

DOI: 10.21847/1728-9343.2020.46170).219173

TETIANA KLYNINA,

National Aviation University (Kyiv, Ukraine)

e-mail: tklynina@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-0334-9852

INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF THE US STATE DEPARTMENT: SOME HISTORIOGRAPHICAL ORIENTATIONS

The article is devoted to the study of the state of development of the issue and the availability of scientific world achievements on the institutional history of the US Department of State. Using the historiographical and problematic research method, the main aspects that reveal the essence of the State Department as a state institution were identified. That is why such aspects as institutional history, legal framework, Secretaries of State (taking into account gender) were chosen for historiographical analysis, as these positions are the minimum that give institutions the status of legitimacy. It was expedient to characterize the available literature on the research topic in accordance with the geographical factor. That is why the scientific achievements are divided into separate layers: foreign literature (mostly American), scientific works of Ukrainian authors and Russian historiography (chosen as a contrast to the existing American). It is pointed out that American scientific papers are fundamental to research and have certain features: they are quite close to the official views of the State Department, not critical enough or full of traditional formulations; however, in general, it is worth noting the fundamentality and detail. Ukrainian scientific achievements are essential in the issue of US foreign policy or Ukrainian-American relations, but not in the history of the State Department, so the author emphasizes the lack of comprehensive Ukrainian research on this topic. A characteristic feature of Russian historiography is the extreme politicization that was and is caused by the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union then, and the United States and the Russian Federation today.

Key word: US State Department; American, Ukrainian, Russian historiography; institutional history.

Introduction

In recent decades, one of the priorities of Ukrainian historical science has been the study of the history of the United States, and accordingly diplomacy and foreign policy are aspects of research that are rapidly evolving in the context of general interest in studying US history. The scientific research and interests of Ukrainian scholars in studying and understanding the United States of America as a world power are so broad that they can become the basis for compiling a thorough historiographical index. However, among such scientific achievements can be identified areas in relation to which explorations are conducted more often. First of all, Ukrainian scholars are interested in the formation and development of American-Ukrainian relations in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries (see, for example, the works of *Sivak, Chernik, 2010; Motzik, 2011; Lakishik, 2018*); borrowing America's experience for Ukraine on completely different issues (see, for example, the works of *Ulyanchenko, 2007; Chentsov, 2009; Ezheev, Nikolaenko, Ustimenko, 2009*). However, a special place among the scientific interests is occupied by US foreign policy issues in different regions of the world. Ukrainian scholars analyze the regions of American presence (*Kurnyshova, 2005; Taran, 2002; Rybchenko, 2011*), answer the question why such a US policy is pursued in a particular region (*Pidbereznykh, 2011; Golovan, 2016*), what are the historical

preconditions, what is the content and consequence of this policy (*Dashkevich, 1998*), etc., but issues related to various historical aspects of public policy still need to be considered. The place in US foreign policy of America's main institution, the State Department, also needs to be covered. It is because of the lack of such work in Ukrainian historical science that the author tries to understand foreign historiography (mostly American and Russian) on the issue of the institutional history of the US State Department.

Materials and Methods

Both during the Soviet period and at the time of Ukraine's independence, American studies was and remains one of the priority areas of research related to the status of the United States as a superpower, and therefore studying its presence on the world stage, understanding American internationalism, politics, understanding who sets the tone in international contemporary and contemporary relations has always been and is relevant. The methodological basis of the work is the method of historiographical research, which was used in determining the state of research of the institutional history of the State Department. The historiographical method consists in a critical analysis of the literature published on the topic of research, while not only the facts reflected in the literature are recorded, but their scientific classification is made. The historiographical

method helped to generalize historical information on the research topic, grouping it by geographical feature and by issues of activity. In this regard, a problematic research method was used, which allowed to highlight certain aspects of the activities and functioning of the State Department as a political institution for foreign policy, and at the same time, in certain areas, to carry out historiographical analysis of available literature. The focus was on aspects that essentially answer the question: What is an institution? When did it appear? What is the legal basis for its existence? Who heads the institution and what are its activities? It is in accordance with the questions and carried out the analysis of existing scientific achievements.

