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The Past is More Than Prologue: Reflections on the Cold War and the War on Terror

Marc J. Selverstone

From virtually the moment the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon occurred, commentators sought to locate September 11, 2001, within a broader historical narrative. Aside from the parallels several observers drew between the Barbary Pirates and al Qaeda, or Pearl Harbor and 9/11, it was the Cold War that was cited most frequently as the relevant historical analogue. Supporters as well as critics of the Bush administration found sources of strength in that conflict, especially in its earliest phases, for what both regarded as important battles that lay ahead. From the reorganization of the national security state to the growth of executive power, from the creation of a bipartisan consensus to the characterization of the enemy itself, the Cold War struggle against Communism provided pundits, scholars, and policymakers with a model for how to move forward in the post-9/11 environment.

But this conversation between the two eras has been decidedly one-sided--a monologue, as it were. If history is supposed to be a dialogue with the past, then at some point historians will need to reverse the flow. They have made a start; 9/11 has helped focus more attention, for instance, on the dynamics of “blowback” and U.S. policy on counterterrorism. But the lion's share of this commentary has invoked the past merely as prologue. It is time to turn this situation on its head and begin to ask just what, if anything, the War on Terror can help us learn about the Cold War. Three questions, drawn from the post-9/11 era and employed heuristically, may help to shed light on this matter.

I. “Why Do They Hate Us?”

This question was perhaps the most pointed one on people’s lips immediately following 9/11. In their initial responses, as well as some recent ones, writers were almost uniform in charging that Americans were targeted because of who they are — that war had been declared on the United States because of the freedoms it holds dear. Over time, as passions cooled, commentators began to pay more attention to the various causes of terrorism. Even the Bush administration, while not backing away from its belief that al Qaeda were wholly to blame for 9/11, saw the need to address the wider roots of terrorism. Inherent in these more recent inquiries was the notion that terrorists hate Americans for what they do. Much of that hatred was believed to stem at least in part from U.S. support of Israel in its struggle with the Arab world and the Palestinians, American backing of autocratic regimes throughout the oil-rich Middle East, and the continued presence of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia long after the end of the 1991 Gulf War.

As the pendulum swung between these two explanations, responses began to converge, with some observers arguing that the United States is hated because what it is and what it does cannot be disentangled. Whether condemning the very notions of secularism, materialism, and liberalism, on the one hand, or the byproducts of these values on the other, terrorists regard all of these dynamics as inherently Western and ultimately American. That linkage fueled the rage that led to the events of 9/11. It is not unreasonable, then, to suggest that the deeply unsettling impact of modernity itself is what seems to lie at the root of the new Islamic terrorism, an impulse that some commentators have taken to calling “religious totalitarianism.”
These are not the first totalitarians to emerge from the disruptions of modernity. Communism and Nazism both gained traction in response to the social convulsions attending the modern age. If this new brand of totalitarianism is indeed detritus from the Cold War, its appearance suggests that there might be good reason to regard both the Cold War and the World War that preceded it as part of a larger struggle to grapple with the shock of modernity. A small but growing literature exists on this subject, much of which focuses on the post-1945 period and employs modernization theory to understand the Cold War in terms of the forces loosed by industrialization and modern state construction.

But this narrative can be carried back at least to the October Revolution of 1917. The battle for the world’s “hearts and minds” that V.I. Lenin and Woodrow Wilson began to wage in earnest that year, a battle their successors continued throughout the 1920s and 1930s, grew out of the seismic disruptions of the Great War and intensified during the Great Depression—events that were themselves outgrowths of broader developments which, collectively, have been equated with the rise of modernity. The ideological battle between capitalism and communism intensified in the postwar world as East and West sought to win political allies, and continued to rage during the 1950s and 1960s amid efforts to shape the economic and political futures of the developing world. Fast-forward to the problems besetting the modern Middle East, with its great disparities in wealth and political opportunity, and the cultural inroads made in that region by the West. These societal challenges were created and subsequently magnified by dynamics stretching back at least to the turn of the century that transformed both the nations of the Middle East and the international system. All of which is to suggest that modernization theory, which has offered a useful lens for understanding the microhistory of the Cold War, may also prove helpful in establishing the Cold War itself as part of a broader continuum, with the present era constituting yet another battle in the Wars of Modernity.

II. “What’s the Matter With Kansas?”

This was the query that Thomas Frank posed as he sought to uncover the reasons, outside of judicial intervention, for George W. Bush’s victory in the 2000 presidential election. While Frank focused much of his study on the dominance of cultural issues over economic ones—a dynamic very much in play in the 2004 campaign as well—that more recent contest apparently turned on matters related to foreign policy. Fear—and not just concern about threats to “traditional” values, but real, palpable fear about issues of life and death—was paramount in the 2004 election. John Kerry, the Democratic challenger, was simply unable to convince a majority of voters that he both understood that fear and could be trusted with addressing it. In fact, Kerry’s description of future terrorist attacks on U.S. interests as a lamentable yet inevitable “nuisance” played right into the Republican strategy of questioning his ability to understand the challenge facing the country. How could Kerry adequately defend America if he persisted in treating those who would fly airplanes into buildings—and conceivably do much worse—as mere irritants? Didn’t he know there was a war going on? A war against terror?

This last question has sparked a fair amount of debate, as commentators have regularly taken issue with the declared object of America’s wrath. Terror is hardly a fit target for attack, the argument runs, for it is a tactic, not an ideology or political doctrine. Focusing on the method as opposed to the madness behind it ignores the more complex dynamics that give rise to such behavior and ultimately limits our effectiveness in combating it. But comparatively few observers have probed the first assumption built into the “War on Terror” label. Is this really a war? If so, how did it come to be seen as one and what are the consequences of treating it as such?

Within twelve hours of the 9/11 attacks, the Bush administration christened the new reality confronting America as a “War on Terror.” Countless news outlets repeated the phrase, hammering it into the national consciousness. Popular acceptance of the notion that the United States was now at war had profound consequences for American political culture as well as for efforts to prevent future assaults on U.S. interests. Much of that impact was structural. The administration seized the opportunity to redesign the national security establishment, alter the nation’s approach to civil liberties, draw broader veils of secrecy over executive branch measures and deliberations, and lay the basis for wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. But
couching the nation’s response to 9/11 as a “War on Terror” also allowed the administration and its allies to marginalize policies, such as those put forward by John Kerry, that downplayed a military response in favor of diplomatic, bureaucratic, financial, and legal options. In so doing, the Republicans were able to tap into the public’s sense of existential fear and persuade the electorate that only a leader who understood the gravity of the situation could be trusted with the nation’s welfare.

