

The Society for Historians of American  
Foreign Relations



**NEWSLETTER**

---

Volume 25

No. 2

June 1994

---

Page

- 1 New Border Crossings: Christopher Thorne and International History by *Jan Aart Scholte*
- 29 Recent Changes in FCO Records Policy by *Richard Bone*
- 34 Research Strategies at the Library of Congress by *Nicholas E. Sarantakes*
- 38 CIA Conference, March 18, 1994 by *Anna K. Nelson*
- 44 Letters
- 45 Announcements
- 50 Calendar
- 51 Personals
- 54 Publications
- 56 Bernath Awards, Prizes, and Funds

---

ISSN 0740-6169

# *The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations*

---

*Founded in 1967*

*Chartered in 1972*

---

**PRESIDENT:** Melvin Leffler, History, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903.

**VICE PRESIDENT:** Robert Dallek, History, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024.

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

**PROGRAM COMMITTEE:** Robert Schulzinger, History, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309-0234.

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

**CHAIR, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE:** Goeff Smith, History, Queen's University, Kingston, ON K7L 3N6 Canada.

**PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE:** Joan Hoff, History, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405.

**FINANCE COMMITTEE:** Gary Hess, History, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403.

**MEMBERSHIP:** Annual dues are \$30.00 for regular members, \$10.00 for all others. A life membership in SHAFR is \$300.00. In the case of membership by husband and wife, dues for one of them shall be one-half of the regular price. Dues are payable at the office of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer. For those wishing only to receive the SHAFR *Newsletter* the cost is \$15.00. Overseas members wishing to receive the *Newsletter* by air mail should remit an additional \$10 per year to the *Newsletter's* editorial offices. Institutions wishing to receive *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 two others honor the late Myrna L. Bernath; these are financed through the generosity of Dr. Gerald J. Bernath. Awards also honor Laura and Norman Graebner, the late W. Stull Holt, the late Warren Kuehl, Robert Ferrell, and Arthur Link. Details of each of these awards are to be found under the appropriate headings in June and December *Newsletters*.

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

NEW BORDER CROSSINGS:  
CHRISTOPHER THORNE  
AND INTERNATIONAL HISTORY

by  
Jan Aart Scholte  
UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

The title of Christopher Thorne's last published book, *Border Crossings*, captures his intellectual and indeed general personal legacy as aptly as any pair of words could do.\* Never one to accept arbitrary limits, in any realm of his richly varied life, as a student of international relations, too, he insisted that a frontier should constitute not a barrier, but an invitation to exploration. In this spirit his investigations covered multiple countries, his research took him on globe-trotting expeditions round the archives and, methodologically, his analysis often defied impositions of disciplinary boundaries. Particularly during his last decade, Christopher took International History where it had not gone before, venturing especially into Sociology to fashion what might be called an "international historical sociology."<sup>1</sup> The resulting work explored interconnections between the history of

\*I am grateful to Rosemary Foot for comments on an earlier draft of this essay and to Gillian Youngs for organising the Christopher Thorne Memorial Conference at Sussex University, 16 October 1993, where this paper was first presented.

<sup>1</sup>With his strong aversion to being pigeonholed, Christopher would probably not have adopted this label as his own, but it seems an apt shorthand characterisation of his later research.

international relations and key circumstances of social life including race, nationalism, the state, militarism, industrialisation, the status of women, and hegemony (in the Gramscian sense of the word). This paper assesses Christopher Thorne's international-historical-sociological enterprise: its relationship to his earlier research, its main features and insights, and the further work that it might inspire.

### *From Diplomatic History to International Historical Sociology*

Christopher initially built his academic reputation in Diplomatic — or, as he came with increasing insistence to call it, International — History.<sup>2</sup> His first book in this field, *The Approach of War* (1967), constituted something of a low-risk practice run, treating a conventional topic (origins of the Second World War in Europe) on conventional lines.<sup>3</sup> At this stage his research concentrated on official documents, his approach was mainly narrative and chronological, and his analysis focused on personalities and decision-making. Indeed, in the wake of the Taylor controversy *The Approach of War* won plaudits largely for not defying established wisdom. Nor did Christopher's next two books, *The Limits of Foreign*

<sup>2</sup>See, e.g., "What Is Diplomatic History?" *History Today*, 35 (July 1985), pp. 41-42; "Introduction," in *Border Crossings: Studies in International History* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1988), p. 7; manuscript of the Becker Lectures, delivered at Cornell University in September 1988, Lecture 1, p. 3, and Lecture 2, p. 1, Thorne Papers, Sussex University Library; "Diplomatic History: Some Further Reflections," *Diplomatic History*, 14 (Fall 1990), p. 603.

<sup>3</sup>*The Approach of War, 1938-1939* (London, Macmillan, 1967).

*Policy* (1972) and *Allies of a Kind* (1978), fundamentally challenge reigning academic orthodoxies.<sup>4</sup> They were rightly hailed as triumphs, but won this praise mainly in relation to prevailing standards of excellence, such as the expansive coverage of issues and situations, the vast range of consulted sources, the sheer bulk of empirical evidence, the wealth of revelations from the archives, the scrupulous treatment of documents, and the lucidity and flair of the prose. Christopher here offered the best in traditional historical method, with his careful accumulation and selection of data, his attention to subtlety and detail, and his sensitivity to time and context. At the same time he established his renown as a jet-setting researcher, a ravenous reader, a walking bibliography, a hyperactive lecturer and a prolific scribbler. Unstoppable. By the rules of the game he was top of the league, and he was duly rewarded with the highest of honours. His professorial appointment came in January 1977, less than a decade after entering the lecturers' ranks. Two years later he became the first non-American to win the Bancroft Prize "for distinguished works in American History and Diplomacy." Oxford's supreme academic distinction, the Doctor of Letters (DLitt), was conferred upon him at an unusually early age in May 1980. Election to the British Academy followed in 1982. Thus at a youthful 48, and after a university career of but fourteen years, Christopher Thorne stood in no international historian's shadow.

Yet Christopher had nothing if he did not have ambition: one could anticipate that he would not rest on his now rich stock

<sup>4</sup>*The Limits of Foreign Policy: The West, the League and the Far Eastern Crisis of 1931-1933* (London, Macmillan, 1972); *Allies of a Kind: The United States, Britain and the War against Japan, 1941-1945* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1978).

of laurels. As he wrote privately to colleague Akira Iriye shortly after completing *Allies of a Kind*:<sup>5</sup>

it's extremely important, if one is to go on creating with freshness, to keep probing into new material at the same time, and thus 'disturbing' one's mind. Far too many scholars...begin to 'live off their fat,' research-wise, which means that they begin to dwindle as scholars. Not for me, if I can help it.

This stricture related in particular to Christopher's perceived need to continue his worldwide pursuit of archival evidence, but he was also driven to travel in a less literal sense. His itchy feet were mirrored in a restless intellect. As his Sussex colleague John Maclean has suggested, "academic enquiry for him was...the continuous generation of...new questions, new problems and new avenues to explore."<sup>6</sup> Having seen the world of International History as it was then normally conceived, Christopher now went in search of untrodden ground. After 1980 his research movements sooner took him between different sections of the library than between continents.

Educated in the mould of the Oxonian generalist, Christopher was further encouraged to disregard academic territoriality by the cross-disciplinary 'School' structure of Sussex University. In contrast to the experience of most academic historians, his neighbours on the faculty corridor included everyone from geographers to literary critics. Even his International

<sup>5</sup>Letter of 8 December 1977, Thorne Papers.

<sup>6</sup>Obituary in *The Daily Telegraph*, 30 April 1992.

Relations “subject group” (Sussex eschewed the convention of disciplinary “departments”) brought together individuals with first degrees in Politics, Economics, Philosophy and History as well as IR itself. Ever the eclectic, Christopher thrived in this environment. It was, he affirmed, “‘rewarding’ — indeed, essential — to enlist the aid of colleagues in...cognate disciplines”<sup>7</sup> and “well-nigh unavoidable that international historians should pursue their enquiries into areas which are usually thought of as the domain of the sociologist or social-psychologist, say, or of the economic or intellectual historian.”<sup>8</sup> At the start of the 1980s he read Fernand Braudel’s calls for interdisciplinarity in *On History* with enthusiastic approval, vigorously underlining the relevant passages in the book, and penning comments like “exactly” in the margins.<sup>9</sup> As the decade progressed Christopher increasingly berated his colleagues in International History for an alleged “disciplinary parochialism” and went his own way.<sup>10</sup>

Like Braudel, the Sussex Professor of IR made his principal academic border crossings between History and Sociology, but

<sup>7</sup>“Further Reflections,” p. 603.

<sup>8</sup>*The Issue of War: States, Societies and the Far Eastern Conflict of 1941-1945* (London, Hamish Hamilton, 1985), released in paperback as *The Far Eastern War: States and Societies 1941-45* (London, Unwin, 1986), p. xii.

<sup>9</sup>(London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980), *inter alia* pp. ix, 10, 17, 45, 56, 68.

<sup>10</sup>“After the Europeans: American Designs for the Remaking of Southeast Asia,” *Diplomatic History*, 12 (Spring 1988), p. 208; also sources cited in note 1.

in contrast to the *Annales* writers his analysis furthermore incorporated insights from that mainly Anglo-Saxon field of study, International Relations. Christopher was not the only researcher to move in the direction of an international-historical-sociological synthesis in the period after 1975, of course, and he in fact gained considerable inspiration from the concurrent efforts of others to interweave questions of social structure, historical development and the international. For example, many sociologists were rediscovering the international dimension of social relations during these years. Some of them, including Wim Wertheim, Immanuel Wallerstein, Theda Skocpol, Eric Wolf, Anthony Giddens, Daniel Chirot and Michael Mann (all of whose work Christopher consulted), sought in addition to build the historian's sensitivity to time and change into their international-sociological understanding of the contemporary world.<sup>11</sup> Meanwhile, the field of International Relations broadened its scope during the 1970s and 1980s to include, at the margins at least, sociological perspectives as developed in modernization theory, Marxism, world-system theory,

<sup>11</sup>Wertheim, *Evolution and Revolution: The Rising Waves of Emancipation* (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1974); Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System* [three volumes] (New York/San Diego, Academic Press, 1974/1980/1988); Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1979); Wolf, *Europe and the People without History* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1982); Giddens, *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism* [two volumes] (London, Macmillan/Polity, 1981/1985); Chirot, *Social Change in the Modern Era* (San Diego, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986); Mann, *The Sources of Social Power. Volume 1: A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986).

feminism, critical theory and postmodernism.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, a few international relationists like Ekkehart Krippendorff, Robert Cox and Fred Halliday crossed disciplinary boundaries from IR into Sociology and History concurrently.<sup>13</sup> In contrast, Christopher's contemporaries in International History in Britain at this stage generally overlooked, and in some instances brashly dismissed, the potentialities of a sociological dimension in their work.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, he rarely addressed

<sup>12</sup>Cf. E.L. Morse, *Modernization and the Transformation of International Relations* (New York, Free Press, 1976); V. Kubálková and A.A. Cruickshank, *Marxism and International Relations* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1985); F. Yalvac, "World System Studies and International Relations," *Millennium*, 9 (Winter 1980-81), pp. 229-44; "Special Issue: Women and International Relations," *Millennium*, 17 (Winter 1988); A. Linklater, *Beyond Realism and Marxism: Critical Theory and International Relations* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1990); J. Der Derian and M.J. Shapiro (eds), *International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics* (Lexington, Lexington Books, 1989).

