FEDERAL HISTORY OFFICE PUBLICATIONS

Federal history office publications are as diverse as the offices that produce them. In this issue, several reports on those publications and on print programs begin to reveal the varied workings of those offices—how they use their unique data and records, define their standards, and serve their agencies’ missions.

THE FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES SERIES

by Edward C. Keefer

Established in 1861 and published ever since, Foreign Relations of the United States is the oldest official documentary publication of its kind in the world. The series presents the official documentary record of the foreign policy of the United States. Beginning with a single volume for 1861, the Foreign Relations series has grown to well over 400 individual volumes. Today, the series can be found worldwide in research libraries, public policy research institutions, classrooms, private libraries, and on the Internet. Foreign Relations is a premier primary resource for scholars, journalists, and the public. From 1861 to 1923, clerks in the Department of State selected and organized the volumes in the series and released them a few years after the events they documented. In 1924, the Department of State hired university-trained historians to produce the series. The current staff of the Office of the Historian—38 professional historians, of whom 29 are dedicated to producing the Foreign Relations series—are the direct descendents of that first small group of professionals.

Based on principles espoused by Secretary of State Frank Kellogg in 1928, the series successfully documented
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PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE

It is both an honor and a very great privilege to greet you as President, matched only by the pleasure of being part of an organization like SHFG.

I should begin by thanking the officers who served last year and especially those whose terms of service have expired: our President, Suzanne Junod, our outgoing Secretary, Randy Papadopoulos, and our departing Council members, Bill Williams and Sara Leach. My year as Vice President has been both instructive and enjoyable, and I would like to thank them for the experience.

What lies ahead? At the risk of sounding like a high-school class valedictorian, I must say that I believe that the Society faces a time of significant challenge. Although our organization is blessed with a richly diverse, highly talented membership—see the contents of this issue of The Federalist!—the size of our membership has remained static and even declined slightly over the past half-decade. It is not difficult to understand why: a generation of our most active membership is reaching or is past the age of retirement, and their numbers have not been matched by new recruits. A glance at our roster and published guide to federal history programs shows that SHFG represents but a fraction of the professionals engaged in federal history and that its membership is concentrated inside the beltway. If we are to grow and prosper as an organization, we need to reach out to the numerous scholars scattered across the length and breadth of this country who are part of or have interest in federal history programs.

To do this, we should, first, take advantage of our strategic position in the nation’s capital. A thumbnail calculation shows a round score of institutions of higher learning either in the capital area, or within a short drive of it. All of these schools have history programs and several even have archival and public history programs. We need to reach out to the students studying history in our own neighborhood and make them aware of SHFG. We also need to make an effort to reach our colleagues working in the federal government—how many federal history programs in Washington are either unrepresented in SHFG, or represented by one or perhaps two members?

Good efforts to remedy this have already been launched. Virtually as a private initiative, Anne Rothfeld and Brooke Fox have planned a “New Members’ Happy Hour” for the 15th of September, to draw in graduating and graduate students from area schools. Thinking longer-term, next year’s annual meeting will feature a graduate students’ panel as well as panels highlighting the rich and active history programs already represented in SHFG. Our Society was well-represented at the last AHA annual meeting, and we plan repeat performances at the AHA and OAH in 2006. All these efforts are designed to familiarize scholars with the breadth of history programs in the federal government and promote their membership in SHFG. More work is needed, and the Council welcomes your support, as well as any ideas that you, the present membership, may have for bringing in new members.

Second, we need to explore ways to better communicate with our membership, especially those located outside the capital area, not only to make them aware of what is going on in the organization, but to keep them abreast of events important to federal history generally. The obvious means of doing this is the Internet, a medium we certainly have hitherto used very little. An effort to investigate how we might best do this began under my predecessor, Suzanne Junod, and we certainly will bring it to fruition this year.

Finally, we as an organization need to undergo a period of self-appraisal. According to our By-Laws, the Society’s task is to “encourage, promote, and foster historical, archival, and other related activities of and about the United States Government” by “fostering a stronger relationship between those engaged in federal history and the larger professional community” and promoting “better public understanding of the important role that history plays in the work of the federal government.” This is our purpose, but are we really doing all we can to fulfill it? The standards of historical literacy have never been lower. History programs are at risk everywhere. As historians, as federal historians, these matters must be of concern to us. As an organization, we need to give them considerable thought, to examine just what our commitments are, and just how we propose to meet them. This is a task we should set for ourselves over the next year and probably for several years to come.

Donald P. Steury is Senior Historian at the Center for the Study of Intelligence and President of SHFG.
the Peace of 1919, the interwar years, the Second World War, and the early Cold War. In the 1980s the series faced a crisis when it failed to present the whole story in Iran and Guatemala during the mid-1950s because of lack of access to intelligence documents. In 1991, Congress passed and President George H.W. Bush signed a new law that requires the Department of State to continue to publish the *Foreign Relations* series as “a thorough, accurate and reliable documentary record of major United States foreign policy decisions and significant diplomatic activity” that is “comprehensive.” *Foreign Relations* is the only U.S. Government historical publication that is specifically required by law to be published. This statutory requirement and over 140 years of tradition more than justify the publication of a series that produces multiple volumes for sub-series that correspond to presidential administrations.

The Department of State is currently publishing *Foreign Relations* for its most recent sub-series, the Nixon-Ford administrations, 1969–1976. Of the 41 planned printed volumes, and the 15 volumes that the Department will release solely on the Internet, the Office has already published 5 print volumes and 1 Internet-only “E-volume.” It plans to complete production and declassification of virtually all of this 1969–1976 sub-series by the end of 2008, moving the series closer to its statutory goal of publication at 30 years after the events being documented.

Two of the most recent publications in the series, *Foreign Relations, 1969–1976*, Vol. XI, *South Asia Crisis, 1971* (March 2005), and *Foreign Relations, E-Volume 7, South Asia, 1969–1972* (June 2005), provide insight into the strategy of the Office of the Historian and the Department of State in covering the key years of the first Nixon administration, one of the most significant periods in U.S. foreign policy. The first Nixon administration is best known for its opening to China, détente with the Soviet Union, the first Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement, and its travails in Vietnam and Southeast Asia. These topics will be covered in multiple volumes in the series. The events in South Asia leading up to the Indo-Pakistan War of 1971 and the creation of Bangladesh presented the Office with major challenges in documenting U.S. foreign policy when a major regional conflict threatened the Cold War equilibrium.

