ST. LOUIS MEETING

Nearly two thousand people registered for the meeting of the Organization in St. Louis from April 7-10. The program, developed by a committee chaired by Alden T. Vaughan and including Henry N. Drewry, Paul S. Holbo, Stanley I. Kutler, Pauline R. Maier, Burt Noggle, and R. Jackson Wilson, gave special attention to the American Revolution and its legacy. A Publicity Committee chaired by James D. Norris, composed also of Walter Ehrlich, George E. Glass, Nedra Branz, Sister Elizabeth Kolmer, Glen E. Holt and Robert Martin, and assisted and advised by a specialist in public relations, worked strenuously before and during the meeting to bring it to the attention of people outside the Organization, preparing and mailing information to professional journals, newsletters, various organizations, department chairpersons in colleges, junior colleges, and universities in the St. Louis area, local historical societies, and local high schools and contacting the news media. The results included over twenty radio and television spots and dozens of news stories. People in the area, as a consequence, seemed aware of the meeting and aware of what historians were doing in it.

One member of the Publicity Committee, Professor Ehrlich, developed a new program consisting of visitations by OAH members to secondary schools. According to Ehrlich's report, the following scholars participated: B. P. Balal, Roger Daniels, Carl N. Degler, Leonard Dinnerstein, Thomas Ferris, John Hope Franklin, Stanley I. Kutler, Henry B. Leonhard, Richard Lowitt, Jackson Turner Main, Edward Pessen, Ben Proctor, G. L. Seligmann, Jr., and Robert W. Sellen. The schools involved in the program were: John Burroughs, Clayton, Ladue, Maplewood-Richmond Heights, McCluer North, Parkway West, Pattonville, Ritenour, St. Charles, Southwest, University City, and Webster Groves. Participants described their experiences in glowing terms, and the program seemed so successful that we plan to repeat the experiment in Atlanta.

THE OUTCOME OF THE ELECTION

In the March election the following members were elected to offices: President: Richard W. Leopold, Northwestern University; President-Elect: Kenneth M. Stampp, University of Virginia; Stanley N. Katz, University of Chicago; Robert H. Wiebe, Northwestern University; Nominating Board: Jesse Lemisch, State University of New York, Buffalo; Linda K. Kerber, University of Iowa; Leon F. Litwack, University of California, Berkeley.

This was the first time that a contest was held for the office of president-elect, and the change in procedure did, as expected, increase participation. In 1975, 1280 members voted for the vice-president; this past year, 1847 members voted in the contest for president-elect. In other words, there was an increase in turnout of nearly 45 percent. Fifteen and one-half percent of the members participated in 1975; the percentage jumped to 22 this year.

THE SLATE FOR 1977

President: Kenneth M. Stampp, University of California, Berkeley
President-Elect: Eugene Genovese, University of Rochester
Oscar Handlin, Harvard University
Executive Board: Andrea Hinding, University of Minnesota
Mary Lynn McCree, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Keith Ian Polakoff, California State University, Long Beach
John Anthony Scott, School of Law, Rutgers University
David Brody, University of California, Davis
Paul Goodman, University of California, Davis
Nominating Board: Barbara Rosenkrantz, Harvard University
Kathryn Kish Sklar, University of California, Los Angeles
John P. Diggins, University of California, Irving
Eric Foner, The City University of New York
One hundred members of the Organization may present a petition for an additional candidate for any office open for election, such petition to be presented to the Executive Secretary by October 15. The names of persons so nominated shall be placed on the official ballot, being identified as "candidates by petition."

THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

The Executive Board met for a full day on April 7th. Members received a favorable report from the outgoing treasurer, William Aeschbacher, on the financial condition of the Organization and an equally encouraging report on the Journal of American History. The Board was also pleased to learn that membership had remained stable. The Board discussed policies of the Organization relative to the issues such as those raised in the Yale-Aptheker controversy, gave considerable attention to two proposals designed to tackle the problems highlighted by the report on the status of history, recommended that one go forward and that the other be revised, and encouraged the Committee on the Status of Women in the Historical Profession to proceed with plans to study the job-interviewing process at our annual meetings. Other subjects discussed were the rules governing the Frederick Jackson Turner and the Merle Curti awards, the work of the Committee on the Status of History in the Schools, the desirability of establishing a committee on historians and the media, the composition of our committees, and the closely related work of the National Study Commission on the Records and Documents of Federal Officials, the Joint Committee of the OAH, the American Historical Association, and the Society of American Archivists on Historians and Archives, and the National Archives Advisory Council. Also considered were the inadequate funding of the new records program of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the preparation of an expanded pamphlet on non-teaching opportunities for historians, the efforts of the Organization on behalf of historic preservation, our newspaper project, the site of the annual meeting in 1981, the campaign on behalf of the Madison Building, the work of several of our committees, and access to the manuscript census.

THE TURNER AWARD

The competition for the Frederick Jackson Turner Award has been resumed, and the first award under the new rules will be made at next year’s annual meeting. Only manuscripts accepted for publication by university presses will be eligible for the competition. Each press can enter one manuscript and only one each year. Other rules and terms of the competition are as follows:
1) The manuscript must deal with some significant phase of United States history;
2) The manuscript must be the work of an author who has not previously published a book-length study of history;
3) If the author has the Ph.D., it must have been received no earlier than seven years before the manuscript was submitted for publication;
4) Copies of the manuscript must be sent by the press to each of the three judges.

THE MERLE CURTI AWARD

Final decisions on the Merle Curti Award were made at the Executive Board meeting and discussed at the Business Meeting. Competition is now underway. The award will be given to the author of a book in American intellectual history and will consist of $500 plus a medal and a certificate. Two committees will look after competition. One will nominate the books, and the other will make the final decision. The award will be made every other year with the first one awarded at the annual meeting.

THE MEEROPOL CASE AND ACCESS TO PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

The Executive Board and the Business Meeting endorsed the following resolution:
WHEREAS full access to public documents is essential to the study of the past and whereas the OAH has consistently
supported such access as essential to its professional obligation and to the democratic political process, and whereas the Freedom of Information Act gives historians and other citizens access to such information, and whereas a legal suit filed by Michael and Robert Meeropol seeks the release of the full governmental record in the Rosenberg and Sobell cases, Be It Resolved That
1) The OAH reaffirms its continuing support for full access to all public documents essential to historical study and to the functioning of the democratic political process; 2) approval in principle of the issue raised in the legal suit filed by Michael and Robert Meeropol under the FOIA follows from this commitment, and 3) in all instances, the OAH supports the principle that public documents be released without deletions of any kind.

RESOLUTIONS ON THE EMPLOYMENT CRISIS

The Business Meeting endorsed two resolutions on the employment crisis, and thus members are called upon to vote on these resolutions in the enclosed ballot and to mail it by September 30th. The resolutions were brought to the Business Meeting by the recently formed Employment Crisis Committee. The committee suggested that the profession faces an employment crisis of unprecedented dimension and that this crisis affects “historians with first-class credentials from universities of national and international repute and in not a few cases with lengthy and distinguished publication records.” The committee was formed to work with the OAH and the AHA in hopes of enabling presently under-employed and unemployed historians to continue utilizing the results of their historical training and research in both academic and non-academic positions. The OAH has made a small financial contribution to assist with the work of the committee.

