The RAI is the seat of Oxford’s conversation with America. It is the foremost academic institution for teaching and research in US history, culture and politics beyond America’s shores.

Annual Report 2013-14
The RAI’s people make the Institute the compact powerhouse that it is. Accordingly, I begin by thanking all those colleagues who have during the past year, either as visitors or residents, brought their sense of intellectual adventure to America’s Home at Oxford. As this report shows, 2013–14 has been a year of remarkable achievement – of powerful lectures, seminars and conferences which have cast new light on America’s history, politics, and literature; of fresh research and publications; and of bringing the RAI’s activities to ever-wider audiences.

It has been our pleasure to welcome Richard Blackett, of Vanderbilt University, as Harmsworth Professor in American History, and Randall Woods, of the University of Arkansas, as Winant Professor of American Government. We welcomed as Visiting Research Fellows:
- Dr Nicholas Guyatt (York) as Senior Fellow;
- Professor Bruce Kuniholm (Duke) as the inaugural Harmsworth-Duke Fellow;
- Dr Christopher Moran (Warwick) and Dr Kate Williams (Illinois) as Postdoctoral Fellows;
- Professor Sarah Rivett (Princeton) and Dr Tom Packer (London), as Associate Fellows;
- The Hon. Jamie Rubin, former Assistant Secretary of State, as Visiting Fellow;
- Professor Ann Schofield (Kansas) and Professor Bob Schuettinger, President of the Washington International Studies Council, as Vacation Fellows.

I thank all of these colleagues, together with our resident fellows Dr Ursula Hackett, appointed this year to a joint RAI–Department of Politics & International Relations Postdoctoral Fellowship and Dr Sebastian Page, the RAI–Queen’s Postdoctoral Fellow in American History, for all their contributions to the RAI.

Highlights of every year are the annual Harmsworth and Winant inaugural lectures. 2013–14 was no exception. Richard Blackett gave his Harmsworth Lecture on ‘The Underground Railroad and the Struggle Against Slavery’. A distinguished historian of the abolitionist movement in the US, its transatlantic connections, and the roles of African-Americans in the effort to outlaw slavery, Richard’s many monographs and articles have profoundly shaped the understanding of slavery. His current project, which he discusses on pages 6 and 7 of this report, examines how and why communities organized to support or resist enforcement of the 1850 Fugitive Slave Law, and how escapees from enslavement influenced political struggles over slavery. Randall Woods, whose reflections are on page 9, used his Winant Lecture – ‘Avatar of Reform: LBJ and the Great Society’ – to link his current work on the Great Society with his earlier, magnificent biography of President Johnson. I thank both Richard and Randall sincerely; both are always warmly welcome to return.

We also celebrate promotions and appointments – of Sarah Rivett to a tenured Professorship in American Literature at Princeton and Nick Guyatt to a University Lectureship in American History at Cambridge; Peter Riley, a postdoctoral fellow at the RAI, to a Lectureship in American Literature at Exeter University; and Seb Page becomes Departmental Lecturer in American History at Oxford. Reflecting the strength of American history at Oxford, the field was further boosted with the news that the University will appoint a fifth permanent University Lecturer in the subject from October 2015.

Students are at the heart of all that the RAI does, and it was a pleasure to offer scholarships and travel grants, and for the first time in 2013–14, hardship assistance. Pages 14 and 15 reveal the diverse projects supported by RAI travel grants and by the philanthropy that makes these grants possible. Overleaf, the five holders of RAI Studentships – Patrick Andelic, Susan Barbour, Angus Brown, Blake Ewing, and Max Thompson – report on their achievements.

None of the fine work done at the RAI would be possible without the commitment of my colleagues in the Institute and the Vere Harmsworth Library. To all of them, I offer my thanks: to Jay Sexton (right), appointed as Deputy Director in October 2013, for his wisdom in guiding the Academic Programme Committee; to Jane Rawson, our superb Librarian and Buildings Manager; and to Huw David, the RAI’s accomplished Development Executive. I thank also those other colleagues upon whom the Library and the RAI depend: Judy Warden, Martin Sutcliffe, Johanna O’Connor, Joanne Steventon, Richard Purkiss, and Ingrid Salisbury.

Programme

The academic year closed with welcome news – of a major boost to research at the Institute. Pekka Hämäläinen, Rhodes Professor of
American History, has been awarded a €1.9m European Research Council grant for a five-year project stemming from his award-winning research on the Comanche Indians of the southwestern United States. Setting the peoples of the bordersland of the American West in a context of nomadic ‘peoples of the horse’ globally, the study exemplifies the RAI’s analysis of the United States in hemispheric and international contexts. It will provide five postdoctoral scholarships and feature two international conferences.

As we strive to share the Institute’s activities as widely as possible, many of 2013–14’s captivating talks are available on the RAI’s website at www.rai.ox.ac.uk/podcasts. Reports on page 16 illustrate their power and breadth, and I express here my personal thanks to David Armitage, Michael Aronstein, General Michael Hayden, Mary Jo Jacobi, Lewis Lehrman, Claire Messud, Chisanga Puta-Chekwe, Tom Tierney, and Ambassador Jim Woolsey for their memorable contributions to our intellectual life.

Other memorable talks included Byron Shafer, Hawkins Chair of Political Science at the University of Wisconsin, a Distinguished Fellow of the RAI, and Winant Chair of American Government in 2014–15, speaking on ‘The Three Worlds of Postwar American Politics: Political Orders and Scholarly Eras’, and Bertrand Van Ruymbeke (Université de Paris VIII) on ‘British and French America: Parallels and Divergences’, held in conjunction with the Maison Française.

Congress to Campus again thrillingly foregrounded the RAI’s engagement with schools. As can be seen on page 20, we were honoured to welcome Bob Clement, Jim Coyne, and Matthew Barzun, US Ambassador to the United Kingdom. Another notable success was the annual Summer School in American Literature – ‘Learning to Write: The Writer, The Artist and Their Notebook’ – led by two RAI Research and Teaching Fellows, Sally Bayley and Martin Hitchcock, and profiled on page 16.

The RAI also marked two significant anniversaries in recent American history with momentous events featuring eyewitnesses to that history. On 22 November 2013, fifty years to the day since President Kennedy’s assassination, Godfrey Hodgson and Randall Woods assessed the Kennedy Presidency before a rapt audience of scholars, students and members of the public. Godfrey recalled his encounters as The Observer’s Washington correspondent with Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and told of witnessing the return of President Kennedy’s body to Washington at Andrews Air Force Base on the evening of 22 November 1963.

‘Nixon the President, Nixon the Man’, held to mark the 40th anniversary of the downfall of President Richard Nixon, brought two of President Nixon’s White House staff, Alexander Butterfield and John Price, to share their personal reflections and propose a profound and moving re-evaluation of the 37th President. Excerpts from a transcript of this remarkable occasion feature on this report’s centre pages. Transcription can hardly do justice to the power of the event, and I urge you to watch the video at www.rai.ox.ac.uk/podcasts.

**Purpose**

I write in the summer of 2014 as the RAI enters the third year of its Campaign to secure its academic programme, to establish graduate studentships and postdoctoral fellowships, and to endow the Directorship. With indefatigable support from the RAI’s Advisory Board, we have made great progress on the first three. I am grateful to all of those who have made that progress possible by their generosity and, in particular, to the major donations made and pledged to the Institute in the past year by Mrs Joan Winant; the Robertson Foundation; the Rothermere Foundation; William and Camille Broadbent; and Professor George Edwards. These and other remarkable friends of the RAI, many of whose names are recorded on the recently refreshed Donor Board in the RAI’s foyer, make possible not just the RAI’s work now and in the coming two or three years but in perpetuity. I am grateful too, to those donors – two of them anonymous – who have made the Fellowship and Studentship programmes possible.

The RAI’s Campaign will not end when its first phase concludes in the summer of 2015. There will be a second and, in all probability, further phases, the shape of which will depend upon the evolving assessments of the RAI’s future Directors, Advisory Boards, and Executive Committees about the Institute’s ambitions. In the remaining year of the Campaign’s first phase, however, our task is to anchor the financial foundation of the RAI’s Directorship. Together with our friends and supporters, the Advisory Board, Executive Committee, and the RAI staff, my commitment to that task is complete.

