in which he proves a three month margin of inaccuracy; (and) who has discovered the records inscribed on the wrong side of public buildings and the lists of foreign consuls on the door-jambs of shrines." (Book XII, 10.9-11.3)

Both make good targets, and when you add in the withering sarcasm of Polybius himself, you get a fair sampling of styles still to be seen in historical writing today. But here at Iowa, I continue to be impressed with what struck me when I first arrived on this campus in 1988 — the collegial and humane character of academic debate, the independent-mindedness of our historians and other social scientists, the range and diversity of opinion, the refusal to form an "Iowa school" in any discipline.

I credit Professors Gelfand and Hawley, along with Bill Aydelotte, with this enlightened approach to historiography. Larry Gelfand and Ellis Hawley exemplify that Iowa character in their work and in their contributions to the university, and I am pleased to join with you in honoring them.

Comments by Trudy Huskamp Peterson on the Retirement of Ellis Hawley

I come to sing and celebrate Ellis Hawley. I come to tell the history of an uncommon historian. I do not mean to provide a thesis or a dissertation on his character; a hypothesis or antithesis or even synthesis on his works or his contributions. I do mean to pay tribute to three aspects of his professional life.

The first quality—and the preeminent one when I think about Ellis Hawley—is his commitment to research in primary sources—difficult primary sources. It requires discipline to read the records of organizations and institutions and identify the web of relationships among them. It takes more time, at the end the researcher is less secure that all the resources have been read, there are no logical beginnings and ends (unless, of course, the organization collapses). Biography is so much easier—we know how a life is shaped. But even setting up the research questions when dealing with twentieth century governmental policy is a major task.

Ellis Hawley has spent his life struggling with the very most difficult research and analytic challenges in modern American history. His superb The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly remains a staggering achievement. His conviction that to understand America you must understand how its constituent organizational entities interact with one another carries increasing explanatory power as the end of the twentieth century approaches.

Another part of his commitment to research is his ability and interest in driving questions backward in time. Some years ago I learned he was working in the Central Research Room of the National Archives Building, so I dropped by to see him. I was surprised to find him working on something in the early part of the century dealing with home economics, if I recall. I expressed surprise, and he said that the longer he researched the more he was interested in the roots of the policies, driving him backward into earlier sources. Assuming that he continues to research in a long and strong retirement, we may all see emerging a first rank colonial historian. (On second thought, with enough time he may solve whether the Indo-Europeans migrated east into the steppes of South Russia or went west out of them.)

But Ellis Hawley has always known that to research is not enough. Most researchers would agree with Samuel Eliot Morison, who wrote:

"Finally, after smoking sundry cigarettes [you can see that this quote is not recent] and pacing about the house two or three times, you commit a lame paragraph or two to paper. By the time you get to the third, one bit of information you want is lacking. What a relief! Now you must go back to the library or archives to do some more digging. That's where you are happy! And what you turn up there leads to more questions and prolongs the delicious process of research."

Ellis Hawley has published major monographs, readers, syntheses: he has contributed to encyclopedias and historical dictionaries; he has provided commentaries, review essays, and an amazing 76 book reviews. He worked with the National Archives as consultant, co-compiler, and annotator of the 6 volume Public Papers of the President: Herbert Hoover. Not only does this prodigious record show the strength of the intellectual work he has produced, but it also says that he is an utterly dependable professional colleague who will not only take on but also complete tasks on time.

Not only does he read the records and publish them, but as an archivist I admire his assumption that he has an obligation to later researchers to provide tracks to his sources. I am, of course, talking about his superlative footnotes. You may know that John Barrymore said, "A footnote is like running downstairs to answer the doorbell during the first night of marriage." I don't believe that, and I don't believe that Ellis Hawley does, either. But how did he write The Great War without a single one?

