

# The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

## *NEWSLETTER*

---

Volume 18

No. 2

June 1987

### Page

- 1 Archival Materials on U.S. Businesses in Central America Before the 1930's Depression by Thomas Schoonover
- 11 Realism, Diplomatic History, and American Foreign Policy: A Conversation with Norman A. Graebner by Jeffrey Kimball
- 20 Report of The Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation: March, 1987 by Bradford Perkins
- 24 Council Minutes
- 32 Summary of the 1986 Annual Meeting by Justus Doenecke
- 42 1st Soviet-American Symposium Report by Warren Kimball
- 45 1987 Educators' Tour to Vietnam: An Evaluation by Jonathan Goldstein
- 50 Calendar
- 51 Announcements
- 54 Publications
- 56 Personals
- 58 Awards and Prizes

ISSN 0740-6169



## SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

FOUNDED IN 1967. CHARTERED IN 1972.

PRESIDENT: Betty M. Unterberger, History, Texas A & M, College Station, Texas 77843.

VICE PRESIDENT: Thomas Paterson, History, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06268.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER: William Kamman, History, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas 76203.

CHAIRMAN, PROGRAM COMMITTEE: George Herring, History, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40536.

CHAIRMAN, MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE: Ralph E. Weber, History, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233.

CHAIRMAN, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Albert Bowman, 511 James Blvd., Signal Mt., Chattanooga, Tennessee 37377.

CHAIRMAN, GOVERNMENT RELATIONS COMMITTEE: Milton O. Gustafson, Diplomatic Branch 5E, National Archives, Washington, D.C. 20408.

MEMBERSHIP: Annual dues are \$16.50, payable at the office of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer. Student fees - \$6.00, retired members - \$8.00, life memberships - \$250.00. In the case of membership by husband and wife, dues for one of them shall be one-half of the regular price. For those wishing only the SHAFR Newsletter the cost is \$10.00. Institutions wishing Diplomatic History should contact Scholarly Resources.

MEETINGS: The annual meeting of the Society is held in the summer. The Society also meets with the American Historical Association in December, and with the Organization of American Historians in April.

PRIZES: The Society administers several awards. Four of them honor the late Stuart L. Bernath, and are financed through the generosity of his parents, Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath of Laguna Hills, California. Awards also honor Laura and Norman Graebner, the late W. Stull Holt, and Warren Kuehl. Details of each of these awards are to be found under the appropriate headings in each Newsletter.

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



**ARCHIVAL MATERIALS ON U. S. BUSINESSES  
IN CENTRAL AMERICA BEFORE THE 1930'S DEPRESSION**

by

Thomas Schoonover

(University of Southwestern Louisiana)

United States business activity abroad has attracted considerable interest, much of which focuses upon the post-World War Two (or at least the post-World War One) period. My own research into United States (and European) involvement in Central America from the independence of that region in 1823 until the onset of the (second) Great Depression (the first lasted from 1873-1898) in 1929 has led me to various firm records as well as those of individual businessmen active in Central America. Since my research plan, despite the large time span encompassed, contemplated extensive use of archives and involved examining cultural, strategic, and political-diplomatic materials as well as records of business activity, I discovered that the most promising, fullest collections, posed insurmountable problems for me. I could not afford to divert weeks or months of research to exhaust the study of each large collection, even those which promised to yield considerable relevant material, because the chronological span and breadth of approach touched so many collections that there simply would not be sufficient time to exhaust all of them. My original resolution of the quandary was to extract the obvious materials and then to 'word-of-mouth' my discoveries to scholars at institutions with sizeable graduate programs to suggest the value of these 'finds' for master's theses or doctoral dissertations. While experiencing the interchange between colleagues at Ralph Lee Woodward's 1986 NEH Summer Seminar on Central America, it occurred to me to cast somewhat broader the suggestion for graduate or post-graduate work. Many of my colleagues at the NEH Seminar were unaware of the variety and quantity of material which described U.S. business activity abroad, even in Central America. The descriptions which follow will focus on the relevance of the specific collection to U.S.-Central American business relations. Since my research has included Central American, German, and French archives, I have described the business records examined in those countries which might shed light on business practices of metropole economic elites or of



U.S. businesses. The German and French collections have intrinsic value which could form the basis of one or more monographs, but they clearly contribute to broader studies of American enterprise abroad or to peripheral matters of international cultural and social exchange.

The largest collection, one touching many areas of the Pacific basin beyond U. S.-Central American relations, was the Pacific Mail Steamship Company records (190,600 items) at the Huntington Library in San Marino, California. These records, stored in scores of huge four-foot long boxes, are unfortunately poorly sorted and catalogued, but useable with patience. John Kemble's studies, "The Genesis of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company," California Historical Society Quarterly, XIII (1934), 240-54, "The Panama Route to the Pacific Coast, 1848-1869," Pacific Historical Review, 7 (1938), 1-13, The Panama Route, 1848-1869 (U. of California, 1943), and "Mail Steamers Link the Americas, 1840-1890," in Greater America: Essays for Herbert E. Bolton (U. of California, 1945), only scratch the surface of this vast holding. The Pacific Mail records begin in the 1850s and run through the 1930s. Captain John M. Dow's papers at Cornell University merited inclusion because they are extensive and more business oriented than personal. Dow was a captain of merchant and steamship line vessels, mostly on the Pacific coast, for most of his adult life beginning about 1860. He worked chiefly for the Panama Railroad Steamship line, alternately a competitor or a collaborator with the Pacific Mail Steamship Company. The Dow papers include his ship records, volumes of business letterbooks, and correspondence received. The Pacific Mail and Dow collections offer insight into the key communications' infrastructure which linked Central America to the Pacific basin and which was intended to serve the railroad, any canal, or other interoceanic transit which might develop.

Another major economic development in Central America between the mid 19th and early 20th centuries was the growth of the coffee industry. Two collections offer insight into this activity, neither is American although one belonged to a German-Guatemalan who sought to form ties to the United States. Tulane University houses the Erwin Dieseldorff collection (85,800 items). Dieseldorff was a late 19th century



German settler who turned to coffee growing and processing (beneficios), while retaining merchant links with family and associates in Germany (mostly Hamburg). Guillermo Nanez has written a master's thesis, "Contributions to the Economic Development of the Alta Vera Paz of Guatemala, 1865-1900," (Tulane, 1961), and a dissertation, "Erwin Paul Dieseldorff, German Entrepreneur in the Verapaz of Guatemala, 1889-1937," (Tulane, 1970), using this material, but insists that he has not exhausted the possibilities of this large collection. The Staatsarchiv Bremen houses the Friedrich Koeper firm and family archives. Friedrich Koeper, like Dieseldorff, emigrated to Guatemala in the late 19th century. He traded in coffee and eventually moved into plantations and coffee processing in Guatemala and Nicaragua. Unlike Dieseldorff, Koeper always maintained his business headquarters and a residence in Bremen, although he also had a residence in Guatemala. Both the Dieseldorff and Koeper collections are very extensive, well sorted, catalogued, and offer personal family correspondence and records as well as account books, copy books, firm correspondence received, receipts, and other miscellaneous business records.

Unfortunately, the fruit companies have chosen to destroy or close their records. United Fruit does not permit access to private scholars, and Standard Fruit, which turned over some records dating from its origins up to about 1960 to Thomas Karnes for his book on Standard Fruit, Tropical Enterprise: The Standard Fruit and Steamship Company of Latin America (LSU, 1978), has either not retained the bulk of its records or it had the collection sanitized at some point. The records that remain are sparse, about 13 two-foot boxes for the period 1905 to the 1960s. Tulane holds the collection now that Karnes' book has appeared. Only the barest outline of fruit company activity is visible from the Standard Fruit Company archives.

The underlying theme which shaped U. S. business activity in Central America was the developmental mentality of entrepreneurial and business adventurers. Several collections trace the early capital investment firms. Stanford University holds two collections. The Pacific Improvement Company--an investment firm organized by Collis P. Huntington, Leland Stanford, Mark Hopkins, Charles Crocker and associates to shift



surplus capital which could not be profitably invested in western railroads and related activity into familiar, largely railroad, activities in the Pacific Basin (principally in Central America) via various subsidiaries--has records (180 linear feet) in Stanford University's main research library. The Stanford University Archive holds the Stanford family collection (14 ft.) which contains additional Pacific Improvement Company records. Syracuse University Archives hold the large body of Collis P. Huntington papers which include some additional Pacific Improvement Company records. The California State Archives contain papers filed in an investigation and law suit involving the Guatemala Central Railroad, one of the Pacific Improvement Company subsidiaries. Even collectively, the business material found in these related collections is more suggestive than satisfying. A 20th century investment banker, James Brown--senior partner in Brown Brothers Harriman investment banking house, holders of the important Nicaraguan loan of 1912 which led Brown Brothers' control of Nicaragua's central bank and national railroad--kept extensive private diaries of his business activities and meetings. These diaries, other business papers, and business and personal correspondence are located in the Brown Brother Harriman collection (10,000 items and 200 volumes) at the New York Historical Society in New York city. Unfortunately, while the Brown Brothers Harriman archives are open to serious scholars, no xeroxing or microfilming is permitted. The Pacific Improvement Company and Brown Brothers Harriman collections permit reasonable insight into major U. S. investor activity and thought about development.

While only peripherally related to Central America, a collection I used during my doctoral work really calls for investigation by scholars of imperialism. The Matias Romero papers at the Banco de Mexico in Mexico City, over 120,000 items, are a well-catalogued mine of information about a Latin American liberal comprador's views on North American capital and the schemes and projects of North American speculators and serious investors. The Romero papers are the largest and fullest collection I am aware of on U. S. business relations with Latin America in the 19th century. Romero's papers do touch briefly upon Central America in terms of ideology and shared interests. Much of the Romero material on U. S.-Mexican links explores



the liberal, laissez-faire ideology of the mid and late 19th century in its Mexican positivist variant.

Other firms and entrepreneurial archives which permitted access, although none offered extensive material for my study, were the Ford Motor Company, Dupont, and Edison archives. These archives might offer more value for other areas of Latin America, for other time periods, or upon further investigation. The Ford, Dupont, and Edison archives are not organized in a fashion which easily allowed locating materials on Central America. Conceivably I missed useful material. Other holdings of records for businesses active in Central America (and their location) are: The East Coast of Central America Commercial and Agricultural Company (Yale); Nicaragua Canal Construction Company (LC); Ferrocarril [Railroad] de Salvador (Univ. of California, Berkeley); American Balsa and Virginia Blue Ridge Companies (Cornell); Pacific Guano Company (Harvard, Baker Library); Marvyn Scudder Business collection (Columbia, Butler Library); the Merchant Exchange (Missouri Historical Society); and the American Federation of Labor (Wisconsin). The latter collection represents a large, tangential archive for those dealing with U. S. business activity abroad. A small sample of the records of individual U. S. businessmen and consuls active in Central America between 1820 and 1929 (and their location) suggests the extent of our possible knowledge about Central American-U. S. business relations:

Trautwine family (Cornell)

James Gordon Steese (Dickinson College)

Samuel L. M. Barlow (Huntington)

Cave Johnson Coutts (Huntington)

Eugene Cunningham (Huntington)

Charles H. Janin (Huntington)

Ephraim G. Squier (LC)

Philippe Bunau-Varilla (LC)

Ambrose Thompson (LC)

Edward A. Burke (LSU)

Edwin M. Ferguson (Minnesota Hist. Soc.)

Thomas C. Reynolds (Missouri Hist. Soc.)

Ephraim G. Squier (NY Hist. Soc.)

E. Z. Penifield (NY Public Lib.)

Edwin Kemmerer (Princeton)

Richard W. Thompson (Rutherford B. Hayes Library)

James Deitrick (Stanford)



Edward L. Plumb (Stanford)  
 Lottie Holman Card (Texas Tech)  
 Edward A. Burke (UC, Berkeley)  
 Charles Butters (UC, Berkeley)  
 Thomas Starr King (UC, Berkeley)  
 Alfred K. Moe (UC, Berkeley)  
 Cornelius Cole (UCLA)  
 Frederick W. Taylor (UCLA)  
 Ephraim G. Squier (U. Michigan)  
 John D. Imboden (U. Virginia)  
 Rives family (U. Virginia)  
 John W. Wingfield (U. Virginia)  
 Henry O. Cole (West Virginia U.)

Students interested in examining U. S. business activity in Central (Latin) America should be warned that the microfilmed diplomatic and consular dispatches might well prove disappointing for the 19th and early 20th centuries. My research in U. S.-Mexican economic relations in the mid 19th century suggested that the microfilmed diplomatic and consular dispatches offer modest quantities of routine, mostly mundane material with an occasional startling episode. The role of U. S. businesses and government in Mexico only surfaced in greater fullness and detail from the consular and diplomatic post records (not microfilmed for the most part). These very extensive records contain the archives of the consular and diplomatic posts which were returned to Washington, D. C., in the 1930s or 1940s. The press books and correspondence in the post records of the 1860s revealed in extensive detail the interaction of U. S. agents with U. S. businesses in Mexico during the French intervention. I suspect the post records of Central America will reveal a full outline of U. S. business relations with Central American countries. The List of Foreign Service Post Records in the National Archives (Record Group 84), Special Lists Number 9 (Washington: GSA, 1967) details the materials available for searching U. S. consular, commercial, and other business activity in Central America.

