

The Society for Historians of American  
Foreign Relations

*NEWSLETTER*

---

Volume XI

Number 4

December 1980

**Page**

- 1 Robert H. Ferrell, The Private Papers of Harry S. Truman
- 10 Sandra C. Taylor with Rex Casillas, Dealing With Defeat:  
Teaching the Vietnam War
- 19 Lawrence Spinelli, The Cunard Archives
- 20 Abstracts of Articles and Papers
- 28 Personals
- 30 SHAFR summer meeting information
- 31 Publications
- 34 In Memoriam
- 35 SHAFR Calendar
- 36 Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Awards



# SOCIETY FOR HISTORIANS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS

Founded in 1967. Chartered in 1972

**PRESIDENT:** David M. Pletcher, Department of History, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

**VICE-PRESIDENT:** Lawrence S. Kaplan, Department of History, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44240.

**EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER:** Gary R. Hess, Department of History, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio 43403.

**CHAIRMAN, PROGRAM COMMITTEE:** Eugene P. Trani, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Regents Hall, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68583.

**CHAIRMAN MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE:** Ralph E. Weber, Department of History, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233.

**CHAIRMAN, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE:** Milton O. Gustafson, National Archives, Washington, D.C. 20408.

**MEMBERSHIP:** Anyone interested in U.S. diplomatic history is invited to become a member of SHAFR. Annual dues are \$8.50, payable at the office of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer. Fees for students, unemployed members, and retired members are \$5.00 per year, while institutional affiliations are \$30.00. Life memberships are \$125.00. The dues for institutions which wish to receive only the **Newsletter** are \$5.00 a year. In the case of memberships by a husband-wife team the dues of one of them shall be one-half that of the regular rate.

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

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

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



# The Private Papers of Harry S. Truman

by Robert H. Ferrell

All of us dream on occasion of how somewhere, sometime, in some dramatic way, we will have the good fortune to come upon box after box of a wonderful collection of manuscripts, hitherto unseen by historical researchers, and of how we then will take these manuscripts and produce from them books that if they do not make us wealthy will at least stretch out our reputations. And yet as the years pass we begin to see that these marvelous strokes of fortune are not likely to happen, and indeed do not happen. Always the dream lies in the future, the mirage is before us so closely that we almost can espy it within reach, and then it floats on to another year, another occasion, and nothing results. Speaking personally about this sort of scholarly hallucination, I have to say that one time, thirty years ago, I enjoyed a marvelous beginner's luck and did make a major manuscript find, for I stumbled upon an unused diary of large importance in the history of American diplomacy, the diary of the late William R. Castle, Jr. It became the foundation of my first two books. Since that time -- until very recently, when my luck turned once more -- no large discoveries have come to hand. Small discoveries, yes; bits and pieces that put together have been interesting, and make the manuscript research interesting. The larger discoveries, alas, did not occur.

The Castle diary was the sort of find that all graduate students dream of, and it happened so easily that it was almost too good to be true. In the year 1950, when I lived in the Hall of Graduate Studies at Yale, in a tiny room on the top floor that looked out on the top of a high school that long since has been torn down, I was reading a new biography of Charles Evans Hughes by the Washington newspaperman Merlo J. Pusey, and in checking the notes saw a reference to a Castle diary. Pusey it seems, had consulted Castle about a point concerning Hughes, who had lived on a street near Castle's house, and Castle had consulted his diary. Here, then, was a possible lead for my doctoral dissertation on the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, for Castle at that time had been assistant secretary of state for Western Europe and one of the negotiators of the treaty, according to the documents in **Foreign Relations of the United States**. Until that time I had not thought anything about possible Castle papers, not to mention a diary. No one had mentioned it. In those antediluvian years before the **National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections** every manuscript collection became known almost from word of mouth, or through reading laboriously in library journals, or from seeing someone's footnotes or bibliography. My teacher, Samuel Bemis, had known nothing of a Castle diary, and none of my fellow seminar members, Larry Kaplan or Art Richmond, had mentioned the possibility.

The result was a hasty consultation in **Who's Who** to obtain Castle's Washington address, and a letter went off to 2200 S. Street asking if it would be possible sometime, during a research trip in Washington, to see Mr. Castle and talk about my work on the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Castle wrote back promptly and asked me to call him when I next was in



Washington, which I did, and he set a time for me to go out to see him, which I did, and we talked for an hour or so, generally, about the pact, and I told him my conclusion, which was that the treaty was a piece of humbug put together by Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg to spoil a proposal about to be made to him by Foreign Minister Aristide Briand of France. He agreed gravely with this conclusion. During our talk neither of us mentioned the diary, and then when I was standing at the front door, not far down the street from where in those days Mrs. Woodrow Wilson was living in retirement, he looked at me quizzically, smiled, and said, "Next time you come to Washington I'll let you see my diary."

The next time was a month or so, and this time "Bill" Castle (we soon were on a first-name basis) again took me into his small downstairs study, opened the closet door, and there it was -- about fifty-five black spring binders, each containing 200-250 pages of doublespace typescript, a wonderful diary that went back to the time of the First World War and then moved forward to the very day, or nearly that, when I was looking at it. The diary was beautifully written, and very frank. Castle had taught English at Harvard, having been a student of Barrett Wendell, and he knew how to write, and he also knew that unless he said exactly what he thought about whatever he was discussing, the result would not be of value to him. I do not think he wrote the diary for some future historian or historians. Surely he wrote it to keep in touch with his life in the long years to come, and to record what he thought was happening, in hope that he could read it later with profit and attention to his errors. This was in truth the reason that the Puritans two centuries and more before had written diaries. The Castle diary was especially rich for the diplomacy of the United States in the 1920s and early 1930s when Castle had been successively head of the West European desk, assistant secretary for Western Europe, and then in 1931-1933 undersecretary of state for Henry L. Stimson and President Herbert Hoover. Castle knew a great deal about Europe and Europeans, and about America and Americans; it was a marvelous diary, useful beyond my dreams. Perhaps twenty or thirty times I visited Castle's house and sat for hours, alone with the diary, taking off this and that. He and I would sit and talk, sometimes upstairs where he maintained a huge personal library and two Steinway grand pianos. I saw Bill Castle over the years, until at last he was ill, and I came to visit just before his evening meal, for which occasion he had dressed carefully; he could hardly talk, and sat there and smiled wanly, and I made what talk I could and went away. He died not long afterward, and in accordance with his will his diary went to Harvard where it has been closed, and will continue to be closed, until the year 1985, when all of his contemporaries will have passed on.

For years thereafter I have speculated on the chance of discovering another such diary, or an equally attractive group of papers, and the discovery did not occur, and after a while and like most of us I produced a theory to fit my circumstances. In the early days of the historical profession, I convinced myself, around the turn of the present century, it was the time of the frontier, so far as concerned historical manuscripts. Woodrow Wilson, typically, did not sense these opportunities, and in



1904 he gave a much noticed address at the St. Louis Exposition marking the centenary of the Louisiana Purchase in which he remarked, with a singular error, that so many young men were pursuing scholarly investigations in the history of their country that no more good topics were left, and the high and dry places remained. This was, to be sure, a decade before young Dexter Perkins and Sam Bemis, joined somewhat later by Will Pratt, entered graduate school and chose such topics as the Monroe Doctrine, Jay's Treaty, Pinckney's Treaty, the expansionists of 1812, the expansionists of 1898, and wrote seminal books on those wonderful topics, and rested their researches on hitherto unused manuscript sources. And for years thereafter, into the 1930s easily, the manuscript collections lay nearly abandoned in private houses and garages and barns, around the country, open to the ingenuity of the young historians of those days. Thomas D. Clark has told about prospecting for manuscripts, much like the forty-niners, and finding bushels of them, often just before they were headed for some trash bin. In a wonderful article in the **Indiana Magazine of History** of two years ago Richard W. Leopold has remarked how Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr, sent him off to the wilds of Southern Indiana to look for the New Harmony records, and of how he traveled uncertainly to the town and found the records and lived in modest circumstances there, after which he journeyed to Indianapolis and found more materials in the Historical Society, whereupon he wrote his book and managed to obtain a teaching position, teaching American diplomatic history, at Harvard. But then (so my theory of the 1950s and 1960s and, for a while, 1970s went) the Second World War generation of scholars came along, my own generation, and after they passed through graduate school in the postwar years they combed the garrets and barns and pulled off the woodwork and just about that time I discovered the Castle diary, and then the Great Age of Manuscript Discovery came to an end. When our own students began to go out to seek novelties to turn into books there were not many left, not much but scraps, although some of the scraps were fairly worthwhile. And when the generation of the 1960s began to look for manuscripts, the generation that would reach full professorships in five years or so, floating home on a sea of grants, turning for a while to historical revisionism and finding thereby the errors of their ill-informed predecessors -- when this generation produced row upon row of books, there was not much left to discover. As I looked at all their manuscript citations ("See Boxes 24-38," would begin the citation) I felt like a person from another generation and rather ashamed of myself for continuing to read the older books and to think of the older collections of manuscripts, now superseded by all the new work that our graduate students dutifully were citing. It was an awkward feeling, and retirement was beginning to look attractive, and besides I had had a good time over the years talking to my colleagues and students and fighting the administrators and it was clear that my work was coming toward its appointed end.

But the above theory then vanished one afternoon in mid-December 1978. As all of us know, our past is bound up inextricably with our



present, and there was a direct if slow connection between William R. Castle, Jr. and President Harry S. Truman. The editor of the Yale University Press of years ago (in those simple days the head of a university press was not known as the director) was Eugene Davidson, now a much-published historian of the Nazi era, then a poet and scholar of American literature. I first met Gene when he accepted my doctoral dissertation in the early spring of 1951, and we have kept closely in touch over the years. After leaving the press in 1958 he removed to Chicago where he edited a magazine and arranged for meetings of a German-American group of scholars now known, on the American side, as the Conference on European Problems. As a member of the executive committee I went to Chicago two or three times a year to discuss committee problems, over a scrumptious lunch and several libations and, ordinarily, a certain kidding of me by my committee friends because of my inveterate voting of the Democratic Party ticket, after which we did the committee's business almost by acclamation and went home. Tiring of winters in Chicago, Gene and his wife at last moved to Santa Barbara, and the question of a meeting place was resolved by the fact that Jerzy Hauptmann, our executive secretary, teaches political science at Park College in Parkville, the western suburb of Kansas City, which is of course near the geographical center of the United States, and has easy access by air, and the airport is close to Parkville, so the decision was taken to meet in mid-December 1978 at Kansas City.

One arrangement led to another. Working on a book about the years 1917-1921 for the New American Nation series I undertook to use to advantage the two days before the Saturday meeting by visiting first the Missouri Historical Society in St. Louis, which contains the papers of the American ambassador to Russia during the First World War, and then going to the Harry S. Truman Library in Independence (the eastern suburb of Kansas City) where I felt certain that I could find a few manuscripts and probably good quotations from letters by Captain Harry S. Truman who was in command of D Battery of the 129th Field Artillery attached to the 35th Division in 1917-1919.

The trip in a crowded plane from Indianapolis to St. Louis was exhilarating, and likewise the night in an impossibly overheated hotel and the long walk out to the Jefferson Memorial and the headquarters of the Historical Society. That night, a Thursday, I flew to Kansas City and took the limousine bus to the Greyhound Bus Station and then a taxi to Independence and the Queen City Motel, a decaying hostelry that is the closest motel to the Truman Library. The next morning I arose at six a.m. and walked along US Route 24 looking for some coffee, without finding any until almost a mile down the road I came to a doughnut shop. The coffee was poor and so were the doughnuts and outside was the noise of the hustling cars and pickups and trucks, the rapidly increasing traffic as people were heading west into downtown Kansas City and their daytime parking places. US 24 is four-laned without sidewalks, and anyone going along the side must step around the beer bottles and cans and heterogenous collections of paper trash and the abandoned fan belts and pieces of tire treads. It was mid-December and the air was



brisk, really on the cold side. Returning to the hotel room and reviewing the notes of the day before, I left again at 8:30 and walked for perhaps a mile and a quarter to the turn-off at the cloverleaf that leads into the Truman Library.