The crisis and then war that engulfed South Asia was relatively short. *Print Volume XI* covers only March to December 1971, but at its height the crisis fully engaged the Nixon administration, not only because India and Pakistan were fighting a major regional war, but because the United States’ superpower rival, the Soviet Union, was a virtual ally of India, and the United States and China were closely associated with Pakistan. The crisis went to the heart of Nixon’s triangular strategy with Moscow and Beijing and threatened to derail détente with the Soviet Union and the opening to China. The documentation for the crisis was massive. There is extensive written documentation in the Nixon Presidential Materials, and in the files of the Departments of State and Defense at the National Archives, as well as in the Central Intelligence Agency records, and Kissinger Papers at the Library of Congress. Also, there are Nixon presidential tape recordings on the crisis and the war itself. One print volume could not cover U.S. foreign policy towards South Asia for 1969–1972. The solution was to reserve the print volume for the crisis and war and place the rest of U.S. foreign policy towards South Asia, including India and Pakistan during the non-crisis period—as well as Afghanistan and, after December 1971, Bangladesh—in an E-volume to be published on the Internet only. The print volume is linked in its annotation to the E-volume, and both are on the Internet with links. An added advantage of this strategy was that transcripts of Nixon presidential tape recordings that required extensive editing and extracting because of space consideration in the print volume could be printed in full transcript form in the E-volume.

The two volumes allow readers to draw their own conclusions about the relative merits of each format, but some are obvious. The print volume has extensive annotation, the so-called value-added dimension of documentary editing, summarizing all referenced documents and allowing the editors to carry the narrative of the policy process forward through substantive annotation in footnotes and editorial notes. In the electronic-only volume, the annotation is limited, allowing more space for documentation on a broader range of issues. All, or any portion, of the E-volume can be downloaded, and the entire volume is word searchable, negating the need for an index and allowing for a more precise search. An electronic-only publication results in substantial savings in cost and time of production, thus allowing the Office to present documentation on a wider range of issues and topics than would have been possible under the print-only format. The Department of State is nevertheless dedicated to printing the vast majority of Foreign Relations volumes in the traditional ruby buckram book format available for sale at the Government Printing Office (also available at no cost on the Internet). The Department will continue to publish both books and Internet volumes to make the series available to as wide an audience as possible. In that sense, this innovation of electronic-only volumes conforms with the principles of the series begun in 1861 by Lincoln and Seward and continued by subsequent presidents and secretaries of state for over 140 years.

*Edward C. Keefer is General Editor of Foreign Relations of the United States at the Department of State, Washington, DC.*
The transition from a somewhat monastic focus on the official history of the U.S. Army in the Second World War to one charged with providing a kaleidoscope of historical services has defined the evolution of the U.S. Army Center of Military History (CMH), the service’s history office, over the past half century or so. Currently composed of about 100 professionals—mostly civilians—and some 60 contractors, the Center is situated on Fort Lesley J. McNair in Washington, DC. Its five divisions supervise roughly 100 museums (and their associated property); an art collection in excess of 15,000 pieces and growing; a field program that embraces history offices throughout the Army as well as several hundred deployed or deployable uniformed historians; a “platform,” or teaching establishment of about 100 more; a broad staff support effort that connects the Center’s professionals directly to the Army’s leading civilian and military decision makers; and an expansive publications program that includes everything from the traditional narrative histories that gave the office its initial reputation to electronic products of every sort, a wealth of archival and instructional guides, several newsletters, journals, and websites, and a range of graphics products featuring images of the Army’s past. But despite many changes in both organization and direction over the years, it is the published histories that still form the core of the Center’s work through their fidelity to the longstanding values of the historical profession regarding accuracy, objectivity, the rules of evidence, and the concept of personal responsibility.

The Center’s current publication efforts can be divided into several distinct categories. First are the major series, the comprehensive narrative histories of Army campaigns, institutions, or functions (such as logistics or training) that are “official” in scope if not in interpretation. All are based on an exhaustive study of primary sources. Examples currently in production include two theater-level Vietnam War volumes prepared by Graham Cosmas, the third civil disturbance work authored by the late Paul Scheips, and the first Cold War series history by Robert Grathwol and Donita Moorhus, which treats U.S. Army engineers in Europe, 1945–91. A similar effort is the Defense Acquisition History Project, a program preparing definitive volumes on the post-1945 development of major weapons systems for all of the services.

A second category of publications comprises our broad range of monographic studies, generally on contemporary topics and often prepared by historians with firsthand experience regarding the events covered. Many, such as Steve Bourque’s recent history of the VII Corps in the first Gulf War, or Shane Story’s projected study of Operation Iraqi Freedom, may be considered as “place-holders” until the more comprehensive histories can be attempted. Others, like Janet McDonald’s monograph on the reconstruction of Kuwait and Gordon Rudd’s covering the Army’s humanitarian efforts in Northern Iraq, tend to be more definitive and may indeed stand the test of time. Currently being edited is field historian Charles Kirpatrick’s extensive study of the U.S. Army V Corps in Europe, an institution that since 1990 has assembled a broad range of military peacekeeping task forces for the Near East, Africa, and the Balkans with little outside attention. At a similar stage is James McNaughton’s detailed treatment of Japanese American Army linguists in World War II. Again, the variety of such efforts is extremely large, encompassing biographical material based on journals and oral histories; co-imprints with other commands and agencies; and anthologies centered on topics of current interest. This last category includes one on the operational art of military campaigning currently in the final stages of production and another on the results of a two-day acquisition history conference, published in late June. All receive a thorough vetting based on the Center’s longstanding practice of holding actual review panels composed of both academic experts and, whenever possible, participants in the events. The process features a lively meeting thrashing out the strong and weak points of draft manuscripts prior to their final revision, with an outside secretarial-level committee of leading academic historians providing oversight to the entire process.

Briefer educational materials include a lengthy series of historical brochures detailing specific Army cam-
Voices of War: Stories of Service

by Tom Wiener

Created in 2000 by an act of Congress, the Veterans History Project was the idea of Congressman Ron Kind (D-WI). At a family gathering, he listened to his father and uncle tell stories of their wartime service and wondered why he wasn’t recording these reminiscences for his own children and grandchildren to enjoy and learn from in the future. The original impulse of the Project was to record, on audio or video, the experiences of wartime veterans of the major wars of the twentieth century—World Wars I and II, and wars in Korea, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf. The project soon expanded its holdings to include other kinds of records: correspondence, memoirs, diaries, journals, and photographs, as well as records of civilians engaged in war work.

