Huddled in a semi-circle near the west base of the Washington Monument, a group of Army civilians and officers take in the history and topography of the monumental core of Washington, DC. Guided by one of their own, these federal employees with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) learn of their agency’s role in the development of the nation’s capital. “We’re standing here today on what would have been the Potomac River bank in the 1870s. Nearly everything you can see from this vantage point was either constructed by or greatly influenced by Army Engineers.” I continue, speaking through my trusty hip-mounted, portable speaker and microphone system, “The Washington Monument and the Lincoln, Vietnam, Korean, WWII, Jefferson, FDR, and new MLK Memorials were all directly managed or made possible due to the Corps of Engineers. As was the tidal basin, the Washington Channel, and the other water resource and flood protection elements of Washington waterfront.”

The tour of roughly 50 employees was organized by the Corps of Engineers Civil Works Directorate. According to the Assistant Director, Lt. Colonel Dale Snider, the command’s intent with these group outings is to provide exposure to the Corps’ past and ongoing contributions to the nation. Headquarters employees are certainly knowledgeable about current and planned construction projects around town: the new Washington Headquarters Service building, the hospital at Fort Belvoir, and the new 17th Street flood wall designed to protect downtown DC from disastrous floods. Aside from these new and ongoing, high-profile projects, many USACE employees do not fully grasp their agency’s impact on both the federal city and the broader nation. Over the past 50 years alone, the Civil Works Directorate has

See History Tours continued on page 3
The most exciting SHFG news is the refurbished web site. If you have not checked www.shfg.org, it’s time to do so. The home page is attractive and offers information on events, publications, awards, and programs, and there is news, a calendar, and numerous avenues to information. We owe Benjamin Guterman enormous thanks for origi-nating the idea and carrying it through to completion.

Several weeks ago Victoria Harden e-mailed her enthusiasm for the new SHFG web site and also reminded me of the role that the SHFG played in writing the statement of Museum Exhibit Standards that grew out of the “Enola Gay” fiasco at the Smithsonian’s National Air and Space Museum back in the early 1990s. For background, see Victoria A. Harden, “Museum Exhibit Standards: Do Historians Really Want Them?” in The Public Historian 21 (Summer 1999) 91–109. Although a National Task Force on Historians and Museums that included members from most major historical and museum organizations met several times to discuss issues relating to exhibits and other concerns, it was SHFG’s Museum Exhibit Standards Committee appointed by Phil Cantelon that ultimately drafted the statement of principles. I think that it is a fair reading of Harden’s article to suggest that the National Task Force bogged down over the authority of curators and input from stakeholders, among other tangential and not-so-tangential issues. The SHFG committee kept its focus and produced a remarkable document that was adopted by the National Council on Public History, the Organization of American Historians, and the American Historical Association. “It was the most effective and amazing committee I have ever been a part of,” Harden wrote in her e-mail, “and SHFG should crow a little about having been the moving force behind the standards.” She recommended that the Standards appear on our web-site, and they have been posted.

Harden’s e-mail was timely given the Smithsonian’s recent decision to remove a video clip by David Wojnarowicz in the National Portrait Gallery’s brave Hide/Seek: Difference and Desire in American Portraiture exhibit. The decision stirred controversy and significant commentary, and Smithsonian leadership hastily buckled in the face of uninformed criticism and political pressure and manifested its hubris in not admitting it made a mistake. Indeed, as the controversy grew it gained an eerie déjà vu glow that revived the ghost of the Enola Gay decision to ground that script and offer no support for curators. Removing a sensitive video from Hide/Seek also struck at curatorial authority, a topic that I commented on in the Organization of American Historians Newsletter several years ago and spoke about on a panel with former Archivist Allan Wein-stein at a SHFG conference. That column earned me an audience with Smithsonian Secretary Wayne Clough, and, although he listened to my arguments, donor intrusion into exhibit planning and the decline of the National Museum of American History’s curatorial/historian ranks were not among his top priorities. Clough blamed his quick reaction to the Portrait Gallery exhibit on the news cycle and, although he stands by the decision, wishes he had taken more time in making it. Perhaps then he could have discussed the video with Portrait Gallery curators and discovered not only their reason for including the video but also what later the Washington Post’s Blake Gopnik eloquently revealed not only about David Wojnarowicz’s intent but also about how museums exist to make people think, not the reverse.

Very near the Smithsonian Castle another quick decision last year bit both the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the White House. The rush to dismiss Shirley Sherrod based on an edited video contrasts remarkably with the tens of thousands of cases of USDA bureaucrats denying Afri-
can American farmers loans, jobs, acreage, information, and courtesy who were neither dismissed or reprimanded. After a bushel of apologies, the USDA offered to reinstate Mrs. Sherrod, an offer she kindly refused. In retirement I have been working on a book on African American farmers and civil rights and am focusing on the 1960s, but there is a direct link between USDA racism then and the 1999 Pigford v. Glickman decision to award $1.25 billion to black farmers and the long-delayed congressional appropriation passed only recently. USDA racism had enormous consequences that no financial compensation could make right. A once prospering community of black farmers was devastated not only by mechanization and chemicals but also by unchecked racism that spread from county agricultural committees through state agencies and on to Washington. In 1920, there were 926,000 black farms in the country. Between 1950 and 1978, the number of black farms dropped from 560,000 to 57,000. Ironically, those years encompassed the Civil Rights Movement when laws were intended to aid African Americans. Today there are roughly 18,000 black farms left in the country. Sadly, the National Museum of American History has no exhibit on rural life that might engage some of these questions.