<sup>13</sup>Krippendorff, *Internationales System als Geschichte. Einführung in die internationale Beziehungen* (Frankfurt, Campus, 1975); Cox, *Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1987); Halliday, "'The Sixth Great Power': On the Study of Revolution and International Relations," *Review of International Studies*, 16 (July 1990), pp. 207-21.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. D.C. Watt, *What About the People? Abstraction and Reality in History and the Social Sciences* (London, London School of Economics and Political Science, 1983); A. Sked, "The Study of International Relations: A Historian's View," *Millennium*, 16 (Summer 1987), pp. 251-62. Papers presented at the annual conferences of the British International History Group, formed in 1988, have predominantly concentrated on diplomatic interchange in interstate conflict. In a recent departure from this pattern, a major International History conference at the London School of Economics in June 1993 covered a much larger canvas.

academic historians in the UK during the last decade of his life, and tended to find more receptive audiences elsewhere in Europe, in the Antipodes and, especially, in the United States. For all that he was profoundly ambivalent about "the Great Republic," a phrase that he iterated with alternating fondness and sarcasm, it was across the pond that international historians were at this time generally most ready to engage with social theory.<sup>15</sup>

Christopher's first foray into international-historical-sociological investigations concerned the problem of race. In the course of his research for *The Limits of Foreign Policy* and *Allies of a Kind* he had been struck by the centrality of oppositions between "East" and "West," "coloniser" and "colonised," "Asian" and "European," "white" and "brown/black/yellow" in the discourse of international affairs during the 1930s and 1940s. Curiosity about this phenomenon led him to consult sociological literature on race relations and works of Social Psychology concerning perceptions. Integrating the resulting insights with his usual mass of empirical evidence, he produced, in November 1980, his first "international social history," under the title of *Racial Aspects of the Far Eastern War of 1941-1945*.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup>See, e.g., C.R. Lilley and M.H. Hunt, "On Social History, the State, and Foreign Relations: Commentary on 'The Cosmopolitan Connection,'" *Diplomatic History*, 11 (Summer 1987), pp. 243-50; M.J. Hogan and T.G. Paterson (eds), *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991).

<sup>16</sup>(London, British Academy [Raleigh Lecture on History for 1980], 1982).

This essay for the British Academy formed only one part of a much larger examination of the implications of the Pacific War for social change in the participating countries. In that project, begun in 1977, Christopher combined a critical reading of sociological texts on “modernization” and “mass society,” an extensive survey of social histories concerning the various lands and peoples involved, an exhaustive coverage of diplomatic histories of World War II, and an abundance of detailed archival material. The outcome, a book released in April 1985 as *The Issue of War*, was widely acclaimed as pathbreaking. Zara Steiner, for instance, observed that “there are few writers in the field of international history who have extended the diameters of the subject so far.”<sup>17</sup> On the other hand Christopher was, in accordance with his own expectations that this “absurdly ambitious” work would be “unpopular,”<sup>18</sup> for the first time confronted with mixed reviews. Harsher critics described the argument as “exceedingly obscure,” “unconvincing,” “elusive and “little short of foolhardy.”<sup>19</sup> Indeed, from the early stages of the

<sup>17</sup>Z. Steiner, “No Return to the Status Quo Ante,” *Financial Times*, 27 July 1985. See also P. Kennedy, “In the Light of Battle,” *Times Literary Supplement*, No. 4297 (9 August 1985), p. 870; I. Nish in *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 14 (May 1986), pp. 237-38; B.A. Shillony in *Pacific Affairs*, 59 (Fall 1986), pp. 485-87.

<sup>18</sup>Letter from Roger Bell, 15 March 1985, Thorne Papers. Also letter to Sheldon Meyer, 17 April 1985.

<sup>19</sup>Respectively, R.H. Immerman in *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 23, No. 3-4 (1988), p. 355; R.H. Minear, “The Issue: What Is the Issue?” *Reviews in American History*, 15 (June 1987), p. 318; *Times of India*, 8 September 1985; G. Warner in *International Affairs*, 63 (Autumn 1987), p. 674.

research Christopher himself had confessed to a fear of being “in danger of getting out of [my] depth in areas of advanced sociology.”<sup>20</sup>

Yet there was no retreat to the predictable comforts of the traditional International History in which he had first made his name. “Retreat” was one word that did not figure in Christopher’s otherwise unbounded vocabulary. At most he would concede to “*reculer pour mieux sauter*,” and even that notion had to be cloaked in a foreign language. So he delved further into Historical Sociology, beginning with a contribution in June 1985 to a conference marking the retirement of his sociologist colleague and friend, the late Tom Bottomore. Before this gathering Christopher proclaimed a conviction that:<sup>21</sup>

for historians and sociologists alike there is considerable scope for development in regard to both the international dimensions of social change and the sociology of international relations...development that will foster the adoption of...an international perspective among sociologists, and of sociological perspectives (transnational as well as national) among historians of international relations.

<sup>20</sup>“End-of-Grant Report” for SSRC-funded project, “A Comprehensive Survey of the Pacific War, 1941-45,” August 1977-August 1980, Thorne Papers.

<sup>21</sup>“Societies, Sociology and the International: Some Contributions and Questions, With Particular Reference to Total War,” Thorne Papers. A revised version was published in W. Outhwaite and M. Mulkay (eds), *Social Theory and Social Criticism: Essays for Tom Bottomore* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1987), pp. 124-53.

During the ensuing years his bottomless reading list lengthened to include works by, among many other social theorists, and in addition to those already mentioned, Aron, Barthes, Berger, Bourdieu, Coser, Derrida, Durkheim, Foucault, Geertz, Gellner, Gramsci, Habermas, Laclau, Lukes, Mills, Moore, Parsons, Polanyi, Runciman, Sorokin, Thompson, Veblen and Weber.<sup>22</sup> By the time Christopher addressed the Historical and Political Science Institutes at the University of Oslo in March 1990, his chosen subject, quite unlike anything that an audience might have expected from him fifteen years earlier, was “Social Science and the Dimensions of International History.”<sup>23</sup>

Anthony Giddens, for one, expressed the hope that Christopher would devote a book to elaborating an international-historical-sociological perspective,<sup>24</sup> but the Sussex professor continued to prefer studies with a specific empirical orientation over exercises in theory construction per se. After 1985 his focus shifted, however, from the subject of social change in the Second World War to the history of post-war external relations of the United States. Already in *The Issue of War*, Christopher had highlighted the USA as the exception to the rule among the belligerents. Uniquely, he maintained, Americans in general moved to the “right” rather than the “left” during the war, and feared rather than

<sup>22</sup>Box “Sociology, Historical Sociology, & IR,” Thorne Papers.

<sup>23</sup>Box “Recent/Current Articles,” Thorne Papers.

<sup>24</sup>Letter from Giddens to Thorne, 17 March 1988, Thorne Papers.

embraced the prospect of social transformation.<sup>25</sup> This diagnosis came out more starkly in a paper that Christopher gave in April 1986 to a conference at Rutgers University on "World War II and the Shaping of Modern America." On this occasion he affirmed that, in spite of its heavy international involvements, "since 1945 [the American] state and nation have become 'estranged' from much of the remainder of humankind."<sup>26</sup> Why Johnson and Reagan, he asked? Why the CIA and NASA? Why Vietnam and Nicaragua? Why the hysterics about "the loss of China" in the early 1950s and "the evil dictator Saddam Hussein" forty years later? How could the US clerisy and general public alike be, on the whole, so blind and relatively indifferent to the blunders and violence perpetrated in their name worldwide?

Christopher's explorations of such questions developed first of all around the concept of "political culture." As he defined it in a lecture at the British Academy in December 1986, this social force involved:<sup>27</sup>

a value-system which can be seen operating at the levels of the community itself (that is, in relation to its fundamental political beliefs and 'rules of the game'), of

<sup>25</sup>*Issue of War*, pp. 295-99.

<sup>26</sup>"En Route to Estrangement: American Society and World War Two in the Global Setting," in *Border Crossings*, p. 280.

<sup>27</sup>*American Political Culture and the Asian Frontier, 1943-1973* (London, British Academy [Sarah Tryphena Phillips Lecture, December 1986], 1988), p. 343.

the regime (that is, the particular arrangements which regulate political demands, debates, and decisions), and of the immediate, day-to-day exercise of authority.

Thus US foreign policy could, he suggested, be understood in the light of certain peculiarly "American" ways of approaching issues of governance and power, e.g., strong pressures for conformity, Manichaeian tendencies, an inability to empathise with foreigners, a fascination with and heavy use of armed force, an aversion to social revolution, a faith in technological fixes, and so on.<sup>28</sup>

A year later, during a sabbatical at the Australian National University, Christopher widened his analytical framework beyond notions of "political culture" and "public opinion" to encompass, as he described it:<sup>29</sup>

American political-economy and sociology in the post-war years...the concept of 'cultural hegemony' and its possible implications for foreign relations...[and] the sociology of knowledge, in relation to the creation of 'cognitive maps.'

These readings in Canberra fed into his Carl Becker Lectures, delivered at Cornell University in September 1988. Under the

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*; also "En Route to Estrangement"; "American Political Culture and the End of the Cold War" [Albert Shaw Lecture, Johns Hopkins University, April 1991], *Journal of American Studies*, 26 (December 1992), pp. 303-30.

<sup>29</sup>Report on Visiting Fellowship to Professor R.G. Ward, Director of the Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, 4 December 1987, Thorne Papers.

title of "Them and Us," the three talks advanced, as he put it, "a set of reflections concerning American society and its international environment between Pearl Harbor and the mid-1960s."<sup>30</sup> Methodologically, this critical examination of US world leadership unfolded, he affirmed, in "an area where international history, cultural history, political science and political sociology overlap."<sup>31</sup> Christopher aimed to turn the Becker Lectures into a book, but found the task more difficult, particularly in conceptual terms, than any of his previous undertakings. Three years and several revisions later the prospective volume, with the title *The Demanding Dream*, remained unfinished when his terminal illness struck.<sup>32</sup>

In sum, then, during the last fifteen years of his life Christopher Thorne moved from being a paragon of diplomatic historians to a pioneer of international historical sociology. Many in the profession did not fully appreciate the shift and continued to identify him in the first place as the author of *Allies of a Kind*. Conference organisers perpetually approached him to speak on interstate politics in the Second World War, and editors persistently asked him to review conventional diplomatic histories. Regrettably, international theorists (with their general shortage of historical sensitivity)

<sup>30</sup>Becker Lecture 1, p. 2.

<sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>32</sup>At Christopher's request, his 279-page manuscript for *The Demanding Dream: American Society, the American Polity, and the World Beyond, 1941-1964* will not be published. Rosemary Foot has summarised the argument in "Christopher Thorne, the United States and the Demanding Dream" (Paper presented to the Christopher Thorne Memorial Conference, Sussex University, October 1993).

and sociologists (with their frequently crude notions of international relations) for the most part did not reciprocate the attention that Christopher gave to their work. *The Issue of War* did not sell particularly well, and twice during the 1980s the television networks rejected his proposals to produce a different kind of series of programmes about World War II, namely, one that would focus on the wider society rather than the trenches, and on the world as a whole rather than Britain or Europe in particular.<sup>33</sup> His attempts in a BBC Radio broadcast at the time of the Gulf War to inject ideas of “international society” and “international system” into the discussion fell on the largely unresponsive ears of the other panelists.<sup>34</sup> In these ways Christopher was, like many an innovator, frequently overlooked and/or misconstrued by the mainstream.

