The making of the Manhattan Project National Historical Park took more than five times as long as the making of the atomic bomb itself (1942–1945). Fifteen years after the first efforts to preserve some of the Manhattan Project properties at Los Alamos, New Mexico, in 1999, Congress enacted the Manhattan Project National Historical Park Act, signed by President Barack Obama on December 19, 2014. The park was officially established by an agreement between the Secretaries of Interior and Energy on November 10, 2015. The following provides the story of how the park was created and a preview of coming attractions.

See “Manhattan” cont’d on page 3

The 2016 joint conference between SHFG and NCPH promises to be our most eventful and exciting conference in many years. Join us to hear sessions on declassification, immigration and exclusion, preservation, the National Park Service and urban landscapes, digital history, cryptologic history, military history, legislative history, women’s history, maritime heritage, oral history, historians and policymaking, historians as legal witnesses, museum work, and much more.

Of course, we will feature our annual Roger R. Trask Lecture with this year’s honoree, Don Ritchie, U.S. Senate Historian Emeritus, and our Awards Ceremony. The SHFG sessions will be on Thursday, March 17, but many sessions on Friday and Saturday will also have great relevance to federal history workers. Walking tours are also available. The conference will take place at the Renaissance Baltimore Harborplace Hotel.

SHFG members can attend Thursday only for $85 (and a $10 fee for the lecture luncheon), and members of both organizations can attend the full conference for $197. Sign up at http://ncph.org/conference/2016-annual-meeting/ where you can also view the program.
President’s Message

By Terrance Rucker

Welcome to the winter issue of The Federalist. The Society has had a busy fall hosting two major events: its first federal jobs workshop on October 17 and the annual Richard G. Hewlett Lecture on October 22.

Throughout the year, we received requests to host a federal jobs workshop of this type, but we did not anticipate the response that we received. The workshop attracted more than 30 registrants who also joined as new members. The attendees learned specifics about strategies for applying for federal history positions. This workshop was the brainchild of Membership Coordinator Eric Boyle, who pitched the idea to the Council, worked with the National Archives to secure the facilities, and contacted SHFG members and government historians to serve as moderators. On behalf of the Society, I thank Eric and the other council members whose tireless work enabled the Society to host such a popular event.

The Society also celebrated the 36th annual Richard G. Hewlett Lecture at the Woodrow Wilson Center. The event had special meaning with the recent passing of Dr. Hewlett. An all-star panel of immigration history experts provided not only historical perspectives about the conception, passage, and consequences of the Immigration Act of 1965, they also engaged with SHFG members in a lively discussion. On behalf of the Society, I would like to thank Tom Gjelten of NPR Public Radio, Marian Smith of U.S.C.I.S., Ruth Wasem of the Library of Congress, and Philip Wolgin of the Center for American Progress for providing their brilliant insights about the Immigration Act. I would also like to thank Christian Ostermann and James Person of the History and Public Policy of the Woodrow Wilson Center for agreeing to host the event.

As this issue goes to press, the Society has sent membership renewal requests for the 2016 calendar year. Since 1979, the SHFG has served as a voice for federal historians within the profession, provided a forum for sharing common concerns, and enabled networking opportunities with colleagues. Through our print and electronic publications such as The Federalist, the eBulletin, the annual Federal History journal, and Explorations in Federal History, members receive a broad range of news and scholarship that features cutting-edge work about the history of the federal government.

As 2015 draws to a close, I feel that the Society is in a strong position to deliver the services that our members expect. With an upcoming spring jobs workshop, the March 2016 annual conference with NCPH in Baltimore, and a variety of other activities, the Society will once again demonstrate its value to the federal history community and the greater history community at large. On behalf of the Society, best wishes for a wonderful holiday season, and we look forward to serving you in 2016 and beyond. Please contact me at shfgpresident@gmail.com with any questions or comments.
Editor’s Note

This new year brings an exciting joint annual conference in Baltimore with the National Council on Public History. That rare convergence of federal and nonfederal public historians will undoubtedly offer a great exchange of ideas and information, and wider exposure for what we do as history workers in government. Some of those diverse contributions are again evident in The Federalist. Cynthia C. Kelly recounts the efforts the establish Manhattan Project National Historical Park, which includes three different sites that preserve the history of our early atomic program. The long-term and painstaking efforts required fundraising, coalition building, and new legislation, but the sites were preserved. Tracy Bradford and Amanda Vtipilson discuss the very special mission of the U.S. Army Women’s Museum at Fort Lee, Virginia. The museum not only features exhibits on the history of women in the U.S. military but, as the authors explain, uses records and artifacts to train and educate enlisted men and women and the general public about that rich history. I thank Justin P. Ebersole for his fascinating interview, which not only provides us a basic entry into NPS archaeological work but demonstrates the professionalism and interdisciplinary complexity of federal historical work at historic sites—of the partnership between archaeologists, historians, curators, and others. Other features include a recap of last fall’s Hewlett Lecture, Chas Downs’s look at past SHFG training programs, a review of newly declassified military records at the National Declassification Center, a look at the USDA’s oral history collection, the NPS’ new Urban Agenda, and brief summaries of exceptional new publications. We hope you enjoy and learn from this issue. Please send news and information to me at benjamin.guterman@shfg.org

“Manhattan” from page 1

Manhattan Project in the Crosshairs

After the end of the Cold War in 1989, Congress directed the Department of Energy (DOE) to clean up decades of contamination at its nuclear production facilities. In 1993, I left the Environmental Protection Agency to work for the Office of Environmental Management at the Department of Energy, which had a $6 billion annual budget.

At Los Alamos, some 50 Manhattan Project structures owned by the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) were slated for demolition. Were any of the original Manhattan Project properties at Los Alamos going to be saved? “Preservation would be a waste of taxpayers’ money,” declared LANL’s Richard Berwick (Associated Press, June 21, 1997). The state of New Mexico concurred, and the buildings were doomed.

At my urging, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) agreed to visit the Los Alamos National Laboratory’s Manhattan Project site called “V Site.” On November 5, 1998, the Advisory Council members were astonished to see the simple properties where the world’s most powerful weapons were developed. Some said the cluster of buildings would qualify as a World Heritage Site. Somewhat chastened, the Los Alamos National Laboratory took the V Site buildings off the demolition list, but insisted that funds to restore them come from elsewhere.

Save America’s Treasures

As First Lady, Hillary Clinton worked with Congress to commemorate the millennium by preserving historic federal properties in danger of being lost. In a competitive process run by the National Park Service, the Department of Energy (DOE) was awarded $700,000 under the new Save America’s Treasures program for the V Site properties.

The complication was that the grant had to be matched by non-federal funds. Rather than have DOE forfeit the grant and demolish the properties, I left my 25-year career with the federal government in 2000 to raise the matching funds.

Gaining Political Traction

The fundraising project quickly evolved into a much bigger effort. To gain greater public attention, the Los Alamos Historical Society collaborated on a weekend of events in March 2001 called “Remembering the Manhattan Project.” The centerpiece was the “Louis Slotin Sonata,” a new play by Paul Mullin about a Manhattan Project scientist who died in a criticality experiment in Los Alamos in early 1946. The play and a heated discussion afterwards were covered by the New York Times and other press, bringing the Manhattan Project to national attention.

In February 2002, I founded the Atomic Heritage Foundation (AHF), a nonprofit in Washington, DC, dedicated to preserving and interpreting the Manhattan Project. AHF Board Member Richard Rhodes, Pulitzer Prize–winning author of The Making of the Atomic Bomb, opened doors to important U.S. Senators and drew crowds for events on the Manhattan Project. With congressional funding to study whether to preserve some of the remaining properties of the Manhattan Project, I convened a series of meetings at Los Alamos, NM, Oak Ridge, TN, and Hanford, WA, to explore the creation of a Manhattan Project national historical park.

Legislation for a Special Resource Study (2004)

Meanwhile, congressional staff started working on legislation for a “special resource study” to be conducted by the National Park Service as the first step towards creating a national park. On September 30, 2003, Senators Jeff Bingaman (D-NM), Maria...
Cantwell (D-WA), and Patty Murray (D-WA), and Congressman Doc Hastings (R-WA) introduced the legislation. With bipartisan support, Congress passed it in October 2004, and President George W. Bush signed it despite the administration’s official opposition to any new parks.

The study involved four sites (including Dayton, OH) and took eight years. The initial recommendations in January 2010 were to designate a park in the community of Los Alamos. The National Park Service was apprehensive of acquiring responsibility for radiologically contaminated facilities such as the B Reactor at Hanford.

Fortunately, on July 2011, a deal was struck. The Department of Energy agreed to maintain its facilities in perpetuity, and the National Park Service would do what it does best as America’s storyteller. Based on this agreement, the Manhattan Project National Historical Park Act was passed in late 2014, and the new park was officially established on November 10, 2015.

