



The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

NEWSLETTER

Volume VII

Number 3

September, 1976

Page

1	Daniel Malloy Smith
3	Samuel Flagg Bemis at Harvard, 1913 - 1916
12	Schoonover, Behavior of State Department Officials and Diplomatic Historians
18	Holbo, Progress Report upon Diplomatic History
20	Announcements
23	Publications
25	Abstracts of Articles and Papers
31	Personals
33	Stuart L. Bernath Prize Competitions
35	Guidelines for Articles in Diplomatic History
36	SHAFR Roster and Research List

SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

Founded in 1967. Chartered in 1972.

PRESIDENT: Robert A. Divine, Department of History, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712

VICE-PRESIDENT: Raymond Esthus, Department of History, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118.

JOINT EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER: Lawrence S. Kaplan, Department of History, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44240, and Warren F. Kuehl, Department of History, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio 44325.

CHAIRMAN, PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Frank Merli, Department of History, Queens College, Flushing, New York 11367.

CHAIRMAN, MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE: Leon E. Boothe, College of Arts and Sciences, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia 22030.

CHAIRWOMAN, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Joan Hoff Wilson, Department of History, California State University (Sacramento), Sacramento, California 95819.

MEMBERSHIP: Anyone interested in U.S. diplomatic history is invited to become a member of SHAFR. Annual dues are \$7.00, payable at the office of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer. Fees for retired members and for students are \$4.00 per year, while institutional affiliations are \$12.00. Life memberships are \$125.00.

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

PRIZES: The Society administers three awards a year, all of them in honor of the late Stuart L. Bernath and all of them financed through the generosity of his parents, Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath of Beverly Hills, California. The details of each of these awards are given under the appropriate headings in this issue of the **Newsletter**.

ROSTER: A complete listing of the members with addresses and their current research projects is issued in even years to all members. (A supplemental list is mailed in odd years). Editor of the **Roster & Research List** is Warren F. Kimball, Department of History, Rutgers University (Newark), Newark, New Jersey 07102.

PUBLICATIONS: The Society sponsors two printed works of a quarterly nature, the **Newsletter**, and **Diplomatic History**, a journal. All members receive these publications.

Daniel Malloy Smith

by

Gerald E. Wheeler*

Daniel Malloy Smith, Professor of History at the University of Colorado, died of a heart condition on July 28, 1976 in Boulder, Colorado. He was 54 at the time of his death. Born in Sanford, North Carolina, he served four years in the Navy during World War II, then entered the University of California at Berkeley. Here he majored in history and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa upon graduation in 1949. Continuing at Berkeley, he received the master's degree in 1950 and completed the doctorate in history in 1953. His dissertation was directed by Armin Rappaport.

At the close of his formal education, Dan Smith accepted appointment as an instructor in the Western Civilization program of Stanford University. After four years at Stanford, during which time he suffered the first of several heart attacks, he moved to the University of Colorado. Early recognized as an outstanding teacher and distinguished scholar, he moved quickly through the ranks to professor. He received further recognition of his abilities when he received a distinguished teaching award from the University in 1966. In 1969 Smith's colleagues elected him chairman of the department and did so again in 1972. Believing strongly in leadership by example, he stressed quality in teaching and publication as goals for the department.

As a professional historian, Dan Smith left behind a record of publication that belied the frail condition of his health. He was a specialist in the diplomacy of the Wilsonian period, and here he left his deepest impression. Disagreeing with the major biographers of Woodrow Wilson, who had dismissed Robert Lansing as little more than the President's law clerk, Smith raised the wartime Secretary of State to much greater prominence. Through articles beginning in 1956 and a major research monograph, **Robert Lansing and American Neutrality, 1914-1917** (1958), Smith reinvigorated the "national interest" argument for interpreting American intervention in World War I. His short interpretive monograph, **The Great Departure: The United States and World War I, 1914-1920** (1965), was an excellent survey of the history and literature of this watershed period in American

*Gerald E. Wheeler is chairman of the Department of History at San Jose State University. He was also the editor of the SHAFR Newsletter during the first three years of its existence. Smith and Wheeler were classmates and became very close friends during their graduate school days at the University of California.

diplomacy. In 1970 he capped his study of Wilson's Administration by publishing **Aftermath of War: Bainbridge Colby and Wilsonian Diplomacy, 1920-1921**. Again he broke new ground and gave new stature to Wilson's last Secretary of State. Because Dan Smith took every writing project most seriously, this writer cannot help but remember, about 20 years ago, chiding him about spending so much intellectual effort on Lansing. His reply, accompanied by a sly grin, was that he might even rescue Bainbridge Colby from the trash bin of history. And so he did.

Because he was a teaching historian, Dan Smith could not resist the temptation to create classroom reading for his students as well as research monographs for the enlightenment of his professional colleagues. In 1964 he edited a volume of readings, **Major Problems in American Diplomatic History**, and two years later another reader, **American Intervention, 1917: Sentiment, Self-Interest, or Ideals?** For those of us who want to probe more deeply the literature of intervention in 1917, Smith's essay, "National Interest and American Intervention, 1917: An Historiographical Appraisal," **Journal of American History** (1965), was a delight to read. Finally, in 1972, Smith brought 19 years of classroom teaching to a focus with his own textbook survey, **The American Diplomatic Experience**. Though brief as far as such textbooks go, this last major publication is rich in interpretive insights and even moreso in the quality of its bibliographical essays. The author was proud of his work — we all regret that he could not see it through many editions.

We could say more about Dan Smith's contributions to the profession, his incisive reviews, his appearances at the professional meetings, his absolute devotion to the business of being an historian. Four major books and a dozen or so articles leave no doubt that he was industrious and a fine craftsman. Yet the true measure of his contributions will be found annually as those who write about the Wilsonian years cite his works and accept his interpretations. But more importantly, those professional historians that he trained, and those students he reached in the classroom in Berkeley, Stanford, and Boulder are the real beneficiaries of the historical largesse that he bequeathed to all of us. He will be greatly missed.

Samuel Flagg Bemis

at

Harvard, 1913-1916

(The **Newsletter** proudly presents in this issue a portion of the memoirs of Samuel Flagg Bemis, 1891-1973, the "Grand Old Man" of U. S. diplomatic history. The second portion will be carried in the December number. We extend our profuse thanks to Mrs. Barbara Bemis Bloch, daughter of the late scholar, and to Ms. Judith A. Schiff, Chief Research Archivist of the Beinecke Library at Yale, for their gracious permission in allowing us to use the material. An added measure of thanks must go to Dr. Robert H. Ferrell, a former student of Professor Bemis and also an ex-president of SHAFR, who did yeoman service in facilitating the arrangements for publication of the memoirs.

Professor Bemis was born in Worcester, Mass., but his family moved to the ancestral farm, not far away, when he was ten years old. Here he lived five idyllic years near Alum Pond, his "private Walden." Back in Worcester, young Bemis graduated from high school in 1909. "My grades were not so high, nor did I do badly in any subject," he reported many years later.

He entered a local institution, Clark College, in the fall of that year. His father paid the initial tuition fee, but the rest of the cash expenses of his college career were taken care of by the young Bemis himself through jobs of various kinds and the aid of scholarships. Still undecided what to do when he took his A. B. in 1912, a tuition scholarship from the graduate division of the institution, Clark University, persuaded him to take his A. M. there. One of his instructors that year was Professor S. B. Gras, a recent Harvard Ph. D. At the urging of the latter he applied for, and secured, a tuition fellowship at Harvard for the academic year 1913-14).

It was in September 1913 that I went down to Cambridge, only forty-five miles away from Hamburg Street, Worcester, and enrolled in the Harvard Graduate School as a candidate for the Ph.D. in history. This was the first time I had really left home (except for summers). I had my University tuition scholarship and only a few dollars in my pocket.

After finding a job at the University employment bureau, the next thing I did was attend a reception for new graduate students at Phillips Brooks House. One extraordinary person that I met there has blanked out of my memory all others present among students and faculty. He was Josiah Royce, second in academic descent of the illustrious line of eminent moral philosophers of Harvard: William James, Royce, George Santayana, Alfred North Whitehead, and William Ernest Hocking.

Royce was then only fifty-eight. He seemed old to me; actually he was in the prime of life. He was of less than average stature, his once high-colored roundish face thinned by maturity and his hair now grey, lines running out from grave and tranquil eyes, a man who looked as if he spent much time in the sun. Actually he had passed his youth in California, and those years, states the **Dictionary of American Biography**, "left a deep impression on his soul," as his personality did on me. He was passing about the room, chatting with the newcomers. Presently he shook hands with me and asked my name. "Professor Royce," he said in return.

"Professor of what?" I asked astutely!

At this sophomoric inanity he smiled kindly rather than indulgently.

"What are you going in for?" he asked.

"History." I didn't know enough to say, "Sir."

"What kind of history?"

Here I was stumped. I hadn't yet realized how many kinds of history there were.

"Modern history," I managed to say, "but I like American history."

"Political?"

Stumped again. Silence

"The history of ideas is the only history that really counts," he said, and passed along to another young customer who could scarcely have been as wet behind the ears as I.

