SOCIETY HOSTS SUCCESSFUL FEDERAL RECORDS WORKSHOP

Matt Wasniewski

On February 1, the Society, in cooperation with the National Archives, held an inaugural “Federal Records Workshop,” in which historians and archivists team-taught sessions on how to conduct research in legislative, judicial, executive, civilian, and military records. The daylong workshop took place at the Boeing Learning Center at the National Archives Building, Washington, DC.

Participants for the sold-out workshop were greeted by Archivist of the United States David S. Ferriero and SHFG President Marc Rothenberg. Thirty-five students (a mix of Ph.D., M.A. and undergraduate history majors) along with several federal historians, and a handful of college faculty participated in the daylong event. Student participants were from James Madison University, Washington College, George Mason, American University, West Virginia University, Northeastern University, and the University of Maryland.

“While they learn in classes and readings about primary resources and how to build their research from them, hearing archivists who work daily providing and explaining how and why to use documents, had a special impact on our students. . . . It shifted the axis from theory to real world practice,” said Michael Galgano, chair of the James Madison University History Department, which sent 10 students examine a revised draft of the Bill of Rights with James Madison’s handwritten editorial marks (courtesy Adam Goodheart).

See “Workshop” cont’d on page 3
Leaving a legacy. Members of our Society do that every day through their work products: a scholarly publication, a preserved historic site, a finding aid, a better informed public, a better informed bureaucracy, and legacies in a myriad of other forms. But there is another way to leave a legacy for the study and interpretation of the history of the federal government that is not a work product. And that is the form of a legacy I wish to address in this column. I want to talk about estate gifts. To be blunt (fund-raising really isn’t a subtle art), would you consider naming SHFG in your will?

The Society has launched new initiatives this year. The Federal Records Workshop in February, organized by past president Matt Wasniewski, was a great success. Demand for seats far exceeded capacity, and there have already been requests by the history departments that participated to have it again next year. There is conversation about having a version of the workshop take place on university campuses outside Washington. The annual conference this year will be held jointly with the organization Oral History in the Mid-Atlantic Region and will be expanded to a day and a half. Part of the program will be an evening reception to allow the members of the two organizations to meet in an informal setting. Through the informal gathering and the formal sessions, we anticipate that the members of the two organizations will find much common ground.

We have also continued successful activities, such as the Holiday Reception. This event continues to grow every year, as members, potential members, and friends of the Society come together for fellowship and cheer. Each year we increase the amount of food and drink, and each year we underestimate the size of the turnout. It is a grand party and a great way to introduce colleagues to the Society. We have relaunched the print version of our journal, and under Ben Guterman’s editorship it has quickly become a home for important scholarship.

The challenge is for the Society to continue to grow, to both maintain its current activities and launch new ones, without placing an undue burden on current members, especially graduate students and young professions, through large increases in dues or registration fees for our activities. On the horizon are increased catering costs, increased publishing costs, and perhaps the need to move more of the Society’s activities to commercial space as the number of participants grows. Success extracts a price. One way to ensure the long-term financial health of SHFG is through estate gifts.

I know. None of us really like thinking about wills. There is something morbid about making a financial contribution to the study of history through dying. But many of you have worked very hard to make the SHFG the wonderful and important organization it has become. Quite unexpectedly, one such member informed me of his intent to leave the Society a legacy. (We will be acknowledging him as soon as the paperwork is complete.) Please think about joining him and taking the step of insuring that the work of the Society continues beyond your lifetime. A legacy can be made to support a particular activity of the Society, such as the Hewlett Lecture or the Holiday Reception. Perhaps you would like to provide a subsidy for the registration fee for graduate students to attend the annual conference. Of course, general support is always welcome. The Society can provide sample language to meet a number of contingencies.

If you would like to help ensure the future of the SHFG, please let me know.
EDITOR’S NOTE
We are reminded in this issue of the variety of vital interdisciplinary history work being done in the federal government. Archeologists with the National Park Service contribute important insights to our understanding of the past at historical sites across the country. J.P. Ebersole details excavation and investigation into the national armory at Harpers Ferry, with its unique water works to power its machinery, thus enhancing our understanding of the developing operation and technological importance of that site. Douglas Wilson’s project investigates people—the inhabitants at Fort Vancouver—yielding new knowledge of the community of Hawaiian laborers there, especially their social structure and their place in the community. These projects demonstrate NPS’s special mandate to not only protect our historic sites but to explore and interpret their significance for all of us. In the end, the historian must tell the tale, but insights from archeologists like Ebersole and Wilson enhance the telling.

Thanks also to Pam Henson for her introduction to the critical work of the Smithsonian’s Institutional History Division. We learn how the division serves a central role of both recording the history of the Smithsonian in all its diversity, and providing access to primary sources for its historians.

We also gain insights from Kennedy Library Curator Stacey Bredhoff on her work and her new exhibit on the Cuban Missile Crisis. The crisis has been analyzed extensively, yet on this 50th anniversary, what new insights have we gained, and how can they inform an exhibition?

SHFG is also exploring how we can reach out to students and professionals on the effective use of documentary resources. Matt Wasniewski describes the successful launch of our records workshop, which we hope can become an annual event.

I hope that you find useful news here of the ever-expanding and innovative range of federal history work. Find more on our website, www.shfg.org, and please send news, information, and comments to me at benjamin.guterman@nara.gov.

Benjamin Guterman

CALL FOR PAPERS

Federal History Journal

Federal History, the journal of the Society for History in the Federal Government, seeks articles for upcoming issues. See http://shfg.org/shfg/publications/federal-history-journal/ for current issue, past issues, and details on submissions, which should be sent to editor-shfg-journal@shfg.org.

Workshop” continued from page 1

students and several faculty to the workshop. Galgano added, “Perhaps the most important aspect of the day was the chance for students to talk to archival specialists as people who share the same love of research and scholarship as they do. Experiencing the richness of archival holdings and seeing the openness, friendliness, and warmth of professionals gives them role models to emulate and something to strive for as they begin to plan their own professional lives.”

Presenters included former SHFG President Pete Daniel, Ronald Granieri from the History Office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Professor Jonathan White of Christopher Newport University, as well as a number of National Archives staff: Kate Mollan, Matt Fulgham, Joseph Schwarz, Juliette Arai, and Robert Ellis. In addition to the teaching sessions, attendees received a tour of the congressional treasures vault led by Christine Blackerby and Sharon Fitzpatrick from the Center for Legislative Archives. An evening reception at District Chop House was attended by about 70 individuals, including workshop participants, presenters, and SHFG members.

“The day was both an exciting and informative one for our students,” said Adam Goodheart, Director of the C.V. Starr Center at Washington College, which sent a group of about a dozen undergraduate students. “It opened up one of the richest historical repositories in the world—a place that can often seem impenetrable, especially to undergraduates—and prepared them to return as researchers.”
THE ARCHEOLOGY OF A TAILRACE: WATER POWER AND THE HARPERS FERRY ARMORY

J.P. Ebersole

BACKGROUND

While for most Harpers Ferry is synonymous with John Brown and his infamous raid in 1859, few are aware that the impetus behind that act was the fact that the town was home to the United States’ second national armory and an arsenal of weapons. The Armory had been in continuous operation since 1801, producing thousands of muskets and other small arms annually. During those six decades of arms production it underwent significant renovations and modernizations, which led to its evolution into one of the most capable manufactories in the country. This made Harpers Ferry a major industrial center, replete with key transportation routes to move goods, nearby resources to supply the manufactories, and water to power the machinery.