News cycles do not fully account for poor decision-making, and it is interesting to speculate on how much homophobia, jingoism, and racism played in the “Hide/Seek”, “Enola Gay”, and Sherrod cases. In removing David Wojnarowicz’s video, the Smithsonian has not only damaged curatorial authority but also offended the generous and enthusiastic funders of “Hide/Seek”. Surely the nation’s premier museum complex that boasts incredible scientific and cultural resources, that produces significant research, and that has a sterling century-and-a-half reputation for mounting important exhibits can withstand carping criticism and funding threats. Those in charge of museums often underestimate the hunger of museum visitors to learn, to be challenged, and to emerge from exhibits wanting to know even more. Bowing to uninformed critics, allowing donors to intrude in exhibit conception and planning, and undermining curators raise serious questions about the future and integrity of the Smithsonian. Reading the Museum Exhibit Standards created by the SHFG would be a good first step in rearranging Smithsonian priorities.

History Tours continued from page 1

provided more than $358 billion in navigation, flood protection, environmental restoration, regulatory programs, hydropower, recreation, emergency response, and water supply to the nation. In the capital city, that translates to everything from bridges to sewers, airports to museums. “The command believes it is important for our Civil Works staff to understand our current involvement and place in history as a National asset,” says Assistant Director Snider. Not only do these tours offer understanding, they also instill a sense of worth and pride in the agency’s achievements. The tours are an excellent way to build morale by getting workers out of their cubicles to see firsthand what their colleagues and forbearers achieved.

The Office of History, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, conducts 5 to 10 tours throughout the DC area per year. Oftentimes they are requested by the Corps’ two largest directorates—Civil Works and Military Programs—for the purpose of showcasing historic Army Engineer projects to employees. However, we also conduct tours for other USACE groups as well as non-agency partners. In recent years, the Office of History has conducted tours for the 249th Engineer Battalion, the staff of Washingtonian Magazine, and we even received a request from the Chief Engineer of the Uganda Peoples Defense Forces to lead a delegation around the District of Columbia.

Feedback from attendees and partners have been nothing but positive. Guides love working with knowledgeable and interested groups, and those who manage the sites visited like the attention and recognition. After a tour to the Washington Aqueduct, which was constructed by and has been managed by the Corps of Engineers since the Civil War, the facilities director thanked our office and added “It was a fun time for us. It’s important that what Washington Aqueduct does is understood by a broad range of elements of USACE.” After each tour, we also get notes from many of the attendees thanking us and indicating how much they learned. The tours have become so popular that we often get repeat guests who come on each one.

The tours are valuable not only for the attendees but also for the office conducting it. History offices can sometimes be afterthoughts in large federal agencies and easy targets when a new chief asks “why do we need historians?” These tours give offices visibility and dedicated time with an agency’s leadership to showcase the knowledge historians possess and how history can be valuable to current operations and morale building. Once begun, the popularity of our tours has escalated so greatly that our small office cannot accommodate all of the requests. This has allowed us to reach out to other federal historians and partners to aid in, but to also share and disseminate information between us, and build lasting relationships. In the past year, our office has been fortunate enough to work with historians

See History Tours continued on page 4
As I complete my tenure as chief of military history and director of the U.S. Army Center of Military History at Fort McNair, I want to leave you with a few thoughts about the Army Historical Program and its immediate future. First, all of you, historians and curators alike, should be proud of the Army’s history program because it is the best such effort in the entire federal government and in the world, and has been recognized as such since World War II. Its publications, archival holdings, and museum collections have a global reach that is not duplicated anywhere else. It has represented the gold standard against which the historical programs of every Army and every federal agency have been measured, and I see no imminent threat to that reputation.

Second, the Army Historical Program’s primary mission is not to preserve the Army’s history—its records, experiences, materiel, artifacts, and so forth—for posterity. Rather, its main purpose is to support today’s Army in meeting its goals. The United States may not have or aspire to have the

James Garber is a historian in the Office of History, Headquarters, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
largest Army in the world, the most tanks and guns, the most brigades and battalions, the fanciest uniforms, or the most historic units, but, given our nation’s heavy worldwide responsibilities, we must have the smartest Army in the world. And that is where you, the Army’s historical professionals, come in.

In all that your commands do, from acquisition to budgeting, from training to operations, from education to tactics, someone has probably done those tasks before—generally many someones. And as historical professionals, you should be able to provide to the institutions your support descriptions of and insights derived from these past experiences, which will in turn give your commanders and staffs valuable historical perspectives on current problems as well as insights regarding future obstacles. Such analytical work has been the Center’s stock in trade for many decades. Over the last three years or so, we have submitted several hundred such products to Secretaries of the Army Pete Geren and John McHugh, Chief of Staff General George Casey, and their staffs. These have addressed issues like the Army’s changing mix of active and reserve component units since the Korean War and the philosophies behind those changes; wartime recruitment, retention and tour lengths; psychiatric casualty rates since the Civil War; efforts to solve strategic problems through silver-bullet acquisitions; countersurgency and occupation-force ratios; and the Department of the Army’s responses to new national administrations and its input to quadrennial defense reviews. Although not every question can be answered from data readily at hand, all Army historians ought to attempt to furnish similar assistance to their commands based on their own specialized knowledge, archival holdings and research experience.

