

Transatlantic Studies Association

'Now well into its second decade, the Association plays an increasingly important role as a meeting-point for scholars, a generator of fruitful projects and partnerships, and an outlet... for transatlantic-focused research across the disciplines.'

- Giles Scott-Smith, TSA Chair



Chair's Report on the Thirteenth Annual Conference of the TSA, University of Ghent, 7-10 July 2014

The year 2014 was important for the TSA, for many reasons. Firstly, the Association's annual conference moved outside of the British Isles for the first time, to be held at the University of Ghent in Belgium. The hope was that this would encourage the participation of a more diverse community of scholars from across Europe, opening up the TSA to new influences and ideas in the process. Overall, the results were definitely rewarding. To start with, the Ghent conference turned out to be one of the largest ever held by the association, with forty panels convened and around 125 papers delivered. There was additionally a healthy balance across the History, International Relations, and Culture/Literature panels, with the latter particularly strong this year. A good mix of scholars was present, and a special emphasis on graduate and post-graduate students secured a youthful turnout.

(Continued on Page 2)

Contents

- 1** Chair's Report
Giles Scott-Smith
- 5** In Memory of Donald
Cameron Watt
Alan Dobson
- 7** Foreign Policy
Think Tanks . . .
Priscilla Roberts
- 14** Publications
- 15** Announcements

Chair's Report

The year marked both the two hundredth anniversary of the Treaty of Ghent and the hundredth anniversary of the beginning of World War I, and both of these themes were strongly represented with several papers. Lastly, the conference also benefitted from two excellent keynotes, a top-level book panel, and a closing roundtable.

The conference opened on the Monday with the book panel, Sarah Churchwell of the University of East Anglia delivering an opening address on her latest book, *Careless People: Murder, Mayhem, and the Invention of the Great Gatsby*. Sarah took time out from her duties with the Booker Prize to join us in Ghent – this involves reading and assessing around 140 novels – and she was an ideal effervescent presence to start the conference, going through how she uncovered the historical context to the ‘facts and figures’ portrayed in the *Gatsby* novel. Following Sarah, a panel consisting of Joe Eaton, Connie Post, and Victoria Bazin responded with their own interpretations of the cultural and literary importance of *Gatsby*. In an interesting aside, Connie reminded us that it was actually F. Scott Fitzgerald, *Gatsby*'s author, who laid the basis for the term 'the 99%' in his prescient pre-Crash essay 'The Swimmers' from October 1929.

The two keynotes followed on the Tuesday. Despite struggling with the Ghent one-way system on the way over from Brussels, Jamie Shea, Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Emerging Security Challenges at NATO, gave a robust overview of the threats facing the Alliance: a post-Afghanistan malaise, a newly belligerent and aggressive Russia, a United States turning to the Asia-Pacific, and a Europe endlessly cutting back on defence budgets and capabilities. A dynamic speaker and always up for a debate, Jamie willingly extended his stay to take on questions from the floor afterwards. He was followed later in the day by Duncan Bell of Cambridge University, who provided masterful coverage of the meaning of the 'transatlantic' among key thinkers of the early twentieth century such as W.T. Stead and H.G. Wells. The conference had planned a third keynote for the Wednesday, but Gregory Castle of Arizona University was forced to withdraw at short notice due to a family bereavement. We wish him well and hope to see him at a conference in the future. The event closed with a roundtable on the significance of the War of 1812 and the Treaty of Ghent, a fitting finale considering the relevance of the conference location for the Association.

Ghent was also a significant event for the changes that were introduced in the TSA's management structure. For the first time, elections were held for the positions on the Management Committee, and the Committee was also reduced to twelve members. This was an important move to democratise procedures and involve the Association's membership more with its overall direction. This democratic leap forward was a success, but it also revealed various shortcomings,

Chair's Report

and efforts will be made to improve the process in the future. Another development was the creation of sub-committees to enable Management Committee and TSA members to combine forces on important issues: publications, awards, membership, conference planning, and teaching and learning initiatives. Questionnaires were available in order to obtain feedback on the conference organisation, and these produced some valuable remarks and suggestions.

