

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

NEWSLETTER

Volume 31

No. 2

June 2000

Page

- 1 The Drafting of the Helsinki Final Act: A Personal View of the CSCE's Geneva Phase *by Charles G. Stefan*
- 11 "It's Not What We Say, It's What We Do": The Study and Writing of U.S. Foreign Relations in the United States *by Thomas Schoonover.*
- 37 Obituary
- 39 Announcements
- 41 Calendar
- 42 Personals
- 43 Publications
- 45 Awards, Prizes, and Funds

ISSN 0740-6169

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

Founded in 1967

Chartered in 1972

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

VICE PRESIDENT: Robert J. McMahon, History, U. of Florida, Gainesville FL 32611-7320

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

PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Richard Immerman, History, Gladfelter Hall, Temple U., Philadelphia PA 19122

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Mary Ann Heiss, History, Kent State, Kent, OH 44242.

MINORITY ACCESS COOMITTEE: Arnold Taylor, Howard U., Washington DC 20059-0001.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ARCHIVES: Ted Wilson, Kansas, Lawrence KS.

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* and a journal, *Diplomatic History*.

**THE SHAFR WEBSITE CAN BE REACHED AT:
HTTP://WWW.OHIU.EDU/~SHAFR/SHAFR.HTM**

THE DRAFTING OF THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT:
A PERSONAL VIEW OF THE CSCE'S GENEVA
PHASE
(SEPTEMBER 1973 UNTIL JULY 1975)

by
Charles G. Stefan
GAINESVILLE

[This article is related to Robert Kagan's review of Henry Kissinger's book in the *New Republic* (June 21, 1999). - editor]

Having served on the United States Delegation to the Geneva Phase of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) which drafted the well-known Helsinki Final Act, I was more than usually interested in Robert Kagan's critical review of Henry Kissinger's latest book, *Years of Renewal* (*The New Republic*, June 21, 1999). I write with some expertise on those portions of the book dealing with the CSCE, as I was the only member of the American Delegation who served on Basket III and Subcommittees 10 (Culture) and 11 (Education) throughout the drafting phase of the CSCE in Geneva, from September 18, 1973, until the adoption of the Basket III preamble on July 15, 1975. This action completed work on the whole of Basket III.

In those portions of his lengthy review dealing with the Geneva phase of the CSCE, Kagan is mostly but not entirely right. He certainly is correct in asserting that the "initial impetus for a pan-European conference had come from Moscow." It was indeed the hope of Brezhnev and other Soviet leaders that the CSCE would be short-lived and would enshrine Soviet dominance in Eastern Europe, which included the Soviet zone of Germany — since 1949 the so-called German Democratic Republic (GDR). He is also on target in asserting that the CSCE was primarily a forum, until near its close, for the West Europeans. Indeed, the French Delegation, which took the lead for Western Europe in the Cultural Subcommittee (No. 10), declined to participate in the informal NATO Caucus on Basket III (presumably because the U.S.A. and Canada were represented in this Caucus).

However, I question Kagan's condemnation of Kissinger's role throughout the Geneva phase of the CSCE. As elaborated subsequently in this article, the Secretary of State acted differently toward the CSCE in 1973-74 than he did in 1975, and it is only fair to point out this change in Kissinger's actions.

It is time for specifics on the CSCE. First of all, it is pertinent to note that the USDEL had no written instructions from the Secretary of State when it arrived in Geneva in September 1973. The Delegation did not even receive the normal telegraphic summary of general objectives usually sent to an American delegation at an international conference.¹

¹To the best of my knowledge, the only book in English devoted exclusively to the CSCE is John J. Maresca, *To Helsinki, The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe 1973-1975* (Duke University Press, 1985). Maresca played an important role in the Helsinki Process, and his book gives an excellent review of this Process. For a summary of the reasons underlying the failure of the

The Delegation's posture during the initial phases of the CSCE was remarkably low-profile. Indeed, the Delegation's posture was so low-key that when Secretary Kissinger asked us to slow down the negotiations, in response to the Soviet-supported Egyptian-Syrian attack upon Israel in early October 1973, the Delegation could, in practice, do little if anything. In any case, the West Europeans imposed a phase of general debate on the CSCE, which lasted three months. Thus, the initial Soviet target date for completion of the Conference — the end of 1973 — passed before any agreed language had been drafted.

Once this phase had passed and drafting had begun, the then head of the American delegation, Davis Eugene "Gene" Boster, was concerned that the U.S. had no proposal in Basket III. Boster, whom I had previously known and served with, turned to me, and together we worked out a joint proposal with the U.K. Delegation in the Education Subcommittee. Boster cleared the language with Washington, and the U.K. delegate on Subcommittee 11 and I jointly presented the proposal early in 1974. It dealt with the promotion of exchanges between East and West, including provisions for improving the situation that scholars from the West confronted in the U.S.S.R. and elsewhere in the Warsaw Pact countries of eastern Europe. The joint U.K.-U.S. proposal was

American delegation to receive written instructions in 1973, see pp. 44-45 of Maresca's book.

Nonetheless, Maresca did not regularly participate in the Basket III negotiations until the Spring of 1975, when he took over from a departing delegate, Guy Coriden, the Human Contacts and Information Subcommittees. He understandably gave little or no attention to the negotiations in Subcommittees 10 (Culture) and 11 (Education) where I represented the small American delegation until the conclusion of negotiations in these bodies.

provisionally registered in Subcommittee 11 in the summer of 1974. However, it was subsequently softened somewhat due to higher-level Soviet concerns. This “softening” took place during informal U.S.S.R.-U.K. talks toward the end of the Geneva phase of the CSCE, and the final language probably represented the maximum concession which the Soviet side was then prepared to accept.²

It was during this low-key phase of the CSCE negotiations that the practice was begun of regular luncheons with key members of the Soviet and American delegations. Each side alternated in hosting the luncheons. I recall one luncheon during which Ambassador Boster skillfully handled complaints by the Soviet side on the general slowness of the negotiations. (This luncheon took place during the so-called period of general debate between September and December of 1973). These luncheons continued on a regular basis until, in 1975, the posture of the American delegation, acting under instructions from Washington, stiffened, and the luncheons were discontinued, undoubtedly to the relief of both delegations.³

²Following the early departure of the first head of the American delegation, George S. Vest, his place was taken by Davis Eugene “Gene” Boster. He served as the Delegation Chief until early 1974, when he was named to be the American Ambassador to Bangladesh. Boster is treated, in my view, rather unfairly in Maresca’s book. He is described as Vest’s successor who “arrived with no prior experience in multilateral diplomacy and no expertise on the CSCE.” Boster was an able diplomat and successfully carried on as head of the American delegation.

³After the final luncheon of the Soviet and American delegations in the Spring of 1975, I recall waiting with Ambassador Sherer, the then head of the American delegation, for a car to take us back to the U.S. Mission in Geneva. My recollection is that we were both relieved that the lengthy luncheons with the Soviet delegation had drawn to a close.

Ambassador Albert “Bud” Sherer, Jr. was an outstanding leader of the American delegation and richly deserves the plaudits given him in Maresca’s book.

In early 1974, the fate of the well-known Russian dissident, Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, was a behind-the-scene concern to the Western delegations at the CSCE. Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoli Kovalev, the head of the Soviet delegation, reportedly played an important role in the resolution of the situation then affecting us at that time. This situation lasted until Solzhenitsyn was expelled to the West instead of being incarcerated in the U.S.S.R. According to Kovalev's own account many years later, he was instrumental in the Kremlin's decision in the case. Kovalev reportedly argued at the time that a decision to jail Solzhenitsyn would mark the end of the Helsinki process.⁴

At about this time, one of the Danish delegates, whose delegation had taken the lead for the EC-9 in the Human Contacts subcommittee, spoke privately to me about his delegation's proposal dealing with emigration from the U.S.S.R. In response to my query about the implications for the West if the Soviets agreed to the emigration of substantial numbers of their citizens, the Dane said that the U.S.S.R. would never permit such a development.

Another episode is particularly pertinent in my recollections of the Geneva phase of the CSCE. It occurred in the Cultural

delegation at an early date to become Secretary of State Kissinger's press spokesman. He subsequently moved on to higher posts in the American Foreign Service. Vest too deserves the praise given him in Maresca's book.

⁴*Vestnik*, a joint venture of the Soviet Foreign Ministry and an Austrian firm, was published during the Gorbachev era when Eduard Schevardnadze was the Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R. *Vestnik*, English Edition, early 1990, pp. 74-76.

As for Kovalev's reference to the Solzhenitsyn case, I recall well the tense period in the CSCE before the Kremlin's decision to expel him to the West. For a good description of this period in early 1974, see Maresca, *op.cit.*, pp. 89-91.

Subcommittee (No.10), where the French delegation, as noted earlier, had taken the lead for the EC-9. The French proposals included a specific reference to the establishment of libraries in both West and East. The American delegation strongly supported this proposal, even though privately we wondered if the Soviets would agree to this idea. The Soviet delegation predictably opposed this proposal, but the French delegation persisted and was strongly supported by other Western delegations. I even recall that the Romanian delegate on the Cultural Subcommittee told me privately that Soviet opposition was holding up acceptance of the idea among at least one of the Warsaw Pact delegations.

Then, sometime in the Spring of 1975 (as near as I can recall), the French delegation suddenly dropped the idea of libraries and reading rooms, catching all of the Western delegates in the Cultural Subcommittee by surprise. I recall that the Belgian delegate on the Subcommittee (who spoke excellent English) informed me subsequently that no one in the EC-9 was aware of this major concession on the part of the French. About this time we in the American delegation received a highly classified telegram from the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. It reported that Jacques Chirac (then the Prime Minister of France and now the French President⁵) had recently visited Moscow and become convinced that the U.S.S.R. would bitterly oppose the idea of Western libraries and reading rooms in the Soviet Union. He had therefore instructed the French delegation to the CSCE to drop immediately their insistence on this idea. I do not recall the Embassy's source for this information, but it had to be a high

⁵For a rather pessimistic view of President Chirac, see "Jacques Chirac, out of steam", *The Economist* (London), July 31, 1999, p. 44.

personage in the French Embassy in Moscow, if not Chirac himself.