The details of that Friday are something I shall never forget, and I trust the reader will excuse their detail, as they may not make sense individually but taken together they do explain what happened. I had written ahead to the chief archivist, Philip D. Lagerquist, and Phil had informed me by letter that the library did not possess many manuscripts on the First World War era but he would be happy to see me anyway. He had arranged for a library truck to be loaded with archival boxes, and it was at once apparent that Captain Truman either was not much of a correspondent or else, equally likely, few people saved his letters, except his cousin Nellie Noland to whom he wrote perhaps a dozen letters relating his disgust with regular army officers, absurd martinets he said, who had no interest in warfare but only in whether horses were properly curried. The captain also sent postcards from Paris and elsewhere, and Nellie had saved every one. In addition to the box or two from the Noland Papers there were several boxes of a minor Truman administration official who had been a social worker in Kansas City during the World War, and Phil Lagerquist said that he thought I might be able to get something out of them. (I confess that I have not looked at them yet, nearly two years later.)

But when the truck with the above material came out it was being pushed by my friend Erwin J. Mueller, an old-timer at the library, and he and I warmly shook hands and expressed delight in seeing each other after some years. And then he said it:

"Bob," he said, "we've recently released a box of material all in the president's handwriting. Would you like to see it?"

"Sure," I said. "Stick it on the truck." I had a momentary feeling that it was another Castle diary, and then I knew it was not, and sensed that Erwin was enamored of all the handwriting. So I virtually forgot about it.

When noon came, Phil and Harry Clark, the latter another old friend among the archivists, and I went to lunch, and enjoyed a leisurely meal speculating on the politics of the National Archives and Records Service where a leading figure was in trouble, and then I returned to the boxes. About 3:30 that afternoon, Friday, I had a choice of looking at the material by the social worker or looking at Erwin's box, and the choice was fairly easy. Without much thought I pulled out Box 333 of the President's Secretary's Files, opened the lid, and took out a folder - everything was neatly in legal-size Xerox -- and opened it up.

Even now the only word I can think of in regard to my emotions of that vital moment is the word that filled my boyhood years back in the 1930s: "Wow!" I could hardly believe my eyes. It certainly was all in Truman's handwriting, and it was virtually all new material. I began to leaf, thinking I was out of my head. Every turn of a page produced a novelty, such as an entry in what was obviously a scattered diary, or a memorandum on some subject or other, or a handwritten letter (some of them marked "Not sent. HST.").



I turned to Liz Safly the librarian, who sensed a slight tenseness in the little downstairs room (the searchroom was being redecorated and enlarged, and researchers had been relegated to a small basement room next to the storeroom), and asked who had seen this box. She said she did not know, and dialed Erwin, who came in, heard the same question, and began to grin broadly. Soon we were almost shouting at each other. It so happened that the box had been released to researchers in mid-October, and just one scholar had seen it before me. Erwin himself had arranged the material in the box and easily sensed its importance, and he had presented it with a flourish to this scholar, a well known American historian who had received the Library Institute's \$10,000 research grant. The scholar, alas, was in a hurry to get back to his university in the East, for he had been gone for a month, and so he had paged the box hurriedly and, as was his wont, inserted a group of xerox slips -- all in the wrong places, as I already had discerned. After an hour or so he had gone to the airport (it was a Saturday morning) and taken his plane home. No one had seen the box for the next two months, though it was accessioned and available, until that wonderful afternoon.

It was too late to do much except page the box, for there was a dinner that evening at the airport Hilton and then the meeting of the committee the next day. Erwin most kindly offered to open the research room that Saturday, but no time was left, and the search room on Friday afternoon closed at a quarter to five. Meanwhile I asked hurriedly for William Hillman's coffee-table book, **Mr. President**, published in early 1952, which I had read years earlier for a diplomatic sketch of George C. Marshall in the **American Secretaries** series, and ascertained what I virtually knew, namely, that almost all of the material in Box 333 was not in Hillman.

Next morning I asked Gene Davidson privately what he thought I ought to do, and he said that if he were still head of the Yale University Press he would give me a contract on the spot. That afternoon, after the meeting, I caught the plane back to Indianapolis and drove down to Bloomington, to find my wife and daughter at a neighbor's house at a party, and after some conversation took my wife into a bedroom and told her I had found a presidential diary. Like me, she hardly knew what should be done. Next morning early I dialed TWA and obtained a reservation for Kansas City that evening, and appeared in the search room the next morning, Monday, to the consternation of Phil and Harry and to the knowing grin of Erwin J., with whom I shook hands and said, although it was hardly necessary, "Erwin, please get me that Box 333."

A year and a half and more after, and twenty-eight trips to Kansas City later, the books are now in press. The Colorado Associated University Press is publishing **The Autobiography of Harry S. Truman** in mid-November, and the press is rolling in Dexter, Michigan, for 7,500 copies. In New Jersey another press is doing 22,500 copies of **Off the Record: The Private Papers of Harry S. Truman**, to be published on election day by Harper and Row.

What can one say about all of this activity? First of all, not everything was in Box 333, to be sure. Since that Friday afternoon I have seen hundreds of boxes, and simply went through the president's private



papers -- that is, the President's Secretary's Files, and the Post-Presidential Files--like a carpet sweeper, putting together the several hundred scattered diary entries and the forty or fifty memoranda and the dozens of fascinating letters, and meanwhile seeing an opportunity to bring together several major autobiographical fragments and some minor pieces, all in the president's hand, into a picture-and-text **AUTOBIOGRAPHY**. There has been much work, and also much enjoyment, for almost all of this material was new, and presidential material at that, dealing with an enormous variety of subjects and concerns. I would venture to say that the private papers of Truman are the most interesting presidential papers for the twentieth century. They are better than the papers of Theodore Roosevelt, who always wrote the same thing; than the papers of Taft, who only occasionally became angry with someone; than the papers of Wilson, with his involuted nineteenth-century style and his romantic vacuities; than Harding, of course; than Coolidge, the master of ambiguity; than Hoover who never wrote more than two lines; than FDR who never said anything on paper; than Eisenhower, perhaps -- Eisenhower's papers have been vastly underestimated.\*

Secondly I must admit to a new theory, now, about the discovery of manuscript materials, for I had so mistakenly accepted the view of the late Woodrow Wilson.

And third, being an inveterate generalizer and moralizer, I would like to venture some commentaries about why my fortune turned so nicely after all the years. It happened for several reasons. I always have been enamored by books and read a great many, and buy them too, and try never to enter a manuscript library without first reading the secondary literature and hence having some knowledge of what has gone before. Unlike some researchers, I abhor Xerox as a method of research, and try to read, on the spot, whatever I am looking at. And lastly, and to employ one of the academic words of recent times, I am simply appalled by the way in which many present-day researchers enter complicated libraries and rely on their own expertness in choosing what to investigate. It is a point of prudence as well as courtesy to seek the advice of manuscript archivists, such as Erwin J. Mueller, who knew a good box of manuscripts when he saw one.

\*Thereby hangs another tale.



# DEALING WITH DEFEAT: TEACHING THE VIETNAM WAR

Sandra C. Taylor  
with  
Rex Casillas  
University of Utah

Watching as the recent past, a time that seems "only yesterday," becomes "ancient history" can be distressing even for a historian. Talking about the Vietnam era to students who were too young to remember it reminds us of our advancing years, and we confront with shock the ephemeral nature of our cherished beliefs and the questionable validity of long-held assumptions. Such is the difficulty in teaching contemporary history. Vietnam was the critical event in many of our lives, much as World War II was for an earlier generation. Combat, protest demonstrations, and the agony of the draft are a part of our lives, and yet as historians we know the truth of Carl Becker's famous dictum that each generation rewrites history to serve the needs of the present. As historians study the war years from documentary sources only recently opened and attempt to evaluate the significance of America's longest and most painful conflict, the "lessons" of the past must be redefined for a new generation.

Several recent studies have claimed that high school texts and teachers are presenting the war to their students as "at worst, a mistake - or, at best, a war to save 'free' South Vietnam from communist invasion."<sup>1</sup> William L. Griffen and John Marciano in their book **Teaching the Vietnam War**, analyzed twenty-eight popular high school history texts, many of which were written by well-known and respected members of our profession, charging them with misrepresenting the truths about Vietnam by deliberate distortions and lies. While a certain amount of the authors' anger lies in the frustrations of radicals with a much more conservative era, one can still grant a measure of validity to their charges while making allowances, as it were, for the differing purposes of historical instruction at the secondary level. Teaching history in college and universities, however, assumes a higher degree of analysis and criticism. In this paper I surveyed instructors at this level to find out how they were teaching about the war.

## **The Sample and the Questionnaire:**

The population studied consisted of 170 names compiled from the membership roster of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations and the American Historical Association's **Guide to Departments of History, 1979-1980**. Questionnaires were sent to those on the first list whose address included an academic affiliation, and this list was cross-checked with the **AHA Guide** in an attempt to distribute questionnaires to historians who taught American diplomatic history or American-East Asian relations at colleges and universities large enough to be listed by the AHA or whose faculty were members of SHAFR. The response was gratifying; of 170 questionnaires mailed out, 100 were returned, a rate of 59%. The mailing was done in late May, and the responses were tabulated at the end of June, 1980.



The questionnaire, included in the Appendix to this paper, considered 17 items. The items stressed data on teaching techniques and materials, while eliciting brief information about the respondent's attitudes about the war. Most items were multiple-choice, but there were some open-ended questions; these elicited some intriguing responses, but were more difficult to tabulate. Although I had administered a similar questionnaire six years ago, I did not survey the identical population nor did I ask the same questions, so comparisons of the result must be speculative rather than definitive.

Evaluations of the data revealed several problems. A few questions were more ambiguous than intended, due to the words used or the choices offered. A number of people found it difficult to identify with any of the standard categories of political viewpoint. An item asking about military service during the Vietnam years inadvertently failed to identify veterans of earlier conflicts. Location of present teaching assignment was omitted by mistake. The item asking about present attitude about the Vietnam War caused difficulty. The original list of choices were taken from Alexander Kendrick, **The Wound Within**,<sup>4</sup> since I had found his list useful in surveying student attitudes. Several respondents disliked those options, while others wrote in their views. In an attempt to avoid asking people to label themselves, I asked instead for them to explain the contextual framework in which they discussed the Vietnam War. This confused some and frustrated others, who said they couldn't possibly do so in a short time. We found, that despite our attempts to steer clear of the "nationalist, realist, or radical" trap, the responses often fell into that mold anyway, and if they didn't, they could usually be seen as attempts to explain why the United States lost the war, rather than efforts to place the conflict in a larger context. In the analysis of the data that follows, quotations from the questionnaires themselves will illustrate these points.

#### **The data:**

The information was tabulated and the results analyzed through use of the SPSS program (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). The resulting data will be manipulated in two ways: first, through an item-by-item analysis, and second, by a comparison of items through crosstabulations. The first yields a descriptive picture of the sample and the second attempts to answer certain questions about sub-groups of the respondents, who were, for that purpose, divided by age and political affinity.

The demographic data can be summarized briefly. The group consisted of 96 men and 4 women. Fifty-five percent of them were 45 or younger (see Table 1). Although five questionnaires were returned from teachers at Canadian or Australian universities, all but one of the respondents were educated in the United States (and can be presumed to be American-born). Thirty-six percent were educated in the midwest, 33% in the east, 10% in the south, and 18% in the west. Their present locations cover the entire country, plus three from Canada and two from Australia. The schools that they affiliate with include most of the major state and private universities in the country. Sixty-one percent identify themselves as liberals. Eighteen percent are conservative (one



checked very conservative.) Ten percent are radicals. Ten percent could not confine themselves to one label, or felt the labels inadequate to express their present sentiments. (see Table 2). One respondent wrote in a question mark and said, "I don't know any more." Another well-known diplomatic historian termed himself "an old New Deal Democratic who believes that we need some government restraint." He checked the box, "moderately conservative." Many probably shared his dilemma but could not bring themselves to identify as conservatives of any kind. One pronounced himself a libertarian.

