

# The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

1988 SUMMER PROGRAM ENCLOSED

## **NEWSLETTER**

---

Volume 19

No. 1

March 1988

Page

- 1 Warren F. Kuehl: In Memoriam
- 6 Past and Future of National Security History by  
David F. Trask
- 16 Foreign Relations of the United States, 1783-  
1789 by Milton Gustafson
- 20 SHAFR Council Minutes
- 27 Summary of 1987 Annual Meeting by George  
Herring
- 45 Abstracts
- 49 Publications
- 51 Announcements
- 55 Personals
- 57 Calendar
- 59 Agreement between SHAFR and Dr. and Mrs. Gerald  
Bernath
- 70 Awards and Prizes
- 78 SHAFR Schedule of Events at OAH

ISSN 0740-6169

**SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS**  
FOUNDED IN 1967. CHARTERED IN 1972.

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

VICE PRESIDENT: Lloyd Gardner, History, Rutgers, New Brunswick, NJ 08903

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

CHAIR, PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Robert Beisner, History, American University, Washington, DC

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

CHAIR, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Garry Clifford, Political Science, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06268.

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

MEMBERSHIP: Annual dues are \$16.50, payable at the office of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer. Student fees - \$6.00, retired members - \$8.00, life memberships - \$250.00. In the case of membership by husband and wife, dues for one of them shall be one-half of the regular price. For those wishing only the SHAHR 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, and Warren Kuehl. Details of each of these awards are to be found under the appropriate headings in each Newsletter.

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

## WARREN F. KUEHL: IN MEMORIAM

by Richard W. Leopold

Warren F. Kuehl, past president of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations, died in Sarasota on December 15, 1987 after a courageous twenty-two-month battle with cancer. No single person has done more for this Society; it can be argued that none has done as much.

Born in Bettendorf, Iowa, on June 14, 1924, Kuehl grew up on a farm and attended local public schools. Graduating from Davenport High School in 1942, he spent one year at the State University of Iowa. Although eager to enter the military, he accepted an occupational deferment as a much needed agricultural worker. When his parents moved to Sarasota in 1946, he attended St. Ambrose College in Davenport for one term and then, in January 1947, enrolled at Rollins College. There he studied with A.J. Hanna and Theodore Collier but also fell under the spell of President Hamilton Holt. During his senior year he did an honors project on the evolution of international organizations. Graduating in June 1949 with high distinction in history, he pursued a long-standing ambition and in September entered the University of Chicago Law School. He quickly changed course, however, and in January 1950 became a graduate student in history at Northwestern University where his fiancée, Olga Llano, was seeking a degree in the School of Music. In Evanston he studied with, among others, Ray A. Billington, Richard M. Brace, Howard F. Cline, Richard W. Leopold, Arthur S. Link, George T. Romani, Franklin D. Scott, L.S. Stavrianos, and Clarence L. Ver Steeg. He received his master's degree in June 1951 and the doctorate in August 1954. His dissertation, directed by Richard W. Leopold, was entitled "The Life and Work of Hamilton Holt, 1872-1925."

After an apprenticeship at Northwestern--assisting in the American survey under Leopold and Link from 1952 to 1954 and teaching his own course on the Chicago campus in the summer of 1954--Kuehl went as an Instructor to Ohio University for the spring term of 1955. He moved to Rockford College as Assistant Professor for 1955-1958 and to Mississippi State University as Associate Professor for 1958-1961. Promoted to Professor in 1961, he resigned in 1964 to head the Department of History at the University of Akron until 1971. During that period he taught summers at Northwestern in 1963, Duke in 1964, North Carolina in 1965, and Case Western Reserve in 1966. In 1970 he became the first Director of the Center for Peace Studies at Akron, a position he held until the diagnosis of his cancer caused him to advance the date of his planned early retirement. On July 31, 1986, he stepped down as Professor and Director and soon thereafter moved to 6994 Country Lakes Circle, Sarasota, Florida 34243. He is survived by his wife of thirty-seven years, Olga Llano, a talented pianist whom he met at Rollins, and by two sons--Marshall, an Assistant Professor of History at the University of Hawaii, and Paul, a geologist of Akron.

Kuehl was a prolific scholar. His Hamilton Holt: Journalist, Internationalist, Educator (1960) revised and expanded his dissertation which had covered only the first two phases of Holt's career. In Blow the Man Down (1959) he edited and arranged into an autobiographical narrative, from a manuscript found in the Holt Papers, the writings of a black seaman. Seeking World Order: The United States and International Organization to 1920 (1969) was the first installment of his major work. Between 1965 and 1985 he compiled three volumes that listed and indexed all doctoral dissertations in history accepted at United States and Canadian universities from 1873 to 1980. In 1983 he edited a Biographical Dictionary of Internationalists, for which he wrote forty-eight sketches. Earlier he had contributed to the Supplements of the Dictionary of American Biography and Notable American Women. He wrote an essay on "International Peace" in 1972 for the Dictionary of

the History of Ideas, on the "Permanent Court of Arbitration" in 1976 for the revised Dictionary of American History, on "Internationalism" in 1978 for the Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy, and on "Internationalism and Peace" in 1985 for an encyclopedia on Franklin D. Roosevelt and his times. He prepared several pamphlets and articles on bibliographical matters, and he served as contributing editor for two chapters of the SHAHR Guide to American Foreign Relations Since 1700 (1983). He published at least a dozen additional essays and notes in various journals. He was general editor of the Library of World Peace Studies, reproduced in microform by the Clearwater Publishing Company, and wrote introductions to six of the titles. His numerous book reviews, appearing in leading professional journals, were informed, critical, and fair. A few months before his death he completed a book-length manuscript entitled "Internationalism and the United States, 1920-1941." It will be published by the Kent State University Press.

He was also a frequent speaker, commentator, and chair at professional meetings. He read his first paper before the Southern Historical Association at Tulsa in 1960, before the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at Detroit in 1961, and before the American Historical Association at New York in 1971. In 1978 and 1984 he again gave papers before the last. His SHAHR presidential address, "Webs of Common Interests Revisited: Nationalism, Internationalism, and Historians of American Foreign Relations," was delivered at New York in December 1985 and appeared in the Spring 1986 issue of Diplomatic History.

Kuehl was an ideal organization man--conscientious, thorough, always present and prepared. He represented the American Historical Association from 1984 to 1986 on the State Department's Advisory Committee on Historical Documentation, chairing that group in 1984-1985, and he participated in the early discussions that led to the decision to compile a new Guide to Historical Literature. For the Organization of American Historians he served on the Program Committee

in 1973, on the Bibliography Committee from 1978 to 1980, and on the Membership Committee since 1971. For the Ohio Academy of History he sat on its Historical Society and Archives Committee from 1966 to 1970 and on its Book Prize Committee in 1975. For the National Endowment for the Humanities he was a member of its Ohio Committee from 1973 to 1976. He chaired the organizing committee of the Association for the Bibliography of History and served on its Nominating Committee beginning in 1985. He was on the Council of the Conference on Peace Research in History from 1975 to 1979 and from 1982 to 1986. He was a founder of the Society for the Study of Internationalism. A long-time member of the Board of Editors of Peace and Change, he was named in 1979 to the Advisory Board for America: History and Life.

His major concern, however, was the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. He chaired the first Program Committee in 1968-1970, served on the Nominating Committee from 1971-1973, was joint executive secretary-treasurer with Lawrence S. Kaplan from 1974 to 1979, and was elected vice president for 1984 and president for 1985. He attended all but six Council meetings from 1974 through 1986, a record which, like Lou Gehrig's for consecutive games, is not likely to be broken. Although others were equally prominent at the outset in planning the SHAHR Guide, he was the key person in keeping the project alive, in seeking an editor and publisher, and in obtaining the low purchase price for members of the Society. Similarly, he negotiated the highly favorable financial arrangements for Diplomatic History. Most of all, his careful oversight and sound investment policy, both while secretary-treasurer and later while on the Finance Committee, enabled the Society to move from a position of no financial reserves in 1974 to the extremely satisfying fiscal situation today. It was most fitting that the Council established in June 1986 the Warren F. Kuehl Prize.

Among his many services to this Society none proved more productive than his close relations with the parents of Stuart L. Bernath, a gifted young scholar

whose promising career was cut short by cancer in July 1970. In August 1968, when he was contemplating a study of the United States and the League of Nations after 1930, young Bernath wrote Kuehl, at my suggestion, for advice and assistance. A warm correspondence ensued. Since Stuart has been a member since June 1969, it was natural for his parents to turn to SHAFR when they decided to establish a prize in his name. It is likely that Alexander DeConde, Stuart's mentor at Santa Barbara, Robert H. Ferrell, president in 1971, and Joseph P. O'Grady, the first executive secretary-treasurer, played a larger role than Kuehl when the Council created in December 1971 the first Bernath Prize, now called the Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Book Competition. But the subsequent Stuart L. Bernath Lecture Prize (1976) and the Stuart L. Bernath Dissertation Fund (1984) stemmed largely from Kuehl's efforts. So, too, did the Bernath Supplementary Discretionary Account with which the Council dealt in December 1986.

No single individual can know or describe all of the scholarly activities and personal traits of Warren F. Kuehl. His teachers at Rollins and Northwestern, his contemporaries in graduate school, his own students at several institutions, his long-time colleagues at Akron, his associates on numerous professional committees, his fellow practitioners in the history of American foreign relations, his co-workers in allied disciplines, and--most of all--those who helped him in building SHAFR, including Gerald and Myrna Bernath, all have their own memories and appraisals. Most would certainly mention his loyalty, modesty, optimism, industry, tolerance, and geniality plus a capacity for friendship and a concern for others. Tireless in his research and thorough in his publications, he set a high standard for himself while gladly accepting criticism. He was an innovator in the field of peace studies and in his early reliance on computer methodology.

These characteristics were evident in his long and painful final illness. He remained cheerful and, outwardly, sanguine. He drained his ebbing strength

complete the manuscript on which he had long worked and read with equanimity and gratitude an extended critique that suggested further revisions. In letters eight months before his death he offered sage advice to the officers of SHAFR. While taking pride in what had been accomplished, particularly the growing endowment fund, he warned against complacency, called attention to plans not yet carried out, and again suggested a program of self-study. His last publication, appearing fittingly in this Newsletter in March 1987, was an obituary of Charles DeBenedetti, himself a victim of cancer, who had recently agreed to chair the first committee to award the Warren F. Kuehl Prize.

## PAST AND FUTURE OF NATIONAL SECURITY HISTORY

by

David F. Trask

Let me begin with a confession: The title of my remarks is misleading. National security history, as I understand the term, has no real past, and I can't be sure that it has a future. I have in mind a unified history of all aspects of national security -- a broad field that integrates the traditionally separate domains of diplomatic history and military history. Among other things, this unified history treats both war and peace, both civil and military activity, both the national and international security contexts, and both domestic and foreign influences on the national security process.

The study of national security history in this comprehensive sense begins with the truism, known long before its well-known enunciation by Clausewitz, that an inseparable relationship exists between force and politics, i.e., the organic connection between the exertion of state power in its various guises and the execution of state foreign policy. Historians of the national security process uniformly endorse this premise in theory but often ignore it in action. It is time for us to take this maxim seriously, e.g., as

seriously as did Thucydides, one of the fathers of our calling.

What does it mean to take the inseparability of force and politics seriously? It means, quite simply, that preparing the history of any aspect of national security affairs requires in every instance one or another mix of the skills associated with two traditional forms of history -- the history of foreign relations and the history of war and peace. I prefer these somewhat awkward terms because they are more comprehensive than the conventional labels -- on the one hand diplomatic history or international history and on the other hand military history, naval history, air history, and peace history.

Don't take this observation as ruling out specialization within the broader field of national security history. On the contrary, I deem specialization essential. I argue only that specialists in any aspect of national security history should pursue their particular inquiries in the light of an expansive conception of the larger field. That broader context conditions relevant historical processes that specialists expose to rigorous investigation. Unless we adopt this comprehensive approach to the history of national security we risk distortions and omissions that limit the authority and the utility of the specialized history we produce.

I am certain that all present know what I mean by "authority," but let me comment briefly on my use of the slippery term "utility." I refer here to the consumption of national security history in the national security community -- to its impact among those responsible for national security policies. Public historians who serve the national security agencies are obviously practitioners of applied history in this sense, but so are most of those who work on national security history in other arenas -- especially the academy. The normal assumption, often implicit, is that an authoritative work in some aspect of national security history, whether the product of a public historian or an academic historian, is of

practical use in some respects to those officials responsible for national security.

National security historians generally assume that respected works in the field are both authoritative and utilitarian. If the national security community -- our client -- fails to take advantage of our output, we usually presume that the targeted planners or decision makers don't know how to use it. The problem for practitioners then becomes the task of educating lay members of the national security community -- especially key planners and decision makers -- to make correct use of historical analysis. This premise informs the recent well-received work entitled Thinking in Time by May and Neustadt.

Surely the lay client is often ill-equipped to make effective use of national security history, but I want to consider another difficulty. Is our scholarly product good enough to serve the discerning client well? I for one do not think that we are doing as well as we could in this respect, and I include in this judgment academic as well as official historians. The reason why I take this view, as you may suspect from my earlier observations, is the failure of many practitioners to adopt a sufficiently comprehensive conception of the field -- one that recognizes the inseparability of force and politics and the corresponding need to unify the history of foreign relations and the history of war and peace.

