's post-Cold War foreign policy is what is at stake....A different and more relevant way of looking at the objectives of historical disclosure and achieving the dissemination of the government's foreign affairs record must be undertaken.

Because the record of American foreign relations since the Second World War is so vast and complex, the print volumes of *FRUS* can no longer approach being a “comprehensive” record. Even if the actual number of print pages/volumes had not decreased over the past two decades, the *percent* of documentation printed versus what is in the files would still have dropped dramatically. Although quantity should not be conflated with quality, some print volumes of the *FRUS* series now contain so small a portion of the record that they may verge on being misleading, despite the best professional efforts of the HO staff. The seemingly obvious solution would be to expand the number of printed pages/volumes for each subject covered by the *FRUS* series. But that is neither a practical nor a cost-effective answer. To produce the “thorough” and “comprehensive documentation” required by statute could require a print series larger by three times or more — and even that would not solve the problem as we move into the era of e-mail and other electronic records.

The statutory charge for the *Foreign Relations* series is set forth in the “Foreign Relations” statute, Public Law 102-138 of 28 October 1991 (22 USC 4351, et seq.), which states that the series “shall be a thorough, accurate, and reliable documentary record of major United States foreign policy decisions and significant United States diplomatic activity.” The law goes on to insist that the volumes “shall include all records needed to provide a comprehensive documentation of the major foreign policy decisions and actions....” That language sets a standard and perhaps a goal, but not the purpose or mission for the series.

What is the mission of the *Foreign Relations* series? With the professionalization of the series in the late 1920s, it aimed primarily at a relatively limited group of international lawyers, the occasional diplomat, and the few historians interested in the documentary record of foreign policy. Since the Second World War, the audience for the series has expanded well beyond that small group. All these audiences, new and old, have often developed without conscious planning on the part of the Historical Office. Some benefit from direct use of the series, others gain indirectly from the work of those users, while still others derive benefit from the quality and reputation of the volumes.

THE AUDIENCES:

The American public as the primary audience for *FRUS* has its origins in the Jeffersonian concept of an informed democracy. *FRUS* has worked to meet that responsibility indirectly by providing “a through, accurate, and reliable documentary record of major United States foreign policy decisions” that educators, journalists, and public leaders could use as they worked to inform the public.

The primary direct user of the *FRUS* project is the **community of researchers**. Academic and non-academic historians, political scientists, journalists, television documentary writers, et al., have depended on *FRUS* for their work. Up to now the series has been a valuable tool. But the needs of those various groups within the community of researchers differ significantly. Moreover, the marketplace of information is changing rapidly, as other public, private, and non-profit institutions provide more and more historical information and documentation about American foreign policy (e.g. the National Security Archive, presidential library web sites, etc.). Intensive research into relatively narrow topics requires a very different *FRUS* than does research on broad themes or the writing of more synthetic and interpretive studies. Precisely what the series does for each sub-group within the research community, what those researchers want and need, now and in the future, are issues that must be addressed through ongoing study and planning, for the *FRUS* project is unlikely to succeed if it tries to be all things to all people.

Foreign researchers are a special category of direct *FRUS* users. For them, the project is often the best and even only way to study the foreign policy and diplomacy of their own governments. Certainly serving the needs of foreign scholars adds to the public relations value the State Department accrues from the series.

FRUS as a teaching tool is a subset of research, since it is usually used as a device to teach students how to do research. Nonetheless, the formal education of our students is a separate and critical social responsibility; one that cannot be ignored.

The **U.S. Government**, particularly the **State Department**, may occasionally be direct users of *FRUS*, but more commonly the government gains from the indirect benefits of education and enhanced knowledge that

is generated by the *Foreign Relations* project. Government leaders depend upon the output of the community of researchers to provide the historical perspectives needed to conduct foreign policy and diplomacy effectively. Simply put, government officials read books, watch television documentaries, read the advice of the punditocracy (which reads books based in part on the *FRUS* project), search the internet, and so on. Without the *FRUS* project, those sources of information would be less informed and less valuable. Moreover, the Department of State gets well-deserved credit for its support of the *Foreign Relations* series.

In addition, both the U.S. Government and the American public benefit from the accountability made possible by research and publication based on the documentary record. The great strength of American democracy is the assumption that government can and should be accountable to those who consent to that governance. That requires an informed public — as difficult, awkward, and even dangerous as that can be. Even in an era of global involvement and greatly expanded national security concerns, the American government must be as transparent as safety allows, lest its foreign policies lose the consent of the public.

The government can and does point to the series as an example to other nations of openness and democracy, and reaps benefit from the reputation of the series for high quality. The *Foreign Relations* series has managed to maintain a high degree of public confidence in its integrity and has earned a reputation as a “reliable documentary record,” despite the rapid growth since the Second World War of a vast classified record. However, in the late 1980s, that reliability was called into question when *FRUS* volumes were published that ignored the role of covert actions and the Central Intelligence Agency in the formulation and implementation of U.S. foreign policy. All this suggests the ongoing need for structured professional advice so as to ensure that the methodology of *FRUS* keeps pace with the complexity of the project and the needs of its audiences.

None of these audiences is spelled out or mentioned in the Foreign Relations statute or other instruments that define *FRUS*, nor has there been planning for how best to serve those audiences. But any definition of the mission and purpose of the *FRUS* project must include consideration of the intended audiences.

The fundamental, bottom-line requirement of all those audiences is **fuller, earlier, easier access** to the documentary record of American foreign relations. That has historically (at least since the Second World War volumes) been an expected and desired outcome of the preparation and publication of the *FRUS* series. The growing broad public involvement in important foreign affairs decisions has increased the urgent demand for the availability of the accurate historical record as early as possible. In the broadest sense, everything about the *FRUS* project relates to access. The *FRUS* print volumes are important not so much as stand-alone books, but as “access” for the audiences served.