If you can help either directly or via friends and contacts that you may have, please let me know. With the help of everyone who reads this Annual Report, I have no doubt that all of us in and around the RAI will succeed. We strive not for ourselves or our own generation, but for our successors as academics, students, and members of the public who will embark here at the RAI upon their own intellectual adventures of discovery about American history, politics, and literature in the decades to come.
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The generosity of the RAI’s friends and supporters has once again enabled the Institute to offer financial support to graduate students working in American history, politics and international relations, and literature. Here, the five 2013–14 recipients describe the impact that these awards have had as they complete their doctoral research.

**Patrick Andelic**

My thesis, ‘Beyond the New Deal Order: Debating the Democratic Future in an “Age of Conservatism”, 1972–84’, explores competing understandings of liberalism within the Democratic Party between 1972 and 1984. The thesis serves as a corrective to recent political historiography which has focused on explaining the rise of modern conservatism and which often assumes something foreordained about liberalism’s collapse. Part of the thesis’s purpose is to reconstruct the political climate of the 1970s and early 1980s, understanding it as an era in its own right rather than a pivot between the liberal/radical Sixties and the ‘Age of Reagan’. In investigating the continued vitality of liberal politics after it had supposedly gone into decline, I hope to illuminate the dialectical relationship between liberalism and conservatism in the years after the Great Society.

This thesis is based on extensive research undertaken across the US, including archives in Washington DC, Minnesota, Massachusetts, Georgia, Colorado, and California. I also interviewed many politicians, political staffers, activists, and public servants who were active in the 1970s and 1980s.

The studentship allowed me to continue taking advantage of both the VHL’s extensive collections and the expertise of the RAI’s community, particularly through such forums as the History Graduate Workshop. I was also able to take up a temporary position as a visiting tutor at Ruskin College, an adult educational institute, teaching ‘Campaigning on Gender, Race, and Class in Twentieth Century America’. As I hope to pursue a career in academia after submission, this has been invaluable as teaching experience.

The time afforded to me by the RAI studentship in American History has not only enabled me to complete my thesis, but to complete it to a much higher standard than would otherwise have been possible. I am grateful to the RAI not only for this studentship, but for its continued support, both financial and pastoral, throughout my doctoral studies.

**Susan Barbour**

I have been able to make great strides in my research this year thanks to the generous support of the RAI and its benefactors. I submitted my D.Phil. thesis in July 2014 and have been awarded a Post-doctoral Fellowship at Caltech and The Huntington Library for 2014–2015.

My thesis concerns the poetry and art of American poet Susan Howe (1937–present). She began her career as a visual artist, but a dearth of information about her early collages has made it difficult to say anything substantive about how they shaped her poetic practice. But recently Howe granted me special permission to see these early works. Along with a number of personal interviews, this heretofore unavailable material enabled me to consider Howe’s poetry in a new light and to establish links between her early visual aesthetics and the poetics of bibliography, historiography, and elegy for which she is now known.

A study of Howe and the visual arts is not only relevant but timely. This year Howe exhibited at the 2014 Whitney Biennial in New York, which showcases a cross-section of current influential artists in America. My RAI studentship enabled me to travel to New York to see Howe’s exhibit at the Whitney first-hand. I was therefore able to end my thesis with a coda that comes full circle to discuss her work in the museum context.

**Angus Brown**

My work this year would not have been possible without a studentship from the RAI. The award has given me the time I needed to make headway with my doctoral thesis while giving me the opportunities to publish, to pursue job applications, and to present my work.

My thesis explores the transatlantic history of ‘close reading’ in the 20th century university and constitutes the first book-length treatment of this widespread literary critical practice. This treatment is particularly timely given the increasing academic interest in the new opportunities that the Digital Humanities afford contemporary scholars.
The studentship allowed me to explore these ideas more fully and to share and develop them at conferences in England and the US. These included the annual Modern Languages Association conference in Chicago and a conference at the University of York, where I delivered a paper entitled ‘Fat Art Thin Art: Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick As Poet’. The conference’s proceedings will be published next year; earlier this year, my first academic article appeared in *The Henry James Review*.

Funding from the RAI, as well as the community it brings together, allowed me to concentrate on writing and to develop my work. The support and advice I received from graduate students, visiting speakers, and lecturers involved with the literary side of things at the Rothermere, particularly Michèle Mendelssohn and Lloyd Pratt, has allowed me to share, improve, and take confidence from the ideas and ambitions that my thesis pursues.

**Max Thompson**

I feel immensely fortunate to have been awarded an RAI studentship to cover the final year of my D.Phil. in International Relations. In April I submitted my thesis ‘Making Friends: Amity in American Foreign Policy’. Without the RAI grant I very much doubt I would have been able to complete it in this timeframe (if at all). Looking back, I can say with absolute certainty that the quality of my thesis, which I hope is high, and its timely submission are entirely due to the generosity of the donors.

Since starting my D.Phil. in 2011 I have been, for the most part, self-funding. All of my living expenses have been met by research and tutoring work in Oxford, as well as part-time vacation work. This posed an enormous strain on my ability to write and conduct my research. With the grant from the RAI, I was not dependent on getting employment last summer and was able to take a lighter teaching load in the run-up to my submission. This was invaluable – I wrote 30,000 words last summer and a further 30,000 between January and April. In the two previous years I had managed only 25,000. I have also been able to devote time to completing articles, two of which are under review by journals.

Outside of the financial relief provided by the award, the studentship was a catalyst in becoming more actively involved in the life of the RAI. The RAI is a really special part of Oxford and this award gave me the impetus to get involved in this community more fully – and for that above all I am grateful.

**Blake Ewing**

With the RAI’s generous support, my aim this year was to explore the techniques employed by American Political Development – the study of the ‘historical dynamics’ of American political institutions – and what I call ‘the politics of time’. The American case is an integral part of my overall project looking at political ideologies and conceptions of historical time – how ideological politics attempts to explain, change or justify political ideas, identities, choices and actions by purveying particular awareness or constructions of historical time.

This year, I applied themes of historical theory to political thinking. The project examines how political thinking weaves the present into a narrative of the past (past-present) – a major theme of the American founding era. The thinking of Jefferson, Hamilton, Adams, and Madison attempts to reconcile the creation of a new republic based on a Lockean framework (present change) with a republican virtue tradition found in Roman and later Florentine political thought (long-term tradition). There are two contrasting views of time and politics in reference to the Founding period. One, following Tocqueville, identifies America as a modern nation. As Tocqueville wrote, ‘The great advantage of the American is, that they have arrived at a state of democracy without having to endure a democratic revolution; and that they are born equal, instead of becoming so’. The other is the politics of the ‘Machiavellian Moment’, where historical contingency is reconciled with a classical virtue tradition. As the architecture of the great buildings in Washington, DC reminds us, it was Roman, not only English, institutions that served as the model.

Using the vast library resources on early America – from Puritan to early 19th century political thought – my project attempts to strengthen the study of political theory and historical ideas. It further connects the study of American history with a framework for understanding an American brand of political thinking, the divisions of which still impact politics today.

“The RAI is a really special part of Oxford and this award gave me the impetus to get involved in this community more fully – and for that above all I am grateful.”

**Max Thompson**
In 2013–14, the RAI welcomed Richard Blackett, Andrew Jackson Professor of History at Vanderbilt University, as Harold Vyvyan Harmsworth Visiting Professor of American History. Professor Blackett’s first book was Building an Antislavery Wall: Black Americans in the Atlantic Abolitionist Movement, 1830–1860, and he has spent much of this year writing his new book, on reactions to the 1850 Fugitive Slave Act. He spoke to Sebastian Page, the RAI-Queen’s Junior Research Fellow in American History.

SP: How would you summarise your body of work?