I won't justify this conception of the field further because I don't detect much opposition to this idea. What I notice is that few historians practice this kind of national security history. I propose to consider briefly the reasons why the history of foreign relations and the history of war and peace have developed narrowly and separately in the United States and why they are still largely divorced. If we can identify the causes of this condition, we might be able to move toward a more useful national security history -- a history that is good enough for the planners and decision makers who need it and who know how to make sound use of it.

Let me begin with a generally accepted observation. The two main fields of national security history were not broadly professionalized until after World War II. Distinguished exceptions aside, especially in diplomatic history, which was ahead of military history, both fields were until about mid-century the province of amateurs rather than fully trained professional historians. Buffs, popularizers, journalists, and thoughtful warriors or statesmen produced most of the works on the history of national security. These writers concentrated on field operations -- in the case of the history of foreign relations on diplomatic negotiations, in the case of military history on battles and leaders. Because these works often minimized other aspects of the field -- in the case of military history policy, strategy, mobilization, and logistics -- they frequently lacked sophistication and comprehensiveness.

What accounts for the underdeveloped state of the two main branches of national security history as late as 1945? I need not dwell overlong on the obvious. During the long century between 1815 and 1914 the nation concentrated on a domestic/continental agenda, largely abjuring foreign adventurism in Eurasia or elsewhere in the Americas. Our foreign policy was political isolation and our defense policy a passive reliance on geography. The Americans were able largely to ignore the rest of the world and to depend almost entirely on a passive defense based on natural barriers because they enjoyed "free security," a function of the dynamic but basically stable balance of power that obtained across Eurasia and also the failure of any neighbor in the Americas to develop imposing power. Potential aggressors in Eurasia could not accumulate sufficient strength to protect themselves at home and at the same time surmount the oceanic expanses and polar wastes that protected the distant New World. Over the same period no aggressor rose elsewhere in the Americas to challenge the Colossus of the North.

The national security paradigm of the age -- political isolation and passive defense -- had obvious

institutional consequences. Americans could easily ignore the incompetence of a small diplomatic and consular corps that was largely made up of political wheelhorses with few qualifications for international service. We could happily bear the light burden of miniscule armed services, hardly professional, dedicated to peacetime missions. The army served on the frontier as a constabulary; the navy guarded a modest maritime commerce. Neither force was prepared to fight well against a strong opponent -- especially a great power located in or near Eurasia -- because neither had any such mission. When war came, always unexpectedly, the unprepared nation relied on improvised armed services, which promptly disappeared at the conclusion of hostilities, leaving little trace.

Small wonder, then, that highly trained professional historians, materializing in considerable numbers during the latter decades of the nineteenth century and after, mostly in academic environs, emphasized historical study of the nation's essentially continental/domestic agenda during the nineteenth century -- creation of a workable polity, acquisition of a continental domain, development of the economy. Neither the history of war and peace nor the history of foreign relations received as much attention from professional historians because they, like their fellow citizens, were preoccupied with peaceful internal processes and paid little heed to national security affairs. Meanwhile, popular historians satisfied public interest on the only real exception to this rule -- the history of the Civil War -- a domestic not an international tragedy that did not generate a serious external threat to national security and that exerted only a fleeting influence on national security institutions, whatever its consequences for other aspects of national development.

This domestic emphasis among historians extended far into the twentieth century, but, meanwhile, the international setting of national security affairs underwent radical change. After 1914 the world

experienced vast and enduring instability, a catastrophe that fostered hegemonic enterprise at both extremes of Eurasia -- the German aggressions of 1914 and 1939 and the Japanese aggression of 1941. It also produced Soviet-American confrontation after 1945. In these gloomy circumstances great and growing challenges to the vital interests of the United States materialized on all sides. The old national security paradigm of isolation and passive defense, which presumed the absence of dangerous external pressures, no longer sufficed, although it took the nation a generation and more fully to accept this reality. Beginning with the statecraft of Woodrow Wilson new national security policies came into vogue that exactly reversed those of the nineteenth century. Now the nation must abandon isolation and commit itself to a foreign policy of extensive and sustained political intervention in the affairs of Eurasia. Now the nation must abandon passive defense and adopt an active defense based on huge armed forces, highly professionalized, dedicated to warfighting.

Like other Americans, historians were slow to realize the adverse consequences of the destabilized international situation, but after 1945 the profession reacted in many ways. Some mature professional scholars abandoned their original fields and produced influential studies in both diplomatic and military history. These "retreads" also encouraged the study of national security topics in colleges and universities. A proliferation of regional studies programs contributed to the growth of both fields. Meanwhile, the federal government strengthened its historical services, especially in national security agencies. In both diplomatic and military history a "new history" developed that had been addressed earlier only in a relatively narrow and isolated way. The retreads and their students dealt not only with political aspects of the national security process but with economic and social dimensions, and like historians in other vineyards made increasing use of novel techniques such as quantification, psychoanalysis, and the theory of organizations.

If we consider the recent evolution of these two traditional fields -- diplomatic history and military history -- we cannot but marvel at the magnitude of the achievement. All we have to do is to compare the basic bibliography for each field in 1945 with that of 1987 to appreciate this accomplishment. Moreover, any comparison of the course offerings of history departments then and now reflects the curricular gains. Finally, official historical programs have expanded beyond the wildest imagination of those who pioneered in this form of practice.

So much for the good news -- the very good news of unprecedented growth and accomplishment over the past forty years. It is better to be late than never! I now turn to the future.

Despite our past accomplishments we still have a long way to go before we can claim that our products compare qualitatively with those of older, more established fields. I do not intend this assertion to be negative or disputatious; I simply seek to make explicit what seems indisputable. We have come a long way in a short time, but we have a good deal to accomplish before we pull even with or move ahead of many other types of history.

What can be done to catch up with the older, more developed fields and in so doing produce works of greater authority and therefore of more utility to planners and decision makers? I propose now to offer a short list of some of the improvements that could enhance the quality of our output -- especially to increase the utility of our work in the national security community. I have touched on most of these items earlier. None of them are new, but only a corporal's guard of American historians now seeks to apply them collectively and systematically across the board in day-to-day scholarship.

1. Let me reiterate the most important of these ideas -- that force and politics go together. The historian of national security affairs must be a generalist in a unified form of the history of foreign relations and

the history of war and peace as a backdrop to his work on specialized subjects. Otherwise, unacceptable deficiencies result that minimize the value of his product to planners and decision makers within the national security community.

2. We can no longer separate the study of peace from the study of war. We did so in the nineteenth century for a good reason. War was an exceptional and unanticipated experience; it occurred only rarely and lasted but a short time. Americans thought of peace as the prevailing -- normal -- state of affairs. In our contemporary circumstances -- when war is frequent, when the distinction between war and peace is at best blurred, and when deterrence is almost always preferable to warfighting -- national security considerations are ever of surpassing importance.

3. We can no longer assume the primacy of either internal or external influences as determinants of national security behavior. Neither the paraRankean nor the paraMarxist formulations that in most cases undergird the regnant neorealist and the new left perspectives lead by themselves to historical analysis of more than secondary utility to planners and decision makers. These approaches leave out too much of significance and introduce too many misrepresentations. They are too reductionist to serve well in complex planning tasks and in confused decision making situations. Partial visions aren't good enough. Historians must develop descriptions of things as they are and provide casual analyses that explain the reasons why processes evolve as they do. If the influences are domestic or if they are foreign, so be it. In most cases some mix of causation exists. Blind obeisance to one or another Germanic mode of analysis obscures the complexity of both description and causation. Surely the seminal insights of both Ranke and Marx, along with many descendants, can inform many aspects of analysis. It seems equally certain that no one set of views is likely to cover all circumstances. In making this observation I offer solace to those among us pejoratively derided as "creeping eclectics." I say: "All power to the

creeping eclectics." I hasten to insist that I do not oppose ideological commitment on the part of historians. Quite the contrary: I applaud it. We can't be political eunuchs any more than others in the society. I do, however, strongly object to ideological perversions of the methods of historical inquiry in the name of one or another secular faith. Let ideology influence choice of topics, and let it influence ethical and pragmatic evaluations of past processes, but don't allow it to pervert the craft, depriving descriptive and causal analyses of scholarly authority. If we commit secular sins of this class, we deprive ourselves of any special claim to a constructive role in the shaping of the future through influence on planners and decision makers.

4. In dealing with the history of national security many historians still appear to believe that the emphasis should be on field operations. We ought to concentrate, they maintain, on the deeds of warriors in battle or statesmen in negotiations. Do such analyses of operations mean anything, if they neglect the larger considerations that influence operations -- the fundamental political objectives of the nation and the strategic design that guide the use of power to achieve war aims? The indispensable study of operations must continue, but not as a thing unto itself. Operations have no rational or moral meaning in vacuo. They can be justified only as reasonable and ethical means of achieving important ends, a justification that is impossible of attainment without due attention to the political and strategic context.

5. In dealing with practically any imaginable aspect of the history of national security we should weigh the actions of all involved individuals and organizations, even if only as background to a specialized topic. We inherit from the earlier fragmented history of national security affairs an emphasis on one or another element thereof, a part of the whole; we do not give sufficient attention to the interaction of such parts with other elements. It is most unlikely that an emphasis purely on the history of the U.S. Army or the Ambassador to France or the

Central Intelligence Agency or a theater command during World War I will serve. Political-military enterprises are now and always have been "joint" enterprises. The utility of our product to the national security community depends on studies that recognize this patent reality.

I could go on, but let me end my list here. I am all too aware that I call for training and experience that few if any of us now possess. Recently one of my colleagues drew attention to this circumstance, saying: "I agree with everything you argue, but at this late date how am I going to develop the skills required to do your kind of history? You don't have all these skills yourself. Where am I going to find others to join me who possess such background?" I sympathize entirely with this cri de coeur. I can only respond that such challenges did not daunt distinguished past practitioners in fledgling fields of historical inquiry. They improved their performance because they added to the quantity and quality of their professional skills in response to heightened demands. We have done this very thing since 1945; let us continue. If we detect a professional requirement that we lack, two things are required. We should seek to acquire the skill; we should do all that we can to support the efforts of colleagues and students to do the same thing.

The need to continue to strengthen our skills explains why I believe that constant attention to professional development -- to the cultivation of the tools of the trade -- is of the greatest possible importance for practitioners of national security history, wherever they may practice. No one of us is ever completely prepared for the complex work that we do. Nevertheless, however imposing the future professional requirements for those who practice the history of national security, I believe that we can rise to the occasion, and I for one look forward to the task with hope and enthusiasm. We possess a brief but distinguished past, one that provides a firm foundation for continuing professional growth and for

enduring contributions that will satisfy more and more demanding public requirements.

## FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1783-1789

by

Milton O. Gustafson (National Archives)

Twenty years ago a SHAFR colleague wrote to the Library of Congress asking about the location of the correspondence and other records of American foreign policy for the period from 1783 to 1789. Where those records are, and what they contain, are still a mystery to many scholars.

Charles Thomson, the Secretary of Congress, transferred them to the Department of State in 1789. They went to the Library of Congress in 1903, and finally to the National Archives (together with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution) in 1952. They are available as National Archives microfilm publications, and they are completely indexed by name and subject in John Butler's five-volume Index: The Papers of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789 (PCC Index).

The PCC Index was a product of the Center for the Documentary Study of the American Revolution, established by the National Archives in the early 1970's to help in the national celebration of the bicentennial of the Declaration of Independence.

From now until 1991, the United States will celebrate the bicentennial of the United States Constitution, the establishment of the National Government, and the adoption of the Bill of Rights. As the repository for the records of the Federal Government, its predecessors (the First and Second Continental Congresses and the Confederation Congress), and the Constitutional Convention, the National Archives has a

greater interest in the bicentennial than almost any other government agency. And just as in the 1970's, the National Archives has a number of bicentennial projects. Two are of particular interest to SHAFR members: a one-volume guide to the pre-federal records in the National Archives, and a multi-volume publication of documents focusing on the Confederation period and the origins of American foreign policy.

The first publication, the pre-federal guide, is organized by subject and will have separate chapters on foreign affairs, commercial affairs, and naval affairs, among others. Each chapter will have sections describing the administrative organization of the government, followed by descriptions of the records within each National Archives record group relating to that subject.

The latter publication will fill a gap in existing documentary publications, be a worthwhile contribution to the history of the period, and is being done with assistance from the Historical Office of the Department of State.

### Filling a Gap

One of the earliest documentary publications authorized by Congress was the 12-volume Diplomatic Correspondence of the American Revolution, edited by Jared Sparks and published in Boston, 1829-1830. That was followed by the seven-volume Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States from the Signing of the Definitive Treaty of Peace 10th September 1783 to the Adoption of the Constitution, March 4, 1789, edited by William Weaver in the State Department and published by Francis Preston Blair, 1833-1834, in Washington. Then six volumes of American State Papers: Class I, Foreign Relations, published from 1832 to 1859, covered the period from 1789 to 1828. The State Department's annual publication of diplomatic documents, Foreign Relations of the United States, began in 1861 and is still continuing.

The Sparks compilation on the revolutionary period proved to be inadequate. Sparks suppressed material he considered embarrassing to important persons, left out parts of documents without indicating the omissions, and garbled portions of his transcriptions. In 1889, the Sparks edition was replaced by a six-volume compilation, edited by Frances Wharton of the State Department, The Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States. The latest document in the Wharton edition, however, is dated in 1783.