That is the only time I ever saw the great Royce. Since then alas, I have not read enough of his philosophy, but some years afterward when living in the Pacific West I read his little book in the American Commonwealth Series, **California from the Conquest in 1846 to the Second Vigilance Committee in San Francisco: A study of American Character** (1886). The book tells how the irate citizens at last rose against the thugs and desperadoes who had taken over San Francisco and other towns, together with their governments, including sheriffs, while the community was too busy finding gold and making money to take care of its own liberty. The citizens resorted to extreme action in defense of freedom and showed no moderation in execution of justice. This radical therapy impressed the gentle Royce who had recently sought to bring together social realism and absolute idealism in **The Religious Aspect of Philosophy** (1885).

About the history of ideas, I suppose Royce was right, in the long run, notably if one measures ideas as external values. Santayana and Hocking thought so too, and A. A. Bowman (of Princeton), but I

knew nothing then about moral philosophy for that matter, and I stuck to my resolution to study modern political history, stressing American history and diplomacy and international law, that is "diplomatic history."

Another great and good man whom I saw and heard by way of introduction to Harvard was President A. Lawrence Lowell. Only at his active intervention had a group of reactionary alumni been balked in an attempt to have the portrait of Harvard's illustrious and most strenuous alumnus, Theodore Roosevelt, taken down from the wall of the Harvard Union after the Bull Moose campaign of 1912! Years later at the time of the Sacco-Vanzetti affair some Harvard liberals called Lowell the Hangman of Beacon Hill because he helped Governor Fuller review the plea of those twice-jury-condemned anarchists for clemency! This was the same President Lowell who left his estate for the creation of the Society of Fellows which has adorned Harvard with so many leading young scholars uncrowned with Ph.D.'s.

President Lowell was addressing an assembly of entering graduate students in the Union. Theodore Roosevelt's portrait was still there looking down at us. Don't shrink from high destiny, Mr. Lowell exhorted: Hitch on to something big and great while you are still in your twenties. This is the time; here is the place!

I was then a few days short of twenty-two.

At that time one had to present for one's initial examination for the doctorate, the so-called "generals"—at least two fields outside one's major interest. Here I chose English constitutional history and the history of modern France since the wars of religion. Narrow as this grouping was, it served my purpose well. English constitutional history made a good background to my American history, and French history took me back to the classical diplomacy of Richelieu and Mazarin, when the European state system was taking shape. Courses in these subjects also brought me in touch with some remarkable teaching scholars.

Professor Gras of Clark had given me a personal letter to Dean Charles Homer Haskins, one of Harvard's truly great in the Republic of Letters. This incisive man, then in the very flush of life, with bristling mustache and bright clear eyes, was the embodiment of vigorous health in body and mind. He enjoyed an international reputation as a scholar in medieval history, and it has stood the test of time. He could turn his hand to any difficult problem with the greatest of ease, as well illustrated a little later when he served as Woodrow Wilson's principal historical counselor at the Paris Peace Conference. There he settled nothing less than the Alsace-Lorraine question, I guess as easily as he settled my program of studies at Harvard. After the war he went back to resume his researches in

Norman history and institutions. Being Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences—perhaps the most successful and distinguished dean in its history—was child's play to him. He devoted the noonday hour to the dean's office in University Hall, then went back to his study. I never took any work with Haskins. Alas. That was my big mistake at Harvard. As a student I saw him only for business, briefly in his office, but he took a personal interest in me, always remembered me, and in after years gave friendly and valuable advice in personal as well as professional matters. It was the same, I feel sure, with hundreds of graduate students who looked briefly across his desk. My last sad sight of him was when in after years I called at his house. He was then emaciated and palsied from Parkinson's disease, his mind keen as ever, his memory unshaken and friendly, and still publishing! He died in 1937, a soldier of scholarship to the last.

Haskins read Gras' letter: "Ah, his familiar handwriting." Knowing what I wanted, the Dean set up my courses in a jiffy, and directed me for formal registration down the hallway to the saintly Registrar of the Graduate School, George Washington Robinson, known behind his back by students—and not irreverently—as Jesus Christ Robinson.

Right away I found myself in Professor Channing's research seminar in American history. Edward Channing was then at the zenith of his lifework, his **History of the United States**. It remains the best attempt at a one-man, multi-volume history of the republic and its colonial background, documented by the best of published scholarship and his own research. As conceived by Channing, it was to cover the period from the discovery to the beginning of his own adult lifetime, that is, to the end of the nineteenth century. Channing died early in 1931 after finishing Volume VI that ended with the close of the Civil War. It was his method to organize his seminar about some central theme or period and to assign problems relating to that general subject to each student—I believe there were six of us that term. He had enough applicants so he didn't have to take in anyone who didn't want to work in this manner. Really it is the ideal way: Teacher and disciples working together as fellow students on aspects of the same subject, each able to give and take; of course the instructor gave and the students took, but the latter could stimulate and occasionally rasp one another. It was all to the good for everybody.

I noticed that it was the custom of old students who dropped into the library to greet Channing by asking him what volume of the "great work" he was now working on. At my time he was writing Volume IV on the Federalist Period—dictating it little by little, so he would tell us casually, "after a cigar in the evening." For my seminar exercise I got the subject of Jay's Treaty with Great Britain of 1794, of which I had scarcely heard. Realizing that the subject had no adequate monograph based on investigation in the public and private archives

of the negotiating countries, he thought that somebody someday should at least make a start in the foreign sources. It was my great luck that he threw that bone to me. Whether he realized how far it would take me, I often doubt.

Channing, Hart, and Turner were then the American history triumvirate at Harvard, joint compilers of the widely-known pioneer **Guide to American History**.

Channing would affect a singular, almost strutting pose (if one can strut in an armchair), and liked with students to take a poke at Hart now and then. But he never took a dig at Turner. Channing never wholly accepted Turner's famous frontier and sectional interpretation of American history and society; he took occasion to challenge it with other ideas, such as the pervasive centripetal and unifying force of nationalism overcoming sectionalism and states rights from colonial times to the present. I once unavoidably heard Channing and Haskins worrying about how they would keep Turner from going back to Wisconsin.

Channing would begin his seminar, which met only once a week, with a few informal lectures, or rather remarks. They were of a discursive and frequently personal nature--never reflecting any discredit on himself. (I never knew a teacher, including myself, who did. We are all vain). These talks were mostly designed, I suspect, to take up time and keep the class together while the neophytes were getting immersed in their several researches. The most instructive feature of his teaching was the half-hour conference he had every week with each member of the seminar at his little desk in the library stacks, where he could reach for a special book or direct a student around the corner to a series in the stacks. Even in these conferences one had to hold Channing to one's own track of study; if you didn't he would get to worming personal information out of you, instead of imparting historical knowledge. As one of my friends who later took Channing's seminar said: "You had to knock it out of him." All this, I suspect, was the most subtle type of teaching. It was helping people to help themselves. Education is self-education: Teachers and libraries are the means by which one educates oneself. Channing knew that; if his students didn't yet know it, they came to realize it.

The other principal feature of his seminar was the report of each student to the group. Channing wouldn't let you read it: all he would allow was a one-page outline of what you wanted to say, and no surreptitious glances at notes under the table. This required you to be so soaked up in your subject that you would have it at the end of your tongue.

The first semester I made no particular impression, or maybe the

Professor thought I was too cocky for so green a tyro. The second semester, when I could really show the results of my research, I did much better. Even though we did not all meet together during the second semester, but were guided rather by individual meetings with Channing, he gave us an examination at the end of the year. It was the custom then for anyone who was anxious to know what grade he to put a self-addressed postcard inside the bluebook. At first glance I read the Card "A", and was quite satisfied. But a second look showed to my real surprise that it was "A,--the best."

Dean Haskins had mapped out the right curriculum for me—with one exception: he did not include his own invaluable introductory course on historical bibliography and criticism. I have always held it against myself that I did not put it down anyway. All this apparatus I had to learn later by myself, the hard way. How much easier it would have been if I had taken Haskins's basic course in the beginning! This lack was only partially compensated by a course I took once a week at the Massachusetts Historical Society with Mr. Worthington C. Ford on manuscript materials in American history. I was the only student that year. Ford would sit across a round table from me and read notes for an hour out of a conventional notebook with mottled red cover. He most probably knew more about such material than anybody else at that time. Charles Francis Adams, President of the Society, would pass by now and then—an elderly gentleman with white mustache, enfeebled in health (he died that very spring). His portrait now hangs on the wall of the Society's grand stairway. Ford's might well be there, too. Little inkling did I, or Mr. Ford either, have that later I would have much to do with the Massachusetts Historical Society and the Adams Family.

Assistant Professor Roger Bigelow Merriman, a native Bostonian, was the best classroom lecturer I ever heard—a big, high-domed charging scholar who made the Tudors, the Puritan Revolution, and the Stuart Restoration live in thrilling histrionics, never letting go the scholarly grip. His education was Oxford and the Thames, and he lived up to the tradition, pedagogically and socially. His erudition covered the whole of Europe during the sixteenth century: from the rise of the rival British, Spanish, and French Empires on one side of the Western world, to the Ottoman Empire on the other.