RB: A large part of my work has been to look again at transatlantic abolitionism. Earlier scholarship studied the international movement more in institutional terms, but I have been interested in how black Americans variously cemented and fractured that alliance. In a broader context, my interests engage with questions of how oppressed people raise international public support for their struggle. As someone once remarked to me, my research was ‘diasporic’ before that term was fashionable, but such developments in my early scholarship were not necessarily by design. As ever in history, one starts with a different question, and then one’s studies go in unexpected directions and achieve greater breadth than one had ever imagined.

SP: So would you characterise your writings as a ‘bottom-up’ reaction to ‘top-down’ history?

RB: To some extent, yes. I grew up reading the work of my famous Trinidadian compatriots, Eric Williams, who wrote Capitalism and Slavery, and C.L.R. James, who wrote The Black Jacobins, and perhaps it was their influence that helped make me a ‘bottom-up’ historian by instinct. But more specifically, I came of age during the 1970s, when scholars were beginning to investigate the origins of twentieth-century black radicalism. My first appointment was at the Department of Black Studies at the University of Pittsburgh, where a number of colleagues were interested in a local man whom many consider to be the original black nationalist, Martin Delany. I was intrigued by the fact that Delany had appealed to the British public at the end of the 1850s to support a projected settlement in the Niger Valley, and that was how I got into the international aspects of the topic.

SP: What questions in history excite you?

RB: How the oppressed, but also their oppressors, act on what they say. One danger of studying the debate over slavery is that it all becomes about words, about vocal constituencies that did not ultimately manage to change the overall situation. But another danger is that we abuse hindsight through knowing that oppressed minorities tend not to win. History would be fairly depressing if we did not study how the oppressed reacted to challenges or, indeed, limited their oppressors’ own successes. In that sense, my work is about politics with a small ‘p’, about the relationship between prevalent ideas and specific actions.
SP: In view of your background, are you interested in comparisons with West Indian societies in the same period?

RB: I am, although no researcher can ever cover as many countries as we would like to think necessary for that kind of study. What made the United States unique was that blacks could articulate such a simple message, namely, demanding nothing more than the inalienable rights promised in the Declaration of Independence. By contrast, there was no single rallying-point for struggles in the post-emancipation Caribbean. Former slaves and free blacks were less insistent on gaining the vote under a constitutional setup where a majority of white men in metropolitan Britain were likewise excluded from the suffrage. Tellingly, black West Indians who engaged in debates in the United States about the relative merits of separation and integration thought in different terms to their American contemporaries. My compilation of black biographies, Beating Against the Barriers, includes a native of Jamaica, Robert Campbell, who emigrated from the United States to Nigeria in the early 1860s. As the fact of his prior migration might suggest, he was a man simply looking for what he considered the best option available in the wider Atlantic. Campbell did not share black Americans’ sense that he was betraying a creed through leaving the United States. Being of mixed race and from a society with less binary notions of colour, he also did not understand many black Americans’ visceral suspicion of whites.

SP: Unlike for many of our Harmsworth Professors, this is not your first sustained experience of British higher education, is it?

RB: I was an undergraduate at Keele University, in Staffordshire. Being from the West Indies, and having recently experienced Britain’s notorious winter of 1962–63, as soon as I found out that Keele offered central heating in its halls of residence, I wrote its name in five spaces out of six on my UCCA form, the shared application form that British universities used. Then I went to Manchester for my postgraduate studies, which was the first time that I got to do American history. Back then, most British universities placed whatever US history they offered under ‘American Studies’, which it might be more accurate to call multidisciplinary, with little or no overlap between its different elements, rather than interdisciplinary. Indeed, I often think that interdisciplinarity as it is now understood has led to a proliferation of jargon and confusion. For my part, I insist on clear language and expression from my students. What is the point of producing history that readers cannot understand?

SP: What do you make of Oxford’s place in the study of American history?

RB: Inevitably, Oxford does not automatically register on the American radar like the top-end US institutions do, but its academics are always well-known, and for all periods of American history. By contrast, US universities tend to suffer more from cyclical reputations for excellence in specific areas, usually lost when an individual academic leaves and thus can no longer attract graduate students. Moreover, you have an incredible asset in the Vere Harmsworth Library, which is dedicated to US history in a way that virtually no American institution can match. If I could change one thing here, it would be to increase teaching capacity for the Master of Studies in American History. With a rapidly growing number of students, the course risks becoming a victim of its own success.

“Oxford’s [American history] academics are always well-known, and for all periods of American history. By contrast, US universities tend to suffer more from cyclical reputations for excellence in specific areas, usually lost when an individual academic leaves and thus can no longer attract graduate students. Moreover, you have an incredible asset in the Vere Harmsworth Library, which is dedicated to US history in a way that virtually no American institution can match.”

Professor Richard Blackett
From ‘Governance of the North American Arctic’ to ‘Watergate: 40 Years On’, to ‘Expert Public Administration’, conferences held at the RAI in 2013–14 reflected the Institute’s intellectual breadth.

A harsh, sparsely populated environment, the Arctic has historically proved difficult for distant governments to administer, exploit, protect, and defend. In recent years, however, with the region's economic potential becoming increasingly clear, and with external actors actively seeking to pursue their own interests there, states with territory north of the Arctic Circle are placing a much higher priority upon making effective their claims to sovereignty in the far north.

Organised jointly by the RAI and St Antony's College's North American Studies Programme, and with financial support from the New York Community Trust and the University of Oxford's Lester B. Pearson Fund, Governance of the North American Arctic examined how the US, Canada, and Denmark (as the sovereign power in Greenland) have sought to govern the North American Arctic and the ways in which history is influencing contemporary policymaking in the region. Speakers included Bill Graham, former Foreign Minister of Canada; William Iggugruk Hensley, founder of the Northwest Alaska Native Association and chair of the First Alaskans Institute; Udloriak Hanson, Special Advisor to Mary Simon, President of Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK), the national organisation representing Inuit from Nunavut, Nunavik in Northern Quebec, Nunatsiavut in Labrador and the Inuvialuit region of the Northwest Territories; and Shelagh Grant, author of Polar Imperative: A History of Arctic Sovereignty in North America.

In March 2014, the RAI’s annual postgraduate conference, this year on Watergate: 40 Years On, was organised by doctoral students Patrick Andelic and Patrick Sandman. The conference examined the political, social, and cultural ramifications of Watergate in the four decades since President Nixon's resignation. Papers considered topics including the electoral impact of Watergate, Nixon's unexpectedly limited mandate after the 1972 election, the rise of anti-feminist campaigning within the Republican Party, and congressional oversight of the CIA. The conference concluded with a memorable keynote discussion featuring two former aides to President Nixon, Alexander Butterfield and John Price – an edited transcript of their remarks can be found on pages 10 to 12 of this report.

Expert Public Administration, Public Life, and the Search for Legitimacy in May 2014 gathered distinguished scholars of public administration from across Great Britain and the United States. With a focus on the US, but also incorporating other jurisdictions, the conference explored the nature and legitimacy of expert public administration in public life. Papers discussed the ways in which expert public administration can be conceptualized and understood; the ways in which ideas of expert public administration have shaped law and policy in different areas and over time; and the possible ways forward.

The conference's papers are likely to be published within the next two years, and will follow the release of three recent publications stemming from RAI conferences: Transparency in Politics and the Media, edited by James Hamilton, David Levy, and Nigel Bowles; Reasoning Rights: Comparative Judicial Engagement, edited by Liora Lazarus, Christopher McCrudden, and Nigel Bowles, and a recent edition of the leading journal Presidential Studies Quarterly, edited by George C. Edwards, Winant Professor in 2012–13, which features papers from ‘Governing the United States in Polarized Times’, a conference held at the RAI in April 2013.

2014–15 promises similarly thought-provoking conferences. The Rights of the Political Minority in America will meet in the shadow of a debate about the future of the rules governing the filibuster in the US Senate, where the rights of individual senators and the minority party to influence the progress of legislation have never seemed stronger, but also in the context of a period where the rights of minority parties in state-level governments seem as weak as they have ever been. Rushing for Gold: Mining, Empire, and Global History, c.1850–1910 will explore the power of 19th and early 20th century gold rushes. The desire to understand this phenomenon better – its drivers and its effects – has provided a rich field for historical exploration. However, most studies have so far remained explicitly national in focus. Hosted by the RAI, in collaboration with Oxford’s African Studies Centre and the Oxford Centre for Global History, the conference will explore the global, transnational and imperial dimensions of gold rushes.