What is so intriguing about the Republicans’ apocalyptic rhetoric is that their standard-bearer is not a politician with a Spenglerian take on history but one whose outlook is precisely the opposite. And it is not only George W. Bush who is endowed with great confidence about America and its ability to remake the world. As James Mann has written, several key members of the Bush team share a deeply held sense of optimism. Their perspective, moreover, was not just the private worldview they brought to policymaking. It was the foundation of their reelection strategy in 2004.

What are we to make of such optimism when it is combined with rhetoric intended to instill fear in the electorate? How are we to square the apparent disconnect between a public that is terrified about what the future holds yet remains gung-ho about the administration’s ambitious foreign policy agenda? If we could ask the question again, what really was going on with Kansas last November?

The relationship between the attitudes of policymakers and the American public, and our difficulty in readily explaining it, hearkens back to a similar dynamic from the early Cold War that is deserving of more scholarly attention. Perhaps the relevant historical question might be, “What was the matter with Kansas in 1947?” One such problem might have been the pervasive sense of angst hanging in the air, an affliction that several contemporaries labeled the dominant mood of the time. Policymakers shared that feeling, with George Kennan perhaps the best known of those who were dubious about America’s ability to wage a cold war over the course of at least a generation. But more central to that outlook was a shared pessimism about the prospects for democracy elsewhere in the postwar world. Certainly the strength of West European Communist parties, as well as those linked to nationalist movements in developing nations, gave Truman officials pause. But it was the unpredictability of democracy, as well as the looming menace of communism, that American statesmen found so threatening. With the “whole political economy of freedom” up for grabs in 1947, as Melvyn Leffler has written, Truman sought to dramatize the challenge facing America in bold and provocative terms. His administration, as various scholars have indicated, may have oversold the costs of U.S. inaction. But how much did his anticommunist program, outlined in his congressional address on aid to Greece and Turkey, need to be magnified to make it consonant with the scope of America’s insecurity?

This debate is far from settled. Scholars have long noted the yo-yoing of policymakers’ rhetoric and public attitudes, with one leading the other at one point and then the situation reversing itself. Attractive as it might be, this “push-pull” model is too simplistic, for the Truman administration seems not to have magnified that general sense of anxiety so much as focused it, doing for the American public what the Long Telegram did for American public servants. A more rigorous analysis of 1940’s political culture, examining what Americans were reading in their living rooms, hearing on their radios, seeing in the theaters, learning in the classroom —for starters—would deepen our understanding of how that generation heard the president’s message.

Absent from this cultural mix of the early Truman era was a neat, descriptive name for the challenge facing the United States. Although the American public had clearly soured on its wartime alliance with Moscow—the percentage of those who expected Soviet cooperation in postwar affairs had dropped from 52 percent in September 1945 to 25 percent in March 1947— there was as yet no name for the troubled relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. In other words, the public had yet to learn it was in a “cold war” with the Kremlin. By way of comparison, the phrase “War on Terror” entered the national consciousness at the same time as the actions that led to its emergence. President Bush lent that term official sanction and it remains to this day the leading, if not the only, name for the post-9/11 epoch. The term “cold war,” on the other hand, seeped into the lexicon over the course of several years, reflecting the history of the events it sought to describe. When media sources invoked it, they did so only occasionally by attaching the “so-called” qualifying prefix: the “so-called Cold War.” Aside from instances in which it was used by various left-leaning publications critical of
U.S. policy toward the Soviets, the term never had the pejorative connotations attached to the “so-called War on Terror,” which is a staple of overseas commentary and Internet blogs, and has also appeared in Bob Herbert’s columns for the New York Times. More to the point, Truman's message to Congress outlining his anticommunist program actually preceded widespread familiarity of the term “cold war” by at least six months, suggesting, perhaps, that popular recognition of the new international reality, as codified in an easily identifiable term, had little bearing on early Cold War policymaking.

Would the same have been true for George Bush had he not locked in the notion of a War on Terror? What is the relationship between recognition that a new reality exists and the consciousness that takes shape alongside it? Could a “Cold War consciousness” emerge without the notion of a cold war underlying it? Did the identification of the postwar reality as a “Cold War,” which was showing up with greater frequency in the pages of newspapers and magazines in 1948, actually limit opportunities to engage the American public in a more searching dialogue about the nature of international communism? In short, was at least one dimension of the Cold War contingent on popular recognition of a “cold war”?

Given our current experience with the War on Terror, this might be a question worth considering.

III. “Are You With Us or Against Us?”

This third and final question, phrased most forcefully by President Bush as a declarative statement, was raised within days of the attacks and offers clear parallels to the language of the Cold War. Much of the post-9/11 rhetoric, in fact, with its invocation of an American mission, its anti-neutralism, its definition of the enemy (and its definition of friends, for that matter), hearkens back to familiar Cold War themes. While this particular question speaks most clearly to the matter of anti-neutralism, its formulation is so stark as to throw a spotlight on the matter of rhetoric itself.

One of the more striking characteristics of the president’s rhetoric in the days and weeks following 9/11 was its religious cast. To be sure, Bush sought to avoid classifying the War on Terror as a religious war or even a war between civilizations. America’s enemy, he declared, was neither Islam nor the Arab world, nor the people of any particular nation. Yet his repeated reference to “evil” as the impetus for the attacks—he invoked the concept four times in his radio address on 9/11—suggests that there was indeed a religious dimension to this conflict. At one time, the president even characterized America’s response to 9/11 as a “crusade,” explicitly invoking images of Christian warriors routing the infidels. None of this should come as a surprise; Bush’s faith is well known, having been documented frequently both during and since the 2000 campaign. Indeed, the president’s belief that the invasion of Iraq would restore liberty—what he described as “God’s gift to humanity”—suggests that Bush thought he was carrying out the Lord’s will on Earth.