The second major quality I celebrate is his commitment to giving full measure to his students. I have in my hand the first draft of my masters' thesis written under his direction. I suspect a number of other people in the audience have had the same shocking experience turning in something you think is reasonably good and having it returned covered with blue ink in miniscule handwriting, with whole pages excised, and instructions to footnote. In this draft, in the first paragraph he eliminated only four words (an achievement!). But the next paragraph he wholly crossed out with a terse marginal note "too mechanical and really unneded." The third...
paragraph—well, only twelve of my original words survived and three of them were “the.”

On Friday I ran into Bruce Bustard, another of Ellis Hawley’s Ph.D.s. I told him that I planned to show my first draft. “Oh,” he said, “I have one just like that. When I got it I just wanted to quit and find another line of work.”

His graduate students whispered to each other, “Read Howard K. Beale; Hawley sounds just like him.” And we—we ended up sounding a lot like Ellis Hawley, to our great, great benefit. I have simply never known anyone who devoted such effort to improve the thinking and writing of his students.

I remember Ellis Hawley once saying to me that it was good advice to read all the notes you had taken before beginning to write a chapter, then move the notes across the room, and write from memory. As I silently considered this feat, my sense of dismay and inadequacy must have shown on my face, for he shook his head gently and said, “I’ve never been able to do it, either.”

The great Greek poet Pindar wrote, “Mere instruction leaves a man a thing of shadows.” Ellis Hawley showed his students by example how a professional behaves. Year after year he participated in professional programs and meetings, as paper presenter, discussant, chair of session or panelist. He served on editorial boards, refereed articles, and evaluated manuscripts for two dozen presses. He served the Organization of American Historians (including fourteen years on the membership committee and a term as chair), the Southern Historical Association, the American Association of University Professors. He has been on the steering committee of the Center for the Study of Recent History in the United States ever since 1976, and he has repeatedly devoted time to the Herbert Hoover Library Association. He showed us how to live a professional life.

The third and final quality I celebrate is Ellis Hawley’s commitment to using the techniques of history to examine the current events of the nation. (I am excluding Hawkeye basketball here, although I suspect he could give us a substantial analysis of that, too.) In his lectures he would bring the analysis up to the Presidential administration in which we were living. Using his association model, he was able to dissect the current policies, even though he was relying on the same public sources any of his students had. But as you listened to him, you could see what power historical techniques had to help you understand the world in which you lived.

Another of his techniques was more subtle but just as effective. He required students to create a primary document—a letter, a memo, a diary entry—based in a particular historical period. By writing in another voice, students learned about the shaping of historical perspective by participants and observers. And that, too, provided us with the tools to analyze the documents thrown up by the tides of contemporary life.

Ellis Hawley was perceptive, too, about the utility of computer languages to the historians’ work. For nearly a quarter century he has permitted his graduate students to substitute a computer language for a foreign one. I did, and while my exposure to French would not be as dated today as my exposure to COBOL is, the introduction to the world of computerization was of enormous value to me as I began to work with the records of modern America.

These three qualities—the commitment to research, the commitment to students, the commitment to linking the historical techniques to the present political reality—provide the profile of an uncommon historian. The Polish journalist Adam Michnik, in a conversation with the German historian Jurgen Habermas, commented on the person’s need for history. “One has to be,” he said, “for amnesty and against amnesia.” Ellis Hawley’s work underscores a rationalist’s faith that we can understand, that change inevitably occurs but stasis may continue, that problems are not necessarily solved and irresolution may not be inherently bad. It is a clear, dry-eyed view of the complexity of modern governance. With historians of Ellis Hawley’s stature, the United States has no fear of amnesia.

The following announcement appeared in a recent Newsletter of the Organization of American Historians (OAH):

ELLIS W. HAWLEY PRIZE
NEARING GOAL

(At its October, 1994 meeting, the OAH Executive Board voted unanimously to approve language for a prize in honor of Ellis W. Hawley for historical work described as follows:)

“The Ellis Hawley Prize is awarded annually for the best book-length historical study of the political economy, politics, or institutions of the United States, in its domestic or international affairs, from the Civil War to the present. The prize of $500 is given in honor of Ellis W. Hawley, Emeritus Professor of History, University of Iowa, an outstanding historian of these subjects.