For more information on these and other conferences at the RAI, please see http://www.rai.ox.ac.uk/conferences.
The John G. Winant Professorship of American Government was established in honour of John Gilbert Winant, United States Ambassador to Great Britain between 1941 and 1946, thanks to the generosity of his son and daughter-in-law, Rivington and Joan Winant. Each year, the chair brings to Oxford a distinguished scholar of American politics and government. In 2013–14, it was held by Randall Woods, the John A. Cooper Distinguished Professor of History at the University of Arkansas.

Randall Woods received his Ph.D. from the University of Texas. In 1985 he was named John A. Cooper Professor of American History, and was promoted to Distinguished Professor in 1996. Woods has served as Associate Dean, Interim Dean, and Dean of Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Arkansas. He has published seven books, most notably *Fulbright: A Biography* (Cambridge, 1995), which was nominated for both the Pulitzer Prize and the National Book Award, and which won the Ferrell and Ledbetter Prizes. In 2006, the Free Press published his biography of President Lyndon Johnson, *LBJ: Architect of American Ambition*. His latest book, published in 2012, is a biography of William Egan Colby, former Director of Central Intelligence, *Shadow Warrior: William Egan Colby and the CIA*.

Professor Woods’s other books include *A Changing of the Guard: Anglo-American Relations, 1941–1946*, *A Black Odyssey: John Lewis Waller and the Promise of American Life, 1878–1900*, and *The Roosevelt Foreign Policy Establishment and the Good Neighbor: Argentina and the United States, 1941–1945*. Professor Woods was selected to be both Mary Ball Washington Distinguished Professor at University College, Dublin and the Fulbright 50th Anniversary Chair at the University of Bonn.

“When I began research on my biography of Lyndon B. Johnson – the thirty-sixth president of the United States – in the late 1990s, I expected to find a body of literature on the Great Society that was comparable to that on Populism, Progressivism and the New Deal. I was sadly disappointed,” Professor Woods writes.

“Despite the fact that the domestic achievements of the Johnson administration – the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, 1965, and 1968; Medicare; federal aid to education; the War on Poverty; clean air and clean water legislation; and the Immigration Act of 1965 to name a few – are the equal of any reform movement in American history, there were only a handful of books and articles dealing with the phenomenon. In part because of space and in part because of the paucity of research, I was not able to do the Great Society justice in the biography. I have set out to remedy that.

“My time at the RAI allowed me to explore the new wave of literature on various aspects of the Great Society. I was able to compare and contrast it with other twentieth century reform movements and explore the political and social forces that drove this unique reform movement, including the post-Sputnik angst that engulfed America in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the burgeoning civil rights movement, the youth rebellion, the aspirations of the Greatest Generation, and the personae of Lyndon Johnson. And I was able to identify the forces that worked against the Johnson program, including the nihilism of the New Left, the collusion between segregationists and anticommunists, the law-and-order mantra seized upon by conservatives in the wake of urban rioting, and the Vietnam War.

“I had the opportunity to expound on my research in my Winant inaugural lecture and during a program at the RAI with the distinguished journalist Godfrey Hodgson on the assassination of President Kennedy and its aftermath. I delivered a paper at a Kennedy assassination conference at the British Library and presented my findings as the Richard Neustadt Lecturer at University College, London. Conversations with faculty and students both at the RAI and Balliol College provided a number of insights. I served as internal examiner on a doctoral thesis at Oxford and external examiner on one at Cambridge, each of which dealt with Southern politics in the wake of the Great Society and Vietnam. My tenure as Winant Professor was an unforgettable intellectual experience.”

“Doing justice to the ‘Great Society’
On 12 March 2014, Alexander P. Butterfield, Deputy Assistant to President Nixon, and John R. Price, Special Assistant to President Nixon for Urban Affairs, spoke to the RAI’s 2014 Annual Postgraduate Conference, ‘Watergate: 40 Years On’. They shared many illuminating and powerful recollections of the complex figure that was Richard Nixon, an edited selection of which appears below. A full recording of this remarkable event is available at http://podcasts.ox.ac.uk/nixon-president-nixon-man.

John Price on Nixon’s approach to policy

Nixon’s relentless – relentless – quest for the presidency resulted, at last, in the grasp of power. From the outset of his term there was unleashed an instinct to take often breath-taking moves in the policy sphere. He held the office; he now wanted to exercise its powers. A phrase so familiar to his staff was, “This is an historic first”. He went for major, often disruptive, policy changes. He came unmoored from party orthodoxy or dogma. Of course he was responding to the salient issues of his time, ran through political checks and consulting people. But he was often willing to override objections or the immediate politics and to go public with quite radical proposals. One evening, it was Christmas Eve, I was in his office with him and he was in a very reflective mood. We were talking about the welfare reform which he had proposed just four months earlier, to put a floor under family income in the United States. And he said, “You know, John, this is a good idea – it’s the right idea. Annually, the Democrats will vote to raise the level of payments under the floor; Annually, the Republicans will vote not to let that happen, and will be defeated. The important thing is that we will establish the principle.” His Congressional relations staffers went berserk – with angst about what was going on, on the hill. Particularly, conservative Republicans, but even liberal Democrats were flat-footed or nonplussed by some of these moves by Nixon.

John Price on Nixon’s early policies

Consider the healthcare initiative of February 1971. At the time, Nixon proposed a truly sweeping insurance and supply combination in healthcare. In today’s context, with toxic partisan battles about virtually every piece of Obamacare, Nixon’s February message stands out: it would provide universal coverage and would impose not an individual purchase mandate; it imposed a mandate on all employers of one or more employees to provide health insurance for their employees. It was radical. And he also provided a federal subsidy, if that were needed, for someone to purchase the policy that their employer was offering them. So, for its time it was a breath-taking attempt at social policy, but it didn’t get traction in Congress. It responded to what I really think Nixon felt as a deep need. It was consistent with the radically new framework of income support that he was fleshing out, largely with Daniel Patrick Moynihan [Counsellor to President Nixon for Urban Affairs] in this first year or 18 months. But he ultimately could not bend the politics to his will. Some of the proposals found their way into law but most did not. And these initiatives mostly happened within the first two years of Nixon’s presidency. Moynihan’s impact was greatest, probably, in the first 18 months; John Ehrlichman [Chief Domestic Advisor to President Nixon] was really responsible for the environmental initiatives of the President and also supervised me on the health insurance proposal in 1971. Nixon all along, though, was looking for ideas; he was trying to tease out proposals from Moynihan and others on the staff.

Alexander Butterfield on Nixon’s daily routine

Nixon’s daily routine was what one might expect of a model president. It was orderly and seldom varied. It seemed to make sense for he had a presidential look: neat and trim in his well-tailored suits, with a demeanour that suggested diligence and discipline. Let me start with his morning arrivals. He’d enter the Oval Office between 7.50 and 8.10, and immediately, while sipping a fresh cup of coffee, read his Daily News Summary. Then, without a pause, he’d buzz for Bob Haldeman [White House Chief of Staff]. It was Haldeman first for 15-20 minutes, then Henry Kissinger for 30-40 minutes followed by Haldeman again and probably me with a heavy load of documents (mostly legislation) to be signed. Morning appointments ran from 10am until about 1pm, at which time the President disappeared into a small room adjoining the Oval Office. It contained a hot-plate, a refrigerator, a bathroom, a desk and a single bed. Once ensconced he was not to be disturbed
while he ate a dish of small-curd cottage cheese, slept for a full hour, then ran over his heavy beard with an electric razor. At 3pm sharp he'd emerge rested and refreshed to begin the second half of his official day. At close to 6pm Haldeman would drop by briefly, then scamp for home. I would have another 'brief' session with the President, as would others: Rose Woods, his secretary, or perhaps John Ehrlichman. Around 7pm the President would depart, not necessarily for the Residence but more frequently for his less formal office across West Executive Avenue. There, with suit jacket still on, he'd slump into a soft chair, put his feet up and jot notes in his ever-present yellow pad. He might sip a Scotch whisky as he worked, or a glass of red wine, and at 8pm or so he'd be served a fine meal by his valet, Manolo Sanchez. Almost always phone calls followed dinner, at least one or two of them to Haldeman. By 10.30, in the company of his Secret Service detail, he'd walk silently back to the Residence. His days were lonely, but he liked it that way.