The fullest possible access today requires more than just the print volumes. Access for HO [Historical Office] historians is the prerequisite to compilation of *FRUS*; public access requires publication (dissemination) in one form or another; future research demands that access be afforded and that the initial researchers-HO historians-describe in detail how to make the best use of that access. Given the sheer size and complexity of the record created since the Second World War, the only way that *FRUS* can meet the statutory mandate that it be a “comprehensive” documentary record is for the series, or project, to promote the fullest, easiest, and earliest possible access to that record for the American public. The print volumes will continue to make a selection of documents readily accessible. Electronic publishing of records can provide a larger selection, but professional judgments of selection and annotation are required to make such collections easily accessible. But it remains impossible to publish in useable form the full and entire record. Guidance on how to navigate the archives so as to gain further access is the final step that the *FRUS* series can take in order to make the record as full and accessible to the public as possible. This “PEG” combination — print, electronic, and guidance — are the only practical way to meet the statutory mandate that *FRUS* be “comprehensive.”

Earlier access is also part of the *FRUS* mission and purpose. The 30-year line appears to be an arbitrary, even whimsical marker with little practical or intellectual justification. Why not 29 or 19 years? The overwhelming bulk of records declassified by systematic review at the 25-year mark established by Executive Order 12958 (Information Security), or after 30 years by the *FRUS* series, could be declassified once they were 20 years old — or perhaps earlier. The initiative and momentum established by the Executive Order should not be squandered. There are legitimate

information security requirements that go beyond a ten or twenty year mark, sometimes even longer, and those requirements will be observed. But that should not prevent opening records that pose no threat to national security — which is the vast majority of the documents. The *FRUS* Project can and should, wherever and whenever practical, work to promote declassification review and public access to the record of American foreign relations at the earliest possible time.

**MISSION of the FOREIGN RELATIONS
SERIES and PROJECT**

TO ENHANCE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE OF THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS; AND TO PROVIDE A PUBLIC RECORD THAT ASSISTS THE PUBLIC AND ITS REPRESENTATIVES IN UNDERSTANDING AND ASSESSING THE ACTIONS OF THEIR GOVERNMENT.

**PURPOSE of the FOREIGN RELATIONS
SERIES and PROJECT**

TO PROVIDE THE EARLIEST, EASIEST, AND FULLEST POSSIBLE PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE RECORD OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS BY:

1. SELECTING AND DISSEMINATING AN ACCURATE, RELIABLE AND COMPREHENSIVE DOCUMENTARY RECORD OF MAJOR FOREIGN POLICY DECISIONS;
2. ACCELERATING THE OPENING OF THE HISTORICAL RECORD TO THE PUBLIC;
3. PROVIDING DETAILED GUIDANCE FOR THE STUDY OF AND RESEARCH IN THE RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN RELATIONS;
and
4. ASSISTING IN THE PRESERVATION OF THE HISTORICAL RECORD OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS BY SEEKING OUT AND GAINING ACCESS TO THAT RECORD WHEREVER IT EXISTS.

Given Knowledge and Access
the Mission and Purpose of
the Foreign Relations Project,

HOW DO WE GET THERE?

In this “new” *FRUS* project, the historical records accessed by the Historical Office (HO) fall into four categories:

1. records warranting publication in the *FRUS* volumes because they document major developments and decisions in U.S. foreign relations or because they are important records not readily available to the public, and which are of interest to a wide number of the audiences served by the *FRUS* series;
2. records important enough to one of the audiences for the *FRUS* Project (most commonly the community of researchers) to warrant electronic publication (or means other than letter-press publication) as a formal part of the *FRUS* series;
3. records significant enough to attract the interest of the community of researchers to warrant written guidance — **access guides** — to the sources;
4. records that do not warrant further attention by HO.

The first three categories together constitute an **integrated and permanent** product, together called the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series, that provides the various *FRUS* Project audiences with the fullest, easiest, and earliest possible access to the record of “major United States foreign policy decisions” and thus constitutes “a comprehensive documentation of the major foreign policy decisions and actions of the United States Government.”

This **integrated** approach will allow HO to shift some resources from the printed volumes in the *FRUS* series by publishing slightly fewer, more tightly conceived compilations, while providing fuller and easier access via electronic publishing and access guides.

WHAT WILL THE "NEW" *FRUS* SERIES LOOK LIKE?

1. The *FRUS* print volumes:

Because the *Foreign Relations* volumes have, in the past, tended to "define" the sub-field of U.S. diplomatic history, great care must be taken to ensure that the series is inclusive not exclusionary. The editors of the series decided shortly after World War II that documents about political issues had to include records from all agencies, not just the State Department, but such matters as cultural issues, particularly ones that involve direct U.S. government action like tourism, cultural exchanges, immigration, etc., have received less attention, despite the increasing interest of researchers. Given a working assumption of "constant resources," *FRUS* compilations will have to balance the myriad of records on major foreign policy issues available from various sources. Consideration needs to be given to how to make appropriate use of non-governmental records (e.g. NGOs, IMF, private philanthropic organizations, etc.) that relate to important United States foreign policy decisions and actions.

Volumes/compilations in the *FRUS* series will fall into three broad categories — CORE, CRISIS, and CONTEXT compilations. While the boundaries are fluid and the dividing lines between the three categories may sometimes be blurred, this C3 approach should move the series in three directions.

I. CORE compilations will constitute the ongoing priority for the series. These compilations are not necessarily bounded by specific time or geographical limits, although boundaries for each volume/compilation/subseries will have to be negotiated among the *FRUS* Project leadership (the Historian, Deputy Historian, General Editor, Division Heads) to avoid duplication of effort. CORE compilations would be broad in scope and designed to provide ready access to the record of overarching issues of foreign relations that go beyond bilateral relations. They could be global, regional, or topical and would document major developments in U.S. foreign relations and national security principles. One way of identifying core compilations would be to look for issues/policies/attitudes that infiltrate and affect the nature and conduct of American foreign relations in almost all situations. Core issues will, of

course, change over time, as is the case today as the United States struggles with post-Cold War foreign policy. Taken as a whole, the core volumes would present a **comprehensive** record of American foreign relations for the era covered.