The diplomatic post records are: legation or embassy, years covered (and quantity of materials in linear feet of shelf space):

Costa Rica,	1854-1935	(59 ft.)
El Salvador,	1862-1935	(31 ft.)



Guatemala,	1826-1935	(80 ft.)
Honduras,	1854-1935	(57 ft.)
Nicaragua,	1894-1936	(34 ft.)
Panama,	1903-1937	(80 ft.)

total: 6 legations/embassies

quantity of material: 341 ft.

The consular post records: country, city, years, and (quantity)

#### Belize/Panama

Belize,	1854-1935	(20 ft.)	
Bocas del Toro,	1885-1935	(10 ft.)	
Colon,	1885-1939	(34 ft.)	
Panama,	1854-1937	(72 ft.)	
	4 consulates		136 ft.

#### Costa Rica

Port Limon,	1882-1949	(41 ft.)	
Puntarenas,	1887-1945	( 8 ft.)	
San Jose,	1886-1942	(51 ft.)	
	3 consulates		100 ft.

#### El Salvador

Acajutla,	1891-1911	( 1 ft.)	
El Triunfo,	1897-1899	(2 vols)	
La Libertad,	1883-1907	( 1 ft.)	
La Union,	1898-1903	(2 vols)	
San Salvador,	1862-1935	(43 ft.)	
	5 consulates		45 ft., 4 vols.

#### Guatemala

Champerico,	1882-1940	( 4 ft.)	
Guat. City,	1825-1945	(70 ft.)	
Izabal,	1882-1895	(2 vols)	
Livingston,	1882-1920	( 4 ft.)	
Ocos,	1892-1915	( 2 ft.)	
Puerto Barrios,	1914-1934	( 8 ft.)	
Quetzaltenango,	1899-1911	(3 vols)	
Retalhuleu,	1895-1898	(2 vols)	
San Jose,	1893-1933	( 6 ft.)	
	9 consulates		94 ft., 7 vols.

#### Honduras

Amapala,	1872-1927	( 4 ft.)
Guanaja, Bay Is.,	1905-1931	( 4 ft.)
La Ceiba,	1824-1948	(47 ft.)



Puerto Castilla,	1923-1933	(10 ft.)
Puerto Cortes,	1886-1946	(30 ft.)
Roatan,	1874-1920	( 2 ft.)
San Juancito,	1894-1917	( 1 ft.)
San Pedro Sula,	1917-1931	( 2 ft.)
Tegucigalpa,	1882-1935	(57 ft.)
Tela,	1903-1938	(17 ft.)
Yuscaran,	1895-1931	(3 vols)
11 consulates		174 ft., 3 vols.

Nicaragua		
Bluefields,	1873-1933	(36 ft.)
Cape Gracias a Dios,	1880-1922	( 1 ft.)
Corinto,	1867-1934	(26 ft.)
Managua,	1884-1935	(13 ft.)
Puerto Cabezas,	1931-1939	( 6 ft.)
San Juan del Norte,	1873-1908	( 5 ft.)
San Juan del Sur,	1855-1917	( 1 ft.)
		7 consulates 88 ft.

total for Central America: 39 consulates

quantity of material: 637 ft., 14 vols.

total diplomatic and consular: 45 post collections

quantity of material: 978 ft., 14 vols.

In addition to Department of State records, other branches of the U. S. government interacted with U. S. businessmen and thus contributed to the understanding of U. S. business in Central America. The interested researcher should consult the guides and archivists in charge of the following record groups (RG) in the National Archives: RG 32 (U. S. Shipping Board), RG 40 (Department of Commerce), RG 43 (International Conferences, Commissions, and Expositions), RG 122 (Federal Trade Commission), RG 151 (Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce), and possibly other record groups.

The existing Central American records, unfortunately often destroyed or damaged through neglect, permit a researcher different insights and supplementary material for interpreting U. S. business activity in Central America. Even when the archival material exists in Central America, there is no guarantee that permission will be given to use the documents, even in



the case of 19th century records. Little archival material has survived a series of earthquakes and fires in Nicaragua. El Salvador's historical archives have fared little better in the 19th century, but Salvador does have abundant 20th century material which is currently not well organized and difficult to obtain access to. Honduras has abundant materials, including materials in ministries of foreign relations, fomento (development), and commerce, and legislative materials (which reflect domestic laws affecting U. S. business and at times the nature of U. S. business intervention in the domestic legislative process). The Honduran national archives are quite well organized. The foreign relations material for 20th century Honduras is held in the less well organized and accessible archives in the Congressional Palace. Guatemala and Costa Rica have enormous bodies of material which are generally accessible for the 19th and 20th centuries, except for the most recent decades. The Guatemalan and Costa Rican materials most useful for pursuing U. S. business activity in Central America are the ministries of fomento (development), foreign relations, commerce, and the legislative records. The interested researcher should consult Kenneth Grieb, Ralph Lee Woodward, Graeme Mount, and Thomas Mathews (eds.), Research Guide to Central America and the Caribbean (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1985), for more guidance to the holdings and the procedures for access.

Finally, it seems reasonable to list some major German and French business and official records for the 19th and 20th centuries for comparative and supplemental use. The Krupp and Siemens companies have opened their archives for scholars, although neither supplied a large amount of materials for my project. I consulted German Chambers of Commerce (Industrie- und Handelskammern -IHK [Industry and Trade Chambers]) in Frankfurt, Dortmund, Bremen, and Hamburg which yielded useful materials on commercial and economic activities in Central America. The Dortmund IHK has collected printed materials for all Chambers of Commerce in Germany and also for many other European chambers. In France, the Archives Nationales maintain a section on Archives d'entreprises (AQ) which contains records for the Compagnie universelle interoceanique de Panama (Panama), the Compagnie generale transatlantique, the Societe de construction des batignolles which worked on the U. S. Panama canal project, and two banks,



Banque de Neufelize and Fould et Heine, which were active in Central America. Many of these collections touch upon U. S. businesses because they describe the chief competitor nation (the United States), or the various major competitive firms (often U. S. businesses). French governmental holdings which reveal U. S. business and financial activity in Central America include: the Archive du ministere de l'economie et des finances, series B and F<sup>30</sup>, the Archive du ministere des affaires etrangeres, affaires diverses commerciales, correspondance commerciale et consulaire (C. C. C.), 1793-1901, correspondance politique et commerciale (C. P), 1897-1918, serie B: Amerique, 1918-1940 (Centre Amerique). German governmental holdings which reveal U. S. business activity in Central America include: Bundesarchiv Koblenz, Auswaertiges Amt (R 85); Politisches Archiv des Auswaertigen Amts, Bonn, Abteilungen I A (Amerika Generalia) and I C (Vereinigte Staaten); Zentrales Staatsarchiv, Merseburg, Abteilungen I and II (Auswaertiges Amt), Rep. 81, Zentral-Amerika, and Rep. 120, Wirtschaft; and Zentrales Archiv, Potsdam, Auswaertiges Amt (09.01). The German and French firms' activities also shed light, when used carefully, on U. S. business practices because of the similarities in metropole business practices. The official German and French archives supply material regarding how German and French businessmen, financiers, and public officials responded to or evaluated U.S. business penetration of Central America. These views often reflect strategic thoughts as well as world economic analysis and competitive perspectives.



**REALISM, DIPLOMATIC HISTORY, AND AMERICAN FOREIGN  
POLICY: A CONVERSATION WITH NORMAN A. GRAEBNER<sup>1</sup>**

by

Jeffrey P. Kimball (Miami University)

JK: The label "realist" is [an] appropriate [one for you].

NG: I would agree with that. I would just hope that it would come through as if I indeed am. A lot of people claim to be, but you can't detect it in what they write.

JK: The difficulty for me, though, is stating exactly what a realist is. I can see that a realist focuses on power as a reality in interstate relations, for example.

NG: Part of the reality. I would not focus on it quite as heavily as...[Hans Morgenthau] does. I think that sometimes his emphasis on power even belies the complexity of his own thought. But power is not the only thing. I don't want to disagree with him, because I think that a law of relations among nations is a struggle for power, but I think that's got to be defined very broadly.

My definition [of realism] is to view the whole situation and analyze all of its components. It's based upon my total study of history all my life. When I approach a situation, I look at the totality of it, and then I try to sort out what all the real elements are, including the elements of power but also the elements of purpose that have been registered through time.

JK: Tell me why you think that [way].

NG: I think I got that way simply because I did not begin as a diplomatic historian. I was an old Craven student at Chicago. My major interest was the American Civil War. I got into this through the back door, because of an interest that



developed and [with] some people constantly asking me to give speeches and so on. I never studied diplomatic history in graduate school. When I finally got around to becoming interested in it, I didn't start by reading Bailey or Bemis; I started by reading Morgenthau, Lippman, and Kennan. So, I was developing a frame of reference and a way of [looking at] things that was far different from a Bailey or a Bemis. Only after I had written two books and maybe thirty articles, I went to the University of Illinois as a full professor. After I was hired, Ward Swain called me and said: now you've got to have a field; you know you've done some writing in diplomatic history, and we don't have a diplomatic historian; why don't you go into that field? And so, I went into the field of diplomatic history. But remember, before I started I had a frame of reference. You see, it makes a lot of difference whether you read Bailey first or Morgenthau first, makes a lot of difference as to what kind of an historian you're going to turn out to be--[whether in your writing you have analysis and ideas or] just facts, more facts, more narrative....

JK: What do you consider your most representative [work]?

NG: I would think Ideas and Diplomacy. That book conveys my overall thought.<sup>2</sup> Now, I'm working on this new general history of American foreign policy. This will be my ultimate work, for it'll reflect thirty years of effort.<sup>3</sup> But it's a tremendous job to try to do the best that one can on every subject in American diplomatic history. When do you feel that you're really doing the best? How much work do you put into a chapter, trying to do something original and different with every one of them?... Just for one chapter [I've examined] 7,000 pages of documents, trying to get at the basic stuff, seeing what they really say, because basically I always like to do my own thing. When I write this chapter there will be no reference to any secondary work. It'll all be mine right from the documents. And I'll quote the documents and see in the documents what I choose to see in them, and it won't be the same that anybody else has seen in them. I have



certain convictions about how I think diplomacy functions. I'm always looking for the statements that have a universal connotation. Mostly I think about the determination and the interests of nations generally.... [This] is the reason I call myself a realist and the reason I regard myself much more than most diplomatic historians....

JK: Often you use the phrase "vital interest". What is vital interest?

NG: A vital interest would be an interest the collapse of which would in one way or another seriously injure the nation's security or its welfare. This is a matter of perception. So what I perceive to be a vital interest would not necessarily be a vital interest for someone else.

JK: Realists tend to pooh-pooh the idea of economic motivation, whether narrowly or broadly understood, and they don't give it a great deal of emphasis. [What is your position?]

NG: You want those harbors because of the fact that you dream of building a great commercial empire in the world of the Pacific. You can get there a lot better if you get frontage on the Pacific, or, as I call it, an empire on the Pacific. All you've got to do is get your railroads so you can bring your power to bear on those harbors, and then you've got an economic power base to reach into the Pacific. And, of course, that's exactly the way it all turned out: we do very quickly become the Pacific power. So, I guess that is economic. But it's economic not in the sense of skullduggery the way your New Left picture it. I see no skullduggery in this. They see it largely in terms of saving American capitalism. I don't use words like that.

JK: One argument, as you well know, about American expansion or imperialism...[concerns] the "open door weltanschauung". One could understand that as a sort of a generalized economic motive as opposed to skullduggery.

NG: I'm willing to accept that as a general motive. But I would not make it the centerpiece. I would



make it one element in some American foreign policies. I'm sure that there's a certain element of truth in the writings of the 1920s that at least one of the driving forces in American foreign policy was the effort to rebuild those European economies through the Young Plan, the Dawes Plan, plenty of investment, and so on. I think that it's a factor, but why not? I see nothing particularly wrong with that. In other words, here's where I make the distinction: it's between economic foreign policy and economic motivation. I think there is such a thing as ongoing economic foreign policy based upon the supposition that if America has the leadership and the economic advantage to begin to make a contribution to world trade and world investment, America will reap its share of the profit from that--and indeed we have. And what's wrong with that? I don't see anything unusual about that....

JK: Without giving any moral label to it, might it not be the case that the desire to expand trade and investment [and to] acquire raw materials on terms favorable to not only the nation but particular corporations--that the effort in doing that does then bring you into conflict with other countries, Japan or Germany or revolutionaries? ... So that if one wants to explain [war], for example, whether it be in Manchuria, China, Vietnam, or El Salvador, this is one of the factors to consider?

NG: It is a factor to consider. I don't want to just wipe it out as something that doesn't exist. There is such a thing as an American worldwide trading empire. This really has always existed. I will not play these things down. They're part of reality. But I'm not sure that people fight over these things. There are too many missing links. And that's where I would disagree with people that jump to conclusions and ignore all the missing links. What I object to is when people will try to define everything in terms of economic motives. And that's the skullduggery side. You can't find the evidence. You never find the evidence; it just doesn't exist....