Assistant Professor R. M. Johnston was an imposing man cut to the figure of a French colonel out of St. Cyr. He could get so wrapped up in his specialty of military history that sometimes in his learned lectures on the French Revolution he would suddenly realize, halfway through the hour, that so far he had been re-reading the last part of the previous installment. This was said to have happened once when he found on his desk the first published copy of his famous book on the first Battle of Bull Run!

It was my experience that Professor Johnston could not recognize students as he passed them on the sidewalk, although he knew them, at least the graduate students, in the classroom. At that time it was the practice at Harvard for graduate students to listen in on advanced courses for undergraduates and get credit if they did extensive outside reading in the subject. Mr. Johnston required little essays—"editorials," he called them—on this extra reading, which pieces he would grade with a mark without further comment, which was reserved for a personal conference usually every fortnight. Uniformly my papers came back marked "B," no matter how hard I tried; and by now I had gained some beginning practice in writing, even (to Professor Merriman's surprise) a review in the **American Historical Review** of R. H. Tawney's famous **Agrarian Problem of the Sixteenth Century**, submitted (at Professor Gras' instigation) just before I entered Harvard. The first sizable reading that Mr. Johnston assigned to me was Taine's monumental history of the French Revolution. After several brief unprofitable sessions with him on Taine's successive tomes, I asked:

"Can you suggest to me, Professor, some way by which I can improve my work?"

"No", he said. "It is impossible."

Frederick Jackson Turner, then at the height of his teaching career, also offered a half-and-half course, i.e., for undergraduates and graduates, on the same lines as Johnston's on the French Revolution and Napoleon (except for the "editorials"). In this course the graduate student could, if he wished to, do an immense amount of monographic reading guided by an extensive syllabus; but one's grade depended on an original essay to be presented at the end of the course. Work on this paper gave me more than anything else in my study with him. His lectures were cut and dried, repeated over and over each year, highlighted by his interpretations that have pollinated a half century of American historiography and are still the inspiration of much fertile disputation and controversial writing. It was rather in his seminar on the American West that he towered above all other contemporary teachers of American history. I did not take his seminar, but some of my inspired fellow students told me much about it, and I moulded my paper for him, "The Canadian-American Frontier and the Anglo-American War Crisis of 1794," on what I understood, second-hand, to be his type of research.

It so happened that in the summer of 1915, going to and returning from my tutorial work in northern Ontario, I passed through Ottawa each way and spent a week in the Canada Archives. I was thus able to look up some fresh unpublished sources, transcripts from the British Colonial Office and originals from the Department of Indian Affairs of Upper Canada. It was my first taste of archival work and

pleased Turner immensely when he read my paper in the autumn. He noted my references to the archival record. "Why didn't you state in your bibliography that you had consulted archives," he wrote on my paper. He invited me over to his study in his home, to consult his own holograph notes on recondite sources relating to the period. I looked at them while Turner leaned back leisurely in his study arm-chair and smoked his cigar, occasionally squinting over at me. In his cabinet drawers were files and files of notes and notes for books and books which he never got to write. My own program did not bring me into further personal contact with Frederick Jackson Turner. He was one of the most unaffected teachers I met at Harvard.

Another great man, modest and endearing scholar, unsurpassed as a teacher in his field, equally friendly to all conscientious students, the more so as time went on, was Charles H. McIlwain. In his course on English constitutional history he took us through Bishop Stubbs' commanding work as well as "old Jellinek," the German authority on the state, and the texts one by one of the basic documents on which English—and American—constitutional liberties are historically grounded. His method was to discuss these Latin texts *seriatim* and their implications, peering down over his half-lenses at a large class, searching for promising commentary. Graduate students had to do a year's paper for him, too. My absorbing thesis was on the British Bill of Rights of 1688 and the American Bill of Rights of 1787 as embodied in the first ten amendments of the Constitution.

George Grafton Wilson was our instructor in international law—a course principally of commentary on the Hague Court and its decisions and on his own high personal contacts. I did very well with him the first year, but not so well in the second year of independent study, which turned out more and more to be a quasi-law-clerkship for him. It was a temptation to desert diplomatic history for international law, and when I finally decided to do my dissertation in the former discipline and under Channing, my grades with Mr. Wilson during the next year fell from the summit to the plain. But what I learned from him, as well as his personal friendship, also stood me in good stead.

My seminar with Archibald Cary Coolidge was a severe workout. It dealt with the diplomatic history of Europe from 1871 to 1893—essentially the Bismarckian period. Professor Coolidge, who wore another distinguished hat as Harvard University Librarian, was a great lover of books and of languages. He was then undoubtedly the most knowledgeable American scholar in the field of European diplomatic history, not then wholly worked out, for world wars and revolutions had not yet opened up the secret archives. If Coolidge had had his way entirely with regard to requirements, he would have insisted on a reading knowledge of Russian for the diplomatic history of modern Europe.

Students are only too quick to notice a teacher's personal idiosyncracies. A great test of their loyalty is when they take them in stride and become all the fonder of the instructor. We respected Mr. Coolidge's lisp, his iron-gray bangs like Elihu Root's, his descent from Thomas Jefferson (which he never mentioned), the myth of the little bag of hard candy he was said to keep in a side drawer of his desk. Woe to the lazy student or bluffer! Coolidge would purse his lips for a great sucking in of indignation, which would then blast out on the wretch in chaste and righteous comment. And how he made us work! I could never get toward the top of his course, if only because I didn't learn Russian. But he showed me no mercy on my German. We were supposed to know German, and I had passed a gentle reading examination given by Professor G. G. Wilson. Coolidge was therefore entitled by the law of the Harvard Medes to assume I could use it, and he did. My topic—and how valuable the work on it proved to be in after years—was Pan-Slavism. "There is a most interesting book that I just read coming over on the boat," he said at the beginning of my second year. "You had better take a look at it." It was Wertheimer's **Andrassy**. Written in a peculiarly Austrian academic style, it was the toughest German I ever read till years later when I encountered Alfred Vagts' learned and priceless **Deutschland und die Vereinigten Staaten in der Weltpolitik**, with its page-long hurdles of Heidelbergian convolutions.

I had the Andrassy volume on the table to refer to when I made my report. Mr. Coolidge, lover of books, saw the smooched edges of the sections I had used so hard. His only comment was: "You have not used these volumes very tenderly, Mr. Bemis." But I could see he was pleased that I had not otherwise neglected them. Coolidge was a stern and respected teacher, and a most kind man personally. A year or so later he helped hold up my chin when I was in very deep water.

There were at that time two brilliant young scholars who had just received their doctorates at Harvard and had been appointed instructors: Robert H. Lord, who got his start with Coolidge, and Samuel Eliot Morison, a Hart (undergraduate) and Channing (graduate) product. Lord had perfected himself in Slavic languages and had written what is now a classic monograph on the Second Partition of Poland. He was a lean and hungry Cassius after learning, of whom the graduate students stood in admiration and awe.

The whole world knows Samuel Eliot Morison, now Rear Admiral Morison, U.S.N. (retired), the greatest living master of American history, whose lectures as a beginning instructor I occasionally listened to.

Those were the days of the giants at Harvard, at least so we

thought for years after the manner of students who sally forth into the academic world to imitate and quote their old masters. Who among us—except perhaps Channing himself—would have thought that Sam Morison would one day surpass him? Nobody is likely to equal the achievement of Channing's one-man gathering up on the scholarship of his time and putting it into a multi-volume history of the United States. But Admiral Morison today has left Channing in his broad wake. And who could question that William L. Langer would outclass his redoubtable teacher, Archibald Coolidge, to become in much more difficult times the greatest authority on diplomatic history? The Harvard history department still marches on, from generation to generation.

How Have State Department Officials (or
Diplomatic Historians) Behaved?

A View from the Computer

by

Thomas Schoonover*

A recent review article by Robert P. Swierenga, "Computers and American History: The Impact of the 'New' Generation," in **The Journal of American History**, LX, 4 (March, 1974), 1045-70, has indicated that almost no quantitative research was being done in, or closely related to, U.S. foreign relations by historians. This perspective was verified by the recent addenda to the research roster of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. Yet, with some minimum exposure to cliometric techniques, many diplomatic historians either could make use of the methodology, at least in a limited way, or could guide their graduate students into such research. A diplomatic historian desirous of learning whether quantitative tools might be useful to his research, could begin by examining some work done by those political scientists who are interested in contemporary international relations. To this end the recent long review essay by Harvey Starr, "The Quantitative International Relations Scholar as Surfer: Riding the 'Fourth Wave'," in **The Journal of Conflict Resolution**, XVIII (June, 1974), 336-368, would be useful. Faced with the paucity of quantitative research in the history of foreign relations, diplomatic historians might welcome a brief introduction to some problems which can be investigated with the aid of computers.