This sense of divine mission was similarly evident in the Cold War and has long been a staple of writing on America’s cultural response to that conflict. Historians have explored an array of related topics, including the influence of figures such as Billy Graham, Francis Cardinal Spellman, and Reinhold Niebuhr; the rise in religious affiliation and attendance at houses of worship; and the wide range of public ceremonies suffused with religious content, from prayer breakfasts to an amended Pledge of Allegiance. But with few exceptions, the majority of this work has focused on the 1950s. There has been no comparable outpouring of literature on the late 1940s that incorporates this religious dimension—and certainly none that aims at a comprehensive account of America’s early postwar response to the Soviet challenge. With all that has been written in the past several years about George W. Bush and his public appeals to faith, the role that faith plays in his approach to the world, the administration’s courting of religious communities, and the manner in which the War on Terror has been framed by a religious narrative, scholars might do well to refocus their energies on how a comparable dynamic informed America’s response to the U.S.S.R.—and not just in the 1950s, when the battle lines had hardened, but in the late 1940s, when the emerging international reality had yet to coalesce.

These questions—“Are You With Us or Against Us?,” “What’s the Matter with Kansas?,” and “Why Do They Hate Us?”—may have resonated not unlike other questions that scholars have asked over the course of the previous half-century. During that time,
developments within the profession, as well as in the world at large, generated successive waves of historical revision on the Cold War, offering greater perspective on the origins and evolution of that conflict. Recently, of course, the emergence of a new set of political realities following the shocks of 1989 through 1991 had a significant impact on Cold War historiography. Apparently, more recent political realities have yet to make their mark on the field. Thus far, historians of the Cold War have done an admirable job of bringing the past into the present. At some point, they will need to reverse the process and shine the light of the present—in the questions they ask—more consciously back on the past.

I would like to thank my colleagues David Coleman and Kent Germany for their thoughts on this essay.
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In “New Evidence from Vietnam,” an article published in the December 2004 issue of Passport, I mentioned the recent publication of a collection of Vietnamese documents entitled Van kien Dang: Toan tap (Party documents: Complete works; hereafter referred to as VKDIT). The collection consists of instructions, resolutions, and guidelines from core members and organs of the Vietnamese Communist Party (VCP) and its previous incarnations, mainly the Indochinese Communist Party and the Vietnamese Workers’ Party, on a wide range of domestic and international issues. As of mid-December 2005, National Political Publishers (NPP) had released several more volumes, extending the series to 1981 (Volume 42). According to officials at NPP, the last volume they have planned is Volume 49, which will appear in 2006 and will take the series to 1988. There are still no definite plans to publish the series in English.

For those interested in Hanoi’s response to the American intervention in the South from 1954 to 1975 or to the air war against the North that began in 1965, NPP recently published a compilation of sixty-five party and government documents relevant to those topics. Entitled Ve dau tranh thong nhat nuoc ta (On the Struggle to Reunify the Fatherland), this single-volume compendium includes some of the best documents from VKDIT, along with materials from various other sources, including the collected works of Ho Chi Minh and Le Duan, who was head (or “first secretary”) of the party throughout the period of direct American military intervention. It also features a series of original works and excerpts from sources previously published by Vietnamese scholars, diplomats, party members, and military staff. Of the edited volumes published on the American war in Vietnam, this one may be the most indispensable.

Among the most revealing documents reproduced in this compilation are: (1) a resolution drafted by the Party Central Committee in late March 1965, some three weeks after the deployment of the first American combat forces in South Vietnam and the beginning of the sustained bombing of the North, on the “situation and urgent responsibilities” facing the Revolution in the new context; (2) excerpts from a January 1968 Party Central Committee resolution discussing various dimensions of the upcoming “general offensive” (i.e., the Tet Offensive), including its implementation and projected outcome; (3) a March 27, 1972 Politburo cable to southern revolutionary leaders, discussing the party’s interpretation of, concerns over, and strategy for undermining the American policy of Vietnamization; (4) a September 20, 1972 cable to the Central Office for South Vietnam (Trung uong Cuc, the party’s central command in the South) from Le Duan, suggesting the imminent finalization of a peace settlement with the United States and delineating the office’s responsibilities following the settlement’s signing; and (5) a series of seven cables sent by the Politburo to southern military commanders between March 27 and April 22, 1975, outlining the party’s strategy for completing the “liberation” of the South by defeating the South Vietnamese armed forces and the Saigon regime that commanded them. Collectively, these and other documents offer invaluable insights into the policymaking process in Hanoi during the war. Most important, they answer myriad questions that have long perplexed American diplomatic historians by revealing the party’s position on various military, political, and diplomatic issues and disclosing the “real” motivations behind some of the most momentous decisions the party made, such as launching the Tet Offensive in early 1968 and completing a negotiated agreement with the United States in the fall of 1972.

There is also good news for diplomatic historians who cannot access primary materials in Vietnamese. Earlier this year, The Gio Publishers (TGP) released 75 Years of the Communist Party of Vietnam (1930-2005): A Selection of Documents from Nine Party Congresses. This book contains more than a thousand pages of documents and is an invaluable tool for those
interested in accurately tracing the course of the Vietnamese Revolution. It also features a concise, official history of the VCP and a detailed chronology, both of which are useful to scholars trying to understand the mindset of Hanoi policymakers during and after the war with the United States. While some of the materials in this volume appeared in whole or in part elsewhere, this is the most accurate and comprehensive collection of its kind to date. A generous and substantively comprehensive section on the 1960 National Party Congress will be of interest to those seeking new insights into the origins of the insurgency in South Vietnam. Besides demonstrating the extent to which ideological considerations inspired foreign and domestic policymaking in Hanoi during a crucial stage of the Revolution, the documents reproduced in this section reveal the importance the party accorded to the development of a socialist economy in the North, even as tensions in the South escalated. Since conditions at the time militated against holding national congresses—the next one did not take place until after reunification in 1976—some of the priorities set by the party in 1960 served to inform North Vietnamese policymaking for the duration of the war, and scholars will find amidst these materials the raison d’être for some of the most consequential initiatives undertaken by Hanoi immediately before and during its war against the Americans and their Saigon “puppets.”

