

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

NEWSLETTER

Volume 21

No. 2

June 1990

Page

- 1 Bill Williams: A Memoir *by Lloyd Gardner*
- 3 The Reluctant Historian: Researching United States-
Brazilian Relations in Rio de Janeiro *by W.
Michael Weis*
- 9 From Diplomatic History to Foreign Relations:
Teaching United States Foreign Policy *by Arlene
Lazarowitz*
- 20 Research Note: William Jennings Bryan's 1916 Plan
for a World Peace Structure *by Kendrick A.
Clements*
- 27 Report On the Foreign Policy Workshop at the
E.A.A.S. *by Serge Ricard*
- 29 Minutes of SHAFR Council Meeting, Warren Cohen
Letter, and Bradford Perkins' Report
- 41 Abstracts
- 44 Publications
- 46 Announcements
- 51 Personals
- 54 Calendar
- 56 Awards and Prizes
- 64 A.E.A.R. Newsletter
- 64 Evaluation of Conference on "Sino-
American Relations Since 1900" *by
Priscilla Roberts*

ISSN 0740-6169

SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

FOUNDED IN 1967. CHARTERED IN 1972.

PRESIDENT: Michael Hunt, History, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514.

VICE PRESIDENT: Gary Hess, History, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403.

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

CO-CHAIR, PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Wayne Cole, University of Maryland and Mark Gilderhus, Colorado State University.

CHAIR, MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE: Ralph E. Weber, History, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI 53233.

CHAIR, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Arnold Offner, History, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215

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

MEMBERSHIP: Annual dues are \$20.00, payable at the office of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer. Student fees—\$7.00, retired members—\$9.00, life memberships—\$250.00. In the case of membership by husband and wife, dues for one of them shall be one-half of the regular price. For those wishing only the *SHAFR Newsletter* the cost is \$10.00. Institutions wishing *Diplomatic History* should contact Scholarly Resources.

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

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

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

BILL WILLIAMS: A MEMOIR

It's funny what sticks out—about Bill at Madison. I've read lots of obits now. And I have a couple to write. But in none do I see him again slowly twirling the cigars he fancied, deeply inhaling (though he pretended he didn't), waiting for the thoughts to get in line. And then....

Bill was pretty good at building suspense. He was even better at squints and raised eyebrows. He had all the techniques down. He could teach with a lot of body English. What was it Henry Adams said about his brother, Brooks? Brooks always treated serious things with amused skepticism, and frivolous things with real earnestness. Something like that, anyway. Several nights—long after the Madison years—Bill tried hard to teach me how to space out shots of Jack Daniels so that the alcohol just matched the metabolism: and (he promised) you never got tired.

Bill's first advice to me, however, (given with the raised eyebrows and puckish smile) was: if you're going to write radical history, be good. Easy said. But we all felt there had to be something more. Frankly, Madison was pretty tired when the bunch of us arrived in the late '50s. The "greats" were still there. But they had had their say. And we had moments of doubt about staying—moments only, but we talked of cabbages and kings every once in a while. Walt thought about becoming a novelist. Tom talked a lot about jazz and Arthur Vandenberg. I was stranded somewhere between Henry James and T.S. Eliot.

We knew about William Appleman Williams, barely. All that he had published at that point was *American-Russian Relations, 1781-1947*. And then UW hired him. (Better put, Fred Harrington summoned him.) The first thing was his office: posters were not yet a history professor's "thing." Bill had big cartoons as well. And he also had the complete Foreign Relations series on one wall. Lots of the books, however, were about strange things for a historian: sociology, economics, anthropology. In brief, there was color and dimension.

We were first year TA's. We had had Harrington's seminar, but nothing prepared you for WAW's lectures—nothing. Moreover, Bill liked to digress. He would announce an intention to discuss the three most important features of "X" and never get beyond two (or maybe one and a half, because two often had two parts, and one part of two often had two parts, and...). Students asked us: What was three? We had no idea. And that was especially embarrassing before undergraduates.

Early on, therefore, we made a decision: Bill and his wife would have to come to dinner so that we could "decode" (not, Heaven help us, "deconstruct") William Appleman Williams. Even more than today, although the pull is still there, the New Deal was enshrined in the academy as the proper ending point (in both senses) of contemporary history. "What else was FDR to do?" we challenged. That was not the right question, cigar a-twirling, voice quietening. The question was why FDR faced the choice he did, or thought he did. And so it went. Corporations, the marketplace, worldview, Marx, Dilthey, visions of John Quincy Adams and William H. Seward, Arthur C. Clarke, and, the New York Yankees as self-conscious members of an elite. We had a private screening, as it were, of *The Contours of American History*.

But it took us weeks to sort out what had happened that evening in Walt's apartment over a student eatery. Some of the time we were on the phone, much more in the library looking at "new" books, and debating at earnest sessions over coffee in Renebohm's drugstore. We had a feeling that the field was never going to be the same. And life was never going to be the same either.

Lloyd Gardner
(Rutgers University)

THE RELUCTANT HISTORIAN: RESEARCHING UNITED STATES-BRAZILIAN RELATIONS IN RIO DE JANEIRO

by
W. Michael Weis
(Illinois Wesleyan University)

(with apologies to Anne Tyler, author, and Lawrence Kasdan, director of *The Accidental Tourist* for their idea.)

Historians of American foreign relations are becoming increasingly aware of the necessity of overseas research, that without extensive foreign archival work their efforts tend to be incomplete and ethnocentric. Thankfully, the day when one can write a booklength study of a bilateral relationship without consulting foreign archives appears to be ending. However reluctantly, American foreign relations historians are acquiring passports and travelling to archives, often alien and bewildering foreign archives. This essay attempts to assist historians researching Brazilian-American relations in Brazil. During the 1985-6 academic year I had a Fulbright-Hays Fellowship for dissertation research. I had the opportunity to return in the summer of 1989 with the help of grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Historical Association, and Illinois Wesleyan University.

Americans accustomed to working in Presidential Libraries, the National Archives, and the Library of Congress will find research conditions in Brazil both agonizing and refreshing and hopefully rewarding. In fact, there are some distinct advantages to working in Brazil. Not only does one get a Brazilian view of the relationship, but also one gets the opportunity to stay in one of the world's greatest cities—Rio de Janeiro. Although no longer the political capital, Rio is still Brazil's cultural center. Moreover, for pre-1960 topics, Rio is virtually the only city one has to visit, although trips to Sao Paulo and Brasilia can be useful. Unfortunately, for post-1960 topics, trips to Brasilia and Sao Paulo are essential.

Rio is an enchanting city that is very easy to get around and is exciting after hours. Despite a recent upsurge in crime caused by the economic crisis and the growing despair of the population, Rio is not really more dangerous than any large North American city. As in the U.S., one must use common sense and avoid dangerous situations. Rio's Metro subway system is cheap, efficient, fast, and safe and taxis are also fairly cheap. Although most tourists stay in the more fashionable districts of Copacabana, Ipanema, Leblon, and Sao Conrado, it may be more practical for a researcher to stay in Flamengo or Botafogo. These areas have affordable hotels and apartments and are still safe, yet close to Rio's various libraries and archives. Because the inflation rate has been chronically high, do not buy a large amount of *cruzados* in the U.S.—bring plenty of traveller's checks. Those planning extensive stays will learn how to use the black market for currency exchange, but the short-term visitor can receive a decent rate from the banks at the tourist rate.

There are an extraordinary number of research facilities in Rio, as well as many personal collections, and for post-World War II scholars several former policymakers, who are usually willing to be interviewed. A partial list of some of the most prominent facilities is attached. Three of the most important are the Center for Research and Documentation of Contemporary History at the Fundacao Getulio Vargas, the Arquivo Nacional and the Biblioteca Nacional.

The National Library is on Avenida Rio Branco, only two blocks from the U.S. Consulate. It has an excellent collection of books, journals, newspapers and magazines and an excellent staff. Microfilming is very inexpensive and fairly rapid. The Biblioteca also has a decent archive with the papers of several prominent foreign policy officials.

Located downtown in the old Federal Mint building, the Arquivo Nacional houses most of the useful pre-1930 documents, including virtually all of the documents from the colonial and imperial eras (1500-1889). The national archives also has the important *Presidencia da Republica*, with many executive agencies. In addition, the Arquivo Nacional also contains the private papers of certain important policymakers and non-governmental organizations. Xeroxing is

inexpensive and the staff is very helpful, although unfortunately the archives are extremely disorganized since being moved five years ago. Still, the Arquivo is an invaluable source to scholars in the pre-1930 period.

Of greater importance to post-1930 historians is the FGV/CPDOC. CPDOC has the private papers of most of the important policymakers in the 1940-64 period, and some of the prominent people in the dictatorship as well. CPDOC also has a fantastic oral history interview collection with more than ninety interviews conducted. CPDOC also has extensive documents from U.S. Presidential Libraries (every president from Franklin Roosevelt to Lyndon Johnson) and the U.S. Department of State. The U.S. collections are not exhaustive and should not be used to the exclusion of a trip within the United States, but they are useful to North Americans.

One should begin immediately by making an application for access to the archives at the Brazilian Foreign Ministry (Itamaraty). Over the years several North Americans, particularly those that study the 1889-1945 period, have used the archive and a few have received access for post-1945 topics. Yet Itamaraty is perhaps the biggest obstacle to researching Brazilian-American relations. Presently, there is no set rule or policy determining access to documents. Access to Itamaraty requires special permission with each request reviewed individually—often a cumbersome and capricious process. For example, someone may be denied access to documents that another already has used and that a third historian may later be granted. This is particularly true with post-World War II topics, where some issues still are controversial. The access problem is not only due to a lack of a clearly defined policy, such as a thirty-year wait, but also the continuing legacy of the patrimonial *clientelismo*, or the prestige of one's contacts. It is advisable to define a topic as narrowly and non-controversially as possible.

Fortunately, Brazil is reviewing the current policy of judging each case separately. Last year, Sergio Bath became the chief of the Commission to Revise the Historical Archive of Itamaraty. Sr. Bath has talked to several historians and has reviewed other national policies, and Brazil may soon adopt

something similar to the policies judging the confidentiality of documents in place in the United States.

There are other problems researching in Rio de Janeiro. Brazil is at least as bureaucratized as the United States. One cannot bring laptop computers, scanners, or even an electric typewriter without a government permit. One must apply to bring such equipment when he applies for his visa. Another and more stereotypical problem is that Brazilians are generally much more relaxed and slower paced than North Americans; breaks are longer, holidays more frequent. Thus, one should plan on activities taking longer than in the States and plan on occasional delays by bringing something to read. Compounding the time problem is the fact that with the exception of a few outstanding archives, most notably CPDOC at the Fundacao Getulio Vargas, Brazilian archives tend to be poorly organized, understaffed, and underfunded. Yet Brazilian archivists generally are extraordinarily helpful and often willing to spend considerable time and effort to find documents, which partially offset problems in organization.

A more important problem concerns the lack of documentation for some topics. With the move of the capital from Rio de Janeiro to Brasilia in 1960 and the 1964 military coup and subsequent dictatorship, many records (including personal papers of presidents Juscelino Kubitschek, Janio Quadros and Joao Goulart) from the late 1950s and early 1960s have been seized, misplaced, or destroyed. Although there are many little archives in Brazil, many personal papers remain in private hands and thus are difficult to track down and use. Also, paper in Brazil tends to disintegrate rapidly, making some relatively recent documents difficult to decipher.

Despite the inconvenience and occasional disorganization, researching in Rio is a great joy and an experience that everyone should have. Should anyone desire more information about living conditions in Rio, contact me at the Department of History, Illionis Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Illinois 61702.