It's a feel that I have as to what the role is or



is not of economic interests. And I think maybe one reason why I tend to play them down, not as part of an ongoing foreign policy, but play them down in terms of war and peace, is that I just can't imagine a man sending people to death to protect an investment. I just can't imagine it. And nobody's ever proved to me that it's ever happened. Besides that, what's an investment compared to the cost of a war--the biggest investment?...

JK: [You wouldn't agree then] that capitalism leads to imperialism [and] that leads to war?

NG: No, you can't demonstrate that historically.

JK: Do you accept the word "imperialism"?

NG: Oh sure. [But] I don't use the word so loosely the way the New Left does.

JK: How do you understand it?

NG: There are two ways, I think, that one can use it. An imperialistic policy is one that is trying to change the status quo. It's the opposite of a status quo policy. That's the way Morgenthau would use it....

JK: What about the status quo power itself? Could it be an imperial power?

NG: It could be an imperial power, but I would think one that's already got its empire....

JK: You don't accept the argument that says that imperialism means some form of domination?...

NG: A status quo power might very well be dominating somebody, too, except it's already got it. It's not trying to get it. In other words, the status quo power was yesterday's imperialist power that won. I'm not going to attribute a superior morality to a status quo power as opposed to one that is more aggressive. It only means that in terms of time it's already won, and therefore, it's trying to hold on to what it has. And it's trying to tell everybody else: why don't you be



satisfied with what you have the way we're satisfied with what we have? And the response is: if we had everything you have, we could afford to be satisfied, too....

A status quo power is one that almost by definition has nothing to gain through war. We entered the twentieth century as a status quo power, and we fought plenty to maintain our favored position. But only because we were forced into it, and never, in no case did we want the war. But ultimately, we were willing to fight to maintain the status quo that served our interests....

JK: Why does the United States oppose [revolution and] the left, as it did in Vietnam--simply because it's a status quo power?...

NG: I would make the point that right after the [Second World] war America was really bent on self-determination. It did not oppose revolution. I don't think it much favored revolution either. But it didn't oppose revolution in places like India and eventually in Africa, because not one of those revolutionaries was ever identified with Marxism. It's only when they're identified with Marxism that the United States takes a different view.

JK: But why the fear of Marxism? Is it because of its challenge to capitalism? Or its association with ...

NG: No. Cold War. Associated with Russia. And radicalism besides. Those things all add up. I don't know where you can draw the line.

JK: ...But the US had opposed revolutions before. There's also that statement in 1964 I will always remember by John McNaughton, the Assistant Secretary of Defense....

NG: Yes, that's the good one. That's the one that talks about the...

JK: The credibility of the US as a counterrevolutionary guarantor.<sup>4</sup> That was the 70-percent reason [for being in Vietnam], whereas the Soviet



Union-China-domino thing was twenty percent.<sup>5</sup> So that fear of the Soviet Union or not, there was also that element of fear of revolution in and of itself....

NG: I think the reason why I played that down is that the United States was supporting a lot of revolutions in those days. Look what it did in the peninsula of Indonesia: it literally forced the Dutch to accept an independent Indonesia. And India, certainly was on the side of independence. In other words, wherever there was no communist presence in the revolutionary leadership, the United States was not anti-revolutionary in those days. Later on, American policy does become counterrevolutionary, because, ultimately, we developed the idea that every revolution does have a communist contingent in it. And therefore in the name of containment it must be opposed. And then you can simply tick them off. We were against all revolution. But not right after the war. But I think that literally it's Ho Chi Minh that changes that....

JK: I think you've discussed...[this next topic] in your writing, and you've said a few things here...[for me to be able] to fathom what you see as the purpose of history. Clearly you see a utilitarian purpose to it.

NG: Oh, absolutely! I'm one of those that believe that history's unbelievably utilitarian, which is the reason why I think I'm doubly disturbed when my colleagues don't seem to be concerned with ideas. Well, of course, you must remember there's a great difference of opinion. I think most historians would say: history for history's sake. Well, I don't happen to be one of them. I happen to think about it the way that I do because I'm trying to teach a lesson. Everything that I write is written to create an idea that has applicability generally....

A lot of people are simply pathfinders, narrative types, not much concerned with analysis or laws or principles, or not concerned with ferreting out universal truths....



My assumptions are out in the open and they're not hidden away [in a way] in which they're almost undefined.... I've had a little running quarrel with one of my good friends in the profession who leans over backwards to keep from taking stands. For him it's a passion that you never take a stand on anything, that he's going to be completely detached from what he's doing, never passing judgment. But I keep telling him: by not passing judgment, you are indeed passing judgment; we all pass judgment, whether we like it or not....

I try to teach something. I don't want anybody to read anything that I write and not somehow be affected by it. I don't write to amuse myself, and I don't write to amuse anybody else....

You're always challenged. You're asked questions. And the idea that you keep exposing yourself and wrestling with questions that have never been posed before is part of the game. It's part of the business. And I don't feel I'm being put upon. I'm completely honest about it. If I don't have an answer, I tell them....

And besides that, I've given all these subjects enough thought that I'm perfectly willing to discuss my views, because I'm always trying to improve them, too. You've asked a lot of questions in the course of these hours. It never occurred to me: I've never made any effort to try to define realism before. Nobody's ever asked me to define it before. And I've tried to wrestle with it, you know. I didn't back away. Tried to wrestle with what I mean by it. And finally I came to the conclusion with which I'm quite pleased: that I look at the totality of the situation, the absolute totality of it--what nations are involved, what are their interests, why are they behaving the way they are, why do they want what they want, how determined to they seem to be to get it. And the result is that when you begin to deal with them, you know what you're up against, you know what's apt to work, what's not apt to work. And then when you get all these things together and you begin to follow the policy down, you can immediately sense it's



going to land up in disaster, because it's not paying enough attention to the realities! You see?

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>The interview took place at Graebner's home in Charlottesville, Virginia, on March 5, 1981, and mainly concerned his historical thought, with a focus on the causes of American wars. The recorded portion of the interview lasted four-and-one-half hours. The following transcript is about one-thirteenth as long and includes some representative portions of the original.

<sup>2</sup>Ideas and Diplomacy: Readings in the Intellectual Tradition of American Foreign Policy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).

<sup>3</sup>Foundations of American Foreign Policy: A Realist Appraisal from Franklin to McKinley (Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1985); America as a World Power: A Realist Appraisal from Wilson to Reagan (Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1984).

<sup>4</sup>McNaughton's actual term was "counter-subversion" in: Bundy Working Group, "Action for South Vietnam," November 6, 1964, Senator Gravel Edition, The Pentagon Papers: The Defense Department History of United States Decisionmaking on Vietnam, vol. 3 (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), pp. 598-599.

<sup>5</sup>McNaughton to McNamara, "Proposed Course of Action Re Vietnam, Annex--Plan of Action for South Vietnam," March 24, 1965, *ibid.*, p. 695.



## REPORT OF

### THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HISTORICAL DIPLOMATIC DOCUMENTATION MARCH, 1987

by  
Bradford Perkins, Chairman

The Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation met in Washington on November 6 and 7, 1986. We considered a wide range of issues. Among these were problems of records preservation in a computerized age, about which we must seek further information, and the possibility of publishing supplements to the Foreign Relations series containing intelligence reports not included when the volumes appeared, a matter on which we can give no opinion until we are permitted access to the materials involved. However, our primary concerns were two: the so-called "1960 by 1990" program for the Foreign Relations series, a time-table established since our last meeting, and the perennial problems of declassification.

#### "1960 by 1990"

Shortly after our meeting last year, President Reagan directed the Department of State and other appropriate agencies to prepare a plan which would "ensure the publication by 1990 of the foreign affairs volumes through 1960." Responding promptly to this directive, the Department and other agencies agreed upon a schedule which envisages publication of more than fifty volumes of Foreign Relations by the end of 1990.

Past Presidential directives have ordered adherence to a "twenty-five year rule" and even a "twenty year rule"--in other words, publication of Foreign Relations no longer than twenty-five or twenty years after events covered in those volumes. Members of the Committee, like the associations they represent, will not be satisfied until one or the other of these "rules" is formally restored and closely observed. On the other hand, we recognize that successful implementation of President Reagan's directive would end the erosion, already under way, of the current



"thirty year" policy. (At present, three volumes in the 1952-1954 series are still unpublished, and all but six of the twenty-seven volumes for 1955-1957 are still enmeshed in the declassification process.) Thus as a practical matter we welcome the President's directive, but we are not sanguine that his goal can be met. We see both problems and dangers ahead.

### Timetable

Those who framed the new plan consider the schedule, in the Historian's words, "ambitious but entirely rational." We hope he is right but are not convinced.

The Historical Office, currently understaffed, is already working at full stretch. To meet the 1990 publication deadline, it is estimated, the Office would have to compile all proposed volumes by 1988. Most are already well along, but work has not yet begun on volume 2, "Foreign Economic Policy," and volume 3, "National Security, Arms Control," both certain to create difficult problems when passed on to the declassifiers.

In the past, the declassification process has seldom taken less than four years. Although we are told that there has been some improvement recently, more dramatic progress is necessary if the 1990 target is to be met. However, the State Department's Classification/Declassification Center (CDC), which clears documents for the Department and then carries on extended negotiations with other agencies which may be involved, has had its budget substantially reduced. We find it difficult to be confident that volumes compiled by the Historical Office as late as 1988, or even 1987, can be cleared in time to appear in print by 1990.

Finally, the sum currently allotted for printing is, as the Department recognizes, inadequate to fund publication of the number of volumes envisaged over the next four years. We urge the Historical Office to continue efforts to reduce printing costs, by negotiation with the Government Printing Office or by some other means, but we believe that additional funds are imperative, even at a time when overall reductions in budget are likely.



## Size of Volumes

While current budgetary conditions probably make some reduction in the scale of Foreign Relations inevitable, such is certainly the case if the 1990 target is to be attained. Editing, indexing and printing costs would greatly exceed even hoped-for resources, and there could be no hope of meeting that target. The current plan calls for publication of about 6000 pages for each year covered by the series, a reduction of forty percent. To compensate, at least to a degree, for this very severe reduction, microform supplements will be issued. (They will not contain the editorial apparatus present in the printed volumes, thus effecting a substantial saving in costs, but the printed volumes will contain footnote references to at least some documents in the supplements.) Overall, the volume of material made available will not drop and may even increase.

The sharp reduction in printed materials will be a very serious development, justifiable only as a temporary response to present conditions. Clearly scholars will find the new system more difficult to use, and there is at least a danger that, cumbersomeness aside, the value of Foreign Relations will be reduced. We view the change warily, urging all involved, especially the Historical Office, to proceed with great care. We are pleased that the Historian desires to counsel with the committee and others; however, in order for us to advise him helpfully we must have access to materials currently denied.

## Declassification

As we noted in our report last year, the declassification process is a matter of serious concern, and not only because it takes so much time. We recognize, as all reasonable scholars do, that some materials cannot be made public even after the passage of thirty years, but we believe that the number of such documents is small. We believe, above all, that classification should not be used to obscure the fundamental record of American foreign relations, and it is our most basic responsibility to assure our professional constituencies, and by extension the American people, that such is not the case. We cannot report to our colleagues that Foreign Relations is, as



historically it proudly has been, as complete and open a record as possible. We hope so, but we cannot be sure.

Certainly the CDC, on its own or at the behest of other agencies, has proposed substantial deletions in manuscripts presented to it by the Historical Office. After often lengthy negotiation, many objections have been withdrawn, sometimes when the Historical Office showed that the documents were already in the public domain. Occasionally, at least, material deleted in one volume is, presumably by a different reviewer, permitted to appear in another. The proportion of material deleted as a result of this process varies greatly, from the insubstantial to as high as fifteen percent.

CDC procedures are cloaked in obscurity. We cannot find out how the very general principles established by executive order are in fact applied. If there are guidelines, they are withheld from us. Nor are we permitted to see or to have described to us any of the documents or passages for which clearance has been denied. At the end of the process, reviewers prepare quite specific guidelines for use by the National Archives when considering declassification of papers not included in Foreign Relations, but these too are withheld from us. We are simply asked by the CDC to take its assurances on faith.

Not so long ago, members of the Committee spent substantial time looking at documents for which clearance had been refused. They came away satisfied, and the republic did not collapse--no one betrayed confidences by running to the newspapers. Some move toward past practice, at least, is urgently required, and we will make recommendations in this regard to the Secretary of State.

The Committee, the Office of the Historian,  
and the Department

The committee noted with gratification that eight volumes of Foreign Relations had been published since its last meeting, the highest output since 1978. We were also pleased to learn that the Office of the Historian had completed compilation of five more volumes, making a total of ten, in the group covering



the years 1958-60. The skill and devotion of the Office are evident, but we are deeply concerned that inadequate financial resources will impede its work.

As always, during the meeting the Committee received helpful assistance from William Z. Slany, the Historian, and his staff, and we also benefited from the useful material circulated in advance. The Committee also welcomed the support of George B. High, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, who attended several of its sessions, and we also received reports on declassification from Deputy Assistant Secretary John P. Burke and others from CDC.