Water power drove the Industrial Revolution, being lucrative, relatively efficient, and expedient. The kinetic energy of flowing water was being harnessed wherever possible to rotate waterwheels and, eventually, turbines. These devices converted that momentum into mechanical energy, which subsequently operated machinery. To achieve this mechanization at Harpers Ferry in the late 1700s, one of the leading engineers in America, James Brindley, was contracted to design a canal. When completed, the canal measured 1.5 miles long by 15 to 30 feet wide. It functioned as the headrace, directing water from the Potomac River towards the awaiting waterwheels. Once that water passed through the wheel and its pit, it exited via another smaller channel known as a tailrace.

Information is scant, but the earliest Armory of 1801 definitely had two such open tailraces. Within these raceways sat anywhere from three to eight wheels providing power for two of the three main shops. By 1860, the manufactury had grown such that there were seven tailraces facilitating the operation of machinery and an eighth channel for excess water flow. The raceways were also vaulted by this time, allowing for a formal street, which acted as the main thoroughfare of the facility, to pass above them.

When the Civil War began in 1861 this water power infrastructure was of little interest to the emerging Confederacy. Rather, the finished small arms, machinery, and tools were desired to jumpstart the almost nonexistent industrial arms manufactory in the South. As such, in one of the strategic early moves of the conflict, Harpers Ferry was seized by Virginia militia. Seeing the futility of defense, the small contingent of federal soldiers tasked with protecting the facility opted instead to deny the rebels by destroying the plant. They set fire to key buildings on April 18, 1861, but were largely unsuccessful. Though the fire did substantial damage to several structures, it did not prevent the Confederacy from obtaining all of the necessary equipment to begin their own small arms manufactories in places like Richmond, Virginia, and Fayetteville, North Carolina.

During the course of the Civil War, the town of Harpers Ferry changed hands multiple times. With each shift, the fate of the Armory changed as well. Buildings began to be demolished for various reasons, and structural materials were reused elsewhere. The Union Army, however, also decided to renovate several of the shops for the purpose of a quartermaster supply depot. They further utilized the Armory grounds for camps.

With the war’s end, the Armory fell into disuse. It was soon placed up for sale by the United States government. Despite the potential for renewed industry using the remaining buildings and the still functional canal, the property was not sold for nearly two decades. Then, in 1884, Thomas Savery purchased the entire property to start a pulp mill business. This private ownership of the Armory later passed to the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad (B&O).

In an interesting twist of fate, the creation of the Harpers Ferry National Monument in 1944, followed by its subsequent growth into a park, soon generated a need to reacquire the old Armory grounds and the site of the Engine House where John Brown had taken refuge during his failed raid. Negotiations with the railroad ensued, but it was not until 2001 that the National Park Service and CSX Corporation finalized an agreement. With the property back in possession of the federal government, an archeological investigation of the Armory became possible.

ARCHEOLOGY AND THE TAILRACE

Tasked with preserving, protecting, and interpreting the diverse history of Harpers Ferry, the National Park Service and the Division of Resources now had unprecedented access to the site of the Armory. Excavations by the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park Archeology Program ensued in 2005–7, looking at both the Smith & Forging Shop and the Warehouse. A second set of investigations were soon to follow. This time they focused on the main Armory street. Initiated in 2011, it was at this time that attention was drawn to the tailrace tunnels.
Unlike most of the Armory, the tunnels were left largely untouched by the Civil War and subsequent private owners. They became forgotten and defunct features, barely visible along the shore. Over time frequent inundations by the Potomac River silted in the tunnels. By the 20th century, one tunnel had been at least partially destroyed by the B&O Railroad, another had collapsed at its entrance, and the rest were quickly disappearing from successive sedimentation by floods.

Archeologists realized that these tunnels potentially contained a wealth of information concerning the original Armory. Fortunately, a single tunnel was still completely accessible. It was believed that if mapping were conducted, the tailrace could reveal construction sequences of the Armory, the organization of the water power infrastructure, and perhaps even details on specific shops under which the raceway flowed. Clearance for access to the tunnel was requested and granted. Exploration ensued.

The results of the mapping justified the time and energy required to complete the work. From the start it became apparent that the tailrace was more than a simple waste-way for water. For one thing, the tunnel is actually comprised of two shafts: the main shaft, A, at a length of 186 feet, and a shorter, curved section dubbed B, measuring only 70 feet. Tunnel B connects with A at a distance of 90 feet from the opening along the river shore. They both have shale and brick vaulting and had water wheels situated at their junction with the now buried main canal, to the south.

The brick sections correlate to the underside of Armory shops that were constructed adjacent to the canal. These shops housed machinery that required water to operate. Specifically, Tunnel A was situated underneath of the Polishing Shop, while B ran beneath the Finishing Shop. The former was so named because it contained stones for grinding and polishing musket barrels. The latter shop turned and finished barrels through the use of lathes and other devices. Indirect evidence of that machinery in the form of three drains were discovered in the ceilings of the tunnels. In Tunnel B, a 1-foot-square hole capped by a perforated shale block most likely allowed excess water to drain into the raceway. In Tunnel A, two 0.46-foot-square drains on opposite sides of the vault contain copper gutters that directed water away from at least two independent polishing machines.

Many other features were evident as well, too numerous to discuss, giving rise to the conclusion that the tailrace underwent seven main phases of construction and alterations. The first phase, its creation, was determined to date to the original construction of the Armory in 1799–1801. This was a crucial discovery because it meant that this tunnel is one of the two oldest races and could reveal critical data about the earliest period of the Armory. Phase II, 1808–10, was also significant and coincided with an expansion of the Armory partially stemming from the build up for the eventual War of 1812. During this alteration, Tunnel B was established to furnish water power for the newly built Finishing Shop. Such an addition meant that the original
canal had to be extended eastward another 156 feet and a third, independent tailrace excavated for the excess water. Little was to happen with regards to the tailrace following that expansion until the 1830s. Between 1833 and 1839, the tunnel was realigned by seven degrees, widened, extended 50 feet further north, and vaulted over. That encompassed Phases III and IV. Next, during Phase V, the B&O Railroad created a new river wall and culvert at the entrance of the tunnel to support a trestle train track. This occurred between 1840 and 1842. The last two phases involved new workshops at the Armory. During Phase VI, the new Smith & Forging Shop was built requiring a reinforced arch in Tunnel A. This occurred around 1845. Finally, the Polishing Shop was built at the back of Tunnel A between 1849 and 1850. The new shop necessitated a brick vault spanning 16 feet of space. With that final alteration, the tailrace continued to function unchanged until the demise of the Armory in 1861.