One particularly incisive document featured in the new volume is the political report submitted by the Central Committee and disseminated to delegates to the 1960 congress. Reproduced in its entirety, it offers an interesting overview of the war against France and the Geneva negotiations that ended it. It also discusses at length the effort to build socialism in the North after 1954, offering fascinating details about issues ranging from the development of heavy industry—which the Central Committee believed had to be achieved “at all costs”—to the “promotion of a broad mass movement of artistic and literary creation” to facilitate the fulfillment of revolutionary tasks by the membership and the masses. With respect to the situation in the South, the report predicts continued “interference” by the United States, which would culminate in “the unleashing of a new aggressive war, in an attempt to conquer our country and to transform it into a spring-board for the struggle against the socialist camp, undermining the national liberation movement in South-east Asia and world peace.” Under the circumstances, the Central Committee felt that building socialism in the North was vital, since “the more solid and stable the North becomes, the more chance we have of frustrating the warmongering and aggressive schemes of the US imperialists and their henchmen.”

Also available in English and published recently (2004) by TGP is a book by Nguyen Dy Nien entitled Ho Chi Minh Thought on Diplomacy, which considers the history of and inspirations for Vietnamese communist foreign policymaking before, during, and after the war against the United States. For those unfamiliar with it, Ho Chi Minh Thought (tu tuong Ho Chi Minh) is essentially a syncretic “ideological foundation” derived from Ho Chi Minh’s writings and deeds as well as other sources, particularly the writings and philosophies of Marx, Lenin, and Mao. The VCP declared it an official and integral part of its ideological platform at the 1991 National Party Congress. It is increasingly de rigueur in Vietnam these days as the party seeks to legitimate itself and certain of its domestic and foreign policies by invoking Ho’s name and alluding to his legacy. Besides tracing the evolution of Ho Chi Minh Thought as it pertains to foreign policymaking, this book presents crucial insights into the theoretical and ideological underpinnings of the strategies and tactics employed by North Vietnamese leaders to prevail over their indigenous and foreign enemies between 1954 and 1975. While scholars and researchers will appreciate this work, excerpts from it could also be useful to those teaching the war in American colleges and universities. Because of the persistent dearth of English language materials addressing the Vietnamese experience generally and the communist perspective specifically, presenting the American war in Vietnam from a balanced and nuanced point of view has been a challenge for many of us. This book, however, is accessible enough to give students a relatively clear sense of the Vietnamese foreign policymaking process and is in many ways an excellent introduction to the forces that guided and, in some respects, continue to inform the conduct of Vietnam’s communist leadership in the international arena.

Lastly, a note on acquiring these and other texts. While NPP does not offer particularly good service for individual buyers from overseas, its books are available in bookshops throughout Vietnam. The best selection, however, is at NPP’s own bookstore, located in Hanoi at 24 Quang Trung Street (tel: 84-4-9422008, fax: 84-4-9421881). Books from TGP may be ordered from overseas via e-mail at thegioi@hn.vnn.vn, telephone at 84-4-8253841, fax at 84-4-8269578, or mail at 46 Tran Hung Dao Street, Hanoi, Vietnam.
Hanoi, December 2005

Lest Westerners forget, the Vietnamese Revolution is not a finished project; the “march to socialism” remains, by official account, an ongoing affair in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam today.


Ibid., 181.
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Europtrip 2004*

Michael Creswell

Last year I was fortunate enough to receive a generous grant from my university to conduct field research. My quest for documents took me near and far, but mostly far. What follows is a short account of my experiences last fall, offered in the hope that it might aid budding scholars planning research trips of their own.

England was my first destination. The flight to London was overbooked, however, so the airline requested volunteers to take an alternate flight that would whisk them to Glasgow, Scotland. There they would change planes for London. For their troubles, volunteers would receive a $600 voucher for future flights or a check for $400 issued right on the spot. I opted for the latter and flew to Glasgow. Although I arrived in London’s Gatwick Airport three hours after the airline had promised (and three hours after my luggage had arrived), I was still $400 richer than when I had left the United States. Fortunately, my travel plans were flexible. This experience leads me to suggest including a measure of flexibility in travel plans, as the opportunity to earn money or travel credit by switching flights will go far toward stretching the very limited budget of most researchers.

After purchasing a train ticket for central London, I darted off to check into my bed & breakfast. Getting around London is straightforward. Travel passes for the underground and city buses can be purchased at any tube station. London is divided into zones, so travelers must make sure to purchase the proper ticket. For example, National Archives (formerly the Public Record Office) is located in Zone 3. Accordingly, researchers staying in Zone 1 must ask for a ticket valid for Zones 1, 2, and 3. For more information, see http://tube.tfl.gov.uk/.

My first research visit was to the London School of Economics (LSE) Archives to examine the papers of Ernest Davies. I had already contacted Sue Donnelly (sdonnelly@lse.ac.uk), the head archivist, to tell her when I would arrive at the archives, which is located in the LSE Library. She reserved a place for me in the reading room, explained how to obtain a temporary pass to enter the library, and told me what the hours were. Space in the reading room is limited to approximately a dozen researchers, so it is wise to contact the LSE Archives in advance to reserve a place.

Working in the LSE Archives is refreshingly easy. Documents are kept in a strong room next to the reading room and can be fetched in minutes. The staff will photocopy documents that are not in bound volumes. Laptop computers and digital cameras are allowed. Many of the LSE Archives’ catalogues are available on the web (http://www.lse.ac.uk/library/archive/), and researchers should consult these catalogues beforehand to plan their research agenda and make the best use of their time in London. Planning ahead also relieves the unfailingly cheerful and cooperative archival staff of the burden of trying to find pertinent holdings for researchers.

Researchers should, as a matter of course, contact each archive they plan to visit at least two months in advance. Although certain archives allow visitors to turn up and begin work almost immediately, other archives operate more deliberately. For example, even though one may submit a form electronically asking for permission to use the French Foreign Ministry Archives, the electronic response will indicate that a letter granting formal permission will be sent within two weeks. It would be best to have that letter in hand upon
arrival.

In general, researchers should ask beforehand if laptop computers or digital cameras are allowed and what type of plug and voltage system is used. It is usually cheaper and quicker to buy an adapter before leaving home.

On the first of September I departed London for Paris. Instead of flying, I took the Eurostar, the high-speed train that travels underneath the English Channel. Prices for the Eurostar rise sharply the closer to the date of travel they are purchased, so I bought my ticket online well before September 1 (www.eurostar.com). I boarded the Eurostar at London’s Waterloo Station. Less than three hours later I arrived at Gare du Nord in Paris.