Results and discussion

Institutional history and functioning of the State Department. In the late twentieth century, the United States Department of State entered its third century as the flagship foreign affairs agency of the US federal government. For a long period of its existence, the Department has provided support and advice to presidents and secretaries of state, cooperated with Congress, and protected the growing number of United States citizens. For more than 200 years, the State Department has pursued American diplomacy through war and peace, among the competing currents of isolationism and internationalism that have shaped American foreign policy in line with its commitment to freedom and democracy. E. Plischke (1999), who is essentially the founder of research on the history of the creation of the State Department, devoted his work to the issue of establishing an agency responsible for the formation and conduct of foreign policy. The works of R. West (1978), B. Glad (*Glad, Smith, 1996: 185-192*), E. Mikhalkanin (2004) also deserve some attention, which consider some aspects of the activities of the State through the prism of American diplomacy in general.

The structural component of diplomatic missions and the State Department is described in the works of Russian researchers A.A. Kokoshina (1981) and S.M. Samyilov (2008). Among American scientists, this aspect was studied by Charles Thayer (1972), W. Blancke (2008). These authors considered the structural changes of the State Department, which took place under the influence of the information factor. The work of John Campbell «The Foreign Affairs Fudge Factory», the title of which traces the author's rather skeptical view of the activities of a foreign policy institution, emphasizes that "the foreign policy machine has become too cumbersome for effective governance", the loss of the central role of the State Department in policy-making due to some influence of the military establishment foreign policy" (Campbell, 1971: 292). The main thesis of the author that reducing the scale of the foreign policy mechanism in the formation of foreign policy will solve all the problems and increase the effectiveness of American diplomacy looks, in our opinion, quite simplistic and unconvincing. He is rather skeptical about the activities of the State Department and R. Rothstein, who points to the inability of the heads of the State Department to predict various scenarios in the international arena. Precisely because of its inability to plan and forecast, America had certain dramatic problems, including, in the author's view, the Vietnam War or the international currency crisis (Rothstein, 1972).

The legislative basis for the functioning of the State Department is considered in the scientific work of A. Evans (1948), whose focus was on the formation of a professional diplomatic service in its historical consideration. In particular, it analyzes the legal framework evaluations of the effectiveness of these acts, trying to trace the consequences of such implementations. His main focus was on one of the most important acts in the history of professional diplomatic service - the so-called Rogers Act of 1924 and the Foreign Service Act of 1946. M. Revneld's article is informative, which gives a list of responsibilities enshrined in law and compares them with those that were, for example, assigned to the diplomatic service during World War II. In particular, he noted that these responsibilities went far beyond the limits set by US legislation on the activities of the professional diplomatic service, although he agreed that such steps were forced due to the military situation in the world (Ravndal, 1942:357-359). More legally meaningful is the work of J. Harrington (1946: 8-12), who focused on the mechanism of adoption of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. And although his work does not provide information on what prompted the change in legislation on the diplomatic service, it is an indication of how difficult the process of adopting an act in the US legal system at the time. The work of M. Bacchus (1983: 194 - 220), in turn, focuses on the next, after 1946, the law on the reorganization of the service from 1980. However, at the same time, it gives an understanding of that, in historical retrospect at the time, which positions of "his predecessor" were not ideal, but over time lost their relevance. This aspect of the functioning of the US State Department in scientific research is quite limited in the United States itself, as works of this nature are more legal and descriptive in nature with the leveling of the historical context. The works of E. Stowell (1931:516-520) and T.L. Reed (1978: 404) are also worth noting.

Secretaries of State. Among the great scholarly achievements of American foreign policy, it is difficult to single out those works that focus on the Secretariat of State as a political institution. Of course, scientists analyze the Secretaries of State, but only through the prism of their activities in tandem with the President of the United States. You will hardly find thorough works on the influence on foreign policy of, for example, R. Lansing, E. Stettinius, J. Byrnes and others. More research is devoted to such Secretaries of State as K. Hell, J. Marshall, F. Dulles or G. Kissinger. However, such attention is caused not so much by their effectiveness as Secretary of State, as by the odiousness of their personality or previous merits in another area of American society.