**CONCLUSION**

Although simplified for this article, these construction phases reveal that the Armory at Harpers Ferry was part of an evolving process of growth and change. New industrial technology, the political climate, and social challenges all had a hand in the evolution of the manufactory in its 60-year existence. Some of that information in the form of photographs, maps, and government documents has long been known, having been filed at the National Archives or discovered in private collections. But without the recent archeology and the tailrace survey, the detailed construction sequence might never have been realized to its fullest.

The project was thus a resounding success. It has given insight and direction for new investigations of the Armory. The Harpers Ferry National Historical Park and the Archeology Program hope to continue this research and offer to the public new interpretive data concerning the Armory as it emerges. For more detailed information on this project and others at Harpers Ferry, please visit the following websites:

- [http://www.nps.gov/archeology/sites/npSites/harpers-FerryTailrace.htm](http://www.nps.gov/archeology/sites/npSites/harpers-FerryTailrace.htm)
- [http://www.nps.gov/hafe/archeology.htm](http://www.nps.gov/hafe/archeology.htm)
- [http://www.nps.gov/archeology/sites/npSites/harpers-Ferry.htm](http://www.nps.gov/archeology/sites/npSites/harpers-Ferry.htm)

J.P. Ebersole is an archaeologist with the National Park Service. He can be reached at justin_ebersole@nps.gov.

---

**HAWAIIAN IDENTITY IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST AT FORT VANCOUVER**

*By Douglas C. Wilson*

Fort Vancouver was the fur-trade “Capital” of the Pacific Northwest in the 1820s–1840s and supported an ethnically diverse population. Surprisingly, many of the villagers were Hawaiian men who worked as fur traders and in other occupations for the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC). Identification of Hawaiian residences and activities has been an important element of research at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Vancouver, Washington, since the 1960s. It is becoming an important focus of interpretation and education.

Research suggests that the population of Hawaiians at Fort Vancouver ranged as high as 138 in 1844 and that 50–60 lived permanently in the village, with many others distributed at the mills, farms, and other posts and stations of the post. Some were part of the voyageur fur brigades, and evidence from historical accounts indicates that they retained and, at times, publically displayed traditional dancing, like the hula.

Fort Vancouver (1825–1860) was the headquarters, supply depot, and cultural heart of the Columbia Department of the HBC, which stretched across the Pacific Northwest from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean and from Mexican California to Russian Alaska. The fort and village population was the largest concentration of colonial people between New Archangel and Yerba Buena prior to the wave of American immigrants that used the Oregon Trail in the mid-1840s. At its height in the 1830s and 1840s, the village population approached 1,000 people.

The large numbers of *engagés* (employees) at Fort Vancouver reflected the need to supply the many fur trade posts and fur brigades of the Department, but also reflected the diverse economy of the post. Besides being specialists in blacksmithing, coopering, tinning, and carpentry, significant numbers of personnel were utilized in growing wheat and other crops on the hundreds of acres under
cultivation at the post and outlying farms; the raising of thousands of head of cattle, sheep, and pigs; and the salting of salmon at the fort’s salmon store. Likewise, a grist mill and lumber mill were established about five miles upriver, with wood products exported as far away as South America.

Descriptions of the village suggest that there were between 40 and 60 houses, built in a variety of architectural styles, with outbuildings, corrals, fenced gardens, roads, and trails. To the south of the village there was the salmon storehouse, boat works, tannery, cooperage, piggeries, stables, and a hospital.

Company management and other employees treated Hawaiians as a distinctive class. Many Hawaiians exhibited body and facial tattooing, and all spoke a language that was unintelligible to others living in the village. Physical separation of the Hawaiian houses from others at Fort Vancouver is suggested by William F. Crate, the millwright, who testified that there were streets for Hawaiians, French-Canadians, and Englishmen and Americans. Unlike contracts with members of other ethnic groups, many of the labor contracts between the HBC and Hawaiians specified that Hawaiian workers were to be returned to Hawaii at the expiration of their contracts. William Kaulehelehe, a Hawaiian Methodist preacher, was brought in to minister to the Hawaiians of the village in 1845, and to help restrain the “corruptions” of the Hawaiians, including drinking, fighting, and gambling.

It appears that most of the Hawaiians hired by the HBC were of the Hawaiian commoner class (maka‘ainana). Hawaiians primarily served as canoe middlemen (paddlers), sailors, farmers, and woodworkers. Some specialized as shepherds, sawyers, cooks, coopers, and woodcutters/stokers.

In addition to Hawaiians, the village was the home of a surprisingly diverse community of Fort Vancouver’s working-class employees and their families, including French Canadians, Scots, English, Metis, and Native Americans representing tribes from across the North American continent. Seasonally, trapping parties (called “Brigades”) would deliver furs to the fort, and to refit, which would swell the population of the village.

Many people of the fur trade spoke languages that were not intelligible to their comrades and exhibited unique racial and ethnic qualities. To further complicate things, it is clear that like the other inhabitants of the village, some Hawaiians took American Indian wives and raised multiethnic families.

Archaeological excavations at Fort Vancouver have sought to explore the unique nature of the village and to fill in the sometimes biased and contradictory written record of the elite white men who wrote about it. Susan Kardas’s excavations in 1968 and 1969 attempted to infer the ethnicity of the inhabitants of four house sites she sampled on the basis of artifacts of Native Hawaiian and American Indian origins. Most of the materials Kardas recovered, however, were British or European in origin, probably purchased from the HBC “Sale Shop,” which was the principal retail outlet for the employees of the company, early missionaries, and Oregon Trail settlers. Kardas attempted to explain the lack of “ethnic markers” by suggesting that Hawaiian males of the commoner class neither had the opportunity for expression of ethnic behavior, nor were they traditionally trained in artistic expression. The historical record suggests, however, that traditional behaviors were maintained by Native Hawaiians in the fur trade, including language, spatial segregation, and traditional dances.

Further confusing efforts to identify ethnic identities is the fact that some Hawaiian laborers lived in the Northwest for longer periods of service and adapted to the dominant culture. John Cox, for example, came with the Astorians in 1811 as a royal observer for King Kamehameha I, and retired at Fort Vancouver in 1843, continuing to live at the village until his death in 1850. Hawaiians serving a longer term of service or who immigrated to the Pacific Northwest may have exhibited their identity in a manner much different from those that were on a much shorter term (three years being the normal contract length).

Since 2001, the National Park Service (NPS) has partnered with Portland State University and Washington State University, Vancouver, to explore portions of the village to confirm historical accounts, maps, and drawings of the site; explore its archaeological context; and provide additional information for the interpretation of the village. Research by the joint archaeological field school has identified at least five previously unknown houses and gathered additional evidence on the tools, byproducts, spatial layout, and other characteristics of this distinctive community.
As part of this project, NPS Archaeologist Robert Cromwell’s research noted similarities in ceramic wares between households within the village. Surprisingly, the ceramics found in the village were similar in value to those at the Chief Factor’s House, the most elite residence at the fort. The house sites in the village, including those likely used by Native Hawaiians, appear to have expended significant resources to acquire ceramics, including china tea wares. One reason posited for these expenditures was that village women, regardless of their ethnicity or that of their husbands, were adopting and maintaining the British tea ceremony.