**John Price on Nixon's unpredictability**

My conviction is that Nixon was temperamental: someone who needed to startle, needed to upset the status quo, and to flex the power of his position. 'Shock and awe' need not have been a phrase which was heard only decades after the Nixon administration. Sometimes the willingness to act radically could startle: Al Haig was the number two guy under Henry Kissinger [as Deputy National Security Advisor]. He and I, and a third person, were having breakfast in the White House mess early in 1969 and Haig said, ‘You know, we had this incident where the North Koreans’ – North Koreans – ‘shot down a reconnaissance plane, EC-121’.

The incident came to be called the Flying Pueblo Incident, because there had been a ship attacked by the name of Pueblo. And Haig said to me, ‘It was all I could do to restrain the President because he wanted to nuke them’. Maybe Nixon was just trying to let stories like that seep out, so that people would be rather slow to do nasty things to us. But it may well be that he meant it. And yet, strangely, there’s the converse of that bellicose and impulsive picture of Nixon. I was just recently at his gravesite. And on the headstone of the gravesite, which is in his home town and just yards from the house where he was born, is a single, simple phrase: ‘The greatest honor history can bestow is the title of Peacemaker’.

**Alexander Butterfield on Nixon’s complexes**

I associate Nixon’s working habits, his sense of order and organization, with his penchant for record-keeping. But doesn’t every president want his or her presidency well-documented? Of course. So let me finish and you be the judge. Was Nixon normal, or over the top? I recall in the earliest days of the administration his suggesting to Haldeman and me that we think about adding a staff ‘reporter’ to every Oval Office meeting. ‘You know,’ he said, “someone to capture the mood or atmosphere as well as the essence of the issues discussed.” We kicked the idea around and realized almost immediately that a person sitting there busily taking notes would intimidate a visitor. The reporter, we agreed, would have to be relaxed, play the role of another meeting participant and, in the process, remember as much as possible of what transpired. And that meant the write-ups would have to be completed quickly while the reporter’s recollections were fresh, and turned into a central staff depositary. Nixon kept emphasizing the importance of atmosphere, so while we instituted the program a few days later and named it officially ‘Memos for the President file’, we began to refer to the memos as ‘color’ or ‘anecdotal’ reports. I became the enforcer-in-chief as well as the depositary, and appropriate staffers filled-in willingly as reporters: Kissinger with foreign guests; John Ehrlichman with judges, mayors and governors; Bill Safire [Nixon’s speech-writer] with journalists; Peter Flanagan [Assistant to the President for International Economic Affairs] with the Wall Street community, and so forth. But, what is interesting is that when the highly-classified listening devices were installed in February of 1971 – as elaborate as that system was – the President would not allow us to eliminate the Memos for the President file. We continued blithely on with dual recording systems. Was that ‘over the top’? Some, I think, would call it paranoid.

**Alexander Butterfield on Nixon’s record-keeping**

I could be wrong, but I don’t believe that any of Nixon’s biographers knew, or know, the truth about Nixon’s complexes. I’m not a psychiatrist, but I saw two aspects to these neuroses. One seemed to be a result of his inability to socialize in an unfamiliar setting or in the company of relative strangers; the other, I believe, was the result of having felt put-down and slighted for as long as he could remember by those he saw as the sanctified privileged class. Looking back on it I can see now that he suffered constantly, that these complexes stayed with him, and that it was all he could do to repress them. He did, however, keep them bottled-up most of the time – friends and associates didn’t seem to have a clue – but when he failed in a social situation he either could not speak at all or he blurted out something altogether pointless and inappropriate. When he failed to repress the resentments, they simply erupted. It will give you an example of the social problem. When Bob [Haldeman] introduced me to the President all three of us were standing in the middle of the Oval Office. Bob said what you might expect, that I
was the fellow he’d told him about and that I’d be working as his [Bob’s] deputy to help manage the White House operation. Then I spoke briefly saying what an honour it was to be a part of his staff and that I looked forward to helping Bob keep the official schedule running smoothly. Now it was the President’s turn. There was a long pause. He had a pitable expression. Already, the man was in distress. Bob and I could only stand there. Then Nixon made some circular motions with one hand, but didn’t speak. There was a guttural sound... and another, but still no words. A minute passed. It was torture. Finally, Bob grabbed me and we both beat a hasty retreat. An hour later I sat at my desk... incredulous. I’d just met the President of the United States and in a six or seven-minute period – because of my presence – he hadn’t uttered a single intelligible word.

Alexander Butterfield on Nixon’s grudges

One day Don Kendall was in the Oval Office. Don was Chairman and CEO of PepsiCo and a good friend of the President. I had to retrieve something from the President’s desk, so I walked in while the two were talking. They were seated near the fireplace, to retrieve something from the President’s desk, so I walked in and asked for Rex Scouten, the chief usher. “Rex,” I said, “is Derek Bok of Harvard University here at the White House?” “Yes sir. He’s in the East Room with Mrs Nixon. He and about eighty others. On another occasion, the President buzzed for me to come in. He said (and I don’t know where he got his information) that Derek Bok, the President of Harvard University, was on the White House grounds. He was furious and demanded an explanation. I’d been broad-sided. I knew nothing about it, so I picked up his phone and asked for Rex Scouten, the chief usher.” “Rex,” I said, “is Derek Bok of Harvard University here at the White House?” “Yes sir. He’s in the East Room with Mrs Nixon. He and about eighty others. She’s hosting this morning the Committee for the Preservation of the White House.” I felt relieved. I hung-up and told the President what Rex had said. But he became more agitated than before. “I don’t give a damn,” he said. “The son-of-a-bitch is on our Enemies List. Doesn’t that mean anything? Why the hell do we have these lists if no one pays any attention? I want you to make god-dammed town club or whatever... his country club? Not a god-dammed one!” “The Old Man knows you’re here. He wants to see you.” And I said, “I can’t go in like this.” – “No, no, he wants to see you.” And this was when Nixon had been near death through his phlebitis and he was truly living in exile. He’d been cut off, he had not started his self-reconstruction, which was so powerful the last decade or so of his life. So I went to his office overlooking the beach in San Clemente, and knocked on the door. Nixon opened the door; alone. He took my hand in both of his and, walking backwards, led me by the hand across the entire length of his large office, and let me down into a chair before taking his own. This man was so needy, he was so destroyed emotionally. And I felt pity for him.

John Butterfield on Watergate and the ‘tragedy’ of Nixon’s presidency

People ask, “Why? Why did Watergate happen?” And the answer is pretty simple. It happened because of Richard Nixon. It really did. None of us who worked for him like to say that or even think it, but the evidence is overwhelming. Nixon’s aides didn’t get him into trouble. He, alone, was the culprit. He was the director of all activity and simply went too far. Think about it. The man was complicated, a study of paradox: he loved the spotlight but was uncomfortable in it; he was wonderfully prepared for the presidency, yet made a record mess of it; he loved his daughters dearly, but was surprisingly distant with Pat; then in another reversal, he came completely apart at her funeral. And while he was usually pleasant to work with, appreciative of good staff work, and thoughtful, we all know that he could be vindictive, foul-mouthed, anti-Semitic, anti-African American, dishonest, and corrupt. The legacy is another question. John Dean has said “There is no Nixon legacy,” but I can think of three: 1) A new emphasis on reform, ethics and ethics training; 2) A not-so-gradual erosion of the power of the Executive and a simultaneous increase in the power and prominence of both Congress and the media; and 3) Tragedy – not only that of Richard Nixon and his foreshortened presidency, but the set-backs and tragedies borne by so many young and well-intentioned staffers ensnared by the glitter and deceit.