Because the Weaver-Blair publication of documents for the period from 1783 to 1789 followed the style of Jared Sparks, it also needs to be replaced. A second edition in seven volumes was published in Washington in 1837 by Blair and Rives. That was reprinted in 1855 in three volumes by John C. Rives of Washington. None of these early publications was in the Public Documents Library when the Checklist of United States Public Documents, 1789-1909 (third edition) was published in 1911. The seven-volume Weaver-Blair edition includes 1,807 documents on 3,514 pages, subdivided into 20 sections by correspondent. There is no index; each volume has a calendar which serves as a table of contents for that volume.

### History of the Period

The Confederation period has received comparatively little attention from historians despite its importance for an understanding of the establishment of the National Government and of America's initial entry upon the stage of foreign affairs. Though much has been written concerning such issues as the disposition of western lands, the balance of power between large and small states, and the division between the North and South, little has been produced regarding the American debate over the control and direction of American foreign policy during this formulative period. Only a few historians (e.g., Frederick W. Marks, in his Independence on Trial: Foreign Affairs and the Making of the Constitution)

suggest that America's inability to resolve foreign policy problems was a major factor in the adoption of the Constitution.

It is particularly unfortunate that this aspect of American history has been neglected, for these early years saw the development of such lasting themes in American foreign relations as isolationism versus internationalism, the concept of "free ships, free goods," balance-of-power considerations, and the close connection between economics and diplomacy. Jonathan R. Dull, in his review of the literature pertaining to the subject, contends that this period has been relatively neglected by diplomatic historians, and the standard collections of diplomatic documents are totally "inadequate."

#### FRUS, 1783-1789

Most of the records from which the published compilation will be selected are in the custody of the National Archives, specifically the records of the Continental and Confederation Congresses (Record Group 360) and the records of the Department of State (Record Group 59). Mary Jane Dowd and Angie Spicer, already working on the publication, have academic backgrounds in 18th-century American history, and documentary editing experience. As part of its contribution to the bicentennial of the Constitution, the Department of State has agreed to provide financial support and editorial assistance for this project.

The current plan is to follow the style of the current Foreign Relations volumes. The transcribed documents will be printed in chronological order, with footnotes providing citations for related documents, whether printed or not, and there will be a name and subject index.

## MINUTES - SHAFR COUNCIL MEETING

27 December 1987

The SHAFR Council met at 8 p.m. in the Truman Room of the Sheraton Washington Hotel, President Thomas Paterson presiding.

Persons attending were: Lloyd Gardner, vice president, George Herring, vice president-elect; Council members Warren Cohen, Gary Hess, Melvyn Leffler, Martin Sherwin, Theodore Wilson, and William Kamman; others were: Robert Beisner, William Brinker, Milton Gustafson, Ann Heiss, Daniel Helmstadter, Robert McMahon, Page Putnam Miller, Thomas Schoonover, Kurt Schultz, Harriet Schwar, Eugene Trani and Nancy B. Tucker.

1. Thomas Paterson informed Council of the death of Warren Kuehl, past president and former secretary-treasurer of SHAFR. Paterson noted the many contributions of Kuehl to the society and observed that his counsel would be missed. Council offered its condolences to Mrs. Kuehl and the family.

2. Thomas Paterson expressed his and SHAFR's appreciation for the institutional support of the University of Indianapolis, North Texas State University, Ohio State University, and Tennessee Technological University.

3. Page Putnam Miller, director of the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, reported on the activities of that organization. Miller expressed concern about the handling of Freedom of Information Act requests. She noted difficulties in appealing decisions to withhold documents and problems in fee waiver requests. Many scholars lack financial resources to challenge FOIA decisions in the courts. Fee waiver requests face judgments by agency personnel such as whether there is a genuine public interest in the subject matter requested, whether the requested information is already available in the public domain, whether the requester has appropriate qualifications, and whether there is evidence that any

commercial or other personal gain will result from use of the material requested.

An important issue for users of the National Archives concerns reference services. Subject specialists may advance to grade G-12; beyond that they go into management positions. Miller suggested that the system should accommodate higher ranks for subject specialists. There is very little new money for additional staff in the Archives budget. The staff is not back to the 1980 level when major cuts were made. The Archives would like support from scholars in increasing the number of research specialists.

Miller discussed the rule of the House of Representatives closing House records for fifty years. She noted that there is support to adopt a twenty-year rule similar to the one practiced in the Senate but that thirty years is more likely.

Miller thanked SHAFR for its support of the the NCC and stated that departments of history, as well as professional organizations, may support the NCC. She urged Council members to encourage their departments to assist the National Coordinating Committee.

4. William Kamman reported on his correspondence with Joseph G. Svoboda, university archivist of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. The University of Nebraska Archives is not the depository of OAH records as Council thought; Svoboda is willing to discuss aquisition of SHAFR records but does not seem eager to acquire the material. Kamman in correspondence with the OAH has found that the JAH records go to the Nebraska State Historical Society. Michael Hogan has been in contact with the archivist at Ohio State University, who has indicated an interest in the records of Diplomatic History. Council requested Hogan to inquire if other SHAFR materials could also be deposited at the Ohio State Archives.

5. Nancy Tucker and Robert Beisner reported on the progress of the program committee for the 1988 summer conference. Tucker noted that a liaison had been

established with the AHA and OAH program committees for furthering diplomatic history sessions on the programs of these two organizations. Contact had also been made with Sam Walker of the Peace Research Group and Dean Allard of the American Military Institute regarding the summer conference. Tucker said that the summer program was in good shape and would be completed during the AHA meeting. There will be two luncheons--one sponsored by the AMI and one by SHAFR. A State Department tour may be arranged. There was discussion of an honorarium for the SHAFR speaker at the summer conference.

Robert Beisner reported that local arrangements were progressing and that dormitory rooms would be available for short periods before and after the conference to accommodate participants who may want to do research.

There was discussion of having foreign scholars on the conference program and thus encouraging larger foreign membership. Nancy Tucker noted the foreign participants on the program. This discussion led to comments on Michael Hogan's desire to increase the international circulation of Diplomatic History. Daniel Helmstadter and Michael Hogan have corresponded on this matter and will develop a plan. It was suggested that while international circulation may be increased, it will not be dramatic.

6. Lloyd Gardner will issue an invitation for proposals for a host site for the 1989 summer conference.

7. Harriet Schwar reported for the Bernath Dissertation Prize Committee. Two awards were made of \$250 each. The winners were: Madhu Bhalla, Queens University, Kingston, Ontario, whose dissertation is "American Journalists and Chinese Communists, 1939-1950: A Study in Culture and Power;" and Elizabeth Cobbs, Stanford University, whose dissertation is "Good Works at a Profit: Private Development and U.S.-Brazilian Relations, 1945-1960."

There was a discussion of how to attract more applications. Suggestions included changing the deadline for applications and perhaps having a series of application periods during the year. The limited amount of money was noted and if money were granted early in a year, better applications coming later might not be funded. The committee will consider these issues.

8. Ralph Weber, membership committee chairman, reported by letter to Thomas Paterson that membership renewals were coming in nicely.

9. Council discussed a nomination committee's recommendation that foreign members of SHAFR visiting the United States for an extended period be invited by the President to sit in on the Council. It was noted that the SHAFR charter and by-laws define membership on the Council and the recommendation would require a vote by the membership to amend the by-laws. Council decided that foreign members of SHAFR could be invited by the President to attend Council meetings and participate in discussions but not vote.

10. Daniel Helmstadter reported on the progress of making an index for past issues of Diplomatic History. Helmstadter believes the work done so far is too general and not satisfactory. He recommended that he and Richard Burns discuss with the student doing the work how the project should be done. Council recommended that Lloyd Gardner appoint a committee to reconsider the index question.

11. William Brinker reported on contacts he has had with foreign scholars for publishing foreign-source materials in the Newsletter. He noted that unfortunately they have not been continuing and have not accomplished much in extending contacts with foreign members.

12. Eugene Trani appeared before Council to encourage SHAFR members to apply for Fulbright opportunities in Poland. Lloyd Gardner will make an announcement at the SHAFR luncheon.

13. Kurt Schultz reported on the status of Diplomatic History. A written report had been sent earlier to members of the Council by Michael Hogan. Hogan recommended that Jerald Combs, Robert McMahon, and Emily Rosenberg be appointed to the editorial board of Diplomatic History. Council approved these nominations.

Schultz noted that a new cover design will be coming for Diplomatic History. He also urged, on behalf of Hogan, more aggressive marketing to improve overseas circulation. Dan Helmstadter and Michael Hogan will discuss this issue.

14. Warren Kimball is working on a proposal for a SHAFR prize for documentary editing. He will report to Council at a later date on his committee's recommendation.

15. Lloyd Gardner discussed with Council an interest of Professor Arthur Funk, chairman of the American Committee on the History of the Second World War, that SHAFR and other historical organizations play a role in selecting American representatives to give papers at the 1990 Congress, International Committee for the Historical Sciences in Madrid. Gardner said that Professor Funk's concern was that the selections be done by an open process. There followed an extensive discussion on whether and how SHAFR might play a role. The question arose on whether announcement through the AHA Perspectives was sufficient. William Brinker indicated a willingness to run announcements dealing with diplomatic sessions at programs in the SHAFR Newsletter.

16. William Kamman gave the secretary-treasurer's report. The financial reports and 1988 budget, all accepted by Council, follow the minutes. Kamman noted that Warren Kuehl had made decisions on investments, purchases and sales, and policy relating to SHAFR's trust, prize, and endowment portfolio. He emphasized the importance that Council determine how such service be obtained in the future. Lloyd Gardner will consult

with the finance committee and others for a recommendation on this pressing matter.

Kamman reported the following 1987 SHAFR election results: Lloyd Gardner, president; George Herring, vice president; Jerald A. Combs, Council member through 1990; John Gimbel, Council member through 1990; Nancy B. Tucker, member of nominating committee through 1990.

17. Thomas Schoonover suggested that SHAFR establish a graduate student essay prize. There will be further consideration of this proposal.

Council adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

### FINANCIAL REPORT FOR SHAFR 1987

December 16, 1986 to December 15, 1987

#### Carryover from 1986

Checking Account	\$2,413.65	
First State Bank		
Money Market	\$14,096.35	
TOTAL		\$16,510.00

#### RECEIPTS

Dues	\$18,490.44	
Bernath Living Trust	\$1,900.00	
Bernath Dissertation		
-reimbursement	\$1,200.00	
Bernath Book, Article,		
Lecture	\$2,973.78	
Sale of SHAFR Mailing List	\$560.00	
Endowment	\$367.50	
Graebner Contributions	\$1,949.25	
Holt Award Contributions	\$1,150.00	
1987 Summer Conference	\$2,147.23	
1987 Luncheon	\$1,348.80	
Net Interest and Dividends	\$832.33	
Guide	\$3,400.72	
Misc. (money for air mail		
postage)	\$8.00	
Reimbursement Student		

Membership	\$715.00	
Reimbursement Kuehl	\$500.00	
Reimbursement Holt	\$1,500.00	
TOTAL		\$39,043.05
GRAND TOTAL		\$55,553.05

#### DISBURSEMENTS

Scholarly Resources	\$10,012.50	
Bernath Prizes and Expenses	\$4,119.78	
Operating Expenses	\$2,171.95	
1986 AHA Conf-luncheon & reception	\$1,045.76	
1987 Summer Conference	\$1,236.00	
1987 OAH Conference (expenses)	\$227.92	
Contribution to NCC	\$850.00	
Treasurer State of Ohio	\$50.00	
Holt Award	\$2,650.00	
Graebner Award	\$1,258.75	
Transfers		
To Endowment	\$66.50	
To Life Membership Fund	\$500.00	
Bernath Trust	\$1,900.00	
Guide Expenses	\$3,060.11	
CPA	\$280.00	
Kuehl Prize	\$500.00	
Diplomatic History Copy Editor	\$625.00	
Susan Shaw Fee and Expenses	\$697.20	
Misc. Fees (safety deposit box and service charge)	\$17.00	
TOTAL	\$31,268.47	

#### CASH ON HAND

First State Bank -- Denton		
Operating	\$1,593.25	
First State Bank Money Market	\$22,691.33	

GRAND TOTAL		\$55,553.05
-------------	--	-------------

## PROPOSED SHAFR BUDGET FOR 1988

Anticipated revenue sources for 1988 are as follows:

Membership dues for 825 regular members	\$ 16,500.00
Membership dues for 150 student members	2,025.00
Membership dues for 65 retired and unemployed members	585.00
Interest on checking account & money market funds	800.00
Sale of membership list	500.00
	-----
	\$ 20,410.00

Anticipated expenditures for 1988 are as follows:

<u>Diplomatic History</u> (Scholarly Resources)	\$ 11,500.00
Copy Editor for <u>Diplomatic History</u>	2,500.00
General operating (postage, stationery, supplies, xeroxing, Secretary-Treasurer expenses)	2,500.00
Convention expense	1,500.00
National Coordinating Committee	850.00
Index for <u>Diplomatic History</u>	1,000.00
Tax Consultant	225.00
	-----
	\$ 20,075.00

### Summary of the 1987 Annual Meeting

by

George C. Herring, (University of Kentucky)  
Co-chair, 1987 SHAFR Program Committee

The thirteenth annual meeting of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations was held at the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, June 24-27, 1987. The meeting was held in conjunction with

the American Military Institute and the Conference on Peace Research in History. About 206 people were in attendance at eighteen different sessions.

