The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

NEWSLETTER

Volume V Number 2 June 1974

Page

SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

Founded in 1967. Chartered in 1972.

PRESIDENT: Bradford Perkins, Department of History, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104.

VICE PRESIDENT: Armin H. Rappaport, Department of History, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92037.

EXECUTIVES 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 44304.

CHAIRMAN, PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Thomas Paterson, Department of History, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut 06268.

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

CHAIRMAN, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Samuel F. Wells, Department of History, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514.

MEMBERSHIP: Anyone interested in U. S. diplomatic history is invited to become a member. Annual dues are $5.00, payable at the office of the Executive Secretary–Treasurer. Student memberships are $3.00 per year, while institutional affiliations are $10.00. Life memberships are $75.00.

MEETINGS: The annual meeting of the Society is held in conjunction with the yearly convocation of the American Historical Association in December. The Society also meets with the Organization of American Historians in April.

PRIZE: The Stuart L. Bernath Prize of $500.00 is awarded each year at the spring meeting of the Society to that person whose first or second book in U. S. diplomatic history is adjudged the best for the previous year.

ROSTER: A complete listing of the members with their 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 and Research List** is Warren F. Kimball, Department of History, Rutgers University (Newark), Newark, New Jersey 07102.

SHAFR Council Minutes
April 17, 1974

The SHAFR Council met on April 17 in the Denver Hilton Hotel during the OAH annual meeting. President Bradford Perkins called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. Members of Council present included Robert Divine, Wayne Cole, John Gaddis, Armin Rappaport, and David Trask. Also present were Nolan Fowler, Robert Beisner, Joseph O'Grady, and Leon Boothe.

Under old business, the Council considered a draft of the Bernath Prize Agreement which was devised and forwarded to the President by the donors of the prize, Dr. and Mrs. Gerald Bernath. One revision was moved and approved, a change in the process of selecting judges so that they will be appointed by the President of SHAFR. Council then approved the entire agreement subject to minor changes of phraseology related to tax matters. A special motion of thanks to Dr. and Mrs. Bernath was unanimously approved for creating this significant award in the name of Stuart L. Bernath. The full text of the agreement, as provided in the contract, will be published in the **Newsletter.**

A discussion of the possibility of a journal for SHAFR followed. Figures compiled by Robert Ferrell showed that a single 96–page issue could be produced, including composition work and printing, for $1,420 for 1,000 copies, Since this figure is substantially below previous estimates, Council approved a motion to create a study committee to (1) determine exact and full costs of producing and mailing a journal, (2) to determine the number of subscription sales that might be expected, (3) to make recommendations concerning the number of issues per year and (4) to determine whether any institutional support is possible and the amount which might be expected if such materializes, and (5) to prepare a list of persons from whom an editor could be selected if a journal is financially feasible. After receiving suggestions for the names of persons to be upon the study committee, Perkins named Robert Ferrell, chairman, and Robert Divine and Richard Heindel as assistants with Ferrell free to suggest other persons.

A report by O'Grady concerning the special SHAFR meeting to be held in Washington D. C., in the summer of 1975 indicated that Georgetown University through Jules Davids is willing to act as sponsor for such a meeting. The only costs to SHAFR will be incidental expenses which can be recovered through a registration fee. Council agreed that details of the conference would be developed through Davids, working with Tom Paterson, chairman of SHAFR's program committee. The dates of August 21–22, were chosen, tentatively, for the meeting, and Joe O'Grady was instructed to clear these with Davids.

Details regarding joint sessions at AHA meetings, according to O'Grady, are still uncertain. He noted that SHAFR's past problems centered upon the selling of tickets for luncheons, which SHAFR has had to assume on its own prior to and during the Convention. Under the

AHA arrangement of joint sessions every other year for organizations, SHAFR will have its next joint meeting in 1975.

Committee reports and information submitted revealed that a new Roster under Warren Kimball's direction will be available in the fall. Leon Boothe reported that the membership committee is preparing a new brochure and planning special campaigns. The composition of the program committee was announced as Thomas Paterson, chairman, Warren Cohen, Jerald Combs, Frank Merli, and Raymond O'Connor.

Robert L. Beisner, chairman, reported that the Bernath Committee selected as the winner of the Stuart L. Bernath Prize for 1974, with an award of $500, Michael H. Hunt for his book **Frontier Defense and the Open Door: Manchuria in Chinese–American Relations, 1895–1911**, Yale University Press.

Under new business, it was decided that the luncheon speakers at the OAH meetings should be selected after nominations by Council members with the president writing the person chosen.

A discussion of the dues for life members resulted in a reaffirmation that the amount should be 15 times the annual dues.

On duly constituted motion, Council voted that annual membership dues to students and emeriti should be set at $3.00.

A discussion of procedures and a timetable for the Nominations Committee led to the recommendation that the September, 1974, **Newsletter** carry an announcement encouraging members to suggest names of potential officers to the Committee.

Warren F. Kuehl and Lawrence Kaplan
Joint Executive Secretary–Treasurer

Remarks at Awarding of Stuart L. Bernath Prize for 1974
Luncheon, members of SHAFR, at OAH Convention
April 18, 1974, Denver, Colorado
Robert L. Beisner*

I have the high privilege to announce the winner of the Stuart L. Bernath Prize for 1974. Before saying anything about this year's competition, however, I'd like first to express my own gratification at being associated with the prize; with the memory of the young scholar for whom it is named, whom I never knew; and with his extraordinary parents, Jerry and Myrna Bernath, whom I've never met but feel I know well through a busy, lively, and enlightening correspondence that's been going on since 1970. What I have learned about Stuart from his devoted parents testifies abundantly not only to the propriety of this annual prize's being named in his memory, but to the pride and honor this Society should feel in being its home. What I have deduced about Stuart's parents from Jerry

*Dr. Beisner is a member of the history department at American University and was chairman of the Bernath prize committee for 1974.

Bernath's many selfless and open-hearted letters testifies to the great good fortune Stuart enjoyed in his short life in having such parents. This prize is an ornament of this organization and an inspiration to young scholars in the field of American foreign affairs. It is a fitting memorial to Stuart Bernath and an equally fitting symbol of his parents' generosity and humanity.

The Bernath Prize jury—Ted Wilson, Ernest May, and myself—had forty-one books to consider this year, including the usual handful that were obviously ineligible for one reason or another. Our reading was certainly varied. We had thirteen books dealing mainly with U.S. relations with Europe, five on Asian affairs, three on Latin American subjects, one on the Near East, and the rest on subjects impossible to put into particular geographical pigeon holes. All but one of the books **were** susceptible to at least a rough chronological classification, though some, of course, including the winner, bridged events of more than one century: two books dealt with the 18th century, eight with the 19th, and—yet another manifestation of this guild's preoccupation with recent times—thirty with the 20th century. Nine of the books were autobiographical or biographical in character.

And more than a half dozen of these books ranked very strongly as potential winners. Nonetheless the jury arrived at a winner with little difficulty. This year's winner is an ambitious work: a reassessment of U.S.-Chinese relations in the era of the "Open Door" and "Dollar Diplomacy." It is a product of thorough research in U.S., British, French, and Chinese sources; the author, with NDEA support, spent two years studying Chinese. He spent a year doing research in Taiwan. His book tells a fascinating and groundbreaking tale—and a rather dispiriting tale, as well—of two nations that might have come together in mutually advantageous policies but didn't, not only because their interests often conflicted but also because the diplomatists of the two countries, who worked under severe constraints made clear in this book, were never able to achieve an understanding of each others' interests.

It is a bold book, forthright, discriminating, and well written. It will be important, the jurors believe, for a long time to come. The winning book is called **Frontier Defense and the Open Door: Manchuria in Chinese-American Relations, 1895-1911,** its author Michael H. Hunt of Yale University. Mr. Hunt, a student of Gaddis Smith, Jonathan Spence, and the late Mary Wright, is presently out of the country and could not be here today. But accepting for him is a fellow student of Gaddis Smith, Professor Robert Schulzinger of the University of Denver's School of International Relations.