Shortly after this incident, the French delegation took a redeeming step. They arranged informal sessions with the leader of the Soviet delegation in Basket III, Yuri Dubinin, one of the hardest hardliners in the Soviet delegation. The head of the French delegation spoke to Ambassador Sherer, who authorized me to join the informal talks along with other EC-9 delegates. I spoke minimal French, but it was enough since the primary burden of negotiations was carried on between the chief French delegate to Basket III and Dubinin, who spoke excellent French. As a result of these informal discussions, the French delegation secured most of their proposals, minus the original French proposal for the establishment of reading rooms and libraries in the major cities of the U.S.S.R.

At about this time, we followed Secretary of State Kissinger's direct role in the working out of a complex issue involving the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the U.S.S.R. I recall, early in the Geneva phase of the CSCE, that a delegate from the FRG had told me privately that a satisfactory resolution of the problem of a peaceful re-unification of the then two German states, at some future point, was absolutely essential for his delegation. The issue involved acceptable language in the Basket I "Declaration on Principles". Since the American delegation held regular staff meetings, I was keenly aware of this prolonged issue. In the end, it was resolved only after one of the periodic meetings between Secretary of State Kissinger and Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko (February 17-18, 1975) and subsequent negotiations between the heads of the two delegations in Geneva. Finally, on March 17, 1975, the agreed text was tabled, reading "The participating States consider that their frontiers can be changed

in accordance with international law, by peaceful means and by agreement". The language was finally incorporated in the Principle of Sovereign Equality. It is noteworthy that the Soviet side assumed — wrongly, as it turned out in the march of historic events — that this concession would be overridden by the assurances in Principle 3 regarding the "Inviolability of frontiers" and in Principle 4 concerning the "Territorial integrity of states". Similarly, the U.S.S.R. leadership in Moscow also incorrectly assumed that the broad assertions in Principle 7 on human rights would, in practice, be overridden by Principle 6 on "Nonintervention in internal affairs".

By the time Secretary Kissinger met with Gromyko in Vienna, on May 19-20, 1975, much had changed in the climate of U.S.-Soviet relations. This change was brought about by a number of factors, including the collapse of the U.S.-supported regime in South Vietnam and the economic and energy crisis then underway. These events had taken place far from the CSCE but their impact was promptly felt in Geneva.

On the occasion of the May meeting between Kissinger and Gromyko, the former for the first time was more informed about the details of the CSCE than was the Soviet Foreign Minister. Kissinger pressed Gromyko to accept the Western package on human rights, recently proposed by the Western delegations to the East at the CSCE. He thereby made it clear that this package was a firm proposal with which the Soviets would have to deal.⁶

⁶In his latest Memoirs, Kissinger gives credit for this insight to the then Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, Arthur Hartman. The latter was a very able FSO, who was subsequently Ambassador to France and to the Soviet Union. Kissinger states that Hartman "mastered all the details" of the CSCE negotiations in Geneva. Henry Kissinger, *Years Of Renewal* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999), p.

There remains little to be written about my experiences in the Geneva phase of the CSCE. It is perhaps worth adding that in his book on the CSCE, Maresca asserts that “Eventually, a team of U.S. linguists was brought to Geneva to check all language versions to ensure agreement among them”.⁷ As a Russian speaker who twice served in the American Embassy in Moscow, it might be helpful to note that most of the team’s efforts were concentrated on ensuring, to the maximum extent possible, agreement between the English and Russian-language texts. In this effort, they were ably supported by a Russian-speaking linguist sent to Geneva by the FRG Foreign Ministry in Bonn.

Two final thoughts are definitely noteworthy. First of all, both Kagan and a number of writers including Kissinger have overrated the importance of the provisions of Basket III as compared with the sweeping language of Principle No. 7 in Basket I. I have already noted the Kremlin’s miscalculation in this regard, but it is worth repeating as this article draws to conclusion.

Secondly, although the stiffer position of the U.S. in 1975 should certainly not be overlooked, it is the West European delegations who bear equal if not greater responsibility for whatever success has been achieved as a result of the Geneva

Henry Kissinger, *Years Of Renewal* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999), p. 641.

It should also be noted that in this book, Kissinger admits that “I for one was initially skeptical about the possibilities of Basket III. We did not expect the Soviet empire to collapse so quickly;” *Ibid*, p.663. Kissinger does not, in this citation, mention the sweeping language of Principle No. 7 in Basket I.

phase of the CSCE. We in the U. S. owe them a debt of gratitude. But even the West European delegations and their leaders, as well as the U.S. side, were unaware that they were among the factors, however slight, leading to the eventual demise of the U.S.S.R. None of the delegations at the Geneva phase of the CSCE could have realized this, and other factors certainly played a more prominent role in the eventual collapse of the Soviet Union, including the special circumstances of the actual event in 1991.

To sum up, with the modifications suggested above, Kagan is on target in his criticism of Henry Kissinger's latest book so far as the Geneva phase of the CSCE is concerned.

It may also be said that, as spelled out above, to compare the Kissinger of 1973-74 with the Kissinger of 1975 is rather unfair, once again so far as the CSCE is concerned.

Finally, to jump from the long-ago gathering of the CSCE in Geneva to the present time, it is difficult to underestimate the current influence and power of the U. S. on the world stage. Nonetheless, it remains both necessary and important to recognize the limits to American efforts abroad as we enter the new Century.

“IT’S NOT WHAT WE SAY, IT’S WHAT WE DO”:
THE STUDY AND WRITING OF U.S. FOREIGN
RELATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

by

Thomas Schoonover
LOUISIANA AT LAFAYETTE

[This paper opened a colloquium, held from 4 to 6 October, 1999, on “México-Estados Unidos: hacía una neuva historia diplomática,” at the Instituto José María Luis Mora, México. An earlier version was read at the University of Wisconsin at Madison on 19 October 1991 at the “Rethinking the Cold War: Conference in Honor of William Appleman Williams.” - editor]

Even William A. Williams, the giant in that subdiscipline of U.S. history called U.S. foreign relations or diplomatic history, only challenged readers to consider societies and intellectual traditions in Europe and the Third World. He never made excursions into the records of foreign countries. But Williams was not unique among scholars of U.S. foreign relations. Until the current decade, not many students of U.S. foreign relations pursued their research projects in foreign archives and languages. The numbers are growing slowly, but it is time that many more do so on a regular basis. This subdiscipline needs revised standards and expectations from its leaders — the senior scholars and teachers who are the doctoral fathers. This essay will describe my views on the study of U.S. international history in the United States during my professional lifetime and of the principal organization for promoting it, the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. Toward the end, I will make some brief observations on some current scholarship on Mexican-U.S. relations in the past two decades, as basis for an evaluation of SHAFR’s role in the study of Mexican-U.S. relations.

First, a sketch of the history of diplomatic history in the United States, and its practitioners is helpful. From the mid-nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries, history was professionalized in Europe and the United States. The subfield of diplomatic history emerged in the interwar decades. World War II and the Cold War greatly increased interest in and study of U.S. foreign relations, but these events, overvaluing the present, also thoroughly distorted the study of the past. The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations (SHAFR) was founded in 1967 and chartered in 1972. Soon SHAFR began a newsletter, organized annual meetings, sponsored the journal *Diplomatic History* in 1977, and awarded the Stuart Bernath Book and Article Prizes (later SHAFR administered ten additional prizes and scholarships).¹ Currently SHAFR has about 1,800 members and *Diplomatic History* has over 2,200 subscriptions around the world. SHAFR and its journal are unquestionably the beacon institutions for the history of U.S. foreign relations. The organization and its journal shape the teaching, research, and publication standards for the subdiscipline. It has ample funds to pursue its mission. SHAFR is an important historical organization.

How has SHAFR affected the teaching and research of the subfield? Are the sessions at its meetings and the articles in its journal and newsletter indicative of what the subdiscipline is accomplishing? What role does SHAFR have in U.S.-Mexican or U.S.-Latin American relations? I assume that SHAFR, its journals, and its prizes, represent the standards and objectives of the subdiscipline in an elevated sense. The articles in *Diplomatic History* and the conference papers at SHAFR's annual meetings demonstrate the fundamental weaknesses in the subfield. The articles and papers are too often ethnocentric, rooted in the examination of only one side of a many-sided process; they offer little encouragement to theoretical work; and they are exceedingly presentist (excessively

¹Items about SHAFR's history are found in the *SHAFR Newsletter* and *Diplomatic History*, see for example Warren F. Kuehl, "A President's Appraisal," *SHAFR Newsletter* 16 (Dec. 1985):1-2.

concerned with World War II and the Cold War). The works in the journal and at the meetings frequently tell the U.S. perspective on a story, even when describing other societies, cultures, and their foreign policies. Moreover, the absence of theory gives the narrative histories of the subdiscipline a distinct U.S. flavor even when describing phenomena which occur universally. The ethnocentrism produces parochial studies which colleagues outside of the subfield often find conservative or nationalistic.²

In the late 1980s the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, the Mormons, conducted a television campaign about child-rearing through example under the slogan "It's not what we say, it's what we do" that counts. This slogan applies equally to the writing and teaching of U.S. international history. Over the past thirty or forty years, historians of this subfield and a few outside critics have pointed repeatedly to the myopia, ethnocentrism, nationalism, exceptionalism, elitism, and presentism in the scholarship of the branch. The fact that the weaknesses have continued for many years suggests a geological rate of transformation. How can we expect students and young people generally to retain an interest in or respect for the past, if as a subdiscipline, we show little interest in events before the past 50 or 60 years? Several SHAFR presidential addresses have confronted these weaknesses of the subfield. But, I remind you, it is not what we say, it is what we do

²Peter Gay's adjective to describe U.S. diplomatic history while delivering the Flora Levy Lecture at the University of Southwestern Louisiana on March 29, 1990; Robert McMahon argues the student enrollment in diplomatic history courses is increasing, Robert J. McMahon, "The Study of American Foreign Relations: National History or International History?" in Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Paterson, eds., *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 11, but I suspect two factors qualify his judgement. First, I suspect his reference point is recent, perhaps about the late 1970s or early 1980s, and second, he includes courses on the Vietnam War where frequently there is limited interest in the diplomacy or foreign relations, but rather more in the internal U.S. popular and student resistance and in military history. See also Sally Marks, "The World According to Washington," *Diplomatic History* 11 (Summer 1987):265.