Nixon the President, Nixon the Man
Reflections on a fellowship at the RAI

“While there are many wonderful things about studying American history outside the United States, the US history community on the other side of the Atlantic is so lively and productive that it can be hard to keep up. This is what makes the Rothermere American Institute such a special place, as I’ve discovered this year as the Institute’s Senior Visiting Research Fellow,” writes Dr. Nick Guyatt (University of York, now University of Cambridge).

“The RAI offers a home not only to the large and impressive group of Oxford Americanists, but to a diverse range of visitors — including, of course, the annual Harmsworth Professor. I would say that I got lucky in 2013–14, with the opportunity to discuss my work with the estimable Richard Blackett; but then I found out that next year’s Harmsworth is Annette Gordon-Reed, so there was nothing out of the ordinary about the exceptional research culture that I’ve enjoyed in Oxford.

“It has been enormous fun to hear Richard talk about his work, to comment on his terrific Harmsworth lecture, and to exchange lengthy emails about the politics and historiography of the black colonization movement. But the Harmsworth Professor is really just the tip of the spear; in terms of the RAI’s commitment to fostering high-level debate and collaboration across a range of topics in American history, politics and culture, I’ve enjoyed the Tuesday seminars enormously, and will long remember some of the highlights: David Blight’s impassioned portrait of Frederick Douglass, the orator; Eric Rauchway’s sardonic reflections on the gold standard debates of the 1930s and early 1940s; and Heather Thompson’s extraordinary work on the emergence of the prison-industrial complex since the end of the Civil Rights era. As impressive as the talks themselves has been the level of discussion that follows, with Oxford’s formidable graduate students in the vanguard. With a consistently large, smart and engaged crowd in attendance, these seminars can feel uncannily like being back in the US; apart from the British accents, and the higher quality of beer during the inevitable pub post-mortems.

“I spent the year finishing my book on the origins of ‘separate but equal’ in the plans to remove African Americans and Native Americans during the early nineteenth century. I greatly appreciated not only the unparalleled resources of the Vere Harmsworth Library, but also the opportunity to share my work with the research seminar and with many friends and colleagues. Given how hard everyone seems to work in Oxford, one can feel like a slacker simply by being on research leave — regardless of how efficiently one may be reading and writing. I’m amazed at the productivity of the Americanists who are affiliated with the RAI, and extremely grateful for their generosity and good humour over the past year.”

2013–14 Fellows

The RAI was also honoured in 2013–14 to host Professor Bruce Kuniholm, Professor of Public Policy, Professor of History and Dean Emeritus of the Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University, as the inaugural Duke-Harmsworth Visiting Fellow. The programme brings distinguished faculty from Duke University to pursue research at the Institute. A prize-winning scholar of American foreign policy in the Near and Middle East, Professor Kuniholm’s current project explores the uses of history in the making of public policy.

The Hon. Jamie Rubin, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs under President Clinton, Chief Spokesman for the State Department between 1997 and 2000, and a top policy adviser to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, held a Visiting Fellowship as he worked on a study of American foreign policy and the politics of war.

The RAI also welcomed in 2013–14: Dr Christopher Moran (Warwick) and Dr Kate Williams (Illinois) as Postdoctoral Visiting Research Fellows, researching the relationship between President Nixon, Henry Kissinger, and the Central Intelligence Agency, and transnational American social movements in the 20th century respectively. Dr Tom Packer (London), who works on American conservatism in the second half of the 20th century, and Professor Sarah Rivett (Princeton), a specialist in early American and transatlantic literature and culture were the year’s Associate Visiting Research Fellows, and Professor Ann Schofield (Kansas), an expert in American women’s history, and Professor Bob Schuettinger, researching foreign perceptions of American democracy and government in the 19th century, joined as Vacation Visiting Research Fellows.

“I have been privileged to be a Visiting Postdoctoral Fellow at the Rothermere American Institute, taking full advantage of its superb resources and stimulating research environment as I research a new book on Richard Nixon and the CIA.”

Dr Christopher Moran, University of Warwick and RAI Postdoctoral Visiting Research Fellow, 2013–14
Thanks to the generous support of a number of benefactors, the RAI is able to offer travel awards to undergraduate and graduate students to undertake primary research in the United States. One such award was made in 2013–14 to Richard Johnson, studying for a M.Phil. in Comparative Government at Nuffield College. Here, he describes the trip he made to conduct research for his thesis entitled ‘The Last Bastion of White Supremacy: US Senate Malapportionment and the Descriptive Representation of African-Americans, 1966–2012’.

In the past half-century African-American politicians have enjoyed extensive electoral gains in local assemblies, state legislatures, and the US House of Representatives, but these victories have not been reproduced in the US Senate. To date, only four African-Americans have won a state-wide senatorial election.

This discrepancy in black electoral success is often attributed to the absence of ‘majority-minority’ constituencies in the Senate, premised on the assumption that a successful candidate will reflect the modal ethnicity of his or her constituency. Finding this explanation incomplete, my thesis attempts to explain the poor electoral success of black senatorial nominees by analysing both racial and infrastructural variables in black senatorial campaigns. My work is based on in-depth analyses of several significant black senatorial candidates and their campaigns.

My travel grant helped to support two months of research travel in the United States. I visited five states – Florida, Tennessee, Illinois, New Jersey, and Massachusetts – as well as Washington, DC. During this time, I conducted 47 interviews with candidates, campaign staff, and legislative staff. These interviews served two important functions. Firstly, they helped me to fill informational gaps in secondary accounts of the campaigns and candidates. Secondly, my interviewees offered interpretive insights which were critical to identifying both implicit and explicit racial cues.

In between interviews, I spent my time in libraries and archives, enjoying differing levels of success in accessing original campaign documents. The archives included the History Miami Archive, the Florida State Archives, the Harold Ford Jr. Collection at the Memphis Public Library, the Harold Washington Archive Collection, the Chicago History Museum Research Center, the University of Chicago Special Collections, the Library of Congress, the Harold Gottlieb Archives at Boston University, and the Endicott Peabody Collection at the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library. I was given access to the excellent Edward Brooke collection at the Library of Congress through the kind permission of Senator Edward Brooke.

In addition, I had the opportunity to engage in participant-observation research of one of my cases, the senatorial campaign of Cory Booker. Through a contact in Oxford, I was able to stay with one of Booker’s advisors for four days in New Jersey in the midst of his 2013 senatorial campaign. I spent two days shadowing the candidate and two days working in his campaign headquarters in Newark. This was an unrivalled opportunity to study a campaign and candidate in an unmediated context.

A personal highlight of the trip was the opportunity to interview Senator Carol Moseley Braun (right), the only black woman ever to serve in the US Senate. Our discussion lasted for three hours and prompted me to think more deeply about understudied dimensions of black candidacies such as symbolic self-perception, motivation, and personal expectations. Subsequently, Senator Moseley Braun gave me a tour of Chicago. It was an evening I will never forget, and it truly brought my research to life.

I would like to offer my sincere thanks to the RAI and the generous benefactors who made this travel grant possible.

“My travel grant helped to support two months of research travel in the United States. I visited five states – Florida, Tennessee, Illinois, New Jersey, and Massachusetts – as well as Washington, DC. During this time, I conducted 47 interviews with candidates, campaign staff, and legislative staff.”

Richard Johnson
The RAI has made twelve awards to outstanding undergraduate, Master’s and doctoral students to enable research in the United States during the 2014–15 academic year:

Robert Blackwell, B.A. in History and Politics, St Catherine’s College: President Kennedy’s Press Conferences and the ‘Bully Pulpit’
Award for archival work at the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library, Boston, MA, and the Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

Josh Carpenter, D.Phil in Politics and International Relations, St Hilda’s College: Tyranny of the Majority? Why Some Voters Lay Dormant in the Deep South
Award for archival work and interviews in Birmingham, AL.