Best known for his pathbreaking books, The New Deal and the Problem of Monopoly and The Great War and the Search for a Modern Order, Professor Hawley has, for three decades, set a model for scholarship in this area. The prize will offer added stimulus to such work and call attention to the best of it.

Members attending the 1994 Annual Business Meeting will be asked to vote on establishing the prize, which will not be awarded until sufficient funds have been raised to endow the award.

On behalf of the OAH, the Hawley Prize Organizing Committee congratulates Professor Hawley, the University of Iowa, and its Department of History on the establishment of this fitting and enduring honor. And
we invite the Department’s many friends and supporters to join us in raising the prize endowment. Please send your tax-deductible contributions, payable to the “OAH/Hawley Prize Fund,” to the following address:

The Ellis W. Hawley Prize
of the Organization of American Historians
Department of History
University of Delaware
Newark DE 19716 USA

Remarks by Michael J. Hogan at the Retirement Celebration for Larry Gelfand

I must say it’s a bit humbling to be introduced in this magnificent Old Capitol at an event in honor of two remarkable scholars and teachers. I can’t help realizing again, as I have before, how very much I owe to this great university, and to the great state of which this old building is such a proud symbol, not to mention the two wonderful historians whose careers we are celebrating today. I had the honor to work closely with both of them, not only as a student here but in the years since then, and I’m glad to have this chance to offer a few remarks about Larry Gelfand.

Let me organize my remarks about Larry around the three roles that all of us must play as professional historians, those of scholar, of teacher, and of servant to our institutions and our profession. I often tell younger colleagues that they should try in their scholarship to succeed in all of the mediums available to us as historians. Larry has had such success. Over the years his work has appeared as articles in prominent journals; he’s delivered more than his share of papers and commentaries at professional meetings; he has a list of book reviews that would choke a horse; and he’s enjoyed enormous success as an editor and co-editor of numerous volumes. His editorial career began in earnest with the memoirs of Lewis Einstein published by Yale University Press in 1968, continued in 1972 with his carefully selected collection of essays on the history of American foreign relations, and in 1979 with another volume of essays on Herbert Hoover during the First World War and its aftermath. My personal favorite of these works is the edited volume of essays on the history of American foreign relations, in part because when I opened it up I saw my own name in print for the first time—I worked as Larry’s research assistant when he was preparing that volume—and in part because my service as Larry’s assistant gave me my first close-up glimpse into the working habits of a real scholar, habits that show up so dramatically in his major work, The Inquiry: American Preparations for Peace, 1917-1919. One of the best things about being invited to this event was the chance it gave me to re-read The Inquiry. It was a good book when I first read it 25 years ago, but I don’t think I realized until this re-reading, after years of research and writing myself, how really good it is. For one thing the writing is impeccable and shot through with Larry’s special insights and humor.

Consider this wonderful sentence at the start of chapter two: “Wars share with certain games like chess, wrestling, and bull fighting an unpredictable tendency for abrupt finales, often ending before the various contestants fully realize the decisive turn of events.” Or consider these observations at the start of chapter four: “Wartime self-interest might logically dictate a national policy of cooperation with allies and associates in a common struggle. There is a special incentive for unity when the balance of power is delicately poised. Yet, in an age of hyper-nationalism, a Machiavellian independence of action ever watchful of advantage gained by friend as well as foe is operative. … Hence the pursuit of victory is characterized by a jealous defense of national interest, a condition which assumes the same importance in war as in peace.”

These and other insights contribute to a book whose significance is indisputable. Published by Yale in 1963, The Inquiry was celebrated as a major work in virtually all of the reviews that I could lay my hands on, including a review in the American Historical Review by Richard Leopold, who was then the dean of diplomatic historians, from whom a positive word was as close to a career-maker as you could get. It’s striking how Leopold and all of the reviewers called attention to the same points, which those of us who did their graduate work with Larry can fully appreciate. They were all impressed, and rightly so, with the book’s enormous erudition, noting Larry’s detailed work in the records of the State Department, praising his close exploration of the previously untapped files of the Inquiry, and going to the trouble in some cases to count up the number of manuscript collections he consulted (26, if I remember correctly). Nor would it be surprising to Larry’s students that all of these reviewers praised the book’s sensible organization, good writing, balanced judgments, and wry humor, particularly in the little vignettes of the key figures in his story.