The Library of Congress, through its American Folklife Center, began collecting these records of wartime experiences. From the start, it was agreed that this project would work best if it were volunteer-based and included an education component, involving schools, civic groups, and individuals all across the country. The Veterans History Project (VHP) created partnerships with dozens of organizations and found a generous national founding partner in AARP, which provided much needed start-up funding and a participant base in the Project’s first years of existence.

The collections of the VHP are now available to scholars who visit the Library of Congress and to anyone with access to the Internet at its web site, www.loc.gov/vets.

Numerous researchers are finding their way to this trove of historical accounts. To date, over 35,000 individual collections have been amassed, 1,300 of them fully accessible on the site. Every four months, the Project offers a group of newly digitized collections under a theme, to highlight its holdings. Recent themes have included Prisoners of War, Military Medicine, and VE/VJ Day, the latter marking the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II.

In November 2003, National Geographic Books approached the Project with the idea of creating a book drawn from the collections. In January 2004, I began work on the book, titled Voices of War. The volume would tell the story of the wartime soldier’s experience, with chapters organized around the various phases of that experi-

Jeffrey Clarke is the Chief Historian at the Center of Military History, Fort McNair, Washington, DC.
ence: Answering the Call, A Day in the Life, Under Fire, They Also Serve (wartime veterans who were not in combat), World War II Home Front (recognizing the supporting civilian collections), Coming Home, and Reflections.

Each chapter drew on excerpts from a dozen or more veterans’ collections—stories from interviews, appropriate letters, or photos—to advance the story of the everyday soldier in wartime. All five wars, all branches of the service were represented, as were women and minorities, to provide as full a picture as possible of American veterans in service to their country. Several congressmen who had given interviews to the Project were included, among them Senator Chuck Hagel (R-NE) and former Senator Max Cleland (D-GA), who both served in Vietnam and offered sharply detailed reminiscences. Hagel and Cleland had cosponsored the bill in the Senate that created the Project; for the book, Cleland wrote the Introduction and Hagel provided the Afterword.

Voices of War was published in November 2004, launched with a book party in the Library of Congress’s Great Hall, at which Senators Hagel and John Warner (R-VA) both spoke. Fourteen of the veterans in the book, or their family representatives, attended and were recognized from the podium. National Geographic Books’ reaction to the positive reception the book received prompted them to suggest a second volume drawn from the Project’s collections. Titled Forever a Soldier, it will be published in November 2005. It will feature stories from 40 individual collections, organized around the theme of life-altering experiences in war time.

As the editor of Voices of War and the author of Forever a Soldier, I was helped immeasurably by my colleagues at the Veterans History Project, who steered me toward collections with dramatic stories as well as a wealth of details that provided texture for both books. Our mission is to record the experiences of the everyday soldier, and my challenge in presenting this material was to stay focused on the words of the veterans themselves, to let them tell the stories. As an editor and author, my job was to provide historical context for the events and explain certain military practices or wartime strategies that created the experiences, while letting the veterans’ voices remain the strength of the narrative.

What’s fascinating about working with such a broad canvas of historical materials is finding so many similarities across generations and among wars fought in such varied locations and with dramatically different equipment. No matter whether it’s in the trenches of France or the deserts of Kuwait, whether the soldier is using a bayonet in face-to-face fighting, dropping a bomb from 20,000 feet, or tending to wounded in Vietnam, the basic human emotions are the same: apprehension, anger, fear, resolve, and yes, boredom. And the experiences are remarkably similar, too: basic training is still a culture shock, life in the barracks a confused jumble, and coming home from any war elicits a mix of emotions, from guilt to relief.

The Veterans History Project is an open-ended program; veterans from wars like World War II and Korea may be passing away (and they are our first priority for interviews), but the current conflict in Iraq is creating thousands of new stories that will some day be told and, we hope, preserved in the Library of Congress for future generations to learn from.

Tom Wiener is Historian for the Veterans History Project, American Folklife Center, Library of Congress.

CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship

by Antoinette J. Lee

CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship is a scholarly, peer-reviewed journal published by the National Park Service’s cultural resources programs. Published twice each year, the CRM Journal is distributed free of charge to more than 7,000 subscribers in the United States and abroad. The letters, “C” “R” “M” stand for “cultural resources management,” a term that connotes the management of the historical and archeological resources under the ownership, management, or influence of government agencies. It also addresses historic preservation activities in the public and private sectors. The journal reflects the definition of “cultural resources” in the National Park Service, which extends from historic architecture and cultural landscapes to museum collections, archeological sites, ethnic and cultural heritage, and historic engineering and industrial heritage properties.

The CRM Journal developed from the CRM Bulletin that was published by the National Park Service from 1978 to 2002. It also emerged from the restructuring of cultural resources publications that included the Common Ground quarterly magazine and the monthly Heritage News electronic newsletter. The first issue of the CRM Journal was published in the fall of 2003 and included articles by well-known heritage professionals, including David Lowenthal and Arleen Pabón, and offered articles on the early years of the Historic American Buildings
Survey Program and an interview with a seasoned professional about his career. The first issue of CRM Journal also provided short reports on research-in-progress and reviews of related books, exhibits, and web sites. These features continue today.

The goal of the CRM Journal is to “address the history and development of and trends and emerging issues in cultural resource management in the United States and abroad. Its purpose is to broaden the intellectual foundation of the management of cultural resources.” Much of cultural resources and historic preservation work involves advocacy and program management. However, there is a significant part of the field that comprises research into historic and archaeological places, inquiries into the history of preservation programs, studies of how preservation approaches have evolved over time, and assessments of the philosophical underpinnings of our work. Thus, sections of the CRM Journal address philosophical viewpoints as well as scholarly work.

Other aspects of the CRM Journal are worth mentioning. The cover provides an opportunity for highlighting the extensive collections of historical and contemporary photographs in the National Park Service and other repositories. The topic addressed in the cover relates in some way to the contents included in the issue, but does not replicate visuals in the issue. The letters to the editor include comments on specific articles and sections. In this way, the journal reflects dialogue among authors and readers, much in the same way that such debate occurs in actual cultural resource work.

Many of the CRM Journal authors are historians, archeologists, and others who work for the National Park Service in headquarters, regional, and park-level positions. Authors also include academics in colleges and universities whose research interests involve the documentation, preservation, and interpretation of cultural resources.