that counts.³

An examination of the programs of SHAFR's annual meetings, the journal *Diplomatic History*, and the Bernath prize awards confirms that major problems exist in the subfield. SHAFR's organs do not encourage the broad quality of scholarship essential to this subdiscipline. I compared the use of foreign language materials in articles published in *Diplomatic History* with those on U.S. international history published in the *Pacific Historical Review* and in *The Journal of American History* over the past twenty plus years. I simply counted footnotes to determine how frequently U.S. historians of foreign relations cited foreign language sources. I sorted each note on a scale that placed them first in non-English language manuscript sources, then in non-English language printed items, and finally in English language materials. This method exaggerated the use of foreign material which made the results that much more disheartening. A footnote with many U.S. sources and one foreign language source counted in a foreign language footnote category. Apparently, the processes for selecting articles at the *Pacific Historical Review* and *The Journal of American History* followed the methodological goals of competent diplomatic history more consistently than did *Diplomatic History*. (See Tables 1, 2, and 3 at the end of this article.) Of course, historians do not monopolize responsibility for these shortcomings. Scholarship

³Alexander DeConde, "What's Wrong with American Diplomatic History?" *SHAFR Newsletter* 1 (May 1970):1-16; Laurence Evans, "The Dangers of Diplomatic History," in Herbert J. Bass, ed., *The State of American History* (Chicago: 1970); Thomas McCormick, "The State of American Diplomatic History," in Herbert J. Bass, ed., *The State of American History* (Chicago: 1970), 119-141; Charles S. Maier, "Marking Time: The Historiography of International Relations," in Michael Kammen, ed., *The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1981), 355-387; Warren F. Kuehl, "Webs of Common Interests Revisited: Nationalism, Internationalism, and Historians of American Foreign Relations," *Diplomatic History* 10 (Spring 1986):107-120; McMahan, "The Study of American Foreign Relations: National History or International History?," 11; Alexander DeConde, "Essay and Reflection: On the Nature of International History," *International History Review* 10 (May 1988):282-301; Iriye, "Culture and Power: International Relations as Intercultural Relations," 115-128; Michael H. Hunt, "Internationalizing U.S. Diplomatic History: A Practical Agenda," *Diplomatic History* 15 (1991):1-11.

which relies upon English language materials (almost to the exclusion of non-English foreign language materials) is intertwined with ineffective language and cultural training.⁴ In the past few years, *Diplomatic History* has been more open to foreign scholars. For example, in early 1999, *Diplomatic History* published an issue with four articles by German scholars dealing with the subject of fraternization in post-World War II German-United States relations. These German scholars all conducted bilingual research. Reliance upon the work of U.S. scholars who examine all relevant sides of an international issue remains scarce, but use of foreign scholarship may be the best route available in the short term.

A few examples will illustrate the common methodological flaws. One scholar searched U.S. and British diplomatic correspondence to describe French policy toward the United States in 1861 rather than examine French sources. Another SHAFR prize-winning book described the political and economic policies and objectives of Latin American societies by referring to U.S. diplomatic and consular reports. Sadly, foreign scholars trained in the United States sometimes catch this U.S. methodological germ and rely upon U.S. printed and archival materials to describe U.S. relations with their native country. One U.S.-trained Latin American scholar analyzed U.S.-Latin American relations without using Latin American sources. A Scandinavian scholar wrote a study of the Cold War which included a chapter, "Socialism and Scandinavian Social Democrats," based upon the reports and correspondence of U.S. foreign service agents rather than Scandinavian documents.⁵

⁴ Akira Iriye, "Culture and Power: International Relations as Intercultural Relations," *Diplomatic History* 3 (Spring 1979):115-128; Frank Ninkovich, "Interests and Discourse in Diplomatic History," *Diplomatic History* 13:2 (Spring 1989):135-161; Richard H. Immerman, "The History of U.S. Foreign Policy: A Plea for Pluralism," *Diplomatic History* 14 (1990):574-583; William O. Walker III, "Drug Control and the Issue of Culture in American Foreign Relations," *Diplomatic History* 12 (1988):365-382.

⁵ Thomas Schoonover, review of Norman Ferris, *Desperate Diplomacy: William H. Seward's Foreign Policy 1861*, in *Pacific Historical Review* 47 (Aug. 1978):480-481; Thomas Schoonover, review of Stephen G. Rabe, *Eisenhower and Latin America: The Foreign Policy*

Such instances suggest it is not only language skills, but also the mentoring perspective of the discipline which induces some foreign scholars with language skills to accept the subdiscipline's and the culture's assumption that only U.S. sources are plentiful, reliable, and unbiased. Yet, if we project U.S. methodology into other cases, these other situations become unacceptable. For example, if a Russian-language U.S. trained scholar wrote a Soviet-U.S. cold war study based solely on Soviet sources, I suspect that many of my colleagues in SHAFR would give it short shrift.

The weaknesses of provincialism and the suspicion of other cultures persisted for a long time in other activities of SHAFR and the profession. Until recently, SHAFR's annual meetings have not attracted foreign scholars, non-U.S.-centered perspectives, nor theoretical approaches to history. The books and articles which win the Stuart Bernath awards often reinforce an image of a profession distrustful or suspicious of the non-English speaking world. (See Table 4 below.) In the past few years, this has changed at least to the extent of attracting scholars from industrial states to the annual meetings. At the 1999 meeting at Princeton University, about 26 of about 200 participants were foreign scholars — 19 from Europe, 3 from Canada, and 4 from Asia. The annual SHAFR meetings since the early-1990s have, on average, attracted eleven percent (11%) foreign scholars as participants. Eighty-six percent of the foreign scholars who have attended SHAFR meetings in the past 5 years, however, have come from the industrial areas — Europe, Canada, or Japan. Latin America, Africa, Asia except for Japan, and the Arab world are poorly represented. Still, these figures represented improvement over the composition of the meetings 10

of Anticommunism, in *The Historian* 51 (May 1989):525-526; Thomas Schoonover, review of Alex Roberto Hybel, *How Leaders Reason: U.S. Intervention in the Caribbean Basin and Latin America*, Michael Krenn, *U.S. Policy toward Economic Nationalism in Latin America, 1917-1929*, and J. Valerie Fifer, *United States Perceptions of Latin America 1850-1930: A 'New West' South of Capricorn?*, in *International History Review* 14:1 (Feb. 1992):139-143; see also Tables 5 and 6 on use of foreign language materials by Bernath Prize winning books and articles; Geir Lundestad, *America, Scandinavia, and the Cold War, 1945-1949* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980).

or more years ago. At SHAFR's 1976 annual meeting, there was widespread ridicule of and poor attendance at two sessions which dealt with theoretical problems. The monographs awarded the Bernath Prize since inception — that means scholarly works judged to reflect the best of the profession — have cited little foreign non-English materials.⁶ (See Tables 5 and 6 below.) This examination of SHAFR's journal, annual meetings, and prizes persuaded me that ethnocentrism, presentism, and provincialism remain common in our subfield despite the repeated admonishments from critics within and without the subfield. In the 1990s, I detect modest progress. (See reliance upon foreign scholarship is not reflected in Table 1 below.) The problem still remains to induce or persuade SHAFR members, especially the senior scholars, to revise their image of what students of U.S. foreign relations should do and also what characteristics of the new scholarship should mark a work as special.

Richard Immerman and Michael Hunt have identified language limitations as a problem in the whole field of U.S. history. U.S. foreign relations scholars are selected through departmental politics where, in too many instances, the U.S. historians place little value upon language skills. Departmental politics are not solely responsible. An honored ex-president of SHAFR confessed that he fled European history to focus on U.S. foreign relations because he could not learn the languages. Reflect on the irony of U.S. diplomatic history as a refuge for those fleeing foreign languages, a skill fundamental to understanding other societies. Sally Marks observed that U.S. scholars who do not learn languages can still achieve preeminence in U.S. international relations. And European historians complain that U.S. historians rarely visit European archives to discover the other side of the story even when Europe is the other side, preferring to rely upon "the assumptions of

⁶David S. Patterson, "What's Wrong (and Right) with American Diplomatic History?" *SHAFR Newsletter* 9 (Sept. 1978):1-14.

American officials about circumstances abroad.”⁷ U.S. historians seldom visit the archives in other non-English language areas either. Scholars of U.S.-Asian relations are the chief exceptions. They commonly know at least one Asian language and often at least one imperial-power language.

The subfield of diplomatic history definitely needs people with transnational capabilities and sensitivity to time. Too often conceived without theory, the U.S. study of international relations has focused upon fact gathering in the recent past and allowed its principal “research design” to be the constantly repeated concern that the U.S. government has not opened up recent records quickly or extensively enough to satisfy research. The subfield is often satisfied with new data, to supplement or deepen existing information, rather than preferring entirely new perspectives available from new data sources, such as the variety of archives available from other countries. Such a new data demands new ideas, new theories, and new methods. Ironically many U.S. diplomatic historians refuse to analyze the voluminous data that already exists for the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries, yet they see doomsday looming because recent data is not released.⁸ The subfield remains presentist which is anti-historical because it ignores two central aspects of history — time moves in a continuum of past, present, and *future*, and every sliver of time is future, present, and past. If the past is of little value to the present, then the present is of little value to the future because the present is the past of the future.

Do the editors and referees of *Diplomatic History* have priorities for method, theory, and writing quality? George Herring noted that one

⁷Marks, “The World According to Washington,” 265; Robert H. Ferrell, “Three Generations of Diplomatic Historians,” *SHAFR Newsletter* 3 (May 1972):1-8; Hunt, “Internationalizing U.S. Diplomatic History,” 1-11; Immerman, “The History of U.S. Foreign Policy,” 574-583.