Of course, these are all impressive accomplishments, but the significance of The Inquiry lies elsewhere. By the time it appeared in print research on Wilsonian diplomacy was already a booming industry. A good deal had been published, more was on the way, and the field was deeply divided and contentious. It was audacious for a young scholar to wade so boldly into the field—that alone is impressive, but even more impressive because Larry managed to find an avenue of research that others had ignored, and yet one that threw important new light on the way Wilsonian foreign policy was formulated. To read Larry’s account, that formulation was often fraught with confusion, disorganization, and other difficulties, including personal animosities, poor administration, and inadequate funding, but nonetheless mani-
aged to produce results that were sometimes of very great significance, such as the Inquiry’s contribution to Wilson’s famous Fourteen Points. All of this makes for interesting reading. The Inquiry remains, some thirty years after its publication, a model monograph.

But when I looked at the book in preparation for this event what struck me most was not how it established Larry as a leading authority on Wilsonian diplomacy, a role, by the way, that he continues to play with the publication of penetrating review essays dealing with recent literature on the subject. No, what actually struck me was how the book anticipated subsequent developments both in scholarship and in the work of policymaking. It’s hard to read this volume today without seeing how it prefigured scholarly concern with the development of the professions, especially the academic professions and the professional foreign service. It also anticipated scholarly concern with the development of an American liberal ideology that celebrates efficiency, expertise, and planning, and with the growing dependence of the modern state on academic knowledge of all sorts. The Inquiry is not about these things directly, and yet it contributes to our knowledge of them. I find particularly interesting what it has to say about the early linkages between the professions and the government in the interest of policymaking. These linkages would emerge in due course as one part of what Ellis Hawley might see as a corporative pattern of collaboration between the public and private sectors, and they would include a variety of government programs that actually sought to manufacture the knowledge that policymakers needed to shape American foreign policy. One thinks of the government’s support of the physical sciences during and after the Second World War, or of its support of the development of area studies programs that could provide policymakers with the specialized expertise that Wilson and House sought in the Inquiry. I guess what I’m saying here is that The Inquiry is such a special book not simply because of the contribution it made in 1963 to the growing debate over Wilsonian diplomacy, but also because it actually anticipated and addressed subsequent issues of scholarly concern.

Larry’s success as a scholar is matched by his record of service to the profession. All of you here at Iowa know well his work for the department of history and the university. To say that he’s been a good citizen does not seem to say enough. He’s served as department chair; he’s represented the university on the board of the Harry S. Truman Library Institute; he’s been President of the University Faculty Council and Senate and member of the Executive Committee of the College of Liberal Arts, the Friends of the Library, the editorial board of the University Press, which he chaired, and well, the record goes on and on. I’m somebody who for too many years sought to avoid university service, or at least keep it to the minimum, which is to say I lived off the service of others, like Larry, who made my universities better places to work. It’s that realization that makes me now feel an admiration for Larry’s record of service that I might not have felt fifteen years ago. Nor is Larry’s record limited to this institution.

Larry played a pivotal role in the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations (SHAFR). You may remember that he was elected to the Presidency of that organization in 1982. Less well know, especially to the younger generation of diplomatic historians, is the part he played in launching that society more than twenty-five years ago. It’s quite literally true that he is one of a dozen or so founding members of an organization that has since emerged as one of the healthiest, best endowed, and most vital professional societies in the country today, really an international society of nearly 2,000 scholars around the world. The only mistake he made, I think, was in opposing the establishment of the society’s journal, Diplomatic History, which I now edit, but a mistake he corrected by doing a stint on the journal’s editorial board and by serving the journal as a regular contributor, referee, and reviewer.