### *Making New Connections*

What, more specifically, was new and different about Christopher Thorne’s international historical sociology? Six general accomplishments might be identified. To begin with, the Sussex professor demonstrated that empirical detail and theoretical precision can go hand in hand in a work of international history, and operate to their mutual benefit. Christopher debunked the claims of many mainstream international historians, “adept in the unexamined assumption,” to be “theory-free” and “narrative” in their

<sup>33</sup>Typescripts of the proposed series are deposited with the Thorne Papers.

<sup>34</sup>“New Worlds To Order,” BBC Radio 4 (“Analysis” programme), 28 February 1991 - transcript deposited with the Thorne Papers.

approach.<sup>35</sup> He was acutely aware that an analysis involved “making choices which have epistemological and even philosophical derivations and implications.”<sup>36</sup> At the same time, however, Christopher remained “careful about facile generalisations,”<sup>37</sup> reminding his readers that history is “full of uncertainties and contradictions and muddle” and therefore “perplexing, confusing, even exasperating.”<sup>38</sup> In seeking to marry the empirical and the theoretical, Christopher often found himself caught in a crossfire between, on one side, demands from social scientists for greater conceptual sophistication and, on another, charges from empiricist historians of building castles in the air. He stood his ground, though, and in doing so helped to expose the falsehood of the supposed dichotomy between theory and history in the study of international relations.

Christopher’s work was innovative in a second respect through its extension of the geographical scope of a work of international history to a breadth theretofore rarely achieved except in survey textbooks. True, Africa, Eastern Europe and Latin America rarely made an appearance between his covers,

<sup>35</sup>Becker Lecture 3, p. 3; “Societies, Sociology and the International,” p. 125; “Introduction,” in *Border Crossings*, p. 11.

<sup>36</sup>Becker Lecture 3, p. 1.

<sup>37</sup>Steiner, *op cit.*

<sup>38</sup>Becker Lecture 2, p. 1. See also A. Roberts, “Muddles, and How Not to Think About Them,” *Times Literary Supplement*, No. 4469 (25 November-1 December 1988), p. 1310; G. Segal, review of *Border Crossings* in *International Affairs*, 64 (Autumn 1988), pp. 688-89.

but he did examine in detail, and draw multiple connections between, developments in Asia, Australasia, Western Europe, North America and the Pacific within an international-systemic whole. In this regard Ian Nish observed, in relation to *The Issue of War*, that Christopher presented “world history, at its most comprehensive.”<sup>39</sup>

Third, Christopher dropped the habit in much (though not all) Diplomatic History of examining states largely in isolation from social life at large. He rejected “the notion that the study of past international relations can be confined to the level of official debate and interchange.”<sup>40</sup> Apart from analysing the acts and experiences of politicians, officials and the armed forces, his international historical sociology also considered the lives of business people, intellectuals, factory workers, schoolchildren, homemakers, journalists, churchgoers and peasants. Moreover, in both *The Issue of War* and the Becker Lectures he turned a Foreign Policy Analysis convention on its head, by tracing not only “domestic” influences on “external” affairs, but also the converse implications of interstate relations for the “internal” social organisation in countries.

Fourth, Christopher moved away from the prevailing methodological individualism of orthodox International History and developed something of a structural analysis of the course of international relations. After 1977 his work located causality far less in day-to-day chronology and the idiosyncratic characters of decision-takers. He continued to

<sup>39</sup>Nish, p. 237.

<sup>40</sup>“After the Europeans,” p. 207.

have an acute sensitivity to the timing and sequence of events, and well sustained his reputation as “a master of personalities,”<sup>41</sup> but his analysis now extended further, too. It was necessary, he maintained, to look “wider and deeper than the musings of presidents and memorandums of Foreign Service officers.”<sup>42</sup> The course of international history was also shaped by embedded social forces relating to, say, race, gender, nationalism, urban life and industrialisation. By the time he delivered the Becker Lectures Christopher was fully concerned to uncover “patterns which take us down to levels of explanation deeper than those of immediate events or even immediate structures.”<sup>43</sup> That said, he was by no means a structuralist, and he had little time for the sweeping teleological visions of a Wallerstein or a Fukuyama.<sup>44</sup> Indeed, his early grounding in empiricist methods continued at times to restrain his enthusiasm for structural perspectives on international history. In many respects he remained, as he observed in *Border Crossings*:<sup>45</sup>

<sup>41</sup>Rosemary Foot, obituary of Christopher Thorne in *The Independent*, 27 April 1992.

<sup>42</sup>“Further Reflections,” p. 604.

<sup>43</sup>Becker Lecture 1, p. 9.

<sup>44</sup>“Societies, Sociology and the International,” pp. 132-33; “End of the Cold War,” p. 320.

<sup>45</sup>“Introduction,” p. 6. In a similar vein, Paul Kennedy (*op cit*) described Christopher as “a ‘splitter’ rather than a ‘lumper’...so agile and lively in pointing to the exceptions to every general trend.”

inclined to think more readily in terms of the particular than of the general; to take note of the contingent and the exceptional; to be sceptical alike of grand theories concerning the historical process and of attempts to reduce the play of politics and relations among untidy, inconsistent human beings to formulae.

The problem, then, was how to link “social dynamics on the one hand and foreign-policy decision-making on the other”<sup>46</sup> and “how to draw out patterns without in doing so losing sight of and ‘feel’ for the confusion that lies in our past.”<sup>47</sup> A tall order indeed.

Fifth, Christopher’s historical-sociological investigations deviated from prevailing convention by inserting questions of ideology into International History. Such matters already occupied him in a broad sense in his very first book, *Ideology and Power*, written during his early career as a schoolteacher. However, he at that juncture treated “ideology” in the superficial sense of “professed beliefs” and “political dogma” (in particular communism and nationalism).<sup>48</sup> Ideational issues surfaced again, this time in relation to perceptions, in *The Limits of Foreign Policy* and *Allies of a Kind*, while *Racial Aspects of the Far Eastern War* focused specifically on a problem of “belief systems.” Yet it was in his unfinished work on American political culture and foreign policy that

<sup>46</sup>“Societies, Sociology and the International,” p. 139.

<sup>47</sup>Becker Lecture 2, p.1.

<sup>48</sup>*Ideology and Power: Studies in Major Ideas and Events of the Twentieth Century* (London, Collier-Macmillan, 1965), p. 1.

Christopher began fully to explore the complex and frequently unseen connections, in the construction of “cultural hegemony,” between worldviews, interests and structural power, all mediated in part through international relations.<sup>49</sup>

This concern with ideology points to a sixth distinct attribute of Christopher’s international historical sociology: namely, its emergent quality of critical theory. Like orthodox academe generally, mainstream international historians have only rarely propounded fundamental critiques of prevailing patterns of social organisation. On the contrary, conventional research in the field has on the whole been inclined, whether openly or implicitly, to reinforce established social structures. Thus, for instance, most international historians have taken existing patterns of authority as given, have assumed that nationality is and must be the primary basis of identity and community, have underlined (if not exaggerated) the power of the state, have treated war as “normal,” and on many occasions have glorified military exploits. At the same time, by (often quite unintentional) omission, orthodox works of International History have usually marginalised or wholly excluded considerations of race, gender, class and other lines of structural conflict and domination in social life. To this extent the field has tended, in effect if not by design, to add academic bricks and mortar to the construction of one or the other hegemonic consensus.

In contrast, Christopher’s work developed increasingly critical if not downright subversive qualities. Even in his methodologically more conventional days he made a point of puncturing myths with, for example, his documentation of

<sup>49</sup>See especially Becker Lecture 3, pp. 3-5.

often profound tensions between the Western Allies (“of a kind”) in the Second World War and his exposure of Winston Churchill’s blatant racism.<sup>50</sup> Thereafter, *The Issue of War* highlighted not only racial prejudice, but also social ills such as gender inequality, the concentration of state power, avoidable starvation, unjust patterns of land ownership, poor labour relations and the alienating effects of modern technology. In this book Christopher also began to draw connections between theory and practice, noting the pursuit by contemporary intellectuals of “new categories,” “changes of world view,” “new habits of thought” and “paradigm shifts” as an integral part of wider efforts to transform the social order in a progressive direction.<sup>51</sup> Thereafter, in his work on American political culture he became alert to, and highly critical of, the role of mainstream US social science in providing intellectual underpinnings for the post-war *Pax Americana*.<sup>52</sup> In contrast, Christopher’s own analyses might be seen to provide academic ammunition for those who would unravel the ideological threads of US world power or would combat racism, sexism and other structural constraints on

<sup>50</sup>*Allies of a Kind*; also essays dating from 1975-1978 republished in Part II of *Border Crossings* under the heading “Conflict and Cooperation among the Western Democracies.”

The wartime prime minister’s grandson of the same name charged that these claims were “grossly offensive and untrue,” to which Christopher replied, “What a silly fellow he is - his grandfather deserved better, in my view!” Correspondence of March-April 1978 with Andrew Knight (editor of *The Economist*), Thorne Papers.

<sup>51</sup>*Issue of War*, pp. 89-90, 317-18.

<sup>52</sup>See, e.g., “En Route to Estrangement,” pp. 280, 297-99.

individual liberty. He did not openly declare such intentions, nor did he assume the role of an avowed "political activist," but his writings reveal an abiding opposition to cant, to intolerance, and to mediocrity in positions of power. To this extent Christopher could be a thorn — this time without the "e" — in the side of academic and popular opinion as well as authority of any kind.

### *Project Incomplete*

Christopher's international historical sociology contained much that was innovative and insightful; however, like many a pioneering experiment, this one generated ever more difficult challenges as it progressed. It is after all no small thing to combine matters of social structure, historical change and international relations in a single analysis. Indeed, no investigator has satisfactorily pieced together the whole of this intellectual puzzle. Not surprisingly, then, Christopher stumbled now and again in his construction of an international-historical-sociological understanding of the twentieth-century world, and he had not made his way through the entire conceptual labyrinth when his life was cut short. To this extent his legacy consists not only of impressive advances, but also of unfinished business.

One of several academic challenges which Christopher bequeaths to us is that of overcoming the material/ideal divide in a social-historical analysis of international affairs. As John Maclean formulated the issue after attending one of

Christopher's research seminars in the late 1980s, the problem was to make:<sup>53</sup>

this difficult connection between...the structure and process of economic and financial interests ...and the structure and process of dominant myths, assumptions, *explicit* ideologies, discourses and so on.

In practice, Christopher's analysis sometimes inclined towards methodological idealism, focusing on images and ideologies without relating these mental dimensions of social relations fully and precisely to their accompanying material conditions, such as commerce, geopolitics and demography. The Becker Lectures, for example, concentrated on "perceptions, feelings and beliefs" while making only a passing mention of the necessity "to explore the nature of and fluctuations in American economic hegemony internationally."<sup>54</sup> Likewise, his accounts of social history in the mid-twentieth century included only limited consideration of capitalist development. In part this general marginalisation of material forces resulted from Christopher's aversion to Marxist historiography, which he rejected (rightly or wrongly) as being structuralist, teleological and (perhaps worst of all from his point of view) dogmatic.<sup>55</sup> In addition, the relative demotion in his writings of economic and ecological dimensions reflected a relative

<sup>53</sup>Undated (c. 1989) note to Christopher, Thorne Papers [Maclean's emphasis].

<sup>54</sup>Becker Lecture 3, pp. 1, 6.