**Bipartisan Support and a Strong Coalition**

The congressional delegations from New Mexico, Washington, and Tennessee formed a very strong, bipartisan team whose support was critical in the final weeks of the Congress. The House passed the legislation as part of the “must pass” 2015 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). The Senate then added some 90 different park and public land provisions to the mix, the first time Congress had taken any significant public lands action since 2009.

While the outcome was in jeopardy at several points, thanks to a concerted lobbying effort, it survived. The Atomic Heritage Foundation led a vigorous coalition including the National Trust for Historic Preservation, National Parks Conservation Association, Energy Communities Alliance, former National Park Service officials, and state and local government officials. As a result, there are now seven new national park units, nine park expansions, and dozens of other public lands provisions.

**Preview of the Park**

The new park will focus on three major sites: Los Alamos, NM, where the first atomic bombs were designed; Oak Ridge, TN, where enormous facilities produced enriched uranium; and Hanford, WA, where plutonium was produced. There are over 40 properties that are officially designated as part of the park with provision for adding others later.

**Los Alamos, NM** The new park includes 13 properties in the Los Alamos community, many of them originally built by the Los Alamos Ranch School in the 1920s. The top-echelon scientists and military leaders lived in the only seven houses with bathtubs on a street known as Bathtub Row.

The cottage where J. Robert Oppenheimer and his family lived could be the “jewel in the crown” of the new park. Right next door, the Bethe House was restored by the Los Alamos Historical Society to interpret the Cold War. Fuller Lodge, a handsome ponderosa pine structure, was a social center for the Manhattan Project.

More than a dozen other properties are owned by the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Public access to some of these properties will be limited for the first few years to address security issues. This includes the V Site buildings, saved from demolition in 1998 and restored in 2006, where the “Gadget,” detonated at the Trinity Site on July 16, 1945, and “Fat Man” bombs with plutonium cores were assembled.

Public access will also be limited at the Gun Site, which was used to develop and test the “Little Boy” or uranium-based bomb. This site is undergoing reconstruction but will eventually have a concrete bunker, periscope tower, cannons, and a firing range.

**Oak Ridge, TN** The mission of the Clinton Engineer Works was to produce enriched uranium, one of the core ingredients of an atomic bomb. Mammoth plants at Y-12 and K-25 used different techniques (electromagnetic separation and gaseous diffusion) to produce enriched uranium. While security is an issue now, we hope that visitors will eventually be able to tour the remaining “Calutron” building at Y-12. While the mile-long K-25 building was demolished in 2013, plans are to recreate a portion of it for visitors.

A third site at Oak Ridge is the X-10 Graphite Reactor, a pilot-scale reactor and prototype for the Hanford plutonium production reactors.

**Hanford, WA** The B Reactor, the world’s first full-scale plutonium production reactor, has welcomed visitors for several years. The second property is the T Plant, a mammoth plant used to chemically separate plutonium from irradiated fuel rods, which can be viewed from the exterior.

In addition, four pre-World War II properties located along the Columbia River will be preserved: the Hanford high school, White Bluffs bank, an agricultural warehouse owned by the Bruggemann family, and an irrigation pump house. Here visitors will hear the stories of the pioneering agricultural families as well as the Native Americans who lived, hunted, fished, and camped near the Columbia River.

The creation of the Manhattan Project National Historical Park was a great collaborative effort. Please visit the Atomic Heritage Foundation’s website at www.atomicheritage.org to learn more, listen to oral histories, and take audio/visual tours of the new park.

As Interior Secretary Sally Jewell said, “Through the preservation and interpretation of the Manhattan Project, the National Park Service will share with the world the story of one of America’s most transformative scientific discoveries that fundamentally altered the course of the 20th century.” Coming soon!

_Cynthia C. Kelly is President of the Atomic Heritage Foundation in Washington, DC. Email: ckelley@atomicheritage.org_
**Hewlett Lecture 2015**  
“Legacies of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965”

This year’s Hewlett Lecture and reception was held at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, DC, on October 22, 2015. A panel of well-known historians discussed the Hart-Cellar Act and its consequences on the 50th anniversary of its passage. The act completely altered the ethnic and racial composition of immigration to the United States from the longstanding quota system that favored Western Europeans.

The panel offered a penetrating and very enlightening discussion and exchange that brought out the major issues and developments in the passage and aftermath of the act. **Phil Wolgin** of the Center for American Progress first provided background information leading to the act. He discussed, among other milestones, the refugee crisis following World War II, which presented a major test for the U.S. immigration system. Congress passed the McCarran–Walter Act of 1952, which upheld the quota system but introduced the important considerations of labor qualifications and refugees. **Ruth Wasem**, currently a Kluge Fellow at the Library of Congress, spoke of social and political changes leading to the 1965 act. She noted the shift in power to pro-immigrant urban areas and the turbulent effects of the civil rights movement for both equality and heightened racism. **Tom Gjelten**, correspondent for Religion and Belief on the National Desk at NPR, traced the political maneuvering behind the act’s passage as well as the increasing call for allowing immigration of family relations as a policy. **Marian L. Smith**, former chief historian for the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, noted that the INS was not consulted, that it had been increasingly processing relatives, and that the agency was greatly understaffed.

Several additional points emerged from the discussion: five laws between 1952 and 1965 chipped away at quotas; Reform of the quota system was pursued by presidents from Truman to Johnson; the racism inherent in acts from the Chinese Exclusion to the 1924 National Origins Act became far less tenable by 1965; immigration increased despite the law, largely from the search for work in the United States; reform in 1965 had to bypass the old immigration basis that barred the indigent in place of the deserving; and most importantly, the 1965 act’s intentions for replacement of quotas by preferences for entry of family members had the unintended consequence of changing the primary source of immigration from Europe to Asia and Central America. These points, in addition to a lively question-and-answer period, made for an exceptional panel.

---

**Welcome New Members**

We welcome the following new members for 2016 and thank those who have supported us at the $100 Patron level.

**New Members**
- Gregory Bereiter
- Forest Brown
- Georgia Brown
- Bruce Bustard
- Bonnie Ferguson Butler
- James Byers
- John M. Carland
- Erin Carpenter
- Kenneth Finlayson
- Jacqueline Guerrier
- David P. Hadley
- Alan Hawk
- Heather Hicks
- Steven Hill
- Nate Jones
- Peter Jones
- Priscilla Dale Jones
- Thomas Jundt
- Zachary Kaufman
- Daniel Kerr
- Seth LaShier
- Jeremy Lundquist
- Greg Martin
- Nils Martin
- Ken McDonald
- Holly Moir
- George Oberle
- Rodney Ross
- Mary Ryan
- Carlyn Swaim
- Adam Thorne
- U.S. Army Heritage and Education Center
- Alisa Whitley

**Patrons**
- Kristin Ahlberg
- Carl E. Ashley
- Richard Baker
- Charlene Bangs Bickford
- Philip L. Cantelon
- David Ferriero
- Kristina Giannotta
- Terrence J. Gough
- Donald Hall
- Maarja Krusten
- Judson MacLaury
- Maeva Marcus
- David B. McMillen
- James McNaughton
- Michael C. Reis
- Donald A. Ritchie
- Terrance Rucker
- Matt Wasniewski

**Federal History Jobs Workshop**

The next federal history jobs workshop for members and guests will be held in March at the National Archives Building in Washington, DC. This follows our successful first workshop on October 17, 2015. Attendees will learn specifics about strategies for applying for federal history positions—how to prepare for a career in federal history, and how to navigate the application and hiring process. Discussions will be conducted by federal history professionals, hiring officials, and career advisers, and cover hiring officials, searching job listings, and work at different agencies. Watch for an announcement for enrollment via our e-Bulletin.
Soldier History and Heritage Education at the United States Army Women's Museum

Tracy Bradford and Amanda Vtipilson

The U.S. Army Women's Museum (USAWM), located at Fort Lee, Virginia, is the only museum in the world dedicated to telling the history and contributions of women to the Army. Part of the Army Museum System, the USAWM is the custodian and repository for over 7,000 artifacts and 1.5 million archival documents pertaining to the service of women across all branches and organizations of the U.S. Army from its inception to the present day. The museum collects, preserves, manages, interprets, and exhibits these unique artifacts and archives as a means to provide training and educational outreach. More than 50,000 soldiers, veterans, and civilians visit the USAWM annually.