This service ethic is something Larry tried to instill in his graduate students, if I might now turn to that part of his long career. Here my memories are very personal, and very happy. I came to graduate school at Iowa with a very indifferent undergraduate record. I was admitted as a probationary student into the M.A., not the Ph.D., program. The department assigned me an advisor. It was Christopher Lasch, of whom I also have fond memories, but Lasch left Iowa at the end of my first year, and I had to find a new adviser. During my first year I had taken a number of courses in different fields, including Larry’s lecture course in the history of American foreign relations. By the way, I also had a course, and later a Ph.D. field, with Stow Persons in American intellectual history, and still later I did some course work with Ralph Giesey, Henry Horwitz, Larry LaForce, and David Schoenbaum, not to mention Ellis Hawley. Looking back on it now, I was so underprepared for graduate school that I had no idea how lucky I was to be working with so many famous historians, all of whom managed to treat me with a good deal of respect and kindness, even though it was the 60s, when students often made a point of being challenging, if not altogether rude, and even though I was a probationary student. Years later I remember Walter LaFeber, Noll Professor of History at Cornell, talking about his selection of a graduate school just a few years before I entered Iowa. He selected Wisconsin, but only after an agonizing debate with himself over what he saw as two good choices: one choice was Wisconsin, which had the best big history department in the country, and the other was Iowa, which had the best small history department in the country. I realized
as soon as he said it how right he was, judged not only by the scholars like Gelfand, Havelhy, Lasch, Persons, Giese, Horowitz and the others with whom I worked but also by the many other distinguished historians who were then in the department, such as Alan Spitzer, Sydney James, Sidney Meade, Bill Aydelotte, Charles Hale, and many others whom I'm sure you know or remember. It was a fantastic place to be.

In any event, I had been assigned to Lasch and after he left I had to make my own choice of an advisor. I chose Larry. I chose him on the basis of his course that I had just taken on the history of American foreign relations, and I can still remember why: He was a good teacher. To begin with, Larry's lectures were excellent and very interesting, particularly at a time when the Vietnam War was heating up and we were all getting interested in American foreign policy. Second, Larry assigned some very challenging books. Most of the reading was drawn from the realist school of the 1950s and 1960s, books by George Kennan and Robert Osgood, which were on the cutting edge in those days and which offered a biting critique of American foreign policy. But also on Larry's reading list, and I wonder if he remembers this, was Gar Alperovitz's book on atomic diplomacy, one of the most controversial books ever to appear in the field. I remember it so well not just because the book was controversial but because Larry didn't like it. He had been a young boy, a young soldier in 1945 serving in the Pacific and was scheduled to join others in an invasion of the Japanese home islands when the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki brought the Pacific war to an end. It was hard for him to wrestle with a book that portrayed that bombing as an act driven by political rather than military necessities, but he assigned it anyway, which revealed to me even then an incredible open-mindedness and tolerance for other points of view. This appealed to me at the time and even more so later when I became very interested in New Left historiography, which Larry also didn't much like but from which he never discouraged me. On the contrary, he tolerated it, even asking me on my general exams at least two questions that drew heavily from revisionist literature. It was as if he knew that letting me pursue my own lights was the way to keep me interested in the work, learning and growing and making it through a difficult program. That tolerance drew me toward Larry as an adviser, as did the comments he made on my bluebook essays and term paper. Those comments were detailed, they were constructive, and they were friendly. He liked my work and he said so. It was this kindness that also drew me toward him when Lasch left.

Larry saw me through a master's essay, he got me off probation and into the Ph.D. program, he got me on aid and kept me there, and he tolerated my own development. That might be enough to say of any graduate teacher, but there was much more. The professional virtues that Larry exhibited and that I talked about earlier, he encouraged in all of his students. He got us launched on our professional lives. He urged us to join SHAAR and to read its journal and to attend its meetings. Later, when Larry served as president of SHAAR, he asked me to do stints on two SHAAR committees, thereby beginning an association with that society that has grown closer and deeper in the years since. He also instilled in us, and this is perhaps my most distinct memory of Larry as a graduate teacher, an intense respect for the historical record, for the documentation and archival research, for a close, skeptical reading of the sources, and for honesty in our research and writing. It always seemed to me that he knew every bibliographical guide ever published, every collection of documents, and that he had visited every archive and depository. He was an encyclopedia of information on such matters.