The subject matter has covered a wide range of topics, such as World War II heritage resources, authenticity, the interpretation of race and slavery at historic sites, the heritage of the Civil Rights movement in the United States, New Deal-Era historic resources, and the preservation of ranches in the American West.

When developing material for the CRM Journal, I remind potential authors of the periodical’s readership. Readers include those who work for museums of history, science, natural history, maritime history, art, and anthropology as well as professors who teach in a wide range of disciplines related to culture and heritage. Staff members from government agencies, parks, historic sites, housing authorities, historical societies and archives, and cultural resources firms make up important constituencies for the publication.

Reader reception to the change in the CRM Journal has been abundant. Hundreds of letters and e-mail messages testify to the value of the new format and the need for intellectual grounding in the heritage field. National Park Service managers and editorial staff are gratified that the reception has been so positive. It is clear that there is a place for intellectual discourse in the heritage field and that the CRM Journal is one place in which to pursue this.

Interested individuals may subscribe to the CRM Journal by doing so online at www.cr.nps.gov/CRMJournal, e-mail NPS_CRMJournal@nps.gov, fax (202) 371-2242, or by mail CRM Journal, National Park Service, 1849 C Street, NW (2251), Washington, DC 20240-0001. Ideas for prospective articles may be e-mailed to the editor at toni_lee@nps.gov.

Antoinette J. Lee is Acting Assistant Associate Director, Historical Documentation Programs, in the National Park Service.
As most federal historians know, there is barely enough time in the schedule—or money in the budget—to satisfy the basic demands of researching and writing reports for over-burdened government agencies. Even when staff time and funding are potentially available, producing new studies generally takes priority over refining completed projects into professionally published products. More often than not, enormous investments of time, money, and intellectual capital result in high-quality historical manuscripts that are consigned to three-ring binders, plastic wraps, or at best, Government Printing Office editions; read (one hopes) by their limited target audiences and then deposited on drab metal filing shelves alongside reams of similarly inaccessible government reports. The unofficial term for this genre, “grey history,” encapsulates the nebulous fate of the neglected outpourings of federal historians.

Most federal historians would love to see their work published by academic or popular presses, to reach broader audiences and receive greater recognition, but securing the administrative and financial support to transform public history projects into published products is a daunting challenge, especially in these days of shrinking staffs and dwindling resources. Not only must skeptical superiors, tight-fisted budget officers, and equally overtaxed colleagues be convinced of the publishing project’s merits, but copyright and other technical issues must be resolved—a not inconsiderable concern when work has been produced with taxpayer dollars and intended for the public domain. Additionally, potential publishers must be convinced that there is, in fact, a market for the proposed volume. Reducing the publisher’s risk through publication subventions or promises to purchase significant quantities of the final product can be effective bargaining chips, but these incentives further complicate the process. Surmounting these obstacles is generally such a convoluted and time-consuming task that few federal history studies ever transcend their bureaucratic origins and reach a broader public as fully formed popular or scholarly books.

Tracing the developmental history of the SHFG’s 2005 George Pendleton Prize-winning volume *America’s National Park Roads and Parkways: Drawings from the Historic American Engineering Record* provides an example of how a compelling product, a fortunate set of circumstances, and a lot of persistence and hard work triumphed over myriad obstacles to produce an attractive and affordable publication that brought the work of dozens of federal historians to a broad and appreciative audience of scholars, designers, engineers, preservationists, and ordinary citizens.

*America’s National Park Roads and Parkways* highlights the results of one of the most ambitious documentation projects ever undertaken by The Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), the federal government’s primary program for advancing and safeguarding our knowledge of the nation’s engineering history. HAER was created in 1969 as an outgrowth of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), a Depression-era program devoted to documenting America’s historic structures through large-format photography, measured drawings, and historical narratives. HAER’s founding reflected the increasing interest in America’s engineering and industrial heritage, which found expression in the program’s initial focus on documenting bridges, mills, factories, canals, and other examples of the nation’s technological evolution.

In 1988, HAER initiated a multiyear study of roads and bridges in the National Park System. This study was supported by the National Park Service’s Park Roads and Parkways Program with funding provided by the Federal Highway Administration’s Federal Lands Highway Program. By the time the final project was completed in 2002, HAER historians and documentation teams had surveyed dozens of park roads and parkways along with hundreds of individual bridges, producing over 4,000 photographs, 476 drawings, and more than 10,000 pages of written history. While not every park could be documented in detail, the oldest and most prominent park road systems were surveyed along with a number of less celebrated roads and bridges. Several non–Park Service roads...
were also documented using funding from state and local sources. These included New York’s Bronx River and Taconic Parkways, Connecticut’s Merritt Parkway, California’s Arroyo Seco Parkway, and Oregon’s Historic Columbia River Highway.

HABS/HAER documentation has always been archived in the Library of Congress’s Prints and Photographs Division, where it is available to researchers for onsite use, or increasingly, through the Library’s web site. The richness of the park roads collection, together with the importance of the resources and the timeliness of the drawings as pioneering examples of the rapidly growing field of cultural landscape documentation, prompted the program’s leaders to explore the possibility of publishing a representative sample of the work under the auspices of a respected university press. One of the program leaders had a long-standing relationship with the Center for American Places, which under the leadership of George Thompson, has played an important role in bringing quality landscape-related books to publication. With Thompson’s assistance, HAER developed a publication proposal that was accepted by Johns Hopkins University Press (JHUP). JHUP was targeted because the press had a strong track record for publishing books on the history of American technology and landscape development.

While the resulting book is a visually impressive and richly informative volume that has already garnered several national awards, selling the project to the press and even to the broader HABS/HAER staff and NPS management was no easy task. Shepherding the project from inception to publication was also a challenge, due in part to the sheer size and technical complexity of the volume and in part to the shifting sands of government bureaucracies, where budgetary concerns, administrative changes, and staffing assignments created issues and uncertainties that are undoubtedly familiar to many federal historians. Fiscal years and accompanying financial commitments came and went throughout the protracted process; skeptical colleagues had to be convinced of the merits of the book and the propriety of devoting staff resources to “added value” publication rather than new research; new managers needed to be persuaded to support endeavors that predated their tenure; the loss and intra-agency migration of key staffers required flexibility on the part of administrators and employees. The National Park Service’s primary nonprofit partner, the National Park Foundation, was brought in to help resolve copyright and contractual issues and facilitate the transfer of a generous publication subsidy from the Federal Highway Administration. Without the assistance of these two partners, the book project would have foundered on both legal and financial grounds.