Three sessions were held on Thursday morning, June 25. The first session, "The U.S. and Asia in the Eisenhower Years," was chaired by Richard H. Immerman, University of Hawaii.

An audience of some 50-60 people was treated to a well-paced and provocative program. The first two papers concentrated on the evolution of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Professor H. William Brands, Jr., of Texas A&M University portrayed SEATO as a U.S. effort to "keep the Pacific as an American lake while at the same time remedying the difficulties inherent in ANZUS." Specifically, SEATO enabled the Eisenhower administration to deflect the desire of Australia and New Zealand to gain a greater voice in regional security programs, compensate Britain for its exclusion from ANZUS, and show a willingness to share responsibility with non-white nations.

Taking a different tack, Professor Gary Hess of Bowling Green State University maintained that in light of the administration's view that the region was of less than vital interest to the U.S., it conceived and perceived SEATO as but a "holding action." This limited objective, combined with allied discord and enmity (especially that of India and Pakistan), produced the weak product. Although Hess emphasized that the ultimate pact was essentially consistent with Washington's definition of deterrence and therefore its aims, he pointed out that in fact SEATO served to enhance the prestige and influence of the very Communist nations it was intended to isolate.

The final paper shifted the focus to the two Taiwan Strait crises. In comparing them Professor Motoyoki Takamatsu of Tezukayama University demonstrated that America's commitment to defending the Offshore Islands actually increased between 1954-1955 and 1958, with the result coming perilously close to crossing the nuclear brink. This comparison led Takamatsu to

suggest that revisionists have underestimated the role of Secretary of State Dulles and paid insufficient attention to Eisenhower's military advisors.

Both commentators pointed out that many questions remain. Professor James I. Matray of New Mexico State University called for more study of the administration's assessment of the "colonial" powers and their former dependents. He also lamented that none of the papers linked SEATO with the Taiwan Strait crises despite the nature of the session. Professor Carol Morris Petillo of Boston College stressed that the analyses were too Washington-centered although, ironically, they all but ignored domestic influences. She continued by mentioning several of the variables omitted from the equation, such as McCarthyism, electoral politics, and the health of some leading actors. This critique dominated the lively discussion that followed.

A second morning session, entitled "The U.S. and Spain: Three Perspectives," examined the role of Spain in the Western Hemisphere from the latter part of the 19th century through the first three decades of the 20th century, and the reaction of the United States to that role. Roger R. Trask of the Department of Defense served as chairman. Richard H. Bradford of the West Virginia Institute of Technology described problems between the United States and Spain, especially the Cuban situation, between 1868 and 1898. Why did the two countries avoid war over earlier serious incidents, such as the Virginus affair of 1873, and go to war in 1898? Bradford argued that accumulated grievances over half a century, coupled with the changed domestic and international atmosphere of the 1890s, explain the outbreak of the Spanish-American War. The fact that by 1898 the United States had a modern navy, Bradford claimed, was a decisive factor.

John Offner of Shippensburg University presented "A Spanish Perspective on an Armistice in Cuba in 1898." Using the Spanish foreign relations archives and other sources, Offner argued, the fundamental political

issues were what was to be Cuba's final fate and who was to determine it. Despite late Spanish concessions and McKinley's interest in preserving the peace, an agreement, which would have to involve the Cubans as well as Spain and the United States, failed to materialize. McKinley, Offner notes, could not persuade the Cubans to accept an armistice, and Congress proved unwilling to grant him more time to negotiate. The Spanish government of Prime Minister Praxedes Sagasta wished to avoid war but could not ignore Spanish nationalism and honor.

Richard V. Salisbury of Western Kentucky University read a paper entitled "The Diplomacy of Hispanismo: Spain, the United States, and Central America." Concerned with "practical" Hispanismo, mainly Spanish efforts to promote closer political and economic ties with Central America, Salisbury surveyed the period between the Spanish-American War and 1930. Early in the 20th century, efforts to interest Spanish businesses in commercial ventures in Guatemala produced few results. Spain tried to influence the Nicaraguan situation, where the United States intervened in 1927, by attempting to gain observer status at the 1928 Havana Conference, and winning observer status for the League of Nations at the conference, but both efforts failed. Salisbury concluded that Hispanismo, while present, was not a very effective or viable force in Central America during the years surveyed.

In his commentary, Joseph A. Fry of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, noted that the three papers adhered well to the central theme of the session and complimented the authors for providing both Spanish and U.S. perspectives. Fry raised several questions about each paper but on the whole found them to be well done and provocative. A lively discussion involving the audience followed the formal presentations. About thirty persons attended the session.

About twenty persons attended the third morning session on "Corporatism, the Oil Industry, and the

Energy Crisis." Linda Wills Qaim-Maqami of Texas A&M University presented a paper, "The American Century: A Corporatist Philosophy for the Oil Industry." David S. Painter of the Department of State spoke on "Oil and U.S. Policy Toward Iran, 1951-1954: The Political Economy of Intervention." Both Qaim-Maqami and Painter made much the same point about the interrelationship -- indeed, symbiotic relationship -- between government and the oil majors: the former to achieve foreign policy and national security objectives; the latter to assure their control over the world's oil supplies. Thus Qaim-Maqami talked about a "corporatist philosophy" for the oil industry, while Painter contended that "U.S. policies maintained Iran's Western orientation and enabled the major oil companies to maintain their control over the world's oil policies." Qaim-Maqami also referred to the "American Century" as "the single most important unofficial doctrine of the post-World War I years" and then remarked that the author of the statement, Henry Luce, pointed to the "true American center" in foreign policy "that isolationists could accept and that met the needs of America's corporatist elites for national unity and internationalist commercial security." Approaching his theme differently, Painter provided a detailed account of the events surrounding the rise and fall in Iran of the Mossadegh government, the nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, and the formation of a new oil consortium in Iran, including American oil interests.

The three commentators on the papers, Edward Crapol of William and Mary College, Stephen J. Randall of McGill University, and Burton I. Kaufman of Kansas State University, who also chaired the session, generally agreed that Qaim-Maqami and Painter offered some interesting insights into the interrelationship between public and private interests and the debate after World War II over the proper role for government in the economy. But they wondered whether the papers were not too narrowly focused on the American side of foreign policy issues, and they took issue with Qaim-Maqami's contention that Luce represented the centrist position insofar as foreign policy was concerned.

Kaufman also argued the need to ask new questions concerning American foreign oil policy.

At a luncheon sponsored by the Council on Peace Research in History, chaired by CPRH president David S. Patterson, Ralph E. Lapp spoke on "A Physicist Reflects on History: Early Days in the MET Lab and Beyond." About 100 scholars heard Lapp reminisce about his early career as a physicist with the Manhattan Project in Chicago during World War II and his subsequent career as an independent consultant on nuclear questions to the Truman and Eisenhower administrations and a writer on nuclear arms control issues and the military-industrial complex. His recollections included personal portraits of J. Robert Oppenheimer, Edward Teller, and Lewis Strauss, the emergence of the nuclear testing question and radiological fallout in the 1950s, and his growing frustrations over the pervasive influence of the defense establishment. In response to several questions from the audience, Lapp provided further details on points made in his presentation.

An early afternoon session attended by 75-100 people and entitled "World Politics and the Early Republic" was chaired by William Stinchcombe of Syracuse University. In the first paper, "Power, Purse and Pride: Diplomatic Origins of the Constitution," Frederick W. Marks III presented an elaboration of the introduction to the paperback edition of his book, Independence on Trial. Marks emphasized the unsettled nature of the country in the years preceding 1787, taking strong issue with Merrill Jensen's thesis of growing prosperity and stability. Marks found a demand for a new form of government and an increasing insistence by both those who became Federalists and Anti-Federalists that the central government be given more power to conduct foreign relations, foreign trade, and Indian affairs, thereby leading to greater stability and prosperity.

Norman A. Graebner delivered a paper entitled "Isolationism and Antifederalism: The Ratification Debates." In the paper, based largely on newspaper

accounts of the ratification debates, Graebner found an emerging line between Federalists and Antifederalists reflecting the degree to which they desired isolation from Europe and a foreign policy based on the ideology of isolationism. Graebner emphasized, however, that both sides of the debate acknowledged a clear need to change the form of conducting foreign affairs from what existed under the Articles of Confederation.

In addition to tracing the growing scholarly interest in foreign affairs and the Constitution in the years since World War II, the commentator, Professor John A. Moore, Jr., of California State Polytechnic University commented on where the two papers could be placed in this expanding field of study. He argued that historians' continuing discussions and debates about the Constitution and foreign policy are important to notice.

Stinchcombe offered brief comments on the Marks paper. He argued that the United States was an underdeveloped country emerging from a long war and the unsettled condition of the body politic was just as bad after the Constitution was ratified as it had been earlier in the 1780s. He also pointed out the immense power in foreign affairs given to the Presidency by the Constitution and the precedents of the Jay Treaty, adding that the question of the Presidency's powers in foreign affairs remains with us today.

About thirty-five appreciative listeners attended the late afternoon session entitled "Intruders or Benefactors: American Occupiers in Germany & Austria." Dr. Forrest Pogue was scheduled to chair this session, but he was unable to attend. Dr. David F. Trask of the United States Army Center of Military History served in this capacity.

Professor Donald N. Whitnah of the University of Northern Iowa presented the first paper entitled "Salzburg Under Siege: The American Occupation." This paper first discussed the establishment of occupation machinery in Salzburg. Close control characterized

the initial stages of the occupation, which involved considerable stress on denazification. Professor Whitnah emphasized the reaction of the Austrians to ten years of occupation, citing both friendly praise and criticisms. Overall the speaker offered a mixed review of the American occupation, noting the American contribution but also the irritations associated with the occupation.

Dr. Boyd Dastrup, the Command Historian of the U.S. Army Field Artillery Center and School, presented the second paper entitled "Nuremburg and Occupation." He noted the fact that the programs of the occupiers -- demilitarization, decartelization, denazification, and democratization -- greatly interfered with the restoration of normality in Nuremburg. Over time, however, and certainly by 1947, the harsh, vindictive policies of 1945 gave way to more enlightened treatment. Aside from the passing of time and the key reason for this transition was the onset of the Cold War and an attendant change in U.S. policy toward the defeated enemy.

Professor Earl Ziemke of the University of Georgia made the first comment, drawing attention to parallels between two papers that were present despite different approaches to the occupation in the two cities. Professor Frank Steely of Northern Kentucky University offered his recollections of Salzburg in 1948, when he lived in the city as a part of the Harvard Salzburg Seminar. A lively question-and-answer session followed the papers and comments.

Kenneth J. Hagan of the U.S. Naval Academy served as substitute chairman for a second late afternoon session on "Kennedy and the Middle East." James F. Goode of Grand Valley State College read a paper on "JFK and Iran" and Douglas Little of Clark University read a paper that explored the relationship between Kennedy and Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser. Mark Lytle of Bard College offered extensive commentary in what amounted to a third paper. The remarks from the audience following the papers and comment added a

great deal of analytical and substantive breadth to the session.

The final late afternoon session on "World War I and the Aftermath" was chaired by Paola Coletta of the U.S. Naval Academy. About thirty persons attended. Daniel M. Esposito of Pennsylvania State University read a paper on "Wilson and the Decision to Send an AEF to France, 1917." Karen A.J. Miller of Alexandria, Virginia read a paper on "The Republican Insurgents and Foreign Policy." Richard W. Fannin of Indiana University read a paper on "The Cruiser Controversy: Naval Disarmament in the 1920s." Mark Gilderhus of Colorado State University and Mark A. Stoler of the University of Vermont commented on the papers, and the audience raised a number of questions.

At a banquet on Thursday evening George Elsey entertained the audience with stories from his days in the Roosevelt and Truman White House. He also showed those present the only signed copy of the Atlantic Charter, a copy he had gotten Roosevelt and Churchill to autograph for him.

On Friday morning, approximately forty people gathered to hear Professor Jules Benjamin, currently a visiting scholar at the Center for International Studies, University of Southern California, read a paper entitled "The Framework of U.S. Relations with Latin America in the Twentieth Century." The paper had previously been published in Diplomatic History. In his assessment of the inter-American relationship, Professor Benjamin argued that American expansionism has dominated its Latin American policy and that this expansionist drive has derived largely, though not exclusively, from American self-assessment as a superior civilization justified in molding Latin America according to American precepts. In the course of the twentieth century both liberals (who argue for reform) and conservatives (who call for stability) have largely accepted this preordained American role of tutelage, though the means by which they seek to carry out policy often varies.

There were three commentators: Robert F. Smith, University of Toledo; Randall Woods, University of Arkansas; and Lester Langley, University of Georgia, who also served as chair. Each was critical. Smith reminded Benjamin that American reformers who call for elections and the spread of democracy in Latin America do have Latin American kindred spirits and that many of Latin America's woes are not attributable to American domination. Quite rightly he pointed out the "legitimate" security interests that have sometimes explained American interference.

Woods, who prepared the most detailed rebuttal of the three commentators, graciously summarized his remarks in order to provide more time for the presenter to read what was a long paper. The audience was thus deprived of Woods' careful, point-by-point evaluation, particularly his notations of the author's inconsistencies. As did Langley, Professor Woods chided Benjamin for his reluctance (and occasional refusal) to square his theory with the Latin American reality. This, indeed, is the major stumbling block American diplomatic historians confront when they are dealing with Latin America. A lively discussion, initiated by Woods, followed.