It could be hard work being Larry's student. He could be demanding and he had high expectations. But there was a human side that I came to know even then. I remember the times he and Miriam entertained us in their home; I remember the gifts they gave when three of our children were born in Iowa City; and I remember at least two times when they emptied their refrigerator of all kinds of food, giving it to us, or so they said, so it wouldn't spoil while they were out of town for a long weekend. I can only hope today, when I have a dozen or so graduate students of my own, that I can inspire such memories and such affection as Larry has inspired in me, and Miriam too.

I was here almost at the beginning of Larry's tenure at Iowa and I am proud to be here today as he closes this chapter in his long career as scholar, teacher, professional citizen, and friend. For all of your students, Larry, I say thanks very much.

FACULTY LECTURES

In 1993 the department instituted a series of faculty lectures to allow senior professors in the department to lecture on their current interests to the department, graduate students, and the general public.

Fall Semester, 1993

September 17th. Professor Donald McCloskey, "Bourgeois Virtue in History."


Fall Semester 1994

September 16, Professor Sarah Hanley, "Marital Regime Government in Early Modern France."

October 21, Professor Michael W. Harris, "History Behind the Veil: A Racial Critique of Historical Methods."

November 18, Professor David Arkush, "The Culture of North Chinese Villagers."

Fall Semester 1995

September 15, Professor David Schoenbaum, "Deconstructing the violin (but not literally, of course)."

October 13, Professor Constanze Berman, "A Dossier for the Suppression of the Nuns of la Cour-Notre-Dame?"

November 17, Professor Steven Hoch, "The Serf Economy and the Social Order in Russia."

GRADUATES


Personal News: Retired since 1958, but maintains an office at the University. Spends winters in Green Valley, Arizona.

Took Ph.D. in 1935 under Louis Pelzer, and has been at the University of Wisconsin-River Falls since 1932, excepting five years spent as President of the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater.

Carl B. Cone, 1940, retired. His last publication was Pictorial History of the University of Kentucky (University Press of Kentucky, 1989).

Alfred Martin, 1941, happy to remain on the right side of the grass.

Vergil S. Fogdall, 1947, in retirement has moved to Willamette View, Inc., in Portland, Oregon, a retirement home. He was longtime professor of history and dean of admissions at Lewis and Clark College. In retirement his most popular talks for interested persons are: "The First Ladies" and "Famous First Pages of newspapers in U.S. History." In the latter the oldest is the New York Times announcing the surrender of Confederate forces at the end of the Civil War.

R. Brice Harley, 1948, continues as the archivist for the Diocese of San Bernardino, CA, a position he has held since retiring as an Air Force historian in 1983. His major effort currently, supported by a grant from the Dan Murphy Foundation of Los Angeles, is the compilation of his many articles on the Catholic church history of inland Southern California into a series of a dozen books under the general title of Readings in Diocesan Heritage, 1774-1994.

Walter Peterson, 1951, continues as Chancellor of the University of Dubuque. He is completing the study of the William C. Brown Publishing Company of Dubuque.


Last year, spring semester of 1994, taught an Irish history Lyceum seminar at the Newberry Library in Chicago.

Duane Meyer, 1956, President Emeritus and Professor of History Southwest Missouri State University, continues to teach full-time. He teaches the first half of the American Survey course, the History of Missouri, and the History of the West. He enjoys teaching very much and has just finished 39 years on the faculty of Southwest Missouri State University.


Leonard F. Ralston, 1960, since retirement in 1987 has completed writing a history of the college where he taught for 30 years, Cortland College: An Illustrated History was published in 1991. He recently completed a short article on Silas Packard for the new American National Biography. Computerizing manuscript census returns for the Cortland County Historical Society is an ongoing project.