History of the Museum

The USAWM originated as the Women's Army Corps (WAC) Museum in Fort McClellan, Alabama. Opened in 1955, the WAC Museum served as a branch museum, preserving the rich history and heritage of the Women's Army Corps. When the Corps was disestablished in 1978, the museum remained at Fort McClellan until a base realignment and closure resulted in the need for a new home for the facility. Fort Lee, Virginia, was chosen because it was the first permanent Training Center for the Women's Army Corps after World War II, and in many ways, the move served as a homecoming for the museum. With the move came a new title, The U.S. Army Women’s Museum, and a new mission, to cover Army women's history from 1775 to the present.

Educational Programs

Education is the cornerstone of all facets of work at the USAWM, and one of the primary missions of the Museum is to serve as an educational institution, providing military history training and instruction to Soldiers, veterans, and the civilian community. The vision of the USAWM education team is to incorporate an interdisciplinary approach to maximize the benefits of the informal learning environment of the museum. In addition, all programs are derived directly from the Museum's archives and collections with the goal of creating unique, relevant, and engaging programming for all visitors. One of the most robust and successful aspects of the education program is Soldier History and Heritage Training, which is delivered to over 10,000 Soldiers annually. While rooted in the USAWM educational philosophy, Soldier training also incorporates the Army Learning Model principles of challenging and inspiring Soldiers with a blended learning approach, utilizing expert teachers who build lessons based on Soldiers’ prior knowledge and experience, and using experiential methodology to design practical and relevant lessons. These programs are tailored to meet the specific needs of each level of professional military education, and thus the content and delivery span an array of best practices. Specific programs have been developed for new Enlisted Soldiers, Non-Commissioned Officers, Warrant Officers, and Officers of all ranks in accordance with the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Military History and Heritage Program (MHHP) guidance. Also, the diversity of the storyline at the USAWM allows for a wide spectrum of educational programming; it can be branch/military, occupational specialty specific; hands-on; or more philosophical in nature.

A perfect illustration of targeted Soldier education is a program called An Island of Integration. This class, delivered to senior Non-Commissioned Officers, unveils the story of the racial desegregation of the U.S. Army—and more specifically the experience within the ranks of the Women's Army Corps (WAC)—a historic transformation that took place in the decade following WWII. By selecting unique and specific objects from the museum’s collection, and collaborating with the entire staff, the education team is able to bring together many voices, from the past and present, to create inclusive and relevant programming. This inquiry-based lesson begins with a puzzling yet inspirational photograph from 1951 of an integrated unit of WACs marching down a well-known route named Sycamore Street in the fiercely segregated city of Petersburg, Virginia. The program then goes back in time to allow participants to examine a small but impactful group of original primary sources that highlight the inclusion and experiences of African American Army women during World War II and the ensuing years. The staff has found that while this history is seemingly focused on African American
women in the Army, it is in fact a national narrative that weaves together gender, race, equality, and service—one that Soldiers, male and female, not only identify with but are also fascinated by. Explored in a larger historical context, the experience of WACs embracing desegregation easily translates to a shared history with which participants can identify at many levels. By providing access to this little-known history and basing the instruction in the Army Learning Model, the museum is able to create relevance and allow Soldiers to make connections between Army history and their service.

**Special Assignments and Partnerships**

While the U.S. Army Women’s Museum offers a varied menu of programs, special assignments and partnerships are always a welcome opportunity. Recently, the museum staff was asked to partner with a local Army unit to provide educational programming for an installation-wide Sexual Harassment and Rape Prevention (SHARP) Stand-down. The USAWM partnered with the local command team to design a program titled *Leading a Legacy* in an effort to help stamp out sexual harassment and assault. The result was a dynamic discussion-based program that examines how Army culture has shifted in the past and helps reinforce the idea that one can “lead” the next legacy, instead of simply “leaving” a legacy.

This program has grown into a product that is now intended for varying audiences, both military and civilian. The material used to generate dialogue, such as video, newspaper headlines, images, and political cartoons comes directly from the Army Women’s Museum archives. The goal is to use historical perspective to examine how Army cultural attitudes towards women have changed over time. The course material focuses on three examples of dynamic and dramatic cultural shifts in the Army that helped it to move forward as an institution. The first example focuses on the contributions of women to the Army in World War II, which resulted in a legacy that created the Women’s Army Corps as a permanent, but separate, part of the Army. The second cultural shift highlights the Army’s efforts to combat inequalities based on race and gender, which resulted in a legacy of the Army creating a truly equal institution in which racial and gender segregation were eliminated. The final example focuses on increased opportunities for women, greatly improving the Army’s ability to do its mission, which has left a legacy in which the gender-specific policies that prevented women from serving in all Army occupations and positions have been recently rescinded. These special assignments and partnerships often result in lasting products that contribute greatly to the USAWM’s Soldier education capabilities.

**Moving Beyond the Classroom**

The scope of the Museum’s story extends beyond the four walls of the facility, encompassing the entirety of Army history. The museum staff realized that it was important to extend the reach of the Museum quite literally around the world. The education staff went to work to create programs that could achieve this goal. The team began to leverage the power of social media, distance learning, and special programming. The USAWM Facebook page serves as an educational platform with carefully planned posts that showcase the history located in the museum as well as current events. Entire Army organizations and units far outside the physical reach of the Museum have been able to interact with Army women’s history through social media. Recently we launched a Live Broadcast Studio with Chroma key technology to allow delivery of programming to students and adults around the globe. The implications for providing Soldier training via this technology are boundless.

The USAWM also seizes unique educational opportunities. One year, the relatively unknown celebration called National Doughnut Day opened the door for a day-long celebration of a rich, tasty, and little-known history that links American soldiers, women, and doughnuts. During World War I, American women went overseas to support the Soldiers on the front lines, and one of their missions, performed in difficult and dangerous locations, was to make and serve doughnuts to the men in the trenches. National Doughnut Day was established in the 1930s to commemorate the contributions of these brave American women. In commemoration of the day, the USAWM worked with a national doughnut company to give out free doughnuts to thousands of Soldiers, while re-enactors, temporary photo exhibits, and period music were used to teach about the contributions of American women during World War I. Soldiers left happy and knowledgeable—who could ask for more? The Soldier education that takes place in the USAWM has served as an anchor for this continually growing network of programs that reach outside the classroom.

**Into the Future**

All educational programming at the Museum is designed to meet the needs of the Army. By creating programs Soldiers can connect with on varying levels, be it in the gallery, the classroom, or digitally, the education team hopes to equip Soldiers with a more complete understanding of the institution they represent. The entire USAWM staff considers it an honor and a privilege to provide history and heritage education to America’s warriors. For more information on the USAWM education program and museum resources, visit [www.awm.lee.army.mil](http://www.awm.lee.army.mil).

Tracy Bradford is the Education Director, and Amanda Vtipilson is the Education Curator at the U.S. Army Women’s Museum, Fort Lee, Virginia. Email: usarmy.lee.tradoc.mbx.lee-awmweb@mail.mil

---

**SHFG Online**

- Latest federal history news
- Oral history collections listing
- Timeline of federal history
- Recent Publications from federal history offices
- *The Federalist* contents
- *FEDERAL HISTORY* journal
- Calendar of conferences
- Directory of federal history offices

Send news and information to webmaster@shfg.org
Justin P. Ebersole is an archeological technician with the National Park Service (NPS) in the Washington, DC, capital area. He graduated from Boston University and worked as an archeologist in the private sector before his service in the U.S. military from 2005 to 2011. He then joined the NPS, worked at Harpers Ferry National Historical Park until 2014, and later obtained his current position at the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park. He has steadily expanded his project skills, working at excavation, the writing of historic structures reports, production of land surveys, interpretation of data, the drawing of plans and maps, and the cataloging of thousands of artifacts. He has also contributed articles and reports on these projects to several journals.

Interview by Benjamin Guterman

What do you think originally drew you to archeological work, and how did you first get started in the field?

My interest in archeology began in my youth and was encouraged and inspired by several experiences. Among them was the fact that, being a resident of Maryland, I was able to visit many historical sites as well as museums. I also benefited from reading many books on world archeology. As I explored ancient cultures described in those volumes I realized that the Mayan civilization fascinated me the most. This drove me towards applying to universities that had archeology programs with a focus on the Maya. My first real field experience was in 1999 when I went to Belize as part of a semester-long field school through Boston University.

What were some of your first work assignments at NPS park projects, and some of the skills required?

My first, and perhaps most significant, NPS project was the Lower Armory Grounds street excavation at Harpers Ferry NHP. During that project I assisted the park archeologist, Darlene Hassler, with investigating both the historic street associated with the second national armory for the United States, which operated from 1799 to 1861, and the prehistoric layers beneath it. We excavated two 10- by 10-foot trenches down to 10 feet. So basic excavation skills, such as interpreting soil stratigraphy as one digs with shovels and trowels, were integral. These skills were further augmented with drafting and photography. I also quickly became familiar with federal regulations and National Park Service policies and computer programs as they relate to archeology and cultural resource stewardship, a facet of archeology that I had little experience with prior to my employment at Harpers Ferry. I learned this by being heavily involved with minor archeological clearance work required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

What do you feel were your most important contributions at Harpers Ferry National Historical Park?