Don Philpott (2015), T. Estes, E. Lightner (1976) are devoted to general aspects of the Secretary of State as a position in the system of state power. Work of R. Walker (1965) is interesting from the point of view of factual material, and although it does not directly reveal the role of the Secretary of State in the system of power or his real powers in foreign policy decision-making, it nevertheless provides an analysis of foreign policy actions by various Secretaries of State.

Many American scholars can vaguely mention the Secretary of State through the prism of the "personal diplomacy" of a particular American president. For example, such a situation is observed when considering the figure of F. Roosevelt, and only then we can find

information about his last Secretary of State E. Stettinius. David Farber in his work «Sloan Rules: Alfred P. Sloan and the Triumph of General Motors» (Farber, 2002), which is dedicated to the triumph of General Motors, provides some information about E. Stettinius as a business man, his career advancement and outlines his specific steps in the company. Schlesinger at work «Act of Creation: The Founding of the United Nations» tells the little-known story of how Edward Stettinius as Secretary of State and the new US President Harry Truman continued the campaign to create the UN, which was initiated and started by Franklin Roosevelt (Schlesinger, 2009). The figure of E. Stettinius is considered in more detail than others in the works of R. Walker (1965), Russian historian V. Yunglyud (1996: 75 – 85), E. Ivanyan (1975), Ukrainian scientist S.V. Yurchenko (2000), although they, like previous researchers, cite certain fragmentary aspects of his work not as Secretary of State but as Head of the State Department. And although in today's sense it is the same person, during the presidency of Franklin Roosevelt the situation was somewhat different. A similar situation is observed when considering the figure of Secretary of State J. Byrnes. If the figure of J. Byrnes attracts the attention of scientists, it is only in the context of Truman's diplomacy, where J. Byrnes is mentioned as one of the founders of the Cold War, supporters of "nuclear diplomacy" and the man who advised G. Truman to drop atomic bombs on Japan without announcement.

Fundamental to the study of this political figure were the works of D. McCoy (1982), R. Messer (1982), M. Richards (1991). The work of the biographer J. Byrnes, journalist D. Robertson (1994), is thorough. He sets the tone from the first pages and declares J. Byrnes one of the most influential members of Congress from the south. Also noteworthy is the work of R. Messer (1982), who speaks of J. Byrnes as a powerful US senator, judge of the Supreme Court, aide to President Roosevelt, etc., and thus tries to show the origins of the Cold War, arguing that it was the interpersonal triangle "F. Roosevelt - J. Byrnes - G. Truman" that played a decisive role in the Soviet-American confrontation.

Some attention is paid to the life and work of Secretary of State J.F. Dulles. Scientific work on it is periodically updated. In this context, the work of R. Immerman (1998), F. Marx (1993) W. Pruessen (1982) attract attention. In particular, F. Marx points out that it is J.F. Dulles has taken over the leadership of politics and also explores the intellectual side of the secretary, saying that the latter, along with John Quincy Adams, was a thinker (Marks, 1995), and researcher R. Immerman speaks of him as the "leader of the free world" during the Cold War (Immerman, 1998). Historiography of the early twenty first century has simplified the assessment of the activities of J.F. Dulles, made possible by the special funds of documents of the Secretary of State and President D. Eisenhower, and now the thesis that the Secretary of State had a dominant voice in the policy-making process recedes into the background. In general, it is noted that D. Eisenhower was the official who made the decision and was an equal partner, and J.F. Dulles was mainly responsible for implementing the president's policies. Researchers emphasize the common views and values, goals and intentions, mutual respect, and therefore it is logical to say that we are jointly responsible for US foreign policy. The figure of Secretary of State

J. Marshall is revealed in the works of S. Gabel (2013), L. Bland (2017), B. Smith (2015), in which the first place treats his military past as the most influential soldier in American history. And only after that, information about his political experience as Secretary of State of the United States of America is given in passing.