THE YALE-APTHEKER RESOLUTION

Our constitution provides that “Resolutions may... be proposed...by a petition of 100 members submitted at the business meeting.” (Article VIII, Section 2) Such a petition on the Yale-Aptehker issue was submitted and read at the Business Meeting in St. Louis and, in accord with our constitution, was not debated or voted on there. The debate is carried on in these pages with the History Department of Yale University responding to a statement prepared by Jesse Lemisch and others, and members are asked to vote on the matter in the ballot enclosed and return it no later than September 30. (All ballots postmarked on or before that date will be counted. Thus, members who do not receive their mail during the summer will have an opportunity to vote.)

The resolution calls for an investigation by our “Committee for the Defense of Historians.” Actually, we do not have a committee with that precise name. At the 1970 Business Meeting, members debated a resolution calling for the establishment of an elected and broadly representative OAH “committee to review cases where the academic freedom of teachers and students of history may have been infringed.” But members endorsed by a vote of 179-109 a substitute motion instructing the Executive Secretary to present to the next meeting of the executive officers of organizations affiliated with ACLS a strong presentation of OAH concern for the defense of academic freedom and to devise means for implementing this concern through the AAUP.

There was, however, another committee in existence at that time—the OAH-AHA Joint Committee on the Defense of the Rights of Historians Under the First Amendment. According to our Bylaws, “The Committee acts to protect the rights of historians.” It had been established in the Spring of 1966 in response to a lawsuit begun in January 1965 by a daughter of Henry Clay Frick against Sylvester K. Stevens. Miss Frick charged that his history of Pennsylvania contained several pages that were “entirely false, scandalous, malicious and defamatory” of her father and herself and asked the court to prohibit Stevens from selling and distributing his book. The committee provided funds for the defense obtained from historians and others. Substantial press support for Stevens suggested to one participant that “historians and their possible critics should never again doubt the possibility of general support for anyone attacked for acting as historian.”

The committee became a permanent committee in 1967 after Stevens was successful in a county court and Miss Frick dropped her appeal before the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. Originally, the committee had been a very large group composed of the presidents of the two organizations and the five immediate past presidents and two other members of each. As a permanent committee, it was composed only of the presidents, the executive officers and two other members of the organizations.

The permanent committee, however, has not dealt with any cases. Although the Frick vs. Stevens experience had seemed likely to encourage historians threatened as Stevens had been to believe their colleagues would come to their aid and although the experience seemed to provide a basis for prompt action, the committee has not been called upon to perform the “watchdog” function that was envisioned for it. Yet, it seemed capable to at least one of its members “of swinging into action at need.” Thus, it occurred to me when I first heard of the Aptheker case that it might be a subject for investigation by the joint committee. It still has a small sum left over from the Frick-Stevens case that would enable it to pay initial lawyers’ fees and the cost of a mail campaign for contributions “when,” in Paul Ward’s words of two years ago, “next we have a real challenge in the courts.”

If the resolution is endorsed, this joint committee will be called upon to make an investigation. The AHA could agree to participate, or could reply that it is handling the case in accord with procedures of its own developed since the establishment of the joint committee. In 1974, the AHA adopted as “official AHA policy” a report of its Ad Hoc Committee on the Rights of Historians, established as a result of a 1970 resolution. The committee reported that there was “cause for concern about the state of academic
freedom in the profession” and recommended that the Association should “increase its activities in support of academic freedom” and adopt “a statement of standards designed to supplement and complement those of the AAUP.” Implementation is the responsibility of the Executive Director, the Professional Division and the Council, and the Executive Director has, in response to an appeal by Herbert Aptheker, made preliminary inquiries to determine whether the AHA should investigate the case. Adoption of the present resolution would lead, therefore, either to joint investigation or investigation by the OAH.

Richard S. Kirkendall

A Statement in Support of the Resolution

Yale’s undergraduate residential colleges may initiate one-semester seminars whose proposed instructors must then secure appointment by a department as Visiting Lecturer. Instructors for these $2000 positions have included established scholars and graduate students, Howard Cosell (course: “Big Time Sports and Contemporary America”), political cartoonists, an undergraduate who taught chess, and others. These are “perhaps the most junior of all appointments” (Yale Alumni Magazine, 2/76, q.v. for the best account). The program is intended, according to the 1968 Hall Report (J. W. Hall, now History Department Chairman), “to provide for experimentation and individual flexibility.”

In the spring of 1975, the Davenport College Seminar Committee (8 Fellows, 15 students) invited Herbert Aptheker to submit a course proposal. He proposed “W.E.B. Du Bois: His Life and I thought.” (Aptheker, Ph.D., Columbia, 1943, best known as author of American Negro Slave Revolts; was a friend of Du Bois, who designated him his literary custodian; editor of Du Bois’ Correspondence [2 vols. published; see review, JAH, Dec. 74] and his Collected Works [19 vols. published]. He is also prominent as a Communist.) In the fall, Davenport approved the course, but the History Department rejected appointment. C. Vann Woodward, Chairman of the History Department committee appointed to consider Aptheker, met with Davenport but failed to convince them. They submitted the appointment instead to Political Science, which approved it without a dissenting vote. Aptheker responded to Yale’s requests for a reserve book list and the class time, and planned spring 1976 with Fridays in New Haven. The History Department presented to the Junior Appointments Committee a written statement in opposition, and again approved. With advance notice that the Aptheker appointment would be argued, more than 90 full professors attended the Joint Board meeting. A majority voted in favor, and again approved. The Junior Appointments Committee met, heard Woodward, and again approved. With advance notice that the Aptheker appointment would be argued, more than 90 full professors attended the Joint Board meeting. A majority voted in favor, but the matter was referred to the Executive Committee, whose members (including President Kingman Brewster) approved (4/26/76). After a semester’s delay, much turmoil, and despite History opposition, the seminar will be offered in the fall.

Aptheker had repeatedly requested that History make public its reasons. History refused. The Political Science Chairman’s request to History Chairman Hall for “information regarding the grounds for . . . rejection . . . met with the reply that they could not be shared with us!” (YDN, 12/17/75). The lack of clear, public explanation led to damaging and insulting accounts. The Yale Daily News spoke of a “forceful attack on . . . Aptheker’s professional integrity during the confidential meeting of the Joint Board.” (A student columnist later wrote: “what is at stake is. . . Aptheker’s . . . integrity. . . [History] opposed Aptheker . . . for his unethical behavior.” [YDN, 4/28/76]; the New Haven Register cited “questionable methodology and research” as one of the issues [4/27/76].) In a very brief letter, Woodward wrote that

no need to attend: “There was no reason,” he later said, “to expect that Aptheker would be singled out for the apparently massive attack on a minor appointment . . . launched at the meeting.” [YAM, 2/76] Without advance notice to Political Science of their intent, about 10 historians attended (total attendance was 40). Woodward and John Blassingame delivered prepared statements. The historians convinced the body that Aptheker would not be suitable for a regular faculty appointment. The appointment was defeated, a few weeks before the course would have begun. The Political Science Chairman saw “grave questions of equity and of freedom of inquiry,” the historians had subjected Aptheker’s credentials to “a degree of scrutiny . . . unusual even in the case of senior appointments. . . . manifestly unprecedented in . . . temporary appointment of persons from outside Yale . . . proposed as teachers of college seminars” (Yale Daily News, 12/17/75). It was, he wrote, “academic overkill,” and a failure of “common courtesy” and “responsible collegiality” to do this at “the eleventh hour,” “without fair warning.” LaPalombara stated that he did not “particularly admire Aptheker or his writings,” and would not put him forward for a regular faculty appointment, “but that is not the issue.” Another political scientist asked why “the very first seminar appointment to be rejected [by the Joint Board] happen[s] to be that of a prominent American Communist?”