Harpers Ferry NHP has an impressive history of archeological excellence spanning nearly sixty years, and so having an impact there was important to me especially since I was the junior member of the program. Fortunately, my drafting skills proved to be one key way to assist the park. The plan and profile views that I produced of one of the historic armory’s tailrace tunnels are a prime example. Those drawings represent original documentation and they are accurate and lasting data that the park can use for research, management, and interpretation. Similarly, I produced detailed drawings of a historic cistern discovered by accident in the park and, on a smaller scale, many drawings of artifacts for publications.

I also coauthored two reports on archeology at the park with Darlene Hassler, the park’s archeologist. One report focuses on the Lower Armory Grounds project, the other on a phase I survey of the Murphy Farm at Harpers Ferry.

You’ve written that excavation at the Harpers Ferry armory has taught us much about that site’s technological evolution over time in the antebellum period. How is that so?

The Armory was the subject of two separate archeological projects. The first series of excavations uncovered portions of two buildings: the Smith and Forging Shop and Warehouse. The second project focused on the Armory street since it was thought that it could reveal buried utilities associated with the facility’s operation and potentially have acted as a protective cover for what were hoped to be undisturbed strata beneath it.

Between the two, investigators were able to track some of the evolving construction at the Armory and uncover portions of the innovative infrastructure. Perhaps the most exciting discovery was the unique downdraft system used at the Smith and Forging Shop. It enabled many forges to operate simultaneously by drawing the exhaust down below the floor and over to a single, massive 90-ft.-tall smokestack. Elsewhere, an investigation within a tailrace tunnel below the Armory led to a better understanding of how the entire facility evolved. Tailraces are essentially channels, either open or enclosed, that direct water away from waterwheels, which were used to power the machinery that the Armory relied upon. While tailraces in and of themselves are neither unique nor rare, the one at Harpers Ferry proved enlightening because it revealed eight separate construction phases. These phases indicate the staggering extent of growth the facility experienced as its superintendents reorganized it to meet the demands of the U.S. government for small arms production and technological advances from flintlock muskets to percussion models. More importantly, mapping and recognizing the phases within the tunnel gave investigators a way to actually document changes to the facility that were either not recorded historically or were, in fact, documented but lacked known physical proof on the ground.
Beyond the armory, has NPS work in the Harpers Ferry region advanced our knowledge of other historical events and figures there, such as John Brown?

Many private researchers utilize the park annually as they investigate the various aspects of the park. So the park benefits from external interests. Internally, NPS employees have continued to research Harpers Ferry with regards to John Brown and the town’s role during the Civil War. For example, the agency’s regional historian, Dean Herrin, investigated the cupola and bell associated with the original Armory’s Guard and Fire Engine House, better known as John Brown’s Fort, and whether those features were present the day of the raid. The park also continues to pursue an interest in improving our understanding of Storer College, an African American school started in 1867. It played a significant role during the Niagara Movement. This movement was a precursor to the NAACP. Lastly, archeological work has long been conducted on Virginius Island. Located on the Shenandoah River side of town, the island was the site of Hall’s Rifle Works. John Hall was an innovator and key figure in the creation of interchangeable parts, which he exemplified in his breechloading rifle.

At the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park, what are the preservation needs and goals?

At 184.5 miles in length and containing approximately 1,300 structures across 20,000 acres of land, the C&O Canal has many responsibilities and preservation needs. Our goals are always to preserve and protect the resource while enabling the public to visit and enjoy the historical and natural heritage contained within our boundaries. Currently, the park is engaged in preparing for a diverse number of major projects. These include a rebuild of Lock 3 in Georgetown, a rehabilitation of the Conococheague Aqueduct in Williamsport, MD, to be the only watered aqueduct in the United States, and a rehabilitation of Swains Lockhouse (#21) near Potomac, MD. The latter project is important because it will be included as part of a program called the Canal Quarters, which enables visitors to experience life in a lockhouse by renting it for overnight stays. This program is operated by the C&O Canal Trust, our nonprofit partner. Lastly, we face a perpetual need of maintaining the park’s historic culverts. Without them, minor tributaries passing beneath the canal can generate catastrophic breeches when culverts clog or fail.

What have been your roles and most difficult tasks on these projects?

My role at C&O Canal NHP is typically to offer archeological assistance when projects involve ground disturbance. I ensure that no culturally sensitive contexts, such as buried foundations, will be harmed by our efforts. Additionally, I provide guidance to the park for ensuring that our projects are compliant with the National Historic Preservation Act and associated policies. This is often a dynamic process that can drastically effect the course of projects as we try to find ways to best preserve and protect the unique heritage within the park. Really, the most difficult part of the job is trying to responsibly manage my portion of these multiple projects simultaneously while still performing my regular duties, such as managing the park’s museum program.

Thinking about the work of NPS historians, how do your duties and efforts intersect with theirs?

At the most basic level, the work of previous historians has established the baseline understanding of the history of our park. Most of that work was conducted in the 1960s through 1970s. While not infallible, it is solid work that we strive to continually update and correct as new research and resources emerge. I use that data to inform my efforts at interpreting the archeological record at the canal. It has also been the case, however, that archeology informs and even corrects what was historically thought to be accurate. So we are in a constant dialogue. We benefit from the fact that we interact with National Park Service regional historians, citizen researchers who take an interest in the park, and C&O Canal NHP staff who are subject-matter experts on various attributes of the park. The end goal of these efforts is to arrive at the most accurate understanding of the past, which we can then present to the public.

Generally, what two or three archeological duties do you enjoy the most?

One of my favorite duties is engaging the public, whether it be via a formal presentation or a casual chat with a curious visitor who stops to see what task I am working on. Not only is it our responsibility to interact with the public, but it is the best way to educate people about archeology, history, and the importance of protecting our shared heritage through proper stewardship and public involvement. The other pleasurable aspect of my job is being able to conduct annual inspections of archeological sites to ensure that they are stable and have not been effected by natural or human threats. I am responsible for monitoring nearly 300 known sites. These inspections inform management decisions about the appropriate level of care for these finite resources.
Could you explain the general requirements under Section 106 and a bit about how you’ve been involved fulfilling those requirements?

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, is a way of formalizing how federal agencies’ undertakings are evaluated and how the effects of those undertakings are mitigated when such actions involve cultural resources contained within their legislative boundaries. It acts in conjunction many other laws, regulations, and policies, but basically is a means of determining if an action will effect a cultural resource, such as a historic building or landscape, that is listed on the National Register of Historic Places or eligible to be listed. It also allows the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, and other groups with vested interests the opportunity to comment and provide guidance. It is this dialogue that moves projects in the right direction such that all interests are entertained and an appropriate course of action is carried out. We use it for each project at the park level to ensure compliance with regulations and to allow for transparency of our actions. My role as a 106 Coordinator is to advise park management on how they need to proceed for their actions to be compliant. As an archeologist, I am also a member of the interdisciplinary team that includes historical architects, historians, landscape architects, and many others who jointly review and provide guidance to ensure proper stewardship of the resource.

In your work of excavating, cataloging, and caring for artifacts, what range of objects have you seen?

I have been fortunate to experience everything from ceremonial ceramic vessels in Guatemala to school children’s slate pencils recovered from buried historic streets in Harpers Ferry. There really is no end to the possibilities for what one might encounter. In addition, I am fortunate to be responsible for museum collections that contain both excavated and donated objects. At the C&O Canal, for example, our collections contain everything from original theodolites used by the Canal Company, to gold specimens associated with the Maryland Gold Mine at Great Falls, to prehistoric lithics and ceramics. We basically have at least 9,000 years of history represented in our collection.

How has technology changed your work in recent years?

As technology continues to advance and innovations abound, I find that my ability to research, document, and archive materials becomes easier. For example, our park project involving the documentation of five historic structures was made exponentially easier by the fact that many deeds and property plats have been digitized and made searchable online thereby eliminating time-consuming travel. It is amazing to locate deeds from the 1700s without venturing to a courthouse or archive. Similarly, digital photography, Global Positioning Systems, and Geographic Information Systems have enabled fast and accurate documentation of cultural resources in the field. This is very beneficial for conducting inspections of resources for mandated annual NPS reports or when recording damage that could be associated with criminal acts within park boundaries. Lastly, we utilize a number of computer programs and online databases that are specific to the NPS and have become an integral way that we conduct business and manage our nation’s cultural and natural heritage.

You have also volunteered at several non-NPS archaeological projects. What have you gained from those experiences?