This past year, Professor Robert Beisner, in a small volume,

*Professor Schoonover is a member of the Department of History at the University of Southwestern Louisiana.

titled: **From the Old Diplomacy to the New, 1865-1900** (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company), critically assaulted the "New Left" historians for what he considered to be a central weakness of their approach: "The behavior of American officials and businessmen does not support the carefully measured, symmetrical case put forward by LaFeber, Williams, McCormick, et al. That the United States government should skillfully and knowingly formulate and execute a farsighted economic foreign policy flies in the face of evidence that most American 'policymakers', at least until the nineties, were amateurish and often maladroit in their diplomatic conduct, ignorant of and not particularly interested in the affairs of other nations, and much more inclined to react in the accustomed way to outside events than to initiate well-defined new policies. Behavior, not occasional rhetoric, is the crucial test. What, in actual fact, did presidents and secretaries of state do through most of the years from 1865 to 1900? . . . And Congress?" (23-24)

Beisner raises interesting points, ones which are relevant to the application of quantitative methodology to foreign relations. Most questions of behavior are subject to empirical tests. But, as best as this writer can tell, Professor Beisner did not systematically examine the behavior of U. S. officials involved with foreign relations in order to gather evidence to sustain his hypothesis. Rather, he relied upon a less broadly-based examination of contemporary evidence and upon conjecture and assertion. For example, he does not prove "amateurish and maladroit . . . diplomatic conduct," he merely asserts it forcefully. Beisner cites the same sources, the same political figures as those historians he criticizes; he merely interprets those sources differently.

Nevertheless, Professor Beisner calls our attention to important questions. How did those U. S. officials responsible for diplomacy behave in the fulfillment of their duties? Furthermore, by counterposing "behavior", and "rhetoric" he raises a further important point: How do we separate behavior from ideas? Was not the very rhetoric of U. S. intellectual, military, political, and business leaders a form of behavior? Can historians, examining the record of the past, distinguish between behavior and non-behavior as Beisner implies? And specifically, for brief consideration below, which aspects of behavior can be measured? This presentation will relate how simple descriptive statistics--percentages, frequency distributions, means, medians, ratios--can be used to measure various aspects of diplomatic behavior and thereby aid us in our search for 'reality' and meaning in the past.

First, however, a reservation about the direction of some quantitative work seems in order. At the current stage in our experience of

applying quantification techniques to historical problems, we would often be best served by sound work devoted chiefly to the less flamboyant task of gathering and verifying data, prior to attempting to use either sophisticated statistical analyses, or intricately conceived, complex models. For example, Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman, despite recognition for their praiseworthy effort to use a sophisticated research design to examine the institution of slavery in **Time on the Cross**, have been repeatedly and correctly criticized for neglecting the elemental step of gathering or constructing data which can be generally accepted as reliable. This kind of problem points to a serious danger which faces historians. The GIGO syndrome (garbage in, garbage out), actually seldom occurs in the historical profession, but rather, it seems, we are more frequently confronted with a variant, which for lack of a name could be called the DDIDOO syndrome--disputed data in, disputed output out. Translated into traditional concepts, the DDIDOO syndrome's cure or at least amelioration demands no more, nor less than thoroughly criticizing, checking, and verifying data before confidently using it in the analysis. However, since the nature of the data for most periods in the past necessitates processing the data via sampling procedures, estimation, calculation, or other manipulation, in order to obtain generally accepted, reliable data, and hence general accepted output, it may be necessary to publish or circulate the data before using it for analysis. On the basis of these considerations, those who primarily compile data, are performing a desirable function.

The writer wishes to submit as examples of elementary, yet useful data processing three research projects in U. S. diplomacy in which he is currently interested. Using collective biography, one can look into the composition of the consular and diplomatic corps in terms of the frequency distribution of social characteristics to seek patterns and structural changes in the foreign service. From what geographic regions were men selected at various periods in the past? from what occupations? what educational backgrounds? with what religious or racial characteristics? from what economic classes? Are there apparent links between their foreign service and their pre- or post-service careers? These are merely examples of questions which could be examined better to understand the process by which diplomats and consuls were selected to obtain desired U. S. goals, desired at least in the minds of those, like the President, State Department officials, the cabinet, and Congress, who exercised the powers of selecting and approving foreign service personnel. Elmer Plischke, in his recent book **United States Diplomats and Their Missions: A Profile of American Diplomatic Emissaries since 1778** (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1975), has manipulated the data on State Department personnel found in Richardson Dougall and Mary Patricia Chapman, **United States Chiefs of Mission, 1778-1973** (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973). While Plischke's study is informative, his

inexplicable decision to analyze the data by decades rather than administrations or some alternative time frame, limits its value by quite effectively removing the variable, politics, from his analysis of the diplomatic corps.

A second project involves an examination of data on trade and navigation between the U. S. and Central America during a period of more than one hundred years. Here also, the focus of the research is upon adding to the data available to describe "reality" during the years under examination, prior to interpreting broadly U. S. relations with Central America. A sample of the relevant questions could include: Trade with Central America made up what percentage of U. S. trade during these years? Trade with the U. S. made up what percentage of Central American trade over these years? At what rate did the total trade of each side increase? How do these two rates correlate? What products or services were important in the exchange between the two trading partners? Such matters bear directly on the economic ties between the United States and Central America. And, the nature of the commercial ties between these two areas consequently formed a part of their diplomatic relationship.

A third project involves an examination of treaties submitted to the Senate between 1776 and 1929, both those accepted and those rejected. One finds information relative to many aspects of measurable behavior in the data on treaties: What regions or countries attracted U. S. attention during various time periods? Were some administrations, decades, or other time periods especially active in diplomatic negotiations? Did some eras reveal rifts between Congressional foreign policy objectives and administrative objectives, that is, reveal a high ratio of rejected treaties? Incidentally, one preliminary finding of this study is that the 1920s were far and away the busiest decade in U. S. history before the Great Depression in regard to the number of treaties submitted to the Senate and also the number receiving Senate approval, including a large number involving European nations. This is not only interesting in light of William A. Williams' thesis that the 1920s were not isolationist, but also in light of the political historians' thesis that the "conservative" Harding and Coolidge administrations were politically inactive, partly because Congress was controlled by a coalition of Democrats and "progressives" which produced a legislative stalemate and a correspondingly low level of legislative productivity. Apparently, in the realm of foreign affairs, the "progressive" Congresses and "conservative" Presidents often agreed.

It is necessary, of course, to avoid overstressing the mere number of items involved, in this case the number of treaties ratified, thereby overlooking the intrinsic value or importance of each item. However, historians have most often overvalued special cases, particularly those which attracted public attention, while neglecting the un-

dramatic items. Often, matters which attract great public attention and which produce close Senate battles for approval or rejection, are matters at the limits of acceptability for the society. Many treaties which pass quietly with little opposition, however, reflect matters of broad consensus among the U. S. governing elite and/or the public. In this sense these treaties possess an added significance since they reflect society's core-consensus of agreement. In fact, many items of considerable significance may be hidden among the large number of quietly-approved treaties of any era. Instructive in this light are some examples from the 1920s, restricted to major treaties, involving in the first three cases most European powers as well as many non-European nations, and in the second three cases most Latin American countries: Universal Postal Union, August 28, 1924; Protection of Industrial Property, November 6, 1925; International Sanitary Convention, June 21, 1926; Publicity of Customs Documents, May 3, 1923; Uniformity of Nomenclature for Classification of Merchandise, May 3, 1923; and Protection of Commercial, Industrial and Agricultural Trademarks and Commercial Names, April 28, 1923. None of these treaties has been given a prominent role in discussing "isolationism" vs "open-door expansion" in the 1920s, yet the titles alone suggest their importance. Here, as so often in quantitative work, it is not only the answers one gets, but also the new questions which arise, that stimulate the researcher.

It is precisely in the kinds of questions which arise from testing a body of data with appropriate statistical tools which render this methodology attractive. When one uncovers patterns of trade, structural changes in the composition of foreign service personnel, patterns of diplomatic negotiations, or other findings which are not consistent with the explanation of "conventional wisdom," the game is not over. From the writer's point of view, the fun and the real value in historical inquiry begin at just that point. Why the inconsistency? How can it be explained? If it cannot be explained, how might the "conventional wisdom" be altered to fit the "facts"? What new kinds of evidence must be sought in order to create a new understanding of the troubled area?

Recently, Professors Bruce M. Russett and Elizabeth C. Hanson have reminded us of the value of incorporating this new methodology with the more traditional approaches:

The traditional research procedures are, by themselves, inadequate --not "wrong", necessarily in fact, but insufficient. They must be supplemented, especially because each of the basic traditional methods tends to be biased in terms of the kind of theories it tends to support. Some lead us to answers emphasizing bureaucratic politics, or economic interests. These biases are rarely intended by the methods' practitioners; the methods seem the best and fairest that can be brought to bear on a particular decision or

set of decision makers. But the biases, in terms of the kinds of evidence the methods find and cannot be expected to find, are there and, for each of the individual methods by itself, virtually unavoidable. The evidence problem therefore has become a methodological one; how can we get the needed evidence, especially to test economic and ideological theories since they are probably the least satisfactorily investigated with the traditional procedures. **Interest and Ideology: The Foreign Policy Beliefs of American Businessmen** (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1975), 19-20.

Fortunately, for those diplomatic historians interested in exploring the possibility of combining the traditional approach with the new quantitative methodology, historians Edward Shorter, Roderick Floud, Charles Dollar and Richard Jensen have published introductions to quantification which permit easy acquisition of the fundamentals of the quantitative methodology. Perhaps the most elemental guide is Edward Shorter's brief, very readable **The Historian and the Computer: A Practical Guide** (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971). Roderick Floud's **An Introduction to Quantitative Methods for Historians** (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1973) is also quite brief, but somewhat more statistically and mathematically orientated. The best introduction to statistics for historians, in this writer's opinion, is Charles M. Dollar and Richard J. Jensen, **Historians's Guide to Statistics: Quantitative Analysis and Historical Research** (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971). Since it is more advanced, though, the Dollar-Jensen manual would best be used after a serious reading of either the Shorter or Floud book. Another valuable feature of the Dollar-Jensen book is a sixty-three page bibliography of source materials for numerical data, statistical manuals, data archives, and articles and books which have used quantitative research techniques. Collectively these three books offer interested historians the possibility of a "painless" introduction to quantification.