Experience with the war varied. Only six were Vietnam veterans, while four served elsewhere during the time period. Thirty-five checked "deferred or exempt" and 35 also checked "not eligible;" these two categories sometimes, but not always, drew the same respondents. Thirty-nine participated in protest movements.

The item assessing "present attitudes about the Vietnam War," drew an interesting response. The first choice, terming it "a mistake from the outset," was checked by a total of 60, but of those, 11 deliberately crossed out the words, "immoral, illegal, and wrong," which were words frequently used during the Vietnam era by the protesters. (It is interesting to compare this figure with that of the 72%, who found the war "more than a mistake--fundamentally wrong and immoral," in a poll conducted by Daniel Yankelovich in 1978.)<sup>5</sup> One reply noted that while the war was an error, it was so not for reasons of immorality and illegality -- terms whose meaning in this context he did not know. One termed it a "**necessary** tragedy" which pointed out to the American public an awareness of "its foreign policy myths and what it was doing in the world." From this comment and many others I could only wish I had asked people to identify what they thought the lessons of Vietnam were: clearly there would have been no consensus. Thirty-one thought the war was a "failure of proportion" in which the error was escalation. There were a scattering of other responses, and 18 were not happy with those choices and wrote in their own. Of those, a half dozen noted that the war was inevitable given our ideological assumptions, and an equal number noted that intervention was based on misperceptions--of the national interest, of the nature of the reality of Southeast Asia and "nation building" in South Vietnam in particular. Only a very few people could find any way in which the venture was even a limited success; two comments indicated that the action did hold off Soviet expansionism for a while, and another wrote that while the war was a failure in the short term, in the long run "the jury is still out." Again, the lessons Vietnam taught our colleagues are quite mixed.

Most respondents, (58%), especially those who felt the war was a mistake, were emphatic in stating that their outlook on the war had not changed during the past decade. The war's outcome seemed to have made no difference in their views. However, of the 30% who did report a change, their new attitudes were quite mixed. Only one person demonstrated the "Joan Baez syndrome" of dismay over how badly those nice Vietnamese communists have behaved now that they have power. Again, the comments are indicative of a very mixed perception of



the "lessons" of the war. Some, about five percent, expressed more sympathy now for groups ranging from the "grunts" to military leadership to the politicians, while an equal number felt more critical of the latter groups. Eight commented on the damage the war had wrought to the national interest, and several expressed concern over neo-isolationism. A few felt that Southeast Asia today was worse off without us, while two blamed the result on "American imperialism."

All the respondents actually teach about the war in some context, 91% in courses on American foreign policy, 66% in a general survey. Forty-four also taught some kind of special offering, either at the graduate or undergraduate level; their responses will be analyzed later in this paper.

Those surveyed were asked to explain the contextual framework in which they place the Vietnam War. While classifying diplomatic historians by "school" is an exercise best left to the compilers of "problems" books, the use of key words in their responses enabled us to group them (see Table 3). Approximately 37% place the war in a Cold War/containment framework, which could, if one wished to make the inference, be labelled "nationlist." Sixteen were clearly New Left or Radical, which is six more than those who considered themselves generally politically radical. However, that number was much larger during the height of the war years, as one can see in comparing this data with that from a survey of the profession I did in 1972 (see Table 4). We have clearly grown more conservative. Twenty-two could be identified as Realists, again on the basis of internal evidence in their responses. Twenty-four did not answer this question, and one of those wrote that it was too complicated to explain in a short time.

A cursory reading of the response to this item indicated that at least a third of those replying felt the need to establish several points of reference in establishing a context for analyzing the war. A significant number (63%) also used this item to give reasons why the war had been lost. The reader can almost sense the frustration many apparently still feel in treating this subject. Explanations of defeat varied; thirteen blamed it on the politicians, five saw it as the result of a conflict of cultures--our lack of understanding of Southeast Asia--fifteen called our goals, unrealistic, and eleven mentioned imperialism and the Open Door concept. Others talked of our misreading of history and noted that the war had demonstrated the real limitations of American power. It is worth noting that almost no one sees the war's outcome as a result of a military error. While one military historian did discuss the "error in ways and means" he perceived while in Vietnam, and lamented his inability to get the "action-oriented military leaders to study and evaluate" this his observations were unique.

The influence of books on students and professors is, as one would expect, significant (see Table 5). Frances FitzGerald's **Fire in the Lake**, which had a wide impact when it came out in 1972, is still important today. Even more influential, again as one would expect, were the **Pentagon Papers**. The historical work which seems to have the greatest appeal today is George Herring's **America's Longest War**, published in



1979. Forty-seven percent of the faculty members mentioned it, and 39 said they assigned it to students. Only a few indicated unfamiliarity with it. On the other hand, the other recent book on the list, Guenter Lewy's controversial and revisionist **America in Vietnam**, was marked as influential by only 19, and several of those noted its usefulness lay in a foil for their own views. Only five used it with students. A wide number of other books were mentioned, and a listing of them would include all the works on a standard bibliography of the war. Among the most frequently mentioned were the works by David Halberstam and Bernard Fall.

Many could not identify war-related issues of concern to their students, and a similar number said their students were uninterested in the war, (but there seems to be no correlation between these items.) However, of those who did perceive student interest, the resumption of the draft was most important, and one might surmise that this issue would rank even higher were the poll to be taken today. Topics ranked in order of their current significance were the draft (56), perceptions of American foreign policy, (49), further interventions (43), the abuse of governmental power (the Watergate syndrome), (34), inflation (22) and the role of the CIA (22). Only the now-dated phenomenon, protest movements scored lower than war crimes and atrocities, which points up another interesting observation, also to be found in occasional comments about student interest in the war. Many noted that students are no longer concerned about the moral issues involved in war itself or its conduct. Only one person mentioned using Seymour Hersch's book **My Lai Four**, for example, while just one used the provocative film "Conversations with My Lai Veterans." Although several people did note that a book such as Philip Caputo's gripping work, **A Rumor of War**, can still draw an emotional response from students, only 16 are using it. Approximately the same number stated that they used and recommended the compelling film, "Hearts and Minds," another emotional portrayal of the moral dilemmas of war. Perhaps this is the inevitable result of the passage of time: as something becomes "ancient history" we no longer perceive the anguish of the immediate. But it is also interesting to note the apparent lack of interest in the refugee problem or the famine and war in Cambodia, unmentioned by any of our sample. Perhaps one of the lessons of Vietnam was the growth of cynicism in ourselves and in the younger generation.

Teaching techniques appear to be a reflection of the amount of time available to deal with the war, the level and age of the students, and the interest of the instructor. Since the subgroup teaching special courses on the war used the widest variety of approaches and material, a discussion of this will appear later in the paper.

Student interest in the Vietnam War appears to be very much a consequence of such variables as the presence of a good teacher, well-developed popular class, and a campus with a student body of widely diverse age groups. One respondent mentioned that the older student tended toward two types: those eager to relive their own experiences, and others who wanted to "forget or avoid discussion of unpleasant memories." Many said the presence of veterans in their



classes did spark interest. Overall, 55% characterized their campus as one with some degree of student interest, although many noted its diminishing nature. Thirty-six percent stated that the war evoked little or no curiosity, and they compared this to interest in the Peloponnesian war, the Thirty Years war or the Korean war -- in other words, it was ancient history. Interest in the war did not appear to be a regional phenomenon. An Australian respondent noted high interest in an event "close to their lives but distant in memory." Other comments ranged from "fascinated horror" to "yawn, what a bore."

### **Age and Politics:**

In an attempt to discover if age or political affiliation made any difference in attitude toward the war, we divided the respondents into categories to analyze their responses. We wished to see if age made a difference. One remembers such slogans of the Vietnam era as, "never trust anyone over thirty." Of our sample, 55% would have been members of the "Vietnam generation;" that is, most of those now between the ages of 25-45 would have been in college or graduate school during the war years. That sub-group does tend to be somewhat more "leftist," if one can use that term today. Sixteen percent are radicals, 64% liberals, and 13% conservatives. Of the so-called "older generation," 59% are liberals, 25% conservative (see Table 6.) The single respondent who checked "very conservative" is in this age grouping, while only one radical is so identified. Five of the six veterans are in the Vietnam generation, but they were quite split politically (of the total group, 61% are liberals, 10% radical, 18% conservative). A significant number, 39%, were involved in war protest, which correlates with the statistics on location of college attendance -- the high percentage of graduates of New England, and midwestern colleges, the low percent from the South. Here too, age mattered. Of the 39 protesters nine went to school in New England, nine in the Mid-Atlantic area, and 14 in the midwest--a whopping 79%. Eighty-three percent of those from the West did **not** protest--double the percent from the South -- where are all those Berkeleyites? The protest movement drew people across the age gap, and this too is reflected in our sample: of the Vietnam generation, 42% were active protesters, while 36% of the "older generation" openly opposed the war. While vulnerability to the draft activated many to opposition, the moral issue of the war itself cut across age groups, but not traditional political groupings. Here the trend is quite clear, as Table 7 shows: nine of ten radicals protested, while only two of 18 conservatives did. The liberals, as one might expect, were ambivalent: of the 61, 27 protested while 34 did not.

Only six of the sample were actual veterans of the Vietnam conflict, while of those in the Vietnam generation, 31 were deferred or exempt and another 11 were ineligible. This too is as one might expect. As the authors of **Chance and Circumstances** have ably documented,<sup>6</sup> far fewer of those who were educated and relatively affluent were caught in the draft net. Access to draft counsellors and the ability to think fast gave many advantage in avoiding service in the unpopular war. But not having to face the war on the personal level may have enabled many to



avoid dealing with the issues it raised, and hence laid the seeds of present ambivalence.

Attitudes about the war are also shaped by age and politics. Fifty-five percent of those of the "Vietnam generation" believe the war to have been a mistake, "immoral and illegal," while only 47 percent of the older generation shared their view. These figures would be more interesting if compared with the general population: I suspect that the so-called "generation gap" was far larger in the population as a whole than it was in our sample, who shared a commonality of interest and education which probably predisposed them to have a greater similarity of outlook on this issue. Those whose attitudes about the war differed from the view that it was a mistake could not be categorized by age at all.

### **Liberals, Radicals and Conservatives:**

Another way of looking at the total population of the sample group is in terms of political identity, and this yields some interesting results. The largest category of the sample were the 61 self-identified liberals. As noted above, their average age was somewhat younger than the total sample, and they were more representative of the Vietnam generation. Four of the six Vietnam veterans were to be found in this group, while the other two were conservatives (no radicals among the veterans!) The conservatives, 19 in number, were on an average, older, and none of them were younger than age 34.

The most pronounced difference appears when one considers present attitudes about the war (see Table 3). Fifty-five percent of the liberals felt the war was a "mistake, illegal and immoral," compared to 90% of the radicals and only 20% of the conservatives. If one adds to these figures the numbers who checked "mistake" without the qualifiers, the totals are even more impressive: 67% of the liberals see the war as a mistake, 90% of the radicals, and only 31% of the conservatives. (Of the radicals, one viewed the war as a failure of proportion, while another noted it was a "crime," not a mistake, and another commented that it was not a mistake, but rather the "logical outgrowth of an imperial foreign policy.") Several who couldn't decide whether they were more liberal than radical pronounced the war both a mistake and a failure of proportion. The conservatives, on the other hand, leaned much more strongly toward seeing the war as a "failure of proportion." They also commented on the errors of military strategy or blamed political limitations for the defeat. In the last decade the great majority of radicals had not changed their opinion of the war (about 70%); 64% of the liberals reported their views as the same, compared to 53% of the conservatives.