Both the secretary of the Army and the chief of staff have recently observed that the Army will soon focus on reforming the “base” or generating force,” sometimes called the TDA (table of distribution and allowances) army as opposed to the TOE (table of organization and equipment), or field, army. For command historians, that means scouring your archives and sources to ascertain how your headquarters has approached such exercises before. Have reorganization efforts been spearheaded by existing staffs, by special committees, or by an ad hoc task force? Were missions changed or recombined with others? Was the emphasis placed on accelerating processes or integrating results? Were changes progressive or incremental? And have rationales for reorganization been consistent or fractal? How have personnel and grades been impacted, and what have been the implications for reserve component forces? Providing such data will both assist your command and keep you tied closely to its current missions, easing your efforts to collect and archive the most critical contemporary material.

Our museum curators can certainly play similar supporting roles. The Center has already provided to the Federal Bureau of Investigation large numbers of AK47s from its museum stocks for training, and we should be doing no less for our soldiers as we prepare them for the type of combat that the U.S. Army has seen so many times before. We should not be surprised that the Army’s recent designs for everything from packanimal harnesses to truck-mounted gun systems and even advanced avionics frames have been informed by items in our museum artifact inventories, as these include advanced experimental materiel. And as the Army’s senior curator recently commented, objects are the most visible and emotionally charged source of historical instruction and can forcefully communicate information at many levels. A group of helmets with division insignia from Normandy, for example, underlines the importance of unit cohesion, while a comparison of the armor used by the U.S. Army and its foes during World War II dramatically illustrates the impact that different armor doctrines had on equipment development and the advantages possessed by the more expensive but generally better armed and armored German machines. (We put our money into speed and mass production.) Thus, although curators have a somewhat different function than historians in this arena of support, they too can supply concrete aid for current missions and should strive to do so at every opportunity. If all of our historical professionals can do that, I know that we will have a smarter and a better Army and that the Army Historical Program will have made a lasting contribution to the national defense.

I recently returned from a great visit to the Grafenwöhr training area, where Elvis Presley was serving in 1960 when I first donned an Army uniform. Certainly I have watched great changes in the U.S. Army since then. Now, after forty years of service to that Army, I will be retiring as this issue of Army History goes to press. But as one who has specialized in military history, I consider myself extremely fortunate to have had such a great career working and sharing wonderful experiences with so many terrific people. I sincerely wish all of you well. I ask only that you build on the fine work done by your predecessors and ensure that our historical programs remain the best in the world as you continue to provide tangible support to our soldiers and leaders.

Dr. Jeffrey Clarke retired as the director of the U.S. Army Center of Military History in July 2010. This article is reprinted by permission of Army History.
Located in the Office of Legislative and Public Affairs (OLPA), the history program of the National Science Foundation (NSF) was reestablished in 2006 after a hiatus of more than a decade following the retirement of George T. Mazuzan. My charge when I came to the NSF after 30 years at the Smithsonian Institution was to restore the program to the status it enjoyed under the earlier leadership of J. Merton England and George Mazuzan, when it was recognized as one of the most successful science agency history programs in the federal government. In order to achieve this goal, I have established a wide-ranging program of preservation, interpretation, dissemination, and reference, covering a multitude of media, including the Internet, print, and exhibition, serving the NSF staff, the scholarly community, and the public. Although I have no staff of my own, I can rely on the extensive editorial, research, IT, and administrative support of the staff of OLPA. In addition, I can draw on the assistance of the NSF intern programs. Underlying all of the activities of the history program is the recognition by the NSF leadership of the truth of George Mazuzan’s argument in *The National Science Foundation: A Brief History*, “that both continuity and change in history need to be understood to deal effectively with the present.”

The research topics investigated by the NSF history program can range from the very broad to the very narrow. They include areas of the administrative history of the Foundation; the history of specific NSF directorates, divisions, or offices (there are six science or engineering directorates and an education directorate, each with multiple divisions, as well as three offices that support science or engineering research) and their impact on the development of specific disciplines in the United States; and biographical information on NSF staff and recipients of NSF grants. In some cases the research is the direct result of my own interests. In other cases, I am responding to queries or expressions of interest from staff, scholars, the press, students, or the general public.

Because histories of specific directorates, divisions, or offices require expertise in the history of the scientific or engineering disciplines supported by those units, contractors who are specialists in the particular field of history of science, engineering, or education are sometimes used to supplement and complement my work, whose own expertise lies in the history of the physical sciences. These contract monographs are produced with the financial and administrative support and cooperation of the individual NSF organizations. Indeed, they could not appear without
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that support and cooperation. Currently, the Biology Directorate is supporting a history of biology at the NSF from 1975 through 2004, with a projected completion date of early 2012. The monograph produced by the program will be published in book form by a scholarly press, ensuring that the product meets the highest peer-review standards for historical research and writing.