Many of us would agree with the thrust of Professor Beisner's remark that we could profit from a closer study of the behavior of those involved in formulating and implementing U. S. foreign relations. But the most reliable way to study behavior, leads through the computing center. This writer thinks that such a journey will be both rewarding and stimulating.

Progress Report

upon

DIPLOMATIC HISTORY

This is a report to the members of SHAFR on the current status of **Diplomatic History**. The interim report of an interim editor should be to the point. My message is that the first issue will appear before the end of the year, barring unforeseen developments.

Some details follow on the editorial office's activities and practices. Much has transpired since April 9, 1976, when President Robert A. Divine announced the interim editorship. The first manuscripts arrived before I completed arrangements with the University of Oregon for office space and funding and before I could employ Ms. Nancy Carpenter (B.A. Wellesley, M.A. Chicago) as editorial assistant. The editorial office began to function, more or less, by mid-May, when SHAFR's members received the written announcement about the journal.

Delays in the editorial work ensued while the editorial board was completed and its members were located. Some were currently on leave, and others were preparing for summer activities or sabbatical research. The moral may be that late spring and early summer are not the ideal times to initiate journals. But all turned out well, as President Divine knew that it would! The Board members have provided invaluable assistance, and they have often responded to my demands at moments inconvenient to them. Several of the members have had to read a substantial number of manuscripts. Meanwhile the chairman of the board and the officers of the Society have helped me to resolve several questions involving particular issues or general policies. The effective aid of all these persons has made the editorial work possible. I thank them for their support.

Twenty other members of SHAFR have responded graciously to my requests to referee manuscripts. No SHAFR member has as yet refused an appeal for help, even when I have called upon the person unexpectedly or insisted upon a prompt reading. I am greatly impressed by the dedication of the members of SHAFR. I shall not list the names of the referees here but I am preparing an honor roll of sorts. I shall pass this roster on to the permanent editor, Armin Rappaport, who no doubt will reward them with further assignments.

Diplomatic History received thirty-eight manuscripts as of August 1. The bulk of these papers arrived during June and July, when a manuscript arrived every other day. The journal must continue to receive manuscripts at this rate. **More manuscripts are needed.** Members should spread the word. Editor Rappaport and I also will do

so. The publication of the first issue hopefully will stimulate further contributions. We especially want broadly significant articles based on fresh materials and new interpretive perspectives.

Most of the offerings so far have come from junior members of the guild. This is quite proper, for the journal is in part meant to be an outlet for their work. But all historians of American foreign relations should look to the journal as a primary publisher of their research. The appearance of senior, respected historians in **Diplomatic History's** pages will enhance the contributions of the younger scholars. We are particularly eager to receive manuscripts from women, scholars of different races and persuasions, and foreign historians. We have received some manuscripts from such persons and look for more.

Ms. Carpenter and I, and on occasion other local scholars or visitors, have read every manuscript received. Most manuscripts have also been read by board members or other referees; some other papers clearly were inappropriate for **Diplomatic History**. All manuscripts are sent to referees without disclosing the identity of the author. Referees' comments are returned to the authors on the same confidential basis. The referees and the editorial officers have attempted to encourage and to assist the authors with their work by suggesting revisions, new sources, and other journals or forums for trial runs.

At this date, we have rejected eighteen manuscripts, though three are possibilities for submission again after substantial revision. Another seventeen manuscripts are in various stages of review; several show substantial promise. Three manuscripts are on the verge of acceptance, pending further revisions. The autumn issue should contain six or seven articles of varying length, diverse subject matter and good quality.

The officers of SHAFR, the chairman of the board and the interim and permanent editor have exchanged ideas about the layout of the journal. I shall present these thoughts and a general format to our publisher, Scholarly Resources, Inc. The editorial office will prepare final manuscript copy, but Scholarly Resources, Inc., will take charge of proofreading.

I have corresponded regularly with Editor Rappaport, who visited Eugene on August 4 for discussion of administrative and editorial procedures. Nancy Carpenter and I will complete work on the first number and begin work on the second number of the journal. We shall transfer the journal to Editor Rappaport around September 1. He will receive all new manuscripts after that date, while we deal collect-

ively with unfinished business. We are very fortunate to have our permanent editor. He and his staff deserve our collective assistance.

August 5, 1976

Paul S. Holbo
Interim Editor
Diplomatic History

SHAFR ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Southern Historical Association will hold its annual meeting in Atlanta, Ga., November 10-13, with headquarters at the Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel. SHAFR will host a reception on Thursday, November 11, 5:00 P.M.--7:00 P.M., in the Virginia Room of the headquarters hotel. Cash bar.

One member of SHAFR, Thomas D. Schoonover (U of SW Louisiana), will read a paper at this convention--"Confederate Diplomacy with Mexico" as part of the program, "Diplomats in Nineteenth-Century U. S.--Latin American Relations". Akira Iriye (U of Chicago) will be a panelist upon the program, "Perspectives on the Origin of the Pacific War, 1941-1945." Norman A. Graebner (U of Virginia and former president of SHAFR) will serve as a commentator upon the program, "Adlai E. Stevenson and American Foreign Policy, 1961-1965," as will Russell F. Weigley (Temple U) upon the one titled, "The Martial South."

* * * * *

SHAFR will meet in conjunction with the annual convocation of the American Historical Association at Washington, D. C., December 27-30. The Council will convene at 7:30 P.M., Monday, December 27, in the Holmes Room of the Sheraton-Park Hotel. The next day the Board of Editors of SHAFR's new journal, **Diplomatic History**, will meet at 8:00 A.M. in the Directors Room of the Shoreham-Americana Hotel. That evening (Tuesday, December 28) SHAFR will hold a reception (cash bar) in the Blue Room of the Shoreham-Americana, 5:00-7:00. SHAFR's official activities will conclude with a luncheon on Wednesday, December 29, in the Richmond Arlington Room of the Sheraton-Park Hotel, 12:15-2:00. The feature of this meeting will be the presidential address by Dr. Robert A. Divine.

* * * * *

The Council on August 14 accepted the invitation of Norman A. Graebner that SHAFR's Third Annual Conference meet in August, 1977, on the campus of the University of Virginia in Charlottesville.

It is imperative that members submit proposals for papers and sessions if the conference is to be held. Suggestions should be sent to the new Chairman of the Program Committee, Dr. Roger R. Trask, Department of History, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

While titles of individual papers are welcome, it would be most helpful if entire panels could be proposed. Consultation between scholars working in the same area or on related topics can often yield quick results. Two papers on a related theme will allow the chairman of the program committee to proceed, although he would also welcome suggestions of names of session chairpersons and commentators.

A deadline of December 15 has been set for the receipt of proposals. This will allow Dr. Trask to report to the Council on December 27 at which time it will be decided whether or not it is feasible to proceed with plans for the Conference.

* * * * *

SHAFR is currently acting as a conduit for the transmission of a grant of \$11,000.00 from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission to the Department of State for 1976-1977. Under its program for granting fellowships in the editing of documentary sources for American history, the NHPRC has allocated one fellowship for 1976-1977 to the Department for the "Foreign Relations" series. Since the NHPRC and the National Archives cannot make grants to other Federal agencies or to individual scholars, the Society has agreed to serve as the intermediary. It is a service from which all parties may benefit. The fellowship is in the field of American diplomatic history.

OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Department of State will sponsor a seminar in late December which will coincide with the meeting of the American Historical Association in Washington, D. C., and which will be tailored for the particular benefit of U. S. diplomatic historians. The topic of the seminar will be "Clio's Handmaiden: the Freedom of Information Act and State Department Materials." Panelists will include William D. Blair, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, as moderator, Barbara Ennis, Director, Freedom of Information Staff, Gene Malmborg, As-

sistant Legal Adviser, John Pruden, Director, Foreign Affairs Document and Reference Center, and David Trask, Director, Historical Office. The meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 28, 12 noon--2 p.m. at the Department of State. Persons wishing to attend should notify the Freedom of Information Office, Room 2811, Department of State, Washington, D. C. 20520, or call 202-623-0783, prior to the session. They will be met at the Diplomatic (or C Street) entrance of the Department and escorted to the seminar room. Coffee and sandwiches will be served.

* * * * *

The Department of State will hold a seminar, April 25-29, 1977, on the topic, "Historical Research Within the U. S. Government on American Foreign Policy." The Historical Office of the Bureau of Public Affairs will be host for the seminar.