The non-NPS projects really established the foundation for my knowledge and skill set and have enabled me to excel at my current work. By participating in archeological investigations involving large-scale architecture and spatially distant sites, I am better capable of handling my duties, such as mapping, excavating, and interpreting complex stratigraphy, in the National Park Service. For example, my experience mapping caves in Belize was directly applicable to the tailrace tunnel project at Harpers Ferry. Similarly, in Guatemala I learned to delineate construction phases within Mayan temple mounds. This, again, was applied to the tailrace tunnel at Harpers Ferry. Essentially, my current work. By participating in archeological investigations involving large-scale architecture and spatially distant sites, I am better capable of handling my duties, such as mapping, excavating, and interpreting complex stratigraphy, in the National Park Service. For example, my experience mapping caves in Belize was directly applicable to the tailrace tunnel project at Harpers Ferry. Similarly, in Guatemala I learned to delineate construction phases within Mayan temple mounds. This, again, was applied to the tailrace tunnel at Harpers Ferry. Ultimately, all of these projects have enhanced my leadership skills, my ability to effectively work with teams, and my fortitude when it comes to enduring diverse environmental conditions in the course of getting the job done properly.
Since the Society’s founding, one of its basic goals has been to encourage and facilitate the professional development of its members. As noted in the SHFG’s Long Range Planning Committee Report, which appeared in the Spring 1997 Federalist, “Over the past several years, Outreach and Professional Development Committees have been formed and discontinued, owing to changing Council interest or the committees’ lack of success. The most significant efforts in this respect have been generated in an ad hoc basis.” The report goes on to cite a series of workshops held in 1995–96 dealing with aspects of federal history that were sufficiently successful to inspire the Executive Council to sponsor another series of seminars for 1996–97. The report’s recommendations included strong support for such efforts.

This series of professional development seminars was the brainchild of past SHFG President Patrick “Pat” Harahan, and he was the driving force behind them. He stressed that such a program was a vital function of an organization like the SHFG. Harahan reported to the Executive Council on September 5, 1995, that he had put together a proposal for a series of three-day courses on “Development and Diversity in Federal History.” It was intended for 8 to 10 participants, held one day per month over three months, at different locations. Harahan asked for the Executive Council to approve this concept, and requested funds to pay the speakers. “The targeted audience for this course would be those who run small offices and mid-level managers.” After some discussion, the Council voted $500 to get the program off the ground, and an ad hoc committee consisting of Dave Pemberton, George Chalou, and Cindy Fox was appointed. Harahan was to prepare a course outline and brochure by October.

In the Winter 1995 Federalist an article by Harahan titled “New Society Professional Development Seminar” described the seminar. Its topic was “Documenting and Interpreting the U.S. Government: The National Archives, Histories, and the Federal History Programs.” Harahan went into a detailed description of the seminars, to be held in January, February, and March, and conducted by senior archivists and historians. It would cover the origin, development, and diversity of federal history programs, as well as contemporary issues and developments. The January session covered Federal historical programs, archives and records collections, documentary editing, and documentary records in Congress and the U.S. courts. The February session covered documenting the national security state, the space race, and the National Park Service. March would include adaptations to new technologies, history contracting, and the history and objectives of the SHFG.

On February 5, 1996, Harahan reported to the Executive Council on the Professional Development Seminar’s January session. He noted that “It was a long day, but an interesting one.” He went on to describe topics of the February and March sessions, and thanked the Council for its support. In its March meeting, the Council voiced support for continuing the seminars on a regular basis, supported by SHFG endowment funds. They thanked Harahan for undertaking the project. The Professional Development Seminar was repeated in fall 1996, and sessions were presented in October, November, and December of that year.

The seminar was given again in 2000, under the shortened title “Documenting and Interpreting the U.S. Government.” The sessions were basically the same as those in 1996, except that the third session omitted references to “Adapting to new technologies.” In 2002 a flyer put out by Dick Myers announced a SHFG Professional Development Seminar to be held on April 12, 2002, titled “Doing Federal History in the Twenty-first Century.” A printed brochure for the 2002 seminars was produced, with Harahan again the seminar leader. He noted that the seminar was intended to be of “special interest to historians, archivists, records managers, and curators who recently joined the Federal service and those who wish to broaden and enrich their knowledge of Federal history programs.” Topics included the Legislative Branch, the Defense Establishment, the Federal Judiciary, Federal History and Public History, and Federal History and Professional Historical Organizations.

Despite Harahan’s best efforts, and generally favorable response to the presentations, seminar attendance did not meet expectations. SHFG interest in further professional development seminars waned, and reluctantly they were discontinued. To learn more about the SHFG Archives, or if you have additional information or documentation on this or other SHFG matters, contact Chas Downs at chasdowns@verizon.net
The NPS’ Urban Agenda

A recent article about revitalization efforts along the Anacostia River, in the National Park Services’ National Capital Parks-East, provides a vivid example of new thinking and work under the NPS’ new Urban Agenda (http://www.capitalcommunitynews.com/category/homepage/hill-rag). Author Bill Matuszewski writes that “who would have thought 10 years ago that the Anacostia would be touted as a “signature urban park” by the National Park Service?” The river has several contaminated sites, a city dump, and contaminated sediments, and has not been an inviting recreational area.

Yet new superintendent Gopaul Noojibail is excited about the potential for revitalization. In his plan the area can become a “paradigm” for “natural resource protection, education, physical exercise, and a stewardship.” A new trail to be completed from Benning Road to the Bladensburg Marina will provide access to parklands; a new bridge at 11th Street will follow; and a new hiking and bicycling bridge will connect to New York Avenue. He sees improved water quality and more recreation, rowing, youth gardens, and job-training programs.

In these ways, the Anacostia project might be seen as model for NPS’ Urban Agenda, announced in April 2015. The agenda emerged from a 2012 meeting of NPS leaders in New York City. A new national campaign to revitalize and even redefine urban parks will be part of the NPS’ rededication to its original goals as it prepares to mark its 100th anniversary in August 2016.

Urban parks are nothing new. As NPS Director Jonathan B. Jarvis pointed out in the announcement of the agenda, “One-third of all NPS sites are located in urban areas,” “Thirty-six percent of all NPS visitation occurs at our urban sites,” and “Some 30 NPS programs serve urban communities, providing funds and technical assistance for recreational facilities, environmental restoration, historic architecture, historic research, trail building, and youth engagement.”

The agenda seeks to “align” park resources, such as funding, related agencies, and civic partners and programs, for greater effectiveness. It has identified 10 model cities and started a nationwide program of Urban Fellows in each model city who will work to broker and promote partnerships at the local level. Key to the effort are collaboration, more effective inclusion of communities, and a spirit of unity (“oneness”), aided by greater use of websites, social media, and webinars.

If the proposed Land and Water Conservation Fund and a $326 million NPS Centennial Fund are approved, Director Jarvis estimates that the NPS would have $107 million for federal land acquisition, $47 million for state grants, and $25 million for the Urban Parks and Recreation Fund. The campaign has drawn serious attention and discussion, including an October 29–30 symposium at the University of Pennsylvania titled “Urban Parks and the National Park Service of the Future.” It brought together professionals from the Park Service, universities, design organizations, and civic alliances to discuss such questions as Parks and Networks. The program stated that we now hold a wider conception of parks, “as seamless networks that range from town squares, to street corners, open spaces, waterfronts, sidewalks, memorials, and all manner of ‘pop-ups.’”

Some prominent urban projects include New York City’s High Line, the St. Louis waterfront at the Gateway Arch, and the Golden Gate’s Crissy Field. All of these projects, Jarvis writes, “have taken an entrepreneurial approach to refresh existing assets, leverage partnerships to activate these sites with programming, and have depended on community insights to ensure they stay relevant and well used.” For more information, visit http://www.nps.gov/subjects/urban/Urban-Agenda.htm

Oral History Notes

The USDA History Collection

The National Agricultural Library makes available online oral history videos from the Alternative Farming Systems Information Center with “Leaders in Alternative and Sustainable Agriculture” at http://afsic.nal.usda.gov/videos/histories These individuals “have provided leadership and inspiration in the field of alternative or sustainable agriculture.” The 11 interviewees include Wes Jackson, co-founder of The Land Institute; Fred Kirschenmann, USDA, NAL, Alternative Farming Systems Information Center; and Jayne T. Maclean, Coordinator of the Alternative Farming Systems Information Center.

The following is an excerpt from a 1990 interview with Dr. James Patrick Madden, acting director of USDA’s Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education program (formerly LISA), who helped to design and develop the program.