Examples of possible Core issues:

- the US and the USSR in the Cold War (US/USSR global confrontation)
- the US and the Middle East (Arab-Israeli/oil/US-Islamic issues, etc.)
- intellectual underpinnings/assumptions behind foreign policy (could be smaller compilations that are part of other volumes)
- broad cultural/social issues (foreign policy and domestic issues, American "values," race relations, human rights)
- economic foreign policy, international monetary issues, etc.
- US, China, & East Asia

II. CRISIS and SPECIAL STUDIES compilations constitute a separate category. Such compilations would provide **intensive** coverage of selected specific, sharply defined major episodes in U.S. foreign relations. Crisis volumes have, in the past, included the Berlin Crisis, Vietnam, the Cuban Missile Crisis. Special Studies have previously included such unique compilations such as Secretary of State's Memoranda of Conversation (1947-52) and the Khrushchev-Kennedy Correspondence, and could in the future include the Dobrynin-Kissinger exchanges and similar important, small lot files. Other examples could be the U.S. and Allende, Afghanistan under Carter and Reagan, and the Oil Crisis. Crisis compilations can be a way to achieve one of the *FRUS* Project goals, **earlier access**. Depending on the likelihood of obtaining releasable records, special compilations could take advantage of high public interest to document definable crises that may be significantly closer in currency than the traditional thirty years after the events. At the same time, research for more recent crisis volumes can help to identify and thus preserve elements of the record that could be quickly lost or set aside.

Intelligence activities might constitute another set of Special Studies. Given current statutes and directives, compilations requiring access to and clearance of certain detailed information about intelligence community activities will sometimes have to await the thirty-year mark established in the Foreign Relations statute. In order to avoid unnecessary publication delays of compilations that contain large quantities of other important documents, that suggests releasing those compilations without the still

classified material, but with “issue statements” — agreed to by the CIA, the NSC, and the Department of State — and some documents that acknowledge the existence of a foreign policy-related covert action (a practice that began in 1999). Detailed intelligence community information important for an understanding of American foreign policy could then be declassified and published — in print or electronically — in an on-going sub-series on *Intelligence, Covert Actions and Foreign Policy*. Those intelligence materials not declassified before the thirty-year mark would still come under the statutory requirements imposed by the Foreign Relations law if they were accessed and compiled for publication in retrospective print or electronic volumes of *FRUS*. Access guides could also be utilized to ease public access and to prompt other agencies to perform declassification reviews of records collections identified in an access guide.

III. CONTEXT compilations will provide selective coverage for important bi- and multi-lateral issues, although a broad regional approach should be used wherever possible. These compilations may or may not fit into presidential administrations. These may be topical, geographic, even bilateral, but in each case, to be included in a published volume of *FRUS*, they must document “major foreign policy decisions and actions” as agreed upon after consultation among the compilers, division directors, and the General Editor. They would, however, differ from the current *FRUS* volumes in that the detailed coverage would come from the integration of all three forms of access — books, electronic dissemination, and access guides. Compilations would be made because events and policies warrant and not necessarily cover each year of relations with a country. Retrospective CONTEXT compilations could also be used for new documentation found and/or released after earlier publications (book or electronic) on the subject.

2. Electronic Compilations in the *FRUS* Series:

Electronic publication seems to offer a way to provide the widest possible access to the record of American foreign relations. The temptation is to treat the information highway as a garbage dump, but the concept of an integrated access structure makes these compilations part of the *FRUS* series (as were the microfiche supplements in the past). That means that the research and selection process that has and will continue to be the hallmark of the letter-press volumes of *FRUS* will be applied to the

Electronic compilations of the *FRUS*. In addition, search engines and electronic links of some kind will be required so as to facilitate access. The precise format of these electronic compilations remains to be determined, but as an integrated part of the *FRUS* series they would most commonly (though not necessarily) follow the path set by the book volumes.

Implementation of electronically published *FRUS* compilations will probably require the assistance of outside consultants and additional hardware, but only after HO has determined firm formatting, access, and search requirements.

3. Access Guides (“road maps”):

The final element in the *integrated Foreign Relations of the United States* Project is to preserve the unique and extensive knowledge of the archival record that HO researchers develop in the course of their work so that the research community, the most consistent users and supporters of *FRUS*, does not have to reinvent the wheel as they do the archival research that is invariably needed in order to supplement the selections in the *FRUS* series. Identifying research dead ends is as important as laying out fruitful avenues of research. Access Guides could be produced in lieu of print or electronic volumes for issues and relations that are not broad enough to warrant published compilations. Access Guides are not guides to archival collections, but are organized within a specific historical framework and cut across collection boundaries in order to guide researchers to the records about a specific subject. They will frequently supplement compilations in print or electronic form, but occasions could arise when special Access Guides are commissioned (e.g. for retrospective issues such as covert actions in the Truman presidency). It may be that some specific collections, such as lot files, would warrant a broad Access Guide based on the research of a number of HO historians who used parts of those files while researching a specific compilation. Access guides, an integral part of the *FRUS* series, would also serve to prompt other agencies to perform declassification reviews of records collections identified in an access guide. (An example could be the nearly 100,000 pages of documentation on CIA covert operations in Guatemala in the mid-1950s. Neither a print volume nor electronic publication of all that documentation is practical, but a clear “road-map” through those documents would be invaluable.)

What Does This Mean for *Foreign Relations*
of the *United States*?

First, more documentation will be made available to the public. The format may be different. Because electronic compilations will afford wider and easier access than print volumes, compilations put between hard covers (an expensive process) will have to meet the high standard set by the Foreign Relations statute — “documentation of the major foreign policy decisions and actions of the United States Government...” The ratio of print to electronic compilations will have to flow from an evaluation of the record by the Historical Office, the Historical Advisory Committee, and advice and comment from the various audiences that use the series.