Other archaeological work is exploring the strategies by which indigenous and non-indigenous groups interacted and borrowed, creolized, and otherwise mixed elements of material culture into their daily lives. The evidence to date suggests that there are more similarities than differences between village households, regardless of ethnicity or household makeup. More fine-grained, material-specific analyses are being implemented to better tease out differences between households, and landscape use. This work is important because it contextualizes people who were critical to the fur trade era but whose history is not well recorded.

Beyond the purely academic interest in colonial contact, one value of scientific exploration of the village is to engage modern people in the history of the Hawaiian diaspora and that of other diverse peoples of the fur trade. The village is a unique archeological landscape that provides, in an urban setting, opportunities to explain how historical archeology recovers evidence of the lives of an early colonial population. Public research and interpretive programs provide urban and nontraditional park users links to stories and intellectual inquiry that tie the context of the workers’ village to meaningful lessons in history. Recent Fort Vancouver park programs to engage youth help to integrate the public archeology program into an overnight and day program for disadvantaged and nontraditional youth from the metropolitan area. This brings nontraditional students into direct contact with the scientific role of historical archeology in recovering the lives of people who are poorly represented in history. Another outreach product is the mobile storytelling app created by Washington State University Vancouver’s Creative Media and Digital Culture Department. Available for free download, this project includes the village’s Hawaiian story. Another product is the “teaching the village with artifacts” lesson plan developed with the local Educational Service District. Our hopes for these programs are to engage local Hawaiian communities and others in the history and the preservation of the village. The research we are generating will not only shed better light on how Hawaiians lived and adapted to the fur trade at Fort Vancouver and the Pacific Northwest, but also bring that unique history to the public.

Douglas C. Wilson is the Director of the Northwest Cultural Resources Institute, a collaborative project of the Pacific West Region and Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, NPS. He is also an adjunct associate professor at Portland State University. For more information on Hawaiians and archaeological research at Fort Vancouver, and links to teaching plans and apps, please consult http://www.nps.gov/archeology/sites/npSitesFOVAHawaiians.htm, http://www.nps.gov/fova/, and Exploring Fort Vancouver (Edited by Douglas C. Wilson and Theresa L. Langford, 2011 University of Washington Press). Douglas C. Wilson can be reached at doug_wilson@nps.gov

VISIT US ON FACEBOOK AND TWITTER

SHFG recently launched Facebook (facebook.com/SHFGHistorians) and Twitter (@SHFGHistorians) pages in addition to our YouTube Channel (youtube.com/user/SHFGHistorians). The Twitter and Facebook pages also serve as a forum for members to share noteworthy information and interact with one another. Please “Like” or “Follow” us and share your links, news, images, and other media.
How did you first become interested in and involved in museum work?

I have always been interested in museums, for the way they can transport you to another time or another way of life. Historic museums and sites have always sparked my imagination and curiosity. When it came time to choose a career, I explored the different aspects of museum work and found I was most interested in education and interpretation inside museums. I focused on the kind of work that both allowed me to be immersed in a topic and then to convey the information to a larger audience.

Prior to the Cuban Missile Crisis exhibit, what two or three projects did you most enjoy working on, and why?

The “American Originals” exhibit was one of my favorites. It was actually a series of exhibits, presented in the National Archives Rotunda in Washington, DC, first in 1996, and then as a traveling exhibit hosted at six museums across the country. It aimed to present a sampling of records that would reflect the breadth and richness of the Archives’ holdings: at different times, the exhibit included everything from President Nixon’s resignation letter and artifacts associated with the Watergate break-in to George Washington’s handwritten draft of his first inaugural address. We included a letter from Annie Davis, who wrote to President Lincoln after he issued the Emancipation Proclamation, to ask if she were free. The exhibit served as a framework to showcase some of the most compelling and intriguing records, while also featuring and celebrating the great milestone events in American history. The traveling exhibit opened in New York City just three weeks after 9-11, and it was wonderful to present some of the nation’s great milestone documents—like records from the Continental Congress and the Revolutionary War—documents that chronicled past challenges that nation had faced—items that could inspire and encourage and lift the spirits of people at the exact moment when, as a nation, we were dealing with a shocking national tragedy.

I also loved working on the exhibit that opened in the Rotunda in 2003, “A New World Is at Hand,” which chronicled the creation of the nation’s Charters: the Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights. It was a fantastically enriching experience to really delve into the story of the American Revolution, to become acquainted with the documents at the National Archives that tell that story, and to present them to the wide audience that visits the National Archives.

Have you changed your approach to creating exhibits or your methodologies in any way since starting at the Kennedy Library?

No, I don’t think so. My approach has always been to start with the records and to take direction from them. You don’t have to be an expert to appreciate the stories that are told in the records. Once we have a general exhibit theme, I work with secondary sources and consult subject experts to get oriented to the topic; then, without imposing preconceptions, I explore the records, flagging the ones that take your breath away. The selection of records always drives the exhibit story line and organization. And it’s always a collaboration involving exhibit designers, archivists, and subject specialists to come up with the most effective presentation of the records and the story they tell.

How do you think your professional duties differ from those of a nonfederal museum specialist?

This job has put me in close contact with some of the nation’s most significant and valuable documents, including the official records from the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention, correspondence from Abraham Lincoln, the original Emancipation Proclamation, firsthand accounts of Civil War battles, milestone treaties, as well as lesser-known accounts from people whose names have escaped the history books, but whose words
breathe humanity into monumental events. The holdings belong to the American public, and it is our job as federal curators to not only preserve the records for future generations but to provide access to them. In that respect, providing opportunities for the public to have contact with the original material, for being in the physical presence of the authentic object, is the experience that we can offer in an exhibit.

*How do you handle questions of interpretation in an exhibit?*

It is not enough to install documents and artifacts in a gallery without any explanation. Visitors can and should expect curators to present some kind of historical context. But I think it is important to structure the exhibit narrative in a way that aims at balance, an attempt to stay close to the facts and true to the story. I believe we must aim to present the material in ways that allow visitors to form their own opinions about events and the materials they are viewing. Curators can acknowledge in the exhibit text that there are different ways to “interpret” these materials and that historians often disagree.

*For this Cuban Missile Crisis exhibit, did you gain any new historical insights from your research that influenced the concept and design?*

One goal of the Cuban Missile Crisis exhibit was to create a presentation that reflected the most recent scholarship. Over the past 20 years, scholars have uncovered sources in the United States, Russia, and Cuba that have changed our understanding of what happened. Some of what we have learned suggests that the crisis was even more dangerous than we had known. For example, the United States was very concerned about the Soviet submarines positioned close to the Soviet ships near the Quarantine line, some 500 miles from the Cuban coast. (The Quarantine was established to prevent any further Soviet military equipment from reaching Cuba.) The President approved the use of depth charges, or small explosives, to force the submarines to surface. We have only recently learned that the effects of those depth charges were much more severe than had been anticipated; they so agitated one Soviet submarine commander that he ordered the arming of a nuclear-tipped torpedo.