Persons interested in participating can obtain application forms and further information by writing to Dr. David F. Trask, The Historian (PA/HO, Room 619, SA-2), Department of State, Washington, D. C. 20520

* * * * *

The Citadel will hold its second Conference on War and Diplomacy on March 10, 11, and 12, 1977, in Charleston, S.C. Proposals for papers and sessions in the general areas of military and diplomatic history are invited and should be directed to Dr. David H. White, Department of History, The Citadel, Charleston, S.C. 29409. Proposals should be submitted by October 1, 1976. Plans are to publish all the addresses and scholarly papers which are presented at the 1977 Conference.

* * * * *

"Thirty Years of the Arms Race: The Deterioration of Economic Strength and Military Security" will be the topic of a paper to be given by Lloyd J. Dumas, Associate Professor of Industrial and Management Engineering at Columbia University, at the American Historical Association meeting in Washington, D. C. this December. The luncheon session, sponsored by the Conference on Peace Research in History, will be held on Tuesday, December 28, 1976, from 12:15 to 2:00 p.m. in the South Assembly Room, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel. Those interested in attending the luncheon may purchase tickets at the Registration Desk. The speech and the discussion following it are open to everyone.

* * * * *

SHAFR is pleased to announce that it has a formal agreement with the Georgetown University Library for deposit and preservation of the Society's archives in the Library's Special Collections. The earlier files have been deposited in the Georgetown Library and future material will be sent there.

The Georgetown Library has several collections of diplomatic papers and is interested in acquiring additional ones pertaining to diplomacy and diplomatic history. Concentrating collections at Georgetown would offer researchers significant advantages.

Members of SHAFR who have such papers which they would like to give to Georgetown should contact Herbert H. Fockler, Special Assistant to the University Librarian, Georgetown University Library, 37th and O Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20057, for information about Georgetown Library interests and possible arrangements.

* * * * *

The Department of History at American University, in cooperation with the National Archives and Records Service, GSA, the Library of Congress, and the Maryland Hall of Records, has announced three institutes, titled Introduction to Modern Archives Administration, for 1976-77. The dates, all tentative, are November 1-12, 1976, February 28-March 11, 1977, and June 6-17, 1977. For details and application forms, one should write to:

Department of History
The American University
Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20016

PUBLICATIONS IN U. S. DIPLOMACY BY MEMBERS OF SHAFR

Robert A. Divine (Texas), **The Reluctant Belligerent: American Entry into World War II**. 1976 (re-issue of 1965 ed.). Krieger. \$8.50.

* * * * *

Reib Bingham Duncan (Emory U), **Whitelaw Reid: Journalist, Politician, Diplomat**. 1975. U of Georgia Press. \$11.00. Favorably reviewed in **History**, May/June, 1976, and in **Journal of Southern History**, August, 1976.

* * * * *

Lloyd C. Gardner (Rutgers), **Imperial America: American Foreign Policy since 1898**. 1976. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. Pb. \$4.95.

* * * * *

Arnold A. Offner (Boston U), **American Appeasement: United States Foreign Policy and Germany, 1933-1938**. 1976. W. W. Norton & Co., Inc. Pb. \$3.95.

ADDITIONAL PUBLICATIONS BY MEMBERS OF SHAFR

Glen St. J. Barclay (U of Queensland,) **The Empire is Marching: A Study of the Military Effort of the British Empire**. 1976. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson. Six pounds.

* * * * *

Stephen M. Millett (Air Force Institute of Technology), ed., **A Selected Bibliography of American Constitutional History**. 1975. ABC-CLIO Press. \$9.75. Reviewed in **Choice**, November, 1975.

ERRATUM

The editor, relying upon a source which proved to be inaccurate, listed in the March issue of the **Newsletter** the work **Woodrow Wilson** by Dr. David W. Hurst (Associate editor, *Papers of Woodrow Wilson*) as being in print. This book has not been published yet, and the editor regrets his precipitancy.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

The March 1973 issue of the **Newsletter** carried this statement: "Of much interest to many researchers in American diplomatic history is a recent announcement by the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, that the hearings held in executive session by that body during the Truman era are in the process of being published." One volume, **The Legislative Origins of the Truman Doctrine**, had been printed at that time. Publication has continued with upwards of a dozen volumes having been issued to date. They are extremely

valuable to anyone doing research in U. S. diplomacy in the immediate post-World War II era. Among the topics covered are the European Recovery Program, China Aid, Assistance to Greece and Turkey, The North Atlantic Treaty, Aid to Korea, Disloyalty in the State Department, Genocide Convention, and so on. A limited number of the volumes may be secured free from the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C. 20510, or, failing that, may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402. They are paperbound.

* * * * *

Some two years ago the Carrollton Press, Inc., 1911 Fort Myer Drive, Arlington, Va. 22209, began what it termed a Declassified Documents Reference System. The intent of the company is to issue "two new self-contained reference systems which index, catalog, and make available on microfiche, those documents which have been declassified under Executive Order 11,652 and the new Freedom of Information Act." The time span of these documents is the last thirty years. The declassified material comes from "35 separate U. S. departments and agencies which report to the Interagency Classification Review Committee," but with the bulk coming from the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of State, and the Department of Defence. "The documents themselves range in size and scope from telegrams, correspondence, and unevaluated field reports to lengthy background studies, detailed minutes of cabinet level meetings, and complete 'National Intelligence Estimates.'" The specifics of this program, as well as the costs, may be secured by writing--or calling (1-202-965-0655)--the above address.

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES PUBLISHED, OR SCHOLARLY PAPERS
DELIVERED, BY MEMBERS OF SHAFR

(Please limit abstracts to a total of fifteen (15) lines of **Newsletter** space. The overriding problem of space, plus the wish to accommodate as many contributors as possible, makes this restriction necessary. Don't send lengthy summaries to the editor with the request that he cut as he sees fit. Go over abstracts carefully before mailing. If words are omitted, or statements are vague, the editor in attempting to make needed changes may do violence to the meaning of the article or paper. Do not send abstracts until a paper has actually been delivered, or an article has actually appeared in print. For abstracts, of articles, please supply the date, the volume, the number within the volume, and the pages. Double space all abstracts).

Phillip J. Baram (unemployed), "American Jews and American Middle East Policy During World War II." Paper delivered at yearly meeting of American Jewish Historical Society, Waltham, Mass., May 1, 1976, and based on a segment of Ph. D. thesis on the State Department's views of the Middle East through 1945. State's wartime dealings with Jewish "lobbies" were mainly with the anti-Zionist American Jewish Committee and American Council for Judaism; Revisionist Zionists; and American Zionist Emergency Council. Anti-Zionists volunteered to help State counter pro-Zionists views in Congress and the White House. State appreciated, but in fact did not need, help. The Revisionists' maximal nationalism, and pro-Western imperialism, were both opposed by State. AZEC, the main Jewish lobby, was State's bete noire; yet it treated AZEC with public respect. The purpose here was to disarm Zionists of hostility, even while State supported Arabs non-publicly. Departmental files show not only that State's tactic often succeeded, but that the notion of a united, powerful Jewish lobby in the Forties is mythical.

* * * * *

Barton J. Bernstein (Stanford University), "The Atomic Bombs: The American Dimension," Conference of Asian Scholars (Pacific Coast), June, 1976. The lecture emphasized the inability of American policy makers to search for alternatives to the combat use of the two atomic bombs, the bonus (impressing the Soviets and retribution against Japan) that the bombs offered, and the fears that a moderation of terms (guaranteeing the Emperor) before Hiroshima might stiffen Japanese resolve and prolong the war. After Hiroshima and Nagasaki, when Japan offered a conditional surrender (guarantee of the Emperor), the Truman administration refused to accept this condition unequivocally and thereby almost shattered the fragile peace coalition in Japan, nearly restored the militarists to power, and came close to unleashing a train of events that might have included the combat use of a third atomic bomb—which Truman, for moral reasons, wanted to avoid.

* * * * *

Barton J. Bernstein (Stanford University), "Défente: The Arms Race in a Revolutionary World," Institute on World Affairs (San Diego State), July, 1976. This paper briefly discussed the escalation of the arms race under John F. Kennedy the return to the doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction under L. B. Johnson, and analyzed the dangers and strategic possibilities of the Nixon-Ford shift toward partial counterforce—with the option of limited nuclear war. Rebutting the recent arguments of Paul Nitze, the analysis called for a movement away from counterforce and a first-strike potential, warned of nuclear accidents and Soviet responses to American counterforce, and argued that the new American strategic posture would still leave

the United States without adequate military power (and public support) to deal with the most likely threats to the American system--Leftist revolutions in the third world.

* * * * *

Barton J. Bernstein (Stanford University), "The Uneasy Alliance: Roosevelt, Churchill, and the Atomic Bomb, 1940-1945," **Western Political Quarterly**, XXIX (June, 1976), 202-230. Based on various lectures in 1971-74 and relying heavily on both British and American documents, this essay offers a new conception of Roosevelt's foreign policy--his understanding of power, his attitude toward the Soviet Union, his views of the United Nations, and his expectations for the postwar world--and **suggests** a new view of the President as a tactician and administrator in at least one important area of foreign policy (atomic energy). Like Churchill, Roosevelt believed in big power politics and wanted the Anglo-American entente ("two policemen") to be the most powerful of the great powers enforcing the peace, especially against Russia, and the President also realized that Britain would remain dependent on the United States, for she would possess the atomic secrets and the economic power that Britain needed to protect her future.