There was “outrage” on campus (YAM, 2/76). A student committee formed in support of the seminar: 2200 (half the undergraduate body) later signed its petition; the elected student council condemned “actions by the faculty which subvert student participation in the appointment process of seminar instructors (YDN, 3/25/76).” A strong faculty statement was signed by 62, including 9 Assistant Professors of History. The course was resubmitted. History refused again, Political Science met, heard Woodward, and again approved. The Joint Appointments Committee met, heard Woodward, and again approved. With advance notice that the Aptheker appointment would be argued, more than 90 full professors attended the Joint Board meeting. A majority voted in favor, but the matter was referred to the Executive Committee, whose members (including President Kingman Brewster) approved (4/26/76). After a semester’s delay, much turmoil, and despite History opposition, the seminar will be offered in the fall.

Aptheker had repeatedly requested that History make public its reasons. History refused. The Political Science Chairman’s request to History Chairman Hall for “information regarding the grounds for . . . rejection . . . met with the reply that they could not be shared with us!” (YDN, 12/17/75). The lack of clear, public explanation led to damaging and insulting accounts. The Yale Daily News spoke of a “forceful attack on . . . Aptheker’s professional integrity during the confidential meeting of the Joint Board.” (A student columnist later wrote: “what is at stake is. . . Aptheker’s. . . integrity. . . [History] opposed Aptheker . . . for his unethical behavior.” [YDN, 4/28/76]; the New Haven Register cited “questionable methodology and research” as one of the issues [4/27/76].) In a very brief letter, Woodward wrote that
the "evidence... consists of [Aptheker's] published works"; they "did not measure up" to Yale standards (YDN, 2/2). The later faculty petition described Aptheker as "fully qualified to teach this seminar" and called the "vague, conflicting and unsubstantiated charges... a blot on the record of the university... Aptheker must be given the opportunity to reply...."

In our opinion, these facts constitute prima facie grounds for an inquiry to determine whether the actions of Yale's History Department constitute a violation of academic freedom. An inquiry, needless to say, is not the same as a finding. The actions justify inquiry because they raise questions of the gravest concern:

1. Aptheker was rejected at a stage in the process where no college seminar appointment, whether of scholar or non-scholar, had previously been rejected. This action, repeatedly described at Yale as "unprecedented," raises a question of discrimination in standards of appointment. If History seeks, as does Chairman Hall, "to tighten up [college seminar] guidelines" [Yale Graduate-Professional, 2/12/76], it would seem more appropriate to reject candidates after change of the guidelines, rather than before. Why, as a student asks, have they "singled out [Aptheker] for such an unusual attack?" [editorial, YG-P, 4/22/76].

2. History's refusal to give Aptheker their reasons, while apparently attacking his professional integrity during the confidential Joint Board meeting, raises the question of whether they have damaged the reputation of a member of the profession and denied him an opportunity to defend himself.

3. History's intervention to block another department's approval of a student-initiated appointment raises serious questions of procedural fairness, civility and collegiality.

Professor Woodward has written, in response to a member's query, that "the OAH should defend historians against political discrimination when there is any evidence of it" (letter to Richard Kirkendall, Executive Secretary, OAH, 3/15/76; copies sent by Yale to others). The sole question is whether there is enough evidence of discrimination, political or otherwise, to warrant an inquiry. We believe there is. Aptheker's appointment, by another department, does not negate the need for an inquiry. On the contrary, too often in the past, historians have accepted a "settlement" without resolving the underlying issues. These issues are too serious for the profession to regard them as closed.

Jesse Lemisch
Associate Professor, American Studies, State University of New York, Buffalo

Marvin E. Gettleman
Associate Professor, History, Polytechnic Institute of New York

John H. Bracey, Jr.
Chairman, W.E.B. Du Bois Department of Afro-American Studies, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Martin Duberman
Distinguished Professor, History, Lehman College, City University of New York

Michael Frisch
Associate Professor, History and American Studies;
Acting Director, Program in American Studies,
State University of New York, Buffalo

Sterling Stuckey
Associate Professor, History, Northwestern University

Reply to the Statement by Professor Jesse Lemisch and Associates

The department of history at Yale University has abided by regular professional standards in the issue now presented to the membership of the OAH. The department stands by the judgment of its committee, which weighed the merits of the appointment recommended to it and rejected it on professional grounds. Never before to the best of our knowledge has a department been expected to explain to a national organization its reasons for not making an appointment it never contemplated making. For a department to be the subject of investigation for such a decision raises serious questions of academic freedom.

The authors of the petition and of the accompanying statement profess to know a great deal about actions taken by the department of history at Yale. The fact is that the only action taken by the department in relation to Herbert Aptheker (to whom the department has never made overtures of any kind, formal or informal) was to decline to serve as Mr. Aptheker's departmental sponsor. All the other actions or presumed actions referred to were taken by other bodies in the university. Members of the history department participated in some of those actions but as individual members of the faculty of the university, not as members of the department. The principal action complained of was taken by the Joint Boards of Permanent Officers, consisting of the full professors of Yale College and the Graduate School. Both the history department's action and the action of the Boards of Permanent Officers are cited as unprecedented. The department's action was not unprecedented. The rejection by a department of persons recommended to teach college seminars is a common occurrence. The action of the Boards of Permanent Officers was unprecedented only because the situation was unprecedented: there had never before been a historian recommended to that body to teach a college seminar whose candidacy the history department had previously rejected.

If the members of the OAH believe that the Organization has a duty to investigate the reasons for a department's or a university's refusal to make an appointment, or that it has a right to know what arguments were made in discussion of the appointment, then they should vote for the proposed resolution. If they disagree with those positions then they should vote against the resolution. In either case, they should know that Yale University policy forbids disclosure of the discussions and reasons for decisions about appointments. The President of the university has made the following statement on the subject:

The President of the University has made the following statement on the subject:
The confidentiality of the deliberations of the faculty about individual cases, whether in department, in committee or in plenary session, has long been taken for granted. This was reaffirmed in my 1969 talk on governance, in which I noted that, "Unless opinion can be received in confidence in such cases, it may well be withheld or watered down to banalities in order to avoid offense or injury." Very often this is in the best interest of the individuals under consideration, for as I said at the time, "Reasons of good manners or simple humanity may make it desirable from time to time to impose a seal of confidence on one man's opinion about another, in the admissions or appointments processes in particular." However, it is not for the interest of the candidates alone, so it cannot be waived by them. These considerations and the consequent policy of non-disclosure of discussions and reasons for decisions about appointments still obtain. They apply to appointments for college seminars just as they would apply to other appointments.

If an investigation by the OAH is ordered as a result of the vote, the department of history will cooperate to the best of its ability, but it will not violate university policy.

The statements accompanying the resolution make charges not only against the department itself but against individual members of the department. Those who believe that the Organization should investigate or censure the opinions of individual historians about the qualifications of persons recommended to them should vote for the resolution. Those who believe that historians ought not to be subject to such investigation should vote against the resolution.