Present at the Committee's sessions were Blanche Wiesen Cook, Robert Dallek and Warren F. Kuehl, representing the American Historical Association; Deborah Larson and Michel Oksenberg, representing the American Political Science Association; John Lawrence Hargrove, representing the American Society of International law; Bradford Perkins, representing the Organization of American Historians; and Warren I. Cohen and Michael H. Hunt, the first representatives from the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. The committee elected Perkins as chairman, succeeding Kuehl, whose term expires this year.

#### **MINUTES: SHAFR COUNCIL**

**Philadelphia**

**April 2, 1987**

**President Thomas Paterson Presiding**

Council members present were: Waldo Heinrichs, Melvyn Leffler, Martin Sherwin, Betty Unterberger, and William Kamman. Also present were Lloyd Gardner, Robert Beisner, Bill Brinker, Garry Clifford, Calvin Davis, Dan Helmstadter, Michael Hogan, Kurt Schultz, and Ralph Weber.

1. President Tom Paterson announced the following committee appointments:

Bernath Book Prize Committee--Walter LaFeber, 1989; Douglas J. Little, 1990.

Bernath Article Prize Committee--William Walker, 1990.

Bernath Lecture Prize Committee--Emily Rosenberg, 1990.

Graebner Prize Committee--Waldo Heinrichs, 1992.

2. Page Putnam Miller, director of the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History discussed the Freedom of Information Act and guidelines for carrying out provisions of the act. It was noted that guidelines sometimes present problems for scholars. An example is the fee charge for commercial use which is operative if the researcher will make money.

Dr. Miller distributed a draft resolution on declassification policy. Council's discussion centered on the length of time that documents should be closed. There were references to the British system of declassification and questions on how the British system might influence what is done in the United States. Council passed a resolution in support of the resolution submitted by Dr. Miller with one amendment in the final paragraph urging legislative enactment of the 30 year rule. The resolution reads:

Whereas,

The number of classified documents in existence is now approaching the trillions; and

Whereas,

The General Accounting Office in a 1981 review of classified documents to determine if various portions of the documents were classified correctly found that 46% had portions that were overclassified; and

Whereas,

The House Committee on Government Operations in 1982 in the report "Security Classification and Executive Order 12356" concluded that the new Executive Order will hamper instead of help current problems because it gives classifiers vaguer guidelines and grants unnecessary additional classification authority; and

Whereas,

The Stilwell Commission, established by Department of Defense, concluded in its 1986 report Keeping the Nation's Secrets that "Too much information appears to be classified and much at higher levels than is warranted;" and



Whereas,

In 1986 the information Security Oversight Office recommended to the National Security Council that steps be taken to reduce unnecessary classification and to increase the professionalism and accountability of security personnel; and

Whereas,

The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives in a February 4, 1987 report calls for the reduction of classified information noting that overclassification "damages the credibility of appropriately classified information;" and

Whereas,

The financial burden of the current declassification policy has become realistically prohibitive because all trillion of our classified documents must be safeguarded in secure storage facilities and by time consuming staff support and must eventually be reviewed by a process that frequently requires an exorbitantly expensive page by page review of thirty year old documents; and

Whereas,

The National Archives has inadequate financial resources with only one-half of the declassification staff in 1987 that it had in 1980 and only limited authority to review and process the 30 year old documents in its custody because current policy requires that agencies originating documents provide guidance for their declassification and give final consent for the declassification of documents; and

Whereas,

There is no central data base for gaining information about those documents that have been declassified through individual requests; and

Whereas,

Access to documents is crucial for the writing of histories of the recent past which then provide needed insights for the making of policies for the future; now therefore, be it

Resolved,

That the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History

1. Urge the National Archives and Records Administration to create a national data base of those records that have been declassified through individual requests;
2. Request before Congressional Appropriations



- Committees sufficient funding for the National Archives to make headway on the systematic declassification of the enormous backlog of 30 year old classified documents in their custody;
3. Encourage further negotiations between the National Archives and federal agencies for streamlining agency guidance, including increased use of bulk declassification, and developing expeditious consent procedures for declassifying 30 year old documents;
  4. Urge the National Security Council to implement the thirteen initiatives recommended by the Information Security Oversight Office in 1986 which would improve the Government-wide information security system by requiring additional professionalism and accountability for security personnel;
  5. Express appreciation to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the House Committee on Government Operations, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee for their work in identifying the weaknesses of the present declassification policy and urge legislative enactment of the 30 year rule to deal with what is emerging as a serious and massive problem with the national security system.

There followed discussion of preservation issues concerning books and documents and the types of catalogs for such materials. Council members expressed the belief that there might be a need for public access to a card catalog as well as to a computerized catalog.

3. The committee appointed to examine Lewis Hanke's proposal for a guide for the study of U.S. history outside the U.S. was not present. President Paterson will contact the committee chairman.

4. Michael Hogan, editor of Diplomatic History, proposed a policy regarding access to the records of Diplomatic History, including referee's reports and correspondence of the editor. After discussion Council passed the following resolutions:

- A. That records generated in connection with Diplomatic History be retained for two years in the editorial office;
- B. That these records be held in strict



confidence, the sole exception being when a referee asks that his/her name be revealed to the author of the work reviewed;

C. That records generated in connection with

Diplomatic History be deposited on a yearly basis in the SHAFR archive;

D. That records deposited in the SHAFR archive remain closed for an additional ten years;

E. That referees for Diplomatic History must be notified of the policy on confidentiality in writing when asked to review a manuscript.

Hogan then recommended and Council passed the following:

That the five resolutions above take effect on January 1, 1988, and that they be published in Diplomatic History as soon as possible.

That records generated in connection with Diplomatic History January 1, 1986, be deposited in the SHAFR archive as soon as feasible, and that they be closed until January 1, 1996.

Concerning the SHAFR archive William Kamman read a letter from Jon Reynolds, University Archivist at Georgetown University, sent in response to an inquiry about depositing SHAFR records at Georgetown. Mr. Young and his special collection division staff concluded that the Georgetown University Archives did not have the space nor the staff to manage properly the back files of the editorial office of Diplomatic History. He noted that Georgetown now holds about nine five-inch Hollinger boxes of SHAFR records. Mr. Young stated that if SHAFR negotiates an agreement for depositing the editorial files with another archives he would be happy to transfer the records presently at Georgetown.

Council asked Kamman to write the archivist at the University of Nebraska about depositing SHAFR records.

Michael Hogan explained the need for a part-time copy editor and offered the following resolution:

That SHAFR defray the cost of a part-time, professional copy editor to aid in preparing issues of Diplomatic History.



In discussion of this resolution it was noted that the cost would be \$2,500. Kamman expressed doubt that SHAFR's operating fund could cover the cost of the copy editor. He noted that SHAFR had committed \$1,000 for the Diplomatic History index and that printing costs for Diplomatic History were increasing by around \$1,000 on January 1, 1988. A proposal for raising SHAFR dues emerged from the discussion. Martin Sherwin urged that alternate funding sources be developed for the editorial assistant based on the principle that SHAFR cannot keep raising dues to pay for a position that will become increasingly expensive and important. Council approved the resolution for a part-time copy editor and a resolution to increase regular annual dues to \$20.00, student dues to \$7.00, and emeriti to \$9.00. The increases would be effective with renewal of memberships.

Michael Hogan offered a resolution:

That the council undertake to study a variety of aggressive marketing strategies with a view to bringing Diplomatic History to the attention of non-American scholars.

Council passed the resolution; Tom Patterson will appoint a committee to make the study.

5. Tom Paterson reported that the program for the 1987 summer conference was complete and would soon go to press.

6. The 1988 SHAFR summer conference will be at The American University on June 9-12, 1988. Co-chairpersons of the committee are Robert Beisner, in charge of local arrangements, and Nancy B. Tucker, in charge of the program. Other members of the committee are: Jerald Combs, Mark Gilderhus, Robert McMahon, Emily Rosenberg, and Richard Welch. Robert Beisner noted that the dates were selected to allow for cheaper airfare for staying over Saturday night. Beisner also suggested that arrangements might be made for persons attending the conference to engage dormitory rooms a few days before or after the conference if they wished to do research in Washington.

Tom Paterson suggested that SHAFR should consider sites for the 1989 conference.

7. Calvin Davis reported on the Stuart L. Bernath Book Prize. Thirty-five books had been nominated. Of



these the committee decided that two should be selected as co-winners of the prize. The winners were Fraser J. Harbutt of Emory University for his The Iron Curtain: Churchill, America, and the Origins of the Cold War (Oxford University Press) and James Edward Miller of the Historical Office, Department of State, for his The United States and Italy, 1940-1950: the Politics and Diplomacy of Stabilization (University of North Carolina Press).

8. Kamman read the report of James Fetzer, chairman of the Stuart L. Bernath Article Prize. The winner was David McLean of the Riverina-Murray Institute of Higher Education, New South Wales, Australia, for his "American Nationalism, the China Myth, and the Truman Doctrine: The Question of Accommodation with Peking, 1949-1950", Diplomatic History, 10, 1 (Winter 1986).

9. Kamman read the report of Ronald J. Nurse, chairman of the Stuart L. Bernath Lecture Committee. The winner is William O. Walker III of Ohio Wesleyan University who will deliver the Bernath Lecture at the 1988 SHAFR luncheon in Reno.

10. William C. Widenor, chairman of the Warren Kuehl Book Prize Committee, reported in a letter that the committee had received 39 submissions and that Tom Paterson should have the name of the first winner by May 1. Richard W. Leopold reported by letter that contributions for the prize had been gratifying.

11. Kamman reported on a telephone call from Keith Nelson of the committee considering uses of the Bernath Supplementary Discretionary Account. The committee composed of Nelson, Dennis Bozyk, and Harriet Schwar, has been discussing the issue and will have a report by the summer meeting. Mr. Nelson requested that Council make suggestions for a minority member of the committee.

12. There was discussion of the index to Diplomatic History. Edward Kamai of the University of Washington is working on the project. On the question of how it would be published, it would have to be a separate issue and not a part of a regular issue of Diplomatic History. There will be further discussion of the index with the committee.



13. Council considered and approved a resolution submitted by David L. Anderson, editor of the Roster and Research List

The information contained in the Roster and Research List is intended for the personal use of the members of the Society For Historians of American Foreign Relations. Any commercial, promotional, or other use of this information is prohibited without the written permission of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer of SHAFR, Department of History, P.O. Box 13757, North Texas State University, Denton, TX 76203.

14. Council considered a proposal from Warren F. Kimball for a SHAFR prize for documentary editing. Kimball suggested that the prize recognize and encourage analytical scholarly editing that is relevant to the history of American foreign relations, policy, and diplomacy. Tom Paterson will appoint a committee to draw up a formal proposal. Anyone having thoughts on such a prize and its funding should send suggestions to Warren Kimball.

15. Tom Paterson will appoint a committee to look at SHAFR's financial standing and SHAFR's needs.

16. Council expressed concern about the scarcity of diplomatic history sessions at the OAH. It was suggested that the SHAFR program chairman might contact the OAH program committee or the executive-secretary.

17. As a follow-up of Council action on December 27, 1986, appointing Susan Shah to maintain the ledgers of SHAFR's non-operating funds on a contract basis, Council approved adding Susan Shah's name to the list of signatures two of which are required upon all checks and other withdrawal orders drawn by SHAFR on its bank accounts with the First National Bank of Ohio.

18. Immediate Past President Betty Unterberger reported that during her stay in California she had visited with the Bernaths. She noted their continuing interest in SHAFR activities.

Council adjourned at 10:30 p.m.



## SUMMARY OF THE 1986 ANNUAL MEETING

by

Justus D. Doenecke

(New College of the University of South Florida)

The twelfth annual conference of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations was held on the campus of Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., from June 25-28, 1986. The meeting was held in conjunction with the American Military Institute and the Conference on Peace Research in History. About 240 people were in attendance at twenty-two different sessions.

The plenary session, held in the auditorium of the Intercultural Center on the evening of Wednesday, June 26, was chaired by SHAFR president Betty M. Unterberger of Texas A&M University. Keynote speaker William J. Casey, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, spoke on the Office of Strategic Service and the French resistance forces in World War II. Addressing an audience of about three hundred, Casey described his own role in this wartime collaboration. He began his talk by announcing that all OSS records were currently being placed in the National Archives, where most of them would be available to scholars. He also said that the CIA was cooperating in implementing President Reagan's directive to provide appropriate documents to the Office of the Historian in order to implement the rapid publication of the Foreign Relations series. A reception followed in the Galleria of the Cultural Center.

Three sessions were held on Thursday morning, June 26. "Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy" was chaired by Marlene J. Mayo of the University of Maryland. Richard O. Curry of the University of Connecticut spoke on "The USIA: The Politicization of International Educational and Exchange Programs" and Athan Theoharis of Marquette University discussed "Foreign Policy and Domestic Surveillance: The Expansion of the FBI." Commentators included Geoffrey R. Stone of the University of Chicago Law School and Professor Mayo (no report submitted).