⁸Christopher Thorne, “After the Europeans: American Designs for the Remaking of Southeast Asia,” *Diplomatic History* 12 (1988):201-208.

rejected writer labeled *Diplomatic History* very boring and dull. Boring and dull history is not as dangerous as attractive, carefully crafted history which is methodologically unsound and of very modest value. Half the story (or less), however well told and cogently argued, remains half the story (or less). Good writing is professionally less central than theoretically and methodologically sound scholarship, although, of course, all three — writing, theory, and method — are essential for enduring history.⁹ Ideally, historians want both substance and form, but they must give substance a higher priority than form — the product of their method and craft before the form used to convey the product.

This cultural myopia for U.S.-centered foreign relations undermines the subdiscipline's methodology. For example, it allows an historian to discuss U.S. policy towards the Brazilian naval revolt of the 1890s solely upon the basis of U.S. archival materials. The ploy or disguise of doing dissertations, articles, and books under titles such as 'U.S. Policy towards country X' marks an effort to circumvent the need to work in country X's archives or its history and culture. Yet diplomatic historians demand that all parties, factions, and interest groups involved in U.S. policy formation deserve attention. They would reject a history of U.S. involvement in Vietnam written solely, for example, from Lyndon Johnson's papers.¹⁰

Some historians argue for the preservation of a niche in national history for U.S. foreign relations. Why is the study of U.S.-German relations any more U.S. history than German history? Placing foreign relations in any national compartment is faulty logic.

⁹Thomas J. Noer, "The 'Dirty Little Secret' in American Diplomatic History," *SHAFR Newsletter* 20:2 (June 1989):22-34; report of Michael Hogan, *Diplomatic History* 11 (Spring 1987):179-180.

¹⁰There are many examples; I took this one from Charles W. Calhoun, "American Policy Toward the Brazilian Naval Revolt of 1893-94: A Reexamination," *Diplomatic History* 4 (1980):39-56.

Scholars Michael Hunt, Hans-Ulrich Wehler, Richard Salisbury, André Gunder Frank, Eric Wolf, Immanuel Wallerstein, Ciro Cardoso, Héctor Pérez Brignoli, Lorenzo Meyer, and Josefina Zoraida Vázquez, to note only a very few scholars who cross national borders, have produced multicultural and multilingual works which present two or more sides of U.S. international relations. Most of these scholars also used theory to shape their work. By definition, U.S. foreign relations involve other countries. Unfortunately, there is greater urgency to find a niche for U.S. diplomatic history in U.S. history than in the history of the other countries. The connection with other governments and cultures is vital however. And the subdiscipline involved much more than intergovernmental or inter-bureaucratic exchanges. In fact, U.S. foreign relations have involved scores of non-national bodies (such as businesses or religious organizations).¹¹

Foreign relations history has demonstrated non-recognition of broader, theoretical approaches. In twenty-three years, *Diplomatic History* had published only a couple of articles and several presidential addresses on theoretical matters until, in the fall of 1990, a special issue dealt extensively with defining the subfield. In 1991, a past president of SHAFR and the editor of *Diplomatic History* edited a volume, *Explaining the History of American*

¹¹ Immerman, "The History of U.S. Foreign Policy," 574-583; Walter LaFeber, 'Ah, if we had studied it more carefully': The Fortunes of American Diplomatic History," *Prologue* 11:2 (Summer 1979):121-131; Michael Hunt, *Frontier Defense and the Open Door: Manchuria in Chinese-American Relations, 1895-1911* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1973); Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Der Aufstieg des amerikanischen Imperialismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1974); Richard Salisbury, *Anti-Imperialism and International Competition in Central America, 1920-1929* (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1989); Andre Gunder Frank, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America* (New York: Monthly Review, 1967); Eric Wolf, *Europe and the People without History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982); Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-system* (3 vols.; New York: Academic, 1974-1988); Ciro Cardoso and Héctor Pérez Brignoli, *Centro América y la Economía Occidental (1520-1930)* (San José: Universidad de Costa Rica, 1977); Josefina Zoriada Vázquez and Lorenzo Meyer, *México frente a Estados Unidos: un ensayo histórico 1776-1980* (México: El Colegio de México, 1982).

Foreign Relations.¹² Eight of the book's sixteen essays came from *The Journal of American History*, six from *Diplomatic History*, and two were written for this book. The essays that tackled theory head on, came from *The Journal of American History*. Now much of the theoretical work on international history has been written outside the United States. One *Diplomatic History* article reflected the deeply rooted ethnocentrism when it discussed some theories of international relations by drawing only upon English language materials. Compare this essay with Hans-Ulrich Wehler's brief, eighty-page essay, "Modernisierungstheorie und Geschichte"¹³ ["Modernization Theory and History"] which rests upon an exhaustive examination of British, U.S., German, Austrian, Spanish-language, French, and some Italian scholarship. Admittedly, the value and utility of these theories is debatable, but so are theories in the sciences and the social sciences. U.S. diplomatic historians could at least join the debate, if only to learn enough to educate the next generation of scholars.¹⁴ The use of theory to understand human interaction will not go away. The subdiscipline apparently suffers from studying a government that too often adopted the policy non-recognition!

In 1847, John Quincy Adams responded to a historian who inquired about how to write a history of the Mexican War with these words: "A Historian you know must have neither Religion nor Country." John Quincy Adams's words have not decreased in value for the profession, especially in light of U.S. exceptionalism within the

¹²Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Paterson, *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

¹³(Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975).

¹⁴Wehler, *Modernisierungstheorie und Geschichte*; Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Imperialismstheorien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980); Hans-Christoph Schroder, *Sozialistische Imperialismusdeutung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1973); Ole R. Holsti, "Models of International Relations and Foreign Policy," *Diplomatic History* 13:1 (Winter 1989):15-43.

profession. The debate over the name of the subfield is more than semantic and suggests positions toward exceptionalism and bias.

The theoretical basis and the fundamental assumptions change when historians see their task to research or teach U.S. diplomatic history, U.S. foreign policy, U.S. foreign relations, or U.S. international history. In the first case, U.S. diplomatic historians pursue the subdiscipline within the confines of U.S. government bureaucracies. Exceptionalism and bias (records of only one side consulted) are difficult to avoid. In the second case, U.S. foreign policy focuses on the public and bureaucratic roles in the formation of national policy. Again exceptionalism and bias are difficult to avoid. In the third case, U.S. foreign relations expands to include formal national and informal corporate, business, social, or cultural contact, preferably for at least two sides. This broader field of study should weaken the weight of exceptionalism and bias. In the fourth instance, U.S. international history, the researcher, in accord with John Quincy Adams's admonition, should be freed from national or cultural bonds and thus be able to surmount the barrier of nationalism. Of course, in all these artificial cases, the integrity of the scholar is essential to the product, but what one's professional task and obligations are will influence his or her work.¹⁵

In my academic lifetime, many who work in the subfield have gone from U.S. diplomatic history to U.S. foreign relations. The search is still frequently limited to English-language archives. In the parlance of the profession, diplomatic historians have advanced their search from what one damn diplomat said to another damn diplomat, to what one damn Anglo-Saxon said to another damn Anglo-Saxon; neither has to be a diplomat anymore.

Still historians need to bring saying and doing into accord within the subfield. Contemporary critics point to the same flaws in the subfield as those critiqued two generations ago when the "founding

¹⁵Edward Pessen, "'A Historian must have no country': John Quincy Adams' Standard for Historians," *OAH Newsletter* 16 (Feb. 1988):2-3.

fathers” of U.S. diplomatic history, Samuel Flagg Bemis (an abandoned pioneer in multi-archival), Thomas Bailey, and Dexter Perkins were active. The heart of the problem apparently lies in the graduate schools where the scholars are trained to conceptualize their field and its problems. If each generation continues to conceptualize the field as narrowly ethnocentric, nationalistic, and presentist, then the profession will remain mired in the ruts of the past.¹⁶ Ultimately, the mentors of the profession need to demand multi-lingual, transnational research within enlightened theoretical and methodological frameworks.

The subdiscipline must try to change its method of instruction and its patterns of reward and recognition. Historians of foreign relations need to do that urgently in how they teach and how they design research projects. Young historians can learn languages and acquire familiarity with one or more cultures. Private foundations, universities, and the U.S. government have grants, scholarships, or loans for language training or study and research abroad. Students and their families or student loans are other possible funding sources. Learning several languages merely takes time and effort. The profession should establish elevated models and standards at which the students should aim. Senior scholars without language skills should recognize that their work would have been enhanced if they had had such skills, and they should help to establish the

¹⁶Lester D. Langley, “The Diplomatic Historians: Bailey and Bemis,” *SHAFR Newsletter*, 4 (Dec., 1973), 2-6; Charles E. Neu, “The Changing Interpretive Structure of American Foreign Policy,” in John Braeman, ed., *Twentieth Century American Foreign Policy* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1971), 1-57; Raymond O’Conner, “Thomas A. Bailey: His Impact,” *Diplomatic History* 9 (1985):303-309; Gaddis Smith, “The Two Worlds of Samuel Flagg Bemis,” *Diplomatic History* 9 (Fall 1985):295-302; Robert H. Ferrell, “They Don’t Make ’em Like Bemis Any More,” *OAH Newsletter* 15:3 (Aug. 1987):2-3; Francis L. Loewenheim, “A Legacy of Hope and a Legacy of Doubt: Reflections on the Role of History and Historians in American Foreign Relations since the Eighteenth Century,” in F. Loewenheim, ed., *The Historian and the Diplomat: The Role of History and the Historians in American Foreign Policy* (New York: Harper, 1971), 2, 66-71; Kuehl, “Webs of Common Interests Revisited,” 107-120; Hunt, “Internationalizing U.S. Diplomatic History,” 1-11; Evans, “The Dangers of Diplomatic History”; LaFeber, “‘Ah, if we had studied it more carefully,’” 121-131; DeConde, “What’s Wrong with American Diplomatic History?,” 1-16.

higher standard for contemporary graduate students. After all, we are supposed to elevate the education of students not clone ourselves.