<sup>55</sup>Cf. *Issue of War*, p. xi; "Societies, Sociology and the International," pp. 132-34.

lack of interest in such matters; hence he was not motivated to fill the gaps when it came to political economy with the same drive that fuelled his pursuit of questions of social psychology, political culture, symbolic universes, ideology and, in *The Demanding Dream*, psychoanalysis. Christopher readily acknowledged a need to integrate the material and the ideal in an understanding of international social life, and he might in a longer lifetime have moved further in this direction. In the event, however, his death has left it to others to complete this particular epistemological border crossing in international historical sociology.

A second important unfinished task of Christopher's research concerns the delineation of relationships between social structure and international history. He presented many vivid and delightfully illustrated descriptions of occasions when international events affected, and/or were shaped by, the social order of the day; however, he did not consider systematically the relative priority of, and interplay between, the various aspects of the social framework that he explored. What, more precisely, was the relationship in the historical experiences that he explored, between race and nationalism, between the state and gender, between machine technology and class, and so on? Christopher did not either consolidate an argument concerning how and why social structure had the character that it did in the middle decades of the twentieth century. To this extent his conceptions of "the modern" and "mass society" remained rather vague. More generally, he did not elaborate his notion of the place of structural power in historical causality much beyond the truism that "I see actions and structures as being linked."<sup>56</sup> In short, Christopher

<sup>56</sup>Becker Lecture 3, p. 3.

stressed the crucial and often neglected insight that international relations and social organisation are integral to one another, but we still face major unanswered questions about the precise nature of these interconnections.

The concept of “the international” was another pointer on Christopher’s epistemological compass which remained rather unsteady at the time of his death. Like a number of other authors of the 1980s, he advanced the notion that international relations involved more than the sum total of transactions across territorial state frontiers: in addition, the international was a distinct realm with certain irreducible qualities of its own. He thus noted, for example, that:<sup>57</sup>

strong ties of a structural and economic kind were by 1937/9 encompassing virtually all societies around the globe...whatever the differences in their individual cultures, patterns of organization, and stages of industrialization and urbanization.

With general observations of this kind, Christopher became intrigued by Eric Wolf’s references to “processes that transcend separable cases” and “the ‘totality of interconnected processes’ which brought into being ‘the social system of the modern world.’”<sup>58</sup> There was, the Sussex professor affirmed, “a network of relations and processes among *and transcending* national societies.”<sup>59</sup> During his last years concepts of

<sup>57</sup>“En Route to Estrangement,” p. 278.

<sup>58</sup>“Societies, Sociology and the International,” pp. 132-33.

<sup>59</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 126 [my emphasis]; also *Issue of War*, pp. 55-58.

“international society” and “the international system” gained increased prominence in his analytical vocabulary. Yet Christopher gave these terms little specific content, and on at least one occasion he even suggested that an international-systemic understanding of social life was “an achievement beyond reach.”<sup>60</sup> Instead, he continued for the most part to divide the world into country units and to compare national experiences, rather than to take international relations as a whole as his starting point. This tendency to separate the domestic and the international, together with his ingrained attachment to notions of “national character,” often led Christopher to reproduce the prevailing presumption that configurations of social structure maintain a one-to-one correspondence with the boundaries of territorial states. To be sure, he highlighted mutual effects between the “inside” and the “outside” of a country; however, he still largely regarded the two as discrete realms, each with its own set of dynamics, and mainly concentrated on domestic forces, leaving the international as a rather empty category.

Thus Christopher has left us with work to do. His was, indeed, “an unfinished journey.”<sup>61</sup> Reviewing *Border Crossings*, Ian Clark concluded that:<sup>62</sup>

<sup>60</sup>“Societies, Sociology and the International,” p. 140.

<sup>61</sup>Donald Cameron Watt, opening address to the Christopher Thorne Memorial Conference, Sussex University, October 1993.

<sup>62</sup>Review of *Border Crossings*, in *Historical Journal*, 32, No. 2 (1989), p. 509.

Thorne's pleas for a sociological approach which goes beyond narrow diplomatic history is [sic] well taken but his examples...indicate schemes for future research rather than mature results already achieved.

Another commentator, Michael Schaller, likewise suggested that "Thorne may not have succeeded in identifying or practicing the synthesis of social science theory that he believes critical to reviving diplomatic history."<sup>63</sup> Yet Christopher himself was the first to acknowledge (and with no little frustration) that "I end up with no all-embracing, hard-and-fast set of 'answers' that can solidly demonstrate the causalities involved."<sup>64</sup> So yes, the cup remained half empty, but Christopher's achievement lies in the half of the cup that was full by the time of his death. In some ways he had become mired in an international-historical-sociological swamp, but he had had the intellectual courage to face up to hard questions that most international historians dared not even pose, let alone pursue. More than any other author in the profession, Christopher opened International History to social analysis, taking it away from its traditions of state-centrism, methodological individualism, a crude equation of power with physical resources, and ignorance of theory-practice connections. At the same time, he retained the strengths of conventional historical method, with an uncompromised sensitivity to questions of evidence, time and context. By bringing the international into Historical Sociology and sociology into International History he

<sup>63</sup>Review of *Border Crossings*, in *American Historical Review*, 95 (December 1990), p. 1498.

<sup>64</sup>Becker Lecture 1, pp. 4, 7.

pioneered a unique mode of social enquiry. Obituaries rightly described Christopher Thorne as “one of the most original and inventive” of voices in historical scholarship.<sup>65</sup> Where might he have gone had fate given him another fifteen years, the time span that had previously taken him from *Allies of a Kind* to *The Demanding Dream*? A point of sad speculation. Fortunately for us, we still have opportunities to rise to the challenges that Christopher has set us.

<sup>65</sup>Donald Cameron Watt, in *The Times*, 5 May 1992.

## RECENT CHANGES IN FCO RECORDS POLICY

by  
Richard Bone

LIBRARY AND RECORDS DEPARTMENT OF THE BRITISH FOREIGN  
AND COMMONWEALTH OFFICE

This paper was delivered as part of a Records Policy Seminar held at the FCO in June 1993. Among the other published papers are ones by I.V. Lebedev (Dir., History and Records Dept., Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and Jonathan Haslam (Corpus Christi College-Cambridge), each examining current foreign policy research opportunities and difficulties in Russian (Soviet) archives.

[editor]

When the Secretary of State said, in May last year, that a balance had always to be struck between withholding and disclosing information, he also said that steadily 'that balance has shifted in favour of openness'. Evidence of what these changes meant for FCO records policy came on 3 June 1992 when the Foreign Secretary told the House of Commons that the FCO was releasing its papers on the flight of Rudolf Hess to this country in May 1941 and that the Office was reviewing its policy on withholding certain records for more than 30 years. He warned that there would not be a sudden avalanche but that there would be a substantial advance for the benefit of historians: one far greater than had been contemplated before by any government. Earlier evidence of this change of policy had been the release, in February 1992, of the Farm Hall transcripts which, like the Hess papers, had been sought after by historians for many years.

More flexible policies in respect of the release of records reflected the commitment to more open government made at the time of the 1992 General Election. In the specific field of records policy it reflected the feeling in the FCO that previous policies on withholding needed a radical overhaul. While the records operation as a whole was coping well with the demands placed on it (and probably was as liberal as any in Whitehall) it had become clear by 1991 that the accumulated withholdings, going back to the end of the first war, and the inability to help *bona fide* historians with legitimate enquiries, were arguably beginning to undermine the credibility of the Office's records policy in the eyes both of outsiders wanting information and the insiders implementing the policy. It was, however, important to keep a sense of proportion. Contrary to what some may think the Office has, over the years, withheld very few of its records.

Every year the Records Branch receives some 2,000 feet of records from FCO departments in London. More than 80% of the political papers are judged to be of historical interest and of these over 95% are released to the Public Records Office in their 31st year (in the United States, for example, records may be released to the National archives after 30 years but it can be many years before they are reviewed for release). Nonetheless this residual 5% can add up. When we looked at this in 1991 we estimated that we had over 730 shelf feet of retained material in the Office alone, not to speak of closed material in the PRO. Naturally enough it was this withheld material which attracted interest. Surely it was there that the keys to some historical puzzles were to be found?

Having said that it is, of course, not our role as officials to criticize the historians' search for the holy grail, even though all of us, officials and historians alike, recognise that the detailed gaps of history, which may be filled in by some of

our releases, are not going to change the understanding of the big issues or change the broad sweep of 20th century British diplomatic history. Historicism is not going to become a way of life, as it has become in some other countries (and perhaps always was). But the fact that so much has been released in the past meant that the spotlight was bound to focus on what has not.

As the Secretary of State said last year, some papers will remain secret. He could have added that all countries, irrespective of their legislation in these matters, need to protect certain categories of information. These categories are given in the Public Records Act of 1958 [Sections 5.1 and 3(4)] and were elaborated in 1982 in the government's response to the Wilson Committee. Briefly the criteria cover exceptionally sensitive papers, information supplied in confidence the disclosure of which would constitute a breach of good faith and documents the release of which would cause distress or danger to individuals. Records retained within departments, under Section 3(4) and covered by the Lord Chancellor's "Blanket" include those dealing with national security and intelligence.

To arrive at a more flexible release policy, within the terms of the legislation, we had to do two things:

- (a) consider whether the interpretation of the guidelines could be relaxed;
- (b) adopt a new approach to the archival methods used for releasing records to the PRO.

In respect of some of our records, particularly those retained under Section 3(4) of the PRA, what quickly became clear was that many had been not for the sensitivity of the information they contained but for what could be described as

“technical” reasons, eg the naming of names or implicit or explicit confirmation of operations in particular places which still needed protection. The problem was made worse by the fact that it might be only one such reference on a multiple paper file. Previously it had been FCO practice to hold back such files until they could be released in their entirety. To have removed a sensitive paper had been anathema to many purists who regarded it as tampering with the record. Clearly this practice could not continue if we were to get more papers into the public domain. We therefore adopted the practice, used in many countries, of removing still sensitive papers from files and blocking out sensitive names and passages, while making it clear to researchers that this was what had been done and, of course, keeping the original against the day when it could be released. To do this we set up a special review team to work through the retained archive, going back to 1923, and by using these expedients, see how much of it could be released. Already we have released over 450 formerly retained records to the PRO and hope to release many more in the coming months. Of course, it is a staff-intensive process and progress is dependent on the resources available. Nonetheless, progress is being made and the fruits can be seen in, for example, the recently released papers on the Cuban Missile crisis and a great number of pre-1962 papers. We hope, soon, to have re-reviewed all the material up to 1939 and a number of other blocks of records, such as papers on the Russia Committee and the early years of NATO, to follow on from last year’s Hess releases. As I said, these releases are unlikely to change the course of history-writing but they will, at least, fill gaps in the record. By the end of the year we should also have released at least part of the surviving SOE archive.

In identifying where to concentrate our efforts we have been helped by suggestions from historians, such as those which

were made at the useful conference held by the Institute for Contemporary British History last November. Over the last few months FCO records staff have received many individual requests to review and release papers from the withheld archive and have been able already to respond positively.

Of course, judgement still has to be exercised over whether to release records which do not have a security or intelligence connotation. While leaning heavily in the direction of release we still need to consider the international and personal implications of releasing a particular document. Clearly it would be of little benefit to release papers which undermined negotiations, compromised the British position in a sovereignty dispute or endangered individuals, particularly those living in regimes who had assisted British diplomacy at some risk to themselves, or even their descendants. Nonetheless, as the figures I gave earlier demonstrated, the number of papers we actually hold back in our annual release to the PRO is very small and, I believe, justified. Decisions to withhold are not taken lightly and to the argument that others, such as academic historians, should be involved in the process I have to say that it would create another layer of decision-making and would undoubtedly delay the review and release process we have started. And it would cost more money. We have our own historians who play a key part in records policy and, like the reviewers, are in a position to judge residual sensitivities. They also have the responsibility for publishing documents on British foreign policy, some of which have not previously been released to the PRO. Over recent years they have published ten such volumes as an important contribution to the writing of history, both here and overseas, and to ensuring that British foreign policy in the post-war world is better understood.