Second, public access to the record of American foreign policy will be substantially improved with electronic publication and access guides. The series will, for the first time, focus on access to the record for all its audiences, from the research community to the interested general public.

Third, the *Foreign Relations* series will furnish a published record, particularly in the print volumes, better suited to provide both the U.S. Government and the American public with an understanding of the history and development of the core issues of American foreign relations.

William Z. Slany, the Historian & Warren F. Kimball,
for the Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation

FAS Note: Comments and suggestions concerning the previous proposal are invited and should be sent directly to Warren F. Kimball of the State Department Historical Advisory Committee at:

kimballw@panet.us-state.gov

The membership of the State Department’s Historical Advisory Committee consists of the following:

Vince Davis, Jr. (Patterson School)
University of Kentucky

Robert D. Schulzinger (History)
University of Colorado (Boulder)

Michael J. Hogan (History)
Ohio State University

Nancy Bernkopf Tucker (History)
Georgetown University

Warren F. Kimball (History)
Rutgers University

Anne H. Van Camp
Research Libraries Group, CA

Frank H. Mackaman (Exec. Dir.)
Dirksen Congressional Center

Philip D. Zelikow (Public Affairs)
University of Virginia

Michael Schaller (History)
University of Arizona

RESOLUTION ON DECLASSIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS Adopted June 26, 1999

Over the past decade, the United States Government has made significant strides toward the kind of rational, cost-effective, common sense policy regarding information security that our democratic principles call for. The documentary record of the Cold War, now history, was becoming more accessible to the American public, allowing it and its representatives to analyze and learn from the historical record. Executive Order 12958 (Information Security), effective as of October 1995, had established clear goals for declassification review, but left declassification standards and implementation procedures up to the agencies holding the records. Some review programs, like that of the State Department, were remarkably successful. In fact, most government agencies, with a few glaring exceptions, made a good faith effort to meet the Executive Order's goal of having *systematically reviewed for declassification* by 2000 all of their records that were 25 years old or older. The success of the process is demonstrated by the fact that some 600,000,000 pages were declassified in the first 3 years of the Executive Order, and that figure approaches 3/4 billion pages as of today.

The key element in that process is the *review of 25-year-old or older* information to determine whether or not it could be released to the public. Only the agencies that "owned" or have an "equity" in the classified information could authorize declassification. In other words, declassification rests firmly in the hands of the agency that originally classified the information. That safeguard has worked. The Information Security Oversight Office reports that it has received no reports of inadvertent disclosures of classified material in documents released under

Executive Order 12958. The director of the Department of Energy's Security Affairs Office has indicated that no release of classified nuclear weapons information (Restricted Data/ Formerly Restricted Data) has occurred through systematic declassification review under the Executive Order.

Despite such impressive results, various efforts are being made that could drastically curb or even destroy this declassification review effort. The year 2000 deadline for review of 25-year-old records set by the Executive Order has been extended by the Executive Branch by as much as 36 months to accommodate those agencies which failed to implement effective systematic review programs. Proposed legislation limiting the resources an agency is permitted to commit to the systematic declassification review of 25-year-old historical records threatens to gut the entire process. These and similar challenges to openness are propelled, in part, by statements by some in the media and some political leaders who wrongly equate declassification of records that are twenty-five years old or older with recent espionage and leaks of classified information. This misconception is exacerbated by the unprofessional records management procedures followed by a number of agencies. Simply put, too many agencies do not know what is in their records, classified or otherwise.

As the record demonstrates, systematic declassification carried out under Executive Order 12958 does not pose any threat to national security. But dismantling the systematic review process does pose a serious threat to the creation and maintenance of an informed public, which is both a prerequisite to and a principle of democracy.

Therefore:

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations urges Congress and the Executive Branch to protect the American Democracy by:

1. rejecting attempts to erode and even eliminate the procedures set forth in Executive Order 12958;
2. enacting and implementing legislation codifying the procedures set forth in Executive Order 12958;
3. restoring and then continuing to provide adequate funding to implement Executive Order 12958; and

4. requiring all agencies to implement professional records management programs that meet the archival standards established by the National Archives and Records Administration.

**SHAFR Council Minutes
Robertson Hall, Woodrow Wilson Center
Princeton
June 26, 1999**

The meeting commenced at 7:30 a.m. Those attending: Walter LaFeber, Allan Spetter, Doug Little, Geoff Smith, David Patterson, Mary Giunta, William Walker, Randall Jones, Steven Schwartzberg, Robert Schulzinger, Eileen Scully, Peter Hahn, Richard Wiggers, Andrew Johnston, David Anderson, Marilyn Young, Chester Pach, Priscilla Roberts, Tom Schoonover, Martin Sherwin, Arnold Offner, Malcolm Crystal, and William Brinker.

Allan Spetter, reporting for Beth McKillen, announced the winners of the Holt Dissertation awards. They are Michael Donoghue, Gregg Brazinsky, and Carol Chin.

Spetter, reporting for David Schmitz, announced that Frances Early is the winner of the Warren Kuehl award. Her award-winning book is *World Without War*.

Walter LaFeber led a discussion concerning the desired frequency in awarding the Graebner Award. No action was taken at this time.

Steven Schwartzberg, Program Chairman for the Princeton meeting, discussed some of the mechanical concerns of the program chair. Discussion followed relative to future summer meetings. Due to the size of the summer meeting it was perceived that there is a need to systematize the processes, perhaps adopting something similar to the AHA "customs and lore" procedures.

Geoff Smith commented on the progress thus far for the Toronto 2000 meeting. There will be some emphasis on Canada and on the 50 year anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War. The dates for the meeting are June 22-25. The meetings will be in downtown Toronto.

Spetter, reporting for Anna Nelson, announced that the 2001 meeting is set for American University in DC.