As I would be in Paris all of September, I purchased a “Carte-Orange” travel card valid for a month on the city’s bus and metro system. This card requires a passport-size photograph. Though many metro stations have photo booths, the time-conscious researcher is well advised to bring photos. And as with London, Paris is divided into zones, so researchers should check to see in which zone the archive they will be using is located.

The following day I made my way to the Archives Nationales (AN). The regular reading room of the AN was closed for extensive repairs, which meant that I had to consult documents in the Hôtel de Soubise (60, rue Francs-Bourgeois), located on the other side of this large complex. Four years had passed since I had last done research at the AN, so I had to renew my reader’s card. There is a twenty-euro fee for researchers who wish to obtain a card valid for a year (ten euros for researchers with a valid student ID). Fees are waived entirely for researchers who simply intend to use the AN for one day.

After renewing my card, checking my belongings, and obtaining a seat number, I traipsed upstairs to the majestic, though non-air-conditioned, reading room. I immediately presented myself to the président de la salle, as one should do in every French reading room, to show my documentation and to inquire how to order documents.

One wall of the reading room is lined with catalogues containing the inventories of the collections held at the AN. Also in the reading room are two computer terminals used to order documents. Documents ordered in the morning should arrive in the early afternoon. After orders are placed, a card (talon) about the size of a business envelope will arrive at the desk where orders are retrieved. Visitors simply give a staff member the reader’s number from their reader’s card and ask if any cartons await them. In principle, researchers who wish to begin working immediately should be able to reserve cartons online ten days in advance. The web address for the AN is: www.archivesnationales.culture.gouv.fr/chan

One should bear in mind that in many cases authorizations to consult certain collections expire after a year or two. Unfortunately, I allowed one of my authorizations at the AN to lapse and had to resubmit a request, which entailed completing a relatively detailed form. Also, because the rules of most archives—including the AN—change over time, procedures may not remain the same from year to year.

There are two vending machines on the ground floor of the AN, but the selection is meager. Visitors might prefer to purchase lunch beforehand and stow it away in a locker. Bringing lunch will save not only time but perhaps money, as a number of the cafes and restaurants in the neighborhood (leMarais) are relatively expensive. However, inexpensive sandwiches can be purchased at any boulangerie.

A week after arriving in Paris, I dined with a French journalist, Hélène Erlingsen, whom I had befriended on a previous trip to France. During dinner she told me that she is a friend of Maurice Faure, who was a high government official in France during the 1950s and is now the last living signatory of the Treaty of Rome, the founding document of the European Economic Community. She kindly offered to arrange a meeting with
him, and I gladly accepted. On September 29 I arrived at M. Faure’s lovely Paris apartment, and he ushered me into his study, where he patiently answered my questions for over an hour. He was also gracious enough to allow me to record our conversation and to pose for photographs. I am grateful for M. Faure’s indulgence because such interviews constitute a primary source and can help supplement or fill in gaps in the written record.

Researchers who work on a recent period and would like to conduct an interview should consult Who’s Who to obtain an address, write to their intended subject with a description of their project, and ask if he or she would agree to sit for an interview. Foreign researchers often have an advantage in this area because interviewees see them as less likely to stir up trouble by reopening old wounds or pressing a political agenda.

My current research project, which explores U.S.–French relations during the early 1950s, contains a component that requires supplemental research in the military archives. I therefore trekked to the magnificent Château de Vincennes, home to the archives of the French Army (http://jomave.chez.tiscali.fr/adgenwebb/shat.html), the Navy (www.servicehistorique.marine.defense.gouv.fr/), and the Air Force (http://perso.club-internet.fr/parabelle/serv_hist/shaa.htm). Given that I was reading private papers of French generals, I worked in the Pavillon du Roi rather than in the building most researchers use. The reading room for private papers is actually the office of the staff that oversees the private collections, and space limits the number of researchers to three or four at most. Laptops are allowed, but photocopying or photographing documents is forbidden. The office closes for one hour at noon, obliging researchers to leave the building, but fortunately there are some good cafes and restaurants in the neighborhood.

While in Paris I also did research at the Centre d’Histoire de l’Europe du Vingtième Siècle (CHEVS), a research center that contains an archives section. CHEVS controls access to the papers of many important people in French political life (Leon Blum and Michel Debré, for example) and in the academy (André Siegfried), as well as the papers of major French political parties (the Mouvement Républicain Populaire and the Union Démocratique Socialiste de la Résistance). Some of the collections are housed at CHEVS (56, rue Jacob) and can be consulted there. Other collections are located at the Archives Nationales, though permission to consult them must be obtained through CHEVS. To learn more about the collections controlled by CHEVS, go to www.sciences.po.fr/recherche/chevs/. Contact Mme. Dominique Parcollet, the director of the archives, at dominique.parcollet@sciences-po.fr, for additional information and to schedule an appointment.

I spent the bulk of my time at CHEVS reading the papers of Alexander Parodi, a secretary general of the French Foreign Ministry (1949-1954), and Wilfried Baumgartner, who served as the governor of the Bank of France (1949-1960). I am grateful to M. Jean-Noël Jeanneney, who was kind enough to grant me permission to consult the Baumgartner papers as well as to make photocopies.

My final stop in the city of lights was the French Foreign Ministry, the famed Quai d’Orsay. Researchers should contact the Foreign Ministry well before their trip (http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/archives.gb/index.html). I also recommend bringing along a letter of introduction (in French) from the head of one’s department. The archive may want to keep the original, and other archives might also ask for a letter of introduction, so it is best to bring a few copies.

Once at the Foreign Ministry, visitors should present themselves at the reception window to request access to the archives. After filling out a card and surrendering their passports, they will be given a badge. However, they can enter the reading room only on the hour and must wait for a member of the archival staff to escort them. Likewise, researchers who are ready to leave the building must wait until the hour to be escorted down to the entrance, where they can retrieve their passports.

On their initial visit to the Foreign Ministry reading room, researchers should tell the staff that they would like to view the inventory. They will be given a place number and should then present themselves to the
président de la salle, who will give them a reader’s card. After registering and perusing the inventory, they should go to the computer terminal in the reading room and order their documents. Barring an emergency, their documents will be ready the next morning.

The reading room is large enough to accommodate approximately thirty researchers. There are four microfilm readers in a room connected to the reading room. Although readers have the option of leaving the ministry to eat lunch, most choose to bring lunch and eat in the basement, where there are vending machines.