All in all, a lot was packed into the three days, and it did feel as if the management meetings were squeezed into an already tight conference schedule. This was unfortunate, and purely the result of cramming many much-needed reforms into a short space of time. Nevertheless, the TSA achieved a great deal in Ghent. It moved into a new phase, both geographically (Belgium) and administratively (elections). It was my first conference as Chair, and despite all the running around trying to keep up with a hectic agenda, I enjoyed it all tremendously. I am indebted to the local organisers – Gert Buelens, Ken Kennard, Marita Dierick – for their dedication to the cause, and for arranging a fantastic location at Het Pand in the centre of Ghent. The students of the American Studies MA programme at Ghent were also of invaluable assistance, particularly the indomitable Jasper, manning the registration desk and providing help when needed right to the bitter end at Thursday lunchtime. The conference received generous support from several sponsors, without which it would not have been possible: The Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek of the Province of Flanders, the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations, and Taylor & Francis Publishers.

Looking ahead, the TSA will continue in its current transition phase for the foreseeable future. Our website is being renewed, a long overdue task, with a new service provider and a new template being introduced this autumn. Immense thanks go to Gavin Bailey for managing the site in recent years, to Ashley Cox for taking over the reins, and to Mike Cullinane for skillfully shepherding the new site along. We hope that this will enable the Association to function more as a community in between the conferences, instead of operating largely as an annual event. We have had changes of personnel, with Gaynor Johnson departing as Secretary after several years of sterling service, and her position being taken by Kristin Cook. The 2015 conference will stay on 'the other side of the Channel' with its location in Middelburg, The Netherlands, and the hope is that this will continue its trans-European outreach and diversification in terms of nationalities and subject-areas.

When the TSA began in 2002, the Transatlantic region was still regarded as the most prominent in terms of security alliances, economic strength, and global public policy. Since then rapid changes have taken place that have undermined this prominent position, and old certainties can no longer be taken for granted. Nevertheless, the region continues to retain a unique place in global governance and cultural awareness. In this context, the TSA needs to change with the times and consider its

Announcements

1. New TSA Member Publications
2. 60th Annual Conference of the British Association of American Studies, April 9th-12th 2015, University of Northumbria
3. British Diplomacy in Latin America at the Turn of the 21st Century: A Witness Seminar, 29th January 2015, Canning House, London
4. Edited Volume: *Nuclear Weapons in the Cold War*

(see pages 14 - 16)

purpose and direction in the second decade of the 21st century. Areas previously marginalised – Latin America, Africa – can become a part of its mission, without losing the essential core focus on the Transatlantic. The Transatlantic paradigm should be healthily reconsidered, and what better place to do this than the Transatlantic Studies Association? No association should stay the same forever, and this process of reflection and renewal is precisely what keeps it alive and meaningful for its membership. I would therefore like to thank all those who have contributed their time and effort to make the TSA a successful academic community over the past year, and I look forward to further collaboration in the future.

- Giles Scott-Smith

Professor of Diplomatic History of
Atlantic Cooperation
Roosevelt Study Center, Leiden University

14th Annual TSA Conference
Middelburg, The Netherlands,
6 - 8 July 2015



In Memory of Donald Cameron Watt, born 1928, died 2014.

In his long, eventful and fully lived life Donald achieved much. He was a larger than life man and academic who many could admire and few could try to emulate. He was engaging and humorous as a friend and colleague and insightful, ground-breaking and encouraging as an academic. He was an accomplished singer and might well have been an opera star if his life had developed differently. And for many, most of all, he was a great raconteur. He will be much missed by friends and the academic community, which he graced with his presence.

Donald's life reflected the flair and bright colours of his character (and his ties). He did military service in Austria before going on to university where he graduated in 1951. After a short spell at the Foreign Office he joined the LSE where he rose to be the Stevenson Professor of International History in 1981. He contributed much to the historical understanding of the twentieth century, and his work culminated in the lengthy study, *How War Came: The Immediate Origins of the Second World War*, which won the Wolfson History Prize. He was a formidable scholar and a warm friend to those he knew well. Warren Kimball recounts many a story of the gentlemanly hospitality and good humour that he experienced with Donald when he and his late wife Jackie came to the UK in the early 1980s. That friendship abided and was strengthened over the years.