It is worth paying attention to the State Secretaries of the "women's article". In the history of the State Department, only three women have held these positions: Madeleine Albright, Condoleezza Rice, and Hillary Clinton. However, despite their "feminine charm", American scientists are in no hurry to praise or criticize them as heads of the State Department. M. Albright's foreign policy issues are partially analyzed in the works of M. Walker (1997:1-10), J. Nijman (1998:267-278), J. Dobbins etc. (2017:181-198). Hillary Clinton's work is periodically the subject of historical or political research, but only as a first lady, or as a senator, or as a member of the presidential campaign. President Barack Obama is more likely to be attacked than his secretary of state for the country's foreign policy. However, in the context of Hillary Clinton's work, work is informative Valerie Hudson and Patricia Leidl (Hudson, M.V. & Leidl P., 2015). The authors drew attention to the role of women in the context of US national security and examined the so-called "Hillary Doctrine", which argued that women's empowerment is a stabilizing force for domestic and international peace. Therefore, the authors try to find out how this doctrine and its implementation in the US foreign policy by the head of the State Department has changed relations with other countries, such as China and Saudi Arabia.

In general, the mentioned works are only the small but the main mass of literature, which is among the multivolume scientific achievements.

A thorough layer of scientific literature can be identified in the gender component of the State Department. In American scientific circles, a woman is the object of study from all positions, while in Ukrainian research she is analyzed from the standpoint of her role in society, family, crimes, as an object of trade, etc., but not as a political figure. Probably, this means that Ukrainian society is not yet ready to accept a woman in a "men's club". In contrast to Ukrainian, the scientific achievements of foreign historiography are much wider. In this context, it is worth mentioning the work of G. Calkin, who provides an analysis of women's employment in the executive body engaged in foreign policy - the State Department of the United States. The author emphasizes that the gradual increase in the number of women in the diplomatic service is directly related to the historical conditions in which the United States found itself at one time or another (Calkin, 1977). Works M. W. Molly (2005; 2015) and A. Hochschild (1969: 76) are interesting in terms of the origins of the representation of women in the diplomatic service. And although their work is not devoted to women's issues in leading diplomatic positions, they nevertheless provide an understanding of the reasons for the "gradual infusion" of women into the diplomatic sphere. Another researcher, BL Mackenzie, points out that despite the evolution of the role of women in American society and the opportunity to hold positions in the US State Department, this did not guarantee her the opportunity to advance in her career. This was due to the fact that "once in the State Department, a woman was discriminated against because

of her gender because she was considered unreliable and unable to cope with her professional responsibilities because she was a woman." In general, the author emphasizes that "sexualization has led to less gender equality among foreign service employees" (McKenzie, 2015). In her work, the American author Kirsten Amundsen compared the role and rights of women in American society with similar positions of the black population of America, noting that these representatives experience discrimination in political life as well. (Amundsen, 1971). Interesting is the author's opinion that in America, a representative of the Negroid race will be elected president rather than a woman.

Cultural diplomacy of the State Department. Along with broad powers in the political sphere, the responsibilities of the State Department include working with various non-profit organizations and foundations representing social and political programs in other countries. A number of works by foreign and Ukrainian researchers are devoted to the issue of US cultural policy in general (although the concept of cultural diplomacy is more often used). Cultural diplomacy today remains a complex concept that is gradually developing a substantive part. For example, cultural diplomacy as an effective tool in achieving the national interests of the state, as part of the "soft power" of the United States considered in the works of W. Glade (2009), M.C. Cummings (2003), A. Wulf (2015), J. Nye (2008). Some works by American authors are inherently quite close to the official views of the State Department and suffer from the so-called "official history", not critical enough and full of traditional formulations. The works of A. Thomson and H. Walter, which provide a broad overview of US cultural programs and their policies, are quite thorough (Thomson, Walter, 1963). Despite the fact that their works were written a long time ago, they do not lose their relevance in the history of the origin of this activity. Ukrainian historical science is also not devoid of scientific work on US cultural diplomacy. In particular, in the works of OP Kuchma shows the basic characteristics and main priorities of US cultural diplomacy in a certain period of their development, namely during the presidency of Obama (Kuchmii, 2015). Gavrylenko II in his dissertation considers cultural diplomacy as a component of "soft power" (Gavrylenko, 2017), and D. Dubov's works are devoted to cultural diplomacy from the point of view of the mechanism of realization of strategic communications of the state (Dubov, 2017).