Report of the Advisory Committee on "**Foreign Relations** of the United States" Meeting Held at the Department of State, November 3, 1972

I

In 1972, publication of volumes of **Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States** reached an all-time high since founding of the series in 1861. A total of eleven volumes appeared, virtually completing the series through the year 1947. Moreover, plans for 1973 call for continuance of this phenomenal rate. The scheduled publication of eleven more volumes in 1973 would bring the series through 1948 and into 1949. The Advisory Committee is most gratified at this development, for in its last several reports the Committee had called attention to the increasing slippage, the widening time gap, between the occurrence of diplomatic events and the appearance of the corresponding volume of **Foreign Relations.** Indeed, the gap had cracked the twenty-five year mark. The Committee realizes that the reversal of this trend required broad concurrence in assigning a higher priority and increased funds to the **Foreign Relations** series. The Committee wishes therefore to express commendation to all concerned, officials within the Department of State, the President's Office, and the Congress, for their recognition of the need for greater support of **Foreign Relations** and to the Historical Office of the Department of State for demonstrating in convincing manner that increased support was amply justified.

II

On March 8, 1972, the President in a momorandum to the Secretary of State called for acceleration of publication of **Foreign Relations** so as to reduce the time span lag to twenty years within a three year period. Or, phrased somewhat differently, to publish '56 in '76. From the materials presented by the Historical Office to the Committee it emerged that the Historical Office might be able to complete the compilation of '56 by '76 but that the present schedule does not provide for the publication of the volumes for 1956 by 1976. The Committee would be less than candid if it suppressed its feeling of dismay at this development. To play catch-up in anything is difficult, so the Committee understands. But once momentum in that direction is gained, it would be most unwise, the Committee believes, to allow it to dissipate. The Committee therefore urges that the publication schedule for **Foreign Relations** be reviewed so as to achieve the goal of '56 in '76, and that every effort within the Historical Office and full assistance from without be dedicated to this end. Return to the 20 year rule for **Foreign Relations** would be a fitting accomplishment to record in the Bicentennial Year of this Nation.

III

Essential to timely publication of **Foreign Relations** is a speedy and effective documentary declassification process. Declassification has always presented many problems, but these have become vastly complicated since World War II. The process has taken on multilateral dimensions, involving not only the Department of State, but also the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Council among others. The President in his memorandum of March 8, 1972 recognized the complex and multilateral nature of declassification when he instructed the above mentioned agencies to cooperate fully with the Secretary of State in collecting and declassifying materials. As **Foreign Relations** moves into the 1950s, it is unlikely that the cooperative process will resolve all problems of declassification. It is also imperative that acceleration of the publication of **Foreign Relations** continue, "without impairing," as the President has stated, "the quality and comprehensive nature of the series." The Committee therefore suggests that on occasions when cooperation fails to resolve matters of declassification, the Secretary of State be empowered to frame specific recommendations and that his recommendations be given substantial weight in the resolution of the matter. Many signs point to significant changes of direction in the course of this nation's foreign affairs from that set by events of the late 1940s and early 1950s. A new generation of Americans will be called upon to live with these new directions, to understand and to guide them. For these tasks, the record of the immediate post World War II decade is essential.

IV

In its past several reports, the Committee has voiced concern over discontinuance of the series **American Foreign Policy: Current Documents.** And in its report for 1971, the Committee endorsed a suggestion emanating from the President's Office that "crisis volumes" might be prepared and issued well before those "crisis" events would be covered in **Foreign Relations** in the normal course. The Committee expresses its disappointment that little progress along either line is evident. Obstacles appear to be of different orders, however. In the case of **Current Documents,** lack of funding seems the main problem. In this respect, the Committee observes that the additional funding required is most modest indeed, given the current scale of public spending generally. In the case of "crisis volumes," it appears that compilation within the Historical Office of a pilot volume proved possible, but clearance did not. Obviously, declassification (a matter spoken of in Section III of this report) was involved, as was also general governmental documentary and informational policy (matters to be spoken of in Sections V and VI below). The Committee repeats its recommendation that the program to publish "crisis volumes" be effectively carried out.

V

On March 8, 1972, the President signed an Executive Order relating to declassification of, and access to, government documents. The Committee took note of the possibility that the limitations of this Executive Order might not be widely understood, and expectations might be raised, especially within the scholarly community, that could not be fulfilled. The Committee therefore suggests that wide publicity be given to the limitations and other features (such as the thirty year rule) of the Executive Order.

VI

During and since World War II, the amount of documentation produced in the course of conduct of this nation's foreign relations has increased by astronomical leaps. This vast body of recent diplomatic documents together with archives from the nation's beginnings constitute a true national heritage. It behooves all concerned to treat this archival resource as a national trust, insuring to the citizenry for their enlightenment adequate preservation of, and ready access to, this national treasure. As to ready access, we are past the threshold of electronic developments whereby a document properly housed in Washington could be made instantly available to the researcher or concerned citizen in virtually any part of these United States. The Committee therefore recommends that immediate consideration be focused on the development of plans and systems whereby diplomatic documents may become avail–

able through electronic means in all regions of the country. The costs of a national electronic retrieval system would undoubtedly be high. But the Committee is convinced that they would pale in the light of the benefits to be obtained. Perhaps the greatest catastrophe of our civilization, so it is sometimes said, was the burning of the library at Alexandria. The burial of this nation's documentary archives could produce a creeping catastrophe of much the same scale. Let us not repeat the intellectual vandalism of an earlier millenium by substituting the tomb for the torch.

David R. Deener, Chairman Alwyn V. Freeman	American Society of International Law
Walter LaFeber Armin H. Rappaport Paul A. Varg	American Historical Association
Richard C. Snyder H. Bradford Westerfield	American Political Science Association

---

MEXICO–UNITED STATES RELATIONS IN THE ARCHIVO HISTÓRICO de MATÍAS ROMERO

Thomas Schoonover*

In the mid–1950's the Banco de México purchased the immense Matías Romero collection. Romero was minister and ambassador to the United States from 1859 to 1868 and from 1882 to 1898. He was an indefatigable writer and preserver of correspondence. The Romero archive consists of well over 100,000 pieces of private correspondence plus a diary and considerable other miscellaneous historical material, forming what is, undoubtedly, the most important single private documentary collection on Mexican–United States economic and diplomatic relations in the latter half of the 19th century.

The Archivo Histórico, located in the Anexo del Banco de México at the corner of Cinco de Mayo and Motolínia in Mexico City, is under the direction of Guadalupe Monroy Huitrón. Since the staff is small the schedule varies from time to time, but the archive is normally open from 9:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. Miss Monroy and the staff are very helpful and accommodating. Xeroxing is not possible; however, several older typewriters are available for visiting scholars. The whole Romero collection is available on microfilm, and at least two United States research centers––the Bancroft Library and the Latin American collection at the University of Texas––possess microfilm copies. However, until the proposed seven or eight volume catalogue to the Romero holdings is completed, the microfilm will not be convenient to use.

Several years ago, Guadalupe Monroy, her assistants, and her staff completed and published, under the patronage of the Banco de

*Dr. Schoonover is professor of history at the University of Southwestern Louisiana.

México, the second volume of their catalogue, **Archivo Histórico de Matías Romero. Catalogo descriptivo. Correspondencia recibida, 1872–1884** (México: Banco de México, 1970). The first volume covering the years 1837 to 1872 had been published in 1965. Unfortunately, this very useful guide to a most valuable historical collection has not received adequate attention in the United States. The Library of Congress, for example, still did not own a copy of volume two on 10 January 1972 when the card catalogue of the Main Reading Room was examined. Still, Matías Romero had important roles in Mexican and United States history in the latter half of the 19th century. From 1857 until 1898 he was involved in Mexican domestic affairs, became a central figure in Mexican–United States relations (including all phases of the United States's economic penetration of Mexico), and played a significant role in the Guatemalan–Mexican border dispute from the 1870's until his death. In fact, it has been argued that Romero was sent to Washington again in 1882 partly in order to explain and defend Mexico's position on the border dispute with Guatemala before the United States government and people. Romero's correspondence is heavy in material to and from the key figures of his epoch—Benito Juárez, Sebastian Lerdo de Tejada, Porfirio Diaz, José María Iglesias, Manuel Gonzalez, Ignacio Mariscal, Ulysses S. Grant, among others. Historians of Mexican–United States relations will be interested to know that the indices of the first two volumes each contain entries for over 500 United States citizens or firms. This correspondence discusses the important events of the time—la guerra de la reforma, the French intervention, Guatemalan–Mexican and United States–Mexican border problems, the American Civil War and reconstruction, and Mexican–United States economic relations.