In Memory

For my own part as a young man of eighteen back in 1969, I first came across D.C. Watt when I chose his new edition of *Mein Kampf* for my school history prize. *Mein Kampf* was still seen as so dangerous that it needed a level-headed historian to provide a substantial preface and Donald certainly did that. Only a few years later when I was studying at Durham University I read his *Personalities and Policies: Studies in the Formulation of British Foreign Policy in the Twentieth Century*. For me it was an iconic piece of work that encouraged me along my academic route and did much to influence my own approach to history. By now D.C. Watt had become quite a feature in my academic life, but even better was soon to come when in the mid 1980s my friend and mentor Warren Kimball invited me to a conference he was organising at Rutgers. One of the keynote speakers was Donald Watt. And so I came personally to know one of my academic heroes, and he did not disappoint.

I met Donald on several occasions later, and my admiration for him as an academic continued to grow. Therefore in 2009 when Tony McCulloch suggested that we should have a prize for the best paper from a young or early career scholar at the annual Transatlantic Studies Association Conference—and that it should be named in honour of Donald—there was no other candidate in the field. Both I, and David Ryan, then Vice Chair of the TSA, deemed it to be so appropriate.

By this time Donald's health was beginning to fail, but we brought him down to Canterbury by car for the TSA conference dinner, and Priscilla Roberts took care of him. He was clearly delighted with the prize named after him and took pleasure in awarding it to the first winner, Bronwen Everill. It is so fitting that he will be remembered this way at every TSA annual conference. It feels good at his departing to know that the TSA will continue to play a role in acknowledging Donald as a scholar who contributed so much throughout his life and who in this small way will continue to encourage young scholars through the award of the prize bearing his name.

- Alan P. Dobson

Professor Honorary, Swansea University

Founder and Editor *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*

Founder and Chair 2002-2013 Transatlantic Studies Association

Foreign Policy Think Tanks and Associated Informal Elite Institutions and Intellectual Networks: Origins, Practice, Influence, and Future

- Priscilla Roberts, *University of Hong Kong*

A substantial number of TSA members have submitted panel or paper proposals for one of the special conference themes for the July 2015 meeting, which focuses on the role of foreign policy think tanks and similar non-official organizations and networks in the making and conceptualization of international affairs. This theme has grown out of a conversation in the reading room of the Mudd Library in Princeton University that I had with Prof. Inderjeet Parmar of City University, London (a keynoter at the upcoming 2015 meeting) last June. Both of us share a long-time interest in informal Anglo-American foreign policy elites, think tanks, philanthropic foundations, and other non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or quasi-non-governmental organizations (Quangos), and their role in the making of foreign policy.

In recent years, my own interests have also expanded into the significance of such relationships within the British Empire and as a force in Anglo-American-imperial relations. Historians, political scientists, literary scholars, and others are currently exploring the significance of non-formal networks of every kind in the formulation and conceptualization of international affairs. We therefore believed that the time was ripe to start a major initiative in this field, bringing in many of the younger and most innovative scholars working in this area, as well as established and senior academics. The Transatlantic Studies Association has been exceptionally kind in providing us with the opportunity to develop this idea and see where we can take it.

Intellectual Background

The role of foreign policy think tanks in the conceptualization, making, and implementation of international policy, and the relationship of these organizations to the state and to official policymaking and bureaucracies, is a topic that would reward further investigation. In most countries today, there are one or more such institutions, but just how they operate and the degree to which they influence and have influenced the making of foreign policy is still poorly understood.