**LIBRARIES AND ARCHIVES IN RIO DE JANEIRO WITH
MATERIALS FOR THE HISTORIAN OF UNITED STATES-
BRAZILIAN RELATIONS AND BRAZILIAN FOREIGN
POLICY**

Arquivo Historico do Itamaraty. The Foreign Ministry is an invaluable source for the 1889-1945 period. Diplomatic records after 1961 are located in Brasilia. (Centro)

Arquivo Nacional. See below. (Centro)

Biblioteca Nacional. In addition to an excellent collection the Library has a large archive with prominent foreign policy officials. (Centro)

Clube Militar

Escola Superior de Guerra. (Urca)

Fundacao Getulio Vargas. (CPDOC) See below. (Botafogo)

Instituto Historico e Geografico Brasileiro. (Centro)

Jornal do Brasil. (Centro)

SELECTED RECORDS IN THE ARQUIVO NACIONAL

Presidencia da Republica (since 1889)

National Economic Council, 1934-67

National Petroleum Council, 1938-65

Estado Maior das Forcas Armadas, 1956-68

Secretary of the President, 1921-66

Finance Ministry, 1807-1959

War Ministry, 1776-1959

Industry and Commerce, 1808-1929

Navy, 1941-68

Foreign Relations, 1808-89

Council of State, 1842-89

P.A. de Goes Monteiro Papers

F.C. San Tiago Dantas Papers

Institute of Research and Social Studies (IPES)

SELECTED RECORDS AT FGV/CPDOC

A. Private Papers

Getulio Vargas	Oswaldo Aranha
Jose Cafe Filho	Clemente Mariani
Ernani do Amaral Peixoto	Eugenio Gudin
Hermes Lima	Negrao de Lima
Juraci Magalhaes	Jose Maria Whitaker
Cordeiro de Farias	Vasco Leitao de Cunha

B. Oral Histories

Alzira Vargas	Cleantho Leite
Juscelino Kubitschek	Renato Archer
Vicente Rao	Tancredo Neves
Henrique Teixeira Lott	Casemiro Ribeiro
Osvaldo Trigueiro	Franciso Juliao

BONERS

"Kennedy wanted to combine technology, reform, and troops all together to get 'flexible response.' He introduced the Green beray and mixed them with regular troops. He felt that 'if we have to fight the gorillas, we have to adapt the techniques of the gorillas.'"

"The Americans did not like what they saw. Daiem's sister-in-law 'Dragon Lady' promoted the burning of Buddust and was vary races about all religion especially the monkeys."

FROM DIPLOMATIC HISTORY TO FOREIGN RELATIONS: TEACHING UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

by

Arlene Lazarowitz

(California State University, Long Beach)

In the years since historians of United States foreign policy took one another to task for the discipline's narrow perspective, the field has burgeoned with new approaches and questions.¹ The foreign policy field of the present bears little resemblance to the diplomatic history of decades ago. Relations between states, power politics, perceived security interests, the actions of presidents and their chief advisors, and the crisis-event remain integral parts of teaching foreign policy, but the conventional narrative approach of diplomatic events and communications is no longer adequate. Concentrating on inter-governmental activities and the role of the elite, although crucial, does not provide a comprehensive account for students. The old debate of realism versus idealism has given rise to new questions about the shaping of foreign policy, the impact of events over time, connections between seemingly separate events, and the nature of international relations. the teaching of foreign policy must incorporate a global perspective, crisis and non-crisis situations, as well as the actions of the state, which are influenced by domestic politics, bureaucratic rivalry and decision-making, economics, ideology, race, notions of American exceptionalism and mission, the role of special interest groups, and public opinion. My intention in this article is to demonstrate some ways of integrating these ideas into classroom teaching. Although much attention in foreign policy classes is given to the twentieth century, the historical perspective and roots are lost unless a sizable portion of the course is allotted to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Foreign policy history textbooks center on United States policy making, but students need to be informed of the

international background. How do pressures, images, and perceptions in other nations mold policy making? Few instructors would leave out the European and Asian setting that was the prelude to World War II, or the history of Soviet-American relations as background to the Cold War, but other events also require background information. Policies in American-East Asian relations were often made on the basis of considerations tangential to the Pacific, and mutual images were formed with little basis in fact.² Both the Mexican-American War and the Civil War were part of the broader context of United States relations with Europe. Panamanian nationalism preceded Theodore Roosevelt's interest in an isthmian canal, and events in Guatemala that precipitated American intervention in 1954 were as much a part of Guatemala's historical legacy as they were of the Cold War.³ To understand the strained relations with India at the height of the Cold War, students need to be given sufficient information to understand the nonaligned movement, India's resistance to American-style capitalism, and India's friction with Pakistan, which was unconnected to the Cold War. The conflict between Vietnamese culture and a nationalistic struggle against foreign involvement and American presence in Vietnam is a vital part of the history of the Vietnam War.⁴ In the contemporary world of dramatic changes in Central Europe, students should grasp the nationalistic rivalries and social and economic systems that predate Soviet dominance or American interest in the region, and which will influence the future course of the area.

Historians of foreign relations are adopting an interdisciplinary approach, using the insights and research of political scientists and other social scientists to study the decisions and motivations of individual policy makers, as well as those of the foreign policy establishment. Interdisciplinary appreciation of bureaucratic politics, decision-making, and public opinion analysis is achieving a broader understanding of the internal roots of foreign policy making. The relative importance of these internal forces versus the weight of international events can make for lively discussion of specific issues.

Analyzing the complex national security bureaucracy that has developed in the post World War II years, along with the changing fortunes of the State Department, the various military branches, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Council, and their relationship with Presidents provides a more accurate picture of policy making. At times each has had a different notion of an effective national security policy. At other times there has been a striking degree of unanimity. Clarification of these rivalries can enhance discussion of such questions as World War II, the Korean War, the Bay of Pigs, President John Kennedy's order that the Jupiter missiles be removed from Turkey, the Cuban Missile Crisis, or the Vietnam War.⁵ For example, in the preparation of National Security Paper 68 in 1950, which called for substantial American rearmament in the face of an assumed Soviet military threat, a conscious decision was made to omit costs from the recommendations to prevent inter-service debates in the Pentagon over budget allocations.⁶ The implementation of NSC-68 budget policies created a dilemma for the Eisenhower Administration, which disputed the need for a high level of military spending. But Dwight Eisenhower's decision-making style, combined with other problems, stymied his course.⁷

The crisis management style of each administration is equally important in determining how decisions are made. The many studies on the Cuban Missile Crisis, for example, provide an abundance of material and questions for class discussion.⁸ The case study approach is useful for this purpose. In addition to the Cuban Missile Crisis, extensive materials are available on such events as the Americanization of the Vietnam War and United States-Middle East diplomacy.⁹ Political scientists, using the methods of psychology, have challenged the assumption that policy makers act with logic and reasonableness.¹⁰ An important issue here is the concept of "groupthink," the idea that mental efficiency and judgment of groups deteriorates when there is strong cohesion among the members.¹¹ The Kennedy Administration miscalculations during the Bay of Pigs debacle offers a striking example of an administration's

failure to seek information, debate, or detect false assumptions.¹² Perceptions of international realities can also diverge from actuality when different values and interests distort national self-interest. Federalist and Republican attitudes toward Britain and France in the early nineteenth century provide one example.¹³ Or in the 1890s, did policy-makers have a conscious plan for American expansion, or were they responding to convenient opportunities?

Political scientists have also raised questions about the role of public opinion in foreign policy making. Students can discuss which issues concern the attentive public on a day-to-day basis and which involve the general public, and what constraints public opinion and electoral politics have on decision-making. When have policy-makers heeded public opinion? Anti-British sentiment in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, William McKinley's decision to go to war with Spain, Franklin Roosevelt's regard for isolationist sentiment and his concern about the influence of the Catholic Church in his decision about the Spanish Civil War, the "China Lobby" and non-recognition of the People's Republic of China, memories of Munich and early Cold War determinations, Kennedy's decisions regarding Cuba, Eisenhower's inability to convince the public that the "missile gap" was not a legitimate threat, the anti-war movement and the public's growing lack of confidence in the policy-making elite after the Tet offensive of 1968, and Lyndon Johnson's decision not to seek reelection are all examples that can be used.¹⁴ Or the question can be put another way: how and when have foreign policy makers manipulated public opinion, when has there been a substantial gap between government rhetoric and behavior? Nineteenth century views of Manifest Destiny, Woodrow Wilson's call for a world made safe for democracy, rhetoric about American moral obligations to insure freedom at the onset of the Cold War, and Harry Truman's pledge to help peoples fighting communist subjugation as a means of selling his aid package for Greece and Turkey to Congress are prominent examples. Another aspect of this question of public opinion is the role the mass media has played in alerting the public to recent foreign policy matters.¹⁵

Other domestic political issues, such as electoral politics, also influence policy. The Monroe Doctrine, which has been traditionally viewed as a defense of American security interests and sympathy for the principle of noncolonization, has also been linked to domestic political considerations, especially the approaching presidential election.¹⁶ The executive-legislative relationship is another part of the domestic political context of foreign policy making.¹⁷ The examples are limitless—Constitutional debates in the early republic, President James Polk and the Mexican-American War, President Abraham Lincoln and the Civil War, Congressional resistance to involvement in World War I, Wilson and the Senate over the League of Nations, isolationist sentiment in the 1930s, the growth of presidential power during the Cold War, the Vietnam War, the War Powers Act, the Panama Canal Treaty ratification process, or the SALT II Treaty.

The power of economic interest groups is certain to prompt student interest. The revisionist thesis of Open Door imperialism continues as an influential and controversial interpretation. The analytical concept of corporatism or corporate liberalism, the theory that foreign policy is the result of collaboration between government and economic groups, has also generated debate among historians of foreign policy.¹⁸ Can the stated economic goals and rhetoric of government and business in the late nineteenth century be taken at face value?¹⁹ What is the role of economic factors in foreign policy considerations? Do policy makers and economic interests share a common viewpoint? Are these groups more influential than individual policy makers? Are economic considerations as decisive as matters of national security? Are there periods, such as the 1920s, when such inaction is more striking? When are economic factors used as leverage, such as in the Cold War, separate from domestic economic influences? Is there sufficient consensus among business organizations or labor unions to dictate foreign policy, or do they exert different kinds of pressures? What is the role of multinational corporations in policy making? Placed within the context of other domestic considerations, this corporatist analysis is an effective teaching tool.

Policy makers are also influenced by less tangible, but equally powerful, cultural and ideological considerations. From the beginning, American foreign policy has celebrated its rejection of Old World models, its exceptionalism, its uniqueness, and the virtuous and idealistic reformist mission of bringing the blessings of liberty, self-government, and the free enterprise system to the rest of the world. Where does Puritan mission and the ideals of the revolutionary period end and nationalistic exuberance begin, or are they intertwined? Was the young nation's rejection of a power-oriented approach to international affairs related to a sense of uniqueness, or were there more pragmatic reasons?²⁰ Readings that celebrate this exceptionalism, that examine its use as a rationale, and that critique its role in justifying empire-building can be used to generate class discussion.²¹ The attitude of exceptionalism raises questions of how Americans viewed the role they should play in world affairs, a concern that leads to questions of racism, ethnocentrism, and attitudes toward revolution. Why were foreign policy activists so certain they should and could set about remaking others in their own image?²² What impact has American intervention had on other cultures? How does America's sense of uniqueness and its actual behavior compare to that of other great powers?²³ What happens when America's perceived self-interest conflicts with an idealistic policy? Did this sense of Americans as the "chosen people" include a sense of racial destiny from the very beginning or does this develop later when a racist ideology was part of a westward drive for territorial and commercial expansion that resulted in Indian removal and the Mexican-American War?²⁴ Or was Manifest Destiny rhetoric a facade for national and commercial expansion through the use of force? When does this obligation to spread American principles and institutions to the rest of the world move beyond just providing an example? This notion of the universal application of American political, economic, and cultural institutions allows for the introduction of such matters long before Wilsonianism is discussed. Later in the Cold War era, the Voice of America and the United States Information Agency were part of an attempt to promote the American way of life.