Chester Pach reported that Ken Bode, Dean of the Medill School of Journalism at Northwestern will be the luncheon speaker at the January 2000 annual AHA meeting in Chicago. His address will be "Global Journalism in the Era of CNN, Cyberspace and Kalashnikovs."

LaFeber, speaking for Michael Hogan, reported that SHAFR has signed a new eight year contract with Blackwell Publishing. SHAFR and Blackwell are pleased with the association and the terms of the extension are most agreeable to both sides.

Bob Schulzinger, Endowment Committee Chair, reported on the healthy growth in value of the SHAFR endowment which is handled by a firm of professional financial managers. Council indicated its satisfaction with the association and the results.

Martin Sherwin presented his views regarding SHAFR "Outreach." The intent is to expand SHAFR's vision and activities, to become more inclusive, and to perhaps internationalize its orientation. Sherwin's proposal will be published in the *Newsletter* thus allowing the membership to participate in a dialogue regarding moving in these directions.

Schulzinger reported on latest developments of the State Department Advisory Committee on the Foreign Relations Series. Elsewhere in this newsletter (pages 34-36) please find the "Resolution on Declassification." Council moved and seconded that copies of the "Resolution" be sent to the White House, the Senate and House

leadership, key committee chairs, the OAH, AHA, the Society for American Archivists, to Page Miller and released to major national newspapers. The motion carried unanimously.

Spetter reported on SHAFR membership and finances. All is in good shape.

Mary Giunta, reported for Robert Beisner, on the progress of the SHAFR Guide. Some unexpected small delays have occurred but nothing of major significance.

LaFeber, for Doug Little, suggested that it would be appropriate to have graduate student representation on the SHAFR Council. Discussion followed and it was moved that the Council be expanded to include two graduate students who would serve three-year terms. The motion carried.

LaFeber announced that David Anderson is retiring from his duties on the Roster & Research List. LaFeber announced a committee to investigate how best to handle the Roster & Research List - where will it be housed and should it continue to be published in paper form, should it be electronic, or perhaps both? The committee will also consider similar questions related to the SHAFR *Newsletter*. The committee will report at the AHA in January 2000.

Several resolutions were unanimously passed:

SHAFR's thanks to David and Helen Anderson for thirteen years' work on the Roster and Research List

SHAFR's thanks to Eileen Scully and Steven Schwartzberg and the respective committees for their work on Local Arrangements and Program for this Princeton meeting.

Respectfully submitted
William Brinker

Regina



Books

SHAFR MEMBER DISCOUNTS

THE UNITED STATES AND POST-COLD WAR INTERVENTIONS: Bush and Clinton in Somali, Haiti and Bosnia, 1992-1998. Lester H. Brune.(1999) 192pp.

Presidents Bush and Clinton's dealings with these three nations highlight many of the factors that continue to influence America's Post-Cold War policies. When the UN, the European Union, the OAS or the OAU failed to solve the issues, the basic problems were left to Washington.

\$29.95 Cloth, \$14.95 Paper **SHAFR Price (pap) \$ 9.00**

INTO THE DARK HOUSE: American Diplomacy & the Ideological Origins of the Cold War. Joseph M. Siracusa. (1998) 288pp.

"...Siracusa describes with cre the 'intellectual world' of the West's Cold Warriors....Among his more interesting conclusions are that [Frank] Roberts and Kennan influenced one another in Moscow in 1946, that NSC 68 did not represent a dramatic break with NSC documents drafted two years earlier, and that the outbreak of the Korean War made it impossible to resolve the Cold War at an early stage." *Choice*

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 authors succeed in dispelling many of the stereotypes surrounding the Finns and their strategic postures in the second half of the 20th century, and they provide ample support for the indictment against American scholars for overlooking Finnish history." *Choice*

Cloth \$32.95, Paper \$14.95 **SHAFR Price (paper) \$8.00**

AMERICA'S AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIA'S AMERICA.

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

"[This is] the best available introduction to relations between these two continental, British-begotten, frontier-shaped, Pacific powers....The writing is robust, at times delightfully so." *Journal of American History*

\$21.95 cloth, \$12.95 pap **SHAFR Price (paper) \$7.00**

Additional Regina Titles

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 International 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**

Brune, *US & Post-Cold War Interventions...* \$ 9.00 —

Siracusa. *In the Dark House,,* \$ 9.00 —

Ruddy. *Charting an Independent Course,,* \$ 8.00 —

Siracusa. *America's/Australia,,* \$ 7.00 —

Brune. *Cuban-Caribbean Missile Crisis* \$ 8.00 —

Brune. *Amer. & the Indochina Wars,,* \$13.00 —

Graebner. *Empire on Pacific...* \$ 9.00 —

Esthus. *Theodore Roosevelt* \$ 8.00 —

Leonard. *Panama, the Canal* \$ 6.00 —

Offer to *individuals* only. 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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

SHAFR Call for Papers

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations invites submissions for its Twenty-Sixth Annual Conference, hosted by Ryerson Polytechnic University, Toronto, Canada 22-25 June 2000.

We welcome proposals dealing with the broadest possible range of topics in international history and foreign policy. Given the year and the venue, we particularly invite proposals on the Korean War or on Canada-US relations. Preference will be given to complete panels and roundtables.