Foreign policy think tanks were very much a creation of the early twentieth century, and more specifically of the First World War. The concept of a private organization of educated

experts who would come together to deliberate on major international issues and if possible devise solutions to them was not entirely new, but it took hold during that conflict. The pre-war international arbitration movement, the Round Table movement to strengthen the British Empire, efforts to promote Anglo-American cooperation, the wartime League of Nations Union in Britain and the League to Enforce Peace in the United States, and the progressive belief in expertise, all played their part in setting the scene for the establishment of elite bodies focusing specifically upon international relations. Two of the most influential and long-lasting, the British Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) and the New York-based Council on Foreign Relations, were actually founded in May 1919 at the Paris Peace Conference, as the result of an initiative by the British and American experts and diplomats (some professional, some temporary) assembled there to advise their respective governments. Another American think tank, the US Foreign Policy Association, was the successor of the League of Free Nations Association, founded in 1918 to promote the idea of a League of Nations. The Institute of Pacific Relations, the third major US foreign policy think tank of the interwar period, came into being in 1925, after a five-year initiative on the part of Americans associated with the Young Men's Christian Association, which had for several decades spearheaded extensive missionary efforts in Asia and elsewhere. All received generous funding from the Carnegie Corporation, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Rockefeller Foundation, and other Rockefeller-funded organizations, as well as from wealthy individual donors.

What did think tanks do, and how did they seek to affect the making of policy and the climate of public opinion? Their actual membership was often somewhat restricted, not simply by the fact that in many countries the number of individuals deeply interested in foreign affairs was relatively small, but also by deliberate limitations on the number of members, with nominees for membership in Chatham House and the Council on Foreign Relations subjected to careful scrutiny and vetting by a membership committee. Members could attend lectures by a variety of international affairs specialists, both homegrown and foreign, and join study and discussion groups. In the case of Chatham House and the Council on Foreign Relations, what was said at such meetings remained strictly confidential, the origin of the phrase "Chatham House rules." Others, such as the public meetings organized by the Foreign Policy Association, were open to the general public. Think tanks often provided a discreet forum where government officials and diplomats could meet informally with a range of academics, businessmen, media representatives, and others interested in foreign policy, and discuss topical issues in privacy. Over time, they also served as interfaces to introduce to those in power figures from the business and academic worlds who might be potential recruits for governmental or quasi-governmental positions. On occasion, think tank personnel and members were sometimes recruited for government positions.

In addition to providing venues for private and discreet discussions among elites, where policies could be formulated, think tanks sought to affect the climate of public opinion through their publications. Most published journals or bulletins, with articles on international issues by a wide range of individuals, in some cases including top politicians from their own and other countries. *Foreign Affairs*, *International Affairs*, and *Pacific Affairs*, the major journals of the Council on Foreign Relations, Chatham House, and the Institute of Pacific Relations, were among the most prestigious of these. Many also published book-length studies of specific controversial or topical international issues, in many cases the products of study or discussion groups organized by the think tank in question. Though some of these might represent pure research, more often than not, both the authors and the think tank that published these volumes hoped that their recommendations would directly influence government policy, as well as public opinion on the questions at issue. During World War II and the Cold War, for example, British and American foreign policy think tanks undertook studies—sometimes with government encouragement and funding—that were intended for consultation by government officials involved in making policy.

Although think tanks were normally based in one particular country, in the interwar period, they often operated on a transnational basis, as part of broader networks intended to boost international understanding and cooperation. Three major networks existed during this period. One, restricted to the British Empire and its dominions and centred upon Chatham House, linked the Institutes of International Affairs established in Britain and those in the dominions, gradually expanding as more British colonies gained independence, and eventually winding down in the 1960s. Until well after World War II, members of dominions institutes who moved to Britain automatically became members of Chatham House. The second, the Institute of Pacific Studies, established in 1925, brought together think tanks from more than a dozen countries bordering the Pacific, including the colonial powers (Great Britain, France, and the Netherlands) with imperial interests in the region. The third, the International Studies Conference, founded by the Institute of International Cooperation in 1928, in association with the League of Nations, sought to unite and encourage liaison and collaboration among all national institutions interested in promoting the scientific study of international relations. At intervals of two to five years, all three of these networks held major themed conferences, at which all member organizations were normally represented. Membership overlapped: depending on their geographical location and affiliations, some national organizations, notably Chatham House and its associated Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand institutes, belonged to two and in some cases all three of these networks. By their very existence, these think tanks became players whose policies and decisions had an impact of their own upon intra-imperial, Anglo-American, and Western-Asian relations. All three networks benefited significantly from substantial funding received from the Carnegie and Rockefeller funding conglomerates.