Such forces as race and ethnocentrism reflect the connections between culture and foreign policy. Commercial, ethnic, economic, and humanitarian factors in American culture exert a strong influence, especially over Congress's involvement in foreign affairs. These private forces—business, labor, ethnic, missionary, and peace groups—made themselves heard along with and oftentimes in conflict with actions of professional policy makers. What role do these domestic forces play in the return to expansion in the 1890s? How influential were religious interest groups in focusing attention on China? Irish-American anti-British sentiment, Polish-American anxiety at the end of World War II, and Jewish concerns over Israel have all affected policy making. The American belief in a special destiny to promote its moral values to the rest of the world often conflicted with the search for profits and the order and stability necessary to ensure them. At times the two themes intertwined, such as American missionaries in China promoting American commercial efforts. Oftentimes the pursuit of private or national profit displaced benevolence, as in the case of American domination of the Philippines. Attempts to separate state from private or foreign from domestic matters ignore these cultural influences.²⁵

The nation's power in the twentieth century made the possibility of promoting American values a reality. Class discussion and lectures can demonstrate how views on isolationism and internationalism, imperialism, racial hierarchy, ethnicity, religion, revolutionary nationalism, such as in Cuba in 1898, or China in 1900, or Nicaragua in the 1980s, provided national leaders with a vision of America's place in the world. To give students a sense of perspective, comparison can be made between this culture and the Western European pattern of racism, violence, and treatment of ethnic minorities.²⁶ Important literature on some groups is available, especially on the peace movement. The differing means and varying successes and failures of the movements from the Puritan migration to the present connotes both the social and cultural campaign against war as well as larger national developments. Students can better understand the dynamics of foreign policy making by comprehending why

peace groups sometimes influence decision-makers, such as in the 1920s, and other times appear to have little impact. When have decision-makers seized the peace initiative for their own purposes?²⁷

As historians investigate these areas, the distinction between domestic and foreign issues and between national and international history blur. This exciting field of inquiry involves setting foreign policy in the broadest possible domestic and international context, linking world and national events with the political, economic, and social system. No one model or framework can be given supremacy.

NOTES

- ¹Thomas J. McCormick, "The State of American Diplomatic History," 119-41, and Lawrence Evans, "The Dangers of Diplomatic History," 142-56 in Herbert J. Bass, ed., *The State of American History* (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1970); Ernest R. May, "The Decline of Diplomatic History," in George Athan Billias and Gerald N. Grob, ed., *American History: Retrospect and Prospect* (New York: Free Press, 1971), 399-430; Alexander De Conde, *American Diplomatic History in Transformation* (Washington, D.C.: American Historical Association, 1976), 18, 47; Richard W. Leopold, "The History of United States Foreign Policy: Past, Present, and Future," in *The Future of History*, ed. by Charles F. Delzell (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1977), 234-42; Walter LaFeber, "'Ah, If We had Studied It More Carefully': The Fortunes of American Diplomatic History," *Prologue*, XI (Fall 1979), 121-31; Charles S. Maier, "Marking Time: The Historiography of International Relations," in *The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States*, ed. by Michael Kammen (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), 355-57; "Response to Charles S. Maier, 'Marking Time: The Historiography of International Relations'," *Diplomatic History* (1981), 353-71; Thomas J. McCormick, "Drift or Mastery?" *Diplomatic History*, X (December 1982), 318-30; Gordon A. Craig, "The Historian and the Study of International Relations," *American Historical Review*, LXXXVIII (February 1983), 3; Ralph Levering, "The Importance of the History of American Foreign Relations," *Organization of American Historians Newsletter*, XII (May 1984), 20-22; Michael G. Fry, *History and International Studies* (Washington, D.C.: American Historical Association, 1987), 103;

Charles R. Lilley and Michael H. Hunt, "On Social History, the State, and Foreign Relations: Commentary on 'The Cosmopolitan Connection'," *Diplomatic History*, XI (Summer 1987), 243-50; Charles F. Hermann, Charles W. Kegley, Jr., and James N. Rosenau, ed., *New Directions in the Study of Foreign Policy* (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1987), especially the introduction.

²See Akira Iriye, *Across the Pacific: An Inner History of American-East Asian Relations* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1967).

³Walter LaFeber, *The Panama Canal: The Crisis in Historical Perspective* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), x; Richard H. Immerman, *The CIA in Guatemala: The Foreign Policy of Intervention* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982), ix, 20; Geir Lundestad, "Moralism, Presentism, Exceptionalism, Provincialism, and other Extravagencies in American Writings on the Early Cold War Years," *Diplomatic History*, XIII (Fall 1989), 527-45.

⁴Frances Fitzgerald, *Fire in the Lake: The Vietnamese and the Americans in Vietnam* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1972); and Loren Baritz, *Backfire: A History of How American Culture Led Us Into Vietnam and Made Us Fight the Way We Did* (New York: William Morrow, 1985) provide provocative materials.

⁵See Charles E. Neu, "The Rise of the National Security Bureaucracy," in *The New American State: Bureaucracies and Policies Since World War II*, ed. by Louis Galambos (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 85-105; Barry Rubin, *Secrets of State: The State Department and the Struggle Over U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); I.M. Destler, *Presidents, Bureaucrats, and Foreign Policy: The Politics of Organizational Reform* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972); James A. Nathan and James K. Oliver, *Foreign Policy Making and the American Political System* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1983) 21-42; Cecil V. Crabb, Jr. and Kevin V. Mulcahy, *Presidents and Foreign Policy Making: From FDR to Reagan* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1986), chapter 2; Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May, *Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision-Makers* (New York: Free Press, 1986), chapter 12. For the view that not all policy disagreements develop from bureaucratic rivalries, see Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), 26. For a dissenting view, that the President's values are more important than bureaucratic analysis, see Stephen K. Krasner, "Are Bureaucracies Important?" *Foreign Policy* (Summer 1972), 150-79.

- ⁶John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar National Security Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 99; Morton H. Halperin, *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1974), 209.
- ⁷H.W. Brands, "The Age of Vulnerability: Eisenhower and the National Insecurity State," *American Historical Review*, LVIXIV (October 1989), 963-89.
- ⁸Graham T. Allison, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971). Recently opened materials supplement this path-breaking book. See, for example, James G. Blight and David A. Welch, *On the Brink: Americans and Soviets Reexamine the Cuban Missile Crisis* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1989); Ray S. Cline, "Commentary: The Cuban Missile Crisis," *Foreign Affairs*, LXVIII (Fall 1989), 190-96.
- ⁹Larry Berman, *Planning a Tragedy: The Americanization of the War in Vietnam* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1982); Edward R. F. Sheehan, "Step by Step in the Middle East," *Foreign Policy* (Spring 1976), 3-70; Neustadt, *Thinking in Time*, chapters 1 and 5.
- ¹⁰DeConde, *American Diplomatic History in Transformation*, 48.
- ¹¹Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*; Irving L. Janis, *Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascos*, 2nd ed., rev. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1983); Ole R. Holsti, "Models of International Relations and Foreign Policy," *Diplomatic History*, XIII (Winter 1989), 15-43.
- ¹²Janis, *Groupthink*, 14-47.
- ¹³Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, 20.
- ¹⁴See David S. Patterson, "What's Wrong (and Right) with American Diplomatic History," *Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations Newsletter*, IX (September 1978), 9; Ralph B. Levering, *The Public and American Foreign Policy, 1918-1978* (New York: William Morrow, 1978), 20, 34, 151-58; Michael Leigh, *Mobilizing Consent: Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy, 1937-1947* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1976), xiii, 167-70; Roger Hilsman, *The Politics of Policy Making in Defense and Foreign Affairs* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), 102; Bernard C. Cohen, *The Public's Impact on Foreign Policy* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1973), especially chapter 3; Ralph B. Levering, "Public Opinion, Foreign Policy, and American Politics Since the 1960s," *Diplomatic History*, XIII (Summer 1989), 389-93; S. Nelson Drew, "Expecting the Approach of Danger: The 'Missile Gap' As a Study of Executive-Congressional Competition in Building Consensus on National

- Security Issues," *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, XIX (Spring, 1989), 317-46; Gordon A. Craig and Alexander L. George, *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Problems of Our Time* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983); Barry B. Hughes, *The Domestic Context of American Foreign Policy* (San Francisco: Freeman, 1978), 21-56.
- ¹⁵Nathan, *Foreign Policy Making and the American Political System*, 188-91.
- ¹⁶Ernest R. May, *The Making of the Monroe Doctrine* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), chapter 4. For a dissenting view, see Harry Ammon, "Monroe Doctrine: Domestic Politics or National Decision?" *Diplomatic History*, V (Winter 1981), 53-56, 61-70.
- ¹⁷John Spanier and Joseph Noyes, ed., *Congress, the Presidency, and American Foreign Policy* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1981); Crabb, *Presidents and Foreign Policy Making*, chapter 1; David M. Abshire, *Foreign Policy Makers: Presidents vs. Congress* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1979); Nathan, *Foreign Policy Making and the American Political System*, chapters 4-5.
- ¹⁸See Michael J. Hogan, "Corporatism: A Positive Appraisal," *Diplomatic History*, X (Fall 1986), 363-72; John Lewis Gaddis, "The Corporatist Synthesis: A Skeptical View," *ibid.*, 357-62; Joan Hoff Wilson, *Ideology and Economics: U.S. Relations with the Soviet Union, 1918-1933* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1974); William H. Becker and Samuel F. Wells, Jr., *Economics and World Power: An Assessment of American Diplomacy Since 1789* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984); Barry D. Hughes, *The Domestic Context of American Foreign Policy* (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1978) 156-64; Richard A. Johnson, *The Administration of United States Foreign Policy* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1971), 262-64; Ronald Steel, "Birth of an Empire," *Reviews in American History*, XVI (March 1988), 151-57.
- ¹⁹See David M. Fletcher, "Rhetoric versus Results: Economic Expansion Questioned," *Diplomatic History*, V (Spring 1981), 93-104.
- ²⁰Akira Iriye, "Culture and Power: International Relations as Intercultural Relations," *Diplomatic History*, III (1979), 119. See also James H. Hutson, *John Adams and the Diplomacy of the American Revolution* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1980) for the view that revolutionary leaders applied the diplomatic ideas of the European powers.
- ²¹Suggested readings: Samuel Flagg Bemis, "American Foreign Policy and the Blessings of Liberty," *American Historical Review*, LXVII (January 1962), 291-305; Dexter Perkins, *The American Approach to*

- Foreign Policy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), 19-48; Tami R. Davis and Sean M. Lynn-Jones, "'City Upon a Hill,'" *Foreign Policy*, (Spring 1987), 20-38; William Appleman Williams, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York, Dell, 1972), 1-16.
- ²²Leopold, "The History of United States Foreign Policy," 239; Michael H. Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), 18, 42.
- ²³For examples see Geir Lundestad, "Uniqueness and Pendulum Swings in U S Foreign Policy," *International Affairs*, LXII (Summer 1986), 405-21.
- ²⁴See Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981), 1, 116, 157, 298.
- ²⁵Morrell Heald and Lawrence S. Kaplan, *Culture and Diplomacy: The American Experience* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1977), 3, 6, 8-9, 124-58, 347-49; Emily S. Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansionism, 1898-1945* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982), 9-12; Thomas M. Frank and Edward Weisband, *Foreign Policy and Congress* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 165-209; Cohen, *The Public's Impact on Foreign Policy*, chapter 3. For examples of irrational cultural influences, see Robert Dallek, *The American Style of Foreign Policy: Cultural Politics and Foreign Affairs* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1983). See also, Becker, *Economics and World Power*.
- ²⁶See Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy*, 6, 17, 42, 52, 90-91; Russell H. Bostert, "Teaching History," in *Scholars Who Teach History: The Art of College Teaching*, ed. by Steven M. Cahn (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1978), 11.
- ²⁷Charles DeBenedetti, *The Peace Movement in American History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980); Roland C. Marchand, *The American Peace Movement and Social Reform, 1898-1918* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973).

RESEARCH NOTE: WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN'S 1916 PLAN FOR A WORLD PEACE STRUCTURE

by
Kendrick A. Clements
(*University of South Carolina*)

As the whirlpool of World War I sucked at non-belligerent nations, including the United States, some Americans began to consider means for avoiding such conflicts in the future. Many of them suggested that some form of international organization was desirable to settle conflicts before they became wars. They took it for granted, tradition to the contrary notwithstanding, that the United States must join such an organization.