Also, as a result of the wealth of historical resources that have become available in recent years, we have a clearer understanding of Khrushchev’s decision-making process, and a fuller picture of Cuba’s role in the crisis; the exhibit was informed by this new information.

*This exhibit was a major collaborative effort within the National Archives. How did that wider cooperation benefit the project?*

The project benefitted from participation by archival experts from both the Kennedy Library and the National Archives in DC. It also benefitted from the fact that my collaboration with the National Archives’ two senior designers, Ray Ruskin and Michael Jackson, was a reunion of an exhibits team that had previously worked together on many projects in Washington. So, it was a wonderful

---

See more on this exhibit at [http://www.archives.gov/nae/visit/gallery.html](http://www.archives.gov/nae/visit/gallery.html) and the catalog at [http://www.archives.gov/nae/support/shop/books.html](http://www.archives.gov/nae/support/shop/books.html)

President Kennedy meeting with the Ex Comm during the Cuban Missile Crisis, October 29, 1962.
experience to have the opportunity to work with my former colleagues once again. But, there are definitely challenges for a team working in different cities. You can’t just walk down the hall and talk through some issue, as you normally would—maybe even several times a day. But, it is hard to imagine how we could have collaborated as successfully within the same time frame if we were not already well acquainted with one other.

White House audio excerpts seem to bind the Cuban Missile Crisis exhibit together. Was that your intention?

We did intend for the audio excerpts to be the centerpiece of the exhibit. The recordings are from the meetings of the Ex Comm (Executive Committee of the National Security Council), the advisory group assembled by President Kennedy to formulate a response to the Cuban Missile Crisis. Throughout the 13 most intense days of the crisis, October 16–28, the group met almost continuously, and—unbeknownst to almost all of them—President Kennedy recorded those meetings. Listening to those recordings puts people inside the room where the President and his most trusted advisers were working furiously to avert a nuclear catastrophe. It is striking how the President and some of the nation’s highest officials were groping in the dark, trying to discern Khrushchev’s purposes, trying to interpret conflicting intelligence, while they were racing against time to prevent the Soviets from completing work on the nuclear weapons installations just 90 miles from our shores. Although we know that the crisis did not end in nuclear war, it is still a sobering and frightening experience to hear the voices on those recordings.

What do you want visitors to experience most vividly from this exhibit?

There is a great deal to be learned in observing the process of how the President came to his decisions. He assembled a group that would provide a wide range of opinions, and explored his options thoroughly. He did not rush to act. He encouraged people to express their opinions; he understood when they changed their positions. He remained remarkably calm and tolerant even of views that were critical of him. He resisted any inclination to act rashly, and would not be deterred from finding a negotiated settlement.

We tried to present the crisis in the larger context of the Cold War, so that visitors would be aware of the nuclear threat that cast a large shadow over those years; and we also wanted to give people the experience of being a “fly on the wall” during those high-level, top-secret meetings. We wanted people to hear the tension and anxiety and exhaustion that, at times, permeated the discussions. It is our hope that visitors will come to understand the Cuban Missile Crisis—not just intellectually—but emotionally, as well.

Interview by Benjamin Guterman
In 1826, Englishman James Smithson drafted his will with a curious contingent clause stating that, if none of his heirs could inherit, his estate should go to the United States to found an institution “for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men.” His sole heir died leaving no heirs, thus, in 1846 the United States Congress passed 9 Stat. 102, creating the Smithsonian Institution (SI) as a trust instrumentality of the United States. The Smithsonian occupies a unique place in the federal city as an independent trust instrumentality charged with caring for the nation’s collections and conducting and disseminating research. The Smithsonian is managed by a Board of Regents consisting of the Chief Justice, Vice President, three Senators, three Representatives, and nine Citizens from across the United States. Its funding is a combination of an endowment from the original bequest and additional funds (30%) and federal appropriations and contracts (70%). The Institution is headed by a Secretary and Undersecretaries who are paid through endowment funds and supervise the work of 6,200 trust and federal employees and over 6,600 volunteers. The Institution’s mission remains to this day “the increase and diffusion of knowledge” through its 19 museums and 9 research centers that are concentrated in Washington, DC, but also span the globe, from Panama to Hawaii to Kenya. Although the public is familiar with the SI’s museums, they may know little about its research programs in astronomy and astrophysics, anthropology, ecology, marine biology, object conservation, and preservation of endangered species. The Smithsonian’s unique and curious history still puzzles many, and it is the Institutional History Division’s mission to provide information about Smithson’s creation.

The Institutional History Division (IHD) of the Smithsonian Institution Archives (SIA) was founded in 1973 and is the official history office for the Smithsonian Institution. IHD historians conduct research and share expertise on the history of the Smithsonian for internal and external audiences. The history of the Institution reflects the history of science, technology, art, and culture, both nationally and internationally. The Institution’s 19 museums (including the National Zoological Park) contain over 137 million objects of art, culture, history, and science. Research centers range from the Archives of American Art in Washington, DC, and the Museum Conservation Institute in Suitland, Maryland, to the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory in Cambridge, Massachusetts; Arizona; and Hawaii, and the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama. A complex and dispersed organization, even Smithsonian staff often have questions about their organization’s history. The IHD’s two historians are responsible for the Smithsonian’s history across all of these disciplines.

IHD staff respond to queries from Smithsonian administrators to assist with management of the Institution, on such topics as the history of earthquakes affecting Smithsonian buildings and collections, prior controversies over exhibits, and the impact of World War II on the museums. Given the Institution’s unique legal status, IHD staff has expertise in the Smithsonian’s legal history and have prepared an online database of Smithsonian legislation, executive orders, judicial opinions, etc. As part of the Smithsonian Institution Archives, the IHD has ready access to all existing primary sources on the history of the Smithsonian.

Historical research is also conducted in support of public programs, publications, and exhibitions. In addition, staff experts conduct oral and video histories that further document important figures and events in the history of the Institution. Oral history captures the devotion and longevity of Smithsonian staff, beginning with the first interviewee who had worked at the SI for 78 years. Fifty to sixty years of service is not unusual at the Smithsonian; thus the oral history program can capture an unusually long span of institutional memories. Interviewees include Smithsonian administrators, research and curatorial staff, security officers, horticulturalists, and taxidermists, as well as visitors and volunteers. The collection is currently being digitized.
so that excerpts can be made available via SIA’s website.

The research conducted by IHD staff is often used to tell important stories about the Smithsonian and helps the public to gain a rich understanding of the role the Institution has played in historical exploration, innovation, and discovery. Recent exhibits include “One Hundred Years at the National Museum of Natural History” (2010–2011), “More than Meets the Eye: Studying the Natural World” (2011–2012), and “When Time and Duty Permit: Smithsonian Collecting in World War II” (2012–2013). The IHD maintains in-depth web pages on the history of the Institution that provide information for audiences ranging from K-12 students to advanced scholars. Another page, “Today in Smithsonian History,” provides a daily vignette from the Institution’s past. The website also includes detailed pages on each museum and research center, profiles of the 12 Smithsonian Secretaries who have led the Institution, and additional resources for K-12 teachers and students. Online exhibits trace the history on topics that include the National Museum of Natural History, the Institution’s role in Latin America, and the Arts and Industries Building. With assistance from volunteers, IHD staff also maintain a History of the Smithsonian catalog in the Smithsonian Institution Research Information System (www.siris.si.edu) that includes an annotated bibliography, chronology, historic image database, legal documents database, and biographical entries for all members (past and present) of the Board of Regents.