The next stop on my research tour was Brussels, where I planned to work at the archives of the Ministère des Affaires Etrangères et du Commerce Extérieur (MAECE). Researchers should write in advance to Ms. Françoise Peemans, the longtime head of the archives at the MAECE, stating the subject, the period, and the goal of their research (archives@diplobel.fed.be). Using that information, she will select documents for the researcher to examine.

Constructed about seven years ago, the large, modern-looking building that houses the archives service is a significant improvement over its previous home. The reading room, which is open Monday through Friday from 9:00 to 4:00, can accommodate fifteen to twenty researchers. Researchers can order photocopies, although no more than a third of each dossier may be copied. Each copy costs 15 to 25 centimes, depending on size of the document (A4 or A3). Microfilm copies cost 30 centimes. There are no vending machines available to researchers, but there is a kitchen next to the reading room that includes a sink, a water cooler, and a refrigerator where visitors may store their lunch.

Many archives have their quirks, and the MAECE is no exception. Every day at 1:00 P. M., baroque music blares from the hallway into the reading room for a minute or two. Though curious, I never ventured to ask why.

While in Brussels, I also did research at the NATO Archives. The bus ride from downtown Brussels to NATO headquarters takes about thirty minutes. Archivist Anne-Marie Smith (nato.archives@hq.nato.int) handled all the steps necessary to ensure that I would receive access to the building. Researchers are given a CD ROM on which they read the documents. Some documents are also on microfilm. The archives will make up to eighty photocopies a day at no charge. The reading room, which is complete with up-to-date computers, can handle about seven researchers at a time. There are now two cafeterias on the premises; the larger one, which offers a greater range of choices, is located in the main building, and there is a smaller one in the building in which the reading room is located.

Ms. Smith was kind enough to arrange for me to meet Paul Marsden, who is the NATO archivist. The three of us sat down for coffee and discussed the progress the NATO Archives has made in the few years it has been open, as well as the areas in which work remains to be done. For example, the records of North Atlantic Council meetings from 1949 to 1965 are available, as are documents of the Military Committee from 1949 to 1969; the next release will cover the period from 1966 to 1972. However, the potentially very important inter-delegation communications and internal memoranda remain classified. A pilot for the declassification and release of three hundred files of such records is currently underway.

There are numerous places to stay in Brussels. I recommend searching online for a room. In general, the least expensive places to stay are youth hostels. Some are as inexpensive as twenty-five euros a night, although at that rate visitors will probably have to share a room. I found a three-star hotel (Hotel Van Belle) about a twenty-five-minute walk from La Grande Place, the heart of downtown Brussels. From there it is a thirty-minute bus ride to NATO and a twenty-minute walk to the Foreign Ministry. I paid fifty euros a night for my room, which was small but clean and comfortable. A breakfast buffet was also included. Surprisingly, there was a line on the bill for a gratuity, something that I had never seen on a hotel bill. I was unsure how much to leave, and the gentleman at the front desk offered no clues (“Whatever you think is appropriate”), so I left ten euros. While on the subject of gratuities, I should remind readers that it is the custom to tip in restaurants in Belgium but not in France. I was less than gently reminded of this fact by a Belgian waiter.
After my stay in Brussels, I returned to the Parisian apartment of a friend, Guy Champagne, for what I assumed would be a restful night before taking a brief vacation. Sometime after going to bed, I was awakened by a noise. After a few moments I discovered the building was on fire. Instinctively, I reached for my laptop computer, digital camera, and the tape of my interview with Maurice Faure (though I was not sufficiently organized to grab my photocopied documents). Unable to leave through the front door due to the heat and smoke, we waited for the firemen to extend a ladder up to the floor below ours. (For some reason our floor had no balcony, so we had to jump down to the floor below.) Surprisingly, the fireman allowed Guy to carry my computer down the ladder. The firefighters quickly brought the blaze under control and prevented it from spreading. Sadly, they were unable to save one woman, who perished in the fire. The survivors were given temporary shelter in a nearby government building.

I learned a valuable lesson that terrible night: although such events cannot be predicted, travelers should nonetheless plan for emergencies. These steps are especially important if they are visiting an impoverished region where resources for fighting fires are limited or absent altogether. They should map out an escape route and keep their valuable belongings (passport, wallet, computer, medication, etc.) where they can easily be found. Researchers should back up data by sending it to themselves as an email attachment. It is also a good idea for travelers to make sure they are covered by insurance in case of injury or illness, and it is helpful if they have access to the address and number of a local physician who speaks their language. I suffered a minor injury in the fire, but luckily I found a physician, Dr. Didier Maufroy, who accepts walk-in patients. Moreover, he charged me only twenty euros—quite a bargain.

My research in France completed, I returned to England on October 21. Back in London I caught a train to Cambridge University, where the Churchill Archives Centre is located. Situated on the grounds of Churchill College, the centre is a short bus ride or a long walk from the railway station in Cambridge, and there are shops in town where those who want to enjoy the fresh air can rent a bicycle. The reading room in the centre can accommodate approximately a dozen people, but researchers should still notify the archivists in advance to reserve a seat. Documents are stored next to the reading room, so orders can be filled promptly. Photocopies and laptop computers are permitted. To learn more about the Churchill Archives Centre, researchers should visit the website: www.chu.cam.ac.uk/archives/.

Doing archival research has often afforded me the occasion to meet interesting people. This trip was no exception. While at the Churchill Archives Centre, I met Ambassador Kishan S. Rana, a former senior Indian diplomat who at one time was posted to the United States. He is a delightful fellow who has forsaken the rough and tumble of diplomacy for the placid world of academia. The author of Inside Diplomacy (2002), Ambassador Rana is currently a professor emeritus and runs a website of interest to diplomatic historians: www.diplomacy.edu. Such meetings should encourage researchers to carry business cards with them. I had run out of cards, but fortunately, Ambassador Rana had his cards with him.

As with history itself, my experiences were unique to me. Other researchers, traveling at different times, working on different topics, visiting different archives, operating under different budgetary restraints, will undoubtedly have different experiences. Nevertheless, I hope that recounting my experiences will make the task of researching abroad a little less daunting for others.

* I thank Max Friedman, Darrin McMahon, Nicholas Sarantakes, and David-Mark Thompson for their helpful suggestions in preparing this essay. My deepest gratitude, however, goes to the many archivists who helped to make my job easier and more productive.