President Wilson was already thinking along these lines and regarded a Pan-American non-aggression treaty the administration had been pushing since 1914 as a possible model for a postwar organization, but Wilson said little about his ideas in public.¹ In the absence of leadership from him, the field was open for private groups to make suggestions, and the League to Enforce Peace, formed by a group of prominent Americans in June of 1915, moved into the vacuum. Relations between the league and the president were strained, but its distinguished membership and determination to force public discussion of the issue enabled it to exert considerable influence on the evolution of the idea of international organization in the United States.²

The program of the league as adopted in 1915 called for the creation of an international tribunal whose member nations would agree to submit to it all disputes in which diplomacy failed to reach a solution. The tribunal would investigate the disputes and recommend solutions. Any member which went to war without first submitting a conflict to investigation would be subject to collective economic and military sanctions by the other members of the organization.³

When he was secretary of state, from 1913 to June 1915, William Jennings Bryan had been an ardent supporter of investigation as in itself a solution for most international disputes and had negotiated thirty bilateral treaties embodying the principle. The stress on investigation in the league's proposals was thus very attractive to him, but the idea that the United States might be compelled to participate in collective economic or military sanctions against aggressors alarmed him. In a written debate with the head of the league, former president William Howard Taft, Bryan argued that membership in the league might endanger the Monroe Doctrine, undermine American control over our own destiny, and, worst of all, promote the use of force in international conflicts.⁴

The objections that Bryan advanced to the program of the league anticipated those raised by the opponents of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, yet Bryan was not simply an isolationist. Like the members of the League to Enforce Peace he believed that the United States had a duty to promote world peace, and like them, he thought that some sort of international organization was the most effective method for achieving that goal. His dilemma, and that of many other Americans of his generation, was how to reconcile the maintenance of complete American independence with the promotion of the ideal of world peace and order.

In his written debate with Taft, Bryan was unable to find a solution to this puzzle. He could only suggest that universal adoption of his investigation principle, plus the spread of democracy and Christianity, would eliminate war. This prescription, however, seemed rather weak with half the world already at war. In the months after his debate with Taft he apparently continued to think about the problem, and in March 1916 he published in his newspaper, *The Commoner*, the proposal given below. Two months later, in a speech to the 22nd Annual Mohonk [New York] Conference on International Arbitration, he repeated the idea.⁵

In the midst of a national election campaign dominated by Wilson's slogan, "He kept us out of war," many Americans seemed to prefer isolationism to involvement in

any sort of international organization, and Bryan quietly dropped his proposal after these two public statements of it. Nevertheless, it is interesting as an attempt to reconcile the basically incompatible goals of maintaining American independence and fulfilling obligations to the world community. In that sense it may well have been a truer indicator of American values than Wilson's league of nations proposal.

Particularly striking about the plan is the degree to which it anticipates and seeks to meet objections later raised against the league of nations idea. It accepts as still true the traditional assumption that the United States normally has no interest in conflicts in Europe or Asia, and that it is concerned only with maintaining its own independence and that of the Western Hemisphere. On the other hand, it shares with Wilson's league the assumption that men are generally rational and perfectible; and it suggests a growing if reluctant recognition on the part of Americans that the existing world system and American isolation have not prevented the outbreak of a war that threatens to involve the United States.

The sloppy grammar and half-thought-out ideas of Bryan's plan suggest that he intended it as a first suggestion in a public discussion of America's role in the postwar world. In fact, however, the man most able to contribute to and stimulate that debate, the president, did not want it to take place. Fearful that any publicly discussed plan would become a focus for opposition, Wilson said little about his own ideas on the subject, refused to discuss the proposals of the League to Enforce Peace, and ignored Bryan's suggestion. As a result, Americans were not challenged to reexamine their isolationist assumptions, and the tentative recognition that the world might be changing that was embodied in Bryan's proposal was left to survive or die without assistance.

From *The Commoner*, Vol 16, No 3 (March 1916), pp 1-2:

Numerous plans are being made with a view to preventing future wars. The spirit is laudable and many of the plans embody suggestions that may fit into a comprehensive plan. The plan most prominently spoken of is that put forward by

the League to Enforce Peace, of which ex-President Taft is the executive head. The trouble about this plan is that it ALLIES US WITH THE NATIONS OF THE OLD WORLD AND COMPELS US TO JOIN IN WAR WITH THEM TO ENFORCE THE FINDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL BODY, when these FINDINGS ARE NOT ACQUIESCED IN. We could not, of course, hope to exert a controlling influence in such a body; we would, therefore, be at the mercy of the European nations and would be compelled to take part in the wars which they undertook. In other words, we would put our army and navy at the service of European monarchs and agree to furnish the men and the money with which to fight out their quarrels, if it so happened that they took advantage of our strength and decided to make use of us in this way.

The plan as it has been set forth would also require the abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine, because we could not have a voice in the settlement of European disputes without giving the European nations a voice in settling the disputes of the western hemisphere. The plan as proposed would therefore be objectionable. First; because it would involve an international alliance with European nations. Second; because it would involve abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine. Third; it would violate our constitution by transferring from congress to an international organization, the power to declare war, and, fourth, it would convert us from a moral influence into a policeman for the enforcement of order across the Atlantic.

It might be possible, however, to so amend the above plan as to eliminate some of the objections without lessening its effectiveness. First; let all the nations agree to the organization of a court to which will be referred all questions of an international character, when these questions can not be settled by diplomacy. Second; let the decisions be enforceable by two groups, the nations of the western hemisphere enforcing, without European aid, the decisions relative to differences between the nations of the western hemisphere, providing a majority of the western nations approve of the decision, the nations of the eastern hemisphere

agreeing to enforce decisions relating to the disputes between the nations of the eastern hemisphere, providing a majority of the nations approve of such decisions. If the Asiatic nations are not willing to join with the European nations in such an agreement, the plan could provide for a third group composed of the Asiatic nations and they could act on the same principle as the western and European nations, that is, enforce the decisions of the whole tribunal on Asiatic nations in so far as these decisions were approved by a majority of the Asiatic nations.

The plan proposed by Mr. Taft's league, with the modifications above suggested, would enable all the nations to bring their wisdom to bear upon all disputes, while each group would enforce the decision as between members of each group. This would cover all disputes except those between nations belonging to different groups. In such cases sufficient length of time could be given for the parties involved to consider the recommendations of the international body, and it is almost certain that time and investigation would bring about a peaceful settlement.

The modifications proposed would save us from being drawn into European and Asiatic contests and it [*sic*] would enable us to retain the Monroe Doctrine in its full force and vigor. Such a plan would doubtless receive the approval of the American people because it secures all that is valuable by international agreement and yet eliminates the dangers embodied in the plan which has been advanced by the League to Enforce Peace. While nothing can be done until the war is over, it is well for the friends of peace to be considering the various suggestions that are being made, for out of discussion comes truth and truth is that which should be desired above all things else.

W. J. Bryan

NOTES

¹For Colonel House's suggestion that the Pan-American treaty would "serve as a model for the European nations when peace is at last brought about," see Edward M. House Diary, 16 December 1914, in Arthur S. Link, et al., eds., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson* 31,

September 6-December 31, 1914 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), 469.

²The League's origin, purposes, and development are discussed in detail in Ruhl H. Bartlett, *The League to Enforce Peace* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944).

³*Ibid.*, 40-41.

⁴William Jennings Bryan and William Howard Taft, *World Peace: A Written Debate between William Howard Taft and William Jennings Bryan* (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1917).

⁵*The Commoner*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (March 1916), pp. 1-2. Bryan's arbitration conference speech is printed in *Ibid.*, No. 8 (August 1916), p. 10.

SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

SPECIAL NOTICE

SHAFR has arrangements with ABC-CLIO Inc. to make the *Guide to American Foreign Relations Since 1700* available to its membership for \$30. Orders must be made through the SHAFR office which will forward them to ABC-CLIO. Make checks for \$30 payable to SHAFR and send them to:

Allan Spetter
Department of History
Wright State University
Dayton, OH 45435

If you know persons who are not members of SHAFR who would like a copy of the *Guide* for \$30, encourage them to join the Society

**REPORT ON THE FOREIGN POLICY WORKSHOP
AT THE BIENNIAL CONFERENCE OF THE
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR AMERICAN
STUDIES (E.A.A.S.)**

April 9-13, 1990

Regent's College, London, UK

Chair: Serge Ricard, University of Provence, France

Theme: "Looking Up to the Victorian Model: The American Empire at the Turn of the 19th Century"

Contributions

Goran Rystad, University of Lund, Sweden: "The Constitution and the Flag: Aspects of American Expansionism at the Turn of the Century" (A detailed analysis of the public debate that preceded the Supreme Court's decisions in the famous Insular Cases).

Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones, University of Edinburgh, Great Britain: "Massachusetts Labor, Henry Cabot Lodge, and the Abortion of Empire" (The compelling demonstration that organized labor helped to change Senator Lodge's mind on imperialism, that the economic welfare of the workers in his state played its part in his political calculations).

Helene Christol, University of Provence, France: "DuBois and Expansionism: A Black Man's View of Empire" (A discerning assessment of the black militant's theorizing on race relations and colonialism).

Serge Ricard, University of Provence, France: "The Anglo-German Intervention in Venezuela and Theodore Roosevelt's Ultimatum to the Kaiser: Taking a Fresh Look at an Old Enigma" (A new interpretation which questions the commonly accepted chronology of Roosevelt's subdued confrontation with William II and proposes a different scenario for what turned out to be a two and a half months' crisis).

Daniela Rossini, University of Rome, Italy, and Harvard University: "The English Influence on the American Preparations for Peace, 1917-1918: George Louis Beer and the Origins of the Mandate System" (A thorough and illuminating study of Beer's influential role in drawing up the postwar colonial settlements as a historian of the British Empire and a leading expert of colonial matters both within the "Inquiry" and within the American delegation at the Paris Peace Conference).

Serge Ricard

MINUTES OF THE SHAFR COUNCIL MEETING

22 March 1990
Washington Hilton
Washington, D.C.
Michael Hunt, presiding

The meeting opened at 8 p.m. Council members present were Michael Hunt, Gary Hess, Rosemary Foot, John Gimbel, Thomas Paterson, Stephen Rabe, Robert Schulzinger, Allan Spetter, and J. Samuel Walker. Others present were William Brinker, Wayne Cole, Warren Cohen, Mark Gilderhus, Dan Helmstadter, Michael Hogan, Warren Kimball, Douglas Little, Page Miller, Anna Nelson, Nancy Tucker, Betty Unterberger, William Walker, Ralph Weber, and Thomas Zoumaras.

1. Page Putnam Miller, director of the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, spoke to Council on two major issues: the new National Archives facility and continuing problems with the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series.

Warren Cohen informed Council that he had resigned from the State Department's Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation because of changes in the review process involving sensitive material excluded from the FRUS volumes.

After a lengthy discussion, Council unanimously approved the resolution appended to these minutes.

2. President Michael Hunt informed Council that he had asked Anna Nelson to chair the new Committee on Documentation. Other members of the committee are Roger Dingman, David Langbart, Robert McMahon, and Vice President Gary Hess, *ex officio*. Nelson made it clear that the committee's first priority will be to deal with the issue of declassification of government documents.

3. Hunt informed Council that arrangements had been finalized for the 1991 summer conference to be held at George Washington University in Washington. Tentative

dates are June 19-22. Sandra Taylor and William Becker have agreed to serve as program and local arrangement chairs respectively.

4. Douglas Little, chair of the Bernath Book Award Committee, reported to Council that the committee had chosen to divide the prize between Walter Hixson of the University of Akron, author of *George F. Kennan: Cold War Iconoclast*, and Anders Stephanson of Rutgers University-Newark, author of *Kennan and the Art of Foreign Policy*.

5. William Walker, chair of the Bernath Article Award Committee, reported to Council that the committee had selected Lester Foltos of Seattle to receive the prize for his article, "The New Pacific Barrier: America's Search for Security in the Pacific, 1945-47," which appeared in *Diplomatic History* in the Summer 1989 issue.

6. Betty Unterberger, chair of an *ad hoc* committee on a new Bernath prize, informed Council that she continues to discuss with Dr. Bernath his proposal for an award in memory of his late wife, Myrna Bernath.

7. President Hunt announced that he had appointed William Kamman to the Finance Committee and offered nominees to the State Department's Advisory Committee.

8. Warren Kimball informed Council that he hoped the first Arthur Link Prize for Documentary Editing would be awarded at the AHA meeting in 1991, with other awards to follow every three years.