A second morning session, "Presidential Leadership and Foreign Policy," was chaired by William C. Widenor of the University of Illinois. Lloyd E. Ambrosius of the



University of Nebraska discussed "Woodrow Wilson's Health and the Treaty Fight" while Randall Woods of the University of Arkansas covered "Franklin Roosevelt and the Triumph of American Nationalism." Commentators were Jonathan Utley of the University of Tennessee and Professor Widenor (no report submitted).

The third morning session, chaired by David D. Newsom, Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Georgetown University, dealt with "How the United States Deals with Political Change." About a hundred persons were present. In his paper on Iran, Harold Saunders of the American Enterprise Institute and former Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East and South Asia, described the growing development of the political crisis and limited options open to the U.S. In discussing Nicaragua, Viron Vaky, former Assistant Secretary for American Republic Affairs, concentrated on the events surrounding the fall of Somoza and the various US efforts to create a moderate alternative. The Philippines was discussed by John Maisto, Country Director for Philippine Affairs, Department of State. Maisto reviewed the response of the American Executive and Congress to the Philippine elections. Commentators included Norman A. Graebner, University of Virginia, and Robert R. Bowie, former Assistant Secretary of State for Policy Planning and former Counselor of the State Department. In that there was a general conclusion from the three presentations, it was that political change can come suddenly and can affect US interests, but that the alternatives open to the US, either in reversing or modifying political change, are limited. The situation in the Philippines was unique because of the special relationships which the US had developed with that country over many decades.

At a luncheon sponsored by the Conference on Peace Research in History, chaired by CPRH president Michael Lutzker, Irwin Abrams of Antioch College spoke on "Nobel's Fifth Prize: Peace and Controversy." At least seventy-five scholars heard Abrams begin by discussing the historical background of the peace prize, something that might have involved the expansion of Nobel's criteria to include peace advocates, humanitarians, statesmen, and fighters for human rights. He also noted how the Nobel selection committee was appointed by the Norwegian parliament, or Storting, given full freedom, and made to take a



vow of silence. Abrams then noted how a prize winner was selected and concluded with a detailed discussion on the controversy over Dr. Chazov, the recipient of the 1985 award.

One early Thursday afternoon session, chaired by Norman A. Graebner and attended by about ninety people, continued the evaluation of the Eisenhower years begun in previous SHAFR meetings. Entitled "The American Commitment to Ngo Dinh Diem during the Eisenhower Administration," the session began with a paper by David R. Turner of Davis and Elkins College, "The Third Force in Action: Mike Mansfield and Ngo Dinh Diem, 1953-1955." Turner related Senator Mike Mansfield's support of Diem. As the Senate's leading authority on Vietnam, Mansfield managed to convince members of Congress and the administration that Diem offered the best chance of keeping South Vietnam free. Mansfield propounded the view that Diem, despite his inexperience and inflexibility, possessed personal integrity and political promise.

The second paper was given by David L. Anderson of Indiana Central University and entitled "J. Lawton Collins, John Foster Dulles, and the Eisenhower Administration's 'Point of No Return.'" It showed that such figures as Mansfield and Diem faced their most determined opposition in General J. Lawton Collins, Eisenhower's special representative in Saigon. Anderson traced in detail Collins' growing disillusionment with Diem as a leader and his unsuccessful attempt to convince the administration that any policy anchored to Diem was a failure. Commentators included Ambassador Leland Barrows, director of the US Operations Missions in Vietnam from 1954-1958, and William B. Pickett, Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology.

At another early afternoon session, this one chaired by William V. O'Brien of Georgetown University, James Turner Johnson of Rutgers University spoke on the topic "The Historical Evolution of the Just War Tradition and the Possibilities of its Contemporary Applications." Before an audience of about 25, Johnson explained the modern just war doctrine: the jus ad bellum concerning recourse to armed force and the jus in bello regulating the conduct of the just war. He stressed the living, practical character of contemporary just war doctrine as a guide to decision-



makers in national security processes. He also illustrated the practicality of just war concepts and terminology with examples from addresses by Secretary of State Shultz and Secretary of Defense Weinberger in their "debate" over the conditions under which the United States should have recourse to force.

In the panel discussion, John Langan of Woodstock Theological Center, Georgetown University, agreed with Johnson's emphasis on the practical applicability of the just war doctrine, pointing to the debate in May 1983 over the American Catholic bishops Pastoral Letter. Gordon Zahn of the Pax Christi Center on Conscience and War rejected just war doctrine as justification for war, deterrence, and defense preparations. Chair O'Brien drew attention to the use of just war concepts in justifications advanced by the Reagan administration for the April 1986 strike against Libya. On the whole, the audience received Johnson's presentation well and appeared to be pleasantly surprised to learn that the just war doctrine could be of practical use in developing security policies.

Still another early Thursday session centered on "The United States and the Origins of World War II: The Perspective of Half a Century." Chaired by Hans L. Trefousse of Brooklyn College, City University of New York, the session was attended by about 65 people. Ella Handen of Bloomfield College, speaking on "the State Department and the Origins of the Neutrality Acts, 1933-1934," examined the proposals of Charles Warren and Edwin Borchard at a conference of the Council on Foreign Relations, January 10, 1934. She stressed their resemblance to later neutrality legislation perfected by Congress. Daniel Kelly, York College, City University of New York, spoke on "America's Retreat from Intervention in Europe, 1933-1935." Kelly concentrated on Norman Davis's 1933 proposals at the Geneva Disarmament Conference as an example of an American tendency to draw away from Europe economically but closer politically. He traced the failure of this brief interlude by recapitulating the growing fears of a renewed war as the result of aggressive moves by the European dictators. Robert H. Whealey of Ohio University addressed himself to the topic "American Oil Industry Controls Spanish Nationalism, 1927-1931: A Study in Economic Imperialism." Whealey examined the loss of the Spanish



oil market in 1927 because of the establishment of the Spanish state oil monopoly, CAMPSA, and the efforts of American and other oil companies to come to terms with the situation.

Commentators included Justus D. Doenecke, New College of the University of South Florida, and Professor Trefousse. They noted the comparative lack of attention given to the actions of the President, the lack of influence of the State Department in the development of the neutrality acts, and the consequent marginal influence of proposals made to it. They also stressed the importance of the differences between Hoover's internationalist approach in economic matters as contrasted with Roosevelt's initial primary interest in domestic affairs. They wished that Whealy had pursued his subject more thoroughly through the Franco years. The audience, which participated actively, raised similar points.

There were several sessions held late Thursday afternoon. Brigadier General Edwin H. Simmons, USMC, Retired, and director of Marine Corps History and Museums, chaired a session "Documenting the Early Years of the Ngo Dinh Diem Government in Vietnam: Foreign Relations of the United States, Volumes I, 1955-1957 and 1958 and 1960." Papers included Edward C. Keefer, Office of the Historian, Department of State, "The United States and the Consolidation of the Diem Government, 1955-1957," and David W. Mabon, Office of the Historian, Department of State, "1958-1960: Divided Counsels amid Growing Insurgency." Commentators included Dr. Robert M. Hathaway, National Security Affairs Legislative Assistant to Senator George Mitchell, and Ambassador Thomas J. Corcoran, formerly Consul in Hanoi and Political Officer in Saigon. About 35 people attended.

Keefer pursued the theme that support of Diem by the Eisenhower administration was not inevitable. It was certainly not the result of a conspiratorial cabal of American anti-Communists, but became increasingly solidified as the considered best judgment of alternatives. Keefer noted that both volumes benefitted by access to more pieces of the jigsaw puzzle than had the Pentagon Papers, including the records of the President, the White House staff, and the National Security Council, and as a result, we now have the best documentary collection on policy



formulation for Vietnam. Mabon spoke of the long, persistent in-fighting within the official American community in Saigon, which could not reach a unified policy, much less speak to the Diem government with a unified voice. He also examined in some detail the attempted "paratrooper coup" of November 1960. In his commentary, Ambassador Cororan stressed that the French, not the United States, had put Diem in power and that there was no viable alternative.

The late afternoon session, "Suez and Cold War Relations," was chaired by Nina J. Noring, Office of the Historian, Department of State, and drew about fifty people. In his paper "The Suez Crisis of 1956: A Reappraisal," Tore Petersen of the University of Minnesota asked why the United States responded so harshly to British and French actions. After indicating why existing interpretations were inadequate, he offered an alternative one: Britain and the US were engaged in a rivalry for control of the Middle East; US actions were designed to prevent a resurgence on Anglo-French influence. To substantiate his argument, Petersen explored the Anglo-American rivalry prior to 1956 in regard to Iran, Egypt, and the Buraimi Oasis.

Peter G. Boyle of the University of Nottingham spoke on "Churchill, Eisenhower, and Detente, 1953-1955." He described the prime minister's repeated but unsuccessful attempts to enlist the American president in a summit meeting with Soviet leaders. Boyle claimed that Eisenhower, swayed by Secretary Dulles and his own anti-Soviet feelings, consistently opposed the proposed meeting, a position quietly favored by the British Foreign Office. Concluding that detente prospects in the early 1950s were poor, Boyle pointed to strong feelings of hostility on both sides. Moreover, he noted that powerful vested interests, both in and outside government in the West, saw the need to preserve public support for a high level of defense spending.

Commentator Chester J. Pach of Texas Tech University found both papers based upon solid primary research and offering interesting insights. He hoped that Boyle's larger work on Anglo-American relations with the Soviet Union would provide more context for the Churchill-Eisenhower exchange and deal more thoroughly



with the broader questions involved. Pach also questioned Petersen's implied criticism of Eisenhower's actions during the Suez crisis, noting that other historians have viewed Suez as Eisenhower's "finest hour." Commentator Noring underlined the importance of examining the US's replacement of Britain as the major foreign power exerting influence in the Middle East. She maintained, however, that US concern that the Anglo-French action would create a catastrophe for Western interests in the Middle East was the main cause of US policy during the crisis.

The last panel held late Thursday afternoon centered on "New Findings in Diplomatic History: Ph.D. Research in Progress." Lloyd Gardner of Rutgers University was chairman. Papers included Lloyd A. Cohen of Boston College, "The Establishment of Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Romania, and the Role of Benjamin F. Peixotto"; Walter L. Hixson, University of Colorado, "George F. Kennan: From Cold War to Neo-Isolation"; and John S. Hill, Brandeis University, "The United States and the French Economy, 1944-1948." Commentators included Robert H. Ferrell, Indiana University, and Professor Gardner (no report submitted).

After the late afternoon receptions, Georgetown University sponsored a social hour in the Hall of Nations.

On the morning of Friday, June 27, Linda Killen of Radford University chaired a session "World War I and the Aftermath." Edward B. Parsons, Hamilton campus of Miami University, presented material on "Some International Implications of the 1918 Roosevelt-Lodge Campaign against Wilson and a Democratic Congress," and George Egerton, University of British Columbia, spoke on "Diplomacy, Scandal, and Military Intelligence: The Craufurd-Stuart Affair and Anglo-American Relations, 1918-1920." Commentators included Daniel R. Beaver, Center of Military History, and Professor Killen (no report submitted).

Another morning session, dealing with "Foreign Relations and the Constitution: A Partnership at 200," was chaired by Cynthia Harrison, Project 87 of Washington, D.C.. John A. Moore, Jr., California State Polytechnic University, spoke on "The Founders and Foreign Affairs: Thoughts on the Bicentennial of



the U.S. Constitution," while Susan L. Roberts, Winthrop College, addressed herself to "The Constitution and Foreign Affairs: Power Sharing in Practice, 1945-1985." Glenn Barkan of Aquinas College commented (no report submitted).

A third Friday morning session dealt with "World War II: Wartime and Post-war Diplomacy." William Stueck of the University of Georgia served as both chair and commentator. In his paper, "Achieving Consensus: Churchill and Roosevelt at Tehran," Paul Mayle of Mount Vernon Nazarene College began by briefly discussing the debate among historians concerning the feelings of each statesman towards the other. He argued that during the conference, after an initial honeymoon, "unqualified agreement was rare." Yet the two figures remained masters at finessing divisive issues, both between themselves and with Stalin. Though FDR and Churchill failed to reach agreement on a precise date for the cross-channel invasion scheduled for spring 1944, they agreed "in principle" that the attack would occur in May. Such an approach created "at least the illusion of harmony."

In her paper on "Secretary Byrnes and the 1945-1946 Iranian Crisis," Mary Jennie McGuire of High Point College noted that Secretary Byrnes stressed negotiation and conciliation at the onset of the Soviet-Iranian troop evacuation. Despite opposition from President Truman and the State Department, Byrnes was unwilling to discredit the Soviets as peacemakers automatically. He used contradictory rhetoric to divert attention away from the concurrent private and United Nations sponsored negotiations, thus helping both sides to reach a mutually acceptable treaty without outside interference. Moreover, his tardy espousal of the hard line after the crisis ended was a useful sign that finally all American diplomats were anti-Communist, something that sent a significant message to the Soviets as the Cold War began.