Jane Dinwoodie, D.Phil in History, Lincoln College: Beyond Removal: Indians, States, and Sovereignties in the American South during the Long Nineteenth Century
Award for archival work at the US National Archives, Washington, DC.

Nadia Hilliard, D.Phil in Politics and International Relations, St Antony’s College: Shaping Democracy: Accountability, State-building and the US Federal Inspectors General
Award for archival work and interviews in Washington, DC.

Award for archival work at the Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago.

Sebastian Huempfer, D.Phil in Economic and Social History, Green Templeton College: The Political Economy of US Trade Policy since the 1930s
Award for archival work at the Boston Chamber of Commerce archives, Harvard University; the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut; and the New York Chamber of Commerce and Industry archives at Columbia University.

Award for archival work at the New-York Historical Society and the Avery Library at Columbia University, New York.

Katharine Millar, D.Phil in Politics and International Relations, Somerville College: When Citizens aren’t Soldiers: The ‘Support the Troops’ Movement and its Implications for Foreign Policy
Award for given for archival work at Swarthmore College, Philadelphia, and in Washington, DC.

Award for archival work at the University of Michigan, Wayne State University, MI, and Southern Illinois University.

Patrick Sandman, D.Phil in History, Trinity College: Bringing Congress Back In: The Politics of Watergate and Institutional Change
Award for archival work at the Rodino Library in Newark, New Jersey; and the Ford Presidential Library in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Mara Tchalakov, D.Phil in Politics and International Relations, St Antony’s College: Great Debates: Hawks and Doves in American Foreign Policy
Award for archival work at the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library in Austin, Texas, and at the US National Archives in Washington, DC.

Katie Whitcombe, M.Phil in Economic and Social History, Hertford College: Tensions between the US Military and the Women of the Philippines since the Second World War
Award for archival work at the National Archives and Records Administration in Maryland and California.
2013–14 saw the RAI play host to a wealth of outstanding lectures, seminars and classes in American history, politics and literature. Videos of many of these events can be found on the RAI’s website at www.rai.ox.ac.uk/podcasts.

Seminars and speakers

In ‘Learning to Write: The Artist, the Writer and their Notebook’, an interdisciplinary summer school led by RAI Research and Teaching Fellow Sally Bayley in June and July 2014, students explored Anglo-American writers and artists through the medium of their notebooks, examining the practice of drafting and devising, rewriting and revising. Beginning with the 18th century tradition of the commonplace book, the participants moved from the notebooks, journals, letters and drafts of transcendentalist writers Emerson, Thoreau and Emily Dickinson, to 19th and 20th century writers such as Walt Whitman, W.H. Auden, W. B. Yeats, Sylvia Plath, and Thom Gunn.

The summer school culminated in the première, in the RAI’s Princess Margaret Memorial Garden on 4th July, of I’m Nobody, Who Are You?, an imaginary encounter between Emily Dickinson, Bob Dylan and Hamlet. Performed and directed by Elisabeth Gray, whose Southern Discomfort enthralled audiences at the RAI in 2013, the play – specially commissioned for the RAI – also featured music from acclaimed folk musician Jack Harris.

The RAI also welcomed a plethora of distinguished speakers on American history and politics throughout the year. Two former Directors of Central Intelligence, Ambassador R. James Woolsey and General Michael Hayden, visited the RAI separately in February and March 2014 to discuss topics ranging from American relations with Pakistan and intelligence estimates in the run-up to the Iraq War in 2003, to Russian intervention in Ukraine and China’s growing military capacity.

In May 2014, the distinguished investor, philanthropist, and historian Lewis Lehrman, delivered a galvanic paper on ‘Lincoln’s Anti-Slavery Campaign, 1854–1865’, while Michael Aronstein, President of Marketfield Asset Management (New York) and one of America’s most respected fund-managers, inaugurated the RAI’s ‘American Business: Past, Present and Future’ lecture series with a compelling discussion of ‘The Futility of Economic Forecasting’.

The Hon. Mary Jo Jacobi, Special Assistant to President Reagan and former Assistant US Secretary of Commerce under President George H. W. Bush, captivated the RAI community with her personal reflections on US and UK politics. Chisanga Puta-Chekwe, Deputy Minister in the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration, joined scholars for a stimulating discussion of the economic effects of immigration in North America.

This year’s Esmond Harmsworth Lecture in American Arts and Letters, made possible by the generosity of Esmond Harmsworth, was given by the acclaimed American novelist Claire Messud, on ‘Kant’s Little East Prussian Head, and Other Reasons why we Write’.

Professor David Armitage, chair of Harvard University’s history department, delivered the annual Sir John Elliott Lecture in Atlantic History on ‘The Age of Revolutions as an Age of Civil Wars’.

Thomas J. Tierney, Chairman and Co-Founder of The Bridgespan Group, the leading international philanthropy advisory and consultancy practice, and one of the foremost global thinkers and authors on philanthropy, shared his thoughts on charitable giving and the social sector in the United States in an event made possible by the generosity of the Robertson Foundation.

As well as all these special events, the RAI’s weekly research seminars and graduate workshops in American history, politics and international relations, and literature continue to bring distinguished speakers to the Institute and allow graduate students in each of these fields to share and hone their research. Graduate papers included ‘Interpretation for the US Military in the Iraq War, 2003–2011’, ‘Migration, Environment, Slavery, and Disease on the Gulf Coast, 1800 to 1830’, and ‘Personality or Politics? Explaining Variation in Anglo-American Relations’. Two one-off interdisciplinary seminars – ‘America at War’ in Michaelmas Term and ‘E Pluribus Unum: Television Cultures of the United States’ in Hilary Term – brought scholars of history, politics and literature together for lively and thought-provoking discussion.
A wide range of books were launched at the Institute in the past academic year, covering topics ranging from the British Empire in early North America, to the building of the Allied coalition in the Second World War, to President Obama’s place in the historical context of US race relations.

In November 2013, David Roll, founder of the Lex Mundi Pro Bono Foundation, launched his book *The Hopkins Touch: Harry Hopkins and the Forging of the Alliance to Defeat Hitler* (OUP). One of the most improbable and important political operators of the 20th century, Harry Hopkins gained Franklin Roosevelt’s trust assisting on campaigns and leading relief and jobs programmes during the 1930s. He then helped the president confront the growing threat – and later the reality – of war. Hopkins grasped that the key to victory was the creation and maintenance of an Allied coalition of military power sustained by economic cooperation. He acted as the self-described ‘catalytic agent’ between the Allied leaders, meeting frequently with Churchill and Stalin both before and long after Pearl Harbor, and coordinating the $50 billion Lend-Lease program. Roll’s portrait of Hopkins discusses his early life and career, but emphasizes his role alongside FDR (and later Truman) in World War II, making use of previously inaccessible private diaries and letters.

In *Nation of Devils: Democracy and the Problem of Obedience* (OUP), launched in January 2014, Stein Ringen, Emeritus Professor of Sociology and Social Policy at Green Templeton College, Oxford, meditates on the art of democratic rule: how does a government persuade the people to accept its authority? Every government must make unpopular demands of its citizens, from levying taxes to enforcing laws and monitoring compliance to regulations. The challenge, Ringen argues, is that power is not enough; the populace must also be willing to be led. Ringen addresses this political conundrum by using the US and Britain as examples, analysing how obedience is created and nurtured. The book explores the paths leaders must choose if they wish to govern by authority rather than power; or, as the philosopher Immanuel Kant put it, to “maintain order in a nation of devils”.

*Barack Obama and the Myth of a Post-Racial America* (Routledge), which its co-editors Mark Ledwidge, Senior Lecturer in History at Canterbury Christ Church University, and Kevern Verney, Professor of American History at Edge Hill University, discussed in February 2014, places President Obama in the historical context of US race relations, and interrogates the idealised and progressive view of American society advanced by much of the mainstream literature on Obama. The book addresses controversial issues such as whether Obama can be considered an African-American president, whether his presidency has actually delivered the kind of deep-rooted changes that were initially prophesised, and whether Obama has abandoned his core African-American constituency in favour of projecting a race-neutral approach designed to maintain centrist support.