Continuing the reconstruction of Eisenhower era foreign policy was a panel Friday morning on John Foster Dulles and Asia attended by some eighty people. The chair was Waldo Heinrichs of Temple University.

The first paper, presented by Roger Dingman of the University of Southern California, was entitled "Cobbler for Collective Security: Dulles and the Creation of SEATO, 1954." Arguing from a wide array of British Commonwealth and Philippine as well as American sources, Dingman described the complex coalition problems Dulles faced, arising from the internal politics of countries involved as well as external relations. Dulles seemed to Dingman "more driven than driving" and more practical, skillful and open to reason than we had supposed.

The second paper, by Ronald W. Pruessen of the University of Toronto, reached a more negative assessment. Entitled "Pondering the 'Evil Fact' in Asia: John Foster Dulles and China, 1953-1954," this paper demonstrated the realism, restraint, and caution of Dulles in dealing with China, despite the anti-communist rhetoric, but argued that these evidences of reasonableness and moderation were tactical. Eisenhower and Dulles, in Pruessen's judgment, had vaulting ambitions for development of American power in Asia and the tight containment of China, with dangerous and tragic consequences.

Commentators were Robert J. McMahon of the University of Florida and William Stueck of the University of Georgia. They found the papers impressive and challenging. They, and in extended questioning, members of the audience, pressed Dingman and Pruessen on various aspects of their papers including the nature and assessment of American interests and the influence of allies and public opinion.

The session on foreign policy between the wars (WWI and WWII) dealt with three rather diverse and much neglected topics. Professor Arnold Taylor of Howard University spoke to the international politics of the Liberian Forced Labor Controversy and emphasized Liberian resistance techniques to the end of demonstrating that economic domination does not necessarily lead to political control. Professor J.B. Donnelly of Washington and Jefferson College analyzed the League of Nations Anti-Terrorism conference of 1937 and stressed the almost insuperable problems involved in getting spokesmen for different political and legal systems to agree on an international code to punish terrorism. Professor John M. Coski of Hollins College analyzed the thought of W. Cameron Forbes and underscored both the value and necessity of integrating American policy in the Philippines with the rest of American diplomatic history.

Commentator and chair William Widenor of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign stressed the freshness and significance of the papers presented

and regretted the fact that the session was rather sparsely attended. Both he and the audience agreed that the profession, in its preoccupation with the Cold War and its origins, had for too long slighted the inter-war period, that the contradictions in American policy in that period needed further exploration and that process would also help explain the ambiguities and problems inherent in the American approach to foreign policy in the much more carefully explored 1940s and 1950s.

The American Military Institute hosted a luncheon on Friday and David Trask, Chief Historian of the U.S. Army, spoke on "The Past and Future of National Security History."

Thomas G. Paterson of the University of Connecticut and President of SHAFR chaired a single early Friday afternoon session titled "Containment at Forty: A Scholarly Dialogue." Approximately one hundred people attended a wide-ranging discussion of the origins of the containment doctrine, George F. Kennan's ideas and prescriptions, and the place of containment in the evolution of the Cold War. Robert H. Ferrell of Indiana University began with an anecdotal treatment of the Truman Doctrine, declaring it a symbol for a generation of Americans and defending it for doing what it was supposed to have done in its time. Lawrence Kaplan of Kent State University followed with a discussion of containment in the 1940s and its presumption, largely correct, of a serious Soviet threat. Melvyn P. Leffler of the University of Virginia concentrated on Kennan's "X" article and criticized it for failing to account for the impact of the Second World War, exaggerating Soviet behavior, assuming that the Soviets would retreat when faced with American counterweight, and demonstrating little appreciation for the nationalist essence of Communist parties. In truth, said Leffler, Kennan was advocating liberation, not containment. Michael Schaller, University of Arizona, closed the formal presentations by exploring the way Kennan's "X" article used a form of "pop" social psychology rather than recent history or social and economic factors to

explain Soviet behavior. The audience then engaged the panelists through questions.

David S. Patterson of the Historians Office, U.S. Department of State, chaired a late afternoon joint session, co-sponsored by the Council of Peace Research in History, on "Postwar Disarmament." In his paper, "World Disarmament Activism, 1945-1965," Lawrence S. Wittner, of the State University of New York at Albany, traced the course of the anti-nuclear movement in the context of escalating Cold War tensions. He perceived two main periods of nuclear disarmament activism, the first from 1945-1949, and "a second and considerably more powerful wave" from the late 1950s to early 1960s. His coverage surveyed anti-nuclear activities in many countries. He stressed the Anglo-American and other transnational dimensions of the movement. He also related the response of the anti-nuclear movement in these countries to the Communist-inspired World Peace Council. The decline of the movement in the mid-1960s, he noted, followed the signing of the partial test ban treaty in 1963 and the onset of the Vietnam War. In conclusion, he emphasized that the main strength of the movement was its ability to focus "narrowly upon eliminating a weapon which most people considered odious, even suicidal," but its main weakness was that the weapons were a symptom, not the cause, of the problem and cannot be divorced from the violent "international conflicts that inspire their development and use." In his paper, "Eisenhower and Arms Control: A Balance of Risks," Charles A. Appleby, Jr., a doctoral candidate at The Johns Hopkins University, reviewed the history of arms control policy formulation during the Eisenhower administration. He emphasized the interaction between the ideas and personality of Eisenhower and other key players on arms control policy. He focused on the nuclear testing issue, particularly Eisenhower's difficulties in overcoming the resistance of the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission to the negotiation with the Soviet Union of a test ban or moratorium as well as the increasing preoccupation of arms control officials

with the question of adequate verification of testing limits.

In his comment Jack M. Holl, Historical Office at the U.S. Department of Energy, stressed the importance of nuclear questions and compared the anti-nuclear movement to the anti-slavery movement in the 19th century. He also emphasized the technical and political difficulties in resolving the nuclear testing issue. Ralph S. Levering of Davidson College commented almost entirely on Wittner's paper. While praising its international perspective, time periodization, and conclusions, he felt it was basically descriptive, relied mainly on secondary sources, and lacked a thesis. He also cited unsubstantiated statements and called for more rigorous analysis of public and Congressional attitudes and systematic comparisons of the different movements. Levering conceded the difficulty in incorporating all these concerns in a short paper on such a large subject.

A second late afternoon session on Sino-American relations was chaired by Russell Buhite, University of Oklahoma. Margaret Denning of Sioux Falls College gave a paper on "The U.S. Policy of Aid to Chinese Communist Forces During World War II." Sally Irvine of Georgetown University gave a paper on "John Stewart Service and the Amerasia Case: A Study of Espionage and Loyalty." Wilson D. Miscamble of the University of Notre Dame gave a paper on "Encouraging Chinese Titoism?: Kennan, Davies, and the Limits of America's China Policy." Robert Blum of the Central Intelligence Agency and David Anderson of the University of Indianapolis commented on the papers, and the papers and commentary evoked some lively discussion among the audience and panelists.

Twenty-two people attended a third late afternoon session, "Eisenhower and Latin America," to hear papers by Professor Loretta Wyatt of Monclair State and Michael Weis of Ohio State and commentary by Professors Judith Ewell of William and Mary and Richard Welch of Lafayette College. Neither

Professors Wyatt nor Welch could attend the session. As such, the session chair, Stephen Rabe of the University of Texas at Dallas, summarized Wyatt's paper and read Welch's comments. The central thesis of Wyatt's paper was that the Eisenhower administration was not hostile to reform or even revolution in Latin America. What the administration found unacceptable was "Marxist-Leninist totalitarianism." Eisenhower, accordingly, supported reformers in Bolivia and Venezuela and opposed Communists in Guatemala and Cuba. Weis, on the other hand, was critical of Eisenhower's diplomacy. The administration consistently tried to thwart Brazil's nationalist economic development policies and thereby undermined the "special" Brazilian-American relationship that had existed since the late nineteenth century. Professors Ewell and Welch had similar assessments of the two papers. Both sharply criticized Wyatt, noting that she exaggerated the assistance the Eisenhower administration gave to Venezuela and Bolivia, that she failed to prove that the Guatemalan Revolution was controlled by Moscow, and that she was wrong in asserting that Eisenhower did not promote the "ostracism of Cuba" in 1960. Both commentators were impressed by the depth of Weis's research and his use of Brazilian archival sources. They believed, however, that Weis had underestimated the Eisenhower administration's fear of communism and the Cuban Revolution in explaining why the administration was trying, by 1959-1960, to conciliate the Brazilians.

The Saturday morning session on "The Truman Administration and the Limits of Globalism" was spirited and well-attended. Professor Howard Jones, University of Alabama, in "The Truman Doctrine: Development of a Global Strategy During the Guerilla War in Greece," posited that the architects of the Truman Doctrine did not propose global intervention but attempted to develop a flexible and restrained policy to combat the renewed threat to freedom without resort to all-out conflict. The Doctrine was intended to contest communism politically, economically, and socially no less than militarily, and constituted a

"dual revolution" by authorizing peacetime intervention in Europe and a viable response to "shadow-like aggressions." Intervention in other regions was to be governed by strategic importance and people's ability to resist aggression; the Soviet sphere in east Europe was considered untouchable. In theory and in ideal, the Greek-Turkish commitment was part of a global strategy, but one intended to be limited in practice and reality by circumstances.

Professor Marc Gallicchio, Northeast State Missouri College, in "From Indifference to Intervention: Postwar Military Planning and American Intervention in China," argued that the Truman administration did not plan to project America power into China; before August 1945 military planners focused on the war with Japan and presumed a strong Red Army presence in Manchuria and North China. But Japan's sudden defeat provided new opportunity for the War Department and Joint Chiefs of Staff -- highly sympathetic to the Nationalists, and persuaded by field reports that the Communists were not so strong -- to press landing 60,000 Marines in North China, transport of Nationalist forces there, and establishment of a Military Advisory Group and continuing aid. Thus the military planners cast off earlier restraints, outmaneuvered the more cautious State Department, and brought unprecedented American peacetime intervention in China's affairs.

Finally, Dennis Merrill, visiting Professor at Clark University, in "Indo-American Relations, 1947-1950: A Missed Opportunity in Asia," posited that by early 1949 the Truman administration began to consider buttressing India with economic aid to foster its Asian leadership. But Truman and Acheson were unsympathetic to Prime Minister Nehru's nonalignment policy, and further upset by his views of China's "agrarian revolution" and belief that the French-backed Bao Dai regime in IndoChina would fail. The Indians emphasized the regional roots of Asia's problems: colonialism's legacy, the rise of radical nationalism, and the need for rapid economic development. The Americans attributed Asian discord

mainly to Moscow-backed communism, and saw events there in terms of Soviet ambitions. Thus in late 1949 the Truman administration decided not to make India the keystone of its Asian policy -- aiding instead staunch anti-communist regimes -- and thereby missed a chance to bolster a major Third World Country and show respect for its nationalism and newly emergent Asia.

Comments by Professors J. Garry Clifford, University of Connecticut, Douglas Brinkley, U.S. Naval Academy, and Arnold A. Offner, Boston University, who also chaired the session, emphasized the lack of analysis of President Truman's role, and grave American misperceptions of foreign history and culture.

About twenty-five conferees attended a lively joint session on Saturday morning with the Conference for Peace Research in History on "Opposition to the Vietnam War." Melvin Small, Wayne State University, chaired the panel that began with a paper by Mitchell K. Hall, University of Kentucky, on "Religious Opposition: Clergy and Laymen Concerned about Vietnam." Based on his recently completed dissertation, Hall's paper traced the origins, development, and activities of Calvac. Calvac was the most prominent, religiously oriented, antiwar organization. It attracted major figures from the Protestant clergy, in particular, as well as political and academic luminaries. Calvac received considerable attention in the media and among the public through its meetings, co-sponsored demonstrations, and large, paid newspaper advertisements. Like many antiwar groups, it was weakened by debates over tactics as well as fundamental disagreement over whether to oppose the Vietnam War or American imperialism in general. Despite its impressive achievements for a new, ad-hoc organization, Hall does not think that Calvac was especially effective in bringing the Vietnam War to an end.

Bob Buzzanco, Ohio State University, next presented "Cautious Warlords: American Military Criticism of Involvement in Indochina, 1950s-1970s." Part of his dissertation in progress, Buzzanco's paper surveyed

in-service and retired military critics of American political and military strategies in Vietnam. During both the French and American periods, major military leaders, publicly and privately, opposed American intervention in Southeast Asia on political, economic, strategic, and even moral grounds. Generals James Gavin and Matthew Ridgway were among those who warned against intervening initially, as well as continuing to escalate on the bases of then current military strategies. Several major position papers produced by analysts working for the joint chiefs questioned the Pentagon's approaches to counter-insurgency warfare, and like fellow civilian critics, stressed those political aspects of the civil war in Vietnam that American policy failed to address. Rarely did military opponents of the war base their arguments on the need for more fire power.

Sandra Taylor, University of Utah, and Small offered spirited critiques that praised both scholars' research but asked them to go beyond their reports to evaluate impact on policy. Did Calcutt affect Johnson and Nixon, they asked, and why did the military critics in service seem to have so little impact? Small was more bullish on the impact of the antiwar movement in general than was Taylor. Comments from the audience revolved around ways to measure impact, the nature of the military mind and caste, and the role of the military in the formulation of foreign policy.