In many cases, I work in cooperation with academic historians who are interested in NSF history, serving as archivist, critic, or researcher, as the need arises. One of the services the NSF history program can provide is bringing together historians interested in different aspects of NSF history. In September 2010, the Office of the Director sponsored a history symposium that brought together four academic researchers and one contract historian to discuss their work, share their common problems working with NSF records, and interact with interested NSF staff. Represented at the symposium were historians of computer science, biology, the social sciences, and science museum education.

I spend the bulk of my own research time on the administrative history of the Foundation. In press is a journal article on the history of the merit review criteria used in evaluating grant proposals (in the journal Technology and Innovation), which grew out of a 2009 international workshop on peer review at the Potomac Institute for Policy Studies. A revised, expanded, and updated edition of George Mazuzan’s The National Science Foundation: A Brief History, originally published in 1988, is scheduled to appear in 2011. Mazuzan’s study, the only broad administrative history of the NSF from conception to the mid-1980s, will be extended into the 21st century.

Publications are just one form of dissemination of the results of the historical research analysis. The history section of the NSF web site (http://www.nsf.gov/about/history/) is an important vehicle for communicating to the general public. It was completely revised in 2010 as part of the commemoration of the 60th anniversary of the establishment of the NSF. The Timeline of NSF History was entirely redone, with a greatly improved layout and expanded content. New components were added to the web site, including the NSF Sensational 60, a celebration of the 60 most important contributions made by NSF funding, and videos of various events celebrating the NSF’s 60th anniversary. The web site also allows members of the general public to send queries about NSF history to the historian.

Oral presentations are another essential form of communication of results. The Foundation supports my efforts to be an active member of the larger historical community, and I regularly make presentations at national and international history conferences; I am already on the program of three conferences for 2011. I also make internal presentations to further historical understanding among members of the NSF staff, a significant percentage of whom are “rotators”—scientists, engineers, and educators from outside the federal government who come to the NSF for one to three years, and have little knowledge of the history of the Foundation. There have been some preliminary discussions of incorporating a formal presentation on NSF history into the orientation for newly hired staff.

Exhibitions will serve as a future outlet for the history program. A pilot program to develop virtual exhibits about the history of the NSF has begun. There is the hope that as the NSF looks towards new or renovated office space later in this decade, the virtual exhibits could be joined by a physical exhibit of key documents in the history of the Foundation.

Of course, underpinning any history program is the preservation of historic documentation. In the area of preservation, I provide advice and support to the NSF records manager and other staff in identifying, preserving, and cataloging historically significant documentation and photographs, not otherwise covered by records schedules, for the use of staff and external scholars. The NSF has focused its formal preservation efforts on the grant “jackets”—the files created in the evaluation process of grant proposals. It has been less concerned with the preservation of documentation regarding program development, especially in its early stages. My first challenge has been to capture that documentation, including the documents, photographs, and memories that accumulated during the decade between my tenure and that of George Mazuzan. Fortunately, during this decade many NSF staff held on to significant records in anticipation of the restoration of the history program. Another major source of significant documentation has been retirees, eager to share their memories and their files. As boxes began to accumulate in my office, the issues of control and dissemination had to be confronted. The decision has been made to go electronic. The history program has just begun to digitize documents and photographs in its possession and to control the images through a digital access management system. The long-term goal is to make the digital images available to scholars and the general public through the NSF web site.

To ensure the preservation of information not captured in documents or photographs, I conduct an oral history program that includes extended interviews with past directors and deputy directors and shorter interviews with selected retired and active staff. These interviews are transcribed and indexed to facilitate retrieval of information. In addition, all contract history projects are required to include a significant oral history component.

For questions about NSF history or the history program, contact me at mrothenb@nsf.gov or 703-292-7729.

Marc Rothenberg is a historian with the National Science Foundation.
David S. Ferriero, 10th Archivist of the United States, delivered the 2010 Hewlett Lecture on October 27 at Clyde’s Restaurant in Washington’s Penn Quarter district. Nearing the first anniversary of his appointment as Archivist, the Hewlett Lecture afforded him an opportunity to “look back and look forward” by presenting “A View from Washington: The First 355 Days.”

As the Nation’s record keeper, it is the responsibility of the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) to preserve federal records and make them accessible. Yet despite a growing volume of digital records and increasing use of the Internet by researchers, Ferriero found that NARA lagged in technology. He declared that the agency needed to be “nimble” and needed a “culture change” in order to “thrive in the digital age.”

Since taking the helm at NARA, one of Ferriero’s principal objectives has been to make NARA a government leader in using Social Media to carry out its mission. The Internet makes it possible to reach the public “where they are,” “to spread the word about NARA,” and to make NARA’s holdings more accessible. Thus, NARA is now revamping its web site, has developed a new web version of the Federal Register (called “Federal Register 2.0”), has wired NARA facilities for WiFi, and is making unprecedented use of Facebook, blogs, and YouTube. All of this, Ferriero pointed out, complies with President Obama’s “Open Government” initiative—which, he added, was already reflected in NARA’s mission of working to enable American citizens to see the records of their government.

Other programs demonstrating NARA’s commitment to Open Government include the Declassification Center, the Government Information Service, and the Information Security Oversight Office. The fact that NARA was entrusted with all of those responsibilities reflect the faith that that President Obama and Congress have in the agency.