Please send proposals — including a one-page abstract for each paper and a current one-page c.v., mailing and e-mail address for each participant — by 19 November 1999 to:

Geoffrey S. Smith, SHAFR 2000 Program Committee, Department of History, 99 Univ. Ave., Watson Hall, Room 212, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada K7L 3N6

Tel: (613) 533-2150

Fax: (613) 533-6298

E-mail: smithgs@post.queensu.ca

For information on local conference arrangements, contact:

Margaret MacMillan, Department of History, Ryerson Polytechnic Univ., 350 Victoria Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5B 2K3

Tel: (416) 979-5000 ext. 7799 E-mail: mmacmill@acs.ryerson.ca

Web Page: www.ryerson.ca/shafr2000

Call for Papers
Anglo-American Conference of Historians

The sixty-ninth Anglo-American Conference of Historians, July 5-7, 2000, will be devoted to the subject of "War and Peace". The conference intends to explore, in the broadest and most wide-ranging historical way, the effects of war and peace on all aspects of society. This may be taken

to include: theories of peace and theories of war; the culture of war and the culture of peace; the organization of military force and war, and of peace and of peacekeeping; the outbreak of war as the end of peace, and the end of war as the beginning of peace; war (and peace) as victory or defeat, conquest or occupation; pressure groups and organizations for war and for peace; the costs of war and the costs of peace; the historiography of war and the historiography of peace. It will give attention to technology, education, government, religion and propaganda as they influence, and are influenced by, war and peace. **The conference will not be addressing the tactics or strategy of war**, and preference will be given to lectures and papers concerned with the inter-relatedness of war and peace. Suggestions for speakers, subjects and sessions are now being invited, as are proposals (not more than three hundred words) for papers and lectures.

The deadline is 30 November 1999. Both suggestions and proposals should be sent to: Dr. Debra Birch, Institute of Historical Research, Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU.

Fax: (0171) 862-8811.

E-mail: d.birch@sas.ac.uk

Call for Papers

The Marine Corps University will host the annual conference of the Society for Military History at Quantico, 28-30 April 2000. The theme of the conference will be "Korea 1950 and 400 Years of Limited War," but papers on other topics in military history are welcome.

Mail one-page proposals by 1 November 1999 to: Director, Command and Staff College; Marine Corps University; Attn: Prof. Rudd, SMH 2000 Coord.; 2076 South Street; Quantico, VA 22134-5068

Ford NSC Minutes Released

The Gerald R. Ford Library announces the further release of minutes to National Security Council meetings of the Ford administration. Nearly 700 pages of transcript-like text, formerly "Top Secret" and covering 33 of the 39 NSC meetings held August 1974-January 1977, are now available in

whole or redacted form. No minutes are known to exist for five of the remaining meetings, although there may be agendas or talking points, and the minutes of a sixth meeting are still under declassification review. Although China was never the topic of a Ford NSC meeting, researchers may be interested in another FY99 mandatory review program release: an exhaustive (82 pp.) memo to Secretary Kissinger "US-PRC Relations and Approaches to the President's Peking Trip: Tasks for the Rest of 1975." A detailed, complete topic list is posted at the Ford Library website: www.ford.utexas.edu

For further information about Ford Library holdings and programs, please contact: David Horrocks, Chief Archivist, Gerald R. Ford Library, 1000 Beal Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48109
Email: david.horrocks@fordlib.nara.gov Tel: (734)741-2218 x 222

Call for Papers

The General Matthew B. Ridgway Center for International Security Studies invites proposals and papers for a conference on the history of the Korean War, to be held in Pittsburgh, June 15-16, 2000. Topics not limited to, but might include Soviet and Chinese decision-making; America's memory of the "forgotten war"; the reorganization and racial integration of the U.S. military; biological warfare; issues surrounding the UN multilateral force; the impact of the war on Asian security; and the future of Korean-American relations. Proposals on these and other economic, social, political, or military topics related to the war are solicited.

Proposals should include a cover sheet, listing the panel or paper topic, names and contacts for proposed participants; a brief bio for each participant; a 250 word summary for individual papers or a 500 word summary of the complete panel. All proposals must be received by December 1, 1999.

Contact: Tom Copeland, Conference Coordinator, Ridgway Center for International Security Studies, University of Pittsburgh, 3J01 Forbes Quad, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

Tel: (412) 648-7408

Fax: (412) 624-7291

E-mail: korea50+@pitt.edu

Gerald R. Ford Library Travel Grants

The Gerald R. Ford Foundation semi-annually awards travel grants of up to \$2000 in support of significant research in Gerald R. Ford Library collections. Collections focus on Federal policies, institutions, and politics in the 1970s. Processed archival collections contain materials on foreign affairs and national security issues such as foreign aid, the Middle East peace process, the Vietnamese war, the Mayaguez incident, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, trade, and foreign economic policy. Application postmark deadlines are September 15 and March 15. Contact:

Mr. Geir Gunderson, Grants Coordinator, Gerald R. Ford Library, 1000 Beal Avenue, Ann Arbor MI 48109

Tel: (734)741-2218 ext. 232

E-mail: library@fordlib.nara.gov

Fax: (734)741-2341

Website: <http://www.ford.utexas.edu>

PUBLICATIONS

Wesley M. Bagby (West Virginia), *America's International Relations Since World War I*. Oxford, 1999. Cloth: ISBN 0-19-512388-1, \$49.95; paper ISBN 0-19-512389-1, \$24.95.

Kathleen Burks and Melvyn Stokes (U College London), eds., *The United States and the European Alliance Since 1945*. Berg, 1999. ISBN 1-85973-277-1.

Bruce Cumings (Chicago), *Parallax Visions: Making Sense of American-East Asian Relations at the End of the Century*. Duke, 1999. ISBN 0-822-32276-5, \$27.95.

Robert Ferrell (emeritus - Indiana), *Truman and Pendergast*. Missouri, 1999. ISBN 0-826-21225-5, \$24.95.

Irwin F. Gellman, *The Contender: Richard Nixon, The Congress Years 1946-1952*. Free Press, 1999. ISBN 0-684-85064-8, \$27.00.

Howard Jones (Alabama), *Abraham Lincoln and a New Birth of Freedom: The Union and Slavery in the Diplomacy of the Civil War*. Nebraska, 1991. ISBN 0-880-322582-2, \$29.95.

Carolyn J. Kitching (Teesside, UK), *Britain and the Problem of International Disarmament, 1919-34* Routledge, 1999. ISBN 0-415-18199-2, \$75.00.

Yukiko Koshiro (Notre Dame), *Trans-Pacific Racisms and the U.S. Occupation of Japan*. Columbia, 1999. Cloth: ISBN 0-231-11348-x, \$45.00; paper: ISBN 0-321-11349-8, \$18.50.