By all accounts, the thirteenth annual meeting was a great success, and I would like to conclude with a word of thanks to some of the people who helped to make it possible. Robert J. McMahon, Joyce Goldberg, and Blanche Wiesen Cook served on the program committee and put together an exciting group of sessions. J. Samuel Walker coordinated the activities of the Conference on Peace Research in History with those of SHAFR, and Milton Gustafson made arrangements for the banquet speaker. Nancy Tucker met with us on several occasions and while beginning long-range preparations for the 1988 program contributed significantly to that of 1987. Most important, my co-

chair, Robert Love, ably assisted by Ensign Mary Kelly, did a superb job with the local arrangements, contributing immeasurably to the success of the meeting.

---

### ABSTRACTS

---

Peter G. Boyle (University of Nottingham, England), "Britain, America and the Transition from Economic to Military Assistance, 1948-51," Journal of Contemporary History, XXII (July, 1987), 521-538. Based largely upon British Foreign Office and Cabinet papers in the Public Record Office in Kew, Surrey, this article analyzes the perspective of the British government on the transition from containment in its economic form, particularly the Marshall Plan, to containment in its military form, particularly NATO, the military assistance programme and Western rearmament, with the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950 acting as a catalyst in this process of change. The evidence from British sources shows that the British government accepted the main trends and assumptions of the Truman-Acheson line of U.S. foreign policy in these years, rather than the views of critics concerned by the over-militarization of Western policy, such as George F. Kennan. The article suggests that the evidence from British sources for 1945-48 has lent support to the post-revisionist interpretation of the origins of the Cold War, and shown sound judgment on the part of contemporary British diplomats, while the views of contemporary critics and later revisionist historians seem more questionable. For 1948-51, however, the article argues that while British sources would lend no more support to revisionist accounts than for earlier years, the judgment of British diplomats on policy on these later years, such as precipitous British rearmament and support for crossing the 38th parallel in Korea, seems much more open to question compared to the judgment of later critical historical accounts or of a contemporary critic such as George F. Kennan.

from the author's larger study of the impact of the anti-Vietnam War movement on Johnson and Nixon, this paper describes how dissenting opinion reached the Oval Office and those activities that were most likely to attract serious attention from the presidents and their advisors. During the Vietnam War period, mass demonstrations, letter writing, public petitioning, and face-to-face meetings with officials all captured administration attention. At times, dissenting activities, especially several large demonstrations, played a central role in the formulation of American foreign policy. In general, however, decision makers reacted unpredictably and sometimes irrationally to criticism. Consequently, foreign policy protesters were wise in employing all of the traditional forms of dissenting activities since all, at one time or another, reached their targets.

Charles G. Stefan (former FSO and currently at Santa Fe Community College, Gainesville, Florida), "The Ups and Downs of Summitry," Foreign Service Journal, (November, 1987), 29-31. Briefly assessing the achievements resulting from various summit meetings over the last thirty years, the author concludes that in the long run summitry has seldom resulted in important changes. The essay concludes on a quotation from Dean Rusk: "Summit diplomacy is to be approached with the wariness with which a prudent physician prescribes a habit-forming drug--a technique to be employed rarely and under the most exceptional circumstances, with rigorous safeguards against its becoming a debilitating or dangerous habit."

---

#### BONERS

---

At Versailles Wilson was a part of a team of four, including Clemenceau of France, Orlando of Italy, and the new prime minister of Britain Harold Wilson.

--Roberto Rabel, University of Otago  
Dunedin, New Zealand

---

## PUBLICATIONS

---

Timothy J. Botti (Columbus), The Long Wait: The Forging of the Anglo-American Nuclear Alliance, 1945-58. Greenwood. 1987. ISBN 0-313-25902-X. \$39.95.

H.W. Brands, Jr. (University of Texas, Austin), Cold Warriors: Eisenhower's Generation and American Foreign Policy. Columbia University Press. 1988. ISBN 0-231-06526-4. \$30.00.

Thomas H. Buckley (University of Tulsa) and Edwin B. Strong, Jr., American Foreign and National Security Policies, 1941-1945. University of Tennessee Press. 1988. ISBN 0-87049-539-9, 0-87049-540-2. Cloth, \$24.95; paper, \$12.95.

Charles W. Calhoun (Austin Peay State University), Gilded Age Cato: The Life of Walter Q. Gresham. University Press of Kentucky. 1988. ISBN 0-8131-1615-5. \$28.00

Kendrick A. Clements (University of South Carolina), Woodrow Wilson: World Statesman. Twentieth Century American Biography Series. Twayne Publishers. 1987.

Paolo E. Coletta (Annapolis), Patrick N.L. Bellinger and U.S. Naval Aviation. University Press of America. 1987. ISBN 0-8191-6534-4. \$28.75.

Paolo E. Colleta, A Survey of U.S. Naval Affairs, 1865-1917. University Press of America. 1987. ISBN 0-8191-6397-X, 0-8191-6398-8. Library, \$28.50; paper, \$15.75.

Frank Costigliola (University of Rhode Island), Awkward Dominion: American Political, Economic, and Cultural Relations with Europe, 1919-1933. Cornell University Press. 1985. ISBN 0-8014-1679-5. Paper, \$11.95.

Brian P. Damiani (Tidewater Community College), Advocates of Empire: William McKinley, the Senate and American Expansion, 1898-1899. Garland Publishing. 1987. ISBN 0-8240-8080-7. \$35.00.

Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana State University), American Diplomacy: The Twentieth Century. Norton. 1987. ISBN 0-393-95609-1. Paper, \$10.95.

Marc S. Gallichio (Northeast State Missouri College), The Cold War Begins in Asia: American East Asian Policy and the Fall of the Japanese Empire. Columbia University Press. 1988. ISBN 0-231-06502-7. \$25.00.

Trumbull Higgins (New York), The Perfect Failure: Kennedy, Eisenhower, and the CIA at the Bay of Pigs. Norton. 1987. ISBN 0-393-02473-3. \$17.95.

William R. Keylor (Boston University), The Twentieth Century World: An International History. Oxford University Press. 1984. ISBN 0-19-503370-1. Now in paper, \$12.95.

Ralph B. Levering (Davidson College), The Cold War, Nineteen Forty-Five to Nineteen Seventy-Two, 2nd ed. Harlan Davidson, Inc. 1988. ISBN 0-88295-811-9. Paper, \$7.95.

Gerald D. Nash, Noel E. Pugach (University of New Mexico), and Richard F. Tomasson, eds., Social Security: The First Half Century. University of New Mexico Press. 1988. ISBN 0-826-31068-0, 0-826-31069-9. Cloth, \$24.95; paper, \$12.95.

Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May (Harvard University), Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers. Free Press. 1988. ISBN 0-02-922790-9. Paper, \$9.95.

Thomas G. Paterson (University of Connecticut), J. Garry Clifford (University of Connecticut), and Kenneth J. Hagan (U.S. Naval Academy), American Foreign Policy: A History, 3rd edition. Heath. 1988.

Vol. I: ISBN 0-669-12664-0, paper, \$13.50; Vol. II: ISBN 0-669-12665-9, paper, \$14.50.

Thomas G. Paterson, Meeting the Communist Threat: America's Cold War History. Oxford University Press. 1988. ISBN 0-195-04533-5. \$26.95.

Stephen G. Rabe (University of Texas, Dallas), Eisenhower and Latin America: The Foreign Policy of Anticommunism. University of North Carolina Press. 1988. ISBN 0-807-81761-9, 0-807-84204-4. Cloth, \$29.95; paper, \$9.95.

Andrew J. Rotter (Vanderbilt University), The Path to Vietnam: Origins of the American Commitment to Southeast Asia. Cornell University Press. 1987. ISBN 0-8014-1958-1. \$29.95.

Barry Rubin (Council on Foreign Relations Fellow), Secrets of State: The State Department and the Struggle over U.S. Foreign Policy. Oxford University Press. 1985. ISBN 0-19-505010-x. Now in paper, \$8.95.

David F. Schmitz (Rutgers University), The United States and Fascist Italy, 1922-1940. University of North Carolina Press. 1988. ISBN 0-807-81766-X. \$29.95.

Reginald Stuart (University of Prince Edward Island), United States Expansionism and British North America, 1775-1871. University of North Carolina Press. 1988. ISBN 0-807-81767-8. \$37.95.

---

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

---

#### BERNATH GIFT TO KUEHL FUND

Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath have announced their intention to contribute \$1,000 toward the Warren F. Kuehl fund on a matching basis. For every dollar contributed up to a thousand, they will match it with

a dollar of their own. This generous gesture was made to honor the memory of one of SHAFR's most devoted and most able supporters. The Bernaths believe that no member has given greater service to the society than Warren had over his many years of activity.

### SHAFR URGES MEMBERS TO SUBMIT PROPOSALS

Mark Gulderhus (Colorado State University) has been asked to serve as SHAFR liaison with the program committees of the OAH and AHA in order to seek greater representation of diplomatic history at the annual meetings of the two groups. Mark asks that members submit a larger volume of proposals to the two groups.

When names, addresses, and deadlines are available, this newsletter includes them regularly at the end of the events listed in "Calendar."

### PUBLIC HISTORY CALL FOR PAPERS

The National Council on Public History and the Organization of American Historians will hold a joint meeting in St. Louis, MO, April 6-9, 1989. Sessions will address the general program theme of "Consciousness and Society." In addition, since 1989 is the 75th anniversary of the outbreak of World War I, the 50th anniversary of the beginning of World War II, and the 25th anniversary of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution proposals that address the issue of war in the twentieth century are invited.

Before June 1, 1988 three copies of proposals should be sent to:

Patricia Mooney Melvin  
Department of History  
University of Arkansas - Little Rock  
Little Rock, AR 72204

## U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY SYMPOSIUM

The United States Military Academy, with support of the National Endowment for the Humanities, will sponsor a history symposium entitled "The Theory and Practice of American National Security, 1960-1968" at West Point, NY, April 13-15, 1988.

For information contact:

Lt. Colonel Charles F. Brower  
Department of History  
USMA  
West Point, NY 10996

## RECORDS OF U.N. WAR CRIMES COMMISSION RECORDS

Records of the United Nations War Crimes Commission (UNWCC) at the UN Archives in New York are now open for research. According to rules issued by the UN, access to the files will be granted for "bona fide research by individuals into the history of the UNWCC and into war crimes." The rules stipulate that applications for access should be submitted to the researcher's government for review and transmittal to the UN. Applications must be accompanied by "an appropriate introduction from an institution of higher learning or research or from a relevant professional society."

Prospective researchers may obtain application forms, rules governing access, and an inventory of the records from the office of the Historian, Department of State. Inquiries and completed applications should be directed to:

Office of the Historian (PA/HO)  
Bureau of Public Affairs  
Department of State  
Washington, DC 20520

## THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

In the wake of the 25th anniversary of the Common Market, Gaston Thorn, the president of the European Commission, invited a number of historians coming from the six founding countries plus Great Britain to an informal gathering that was held in Luxemburg in January 1982. Its purpose was to consider ways and means to stimulate research on the origins and the growth of cooperation and integration efforts in Western Europe. The meeting resulted in forming a small group of historians, who, under the auspices of the European Commission, fairly regularly met at Brussels, in order to define and promote the work for which they had assumed responsibility. They considered their task to be of a threefold nature. First of all, it seemed necessary to facilitate access to the archives of the European institutions; secondly, younger scholars and graduates had to be stimulated to work in this field; last but not least, scholarly interest had to be attracted to European unification history at large and a beginning to be made in the way of writing this history on the basis of the archival material that is becoming available. While little progress has been made on the way of a liberal declassification of European community records, research on the "history of Europe" has commenced on a wider scale. International conferences were held in Strasbourg (1984), Aachen (1986), and Rome (1987), and another one is scheduled for May 1989 in Luxemburg. The proceedings of the conferences are being published. A first volume, Origins of European Integration, March 1948-May 1950 has been edited and published by Raymond Poidevin (1986). The next volume, for which the writer of this report is responsible, is in print and will appear in the summer of this year under the title, The Origins of the Schuman Plan. Under the chairmanship of Gilbert Trausch of the universities of Luxemburg and Liege the group of historians has transformed itself into an international association. Members of SHAFR will be interested in the activities of this new association for two reasons: for one thing, American scholars have participated in and contributed to the just

mentioned conferences. In addition, due note has been taken of American policies vis-a-vis the integration of Europe, and thus a field of particular interest in post-World War II American diplomacy has been covered, in part on the basis of archival sources available at American depositories. U.S. historians interested in the work undertaken by the Association of European

Historians in Contemporary History are encouraged to contact Professor Gilbert Trausch, Centre Universitaire de Luxembourg, Avenue de la Faiencerie, L1511 Luxembourg; or, on the British side, Professor Alan S. Milward, Department of International History, London School of Economics, Houghton Street, London WC 2 A 2 AE.

Klaus Schwabe  
University of Technology  
Aachen, West Germany

---

#### PERSONALS

---

Peter M. Adzuarra (University of Hawaii), Anna K. Nelson (American University), and Andrew J. Rotter (Vanderbilt University) have received grants from the Harry S. Truman Institute.