9. Gary Hess, chair of the Finance Committee, informed Council that the late Mrs. Bernath had named SHAFR a beneficiary of a life insurance policy. That money has been deposited in a new endowment account.

10. Michael Hogan reported to Council that he had selected William Walker to be Associate Editor of *Diplomatic History*. Council endorsed the selection.

Hogan and Tom Paterson told Council that SHAFR will receive royalties from a book they are co-editing. They hope to use the money and additional contributions to create a fund in the name of Armin Rappaport to help with *Diplomatic History* finances. The first priority would be to raise enough money to pay the salary of a half-time copy editor.

11. Mark Gilderhus and Wayne Cole brought Council up to date on plans for the 1990 summer conference.

12. Council noted the passing of distinguished diplomatic historian William Appleman Williams.

13. Various members of Council expressed concern about the very small number of sessions on diplomatic history at the OAH conference.

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

*RESOLUTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY SHAFR
Council Meeting, Thursday, 22 March 1990*

*Resolution on Integrity of the Foreign Relations of
United States Documentary History Volumes*

Whereas, the *Foreign Relations of the United States* has been published by the Department of State since 1861 and serves as a record of American foreign relations, as faithful as possible, given legitimate security concerns; and

Whereas, this highly respected and prestigious documentary series, now numbering over 300 volumes, has been a cornerstone of scholarly research and writing in American foreign relations; and

Whereas, until recently the scholarly community has expressed strong confidence in the editorial integrity of the series which provided both detailed coverage of major issues and guidance for locating unpublished State Department documents; and

Whereas, the integrity of the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series is now threatened by changes during the last decade in the editorial review process for handling sensitive material; and

Whereas, recent volumes of the *Foreign Relations of the United States*, published more than thirty years

following the historical events described, contain an appalling increase in the amount of incomplete and deleted documents, which the State Department's Committee on Declassification/Classification and other government agencies have excised from the volumes; and

Whereas, recent *Foreign Relations* volumes with significant increases in deletions and omissions create an incompleteness that in itself is a distortion; and

Whereas, the Department of State itself in carrying out the foreign policy of the United States needs a full and accurate record of its past programs and decisions on which its own offices can rely; and

Whereas, our democratic government rests on informed public debate and deliberations by policy-makers based on access to the fullest possible records of the past and on an accurate presentation of our history; and

Whereas, various agencies of the United States government are urging foreign governments to open their archival records, it is essential that the United States follow a standard worthy of emulation; and

Whereas, the role of the State Department's Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation, made up of representatives of the American Historical Association, the Organization of American Historians, the American Political Science Association, the American Society of International Law, and the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations, is now threatened as they are no longer informed participants in the review process and are no longer in a position to attest to the integrity of the series;

Resolved, the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations urges Secretary of State James Baker to take necessary steps to restore the integrity of the

Foreign Relations of the United States by establishing a procedure by which the Advisory Committee members who have "secret" clearance may review the necessary material in order to make informed judgments on the integrity of the series; and

Resolved, the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations send copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Chairperson and ranking minority member of the appropriate Congressional committees.

Warren I. Cohen sent the Newsletter a copy of his recent correspondence with Secretary of State James Baker. It is included for your understanding of the resolution above and the report by Bradford Perkins which follows Cohen's letter.

editor

15 February 1990

Hon. James A. Baker
Secretary of State
U.S. Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

Dear Mr. Secretary:

It is with regret that instead of my annual report, I am obliged to submit my resignation as chairman of your Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation.

The Department has reneged on the agreement I spent two years negotiating and undermined my credibility with the professional organizations to whom I report. The entire process by which the committee attempts to serve the Department by insuring the integrity of the historical record has been brought into question. The *Foreign Relations of the United States* series, the most respected diplomatic record in

the world, has been compromised—and the Committee has been denied the means to remedy the situation. I am unable to provide the service you and your staff have asked of me. I cannot protect the integrity of the series, the reputation of the Department, or testify to the concern of this administration for providing an honest historical record.

Sincerely yours,

Warren I. Cohen, Chairman
U.S. Department of State Advisory Committee
on Historical Diplomatic Documentation

Explanatory Note:

1. For several years, the Advisory Committee has argued that it cannot give the advice asked of it or testify to the credibility of the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series if it is denied its traditional opportunity to review material excised in the course of the Department's declassification process. The Department refused to return to the earlier review procedure.

2. My predecessor, Professor Bradford Perkins of the University of Michigan, began a dialog with Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Charles Redmond, which was continued at several levels within the Department. Professor Perkins succeeded in gaining the attention and understanding of key officials. I also participated in most of these discussions.

3. I was elected chairman of the Committee in December 1988 and continued the dialog until agreement was reached in September 1989 with Dr. Gene Bovis, then head of the declassification operation. The Committee was to be briefed by his staff on three volumes and allowed to review excisions from them at its annual meeting, scheduled for 15-16 November. Given the limited time available at the meeting, I suggested that the Committee would be satisfied to be shown the material from one of those volumes. When we met, *nothing* was available for the Committee's review.

4. After the Committee adjourned, I met with Deputy Assistant Secretary V. Kim Hoggard who assured me that the Department would meet its commitment. I asked that the material excised from all three volumes on which the Committee had been briefed be made available to the Committee.

5. In mid-December, the Department offered to allow me but not the rest of the Committee—to see material from one volume. I indicated that the offer fell short of the agreement. For the next two months I tried unsuccessfully to meet Ms. Hoggard or her superior, Assistant Secretary Margaret Tutwhiler. I finally met with Ms. Hoggard on 1 February, but without progress. Responsibility for making the necessary decision was alleged to rest elsewhere. I was advised to meet with a different deputy assistant secretary who was not available.

6. Today, three months after being assured that the agreement of September 1989 would be honored, I was informed that the Department would not budge. I can do no more and have resigned.

7. I urge the professional organizations involved to take appropriate action to press upon the Department the importance of providing for the credibility of the FRUS series, already compromised by the recent Iran volume—and to leave no doubt with the Secretary of State that an advisory committee, if it is to help, must be given the necessary support and information by those it would serve. In the absence of an acceptable response from the Department, I question not only the continuation of the Advisory Committee—which some within the Department would eliminate happily—but also of a *Foreign Relations* series, the integrity of which can no longer be assured.

Warren I. Cohen

After Professor Cohen's resignation from the Advisory Committee, Professor Bradford Perkins, as rapporteur, prepared the following report.

editor

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
HISTORICAL DIPLOMATIC DOCUMENTATION

June, 1990

The Committee met at the State Department on November 16 and 17, 1989. Present were Warren I. Cohen and Michael H. Hunt, representing the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations; Ronald H. Spector, representing the American Historical Association; Anne H. Van Camp, representing the Society of American Archivists; Paul M. Kattenburg, representing the International Studies Association; Stephen T. Zamora, representing the American Society of International Law; and Bradford Perkins, representing the Organization of American Historians. As always, William Z. Slany and his colleagues in the Office of the Historian provided helpful information and pointed to the key problems requiring discussion.

The Committee re-elected Professor Cohen as chairman. However, before he could draft this report, he felt compelled to resign because of differences with the Department over policy. Consequently, this report is both belated and less detailed than has been customary. Attention is given only to areas of major importance.

In 1989, ten volumes of *FRUS* were published, and ten to thirteen more are expected in 1990. (One of the latter dates back to the 1951-54 Triennium.) However, not at least until 1992 will all volumes covering the Eisenhower years be available. In other words, as the Committee feared from the outset, President Reagan's directive that documents through 1960 be available by 1990 has not been implemented. For this failure, there are numerous causes, among them the ever-escalating volume of manuscript material to be examined, budgetary restrictions, and the perennial problem of declassification. (In some instances, review takes as much as nine years.)

The Committee, although favorably impressed by the energy and skill of the Historical Office, believes that office

cannot hope to speed up the time-table nor indeed to keep *FRUS* publication up to standard unless changes are made in the very conception of the series. Because of the increasing masses of material, it simply is no longer possible to prepare, declassify and publish a record as detailed as that to which the scholarly professions have become accustomed. Forced to choose between thin but comprehensive coverage and in-depth treatment of the most important areas, the Committee favors the second course. If this approach is adopted, *FRUS* volumes will focus on major crises and developments, while brief summaries and historiographic and bibliographic guides will be provided for less important decisions and themes. This scheme clearly has shortcomings and, if implemented, will require painful decisions by the compilers of *FRUS* volumes. The Committee welcomes the Historian's plan to involve it in the decisions and to seek counsel from scholars with expertise in specific areas.

Preparation of future volumes in the series, those covering the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, is seriously hampered by staff shortages in the presidential libraries. The National Archives and Records Administration has made only modest efforts to overcome this problem, and the Committee urges that greater attention be given to it. Evidence of concern at the highest levels of the State Department seems required.

We also urge the State Department to use its influence to reverse the decision taken in 1986 by the Superintendent of Documents to remove deposit libraries from the distribution list for *FRUS* volumes. Although this decision saves only a small amount of money, it deprives the scholarly community and, by extension, inquiring citizens and the nation at large of convenient access to the record of its government's foreign policy decisions.

As in all recent years, in 1989 the Committee was forced to devote primary attention to declassification matters. The Committee does not believe that it can fulfill its responsibilities either to the Department or to the associations its members represent unless it is given much greater understanding of declassification policies and practices. Presently, it is denied knowledge of the general guidelines

establishing policy and of the implementation of those guidelines in specific cases. Consequently, it is hampered in its ability to offer advice to the Department, and it cannot assure the scholarly community that *FRUS* accurately presents the historical record. Most responsible scholars recognize that some material cannot be declassified, even after a substantial number of years, but all would agree that such cases should be held to a minimum. We cannot be sure that this is the case. In 1989, Chairman Cohen reached an understanding with the declassification office which, while not entirely satisfactory to him or to the committee, promised to improve the situation. It was the Department's refusal to carry through on this agreement which led to his resignation.

For the Committee, the problem was starkly revealed during discussion of the recently published volume, *Iran, 1951-1954*. An expert in the field who reviewed this volume for the Committee concluded that, because of extensive deletions, the volume presented not only a woefully incomplete but even an entirely misleading account of events surrounding the ouster of Mosadeq. Since the general picture is already well known (and the CIA representative in Iran has published his memoirs, presumably with the Agency's concurrence), the Committee fears that excessive deference may have been paid to security considerations. It regrets the lack of access to classified materials that might lay these fears to rest.

The Committee discussed inserting a disclaimer in those *FRUS* volumes which, because of refusals to declassify, distort the historical record. But such an approach is attended by serious problems. It is by no means clear that any disclaimer, beyond the most banal, would itself be declassified. Additionally, it may well be that the insertion of a disclaimer might encourage departments and agencies to resist declassification on the ground that the disclaimer had already made it clear that the record was not complete. This is an important question, on which the Committee has as yet taken no firm position, nor can it easily do so until it possesses all the facts.

The Committee hopes that the Department of State will be willing to engage in a dialog designed to preserve what

has been, for over a hundred years, the most distinguished record of its kind, a testimonial to the American belief that, in a republic, citizens have a right to know what is being done in their name and that officials have an obligation to meet this expectation.

Lastly a copy of a letter from John Kennedy to Douglas Dillon which was provided to the Newsletter by Tom Zoumaras seems appropriate to include.

editor

September 6, 1961

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The effectiveness of democracy as a form of government depends on an informed and intelligent citizenry. Nowhere is the making of choices more important than in foreign affairs; nowhere does government have a more imperative duty to make available as swiftly as possible all the facts required for intelligent decision.

As many of these facts as possible should be made public on a current basis. But, because of the inherent need for security in the current conduct of foreign affairs, it is obviously not possible to make full immediate disclosure of diplomatic papers. However, delay in such disclosure must be kept to a minimum.

It has long been a pride of our government that we have made the historical record of our diplomacy available more promptly than any other nation in the world. The Department of State has the responsibility within the Executive Branch for putting out this permanent record in the series "Foreign Relations of the United States." The discharge of this responsibility requires the active collaboration of all departments and agencies of our Government in the submission and clearance of papers necessary for the completeness of this record.