There are success stories out there, and now there’s an increasing body of scientific knowledge which unpacks and explains those success stories. It also . . . helps us understand the failures, and predict the difference between a failure and a success, and that’s where I get really excited, is where we move out of the realm of the grateful testimonial into the realm of a predictive science where we can help the farmer to make an informed choice to make that transition from heavy dependence upon the pesticides to systems that are either free of or have greatly reduced dependence upon those kinds of input.

See the collection at http://afsic.nal.usda.gov/videos/histories

See SHFG’s listing of federal oral history collections at http://shfg.org/shfg/programs/interviews/
Newly Declassified Records

This quarter’s feature highlights selected record series newly declassified by the National Archives’ National Declassification Center (NDC). One such recent release features a six-FRC-S-box series from the Department of Defense. The series, Strategic Planning Files of the Deputy of Special Operations, consists of subject files maintained by one of the more controversial figures in American Cold War history, Air Force Maj. Gen. Edward G. Landsdale. For five years, from 1957 to 1962, General Landsdale occupied a position high in the Office of the Secretary of Defense hierarchy, always in a post dealing with the obscure world of military special operations. His files are arranged in rough alphabetical order, with folders pertaining to countries mingled with those for specific topics such as Counter Guerilla (CG) warfare, Special Mission Aircraft, and the AR-15. Of special note is the fact that subject files for Vietnam constitute more than one of the six boxes in the series. The series belongs to Records of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Record Group 330, with a Records Entry ID number of 343364. Several of the boxes bear copies of the labels that appeared on the original boxes: “Top Secret Sensitive Not to be opened without permission of General Landsdale.” Although the formal NARA descriptions give the inclusive dates for the documents in this series as 1960 and 1961, the documents actually span the dates that General Landsdale worked for the Department of Defense, from 1957 to 1962. This series has been processed for declassification. As might be expected for a man in a position such as General Landsdale’s, numerous documents have been withdrawn for national security reasons. In some cases, NDC staff provided redacted copies of documents withdrawn. All other document withdrawals are represented by the standard NDC red-striped withdrawn item notice. To discover more record series declassified by the NDC, please visit the NDC Blog at http://blogs.archives.gov/ndc/ for the complete list of declassified record series.

A page from an Armalite Corporation brochure on their AR-15 5.56mm rifle. The presence of the brochure and other Armalite materials in the Landsdale Strategic Planning Files is a measure of the lobbying efforts used in 1961 to sell the future M16 rifle to the U.S. Armed Forces.

11th Annual Summer Institute for Teachers

Federal Trials & Great Debates in United States History
June 19–24, 2016. Washington, DC.

Designed especially for teachers of U.S. History, Government, Civics, and Law...

The Federal Trials and Great Debates Summer Institute deepens participants’ knowledge of the federal judiciary and of the role the federal courts have played in key public controversies that have defined our constitutional and other legal rights.

Cases studied included:
- The Debs Case
- The Trial of Susan B. Anthony
- The Rosenberg Trial

Participants work closely throughout the week-long Institute with leading historians, federal judges, and curriculum consultants, focusing on three landmark federal trials through curriculum developed by the Federal Judicial Center.

Applications must be postmarked no later than Wednesday, March 2, 2016.

For full information and to apply, visit www.ambar.org/summerinstitute
Many recent federal agency publications are featured at http://shfg.org/shfg/category/recentpublications/


Spies and Shuttles deepens our view of relations between NASA and the U.S. military and Intelligence Community during the Cold War. David’s extensive research and use of newly declassified materials reveal areas of their cooperation as well as tension. NASA’s Shuttles provided valuable payload capacity for intelligence satellites, until the Challenger disaster in January 1986. NASA scientists served as advisors on CIA panels to analyze photographs of Soviet aircraft, missiles, and spacecraft, and even helped test models of them in its facilities. While the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) lent NASA its classified cameras for mapping lunar landing sites, the DoD restricted other NASA Earth-imaging activities, as well as astronaut photography, to prevent leaks of data information. DoD technical support helped develop the Hubble Space Telescope. Tensions arose with the DoD over the collection and classification of satellite geodesy, and over encryption of SEASAT-A radar altimeter data. Yet NASA needed DoD’s financial and political support. These stories and many more provide a penetrating look into the secretive relationship between our civilian and military space programs. Some of the documents used in the book have been posted by the National Security Archive at The George Washington University at http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB509/#_cdn


Our post–9/11 world operates under a new norm, that of constant vigilance in the preemption and prevention of the use of weapons of mass destruction. We guard against nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons in the hands of terrorists. This study by Joseph Harahan, however, returns us to the roots of that apprehension with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the sudden “inheritance” of stockpiles of nuclear missiles and warheads, and chemical and biological facilities and weapons by the new breakaway nations of Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus. This is the story of the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program passed by Congress in 1991 to secure and dismantle those weapons—an acknowledgment of a grave international crisis in which America had to lend funds and know-how to nations that could not disarm on their own. Harahan is eminently qualified to tell the story as the former chief historian with the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA), where he was able to conduct interviews with many of the U.S., Eastern European, and Russian officials involved in that work. The book traces U.S. efforts under the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (CTR) to serve as a broker between Russia and the other three nations not only to remove the weapons but to assure arms reduction under the four START Treaties from 2001 to 2010. Harahan delves into the many problems involved: distrust between Russia and Ukraine, deteriorating weapons and systems, declining economies and inability to complete dismantling, and changing national goals. We learn about the immense expense of dismantling launch facilities, missiles, and bases; the need to employ and house Russian nuclear scientists; the cost of constructing new chemical destruction sites; and the challenge of defining baseline and operational standards in reviews with Russian authorities, among others. The book does a good job of detailing the complexity and difficulty of the undertaking. The program’s results: destruction of more than 2,500 nuclear-capable missiles, 1,187 missile launchers, 33 submarines, 155 bombers, over 1.6 rounds of chemical munitions, and over 4,129 metric tons of chemical weapons. The book ends, although briefly, with the CTR’s shift today to containing biological weapons and disease in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Africa, and Southeast Asia. With its use of new sources, this study is an invaluable one for future work on disarmament as well as U.S.–Russian relations in the post–Cold War period.


The Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS) series is far more than a select documentary collection of records tracing our diplomacy. We realize from this important introspective history that the original transmission of diplomatic documents from the executive to Congress (ultimately through
the *Foreign Relations* series) has a constitutional basis in Congress’s need for information on the conduct of foreign affairs in order to exercise “advice and consent.” Thus, President Abraham Lincoln’s delivery of the first *Foreign Relations* volumes to Congress in 1861 “formalized ad hoc antebellum precedents” of document sharing with Congress going back to the Washington administration.

This story of the *FRUS* series offers unexpected drama at every turn, as State Department Historian Stephen Randolph writes in the introduction. *FRUS* was used at times for public relations, fell behind in production schedules, struggled to gain access to foreign and U.S. security documents, was the focus of intense internal debates on standards and declassification, sacrificed timely production for completeness, and adapted to the post–World War II security state in which additional agencies shared in the formulation of foreign policies. With extensive research and discussion, the authors show the ultimate change of *FRUS*’s focus from the narrow publication of diplomatic materials to inclusion of those revealing decision making. As production time extended to 15 years and more in the 1920s, the “Contemporaneous *FRUS*” became unachievable, and the series gained less importance for Congress and more as a vehicle for transparency in government and as a documentary source for scholars and students of U.S. diplomatic history. The complex drama of the series’ evolution includes detailed discussion of several major controversies and crises, and their consequences, including the Versailles volume in the 1930s; the expanding content required from national security agencies like the DoD, CIA, and NSC; the Yalta Conference and Iran volumes; congressional statutes; executive orders on publication schedules and mandatory reviews of documents; the Historical Advisory Committee (HAC) at the State Department and its role; lack of access to the Truman and Eisenhower Library documents; and much more—all deeply affecting the production and integrity of the volumes.

The authors to their credit set this history of *FRUS* within the larger picture of our historical struggle to find that difficult and imperfect balance between transparency and reasonable protection of state secrets. While this account is written from the State Department perspective, which undoubtedly affects the emphasis and analyses at many points, it is based on extensive research and offers in-depth discussions of the major issues involved in the effort to make diplomatic records publicly available. In the end, we gain an important basis for understanding the positions of stakeholders and issues involved in the process, and a true appreciation of the complexity of compiling a public record of diplomacy in a modern security state.

— Benjamin Guterman

See additional titles at Recent Publications, [http://shfg.org/shfg/category/recentpublications/](http://shfg.org/shfg/category/recentpublications/)

---

**Foreign Language Propaganda, World War II**

The George C. Marshall Foundation has made available online a unique collection of 129 foreign language propaganda leaflets, booklets, and pamphlets prepared by the Psychological Warfare Department (PWD), Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces (SHAEF). The materials were recently donated by the wife of John S. Minary, who served under Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in the department.