Frederick W. Marks III of Forest Hills, New York spoke on "Roosevelt and Churchill: Their Real Estimate of One Another and Their Image in the Eyes of the World." Marks found that the relationship "was far less warm beneath the surface, far less cordial, and far less grounded by mutual respect than is generally believed." He went on to claim that "Roosevelt was not highly regarded by the great majority of foreign



officials with whom he dealt." After reciting various private unflattering remarks that Churchill and Roosevelt said about each other, Marks described Churchill as Roosevelt's "tutor" and "suitor." He then outlined the hostile views of Roosevelt held by numerous other high officials, ranging from Anthony Eden to Chiang Kai-shek.

In his commentary, Stueck concentrated his remarks on Marks' paper. While commending Marks for broad multiarchival research, Stueck questions some of Marks' judgements. If Churchill and Roosevelt were less fond of each other, what impact did their mutual distaste have on their conduct of the war? Even before the war, when Anglo-American relations were admittedly less than cordial, there is considerable doubt as to the degree of responsibility FDR should bear for the coming of the 1939 war. Differences between the two countries derived from serious conflicts of national interests, not Roosevelt's personality. As for perceptions of FDR among other world leaders, Stueck questioned Marks' reading of evidence that always put the president in the worst possible light. Lively discussion followed, particularly centering on Marks' paper.

At a luncheon sponsored by the American Military Institute and chaired by John T. Greenwood, Office of History, US Army Corps of Engineers, AMI president Allan Millett of Ohio State University spoke on "Military History and Diplomatic History: What's the Difference?" (no report submitted)

Among the early Friday afternoon sessions was one entitled "Historical Coverage of Joint Operations: A Panel Discussion." Chair Alexander S. Cochran, Jr., Center of Military History, offered general overview and background. William S. Dudley, Naval History Center, spoke on "Past Historical Coverage of Joint Operations: 1775 through 1941." Jack Shulimson, Marine Corps Historical Center, offered a paper "Current Coverage on Joint Operations: 1941 through 1985." B. Franklin Cooling, Office of Air Force History, addressed himself to "Future Coverage of Joint Operations." The audience offered discussion (no report submitted).

Early in the afternoon, a session was held entitled "Peace Activism in the 1950s" and sponsored in



cooperation with the CPRH. Maurice Isserman of Smith College presented a paper "Prelude to the Sixties: The Committee for Non-Violence Action in the Eisenhower Years." Nancy Roberts of the University of Minnesota spoke on "Catholic Workers in the 1950s." Commentators included David Garrow of the City College of New York and of the City University Graduate School, who also chaired the session, and Anne Klejment of the College of St. Thomas (no report submitted).

Early in the afternoon, various conferees also had the chance to tour the Historical Office of the State Department. They were addressed by several officials, including diplomat Michael H. Armacost.

Several panels were held late Friday afternoon. Harold Josephson of the University of North Carolina (Charlotte) chaired a session entitled "The Tactics of the Outsider: American Women Organize to Influence Foreign Policy." Judith Papachristou, Sarah Lawrence College, spoke on "A New Voice in Foreign Policy Activism: American Women and International Politics." Amy Swedlow, also of Sarah Lawrence College, presented a paper entitled "Pure Milk, Not Poison: Women's Strike for Peace and the Test Ban Treaty of 1963." Commentary was offered by James L. Abrahamson, U.S. Army War College, and the late Charles DeBenedetti, University of Toledo (no report submitted).

Another late afternoon session, "Social History of American-East Asian Relations in Early Twentieth Century," was chaired by Warren I. Cohen of Michigan State University. About forty attended. Jane Hunter of Colby College spoke on "American Women Missionaries in China." Outlining the findings of her book, she not only discussed the effects of China on these missionaries, but their own work with Chinese women. James Huskey, United States Information Service, discussed "Americans and Chinese in Shanghai," and Sandra Taylor, University of Utah, addressed herself to "American Protestant Missionaries and Japan." Comment was supplied by Charles Lilley, North Virginia Community College, and Michael H. Hunt, University of North Carolina. Both focussed on methods of writing interdisciplinary social history.



After the afternoon sessions, the Committee on American-East Asian Relations held a reception in the Hall of Nations.

On Saturday morning, June 28, a session was held entitled "American Cultural and Economic Penetration into the Third World." Nathan Godfried spoke on "American Labor Education: Technical Aid for Third World Labor," James Schwoch of Northwestern University on "American Mass Culture in the Global Arena: Radio Broadcasting Comes to Brazil and Latin American," and Mark Tolstedt of the George Washington University on "Micronesian Development Aid and U.S. Strategic Interests: From Infrastructure to Culturalization." Comment was supplied by Montague Kern (no report submitted).

A session was held on "American Diplomacy and Military Construction Abroad," chaired by John T. Greenwood, Office of History, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. John W. Chambers, Rutgers University, spoke on "Diplomacy and U.S. Air Base Construction in the Arctic and Atlantic in the 1950s." Frank N. Schubert, also of the historical office of the Corps of Engineers, gave a paper on "Relations between the U.S. Embassy and the Construction Agent (Near East Project Office, Corps of Engineers) during the Israeli Air Base Construction Program, 1979-1982." David P. Trask of the Center of Military History commented (no report submitted).

Also available to conferees was a tour of the Old Executive Office Building, long the home of the Department of State.

-----

#### **1st SOVIET-AMERICAN SYMPOSIUM ON US-USSR RELATIONS DURING WORLD WAR II, Moscow, USSR, Oct. 20-29, 1986**

The Symposium. The actual conference took place in three days, Tuesday through Thursday, Oct. 21-23, 1986 in Moscow, USSR. Each of the major participants prepared an original, scholarly paper, although the oral presentations were limited to a ten minute precis.

In addition to the participants shown in the program, between fifteen and thirty other people attended, most



of them quite regularly. Some made interventions, but many just listened.

It is not practical to discuss the papers at length, but I should mention that the American delegation was struck by what we considered the Soviet willingness to concede certain points, at least in part. For example, they are now saying that lend-lease did contribute significantly to their war effort, even though what was actually delivered came to only about 4% of what the Soviets themselves produced. (U.S. historians state that we sent supplies amounting to about 10% of Soviet production.) Another characteristic of the discussions was their willingness to introduce and discuss what we considered difficult or awkward issues. Perhaps the greatest shortcoming of the talks was that the Soviets depend very heavily on American and British sources and focus their research on U.S. policy. It was very difficult to get them to talk in depth about Soviet policy-making. They are, for example, reluctant publicly to criticize the Party or to examine internal policy-making debates (we were told once that Soviet policy is very clear--just read the official Party declarations), but they did not consistently avoid the hard questions.

The Soviet project leader, Dr. G. N. Sevostianov, summed up the conference by noting that the reports and the dialogue were excellent, but that both sides needed to continue to work to develop a more objective, balanced approach. He did gently chastise the Americans for not making fuller use of printed Soviet documents. During the conference itself, he constantly remarked that this or that American was "a serious scholar" and "knows the documents very well."

At the close of the conference on Thursday, we met with the head of the Soviet National Committee of Historians, Academician Tichvinsky. He did stated, with some enthusiasm, that he was pleased and that the Soviet National Committee of Historians was eager to continue the program.

The conference closed with a nice reception, held at the Soviet Academy hotel where we stayed, that was attended by all of the conferees. It is worth noting that we were treated with great courtesy and that



every effort was made to make our visit pleasant and memorable.

Publication. The Soviets hope to publish shortened versions of some of the papers. They mentioned book form publication in Russian, but said that such things would take time and some negotiations. They are more than happy to see some or all of the papers published here in English, and that is being pursued.

Future Planning. We agreed that the 2nd symposium would be in the U.S. sometime in the autumn of 1987 (probably at the FDR Library during the week of October 19th), and that the period under discussion would be summer 1942-autumn 1943 (to include the Moscow Foreign Ministers Conference). The long-term plan continues to be for a total of six symposia.

Evaluation. The American participants were unanimous that the symposium and the overall experience were intellectually stimulating and academically rewarding. We all agreed that it was extraordinarily valuable for us to gain a better understanding of the Soviet perspective on events. Moreover, most of us learned by the exchange with what we found to be a group of serious scholars. There is no doubt in our minds that our experience was shared by the Soviet historians, a conclusion that was reinforced by private discussions with our counterparts during the various social occasions.

Dr. Chubarian, vice-chairman of the Soviet National Committee of Historians (the primary sponsoring group in the USSR for the project), said that he believed that this symposium set the example for others to follow. We agreed that this was most successful--much more so than we had anticipated. Most important of all, the conference faithfully adhered to the subject--Soviet-American Relations during the 1933-1942 period.

Warren F. Kimball  
WWII History Project Director



## LIST OF UNITED STATES PARTICIPANTS

Theodore Wilson (Kansas)  
Charles C. Alexander (Ohio)  
Edward Bennett (Washington State)  
Hugh Phillips (Alabama-Huntsville)  
Mark Stoler (Vermont)  
Garry Clifford (Connecticut)  
Steven Miner (Ohio)  
David Glantz (US Army, Ft. Leavenworth)  
Warren Kimball (Rutgers)

### THE JANUARY 1987 UNITED STATES EDUCATORS' TOUR TO VIETNAM: AN EVALUATION

by

Jonathan Goldstein (West Georgia College/Harvard  
University Fairbank Center)<sup>1</sup>

This article is a sequel to Sandra C. Taylor's "The First Educational Exchange to Indochina," SHAFR Newsletter 17, no. 3 (September 1986), pp. 9-13. A comparison of Taylor's 1985-86 trip and mine in 1987 may be of practical use to other researchers who are contemplating Indochina trips.

Any American academic who is considering doing research in Indochina or even casual travel there in 1987 should carefully weigh whatever value might derive from such a trip against the formidable logistical obstacles which may have to be overcome in realizing the venture. There is neither an American embassy in Hanoi, a Vietnamese embassy in Washington, nor interest sections in third country embassies to facilitate normal travel or to handle emergencies. Airmail letters between the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SRV) and the United States have taken as long as four months to arrive. My group personally experienced the non-delivery of mail within the city of Hanoi. Travel conditions were primitive. The major highway between the capital city and the major port is riddled with one-lane roads and bridges, some of which alternately accommodated railroad trains, motor vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians and animals. Two of Vietnam's best known "scenic" boat tours-to Thay Son Island in the Mekong Delta and to an island-cave in Ha Long Bay-each required precarious gang-



plank walking which effectively discouraged both older and younger members of the 1987 tour. In two of Vietnam's fanciest hotels, in Hanoi and at Ha Long Bay, large rats entered the formal dining room and on one occasion jumped on the chairs and table. Minor emergencies occurred regularly and entailed many hours of delay: two small boats broke their moorings on Bach Dang River and floated powerless into the Gulf of Tonkin; two large tourist boats on Ha Long Bay entwined their anchor chains. The 1987 tour avoided any major catastrophe, but one wonders how a truly life-threatening situation would have been handled.

Both Professor Taylor's 1985-86 trip and mine in January 1987 were organized by the Philadelphia-based United States-Indochina Reconciliation Project (USIRP). This program attempts to steer a politically-neutral course amid the often conflicting foreign policies of Vietnam, Laos, Kampuchea, and the United States. USIRP lists its objectives to:

- 1) strengthen teaching about Indochina in the United States through discussions of the American-Indochina War with the "other side" and through first hand observations of daily life;
- 2) provide Indochinese teachers and scholars greater opportunity to meet their American counterparts;
- 3) lay the groundwork for normal educational exchange and field research to be conducted by American and Indochinese institutions; and
- 4) foster understanding and reconciliation between countries and cultures separated by four decades of war and hostility.<sup>2</sup>

In the absence of the services of embassies, both USIRP tours benefited from the logistical assistance of three historic American peace churches active in Indochina: the Akron, Pennsylvania-based Mennonite Central Committee, composed of Mennonites and The Church of the Brethren; and the Philadelphia-based American Friends Service Committee (AFSC). While the 1985-86 tour included Laos and Kampuchea as well as Vietnam, logistical problems ultimately prevented the inclusion of Laos and Kampuchea in 1987.

John McAuliff led both USIRP tours. He may be the most experienced American in the never-never land of postwar American-Vietnamese relations. The 1987 Vietnam tour was his eighth. He summarized his



experience for a September 1986 Manchester, U.K., Conference on the Cultural Effects of the Vietnam War:

I must be the only American active at the national leadership level of the anti-war movement who also has worked persistently on post-war Indochina issues. As President of the Committee of Returned [mostly Peace Corps] Volunteers, I became a member of the Executive Committee of mobilization committees, was active in major demonstrations and attended a couple of Stockholm conferences. For a decade (1972-82) I directed the AFSC peace education program on Indochina. I probably am one of the few veterans of the anti-war movement who is an Associate Member of Vietnam Veterans of America.<sup>3</sup>

McAuliff seemed to have established personal relationships with every Vietnamese and Western government official we met. His experience was poignantly evoked in the Ho Chi Minh Museum in Hue, where our guide pointed out a large blown-up photograph of a 1975 Hanoi street demonstration celebrating reunification. McAuliff casually mentioned that he was also in that crowd. McAuliff's expertise was critical in securing a hard-to-get written permit to bring out of Vietnam cassette tapes which we recorded inside the country, as well as other feats of diplomatic legerdemain which were necessary on a daily basis for the 1987 tour to proceed.