In recent years the publication of the "Foreign Relations" series has fallen farther and farther behind currency. The lag has now reached approximately twenty years. I regard this as unfortunate and undesirable. It is the policy of this Administration to unfold the historical record as fast and as fully as is consistent with national security and with friendly relations with foreign nations.

Accordingly I herewith request all departments, agencies and libraries of the Government to collaborate actively and fully with the Department of State in its efforts to prepare and publish the record of our diplomacy. In my view, any official should have a clear and precise case involving the national interest before seeking to withhold from publication documents or papers fifteen or more years old.

Sincerely yours,

John Kennedy

Honorable C. Douglas Dillon
Secretary of the Treasury
Washington 25, D.C.

ABSTRACTS

James H. Hitchman (Western Washington University), "Measuring Pacific Coast Trade, 1900-1981," in *International Journal of Maritime History* (December 1989), vol. 1, no. 2.

The waterborne commerce of the Pacific coast has increased more rapidly than its national counterpart in the twentieth century. During those years, the value of U.S. foreign trade expanded 113 times and the volume of foreign, coastal, and local cargo tonnage multiplied tenfold. On the Pacific Coast, the value of foreign trade quintupled the national rate as the cargo tonnage surged 28 times. While there are many ways to calculate such development, this article relies on U.S. Department of Commerce documents for the value of foreign commerce and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reports for the volume of foreign, coastal, and local cargo tonnage. Figures are separated into decadal, port, and customs district categories.

The value of Pacific Coast waterborne foreign trade, 1900-1981, grew from \$125 million to \$66 billion, i.e., 528 times, in current dollars. The volume of Pacific coast trade in all types of waterborne commerce increased from 15 million short tons in 1900 to 420 million. The Pacific Coast portion of national waterborne commerce rose from seven percent to about 25 percent in the twentieth century.

San Francisco led all coast ports until the 1920s; since then Los Angeles-Long Beach has been the largest port on the Pacific Coast. Northern California led Southern California, Washington and Oregon until the 1970s, when Southern California and Washington passed the original leader. Hawaii and Alaska grew after World War II and Alaska leapfrogged from last to first in cargo tonnage in the late 1970s, due to Valdez oil shipments.

During most of the twentieth century, local and coastal trade exceeded foreign trade, but in the last twenty years, foreign trade has increased in importance. Depression and war caused fluctuations, but since 1950, growth has been

steady. Predictions point to continued growth as Pacific Rim trade expands.

Cathal J. Nolan (St. Francis Xavier Univ., Nova Scotia), "Road to the Charter: America, Liberty, and the Founding of the United Nations," in *Paradigms: Kent Journal of International Relations* (Fall 1989), vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 24-37.

Practitioners of early American diplomacy were aware that the reality of national weakness dictated remaining prudently passive concerning foreign struggles for liberty. That wisdom was challenged once continental expansion and the elimination of powerful neighbors produced unparalleled national security and confidence. The hitherto passive perception that long-term American security was intimately connected to the spread of liberty abroad became explicit in Wilson's wartime rhetoric and postwar diplomacy. That pattern was repeated, though with a closer eye to abiding realities of "power politics," in plans for post-World War II reconstruction of world order. At Dumbarton Oaks, the United States alone among the founders insisted on including promotion of the "Rights of Man" as a fundamental purpose of the United Nations. Simply, top American policy makers saw the expansion of liberty as a key prerequisite for world order and lasting peace. The UN Charter—in its insistence that differing national interests might be harmonized through ecumenical ordination of individual liberty and warfare—thus reflected the new role of American power, as well as the fresh importance of American ideas in the world. However, it was discovered as early as San Francisco that setting up an international organization as the ostensibly authoritative interpreter of the Rights of Man may have ill-served that cause. After all, only a handful of states had more than a passing acquaintance with liberty.

Cathal J. Nolan (St. Francis Xavier Univ., Nova Scotia), "Legacy of the Bancroft Conventions: American Diplomacy and International Acceptance of a Right of Expatriation," in *Canadian Political Science Association* (May 28, 1990).

The United States from its earliest days has insisted that an individual has a natural right to voluntary expatriation, and to become a naturalized citizen of another country. That claim led to repeated and sometimes serious conflict with other powers, most of which did not recognize the right of expatriation, holding instead to the doctrine of "indefeasible allegiance." The most notable case of such conflict of course was the impressment dispute with Britain preceding (and after) the War of 1812. Important questions of loyalty and nationality raised by the Union during the Civil War, and America's new-found power following the conflict, convinced other powers (crucially, Prussia and Britain) that the better part of valour would be to accede to Washington's interpretation of naturalization rights and law. Beginning in 1868, a series of bilateral treaties (the Bancroft Conventions) entrenched the American interpretation of a right of expatriation as a widely accepted principle of international law.

There was an important exception to general agreement on an internationally recognized right of expatriation: Russia. During the 1880s and 1890s, Tsarist officials continued to harass or arrest persons of Russian birth whom the United States claimed were naturalized American citizens, in particular Jews. By 1912 that issue led to a serious deterioration in American/Russian relations, after Congress protested by passing a unanimous joint resolution severing a seventy year-old commercial treaty with Russia. Nor did the issue disappear with the passing of Tsarism: Russian Commissars proved even more unwilling that Tsarist officials to permit individuals to divest themselves of Soviet citizenship and depart Russia. The issue resurfaced in virulent form after World War II, and in some measure contributed to the deterioration of relations in the early Cold War. It continued to be a significant irritant in American/Soviet relations throughout the period. Moscow's explicit acceptance in the Helsinki Accords of the principle of free movement of people hence represented a historic victory for American diplomacy. Today, with few exceptions, neither traditional claims of national collectives nor the restraints imposed by totalitarian ideologies any longer stand

against an individual's recognized right to emigration, and concomitant right of voluntary expatriation. States still may refuse to permit emigration and expatriation, but owing to persistent American efforts such action now is taken in violation of international law, not with its support.

PUBLICATIONS

Lloyd E. Ambrosius (University of Nebraska-Lincoln), *A Crisis of Republicanism: American Politics during the Civil War Era*. Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1990. ISBN 0-803-21026-4, \$19.95

———, *Woodrow Wilson and the American Diplomatic Tradition: The Treaty Fight in Perspective*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1987. Now in paper: ISBN 0-521-38585-7, \$12.95

H.W. Brands, Jr. (Texas A&M), *The Specter of Neutralism: The United States and the Emergence of the Third World*. Columbia Univ. Press, 1990. ISBN 0-231-07168-X, \$40.00

Jongsuk Chay (Pembroke State University), ed., *Culture and International Relations*. Praeger, 1990. ISBN 0-275-93018-1, \$45.00

———, *Diplomacy of Asymmetry: Korean-American Relations to 1910*. Univ. of Hawaii Press, 1990. ISBN 0-8248-1236-0, \$32.00

Paolo E. Coletta (United States Naval Academy), *Sea Power in the Atlantic and Mediterranean in World War I*. Univ. Press of America, 1989. Cloth: ISBN 0-8191-7427-0, \$24.75

Rosemary Foot (University of Sussex), *A Substitute for Victory: The Politics of Peacemaking at the Korean Armistice Talks*. Cornell Univ. Press, 1990. ISBN 0-801-42413-5, \$32.50

Donald R. Hickey, *The War of 1812: A Forgotten Conflict*. Univ. of Illinois Press, 1990. ISBN 0-252-01613-0, \$32.50

James H. Hitchman (Western Washington University), *A Maritime History of the Pacific Coast, 1540-1980*. Univ. Press of America, 1990. ISBN 0-819-12816-0.

- Charles Stuart Kennedy (Annandale, VA), *The American Consul: A History of the United States Consular Service, 1776-1914*. Greenwood Press, 1990. ISBN 0-313-27212-3, \$39.95
- David E. Kyvig (University of Akron), *Reagan and the World*. Greenwood Press, 1990. Cloth: ISBN 0-313-27341-3, \$40.00; paper: ISBN 0-275-93565-5, \$15.00
- Howard Schonberger (University of Maine), *Aftermath of War: Americans and the Remaking of Japan, 1945-1952*. Kent State Univ. Press, 1989. Cloth: ISBN 0-87338-369-9, \$26.00; paper: ISBN 0-87338-382-6, \$16.50
- Robert D. Schulzinger (University of Colorado), *Henry Kissinger: Doctor of Diplomacy*. Columbia Univ. Press, 1990. ISBN 0-2310-6952-9, \$27.95
- Richard Berry Speed III (Hercules, CA), *Prisoners, Diplomats, and the Great War: A Study in the Diplomacy of Captivity*. Greenwood Press, 1990. ISBN 0-313-26729-4, \$40.00
- James F. Vivian (University of North Dakota), ed., *William Howard Taft: Collected Editorials, 1917-1921*. Praeger, 1990. ISBN 0-275-93199-4, \$75.00
- Michael Wala (Universitat Erlangen-Nurnberg), *Winning the Peace: Amerikanische Außenpolitik und der Council on Foreign Relations, 1945-1950 [Winning the Peace: American Foreign Policy and the Council on Foreign Relations, 1945-1950]*. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag, 1990. ISBN 3-515-05334-4, DM 68,00
- Samuel F. Wells, Jr. (Washington, DC), *The Challenges of Power: American Policy, 1900-1921*. Univ. Press of America, 1990. Paper: ISBN 0-8191-7636-2, \$12.75

ANNOUNCEMENTS

UPDATING THE SHAFR GUIDE

Richard Dean Burns

The SHAFR Council, meeting at the AHA in San Francisco, endorsed my suggestion that we ask the National Endowment of the Humanities for funds to update the SHAFR Guide. I'm exploring (with ABC-CLIO) the prospects for publishing either a new, revised edition of the Guide or a Supplement to it; and that in either event we establish an online SHAFR bibliographical database.

Professor Peter Buckingham at Linnville College, Oregon, has agreed to serve as Associate Editor of the new edition. He and I will be able to design an updating procedure, especially if we are able to create an online computerized database.

The support of the SHAFR membership is necessary if our new endeavor is to be successful—would you drop me a note on the following points?

- (1) Have you found the Guide useful? In what way?
- (2) How might we improve the next version?

We will require volunteers to serve as editors, contributors, and reviewers (to supplement those of the initial group who wish to continue) for the new edition. Grant funds will not be sufficient to pay SHAFR members for their contributions; however, all royalties from the sale of the Guide will go to a designated SHAFR fund and will be used in future updating activities. Please contact me:

Richard Dean Burns
Department of History
California State Univ., Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA 90032

WILLIAM APPLEMAN WILLIAMS
MEMORIAL MEETING

On June 10, 1990, historians and writers will hold a one day colloquium in memory and honor of the late William Appleman Williams. The colloquium will be a mix of personal remembrances and substantive presentations on the enduring importance of Williams' work. The meeting will be held at the Dupont Plaza Hotel on New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, DC.

The editor realizes that this announcement may not reach the members until after the event. However, should this issue be mailed early, reservations (\$35 for lunch and refreshments during the day, \$20 for students) may be sent to Ms. Laura Burstein, IPS, 5th floor, 1601 Conn. Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20009.

ASSOCIATION OF FORMER INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS
ACADEMIC EXCHANGE PROGRAM

The Association of Former Intelligence Officers invites college and university professors who are teaching courses in American intelligence history to apply for participation in the Academic Exchange Program. Instituted several years ago to enhance communications between academic and intelligence communities, this Program provides a publication, *Academic Exchange*, which carries excellent book reviews, syllabi contributed by professors teaching on-campus intelligence courses, and other data which are useful for preparation and research. In addition, AFIO sends a selected intelligence book each semester (the most recent book was by Gordon Brook-Shepherd, *The Storm Birds*) to participants in the Program. These publications and books are provided without cost to college and university professors.

If you wish to be considered for participation, please send your name, address, and phone number along with estimated

enrollment of your intelligence related courses (and how often they are offered) to:

Association of Former Intelligence
Officers

6723 Whittier Ave. Suite 303A
McLean, VA 22101

WORLD WAR II CONFERENCE

Siena College is sponsoring a series of multidisciplinary conferences commemorating the 50th anniversary of World War II. The focal point for the May 30 and 31, 1991, conference will be 1941 and earlier.