John W. Hall
Chairman, Department of History
Yale University

PROGRAMS FOR 1977 and 1978

The Program Committee for the 1977 Atlanta meeting, chaired by Otis L. Graham, Jr., of the University of California, Santa Barbara, is now in the late stages of its work. The Program Committee for the convention to be held in New York City in 1978 invites proposals for papers, workshops, panels, or other professional contributions to the program. We ask that each proposal be described in a two-page résumé that summarizes its thesis, methodology, and significance. The committee welcomes suggestions for companion papers or commentators. In fact, it welcomes all suggestions for the enhancement of the program.

Proposals should be addressed to:
Professor Mary E. Young
Department of History
The University of Rochester
Rochester, New York 14627

or to any member of the committee (see below).

In recent years the convention has stressed themes appropriate to the Bicentennial, overviews of historical problems, and other matters of timeliness. The committee for the 1978 convention contemplates no special stress. We hope to present a program composed of the best scholarship on both familiar and novel subject areas, and at the same time to give ample attention to the professional and teaching aspects of historians’ activities.

The realities of producing a program dictate that the program for 1978 be substantially completed during the 1977 convention in Atlanta. Accordingly, our deadline for receipt of proposals is 15 March 1977.

Program Committee:
Eric Foner, City College of New York
Ann Lane, John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Barbara B. Rosenkrantz, Harvard University
Joan Hoff Wilson, Sacramento State College
Harold Woodman, Purdue University
Bertram Wyatt-Brown, Case-Western Reserve University
Mary E. Young, University of Rochester, Chairperson

1976 AWARD WINNERS

At the St. Louis meeting the following awards were conferred: Louis Pelzer Memorial Award to Deborah L. Haines, University of Chicago, for her essay, "Scientific History as a Teaching Method: The Formative Years;" Binkley-Stephenson Award to Richard Allen Gerber, City University of New York, for his article, "The Liberal Republicans of 1872 in Historical Perspective."

OAH-LIBRARY OF CONGRESS NEWSPAPER PROJECT

The National Endowment for the Humanities has awarded $89,000 to the OAH in support of the "OAH-Library of Congress United States Newspapers Project." The grant will enable the OAH to join the Library of Congress in a joint effort to upgrade state newspaper collection and preservation programs. By giving increased national attention and leadership to existing state and local efforts to locate, preserve, and prepare bibliographical guides to newspapers, the OAH/LC project should help meet the needs of researchers for more accurate and up-to-date guides to newspapers and for promoting the preservation of the nation's newspaper resources.

The project stems from the results of a study that the OAH conducted in 1973 and 1974 with NEH support into the need for revising and updating American Newspapers, 1821-1936: A Union List of Files Available in the United States and Canada, edited by Winifred Gregory. That study resulted in an OAH application to the NEH for a project that would have attempted to subsidize reports from each state resulting in an updated and computerized Gregory Directory. In April 1975 the NEH indicated that the requested funding level ($605,000 outright plus $600,000 gifts-and-matching) was too large and that the project should demonstrate a larger commitment and involvement by the Library of Congress. Accordingly, in mid-1975 the OAH adjusted the scope of the project and the Library of Congress agreed to co-sponsor a new application.

The present grant will permit the OAH to establish an office with a two-person staff which will concentrate on promoting state newspaper projects in as many places as possible and
helping such projects obtain funding from both public and private sources. Gale E. Peterson, who carried out the feasibility study, will be the OAH’s project director. The Library of Congress will perform a variety of functions at no cost to the project. The Library will develop and disseminate information on the cataloging of newspapers; promote adherence to a national standard for microfilming newspapers and assist states in setting up and/or bringing existing programs up to archival standards; and prepare and distribute reporting forms and guides that will facilitate future conversion of the reported data into machine readable form. In addition, the Library will publish the *Newspaper and Gazette Report* three times a year under the editorship of Imre T. Jármy. This publication will serve as a clearinghouse for information about hard copy files of newspapers and will constitute the project’s newsletter. Requests for free subscriptions to the publication should be directed to Mr. Jármy, Acting Newspaper Microfilming Coordinator, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540. At present the Library anticipates no changes in its *Newspapers in Microform* publication, which is a union list of those newspapers which have been reduced to a microform.

A major portion of the NEH award will be used to carry out a pilot bibliographical project in the state of Iowa that will be administered through the facilities of the State Historical Society under the directorship of Peter T. Harstad. In addition to making $10,000 of the outright grant available to Iowa, the NEH has offered to match up to $42,292 in gifts from Iowa, for a total budget of $94,584 for the two-year project. In May the Iowa Legislature responded to the NEH award by appropriating $17,170 to the State Historical Society to enable it to qualify for a similar amount from the Endowment and thus to meet its first year budget. In announcing the grant, the NEH Chairman, Ronald S. Berman, stated that the Endowment would not make additional outright grants for state newspaper projects but added that the NEH would consider supporting them through its gifts-and-matching program.

The NEH grant also provides $5,000 to absorb a portion of the costs of organizing and holding several state planning conferences to help develop collateral newspaper projects in additional states. Finally, the grant supports the meeting expenses of a national advisory panel composed principally of historians and librarians that will provide advice and guidelines for the project director.

While the NEH has made no commitment beyond the current funding period extending through 1977, the OAH is hopeful that it will be permitted to continue its catalytic role for about five or six years. For further information about the project, write Dr. Peterson, c/o Organization of American Historians.

---

**THE STATUS OF HISTORY**

Since the January issue, several members of the Committee on the Status of History in the Schools have submitted reports on developments in their states. Seven deal only with the past year and supplement the article published in January. It suggested that history’s crisis might be moderating somewhat. These reports are less optimistic. Four others examine states that were not included in the original report published in the *JAH* (September 1975). These support the original conclusions about our troubles.

The first seven do support the earlier suggestion that the situation in the secondary schools seems to be about the same as a year ago, and three find some encouraging signs. No changes in certification requirements for teachers of history in the secondary schools have been reported. In fact, the Rhode Island member notes that a threatened change in such requirements has not materialized. He also finds some evidence of increased attention to history in those schools.

In Illinois, the committee member sees opportunities for historians in the efforts by the State Superintendent of Education to promote “responsibility education,” and in Tennessee, the legislature provides effective support for the study of United States history against its critics in the Department of Education.

On the college level, the January article pointed to increases in history enrollments in more than half of the states studied, but the new reports on the past year add only two states, Nebraska and Tennessee, to that category. In Nebraska enrollment has increased by more than five percent. In Tennessee, a 1974 law making the study of United States history a requirement for graduation by almost all baccalaureate students after July 1, 1978 seems to have stopped the decline in enrollment.

In four other states, the situation is less encouraging. In Rhode Island, enrollment in the Fall of 1975 was about what it had been in the Fall of 1974, but this amounted to a decline in comparative terms as vocational subjects had enjoyed increases. In upstate New York, enrollment dropped one percent from 1974 to 1975; in Missouri, enrollment dropped by more than one percent; and in Indiana, enrollment decreased by two percent in spite of an increase in total enrollment in colleges and universities.

The four long-term reports disclosed some variations in the qualifications required for teachers of history in the secondary schools. In Delaware, a history teacher must have been trained in the social sciences and not necessarily in history. It is defined as one of seven social studies areas, and a history teacher must have worked in at least five of them. In South Dakota, a history teacher need not have studied history, but most of the history teachers, apparently, have taken at least twenty-four semester hours of history. In Florida, history teachers must have had at least eighteen quarter hours of history according to state requirements while the universities that train history teachers tend to require more hours.