In the aftermath of World War II, such networks gradually wound down. The Institute of Pacific Relations and British Commonwealth conferences continued for a while, but the first fizzled out in the late 1950s, with the dissolution of the IPR, while the British Commonwealth Conferences were no longer held after the mid-1960s. North American and European international affairs institutes and think tanks came together in the late 1940s, as Western Europe began the long process of recovery from World War II, to discuss policy towards Germany. In the early 1950s, the Carnegie Endowment also funded a multi-national study of various countries' policies towards the United Nations, undertaken by their assorted foreign policy think tanks. But as academic institutions undertook more extensive research in numerous areas of international relations, especially international relations theory and developmental economics, establishing special institutes and centres for the purpose, bilateral or occasionally trilateral cooperation among foreign policy think tanks on specific projects became a more usual *modus operandi*. Before World War II, in the 1930s Chatham House and the Council on Foreign Relations had organized parallel study groups on Anglo-American relations, their objective to devise solutions to various disputes between the two countries. The Canadian Institute of International Affairs and the Council also mounted joint conferences focusing on American-Canadian relations. Similar initiatives continued after the war, with a major joint Council-Chatham House study group on tensions in Anglo-American relations meeting from 1951 to 1953 and producing a co-published book on the subject. In the mid-1950s, a British-American-Canadian conference focused on the complicated trilateral relationship among Britain and the two North American powers. From then onward, Canadian-American joint conferences were a regular feature of the operations of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Canadian Institute, and the CIIA even had a branch in New York City. More innovatively, from the 1960s onward Chatham House, the Council on Foreign Relations, and the Canadian Institute of International Affairs each undertook joint workshops with assorted Soviet and East European international affairs institutes, which may have played some part in helping to encourage détente and the Helsinki process.

Exactly what constitutes a foreign policy think tank is itself far from being entirely clear. Some organizations cover the entire spectrum of foreign affairs, but others focus on particular regions. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace was both a philanthropic institution that funded research by other organizations, and a body that undertook major research projects of its own. At least in the United States, the same group of personnel tended to circulate through the bureaucracy of think tanks, the major foundations, organizations such as the Trilateral Commission, the Japan Society, and the Asia Society, the CIA, the State Department, and the major universities. Single-issue advocacy organizations, such as the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies, Fight For Freedom/the Century Group, the Committee for the Marshall Plan, and the Committee on the Present

Danger, included prominent members of the Council on Foreign Relations and were effectively arguing for policies that the Council—despite its avowedly neutral stance on policy—favoured and had helped to formulate. Some think tanks, the Brookings Institution and the Aspen Institute, for example, did not concentrate entirely on foreign policy, but also paid attention to various domestic issues. Such bilateral societies as the English-Speaking Union, the Pilgrims Society, the Japan Society, the National Committee for US-China Relations, and the Great Britain-China Centre, undertook at least some of the same activities as did think tanks, but clearly had an agenda that focused upon promoting good relations and understanding between two specific countries. The Asia Society's Williamsburg conferences and the Bilderberg meetings were both examples of discreet high-level exchanges of opinion among transnational political, business, intellectual, and opinion-forming elites, encounters that generally occurred on an annual basis. The Williamsburg conferences were important events in terms of helping to integrate Asian elites into what had previously been a predominantly Western-run international power structure. Ditchley Park has been the venue for significant transnational meetings, not all of them focusing upon issues of foreign affairs. The Rhodes Trust undoubtedly constituted an exercise—now well over a century old—in encouraging informal international understanding, as does the Rothermere American Institute at Oxford University, conveniently situated next to Rhodes House. Universities have set up their own academic think tanks, several of them, such as the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University and the LSE-IDEAS Centre, very highly regarded. So too are such organizations as the Woodrow Wilson Center of Washington, DC.