The IHD annually hosts numerous scholars and interns. On average, the IHD has six pre- and post-doctoral fellows in residence conducting research related to Smithsonian history, including such topics as the impact of the Americans with Disabilities Act on museum practices; the interrelations of science, industry, and tourism in the Caribbean in the early 20th century; and the cultural significance of zoos. Additionally, the division supports Research Associates, affiliated scholars who conduct research on topics related to the Smithsonian, such as the history of tropical natural history, the history of ecology, and the dissemination of science on television in the 20th century. The IHD also sponsors interns who gain important public history skills working at the History Division.

As a full-service public history office, the IHD carries out Smithson’s mandate for the “increase and diffusion” of knowledge about a diverse and complex organization to a broad audience of Smithsonian staff, scholars, and the general public.

**Institutional History Division**

**Smithsonian Institution Archives**

Capital Gallery 3000, MRC 507
Washington, D.C. 20013-7012

**Historian:** Dr. Pamela M. Henson

**Program Assistant:** Courtney G. Bellizzi

**Office Activities and Responsibilities:**

The Institutional History Division of Smithsonian Institution Archives is responsible for research on the history of the Smithsonian Institution, including an oral history program, administrative reference, scholarly reference, public inquiry, exhibits, web interface, and public programs.

**Recent Publications, exhibits or web pages:**


*Smithsonian History*, October 2011, [http://siarchives.si.edu/history](http://siarchives.si.edu/history)


**Contact:** Dr. Pamela M. Henson
Tel: 202-633-5907
Fax: 202-633-5928
E-mail: hensonp@si.edu
Website: [www.siarchives.si.edu](http://www.siarchives.si.edu)
FROM THE ARCHIVES
FORREST C. POGUE: PIONEER IN MILITARY HISTORY

Charles Downs, SHFG Archivist

The SHFG’s early years are not well-documented by photographs, so it was a real find when I ran across a set of black-and-white snapshots taken of the Fourth Hewlett Lecture, given in 1983. The fact that the speaker was the renowned military historian Forrest C. Pogue made it all the better.

Given on September 14, 1983, at the Ft. McNair Officers Club, the title of Pogue’s speech was “My life as a Public Historian.” Unfortunately, there is no copy of his remarks among the SHFG Archives. That is indeed our loss.

Pogue was born in Eddyville, Kentucky, in 1912, and was a student at Murray State, where he graduated at age 19. He went on to get his Masters degree from the University of Kentucky, He later received a scholarship to Clark University, where he earned his Ph.D. Drafted into the Army in 1942, he became a combat historian in Europe, and participated in the D-day invasion and the subsequent battles through France and into Germany. His wartime service earned him a Bronze Star.

After the war, Pogue briefly taught high school before joining the Center for Military History. A pioneer in the collection and use of oral history, Pogue demonstrated his command of the historian’s art by writing his magisterial *The Supreme Command*. It was the keystone of *The European Theater of Operations* subseries of the multivolume series *The United States Army in World War II*, also known as the “Green Series.”

Later, Pogue organized and led the George C. Marshall Research Foundation, where he gathered material for his multivolume biography of Marshall. He ended his illustrious career by heading the Eisenhower Institute for History Research. His alma mater, Murray State, named its special collections library after him. Pogue died in his home state of Kentucky in 1996, survived by his wife Christine Brown Pogue.

After Wayne D. Rasmussen, the third SHFG President, made opening remarks, Pogue was introduced by his longtime friend and colleague Paul J. Scheips. In his introduction, Scheips lauded Pogue for his long career as a public historian, listing his friend’s many honors and numerous publications. Scheips concluded his remarks by saying of Pogue, “If you are looking for a role model, you need look no farther.” For more information on the SHFG Archives, contact chasdowns@verizon.net

NATIONAL ARCHIVES OPENS ROBERT KENNEDY’S CUBAN RECORDS

To help mark the 50th anniversary of the Cuban Missile Crisis, the National Archives and Records Administration and the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library released seven boxes of material in October 2012 from the Robert F. Kennedy Papers, housed at the Kennedy Library in Boston. The material consists of over 2,700 pages of documents relating to Cuban affairs from 1961 to 1964.

The released material consists of memorandums, correspondence, telegrams, reports, and notes of Executive Committee meetings. In particular, there are draft memos to the President on negotiations with the Soviets over the Missile Crisis as well as personal notes on meetings with the President and the Executive Committee. There are also secret documents showing how the attorney general oversaw efforts to overthrow Fidel Castro, including the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Scholars reviewing the documents consider them vital to understanding Robert Kennedy’s role in Cuba policy and the Cold War. While the released documents do not suggest any significant revision of histories of the Cuban Missile Crisis and Cuban affairs, they do reveal the unusual central role played by the attorney general in the conduct of foreign policy.
The new U.S. House of Representatives website, “History, Art & Archives of the United States House of Representatives,” http://history.house.gov/, launched in late December 2012, has reimagined how users can access the collections of the Office of the Historian and the Clerk of the House’s Office of Art and Archives. The site includes essays, archival collections, art and artifacts, oral histories, and more on the institutional history of the House of Representatives as well as its broader role in United States history. Materials highlight everything from the laying of the Capitol’s cornerstone to the House’s current-day Members. The new site promotes easy access to these materials through innovative navigational tools and highlights the House’s rich history through newly created content.

Among the navigational tools is a new interactive map feature that allows users to interact with a choropleth map of the United States to visually explore the demographics of the House throughout its history. Users can control a slider bar to indicate what date range they are interested in, and also filter the data presented to topics such as “Women in Congress” or “House Minority Leaders.” Beyond allowing for quick and visual answers to targeted questions such as “Who were the House Majority leaders from Wyoming?” presenting data in this way allows users to serendipitously discover information such as the apparent fact that Iowa, Mississippi, and Vermont have never had women in Congress.

Serendipitous discovery is a theme of the new House site. Through the use of sidebars that highlight “Featured” and “Related” content, users may discover useful content they could have otherwise missed. For instance, when searching through the House Committees Bibliography, I am presented with a “Related Video” on Chairmen and Committee Seniority, a “Collection Highlight” on the Ways and Means Committee, and a “Historical Highlight” on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. While not every page or search results in so many related materials, the site and its content are meant to be expanded upon. Beyond the shiny new features and content of the site, a much more important principle is at work—no longer are the collections of the Clerk of the House and the Historian separated; no longer are the records, historical lists, art, and artifacts kept in separate silos. Visitors to the site, who likely would not have found these distinctions useful, no longer have to learn the seemingly arbitrary ways in which historians, archivists, and librarians organize information. While what we do as information professionals is obviously important on the backend, the new House history website is an example of the ways that, if done well, our work will be invisible to users. It is the information that they seek that instead becomes visible.