In addition to McAuliff both the 1985-86 and 1987 tours included eleven geographically and institutionally diverse participants selected by a politically-neutral international advisory committee of academicians who specialize in Indochina studies. Both tours contained high school as well as college faculty, veterans of the American-Indochina War as well as of the anti-war movement, and specialists in the political history of Southeast Asia, China, and the United States. The 1987 delegation brought individuals with expertise in academic administration: a history department chairman who has overseen one of the first post-normalization American student programs in China; national and regional officers of the Ann Arbor, Michigan-based Association for Asian Studies; a Southeast Asian grants specialist from New York's Social Science Research Council; and the co-director of a large state university's Vietnam veterans program.



On two occasions we met with members of the Social Science committee of the Vietnamese Academy of Sciences. Most Vietnamese academics speak French, English or Russian. I had two lengthy discussions with Van Tao, Director of the Institute of History and one of the editors of the scholarly journals Viet Nam Social Sciences and Nghien Cuu Lich Su ("Historical Studies"). He and I isolated three historical questions on which research collaboration and exchange of documents between American and Vietnamese scholars might prove mutually beneficial: relations between Ho Chi Minh and the Roosevelt Administration; relations between the Japanese and the Viet Minh, using documents available in the United States; and the history of the American protest movement against United States involvement in the American-Indochina War.<sup>4</sup>

Those were high points of the trip and suggest some of the benefits a researcher might derive from a Vietnam tour. None of us in 1987 had the opportunity to do any primary source research, apart from making an occasional tape recording or gathering printed matter to peruse back in the States. Much of our popular as well as official reception had been well orchestrated. On the other hand, on only one occasion do I recall our national Vietnam Tourism guide asking us specifically not to go somewhere - in that case into a primitive mud-brick farming village near Hanoi. When we stopped for a photo opportunity at a Roman Catholic Church at the village's outskirts, within minutes we were surrounded by what seemed to be every man, woman, and child from that village.<sup>5</sup>

What opportunities can there be for substantial, unhindered research by American academics in Vietnam in the near future? Many Vietnamese and Western officials in Hanoi expressed optimism that, within the context of strong Soviet influence, Vietnam might nevertheless be open to some limited form of academic exchange with the United States in 1990. In that year, Vietnam has pledged to withdraw from Kampuchea, and would thereby remove a major obstacle to the normalization of Vietnamese-American diplomatic relations. There are currently joint social science ventures between India and Vietnam within the context of Soviet influence.<sup>6</sup> This may be the time to be thinking about similar, modest ventures. Educators' tours such as those run by the USIRP, while arduous



and costly at this time, may well lay the groundwork for broader scholarly cooperation.

### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Copyright Jonathan Goldstein, 1987. Used here with the author's permission. The author wishes to thank West Georgia College Professors Paul Masters and Robert Claxton for critiquing drafts of this article, and West Georgia typist Darlene Jones for secretarial assistance.

<sup>2</sup>U.S.-Indochina Reconciliation Project, "1986/87 EDUCATORS' TRIP," printed flyer (n.d., ca. September 1986).

<sup>3</sup>Printed biographical flyer, First International Conference on the Cultural Effects of Vietnam, September 4-6, 1986, Manchester (U.K.) Polytechnic.

<sup>4</sup>For discussion of these research concerns from an American perspective, see, for example, Alexander DeConde, "What's Wrong With American Diplomatic History," Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations Newsletter I (May 1970), pp.I-II, and Thomas A. Bryson, "United States Involvement in Vietnam: A Survey of Conflicting Interpretations," West Georgia College Studies in the Social Sciences 9 (1970), pp. 40-56.

<sup>5</sup>On private walks, both last year's and this year's USIRP tourists were regularly greeted with the popular cry "Lien Xo" ("Russians"). Usually this was a friendly and exuberant cry of young children. Once on our trip, two tourists wandered into a residential district, were accosted with the cry "Lien Xo," were stoned, and then managed to negotiate their freedom from the hostile mob by proclaiming "Nuc My" (We are Americans), whereupon the rock throwing stopped. This unusual display of philo-Americanism in a Soviet-bloc country found its way into The New York Times on February 3 and The International Herald Tribune on February 5. It was not, however, the norm.

<sup>6</sup>For a discussion of the limitations and achievements of the Indian projects, see Jaganath Pathy, "Social



---

### CALENDAR

---

June 25-28	The 13th annual conference of SHAFR will be held at Annapolis, Maryland Program co-chairs are George Herring, University of Kentucky and Robert Love, U.S. Naval Academy.
August 1	Deadline, materials for the September <u>Newsletter</u> .
November 1	Deadline, materials for the December <u>Newsletter</u> .
November 1-15	Annual election for SHAFR officers.
December 1	Deadline, nominations for the Bernath Dissertation Support Awards.
December 27-30	The 102t annual meeting of the AHA will be held in Washington. The deadline for proposals has passed.
January 1, 1987	Membership fees in all categories are due, payable at the national office of SHAFR.
February 1	Deadlines for the 1986 Bernath article award and the Bernath book award.
February 1	Deadline, materials for the March <u>Newsletter</u> .
March 1	Nominations for the Bernath lecture prize are due.
April 1	Applications for the W. Stull Holt Dissertation Fellowship are due.



March 30- The 81th annual meeting of the OAH  
April 2 April 2 will be held in Reno with  
headquarters at Bally's Grand  
Hotel. (The deadline for  
submissions has passed.)

May 1 Deadline, materials for the June  
Newsletter.

The 1989 meeting of the OAH will be held in St. Louis,  
Mo, at Adam's Mark Hotel, April 6-9.

The Program Chair is:  
Professor Richard Fox  
Department of History  
Reed College  
Portland, OR 97202

The deadline for proposals is March 15, 1987.

In 1988 the AHA will meet in Cincinnati.

In 1989 the AHA will meet in San Francisco.

---

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

---

#### SHAFR WELCOMES SUGGESTIONS FOR SITE FOR 1989

President Tom Paterson and Council have requested that  
they would like to hear suggestions concerning the  
meeting place for SHAFR's 1989 summer meeting.

#### CALL FOR SHAFR CONFERENCE PAPERS

The Society for Historians of American Foreign  
Relations 1988 Conference will be held at The American  
University in Washington, D.C. June 9-12, 1988.  
Program co-chairs Nancy Bernkopf Tucker and Robert  
Beisner urge you to submit ideas for panels and  
papers. Fully assembled sessions are preferred but  
individual submissions will also be considered. The  
committee encourages volunteers for chairing and/or  
commenting on panels. The theme for the meeting will



be American Foreign Relations and National Security but as an equal opportunity committee we welcome papers on other subjects as well. The deadline for proposals is **October 15, 1987**. Please send a one page abstract and your vita to Robert Beisner, The American University, Department of History, Washington, D.C. 20016.

### **SIENA COLLEGE CALL FOR PAPERS**

Siena College is sponsoring its third annual multidisciplinary conference on the 50th anniversary of World War II. The focus for 1988 will be 1938 - though papers dealing with broad issues of earlier years will be welcomed. Topics welcomed include, Fascism and Naziism, the War in Asia, Spain, Literature, Art, Film, Diplomatic, Political and Military History, Popular Culture and Women's and Jewish studies dealing with the era. Obviously, Czechoslovakia and the Munich Conference will be particularly appropriate.

Replies and inquiries to: Thomas O. Kelly, II  
Dept. of History  
Siena College  
Loudonville, NY 12211

### **NAVAL HISTORY CALL**

The Naval Historical Center will host the annual meeting of the American Military Institute on April 8 and 9, 1988, at the Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C. The conference theme is Technology, Industry, and Sea Power. Papers that treat naval technological developments, naval-industrial relations, strategy, and other aspects of naval history are invited. Please send proposals to AMI Conference Coordinator, Naval Historical Center, Building 57, Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C., 20374, before October 1, 1987.

### **SOUTHWEST ASIAN STUDIES CALL FOR PAPERS**

The Southwest Conference on Asian Studies to be held in Dallas, Texas under the sponsorship of Southern Methodist University is inviting proposals relating to Asia or to American-East Asian relations. Paper-



givers need not be members of the SWCAS but they will be expected to register for the meeting.

Contact: Prof. Mark Wilkinson  
History Dept.  
Box 1589  
Austin College  
Sherman, TX 75090

### THE 1987 GILBERT CHINARD PRIZE

The Chinard awards are made jointly by the Society for French Historical Studies and the Institut Francais de Washington for distinguished scholarly books or manuscripts in the history of Franco-American relations by Canadian or American authors published during 1987. The Gilbert Chinard prize of \$750- is awarded annually for a book or manuscript in page-proof, the Incentive Award of \$250 is for an unpublished book-length manuscript, generally by a younger scholar.

Deadline for the 1987 award is December 31, and five copies of each entrant should be sent to:

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

### PEACE ARCHIVES

Peace Archives, a guide to library collections of the papers of American peace organizations and of leaders in the public effort for peace, has been compiled and edited by Marguerite Green. This 80-page directory identifies manuscript holdings in some 30 major repositories and describes over 70 individual collections. The guide costs \$7.00 and checks should be made out to:

World Without War Council  
1730 Martin Luther King, Jr. Way  
Berkeley, CA 94709



---

## PUBLICATIONS

---

Michael Barnhart (SUNY Stonybrook), Japan Prepares for Total War: The Search for Economic Security, 1919-1941. Cornell University Press. 1987. \$29.95, ISBN 0-8014-1915-8.

Michael Hunt (University of North Carolina), Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy. Yale University Press. 1987. \$18.00, ISBN 0-300-03717-1.

Patrick J. Hearden (Purdue University), Roosevelt Confronts Hitler: America's Entry into World War II. Northern Illinois University Press. 1987. \$27.00 cloth, ISBN 0-87580-124-2; \$9.00 paper, ISBN 0-87580-538-8.

Richard E. Welch (Lafayette College), Response to Imperialism: The United States and the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902. Now in paper \$9.95, ISBN 0-8078-4177-3.

Mark T. Gilderhus (Colorado State University) Pan-American Visions: Woodrow Wilson and the Western Hemisphere, 1913-1921 University of Arizona Press. 1986. \$29.95, ISBN 0-8165-0936-0.

Roger Daniels, Sandra C. Taylor (University of Utah), and Harry H.L. Kitano, eds., Japanese American: From Relocation to Redress. University of Utah Press. 1986. \$24.95, ISBN 0-87480-258-X.

Warren I. Cohen (Michigan State University), Empire Without Tears: America's Foreign Relations, 1921-1933. Knopf. 1987. paper, ISBN 0-394-3414507.

Howard Jones (University of Alabama), Mutiny on the Amistad: The Saga of a Slave Revolt and its Impact on American Abolition, Law and Diplomacy. Oxford University Press. 1987. 19.95, ISBN 0-19-503828-2.

Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State University), "Entangling Alliances With None": American Foreign Policy in the Age of Jefferson. Kent State University Press. 1987. cloth \$24.--, ISBN 0-87338-336-2, paper \$14.40, ISBN 0-87338-347-8.



Arthur C. Walworth (New Haven, CT), Wilson and His Peacemakers: American Diplomacy at the Paris Peace Conference, 1919. Norton. 1986. \$35.00, ISBN 0-393-01867-9.

Joyce Goldberg (University of Texas at Arlington), The "Baltimore" Affair. University of Nebraska Press. 1986. \$19.95, ISBN 0-8032-2122-3.

Reinhard R. Doerries (Universitaet Hamburg) Iren and Deutsche in der Neuen Welt: Akulturationsprozesse in der amerkanischen Gesellschaft im spaeten neunzehnten Jahrhundert (Irish and Germans in the New World: Acculturation Processes in U.S. Society in the Late 19th century). Franz Steiner Verlag: Stuttgart. ISBN 3-515-04102-8. Deutschemark 80.00.

John A. Thompson (Cambridge University), Reformers and War: American Progressive Publicists and the First World War. Cambridge University Press. 1987. ISBN 0-52125289X.

Robert Divine, ed. (University of Texas), The Johnson Years: Vol. I Foreign Policy, the Great Society, and the White House (previously titled Exploring the Johnson Years). Now in paper, Kansas University Press. \$9.95, ISBN 0-292-72031-9.

Gregg Herken, (Yale University), Counsels of War. Oxford paperback \$9.95, ISBN 0-394-52735-6

Clayton Koppes (Oberlin College) and Gregory D. Black, Hollywood Goes to War: Politics, Profits, and Propaganda in World War II Movies. The Free Press. 1987. \$22.50, ISBN 0-02-903550-3.

Gary R. Hess (Bowling Green State University), The United States' Emergence as a Southeast Asian Power, 1940-1950. Columbia University Press. 1987. \$45.00, ISBN 0231-06190-0.

Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana University), American Diplomacy: The Twentieth Century. Norton. 1987. \$24.95, ISBN 0-393-09309-3.

James C. Bradford (Texas A & M University), Captains of the Old Steam Navy: Makers of the American Naval Tradition, 1840-1880. Naval Institute Press. 1986. \$24.95, ISBN 0-87021-013-0.