* * * * *

John M. Carroll (Lamar University), "Henry Cabot Lodge's Contribution To The Shaping Of Republican European Policy, 1921-1924," **Capitol Studies**, III (Fall, 1975), 153-65. The last four years of Henry Cabot Lodge's career have been frequently overlooked by historians in articles and monographs. When scholars have dealt with this period during which Lodge was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, they have depicted him as a bitter obstructionist attempting to stamp out Wilsonian internationalism and impede the Harding administration from cooperating as fully as possible in European affairs. This article attempts to correct the mistaken view that Lodge restricted Republican European policy beyond the limits which Harding and Hughes agreed to set in 1921. Lodge cooperated to a great degree with Hughes in shaping a European program of constructive involvement in the old world without forfeiting American independence of action. The Massachusetts Senator often defended administration policy on the reparations and war debt issues and spoke out in the Senate against dangerous congressional interference in foreign affairs. During the early 1920's, Lodge helped the Republicans shape a workable European policy in the wake of the bitter debate over membership in the League of Nations.

* * * * *

John M. Dobson (Iowa State University), "Desperadoes and Diplomacy: The Territory of Arizona v. Jesús García, 1893," **Journal**

of **Arizona History**, XVII, 2 (Summer, 1976), 137-60. In July, 1893, Jesus Garcia, a Mexican national claimed that he had crossed into Mexico before an Arizona deputy sheriff arrested him in downtown Nogales. Attempts including the intervention of both Mexican and American consular officers failed to settle the controversy at the local level. The Mexican Foreign Minister then lodged an official protest with the U. S. State Department, contending that the incident proved that the U. S. did not properly respect the sanctity of the international boundary and, by inference, the sovereignty of Mexico. The controversy festered until late 1896 when the U. S. Secretary of State, Richard Olney, finally obtained from his consul a detailed report on what had happened that proved satisfactory to the Mexican government.

* * * * *

E. James Hindman (Sul Ross State University, Alpine, Texas), "Alvaro Obregón and the Southwestern Border." Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Texas State Historical Association, Galveston, Texas, March, 1976, and at the "Humanities on the Border" conference, The University of Texas at El Paso, May 7, 1976. Foreign intrigue and intervention are major obstacles for nations experiencing revolutionary upheaval. Mexico after 1910 was no exception. Factions in the U. S., attempting to orchestrate Mexican revolutionary movements for their own ends, meddled below the Rio Grande. One group included General Hugh L. Scott, James R. Garfield, Nelson Rhoades, and George Carothers. They attempted to prevent the U. S. from recognizing Venustiano Carranza and to separate Alvaro Obregón from Carranza. Their attempts ultimately failed. Issues raised in the paper include the following: What was the impact of Scott-Garfield-Rhoades-Carothers on U. S. foreign policy? Were Scott's actions insubordinate or was he merely naïve? Was Villa's raid on Columbus, N.M., partially motivated by revenge against the U. S. group, since his men raided simultaneously a ranch owned by Garfield?

* * * * *

1

Howard Jones (U of Alabama), "Anglophobia and the Aroostook War," **The New England Quarterly**, XLVIII, 4 (Dec., 1975), 519-39. The "Aroostook War" in Maine in early 1839 was significant because it focused attention on the undetermined northeastern boundary between the United States and Canada and encouraged a further breakdown in Anglo-American relations which could have led to war. These border troubles, an outgrowth of the vaguely-defined boundary provisions contained in the Treaty of Paris ending the Revolutionary War in 1783, began in the following decade and gained momentum after Maine was admitted as a state in 1820 and its spokesmen appealed to Anglophobia and the doctrine of states' rights for support against alleged British encroachment in the disputed area. Local

disagreements between New Englanders and residents of New Brunswick soon threatened to force a confrontation between Great Britain and the United States. Fortunately the following factors eased the dangerous situation: the patience of leaders in London and Washington, the adept diplomacy of General Winfield Scott, the involvement of both nations in problems elsewhere, and their commercial ties. Yet it was not until 1842 that Britain and the United States resolved the northeastern boundary dispute by signing the Webster-Ashburton Treaty.

* * * * *

Warren F. Kimball (Rutgers-Newark), "The Ghost in the Attic: Russia as a Factor in Anglo-American Planning for Germany, 1943-1945," delivered at the International Congress of the Historical Sciences, San Francisco, Calif., August, 1975.

Based upon research in the Public Record Office, the national Archives, the FDR Library, and the Harry D. White papers, this analysis concludes that fear of the Soviet Union did not dominate Anglo-American planning for postwar Germany until after Roosevelt's death. The British military occasionally raised the question of using Germany as a bulwark against Russia, but the British Foreign Office, particularly Anthony Eden, flatly rejected that suggestion as contrary to Allied grand strategy. A significant number of American and British military planners opposed any military reconstruction of Germany because they feared that a rearmed and reconstructed Germany might side with the Soviet Union. The vague fears of a postwar confrontation with Russia constantly lurked in the background, but more pressing questions of chaos in France and the long-term reform of Germany dominated Anglo-American planning.

* * * * *

Arnold P. Krammer (Texas A & M University), "German Prisoners of War in the United States," **Military Affairs**, XXX, No. 2 (April 1976), 68-73. With America's entrance into World War II, the Government found itself in control of nearly half a million prisoners of war, transported from the battlefields of North Africa and Italy to more than 500 base and branch camps in the United States. During the years from 1942 until 1946, the War Department and the Provost Marshal General's Office supervised a novel experiment in American history, which grew to include the housing, clothing and feeding, recreation, labor utilization, and, in many cases, the reeducation of the war captives. The POW program not only involved the participation of dozens of governmental and humanitarian agencies, but depended, in large measure, on America's relations with the Protecting Powers, Switzerland and Spain. Aside from the program's ultimate success, the experiment served to protect American POW's in German hands,

and shortened the war by making surrender an attractive alternative to resistance. Professor Krammer is completing a book on this subject.

* * * * *

Warren F. Kuehl (U of Akron and Joint Executive Secretary-Treasurer of SHAFR), "The Principle of Responsibility for Peace and National Security, 1920-1973", **Peace and Change**, III (Summer and Fall, 1975), 84-93. The article traces the advocacy of the idea by internationalists of the 1920's and 1930's that the United States should play a more positive role in world affairs and notes how this "doctrine of responsibility" became an accepted foreign policy in postwar decades through alliances, wars, the United Nations, and interventionist activities.

* * * * *

Gary B. Ostrower (Alfred University), "The American Decision to Join the International Labor Organization," **Labor History** (Fall, 1975), 495-504. The author traces the Roosevelt Administration's campaign to secure congressional approval of the ILO resolution. Key to the campaign's success were: 1) overcoming isolationist suspicion of the ILO by stressing the difference between the labor body and the more familiar League of Nations, 2) having the Labor Department, not the State Department, carry the burden of responsibility, and 3) linking the ILO's work to New Deal recovery efforts. Nevertheless, significant ILO support stemmed from the organization's loose association with the League, and the entire episode illuminates a strong internationalist current during the early New Deal.

* * * * *

Salvatore Prisco III (Stevens Institute), "The Pan-Americanization of the Monroe Doctrine, 1907-1920: A Policy that Failed." Paper delivered at the Southeastern Conference on Latin American Studies, Miami, Florida, May 6, 1976. Unilateral intervention under the Monroe Doctrine by Theodore Roosevelt set off a strong reaction in Latin America. In an attempt to repair strained relations, John Barrett, Director of the Pan-American Union, encouraged the Pan-Americanization of the Monroe Doctrine. Critical issues were the creation of the Central American Court, the Panama Canal Tolls controversy, and multilateral mediation of the Mexican Revolution. In each of these incidents the Taft and Wilson administrations and the State Department chose to maintain unilateral freedom of action in place of permitting Latin American participation as juridical equals in Pan-American matters. After repeated disappointments, even Latin American representatives were unenthusiastic about Pan-Americanism. The psychological confrontation between Barrett and Wilson further com-

plicated the situation. By the 1930's, however, Naziism and economic necessity helped bring to fruition multilateral Pan-Americanism.

* * * * *

Joseph M. Siracusa, (University of Queensland, Australia), "Ambassador Marshall Green, America, and Australia: The Making of a New Relationship," **World Review**, 14 (October, 1975), 17-25.

The accession to power in late 1972 of the Australian Labor Party (A.L.P.) with its strong-willed leader Gough Whitlam and its anti-American policy regarding Viet-Nam, among other places, brought greater pressures to bear on the ANZUS allies. The Whitlam Government, in opposition to the overly pro-American Liberal-Country Party coalition replete with such embarrassments as the late Harold Holt's exhortation of "All the Way with LBJ" purposely set out to readjust and re-define Australian-American relations in a manner that emphasized **Australian** (read A.L.P.) solutions to **Australian**-related problems. Such issues concerned themselves with, inter alia, the American Northwest Cape Naval Communications Facility in Western Australia and the expansion of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. With the skillful diplomacy of the American Ambassador, Marshall Green, and against the background of the collapse of American policy in Southeast Asia, these and many other matters have been adjusted to the satisfaction of both parties. Nonetheless, Washington's relative unconcern with this Southwest Pacific power still belies America's actual stake in Australia.

PERSONALS

Harold E. Barto has been appointed chairman of the Department of History at Monmouth College (West Long Branch, N. J.)