RESEARCH STRATEGIES  
AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

by  
Nicholas E. Sarantakes  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

The Library of Congress was established in 1800 and burned to the ground by the British during the War of 1812. After the war, Thomas Jefferson sold his private library to Congress in order to rebuild the legislative library. Jefferson wrote of this collection, "I do not know that it contains any branch of science which Congress would wish to exclude from the collections; there is, in fact, no subject to which a Member of Congress may not have occasion to refer." Because of this attitude, and the absence of another invading army, the Library of Congress has become the largest library in the world. The three building complex holds over 28 million books, hundreds of manuscript collections, and a vast number of films, photos, and audio recordings. In fact, many of the Library's European, Latin American and Asian collections are superior to anything abroad. Without a doubt, there is something useful in the Library for diplomatic historians. The purpose of this paper is to share with my colleagues in the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations what I learned about this institution during my summer as a Library of Congress Junior Fellow. I found that patience and planning are the key elements in a successful research endeavor at the Library of Congress.

PREPARATION

A wise and effective research effort at the Library starts before even leaving for Washington. The first step is to

access the Library's computer catalog system. This can be done via E-mail. The Library's address is:

telnet locis.loc.gov

Be warned: using the Library of Congress Information System (LOCIS) requires patience. The system is extremely frustrating, and slow. Nonetheless, it is worth mastering. The system lists books, photos, audio material, periodicals, pamphlets, and manuscript collections housed in the Library. While LOCIS is helpful, it is not comprehensive. Only a fourth of the Library's holdings are in this computer catalog. The old fashioned paper finding aides, indices, and card catalogs still must be consulted. Nevertheless, with LOCIS research at the Library of Congress can start without being in Washington, an important plus for a historian working with limited time and money.

A researcher should also contact the appropriate division or reading room, before leaving for Washington. It is in your best interests to inform the Library staff in advance of your research, and the material that you will want to use. Advance notice will reduce waiting time and allow the staff to have items ready for use. *This is particularly important when material is stored off-site.* Correspondents should also inquire about hours of operation. Each reading room has different hours. Although some rooms are open at night and during the weekends, you should generally plan on doing research between 8 a.m.-5 p.m., Monday through Friday only. The central phone number is (202) 707-5000. Reading room hours are available on a pre-recorded message: (202) 707-6400. The general mailing address is: Library of Congress Washington, D.C. 20540

## RESEARCH

There are two important rules every patron of the Library of Congress should keep in mind. First, remain patient. The stacks are closed; researchers are not allowed into these areas. Every item is brought to a researcher by a deck attendant. A typical fetch takes forty minutes to an hour. After waiting, an attendant might return empty handed.

The one exception to this rule is the manuscript reading room. A fetch in this division takes only about ten minutes. There is a reason for this — the manuscript stacks are right next to the reading room.

Rule number two, use the Library for obscure material. It is also easier to find obscure items, than common material. Even though the Library might own one of the view copies of a particular text, there is less demand for that item. People are also willing to wait an hour to get a hold of a rare newspaper than they are for a six month old copy of *Time* magazine. It is best to conduct preliminary research before trekking to Washington. At the Library, take full use of the Library's staff, but above all else remain patient. The Librarians are extremely knowledgeable about the library's holdings and can guide you to useful holdings. Communicate your needs and interests to the staff fully. Then expect to wait.

## TRANSPORTATION

Traveling to and from the Library is easy. Washington, D.C. has a clean, safe, and inexpensive subway system called the "Metro." This subway is the best way to travel to the Library and about Washington. With exits evenly spaced around the city, the "Metro" is quicker and less frustrating than car travel. The roads in Washington are a confusing series of grids that are often congested. Traveling to the Library by

car is unwise, since there almost no nearby parking spaces. There is a stop directly behind the Library's Madison building — Capitol South.

The "Metro" is not limited to Washington. The tracks go into Northern Virginia and suburban Maryland. The system also stops at Washington National Airport. (If you fly into Washington, use this airport — Dulles Airport has no "Metro" station.)

### FOOD

There are many places to eat in and around the Library. All the food facilities in the Library are in the Madison building. A snack bar is on the ground floor, while a cafeteria and dining room are located on the sixth floor. These eateries are fairly expensive; fortunately, there are several other places to eat nearby. Establishments ranging from a McDonalds to full-service restaurants are to the east of the Library complex on Independence Avenue. While to the south, on 1st Street, SE are two moderately priced full service restaurants. Six blocks to the north on the same street, past the U.S. Capitol and the Supreme Court, is Union Station. This railroad station/shopping mall has a good number of diverse restaurants. As one might expect, all these eateries vary in price and quality. The most inexpensive establishments in the immediate area are the Congressional snack bar and cafeteria. These are accessible from the Madison Building through the tunnel to the Cannon House Office Building on the basement level. These two facilities, however, have limited hours of operation and during peak hours restrict service to Congressional staff.

### EMPLOYMENT AND INTERNSHIPS

There are several options available at the Library for members of SHAFR planning long research trips in Washington, D.C.

The Junior Fellows program provides paid internships in many of the Library's divisions. This program is primarily for graduate students, although there were a few undergraduates last summer. Work schedules are flexible enough to allow time for research. Another option is to get a temporary job at the Library. The Library is currently working under a hiring freeze, but many 90 and 120 day appointments are made so the Library can continue to operate. The pay for these jobs are roughly equal to Junior Fellows, but temporary employees do not enjoy the same flexibility. One big benefit to these two options is that Library employees can go into the stacks and can be in the buildings before opening and long after closing doing research. The best benefit though, is that as library staff you can check books out of the Library. Members of Congress are the only others with this privilege.

## CIA CONFERENCE, MARCH 18, 1994

by

Anna K. Nelson

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

Researchers at the National Archives receive their boxes of documents on metal carts, much like the familiar library cart. Many of these carts were once assigned to various entities within the archives and still bear their names. Written in bold letters on the cart that recently brought my CIA documents were the words, "Center for Polar Archives."

My first thought was that, surely, this was the ultimate cover. My second was that Polar Archives was an apt description for a set of documents that have been hidden for more than forty years under an impenetrable layer of ice. Now the ice is

cracking a bit, and we are all delighted with our glimpse of the world beneath it. However, it seems clear that we are in no danger of being overcome by a massive ice floe!

I would like to concentrate today on the documents now available in the National Archives building from the perspective of the researcher. The CIA collection in the Archives building consists of three groups of documents that reflect the period of the Truman Administration. First there are the intelligence estimates, OREs and NIEs, (the subject of a panel this morning.) Second, there are the 11 boxes that contain the articles from *Studies in Intelligence*, and third there is a "History Series," which includes, for example, the documents and oral interviews conducted by Ludwell Montague as he prepared his biography of Walter Bedell Smith. The memoranda in the printed volume that is being distributed during this conference are not available to researchers in the Archives.

Although there are some NIEs that are still classified, (unfortunately, the Archives has no list of these), the available estimates have been released in their entirety. Intelligence estimates, of course, have an inherent value in themselves, and their release is a giant step forward in understanding the evaluations of the intelligence community. They include distribution lists, for example, and contain notations indicating disagreements between various members of that community.

Yet the experience of reading them is disquieting to the researcher because it is so difficult to discover their relationship to policy. Establishing cause and effect is always difficult and requires perseverance and imagination in the best of circumstances. But since there are no ancillary documents to accompany the estimates it becomes a guessing game. In his presentation yesterday, Thomas Powers noted that Lewis

Strauss once insisted on information concerning the sources and methods by which the CIA reached its conclusions. Researchers are not seeking "sources and methods," but rather information on the course of decision making.

For example, an ORE dated April 6, 1950 that re-examined the national security in light of the detonation of the Soviet atomic bomb concluded that the USSR would nevertheless *not* find it to their advantage to attack the U.S. The ORE then noted that State, Army, Navy and Air Force intelligence representatives strongly dissented. Two months later, June 9, 1950, a second ORE (reprinted in the printed volume prepared for this conference) concludes that Soviet atomic capability has increased the possibility of war and that "the security of the United States is in increasing jeopardy."<sup>1</sup> Why the change? Was it the effect of NSC 68 and its clarion call for greater resources and a deeper commitment to the Cold War? Were these estimates important for new policies or did they reflect the preceding policy changes? Here as elsewhere, the estimates lead to more questions than answers.

*Studies in Intelligence*, as all of you know, are not really agency records but, rather, a collection of articles from an internal, classified journal produced by the agency since 1955.

The index to the collection that has been published by the Center indicates the wide range of subjects covered by this journal. Many bring a touch of history (Napoleon), one uses aerial reconnaissance photos for studying an aspect of the Holocaust, and of special interest to this group is an article on

<sup>1</sup>ORE 91-49, April 6, 1950 and ORE 32-50, June 9, 1950, Box 4, Second Set, RG 263, NA.

Truman and CIA covert operations.<sup>2</sup> In general, the collection contributes to our understanding of the ideas and events that influence the intelligence community.

Since *Studies in Intelligence* was a journal, I expected to open the archive boxes and find bound issues or, at least binders of complete issues. Instead, I found copies of articles with no date within file folders identified only by number. Some articles had words and sentences blacked out. Others had authors who remain anonymous under the heavy black rectangle that replaced their name. Were articles also missing? The last paragraph of the preface to the index states "The purpose of this index...is to make as much of the record available as possible..." There is no list of those articles that might still be classified.

The third collection actually contains material we associate with archives: memoranda, summaries of interviews, information rarely to be found in the official written record. This is the kind of information that helps researchers understand the bureaucratic struggles and conflicting personalities that influence policy. In these boxes the researcher learns from Sidney Souers that it often seemed as if no agency wanted a CIA unless it could control it; that Bedell Smith thought Allen Dulles "a fair operator" of clandestine operations but a weak administrator and that William Jackson thought Dulles a man of "arrogance and self-satisfaction" whose brother engineered his position as DCI. Whether accurate or not, these comments illuminate important relationships between those responsible for the early formation

<sup>2</sup>Brugioni, Dino and Poirer, Robert, "The Holocaust Revisited," Box 7, File 80; Hayden B. Peake, "Harry S. Truman on CIA Covert Operations," Box 7, File 89, RG 263, NA.

of the CIA. If Jackson disliked and demeaned Dulles surely that had an effect on the Dulles-Jackson-Correa Committee. If "Beetle" Smith had such a negative view of Dulles, why was Dulles made DDCI during his tenure?<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately, the Montague collection also contains an inordinate number of shocking pink withdrawal cards, indicating that the documents are unavailable and the information is still classified.

*Some* information is always an improvement over *no* information and those who have been battling the cold war mentality within the CIA and successfully opened the information now available are to be commended and congratulated. But the efforts of CIA public relations officials notwithstanding, the Agency has released very few of its records. If the CIA is seriously interested in promoting the study of intelligence, its internal "culture," and its role in the making of foreign policy then it will have to consider a number of changes:

1. Declassified documents should be released with the file markings that indicate their origins and course through the agency. Withdrawn documents should be noted in every instance. The printed volumes of records released by the CIA, while better than nothing, no neither. Published collections of pristine documents are very difficult to evaluate and lead the researcher to suspect that important documents have been withheld, even when that assumption may be incorrect.