In the area of opening government records for use by researchers, Ferriero stated that his philosophy was to “Release all we can but protect all we must.” NARA is attacking the declassification backlog and working to prevent the buildup of a new backlog. The agency has appointed a Freedom of Information Act Ombudsman, and the Information Security Oversight Office is working to reform the classification system.

The backbone of the Freedom of Information Act and Open Government, Ferriero said, is good records management. He noted that 4 out of 5 agencies have a moderate to high-level risk associated with their records management programs, especially in connection with electronic records. For this reason, Ferriero declared that NARA needed to be more aggressive with the agencies in promoting effective records management.

In addition, Ferriero discussed the impending reorganization of NARA. Among the goals of reorganization is the establishment of a “culture of leadership” that will “trust and empower” NARA employees to better serve customer needs.

David S. Ferriero became Archivist of the United States on November 6, 2009. Before that, he was the Andrew W. Mellon Director of the New York Public Libraries, one of the largest public library systems in the United States, and an internationally renowned research library. Ferriero began his library career at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he served for more than 30 years. Later, he became University Librarian and Vice Provost for Library Affairs at Duke University. A veteran of the U.S. Navy, Ferriero earned his bachelor’s and master’s degrees in English literature from Northeastern University, and a master’s degree in Library and Information Science from Simmons College.

The Annual Hewlett Lecture is named in honor of Dr. Richard Hewlett, former Chief Historian of the Atomic Energy Commission and Senior Vice President of History Associates Incorporated. Dr. Hewlett attended the banquet and lecture, sitting at the head table with the speaker, and receiving the greetings of his many friends in the Society.
HFG’s archives has many newspaper clippings, but rarely do they refer to the Society directly. Sadly, most recent newspaper references to the Society seem to be mentions in the obituaries of deceased members.

One substantive article about the SHFG appeared on the “Federal Report” page of the Washington Post, Monday, June 10, 1985. Written by Myron Struck, a Post staff writer, and titled “Federal History Yields Policy Signposts,” it featured Dr. Wayne Rasmussen, then President of the Society, as well as Chief Historian of the Department of Agriculture. Rasmussen, David K. Allison, and other Society members were quoted highlighting the value of historical programs to their agencies. In the center of the article, appeared a box labeled “Agencies Having Most Historians.” Using 1983 figures, it listed a total of 596 historians in the government, with the most at the Air Force (214), the Army (123), and Interior (110). The fourth highest was the Navy at 38, with State, Agriculture, and NASA having far fewer, at 22, 26, and 12 respectively.

President Rasmussen discussed the Post article at the Executive Council Session held June 19, 1985. According to the minutes of that meeting, some council members found it somewhat shallow, but the article itself provided the public a positive view of the SHFG and the value of Federal history programs. Although general reaction to the article was favorable, the chart showing the number of Federal historians “created some difficulties.” It seems that the House Armed Services Committee had recently asked the military services to justify their history programs, and was considering cuts to those programs.

In the same folder as the Post story, there is a copy of the House Appropriations Committee Report on the “Department of Defense Appropriation Bill, 1986,” dated October 14, 1985, in which a section titled “Historian Programs” appeared. Using slightly revised figures, the Committee found the size of the Army and Air Force programs to be excessive and recommended substantial reductions in their funding. In addition, it recommended that the services consider the possibility of regionalized or centralized staffing for their historical programs. The Committee also suggested that “The Services should evaluate the true mission of a historian program and determine if their current approach is compatible with that mission.” This led to a GAO “Review of DOD Historians,” which was published as a fact sheet in July 1986.

Dennis Roth’s 10-year history of the SHFG notes that some Air Force historians blamed the SHFG’s activities for the budget cuts they experienced in 1985 and 1986.* Thus, they became reluctant to support the Society’s attempts to publicize and expand Federal history programs, not wanting to draw attention to them. As this incident demonstrates, in an environment of austerity, budget cuts, and government bashing, even good publicity may have unintended negative consequences. For more information on the SHFG Archives, write to chasdowns@verizon.net

---

The Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) has been in operation over a year and has already made an important difference in the culture and operation of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) process. Viewing improvement in the FOIA process as central to declassification efforts, President Barrack Obama acted promptly on his first day in office, January 21, 2009, to sign a memorandum to promote among federal agencies “a new era of government.”

OGIS opened on September 8, 2009, within the National Archives and Records Administration. Its mandate from Congress was twofold: to review agencies’ policies, procedures, and compliance with FOIA requirements, and to act when required as a mediator between agencies and requestors. OGIS would be, in effect, an “ombudsman” for more effective government-wide FOIA procedures. The mediation option was new in these circumstances and offered opportunities for amenable resolution, as well as reform and improvement of government policies.

OGIS worked in conjunction with the Department of Justice’s Office of Information Policy (OIP), which has responsibility to develop and implement FOIA policies. “There is an intersection of duties,” states the Office’s first annual report, now available at http://www.archives.gov/ogis/reports/building-bridges-report.html. “To that end,” it continues, they “are working together to define interagency procedures for successfully fulfilling both offices’ roles. Collaboration between OGIS and OIP, while not yet fully realized, is critical to the effectiveness of both offices.”