Conclusions

In order to conduct a historiographical analysis of the current world achievements on the existence and functioning of the State Department as a flagship in US foreign policy, the main aspects that reveal the essence of the State Department as a state institution were identified. These aspects do not in any way repeat the work of the Ukrainian historiography, because, as noted above, the US State Department and, if certain parallels, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, do not become an independent object of study of Ukrainian scholars. Previous works of the author, careful acquaintance with the scientific literature made it possible to identify the main trends that attract the attention of scientists in considering this institution. Like any state institution, the US State Department has its own history and functional orientation in the state apparatus and society. Like any

state institution, the State Department has a legal basis for its operation. Like any state institution, the State Department has its own head, who directs the foreign policy course in one direction or another. That is why aspects such as institutional history, legal framework, and Secretaries of State (based on gender) - as heads of the State Department - have been selected for historiographical analysis, as these positions are the minimum that give institutions legitimacy. It was expedient to characterize the literature in accordance with the geographical factor. That is why the scientific achievements are divided into separate layers: foreign literature (mostly American, because it is primarily due to the interest of Americans in their history; European researchers were almost not taken into account because it is due to two factors: 1) literature on this topic is almost absent ; 2) that small layer of scientific achievements is almost indistinguishable from the American, which is explained by the closeness of relations between the United States and Europe); scientific achievements of Ukrainian authors; Russian historiography (chosen as a contrast to the existing American).

As for the achievements of foreign historiography, it should be noted that it is fundamental for research on the activities of the State Department. Of course, American researchers are interested in promoting the history of their country and its achievements on the world stage. Some works by American authors are quite close to the official views of the State Department, some works are not critical enough and full of traditional wording, and some works contain background information, certain sketches of the lives of famous State Department figures, rather than critical historical portraits. Among the shortcomings is the lack of comprehensive works on the history of the State Department, as well as the fact that researchers take into account either the odious heads of the State Department, or high-profile foreign policy actions. However, in general, it is worth noting the fundamental and detailed (sometimes even too much) work of American authors on the formation and functioning of the State Department as a flagship of foreign policy. Speaking of Ukrainian scientific achievements, it should be noted that it is also important in the issue of US foreign policy or Ukrainian-American relations, but not in the history of the State Department. To date, there is no comprehensive research in Ukrainian historiography devoted to the institutional history of the US State Department. Directly in the works of Ukrainian scholars, the emphasis is on broader topics in the history and politics of the United States, while the study of the functioning of the State Department is a rather narrow issue. A characteristic feature of Russian historiography, the scientific achievements of which are very indirectly related to the topic of our study, is the extreme politicization that was and is caused by the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union then, and the United States and the Russian Federation today. In the circle of scientific interests of Russian scientists are the presidents of the United States and the institution of the presidency as such. A special layer of literature is devoted to Soviet / Russian-American relations, more precisely to finding an answer to the question of why the United States pursues such a "pretentious and unfriendly" policy towards a friendly Russia. However, it should be noted that some works have some theoretical and factual material, the publication of which occurred mainly during

periods of easing tensions between the two countries, which once again proves the existence of inseparability of science from the national course of the country.