The contextual framework for teaching the war also brought differing responses from the three groups. While most of the radicals used terms like "neo-Marxist," "imperialist," "open-door," and "pacifist" in their explanations only one clearly preferred a "realist-idealistic pattern a la Morgenthau and Graebner," a strange choice for a radical. The conservatives and liberals showed a more disparate pattern. Liberals favored a Cold War/containment approach by about 40% but a strong quarter leaned to a realist interpretation and nine or 15% were



persuaded by a radical or New Left interpretation. No conservatives went that far, but a majority did prefer a containment-type explanation. Twenty-eight percent of the conservatives did not answer this item, compared to eighteen percent of the liberals. Explanations of the loss ranged from a comparison of Vietnam to the Boer and Balkan Wars, to those who alluded to a frontier mentality -- perhaps reflecting the soldiers' own analogy of "cowboys and Indians."

As for influential books, here too political outlook influences-or shapes-selection. Sixty-one percent of the liberals liked Frances FitzGerald, together with half the radicals, but only 42% of the conservatives mentioned her book. On the other hand, none of the radicals liked Guenter Lewy, compared to 18% of the liberals and 28% of the conservatives. George Herring's book is mentioned by 61% of the conservatives, 41% of the liberals, and only 30% of the radicals, while the **Pentagon Papers** influenced over half in all groups. The radicals mentioned as significant books reflecting their own view, such as Walter LaFeber's **America, Russia and the Cold War** and works by Noam Chomsky. The conservatives and liberals selected a wide range of works.

### **Teaching the War:**

One further way of analyzing the group is to break it down into a subgroup of 44, composed of those who teach some type of special course on the war: undergraduate or graduate seminars, special topics courses, general education or humanities classes, or special offerings in American-East Asian relations. The assumption was that this group might show some different characteristics from the total population: the outcome, however, proved the reverse. We also sought to determine if this group found (or made) their students more interested in the war era, and again we found that assumption generally to be unwarranted. In terms of teaching techniques these respondents did differ, as will be noted, since they by definition could devote more time to the subject.

The profile of this subgroup paralleled that of the total as to age. Over half are full professors, which may reflect the greater latitude this rank has in designing or teaching courses of their own interest. Five of the six veterans are included in the group. The percentage of liberals (61%) is the same as the total, and a slightly higher percent were involved in protest movements (43% compared to 39%). A somewhat greater percent (52% compared to 49%) felt the war to be a mistake, while the same proportion (11%) crossed out the qualifiers. Fifty-five percent had not changed their opinion about the war, compared to 38% of the total. They appeared to interpret the war in the same ways.

This subgroup was, by definition, more interested in the subject matter of the war, and hence were far more conversant with its literature. Not only did they recommend a greater number of secondary sources as influential, but they assigned a greater diversity to their students. The most popular titles for students were still **Fire in the Lake, America's Longest War**, and the **Pentagon Papers**, but they mentioned using as well a number of the growing list of war memoirs and novels, such as Michael Herr's **Dispatches** and James Webb's **Fields of Fire**. Their



students were, they reported, no more interested in Vietnam than the average, and they were concerned about the same issues as those in the larger groups.

While teaching techniques in this subgroup are, for the majority, as traditional as among the larger, some interesting ideas were mentioned. Several attempted to capture the spirit of those years through the use of protest music and through bringing in outside speakers, such as veterans, participants in the protest movement, and professional military. Some innovation was apparent in the use of role playing and simulation games, although most preferred the more traditional oral and book reports. Some forty percent do use audio-visual materials; the few who apparently have large film rental budgets at their disposal mentioned the wide variety of media available, which ranged from contemporary television documentaries and pro-war army propaganda films to anti-war dramas like "Go Tell the Spartans" or the award-winning "Hearts and Minds." About 15% assigned their students to attend current commercial films, while many others noted that most of their students had seen these anyway. "Apocalypse Now," "The Deerhunter," and "Coming Home" seemed to have equal appeal.

Most of the special courses mentioned were apparently small-group courses, although several mentioned large and very popular undergraduate courses. It did seem that the success of the latter depended very much on the usual variables--an outstanding instructor, a well-designed class -- rather than on the greater intrinsic appeal of the Vietnam War as a topic. It is, after all, "ancient" history to most of our students.

**(To be continued)**

## **STUDENT BONERS**

"The League was intended to preserve peace, but backfired into the embryo of World War II." ----David Pletcher

\* \* \*

"Eugene V. Debs was a case that came before the Supreme Court, of Mr. Eugene against Mr. Debs."----Reid Gagle

\* \* \*

"Bernard Baruch was the heir to the Austrian throne, who was assassinated at Sarajevo."----Sheila Barff

\* \* \*

Q: Explain President Jefferson's attitude toward the French and the British in foreign affairs.

A: Jefferson was a British hater and a French lover.----John Wickman



# THE CUNARD ARCHIVES

by

Lawrence Spinelli

The vital role that shipping has played in the development of Anglo-American relations makes the Cunard archives an important new source for diplomatic historians. The Cunard Shipping Line collection of approximately 1700 pieces was deposited at the University of Liverpool by the parent company Trafalgar House Investment Limited in 1971. After extensive organizing by the University Archivist the papers were opened to scholars in 1978.

The collection dates from 1878 when the company was publicly organized but the major focus of the archive is on the post-World War One period and tends to be clustered around the papers of the various Board Chairmen during this time. The collection also contains papers from the various Cunard subsidiary companies.

Sir Alfred Booth served as Cunard's Chairman from 1909 to 1922 and was the guiding force of the company during the critical war years. While his papers are perhaps the most extensive in the collection there is an equally extensive list of missing files. The papers are indexed by correspondent and a small number of files are listed by subject. The papers of Chairman Sir Thomas Royden (1922-1930) cover the period of intense Anglo-American passenger ship rivalry. Particularly rich are the letters from Royden to Cunard's New York agent Sir Ashley Sparks. The close personal relationship between the two makes this file an important chronicle of Anglo-American maritime concerns in the 1920's (though it should be noted that this file was incorrectly described in the original Cunard index). The papers of Chairman Sir Percy Bates include the years 1930-1946.

Additional sources for diplomatic historians include the Chairman's letter books which chronologically document all outgoing letters sent by the Chairman. The Secretary's letter books are divided into two categories. Letter book-I lists by correspondent the Secretary's outgoing letters and letter book-II is organized according to the various Cunard departments and also contains a subject index. For an analysis of company activities the minutes of the Board of Directors record those subjects considered by the Board. But the Executive Committee minutes serve as a clearer indicator of Cunard concerns considered by the "real" working body of the company.

The Cunard archives are presently housed in a separate building on the campus of the University of Liverpool. University Archivist Michael Cook is both extremely helpful and knowledgeable of the collection. Owing to the physical location of the papers and the small size of the staff it is imperative that prior arrangement be made for using the Cunard archives.



---

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

---

(Please limit abstracts to a total of twenty (20) lines of **Newsletter** space, or approximately two hundred (200) words. The desire to accommodate as many contributors as possible, plus the overriding problem of space, makes this restriction necessary. Double space all abstracts, and send them as you would have them appear in print. For abstracts of articles, please supply the date, the volume, the number within the volume, and the pages. It would be appreciated if abstracts were not sent until after a paper has been delivered, or an article has been printed. Also, please do not send abstracts of articles which have appeared in **Diplomatic History**, since all SHAFR members already receive the latter publication).

## **SHAFR CONVENTION, AUGUST 14**

### **New Methodologies and American Diplomatic History**

The Sixth National Meeting opened with an evening session that some years back surely would have competed unsuccessfully with the closing evening of the Democratic National Convention. Though the moderator is not yet prepared to stake his reputation on the assertion that a sophisticated attention to methodological issues and sister disciplines now stands in the forefront of the concerns of American diplomatic historians (especially considering the quality of the competing attractions in Madison Square Garden), this opening-evening feature did attract nearly sixty scholars, only one of whom was seen definitively to have gone to sleep.

Most, however, found the papers stimulating, though for different reasons. Three diplomatic historians may have shared a single platform under an umbrella of "methodology," but the fact is they were addressing themselves to disparate concerns. David Herschler of the National Archives, in a straightforward, descriptive paper, "A Methodological Problem of Researching State Department Documents in the Period Since 1973: The State Department's Automated Document System," described to those assembled the new automated and computerized system of information reception, storage, and retrieval operating in the Department of State since 1973. Of special interest were his projections of what this system will mean in the future to the historian arriving on the steps of the Archives eager to research U.S.-Nicaraguan relations in 1979, the American role in the Zimbabwe settlement, or other events transpiring since 1973. Few will be wetting their thumbs to turn ever more paper but will instead be dealing with



"machine--readable" materials. (It seems conceivable as a result that members of SHAFR in the future will contract more terminal diseases than in the past.)

David Patterson of the Department of State focused his attention on another kind of methodological concern in "The Role of Third Parties in Mediating International Disputes: Some Methodological Reflections," *vis.*, suggesting some models by which scholars as well as diplomatic officials could judge the efficacy of various forms of third-party mediations in a range of different kinds of international disputes. The paper emphasized pioneering work already done by scholars of international relations and suggested how historians might profit thereby.

Finally, in a paper roundly regarded as a **tour de force**, John Zeugner of the Worcester Polytechnic Institute examined "Cold War Content Analysis: Some Problems and Possibilities in a Frames Approach." Drawing upon his own training as an historian and recent developments in cognitive psychology and AI ("artificial intelligence"), he attempted to resuscitate content analysis as an analytical tool worthy of diplomatic historians' attention, using a study of early Cold War rhetoric, especially that of Walter Bedell Smith, as a point of departure.

Thirty minutes of discussion and questions from the floor followed. David Trask shed further light on the issues raised by Dr. Herschler. Most of the questions were directed to Messrs. Herschler and Zeugner.

Robert L. Beisner

\* \* \*

About 60 persons attended the first regular session on "Multinational Corporations and American Foreign Policy, 1930-1950," chaired by Alfred Eckes of the Republican Conference, U.S. House of Representatives. In discussing "Du Pont Foreign Relations, 1920-1950," Patricia E. Sudnik of the University of Chicago presented a case study of "associationism on a global scale." To protect its position in the U.S. domestic market and maintain access to European technology, she indicated that Du Pont negotiated cartel arrangements with its European rivals. However, World War II hastened the dissolution of these arrangements, and forced Du Pont to devise a new set of guidelines for its overseas involvement. While the U.S. government's antitrust policies "stifled thoughts about postwar collaboration," Sudnik noted that "institutional imperatives. . . were making such cooperation increasingly difficult."

In the second paper Graham D. Taylor of Dalhousie University considered "American Policy Makers and the Problem of International Cartels, 1942-1950." The U.S. effort to control cartels through multilateral agreements failed, he said, because wartime passions cooled and other countries did not share the American commitment. Despite the failure, the anti-cartel campaign "established precedents hedging the range of agreements American firms could enter with foreign companies." As a result, when American enterprise moved



abroad again in the 1950s, the multinational corporation "with its branch plants, wholly owned subsidiaries, and centralized financial and technical staffs was the primary vehicle of expansion."

"New Deal Economic Foreign Policy and Multinational Corporations" was the subject of the final paper, presented by James Elston of Boston University. He concluded that the U.S. government, unlike its European rivals, did not actively and consistently coordinate business to serve the requirements of peacetime foreign policy. For instance, Washington did not restrict the export of patents or technologies. And it did not stockpile critical raw materials. These unsatisfactory experiences, Elston said, led the Roosevelt administration to pursue a "more active policy" designed to "encourage or require multinational firms to promote, not to undermine U.S. policies."

Commenting on these papers Michael Hogan of Miami University (Ohio) offered words of praise and raised a number of questions about alternative interpretations. His observations sparked a lively exchange with members of the audience that lasted until time for lunch.

Alfred Eckes, Jr.