Change and pressure for change are features of this area. Delaware recently allowed prospective teachers a broader choice from the entire field of the social sciences. In North Dakota, the North Central Association is pressing for upgrading of the secondary schools, proposing, for example,
that all history courses must be taught by people who majored in history. It is easier for the city schools than for the many rural schools to accept such a recommendation.

History is guaranteed a place in the secondary school curriculum in Maine, Delaware and Florida but not in North Dakota. In Maine, American history in some form is required for all high school graduates; similar requirements influence curricula in Delaware and in Florida. In North Dakota, however, social studies, not history, is mandated by the state. Some school districts do require a year of American history, yet many students do not take any history courses, and history seems to be a neglected subject in the secondary schools.

The four representatives see a move away from history, at least history as traditionally taught. In Maine, “dove-tailing of relevance and social science direction sets the tone;” there is “considerable interest in devising broad-ranging curricula in which humanist history remains at least an equal partner among social science courses. But that history stands alone very successfully seems no longer true.” In Delaware, in place of the traditional, full-year, chronological approach many schools now offer a wide range of topically oriented mini-courses. In Florida, the weight of the evidence suggests that history is less important than it was ten years ago. Although not dead yet, the tendency is to teach it as a “social science, i.e., conceptually, rather than as a humanity” and to “use selected historical events, movements, beliefs, and ideals in order to teach social science concepts and generalizations.” And in North Dakota, where history receives less attention than it did in the past, the “brunt of the decline in history enrollments has apparently been borne by world history-western civilization.” The entire social science curriculum seems to be shifting away from history and has suffered from an increased emphasis on vocational studies. We can derive little comfort from the realization that the hard sciences such as physics and chemistry have fared much worse than history.

Turning to enrollments in higher education, the new reports reveal the same pattern that emerged in the original examination: sharp increase from the mid-1960s to the early 1970s and drastic decline since then. The fall-off in Maine has been sharp in the past few years and has carried enrollments close to the level of 1964, and history appears to be losing out to the other social sciences as well as to other disciplines. History enrollments in Delaware increased by nearly 35 percent from 1964 to 1971 but then began to decline rapidly so that by 1974 the figure was about 10 percent below the figure of 1964. In Florida, history enrollments is lower than it was five years ago and lower than ten years ago, while enrollments in the other social sciences are higher than they were in the mid-1960s. In South Dakota, enrollment increased to 1971, dropped off sharply through 1974, rose slightly this past fall because of an overall increase in enrollment in higher education but remained below what it had been a decade earlier. Furthermore, our representative in North Dakota predicts that “when enrollments resume their downward plunge, and demographic projections seem to indicate they will, we shall probably be worse off than we are now.”

These new reports on long-term trends, like the early ones, include efforts to explain developments. Explanations of history’s troubles in the secondary schools emphasize a combination of factors: a widespread belief that it is not a practical subject and equally widespread unhappiness with the ways in which it is taught. According to the representative from Maine, “the trend to social sciences suggests clearly that traditional history is neither imaginatively presented, understandable to today’s young nor apparently relevant.” Efforts to explain the pattern in the nation’s colleges and universities call attention to the removal of history from lists of courses required for graduation, the drop in overall enrollment in the early 1970s and the failure of historical study to lead to satisfactory employment.

Also like the earlier reports, these include some proposals for change, including improvements in the training of teachers. A North Dakotan indignantly referred to the “generally accepted fact that the social science courses in our high schools are taught by the coaches” and reported that at his first high school teaching interview he was told that “any damn fool can teach history.” And our representative in Maine suggests that “there is a need for improved teacher-training not only in the substance of history but in the substance of the social sciences and in the interaction of the two.”

Suggestions for change include improvements in courses as well as teaching. Committee members suggest that we should develop both broader courses and mini-courses. The latter have been used in both the secondary schools and the colleges in North Dakota and have proved to be popular there and capable of combatting with some effectiveness pressures against history enrollments. As to a broader approach, the member from Maine writes: “Without abandoning that which makes it distinctive, history can, by broadening its own perceptions with the analytic tools of the new social history, yet recapture its old position and be healthier—and even relevant—in the bargain.” And one report suggests that we should reorient some of our instructions so that it helps a student prepare for a non-teaching career.

The Florida member supplied very valuable suggestions for the development of closer, more effective working relations between professional historians in the colleges and universities on the one hand and teachers of history in secondary schools, methods instructors and social scientists on the other. “Historians report that they are interested in helping pre-college teachers of history,” he writes. “Historians had best get on with the task, aware that the task will measure their commitment.”

Finally, one committee member points to a change that must not be made. To him, it seems “that one of the greatest problems in the era of contraction is maintaining academic standards. The temptation to assign less reading and no writing becomes too great when one must justify his position to an administration or a legislature which is concerned only with FTE.”

One problem encountered by the committee has been the lack of cooperation by too many department chairpersons.
Members of the OAH are urged to encourage the people who chair their departments to respond to appeals from the committee for information on enrollment. The profession could be helped by this.

Members of the committee who submitted reports during the past year are:

Alaska . . . . Orlando W. Miller, University of Alaska
Arizona . . . . William H. Lyon, Northern Arizona University
Arkansas . . . . David Baird, University of Arkansas
California . . . . Donald O. Dewey, California State University, Los Angeles
Connecticut . . . . Herbert Janick, Western Connecticut State College
Delaware . . . . William Pulliam, University of Delaware
Florida . . . . James Doyle Casteel, University of Florida
Georgia . . . . William F. Muggleston, Albany Junior College
Hawaii . . . . Brett Melendy, University of Hawaii
Illinois . . . . Robert A. Waller, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Indiana . . . . Alfred D. Sander, Purdue University, Calumet Campus
Iowa . . . . Ellis W. Hawley, The University of Iowa
Kansas . . . . Joseph M. Hawes, Kansas State University
Kentucky . . . . Jack Morgan, University of Louisville
Maine . . . . William Pease, University of Maine
Maryland . . . . Douglas D. Martin, Towson State College
Massachusetts . . . Paul H. Tedesco, Northeastern University
Michigan. . . . Ruth Bordin, Eastern Michigan University
Mississippi . . . Joseph C. Kiger, University of Mississippi
Missouri . . . . David P. Thelen, University of Missouri-Columbia
Montana . . . . Alton B. Oviatt, Montana State University
Nebraska . . . . Harl A. Dalstrom, University of Nebraska at Omaha
Nevada . . . . John S. Wright, University of Nevada
New Hampshire . . . Baldwin M. Domingo, Nathaniel Hawthorne College
New Jersey . . . . Peter Romanofsky, Jersey City State College
New Mexico . . . . Paul Brewer, The University of New Mexico
New York . . . . John L. Myers, State University of New York at Plattsburgh
North Dakota . . . . Richard Beringer, University of North Dakota
Oklahoma . . . . Homer L. Knight, Stillwater
Oregon . . . . Marvin Jaegers, Lane Community College
Pennsylvania . . . . Hugo A. Meier, Pennsylvania State University
Rhode Island . . . . J. Stanley Lemons, Providence College
South Carolina . . . Robert D. Ochs, University of South Carolina
South Dakota . . . . Stephen R. Ward and Gerald W. Wolff, University of South Dakota

Tennessee . . . . Charles W. Crawford, Memphis State University
Vermont . . . . Samuel T. Hand, University of Vermont District of Columbia . . . Ronald M. Johnson, Georgetown University

THE TIMES SURVEY OF HISTORICAL KNOWLEDGE

The series of articles about The New York Times American History Knowledge and Attitude Survey, published in The Times and other newspapers May 2-4, was the culmination of a year-long collaboration between The Times and Educational Testing Service. The purpose of the Survey was to probe college freshmen’s knowledge of, and attitudes toward, significant aspects of the American past, as well as their opinions on issues concerning the study and teaching of American history.