Although occasional minor errors occur in the catalogues (for example Ulysses S. Grant appears Ulises S. Grant which is inconsistent with Guadalupe Monroy's practice of leaving English names in their English form), the two volumes so far published are reliable and functionally well conceived. Each document in the Romero collection has been numbered in chronological order and its entry in the catalogue includes a one to ten line summary of the document's contents. Additionally, each volume contains an extensive onomastic index. The third and concluding volume of the correspondencia recibida series was about ready for the printer when this writer was in Mexico City in late 1971. Since Romero's letterbooks contain more outgoing correspondence than the incoming material he preserved, the editor believes the correspondencia mandada series will be four or five volumes. Published in a small edition of 500 copies, the volumes are available through the bookstore of El Colegio de México, 125 Guanajuato, México 7, D.F., rather than from the Banco de México.

THE AVAILABILITY OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE RECORDS*

by William M. Franklin
Director of the Historical Office

Ever since the sensational publication of the "Pentagon Papers" a year and a half ago, the public prints, the halls of Congress, and the

*Reprinted from the Department of State Bulletin, January 29, 1973. Based upon an address made by Dr. Franklin, a member of SHAFR, at the University of Virginia, in November, 1972.

conventions of learned societies have buzzed with talk of "declassification" of official documents. On March 8, 1972, President Nixon signed a new Executive order on the subject. The National Archives and Records Service has built up a declassification staff which is energetically tackling the problem. The Department of State has set up a Council on Classification Policy, chaired by William B. Macomber, Jr., the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management. A highlevel Interagency Classification Review Committee has been established, with former Ambassador John Eisenhower as chairman. All of this suggests that this might be an appropriate time to take a look at the whole problem of the availability to the public of State Department documents.

First of all, we have to sort out our terms. "Classification" as used in this context refers to the system of marking documents as Confidential, Secret, or Top Secret, depending on their importance to the national security. "Declassification" is, of course, the reversal of the process. In general it can be said that the authority to classify or declassify a given piece of paper rests with the offices having responsibility for the policy toward the particular country, organization, or type of problem to which it relates. Historians and archivists may have a voice with respect to classification and declassification, but they do not make the decisions—at least not in State Department practice.

Not infrequently one hears the accusation that classification is nothing but a "coverup for errors by the bureaucrats." I cannot speak for other agencies, but in the State Department system this would be most unlikely. Almost all our policy officers are either political appointees or Foreign Service officers, most of whom stay in a given assignment only a few years (eight is about the maximum), after which the control over the documents that they have classified passes to other officials—perhaps of an opposing political party—who can declassify any of those documents without any reference back to the original classifiers. Documents may be kept classified far longer than scholars and reporters may consider necessary, but this is done for reasons of policy—not for the protection of persons, most of whom never thought they had made any errors anyway.

Another relationship that needs attention is that between classification and secrecy. The present classification system came into the United States Government only with World War II. Prior to that time documents of special sensitivity were sometimes marked as "confidential" but generally they bore no such indication at all. Does this mean that prior to World War II government documents were in principle more open to the public? On the contrary, the principle was firmly embedded that every paper prepared on official business was to be shown only to other officers on a need-to-know basis. The only papers that were properly releasable to the public were those specifically so designated by higher authority. So, ironically, it can be said that the present classification system marked in principle a step toward greater liberality in that it made thousands of unclassified documents immediately releasable to the public.

But being "unclassified" or "declassified" does not in itself make a document available to the public. Papers unclassified or declassified are still in government file rooms closed to the public.

So declassification is not enough. In order to become available to the public, official records which are unclassified or which have been declassified must be (1) published in some manner, (2) opened up for public access, or (3) released in response to requests from the public for particular documents. Each of these procedures has a history of its own in the practice of the Department of State, and from this historical perspective some useful insights may be derived.

Publication of Official Papers

The traditional and original method of releasing official papers was publication on particular topics. The practice arose in 18th century England, where Parliament, beginning to reach for the reins of power, demanded on occasion that the government publish papers on particular subjects, particularly crises in foreign affairs which were becoming matters of increasing popular concern. When the government acceded—or when it decided on its own to release some papers—it had first to select from the files those that were to be released and then to send them to the public printer, often with portions still sensitive marked for omission. The printer would run the documents in the requisite number of copies (enough at least for parliamentary distribution) and would bind them together with "printer's wrapper"; i.e., covers of white paper. If the size of the text warranted it, he might be forced to use heavier covers, which were customarily of blue cardboard. Thus originated the eminent series of British White Papers and Blue Books which in the 19th century blazed a trail toward greater freedom of information in matters, such as foreign affairs, which had hitherto been regarded as prerogatives of the Crown, too sensitive or too complex to be shared even with Parliament, let alone the people. The time for sharing had begun.[1]

The young United States inherited this tradition and extended it in its own way. From the earliest days documents on foreign affairs were made available to Congress on particular subjects of interest, but the novel characteristic which developed in American practice was the annual review. To the President's annual message to Congress on the state of the Union (traditionally delivered in December) there were attached detailed reports from the various Cabinet officers except from the Secretary of State, who customarily rendered his report not in narrative but in the form of papers illustrating American foreign policy and diplomatic relations during the year. These papers, along with the Presidential address, were printed up as a congressional document and were circulated in the Capitol. In 1861 the Department of State, for the first time, had these foreign policy documents bound in hard covers and published under the title **Papers Relating to Foreign Affairs**. Thus there began that continuing series of annual volumes which, under the newer title, **Foreign Relations of the United States**, has now reached the documents for the year 1948.

It is interesting to note that the **Foreign Relations** series was started as a medium for releasing current documents of major importance. Indeed, the volume issued in 1861 contained documents of that very year, many of them on the hot and vital question of keeping the Great Powers from aiding and recognizing the Confederate States of America. Under the modern system of classification such documents could easily justify a Top Secret stamp, for they literally concerned the very existence of the United States of America and dealt with the imminent possibility of war with several European states. In those days the documents bore no stamp of classification, but it was understood that nothing of this sort was to be released without higher approval. Today this would be called "declassification"; at that time it was "clearance"—a term still used in the Historical Office of the Department. It would be my guess that the documents of 1861 were "cleared" by Secretary Seward personally, and probably also with President Lincoln, before they were published. The process has not essentially changed through all the years, although we do not generally have to go so high for clearance.[2] The documents for each year have to be located, selected, copied, and annotated by the Historical Office. Then galley proofs are run at the Government Printing Office and copies thereof—appropriately divided up by subjects—are circulated for declassification to all the concerned policy offices in the Department of State and to all other departments, agencies, and sometimes foreign governments whose documents we are proposing to publish. Since each volume now runs well over 1,000 pages, with seven to twelve volumes per year, it is no exaggeration to say that the staff of historians working on the **Foreign Relations** series is now the Department's principal declassification team.

The release of documents through the medium of a continuing series has certain great advantages. In contrast to a haphazard releasing of individual documents, the series presents all the important documents on each subject in context. The series provides a convenient and lasting reference source for students and scholars throughout the world. The release of documents through official publication is obviously equitable; there are no favorites and no "scoops." Placed in their historical setting, the documents are often easier for the Department to declassify and release because in such context their release is less likely to be misunderstood as having some current political significance.

Some of these desirable characteristics, however, worked to the disadvantage of the series in other respects, notably in speed of publication. To the end of the 19th century the volumes were being brought out when the documents were only a year or two old. In the present century the series began to lag, and by World War I the documents published were about eight years old. The huge increase in the volume of documentation occasioned by both World Wars, plus the increasingly important role played by the United States on the world stage, worked to make the series slip back year by year, until by 1970 the documents being released were over 25 years old. This situation came to the attention of President Nixon early in 1972, and on March 8 of that year he issued instructions that the series be brought up to a 20-year line. Three additional positions have been added to the **Foreign Relations** staff, and more money has been provided for indexing and printing, but the attainment of the President's goal will depend in large measure on the speed with which busy policy officers (not historians) can be persuaded to review the documents proposed for declassification and publication.

From all this it is clear that the **Foreign Relations** series in the 20th century has no longer fulfilled its original purpose as a medium for the release of current documents. As the series slid backward in time, its place was taken on the contemporary scene by press releases and by special publications on particular subjects on which the Department felt it necessary or desirable to give out documents. The press releases were reprinted in a weekly publication entitled **Press releases** beginning in 1929. In 1939 the title of this publication was changed to the **Department of State Bulletin**, and the scope was broadened to include not only documents, strictly speaking, but also statements, announcements, and articles which may contain information previously classified. The special documentary publications issued by the Department in the period since World War II (such as the so-called China White Paper) number several dozen, not counting the voluminous serial publications of treaties and other international acts, the digests of international law, and the multilateral publication of German documents. This is not the place to discuss any of these in detail, but it is worth noting that thousands of documents previously classified or closely held have been released in this fashion, far ahead of the **Foreign Relations** volumes.