2. Second, the Agency must acknowledge the different levels of documents that concern "intelligence." Montague's memoranda are not on the same level as documents reflecting U.S. covert activity behind the iron curtain. There seems

<sup>3</sup> Box 2, HRP 82-2/00286, RG 263, NA

little need to give them the same level of review under identical standards.

3. Finally, the passage of time should be acknowledged by new declassification procedures. The Truman Administration came to an end more than 40 years ago. There may still be individuals who require protection, but is it necessary to protect codes that have been obsolete for 25 years, or information indicating the presence of the CIA in U.S. embassies more than 40 years ago? Will security be breached or individuals threatened if the State Department releases a document with a certain combination of letters long since replaced?

Given the circulation of a new draft executive order that establishes new government-wide declassification procedures, the CIA has an obligation to rethink its old procedures and adjust to new ones. The agency should cooperate rather than obstruct the current effort to release old documents, many from the very years we have been discussing in this conference.

Examining CIA documents available in the National Archives brought to my mind the trendy phrase, "virtual reality"; the agency has come close but has not yet given researchers the necessary documents to reconstruct history. When the CIA decides to relax its demands for page by page review of every national security document from the Truman years, then researchers will begin to understand the dynamics behind the formation of this agency and its role in American national security policy.

---

## LETTERS

---

25 January 1994

To the Editor

While there is a great deal in Bruce Cumings' hit-and-run "Revising Postrevisionism," I would like to take issue with, I will reluctantly confine myself to correcting his two demonstrably false references to me.

On page 542, Professor Cumings claims that the "orthodox school dealt with William Appleman Williams by calling him "a Communist. Not a revisionist, not a neo-Marxist, but a Communist." In proof of this assertion, Cumings cites me as having called Williams a "pro-Communist scholar." But if Cumings cannot see any difference between membership in the Communist Party and scholarship that absolves the Soviet Union and Stalin and places the blame for the Cold War on the United States and capitalism, he ought to abandon the historical trade. We all used to complain when Joe McCarthy refused to make precisely this distinction. It is no more defensible when Cumings rejects the distinction today. Let Cumings produce a single historian orthodox or otherwise, who called Williams a Communist.

Late on (page 552) Cumings write that I judged "James Burnham's new book (calling for a unilateral American global empire) to be brilliant and perceptive." Cumings provides no citation. I have no doubt that over the past half century I have written foolish things, but I don't recall ever having written that.

My files yield two reviews of Burnham's books. I reviewed *The Coming Defeat of Communism* in the *New York Post*, 19

February 1950, where I described his argument as “romantic and naive” and marked by “curious political blindness,” and *Containment or Liberation?* in the *New Republic*, 16 March 1953, which I called a book “filled with confusion, contradiction, ignorance and misrepresentation...an absurd book written by an absurd man.”

Sincerely yours,

Arthur Schlesinger, jr.

[Bruce Cumings’ “Revising Postrevisionism” appeared in *Diplomatic History*, 17 (Fall 1993): 539-569 -editor]

---

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

---

### OAH Papers Requested

Michael Hogan of Ohio State University has agreed to serve as co-chair of the Program Committee for the 1996 meeting of the Organization of American Historians. The theme of that meeting is “History, Memory, and Identity.” Please consult the August 1994 OAH *Newsletter* for the committee’s announcement of the 1996 program, and for a cover sheet that must accompany sessions and papers that are proposed. The Committee encourages session proposals from all fields of American history, including diplomatic history. Hogan suggests that diplomatic historians who are interested in preparing sessions for the 1996 program might consider pairing themselves with non-diplomatic historians on a panel that addresses an important theme or topic. In the past, for example, sessions on the New Deal have included both specialists in domestic affairs as well as foreign affairs. The same was true of a recent session that paired a paper on race and U.S. policy toward the Philippine insurgency with a paper on the triumph of Jim Crow legislation in the late 19th century. This kind of

mixing is healthy in its own right and may offer a helpful way of increasing the number of sessions that deal with diplomatic history.

### **SHAFR Call for Papers**

The Society of Historians of American Foreign Relations calls for papers for its Twenty-first Annual Conference at the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD, June 21-14, 1995. We welcome proposals for individual papers and complete panels from historians and scholars in related disciplines dealing with the broadest possible range of topics in international history and foreign policy. Submit a one page abstract and a current c.v. to: Robert D. Schulzinger, SHAFR Program Committee, History Department, CB 234, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309-0234. FAX (303) 492-1868. E-mail: schulzin@spot.COLORADO.EDU. The deadline for proposals is December 1, 1994.

### **Archives II at College Park**

Records are moving from the National Archives Building in Washington, DC and the Washington National Records Center Building in Suitland, Maryland to the new Archives Building in College Park, Maryland. Records of the State Department will be closed for specific periods from August 1994 to February 1996. For specific move dates by record group call 202-501-5400. To get the "Archives II Researcher Bulletin" (especially #8), write to the Textual Reference Division, NARA, Washington, DC 20408, or call 202-501-5380. There will be more information in the *SHAFR Newsletter* in September.

### **Peace Group Selects New Name**

Effective April 15, 1994 the Council on Peace Research in History (CPRH) has a new name: Peace History Society (PHS). Its current officers are Jeffrey Kimball (Miami), President; Harriet Hyman Alonso (Fitchburg State), Vice-President; and Geoffrey Smith (Queen's), Secretary-Treasurer. Peace History Society co-editor of *Peace and*

*Change*, Scott Bills (Stephen F. Austin). Tel: 409/568-3802; Fax: 409-568-2190.

## **World War II — A 50 Year Perspective**

June 1 — 2, 1995

Siena College is sponsoring its ninth annual international, multidisciplinary conference on the 50th anniversary of World War II. The focus for 1995 will be 1945 — though papers dealing with broad issues of earlier years will be welcomed. Inquiries Re Chairs and Commentators are invited as well. Deadline for submissions: December 1, 1994. Contact: Thomas O. Kelly, II, Department of History, Siena College, 515 Loudon Road, Loudonville, NY 12211—1462, (518) 783-2595 — FAX 518-783-4293

## **Free Database Tutorial and Workshops**

The History Computerization Project now offers free workshops and a printed tutorial on the use of computer database management for historical research, writing, and cataloging. Those unable to attend the workshops can still obtain the 80—page workshop tutorial by mail. The workshops and tutorial give organizations and researchers a chance to see how easy it can be to build an historical database, at no cost or obligation. The project, sponsored by the Regional History Center of the University of Southern California and the Los Angeles City Historical Society, is building a Regional History Information Network through which researchers and repositories can exchange information. The Los Angeles Bibliography Project has created a database of source materials and a directory of historical repositories. Both projects employ the History Database program, running on IBM PC compatible computers. The computer classroom includes 10 IBM PCs connected to a shared database. The course textbook, *Database Design: Applications of Library Cataloging Techniques*, by David L. Clark, is published by the TAB division of McGraw—Hill. For a current workshop schedule and a free copy of the tutorial contact: History Computerization Project, 24851 Piuma Road, Malibu, California 90265. Phone: (818) HISTORY, (818) 591-9371.

**Contributors Sought**

The Editor of "Speculations on American Foreign Policy and Diplomatic History: Interests, Ideals, and Power," a collection of topical and thematic essays to be published in early 1995, seeks papers from interested scholars in the field. For project description, prospective essay topics and further information, please contact Prof. Jonathan M. Nielson, Department of History, El Camino College, 16007 Crenshaw Blvd., Torrance, Calif. 90506.

**DeBenedetti Peace History Prize**

The Council on Peace in History invites submissions for the Charles DeBenedetti Prize to be given to the author or authors of an outstanding journal article published in English during 1993 or 1994 that deals with peace history. This may include articles focusing on the history of peace movements, the responses of individuals to peace and war issues, the relationship between peace movements and other reform activities, comparative analyses, and quantitative studies. The DeBenedetti Prize includes a cash award of \$500. Submit three copies by April 1, 1995 to Dr. Mitchell Hall, History Department, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, Michigan 48859. Telephone 517/774-3807 or FAX 517/774-7106.

**Sixties Generations: From Montgomery to Viet Nam**

**November 4-6, 1994**

**Western Connecticut State University**

**Danbury Connecticut**

Sixties Generations is a multimedia, interdisciplinary conference. We are looking for proposals for presentations, papers, panels, and workshops in the arts, the humanities, and the sciences. Our emphasis is on exploring the diversity and complexity of American and international cultures during the 1960s, in terms of their continuing influence on contemporary U.S. culture. Please send 1-2 page proposals and abstracts to: Viet Nam Generation, 18 Center Rd., Woodbridge, CT, 06525; (203) 387-6882; FAX (203) 389-6104; email: kalital@minerva.cis.yale.edu. Deadline for proposals is July 1, 1994.

**FDR After 50 Years  
Politics and Culture of the 1930s and 1940s**

Louisiana State University in Shreveport is to host the second in a series of international and multidisciplinary conferences on America's greatest presidents on September 14-16, 1995. Among the topics to be considered for inclusion are "FDR's Foreign Policy" and "FDR's International Impact." Brief proposals are invited (no more than 20 lines) with a brief biographical sketch (10 lines), both on a single sheet of letterhead stationery. Deadline for proposals: October 1, 1994. For information contact: William D. Pederson, History and Social Sciences, Louisiana State University in Shreveport, One University Place, Shreveport LA 71115-2301, (318) 797-5337, or 797-5351.

**New Archives Publication of Interest**

The National Archives has published the first volume in a series of guides to holdings on the Trans-Mississippi West. Volume I deals with records of the Department of State and related agencies, like the commissions on settling boundary disputes. This volume contains "crossover" material - the intersections of foreign and domestic policy. This first volume is entitled, *The Trans-Mississippi West: 1804-1912. Part I, A Guide to the Records of the Department of State for the Territorial Period* (NARA, 1993).

**1995-96 Fulbright Visiting Scholar-in-Residence Program**

U.S. colleges and universities, including community colleges, are invited to submit proposals for a Fulbright grant to host a visiting lecturer from abroad. The purpose of the program is to initiate or develop international programs at colleges and universities by using a scholar-in-residence to internationalize the curriculum, set up global studies or area-specific programs or otherwise expand contacts of students and faculty with other cultures. Grants are for one semester or the full academic year. Preference is given to proposals in the humanities or social sciences, although other fields focusing on international issues will be considered.

**1995-96 European Communities  
Official-in-Residence Program**

To bring officials from the European Communities to campuses where there are programs in international affairs, business, political science, or other fields in which an EC official-in-residence would be beneficial. Grants are for one semester or the full academic year. The resident official will give guest lectures and conduct seminars as appropriate, consult with faculty and students on research, engage in collaborative study, and provide outreach to neighboring institutions and the local community. The resident official is not expected to teach regular course offerings.

**Deadlines:** November 1, 1994. Application materials and proposal guidelines may be obtained by contacting: Council for International Exchange of Scholars, 3007 Tilden St., NW, Suite 5M, Box NEWS, Washington, DC 20008-3009. (202/686-7866).