REFERENCES

- Amundsen, K. (1971). The silenced majority. Women and American democracy. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall. 184 p.
- Bacchus, W. (1983). The Foreign Service Act of 1980: Moving from Diagnosis to Action. In *Staffing For Foreign Affairs: Personnel Systems for the 1980s and 1990s*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 194 – 220. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt7zv2f.12>
- Blancke, W. (2008). Foreign Service of the USA. N.Y.
- Bland, L. (2017). Institutional Leadership: George C. Marshall. In McMaster H. & Boutelle S. (Authors) & Laver H. & Matthews J. (Eds.), *The Art of Command: Military Leadership from George Washington to Colin Powell* (pp. 63-94). Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1vw0s98.8>,
- Calkin, H. L. (1978). Women in the Department of State: Their Role in American Foreign Affairs.
- Campbell, F.J. (1971). The Foreign Affairs Fudge Factory. New York: Basic Books, 292 p.
- Chentsov, V.V. (2009). Experience of modernization of the US customs service and possibilities of its implementation in Ukraine. Public administration: theory and practice. (in Ukrainian).
- Cummings, M.C. (2003). Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: a Survey. Center for Arts and Culture. Retrieved from <http://www.culturalpolicy.org/pdf/MCCpaper-.pdf> (Accessed 22 September 2020)
- Dashkevich, A.V. (1998). The evolution of the system of doctrinal support of US foreign policy in the postwar period (Doctor Thesis). Kyiv, Nat. acad. Sciences of Ukraine, Inst. of World Economics and International relations. 450 p. (in Ukrainian).
- Dobbins, J., & Zoellick, R. (2017). War in Kosovo. *Foreign Service: Five Decades on the Frontlines of American Diplomacy*, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, Pp. 181-198. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.7864/j.ctt1hfr1r2.24> (Accessed September 1, 2020)
- Dubov, D. (2017). The policy of cultural diplomacy as a mechanism for implementing strategic communications of the stage. Retrieved from http://nbuviap.gov.ua/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=3064:politika-kulturnoji-diplomatiji-yak-mekhanizm-realizatsiji-strategichnikh-komunikatsij-derzhavi&catid=81&Itemid=415 (Accessed 01 October 2020).
- Estes, T., Lightner, E. (1976). The Department of States. N.Y.
- Evans A. E. (1948). The Reorganization of the American Foreign Service. *International Affairs*, N 24(2), Pp. 206–217, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3017973>
- Ezheev, M., Nikolaenko, S., & Ustimenko, O. (2009). Training of officers and specialists in the field of national security in the United States. Experience for Ukraine. *Bulletin of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine*, (2), pp. 314-323. (in Ukrainian).
- Farber, D. (2002). Sloan Rules: Alfred P. Sloan and the Triumph of General Motors. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gabel, C. (2013). George Catlett Marshall. In Sullivan G. (Author) & Willbanks J. (Ed.), *Generals of the Army: Marshall, MacArthur, Eisenhower, Arnold, Bradley* (pp. 19-62). Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt2jcf6z.7>
- Gavrylenko, I.I. (2017). Diplomatic component of "soft power" of the USA (Candidat Thesis). Kyiv, 241 p.
- Glad, B., & Smith, J. (1996). The Role of the Historical Advisory Committee, 1990-94, in the Declassification of US Foreign Policy Documents and Related Issues. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 29(2): 185-192.
- Glade, W. (2009). Issues in the genesis and organization of cultural diplomacy: a brief critical history. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 39(4): 240-259.
- Golovan, O.O. (2016). The evolution of US foreign policy at the beginning of the XXI century (Candidat Thesis). Mykolaiv, the Black Sea state Univ. Petra Mogyly. 22 p. (in Ukrainian).
- Harrington, J. P. (1946). How the Legislation Developed. *American Foreign Service Journal*, 23: 8-12.
- Hochschild, A. (1969). The Role of the Ambassador's Wife: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*.
- Hudson, V. & Leidl P. (2015). *The Hillary Doctrine: Sex and American Foreign Policy* New York: Columbia University Press, 456 p.
- Immerman, R. H. (1998). John Foster Dulles: Piety, Pragmatism, and Power in U.S. Foreign Policy. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. 221 p.
- Ivanyan, E. A. (1975). The White House: presidents and politics. Moscow.
- Kokoshina, A. A. (1981). USA: behind the facade of global politics. Moscow, Publishing house polit. literature, 321 p. (in Russian).
- Kuchmii, O. P. (2015). The Obama Administration's Cultural Diplomacy Strategy. *International Relations. Political Science Series*. 5. Retrieved from http://journals.iir.kiev.ua/index.php/pol_n/article/view/2510 (Accessed 22 November 2019)
- Kurnishova, Yu. V. (2005). The Berlin Crisis of 1958-1963 and US Foreign Policy (Candidat Thesis). Kyiv: Kyiv National University named after Taras Shevchenko, 220 p. (in Ukrainian).
- Lakishik, D. (2018). Features of American-Ukrainian relations in 1991-2004. *American history and politics*, 5: 50-58 (in Ukrainian).
- Marks, F. (1993). Power and Peace: The Diplomacy of John Foster Dulles. Westport: Praeger.
- McCoy, D.R. (1982). The Presidency of Harry S. Truman Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- McKenzie, Beatrice Loftus (2015). The Problem of Women in the Department: Sex and Gender Discrimination in the 1960s United States Foreign Diplomatic Service, *European journal of American Studie*. Doi : <https://doi.org/10.4000/ejas.10589>
- Messer, R. (1982). The End of an Alliance: James F. Byrnes, Roosevelt, Truman, and the Origins of the Cold War. Chapel Hill : The University of North Carolina Press
- Mihalkanin, E. S. (Ed.). (2004). American Statesmen: Secretaries of State from John Jay to Colin Powell. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Molly, M. Wood (2005). Diplomatic Wives: The Politics of Domesticity and the "Social Game" in the U.S. Foreign Service, 1905-1941. *Journal of Women's History*, 17 (2): 142-165. Retrieved from <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/184087> (Accessed 20 September 2020).
- Molly, M. Wood (2015). Wives, Clerks, and 'Lady Diplomats': The Gendered Politics of Diplomacy and Representation in the U.S. Foreign Service, 1900-1940. *European journal of American studies*. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.4000/ejas.10562>.
- Motzik, O.F. (2011). Current trends and prospects of Ukrainian-American relations. *Scientific Bulletin of the Diplomatic Academy of Ukraine*, 17: 19-23 (in Ukrainian).
- Nijman, J. (1998). Madeleine Albright and the geopolitics of Europe. *GeoJournal*, 46(4), 267-278. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41147309> (Accessed October 1, 2020).
- Nye, J. S. (2008). Security and Smart Power. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51(9), 1351–1356. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764208316228>
- Philpott, D. (2015). Understanding the Department of State. Bernan Press.
- Pidberezykh, I.E. (2011) Far Eastern direction of US foreign policy in the Yalta-Potsdam world system (1945-1991): (Doctor Thesis). Donetsk National University, 20 p. (in Ukrainian).
- Plischke, E. (1999). US Department of State: A Reference History. Greenwood Publishing Group
- Pruessen, W.R. (1982). John Foster Dulles: The Road to Power. New York: The Free Press.
- Ravndal, C. M. (1942). The New Duties of Our Foreign Service. *American Foreign Service Journal*, N 19, Pp. 357–359.