Robert Kumamoto (San Jose State), *International Terrorism and American Foreign Relations, 1945-1976*. Northeastern U. Press, 1999. ISBN 1-55553-389-2, \$45.00.

Tom Leonard (North Florida), *Castro and the Cuban Revolution*. Greenwood, 1999. ISBN 0-313-29979-x, \$39.95.

----- editor, *The United States-Latin American Relations, 1850-1903: Establishing a Relationship*. Alabama, 1999. ISBN 0-817-30937-3, \$44.95.

Ralph Levering (Davidson) and Miriam L. Levering, *Citizen Action for Global Change: The Neptune Group and Law of the Sea*. Syracuse, 1999. Cloth: ISBN 0-8156-2794-7, \$45.00; paper 0-8156-2795-5, \$19.95.

Robert McMahon (Florida), *The Limits of Empire: The United States and Southeast Asia Since World War II*. Columbia, 1999. ISBN 0-2331-19881-x, paper \$17.50.

Karen A. Miller (Oakland), *Populist Nationalism: Republican Insurgency and American Foreign Policy Making, 1918-1925*. Greenwood, 1999. ISBN 0-313-30776-8, \$57.95.

Leopoldo Nuti (Università Roma Tre), *Gli Stati Uniti e l'apertura a sinistra: Importanza e limiti della presenza americana in Italia*. Bari-Roma, Laterza, 1999). ISBN 88-420-5749-5, 90,000 Italian lire (roughly 45 to 50 US\$).

Melvin Small (Wayne State), *The Presidency of Richard Nixon*. U Press of Kansas, 1999. ISBN 0-7006-0973-3, \$29.95.

David F. Schmitz (Whitman), *Thank God They're on Our Side: The United States and Right-Wing Dictatorships, 1921-1965*. Carolina, 1999. Cloth: ISBN 0-807-82472-0, \$45; paper: ISBN 0-807-84773-9, \$18.95.

E. Timothy Smith (Barry), *Opposition Beyond the Water's Edge: Liberal Internationalists, Pacifists and Containment, 1945-1953*. Greenwood, 1999. ISBN 0-313-30777-6, \$57.95.

CALENDAR

2000

- January 1 Membership fees in all categories are due, payable at Blackwell Publishers, 350 Main St., Malden MA 02148.
- January 6-9 114th annual meeting of the AHA in Chicago.
- January 15 Deadline for the Bernath Article Award.
- February 1 Deadlines for the Bernath Book Award, the *March Newsletter*, and the Ferrell Book Prize.
- February 15 Deadline for the Bernath lecture prize.
- March 1 Deadline for Graebner Prize nominations.
- April 15 Applications for the W. Stull Holt dissertation fellowship are due.
- March 30-April 2 The 93rd meeting of the OAH will take place at the Adam's Mark in St. Louis.
- May 1 Deadline: materials for the June *Newsletter*.
- June 24-27 SHAFR's 26th annual conference will meet in Toronto. Program chair: Jeffrey Smith, History Dept., Queen's U, Kingston, Ontario. See: www.ryerson.ca/shafr2000
- 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 Book Award

The AHA will meet in Boston, January 4-7, 2001. Proposal packages should be sent to: Michael Bernstein, Co-chair, AHA 2001 Program Committee, Dept. of History, University of California at San Diego, 9500 Gilman Dr., LaJolla, CA 92093-0104 (See page 42 of AHA *Perspectives*, Sept 1999. Subsequent meetings: San Francisco, January 3-6, 2002; Chicago, January 2-5, 2003; and Washington, January 8-11.

The 2001 meeting of the OAH will take place at the Westin Bonaventure in Los Angeles, April 26-29. The 2002 meeting will be held in Washington, April 11-14, at the Renaissance Hotel.

PERSONALS

Kathleen Burk (U College London) was a Visiting Fellow at All Souls College, Oxford during Michaelmas Term (September-December), 1998.

Jim Goode (Grand Valley State) has received a Fulbright to Turkey for 1999-2000. He will be teaching at Bilkent University, Ankara, beginning September 1.

Kenneth J. Grieb (Wisconsin, Oshkosh) was awarded the 1998 Regents Teaching Excellence Award by the Board of Regents of the U of Wisconsin system — awarded annually to only one professor from all the faculty members teaching at its 13 four-year campuses.

Charles M. Hubbard (Lincoln Memorial U) has been awarded a research fellowship at the John Nicholas Brown Center at Brown U. Hubbard is Director of the Abraham Lincoln Museum and Vice

President for Lincolniana at Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, TN.

Howard Jones (Alabama) has received the University of Alabama's Blackmon-Moody Outstanding Professor Award.

Thomas M. Leonard (North Florida) is project director for a USDOE project on the European Union and its implications for the U.S. He is also researching the triangular relationship between the EU, Latin America, and the U.S.

Leo P. Ribuffo (George Washington) has been named Society of the Cincinnati George Washington Distinguished Professor.

Milton Meyer (Cal State L.A. - emeritus) sponsored a conference, April 28-29, 1999, commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Meyer Asian Collection, housed in the Henry Luce III Library, Central Philippine University, Iloilo City. Numerous university administrators, curators, diplomatic officers, and nationally prominent authors were in attendance.

Frank Schumacher (U. of Bonn/Germany) has been appointed Assistant Professor of North American History at the U of Erfurt.

AWARDS, PRIZES, AND FUNDS

Complete details regarding SHAFR awards, prizes, and funds are found in the June and December issues of the *Newsletter*, abbreviated information in the March and September issues.

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

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. Nominations and five (5) copies of each book may be submitted at any time during 1999, but should not arrive later than February 1, 2000. Materials should be sent to: Doron Ben-Atar, History, Fordham Univ., Bronx NY, 10458.