If one chooses the subdiscipline of foreign relations, one has to accept multicultural and multilingual training to do it right. In assessing the value of foreign language training, SHAFR members might consider the reasoning of University of Minnesota Regents Professor Tom B. Jones, retired historian of the ancient world. Jones would not allow his graduate students to use Latin or classical Greek to meet their foreign language requirements (although they had to be highly skilled in *both*). He insisted that a professional could not function in the field of ancient history without these languages. Certainly, for a person undertaking graduate study of U.S.-Latin American relations, for example, Spanish or/and Portuguese are fundamental to their career choice. Requirements along these lines must become the norm in order for U.S. diplomatic historians to perform adequately in their chosen subfield.

One senior historian cited the closed French foreign ministry archives to deflect some of the criticism regarding poor use of foreign language sources. That seems a weak excuse. The doctoral candidate or researcher does not need to select a topic where records are not available in ample quantity and in a variety to let him or her investigate and analyze the topic. Scholars do not have to select the most recent decades where sources are scarce. Sure the French archives are not open for recent decades, but the archives of every country are closed at some point before the present. Even when a scholar selects a project in a period where the French archives are closed, that scholar is not excused from locating the same printed sources in French society — government publications, diaries and memoirs, published correspondence, journalist accounts, and newspapers — which she or he would use to ferret out information on contemporary history in the United States.¹⁷

¹⁷ Immerman, "The History of U.S. Foreign Policy," 574-583; Hunt, "Internationalizing U.S. Diplomatic History," 1-11.

Consider the recent works of a few scholars who write about Mexican-U.S. relations. Some U.S. and Mexican archives related to Mexican-U.S. relations are closed. In the past decade or two, both Mexican and U.S. scholars have produced high quality essays, monographs, and works synthesizing Mexican-U.S. relations. They selected topics where materials were available. The list of works contains bilingual and multilingual studies which offer persuasive evidence and arguments. Two excellent interpretive studies illuminate Mexican-U.S. relations since the early nineteenth century. Josefina Zoraida Vázquez and Lorenzo Meyer's *México frente a Estados Unidos: un ensayo histórico 1776-1980*.²⁵ The Vázquez-Meyer book evokes discussion and resistance among students in the United States as they are confronted with the alternative nationalist view of the long Mexican-U.S. relationship. W. Dirk Raat's fine *Mexico and the United States: Ambivalent Vistas*²⁶ also offers a story sensitive to Mexican and U.S. sources while it challenges the traditional narrative across the whole spectrum of disputes from the Texas crisis of the 1820s and 1830s to the maquilladores, undocumented immigrants, and drug trafficking.

Contemporary German scholars commonly produce multilingual studies: the old master Friedrich Katz's *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa*²⁷, Jürgen Buchenau's *In the Shadow of the Giant: The Making of Mexico's Central American Policy, 1876-1930*²⁸, and Friedrich Schuler's *Mexico between Hitler and Roosevelt: Mexican Foreign Relations in the Age of Lázaro Cárdenas*²⁹ all

²⁵Vázquez and Meyer's *México frente a Estados Unidos*, translated by University of Chicago Press in 1985.

²⁶(Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992).

²⁷(Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998).

²⁸(Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1996).

²⁹(Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998).

draw upon Mexican, U.S., and European archives (and Central American archives in Buchenau's case). We must remember that the relationship between two governments is almost always important to more than those two governments. Looking at a third, a fourth, or a fifth side is valuable even if it requires special kinds of funding, language ability, and scholarly research design.

Some recent monographs of limited time frame reflect high quality scholarship. Josefina Vázquez has produced *De la rebelión de Texas a la guerra de 1847*³⁰ and *La intervención norteamericana, 1846-1848*³¹ which have strongly argued themes and the support of impressive visual imagery. Ana Rosa Suárez's *Un duque norteamericano para Sonora*³² and her prize-winning *De Maine a México: La misión diplomática de Nathan Clifford (1848-1849)*³³ draw upon bilingual archival and printed primary and secondary sources to study important historical moments.

Some recent Mexican and U.S. monographs present high quality studies of Mexican-U.S. relations from the revolution through its aftermath and the oil crises of the 1920s and 1930s. Helen Delpar traces the cultural images and relations between 1920 and 1935 in *The Enormous Vogue of Things Mexican: Cultural Relations between the United States and Mexico, 1920-1935*³⁴, while Emilio Zebadua's *Banqueros y revolucionarios: la soberana financiera de México, 1914-1929* and Linda Hall, *Oil, Banks, and Politics: The*

³⁰(México: Nueva Imagen, 1994).

³¹(México: Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1997).

³²(México: Dirección General de Publicaciones, 1990).

³³(México: Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1994).

³⁴(Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1992).

*United States and Postrevolutionary Mexico, 1917-1924*³⁵ treat a well travelled road but use Mexican and U.S. banking and bankers' records to look at new bi-lateral aspects of the problem. Jonathan Brown's *Oil and Revolution in Mexico*³⁶ adds an examination of the workers to the business and elite records. These studies use at least U.S. and Mexican sources and some also draw upon British archives.

These few works from a larger body of recent scholarship are merely suggestive; the selection is not exhaustive nor representative because my point lies a bit beyond the themes and intrinsic value of this scholarship. None of the scholars of the studies mentioned here is a member of SHAFR (according to the "1996 Membership Guide"). The "Membership Guide" noted quite a few SHAFR members who listed their research interest as Latin America generally or Mexico specifically — 43 listed Latin America and 21 noted Mexico. I wish to make a point here, but without belaboring the issue. Of the scores of good quality work on Mexican-U.S. relations in the past two decades, very little, perhaps none, seems to come from SHAFR members. Somehow, either SHAFR has not attracted the serious scholars doing Mexican-U.S. relations, or those doing serious Mexican-U.S. relations have not considered SHAFR, its meetings, and its journal as a place to present their research. I find either alternative unfortunate and a bit unsettling. If U.S. foreign relations is to remain healthy, some, perhaps most, of the scholars doing quality bilingual or multilingual studies of Mexican-U.S. or Latin American-U.S. relations should find SHAFR a necessary part of their professional lives. If not, SHAFR needs to restructure itself so these historians do find SHAFR relevant.

SHAFR and the profession should set a high priority on the task of revising the discipline's standards and making their departmental

³⁵(Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995).

³⁶(Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

colleagues aware that foreign language skills are necessary for good scholar-teachers of U.S. foreign relations. In fact, it was always difficult to work in U.S. domestic history without language skills. Vast bodies of governmental records, private diaries, letters, and business records are in non-English languages. The continent north of Mexico is overwhelmingly a place of immigrants. To incorporate these millions of U.S. residents into U.S. history requires many languages.)

Reaffirming the value of theory, methodology, and professionalism offer the best hope for correcting some persistent problems. The profession needs the determination and perseverance to correlate what it says with what it does. The subdiscipline would be better served if some of the labor devoted to opening up more boxes of government records could be diverted to assuring that the major bibliographical guide, the *SHAFR Guide to American Foreign Relations*, which is currently being revised and updated under chief editor Robert Beisner, will incorporate foreign language materials. Some chapter editors apparently want to make space by eliminating non-English language sources. SHAFR has an increasingly large number of foreign members and many foreign library subscriptions. They, a large minority of U.S. members, and some other U.S. and foreign non-members will judge an essentially English-language guide harshly. I feel confident that SHAFR and the guide's editors will not opt to produce a flawed, inferior product.

There is a need for radical transformation of the instruction of U.S. international history. Reform will be difficult. Scholars need to rethink the objectives of the profession and to reexamine how to guide students and the professional organization along a different course. There are signs that the subdiscipline may be changing slowly. Recently, *Diplomatic History* published articles discussing theoretical aspects of international relations. In the 1990s, the SHAFR's W. Stull Holt Dissertation Awards have gone several times to doctoral students to conduct research abroad and SHAFR's Council commended the program committee of the 1991 conference for incorporating foreign scholars into the meeting. The guidelines

for the Stuart Bernath Prizes, however, desperately need a sentence of instruction to the selection committee that prize quality history of foreign relations scholarship should incorporate materials in all relevant languages and from all relevant countries. Serious historians of domestic events demand examination of all relevant sources and perspectives; the methodological standard applied in U.S. foreign relations scholarship should not be inferior to the domestic methodology. Historians should not continue to accept "national" foreign policy history as a legitimate substitute for U.S. foreign relations or international history. Michael Hunt and Richard Immerman have given considerable attention to the practical problems involved in changing the nature and methodology of the subdiscipline. Hunt clearly sees the need to alter the situation at the training level.³⁰ Members of the profession need to set examples in their teaching and publishing and demand appropriate preparation of their students.

It is not what we — SHAFR members and the practitioners of U.S. foreign relations history — say, but what we do that will bring about the changes necessary to give scholars of international history the necessary sensitivity to and the knowledge of foreign cultures. About three decades ago, as SHAFR was founded, there was a debate about the name and objectives of what had been U.S. diplomatic history. Those urging a broader approach to the subdiscipline apparently won as the organization, textbooks, and course descriptions commonly opted for the history of American foreign relations. Shades of Karl Marx and Gabriel Kolko, there may have been a "bounapartist" "triumph of conservatism." The organization and its members incorporate little history, if we include human activity more than sixty years ago as part of history, and very little foreign in what they do.

³⁰"SHAFR Council Meeting, June 20, 1991," *SHAFR Newsletter* 22 (Sept. 1991):52-54; Immerman, "The History of U.S. Foreign Policy," 574-583; Hunt, "Internationalizing U.S. Diplomatic History," 1-11.

A historical subdiscipline sensitive to foreign cultures should also allow a more sympathetic comprehension of those Third World societies which have paid much of the past costs, and seem slated to bear much of the future burden, of the North Atlantic communities' expansion and accumulation of wealth and of the Cold War. Their price is debt burdens, reduced living standards, and loss of sovereignty. The study of U.S. international relations has great and vital meaning for the world. The U.S. government was unable to relate to Third World countries during the Cold War in part because U.S. experts in foreign relations were poorly trained to comprehend or communicate with these societies; some of the long proclaimed Cold War military savings should be diverted to raise the language ability and cultural contact of U.S. scholars. SHAFR should follow the course that William A. Williams indicated but never pursued.