- Retrieved from <https://www.afsa.org/foreign-service-journal-july-1942#page=7> (Accessed 20 September 2020).
- Reed, T. L. (1978). Organizational Change in the American Foreign Service, 1925-1965: The Utility of Cohort Analysis. *American Sociological Review*, 43(3). doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2094498>.
- Ribchenko, T.O. (2011). Foreign policy of the administration of US President Boris Obama on the Russian Federation: (Candidat Thesis), National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, World Institute of economics and international relations, 20 p. (In Ukrainian).
- Richards, M. (1991). James F. Byrnes on Foreign Policy. *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*, 92(1). Retrieved from: www.jstor.org/stable/27568199 (Accessed February 10, 2020).
- Robertson, D. (1994) Sly and Able. A political biography of James F. Byrnes. New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Rothstein, R. (1972). Planning. Prediction and policymaking in foreign affairs. Theory and practice. Boston, Little, Brown and Company. 215 p.
- Samylov, S.M. (2008). On the modern reform of the State Department. *Russia and America in the XXI century*. Retrieved from: <http://www.rusus.ru/print.php?id=68> (Accessed 22 Mars 2020) (in Russian).
- Schlesinger, S. (2009). Act of Creation: The Founding of the United Nations. Hachette UK.
- Sivak, O. & Chernik, P. (2010). The latest Ukrainian-American relations. In: *Ukrainian national idea: realities and prospects of development* (in Ukrainian).
- Smith, B. (2015). Birth of the Marshall Plan, 1947–1948. In *Lincoln Gordon: Architect of Cold War Foreign Policy* (pp. 118-137). Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt14jxwtg.12>.
- Stowell, E. (1931). The Moses-Linthicum act on the Foreign Service. *American Journal of International Law*, 25(3), pp. 516-520. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2189836>.
- Taran, M. A. (2002). The Impact of Democratization in Taiwan on US Foreign Policy in East Asia in the 1990s, Kyiv: Kyiv National University Taras Shevchenko. 39 p. (in Ukrainian).
- Thayer, Ch. (1972). *Diplomat*. N.Y.: Macmillan
- Thomson, A. Charles & Walter, H. S. (1963). *Cultural relations and U.S. foreign policy*. Bloomington. 352 p.
- Ulyanchenko, Yu. O. (2007). State regulation of the agricultural market in the EU and the USA: experience for Ukraine. State construction. (in Ukrainian).
- Walker, M. (1997). Present at the Solution: Madeleine Albright's Ambitious Foreign Policy. *World Policy Journal*, 14(1), pp. 1-10. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40209512> (Accessed December 3, 2019)
- Walker, R. (1965). *The American Secretaries of State and their diplomacy*. (Vol. XIV). New York: Cooper Square Publishers.
- West, R. (1978). *The Department of State on the Eve of the First World War*. University of Georgia Press.
- Wulf, A. J. (2015). US international exhibitions during the Cold War: winning hearts and minds through cultural diplomacy. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Yunglyud, V. (1996). The last Secretary of State of the Franklin Roosevelt era in USA: *Economy, Politics, Ideology*, 9, pp. 75 – 85 (In Russian).
- Yurchenko, S. (2000). *Towards World Domination: US Geostrategy 1941–1963*. Sevastopol: Ukraine's navy.