Most books encounter considerable editorial and production delays that make authors—and their superiors—wonder when and if the publication will ever appear and whether or not the enterprise was worth the time, effort, and expenditure. In this instance, the production process was complicated by the fact that the book was so large (400 pages and 11 by 17 inches, tipping the scales at over eight pounds) that it had to be specially bound and wrapped in traditional cloth-covered wood boards, which were embellished with attractive pasted-on illustrations. Ensuring that the book’s 331 drawings were scanned in a consistent and high-quality manner was a meticulous task, ably handled by co-editors Todd Croteau and Christopher Marston. Timothy Davis, the book’s other co-editor, provided an introductory essay that summarized the history of park road development and described the documentation project. The JHUP production staff coordinated the design, printing, and binding operations, going all the way to China to find a printer who could accommodate the publication’s unique demands at a reasonable rate. (The book’s cover price of $55 is an astonishingly low sum for a volume of such size and quality, reflecting the Federal Highway Administration’s ample publication subsidy).

By the time the book finally arrived in November 2004, the period from preliminary proposal to published product had stretched for over five years. The acclaim the volume has received seems to have convinced even the most skeptical observers that the endeavor was well worth the time and effort. In addition to sharing the SHFG’s award for the best book produced by a federal history program, America’s Park Roads and Parkways has received an Award of Merit from the National Council on Public History and is under consideration for several other honors. Scholars, educators, park professionals, and members of the general public have provided numerous testimonials to the volume’s value, not just as a repository of information on park road development, but as a source book and inspiration for future documentation projects. While HAER would have fulfilled its programmatic mission by routinely filing the park roads documentation with the Library of Congress, the positive response elicited by America’s Park Roads and Parkways—together with the attention the book has directed to the pressing issue of park road preservation—underscores the value of making the additional effort to transform public history projects into professionally published and publicly accessible products.

Timothy Davis is Lead Historian in the Park Historic Structures and Cultural Landscapes Program, National Park Service.
The number of National Institutes of Health (NIH) scientists still living who conducted research on campus in the 1940s and 1950s is declining rapidly. After realizing that the number of those from the 1940s had fallen from 30 to 3 in ten years, the staff in the Office of NIH History discussed what action to take to capture the scientific history of the 1950s before we lost the individual scientists from that decade. NIH is comprised of multiple institutes, and no one person in the office is expert in the history of them all. We had in residence, however, Dr. Ingrid Farreras, a Stetten Memorial Fellow in the history of biomedical sciences and technology, whose field of interest was the Laboratory of Psychology of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Farreras was willing to undertake the documentation of the joint intramural research program in the 1950s of the NIMH and what was then known as the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness (NINDS). The goal was to document research in the behavioral sciences and neurosciences in the 1950s.

We proposed to the two institutes involved, NIMH and the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke (NINDS), that we hold a conference at which alumni of the 1950s programs would discuss their lines of research. That conference, “NIMH and NINDS Intramural Research in the 1950s,” was held on April 11, 2003. As one might expect, the presentations by the scientists were highly focused on research topics and lacked a broader historical context that would make the papers more generally useful to interested readers. The conference did elicit, however, widespread interest in the history of these research areas, and one outcome was that the Office of NIH History received a large number of donations of photographs and other materials.

The two institutes agreed to support Farreras for another year—this was in addition to her full-time teaching duties at Hood College—both to prepare a broader overview history of the joint program and to serve as editor-in-chief of a project to turn the conference proceedings into a book for publication. Drs. Caroline Hannaway and Victoria Harden from the Office of NIH History also participated as editors for the project.

From her experience as a Stetten Fellow researching the Laboratory of Psychology, Farreras knew that she would be assembling much of the historical information about the program from primary sources alone, as very few secondary studies on these fields had been done by other scholars. In order to reconstruct personnel lists of the NIMH and NINDS laboratories and branches, she had to examine old NIH telephone books and other such sources. She went to the annual reports of the institutes from the period to digest and analyze the major basic and clinical lines of research, not only in her own field of expertise, the behavioral sciences, but also in neurological research. Fortunately, NIMH and NINDS scientists were most generous in assisting her understanding of the highly technical medical and scientific materials in the neurosciences.

The book project was completed in an arduous one-year time frame. Farreras prepared overview chapters tracing the institutional history of the institutes and their clinical and basic research programs, which Hannaway edited. Hannaway and Harden worked on editing the papers submitted by the scientists and organizing more than 70 photographs that accompanied the text. NIH’s Medical Arts and Printing division designed the book’s layout and set type. In December 2004, IOS Press, a European scientific publisher, printed and marketed the book, which was titled, Mind, Brain, Body, and Behavior: Foundations of Neuroscience and Behavioral Research at the National Institutes of Health.

All through the bookmaking process, we were conscious of the fragility of many of our human historical sources. Indeed, one of the conference speakers died before the book was published, but not before his article was prepared and he had donated and assisted us in cataloging a large number of photographs from his research.

What we produced was a book that captures a broad overview of the research in two NIH institutes in the 1950s. Its detailed notes on sources and multiple appendices should ease the way for scholars who want to focus on more specific aspects of this complex biomedical research field. One of the goals of the Office of NIH History is to encourage historians from academia to pursue studies of NIH-supported research, and the production of this book should help historians of mental health and the neurosciences to identify themes and research materials that will result in a greater understanding of what the federal government did to advance knowledge of these areas in the 1950s.

Victoria A. Harden is Director, and Caroline Hannaway is Historian and Editor, in the Office of NIH History, at the National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD.
A CLOSE RELATIONSHIP: THE MODERN CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

by Walter B. Hill, Jr.

In the fall of 2005, the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) will release a reference information paper entitled Federal Records Relating to Civil Rights in the Post–World War II Era. The guide will highlight federal records that document the long-term relationship between many government programs and initiatives and the modern Civil Rights movement, ca. 1945–1970. It will be the first federal reference guide on Civil Rights history. The guide will consist of four parts and four appendixes: Introduction; Records of the Executive Branch; Records of the Office of Presidential Libraries; Records of the Office of Regional Archives Services; Appendix A, Congressional Index System on Civil Rights; Appendix B, Dept. of Justice Microfilm Collection on Civil Rights; Appendix C, Select List of Publications of the U.S. Government, RG 297; and Appendix D, Electronic Records Relative to Civil Rights.