New procedures are taking shape. OGIS has seven professionals on staff, and agencies have begun to contact and work with them to build a sense of trust through resolution of difficult cases. OPM has allowed creation of new positions at federal agencies titled “FOIA Officer” or “FOIA Specialist.” Agencies are to develop web pages clearly listing offices responsible for addressing FOIA requests, and to regularly produce information about their compliance in order to gauge progress and improve procedures (per Presidential memorandum of Jan. 18, 2011).

OGIS’s mediation role can include formal mediation, facilitation, and ombudsman services. With the high expense of formal mediation (using outside mediators), parties have thusfar exclusively taken advantage of facilitation services. In its first year, OGIS has handled 391 cases, with 83 involving more serious disputes between FOIA requestors and 24 departments and agencies. The report states that “more than four out of five cases ended with the requestor and the agency reaching an agreement. But for OGIS, most of these customers would not have received help.” In these 83 cases, facilitation “succeeded in 68 cases, with the requestor and the agency reaching an agreement. Whether records were disclosed or withheld, the parties in each of these cases agreed with the outcome, and the FOIA process worked.”

The report states that OGIS has tried to advance its mission in five ways: “by establishing a comprehensive process for reviewing agency FOIA policies and procedures, better educating FOIA requesters, establishing a permanent case management system, developing a fully operational mediation program, and regularly offering dispute resolution skills for agency FOIA professionals.” This last point has been particularly effective through cooperation with Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) programs at the agencies that can train agency FOIA personnel. That process has engendered better communication and improved results, and made formal mediation less likely. The ADR offices at the Departments of Defense, Interior, and Veterans Affairs have volunteered in pilot programs “in extending their existing mediation and dispute resolution programs to include FOIA disputes.”

The report cites numerous examples of the importance of released documents. The following provides a timely example: After the April 2010 BP oil disaster in the Gulf of Mexico, the nonprofit Center for Public Integrity analyzed data obtained under FOIA and reported in May that 97 percent of all “egregious willful” violations cited by Occupational Safety and Health Administration inspectors in the previous three years were found at two BP-owned refineries. The Associated Press relied on FOIA to report in May that the Minerals Management Service (recently renamed the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement) violated its own policy by not conducting monthly inspections on BP’s Deepwater Horizon rig. Two weeks later, The New York Times reported that Federal drilling records and well reports obtained from the Bureau under FOIA helped reveal a history of problems with a blowout preventer and casing long before the Deepwater Horizon explosion.
These developments provide encouraging news of improved and improving FOIA procedures, eventually with more uniform regulations and practices across the government. Of course, these facilitation efforts don’t guarantee release of documents to requestors, as many federal offices will continue to exercise their particular standards and reasons for denial of requests. But these procedures have begun a process of greater dialogue, uniform practices, and traceable progress for those requests. OGIS’s report notes efforts to promote “best practices,” closer work with agency liaisons on training and policies, and more precise recordkeeping of FOIA requests and their resolutions. OGIS has worked with 36 federal departments and agencies so far, a good start for government-wide progress in freedom of information.

Much progress is still needed, particularly with agencies that have been slow to comply with the new rules. Importantly, data on the number of FOIA requests, their disposition, and the backlog are reported on the justice Department’s website at www.foia.gov.

WEB SITES:
OGIS: http://www.archives.gov/ogis/
Department of Justice FOIA: www.foia.gov

Benjamin Guterman is a writer/editor with the National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
James Grossman became the new executive director of the American Historical Association on September 1, 2010. For more information visit: http://blog.historians.org/

CENTER OF MILITARY HISTORY
Robert Dalessandro became the director of the U.S. Army Center of Military History on February 13, 2011. A retired Army colonel, Dalessandro previously served at the Combat Studies Institute at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, and was also the director of the Army Heritage and Education Center at Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

The center recently published two new books. The first, Engineers at War, describes the role of military engineers, especially the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, in the Vietnam War. Written by Adrian Traas, the history is the story of the engineers’ battle against an elusive and determined enemy, operating in one of the harshest climates in the world. Despite many challenges, during the long war the engineers successfully carried out a wide variety of combat and construction missions. That construction support was vital, for during the war the United States deployed and operated a modern 500,000-man fighting force in the often inhospitable jungles of Southeast Asia. During the war, U.S. military engineers, augmented by a large force of contractors, built ports and supply depots, carved airfields and airstrips out of the jungle, built and repaired roads and bridges, and constructed innumerable bases.

The second publication is Dale Andrade’s Surging South to Baghdad: the 3D Infantry Division and Task Force Marne in Iraq, 2007–2008. The book, the first in-depth study of counterinsurgency operations in Iraq during the Bush administration’s troop surge, focuses on operations in the Multi-National Division-Center, an area of operations established in the spring of 2007 to focus on insurgent sanctuaries south of Baghdad. Prior to 2007 the area was a backwater, used by al-Queda and other insurgent groups.
groups to recruit new fighters and build roadside bombs, and served as a staging area to transport insurgents and materiel into the fighting in Baghdad. The fighting south of Baghdad reflects many of the lessons that shaped later operations in Iraq, notably the necessity of combining adequate troop strength with sound planning to defeat an entrenched enemy living among the population. The book, completed only a short time after the event, provides a valuable perspective for the ongoing counterinsurgencies in Iraq and Afghanistan.