\* \* \*

Michael Schaller and James Elston, "Securing the Great Crescent: The Dodge Line and the Containment of Communism in Southeast Asia." Presented at the International Conference on the Occupation of Japan, Amherst College, August 22, 1980. This paper discusses the evolution of policy towards occupied Japan in light of the successful Chinese revolution and growing communist insurgencies in Southeast Asia. Beginning in late-1947, the "reverse economic course" within Japan and the growing U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia became linked. A strong, Western-oriented Japan and a non-communist Southeast Asia were each considered indispensable to the other. Blocking Soviet expansion in Asia (beyond China) came to be viewed as nearly as vital as containment in Western Europe. The export-oriented economic programs imposed on Japan by the Dodge Mission; new aid schemes for the region; and the security programs being initiated by the State Department, NSC, and Joint Chiefs from 1948 to 1950 all demonstrated this region-wide concern. Even the American military response to the outbreak of the Korean War is partly explained by the developments in this period.

\* \* \*

David Reynolds (Caius College, Cambridge University, England), "Competitive Co-operation: Anglo-American Relations in World War Two," **The Historical Journal**, 23, 1 (March 1980, pp. 233-245. This review article considers recent work on the subject, particularly books by Joseph P. Lash, James R. Leutze, Wm. Roger Louis, Mark A. Stoler, Christopher Thorne and Armand Van Dormael. It looks at the picture of the Anglo-American relationship that emerges and tries to define some of the areas of competition and co-operation.

\* \* \*

Melvin Small (Wayne State University) "Hollywood and Teaching About Russian-American Relations." **Film and History**, X, 1 (February,



1980), 1-8. This article describes the construction of a course on Hollywood films about Russia and Communism from **Ninotchka** (1939) to **The Russians are Coming!** (1966).

Attention is paid to the ways such evidence may be used to illustrate the drift of Soviet-American relations as well as the pitfalls involved in such an exercise. Most surprising were differences in the reactions of contemporary audiences and critics and the reactions of members of the class to those same films today.

Frank A. Ninkovich (St. John's University, New York), "Cultural Relations and American China Policy, 1942-45," **Pacific Historical Review**, Vol. 49, No. 3 (August 1980), 471-98.

The State Department's program of cultural relations in China began as a form of "cultural Lend-Lease" aimed at providing China with technical assistance for its struggle with Japan. The initial objective of the program was frankly political, its purpose being to prop up the beleaguered Nationalist regime. But as the war wore on American policy-makers came to view the Kuomintang's reactionary political and cultural policies as the key source of China's difficulties. By mid-1944, cultural policy was re-oriented in a humanist direction in the hope that an infusion of liberal values would provide China with the cultural vitality needed to cope with its critical domestic and foreign problems. This policy shift marked a reversion to the pre-war, American view of the Chinese question as a problem of acculturation rather than of power politics. However, in order to promote cultural change in a liberal direction in the face of Chinese resistance, the U.S. government was forced to adopt secret initiatives that violated the cultural program's own liberal norms. The end result, for a cultural program that was designed to foster "mutual understanding," was a misunderstanding of China and its problems and an ideological distortion of American liberal principles.

\* \* \*

Stanley L. Falk (U.S. Army Center of Military History), "Comments on 'MacArthur as Maritime Strategist,'" **Naval War College Review**, XXXIII, No. 2 (March-April 1980), 92-99. A critique of Clark Reynolds' paper on this subject, both read at the 1979 meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch, American Historical Association. This analysis views MacArthur as a peripheral and parochial strategist, with limited understanding of the capabilities and limitations of naval forces and a self-serving view of Pacific strategy that focused more on ground warfare than on the maximum utilization of sea (or, for that matter, air) power.

\* \* \*

Stanley L. Falk (U.S. Army Center of Military History), "Individualism and Military Leadership," **Air University Review**, XXXI, No. 5 (July-August 1980), 96-102. This review article contrasts the leadership of Generals Douglas MacArthur and James N. Gavin by comparing William Manchester's biography of the former with General Gavin's own recent World War II memoir. Both volumes are seen as appropriate for



their subjects: Manchester's grand, high-flown, unreliable, melodramatic, and self-serving; Gavin's controlled, positive, honest, and professional.

\* \* \*

William Stueck (Georgia), "American Policy toward Korea, 1946-1950: The Continuity of Commitment." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association, August 21, 1980. The American military intervention in Korea in June 1950 was not primarily a result of short-term factors such as domestic politics or a recent hardening of U.S. perceptions growing out of the Communist victory in China or the Soviet explosion of an atomic device. Rather, the intervention was an outgrowth of a political commitment to South Korea that may be traced back at least to 1946 and State Department domination of the decision-making process. Unlike the situation in China three years before, in 1950 State Department officials viewed American credibility as being tied to the survival of a non-Communist government in South Korea.

\* \* \*

Robert J. McMahon (Office of the Historian, Department of State), "The United States and the Developing World, 1945-1950: The Case of Indonesia." Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association. This paper analyzes the American response to the Indonesian struggle for independence. It argues that more than any other single factor, direct American pressure on the Netherlands in the spring of 1949, which took the form of a threatened withdrawal of U.S. economic assistance to Holland, compelled the Dutch to relinquish their prized colony. American support for the Indonesian Republic, however, came only very slowly and with the greatest reluctance. Prior to the second Dutch "police action" in December 1948, the United States consistently supported the position of the Netherlands. American officials believed that the success of the Truman Doctrine, the European Recovery Program, and NATO necessitated the steadfast support of the European nations, including of course the Netherlands. The intensification of the Cold War during these years underscored this need. It was only in the wake of the second Dutch police action, when the nearly universal denunciation of The Hague's militancy by the international community merged with similar sentiment in the American public and Congress, that Washington changed its policy orientation and moved to support the Indonesian Republic.

\* \* \*

Jonathan Goldstein (Nasson College), "Cantonese Artifacts, Chinoiserie, and the Formation of an Early American Image of the Chinese." Paper presented as part of a panel on "Early American Perception of the Chinese American" at the National Conference on Chinese American Studies, San Francisco, October 11, 1980. In the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries, before the development of mass media in the United States, Americans received



pictorial images of China from decorated objects exported from Canton. These products, along with stateside imitations of them known as **chinoiserie**, fostered highly romanticized visual images of China and the Chinese. Fairy-like beings cavorted -- on porcelain, furniture, carvings, textiles, and paintings -- in a never-never land of cloud-like rocks, exotic plants, and airy pavilions. Elaborately clad manequins in "Chinese Museums" performed essentially entertainment functions, as did pagodas and Chinese-style garden objects, villas, and amusement parks. Such unrealistic imagery in no way equipped European-Americans for real-life encounters with Chinese immigrants after midcentury. A romantic image of Cathay appears to have had little or no effect in mitigating the overwhelmingly negative stereotypes of China and the Chinese prevalent in American mass media by the 1870's.

\* \* \*

Craig Symonds (U.S. Naval Academy), "Jefferson's Naval Policy Reconsidered," a paper delivered at the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association meeting, 1980. The paper argues that Jefferson was consistent in his application of naval force in American diplomacy. He used it unhesitatingly when he felt that it was both cost-effective and unlikely to provoke a superior power into an escalative response, and he forebore from using it in a situation where it was likely to have little impact other than a violent one. Although Jefferson understood the potential importance of the navy as a means of enhancing national prestige, he refused to play great power politics with it or use it as an entre to an American role in the European balance of power. In short, Jefferson was a practical statesman insofar as the use of the small U.S. Navy was concerned and his naval policy decisions were based on practicality more than ideology.

\* \* \*

Thomas M. Leonard (University of North Florida), "The 1923 Central American Conference" Paper presented at the American Historical Association - Pacific Coast Branch meeting August, 1980. The United States sought to promote Central American democracy and political stability by having the five nations adopt a policy of non-recognition of governments coming to power through revolution, and to refrain from assisting revolutionaries. Although not a signatory to the agreement, the United States applied the non-recognition policy and subsequently intervened in the 1923-1924 Honduran and 1926-1927 Nicaraguan revolutions. The United States application of the non-recognition policy facilitated the downfall of Guatemalan provisional president Manuel Orellana in 1930, but not Salvadoran Maximilliano Hernandez Martinez. Neither the non-recognition policy nor the interventions, however, advanced regional democracy or improved the political climate.

\* \* \*

Joseph M. Siracusa (University of Queensland, Australia) "NSC 68: A Reappraisal," **Naval War College Review**, XXXIII, 6 (November-December 1980), 4-14. Based on an examination of recently declassified archival materials as well as interviews with the principal



actors, this paper suggests that the basic American strategic position taken toward the USSR in NSC 68 (Policy Paper No. 68 of the National Security Council) in 1950 had, with minor modifications, remained relatively unchanged since that taken in late 1948 in the wake of the Berlin Crisis. The only appreciable, though a most dramatic, assessment in those years--if the unheralded NSC 20 series may serve as a guide--was the Truman Administration's shift in perception regarding the meaning of the Soviet acquisition of the atomic bomb, which with its presumed first-strike character, led in its turn to the decision to pursue further the feasibility of a thermonuclear capability. Equally significant, the available evidence indicates that the case for the direct relationship between the recommendations contained in NSC 68 and the final U.S. determination to the UN police action in Korea is at best tenuous.

"The Arms Race: Problems and Prospects," paper read at the University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., October 30, 1980. An analysis of the history of the arms race from the Baruch Plan to SALT II, this paper concludes that neither of the superpowers has yet devised a strategy to assuage the worst fears of the other, though it would seem that a cooperative environment exists despite the obstacles of linkage. Perhaps the greatest difficulty ahead remains the problem of developing a strategy to persuade the public and politicians alike that despite the notion of a "margin of safety" that in the arms race there is only "losing" for those who can think only of "winning."

"U.S.-Australian/New Zealand Relations: U.S. Policy Interests in the Region," paper read at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, National Defense University, Washington, D.C., October 21, 1980. This paper deals with the changing nature of the ANZUS relationship from 1950 to the present, from the Korean War to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. From a number of levels--political, economic and military--Australia and New Zealand have had and will continue to have an important contribution to make to regional as well as various aspects of American global strategy in the Pacific. The only real threat to the functioning of this triangular relationship would be that ensuing from an economic quarrel over such matters as wool and wheat.

"Australia-American Relations, 1980: A Historical Perspective," **Orbis** Vol. 24 (1980), 271-87. Basically an historical survey of what has come to be known as a "special relationship," this paper examines the perceptions Australians and Americans have had of each other in the twentieth century and the extent to which they have shaped national security considerations. At present, the analysis concludes, Australian and American foreign policies tend both to complement and parallel each other, each adding in its own way to a more positive and constructive post-Vietnam foreign policy outlook.

\* \* \*

Joseph M. Siracusa and Glen Barclay (both of the University of Queensland, Australia), "Australia, the United States and the Cold War, 1945-1950, from V-J Day to ANZUS," paper read at the annual meeting of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations, College Park, Maryland, August 15, 1980. The traditional image of Australia as



one of the most consistently reliable allies of the United States is substantially correct. It does however imply a tendency to subservience on the side of the junior partner which has in fact generally been conspicuously lacking. The two Pacific nations have customarily been as one on major ideological and strategic issues. The relationship in other areas could fairly be called turbulent. This turbulence was particularly evident during the tense and frustrating years of developing East-West confrontation immediately after the defeat of the Axis, from V-J. Day to the ANZUS Treaty in 1951.

## **HAROLD L. PETERSON AWARD**

The Harold L. Peterson Award for the best article on any facet of American military history written in the English language and published during 1980 in an American or foreign journal has been announced by Herbert E. Kahler, chairman of the board of Eastern National Park and Monument Association. Clear copies of articles nominated must be received at the principal office of Eastern National Park and Monument Association, 339 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19106, not later than February 1, 1981. The Board of the Association will choose the winner. The award will be presented to the winner during 1981 at a special ceremony in Washington, D.C.