Tali.Beesley@bep.gov
Marc J. O’Reilly has undertaken the kind of systematic and objective analysis of our foreign policies that is essential for policymakers. He evaluates the changing U.S. policies in the Persian Gulf from 1941 to 2007 within the broad spectrum of historical imperial regimes, including the Roman and Ottoman Empires. He finds that the United States is not, in some vague and imprecise sense, an “exceptional,” benevolent world power fully guided by our democratic principles. We are a “neo-classical and/or liberal-classical” imperial power, not an occupying power, that has pursued its goals realistically and often ruthlessly.

O’Reilly elaborates on that characterization of our “imperium” by tracing our changing and adaptive foreign policy actions through the decades, concluding that they are best understood collectively as a “contingent imperialism” that changes with conditions and opportunities. Using a “dynamic construct” to characterize those policies era by era, each new U.S. approach fits into one of the following typologies: unilateral; alliance; proxy imperialism; no contingent imperialism, with a threat to U.S. interests; and no contingent imperialism, without a threat to U.S. interests.

O’Reilly’s narratives of U.S. policies in the decades from 1941 to 2007 are dense, rushed, and occasionally difficult to follow, but full diplomatic and military accounts are not his goal. His summaries of events allow him to demonstrate the changing nature of our involvement. He finds that in the 1940s and ’50s the United States favored “alliance imperialism” as it allied with Britain to ward off Soviet designs on Gulf oil reserves. In the 1960s and ’70s, U.S. presidents practiced “proxy contingent imperialism.” After the Six-Day Arab-Israeli War in June 1967, the United States saw advantage in supporting Israel as a counter to communist influence in the region. The Nixon administration’s “Twin Pillars” policy relied on Iran and Saudi Arabia as bulwarks against the Soviet Union. In the Vietnam era, the United States tried to “balance enemies and export weapons to area partners.” The Carter administration faced a setback with the fall of the Shah of Iran.

In the late 1970s through the ’90s, U.S. administrations chose the more interventionist approach of “alliance imperialism” to protect its geopolitical interests. Under the Carter Doctrine of 1980, the United States armed Iraq in its war with Iran and sold air surveillance (AWACS) aircraft to the Saudis. Operation Desert Shield/Storm in 1991 protected the area’s balance of power from Iraqi and Iranian dominance and secured Western access to the Gulf oil reserves. In the 1990s, O’Reilly concludes, America used its technological military capabilities to secure its interests in such an “uncompromising” way that it “resembled imperial powers of eras past.”

After 2001 the new George W. Bush administration seemed guided by concerns for U.S. “self-sufficiency rather than global well-being,” which translated to a policy of “multilateralism when we can, unilateralism when we must.” Bush responded to the 9/11 attacks with Operation Enduring Freedom to eradicate Taliban influence in Afghanistan. He followed in 2002 with his doctrine of prevention through preemptive military action, a stance that would justify a hard-line policy toward Saddam Hussein and Iraq. Bush secured approval from the U.S. Congress for military action in Iraq, and he soon developed a “coalition of the willing” that included Prime Minister Tony Blair of Great Britain. Simultaneously, the United States and other nations gained UN sanctions to secure inspections of Iran’s nuclear enrichment program. In that period, the United States practiced both unilateral and alliance policies, developing an “emirates” strategy with bases in various emirates.

The book’s broad survey and its meaningful and useable identifications of policy types provides a clearer picture of what kind of superpower we have been and what are the potentialities and limits of our influence. O’Reilly concludes that we are not an “exceptional,” more benevolent imperial power always acting in accord with our founding humanist principles; that “efforts to blend liberalism and realism typically resulted in policy incoherence.” Rather, we have been an “unexceptional” imperial power in the neo-classical sense, shunning the overt occupation practiced by the Roman and Ottoman empires for an informal imperialism. He urges flexibility by appropriately employing both our “hard” power (“military-economic prowess”) and “soft” power (ability to co-opt). Such policies may sometimes require alliances with despotic rulers, but we must avoid the kind of “overt imperialism” and unilateral policies that can leave us weakened, isolated, and endangered. We can never achieve a “happy imperium” in the region, he writes, because of its inflamed political and theological “Islamic Reformation” that will never fully accept U.S. policies and influences. But, informed by lessons of the past we can forestall the grim fate of past empires and both promote American geopolitical interests and maintain our status in future decades as a world leader. With this perceptive and apt study, O’Reilly demonstrates the integral value of history and the historian’s crucial role of counselor to the nation’s policymakers.
MAKING HISTORY

AIR FORCE HISTORICAL STUDIES OFFICE

The AFHSO has made these three titles, among others, available on its website: Strategic Bombing in the Gulf War by Richard G. Davis; Planning the Gulf War Air Campaign, 1989-1991, by Diane T. Putney; and On Target: Organizing and Executing the Strategic Air Campaign Against Iraq by Richard G. Davis. Visit http://www.afhso.af.mil/index.asp

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

The APSA makes available several dozen draft papers from its annual meetings. The 2012 selection includes many pertinent to the history of the federal government, such as “Presidential Leadership and Bureaucratic Appointees: The Clinton Administration and Fair Housing,” by Charles M. Lamb, State University of New York (SUNY) at Buffalo—Department of Political Science, and Joshua Boston, Political Science, SUNY Buffalo; and “Public Sector Unions and the Costs of Government,” by Sarah F. Anzia, University of California, Berkeley, and Terry M. Moe, Stanford University—Department of Political Science. These papers constitute a wide variety of political science research, including international topics. Visit https://www.apsanet.org/content_43579.cfm?navID=840

ASSOCIATION FOR DOCUMENTARY EDITING

The 2013 Summer Institute for Editing Historical Documents will be held July 7–11, 2013, at the Sheraton Hotel in Ann Arbor, Michigan. The Institute will be funded by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission through a grant to the Association for Documentary Editing. Faculty members will include Mary-Jo Kline (History Today), Daniel Feller (Papers of Andrew Jackson), Andrew Jewell (Willa Cather Archive), and Michael Stevens (Wisconsin Historical Society). The Institute is free, and a travel stipend will be provided to those living outside the Ann Arbor area. Applications are available at http://documentaryediting.org/meeting/campedit.html

COMBAT STUDIES INSTITUTE


DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Office of the Historian at the U.S. Department of State is pleased to announce the release of its fourth set of public beta FRUS e-books at http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/ebooks. The 152 year-old FRUS series presents the official documentary historical record of major foreign policy decisions and significant diplomatic activity of the U.S. government. This batch of e-books includes updates to previously released volumes and over 80 additional volumes from the Nixon–Ford (1969–76), Johnson (1964–68), Kennedy (1961–63), and Eisenhower (1958–60) subseries. 108 FRUS volumes are now available as e-books.

JOINT HISTORY OFFICE, OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN


NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION


NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION


The National Declassification Center (NDC) has issued its sixth biannual Report on Operations. NDC has completed the initial assessment of a backlog of 361 million pages of...
classified records and all processing for more than 90 million pages of this backlog. The report is online at www.archives.gov/declassification/ndc/reports.