The relationship between governments, specific think tanks, and official policy is likewise often paradoxical. Initially, think tanks tended to pride themselves on the independence of their findings, and to dissociate themselves from adherence to any one particular party or viewpoint. The Council on Foreign Relations, blessed with a wealthy membership and good relations with the major US philanthropic foundations, consistently declined to accept US government funding. Yet in practice, many think tanks were very far from being free of government influence. The Council on Foreign Relations repeatedly undertook studies that were intended for use by the State Department, Congress, and other organs of government. Officials from the State and Defense Departments, the CIA, and other government agencies belonged to the Council, regularly attended its meetings, and were members of major Council study and discussion groups, some of which had a significant impact upon the formulation of US policies. Top Council officials often showed themselves reluctant to publish studies or take positions that might embarrass the US government. In the 1960s and 1970s, the National Committee on US-China Relations and the Asia Society both accepted government funding for various programmes, including efforts to host and devise appropriate study tours for a wide range of Chinese visitors to the United States, and studies of Southeast Asian development. Before a Trilateral Commission delegation visited China in 1980, its members

If the boundaries in the United States were far from clear, this was still truer of other countries. During World War II, Chatham House undertook to analyze the foreign press for the British Foreign Office, an enterprise that ultimately became the basis of the Foreign Office Research Department. Chatham House received substantial payments for this service, and the Foreign Office also subsidized the attendance of Chatham House representatives at Institute of Pacific Relations conferences in the United States and Canada where British colonial policies came under attack from Indian, Chinese, and North American delegates. In the 1960s and 1970s, the British government provided regular annual subsidies to Chatham House. Similar patterns were true for the Canadian and Australian Institutes. During World War II, Canadian government officials were heavily involved in the affairs of the Canadian Institute, including its hosting of the 1942 Institute of Pacific Relations conference, an enterprise to which the Department of External Affairs devoted significant attention. From the 1960s to the 1980s, the Canadian Institute received substantial annual subsidies from the Department of External Affairs, without which its continued survival proved unviable by the early 2000s. The Australian Institute of International Affairs likewise benefited from government subventions to enable delegates to attend British Commonwealth and Institute of Pacific Relations conferences. In the 1970s and 1980s, it too received significant annual financial subsidies from the Australian government. These subventions were, if nothing else, indications that the governments involved perceived the activities of both organizations as desirable, in terms of encouraging informed discussion and consideration of international affairs through meetings, study groups, conferences, and publications. Most European foreign policy think tanks likewise benefited from financial support provided by their governments, evidence cited by Chatham House in the 1960s when it too sought comparable assistance from the British Foreign Office.

By the early 21st century, the fact that a country possessed credible think tanks, especially in the area of international relations, institutions that ideally helped to set the global intellectual agenda for debate and generate such paradigmatic concepts as “the clash of civilizations” or “the end of history” was widely perceived as an index of national prestige and soft power. Rising Asian governments, especially that of China, proclaimed their desire to develop credible think tanks, the outputs of which would be internationally respected and would contribute to global debates. Often, however, it seemed that authoritarian regimes failed to appreciate that maintaining a certain distance between the state and such institutions was essential if their findings were to gain a hearing beyond the borders of the country involved. Heavy-handed governmental efforts to pressure, intimidate, and even silence the personnel of Asian think tanks who were perceived as stepping beyond the approved official boundaries could indeed prove counter-productive, in terms of destroying international respect for those institutions.

A Specific Proposal

An international team of academics, based in Britain, Europe, North America, Hong Kong, and Australia, has recently set up an initiative to develop a major research programme focusing on foreign policy think tanks and associated organizations and individuals. This will seek to understand the origins, nature, and influence of these institutions; their relationship to state power and to other non-governmental institutions; and how these institutions contributed to the establishment of transnational intellectual networks of knowledge and to the founding of the discipline of international relations. This initiative will also seek to understand the potential future of such organizations. Besides myself, the founders of this initiative include Prof. Jeremy Adelman of Princeton University in the United States; and Inderjeet Parmar of City University, London. By the time of the July 2015 TSA meeting, we hope to have laid at least laid the foundations of something concrete, in terms of a series of workshops to develop this idea further and prepare major grant proposals in this area.