## **REMINDER**

For those members interested in nominating persons for the various Bernath prizes, the following persons chair the committees: (See calendar in this issue for deadlines)

### **Book Prize**

Robert Dallek, Department of History, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024

\* \* \* \* \*

### **Lecture Prize**

Keith L. Nelson, Department of History, University of California, Irvine, CA 92717

\* \* \* \* \*

### **Article Prize**

Lester D. Langley, Department of History, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602



---

## PERSONALS

---

Warren I. Cohen, director of the Asian Studies Center at Michigan State University and editor of SHAFR's **Diplomatic History**, has just returned from an extended visit to the People's Republic of China. Cohen, along with seven colleagues from Michigan State was invited by the Chinese Ministry of Education to participate in discussions on mutually beneficial research and exchange programs.

\* \* \*

John L. Gaddis (Ohio University) has been awarded a 1980-81 Fulbright Award to lecture at the University of Helsinki, Finland.

\* \* \*

Edward W. Chester (University of Texas at Arlington) was invited to deliver an address at Bermuda College during the Thanksgiving period. While in Bermuda, Dr. Chester also addressed such groups as the Hamilton Rotary Club, the English Speaking Union, and the Royal Commonwealth Society.

\* \* \*

David Reynolds (Caius College, Cambridge University), is spending a year's leave in the United States. He is a fellow of the Charles Warren Center at Harvard supported by the American Council of Learned Societies. His book on Anglo-American relationships 1938-1941 is due for publication. He is presently working on a study of the American presence in Britain during World War II.

\* \* \*

Duane A. Tananbaum has been awarded his Ph.D. with distinction from Columbia University. His dissertation, "The Bricker Amendment Controversy: The Interaction Between Domestic and Foreign Affairs," has been nominated for a Bancroft Prize. In addition, Dr. Tananbaum has been selected as an American Historical Association Congressional Fellow and is spending his fellowship year working for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

\* \* \*

Joseph M. Siracusa (University of Queensland, Australia) has been promoted to Reader in American Diplomatic History.

\* \* \*

Jules R. Benjamin (University of Rochester) has been awarded a grant-in-aid by the American Council of Learned Societies to study the origins of the Cuban Revolution of 1959.

\* \* \*

Russell H. Bostert (Williams College) has received a Fulbright award. He will lecture at Hong Kong Baptist College on American studies.

\* \* \*

David E. Kyvig (University of Akron) has received a fellowship from the American Council of Learned Societies for work on constitutional amendments in the 20th century.

\* \* \*



Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State University) has been awarded a grant-in-aid from the American Council for research on European political integration since World War II.

\* \* \*

Michael H. Ebner has been promoted to associate professor at Lake Forest College.

\* \* \*

Joseph Strange (University of Maryland) has been selected as a U.S. Army Center of Military History Visiting Research Fellow for 1980-81.

\* \* \*

John E. Findling (Indiana University, Southeast) has become Acting Chairman of the Division of Social Sciences since his return from a year in Lima, Peru, where he was Resident Director of Indiana University's Overseas Study Program.

\* \* \*

D. Clayton James, who occupied the Harold K. Johnson Chair at Carlisle this past year, is the incumbent of the John J. Morrison Chair of Military History at the Command and General Staff College.

\* \* \*

Phyllis Zimmerman and Alexander Cochran, retiring Center of Military History Fellows, gave presentations at the final CMH seminar series for 1979-1980.

\* \* \*

Stanley L. Falk has joined the Center of Military History as Deputy Chief Historian for Southeast Asia. Dr. Falk was formerly Chief Historian in the Office of Air Force History.

\* \* \*

Forrest Pogue (Smithsonian Institution) and Russel F. Weigley (Temple University) have delivered lectures in the 1980-81 series "Perspectives in Military History" at the Military History Institute, Carlisle Barracks.

\* \* \*

## ANNOUNCEMENT

The Historical Division of the Joint Chiefs of Staff reports that as of January 1, 1981, review of the official records of the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be complete through the year 1959, and declassified documents will be available for research at the National Archives and Records Service in Washington, D.C.



---

## SHAFR SUMMER MEETING INFORMATION

---

**NOTE:** The dates for the summer conference have been changed!!! The meetings at American University will be held from Thursday, July 30 to Saturday, August 1.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Program Committee, chaired by Charles DeBenedetti, welcomes suggestions for papers and sessions. These should be sent no later than February 1 to:

Professor Charles DeBenedetti  
Department of History  
University of Toledo  
Toledo, Ohio 43606

---

## OTHER CONFERENCES TO COME

---

The History Department of the United States Naval Academy will sponsor its fifth Naval History Symposium on October 1-2, 1981. The symposium welcomes suggestions for papers on all topics relating to naval history. Proposals should be sent to Associate Professor Frederick S. Harrod, History Department, U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD 21402. The deadline is April 1, 1981.

New College, University of South Florida, will sponsor a conference on East Central Europe, Russia, and the Soviet Union. The Program Committee welcomes suggestions for papers on 19th and 20th century topics. Deadline for proposals is November 1, 1980. Contact: Laszlo Deme, Chairman, Division of Social Sciences, New College, University of South Florida, Sarasota, FL 33580.



---

## PUBLICATIONS IN DIPLOMACY BY MEMBERS OF SHAFR

---

Barry Rubin (Bethesda, Md.), **Paved with Good Intentions: the American Experience in Iran.** 1980. Oxford University Press. \$15.95.

David F. Long (University of New Hampshire), **A Documentary History of U.S. Foreign Relations, 1762 to the Mid-1890's: Selections from Ruhl J. Bartlett's The Record of American Diplomacy.** 1980. University Press of America. \$7.50.

Thomas R. Maddux (San Fernando Valley State College), **Years of Estrangement: American Relations with the Soviet Union, 1933-1941.** 1980. University Press of Florida. \$15.00

John Curtis Perry (Lincoln Center, Mass.) **Beneath the Eagle's Wings: Americans in Occupied Japan.** 1980. Dodd and Mead. \$12.95.

Warren I. Cohen (Michigan State University), **America's Response to China: An Interpretative History of Sino-American Relations.** 1980 2nd edition. John Wiley and Sons.

Michael Schaller (University of Arizona), **The United States and China in the Twentieth Century.** 1980. Paperback edition. Oxford University Press. \$2.95.

James W. Cortada (Fords, N.J.) ed., **Spain in the Twentieth Century World: Essays on Spanish Diplomacy, 1898-1978.** 1980. Greenwood Press. Included in the above the editor wrote the essay entitled "The United States."

---

## OTHER PUBLICATIONS BY SHAFR MEMBERS

---

Paolo E. Coletta (U.S. Naval Academy), **French Ensor Chadwick: Scholarly Warrior.** 1980. University Press of America. Paperback. \$10.75.

David L. Porter (William Penn College), **Congress and the Waning of the New Deal.** 1980. Kennikat Press. \$13.50.

Thomas A. Bailey (Bryne Professor of American History, Emeritus), **The Pugnacious Presidents: White House Warriors on Parade.** 1980. Macmillan Free Press.

James J. Barnes and Patience P. Barnes (Wabash College), **Hitler's Mein Kampf in Britain and America, 1930-39.** 1980. Cambridge University Press.

Melvin Small (Wayne State University), **Was War Necessary? National Security and U.S. Entry into War.** 1980. Sage Publications. \$18.00, paperback \$8.95.

Ronald Steel (New York City), **Walter Lippman and the American Century,** 1980. Little and Brown. \$19.95.

Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana University) ed., **Off the Record: the Private papers of Harry S. Truman.** 1980. Harper and Row. \$15.00.

Robert H. Ferrell ed., **The Autobiography of Harry S. Truman,** 1980. Colorado Associated University Press. \$10.00 paper \$4.95.

Ernest E. Rossi and Jack C. Plano (Western Michigan University), **The Latin American Political Dictionary.** 1980. ABC-Clio. \$25.25.



---

## OTHER PUBLICATIONS

---

The National Archives and Records Service has published the first major documentary collection of early Russian-American relations. **The United States and Russia: The Beginning of Relations, 1765-1815** was made possible by an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States on cultural cooperation that was signed in 1973. American members of the editorial board include Milton O. Gustafson (National Archives, SHAFR), David F. Trask (State Department, SHAFR), and S. Frederick Starr. The American editors were John H. Brown, J. Dane Hartgrove (National Archives, SHAFR), Ronald D. Landa (State Department, SHAFR), and Charles S. Sampson. The volume costs \$24.00. It is available from: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. (The stock number is 022-022-00068-6.)

### SCHEDULE OF SHAFR ACTIVITIES AT THE AHA

- Council Meeting, Saturday, December 27  
Room 1042 Sheraton Washington..... 8:00-10:00 p.m.
- Reception (cash bar), Sunday, December 28  
Arlington Room, Sheraton Washington..... 5:00- 7:00 p.m.
- Luncheon, Monday, December 29  
North Cotillion Room, Sheraton Washington .. 2:15- 2:00 p.m.
- Joint Session with AHA. The United States and  
the "United States of Europe" 1941-50.  
Tuesday December 30, Baltimore Room,  
Sheraton Washington ..... 9:00 a.m.

The luncheon will feature David Pletcher's presidential address: "Rhetoric and Results: A Pragmatic View of American Economic Expansionism, 1865-1898." Tickets for the luncheon are to be purchased at the registration area.

\* \* \*



## **ANNOUNCEMENT**

### **Election Returns**

In the recent election for officials of SHAFR, Lawrence Gelfand (University of Iowa) was chosen as vice president. Walter LaFeber (Cornell University) and Sandra Taylor (University of Utah) were elected for three-year terms on the Council, Arnold Offner (Boston University) for a two year term on the Council, and Samuel Wells (Woodrow Wilson Center) to the Nominations Committee.

The proposed amendment to establish a Committee on Government Relations was approved by the membership.

## **NOTICE**

Mack Thompson, Executive Director of the American Historical Association, requests the support of historians to improve public access to official records of the United States House of Representatives.

Thompson asks historians who agree with the proposed amendment of the Federal Records Act to make House records available for use by researchers after 30 years rather than 50 years, to write William G. Phillips, Staff Director, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, H-326 The Capitol, Washington, DC 20515. Mr. Phillips is particularly interested in finding out about "articles or other publications that used House records for primary research, and how access to the materials was obtained." He would also appreciate receiving "copies of articles relating to the need for a records management policy in the House that would support systematic research yet be cognizant of the special needs for confidentiality of legislative records."



## IN MEMORIAM Thomas A. Bryson III

Thomas A. Bryson III, Professor of American Diplomatic History at West Georgia College in Carrollton, died of an apparent heart attack June 10.

A dedicated and prolific scholar, he was the author of seven books and 30 articles. Much of his research dealt with relations between the Middle East and the United States. The high quality of his work was recognized this year by a State Department invitation to be one of 12 qualified experts to participate in a conference with top field officers from the Middle East.

His writings on the United States and the Middle East included a bibliography covering events from 1784 to 1978 and a survey of the diplomacy of the same period. He also wrote in detail on the post World War II developments in the area. His latest book was **Tars, Turks and Yankees: The Role of the United States Navy in the Middle East, 1800-1979.**

A native of Savannah, he graduated from Georgia Southern College in Statesboro. During the Korean Conflict he served in the United States Navy aboard the USS **Henrico**.

He earned his MA and PhD degrees in American Foreign Policy at the University of Georgia, completing his studies in 1965. After two years as an assistant professor at DeKalb Junior College he went to West Georgia College where he taught for 14 years. He remained throughout his career an enthusiastic student eager to learn and anxious to share his knowledge.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Anne Sloss Bryson, and two children, all of Carrollton.