Jerald A. Combs (San Francisco State University), American Diplomatic History: Two Centuries of Changing Interpretations, University of California Press. paper \$11.95, ISBN 0-520-04590-4.

Stephen Ambrose (University of New Orleans), Nixon: The Education of a Politician, 1913-1962 Simon & Schuster. 1987. \$18.95, ISBN 0-671-52836-X.

---

### PERSONALS

---

Richard Immerman (University of Hawaii at Manoa) has been awarded a two-year MacArthur Fellowship in International Peace and Security Studies by the Social Science Research Council. He plans to spend a year studying at Princeton and Columbia, and thereafter continuing research on the foreign policies of the Eisenhower administration. Immerman has also received a National Endowment for the Humanities award for research on Eisenhower.

Reinhard R. Doerries (University of Hamburg) was Guest Professor at the Department of Politics, University of Southampton, England during the spring semester 1986.

Howard Jones (University of Alabama) has received a research grant from the University of Alabama to begin work on JFK and Vietnam.

Norman Graebner (University of Virginia) is the new representative of the Organization of American Historians on the National Historical Publications and Records Commission.

Priscilla Roberts (University of Hong Kong) has recently been awarded a grant from the Harry S. Truman Library Institute.

Thomas J. Noer (Carthage College) has been awarded a Kennedy Library Research Grant for research on the Kennedy Administration and Black America.

Michael Schaller (Arizona) has been named department chairman.



Akira Iriye (Chicago) has been elected President-elect of the AHA. Congratulations!

Charles Calhoun (Austin Peay State University) has been named departmental chair.

Kenneth Hagan (United States Naval Academy) has been promoted to full professor.

Nancy Tucker (China Desk, State Department), after her one-year stint at the State Department, will join the faculty at Georgetown University.

Joyce Goldberg (University of Texas at Arlington) has received tenure and has been promoted to Associate Professor.

Ted Wilson (Kansas), Edward Bennett (Washington State), Lloyd Gardner (Rutgers), Mark Stoler (Vermont), J. Garry Clifford (Connecticut), and Warren Kimball (Rutgers) were among those who recently participated in the 1st US-USSR Symposium on the History of the Second World War. (See pages 42-45).

James I. Matray (New Mexico State University) has been awarded Phi Alpha Theta's Best Book Prize for 1986. This award is for the best book published by a member of the society as their first book in the field of history. Matray's prize winner is: The Reluctant Crusade: American Foreign Policy in Korea, 1941-1950. In March Matray also presented the banquet address at the Phi Alpha Theta Southwest Regional Conference in Flagstaff, Arizona.

Guenter Bischof (Harvard) is co-organizing and co-directing a conference at the University of Vienna June 10-12, the topic is "Oesterrich 1945-1949: A Nation under Tutelage?"

The following SHAFR members are among scholars recently awarded Lyndon Baines Johnson Foundation awards. David DiLeo (San Clemente), "George Ball's Vietnam Dissent; Robert M. Hathaway (Herndon, VA), "Special Relations: Britain and America in the Postwar World;" George Herring (Kentucky), "LBJ's Conduct of Limited War in Vietnam;" Robert Hilderbrand (So. Dakota), "The Johnson Administration and the Vietnam War;" Michael Schaller (Arizona), "General



Douglas MacArthur and American Policy in Asia, 1935-1951."

Among the several SHAFR members serving on various committees of the AHA are: Akira Iriye (Committee on Committees, Committee on Affiliated Societies, and Committee on the Harmsworth Professorship); Sally J. Marks (Committee on the George Louis Beer Prize); William Becker (Committee on the NASA Fellowship); Thomas Paterson (Joint AHA-OAH-SAA Committee on Historians & Archivists); and Warren Kuehl, Robert Dallek, and Blance Wiesen Cook are delegates on the Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation.

Robert J. McMahon (University of Florida) has been invited to spend the academic year 1987-88 as a Visiting Associate Professor of History at the University of Virginia.

---

### THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL PRIZES

---

The Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Lectureship, the Memorial Book Competition, and the Memorial Lecture Prize, were established in 1976, 1972, and 1976 respectively, through the generosity of Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, Laguna Hills, California, in honor of their late son, and are administered by special committees of SHAFR.

#### **The Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Book Competition**

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

Eligibility: The prize competition is open to any book on any aspect of American foreign relations, published during 1987. It must be the author's first or second book.

Procedures: Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. Five (5)



copies of each book must be submitted with the nomination. The books should be sent directly to: Calvin Davis, History Department, Duke University, Durham, NC 27706.

Books may be sent at any time during 1987, but should not arrive later than January 20, 1988.

The award of \$2000.00 will be announced at the annual luncheon of the Society of Historians of American Foreign Relations held in conjunction with the Organization of American Historians, in April, 1988, in Reno.

#### Previous Winners:

- |      |  |
|------|--|
| 1972 | Joan Hoff Wilson (Sacramento)                |
|      | Kenneth E. Shewmaker (Dartmouth)             |
| 1973 | John L. Gaddis (Ohio U)                      |
| 1974 | Michael H. Hunt (Yale)                       |
| 1975 | Frank D. McCann, Jr. (New Hampshire)         |
|      | Stephen E. Pelz (Massachusetts-Amherst)      |
| 1976 | Martin J. Sherwin (Princeton)                |
| 1977 | Roger V. Dingman (Southern California)       |
| 1978 | James R. Leutze (North Carolina-Chapel Hill) |
| 1979 | Phillip J. Baram (Program Manager, Boston)   |
| 1980 | Michael Schaller (Arizona)                   |
| 1981 | Bruce R. Kuniholm (Duke)                     |
|      | Hugh DeSantis (Department of State)          |
| 1982 | David Reynolds (Cambridge)                   |
| 1983 | Richard Immerman (Hawaii)                    |
| 1984 | Michael H. Hunt (North Carolina-Chapel Hill) |
| 1985 | David Wyman (Massachusetts-Amherst)          |
| 1986 | Fraser J. Harbutt (Emory)                    |
|      | James Edward Miller (Department of State)    |

#### The Stuart L. Bernath Lecture Prize

Eligibility: The lecture will be comparable in style and scope to the yearly SHAFR presidential address delivered at the annual meetings of the American Historical Association, but will be restricted to younger scholars with excellent reputations for teaching and research. Each lecturer will address himself not specifically to his own research interests, but to broad issues of concern to students of American foreign policy.



Procedures: The Bernath Lecture Committee is soliciting nominations for the lecture from members of the Society. Nominations, in the form of a short letter and curriculum vita, if available, should reach the Committee no later than March 1, 1988. The chairman of the committee to whom nominations should be sent is: Dorothy V. Jones, 1213 Main St., Evanston, IL 60202.

The award is \$500.00, with publication in Diplomatic History

#### Previous Winners

1977	Joan Hoff Wilson (Fellow, Radcliffe Institute)
1978	David S. Patterson (Colgate)
1979	Marilyn B. Young (Michigan)
1980	John L. Gaddis (Ohio U)
1981	Burton Spivak (Bates College)
1982	Charles DeBenedetti (Toledo)
1983	Melvyn P. Leffler (Vanderbilt)
1984	Michael J. Hogan (Miami)
1985	Michael Schaller (Arizona)
1986	Nancy Bernkopf Tucker (Colgate)
1987	William O. Walker III (Ohio Wesleyan)

#### The Stuart L. Bernath Scholarly Article Prize

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

Eligibility: Prize competition is open to any article on any topic in American foreign relations that is published during 1987. The author must be under 45 years of age, or within 10 years after receiving the Ph.D., at the time of publication. Previous winners of the Stuart L. Bernath Book Award are excluded.

Procedures: Nominations shall be submitted by the author or by any member of SHAFR by January 15, 1988. It will be helpful if the person making the nomination can supply at least one copy and if possible five (5) copies. The chairperson of the committee is: Sally J. Marks, Department of History, University of Rhode Island, Providence, RI 02908.



The award of \$300.00 will be presented at the SHAFR luncheon at the annual meeting of the OAH in April, 1988, in Reno.

**Previous winners:**

- 1977 John C.A. Stagg (U of Auckland, N.Z.)
- 1978 Michael H. Hunt (Yale)
- 1979 Brian L. Villa (Ottawa)
- 1980 James I. Matray (New Mexico State)  
David A. Rosenberg (Chicago)
- 1981 Douglas Little (Clark)
- 1982 Fred Pollock (Cedar Knolls, NJ)
- 1983 Chester Pach (Texas Tech)
- 1985 Melvyn Leffler (Vanderbilt)
- 1986 Duane Tananbaum (Ohio State)
- 1987 David McLean (Riverina-Murray Institute, NSW)

**The Stuart L. Bernath Dissertation Fund**

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

**Requirements include:**

1. The dissertation must cover some aspect of American foreign relations.
2. An award will help defray:
  - (a) last-minute costs to consult a collection of original materials that has just become available or to obtain photocopies from such sources
  - (b) typing and/or reproducing copies of the manuscript
  - (c) abstracting costs.
3. The award committee presumes that most research and writing of the dissertation has been completed. Awards are not intended for general research or for time to write.
4. Applicants must be members of SHAFR.
5. A report on how the funds were used must be filed by the successful applicant(s) not later than six (6) months following presentation of each award.
6. The applicant's supervisor must include a brief statement certifying the accuracy of the



applicant's request and report of completion. Generally an award will not exceed \$500.00, and a minimum, of three awards each year will be made. More awards are possible if the amounts requested are less.

Nominations, with supporting documentation should be sent to Keith Nelson, Department of History, University of California, Irvine, CA 92717. The deadline for applications is December 1, 1987.

**Previous winners:**

1985 Jon Nielson (UC-Santa Barbara)  
1986 Valdinia C. Winn (Kansas)  
Walter L. Hixon (Colorado)  
1987 Janet M. Manson (Washington State)  
Thomas M. Gaskin (Washington)  
W. Michael Weis (Ohio State)  
Michael Wala (Hamburg)

---

**THE W. STULL HOLT DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP**

---

The Holt Dissertation Fellowship was established as a memorial to W. Stull Holt, one of that generation of historians which established diplomatic history as a respected field for historical research and teaching.

The award will be \$1500.00.

Applicants must be candidates for the degree, Doctor of Philosophy, whose dissertation projects are directly concerned with the history of United States foreign relations. The award is intended to help defray travel and living expenses connected with the research and/or the writing of the dissertation.

To be qualified, applicants must be candidates in good standing at a doctoral granting graduate school who will have satisfactorily completed all requirements for the doctoral degree (including the general or comprehensive examinations) except for the dissertation before April, 1988.

There is no special application form. Applicants must submit a complete academic transcript of graduate work

to date. A prospectus of the dissertation must accompany the application. This should describe the dissertation project as fully as possible, indicating the scope, method, and chief source materials. The applicant should indicate how the fellowship, if awarded, would be used.

Three letters from graduate teachers familiar with the work of the applicant, including one letter from the director of the dissertation, should be submitted to the committee.

Deadline for filing applications and supporting letters for this year's award will be April 1, 1988.

Applications should be addressed to the Chairperson of this year's W. Stull Holt Fellowship Committee: Bernard V. Burke, Department of History, Portland State University, P.O. Box 751, Portland, Oregon 97207.

Prior winner: 1986 Kurt Shultz (Miami)

---

#### THE NORMAN AND LAURA GRAEBNER AWARD

---

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

#### Conditions of the Award:

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

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

Applicants, or individuals nominating a candidate, are



requested to submit three (3) copies of a letter which:

(a) provides a brief biography of the candidate, including educational background, academic or other positions held and awards and honors received;

(b) lists the candidate's major scholarly works and discusses the nature of his or her contribution to the study of diplomatic history and international affairs;

(c) describes the candidate's teaching career, listing any teaching honors and awards and commenting on the candidate's classroom skills; and

(d) details the candidate's services to the historical profession, listing specific organizations and offices, and discussing particular activities.

Chairman of the committee: Edward Bennett, Dept. of History, Washington State, Pullman, WA 99163.

Prior winner: Dorothy Borg (Columbia)

---

#### 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 beginning with the Annapolis conference in June, 1987. Deadline for submissions is March 1, 1987. Submissions and questions should be directed to the chairman of the selection committee:

William C. Widenor, Department of History,  
University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801.



## THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

- SPONSOR: Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.
- EDITOR: William J. Brinker, Department of History.
- EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS: Timothy Cross and Jay Fain.
- ISSUES: The Newsletter is published on the 1st of March, June, September and December.
- DEADLINES: All material should be sent to the editor four weeks prior to publication date.
- ADDRESS CHANGES: Changes of address should be sent to the Executive Secretary-Treasurer: William Kamman, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas 76203.
- BACK ISSUES: Copies of back numbers of the Newsletter may be obtained from the editorial office upon payment of a charge of \$1.00 per copy: for members living abroad, \$2.00.
- MATERIALS DESIRED: Personals, announcements, abstracts of scholarly papers and articles delivered--or published--upon diplomatic subjects, bibliographical or historiographical essays, essays of a "how-to-do-it" nature, information about foreign depositories, biographies, autobiographies of "elder statesmen" in the field, jokes, etc.

## FORMER PRESIDENTS OF SHAFR

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