Opening of Files to Access

The ultimate in openness is to let members of the public into the files, where they can see all the documents and copy any that interest them. If this "see for yourself" method has the advantage of high credibility, it also has the disadvantage of being a type of operation which generally can be used effectively only by graduate-level scholars and professional researchers. Documents published by the Department of State are available in all the major public and university libraries throughout the world; documents that are merely opened to access in Washington will actually reach the public only to the extent that nonofficial historians choose to reproduce or describe them in their books and articles.

One might think that opening the files (or "granting access" as we call it) would be the easiest and cheapest method of making documents available to the public, but this, too, requires some qualification. Before files can be opened, they must be declassified by decision of policy officers, and this can only be effected on the basis of some sort of examination of the documentation either paper by paper or by spot checking, or by bulk categories where these can be defined. The records thus declassified must be defined by chronology or subject; they must be brought together as much as possible and physically separated from files still classified. Finding aids (indexes) to the open records must be prepared or made accessible, and adequate accommodations for researchers must be provided, including trained personnel to service their requests.

While the publishing of documents on foreign affairs goes back to the 18th century, the opening of files to access by the public or even to eminent scholars is a comparatively recent method of making documents available. Many foreign offices still do not open their files to the public in any systematic manner, contenting themselves with letting in an occasional privileged scholar whom they regard as "reliable." This was in fact the practice followed in the 19th century by even the most democratic foreign offices, including the Department of State. And historians did not fail to complain about it. In the annual report of the American Historical Association for 1893 it was sourly noted that "historical papers in the State Department are not accessible to the historical student except as a special favor."[3]

By today's standards it would appear that Clio's disciples had something to complain about. It was not until 1901 that Congress passed a law providing that "facilities for study and research in the Government Departments shall be afforded to scientific investigators and duly qualified individuals, students, and graduates of institutions of learning under such rules as the heads of the Departments may prescribe."[4]

Apparently the Department of State began thereafter to admit scholars to the files in greater numbers, but only to documents of the pre-Civil War period, and even then under the proviso that the Department would review every researcher's notes or manuscript. In 1916 some notes were withheld on papers as much as 66 years old, and as late as 1920 the Department refused a researcher's request to see files of the war years—that is, the war of 1861–65.

Not until 1921 did the Department have a regulation providing for systematic access to records, and that access was still under careful control, cases being judged on an ad hoc basis. In 1927 the Department's eminent Historical Adviser, Tyler Dennett, stated that the files were open only up to 1898 although some subjects "might be pursued down to 1906."[5] Here was the beginning of a pattern which the Department followed for many years thereafter: (1) Records were "declassified" in bulk when they were about 30 years old, and those files were then opened to researchers. (2) There was a "restricted" period (five to ten years ahead of the "open" period) to which "bona fide" or "trustworthy" American scholars might be admitted subject to certain controls. (3) There was a "closed" period covering the most recent records. The establishment of the National Archives in 1936 did not alter this basic pattern, although it produced a sharper definition of the open period and provided much better facilities for taking care of both records and researchers.

It is no secret that in recent decades the administration of the restricted period caused increasing friction between the Department and the academic world. The determination as to which "scholars" were to be admitted provoked invidious distinctions. Those who were admitted frequently resented the censorship of their notes. After World War II a security investigation became a requirement for admission to the still-classified records of the restricted period, a requirement costly to the government and resented by most applicants for access. Accordingly, at the beginning of 1972 the Department decided to open, i.e., declassify, its records for the entire period of World War II, an action which in effect abolished the old restricted period, which at that point had included the years 1942–45. Later in 1972 the Department extended the open period to include 1946, after the last of the **Foreign Relations** volumes for 1946 had been published; and the regulations were changed to provide for just two periods, "open" and "restricted." Records of the new restricted period (1947 on) are closed to access by nonofficial researchers,[6] but copies of individual documents may be obtained by request, as will be explained later in this paper.

Until recent years there was never any apparent relationship between the publication of the **Foreign Relations** series and the opening of files to access. This was because the series, beginning in 1861 and for all the rest of the 19th century, was publishing documents at least 50 years ahead of the period to which access was granted. In the 20th century this gap began to narrow as the publication was allowed to lag while access was rapidly advanced. Even so, the published volumes have always been far ahead of the open period of the files, and indeed they were well ahead of even the restricted period until the end of World War II. Then for a brief period some private scholars were permitted into some of the wartime records before the publication of **Foreign Relations.** This aberration was made possible by the flood of documents on the war and its origins, released through memoirs, the Pearl Harbor hearings, etc., but the usefulness of this special access was limited by the fact that these historians were not permitted to cite many of the most important classified files that they were permitted to see. In the files of the postwar period a higher proportion of important records are classified, so that no access is really possible until after the subjects have been considered and the principal papers declassified for publication in **Foreign Relations.** To say that the series is holding back access is like saying that the tugboat up front is holding back the barge.

Release of Specific Documents by Request

With the Freedom of Information Act (effective July 4, 1967) there was provided a third mechanism whereby documents might be made available to the public; namely, by special request through a designated channel. Each department and agency was required to designate an official with whom members of the public might register their requests for copies of specific documents.[7] The act required that the documents be "identifiable" and provided that the department or agency might deny the request if the documents fell into any of nine exempted categories and that otherwise the requester must be provided with copies of what he wanted (subject to payment of a fee for research and copying). Among the nine possible exemptions the most important with respect to Department records was the one that made exemptible those "specifically required by Executive Order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy." The Department, however, has not taken any general refuge in this provision. Whenever the documents requested under the act have been identifiable and have turned out to be classified, the Department has seen to it that they have been reviewed by officers authorized to declassify them and that any negative answers to requesters would be reviewed by the Office of the Legal Adviser in the Department, as well as, more recently, by the Bureau of Public Affairs. The requester may also file an appeal with the Department's

Council on Classification Policy and/or with the Interagency Classification Review Committee, established by Executive Order 11652, signed by the President on March 8, 1972, which became effective on June 1, 1972.

This Executive order contains several other provisions designed to facilitate the operation of the Freedom of Information Act. It greatly reduced the number of officers authorized to classify documents, and it set up a general declassification schedule under which many Top Secret documents will be automatically declassified after ten years, Secret papers in eight years, Confidential ones in six years. The full effect of these measures will not be felt for some years, but obviously they will tend to reduce the number of classified documents and thus to improve the likelihood of larger returns to members of the public who ask for copies of documents.

The amount of documentation so far made available to the public by the State Department under Freedom of Information Act procedures is impressive—about 13,000 pages. Actually, an additional 10,000 pages were approved for release by the Department in response to requests, but the requesters, for one reason or another, failed to order their copies.

On the other hand some scholars and reporters have been bitterly disappointed with their meager returns under the act, and it appears from some of these cases that there has been a fundamental misunderstanding. The Freedom of Information Act was not designed primarily to meet the broad needs of scholars, and not even its most enthusiastic sponsors ever claimed that it would take the place of publication and access to files as mechanisms for the wholesale release of documents. The report on the bill to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Government Operations[8] makes it quite clear that the sponsors of the measure were thinking along more limited and practical lines, principally of how to help the citizen who had been adversely affected by some government ruling or decision and was unable to find out where or how to proceed with his complaint or inquiry. Nothing in the report suggests that the sponsors of the bill were aiming to release to scholars large quantities of highly classified documents on recent foreign policy and international relations. The fact of the matter is that the Freedom of Information Act procedure, in the experience of this Department, works rather well for what it was intended to do. It will also assist the occasional scholar who wants only documents that are individually identifiable on subjects relatively nonsensitive. Judging from the experience of recent years, I should say in all honesty that "grab bag" requests for documents by subjects or categories will generally not receive favorable action, and neither will requests for the highest level documents on the most sensitive international crises of recent years.