* * * * *

Calvin L. Christman (William Penn) has received a grant from the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute for research at the FDR Library upon the subject of U. S. economic mobilization for World War II. He served as visiting professor at the U of Iowa during the spring of this year.

* * * * *

David H. Culbert (Louisiana State) has been appointed a fellow of the National Humanities Institute at Yale University for the academic year 1977-78.

* * * * *

Robert A. Divine (U of Texas and current president of SHAFR) has received a Humanities Fellowship from the Rockefeller Foundation for the academic year 1976-77. The fellowship was awarded to support his research upon a project with the tentative title of "The Nuclear Test Ban Debate of the 1950s." Specifically, the research will involve studying the issue of fallout from the H-bomb tests of the Eisenhower era, and will necessitate work in Washington, D. C., and the Eisenhower Library in Abilene, Kansas.

* * * * *

Philip W. Kennedy has been reappointed to a three-year term as chairman of the Department of History at the U of Portland, effective June, 1976.

* * * * *

Arthur G. Kogan has been designated as Adviser on Records Policy in the Historical Office of the Department of State.

* * * * *

Geoffrey S. Smith (Queen's U, Ontario) has received sabbatical and research grants from the Canada Council in order to do work in London, England, upon a prospective book, titled "Charles Wilkes and the Growth of American Naval Diplomacy."

* * * * *

Samuel F. Wells (U of North Carolina) has replaced John L. Gaddis (Ohio U) upon the Bernath Speaker Award Committee.

* * * * *

Six members of SHAFR constituted a panel upon the topic, "What Was the Open Door?" at the Western Conference meeting of the Association for Asian Studies, October 11, 1975, in Boulder, Colorado. The panel was chaired by Sandra C. Thomson (U of Utah), and the speakers were Linda M. Papageorge (Georgia State U), "Completing the Open Door Policy: Sino-American Rapprochement during the Boxer Uprising;" David L. Wilson (Southern Illinois U), "A Radical View;" Noel Pugach (U of New Mexico), "A Global View;" Warren W. Tozer (Boise State U), "A Pragmatic View;" and Frederick B. Hoyt (Illinois State U), "The Dynastic Cycle of the Open Door Empire: Its Rise, Splendour and Fall."

 THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL BOOK COMPETITION FOR 1977

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations announces that the 1977 competition for the Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Prize upon a book dealing with any aspect of American foreign affairs is open. The purpose of the award is to recognize and to encourage distinguished research and writing by young scholars in the field of U.S. diplomatic relations.

CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD

ELIGIBILITY: The prize competition is open to any book on any aspect of American foreign relations that is published during 1976. 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 SHAFR. Five (5) copies of each book must be submitted with the nomination. The books should be sent to: Dr. John L. Gaddis, Chairman, Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Prize Committee, Department of Strategy, Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island 02840. The works must be received not later than February 1, 1977.

AMOUNT OF AWARD: \$500.00. If two (2) or more works are deemed winners, the amount will be shared. The award will be announced at the luncheon for members of SHAFR, held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the OAH which will be April, 1977, at Atlanta, Georgia.

PREVIOUS WINNERS

1972	Joan Hoff Wilson (Sacramento) Kenneth E. Shewmaker (Dartmouth)
1973	Michael H. Hunt (Yale)
1974	Frank D. McCann, Jr. (New Hampshire) Stephen E. Pelz (U of Massachusetts-Amherst)
1975	Martin Sherwin (Princeton)

THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL PRIZE FOR THE BEST
SCHOLARLY ARTICLE IN DIPLOMATIC HISTORY DURING 1976

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations announces that the 1977 competition for the best published article on any aspect of American foreign relations is open. The purpose of the award is to recognize and to encourage distinguished research and writing by young scholars in the field of diplomatic relations.

CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD

ELIGIBILITY: Prize competition is open to any article on any topic in American foreign relations that is published during 1976. The article must be among the author's first five.

PROCEDURES: Articles shall be submitted by the author or by any member of SHAFR. Five copies of each article (preferably reprints) should be submitted to the chairman of the Stuart L. Bernath Article Prize Committee by January 15, 1977. The chairman of the committee for the coming year to whom the articles should be sent is Dr. Martin Sherwin, Department of History, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08540.

AMOUNT OF AWARD: \$200.00. If two or more works are deemed winners, the prize will be shared. The award will be announced simultaneously with the Bernath book award at the luncheon for members of SHAFR, to be held in April, 1977, at Atlanta, Ga.

THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL LECTURE
IN AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC HISTORY

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations announces establishment of the Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Lecture. The Lecture will be delivered at the Society's luncheon, coinciding with the annual meeting of the Organization of American Historians.

Description and Eligibility: The first Bernath Lecture will be presented in Atlanta in 1977. The lecture will be comparable in style and scope to the yearly SHAFR presidential address delivered at 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 relations.

Procedures: The Bernath Lecture Committee is now soliciting nominations for the first Bernath Lecture from members of the Society. Nominations, in the form of a short letter and curriculum vitae, if available, should reach the Committee not later than October 15, 1976. The chairman of the Committee for the coming year to whom nominations should be sent is Professor Geoffrey S. Smith, Department of History, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada K7L 3N6.

Honorarium: \$300.00 with publication of the lecture assured in the Society's **Newsletter**. The name of the lecturer will be announced at the Society's luncheon at the American Historical Association meeting in Washington, D.C., in December.

GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO DIPLOMATIC HISTORY

Diplomatic History is a new quarterly journal, sponsored by SHAFR and published by Scholarly Resources, Inc., which is devoted to scholarly articles in the field of American diplomatic history broadly conceived. The journal will include contributions that deal not only with the foreign policy of the United States but with the extensive foreign relations of the American nation--cultural, economic, and intellectual. Priority will be given to articles that make a significant scholarly contribution either by presenting new evidence and exploiting new sources or by offering new interpretations and perspectives. Preference will be given to manuscripts that illuminate broad themes in the American diplomatic experience, but articles that deal intensively with specific historical events are welcomed if they cast light on more central issues.

The journal is not designed to reflect any single ideological viewpoint. Articles by those who consider themselves traditionalists, revisionists, realists, moralists or generalists will receive an equally impartial reading. The sole objective is to further scholarly discourse among diplomatic historians and to provide them with a new outlet for their research and writing.

All manuscripts should be submitted in duplicate, with the author's name, affiliation and address on a separate cover page. Each manuscript should be typed in a double-spaced fashion on standard size paper, and the notes should be typed separately, in sequence, at the end of the manuscript.

Pending the appointment of a permanent editor, references in the notes should follow the style of the **Journal of American History**.

All manuscripts should be submitted to: Dr. Armin Rappaport, Department of History, U of California, San Diego La Jolla, California 92093.

SHAFR ROSTER AND RESEARCH LIST

Please use this form to register your general and current research interests as well as your address. This **List** is stored upon computer tapes so that information may be quickly retrieved. In order for the system to work, though, two things are necessary from the members: (a) simple, concise, obvious titles should be used in describing projects; (b) a key word should be specified for each project. It would be quite helpful if members would send revised information to the editor whenever new data is available, since it will be much easier to keep the files up to date and avoid a rush in the fall. If a form is not available, a short memo will suffice. Changes which pertain only to addresses should be sent to the Executive Secretary, and he will pass them on to the editors of the **List** and the **Newsletter**. Unless new data is submitted, previously listed research projects will be repeated.

Name: _____ Title: _____

Address _____

State: _____ Zip Code _____ Institutional Affiliation
(if different from address) _____

General area of research interest: _____

_____ Key word _____

Current research project(s): _____

_____ Key word(s) _____

If this is pre-doctoral work, check here _____

Mail to: Dr. W. F. Kimball, editor
SHAFR R & R List
Department of History
Rutgers University, Newark
Newark, New Jersey 07102

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

SPONSOR: Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.

EDITOR: Nolan Fowler, Department of History, Tennessee Tech, Cookeville, Tennessee 38501.

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

DEADLINES: All material must be in the office of the editor not later than four (4) weeks prior to the date of publication.

ADDRESS CHANGES: Notification of address changes should be in the office of the editor at least one month prior to the date of publication. Copies of the **Newsletter** which are returned because of faulty addresses will be forwarded only upon the payment of a fee of 50¢.

BACK ISSUES: Copies of all back numbers of the **Newsletter** are available and may be obtained from the editorial office upon the payment of a service charge of 50¢ per number. If the purchaser lives abroad, the charge is 75¢ per number.

MATERIALS DESIRED: Personals (promotions, transfers, obituaries, honors, awards), announcements, abstracts of scholarly papers and articles delivered—or published—upon diplomatic subjects, bibliographical or historiographical essays dealing with diplomatic topics, lists of accessions of diplomatic materials to libraries, essays of a "how-to-do-it" nature respecting diplomatic materials in various depositories. Because of space limitations, "straight" articles and book reviews are unacceptable.

FORMER PRESIDENTS OF SHAFR

1968	Thomas A. Bailey (Stanford)
1969	Alexander De Conde (U of 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 (U of California - San Diego)

Box 5146

TENNESSEE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

**BLK. RT.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID**

Cookeville, Tenn.
PERMIT NO. 57