Helen M. Bailey retired in November 1987 after 19 years as historian and deputy chief of the Historical Division of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Mrs. Bailey, among other duties, reviewed for the Joint Chiefs of Staff the documents selected for the Department of State's series Foreign Relations of the United States for the years 1950-1954.

Barton J. Bernstein (Stanford University) has been appointed Mellon Professor of Interdisciplinary Studies.

Calvin L. Christman (Cedar Valley College) has been awarded a Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute grant.

Lorna S. Jaffe has moved from the Army Center of Military History to the Historical Division, Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Her article, "Quantitative Analysis and Army Decision Making: A Historical Perspective," appeared in the June 1987 issue of PHALANX: The Bulletin of Military Operations Research.

Clayton R. Koppes (Oberlin College) and Gregory Black have won the Cathy Covert Prize awarded for the best essay in mass communication history for "Blacks, Loyalty, and Motion-Picture Propaganda in World War II," published in the Journal of American History (September, 1986).

Melvyn Leffler (University of Virginia) is co-chairing the Program Committee of the 1988 Program for the AHA.

Delber L. McKee (Westminster College) has received the Louis Knott Kootz Award for his article, "The Chinese Boycott of 1905-1906 Reconsidered: The Role of Chinese Americans," as the most deserving article to appear in the Pacific Historical Review in 1986. Congratulations!

Forrest Pogue has been awarded an Outstanding Alumni Award given to Kentucky university or college graduates who have achieved national status in their chosen careers.

Walter S. Poole has been named deputy chief of the Historical Division of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

William O. Walker III (Ohio Wesleyan) has been awarded an SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Fellowship in International Peace and Security. He will spend the two-year fellowship on a project involving drug control as an aspect of national security policy.

Lawrence Wittner (SUNY-Albany) has received an ACLS/Ford Fellow grant for work on "The World Nuclear Disarmament Movement."

Clarence E. Wunderlin, Jr. (Marshall Foundation) was

named a Hoover scholar for 1987 by the Hoover Library Association. His project is "The Social Scientist as Public Servant: The Career of E. Dana Durand as Government Expert During the New Era and New Deal." Wunderlin also has accepted a position with the Naval Historical Center.

Marvin Zahniser (Ohio State University) has received a Franklin D. Roosevelt Four Freedoms Foundation grant for work on "The United States and the Fall of France, 1940."

Several members have contributed to the SHAFR endowments fund. Among them are: Tadashi Aruga (Tokyo), Gunter Bischof (Harvard), John D. Cozy (Palos Verdes Estates, CA), Emma S. Etuk (Washington, DC), John Dirks (Kingston, Ontario), Hansjuergen Schroeder (Mainz, FRG), Semyen Appatov (Odessa, USSR), Tore Tingvold Petersen (Norway), Fred H. Harrington (Madison, WI), and Martin Cramer (Bethesda, MD).

Three SHAFR members received 1987-88 Fulbright awards for travel, lecture, and research abroad. Among them are: Lawrence E. Gelfand (Iowa)-Ireland; David E. Kyvig (Akron)-Norway; and Carol M. Petillo (Boston)-China.

The Lyndon Baines Johnson Foundation has awarded grants to Bob Buzzanco (Greenbelt, MD), Rena Fonseca (Harvard University), and Steven Livingston (University of South Dakota).

---

### CALENDAR

---

March 24-27                      The 81st annual meeting of the OAH will be held at Bally's Hotel in Reno, Nevada.

April 1                              Applications for the W. Stull Holt Dissertation Fellowship are due.

- May 1 Deadline, materials for the June Newsletter.
- June 9-12 14th SHAFR Summer Conference at American University.
- August 1 Deadline, materials for the September Newsletter.
- November 1 Deadline, materials for the December Newsletter.
- November 1 Applications due to Bernath Dissertation Fund Committee.
- November 1-15 Annual election for SHAFR officers.
- December 27-30 The 103rd annual meeting of the AHA will be held in Cincinnati.
- January 1, 1989 Membership fees in all categories are due, payable at the national office of SHAFR.
- January 15 Deadlines for the 1987 Bernath article award and the Bernath book award.
- February 1 Deadline, materials for the March Newsletter.
- March 1 Nominations for the Bernath lecture prize are due.
- April 1 Applications for the H. Stull Holt dissertation fellowship are due.
- April 6-9 The 82nd meeting of the OAH will be held in St. Louis, MO.

SHAFR's 14th annual conference will meet at American University. Co-chairs: Nancy Tucker and Robert Beisner.

In 1989 the AHA will meet in San Francisco. Program chair: Timothy N. Tackett (Catholic University)

**AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SOCIETY FOR  
HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS AND  
DR. AND MRS. GERALD J. BERNATH**

This agreement, made this 24th day of August 1974, by and between the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations, hereafter referred to as S.H.A.F.R., and existing under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania, and Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath (the latter also known as Myrna F. Bernath), shall encompass an explanatory preamble, monetary agreements and other terms, including Conditions, Rules and Specifications for the Annual Stuart L. Bernath Prize Contest. In the event that S.H.A.F.R. subsequently exists legally under the laws of any other state, this agreement shall remain valid. It is expected that S.H.A.F.R. shall maintain a tax-exempt status under the rules and regulations of the Internal Revenue Service, an agency of the United States government. This agreement shall replace that of October 15, 1971.

I. PREAMBLE:

Whereas Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath desire to establish a permanent memorial to their late, beloved son, Historian Dr. Stuart Loren Bernath, who died on July 3, 1970, they do hereby enter into a contract with S.H.A.F.R. to perpetuate the previously established annual prize award for the best published book on any aspect of American foreign relations. The purpose of the award shall be to encourage and promote the study of American foreign relations. Only the first or second book of an author is eligible. Such studies need not be traditional. Books may be expressions of original thinking and may be innovative in interpretation. They may be based on journalistic or entirely new, contemporary and independent source materials, as well as usual archival historical documents. Works based on authoritative sources such as personal interviews with people directly associated with recent or contemporary events shall be considered

qualified for entrance into the contest. Authors may be non-academic and do not have to be a member of any society. Books by foreign writers may be entered into the contest providing they are published in English. (Note: Once each year, this preamble shall be published in full in any S.H.A.F.R. publication circulated to all S.H.A.F.R. members. This should be done in conjunction with the standard announcement of the Stuart L. Bernath Prize. It is recommended that publicity for the contest be announced in other historical, political science, and journalism publications, as well as any selected magazines or newspapers willing to publish such announcement without cost to S.H.A.F.R.)

## II. CONDITIONS:

Now, therefore, in consideration of the premises and in further consideration of the mutual promises and covenants hereinafter set out in this agreement and in the prize rules and in any amendments agreed upon by both S.H.A.F.R. and Dr. and/or Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, it is hereby agreed:

1. That said Dr. and/or Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath will contribute to S.H.A.F.R. long term United States Treasury Bonds whose total interest yield will amount to a minimum of five hundred dollars (\$500.) annually. S.H.A.F.R., in turn, will grant five hundred dollars (\$500.) to the designated winner of the Stuart L. Bernath Prize for that year. The bonds will be registered in the name of S.H.A.F.R. either by Dr. and/or Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, and will be kept in safekeeping by S.H.A.F.R. until call or maturity dates. All interest income generated by these bonds are to be deposited in a special interest-bearing trust account for the Stuart L. Bernath Prize. This account shall be entitled "The Special Stuart L. Bernath Prize Account of S.H.A.F.R." The five hundred dollar annual prize money is to be withdrawn from this account, which is to be used for no other purpose. Withdrawals shall require the signatures of two officers of S.H.A.F.R. Any excess interest income generating from the bonds over and above the five

hundred dollars required annually, shall be allowed to accumulate in the special trust account in order to provide growth of the funds. When the excess accumulation from principal and interest have totalled an amount sufficient to buy a one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00) long term United States Treasury Bond either at par or at a discounted price, S.H.A.F.R. shall purchase such a bond and register it in S.H.A.F.R.'s name, provided that the yield is equal to or higher than the then prevailing commercial bank interest yield. The yield from this additional bond will be used to help maintain the amount of the Stuart L. Bernath Prize, at, or as near as possible to, Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.) per year. If there are sufficient funds from the original Eight Thousand Dollars (\$8,000.) long term bond or other donated sources to support this prize at that level, then S.H.A.F.R. may use the additional yield from this or subsequent One Thousand Dollar (\$1,000.) bonds only as follows:

- a. to increase the amount of the Bernath Prize;
- b. to retain the interest yield in the special Stuart L. Bernath Prize trust account for compounding until sufficient monies are accumulated to purchase a second One Thousand Dollar (\$1,000.) long term United States Treasury Bond, either at par or discounted, whereupon the additional yield from that bond becomes subject to all of the terms outlined in this entire agreement. This may be repeated indefinitely; also refer to III;
- c. or to establish up to two prizes for the best articles published in scholarly magazines on the subjects of American Foreign Relations and Diplomatic History. The precise rules for such awards are to be drawn up by S.H.A.F.R. Council and approved by the general membership with the stipulation that the spirit of the preamble to this agreement be followed, and that the amount of any such prize(s) never exceed ten percent (10%) of the amount of the Stuart L. Bernath book award prize.

Any funds not utilized as outlined above in a,b, or c, will be allowed to accumulate in the special trust fund. Interest generating from the original, donated

Eight Thousand Dollar bonds and their subsequent direct replacements upon call or maturity dates, must be primarily used to safeguard the perpetuity of the Stuart L. Bernath Prize. The use of interest accumulations from all additional bonds shall be recommended by the Council or a special advisory or feasibility committee, and be subject to approval of the entire membership. Ballots for such voting may be printed in any regular S.H.A.F.R. publication to eliminate additional mailing costs to S.H.A.F.R. A plurality vote shall prevail.

A long term United States Treasury bond shall be defined as one which is not callable for at least ten (10) years, and does not reach maturity for ten or more years. When this contract is executed, Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath shall contribute Eight Thousand Dollars (\$8,000.) face value of United States Treasury bonds.

Semi-annual interest will be mailed to S.H.A.F.R. by the United States Treasury on February 15th and August 15th of each year. The bonds may be called in by the U.S. Treasury for redemption after August 15, 1988, and mature on August 15, 1993.

### III. PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING ORIGINAL DONATED BONDS AND THEIR DIRECT REPLACEMENTS:

1. If bond yields have remained the same as on the original donated bonds or increased at the call or maturity dates of the original bonds or subsequent bonds, the Council of S.H.A.F.R. shall use the proceeds of the called or matured bonds to purchase new, long term, United States Treasury bonds registered in the name of S.H.A.F.R. The Society may increase the amount of the Prize if, in its prudent judgment, such a move does not endanger the permanency of the Prize, and provided that only Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.) per year be allocated from the yield from these bonds. The increase in the prize award would then come from the yield of the aforementioned and subsequent One Thousand Dollar bonds. The excess

yields from all bonds are to be deposited in the Special Stuart L. Bernath Prize Trust Account.

2. On the other hand, if yields from United States Treasury bonds of long maturity dates have fallen to the extent that proceeds from the called or matured original or subsequent bonds are insufficient to generate the necessary Five Hundred dollars annually, S.H.A.F.R. may draw from the accumulated funds in the special Trust Account in order to purchase a replacement long term U.S. treasury bond of sufficient face value to yield the necessary Five Hundred Dollars or more. This same procedure shall be followed in perpetuity.

3. It is recognized that it is impossible to foresee, at this time, the economic status of this country in the callable year or the maturity year of the original donated bonds. In the event that none of the stipulations in above Items 1 and 2 are employable to maintain the Stuart L. Bernath Prize at the Five Hundred Dollar level, the Council may reduce the prize to a lower level or seek small contributions to make up the difference, or, if necessary, make the award less frequently. It is preferred that the book award be maintained annually and in the amount of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.) even at the sacrifice of additional prizes which may have been established for articles. In this world of inflation, this contingency presently seems unlikely. But the Prize is to continue in perpetuity by whatever means the Council or its qualified advisors find practical.

4. If long term United States Treasury bonds are no longer available for purchase at the time of call or maturity of the original or subsequent bonds, then an equivalent quality United States Agency long term, interest-bearing bond shall be purchased, or the proceeds shall be deposited in the special trust account for the prize. The interest generating therefrom shall be used for the Five Hundred Dollar annual award.

5. It is intended that the Special Trust Account shall forever act as a cushion or safeguard for the Stuart L. Bernath Prize. This trust account shall be a savings account set up in a Federally-insured National bank (not a savings and loan bank, or a so-called Thrift bank) of large capitalization and of excellent repute.

Note: The United States Treasury normally mails interest checks to the bonds' owner (S.H.A.F.R.) semi-annually as long as the bond is registered. If, at any time, the Treasury issues a replacement bond requiring the cutting of bond coupons for the purpose of obtaining the interest, it shall then be the duty of the Treasurer of S.H.A.F.R. to do this. In any event, the interest received shall be promptly deposited in the Special Stuart L. Bernath Prize Trust Account. The bonds shall be kept in a secure and safe place, such as a bank vault in the Society's name.

6. During the lifetime of Dr. and/or Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations shall submit to them the financial status of the trust account on an annual basis. Information regarding purchase of additional bonds shall also be supplied to the original donors. The donors shall be informed of any change in S.H.A.F.R.'s tax status.

#### IV. ADDITIONAL TERMS

1. That said Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath and S.H.A.F.R. have agreed to the attached statement of terms and procedures as herein laid out.