Some scholars have asked to see indexes or lists of documents in order that they might be better able to identify what they want. It is not feasible at present to produce such a listing, but this may become possible as the files of the Department are computerized. Looking ahead one can see the day when the Department will be able to issue periodic lists of documents unclassified and declassified from which anyone can pick his desired items and obtain copies with great speed. Thus the providing of copies by request may become in time a far more important method of releasing documents than it can be at present.

In the foregoing pages I have described the three ways of making government documents available to the public: by publication, by granting access to files, and by providing copies on request. Each of these methods has characteristics of its own, and all of them are necessary to meet the varying needs of different types of persons and problems. In recent years the Department has moved to improve and expedite every one of these mechanisms, all of which admittedly need from time to time a shot of "openness." We are continuing to work to improve still further. Only in this way can there be maintained a proper balance between the immediate need of the government in the interest of the public as a whole for confidentiality in some matters of national security and foreign affairs and the sometimes temporarily conflicting right of the individual citizen in a democracy to know what is going on.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See Harold Temperley and Lillian M. Penson, A Century of Diplomatic Blue Books, 1814–1914 (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1966).

[2] For an example of a question of clearance (declassification) that went to Roosevelt and Churchill for decision, see Foreign Relations of the United States, The Conferences at Washington and Quebec, 1943 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970), pp. 1334–35, 1338.

[3] American Historical Association, 1893 (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1894), p. 4. Background data for this portion of the article were supplied by Dr. Milton Gustafson, Chief of the Diplomatic Branch, National Archives, and Dr. Arthur G. Kogan of the Historical Office, Department of State.

[4] 31 Stat. 1039.

[5] Department of State files, June 1927, 116.2/4440.

[6] The Department's regulations provide for an exception: "Persons who previously occupied policymaking positions to which they were appointed by the President may be authorized access to classified information or material which they originated, reviewed, signed, or received while in public office." (5 FAM 946).

[7] The officer in the Department of State is Donald J. Simon, Chief of the Records Services Division.

[8] House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 2d session, Report No. 1497, May 9, 1966.

PUBLICATIONS BY MEMBERS OF SHAFR

Albert H. Bowman (U of Tennessee at Chattanooga), **The Struggle for Neutrality; Franco-American Diplomacy during the Federalist Era.** 1974. U of Tennessee Press. $13.50.

* * * * * *

Charles S. Campbell (Claremont Colleges), **From Revolution to Rapprochement: The United States and Great Britain, 1783–1900.** 1974. John Wiley and Sons. $4.50 pb. $8.50 cl.

* * * * * *

Daniel B. Carroll (Villanova), **Henri Mercier and the American Civil War.** 1971. Princeton U. Press. $12.50. Review in **American Historical Review,** April, 1974.

* * * * * *

Richard D. Challener (Princeton), **Admirals, Generals, and American Foreign Policy, 1898–1914.** 1973. Princeton U. Press. $16.00. Reviewed in **American Historical Review,** December, 1973.

* * * * * *

Robert A. Divine, **Foreign Policy and U. S. Presidential Elections.** 1974. New Viewpoints Press. Vol. I: **1940–1948,** Vol. II: **1952–1960.** Pb. $4.95 per volume.

* * * * * *

George C. Herring (U of Kentucky), **Aid to Russia, 1941–1946: Strategy, Diplomacy, the Origins of the Cold War.** 1973. Columbia U. Press. $15.00. Reviewed in **Journal of American History,** March, 1974.

* * * * * *

Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State U), ed., **Recent American Foreign Policy; Conflicting Interpretations.** Rev. ed., 1972. Dorsey Press. Pb. $5.75.

* * * * * *

Richard S. Kirkendall (Executive Secretary, OAH), ed., **The Truman Period as a Research Field; A Reappraisal, 1972.** 1974. U of Missouri Press. $10.00. Reviewed in April, 1974 issue of **History.**

* * * * * *

Ernest R. May (Harvard), **"Lessons" of the Past: The Use and Misuse of History in American Foreign Policy.** 1973. Oxford U. Press. Cloth. $6.95.

* * * * * *

Fran Merli (Queen's College, N. Y.) and Theodore A. Wilson (Kansas), eds., **Makers of American Diplomacy.** Vol. I: **Benjamin Franklin to Alfred Thayer Mahan.** Pb. $4.50. Vol. II: **Theodore Roosevelt to Henry Kissinger.** Pb. $4.95. 1974. Charles Scribner's Sons. Cloth. $15.00. Approximately two–thirds of the 25 authors are members of SHAFR.

* * * * * *

Thomas G. Paterson (U of Connecticut), **Soviet–American Confrontation: Postwar Reconstruction and the Origins of the Cold War.** 1974. Johns Hopkins Press. $12.00. Reviewed in **Perspective,** April, 1974.

* * * * * *

Joan Hoff Wilson (California State U at Sacramento), **Ideology and Economics: U. S. Relations with the Soviet Union, 1918–1933.** 1974, U of Missouri Press. $12.00. Reviewed in **Perspective**, April, 1974.

PERSONALS

David F. Trask (SUNY at Stony Brook) was recently named to the editorial board of the **Journal of American History.**

* * * * * * *

Hugh B. Hammett (formerly of Ithaca College, N. Y.) has been named associate professor and chairman of the Department of History and Political Science in the College of Continuing Education at the Rochester (N. Y.) Institute of Technology.

* * * * * * *

Philip W. Kennedy (U of Portland, Ore.) was elected to a two-year term (1974–76) as International Councillor for Phi Alpha Theta, national honor society in history, at the latter's convention in San Francisco, Dec., 1973.

* * * * * * *

Kenneth J. Hagan (U. S. Naval Academy) has been awarded two grants for the study of the U. S. Navy, 1845–1861: (a) National Endowment for the Humanities summer stipend, 1974; (b) Smithsonian Institution post-doctoral fellowship, spring semester, 1975.

* * * * * * *

Thomas G. Smith (graduate student, U of Connecticut) has received a grant from the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute in order that he may complete his study of the diplomatic career of Lewis W. Douglas, ambassador to Great Britain, 1947–50.

* * * * * * *

Bruce Kuklick (U of Pennsylvania) was recently named editor of the **American Quarterly.**

THE STUART L. BERNATH PRIZE COMPETITION FOR 1975

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations announces that the 1975 competition for the Stuart L. Bernath Prize upon a book dealing with any aspect of American foreign relations is now open. The purpose of the award is to recognize and to encourage distinguished research and writing by young scholars in the field of American foreign 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 1974. 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. Theodore A. Wilson, Chairman, Stuart L. Bernath Prize Committee, Department of History, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044. The volumes must be received not later than December 31, 1974.

AMOUNT OF AWARD: $500.00. If two (2) or more works are deemed winners, as in 1972 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 in April, 1975, at Boston, Mass.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The **Newsletter** is mailed on or about the fifteenth of March, June, and September, and on the first of December. Each issue is mailed fourth class (bulk rates), and, therefore, some delay should be expected in delivery. There seems to be no good reason, though, for the delay to extend beyond three weeks at the most——and that is allowing for all contingencies which we can contemplate. If, then, you do not receive your copy within the period indicated, and after you have carefully checked into the possibilities for misplacement in your local area, have no hesitation in writing to the editorial office and requesting a replacement.

* * * * * *

The membership of the Program Committee consists of Thomas G. Paterson, chairperson (University of Connecticut); Raymond O'Connor (University of Miami, Coral Gables); Warren Cohen (Michigan State University); Jerald A. Combs (San Francisco State University); and Frank Merli (Queens College, CUNY).

The Committee welcomes proposals for panels for possible joint sessions with the Organization of American Historians (April, 1975), Southern Historical Association (Fall, 1975), and the American Historical Association (December, 1975).

The Committee particularly invites proposals for the independent national SHAFR meeting scheduled for Washington, D.C., August 15–16, 1975.

All proposals for panels should follow these guidelines:

(1) The proposals should be sent to the chairperson **and** to each member of the Program Committee.

(2) Each proposal should be as complete as possible, with the following information: statement of purpose, title of panel topic, list of participants (including commentators and chairperson), and rationale.

(3) Please indicate for which meeting the panel is proposed.

(4) The Committee will assist members who have individual papers to present in reaching scholars having similar topics, but individuals should first attempt to make such contacts themselves in organizing complete panels.

(5) The Committee welcomes suggestions on its procedures and possible topics for future meetings.

* * * * * *

Dr. Richard H. Heindel (professor of international relations, Pennsylvania State U) has recently accepted the editorship of a new section, "International Affairs," in the journal **Intellect.** The journal is planning a new format and wishes to appeal to a wider intellectual audience. Professor Heindel invites interested individuals to write for copies of a guideline which he has devised for prospective articles.