The Civil Rights movement restructured race relations and racial policies in the United States. It influenced and impacted the course of federal efforts to promote nondiscrimination. The movement emerged as the most dynamic force for social change in 20th-century American society, moving public social policy from acceptance of an “Apartheid-like” society to one that began to embody the ideals of the Declaration of Independence. While there has been exceptional scholarship, remarkably, scholars, journalists, students, and historians continue to overlook the centrality of the federal government. Federal records deposited in NARA document extensively the social and political history of post–World War II American society, particularly the intricate and evolving interrelationship between government and the Civil Rights movement.

In the last quarter of the 20th century, historians offered numerous ideological and theoretical interpretations and frameworks to explore individual aspects of the movement. The complexities of that social movement required writers to use a variety of sources to write Civil Rights history narratives. Although there was a complex and multi-leveled interrelationship between the movement and federal policies and activities, federal records remain perhaps the least used source for interpreting, analyzing, and writing the history of the Civil Rights movement, or any aspects of this multifaceted social construction.

This historiographical gap led us to devise an agency-wide plan to identify the records associated with the critical aspects and events of the Civil Rights movement. We assembled a project team of four senior archivists and four archives technicians to execute the work plan for the guide. While the Civil Rights movement had a regional face and a directed target of “Jim Crow Laws,” the federal government made a nationwide effort to improve upon Civil Rights issues within its bureaucracy and to work with the leadership and communities intensely involved in the Civil Rights movement. The team had to identify those agencies, commissions, and offices that established policy and regulation. This meant examining the activities of all branches of government and their records that were deposited in the record repositories of NARA: 13 regional archives; 12 Presidential libraries; and the 2 NARA facilities in the Washington, DC, area. The project worked closely with the staffs of the regional archives (NR), 7 of the Presidential Libraries, and the Center for Legislative Archives. All contributed to the team effort to produce this guide.

The records of Executive Branch agencies reveal the internal dynamic of Civil Rights reform as many agencies

Attorneys George E. C. Hayes, Thurgood Marshall, and James M. Nabrit (left to right) celebrate the historic May 17, 1954, Brown v. Board of Education decision.
undertook reform of their policies in regards to race and race relations. Nondiscriminatory policies were being put into practice within the federal bureaucracy by the late 1950s and early 1960s. In addition, through federal legislation, agencies were given responsibilities to reform governmental policies that pertained to the larger society. Twenty-two federal agencies and three commissions were identified with Civil Rights reforms spanning 27 record groups. In particular, because of its documentation of fiscal responsibilities, the Records of the Office of Management and Budget, Record Group 51, illustrate the government’s reorganization of Civil Rights policies under President Jimmy Carter, revealing the extensive input of all federal agencies with Civil Rights functions.

Presidential administrations determined the direction that the government and nation would follow. They were fundamental to the modern Civil Rights movement. Beginning with the Harry S. Truman Library and concluding with the Jimmy Carter Library, archival teams in those institutions assisted the project team with valuable information of the Civil Rights activities of these Presidents. The records reveal the views and beliefs of the Presidents, their policy intent, and the people who carried them out. The staff of Presidential libraries identified collections that were germane to the movement. In some instances, they had to be very selective because of the volume of records. The Lyndon B. Johnson Administration had extensive involvement with the movement, and Johnson led the effort of getting Congress to act upon Civil Rights legislation. There were over a million individual documents to select from, but we could only include a few series in the guide. The collections of the Libraries demonstrate how these administrations worked with external forces in striving for greater civil rights for all Americans.

The federal government is truly a national government and the records of the regional archives demonstrated this broad scope and emphasis on civil rights. While the Civil Rights movement focused on the American South, these records reveal that Civil Rights activities occurred throughout the nation. The staff of the regional archives selected judicial and executive branch records that highlight these activities. The records are important for understanding the national scope of the movement, and the National Archives believes that this guide will stimulate and broaden future scholarship on the complex interrelations between the Civil Rights movement and government.

Walter B. Hill, Jr., is a Senior Archivist and Subject Specialist with the Office of Records Services at the National Archives at College Park, MD.

**Oral History and the First Black Midshipman**

*by Robert Schneller*

*Breaking the Color Barrier: The U.S. Naval Academy’s First Black Midshipmen and the Struggle for Racial Equality* (New York University Press, 2005) describes the experiences of Wesley Brown—the Academy’s first African American graduate—as well as the travails of his black predecessors. Although firmly grounded in documentary sources, the heart of the story comes from oral history. My definition of oral history includes answers to questionnaires and personal correspondence as well as interviews. All are products of human memory.

Brown’s experience is the part of the story to which oral history makes the greatest contribution. Brown graciously allowed me to interview him extensively, sitting in front of a tape recorder for more than 20 hours over five sessions. Many of Brown’s classmates also shared their recollections. Because midshipmen were most vulnerable to hazing during their “plebe” or freshman year, I attempted to contact every surviving former midshipman who was in Brown’s battalion during his first year (1945–46). I sent a list of questions to more than 300 former midshipmen, inviting the recipients to reply “in a letter . . . by e-mail, by fax, or on an audio cassette tape, over the telephone, or by any other format you find convenient.” I received replies from about a third of them and managed to tape some 40 interviews. In many cases, I sent follow-on questions and received replies to those as well. The highest proportion of respondents consisted of Wesley Brown’s classmates, particularly those in his company.

The story that emerged from this material is fascinating. Brown, the sixth African American to enter the Academy, matriculated in June 1945. While the vast majority of midshipmen were indifferent to his presence, a handful of racist upperclassmen tried to railroad him out of the Academy by filing false conduct reports in the hope that he would accumulate enough demerits to ensure his expulsion.

During the 1940s, each plebe had a mentor in the senior class who helped him get through the year by offering advice, and intervening if the plebe was having problems with other upperclassmen. This system functioned informally and on a voluntary basis. Two seniors became Brown’s first classmen, Howard Allen Weiss and Joseph Patrick Flanagan, Jr. Both assumed Brown would run into trouble because of prejudice
and wanted to help. Flanagan had another reason. The commandant of midshipmen asked Flanagan, the highest-ranking midshipman at the Academy, to monitor Brown's progress, with a view towards signaling the midshipmen that the leadership wanted Brown to receive fair treatment. Flanagan became Brown's first classman, in part, to carry out the commandant's wishes. Interviews with Weiss and Flanagan provided many of the details about the demerit campaign against Brown. Correspondence generated by my questionnaire campaign corroborates the broad pattern of their recollections.