---

**CALENDAR**

---

*1994*

- |               |  |
|---------------|--|
| August 1      | Deadline, materials for the September <i>Newsletter</i> .  |
| November 1    | Deadline, materials for the December <i>Newsletter</i> .   |
| November 1-15 | Annual election for SHAFR officers.  |
| November 1    | Applications for Bernath dissertation fund awards are due.   |
| November 15   | Deadline for SHAFR summer conference proposals.  |
| November 15   | Deadline for M. Bernath Research Fellowship  |
| <i>1995</i>   |  |
| January 1     | Membership fees in all categories are due, payable at the national office of SHAFR.                |
| January 6-9   | The 109th annual meeting of the AHA will take place in Chicago. Deadline for proposals has passed. |

- January 15 Deadline for the 1994 Bernath article award.  
February 1 Submissions for Warren Kuehl Award are due.
- February 1 Deadline for the 1994 Bernath book award.  
February 1 Deadline, materials for the March *Newsletter*.
- February 1 Deadline for Ferrell Book Prize.  
February 15 Deadline for the 1995 Bernath lecture prize.  
April 1 Applications for the W. Stull Holt dissertation fellowship are due.
- March 30-April 2 The 88th meeting of the OAH will take place in Washington with headquarters at the Washington Hilton and Towers.
- May 1 Deadline, materials for the June *Newsletter*.  
June 21-24 The 20th annual meeting of SHAFR will be held at the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD. Robert Love is chairing local arrangements.

The OAH will meet at the Palmer House Hilton (Chicago), March 28-31, 1996, the San Francisco Hilton, April 17-20, 1997, at Indianapolis, April 2-5, 1998, and Toronto in 1999.

The AHA will meet in Atlanta, January 5-8, 1996. The program chair is Renate Bridenthal, Graduate School - CUNY, 33 West 42nd St., New York, NY 10036-8099. The first deadline for proposals of October 28, 1994.

---

## PERSONALS

---

Kinley Brauer (Minnesota) has received a Fulbright Award for Austria to lecture at the University of Graz and the Diplomatic Academy in Vienna from October 1994 to February 1995. He has also been appointed chair of the Department of History.

William Brinker (Tennessee Tech) has been named chair of the History Department.

Joseph "Andy" Fry (UNLV) has received the UNLV William Morris Award for Excellence in Scholarship for his *John Tyler Morgan and the Search for Southern Autonomy* (Knoxville: U. of Tennessee Press, 1992).

Regina Gramer (Rutgers) has been awarded a Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute grant for her work on "the Second New Deal and the Americanization of West Germany."

Howard Jones (Alabama) has been awarded the Phi Alpha Theta Book Award in the Subsequent Book category for his *Union in Peril: The Crisis Over British Intervention in the Civil War*.

Rafael Medoff (Ohio State) has been named to the Advisory Committee of the Columbus Holocaust Video Project, in association with the Ohio Council on Holocaust Education.

Wilson D. Miscamble, C.S.C. (Notre Dame) has received the Truman Book Award for *George F. Kennan and the Making of American Foreign Policy, 1947-1950* (Princeton, 1992).

Anna K. Nelson (American) has been appointed to the Assassinations Records Review Board. The board is to determine what constitutes an assassination record so that federal agencies cooperate in making these records available to the public as required by Pubic Law 102-526 - The Assassination Materials Disclosure Act of 1992.

Christian Ostermann (Hamburg) and Frank Schumacher (Cologne) have received awards allowing them to use facilities of the Harry S. Truman Library.

Jonathan Utley (Tennessee) is retiring at the end of spring semester and will write a little, research a little, coach soccer a little, and perhaps teach in Chicago area institutions a little. Sounds like Jonathan a little!

PLUTO PRESS  
WESTVIEW PRESS INC., BOULDER, CO

# Atomic Diplomacy

## Hiroshima and Potsdam

(A reissue of the expanded edition plus special new appendices)

BY  
Gar Alperovitz

In anticipation of 1995 – the 50th anniversary of  
the launching of the Nuclear Era.

“One of the most influential books of Cold War revisionism”  
Barton Bernstein, Stanford University

“*Atomic Diplomacy*...shaped the debate over the bomb and  
how historians approached it...

Experts continue to disagree on some issues, but critical questions  
have been answered. The consensus among scholars is that the  
bomb was not needed to avoid an invasion of Japan... It is clear  
that alternatives to the bomb existed and that Truman and his  
advisers knew it.”

J. Samuel Walker, Chief Historian of the  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

“Seldom has the first work of a young historian achieved such  
instant fame or notoriety... [T]he preponderance of new evidence  
that has appeared since 1965 tends to sustain the original argument.  
It has been demonstrated that the decision to bomb Japan was  
centrally connected to Truman’s confrontational approach to the  
Soviet Union.”

Gaddis Smith, Yale University

To order contact: Sage Communications  
1000 Connecticut Ave., NW Suite 9  
Washington, DC 20036  
or call: 1-800-656-3377

416 pp. • Paper \$17.95

**Available: September 1, 1994.**

## PUBLICATIONS

---

Jules R. Benjamin (Ithaca College), *A Student's Guide to History* Sixth Edition. St. Martin's, 1994. ISBN 0-312-08432-3.

H. William Brands (Texas A&M), *Into the Labyrinth: The United States and the Middle east, 1945-1993*. McGraw-Hill, 1994. ISBN 0-07-007188.

Timothy Castle (Air Force Academy), *At War in the Shadow of Vietnam: The United State's Military Aids to the Royal Lao Government, 1955-1975*. Columbia, 1993. Cloth, ISBN 0-231-07976-1, \$47.50.

Charles Chatfield (Wittenberg) and Ruzanna Ilukhina, eds., *Peace/Mir: An Anthology of Historic Alternatives to War*. Syracuse, 1994. Cloth, \$49.50; Paper, \$18.95.

Saki Dockrill, ed., (King's College, London), *From Pearl Harbor to Hiroshima*. St. Martin's, 1994. Cloth ISBN 0312-10236-1, \$68.00.

Antonio Donno (Universita' Degli Studi Di Lecce), *Gli Stati Uniti e il Medio Oriente (1945-1940)*. Piero Lacaita Editore, 1992.

-----, *Gli Stati Uniti, il sionismo e Israele*. Bonacci Editore Roma, 1992.

Robert Ferrell (Indiana - emeritus) and Lawrence Wikander, eds., *Grace Coolidge: An Autobiography* (High Point).

Robert Ferrell, *Choosing Truman: The Democratic Convention of 1944*. University of Missouri, 1994. ISBN 0-8262-0948-3.

Steven M. Gillon & Diane B. Kunz (Yale), *America During the Cold War*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1993. Paper ISBN 0-15-500415-8.

Carol Gluck (Columbia) and Stephen Graubard, eds., *Showa: The Japan of Hirohito*. Norton, W.W., & Company, Inc., 1992. Cloth, ISBN 0-393-02984-0, \$29.95.

Joan Hoff (Indiana), *Nixon Reconsidered*. Basic Books, 1994. ISBN 0-465-03076-9, \$24.00.

Linda Killen (Radford), *Testing the Peripheries: US-Yugoslav Economic Relations in the Interwar Years*. Boulder, 1994. ISBN 0-88033-279-4, \$48.00.

Ralph Levering (Davidson), *The Cold War: A Post-Cold War History*. Harlan Davidson, 1994. ISBN 0-88295-912-3.

Jonathan M. Nielson (El Camino), *Historians in War and Peace: American Historians at the Versailles Peace Conference, 1919*. Kendall-Hunt, 1993.

Robert A. Pastor (Emory), *Whirlpool: U.S. Foreign Policy toward Latin America and the Caribbean*. Princeton, 1993. Paper, ISBN 0-691-02561-4, \$14.95.

Thomas G. Paterson (Connecticut), *Contesting Castro: The United States and the Triumph of the Cuban Revolution*. Oxford University Press, 1994. ISBN 0-19-508630-9, \$30.00.

David Reynolds (Cambridge), ed., *The Origins of the Cold War in Europe: International Perspectives*. Yale University Press, 1994. ISBN 0-300-05892-6, \$27.50.

Jerel A. Rosati (South Carolina), *The Politics of United States Foreign Policy*. Harcourt Brace, 1993. Paper, ISBN 0-03-047024-2.

Theodore A. Wilson, ed., (Kansas), *D-Day 1944*. University Press of Kansas, 1994. Cloth ISBN 0-7006-0673-4, \$45.00; paper ISBN 0-7006-0674-2, \$22.50.

David R. Woodward (Marshall), *Trial by Friendship: Anglo-American Relations, 1917-1918*. Kentucky, 1993. Cloth ISBN 0-8131-1833-6, \$34.00.

Qiang Zhai (Auburn at Montgomery), *The Dragon, The Lion, and the Eagle: Chinese-British-American Relations, 1949-1958*. Kent State University Press, 1994. ISBN 0-87338-490-3, \$32.00.

## AWARDS, PRIZES, AND FUNDS

---

### THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL PRIZES

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

#### The Stuart L. Bernath Book Prize

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

**ELIGIBILITY:** The prize is to be awarded for a first book. The book must be a history of international relations. Biographies of statesmen and diplomats are included. General surveys, autobiographies, editions of essays and documents, and works which are representative of social science disciplines other than history are *not* eligible.

**PROCEDURES:** Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. A nominating letter explaining why the book deserves consideration must accompany each entry in the competition. Books will be judged primarily in regard to their contribution to scholarship. Winning books should have interpretative and analytical qualities of high levels. They should demonstrate mastery of primary material and relevant secondary works, and they should be examples of careful organization and distinguished writing. Five (5) copies of each book must be submitted with the nomination and should be sent to: Frank Ninkovich, Department of History, St. John's University, Grand Central and Utopia Parkways, Jamaica, NY 11439.

Books may be sent at any time during 1994, but should not arrive later than February 1, 1995.

The prize will be divided only when two superior books are so evenly matched that any other decision seems unsatisfactory to the committee. The committee will not award the prize if there is no book in the competition which meets the standards of excellence established for the prize. The 1994 award of \$2,000.00 will be announced at the annual luncheon of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations held in conjunction with the Organization of American Historians' annual meeting in Spring, 1995.

**PREVIOUS WINNERS:**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1972 Joan Hoff Wilson<br>Kenneth E. Shewmaker | 1983 Richard Immerman                         |
| 1973 John L. Gaddis                           | 1984 Michael H. Hunt                          |
| 1974 Michael H. Hunt                          | 1985 David Wyman                              |
| 1975 Frank D. McCann, Jr.<br>Stephen E. Pelz  | 1986 Thomas J. Noer                           |
| 1976 Martin J. Sherwin                        | 1987 Fraser J. Harbutt<br>James Edward Miller |
| 1977 Roger V. Dingman                         | 1988 Michael Hogan                            |
| 1978 James R. Leutze                          | 1989 Stephen G. Rabe                          |
| 1979 Phillip J. Baram Manager,                | 1990 Walter Hixson<br>Anders Stephanson       |
| 1980 Michael Schaller                         | 1991 Gordon H. Chang                          |
| 1981 Bruce R. Kuniholm<br>Hugh DeSantis       | 1992 Thomas Schwartz                          |
| 1982 David Reynolds                           | 1993 Elizabeth Cobbs                          |

**The Stuart L. Bernath Lecture Prize**

**ELIGIBILITY:** The lecture, to be delivered at the annual meetings of the Organization of American Historians, 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 research and teaching. Each lecturer will address not specifically his/her own research interests, but 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 February 15, 1995. The chairperson of the committee to whom nominations should be sent is: Lorraine Lees, Department of History, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA 23508.