2. This is an irrevocable agreement, and neither Dr. or Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath retain any incidence of ownership in any contributions made pursuant to this agreement.

3. S.H.A.F.R. and Dr. and/or Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath have agreed that mechanical changes to the terms of this agreement can be initiated by either party after a thirty day notice to do so, but require the approval

of S.H.A.F.R. and Dr. and/or Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath. After the demise of both Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, no alterations in this agreement will be permissible. Heirs, trustees, or successors of Dr. and/or Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, as well as other persons or parties interested in this Prize, may make financial contributions to the special Stuart L. Bernath Prize trust account, or to S.H.A.F.R. for the Prize account, but shall have no rights in its management. Regardless of any changes or alterations in the working terms of this agreement, the irrevocability of donations and funds generating therefrom shall never be altered. Dr. and/or Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath hereby declare all their contributions to S.H.A.F.R. for the Stuart L. Bernath Annual Prize, and any funds generating therefrom, to be irrevocable gifts.

4. One copy of each book submitted by the contestants shall be forwarded to the Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Book Collection at the Library of the University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California 93106, or its successor. Another copy of each book submitted shall be sent to Dr. and/or Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, 345 North Rexford Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210, or their nominee. These books shall be sent by the Chairman of the Judges' Committee.

5. Every mailing shall be identified as coming from the Stuart L. Bernath Prize Committee of S.H.A.F.R. and addressed:

a. to The Stuart L. Bernath Special Book Collection of the Library at the University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California 93106;

b. Also to Dr. and/or Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, 345 North Rexford Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210, or their nominee.

c. All books shall be sent insured, either via United States mail, United Parcel Service, or other reliable carrier. Recipients of books shall be notified in advance of forthcoming mailings.

6. If the Stuart L. Bernath Prize Award of the

Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations becomes the beneficiary of insurance policy proceeds or other bequests, these funds shall be deposited in the special trust account for the Prize.

7. The Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath referred to herein is the same as Mrs. Myrna Freden Bernath, or Mrs. Myrna F. Bernath, and pertains to no other person.

8. In the event that S.H.A.F.R. shall find it necessary to terminate its existence or to amalgamate with another history organization, the following conditions shall prevail:

a. If amalgamation takes place, the prize shall be continued under the auspices of the newly combined organization.

b. If S.H.A.F.R. simply changes its name, the newly-named organization shall continue to administer the Stuart L. Bernath Prize.

c. If S.H.A.F.R. should cease to exist either as a separate entity or a combined organization, or lose its tax-exempt status, the administration of the Prize and its terms shall be transferred to the Organization of American Historians, providing it is tax-exempt according to Federal and State law, and is willing. If assumption of this responsibility is not acceptable to the Organization of American Historians, then the officers of S.H.A.F.R. shall grant the administration of the Stuart L. Bernath Prize and its funds to any reputable American History society desirous of handling it, provided that the American History society is tax-exempt according to Federal and State law. Any organization which administers this Prize must be and remain tax-exempt according to Federal and State law.

d. Any History society accepting the management of this prize shall abide by the terms of this contract.

e. If no American History organization is willing to administer the Prize, all monies and bonds held by S.H.A.F.R. or its trustees for the Stuart L. Bernath Annual Prize shall be transferred to the Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Book Collection Endowment Fund at the Library of the University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, Calif. 93106.

9. The Secretary of the Society shall maintain in S.H.A.F.R.'s files a copy of Stuart L. Bernath's brief biography as submitted to the Society in 1971, as well as a copy of Dr. Gerald J. Bernath's first Stuart L. Bernath Prize Award presentation speech of December, 1972, inasmuch as this also pertained to Stuart's life and character. Any available future articles or speeches discussing primarily Stuart's life shall also be kept in that file.

10. This agreement also includes an acceptance of the Rules and Specifications for the Stuart L. Bernath Annual Prize Award as outlined in Section V following.

11. Up to \$25.00 a year may be applied for costs directly related to the administering of the terms of this contract.

#### V. CONDITIONS, RULES, AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE STUART L. BERNATH PRIZE CONTEST

##### ELIGIBILITY:

The Stuart L. Bernath Prize Competition is open to any book on any aspect of American foreign relations or foreign policy that was published at any time during the calendar year preceding the award. Only an author's first or second book is eligible. Books having more than two co-authors shall not be eligible. The author is not required to be an historian or political scientist, or be university-attached. Serious books and book-length essays of laymen, journalists, political scientists, past or present government employees, etc., shall be eligible. The author need not be a member of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. See Preamble.

##### DEFINITION:

The term, "American Foreign Relations or Foreign Policy", is to be interpreted in a broad concept which would include not only American Diplomatic History such as previously known or unknown facets of past

foreign policy, but also any aspect of recent or current foreign relations.

#### NOMINATIONS:

Books may be nominated by the author or his agent, the publisher, any member of S.H.A.F.R., or any other member of any established history, political science, or journalism organization.

#### BOOKS SUBMITTED:

Five copies of each book nominated are to be submitted to the Chairman of the Stuart L. Bernath Prize Committee of S.H.A.F.R. The final acceptance or cut-off date shall be predetermined each year by the judges. For further details, the Chairman of the Judges is to refer to Item 5 of this agreement.

#### AMOUNT:

The winner will receive Five Hundred Dollars (\$500). If two or more books are deemed winners, the \$500 shall be shared equally. The award shall be publicly announced at the annual luncheon for members of S.H.A.F.R. or as determined by the Council. Winners shall be notified of the fact in advance of the meeting, and shall be invited to attend the luncheon in order to receive the prize, if able to do so. The prize may be presented along with a short speech, preferably under ten minutes' duration, by the nominee of the donors or by an historian selected by S.H.A.F.R. or by mutual agreement. If possible, the Prize presenter should be one who had known Stuart, or had had some meaningful contact with him. Once in five years a reading of the resume of Stuart's life would be in order. The Prize amount can be changed as described in this agreement. The Prize amount can also be changed upwards if the trust account is increased by insurance proceeds or bequests, or additional contributions.

NOTE: The place and time of the Prize presentation may be changed at the discretion of the President of the Council.

JUDGES:

a. There shall be a committee of three (3) judges serving staggered terms. The purpose of the judging committee shall be to choose the best book submitted. The chairman of the committee shall be the judge with the most seniority of the committee. The chairmanship shall rotate each year. No judge shall serve more than three (3) years. Effective January 1, 1975, at least one judge shall be under forty-five (45) years of age. The president of S.H.A.F.R. will appoint annually the three judges, who may be, but are not restricted to Council members, keeping in mind the donors' general wish that young members be fully represented as stated in item c following.

b. Judges shall not be appointed if they are affiliated with the university or college of the President, Vice President, Secretary or Treasurer of S.H.A.F.R.

c. The age specification is part of the agreement because the donors wish to encourage the thinking and enthusiasm of the young historian, so well exemplified by Stuart.

Vacancies caused by illness, death or resignation shall be filled in the manner described above.

d. No judge shall simultaneously serve as a judge on any other prize committee of any other historical society, organization or association.

e. The nominating committee, the President, the Council, and general membership of S.H.A.F.R. shall always endeavor to have an open-minded committee of judges that reflects a wide and varied range of interpretations. (Note: Although Stuart had great reverence for his fellow historians, he also had high esteem for the works of many non-academic historians, journalists, and other serious thinkers who were seeking and presenting facts on recent or contemporary American diplomatic policy. Because the Prize was established in his honor and memory, it is

expected that the judges will manifest an equal sense of fair-mindedness and ability to waive personal political beliefs in the interests of judging excellence).

f. The Chairman of the Judging Committee shall notify Dr. and/or Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath of the names of the winners. It is the desire and intention of the donors during their lifetimes to present the winners with a copy of Stuart's own book, "Squall Across the Atlantic", as an additional bonus.

g. Each judge shall be entitled to retain one copy of each submitted book for his own use. The donors, being fully cognizant of the time and effort donated by the judges, do hereby express their eternal gratitude for this devotion and generosity. Every judge shall be given a copy of this entire agreement by the President and/or Secretary of S.H.A.F.R.

A copy of this agreement shall be sent, by the Secretary, to any S.H.A.F.R. member requesting it. This contract shall be published in a S.H.A.F.R. journal after bilateral acceptance. It shall be republished with any modifications every five (5) years.

S.H.A.F.R. shall accept, but need not solicit, contributions for addition to the Stuart L. Bernath Special Trust fund for the Stuart L. Bernath Prize from any interested person(s) or organization(s). Such donations shall be duly acknowledged by the Treasurer of S.H.A.F.R. Messages in honor of special occasions mentioned by donors shall be forwarded as requested by such donors.

---

### THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL PRIZES

---

The Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Lectureship, the Memorial Book Competition, and the Memorial Lecture Prize, were established in 1976, 1972, and 1976 respectively, through the generosity of Dr. and Mrs.

Gerald J. Bernath, Laguna Hills, California, in honor of their late son, and are administered by special committees of SHAFR.

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

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

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

Procedures: Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. Five (5) copies of each book must be submitted with the nomination. The books should be sent directly to: Calvin Davis, History Department, Duke University, Durham, NC 27706.

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

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

#### **Previous Winners:**

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

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

### **The Stuart L. Bernath Lecture Prize**

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

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

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

#### **Previous Winners**

- 1977 Joan Hoff Wilson (Fellow, Radcliffe Institute)
- 1978 David S. Patterson (Colgate)
- 1979 Marilyn B. Young (Michigan)
- 1980 John L. Gaddis (Ohio U)
- 1981 Burton Spivak (Bates College)
- 1982 Charles DeBenedetti (Toledo)

- 1983 Melvyn P. Leffler (Vanderbilt)
- 1984 Michael J. Hogan (Miami)
- 1985 Michael Schaller (Arizona)
- 1986 Nancy Bernkopf Tucker (Colgate)
- 1987 William O. Walker III (Ohio Wesleyan)

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

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

**Eligibility:** Prize competition is open to any article on any topic in American foreign relations that is published during 1987. The author must 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 1988 to the chairperson of the committee, who for 1988 is: Sally Marks, Department of History, University of Rhode Island, Providence, RI 02908.

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

#### **Previous winners:**

- 1977 John C.A. Stagg (U of Auckland, N.Z.)
- 1978 Michael H. Hunt (Yale)
- 1979 Brian L. Villa (Ottawa)
- 1980 James I. Matray (New Mexico State)
- David A. Rosenberg (Chicago)
- 1981 Douglas Little (Clark)
- 1982 Fred Pollock (Cedar Knolls, NJ)
- 1983 Chester Pach (Texas Tech)

- 1985 Melvyn Leffler (Vanderbilt)  
1986 Duane Tananbaum (Ohio State)  
1987 David McLean (R.M.I.H.E., Australia)

### **The Stuart L. Bernath Dissertation Fund**

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

Requirements include:

1. The dissertation must cover some aspect of American foreign relations.
2. An award will help defray:
  - (a) last-minute costs to consult a collection of original materials that has just become available or to obtain photocopies from such sources
  - (b) typing and/or reproducing copies of the manuscript
  - (c) abstracting costs.
3. The award committee presumes that most research and writing of the dissertation has been completed. Awards are not intended for general research or for time to write.
4. Applicants must be members of SHAFR.
5. Deadline for receipt of applications is November 1.
6. The application should include an itemized listing of how the money is to be used; an abstract and a description of the significance of the study; and a projected date of completion.
7. The applicant's supervisor must include a brief statement certifying the accuracy of the applicant's request and report of completion.
8. When the dissertation is finished the recipient must send to the chairman of the committee a copy of the abstract sent to University Microfilms (University of Michigan).
9. Generally an award will not exceed \$500.00, and a minimum, of three awards each year will be

made. More awards are possible if the amounts requested are less.

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

Previous winners:

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

---

### THE W. STULL HOLT DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP

---

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

The award will be \$1500.00.

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

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

There is no special application form. Applicants must submit a complete academic transcript of graduate work to date. A prospectus of the dissertation must accompany the application. This should describe the

dissertation project as fully as possible, indicating the scope, method, and chief source materials. The applicant should indicate how the fellowship, if awarded, would be used.

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

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

Applications should be addressed to the Chairperson of this year's W. Stull Holt Fellowship Committee: Terry Anderson, Department of History, Texas A&M, College Station, TX 77843

Prior winners: 1986 Kurt Shultz (Miami)

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

---

#### THE NORMAN AND LAURA GRAEBNER AWARD

---

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

Conditions of the Award:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prior winner: Dorothy Borg (Columbia)

---

#### WARREN F. KUEHL AWARD

---

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

The award will be made every other year at the SHAFR summer conference. The next award will be for books

published in 1987 and 1988. Deadline for submissions is February 1, 1989. One copy of each submission should be sent directly to each member of the selection committee.

David Patterson  
9011 Montgomery Ave.  
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Robert Accinelli  
Dept. of History  
University of Toronto  
Toronto M5S 1A1  
Canada

Harold Josephson  
UNCC St. - History  
U. of N. Carolina/Charlotte  
Charlotte, NC 28223

1987 winner: Harold Josephson (University of North Carolina at Charlotte)

---

#### SCHEDULE OF SHAFR EVENTS AT THE OAH

Council Meeting	Thursday, March 24	8:00 p.m.
	Bally's Reno, Director's Room	
SHAFR Reception	Friday, March 25	5-7 p.m.
	Roxy A and B	
SHAFR Luncheon	Saturday, March 26	12 noon
	Palace A & B	