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

Table 1: Foreign research evident in the articles of *Diplomatic History* footnotes using materials from:

Vol	# of arts.	arts. only U.S.	total foot-notes	non-Engl. print	non-Engl. mss.	% non-Engl.	% for. mss.
1	22	10	1,222	25	46	5.8	3.8
2	23	8	1,303	43		3.3	
3	23	11	1,167	24	18	3.6	1.5
4	20	11	1,195	18		1.5	
5	18	8	1,095	3		0.3	
6	18	11	1,158	11		0.9	
7	16	7	948	80	17	10.2	1.8
8	18	9	1,073	27		2.5	
9	17	10	901	16		1.8	
10	19	7	969	22	23	4.6	2.4
11	18	9	920	34	3	4.0	3.3
12	16	9	961	46	9	5.7	0.9
13	19	7	1,193	33		2.8	
14	23	5	1,353	20	10	2.2	0.7
15	12	5	813	9	2	1.4	0.2
16	14	10	965	16	27	4.5	2.8
17	15	8	1,190	129	80	7.6	6.7
18	14	7	910	155	18	19.0	2.0
19	24	10	1,815	125	40	9.1	2.2
20	18	9	1,073	80	48	11.0	4.5
21	14	7	841	34	80	13.6	9.5
22	12	7	747	7	40	6.3	5.4
total	298	127	17,465	957	461	8.1	2.6
% of total		42.6		5.5	2.6		

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

Table 2: Foreign research evident in the articles of *Pacific Historical Review*

Vol	# of arts.	arts. only U.S..	total foot-notes	non Engl. print	non Engl. mss.	% non Engl.	% for. mss.
46	14	3	861	64	21	9.9	2.4
47	10	3	576	67		11.6	
48	12	3	720	92	44	18.9	6.1
49	10	3	543	35	12	8.7	2.2
50	5	3	326				
51	6	2	333	16		4.8	
52	5	3	183		3	1.6	1.6
53	5	3	244	20	3	9.4	1.2
54	3	1	155	3		1.9	
55	6		389	48		12.3	
56	7	3	432	16	5	4.7	1.2
57	6	3	360				
58	5	2	268	9	8	6.3	3.0
59	8		608	34	93	20.9	15.3
60	5	3	292	73	23	32.9	7.9
61	2	1	99	21		21.2	
62	1	1	67				
63	1		45	1	29	64.4	
64	2	1	98	2	4	17.3	13.3
65	3	3	207				
66	2	1	158		4	25.5	
67	2		220	12	140	69.1	63.6
tot	120	42	7,184	547	365	12.7	5.1
% tot		33.3		7.6	5.1		

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

Table 3: Foreign research evident in the articles of *Journal of American History*

Vol	# of arts.	arts. only U.S..	total foot-notes	non Engl. print	non Engl. mss.	% non Engl.	% for. mss.
64	2		130	3	2	3.8	1.5
65	3	1	178	16	7	12.9	3.9
66	4	4	336				
67	1	1	46				
68	3	1	247	8	57	26.3	23.1
69	2	1	104				
70	2	2	113				
71	3	1	160	3		1.9	
72	4	4	202				
73	3		115				
74	3	3	141				
75	3		148	4	1	3.4	0.7
76	2		118	2		1.7	
77	9	2	163	6		3.7	
78	1	1	50				
79	0						
80	1		65		21		32.3
81	5	4	255	6	42	16.5	
82	2	1	125	20	20	32.0	16.0
83	1	1	77				
84	0						
85	0						
tot	54	26	2,773	68	150	7.9	3.4
% tot		48.1		2.5	0.4		

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

Table 4: SHAFR annual meetings: English language and non-English language foreign participants.

meeting year	partic- ipants	Engl. lang.	non- Engl. lang.
1975 (I)	37	0	0
1976 (II)	20	1	0
1977 (III)	30	0	0
1978 (IV)	22	1	0
1979 (V)	22	0	0
1980 (VI)	27	1	4
1981 (VII)	27	1	0
1982 (VIII)	29	2	1
1983 (IX)	56	2	5
1984 (X)	71	3	0
1985 (XI)	58	11	8
1986 (XII)	46	2	0
1987 (XIII)	39	1	1

meeting year	partic- ipants	Engl. lang.	non- Engl. lang.
1988 (XIV)	48	5	3
1989 (XV)	101	6	2
1990 (XVI)	105	7	5
1991 (XVII)	109	4	12
1992 (XVIII)	204	7	13
1993 (XIX)	171	3	5
1994 (XX)	218	14	22
1995 (XXI)	210	14	14
1996 (XXII)	244	12	14
1997 (XXIII)	225	27	9
1998 (XXIV)	175	7	9
1999 (XXV)	205	10	16
Totals	2549	140	144
% of Totals		5.5 %	5.6 %

Table 5: Bernath Book Awards and use of foreign sources.

year	# of foot- notes	# non- Engl. print	# non- Engl. mss	Engl. biblio- graphy	non-Engl. biblio- graphy
1972	490			295	
1972	1023	12		397	3
1973	614			255	
1974	774	274	6	154	48
1975	1011	266	272	66	16
1975	519	170	53	135	70
1976	568			n.a.	n.a.

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

1977	501	111	36	420	134
1978	761			306	
1979	512	1		n.a.	n.a.
1980	525	4		213	3
1981	1043	8		595	5
1981	390	3		349	5
1982	1292	6		470	1
1983	672	93		462	37
1984	570	193		n.a.	n.a.
1985	n.a.			448	9
1986	619			269	
1987	708	14		329	3
1987	829	162	13	198	128
1988	980			565	
1989	510		1	285	5
1990	1615	10		457	11
1991	636	14		341	6
1992	593	72	68	n.a.	n.a.
1993	672	35	42	175	22
1994	853			161	
1995	3890	333		957	390
1996	924			234	
1997	1755	11		395	10
1998	936			n.a.	n.a.
total	26785	1792	481	8931	906
%totals		6.9	1.6		0.2

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

Table 6: Bernath Article awards and use of foreign sources:

	#fns	# fns non-Eng. print	# fns non-Eng. mss
1977	102		4
1978	59	28	
1979	128		
1980	84		
1980	95		
1981	68	2	
1982	60		
1983	58		
1985	89		
1986	58		
1987	41		
1988	94		
1989	56		

	# fns	# fns non-Eng. print	#fns nonEng mss
1990	84		
1991	82		
1992	86		
1993	63		
1994	69	34	1
1995	91	52	
1996	31		
1997	81	8	
1998	52		
1999	107		
total	1738	124	5
% of fns		7.1	0.3
% of fns using non- Eng. sources			7.4

Table 7: Bernath Book and Article Summary

	notes	non-Eng. printed	non-Eng. mss.
Bernath Book	26785	1792	481
Bernath Article	1738	124	5
total	28523	1916	486
percentage		6.7%	1.7%

OBITUARY

John A. DeNovo, age 83, died in Madison, Wisconsin, on January 26, 2000. A specialist on U.S. policies in the Middle East, he taught at both Pennsylvania State University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison and was one of the founding members of SHAFR.

John DeNovo was born on November 5, 1916 in Galva, Illinois, the son of Italian immigrant August DeNovo and Paula DeNovo. He received his B.A. *cum laude* from Knox College in 1938 and his M.A. from the University of Minnesota in 1940. During World War II he served as a naval officer in the South Pacific. After the war he returned to his graduate studies under the G.I. Bill, this time at Yale University where he was a student of Samuel Flagg Bemis. In 1948 he completed his doctorate under Bemis at Yale, married his Knox College classmate Jeanne Humphreys, and began teaching at Penn State. He remained at Penn State until 1964, rising from instructor to full professor. During these years he also studied at Harvard University's Center for Middle Eastern Studies and Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies (1956-57), and was a visiting professor at George Washington University (summer, 1949), the University of Wisconsin (summer, 1961), and Cornell University (1963-64). In 1964 he became a member of the History Department at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where he taught until his retirement in 1981.

DeNovo was one of the first U.S. diplomatic historians to specialize in the Middle East. He is best known for his 1963 book, *American Interests and Policies in the Middle East, 1900- 1939*, which won the biennial national book award of Phi Alpha Theta. He also published a two-volume reader in American history (1969) and numerous scholarly articles, mostly but far from exclusively on U.S. Middle East policies, that appeared in such noted journals as the *American Historical Review*, the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, and its successor, *The Journal of American History*.

In the 1960s DeNovo helped to create SHAFR and was quite active in its early years. In 1969 he was elected to its Council and in 1979 he was a vice-presidential nominee. In 1976-77 he was a visiting scholar in the Historian's Office of the U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration (now the Department of Energy). Throughout these years he was also preparing a second volume on U.S.-Middle East relations from 1939-1950, but serious heart illness forced him to stop working on the project and to retire in 1981. He gave his notes and research materials to Georgetown University, where they remain available to other scholars.

At both Penn State and Wisconsin, DeNovo was known as an outstanding and caring mentor. His graduate students came first in his professional life, and all who worked with him knew it. His rigorous seminars emphasized improvement of their critical faculties and writing styles without attempting to foist his thoughts and conclusions onto them. He was simultaneously a demanding and exceptionally supportive doctoral adviser and mentor, helping his students with everything from topic choice through archival selection, financial support and dissertation drafting, to completion and eventual employment. He supervised thirty-four M.A.s and fifteen Ph.Ds at Penn State and Wisconsin, many of whom went on to successful careers as government historians as well as university professors and administrators. He followed their careers with great interest, took exceptional pleasure in their accomplishments, and remained in regular contact with them — even after a crippling 1992 stroke confined him to a wheelchair and nursing home in Madison.

John DeNovo was also an accomplished musician, a wry humorist, and a devoted husband to his wife Jeanne and father to his two children, Anne and Jay. He will be sorely missed by his family, his colleagues, and those of us who were lucky enough to be his students and friends.

Mark A. Stoler, University of Vermont

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Nazi War Criminal Records Sought

The Nazi War Criminal Records Interagency Working Group (IWG) solicits assistance in locating information about classified Federal records relating to Nazi war criminals, Nazi war crimes, Nazi persecution, and looted assets.