Development of the Survey was guided by a panel of historians appointed by The Times. The members of the panel were Professors Bernard Bailyn of Harvard, William E. Leuchtenburg of Columbia, Benjamin Quarles of Morgan State, and C. Vann Woodward of Yale. At the first meeting of the panel the topical content of the knowledge survey was established. ETS staff then contacted a number of college and secondary school teachers to write basic questions (in multiple-choice format) that would meet the topical specifications. The writers were asked to pitch the difficulty of the questions at the level of a secondary school course in American history, i.e., the level that could be assumed for all college freshmen. Concurrently, the drafting of the attitude survey commenced internally at ETS. Both the knowledge and attitude questions were then pretested on a college freshman population. From the pretested material a final draft of the Survey was assembled and approved by the panel of historians.

During the period of survey construction, arrangements for administration were made. Using data provided by the American Council on Education on the more than 2500 colleges and universities in the United States, ETS staff chose a stratified sample of two and four-year colleges. Because an equal number of students was to be invited to participate in the Survey at each institution, institutions were selected with probability proportional to their enrollment. This procedure automatically made it more likely that larger schools would be selected, and thus gave to each student in the population an equal chance of being selected. Likewise, the number of schools invited within each sampling stratum was proportional to the percentage of freshmen contained in that stratum, so that a completely self-weighting sample would be obtained. Ultimately, 212 institutions administered the Survey and supplied ETS with data. Of these, 20 institutions were eliminated, chiefly because of evidence of administrative irregularity. The final results were based upon data from 192 institutions and 1856 students.

In some cases it was necessary to allow the Survey to be administered in an introductory course despite the preferred procedure of selecting 20 students at random from the total freshman enrollment at each school. This was particularly true in two-year institutions.
On the average, about 10 of the 20 students invited to participate at each institution did so. Only in a few instances did the survey administrator on campus feel that students stayed away because of fear that they knew too little history or were hostile to testing. In general, absences were attributed to apathy, forgetfulness, or conflicting commitments at the time of survey administration. Since many of the student comments indicated that those who did participate had high expectations for themselves and were surprised when they found the test difficult, it seems likely that the survey drew highly motivated and cooperative students.

The mean score on the knowledge survey was 21.1 out of a possible 42. The conclusion of the panel of historians, as verbalized by The Times, was that college freshmen “generally know the high points of American history but...their knowledge of the details and context of these epochal events does not run deep.” Further statistical analyses revealed that scores on the test were related more to indicators of history knowledge and achievement (e.g. grade in secondary school American history course, liking for secondary school American history course, history as a major or secondary interest in college, participation in a college-level American history course, and recent reading—outside of courses—in books about history) than to indicators of general ability and aptitude (e.g. average grade in secondary school for all subjects, scholastic aptitude test scores, level of parents’ education, and academic degree aspiration). The latter variables did show a pattern of association which indicates the expected large role of general aptitude variation within the freshman population, but they account for a good deal less of the reliable score variance on the knowledge survey than do the indicators of historical knowledge and achievement mentioned above. In fact, general ability or aptitude in the population studied is most highly associated with indicators of non-historical knowledge and achievement, such as a liking for high school mathematics and science courses and high SAT-verbal and mathematics scores, as well as high scores on the ACT Assessment. Therefore, above average general ability and aptitude does not in itself seem to be a sufficient condition for highly developed knowledge of history on the part of a student. Such a student is apt to be interested in and capable of functioning in the sciences, mathematics (at least at the secondary school level) and many other disciplines besides history.

A number of the questions in the attitude section of the Survey were developed in the expectation that they would reveal a distinction between “cynics” (or skeptics) and “patriots” in the population. That expectation proved wrong only in that there is not just a single bipolar contrast among such attitudes; on the contrary, there exist two distinct modes of expression which are rather independent in that an individual is not necessarily low on one when he or she is high on the other. The “patriotic” mode of expression is well defined by the following pattern of responses to questions in the attitude survey: attributing to American history the support of a patriotic attitude toward America, characterizing one’s own political views as conservative, designating the more famous and generally less negative events as particularly marking of the character of American history, and recently gaining significant knowledge of American history from newspapers and magazines, commercial television, and visits to historical sites. It is noteworthy that such indicators of patriotism are more likely to be encountered in the white population than among blacks.

What emerged in contrast to the “patriotic” mode of expression was not so much cynicism or skepticism as a critical interest in history. The indicators here were as follows: interest in American history for its ability to explain the present, to expose a person to a broad range of human experience, and to help a person establish his or her personal identity; interest in American history for its support of a open-minded attitude toward America; a reported recent gain of significant knowledge of American history from a wide variety of sources; a tendency to make comments or complaints about the survey and its content.

Students with such a tendency for self-expression, involvement, and criticism tend to have more highly educated parents and greater verbal ability (as indicated by liking for English, foreign languages, and the arts in secondary school, as well as higher than average SAT-verbal scores). Likewise, this attribute tends to be characteristic of younger students who are somewhat dissatisfied with their high school history teacher, who are politically liberal, and who are inclined to point to negative aspects of American history as particularly characteristic.

It is interesting that a student’s orientation toward either the patriotic mode of expression or a critical historical interest does not seem to have much to do with performance on the test. However, to the extent that there is an influence, it seems that students who are oriented toward either mode of expression have slightly higher scores on the test than others.

Finally, there were two other student response patterns worth noting. The first was delineated by a marked liking for secondary school American history and high satisfaction with both the teacher and course content, especially relevance. The courses were characterized as being conceptual and methodological rather than factual. Test scores associated with this response pattern were slightly higher than average. The second response pattern, which was prominent among women, was delineated by a marked liking for English, foreign languages, and the arts in secondary school, high grades in all secondary school courses, including American history, and an interest in the field of education at the college level. In this response pattern, test scores were slightly lower than average.

Stephen F. Klein and Allen Yates, Educational Testing Service

PLANNING FOR THE 1980 CENSUS

The decennial census is a major national undertaking, and census data are widely used in many important government, private, and community programs. The Census Bureau is now actively working on plans for the 1980 census and important
decisions have to be made in the relatively near future. For example, the full content of the basic census questionnaire must be determined by the spring of 1977 so that further preparatory steps can be accomplished successfully. Although there are many constraints on the census in terms of what and how much information can be collected and tabulated, the Bureau believes that it is very important to obtain and review the recommendations of as wide a range of users and potential users of decennial census data as possible. The Census Bureau is therefore anxious to have the ideas of the members of the OAH.

If you have any suggestions, questions, or comments on the 1980 census, please send them to: Director, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233.