J. Chal Vinson



## SHAFR'S CALENDAR, 1981

- January 1 Membership fees of all categories are due, payable at the National Office of SHAFR.
- January 15 Deadline, nominations for 1981 Bernath article award.
- February 1 Deadline for materials-March **Newsletter**
- February 1 Deadline, nominations for 1981 Bernath book prize.
- February 1 Deadline, proposals for papers and/or panels to be included in the 1981 SHAFR SUMMER MEETING.
- April 1-4 The 74th annual meeting of the OAH will be held in Detroit with headquarters at the Detroit Plaza. There will be the usual SHAFR activities at this meeting.
- May 1 Deadline for materials-June **NEWSLETTER**
- July 30-  
August 1 SHAFR'S seventh annual conference at American University in Washington, D.C.
- August 1 Deadline for materials-September **NEWSLETTER.**
- November 1 Deadline materials-December **Newsletter.**
- November 1-15 Annual elections for officers of SHAFR.
- November 11-14 The 47th annual meeting of the SHA will be held in Louisville with headquarters at the Galt House.
- December 1 Deadline, nominations for 1982 Bernath memorial lectureship.
- December 28-30 The 96th annual convention of the AHA will be held in Los Angeles. As usual, SHAFR will have a full round of activities at this meeting.



---

## THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL LECTURE IN AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC HISTORY

---

The Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Lectureship was established in 1976 through the generosity of Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, Beverly Hills, California, in honor of their late son, and is administered by a special committee of SHAFR. The Bernath Lecture is the feature at the official luncheon of the Society, held during the OAH convention in April of each year.

**DESCRIPTION AND ELIGIBILITY:** The lecture should be comparable in style and scope to the yearly SHAFR presidential address, delivered at the annual meeting with the AHA, but is restricted to younger scholars with excellent reputations for teaching and research. Each lecturer is expected to concern himself/herself not specifically with his/her own research interests, but with broad issues of importance to students of American foreign relations. The award winner must be under forty-one (41) years of age.

**PROCEDURES:** The Bernath Lectureship Committee is now soliciting nominations for the 1982 award from members of the Society, agents, publishers, or members of any established history, political science, or journalism organization. Nominations, in the form of a short letter and curriculum vitae, if available, should reach the Committee no later than December 1, 1980. The Chairman of the Committee, and the person to whom nominations should be sent, is Dr. Keith L. Nelson, Department of History, University of California (Irvine), Irvine, California 92717.

**HONORARIUM:** \$300.00 with publication of the lecture assured in the SHAFR **Newsletter**.

### AWARD WINNERS

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



---

**THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL PRIZE FOR THE  
BEST SCHOLARLY ARTICLE IN U.S. DIPLOMATIC  
HISTORY DURING 1979**

---

The Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Award for scholarly articles in American foreign affairs was set up in 1976 through the kindness of the young Bernath's parents, Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, Beverly Hills, California, and it is administered through selected personnel of SHAFR. The objective of the award is to identify and to reward outstanding research and writing by the younger scholars in the area of U.S. diplomatic relations.

**CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD**

**ELIGIBILITY:** Prize competition is open to the author of any article upon any topic in American foreign relations that is published during 1979. The article must be among the author's first five (5) which have seen publication. Membership in SHAFR or upon a college/university faculty is not a prerequisite for entering the competition. Authors must be under thirty-five (35) years of age, or within five (5) years after receiving the doctorate, at the time the article was published. Previous winners of the S. L. Bernath book award are ineligible.

**PROCEDURES:** Articles shall be submitted by the author or by any member of SHAFR. Five (5) copies of each article (preferably reprints) should be sent to the chairman of the Stuart L. Bernath Article Prize Committee by January 15, 1980. The Chairman of that Committee for 1979 is Dr. Arnold A. Offner, Department of History, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts 02215.

**AMOUNT OF AWARD:** \$200.00. If two (2) or more authors are considered winners, the prize will be shared. The name of the successful writer(s) will be announced, along with the name of the victor in the Bernath book prize competition, during the luncheon for members of SHAFR, to be held at the annual OAH convention, meeting in April, 1980, at San Francisco.

**AWARD WINNERS**

- |      |  |
|------|--|
| 1977 | John C. A. Stagg (U of Auckland, N.Z.)                                       |
| 1978 | Michael H. Hunt (Yale)   |
| 1979 | Brian L. Villa (U of Ottawa, Canada)   |
| 1980 | James I. Matray (U of Texas, Arlington)<br>David A. Rosenberg (U of Chicago) |



---

## THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL BOOK COMPETITION FOR 1980

---

The Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Book Competition was initiated in 1972 by Dr. and Mrs. Gerald J. Bernath, Beverly Hills, California, in memory of their late son. Administered by SHAFR, the purpose of the competition and the award is to recognize and encourage distinguished research and writing of a lengthy nature by young scholars in the field of U.S. diplomacy.

### CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD

**ELIGIBILITY:** the prize competition is open to any book on any aspect of American foreign relations that is published during 1979. It must be the author's first or second book. Authors are not required to be members of SHAFR, nor do they have to be professional academicians.

**PROCEDURES:** Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of SHAFR. Five (5) copies of each book must be submitted with the nomination. The books should be sent to: Dr. Walter F. LaFeber, Department of History Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853. The works must be received not later than February 1, 1980.

**AMOUNT OF AWARD:** \$500.00. If two (2) or more writers are deemed winners, the amount will be shared. The award will be announced at the luncheon for members of SHAFR, held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the OAH which will be April, 1980, in San Francisco.

### PREVIOUS WINNERS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 1972 | Joan Hoff Wilson (Sacramento)<br>Kenneth E. Shewmaker (Dartmouth)                    |
| 1973 | John L. Gaddis (Ohio U)  |
| 1974 | Michael H. Hunt (Yale)   |
| 1975 | Frank D. McCann, Jr. (New Hampshire)<br>Stephen E. Pelz (U of Massachusetts-Amherst) |
| 1976 | Martin J. Sherwin (Princeton)  |
| 1977 | Roger V. Dingman (Southern California)   |
| 1978 | James R. Leutze (North Carolina)   |
| 1979 | Phillip J. Baram (Program Manager, Boston, MA)                                       |
| 1980 | Michael Schaller (U of Arizona)  |





This second issue of our newsletter will focus on conference papers delivered since 1978. Our next issues this Spring and Summer will provide information on research in progress and a bibliography of books and articles published since 1978. We welcome information from anyone who has not already responded to our questionnaire. Please write to Mordechai Rozanski, Office of International Education, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, Washington 98447.

\* \* \* \* \*

---

**PAPERS AND CONFERENCES IN AMERICAN-EAST ASIAN  
RELATIONS**

---

Only papers presented **since** 1978 are listed. The conferences from which this list were drawn include those of the American Historical Association, the Organization of American Historians and the Association for Asian Studies. In addition, major special conferences on topics relating to the field were included. In general, the list does not include papers given at regional historical meetings unless their titles were sent to us in response to our questionnaire.

**Michael Schaller**

---

**THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN HISTORIANS, 71ST, MEETING,  
APRIL 12-15, 1978, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK**

---

Warren I. Cohen, "Dean Rush-American Liberal."

Gary R. Hess, "The American Search for Stability in Indochina, 1945-50: Acceptance of the 'Bao Dai Solution.' "

Gareth Porter, "Bombing and Negotiating: The 1973 Paris Peace Agreement."

Noel H. Pugach, 'Anglo-American Relations in East Asia, 1914-1928.'

Ronald Spector, "The 'One War in Asia.' General DeLattre de Tassigny, the United States and the First Vietnam War 1950-54."



---

**MacARTHUR MEMORIAL SYMPOSIUM, THE OCCUPATION OF  
JAPAN: ECONOMIC POLICY AND REFORM, APRIL 13-15, 1978,  
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA**

---

Burton F. Beers, "American Images of Occupied Japan: Some Notes on the Literature as Cold War History."

William S. Borden, "The U.S. and Japanese Trade Recovery, 1950-52."

Roger W. Buckley, "The British Foreign Office and Economic Policy for Japan."

Theodore Cohen, "Labor Democratization in Japan: The First Years."

Henry Esterly, "Overseas Fisheries and International Politics in the Occupation of Japan, 1945-1952."

Ikuhiko Hata, "Japan Under the Occupation."

Leon Hollerman, "The Formation of International Economic Policy During the Occupation of Japan."

Hiromitsu Kaneda, "Structural Change and Policy Response in Japanese Agriculture after the Land Reform."

Marlene Mayo, "American Economic Planning for Occupied Japan: The Issue of Zaibatsu Dissolution, 1942-1945."

Orville J. McDiarmid, "The Dodge and Young Missions."

Ariga Michiko, "Deconcentration During the Occupation of Japan."

Dick Nanto, "The Dodge Line: A Re-evaluation."

Robert S. Ozaki, "The Impact of Deconcentration: A Twisted Dream and an Ironic Consequence."

Frank J. Sackton, "The Transfer of Land Ownership to the Peasants: The Priceless Economic Reform."

Howard Schonberger, "The Dodge Mission and American Diplomacy, 1949-1950."

Koji Taira, "Unions, Ideologies, and Revolutions in Japanese Enterprise During the Occupation."



---

**CONFERENCE IN THE CAUSES OF THE COLD WAR AND SINO-AMERICAN RELATIONS, JUNE 9-11, 1978, MT. KISCO, NEW YORK**

---

Warren I. Cohen, "Acheson, His Advisers, and China, 1949-1950."

John L. Gaddis, "The Rise and Fall of the 'Defensive Perimeter' Concept:" United States Strategy in the Far East, 1947-1951."

Michael Hunt, "Mao Tse-tung and the Issue of Accommodation with the United States, 1948-1950."

Martin J. Sherwin, "The White House, the Red Menace, and the Yellow Peril: An Inquiry Into the Relationship Between U.S. Policy Toward China During the Roosevelt-Truman Administrations and the Origins and Evolution of Containment, 1942-1950."

Nancy Bernkopf Tucker, "The Decline of Nationalist China and Its Impact on Sino-American Relations."

---

**THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 28-30, 1978, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

---

Daniel H. Bays, "The Missionary Audience: Chinese Christian Converts in the Nineteenth Century."

Jacques M. Downs, "The Mercantile Origins of American China Policy, 1784-1844."

John English, "Canadian Recognition of China: An Incident in Canadian-American Relations."

Jonathan Goldstein, "The Decorative Arts of the Old China Trade: Their Influence in America to 1846."

Akira Iriye, "Culture and Power: Intercultural Dimensions of International Relations."

Wayne Patterson, "The Korean Frontier in America: Immigration to Hawaii, 1896-1910."

James E. Reed, "China in American Eyes: Public Opinion and China Policy, 1958-68."

Murray Rubenstein, "The Northeastern Connection: American Board Missionaries and the Formation of American Opinion Toward China, 1830-1860."

John J. Sbrega, "Anglo-American Perspective (on Indochina): A Comparison, 1940-45."



Robert W. Sellen, "The French Perspective (on Indochina), 1940-45."

Barbara Welter, "The Nineteenth-Century China Missionary: Changes in Perspective."

Donald H. White, "The American Perspective (on Indochina): The Department of State, 1940-45."

---

**THE ASSOCIATION OF ASIAN STUDIES, 31ST MEETING, MARCH  
30-APRIL 1, 1979, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

---

Barton Bernstein, "The Struggle Over the Armistice."

Won Moo Hurh, "Social and Occupational Assimilation of Korean Immigrants to the United States."

Hak-joon Kim, "The Origins of the Korean War from Korean Sources."

Nancy Lee Kroschmann, "American Wives and Japanese Husbands: The Construction of an Intercultural Marriage."

Changsoo Lee and Hiroshi Wagatsuma, "The Settlement of Koreans in Los Angeles: A Demographic Survey."

Don Chang Lee and Robert H. Kin, "The Korean Church as an Agency for the Assimilation of Korean Immigrants in the United States."

Marlene J. Mayo, "Deconcentration and the Reverse Course: Washington and Tokyo, 1945-1948."

Yasuko Minoura, "Learning the Grammar of Interpersonal Relations: Japanese Children Growing up in Los Angeles."

Ray A. Moore, "Saving the Japanese Imperial Institution."

Dian Murray, "Cantonese Piracy and the Foreign Maritime World."

Masao Okonogi, "The Korean War: The Structure of International Civil War."