Minary was fluent in French, and helped in negotiations with the French before he was transferred to the PWD. He contributed to the formulation and distribution of the propaganda materials, which started just before D-day and continued until the end of the war. Using newspapers and radio broadcasts as well as these materials, the target audiences were German soldiers, German civilians, people living in German-occupied countries, and displaced persons. The materials are in German, French, English, Polish, Russian, Italian, Serbian, and Dutch. They urged surrender amidst certain defeat, and argued that continuing the destruction and killing only made postwar reconstruction even more difficult. Included was a Safe Conduct Pass, dropped at the rate of over 10 million per month.

All the leaflets have been digitized and translated. See the collection at [http://marshallfoundation.org/library/collection/john-s-minary-collection/#!/collection=931](http://marshallfoundation.org/library/collection/john-s-minary-collection/#!/collection=931)

---

**Donate to SHFG**

Support New SHFG Events

Please donate to SHFG’s current efforts to organize and promote new events and workshops. These events will provide opportunities for professional development: to meet colleagues, exchange ideas, and learn more about the federal community.

We urge you to contribute to our General Fund. You can donate the amount of your choice, either by check or online payment ([at http://shfg.wildapricot.org/Donate](http://shfg.wildapricot.org/Donate))

Your donations also support all activities of the Society, including publication of The Federalist newsletter, Federal History journal, and stories and news for our website; our annual conference, the Richard G. Hewlett Lecture; and programming such as occasional tours, workshops, and social events that help students and historians develop in their careers.
Oral History Guidelines Under Review

The recent proposed changes to Institutional Review Board (IRB) rules are crucial to federal historians who conduct and use oral histories in their work. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and 15 other federal departments and agencies have agreed on revisions and published them in the Federal Register on September 8, 2015, with a 90-day comment period. The proposed “Notice of Proposed Rulemaking: Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects” is posted at http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/regulations/nprmhome.html

The original rules, collectively called the Common Rule, required that oral testimonies be approved by IRBs in order to protect human subjects of medical and scientific research. But over the last three decades all researchers, including historians have been held to those review requirements. Delays, obstruction, and confusion abounded in oral history projects. As Don Ritchie points out, university IRBs often delayed or even rejected oral history research projects. Some historians simply gave up, declining to face the legal and bureaucratic obstacles (http://blog.oup.com/2015/10/oral-history-federal-regulation/). The result was an environment of confusion that hampered progress in research. In 2003, DHHS’s Office of Human Research Protection (OHRP) began to explore possible modifications to the rules.

More organizations began to seek the need for distinctions and reforms in the guidelines, following the lead of the Oral History Association and other historical groups. The OHA had already developed its own ethical guidelines adapted for historical work. The organization Public Responsibility in Medicine and Research (PRIM&R) has begun to reverse its earlier opposition to reform of the rules. Executive Director Elisa Hurley recently wrote of the desirability of exceptions to the areas of journalism, oral history, biography, and historical scholarship activities (http://blog.primr.org/unpacking-the-nprm-a-new-category-of-exclusions/). Reasons for such revisions, she noted, are great changes in research technologies and methodologies that create great variations and approaches in how oral interviews are conducted, and the emergence of a “participatory” research model, in which private citizens comment on and influence such studies and projects. The reform efforts, she states, help improve and “strengthen” oral history work by “making the level of review more proportional to the seriousness of the harm or danger to be avoided.”

SHFG has signed a letter by the National History Council and other NCH Board member organizations in support of the new proposed ruling. The letter notes the distinctions between oral history, journalism, biography, and historical scholarship activities, on the one side, and scientific work on the other, stating that “the ethical requirement is to provide an accurate and evidence-based portrayal of the individuals involved, and not to protect them from public scrutiny.” These fields, especially history, have their own codes of ethical conduct and incorporate their own sufficient modes of consent, and so should be excluded from the common rule. The letter provides more specific justifications:

- that oral history interview practice is inherently open-ended and not bound by a set of pre-existing interview questions; that in its focus on particular individuals, oral history fell outside of the “generalizable” research targeted by the Common Rule; that requiring the anonymity of subjects was antithetical to oral history, and to the discipline of history more generally; that oral historians already operated under a code of ethics, including the principle of informed consent; and that efforts to force oral history and historical inquiry into a regulatory framework designed for scientific research caused harm, confusion, and undue burden. Therefore, oral history should be excluded altogether from IRB review.

SHFG is keenly aware of the unique value of oral histories for advancing knowledge of federal history. It has featured the innovative oral history work of many federal agencies at its conferences and in The Federalist, and will report on DHHS’s decision when it is released.
Richard W. Stewart Retires

Dr. Richard W. Stewart, acting Director and Chief Historian of the U.S. Army Center of Military History, retired in October 2015. He was honored at a ceremony at Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, DC, on October 29 at which he received the Army’s Decoration for Exceptional Civilian Service. Dr. Stewart received his Ph.D. from Yale University, New Haven, CT, in 1986. His long career includes service as Chief of Histories Division, Center of Military History (CMH); Command Historian at the U.S. Army Special Operations Command, Fort Bragg, North Carolina; Research Historian at the Center for Army Lessons Learned and most recently as Chief Historian of the U.S. Army Center of Military History, Fort McNair, in Washington, DC, since 2006. Dr. Stewart’s 30-year career as a commissioned officer includes deployment as a reserve officer to Operation Desert Storm (Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, 1991), Operations in support of Task Force Ranger during UNOSOM II (Somalia, 1993), DESERT SPRING (Kuwait and Bahrain, 1999), and after 9/11 to Uzbekistan and Afghanistan in support of Task Force Dagger during Operation Enduring Freedom (2002). His historical works include War in the Persian Gulf: Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, August 1990–March (CMH, 2010), The U.S. Army in Somalia (CMH, 2002), Operation Enduring Freedom (CMH, 2004) and Gen. Ed. American Military History, 2 Vols. (CMH, 2009). Military decorations include the Legion of Merit (2002), the Joint Commendation Medal (2002), the Meritorious Service Medal w/oak leaf cluster (1990, 98), the Army Commendation Medal w/oak leaf cluster (1978,93), and campaign ribbons for service in Southwest Asia (1991), the Global War on Terrorism (2004), the Afghanistan Campaign Medal (2005), and NATO Service Medal for Former Yugoslavia (1997). Dr. Stewart’s tenure as Chief Historian will be remembered for his strong support and leadership in the Army history program. He promoted more wide-reaching and efficient hiring practices and top-quality historical scholarship; established the new Career Program 61 for all Army Historians, Archivists, and Museum Professionals; and continually urged that military historians must use their special skills and insights to improve the record and serve as an authoritative basis for future military doctrine and planning.

Retirement ceremony in honor of Dr. Richard W. Stewart (left), at Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, DC, Oct. 29, 2015. Photo by Alfredo Barraza

Making History

Army Historical Foundation


Department of the Interior

Dr. Jerad Bales, U.S. Geological Survey Chief Scientist for Water will speak on “Drought: Impact and Resilience in a Warming World” on February 3. He will speak about current and historical droughts, the potential for droughts in a warming world, and methods for improved resilience. When rainfall levels decrease for extended periods, impacts are seen to the flow of streams and rivers, levels in lakes and reservoirs, and access to well water. Rachel Carson Room, Stewart Lee Udall Department of the Interior Building, 1849 C Street NW, Washington, DC, 20240.

Department of State


Environmental Protection Agency

An EPA history office was established in 1992, but it has since been phased out. The agency does maintain historical information at http://www2.epa.gov/aboutepa/epa-history. The site provides background information, photographs, and a timeline of important events. The photos include those of the 1970s-era Documerica program, “a project that hired freelance photographers to capture images relating to environmental problems, EPA activities, and everyday life. Documerica ultimately collected over 15,000 photos that serve the agency and the public as “a visual baseline for comparing how our environment looked then, with how it looks now and in the future.” Many other topics are addressed through background information, including the Clean Water Act, the Food Quality Protection Act, and the Superfund.