British Airways occasionally advertises special offers for flights to Europe. Sign up to receive this information at www.ba.com.
Researchers should be forewarned that a limited number of indexes are found on the AN website. They would do well to identify the archivist who deals with the collections of interest to them. That person might be able to point them toward items they might have otherwise overlooked.

For a useful guide to using the Foreign Ministry Archives, which can be purchased in the reading room, see Paul M. Pitman, *A Short Guide to the Archives of the Quai d’Orsay* (Paris: Association des amis des archives diplomatiques, 1993).

Researchers could also lose their work because of theft or computer malfunction. Last year my laptop crashed while I was in Paris. Fortunately, I was able to recover the information.

For more information about visiting Cambridge, see [www.cole.co.uk/about/visitors.html](http://www.cole.co.uk/about/visitors.html).
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Researching Modern International History in Madrid

David A. Messenger

Scholars who research and write about the foreign affairs of Iberia are, quite naturally, drawn to the histories of the great Spanish Empire. Many of them treat post-imperial Spain as an aberration from the rest of Europe. However, some historians now believe that Spain remained an important presence in the international community long after the slow decline of Spanish power that began in the late seventeenth century and was apparent to all by the time of the French Revolution. This new perspective on the importance of post-imperial Spain has not led to a mad rush into the archives of Iberia. Yet there are many topics of interest from the post-imperial era that are deserving of more attention, including the 1823 French intervention against Spain’s liberal government; the colonial wars Spain fought alongside France in Morocco in the 1920s; the Spanish Civil War and its international implications; and the semi-fascist dictatorship in post-1945 Spain, delicately balancing its commitment to authoritarian rule with its participation in the Atlantic Alliance.

International historians and SHAFR members who are interested in foreign affairs in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries will be drawn to Madrid for the wealth of archival material available there. The Archivo Historico Nacional has a limited number of state documents concerning foreign affairs, most especially relating to the last third of the eighteenth century and the Napoleonic era. The majority of relevant documents, however, are held in smaller archives. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs maintains its own archive inside its offices at the Palacio Santa Cruz, just off the Plaza Mayor in the center of the city. This is the primary archive for anyone researching world policy since the late eighteenth century. Its main holdings consist of the paperwork produced by members of the Foreign Ministry in Spain and across the world, but it has important special collections as well. One of these is the collection of papers from the Republican government-in-exile between 1939 and 1954, which documents the Republicans’ failed effort to find international support for their cause in the aftermath of the Spanish Civil War. Additionally, the collection of personal papers, called Archivos Particulares, holds the records of Juan Negrín, who was prime minister during the Civil War (1937-39). For those wishing to pursue a topic in greater depth, the Archivo General de la Administración, just outside of Madrid in Alcala de Henares, holds records from a variety of government entities, including Foreign Ministry files from the years 1711 to 1981 from embassies, legations and consulates. Files from the Washington embassy and important American consulates like New York will be of special interest to SHAFR members. For those interested in the diplomacy of imperialism and decolonization, the records of the Diplomatic Cabinet of the Spanish High Commission in Morocco (1909-1956) are also housed in Alcala.

Both archives are easy to access. Two photographs are required, plus a passport or national identification card, and researchers are asked to take a few minutes to fill out an information form. Both archives provide lockers for jackets and other items, and both allow researchers to begin ordering documents and doing research the first day. For those who are accustomed to working in major archival repositories such as the National Archives in College Park or the National Archive-Public Record Office outside of London, these two archives will seem quaint, but their small scale makes them enjoyable places to work.

However, their small size also means that there are some practices here that researchers may not be familiar with. Unlike the larger archives and libraries in Madrid, such as the Archivo Historico Nacional and the Biblioteca Nacional, which have much more in common with facilities like the National Archives in College Park, these two archives have yet to give up the

afternoon siesta. The Foreign Ministry archive closes at 2:00 P.M., the one in Alcala at 2:30 P.M., and neither reopens. So visitors must be sure to arrive close to opening at 9:00 A.M. and 8:30 A.M., respectively. In reality, this is not a difficult circumstance to adjust to: soon enough the motivated historian comes to relish the lengthy meal and rest that will follow a half-day of research!

The photocopying process is another somewhat archaic ritual at the Foreign Ministry. While photocopying is quite inexpensive, researchers cannot do it themselves. They indicate what they want photocopied from a file, and the staff will take it away and have copies made in a week or so. Researchers must ask when their copies are ready; there is no notification process. And before the staff will actually hand over the photocopies, payment must be deposited in a bank around the corner. This can be frustrating for anyone who tries to get photocopying done at the end of a visit to Madrid, as I did. Luckily for me, wonderful archivists and workers expedited the normal process to have my copies ready before my departure.

The photocopying situation aside, the Archivo General in the Foreign Ministry is a pleasant place to work. There are desk for thirty-two researchers, and most now have plugs for computers. Three microfilm readers are also available. The reading room staff is very friendly, especially once visitors establish themselves as regulars. Documents are organized into two sections: Archivo Historico, for documents from the mid-to-late eighteenth century through 1931, and Archivo Renovado, for documents from 1931 on. In addition, there are a number of special collections, such as that of the Republican government-in-exile. For the Archivo Renovado, which is the one I have worked with, ordering is done by computer. Documents appear within fifteen to thirty minutes. While only one set of documents can be ordered at a time, the speed with which they are retrieved means there is really little time spent waiting. The online ordering system is efficient but frustrating. Rather than offer a comprehensive search guide online, it operates by keyword search. It is impossible to see a complete listing of files, so researchers can never be quite sure they have all the references they need. And because the numbering system of the Archivo Renovado is not organized in an obvious way, simply ordering one set of files after another numerically will not guarantee that researchers will see everything of relevance. The only way to be comprehensive is to experiment with keyword searches.

The secondary archive in Alcala de Henares, the Archivo General de la Administración, is a forty-minute train ride from Madrid’s Atocha train station. Trains leave every fifteen to forty minutes throughout the day. From the Alcala train station, the archive is a fifteen-to-twenty-minute walk through the modern part of the city. Alcala is the birthplace of Miguel de Cervantes and a traditional university town. The Old Town, which is about a ten-minute walk from the archive, is a great place to find wonderful and inexpensive restaurants.