THE FIFTY YEAR INDEX

Copies of the Fifty Year Index to the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (1914-1964) are available. The volume is priced at $25 for individuals and $35 for institutions. Purchasers may send orders directly to the Organization of American Historians, 112 North Bryan Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

ROSTER OF HISTORIANS OF WOMEN

The Organization has published a *Roster of Historians of Women*, a compilation of the names and credentials of more than 130 scholars who teach and write about the history of women in America. Organized geographically by state and alphabetically by surname within each state, the roster provides for each historian listed an address, institutional affiliation and rank, degrees and dates, dissertation topic, area of specialization, and publications. The criteria for inclusion are teaching experience in women's history and/or publications in the field. Graduate students writing dissertations in women's history are also included. For each copy please send $1.50 with your name and address to: Organization of American Historians, 112 North Bryan Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

BACK ISSUES AND BINDERS

Back issues of the JAH, Volume 51, No. 2 (September 1964) through Volume 59, No. 4 (March 1973) are available at $2. Copies will be mailed postpaid upon receipt at the Office of the Executive Secretary of $2 for each copy ordered plus an additional 50 cents each for overseas mailing. With the exception of Volume 56, No. 1 (June 1969) all issues are available. Issues published since March 1973 may be ordered at $4 each.

Binders may also be obtained for $3 each. A standard binder holds one volume of four issues, although it has been necessary to stock larger binders to accommodate Volumes 60 and 61. These are available at the same price, although orders should specify the larger size. Orders for back issues and binders should be directed to the Organization of American Historians, 112 North Bryan Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS COMMISSION

The National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials, which is empowered by the Congress to study questions concerning the control, disposition, and preservation of records and documents produced by or on behalf of federal officials (whether in the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of government) with a view toward the development of legislative recommendations (Title II of Public Law 93-526), desires to learn of problems experienced by historians and archivists when dealing with federal documents and records. Particular areas of concern include:

1. Access - including questions of location, finders' aids, retrieval, and use of restricted material (both classified and donor restricted).

2. Preservation - including questions of the completeness of material preserved as well as the archival procedures used and facilities available for those using the material.

Anyone who wishes to share their experience in these areas with the Commission is urged to do so. In addition, the Commission is interested in any suggestions for changes in the current laws and practices regarding federal documents and records.

Please address all comments to: Mr. Robert Brookhart, Director, National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 900, Washington, D.C. 20036.

The OAH representative on the Commission is Frank Freidel; his alternate is the Executive Secretary.

HISTORY OF AMERICAN PUBLIC WORKS

The American Public Works Association has published a *History of Public Works in the United States, 1776-1976* as its bicentennial contribution to the nation. The comprehensive, illustrated 750-page volume discusses engineering and technological development within the context of broad social, economic, and political themes. It was written by a team of professional historians with the cooperation of many governmental agencies and professional organizations in the public works field. Paul Gates, former OAH president, served on the project's Advisory Board.

This twenty-chapter history surveys the development of urban services such as water supply, sewers and wastewater treatment, solid waste disposal, and drainage and flood control. In the transportation field, the history treats streets and highways, traffic controls, urban mass transit, waterways, railroads, and airports. Other topics relating to community life are public buildings, educational facilities, public housing, parks and recreation, and power utilities. Irrigation public works are discussed as well as the development of military installations.
and the aerospace program. In addition to these topical subjects, the history offers a chapter on the development of the commitment to public service and community cooperation that underlies the construction and maintenance of public works and another that places the public works professions of engineering and administration in historical perspective.

Because of the interest generated by this project, the Public Works Historical Society was created in 1975 to foster in-depth investigations of the topics surveyed in the APWA Bicentennial History. The society is located at 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, and has inaugurated an essay series in public works history.

The History of Public Works in the United States, 1776-1976 is available for $15.00. Members of the Public Works Historical Society (annual membership fee is $10.00) may obtain a copy for $10.00. Send your book orders and requests for information about the Society to: American Public Works Association, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637.

WOMEN’S STUDIES

Three publications are available from the Women’s Studies Program of Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, New York 10708. One is a bibliography of the history of American women; another is a revised bibliography of the history of European women; and the third is a collection of monographs by historians on “Conceptual Frameworks for the Study of Women’s History.” To obtain these publications send $2 each for the bibliographies and $1.75 for “Conceptual Frameworks” to the Women’s Studies Program.

HISTORIANS WANTED

The National Commission on the Observance of International Women’s Year is looking for popularly-written histories of women in each of the 50 states and 6 territories of the United States for use at the women’s conferences to be held late this year and early in 1977. These conferences will precede a National Women’s Conference to be held in November 1977. The conferences were authorized by Congress last December in a bill (P.L. 94-167) which specifies that the conferences, in evaluating the status of women and issues of concern to them, shall “recognize the contributions of women to the development of our country.” The conferences will be open to the public, with special emphasis on the representation of low-income women, members of diverse racial, ethnic and religious groups, and women of all ages. For further information, please write to Sheila Leader, IWY Secretariat, Department of State, Washington, D.C. (Phone 202-632-9701)

AMERICAN HISTORY MERIT BADGE

The American History Merit Badge Program of the Boy Scouts of America, to which attention was called in our January 1976 Newsletter, is now functioning. Interested historians may write for the attractive pamphlet describing the program. Copies are available from the National Office—Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08902.

SOME MEETINGS OF INTEREST

On 13 and 14 August 1976 the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations, in conjunction with the Ohio Bicentennial Commission and the Department of History of Ohio State University, will hold its second annual meeting at Columbus, Ohio, on the general theme of Lessons of the Past for the Future of American Diplomacy. Coordinator, Professor Al Eckes, Department of History, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

The Department of History of the University of Mississippi announces a symposium examining race relations in the New South. The symposium, entitled “What Was Freedom’s Price?”, is scheduled for September 22-24, 1976 on the campus at Oxford, Mississippi; participants include James McPherson, Willie Lee Rose, Herbert Gutman, Richard Sutch, Mary Berry, Joel Williamson, Harold D. Woodman, George Fredrickson, Louis Harlan, and C. Vann Woodward. For further information contact the Division of Special Activities, University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677; (601) 232-7282.

The Indiana State University Bicentennial Committee invites papers to be presented at a conference to be held October 13-14, 1976 with the theme “Fiction and Facts: Dramatic License and the American Past.” The committee welcomes papers dealing with both scholarly and popular aspects of the issues surrounding the current interest in popular history, “docu-drama” in film and television, historical themes in fiction, and popular biography. The conference will include panels and presentations by prominent writers and directors from these fields as well as several sessions devoted to papers. Please submit an abstract of your proposed paper before September 1, 1976. $100 honoraria for expenses. Submit abstracts or requests for further information to Dr. Richard Clokey, Department of History, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana 47087.

The Eleutherian Mills Historical Library will sponsor a conference on October 22, 1976 at 2:00 p.m. Subject of the program will be “The Mid-Atlantic Agricultural Experience: Change in Wealth, Labor and Learning, 1750-1850.” Chairman is Richard A. Easterlin, University of Pennsylvania, and speakers will be: W. Ross Fullam, Bishop’s Mill Historical Institute, “The Colonial Pennsylvania Plantation: the Farm that Never Was;” Donald B. Marti, Indiana University at South Bend, “Agricultural Change in the Northeast, 1791-1850: Contemporary Initiatives and Reactions;” Duane E. Ball, Swarthmore College, “The Early 19th Century ‘Watershed’ in Agriculture.” John T. Schlebecker, Smithsonian Institution, will be the commentator. Anyone desiring further information please contact Dr. Richmond D. Williams, Eleutherian Mills Historical Library, Greenville, Wilmington, Delaware 19807.