**History Associates Incorporated**

The history of the National Institute for Nursing Research (NINR) has recently been published to commemorate the Institute’s 25-year anniversary at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). *NINR: Bringing Science to Life*, written by History Associates co-founder Dr. Philip L. Cantelon, traces the origins of NINR, details how nursing research became part of NIH—evolving from a research center into a full institute—and explores how nursing science has progressed in the past quarter-century.

For more information, or to download the entire book online, visit: [http://www.ninr.nih.gov/NewsAndInformation/NINRPublications/HistoryBook](http://www.ninr.nih.gov/NewsAndInformation/NINRPublications/HistoryBook).

History Associates senior historian James P. Rife recently delivered a presentation titled “Lessons Learned: Bridges to Baghdad, the Seabees in the Iraq War” with Rear Admiral Charles R. Kubic, CEC, U.S. Navy (ret.) at the Society of American Military Engineers 2010 Joint Engineer Training Conference & Expo (JETC) in Atlanta, Georgia.

Mr. Rife and Rear Admiral Kubic discussed the historical legacy of the U.S. Navy Seabees with respect to “lessons learned” from the organization’s contingency operations in Iraq from 2003 through 2008. The presentation evolved from the book *Bridges to Baghdad: The U.S. Navy Seabees in the Iraq War*, co-authored by Mr. Rife and Rear Admiral Kubic last year, which chronicled the experience of the “fighting Seabees,” the U.S. Navy’s premier expeditionary construction force.

Mr. Rife specializes in military history and the history of weapons technology at History Associates. His publications include *The Sound of Freedom: U.S. Naval Weapons Technology at Dahlgren, Virginia, 1918–2006* and *Caring & Curing: A History of the U.S. Indian Health Service*. Rear Admiral Kubic is currently president of ECC International, LCC, a global expeditionary engineering company headquartered in Burlingame, California.

**Marine Corps History Division**

The Division has published an extensively illustrated volume titled *Afghanistan Alone and Afraid*, with photographs by field historian LtCol David A. Benhoff. The volume attempts to capture “the interaction of Marines with the Afghan people and the Afghan National Army (ANA).” Lt Colonel Benhoff writes that the story is told both through images and from oral interviews. Three activities are covered: humanitarian assistance activities with the local population; ANA training; and “an ANA brigade-level cordon and search operation initiated by an air assault. The result is a close look at this unique and dangerous mission.

**National Archives and Records Administration**

The Interagency Working Group (IWG), under the direction of the National Archives, has released a new volume titled *Hitler’s Shadow: Nazi War Criminals, U.S. Intelligence, and the Cold War*, by Richard Breitman and Norman J.W. Goda. It supplements the IWG’s 2005 volume *U.S. Intelligence and the Nazis*. The new volume analyzes many of the documents released since 2005. In 2005–7 the CIA and the Army took “a more liberal interpretation” of the 1998 Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act. The CIA released 1,100 new files, and the Army released about 1.3 million files from its Investigative Record Repository. The authors note that it will be years before the records are fully available to researchers, due to the reformatting necessary from the original optical disks, and the ongoing declassification work. But they have been able to analyze hundreds of files that are now available. They have presented their findings in five chapters: “New Information on Major Nazi Figures,” “Nazis and the Middle East,” “New Materials..."
Reference Information Paper (RIP) 116, Records Relating to Railroads in the Cartographic Section of the National Archives, compiled by Peter F. Brauer, is now available. It describes records housed in the Cartographic Section at College Park, in College Park, Maryland. The records include cartographic records, architectural and engineering drawings, and aerial photographs relating to railroad equipment, tracks, and property. These records focus primarily on the United States, although there is widespread coverage of countries and regions worldwide. The dates of these records range from 1828 to 2009. Foreign coverage dates mostly from the early to mid-20th century. The records described include more than 215 series of records in 69 record groups. Additional railroad records are housed in other National Archives offices nationwide. The guide includes an introduction, a topical index, an index by railroad name, and illustrations of representative records. The guide is particularly useful for the identification of railroads nationwide, tracing railroad expansion and technological innovations, government policies, and military operations. For a free copy, contact the Research Support Staff (NWCC1) at 1-866-325-7208, or view it online at www.archives.gov/publications.

New microfilm and digital publications include Mortuary Records of Chinese Decedents in California, July 1870–April 1933, Compiled by the San Francisco, California, Immigration Office (A4040, RG 85, 1 roll); and Records of the Property Control Branch of the U.S. Allied Commission for Austria (USACA) Section, 1945–1950 (DN1929, RG 260, 413 disks).

NARA has a new Online Public Access prototype available to the public at http://www.archives.gov/research/search. The Online Public Access prototype is a public portal that provides access to digitized records, and information about the records. It also provides a centralized means of searching multiple National Archives resources at once. Currently, researchers perform separate searches in the Archival Research Catalog (ARC) for catalogue descriptions, histories and biographies; Access to Archival Databases (AAD) for electronic records; and Archives.gov. The new interface illustrates a streamlined search experience for users, searching across all of these resources. The National Archives will add additional functionality in the coming year, including an image zooming feature that will enable users to zoom and pan its online holdings, and social sharing through Facebook, Twitter, and other sites.