We anticipate and welcome presentations on Fascism and Naziism; the War in Asia; Literature; Art; Film; Diplomatic; Political and Military History; Popular Culture and Women's and Jewish studies dealing with the era. Asian, African, Latin American and Near Eastern topics of relevance are solicited. Obviously, collaboration and collaborationist regimes, the events in Greece, Yugoslavia and the Balkans in general, as well as North Africa, the invasion of Russia, Pearl Harbor, etc. will be of particular relevance. For information contact:

Thomas O. Kelly, II
Department of History
Siena College
Loudonville, New York 12211

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON PUBLIC HISTORY— CALL FOR PAPERS

The program committee of the National Council on Public History invites submissions for complete sessions, individual papers or panels for its Thirteenth Annual Conference, to be held in Toledo, Ohio on May 3-5, 1991. Proposals may relate to any subject of Public History, but the Committee especially encourages those tied to the theme of the meeting: "The Audiences of Public History." This theme includes many issues, such as communication between the

users and practitioners of history; how the public learns history; the problems and needs of public history constituencies; and the role of the public in public history. Deadline for proposals is June 1, 1990. For information contact:

Diane F. Britton
Department of History
The University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606

EISENHOWER CONFERENCE

To commemorate the Eisenhower Centennial, the University of Kansas will hold a conference, **Ike's America**, on the Eisenhower presidency and American life in the 1950s, on October 4-6, 1990. For further information, contact:

Rose Rousseau
Division of Continuing
Education
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045-2607
Phone: (913)864-3284

CHINARD PRIZE

The Gilbert Chinard Prize is awarded jointly by the Society for French Historical Studies and the Institut Francais de Washington for distinguished scholarly books or manuscripts in the history of relations between France and the Americas published by a Canadian or American author. The 1990 prize will be awarded at the annual conference of the Society of the French Historical Society in the spring of 1991. For further information contact:

Professor John McV. Haight, Jr
Chairman, Chinard Prie Committee
Department of History
LeHigh University
Maginnes Hall #9
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015

FROM THE DIRECTOR'S REPORT NATIONAL
COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE PROMOTION
OF HISTORY

Page Putnam Miller

Copyright Legislation Introduced. On March 14 Representative Robert Kastenmeier (D-WI) introduced H.R. 4263, a bill to amend the copyright law to clarify that the principle of fair use established for published copyrighted works also applies to unpublished copyrighted materials. Considerable confusion concerning the legality of quoting limited amounts of unpublished letters and diaries has resulted from the Supreme Court's recent decision not to review the case of New Era Publications v. Henry Holt. Senator Paul Simon (D-IL) introduced a parallel bill, S. 2370, in the Senate on March 29 stating that "some federal courts have adopted a rule that would tip the scales against critical historical analysis."

Foreign Relations of the United States. The NCC and other historical organizations passed resolutions last month expressing concern about the deletions in the *Foreign Relations of the United States* documentary series that have resulted in serious distortions of the historical record. The resolutions generated articles in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and the *Washington Post* and interviews with the BBC and NPR. This media coverage has aided efforts to gain Congressional attention to the inadequacy of our federal declassification policy.

PERSONALS

Robert Ferrell (emeritus-Indiana), Warren Kimball (Rutgers-Newark), D. Clayton James (Virginia Military Institute), Norman Graebner (Virginia), Betty Unterberger (Texas A&M), and Stephen Ambrose (New Orleans) were featured in a Military Studies Institute 1990 Symposium at Texas A & M. The April 19-20 meeting dealt with the "Modern President as Wartime Commander-in-Chief."

Kenneth J. Hagan (Naval Academy) has accepted the post as Museum Director and Archivist (while retaining his professorship of History) at Annapolis.

David Reynolds (Cambridge University, England) has a Nuffield Foundation grant for further research and travel in the USA (August-December 1990). He will be based at Harvard as a Visiting Fellow at the Charles Warren Center for American Studies.

John H. Schroeder (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee) will assume the position of Interim Chancellor at that institution.

Geoffrey S. Smith's (Queen's University) article, "Historical Perspectives on AIDS: Society, Culture, and STDs," has been judged one of Canada's "best essays" for 1990, and will be published in Douglas Fetherling (ed.), *Best Canadian Essays—1990*, in May. The article originally appeared in *Queen's Quarterly*, Summer, 1989.

Regina



Books

SPECIAL SHAFR DISCOUNT

**AMERICAN-RUSSIAN ECONOMIC RELATIONS,
1770s-1990s** James K. Libbey

Libbey has succeeded in summarizing the basic economic activities in the long commercial relationship between the United States and Russia.

"It strikes me that we don't have anything like it."

Lloyd Gardner, Rutgers University.

"I think it is very good—informative, balanced, thoughtful...."

Raymond L Garthoff, Brookings Institution.

1989 \$21.95 cloth [ISBN 0-941690-35-0], \$12.95 paper [ISBN 0-941690-36-9], \$9.95 text **SHAFR Discount \$7.00**

**AMERICA SEES RED: Anti-Communism in America,
1890s to 1980s. A Guide to Issues & References** Peter H.
Buckingham.

"I was greatly impressed by the thoroughness of the author's survey of issues, especially in the post-World War II period."

—Professor Robert Griffith, University of Massachusetts at Amherst

220 pages (1987) \$21.95 cloth [ISBN 0-941690-23-7] \$12.95 pbk [ISBN 0-941690-22-9] \$9.95 text **SHAFR Discount \$7.00**

**EMPIRE ON THE PACIFIC: A Study in American
Continental Expansion** Norman A. Graebner.

Graebner contends that Texas, California, and Oregon were acquired so that eastern merchants could gain control of the harbors at San Diego, San Francisco, and Puget Sound—and thereby increase their lucrative trade with the Far East.

LCCN 82-22680. Reprint ed. with updated bibliography. 278 pages. (1983) \$19.95 cloth [ISBN 0-87436-033-1], \$11.95 pbk, \$9.95 text **SHAFR Discount \$7.00**

Offer expires September 15, 1990

Individuals only, please

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AND THE INTERNATIONAL RIVALRIES. Raymond R. Esthus. The story of Roosevelt's role as a pragmatic diplomat, employing secret diplomacy to placate rivalries without involving his country in commitments abroad. This account deals both with TR's involvement in European and East Asian controversies. Bibliography, index.

165 pages. (1971, 1982) \$8.95 text **SHAFR Discount \$6.00**

THE MISSILE CRISIS OF OCTOBER 1962: A Review of Issues and References. Lester Brune.

"Brune skillfully...scrutinizes the origins of the major issues and analyses the reaction and response of Washington and Moscow, relating them to domestic politics and international affairs....Highly recommended as a brief, analytical review of the crisis situation." —*Choice* (April 1986)

165 pages (1985) \$ 7.95 text **SHAFR Discount \$6.00**

Libbey. <i>Economics</i>	discount \$7.00	_____
Buckingham. <i>America Sees Red</i>	discount \$7.00	_____
Graebner <i>Empire on Pacific...</i>	discount \$7.00	_____
Esthus. <i>Theodore Roosevelt</i>	discount \$6.00	_____
Brune. <i>Missle Crisis</i>	discount \$6.00	_____

Offer limited to *individuals* only. All orders must be pre-paid (a personal check is fine): Regina Books will pay the postage of orders of 3 or more books. California orders, please add 6% sales tax.

sub-total _____

postage (\$1 per title) _____

TOTAL _____

Ship to:

Name: _____

Address _____

Send to: Regina Books, Box 280, Claremont, Ca. 91711

CALENDAR

1990

- August 1-4 The 16th SHAFR Summer Conference at the University of Maryland. The program chair is Mark T. Gilderhus, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523.
- August 1 Deadline, materials for the September *Newsletter*.
- November 1 Deadline, materials for the December *Newsletter*.
- November 1-15 Annual election for SHAFR officers.
- November 1 Applications for Bernath dissertation fund awards are due.
- December 27-30 The 105th annual meeting of the AHA will be held in New York. The deadline for submissions has passed.

1991

- January 1 Membership fees in all categories are due, payable at the national office of SHAFR.
- January 15 Deadline for the 1990 Bernath article award.
- January 15 Deadline for submissions for 1991 Summer SHAFR panels and proposals.
- January 20 Deadline for the 1990 Bernath book award.
- February 1 Deadline, materials for the March *Newsletter*.

- February 1 Submissions for Warren Kuehl Award are due.
- March 1 Nominations for the Bernath lecture prize are due.
- April 1 Applications for the H. Stull Holt dissertation fellowship are due.
- April 11-14 The 84th meeting of the Organization of American Historians will take place in Louisville with headquarters at the Galt House.
- May 1 Deadline, materials for the June *Newsletter*.
- June 19-22 The 17th annual meeting of SHAFR will take place at the University of Maryland. Sandra Taylor and William Becker are in charge of the program and the arrangements, respectively.

(The AHA will meet in Chicago in 1991. The OAH will meet in Chicago in 1992 and in Anaheim in 1993.)

AWARDS AND PRIZES

THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL PRIZES

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

THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL BOOK COMPETITION

Description: This is a competition for a book which is a history of international relations, which is meant to include biographies of statesmen and diplomats. General surveys, autobiographies, editions of essays and documents, and works which are representative of social science disciplines other than history are *not* eligible. The prize is to be awarded to a first monograph by a young scholar.

Procedures: Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. Five (5) copies of each book must be submitted with the nomination. The books should be sent directly to: Mark Stoler, Dept. of History, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05401.

Books may be sent at any time during 1990, but should not arrive later than January 20, 1991.

The award of \$2,000.00 will be announced at the March 1991 luncheon of the Society of Historians of American Foreign Relations held in conjunction with the Organization of American Historians in 1991 in Louisville.

Previous Winners:

1972	Joan Hoff Wilson (Sacramento)
	Kenneth E. Shewmaker (Dartmouth)
1973	John L. Gaddis (Ohio U)
1974	Michael H. Hunt (Yale)
1975	Frank D. McCann, Jr. (New Hampshire)
	Stephen E. Pelz (Massachusetts-Amherst)
1976	Martin J. Sherwin (Princeton)
1977	Roger V. Dingman (Southern California)

1978	James R. Leutze (North Carolina-Chapel Hill)
1979	Phillip J. Baram (Program Manager, Boston)
1980	Michael Schaller (Arizona)
1981	Bruce R. Kuniholm (Duke) Hugh DeSantis (Department of State)
1982	David Reynolds (Cambridge)
1983	Richard Immerman (Hawaii)
1984	Michael H. Hunt (North Carolina-Chapel Hill)
1985	David Wyman (Massachusetts-Amherst)
1986	Thomas J. Noer (Carthage College)
1987	Fraser J. Harbutt (Emory) James Edward Miller (Department of State)
1988	Michael Hogan (Ohio State)
1989	Stephen G. Rabe (Texas-Dallas)
1990	Walter Hixson (Akron)

THE STUART L. BERNATH LECTURE PRIZE

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

Procedures: The Bernath Lecture Committee is soliciting nominations for the lecture from members of the Society. Nominations, in the form of a short letter and *curriculum vita*, if available, should reach the Committee no later than March 1, 1991. Nominations should be sent to: Keith Olson, Department of History, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

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

Previous Winners

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

- 1986 William Stueck (Georgia)
- 1987 Nancy Bernkopf Tucker (Colgate)
- 1988 William O. Walker III (Ohio Wesleyan)
- 1989 Stephen G. Rabe (Texas at Dallas)
- 1990 Richard Immerman (Hawaii)

THE STUART L. BERNATH SCHOLARLY ARTICLE PRIZE

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

Eligibility: Prize competition is open to any article on any topic in United States foreign relations that is published during 1990. The author must not be over 40 years of age, or within 10 years after receiving the Ph.D., at the time of publication. Previous winners of the Stuart L. Bernath Book Award are excluded.

Procedures: All articles appearing in *Diplomatic History* shall be automatically considered without nomination. Other articles may be nominated by the author or by any member of SHAFR or by the editor of any journal publishing articles in American diplomatic history. Three (3) copies of the article shall be submitted by 15 January 1991 to the chairperson of the committee: Richard Immerman, Department of History, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI 96822.