Over a decade ago, I was among those academics involved in the efforts to establish the Trans-Atlantic Studies Association. While the geographical fact that I am based in Hong Kong has meant that I have not been among its most active participants, for the past decade and more I have been a strong supporter of the organization. Its upcoming conference therefore seemed a natural fit to host a series of panels that would focus upon the role of foreign policy think tanks and other informal organizations and non-governmental networks in the formulation and implementation of policies on international issues, and their relationship to official policymaking. I am most grateful to Giles Scott-Smith and other members of the TSA Management Committee for their instant and generous interest in providing a forum for such discussions.

- Priscilla Roberts

University of Hong Kong

TSA members who wish to contribute a panel or paper proposal can contact me by e-mail at proberts@hku.hk, copying their proposal to: 2015TSA14@gmail.com.

Publication Announcements

Sleeping with a Tiger

Ekavi Athanassopoulou, TSA Member and Assistant Professor at the University of Athens, announces the publication of her book, *Strategic Relations Between the US and Turkey, 1979-2000: Sleeping with a Tiger* (Routledge, 2014).

‘Dr Ekavi Athanassopoulou offers a sophisticated critical interpretation of a dynamic and difficult chapter of the strategic relationship between Turkey and the United States. Her achieved study is undoubtedly a very important read not only for those who are interested in the history of NATO's Southern Flank in the Cold War, but also for those who wish to have a clearer understanding why and how both states have so far been able to manage their strategic cooperation throughout the first decades of the post-Cold war era despite the complexities of that transformational period.’

- Ali L. Karaosmanoğlu
Professor Emeritus
International Relations
Bilkent University

Details available at:
<http://www.routledge.com>

Arsenal of Democracy

TSA Member **Gavin J. Bailey** would like to announce the publication and continuing success of his book, *The Arsenal of Democracy. Aircraft Supply and the Anglo-American Alliance, 1938-1942* (Edinburgh University Press, 2013).

The book is a critical re-examination of the conduct and outcome of Anglo-American wartime aircraft supply diplomacy. Through a series of case studies, Gavin J. Bailey reveals new details of how Britain used American aircraft and integrates this with broader British statecraft and strategy. He challenges conceptions that Britain was strategically reliant on the US and reveals a complicated, asymmetrical dependency between the wartime allies. Aircraft were at the heart of British supply diplomacy with the United States in the Second World War and were at the forefront of the Roosevelt administration's policy of aiding the Anglo-French alliance against Germany. They were the largest item in British purchasing in the US in 1940, a key consideration in the Lend-Lease of 1941 and a major component of several wartime conferences between Churchill and Roosevelt.

'...an important contribution to understanding a period when what became known as the special relationship developed.'

- Professor George Peden
University of Stirling

Details available at:
<http://www.euppublishing.com>

Sharing the Burden?

Ben Zyla, TSA Member and Assistant Professor in the School of International Development and Global Studies at the University of Ottawa, announces the publication of his book, *Sharing the Burden?: NATO and its Second-tier Powers* (University of Toronto Press, 2015).

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, NATO's middle powers have been pressured into shouldering an increasing share of the costs of the transatlantic alliance. In *Sharing the Burden?* Benjamin Zyla rejects the claim that countries like Canada have shirked their responsibilities within NATO.

Using a range of measures that go beyond troop numbers and defense budgets to include peacekeeping commitments, foreign economic assistance, and contributions to NATO's rapid reaction forces and infrastructure, Zyla argues that, proportionally, Canada's NATO commitments in the 1990s rivaled those of the alliance's major powers. At the same time, he demonstrates that Canadian policy was driven by strong normative principles to assist failed and failing states rather than a desire to ride the coattails of the United States, as is often presumed.

An important challenge to realist theories, *Sharing the Burden?* is a significant contribution to the debate on the nature of alliances in international relations.

Details available at:

<http://utppublishing.com/Sharing-the-Burden-NATO-and-its-Second-Tier-Powers.html>

Conference Announcements

The 60th Annual Conference of the British Association of American Studies University of Northumbria 9- 12 April 2015

Plenary speakers:

- **Gary Younge**, Author, broadcaster and award-winning columnist for *The Guardian* and *The Nation*.
- **Dana Nelson**, Gertrude Conaway Vanderbilt Professor of English, *Vanderbilt University*.
- **Sarah Churchwell**, Professor of American Literature and Public Understanding of the Humanities, *University of East Anglia*.