Federal Trade Commission

The FTC makes available a feature titled Centennial Blog Series on its history page. The blogs explore such developments as The Clayton Act; the Hart-Scott-Rodino (HSR) Antitrust Improvements Act, which requires notification of certain mergers; background on debates for reform of public utility holding company laws; the effects of the Cold War on a report on the International Petroleum Cartel; and a look ahead to the FTC in the next century. Visit http://www.ftc.gov/about-ftc/our-history
Library of Congress
The Library will host an exhibition titled “Jacob Riis: ‘Revealing How the Other Half Lives,’” Apr. 14 through Sept. 5, 2016. It will be presented in collaboration with the City Museum of New York, where it is showing from Oct. 14, 2015, through Mar. 20, 2016. The exhibition is based on Riis’s extensive photography and lecture campaign to document poverty, immigration, education, public health, and child labor in New York at the turn of the 20th century. The images appeared in his 1890 book, How the Other Half Lives: The Tenements of New York. Author Bonnie Yochelson has written the companion volume with research based in five archives collections. The Library’s Riis collection contains about 3,000 items, and includes correspondence, drafts and printed copies of articles, outlines of lectures, newspaper clippings, scrapbooks, appointment books, financial records, and family photographs.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NASA’s History Office Program has published Emblems of Exploration: Logos of the NASA and NACA, by Joseph R. Chambers and Mark A. Chambers, No. 56 in the Monographs in Aerospace History series (Wash., DC: 2015). The book has two purposes: to provide “detailed information about the designers and design processes for the emblems,” and second, to “briefly illustrate the applications of these respected and admired insignias and seals within the cultures of each agency.” These seals and insignias were “displayed for decades on aeronautics and space research vehicles and facilities.” The book is available as a free download at http://www.nasa.gov/ebooks

Call for Papers — NASA will hold a symposium on March 16–17, 2017, in conjunction with the University of Alabama Huntsville (UAH) titled “NASA in the ‘Long’ Civil Rights Movement.” The purpose of the symposium is to address the role/relationship of NASA to the “Long” Civil Rights Movement, particularly, but not limited to, the Deep South (Huntsville, Florida, Houston, Mississippi, and New Orleans). The conference welcomes papers addressing the Civil Rights experience across NASA that not only explore the experience of African Americans, but also of women, immigrants, and other politically/legally marginalized groups. The intention is to publish a subset of the papers as an anthology. Send an abstract of no more than 400 words and a short biography to Brian Odom at brian.c.odom@nasa.gov or Dr. Stephen Waring at warings@uh.edu. For more information see https://networks.h-net.org/node/73374/announcements/99690/nasa-long-civil-rights-movement

National Archives and Records Administration
A panel titled “The 13th Amendment at 150: Emancipation, America’s Second Founding, and the Challenges That Remain” was held at the National Archives Building in Washington, DC, on December 7, 2015. It was hosted by Jeffrey Rosen, President and Chief Executive Officer of the National Constitution Center. Discussants included Representative G. K. Butterfield (D-NC), chair of the Congressional Black Caucus; Judge Bernice Donald, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit; Judge James Wynn, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit; Thavolia Glymph, professor of history, Duke University; Richard Brookhiser, author and journalist; and Kate Masur, professor of history, Northwestern University. View the discussion at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=asQ_6igdACM

Lyndon Johnson Library
The Johnson Library is featuring selected sections from eight newly released briefings called the President’s Daily Brief (PDB). The selections from the Kennedy and Johnson administrations provide examples of the kinds of intelligence information and analyses information provided to the president. “Not only did the PDBs include an update on actions inside countries, it also provided analysis, observations, and details of foreign propaganda campaigns.” The documents were recently released by the CIA, and are on its website at http://www.fotia.cia.gov.

National Building Museum
The Museum will host a Section 106 Essentials Course on February 23–24, 2016, suitable for new federal employees or those wanting a refresher. An advanced section is offered for February 25. The courses explain the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, which applies any time a federal, federally assisted, or federally approved activity might affect a property listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Location: 401 F St NW, Washington, DC. Contact: Cindy Bienvenue, email: cbienvenue@achp.gov, tel: 202-517-0202.

National Institutes of Health
The National Institutes of Health hosted a summit on October 19, 2015, to explore how digital technology is being used by government agencies, clinicians, scientists, patients, and the public to communicate information on health and science. Keynote speakers were Susannah Fox, Chief Technology Officer of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; and Richard Besser, M.D., Chief Health and Medical Editor, ABC News. See the agenda at http://www.nih.gov/news-events/nih-digital-summit-2015

The NIH launched its new Image Bank on Flickr. The Flickr collection contains primarily scientific, biomedical, and disease-related imagery, but also photos of NIH leadership, labs, buildings, and major historical events. The site allows NIH to “coordinate distribution while ensuring that proper licenses, permissions, and copyright protections are fully documented and respected.” Visit https://www.flickr.com/photos/nihgov/albums Also, Institute images are posted for public access at https://www.flickr.com/photos/niaid/

National Museum of the American Indian
The NMAI in Washington, DC, is hosting an exhibition titled “Kay WalkingStick: An American Artist” through September 18, 2016. It showcases the work of Kay WalkingStick (b. 1935), a citizen of the Cherokee Nation and one of the world’s most celebrated artists of Native American ancestry. The materials include paintings, drawings, small sculptures, notebooks, and diptychs spanning over four decades of her work. The Museum notes that “her distinctive approach to painting emerged from the cauldron of the New York art world, poised between late modernism and postmodernism of the 1960s and 1970s.” A special

http://
symposium titled “Seizing the Sky: Redefining American Art” on November 5, 2015, reflected on the Kay WalkingStick exhibition and her influence on modern Native American art. Speakers included scholars, artists, and curators Janet Berlo, Jessica Horton, Robert Houle, Elizabeth Hutchinson, Angela Miller, Kate Morris, Jolene Rickard, Lisa Seppi, and Paul Chaat Smith.

Office of the Secretary of Defense


U.S. Army Center of Military History

The Fall 2015 issue of Army History is now available. Articles include:

- “Joint Planning for Global Warfare,” by Mark E. Grotelueschen;
- “Art in the Trenches, The World War I Paintings of Samuel Johnson Woolf (Part 2)”;

The fall issue, as well as the complete collection of back issues, of Army History can be viewed online at: www.history.army.mil/army-history/index.html

The CMH has released three new publications: The Civil War in the Trans-Mississippi Theater, 1861–1865, by Jeffery S. Prushankin; The Civil War on the Atlantic Coast, 1861–1865, by R. Scott Moore; and The Maryland and Fredericksburg Campaigns, 1862–1863, by Perry D. Jamieson and Bradford A. Wineman. They are available from the Government Printing Office.

U.S. Forest Service

The USFS history program sponsored publication of Dr. Stephen Pyne’s book, Between Two Fires: A Contemporary Fire History of America (University of Arizona Press, 2015).

The Angeles National Forest heritage staff, Santa Clarita Valley Historical Society, and California State University, Northridge are collaborating to research and interpret the St. Francis Dam catastrophe in southern California. The dam collapsed on March 12, 1928, just two years after its construction, and killed at least 450 people. Recognized as a significant civil engineering failure, it also marked the professional experience of William Mulholland who previously oversaw construction of the Los Angeles Aqueduct.

A new YouTube video (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2dbHI RLJU2oa&feature=youtu.be) features the Swett Ranch, an early 20th-century homestead in northeast Utah. The National Register property is an interpretive site on the Ashley National Forest.

Heritage staff on the Deschutes and Willamette National Forests helped to develop interpretive materials for the Free Emigrant Road, including a travelling exhibit and brochure (http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdr3843801.pdf) that discuss the route, the planners and travelers, and the road’s significance to Oregon history.

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum

The USHMM will present a workshop titled “New Directions in the Use of Oral Testimonies: Soviet Experiences of the Holocaust” on August 1–12, 2016. This workshop will bring together scholars whose work relies heavily upon oral and written testimonies of perpetrators, bystanders, and victims of the Holocaust on the territory of the former Soviet Union. Participants from North America and the states of the former Soviet Union will discuss research strategies and some of the central issues surrounding the use of testimonies in their work. Participants will also have the opportunity to engage with the many thousands of oral history testimonies available at the Museum, which include those of the USC Shoah Foundation and Yahad-In Unum. The program will culminate in a public presentation by the participants, in which they will discuss current issues and future directions in the use of testimony in research and in the teaching of the topic of the Holocaust in the former Soviet Union. All application materials must be received by February 14, 2016. For applications and information, visit http://www.ushmm.org/research/scholarly-presentationsconferencenews-new-directions-in-the-use-of-oral-testimonies-soviet-experiences-of-the-holocaust

U.S. Marine Corps


The Marine Corps History Division has published the first issue of Marine Corps History in summer 2015. The heavily illustrated journal replaces the program’s previous newsletter, Fortitudine. Dr. Charles P. Niemeyer, Director of the History Division, writes that the new journal “will deliver scholarly military history” that will make “a more direct contribution to Marine Corps University,” and help students, researchers, and the general public. See issues at www.history.usmc.mil

Members Page Now Available

SHFG’s new members’ online login page is at http://shfg.wildapricot.org/

Members can review and renew their membership status, manage their personal profile (including address and email), register for Society events, and view new and past issues of The Federalist and Explorations. Contact shfg.ebulletin@gmail.com for any questions.
Federalist Calendar


Additional listings at http://shfg.org/shfg/category/calendar/