In the past two years, NARA has received over 37,000 cubic feet of Class 100 FBI case files. Class 100 is for domestic security investigations including files on individuals and organizations. These records include interesting files on individuals (Hunter S. Thompson) and important organizations (Black Panthers and Communist Party of the United States).

The National Archives at New York City opened at the Alexander Hamilton U.S. Customs House on February 4. The new location, with its higher visibility, will introduce the Archives and its services to more people.

The culmination of this project and its debut on Ancestry.com to mark Veterans Day 2012 was the subject of NCA’s fifth Civil War Sesquicentennial (2011–15) program at VA Central Office in November. The online “U.S. Burial Registers, Military Posts and National Cemeteries, 1862–1960” collection is available to personnel of the Department of Veterans Affairs, National Park Service, and Army—the three federal agencies that oversee national cemeteries—without a subscription to Ancestry.com through NCA’s agreement.

In January 2009, concern for fragile hand-written ledgers housed at cemeteries, and limited public access to them, led the NCA History Program to recall them for digitization, after which they were transferred to NARA for preservation. For more information visit http://www.cem.va.gov/CEM/pdf/Project_description_Internet_Ancestry.pdf, or contact NCA Senior Historian Sara Amy Leach (sara.leach@va.gov).

The December 2012 issue of The Trail Companion: A Newsletter of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail (http://www.nps.gov/lecl/parknews/newspaper.htm) contains an article on Spirit Mound, a site visited by the explorers. The mound is nine miles north of Vermillion, South Dakota, and was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1974. Lewis and Clark documented the site in their journals on August 25, 1804. It was important to local Indian tribes, who knew it as the “Hill of little Devils.” “The view from atop Spirit Mound is significant,” the article notes, “because it marks the first time that Lewis and Clark had realized the wide expanse of the Great Plains landscape.” Now surrounding agriculture and residential use define it as a “cultural landscape that embodies value for both its natural features and human interaction.” The spot was purchased from its owner in 2011. The February 2013 issue highlights the Sioux City Lewis & Clark Interpretive Center, a 20,000-sq.-ft-complex opened in 2002. It features interpretive displays through which visitors can begin to understand the personalities on the explorers. An animatronics exhibit displays models of Lewis and Clark talking at the grave site of Sergeant Floyd, the only member who died on the way. See information on other NPS cultural landscapes at www.nps.gov/cultural_landscapes/index.html

The National Security Agency’s Center for Cryptologic History biennial Cryptologic History Symposium is scheduled for Thursday and Friday, October 17 and 18, 2013. The theme of the Symposium is “Technological Change and Cryptology: Meeting the Historical Challenges.” For more information or to submit a proposal on a cryptologic-related topic (first-round consideration already underway), contact the Executive Director of the Symposium, Dr. Kent Sieg, by email at kgsieg@nsa.gov or by phone 301-688-2336.
**SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION ARCHIVES**

Institutional History Division, Smithsonian Institution Archives: In 2012, the IHD launched a new website on Joseph Henry (1797–1878), the first Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, from 1846 to 1878. The website covers his career as a scientist and as a science administrator. See “Joseph Henry: A Life in Science” at http://siarchives.si.edu/history/exhibits/joseph-henry.

**U.S. ARMY CENTER OF MILITARY HISTORY**

The Winter issue of *Army History* is now available at http://www.history.army.mil/armyhistory/index.html. A print version is sent to interested Army officers, soldiers, and civilian employees, as well as to individuals and offices that directly support Army historical work or Army educational and training programs. This issue contains the articles “Let the Stain of Innocent Blood Be Removed from the Land: The Trial of Lincoln Assassination Conspirators by Military Commission,” by Fred L. Borch; “‘As a Token of Esteem and Respect’: Presentation-Grade Sword Given to 1st Lt. Oscar D. McMillan, U.S. Army, 1865,” by Dieter Stenger; “Arthur L. Wagner: Military Educator and Modernizer,” by Wilson C. Blythe, Jr.; and a section of book reviews.


**U.S. COAST GUARD**

The Coast Guard Oral History Program maintains an online collection of oral history transcripts at http://www.uscg.mil/history/oralhistoryindex.asp. The collection covers all time periods, but is especially representative of World War II personnel. The Coast Guard was commended for its prompt and effective rescue efforts during Hurricane Katrina, and those testimonies are divided into the categories of Aviation Forces, Surface Forces, Command & Control, Logistics & Support, and Marine Safety and Environmental Responders.

**U.S. FOREST SERVICE**

On January 29, Donna Sinclair presented her dissertation research and hosted a discussion in the Forest Service’s national headquarters on changing demographics in the agency and the intersections of law, policy, and individual action and experience since the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Her work is especially timely as the Forest Service seeks to produce a workforce that demographically represents the nation. Sinclair is a Ph.D. candidate in Urban Studies at Portland State University and the recipient of the 2012 Grey Towers Scholar-in-Residence Fellowship. The Scholar-in-Residence program invites professional historians and graduate students with a research project on the Pinchot family, the U.S. Forest Service, or conservation history to reside at Gifford Pinchot’s ancestral home, immersing themselves in the site where Pinchot gained the inspiration to write, legislate, and tirelessly work on behalf of forest conservation. Grey Towers offers recipients an idyllic setting for research and writing that will inspire new directions and ideas on conservation and the Forest Service while speeding completion of their work. For more information about the Grey Towers program, contact Dr. Lincoln Bramwell, Chief Historian of the U.S. Forest Service, at lbramwell@fs.fed.us.

The history collection of the Inyo National Forest, established in 1907 and located in California’s Eastern Sierra, is receiving wider exposure than ever. Forest Service heritage personnel and staff of the Eastern California Museum will make over 1,300 photographs and 15 linear feet of photocopied records available to researchers through the internet (www.inyocounty.us/ecmsite) and in Independence, California. The original records are being prepared for transmittal to the National Archives. Author Andy Selters, on behalf of the Eastern Sierra Interpretive Association, used the collection to compile *A Pictorial History of the Inyo National Forest* (Arcadia Publishing, 2012). For more information, contact Sarah E. Johnston, Inyo National Forest archaeologist, at sejohnston@fs.fed.us.

In December 2012, the Rocky Mountain Region published *From Prairies to Peaks: A History of the Rocky Mountain Region of the U.S. Forest Service, 1905–2012*, by Dr. Anthony Godfrey of U.S. West Research Inc. of Salt Lake City, Utah. The Rocky Mountain Region includes 17 national forests and 7 national grasslands within Wyoming, Colorado, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas. *From Prairies to Peaks* chronologically and topically details the Region’s history from the westward advance of those who exploited the West’s natural wealth to the passage of the 1905 Transfer Act and the Forest Service’s role and contributions to public lands conservation and land management. The book is “more than an interesting read,” according to U.S. Forest Service Chief Historian Lincoln Bramwell. It is also “a tool for Forest Service employees to expand their knowledge as they work to solve today’s forest management challenge.” For a copy, please contact Dave Steinke, Rocky Mountain Regional Office, 740 Simms Street, Golden, Colorado 80401 or dsteinke@fs.fed.us.
**FEDERALIST CALENDAR**