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

**PREVIOUS WINNERS:**

- |                          |                            |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1977 Joan Hoff Wilson    | 1986 William Stueck        |
| 1978 David S. Patterson  | 1987 Nancy Bernkopf Tucker |
| 1979 Marilyn B. Young    | 1988 William O. Walker III |
| 1980 John L. Gaddis      | 1989 Stephen G. Rabe       |
| 1981 Burton Spivak       | 1990 Richard Immerman      |
| 1982 Charles DeBenedetti | 1991 Robert McMahon        |
| 1983 Melvyn P. Leffler   | 1992 H.W. Brands           |
| 1984 Michael J. Hogan    | 1993 Larry Berman          |
| 1985 Michael Schaller    | 1994 Diane Kunz            |

### 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 or essay appearing in a scholarly journal or edited book, on any topic in United States foreign relations that is published during 1994. The author must not be over 40 years of age, or, if more than 40 years of age, must be within ten years of receiving the Ph.D. at the time of acceptance for publication. The article or essay must be among the first six publications by the author. 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 nominations shall be submitted by the author or by any member of SHAFR by January 15, 1995. Three (3) copies of the article shall be submitted to the chairperson of the committee: Diane Kunz, Department of History, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520.

The next award will be announced at the SHAFR luncheon held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the OAH in Spring, 1995.

#### PREVIOUS WINNERS:

1977 John C.A. Stagg

1978 Michael H. Hunt

1979 Brian L. Villa

1980 James I. Matray

David A. Rosenberg

1981 Douglas Little

1982 Fred Pollock

1983 Chester Pach

1985 Melvyn Leffler

1986 Duane Tananbaum

1987 David McLean

1988 Dennis Merrill

1989 Robert J. McMahon

1990 Lester Foltos

1991 William Earl Weeks

1992 Marc Gallicchio

1993 Daniel P. O'C. Greene

### The Stuart L. Bernath Dissertation Grant

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

Requirements are as follows:

1. The dissertation must deal with some aspect of United States foreign relations.
2. Awards are given to help defray costs for dissertation research.
3. Applicants must have satisfactorily completed all other requirements for the doctoral degree.

4. Applications must include:
  - (a) a one-page curriculum vitae of the applicant and a dissertation prospectus;
  - (b) a paragraph regarding the sources to be consulted and their value to the study;
  - (c) an explanation of why the money is needed and how, specifically, it will be used; and
  - (d) a letter from the applicant's supervising professor commenting upon the appropriateness of the applicant's request. (This should be sent separately.)
5. One or more awards may be given. Generally awards will not exceed \$1000.
6. The successful applicant must file a brief report on how the funds were spent not later than eight months following the presentation of the award (i.e., normally by the following September).

Applications should be sent to: Peter L. Hahn, Department of History, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH. 43210. The deadline is November 1, 1994.

**PREVIOUS WINNERS:**

1985 Jon Nielson  
1986 Valdinia C. Winn  
Walter L. Hixson  
1987 Janet M. Manson  
Thomas M. Gaskin  
W. Michael Weis  
Michael Wala  
1988 Elizabeth Cobbs  
Madhu Bhalla

1989 Thomas Zeiler  
Russel Van Wyk  
1990 David McFadden  
1991 Eileen Scully  
1992 Shannon Smith  
1993 R. Tyler Priest  
Christian Ostermann

**The Myrna F. Bernath Book Prize**

A prize award of \$2,500.00 to be offered every two years (apply in odd-numbered years) for the best book by a woman in the areas of United States foreign relations, transnational history, international history, peace studies, cultural interchange, and defense or strategic studies. Books published in 1991-93 will be eligible next fall. Five copies of each book (or page proofs) must accompany a letter of application. Contact: Anders Stephanson, History Department, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027.

**PREVIOUS WINNERS**

1991 Diane Kunz  
Betty Unterberger

### **The Myrna F. Bernath Research Fellowship**

A \$2,500.00 research fellowship awarded every two years (apply in even-numbered years) for a woman to do historically-based research abroad or for a female citizen from a foreign country to do historically-based research in the United States on United States foreign relations, transnational history, international history, peace studies, cultural interchange, and defense or strategic studies. Whenever possible preference will be given to a graduate student. Three copies of each proposal, consisting of no more than fifteen double-spaced pages and three references, should be sent to: Professor Anders Stephanson, Department of History, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027. Submission deadline is November 15, 1994.

#### **WINNERS:**

1992 Shannon Smith

### **THE W. STULL HOLT DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP**

The Society of Historians for American Foreign Relations is pleased to invite applications from qualified doctoral candidates whose dissertations are in the field of the history of American foreign relations. This fellowship is intended to help defray costs of travel, preferably foreign travel, necessary to the pursuit of research on a significant dissertation project. Qualified applicants will have satisfactorily completed comprehensive doctoral examinations before April 1995, leaving only the dissertation as the sole, remaining requirement for the doctoral degree.

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

Applications and supporting papers should be sent before April 1, 1995 to: Katherine A.S. Siegel, Department of History, St. Joseph's University, Philadelphia . PA 19131.

The Holt Memorial Fellowship carries an award of \$1,500.00. Announcement of the recipient of the Holt Memorial Fellowship will be made at the Society's annual summer meeting. At the end of the fellowship year the recipient of the

fellowship will be required to report to the Committee relating how the fellowship was used.

**PREVIOUS WINNERS:**

1984 Louis Gomolak  
1986 Kurt Schultz  
1987 David McFadden  
1988 Mary Ann Heiss  
1990 Katherine A.S. Siegel

1991 Kyle Longley  
1992 Robert Brigham  
1993 Darlene Rivas  
1994 Christian Ostermann

### 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 career, lists any teaching honors and awards, and comments 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: Leon Boothe, 1 University Drive, Highland Hts., KY 41099-0001.

**PREVIOUS WINNERS:**

1986 Dorothy Borg  
1988 Alexander DeConde

1990 Richard W. Leopold  
1991 Bradford Perkins

## THE 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 1993 and 1994. Deadline for submissions is February 1, 1995. One copy of each submission should be sent to each member of the selection committee: *[Thomas Knock, Chair.]*

Lawrence Wittner  
Dept. of History  
SUNY at Albany  
Albany, NY 12222

Melvin Small  
Dept. of History  
Wayne State University  
Detroit, MI 48202

David Schmitz  
Dept. of History  
Whitman College  
Walla Walla, WA  
99362

### PREVIOUS WINNERS:

1987 Harold Josephson  
1989 Melvin Small  
1991 Charles DeBenedetti (deceased) and Charles Chatfield  
1993 Thomas Knock

## ARTHUR LINK PRIZE FOR DOCUMENTARY EDITING

The inaugural Arthur S. Link Prize For Documentary Editing was awarded at the American Historical Association meeting in December 1991. The prize will be offered hereafter whenever appropriate but no more often than every three years. Eligibility is defined by the following excerpt from the prize rules.

The prize will recognize and encourage analytical scholarly editing of documents, in appropriate published form, relevant to the history of American foreign relations, policy, and diplomacy. By "analytical" is meant the inclusion (in headnotes, footnotes, essays, etc.) of both appropriate historical background needed to establish the context of the documents, and interpretive historical commentaries based on scholarly research. The competition is open to the editor/author(s) of any collection of documents published after 1984 that is devoted primarily to sources relating to the history of American foreign relations, policy, and/or diplomacy; and that incorporates sufficient historical analysis and

interpretation of those documents to constitute a contribution to knowledge and scholarship. Nominations may be made by any person or publisher. The award is \$500 plus travel expenses to the professional meeting where the prize is presented. For all rules and details contact the committee chair. One copy of each entry should be sent directly to each member of the committee.

M. Giunta, Act. Dir.  
Documentary History  
of US Foreign  
Relations under the  
Articles of  
Confederation,  
National Archives  
Washington, DC 20408

Justus Doenecke  
New College, U. of S.  
Florida  
Tampa, FL 33620

George Herring  
Dept. of History  
Univ. of Kentucky  
Lexington, KY 40506

PREVIOUS WINNER

1991 Justus Doenecke

### THE ARMIN RAPPAPORT FUND

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations established this fund in 1990 to honor Armin Rappaport, the founding editor of the Society's journal, *Diplomatic History*. The fund will support the professional work of the journal's editorial office. It was initiated by Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Paterson, who donated earnings from their book, *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, and by the authors of essays in this book, who waived fees. Further donations are invited from authors, SHAFR members, and friends. Please send contributions in any amount to Professor Allan Spetter, SHAFR Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Department of History, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435.

### ROBERT H. FERRELL BOOK PRIZE

This is competition for a book, published in 1994, which is a history of American Foreign Relations, broadly defined, and includes biographies of statesmen and diplomats. General surveys, autobiographies, or editions of essays and documents are not eligible. The prize of \$1,000 is to be awarded as a senior book award; that is, any book beyond the first monograph by the author. The deadline for submission of books is February 1, 1995.

Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of SHAFR. A letter of nomination should be sent to the Ferrell Prize committee

chairman, and a copy of the book should be sent directly to each member of the committee at the addresses listed below.

Joyce Goldberg  
Department of History  
U. of Texas-Arlington  
Arlington, TX 76019

Ted Wilson  
Department of History  
U. of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS 66045

Doug Brinkley  
Department of History  
Hofstra University  
Hempstead, NY 11550

**PREVIOUS WINNERS:**

1992 David Anderson and Diane Kunz

1993 Mel Leffler

# The SHAFR Newsletter

---

**SPONSOR:** Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.

**EDITOR:** William J. Brinker, Box 5154, Cookeville, TN 38505 Tel. (615) 372-3332.

**EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS:** Nanci Long, Dana Mason, and Jody Reecer.

**Address Changes:** Send changes of address to the Executive Secretary-Treasurer: Allan Spetter, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435.

**BACK ISSUES:** The *Newsletter* was published annually from 1969 to 1972, and has been published quarterly since 1973. Copies of many back numbers of the *Newsletter* may be obtained from the editorial office for \$2.00 per copy (for members living abroad, the charge is \$3.00).

**GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION:** The *Newsletter* solicits the submission of personals, announcements, abstracts of scholarly papers and articles delivered or published upon diplomatic subjects, bibliographical or historiographical essays, essays of a "how-to-do-it" nature, information about foreign depositories, biographies, autobiographies of "elder statesmen" in the field, jokes, *et al.* Papers and other submissions should be typed and the author's name and full address should be noted. The *Newsletter* accepts and encourages submissions on IBM-formatted 5 ¼" or 3 ½" diskettes. A paper submitted in WordPerfect is preferred. A hardcopy of the paper should be included with the diskette. The *Newsletter* goes to the printer on the 1st of March, June, September, and December; all material submitted for publication should arrive at least four weeks prior.

## FORMER PRESIDENTS OF SHAFR

1968 Thomas A. Bailey (Stanford)	1981 Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State)
1969 Alexander DeConde (CA-Santa Barbara)	1982 Lawrence E. Gelfand (Iowa)
1970 Richard W. Leopold (Northwestern)	1983 Ernest R. May (Harvard)
1971 Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana)	1984 Warren I. Cohen (Michigan State)
1972 Norman A. Graebner (Virginia)	1985 Warren F. Kuehl (Akron)
1973 Wayne S. Cole (Maryland)	1986 Betty Unterberger (Texas A&M)
1974 Bradford Perkins (Michigan)	1987 Thomas G. Paterson (Connecticut)
1975 Armin H. Rappaport (CA-San Diego)	1988 Lloyd Gardner (Rutgers)
1976 Robert A. Divine (Texas)	1989 George Herring (Kentucky)
1977 Raymond A. Esthus (Tulane)	1990 Michael Hunt (North Carolina)
1978 Akira Iriye (Chicago)	1991 Gary Hess (Bowling Green)
1979 Paul A. Varg (Michigan State)	1992 John Lewis Gaddis (Ohio)
1980 David M. Pletcher (Indiana)	