* * * * * *

The **Roster and Research List** of SHAFR is revised and issued in a complete form in even years with supplements being done in the odd years. As a consequence, the editor of the **List**, Dr. Warren F. Kimball (Rutgers U, Newark), and his associate, Mary Jo Lemaldi, will be preparing this compilation for publication in a few months and they would like to have all relevant information from the membership as soon as feasible. All members, and especially those of some years standing, should, therefore, carefully review their current entries upon the **List** and make all changes that are necessary to bring them into conformity with present conditions. This **List** is a valuable one for all those who are working in the area of U. S. diplomatic history, and its thorough revision well deserves the active support of all members of SHAFR. (The form to be used in complying with this request will be found on page 30 of this issue of the **Newsletter**).

* * * * * *

The first independent national meeting ever of SHAFR is scheduled to be held at Georgetown U, Washington, D. C., during the middle of August in 1975. All national meetings of SHAFR have thus far been held in conjunction with the two older and much larger historical organizations, the AHA and the OAH. A separate national gathering will be a milestone in the independence of the Society, indicating an advanced degree of maturity. This meeting will, hopefully, become an annual event, but the materialization of this hope will depend greatly upon the reaction of the membership to this initial convention. All members of the Society should then "lay it upon their hearts" to include this convocation among their "musts" for 1975. The assemblage will be for two days with two full-length sessions each day. A couple of luncheons and one or two dinners are also contemplated, at each of which formal papers will be presented. Individuals who have ideas concerning the sessions, or who are willing to present papers, should contact the personnel of the Program Committee (listed in the second announcement above) at once.

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

(Please limit abstracts to a total of twelve (12) 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).

* * * * * *

Michael S. Blayney (Illinois State U, Normal, Ill.), "The View from Europe: Herbert C. Pell and the European Power Balance." Annual meeting of OAH, April, 1974. Herbert Claiborne Pell served as United States minister to Portugal from 1937 until 1941. Convinced that another world war was on its way, Pell provided President Franklin Delano Roosevelt with some of the most cogent diplomatic analysis of the decade. The United States, maintained Pell, could ignore Hitler's disruption of the European balance of power at its own risk. Because Pell couched most of his argument in the language of realism, and because from hindsight his predictions were proven correct, his thinking seems to be that of a classic realist. Beneath this seeming realism, however, were other nonrational, emotional forces at work. Chief among these were Pell's devotion to France and French civilization. Largely because of this Francophilia, Pell regarded France's traditional enemy, Germany, with an antipathy bordering on hatred. Pell's career would seem to suggest that realism in the art of diplomacy may be a rather elusive quality.

* * * * * *

Lester H. Brune (Bradley U), "The View from Washington: William E. Borah and Western Hemisphere Defense." Annual meeting of OAH, April, 1974. From the perspective of the early 1970's two aspects of isolationist beliefs during 1935–40 which appear clearer were their emphases on policies of nonintervention and on an air defense as the principal means of national defense. While avoiding intervention in either European or Far Eastern affairs, Borah and other isolationists desired an increase in aircraft production, thus giving the Air Corps the capability of protecting the Western Hemisphere as far west as Hawaii. These air defense plans coordinated well with the official Army Air Corps program proposed early in 1939. Isolationists accepted the Air Corps increase while opposing efforts to increase American naval forces which were considered to be aggressive force elements. Aerospace developments since 1940, permit consideration of nonintervention policies but have caused a specter to haunt national defense policies.

* * * * * *

Justus D. Doenecke (New College, Fla.), "Harry Elmer Barnes," **Wisconsin Magazine of History**, 56 (Summer, 1973), 311–323. The essay began with a description of Barnes' tremendous popularity in the 1920s and 1940s, then moved to his academic exile in the 1940s and 1950s. In an effort to show why Barnes was far more unpopular than such fellow-revisionists as William L. Neumann and William Henry Chamberlin, the paper went into (a) the extreme nature of the charges he made concerning Pearl Harbor, (b) his effort to promote David Leslie Hoggan, a historian who claimed that Hitler was innocent of starting World War II, and (c) his fostering of Paul Rassinier, who denied that the Germans ever had any death–camps. The essay concluded with Barnes' Cold War views and with explanations concerning his unorthodox behavior.

* * * * * *

Justus D. Doenecke (New College, Fla.), "The Making of a 'Seditionist': The **Realpolitik** of Lawrence Dennis." 7th Annual Duquesne History Forum, Pittsburgh, Nov., 1973. The writer described in detail Dennis' response to Axis policy as revealed in his newsletter, **The Weekly Foreign Letter.** In this publication, Dennis defended appeasement of Germany, attacked Britain and America as "decadent," and predicted Axis victory. Once Germany attacked Russia, Dennis soured on Germany's policy and called Stalin the only "realist" of the war. Doenecke compared Dennis to certain New Left historians—a point made earlier in his treatment of Dennis' Cold War views (**Wis. Mag. of Hist.**, Summer, 1972), and found Dennis a victim of his own faith in human rationality and a mechanized picture of human behavior.

* * * * * *

Justus D. Doenecke (New College, Fla.) "The Strange Career of American Isolationism, 1944–1954." Annual meeting of AHA, San Francisco, Dec., 1973. The paper began by describing the author's research sample, then went on to note the difficulty in defining the concept of "isolationism." The first major part of the paper noted how the isolationists—even before VJ day—were involved in efforts to discredit American entry into World War II, the wartime diplomatic conferences, and the new United Nations organization. The second part traced a healthy suspicion of presidential warmaking power, overcommitment of military forces, and indiscriminate foreign aid. The third part of the essay noted such "negative" postures as the Asia–First ideology, flirtation with General MacArthur, obsession with conspiracy, and the lack of a positive program. The author denied that one can separate the positive and negative parts of isolationist ideology and called upon historians to study the roots of isolationist estrangement. Careful scholarship, not heroes, are needed.

* * * * * *

Warren F. Kimball (Rutgers U, Newark), "The Churchill–Roosevelt Correspondence, 1939–1945." Annual meeting of AHA, San Francisco, Dec., 1973. The paper summarized the nature of the newly–opened Map Room collection of Churchill–Roosevelt correspondence at the FDR Library; emphasized the great importance of the recently–opened Foreign Office and Prime Minister's papers at the Public Record Office in London, England: and gave a number of examples of the new insights which are provided by the Churchill–Roosevelt materials. Kimball closed with a tentative thesis regarding the various stages through which the Churchill–Roosevelt relationship passed. He (Kimball) asserted, too, that Roosevelt maintained his policy of cooperating with the Soviet Union until his death.

Lester D. Langley (U of Georgia), "The United States and Panama, 1933–1941." Annual meeting of SHA, Atlanta, Nov., 1973. Taking Bryce Wood's analysis of the positive benefits of the Good Neighbor policy as a model, this paper traced the negotiations of the United States with Panama from 1933 to 1941 in two areas: modification of the Hay–Bunau–Varilla treaty and discussions for defense sites. The 1936 treaty with Panama, negotiated by Sumner Welles and Ricardo Alfaro, substantially improved Panama's economic benefits from the canal and made Panama jointly responsible for canal defense. The defense sites negotiations later proved more troublesome, principally because of War Department requests and the difficulties of dealing with the nationalistic Panamanian president, Arnulfo Arias.

* * * * * *

Jamie W. Moore (The Citadel), "Isolation and Neurality; 'Calculated' Responses to the External Order." Annual meeting of SHA at Atlanta, Nov., 1973. This paper evaluated American diplomacy for the years 1933–1936 in light of paradigms of the decision–making process. The major conclusions were: that Far Eastern policy approximates Allison's model of the nationstate as rational actor, that European policy can best be discussed in terms of bureaucratic output, and that the process of political bargaining resolved or hid away foreign policy problems which were holdovers from the previous decade. As a result, by 1936, the United States had settled upon a diplomacy based upon isolation from foreign quarrels which did not involve a vital American interest. This diplomacy was characterized by a selective neutrality which was also its nominal aspect. Scholars have long argued that this policy resulted from a strong domestic consensus. But exploring the conceptual linkage between the internal and external environments in the light of a model leads one to the conclusion that this policy was the only one compatible with both the international order and the domestic climate. This made it preferable to the available alternatives.