President Clinton created the IWG by Executive Order 13110 in January 1999, to coordinate the implementation of the Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act of 1998, requiring the U.S. Government to locate, inventory, recommend for declassification, and make available to the public records relating to Nazi war crimes and looted assets. The group is composed of seven key agency representatives and three public members appointed by the President.

Last year, the IWG initiated a large-scale U.S. Government effort to identify relevant records and to begin the process of declassifying and transferring pertinent records to the National Archives and Records Administration. Agencies were directed to identify bodies of records likely to contain pertinent information and then go through those records to specifically identify relevant files. The universe of records currently being reviewed is approximately 100 million pages, and well over 300,000 pages have been declassified to date.

In addition, the IWG held special meetings with experts, historians, Holocaust scholars, and the general public to open lines of communication with knowledgeable individuals and concerned organizations. The IWG established an Internet website, at www.nara.gov/iwg, to notify the public of record openings of declassified records; to provide background on the IWG and its activities; to maintain reference materials and finding aids; and to serve as a clearinghouse for sharing information.

The IWG seeks information about the location of relevant still security classified U.S. Government records. SHAFR members may also be aware of information about U.S. Government programs and activities that were related to identifying, apprehending, utilizing, and protecting Nazi war criminals, as well as programs and activities related to the identification, recovery, and restitution of looted assets.

Any relevant information should be sent to the Interagency Working Group Staff, National Archives at College Park, Room 2600, 8601 Adelphi Road, College Park, MD 20740-6001 or to the IWG email address: iwg@arch2.nara.gov.

Call for Papers

The organizers of the Fourth Biennial Inter-American Relations conference to be held in Jacksonville, Florida, March 28-30, 2001 is soliciting proposals. Proposals for individual papers, complete panels, session chairs and commentators in all fields of study are welcome. The deadline for submission is November 1, 2000. Send proposals to: Tom Leonard - Conference Coordinator, International Studies Program, College of Arts and Sciences, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL 32224 e-mail: tleonard@unf.edu

Cold War Symposium

"Point of No Return: 1950, the Cold War, and the 20th Century" - a series of symposia will be held at The University of Iowa, the Hoover Presidential Library, and Truman State University during 2000-2001. As events draw closer, dates and lists of symposiums will be available from: Jay Semel, Director, Oberman Center for Advanced Studies, N134 OH, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242-5000.

tel: 319-335-4034

e-mail: Jay-Semel@uiowa.edu

Gift to Nimitz Library

The Special Collections and Archives Division of the Nimitz Library, United States Naval Academy, has recently been given a unique copy of Samuel Eliot Morison's *History of United States Naval Operations in World War II*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company (1947-62). This definitive 15-volume history of the war at sea is arguably the crowning achievement of the famed Harvard University historian, who was awarded Pulitzer Prizes for his biographies of Christopher Columbus and John Paul Jones. In addition, letters from such important World War II figures as Dwight Eisenhower, Lord Mountbatten, and Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, are bound into the volumes. Each of the letter writers was associated with Morison during the war, and in some cases the letters comment on the contents of the volume in which they are bound. This extraordinary set is the gift of Maxine Good Pineau, of Bethesda, Maryland, and Bar Harbor, Maine, in memory of her late husband, Captain Roger Pineau, USN (Ret) - a noted naval historian in his own right, and an expert on the Japanese and their language.

CALENDAR

2000

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| August 1 | Deadline, materials for the September <i>Newsletter</i> . |
| November 1 | Deadline, materials for December <i>Newsletter</i> . |
| 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. |

2001

- January 1 Membership fees in all categories are due, payable at Blackwell Publishers, 350 Main St., Malden MA 02148.
- January 6-9 115th annual meeting of the AHA in Boston.
- January 15 Deadline for the Bernath Article Award.
- February 1 Deadline for the Bernath Book Award, deadline for March *Newsletter*, and deadline for Ferrell Book Prize.
- February 15 Deadline for the Bernath lecture prize.
- March 1 Deadline for Graebner Prize nominations.
- April 15 Applications for the W. Stull Holt dissertation fellowship are due.
- April 26-29 The 94th meeting of the OAH will take place at the Westin Bonaventure in Los Angeles.
- May 1 Deadline, materials for the June *Newsletter*.
- June 14-16 SHAFR's 28th annual conference will meet at American University. Randall Woods is Program Chair, Anna Nelson is Local Arrangements Chair.

The AHA will meet in San Francisco, January 3-6, 2002; Chicago, January 2-5, 2003; and Washington, January 8-11; the 2002 meeting of the OAH will be held in Washington, April 11-14, at the Renaissance Hotel; and the 2002 SHAFR annual meeting will be held in Atlanta.

PERSONALS

Warren I. Cohen (UMBC) gave the Edwin O. Reischauer Memorial Lectures at Harvard in April. The lectures were entitled "East Asia and the United States in the 'American Century: Politics and Culture."

Jussi Hankimaki is leaving the London School of Economics to take up a post as Professor of International History and Politics at the Graduate Institute of International Studies in Geneva, Switzerland.

Charles M. Hubbard (Lincoln Memorial U) has been awarded a Fulbright Scholarship to the Philippines for the 2000-2001 academic year. Hubbard has also served as the director of the Abraham Lincoln Library and Museum.

Thomas G. Paterson (Emeritus - Connecticut) has received the 2000 Horace Kidger Award from the New England Teachers Association for excellence in teaching and mentoring.

Chester Pach (Ohio U) has been awarded a NEH Summer Stipend to support the writing of a book entitled "The First Television War: TV News, the White House, and Vietnam."

Noel Pugach (New Mexico) continues to serve as Assistant Chair. He gave a presentation of President Harry S. Truman in Washington for the Millennium on the Mall. He performed on January 2, 2000 at the Baird Auditorium in the Museum of Natural History, and afterwards was a guest of the Clintons at the White House.

Nick Sarantakes (Texas A&M - Commerce) received the 1999 H. Bailey Carroll Award from the Texas State Historical Association for the best article on Texas history published in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*. His article "Lyndon Johnson, Foreign Policy, and the Election of 1960" appeared in the October 1999 issue of volume 103.

PUBLICATIONS

David Dykstra (Dean College-retired), *The Shifting Balance of Power: American-British Diplomacy in North America, 1842-1848*. University Press of America, 1999. ISBN 0-7618-1363-2, \$39.00.

Aaron Forsberg (University of Maryland), *America and the Japanese Miracle: The Cold War Context of Japan's Postwar Economic Revival, 1950-1960*. University of North Carolina Press, 2000. ISBN 0-8078-2528-X, \$45.00.

John Fousek (Franklin & Marshall), *To Lead the Free World: American Nationalism and the Cultural Roots of the Cold War*. University of North

Carolina Press, 2000. ISBN 0-8078-2525-5, \$49.95, cloth. ISBN 0-8078-4836-0, \$18.95, paper.

Michael Hogan (Ohio State), *The Ambiguous Legacy: U.S. Foreign Relations in the "American Century"* Cambridge, 1999. ISBN 0-521-77019-x. \$49.95.

Jonathan Goldstein (West Georgia) ed., *China and Israel, 1948-1998*. Praeger, 1999. ISBN 0-275-96306-3, \$65.00.

-----, *The Jews of China, Vol. II: A Sourcebook and Research Guide*. M.E. Sharpe, 2000. ISBN 0-7656-0105-2, \$69.96. Volume I, published in 1998 was titled *Historical and Comparative Perspectives*. Volumes I & II, East Gate. ISBN 0-7656-0443-4, \$130.00

Klaus Larres (Queen's University of Belfast), ed., with the cooperation of E. Meehan, *Uneasy Allies: British-German Relations and the European Integration since 1945* Oxford, 2000. ISBN 0-19-829383-6, \$

Michael E. Latham (Fordham University), *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era*. University of North Carolina Press, 2000. ISBN 0-8078-2533-6, \$45.00, cloth. ISBN 0-8078-4844-1, \$18.95, paper.

Patrick M. Morgan and Keith L. Nelson (UC-Irvine) eds., *Re-viewing the Cold War: Domestic Factors and Foreign Policy in the East-West Confrontation*. Praeger, 2000. Cloth: ISBN 0-275-96636-4 \$69.50; paper: ISBN 0-275-96637-2, \$24.95.

Williamson Murray and Allan R. Millett (Ohio State), *A War to be Won: Fighting the Second World War, 1937-1945*. Harvard U. Press. ISBN 0-674-00163-x, \$35.00.

Charles R. Shrader (independent historian), *The Withered Vine: Logistics and the Communist Insurgency in Greece, 1945-1949*. Praeger, 1999. ISBN 0-274-965454-9, \$65.00.

Qiang Zhai (Auburn), *China and the Vietnam Wars, 1950-1975*. University of North Carolina Press, 2000. ISBN 0-8078-2532-8, \$49.95, cloth. ISBN 0-8078-4842-5, \$19.95, paper.

AWARDS, PRIZES, AND FUNDS

THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL PRIZES

The Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Lectureship, the Memorial Book Competition, and the Memorial Lecture Prize were established in 1976, 1972, and 1976, respectively, through the generosity of Dr. Gerald J. and Myrna F. Bernath, in memory of their son, and are administered by special committees of SHAFR.

The Stuart L. Bernath Book Prize

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

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

PROCEDURES: Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. A nominating letter explaining why the book deserves consideration must accompany each entry in the competition. Books will be judged primarily in regard to their contribution to scholarship. Winning books should have interpretative and analytical qualities of high levels. They should demonstrate mastery of primary material and relevant secondary works, and they should be examples of careful organization and distinguished writing. Five (5) copies of each book must be submitted with the nomination and should be sent to: Randall Woods, Main 416, Department of History, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville AR 72701.

Books may be sent at any time during 2000, but should not arrive later than February 1, 2001.

The prize will be divided only when two superior books are so evenly matched that any other decision seems unsatisfactory to the committee. The committee will not award the prize if there is no book in the competition which meets the standards of excellence established for the prize. The 2001 award of \$2,000.00 will be announced at the annual luncheon of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations held in conjunction with the Organization of American Historians' annual meeting in Spring, 2001.