Wayne Patterson, "A Profile of Early Korean Immigrants to America."

Joseph Jay Tobin, "Dependent, Independence, and **Amae**: American Reaction to Living in Japan."

Samuel F. Wells, Jr., "Impact of the Korean War on United States Strategic Programs."

Merry White, "The Rites of Return: Re-entry and Re-integration of Japanese Businessmen."



---

**THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN HISTORIANS, 72nd MEETING,  
APRIL 11-14, 1979, NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA**

---

Ellen P. Conant, "Ernest Fenollasa: Yankee Philosopher and Imperial Commissioner of Art in Japan."

Robert A. Rosenstone, "Learning from those 'Imitative' Japanese: Another Side of the 19th Century American Experience in the Mikado's Empire."

Eckard V. Toy, "The Pacific Coast Race Relations Survey: Sociologists and Japanese in the 1920's."

Marilyn B. Young, "Revisionists Revised: The Case of Vietnam."

---

**THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 27-30,  
1979, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK**

---

Sister Susan Bradshaw, O.S.F., "Catholic Sisters in China: An Effort to Raise the Status of Women."

Robert J. C. Butow, "Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Far East."

Bruce Cumings, "The Course of U.S. Policy Toward Korea, 1942-50: Internationalism to Containment to Rollback and Back Again."

Roger V. Dingman, "The Truman-MacArthur Controversy Revisited."

Kathleen L. Lodwick, "The Chinese Recorder: Its Scope and Content: Report on the Index."

Norman G. Owen, "Accommodation in Albany: Winding Down the Filipino-American War."

Stephen E. Pelz, "Truman's Decision to Cross the Thirty-Eighth Parallel, July to September 1950."

Yu-ming Shaw, "Ideals and Strategies of John Leighton Stuart as a Missionary Educator."

Paul A. Varg, "Sino-American Relations and the Limits of Diplomacy."

---

**THE ASSOCIATION FOR ASIAN STUDIES, 32nd MEETING, MARCH  
21-23, 1980, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

---

Nguyen Van Chau, "International Implications of Indochina Refugees."



- King C. Chen, "The Implications of the Sino-Vietnamese Conflict."
- William L. Givens, "The Facts and Implications of Japan's Displacing the United States as the World's Leading Industrial Power."
- Guy Gran, "Development Versus the World System: The World Bank in Indonesia and Thailand, 1960-80."
- Maj. General Sohn Jangnai, "A Korean View."
- Yur-bok Lee, "Korean Relationships with the United States, 1887-89."
- Craig A. Lockard, "Global Change, the World-System Approach and the Study of Modern Southeast Asian History."
- Jonathan Pollack, "Chinese Security Issues in the 1980's."
- Peter A. Poole, "The Vietnamese-Cambodian Conflict and the 'Indochina Federation.' "
- Leonard C. Pronko, "Sweet Revenge: Kabuki East and West."
- William V. Rapp, "Policy Alternatives (viz. Japan) for the U.S."
- Thomas W. Robinson, "The United States and the Indochina Conflict."
- David Shambaugh, "China's Defense Industries: Indigenous Development and Foreign Procurement."
- Robert T. Snow, "Southeast Asia in the World System: The Origins and Consequences of Export-Oriented Industrialization."
- General Richard G. Stilwell, "Keeping the Peace in Northeast Asia: An American View."
- Lt. General Yoshio Takenaka, "A Japanese View."
- Raju G.C. Thomas, "Security Relationships in Southern Asia: Differences in Indian and United States Perspectives."
- Vice-Admiral Ko Tun-hwa, "A Chinese View."
- Ezra Vogel, "Japan as Number One--The Lessons for America."
- Donald S. Zagoria, "Soviet Policy Toward the Indochina Conflict."



---

**THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN HISTORIANS, 73rd MEETING,  
APRIL 9-12, 1980, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

---

Jack Calhoun, "The Vietnam War--The New Revisionism and Its Critics."

George Herring, "The Nixon-Kissinger Foreign Policy in Asia."

---

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE OCCUPATION OF JAPAN,  
AUGUST 20-23, 1980, AMHERST COLLEGE, AMHERST,  
MASSACHUSETTS**

---

Jun Eto, "Occupation Censorship and Its Impact on the Japanese Creative Mind."

Peter Frost, "Changing Gears: The Concept of the Reverse Course in Studies of the Occupation."

Takeshi Igarashi, "George Kennan and NSC 13/2."

Joe B. Moore, "From Industrial Unionism to Enterprise Unions: Workers Control During the Occupation of Japan."

Gail Mieko Nomura, "The Labor Standards Law of 1947 and Its Effects on Women Workers."

Donald T. Roden, "Guidance for Equality and Self-Identity: Training Deans of Women During the Occupation of Japan."

Michael Schaller and James Elston, "Securing the Great Crescent: The Dodge Line and Containment in Southeast Asia."

Howard Schonberger, "General William F. Draper, Jr., the 80th Congress, and the Origins of Japan's Reverse Course."

Eiichi Schindo, "Japan Divided: The Soviet Spectre and American Bases."

Eiji Takemae, "Revision of the Labor Relations Law of 1949."

Harold Wray, "CI & E, the Mombusho, and the Japan Education Reform Committee."



---

**NINTH MILITARY HISTORY SYMPOSIUM, "THE AMERICAN  
MILITARY AND THE FAR EAST" OCTOBER 1-3, 1980, U. S. AIR  
FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO**

---

Sadao Asada, "Japanese Perceptions of the A-Bomb Decision, 1945-1980."

Roger V. Dingman, "The American Military Presence in East Asia, 1900-1945."

Col. Roy K. Flint, "The U.S. Army on the Pacific Frontier."

John M. Gates, "The Pacification of the Philippines, 1898-1902."

Norman A. Graebner, "The Far East: The Evolution of a Commitment: 1945-1960."

Ikuhiko Hata, "Japanese Occupation, 1945-52."

D. Clayton James, "The MacArthur Viewpoint."

Frank A. Kierman, "Ironies of Chinese-American Military Contact."

C. I. Eugene Kim, "The Korean Experience."

Col. John Schlight, "The Impact of Air Power (on U.S. Asia Policy)."

Capt. Paul R. Schratz, "The Effect of the Orient on U.S. Naval Strategy."

Ronald Spector, "The First Vietnamization: U.S. Advisors and Vietnam."

---

**MacARTHUR MEMORIAL SYMPOSIUM, THE OCCUPATION OF  
JAPAN: EDUCATIONAL AND SOCIAL REFORM, OCTOBER 16-18,  
1980, NORFOLK, VIRGINIA**

---

Gary D. Allinson, "Spoil Not the System: Civil Service Reforms and the American Occupation."

Edward R. Beauchamp, "First U.S. Education Mission to Japan, 1946."

Gordon Daniels, "Social Reform in Postwar Japan-British Perspectives."

Peter Frost, "Examination Hell: Reform of Entrance Examinations in Occupied Japan."

Norman Graebner, "Occupation Policy and the Schools of Yokohama, 1945-46."

Angus M. Gunn, "Democratization of Education in Japan."



- Sidney Klein, "Land Reform: The Educational and Social Dimension."
- Marlene Mayo, "Pre-Occupation Educational Reform Planning."
- Yuichi Nakamura, "The Development of Postwar Japanese Social Welfare: The Occupation Period and Afterwards."
- Toshio Nishi, "Education During Meiji-Taisho-Showa Periods."
- Toshiuki Nishikawa, "Thirty Years After the Allied Occupation."
- Susan J. Pharr, "The Bureaucratic Politics of Social Reform: The Birth of the Women's and Minors' Bureau in Japan."
- Toshio Tatara, "The Allied Occupation and Japanese Welfare."
- Vivian E. Todd, "Education and Social Reform Through Enlightened Curriculum Development."
- Elizabeth Gray Vining, "An American View of Educational Reform from the Japanese Side."
- Donald V. Wilson, "Democratization of the Japanese Welfare System: SCAP Policy on the **Minsel In** System."
- Harry Wray, "C I & E Objective of Decentralizing Japanese Education."

---

**PAPERS DELIVERED AT VARIOUS OTHER CONFERENCES,  
1978-1980**

---

- Thomas A. Breslin, "The Role of Catholicism in the First Chinese Revolution," **Southeast Conference, Association for Asian Studies**, January 1978.
- Thomas H. Etzold, "The Far East in American Strategy, 1948-1951," **Harvard East Asia Center Conference on Security in Northeast Asia**, June 1978.
- Irwin T. Hyatt, Jr, "Hunter Corbett and the Shantung Presbyterian Church, 1864-1920," **Mid-Atlantic Region, Association for Asian Studies**, October 1979.
- Howard Schonberger, "Of Arms and Men: Harry F. Kern and the Corruption of Postwar Japan," **New England Association of Asian Studies, October 1979.**
- Akira Iriye, "Wartime Japanese Planning for Postwar Asia," **Conference on World War II**, London, July 1979.



Allbert Dayer, "The Political Influence of Foreign Bankers in China, 1921-1925: The Customs Surplus Issue," **Pacific Coast Branch, American Historical Association**, August 1979.

F. Gilbert Chan, "Sino-American Reapproachment and the Future of Taiwan," **Midwest Conference of Asian Affairs**, November 1979.

Marlene J. Mayo, "The Problem of the Emperor in the American Occupation of Japan: War Criminal or Patron of Democracy?" **Southeast Conference, Association for Asian Studies**, January 1980.

PAPERS DELIVERED AT VARIOUS OTHER CONFERENCES

1978-1989



## THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

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

**EDITOR:** William Brinker, Department of History, Tennessee Tech, Cookeville, Tennessee 38501.

**EDITORIAL ASSISTANT:** William K. Baker, Tennessee Tech.

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

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

**ADDRESS CHANGES:** Notification of address changes should be in the office of the editor at least one month prior to the date of publication. Copies of the **Newsletter** which are returned because of faulty addresses will be forwarded only upon the payment of a fee of \$1.00.

**BACK ISSUES:** Copies of most back numbers of the **Newsletter** are available and may be obtained from the editorial office upon the payment of a service charge of 75¢ per number. If the purchaser lives abroad, the charge is \$1.00 per number.

**MATERIALS DESIRED:** Personals (promotions, transfers, obituaries, honors, awards), announcements, abstracts of scholarly papers and articles delivered--or published--upon diplomatic subjects, bibliographical or historiographical essays dealing with diplomatic topics, essays of a "how-to-do-it" nature respecting the use of diplomatic materials in various (especially foreign) depositories, biographies and autobiographies of "elder statesmen" in the field of U. S. diplomacy, and even jokes (for fillers) if upon diplomatic topics. Authors of "straight" diplomatic articles should send their opuses to **Diplomatic History**. Space limitations forbid the carrying of book reviews by the **Newsletter**.

### FORMER PRESIDENTS OF SHAFR

- |      |   |
|------|---|
| 1968 | Thomas A. Bailey (Stanford)                         |
| 1969 | Alexander De Conde (U of California--Santa Barbara) |
| 1970 | Richard W. Leopold (Northwestern)                   |
| 1971 | Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana)                         |
| 1972 | Norman A. Graebner (Virginia)                       |
| 1973 | Wayne S. Cole (Maryland)                            |
| 1974 | Bradford Perkins (Michigan)                         |
| 1975 | Armin H. Rappaport (U of California--San Diego)     |
| 1976 | Robert A. Divine (Texas)                            |
| 1977 | Raymond A. Esthus (Tulane)                          |
| 1978 | Akira Iriye (Chicago)                               |
| 1979 | Paul A. Varg (Michigan State)                       |



Box 5146  
TENNESSEE TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY  
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED  
**EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS**

Bulk Rate  
U.S. Postage Paid  
Permit No. 101  
Cookeville, Tenn.  
38501

F000084700  
ROBERT D SCHULZ INGER  
DEPT OF HISTORY  
UNIV OF COLORADO  
BOULDER, CO

80309