* * * * * *

Noel H. Pugach (U of New Mexico), "American Friendship for China and Stability in the Far East: the Shantung Question at the Washington Conference, 1921–22". Annual meeting of AHA, San Francisco, Dec., 1973. Historians of Sino–American relations have correctly pointed to the disparity between American professions and action in China. Nevertheless, American friendship did play an important role in bringing about a more favorable settlement for China of the Shantung Question at the Washington Conference than was generally expected or thought possible under the prevailing circumstances. Secretary of State Charles E. Hughes thought at first that Japan should receive a share in the Shantung Railway. In the end, however, Japan made most of the compromises. That was partly due to Japan's desire to improve its relations with the United States, as well as the persistence of the Chinese delegation in maintaining China's claims. But the friends of China in the State Department, especially E. T. Williams and Stanley Hornbeck, made their influence felt by convincing Hughes of the centrality of the railway issue and the necessity of returning it to China.

* * * * * *

Noel H. Pugach (U of New Mexico), "Embarrassed Monarchist: Frank J. Goodnow and Constitutional Development in China, 1913–1915."

Pacific Historical Review. 1973. 42 (4), 499–517. The monarchical clique surrounding Yuan Shih–K'ai deliberately used Frank J. Goodnow, the American Constitutional Adviser to the Chinese Government, to forward their plans to raise Yuan to the Imperial Throne in 1915. However, the thrust of Goodnow's controversial memorandum of 1915, advising the reversion to a monarchy under certain stipulated conditions, represented his true position. A review of Goodnow's recommendations as Constitutional Adviser in 1913–1914 indicates clearly that he favored a highly centralized government for China and a powerful chief executive in order to prevent chaos and pave the way for China's orderly development. Moreover, he had long wished to influence the course of political development in China, rather than doing mere window–dressing like the other foreign advisers in Peking.

* * * * * *

Barry Rigby (graduate student, Duke U), "Private Interests and the Origins of American Involvement in Samoa, 1872–1877." **Journal of Pacific History.** 8 (1973), 75–87. American involvement in Samoa in the 1870s stemmed from the activities of private interests, in particular a San Francisco––based land company which encouraged Commander Richard W. Meade to secure a foothold at Pago Pago in 1872. The two missions of Albert B. Steinberger as a special agent of the State Department in 1873 and 1875 were probably intended to consolidate an informal type of control over Samoan affairs. The most interesting facet of this episode was the role of Orville E. Babcock, private secretary to President Grant and negotiator of the 1869 Santo Domingo annexation treaty, in the sending of Steinberger to Samoa. The article is based on a wide range of primary sources in U.S., British and Samoan archives.

* * * * * *

James E. Sargent (Clemson U), "Franklin D. Roosevelt and Foreign Policy, 1933–1936: The Domestic–First Perspective." Annual meeting of SHA, Atlanta, Nov., 1973. This paper argued that two of the major influences in Roosevelt's making of major foreign policies during his first administration were his domestic–first perspective and his often casual or disorderly thinking. The domestic–first perspective meant to FDR that in case of a conflict––particularly a congressional conflict––between domestic and foreign policies, the domestic policy always received top priority. The president's thinking was critiqued by friendly contemporaries and favorable historians, like Rexford G. Tugwell, Adolf A. Berle, and Kenneth S. Davis. The thesis was illustrated by an analysis of Roosevelt's handling of the World Economic Conference, the St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty, the World Court Protocols, and the arms embargo–neutrality legislation.

* * * * * *

Joseph M. Siracusa, (University of Queensland, Australia), "Origin of the Cold War: The View from the New Left." **World Review,** 12 (Oct., 1973). Though dismissing as simplistic the revisionist model of explanation that made United States foreign policy an almost exclusive function of the nation's political economy, the history academy on balance found the New Left significant to the extent that it compelled a reassessment of past interpretations and a reexamination of historical source materials. Moreover, a number of traditional historians, who in every case tended to deny the New Left metaphysics, increasingly con–

ceded that radical scholarship had proved beyond question the self-interested nature of American diplomacy, a fact that perhaps the moral superiority of earlier writers had prevented them from admitting. From another level of analysis, the New Left's replacement of the former historicizing question **Wie es eigentlich gewesen?** (How it actually was?) with the question **Wie es dazu kommen konnte?** (How was it possible for it to come about?) uniquely filled the intellectual needs and requirements of a public disgusted with the Viet Nam War and suspicious of the current arbitrary use of executive power. In this sense the New Left diplomatic historiography of the 1960's both reinforced and reflected the American climate of opinion. To what extent New Left scholarship will impress public opinion in the 1970's remains to be seen.

* * * * * *

Geoffrey S. Smith (Queen's U, Ontario), "The Navy before Darwinism: Science, Exploration, and Diplomacy, 1838–1854." Annual meeting of AHA, San Francisco, Dec., 1973. The paper assessed varied implications of naval exploration, from the Charles Wilkes expedition (1838–1842) through the epochal voyage to Japan of Matthew C. Perry. The paper stressed the interrelatedness of scientific and commercial considerations during this formative period in naval diplomacy. Attention was also directed to the relationship between nascent navalism and important domestic developments, most notably continental expansion. The paper demonstrated the existence of a global **Weltanschauung** among naval officers, a view that was distinct in several ways from the continental version of Manifest Destiny. In keeping with the title, the essay suggested that a concern for genuine scientific advancement (highlighted by the tenure at the Naval Observatory of Matthew Fontaine Maury) comprised an integral component of naval exploration. This point allows the historian both to compare and contrast antebellum naval diplomacy with the vogue of Social Darwinism that accompanied the emergence of the "new" navy of the late nineteenth century.

* * * * * *

Ronald Spector (Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army), "Getting Down to the Nitty Gritty: Official History, and the American Experience in Vietnam." **Military Affairs.** 1974. 38 (1). In Vietnam events on the battlefield, although not in themselves very decisive, did have a decisive effort on public opinion and, ultimately, on American foreign policy. Witness the TET offensive of 1968. Official military history, although it faces special problems can still play a useful role in our understanding of these events.

* * * * * *

Ronald Spector (Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army), "The Naval War College and 'America's Outward Thrust,' 1883–1898." Annual meeting of AHA, San Francisco, Dec., 1973. This paper suggested that it was time for historians to cease to view the naval history of the United States of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as merely the precursor to the triumphs of World War II or the tragedies of the Vietnam era, and to begin to see it in the context of its own time.

This paper attempted to describe briefly the ideas about war and its conduct which were held by pre–World War I officers as the re–

sult of an examination of their writings, and a perusal of the plans and studies of the Naval War College, the Office of Naval Intelligence, and the General Board. It contended that the military of that era were more bellicose in rhetoric but more conservative in strategic thinking than their present day counterparts.

* * * * * *

J. K. Sweeney (South Dakota State U), "The Portuguese Wolfram Embargo; a Case Study in Economic Warfare." **Military Affairs.** 1974. 38 (1), 23–26. The story of economic warfare in Portugal during World War II was largely one of conflict—conflict between belligerents over the neutral production of critical items, and conflict between "allies" over strategic goals and tactical developments. In the latter case the struggle involved items so fundamental to the conduct of the war that the alliance was several times on the verge of splintering. But for the fact that Portugal was essentially a side show, albeit an important one, the history of the Anglo–American connection during the war in Europe might have been drastically different.

* * * * * *

Richard W. Turk (Allegheny College, Pa.), "Defending the 'New Empire': Strategy and Foreign Policy in the Caribbean, 1900–1917." Annual meeting of AHA, San Francisco, Dec., 1973. This paper suggested that the search for security in the Caribbean stemmed from a Social Darwinist–inspired fear of German aggression which was shared by civilian and military authorities of three administrations. Strategic defensive considerations, rather than economic expansion or a desire to extend the American **imperium**, governed American foreign policy in the Caribbean during the period under review. Rival German and American war plans both assumed that the Caribbean would be the scene of operations. The U. S. Navy exerted influence on foreign policy in two ways: first, efforts to acquire coaling stations inevitably focused civilian attentions on certain strategic locations; second, naval participation in such events as the Panama revolution and the Dominican customs receivership permitted officers to familiarize themselves with conditions in the Caribbean, and often led to interchanges of information and views with their diplomatic counterparts. During the Roosevelt years, naval and civilian policy–makers appeared to share similar views regarding American interests in the Caribbean. Under Taft and Wilson, the State Department became far more willing to intervene. The Navy, perforce, became an instrument of intervention. The outbreak of World War I brought the Caribbean policy of the Navy and State Departments into harmony once more.