One particularly useful letter came from Jimmy Carter, who, like Weiss and Flanagan, was a senior when Brown was a plebe. Carter noted: "There were a few upperclassmen who tried to give Midshipman Brown undeserved demerits." Carter played an interesting role in Brown's drama. Walter G. Moyle, Jr., a classmate of Carter, recalled that the perpetrators of the demerit campaign were largely southerners. Moyle recalled that Carter "came under a fair amount of heat because he joined up with the north-Midwestern contingent who made it a point to take Brown under their wing. . . . At first, [Carter] was treated as if he was a traitor, because here he was from a small rural town in Georgia, and he was lined up with the others who were looking out for [Brown]."

Brown remembered Carter as being friendly and supportive. He recalled a particular incident: "One time when I was talking with Carter, . . . he kind of put his arm around me and . . . said something encouraging. I've forgotten just what the situation was. I think I'd gone around to somebody's room and I'd done some pushups. . . . Carter said something [encouraging], and he went on one way, and I went on another. And . . . I heard this guy yell out, 'God damn nigger lover.'"

Most of the people who responded to my queries considered themselves supporters of Brown. Although some have admitted to deliberately ignoring him, none have admitted to trying to railroad him. Some of the replies were not cordial. One respondent accused me of being on a "witch hunt." Another said sarcastically, "I am sure also that you, being an historian, will continue to produce publications on the first Chinese-American, the first Irish-American, the first Japanese-American, the first Italo-American, the first Hispanic-American and the first Native American to graduate." It is possible that these letters came from individuals who tried to railroad Brown. Even friendly responses highlight another obstacle to anyone tackling military-social history subjects. The obstacle is embodied in the credo, "never bilge a shipmate." In Navy culture, officers are expected not to divulge negative information on brother officers to outsiders. Hence, many respondents discussed classmates' actions in general terms, but as a rule, did not name names. Although I didn't particularly care to name names, I did want to obtain general information on the kind of people who took action against Brown for racist reasons. Howard Weiss said they were all southerners, while Joe Flanagan said that they were mostly northerners.

These observations highlight another difficulty with oral history—differences in perception. A key aspect of the story that varies from one memory to the next is exactly how the demerit campaign against Brown ended. According to one version, the leadership stopped it by subtle means. Eugene Barham, one of Brown's battalion officers, recalled: "For instance if [Mr. Brown] was reported for room in gross disorder, I would have the reporting midshipman accompany me and we would together inspect both Mr. Brown's room as well as that of the reporting midshipman." Barham always found Brown's room "in a superior condition." In such cases Barham discarded the report. Barham believed the word spread "through the grapevine" that the leadership would tolerate no more spurious or frivolous conduct reports on Brown.

Other versions of the story have it that the leadership stopped the campaign against Brown in a big, dramatic way. Several class of '47 alumni recall that sometime during the fall semester, the commandant of midshipmen convened a special meeting of the seniors. The commandant said that congressmen interested in seeing Brown treated fairly were monitoring the situation closely. If anyone did anything illegal or improper to Brown, the commandant warned, there would be serious repercussions. He advised the seniors not to put Brown on report, unless it was for a legitimate, clear-cut infraction. Other recollections fall in between these two extremes.

A document in Brown's midshipman personnel jacket indicates that he received 103 demerits during his first semester and 5 during his second, totaling 108 for plebe year. The numbers corroborate assertions in the oral histories that there was indeed a demerit campaign against Brown, and that the Academy's leadership stopped it cold. Memory sources also indicate that Brown weathered the storm of demerits with help from fellow plebes, upperclassmen, the Naval Academy leadership, Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, and Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. (D-NY).

Oral history provides details not included in official records. Wesley Brown's official service record bears no indication that certain upperclassmen sought to ensure his failure, or that other upperclassmen, as well as the Academy's leadership, sought to prevent such efforts from succeeding. Without oral history, the full story of the U.S. Naval Academy's first African American graduate would never be known.

Robert Schneller is a historian in the Contemporary History Branch of the Naval Historical Center.
Federal Historians in a Contract Setting:
The HAI Approach

by Kenneth Durr

For 25 years History Associates Incorporated (HAI) has worked in partnership with the historical offices of the federal government. That partnership has changed the way many historians outside the academy work, and expanded the use of federal history for government policymakers. Here is how the “HAI Approach” has altered the broader context of federal history.

It started in the spring of 1979 when Department of Energy (DOE) officials called in agency historians to document the crisis at Three Mile Island. Richard Hewlett and Jack Holl, busy with their own agency history, called in contract help: Philip L. Cantelon and Robert C. Williams. From that beginning the company was founded.

Before then, many federal histories were written on a large scale. The history of the Atomic Energy Commission, pioneered by Hewlett, was the hallmark of superb professional agency history that took the “big book” approach. HAI pioneered a new approach, dictated of course by the contract setting but also by the new reality that federal historians were becoming too occupied keeping programs going and responding to inquiries to jump into extended research and writing projects. Histories, after all, are perfect contracting opportunities—non-recurring projects in which a successful author works himself or herself out of a job. HAI historians are usually happy to work themselves out of a job since, instead of unemployment, they face a new story to discover and recount.

The charge could be made that a historian who goes from one commissioned project to another can hardly develop the specialized expertise considered necessary to the practice of good history. Cantelon and Williams had little more than laymen’s knowledge of nuclear energy when they took the call from DOE, but they learned. Happily, our historical practice more closely resembles that of the expert teacher who shares the excitement of learning. This approach also has the benefit of not carrying old baggage to new analyses.

Similarly, we have found distinct advantages in being outsiders rather than members of the court. Like Cantelon and Williams were, HAI is well positioned to provide federal agencies with outside perspective. Internal pressures do sometimes threaten the quality of work overseen by federal history offices, but more often the appearance of objectivity is as important as the reality itself. For those wishing to transcend court history, HAI and other contractors can serve as the historian with “no axe to grind.” Internal pressures may remain, but our best federal clients know how to count-er them by providing the access and consultation contractors need to do good work and then vouch for the results.

Another key to the HAI approach is the incorporation of an archival function into history projects. Indeed, a factor that led DOE to turn to historians in the first place was the understanding that historians were suited for collecting, organizing, and interpreting voluminous materials. In years since, HAI has conducted joint archival and history projects for a number of clients, among them the National Library of Medicine (NLM) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Historian’s Office.

Work being done for those two program offices has been particularly exciting since it provides a chance to work in mediums beyond the historical monograph, particularly in creating content for both physical and web exhibits. Those programs also vividly demonstrate how closely HAI has been able to work with federal clients, even to the point of sharing staff. Sarah Leavitt’s involvement with NIH began as an HAI contractor and the creation of the “Deciphering the Genetic Code” web exhibit. Walter Hickel began working on the “Profiles in Science” project as an NLM contractor before moving over to HAI.