RECENT WINNERS:

1996 Robert Buzzanco
1997 Carolyn Eisenberg

1998 Penny Von Eschen
1999 Eric Roorda
Kurk Dorsey

The Stuart L. Bernath Lecture Prize

DESCRIPTION: The Bernath Lecture Prize seeks to recognize and encourage excellence in teaching and research in the field of foreign relations by younger scholars. The winner of the 2001 competition will deliver a lecture at the SHAFR luncheon at the annual meeting of the OAH. The lecture is to be comparable in style and scope to the yearly SHAFR presidential address and is to address broad issues of concern to students of American foreign policy, not the lecturer's specific research interests. The award is \$500, with publication of the lecture in *Diplomatic History*.

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

PROCEDURES: Nominations, in the form of a short letter and *curriculum vita*, should be sent directly to the Chair of the Bernath Lecture Committee. The nominating letter requires evidence of excellence in teaching and research and must reach the Committee no later than 15 February 2001. The Chairperson of the Committee is: Darlene Rivas, Humanities Division, Pepperdine U., 24255 Pacific Coast Hwy., Malibu CA 90263-4225.

RECENT WINNERS:

1994 Diane Kunz
1995 Thomas Schwartz
1996 Douglas Brinkley

1997 Elizabeth Cobbs
1998 Peter Hahn
1999 Robert Buzzanco

The Stuart L. Bernath Scholarly Article Prize

The purpose of the prize is to recognize and to encourage distinguished research and writing by young scholars in the field of diplomatic relations.

ELIGIBILITY: Prize competition is open to any article or essay appearing in a scholarly journal or edited book, on any topic in United States foreign relations that is published during 2000. The author must not be over 40 years of age, or, if more than 40 years of age, must be within ten years of receiving the Ph.D. at the time of acceptance for publication. The article or essay must be among the first six publications by the author. Previous winners of the Stuart L. Bernath Book Award are excluded.

PROCEDURES: All articles appearing in *Diplomatic History* shall be automatically considered without nomination. Other nominations shall be submitted by the author or by any member of SHAFR by January 15, 2001. Three (3) copies of the article shall be submitted to the chairperson of the committee: Priscilla Roberts, Department of History, Univ. of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Rd., Hong Kong. The award is given at the SHAFR luncheon held in conjunction with the OAH annual meeting.

RECENT WINNERS:

1995 Heike Bungert	1998 Nancy Bernhard
1996 David Fitzsimons	1999 Robert Dean
1997 Robert Vitalis	Michael Latham

The Stuart L. Bernath Dissertation Grant

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

Requirements are as follows:

1. The dissertation must deal with some aspect of United States foreign relations.
2. Awards are given to help defray costs for dissertation research.
3. Applicants must have satisfactorily completed all other requirements for the doctoral degree.
4. Applications, in triplicate, must include:
 - (a) applicant's vita;
 - (b) a brief dissertation prospectus focusing on the significance of the thesis (2-4 pages will suffice);
 - (c) a paragraph regarding the sources to be consulted and their value;
 - (d) an explanation of why the money is needed and how, specifically, it will be used; and
 - (e) a letter from the applicant's supervising professor commenting upon the appropriateness of the applicant's request. (This should be sent separately to the selection committee chair.)
5. One or more awards may be given. Generally awards will not exceed \$1,500.

6. The successful applicant must file a brief report on how the funds were spent not later than eight months following the presentation of the award (i.e., normally by the following September).

Applications, in triplicate, should be sent to: Ted Wilson, History, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS66045. The deadline for application is November 1, 2000.

RECENT WINNERS:

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1995 Amy L. Staples | 1998 Max Friedman |
| 1996 David Fitzsimons | 1999 Elizabeth Borgwardt |
| 1997 D'Arcy M. Brissman | Deborah Kisatsky |

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.

RECENT WINNER: Elisse Wright (Ohio State)

The Myrna F. Bernath Book and Fellowship Awards

A prize award of \$2,500.00 to be offered every two years (apply in odd-numbered years) for the best book by a woman in the areas of United States foreign relations, transnational history, international history, peace studies, cultural interchange, and defense or strategic studies. Books published in 2000 and 2001 will be considered in 2002. Submission deadline is November 15, 2001. Five copies of each book (or page proofs) must accompany a letter of application. Contact: Carol Adams, Salt Lake Community College, 4600 Redwood Road, Salt Lake City, UT 84130

PREVIOUS WINNERS

- 1991 Diane Kunz and Betty Unterberger
1996 Nancy Bernkopf Tucker

An award of \$2500 (apply in even-numbered years), to research the study of foreign relations among women scholars. The grants are intended for women at U.S. universities as well as for women abroad who wish to do research in the United States. Preference will be given to graduate students and newly finished Ph.D's. The subject-matter *should be historically based* and concern American foreign relations or aspects of international history, as broadly conceived. Work

on purely domestic topics will not be considered. Applications should include a letter of intent and three copies of a detailed research proposal of no more than 2000 words. Send applications to: Katherine Sibley, Department of History, St. Joseph's University, Philadelphia, PA 19131. Submission deadline is November 15, 2000.

RECENT WINNERS:

1992	Shannon Smith	1997	Deborah Kisatsky
1994	Regina Gramer		Mary Elise Savotte
	Jaclyn Stanke		
	Christine Skwiot		

THE W. STULL HOLT DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP

The Society of Historians for American Foreign Relations is pleased to invite applications from qualified doctoral candidates whose dissertations are in the field of the history of American foreign relations. This fellowship is intended to help defray costs of travel, preferably foreign travel, necessary to the pursuit of research on a significant dissertation project. Qualified applicants will have satisfactorily completed comprehensive doctoral examinations before April 2001, leaving only the dissertation as the sole, remaining requirement for the doctoral degree.

Applicants should include a prospectus of the dissertation, indicating work already completed as well as contemplated research. The prospectus (8-12 pages, double spaced) should describe the dissertation project as fully as possible, indicating the scope, method, chief source materials, and historiographical significance of the project. The applicant should indicate how the fellowship, if awarded, would be used. An academic transcript showing all graduate work taken to date is required, as well as three letters from graduate teachers familiar with the work of the applicant, including one from the director of the applicant's dissertation.

Applications and supporting papers should be sent before April 15, 2001 to: Doug Little, History, Clark University, Worcester MA 01610. Holt Memorial Fellowships carry awards of \$2000, \$1500, and \$1000. Announcements of the recipients will be made at the Society's annual summer meeting. At the end of the fellowship year the recipient of the fellowships will be required to report to the Committee relating how the fellowship was used. A version of the report of the first-place winner will subsequently be published in the *SHAFR Newsletter*.

RECENT WINNERS:

(2nd) Richard Wiggers
(3rd) Xiaodong Wang

(3rd) Carol Chin

THE NORMAN AND LAURA GRAEBNER AWARD

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

CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD: The Graebner prize will be awarded to a distinguished scholar of diplomatic and international affairs. It is expected that this scholar would be 60 years of age or older. The recipient's career must demonstrate excellence in scholarship, teaching, and/or service to the profession. Although the prize is not restricted to academic historians, the recipient must have distinguished himself or herself through the study of international affairs from a historical perspective.

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

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

Chairman: James Matray, History, Box 3H, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM, 88003-8001. Phone: 505-646-1515, Fax: 505-646-8148, email: jmatray@nmsu.edu

The deadline for nominations is March 1, 2002.

RECENT WINNERS:

1988 Alexander DeConde
1990 Richard W. Leopold
1992 Bradford Perkins

1994 Wayne Cole
1995 Walter LaFeber
1998 Robert Ferrell

THE WARREN F. KUEHL AWARD

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

The award will be made every other year at the SHAFR summer conference. The next award will be for books published in 1999 and 2000. Deadline for submissions is February 1, 2001. Current Chairperson: Mel Small, History, Wayne State U., Detroit MI 48202.

PREVIOUS WINNERS:

1987 Harold Josephson

1988 Melvin Small

1991 Charles DeBenedetti and
Charles Chatfield

1993 Thomas Knock

1995 Lawrence S. Wittner

1999 Frances Early

**ARTHUR LINK PRIZE
FOR DOCUMENTARY EDITING**

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

The prize will recognize and encourage analytical scholarly editing of documents, in appropriate published form, relevant to the history of American foreign relations, policy, and diplomacy. By "analytical" is meant the inclusion (in headnotes, footnotes, essays, etc.) of both appropriate historical background needed to establish the context of the documents, and interpretive historical commentaries based on scholarly research. The competition is open to the editor/author(s) of any collection of documents published after 1984 that is devoted primarily to sources relating to the history of American foreign relations, policy, and/or diplomacy; and that incorporates sufficient historical analysis and interpretation of those documents to constitute a contribution to knowledge and scholarship. Nominations may be made by any person or publisher. The award is \$500 plus travel expenses to the professional meeting where the prize is presented. For all rules and details contact the committee chair. One copy of each entry should be sent directly to each

member of the committee. Current Chairperson: Mary Giunta, NHPRC - Room 300, National Archives, Washington DC 20408.

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

THE LAWRENCE GELFAND - ARMIN RAPPAPORT FUND

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations established this fund in to honor Lawrence Gelfand, founding member and former SHAFR president and Armin Rappaport, founding editor of *Diplomatic History*. The fund will support the professional work of the journal's editorial office. Contact: Allan Spetter, SHAFR Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Department of History, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435.

ROBERT H. FERRELL BOOK PRIZE

This is competition for a book, published in 2000, which is a history of American Foreign Relations, broadly defined, and includes biographies of statesmen and diplomats. General surveys, autobiographies, or editions of essays and documents are not eligible. The prize of \$1,000 is to be awarded as a senior book award; that is, any book beyond the first monograph by the author. The deadline for submission of books is February 1, 2001.

Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of SHAFR. Current chairperson: Frank Ninkovich, History, St. John's U., 8000 Utopia Parkway, Jamaica NY 11439.

PREVIOUS WINNERS:

1994 Mel Leffler	1997 Robert Schulzinger
1995 John L. Harper	1998 Jeffrey Kimball
1996 Norman Saul	

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 recognize research, writing, and relations to encourage a better understanding of peaceful interactions between nations. The award may be given in any of the NHD 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, 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) | 1999 Walter LaFeber (Cornell) |