By–Laws of SHAFR

Article I: Membership

Section 1: Any person interested in furthering the objects of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations as set forth in the Certificate of Incorporation shall become a member upon submitting an acceptable application and paying the dues herein provided.

Section 2: The following are the classes of membership in the Society: Regular, Student, Life, and Institutional. The specific qualifications of each class of membership shall be established by the Council.

Section 3: Annual dues for Regular, Student and Institutional member shall be established by the Council.

Section 4: (a) All members in good standing, except institutional members, shall have the right to attend, participate in, and vote in all of the Society's meetings and to vote in its elections. Each member shall be supplied without additional charge one copy of each issue of the **Newsletter** while he is a member, shall receive a copy of the By–Laws, and shall have such other privileges as may be prescribed by the Council. (b) Membership in good standing is defined as paid membership certified by the Executive Secretary–Treasurer at least thirty days before participating in an election or in the Annual Membership Meeting except that the ballot for the annual election shall not carry the name of any member whose current membership was not paid by July 1.

Section 5: Any member whose dues become six months in arrears shall be automatically suspended.

Section 6: Dues are payable in advance of the first day of each year. New membership shall become effective at the beginning of the calendar year in which application is received and dues are paid, or at the applicant's discretion, at the beginning of the following year.

Article II:
Officers, Elections, and Terms of Office

Section 1: The officers of the Society shall consist of a President, a Vice–President, and an Executive Secretary–Treasurer.

Section 2: The President and Vice–President shall be elected for terms of one year each, beginning on January 1. The Vice–President shall be an automatic nominee for the office of President the following year, although contesting nominees may be offered in accordance with provisions of the By–Laws.

Section 3: The Executive Secretary–Treasurer shall be appointed by the Council to serve at the pleasure of the Council.

Section 4: In the event of the death, resignation or disability of the President, the last to be determined by a majority vote of the Council, the Vice–President shall succeed to the Presidency until the following January 1. Since the office of Vice–President will then be vacant, the Council by majority vote may designate one of its own members to act as chairman of meetings in the President's absence. A Vice–President who suceeds to the Presidency under the provisions of this section shall still be an automatic nominee for the next year's Presidency. If the Presidency, while filled by the elected Vice–President under the terms of this section, shall again become vacant, the Council, by majority vote, shall designate a President ad interim to act until the office is filled by an annual election.

Section 5: (a) Elections shall be held annually by mail ballot. The candidate for each office who receives the highest number of votes is elected. When more than two nominees are slated for a particular office, a run–off election will be held between the candidates with the two highest vote totals.
(b) The Nominating Committee shall present the name of the outgoing Vice–President as an automatic nominee for the office of President.
(c) The Nominating Committee shall also present a slate of two candidates for each of the following offices: Vice–President; member of the Council, and member of the Nominating Committee.
(d) Additional nominees for any office shall be placed on the ballot when proposed by petition signed by twenty–five members in good standing; but such additional nominations, to be placed on the ballot must reach the Chairman of the Nominating Committee by October 10.
(e) The Chairman of the Nominating Committee shall certify the names to be placed on the ballot to the Executive Secretary–Treasurer by October 20. The Executive Secretary–Treasurer shall mail the completed election ballot to the membership not later than November 1 for return to him by December 1. The elections results, certified by the Nominating Committee, shall be announced at the Annual Membership Meeting.

Article III:
Powers and Duties

Section 1: The President shall supervise the work of all committees, formulate policies for presentation to the Council, and execute its decisions. He shall appoint the members of the Membership and Program Committees and of special committees, commissions, and boards, subject to the approval of the Council. He shall sign all documents requiring official certification. The President shall be ex officio a member of the Council and shall preside at all Membership and Council meetings at which he is present. A retiring President shall retain membership on the Council for three years after the expiration of his term of office as President.

Section 2: The Vice–President shall preside at Membership and Council meetings in the absence of the President and shall perform other duties as assigned by the Council. The Vice–President shall be ex officio a member of the Council.

Section 3: The Executive Secretary–Treasurer shall have charge of all Society correspondence, and shall give notice of all Membership and Council meetings. He shall keep accurate minutes of all such meetings, using recording devices when deemed necessary. He shall keep an accurate and up–to–date roll of the members of the Society in good standing and shall issue a notification of membership and copies of the Certificate of Incorporation and the By–Laws to each new member. He shall submit all mail ballots to the membership and shall tabulate the results. He shall retain those ballots, for possible inspection, for a period of one month. He shall give instructions of the Council to the new members of committees when necessary. Under the direction of the Council, he shall manage all funds and securities in the name of the Society. He shall submit bills for dues to the members and deliver an itemized financial report annually to the membership. He shall have custody of all records and documents pertaining to the Society and be responsible for their preservation, and shall prepare an annual budget for approval by the Council. The Executive Secretary–Treasurer's accounts shall be audited annually by a Certified Public Accountant designated by the Council. The Executive Secretary–Treasurer shall be ex officio a member of the Council, but without vote.

Article IV: The Council

Section 1: The Council of the Society shall consist of (a) those officers or former officers of the Society who, in accordance with Article III of the By–Laws, serve ex officio as members of the Council and (b) four members elected by the members of the Society. The new Council shall absorb the existing Board of Managers, permitting the four members of the Board elected for staggered terms to complete those terms. All future elective members of the Council shall be elected for four years. In the event of a vacancy on the Council caused by death or resignation, the vacancy shall be filled at the next annual election.

Section 2: The Council shall have power to employ and pay necessary staff members; to accept and oversee funds donated to the Society for any of the objects of the Society stated in the Certificate of Incorporation; to appoint the Executive Secretary–Treasurer; to arrange for meetings of the Society; to create, in addition to committees named in the By–Laws, as many standing or ad hoc committees as it deems necessary to fulfill its responsibilities; and to transact other business normally assigned to such a body.

Section 3: The Council may reach decisions either at meetings or through correspondence filed with the Executive Secretary–Treasurer, provided that such decisions have the concurrence of 2/3 of the voting members of the Council.

Article V: Committees

Section 1: The Nominating Committee shall consist of three members in good standing who hold no other office in the Society and shall be elected for a term of three years, except that members of the first Nominating Committee shall be appointed by the President to terms of one, two, and three years, respectively. The Chairmanship shall be held by the member with the longest years of service, except that when two or more members have equal length of service the President shall designate which of them shall serve as Chairman. If a post on the Nominating Committee becomes vacant through death, resignation, or ineligibility through acceptance of an office in the Society, the President shall appoint a member to fill the post until the next annual election, when a replacement shall be chosen for the unexpired term.

Section 2: The Membership Committee shall consist of members in good standing, appointed by the President for a term of three years; except that for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a regular rotation of membership on the Committee the President may, as appropriate, appoint members for a term shorter than three years. The Chairmanship shall be held by the Committee member with the longest years of service; except that when two or more members of the Committee have equal seniority the President shall determine which of them shall serve as Chairman.

Section 3: The Program Committee shall consist of members in good standing, who hold no other office in the Society, appointed by the President for a term of three years; except that for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a regular rotation of membership on the Committee the President may as appropriate, appoint members for a term shorter than three years. The Chairmanship shall be held by the Committee member with the longest years of service; except that when two or more members of the Committee have equal seniority the President shall determine which of them shall serve as Chairman.

Article VI: Amendment

Section 1: Amendments to the By-Laws may be proposed by twenty-five members in good standing or by any member of the Council.

Section 2: Once proposed, amendments must be approved by a majority vote of Council and a concurring majority vote of those participating in a mail ballot.

Article VII: Meeting

Section 1: There shall be an Annual Membership Meeting open to all members of the Society in good standing. The Council shall set and publish the tentative date and place of the Annual Membership Meeting one year in advance of that meeting. Notice of the final time, place, and agenda of the Annual Membership Meeting shall be mailed by the Executive Secretary-Treasurer to each member of the Society at least fifty days prior to that meeting.

Section 2: Resolutions tentatively approved at the Annual Membership Meeting shall be submitted by the Executive Secretary-Treasurer directly to the full membership of the Society by mail ballot for final approval.

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

Box 5146
TENNESSEE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

BLK. RT.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Cookeville, Tenn.
PERMIT NO. 101