Although the back and forth is usually more intellectual than physical, it is no less critical to a successful contracting relationship. Because we are committed to supporting rather than supplanting government historians, our best clients are usually the strongest federal history offices. The best measure of the “HAI Approach,” after all, is how well it works for our clients.

Kenneth Durr is Senior Historian and Director of the History Division at History Associates Incorporated, Rockville, MD.

SHFG News

New Society officers elected for the coming year are Donald P. Steury, Center for the Study of Intelligence, as President; John W. Roberts, National Park Service, as Vice President; Anne Rothfeld, National Library of Medicine, as Secretary; and Kristin Ahlberg, Department of State, and Lee Ann Potter, National Archives and Records Administration, to two-year terms on the Executive Council.

The Hewlett Lecture and dinner is on October 19. Visit www.shfg.org for details and registration.
AMERICAN RED CROSS
The American Red Cross closed its Visitors Center near the Corcoran Gallery recently, and disbanded its Historical Resources Division, eliminating the positions held by the executive director, Steven E. Shulman, and historian Brien R. Williams. A historical component will continue to reside on the American Red Cross web site, www.redcross.org.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

NASA

NATIONAL ARCHIVES
NARA celebrated its 20th year of “Archives Independence” on May 20, 2005. The events included the naming of the new research center in honor of former Archivist Robert M. Warner, who led the struggle for agency independence in 1984.


On Sept. 22, Preservation Programs will host the 19th Annual Preservation Conference in the William G. McGowan Theater at the National Archives Building in Washington, DC. Its theme is “Parchment and Titanium: Preserving the Charters of Freedom.” The conference will focus on the multiyear, state-of-the-art project undertaken by NARA to preserve and re-encase the Charters of Freedom. It addresses issues of interest to archivists, historians, conservators, librarians, museum curators, exhibit designers, and preservation specialists.

The Franklin D. Roosevelt Library will host a conference on Sept. 22–25 titled “In the Shadow of FDR: How Franklin Roosevelt Shaped the Post-War World.” Leading scholars from both sides of the Atlantic will participate. Sessions will include Reckoning with Roosevelt, 1944–55; Mental Maps; The Institutions of American Military Power; Moral Leadership in Wartime; Visions of World Order; Empires and After; The China Question; Management of the World Economy; and The Roosevelt Legacy: A Summing Up. To register, phone 845-486-1150 or visit www.feri.org.

The Freedmen’s Bureau Preservation Project has published the microfilm series Records of the Field Offices for the State of North Carolina, 1865–1872 (M1909, 78 rolls).

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION
In December 2004, the History Program of the National Cemetery Administration finalized the first comprehensive inventory of the memorials/monuments located in its 120 national cemeteries and 33 soldiers’ lots. The overall survey used hundreds of volunteers and took 2½ years to complete. The final tally is 878 memorials installed between 1833 and 2005 at 129 cemeteries. A searchable database will be available on the Internet.

NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY
The Museum featured an exhibit through September 5 titled “Separate Is Not Equal: Brown v. Board of Education.” The exhibition features the dining room table from the home of Lucinda Todd, secretary of the NAACP in Topeka, Kan., where the Brown case was first discussed, and a classroom from a segregated school; videos of the announcement of the public’s reaction to the Court’s decision; photos depicting segregated life in the 1920s and 1930s; and materials from the subsequent Civil Rights movement including the Woolworth’s lunch counter that was the site of a 1960 sit-in protest and materials from the 1963 March on Washington.

The exhibit “Whatever Happened to Polio?” opened on April 12. It commemorates the 50th anniversary of the invention of the polio vaccine. The exhibit tells the story of polio, primarily from the perspective of the patient; the vaccine development that ended polio in the U.S.; and the story of sur-
The exhibition also explores the changes in American medicine in the 20th century and the impact a disease can have on society as a whole. The show draws upon the themes of community activism, human resilience, the development and use of medical technologies and medical science and competition and rivalry in science.

**National Park Service**

Chief Historian Dwight Pitcaithley retired in June, concluding a 29-year career with the National Park Service. Before being named Chief Historian in 1995, Pitcaithley served in the Southwest, North Atlantic, and National Capital Regions of the National Park Service. Pitcaithley is a past president of the George Wright Society, recipient of the 2005 Distinguished Service Award of the Organization of American Historians, and a prolific writer and public speaker on American history. A former adjunct professor at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia, he earned his Bachelors and Masters degrees in history from Eastern New Mexico University and his Ph.D. from Texas Tech University, and he will be joining the faculty at New Mexico State University in Las Cruces.

The Park History Program and Harpers Ferry Center have updated and reprinted *The National Parks: Shaping the System*. Written by former Bureau Historian Barry Mackintosh, the 2005 (fourth) edition has been updated and edited by current Bureau Historian Janet McDonnell. The volume traces the development of the National Park system from the 1832 legislation setting aside Hot Springs Reservation in Arkansas, through the landmark 1872 legislation creating Yellowstone National Park, the addition of national battlefield parks during the 1890s, the national monuments following the Antiquities Act of 1906, to parks created by the last Congress. For further information, check www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/mackintosh1.

Secretary of the Interior Gale A. Norton announced the designation of 24 new National Historic Landmarks on April 6. The National Park System Advisory Board recommended the sites to the Secretary in recognition of their national significance in American history and culture. The newly designated landmarks range from Meadowcroft Rockshelter, a Paleo-Indian rock shelter used by Native American peoples 18,000 years ago, to the Auburn Cord Duesenberg Automobile Facility, where cars were hand-assembled rather than mass-produced. Four sites connected with African-American history were also designated: Bethel Baptist Church (associated with one of the first organized groups of the modern civil rights movement); Howard High School (aligned with the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* school desegregation case); Foster Auditorium (associated with the desegregation of public higher education); and the Mount Pleasant Historic District (important for the role it played in the antislavery movement and the Underground Railroad). For more information, check www.cr.nps.gov/nhl/.

**Senate Historical Office**

C-SPAN’s Brian Lamb conducted an hour-long interview with Senate Historian Dick Baker on the June 12 “Q & A” program. The program, which includes cameo appearances by the Senate Historical Office’s six other historians, can be seen by going to the Q & A section of the C-SPAN web site at http://www.q_and_a.org/.