Тетяна Клинїна,

Національний авіаційний університет (м. Київ, Україна)

e-mail: tklynina@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-0334-9852

ІНСТИТУЦІЙНА ІСТОРІЯ ДЕРЖАВНОГО ДЕПАРТАМЕНТУ США: ДЕЯКІ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЧНІ ОРІЄНТИРИ

Стаття присвячена вивченню наукового світового доробку щодо інституційної історії Державного Департаменту США. Із застосуванням історіографічного та проблемного методу дослідження були виокремлені основні аспекти, які розкривають сутність Державного департаменту як державної інституції: інституційна історія, законодавча база, державні секретарі (з урахуванням гендерності). Історіографічний аналіз цих позицій є тим мінімумом, які дозволяють охарактеризувати всі легітимні аспекти цієї інституції. Літературу з теми дослідження охарактеризовано у відповідності до географічного чинника. Наявний науковий доробок виокремлено в окремі пласти: зарубіжна література (переважно американська), науковий доробок українських авторів та російська історіографія (обрана як контраст до американської). Вказується, що американські наукові праці є фундаментальними для дослідження та мають певні риси: досить близькі до офіційних точок зору Державного департаменту, недостатньо критичні чи переповнені традиційними формулюваннями; однак, разом з тим, є досить фундаментальними та деталізованими. Український науковий доробок є суттєвим в питанні зовнішньої політики США чи то українсько-американських відносин, але не в питанні історії Держдепу, тому автор наголошує на відсутності комплексних українських досліджень із зазначеної теми. Характерною особливістю російської історіографії є крайня політизація, що була та є спричиненою протистоянням між США та СРСР тоді, й США та Російською Федерацією зараз.

Ключові слова: Державний департамент США; американська, українська, російська історіографія; інституційна історія.

© Tetiana Klynina

Надійшла до редакції: 20.10.2020

Прийнята до друку: 07.11.2020