The Stuart L. Bernath Lecture Prize

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 deliver a lecture, comparable in style and scope to the SHAFR presidential address, at the SHAFR meeting during the annual OAH conference. Nomination is open to any person under forty-one years of age whose scholarly achievements represent excellence in teaching and research. Send nominating letter and *curriculum vita* no later than 15 February 2000 to: Kathryn Weathersby, 3225 Grace St. NY, Apt. 226, Washington DC, 20007-3643.

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. The prize 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 1999. The prize is open to any person within ten years of reception of the PhD. Nominations shall be submitted and three copies of the article must be submitted to the chairperson of the committee: Anders Stephanson, History, Columbia Univ., NY, NY 10027. Entries must be submitted by January 15, 2000.

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 research of their U.S. foreign relations dissertations. Applications should be sent in triplicate to: Susan Brewer, History, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, Stevens Point WI 54481. The deadline for application is November 1, 1999.

Georgetown Travel Grants

The Bernath Dissertation Grant committee also administers grants to be funded from the SHAFR Georgetown fund to support travel for research in the Washington area. The amounts are determined by the committee.

The Myrna F. Bernath Book and Fellowship Awards

A prize award of \$2,500 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. The next prize will be awarded to a book published in 1998-1999. Contact: Katherine Sibley, History, St. Joseph's University, Philadelphia PA 19131. Submission deadline is November 15, 1999.

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: Katherine Sibley, History, St. Joseph's University, Philadelphia PA 19131. Deadline for applications is 15 November 2000.

THE W. STULL HOLT DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP

This fellowship is intended to help defray costs of travel, preferably foreign travel, necessary to the pursuit of research on a significant dissertation project. Contact: Elizabeth McKillen, History, 5774 Stevens Hall, University of Maine, Orono, ME 04469-5774.

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. Contact: Chester Pach, History, Ohio Univ., Athens OH, 45701. The deadline for nominations is March 1, 2000.

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." Contact: Mel Small, History, Wayne State Univ., Detroit MI, 48202.

ARTHUR LINK PRIZE FOR DOCUMENTARY EDITING

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. Contact: Mary Giunta, NHPRC - Room 300, National Archives, Washington DC 20408

THE LAWRENCE GELFAND - ARMIN RAPPAPORT FUND

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations established this fund in 1990 to honor Lawrence E. Gelfand, founding member and past president of SHAFR, and Armin Rappaport, the founding editor of the Society's journal, *Diplomatic History*. The fund will support the professional work of the journal's editorial office. Contact: Allan Spetter, 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 is to be awarded as a senior book award; that is, any book beyond the first monograph by the author. Deadline for submissions is February 1, 2000. Contact: Robert Johnson, History, Brooklyn College, City Univ. of NY, Bedford Ave. and Ave. H, Brooklyn NY, 11210-2889.

National History Day Award

SHAFR has established an award to recognize students who participate in the National History Day (NHD) program in the area of United States diplomatic history. The purpose of the award is to encourage as well as recognize research, writing, and relations to encourage a better understanding of peaceful interactions between nations. The award may be given in any of the NDH categories. For information contact: Cathy Gorn, Executive Director, National History Day, 0119 Cecil Hall, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

The SHAFR Newsletter

SPONSOR: Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.

EDITOR: William J. Brinker, Box 5154, Cookeville, TN 38505
Tel. (931) 372-3332; e-mail Wbrinker@TNTECH.edu; FAX (931) 372-6142.

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS: Heather White and Sara Wilkerson.

BACK ISSUES: The *Newsletter* was published annually from 1969 to 1972, and has been published quarterly since 1973. Copies of many back numbers of the *Newsletter* may be obtained from the editorial office for \$2.00 per copy (for members living abroad, the charge is \$3.00).

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION: The *Newsletter* solicits the submission of personals, announcements, abstracts of scholarly papers and articles delivered or published upon diplomatic subjects, bibliographical or historiographical essays, essays of a "how-to-do-it" nature, information about foreign depositories, biographies, autobiographies of "elder statesmen" in the field, jokes, *et al.* Papers and other submissions should be typed and the author's name and full address should be noted. The *Newsletter* accepts and encourages submissions on IBM-formatted 3½" diskettes. A paper submitted in WordPerfect is preferred. A hardcopy of the paper should be included with the diskette. The *Newsletter* goes to the printer on the 1st of March, June, September, and December; all material submitted for publication should arrive at least four weeks prior.

FORMER PRESIDENTS OF SHAFR

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1968 Thomas A. Bailey (Stanford) | 1984 Warren I. Cohen (Michigan State) |
| 1969 Alexander DeConde (CA-Santa Barbara) | 1985 Warren F. Kuehl (Akron) |
| 1970 Richard W. Leopold (Northwestern) | 1986 Betty Unterberger (Texas A&M) |
| 1971 Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana) | 1987 Thomas G. Paterson (Connecticut) |
| 1972 Norman A. Graebner (Virginia) | 1988 Lloyd Gardner (Rutgers) |
| 1973 Wayne S. Cole (Maryland) | 1989 George Herring (Kentucky) |
| 1974 Bradford Perkins (Michigan) | 1990 Michael Hunt (North Carolina) |
| 1975 Armin H. Rappaport (CA-San Diego) | 1991 Gary Hess (Bowling Green) |
| 1976 Robert A. Divine (Texas) | 1992 John Lewis Gaddis (Ohio) |
| 1977 Raymond A. Esthus (Tulane) | 1993 Warren Kimball (Rutgers-Newark) |
| 1978 Akira Iriye (Chicago) | 1994 Melvyn Leffler (Virginia) |
| 1979 Paul A. Varg (Michigan State) | 1995 Robert Dallek (UCLA) |
| 1980 David M. Pletcher (Indiana) | 1996 Mark Gilderhus (Colorado State) |
| 1981 Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State) | 1997 Emily Rosenberg (Macalester) |
| 1982 Lawrence E. Gelfand (Iowa) | 1998 Arnold Offner (Lafayette) |
| 1983 Ernest R. May (Harvard) | |