A TSA-sponsored panel at the BAAS conference will feature Dr. Michael Patrick Cullinane, Dr. J. Simon Rofe, and Professor Serge Ricard presenting three papers on Theodore Roosevelt in a transatlantic context, primarily examining his last year as president, the World War I years, and how his death effected the Treaty of Versailles negotiations.

You can follow the conference on Twitter @BAASconf2015 or #BAAS2015. For more information see the [conference website](#).

**British Diplomacy in Latin America at the
Turn of the 21st Century:
A Witness Seminar***

—
Thursday 29th January 2015, 3.30-6:00 pm
Canning House, 14/15 Belgrave Square,
London, SW1X 8PS

This event will bring together former British diplomats to reflect on their experience of serving in a variety of key Latin American capitals from the 1990s to the present day. The seminar will take the format of a group interview, followed by questions from the audience. A wine reception will follow. Speakers for the seminar include:

Chairperson: Baroness Hooper GMC (Chair of the All-Party Parliamentary British-Latin America Group, 2009-Present)

Witnesses:

Dr Peter Collecott CMG (ambassador to Brazil, 2004-8).

Dame Denise Holt DCMG (ambassador to Mexico, 2002-5; first secretary at embassy in Brazil; 1991-3; head of Central American Section of FCO, 1988-90).

Donald Lamont (ambassador to Venezuela, 2003-6; Governor of Falklands Islands, 1999-2002; ambassador to Uruguay, 1991-4).

Giles Paxman CMG, LVO (ambassador to Mexico, 2005-9; ambassador to Spain, 2009-13).

Conference Panel:

**'Churchill's Fulton Missouri Iron
Curtain Speech: Origins, Content
and Effects'**

**TSA Annual Conference,
Middelburg, July 2015**

Steve Marsh (Cardiff University) and Alan Dobson (Swansea University) would like to invite proposals for the above panel. We hope to have 3-4 panel sessions and up to 6 papers will be offered the chance of publication in a special issue of *The Journal of Transatlantic Studies*.

Contact: a.p.dobson@swansea.ac.uk or
marshsi@cardiff.ac.uk.

*The Latin America Witness Seminar is being jointly hosted by the following: Lancaster University, the Institute of Contemporary British History (King's College, London) and Canning House. This event is supported by the Lancaster University FASS - Enterprise Centre.

Attendance at this event is free but places are limited. To register your interest and reserve a place email: events@canninghouse.org.

Specific queries about the content of the seminar should be directed to Dr Thomas Mills at t.c.mills@lancaster.ac.uk

Call for Contributions: Edited volume, *Nuclear Weapons in the Cold War*
(Proposals Submission Deadline 9th February 2015)

The destruction of the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by American atomic weapons in August 1945 began an arms race between the US and the Soviet Union. This lasted until the signing of the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty of November 1990. An entire generation grew up under the shadow of imminent catastrophe. There were widespread fears that humanity could not survive. A single reckless leader, or even a mistake or misunderstanding, could initiate the extinction of mankind. Stockpiles of fearsome weapons were built up to levels far beyond any conceivable purpose, and only seemed to add to the uncertainty and instability of their age.

Did Cold War leaders act irrationally through fear and distrust? Was there a degree of rationality and reason behind the colossal build up?

Did nuclear weapons cause the Cold War? Did they contribute to its escalation? Did they help to keep the Cold War cold? We should also ask how the Cold War shaped the development of atomic energy. Was the nuclear arms race a product of Cold War tension rather than its cause?

At a time of global economic and political uncertainty and the emergent threat of international terrorism and nuclear proliferation, these are important questions that still need further investigation. The purpose of this book therefore is to gather new academic research by historians and political scientists on the history of nuclear weapons during the Cold War.

Possible topics included but not limited to:

- Military crises
- Armistice
- Détente
- Effect of nuclear race on culture and society
- Transatlantic relations
- Third world
- US / Japan
- Race issues
- Nuclear Proliferation

Proposals of 500 words submitted in a word doc together with a brief bio and contact info should be sent to m.oliva@reading.ac.uk by 9th February 2015.

Full chapters due 31st May 2015.