*British North America in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: The Oxford History of the British Empire Companion Series* (OUP) was launched at the RAI in June 2014 by its editor Stephen Foster, Distinguished Research Professor Emeritus at Northern Illinois University. It has lately become commonplace to view the history of America in domestic terms as a three-way mêlée between ‘settlers’, the indigenous populations, and the forcibly transported African slaves and their creole descendants. The book advocates a more pluralistic approach to the subject and attempts to demonstrate that metropolitan power was of more than secondary importance. Its central theme is the question: what difference did it make to the inhabitants of British North America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that they were part of an empire, and that the empire in question was British?

If you are an author or publisher and would like to find out more about holding a book launch at the RAI, please email: enquiries@rai.ox.ac.uk.
The Vere Harmsworth Library in 2013–14

The Vere Harmsworth Library continues to be popular with students and researchers from Oxford and beyond, and increasing demand led us to trial extended opening hours on Saturdays during Trinity Term, opening from 10am to 4pm each week instead of our previous hours of 10am to 2pm, writes Jane Rawson, the Vere Harmsworth Librarian.

The additional hours proved extremely successful, with over three times more readers using the library on Saturdays in Trinity Term 2014 than in the same period last year. We are now reviewing feedback gathered throughout the term and are considering staffing options to determine whether we can offer longer hours all year round in 2014–15.

In terms of our collections, we have been able to purchase one new major electronic resource this year: Reader’s Guide Retrospective, 1890–1982. This database provides searchable access to the archive of the Reader’s Guide to Periodical Literature, and will significantly improve researchers’ ability to find articles in a wide range of American magazines covering the majority of the twentieth century, including many titles that we hold in the library such as The Nation, National Review, The New Republic, Ebony, and Time.

Researchers at the VHL have also benefited this year from the Bodleian Libraries’ agreement to provide access to all current online content from Oxford University Press. For Americanists in particular this brings access to the African American Studies Center and a wide range of demographic data in SocialExplorer, as well as a huge number of ebooks from partner university presses, including Chicago and Yale.

Alongside these new electronic resources, we are grateful as ever to the many donors who have given books, periodicals and magazines to the library. We would like to thank in particular the Association of American Rhodes Scholars (AARS) for their ongoing support of the Aydelotte-Kieffer-Smith collection, to which we have added a further 88 books this summer.

In November 2013, the Institute marked the 50th anniversary of President Kennedy’s assassination. To accompany the commemorative event held with distinguished journalist and writer Godfrey Hodgson and Randall Woods, Winant Professor of American Government for 2013–14, we set out an exhibition drawing on our collections, including the Philip & Rosamund Davies US Elections Campaigns Archive, and news clippings donated by Godfrey Hodgson from his time as Washington Correspondent for The Observer in the 1960s. More information about this exhibition can be found on the library blog at http://blogs.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/vhl.

All that is done in the Vere Harmsworth Library is made possible by the tremendous work of my colleagues Judy Warden, Johanna O’Connor, Martin Sutcliffe, Richard Purkiss, and Ingrid Salisbury. I would like to take this opportunity to extend my gratitude to them.

We are always delighted to welcome visitors to the library. You can find us online both on the RAI website at www.rai.ox.ac.uk/vhl and also our own site at www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/vhl. We also have a blog (http://blogs.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/vhl), Facebook (http://www.facebook.com/VereHarmsworthLibrary) and Twitter (http://twitter.com/vhllib) if you want to keep up with our news.
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A record number of donations to the RAI from benefactors in 2013–14 has offered the prospect of securely underpinning the Institute’s general running costs in the medium-to-longer term, as well as continuing the RAI’s extensive programme of financial support for students, including travel grants, scholarships and, for the first time this year, hardship assistance.

We thank all our donors for their generosity, and in particular those who have made or pledged major donations to the Institute in the past year: Mrs Joan Winant; the Robertson Foundation; the Rothermere Foundation; William and Camille Broadbent; Professor George Edwards, and a donor who wishes to remain anonymous.

Donations received in 2013–14 exceeded £300,000, enabling the RAI to boost its general endowment by some £130,000. This excellent outcome will also make possible the endowment of a new graduate studentship in American History from October 2014, and covers the gap between RAI’s income (from trust funds, the Bodleian Library, the University, and conferences and room hire) and the costs of the RAI’s staff, premises, and activity.

Charts on this page show the distribution of the RAI’s income and expenditure during the 2013–14 financial year. The Institute is funded largely from two main trust funds: the first supports general running costs, and the second the academic programme. The annual income streams from these two funds are approximately £100,000 and £75,000 respectively.

The RAI receives income from the University which is calculated according to the research and teaching activity that takes place here. This year we have seen this income almost double, from £22,000 in 2012–13 to £41,000. The Institute also received £35,000 (£38,000 in 2012–13) from the Bodleian Libraries as a contribution to premises costs based on the proportion of the building occupied by the Vere Harmsworth Library. Other sources of income are revenue from hiring out our seminar rooms and fees paid by participants at the RAI’s annual summer school.

Against the income that the RAI receives from the University, it also pays to the University annual infrastructure and capital charges which amounted to £91,800 in 2013–14 (£95,600 in 2012–13). Staff costs and buildings and utilities costs together amount to approximately half the Institute’s expenditure.

Nigel Bowles
The centrepiece of the RAI’s programme to open its research and the study of the United States to wider public audiences, the annual ‘Congress to Campus’ event brought former US Representatives Bob Clement (D-Tennessee) and James K. Coyne III (R-Pennsylvania) to the RAI in March 2014 for a discussion of American politics with school students from across England.

Organised in association with the US Association of Former Members of Congress and the Eccles Centre at the British Library, the day-long visit each year brings bipartisan pairs of former Members of Congress to the Institute. The former Congressmen were also joined, for the first time in the event’s history, by the US Ambassador to the United Kingdom, His Excellency Matthew Barzun.

The 2014 event brought school students from as far afield as Rossendale (Lancashire), Stourbridge (Worcestershire), Bromsgrove (West Midlands) and Northampton, together with a number of students from local schools, to the RAI to hear insights from the former Congressmen into how American democracy works as they shared their real-life experiences as candidates and office-holders. Ambassador Barzun then led an interactive session with the students on perceptions of the United States, featuring real-time electronic polling on issues such as healthcare, firearms, and foreign policy.

The day concluded with a special seminar for undergraduate and graduate students, ‘What Political Scientists Need to Understand about Congress’. Chaired by former US Assistant Secretary of State and RAI Visiting Fellow, Jamie Rubin, the former Congressmen were joined in conversation by Professor Philip Davies, Director of the Eccles Centre, and RAI Director Nigel Bowles.

The son of former Governor of Tennessee Frank G. Clement, Bob Clement served for fifteen years as Member of Congress for the 5th District of Tennessee, which centres on Nashville. He was a member of the US House Transportation Committee and the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, and also served as President of Cumberland University.

Besides his service in Congress for the 8th district of Pennsylvania, in the south east of the state, Jim Coyne was Special Assistant to President Reagan and directed the President’s Office of Private Sector Initiatives. Between 1994 and 2012, he served as President of the National Air Transportation Association.

If you have links with schools and would like to find out more about participating in next year’s Congress to Campus, please email enquiries@rai.ox.ac.uk.

Staying in touch with the RAI all year long

The RAI website – [www.rai.ox.ac.uk](http://www.rai.ox.ac.uk) – contains all the latest news of events and activities at the Institute. The site features dedicated pages for podcasts – [www.rai.ox.ac.uk/podcasts](http://www.rai.ox.ac.uk/podcasts), past and upcoming conferences – [http://www.rai.ox.ac.uk/events/archive](http://www.rai.ox.ac.uk/events/archive), and mini-sites for American history, politics and literature. The RAI can also be found on Facebook – [www.facebook.com/RAIOxford](http://www.facebook.com/RAIOxford) and Twitter – [www.twitter.com/RAIOxford](http://www.twitter.com/RAIOxford). If you are not already on the RAI’s mailing list and would like to receive updates of forthcoming events and activities, please contact enquiries@rai.ox.ac.uk.