Like the Foreign Ministry archive in Madrid, the Archivo General de la Administración is small, with forty-seven seats, ten of which have plugs for computers, and one microfilm reader. Most researchers come to use a variety of government sources, with only a few using the “Embassies, Legations and Consulates” section of Ministry of Foreign Affairs materials. Photocopying is done on site and is again fairly reasonable. The reading room staff here is a bit stricter than at the Foreign Ministry in Madrid, allowing pencils only and forbidding the use of dictionaries or other books at the desks. The archivists are very approachable, however, and they know the collection well. There are two sets of finding aids one must consult before a document can be ordered, and the archivists will guide researchers through them quite quickly.

As noted, both archives register researchers upon arrival; all that is needed is a passport or national identity card and two photographs, and researchers can begin working that day. Since the Archivo General de la Administración is part of the Ministry of Culture’s archive system, it issues the National Research Card, which is good at all ministry-run archives in Spain; the Foreign Ministry is one of the few government departments that operates its own archive.

Much can be found at these archives, which are especially underused when it comes to nineteenth- and twentieth-century international history (the same is true of the Archive of the Spanish Civil War in Salamanca). Very few non-Spaniards seem to have discovered them. However, research at these institutions can be frustrating. Their small size creates some problems. In addition, if researchers are working on a fairly secretive dictatorship like that of General Francisco Franco, they will
often find large gaps in the documentation, which probably reflect that government’s general disregard for record-keeping more than any desire to expunge the record. The frustration engendered by these gaps, of course, is sometimes compensated for by the excitement of finding something significant and substantial. Researchers who come to these archives determined to work through the complications and frustrations may find that their persistence ultimately pays dividends. If it does not, they will at least have enjoyed many long afternoon meals and spent time in one of the liveliest and most inviting of Europe’s capital cities.

El Archivo General del Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores

Plaza de la Provincia, 1
28012-Madrid

http://www.mae.es

M-F 9:30-14:00

Archivo General de la Administración

C/ Paseo de Aguadores, 2
28871 Alcalá de Henares

http://www.mcu.es/archivos/index.jsp

M-F 9:30-14:30

The **Mary Ball Washington Chair in American History** was established as a full-time professorship in the School of History and Archives, University College Dublin in 1979. It is an endowed Chair for which funding was initially provided by the Alfred I Du Pont Foundation, the American Ireland Foundation and by American and Irish business interests through the good offices of the then American Ambassador to Ireland, H.E. Ambassador John Moore.

The creation of the Chair has enabled UCD to bring distinguished professors in the field of American History to the college each year, thereby firmly establishing the field as a core academic discipline in the School of History and in the wider academic life of the college.

Since 1986 the chair has been filled each year by a US academic under the Fulbright Distinguished Chairs Programme. This makes the MBW Chair one of the oldest Chairs in the international Fulbright Distinguished Chairs Programme. Over the years the post has been filled by very eminent scholars of American History and Foreign Policy from a wide range of US states and colleges, many of whom have retained on-going links with UCD.

This award has previously been advertised under the *Fulbright Distinguished Chairs* Program. Going forward it has been decided to fill the position through the *Fulbright Traditional Scholars* Program. The main reason for this change is to open the award up to a wider pool of applicants. The School of History in UCD is particularly interested in received applications from scholars in the field of US foreign policy. The recipient of the award will continue to retain the title of *Mary Ball Washington Chair in American Studies*. However, applications are welcomed from mid-career faculty members as well as distinguished senior scholars.

The award is for a full academic year and the stipend will be €50,000, inclusive of travel and accommodation. This is a higher level of grant that for other US scholar awards (€37,000) to reflect the fact that the recipient will hold a Chair position in UCD. The Chair will teach three courses at advanced undergraduate and/or postgraduate level, supervise postgraduate research students and assist with tutorials.

The School of History & Archives in UCD is a long-established and very dynamic center of excellence in teaching and research. With almost 30 full-time academic staff, the School offers a wide range of undergraduate modules — in Irish and European history from the fifth century to the present day, and in American, Australian and Asian history from the eighteenth century onward. There are 1,000 students enrolled in undergraduate programmes. Teaching is carried out in an environment that encourages discussion and debate in small tutorial and seminar groups, and that involves regular contact with staff. At postgraduate level the School has over 130 diploma, masters and doctoral students, and offer the only professional
education of archivists in Ireland.

Further information on the School, and the research interests of staff, is available at http://www.ucd.ie/historyarchives/. The contract person for the Mary Ball Washington Chair is the Head of School, Professor Michael Laffan, email Mlaffan@ucd.ie

The Irish-US Fulbright Commission will be happy to assist potential applicants with any enquiries about the award, or about any aspect of living in Ireland. Please contact admin@fulbright.ie. The Commission’s website is www.fulbright.ie

**Holders of the Mary Ball Washington Chair in American History at University College Dublin which have been appointed through the Fulbright Programme**

**Glenda Riley** 1986/87

Department of History

University of Northern Iowa

Cedar Falls, IA 50614

**Lawrence E. Gelfand** 1987/88

Department of History

University of Iowa

Iowa City, IA 52242

**Merrill Peterson** 1988/89

Department of History

University of Virginia

Charlottesville, VA 22903
**Peter S. Onuf** 1989/90
Department of History
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, TX 75275

**Stephen G. Rabe** 1990/91
Department of Arts and Humanities
University of Texas—Dallas
Richardson, TX 75083

**Walter Nugent** 1991/92
Department of History
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556

**Joan Hoff** 1992/93
Department of History
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

**Thomas McCormick** 1993/94
Department of History
University of Wisconsin—
Madison
Madison, WI 53706
Ingrid Winther Scobie 1994/95
Department of History and Government
Texas Woman's University
Denton, TX 76204

Theodore A. Wilson 1995/96
Department of History
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045–2130

Elaine Tyler May 1996/97
Program in American Studies
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455–0225

Kevin G. Boyle 1997/98
Department of History
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003–3930

Department of History
University of New Hampshire
Durham, NH 03824

Robert J. McMahon 1999/00
Department of History
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

Mark Hamilton Lytle 2000/01
Department of History
Bard College
Annandale-on-Hudson, NY 12504

Terry Anderson 2001/02
Department of History
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-4236

Not filled through the Fulbright Programme 2002/03

Elizabeth Cobbs Hoffman 2003/04
Department of History
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182-8147

Not filled through the Fulbright Programme 2004/05

Mitch Lerner 2004/05
Department of History