The 10-year Holocaust-Era Assets Records Project has been completed and readied for online access. During World War II, the Nazis looted enormous amounts of cultural, religious, intellectual, historical, and financial property. At the end of the war, the Allies were faced with the overwhelming task of determining whom the assets belonged to and how to restitute them. Since the mid-1990s, records pertaining to these looted assets have been among the most heavily used in the National Archives. This massive undertaking continues to this day. In 2000, NW initiated the Holocaust-Era Assets Records Microfilming Project (HRP). The goal was to arrange, describe, conserve, and reformat the most important series of NARA’s holdings pertaining to looted assets. In December 2010, the HRP finished its work. All 2.5 million pages of the records have been processed and described by NWC and microfilmed or digitized by NWT. This comprises 24 separate microfilm...
or digital publications. These publications are now available, or soon will be available, through Order Online! or in NARA’s research room. Reformattng the original records has also greatly facilitated their digitization. For the last year, Footnote.com, one of NARA’s digitization partners, has been digitizing and indexing the Holocaust-era assets microfilm and making the images and metadata available online. On May 5, NARA will launch its web portal that will link to the digital versions of the HRP publications on Footnote and to digital records and finding aids on the topic that are held in archival institutions in Great Britain, Germany, France, Ukraine, and other nations.

The Kennedy Presidential Library in Boston has been working for four years on a $10 million digitization project called “Access to a Legacy.” It will feature 200,000 pages of materials, 300 reels of audio tape, 300 museum artifacts and 1,500 photographs. It can be accessed at jfklibrary.org. It will be an excellent resource for young students and the most serious scholars. The library’s total archive encompasses 48 million pages, 7,000 hours of audio recordings, 16,000 museum artifacts and 400,000 photographs.

National Cemetery Administration
In August 2010, the nation’s oldest existing Civil War monument was placed on exhibit at the Frazier International History Museum in Louisville, Kentucky. The move was the result of nearly a decade’s coordination among the Department of Veterans Affairs, National Cemetery Administration (NCA), which manages Cave Hill National Cemetery where the monument resided from 1867 to 2008, and many partners including the Kentucky Heritage Council and local stakeholders.

The fragile 32nd Indiana Infantry Monument, informally known as the “Bloedner Monument” after carver Private August Bloedner, is of exceptional significance as the country begins the Civil War sesquicentennial. It was carved in the first weeks of 1862 to memorialize 13 casualties of the battle of Rowlett’s Station in Munfordville, about 70 miles south of Louisville.

NCA’s contractor on the project, which includes conservation of the original monument and forthcoming installa-
tion of a replacement monument in the cemetery, is Washington, DC–based Heritage Preservation Inc. Conservation Solutions Inc. was the materials conservator.

The final step in the project will occur in fall 2011, when NCA installs a new monument in Cave Hill National Cemetery that will reflect the appearance of the original, along with a translation in English and an interpretive sign. The new monument will be created by noted carver Nick Benson of the John Stevens Shop of Newport, Rhode Island. More information about this project can be found at: http://www.cem.va.gov/hist_histhome.asp.

National Postal Museum
The National Postal Museum (NPM) recently held its annual Winton M. Blount Postal History Symposium. Over two days, 20 papers were presented on the theme of imagery, icons, and identity in stamps and the mail. According to the NPM, “Stamps, as official government documents, can be treated as primary resources designed to convey specific political and esthetic messages.” The keynote speaker was Dr. Jack Child. Next year’s symposium will be around the theme of how commerce and industry shaped the mails and will take place in Bellefonte, Pennsylvania. More information can be found at the National Postal Museum web site: www.postalmuseum.si.edu/symposium2011/index.html.

National Preservation Institute
The Institute has released its 2011 schedule of Professional Seminars in Historic Preservation & Cultural Resource Management. It is a nonprofit organization that “educates those involved in the management, preservation, and stewardship of our cultural heritage.” The extensive curriculum offerings include “Historic Structure Reports: A Management Tool for Historic Properties,” “Conflict Resolution and Consultation Tools for Cultural and Natural resource Projects,” and “Landscape Preservation: An Introduction.” Workshops are held nationwide and by arrangement, and scholarships are available. The schedule and registration are available at www.npi.org.

Treasury Historical Association
Over the summer, the THA saw the completion of a restoration project on the exterior of the Treasury building at 15th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, DC. Cast iron fencing, replicating the original from the 1840s, was installed between the columns of the 15th Street façade. The original fencing was removed in 1910 when the columns were replaced.

The THA has also celebrated the publication of its book Fortress of Finance: The United States Treasury Building. Authored by architectural historian Pamela Scott, it explores the various homes of the Treasury Department since 1789 while giving pride of place to the Department’s current home, a National Historic Landmark. The book runs for 336 footnoted pages and contains 185 illustrations. More on the book can be found at: www.treasuryhistoricalassn.org/newsletters/Advertisement7Ppdf. Book-signings are scheduled for various venues in Washington.

One book-signing event occurred at the September THA Lecture in which Pamela Scott spoke about the work of writing the book. The next lecture will feature former Fed Chairman Paul Volcker.
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Oct. 6–7, 2011. National Security Agency’s Center for Cryptologic History, Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Laboratory’s Kossiakoff Center, Laurel, Maryland. Send proposals for presentations or full panels (including abstracts for each paper and biographical sketches for each presenter, to Dr. Kent Sieg, Tel: 301-688-2336, or via e-mail at kgsieg@nsa.gov.