The award of \$300.00 will be presented at the SHAFR luncheon at the annual meeting of the OAH in 1991 in Louisville.

Previous winners:

- 1977 John C.A. Stagg (U of Auckland, N.Z.)
- 1978 Michael H. Hunt (Yale)
- 1979 Brian L. Villa (Ottawa)
- 1980 James I. Matray (New Mexico State)
David A. Rosenberg (Chicago)
- 1981 Douglas Little (Clark)
- 1982 Fred Pollock (Cedar Knolls, NJ)
- 1983 Chester Pach (Texas Tech)
- 1985 Melvyn Leffler (Vanderbilt)
- 1986 Duane Tananbaum (Ohio State)
- 1987 David McLean (R.M.I.H.E., Australia)
- 1988 Dennis Merrill (Missouri-Kansas City)
- 1989 Robert J. McMahon (Florida)
- 1990 Lester Foltos (Seattle)

THE STUART L. BERNATH DISSERTATION FUND

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

Requirements include:

1. The dissertation must deal with some aspect of American foreign relations.
2. Awards are given to help defray costs involved in:
 - (a) consulting original manuscripts that have just become available or obtaining photocopies from such sources,
 - (b) typing, printing, and/or reproducing copies of the dissertation,
 - (c) abstracting the dissertation.
3. Most of the research and writing of the dissertation must be completed at the time application is made. Awards are *not* intended to pay for time to write.
4. Applications must include:
 - (a) A one page curriculum vitae of the applicant, a table of contents for the dissertation, and a substantial synopsis *or* a completed chapter of the dissertation,
 - (b) a paragraph regarding the original sources that have been consulted,
 - (c) a statement regarding the projected date of completion,
 - (d) an explanation of why the money is needed and how, specifically, it will be used, and
 - (e) a letter from the applicant's supervising professor commenting upon the appropriateness of the applicant's request. (This should be sent separately.)
5. One or more awards may be given. Generally awards will not exceed \$500.
6. The successful applicant must file a brief report on how the funds were spent not later than eight months following the presentation of the award (i.e., normally by the following September). In addition, when the dissertation is finished, the awardee should submit to the committee a copy of the abstract sent to University Microfilms (University of Michigan).

Applications should be sent to David Schmitz, Department of History, Whitman College, Walla Walla, WA 99362. The deadline is November 1, 1990.

Previous winners:

- 1985 Jon Nielson (UC-Santa Barbara)
- 1986 Valdinia C. Winn (Kansas) & Walter L. Hixson (Colorado)
- 1987 Janet M. Manson (Washington State), Thomas M. Gaskin (Washington), W. Michael Weis (Ohio State) & Michael Wala (Hamburg)
- 1988 Elizabeth Cobbs (Stanford) & Madhu Bhalla (Queen's, Ontario)
- 1989 Thomas Zeiler (Massachusetts-Amherst) & Russel Van Wyk (North Carolina-Chapel Hill)
- 1990 David McFadden (UC-Berkeley)

THE W. STULL HOLT DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP

The Holt Dissertation Fellowship was established as a memorial to W. Stull Holt, one of that generation of historians which established diplomatic history as a respected field for historical research and teaching. The award will be \$1,500.00.

Applicants must be candidates for the degree, Doctor of Philosophy, whose dissertation projects are directly concerned with the history of United States foreign relations. The award is intended to help defray costs of travel, preferably foreign travel, necessary to the pursuit of research on a significant dissertation project. Qualified applicants will have satisfactorily completed comprehensive doctoral examinations before April 1991, leaving only the dissertation as the sole, remaining requirement for the doctoral degree.

Applicants should include a prospectus of the dissertation, indicating work already completed as well as contemplated research. The prospectus should describe the dissertation project as fully as possible, indicating the scope, method, and chief source materials. The applicant should indicate how the fellowship, if awarded, would be used. An academic transcript showing all graduate work taken to date should accompany the application and prospectus of the dissertation. In addition, three letters from graduate teachers familiar with the work of the applicant, including one letter from the director of the dissertation, are required.

At the end of the fellowship year the recipient of the fellowship will be required to report to the Committee relating how the fellowship was used.

Applications and supporting papers should be sent before April 1, 1991 to: Frank Costigliola, Department of History, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881.

Announcement of the recipient of the Holt Memorial Fellowship will be made at the Society's annual summer meeting.

Prior winners:

1986 Kurt Schultz (Ohio State University)

1987 David W. McFadden (University of California, Berkeley)

1988 Mary Ann Heiss (Ohio State University)

THE NORMAN AND LAURA GRAEBNER AWARD

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

Conditions of the Award:

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

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

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

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

Chairman of the committee: Lloyd Ambrosius, Dept. of History, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588.

Previous winners:

1986 Dorothy Borg (Columbia)

1988 Alexander DeConde (University of California at Santa Barbara)

WARREN F. KUEHL AWARD

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

The award will be made every other year at the SHAFR summer conference. The next award will be for books published in 1989 and 1990. Deadline for submissions is February 1, 1991. One copy of each submission should be sent directly to each member of the selection committee.

Robert Accinelli
Dept. of History
University of Toronto
Toronto M5S 1A
Canada

Harold Josephson
Department of History
U. of N. Carolina/Charlotte
Charlotte, NC 2822

Previous winners:

1987 Harold Josephson (University of North Carolina at Charlotte)

1989 Melvin Small (Wayne State University)

ARTHUR LINK PRIZE FOR DOCUMENTARY EDITING

PURPOSE. The prize will recognize and encourage analytical scholarly editing of documents, in appropriate published form, relevant to the history of American foreign relations, policy, and diplomacy. By "analytical" we mean the inclusion (in headnotes, footnotes, essays, etc.) of both appropriate historical background needed to establish the context of the documents, and interpretive historical commentaries based on scholarly research.

CRITERIA. To be selected for the award, the collection, which must have been published in some form, must, taken in its entirety, meet all or most of the following criteria:

- a) makes more available an historically important collection of documents relevant to the history of American foreign affairs;
- b) makes a significant contribution to an understanding of American foreign relations;
- c) significantly expands, updates, or changes our knowledge of American foreign relations;
- d) provides historical context for the documents based upon research in both the sources and relevant secondary materials;
- e) conforms in editorial methodology to standards of modern day documentary editions (e.g. *Foreign Relations of the United States* series);
- f) offers an interpretive historical analysis, not by selectivity of documentation, but in an appropriate but separate commentary;
- g) the format would normally have documents and analysis together, but that would not exclude separate presentation so long as they were essentially one project.

ELIGIBILITY. The competition is open to the editor/author(s) of any collection of documents published after 1984 that is devoted primarily to sources relating to the history of American foreign relations, policy, and/or diplomacy; and that incorporates sufficient historical analysis and interpretation of those documents to constitute a contribution to knowledge and scholarship.

PROCEDURES. The prize winner shall be selected by a three member committee appointed by the President of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. Nominations may be made by any person or publisher. Recommendations for nominations may be requested from the Association for Documentary Editing and any other similar professional organization.

FREQUENCY. The prize shall be awarded whenever the committee determines there is a qualified entry, but no more frequently than once every three years.

PRIZE. To be determined by the amount of monies available in excess of capital, but \$500 plus travel expenses to the professional meeting where it is presented is the current goal.



AMERICAN-EAST ASIAN RELATIONS NEWSLETTER

EVALUATION OF CONFERENCE ON "SINO-AMERICAN RELATIONS SINCE 1900"

January 3-6, 1990, University of Hong Kong

by

Priscilla Roberts

(University of Hong Kong)

This conference was held at the University of Hong Kong over the four days January 3rd to 6th 1990. It was jointly organized by the Centre of Asian Studies of the University of Hong Kong and the American Studies Association of Hong Kong, and its sponsors included the Asia Foundation, the British Council, the Ford Foundation, Dr. Stanley Ho, Lark International Ltd., the Louis Cha Fund of the University of Hong Kong, Northwest Airlines, Rank Xerox (Hong Kong) Ltd., the United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia, and the U.S. Information Service, Hong Kong. Academics from the University of Hong Kong, the Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Baptist College, Hong Kong Lingnan College, and the Institute of International Education were represented on the organizing committee.

In all, over thirty papers were presented, all focusing on various aspects of twentieth-century Sino-American relations. There were fourteen papers from the People's Republic of China, four from Hong Kong, one from Taiwan, eight from the United States, two from Great Britain, and one each from Austria and Bangladesh. As a rule, these were chosen submissions in response to an international call for papers. Six papers, five by PRC speakers and one by an American, were delivered *in absentia*, since for various reasons their authors unfortunately could not attend in person.

The keynote address, "America's Greatest Asia Experts? Douglas MacArthur and the American Misunderstanding of China and Asia, 1935-51," was delivered by Prof. Michael Schaller of the History Department of the University of Arizona. Prof. Schaller has written several highly-regarded books on Sino-American and Japanese-American relations, and his keynote address utilized material from the most recent, a study of General Douglas MacArthur. The other papers covered a wide range of topics, including China and American mutual perceptions and misperceptions, cultural and literary interactions, and American influences upon Chinese higher education. About half the papers presented covered the broad area of Sino-American diplomatic relations, and these ranged from broad surveys of several decades to detailed studies of more limited topics. Besides purely diplomatic studies of various issues, incidents, and individuals, the latter including Claire Chennault, Henry Luce, and John Leighton Stuart, several papers focused upon economic or technological relations.

Beyond its purely academic results, the conference provided an opportunity for the various speakers, session chairs, and others attending to meet a variety of scholars from different countries and disciplines, to develop a greater appreciation and understanding of one another's work, and to learn about work in progress in other institutions. The directors of at least four research institutes in Mainland China and Taiwan were present at the conference, together with academics from various parts of the world, and the outside audience also included individuals of many different nationalities. It is to be hoped that some of these encounters will bear fruit in the future in closer cooperation between some of the individuals and institutions involved.

The conference also helped to make many of those attending more familiar with the resources for the study of the United States which are already available in Hong Kong, and demonstrated that many academics in the surrounding region are eager to take advantage of these. It is to be hoped that it will pave the way for closer cooperation between Hong Kong academic institutions and others in this region.

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

SPONSOR: Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.

EDITOR: William J. Brinker, Department of History. **EDITORIAL ASSISTANT:** Brent W. York.

ISSUES: The *Newsletter* is published quarterly.

ADDRESS CHANGES: Changes of address should be sent to:
the Executive Secretary-Treasurer: Executive Secretary-Treasurer:
Allan Spetter, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435.

BACK ISSUES: Copies of most back numbers of the *Newsletter* may be obtained from the editorial office upon payment of a charge of \$1.00 per copy: for members living abroad the charge is \$2.00.

MATERIALS DESIRED: Personals, announcements, abstracts of scholarly papers and articles delivered—or published—upon diplomatic subjects, bibliographical or historiographical essays, essays of a "how-to-do-it" nature, information about foreign depositories, biographies, autobiographies of "elder statesmen" in the field, jokes, etc.

FORMER PRESIDENTS OF SHAFR

- 1968 Thomas A. Bailey (Stanford)
 - 1969 Alexander DeConde (California-Santa Barbara)
 - 1970 Richard W. Leopold (Northwestern)
 - 1971 Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana)
 - 1972 Norman A. Graebner (Virginia)
 - 1973 Wayne S. Cole (Maryland)
 - 1974 Bradford Perkins (Michigan)
 - 1975 Armin H. Rappaport (California-San Diego)
 - 1976 Robert A. Divine (Texas)
 - 1977 Raymond A. Esthus (Tulane)
 - 1978 Akira Iriye (Chicago)
 - 1979 Paul A. Varg (Michigan State)
 - 1980 David M. Pletcher (Indiana)
 - 1981 Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State)
 - 1982 Lawrence E. Gelfand (Iowa)
 - 1983 Ernest R. May (Harvard)
 - 1984 Warren I. Cohen (Michigan State)
 - 1985 Warren F. Kuehl (Akron)
 - 1986 Betty Unterberger (Texas A&M)
 - 1987 Thomas G. Paterson (Connecticut)
 - 1988 Lloyd Gardner (Rutgers)
 - 1989 George Herring (Kentucky)
-