The Sixth Biennial Convention of the American Studies Association will be held at the Sheraton-Boston Hotel, October 27-30, 1977. Program co-chairpersons, David Hall, Department of History, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, and Lilian Schlissel, Brooklyn College, CUNY, Brooklyn, New York 11210.
The Eastern Community College Social Science Association will hold its 1976-77 conference at the Webster Hall Hotel in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania from April 14-16, 1977. Those interested in presenting papers, participating in panel discussions or presenting media demonstrations should send an abstract of their proposal by September 30, 1976 to George H. Skau, Program Chairman, Social Science Department, Bergen Community College, 400 Paramus Road, Paramus, New Jersey 07652.

GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS

The United States Energy Research and Development Administration's Historian's Office plans to appoint two senior visiting research scholars in 1977-1978. Under the ageis of the Intergovernmental Personnel Exchange Act of 1970, ERDA will support established scholars whose research interests include the history of energy technology or U.S. energy policy. The grants are designed to aid scholars whose work requires extended research in the Washington, D.C. area. Consideration will be given to proposals for the study of energy technologies, including the history of energy conservation or of fossil, solar, wind, geothermal, magnetic fusion, and nuclear energy systems. Depending on the visiting scholar's experience, current salary, and research needs, ERDA will pay up to full salary plus expenses for a period not to exceed two years. Although visiting scholars need not have published prior research in energy history, close attention will be paid to the applicant's publications and to the likelihood that the research proposal will lead to publishable results. Applications are encouraged before January 1, 1978. For additional information write to Richard G. Hewlett, Chief Historian, U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration, Washington, D.C. 20545.

Post-doctoral fellowships are available for historians and others. The stipends can meet but not exceed an individual's income rate of the preceding year and can be supplemented by certain travel expenses for a fellow, accompanying spouse and young children. Fellows are expected to devote full time to research and writing. Fellowships normally extend from four months to a year. The deadline is October 1 and applicants will be notified of results in mid-December. For application materials, applicants should contact the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, Tel. 202-381-6247, Cable: WILCEN.

The US Army Military History Research Collection, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013 is sponsoring an "Advanced Research Program in Military History" as one means of stimulating research and study at the Army's major repository for materials in the history of military affairs. Awards will be made to cover expenses while conducting research and writing at this facility. Recipients will be designated "Advanced Research Project Associates."

Applicants must submit a written proposal describing the subject, scope, and character of their project; the time estimated for residence at MHRC; how MHRC facilities, personnel, and materials will aid in their research project; and a careful estimate of expenses to be incurred for which this grant is requested. Careful consideration will be given to each project's usefulness for USAMHRC and the professional field of military history, as well as the United States Army. Inter-disciplinary projects are encouraged. Both civilian and military scholars in the field of military history are invited to apply to Director, US Army Military History Research Collection, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013. Completed applications must be returned by 1 December 1976.

LECTURESHIPS, ETC.

Friends and close associates of Sidney H. Ditzion have organized the Sidney H. Ditzion Foundation. The purposes of the Foundation are to provide for annual visiting lecture-ships, scholarships and research grants to students of social and intellectual history and sponsorship of academic convocations. Persons interested in making contributions should send them to: The Sidney H. Ditzion Foundation, c/o Dr. R. Christian Johnson, Princeton University, 21 Prospect Avenue, Princeton, NJ 08540.

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations announces the establishment of the Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Lecture. The Lecture will be delivered before the Society's luncheon, coinciding with the annual meeting of the OAH. The first Bernath Lecture will be presented in Atlanta in 1977. The lecture will be comparable in style and scope to the yearly SHAFR presidential address delivered at the American Historical Association, but will be restricted to younger scholars with excellent reputations for teaching and research. Each lecturer will address himself not specifically to his own research interests, but to broad issues of concern to students of American foreign relations. The Bernath Lecture Committee is now soliciting nominations for the first Bernath Lecture from members of the Society. Nominations, in the form of a short letter and curriculum vitae, if available, should reach the committee no later than October 15, 1976. The chairman of the committee for the coming year to whom nominations should be sent is Professor Geoffrey S. Smith, Department of History, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada K7L 3N6. Honorarium: $300.00 with publication of the lecture assured in the Society's Newsletter. The name of the lecturer will be announced at the Society's luncheon at the AHA meeting in Washington in December.

FILMS, ETC.

"SPIRIT '76," a multi-media presentation which analyzes the legacy of America through slides, film, narration and music, is available. The program is 18 minutes and has been used by a variety of groups. Further information can be obtained by contacting Allan R. Blatecky, Media Specialist, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.
Shell Oil Company's new film, *The Early Americans*, traces the story of man from his arrival in the New World to just short of the 15th century. "It is the hope of Shell that *The Early Americans* communicates a sense of man's relationship with the environment by giving viewers a more scientific perspective of early human experiences, a message appropriate not only in a Bicentennial year, but in the years that follow," a Shell spokesman said. Organizations and schools can obtain a copy on loan from the Shell Film Library, 1433 Sadlier Circle West Drive, Indianapolis, IN 46239.

**A BICENTENNIAL EXHIBIT**

*A Nation of Nations*, a major new Bicentennial exhibition of over 6,000 artifacts which explains through the objects people used and valued how the American nation was created by immigrants from many nations, has been opened at the National Museum of History and Technology, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. and will remain open every day except Christmas for the next five years. Admission is free.

**AWARDS FROM OTHER ORGANIZATIONS**

The American Society of Church History announces that its next Brewer Prize competition for a booklength manuscript in Church History will conclude in 1976. The award will be announced at the meeting of the Society in the Spring of 1977. It will consist of a subsidy of $1,000 to assist the author in the publication of the winning manuscript, which shall be described on its title page as the "Frank S. and Elizabeth D. Brewer Prize Essay of the American Society of Church History" and shall be published in a manner acceptable to the Society. If competing essays are otherwise of equal quality, preference will be given to those dealing with topics relating to the history of Congregationalism. Complete manuscripts in final form, fully annotated, must be in the hands of William B. Miller, Secretary, American Society of Church History, 305 East Country Club Lane, Wallingford, Pennsylvania 19086, on or before November 1, 1976, with return postage included. No manuscripts previously submitted will be considered.

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations announces that the 1977 competition for the best published article on any aspect of American foreign relations is open. Competition is open to any article on any topic in American foreign relations that is published during 1976. The article must be among the author's first five.

Articles can be submitted by the author or by any member of SHAFR. Five copies of each article (preferably reprints) should be submitted to the chairman of the Stuart L. Bernath Article Prize Committee by January 15, 1977. The chairman of the committee for the coming year is Martin Sherwin, Department of History, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08540. The amount of the award is $200. If two or more works are deemed winners, the prize will be shared. The award will be announced simultaneously with the book award at the luncheon for members of SHAFR, held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the OAH in April 1977 in Atlanta.

The 1975 winner of the Stuart L. Bernath Award of $500 is Martin J. Sherwin. This prize is granted annually by the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations for the best book in diplomatic history for the academic year. Professor Sherwin's book is *A World Destroyed: The Atomic Bomb and the Grand Alliance*.

**NEW JOURNALS**

Urban specialists at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee are the editors of a new journal, *Urbanism Past and Present*. The semi-annual journal supersedes the Urban History Group Newsletter.

Editor of the new journal is Bruce Fetter, author of a forthcoming book on history of the modern African city of Lubumbashi. His co-editors include urban historian A. Theodore Brown and urban sociologist Ann Greer. An editorial board also includes scholars from the departments of Geography, Political Science, Economics and Anthropology.

The editors welcome contributions from individuals working in any aspect of urbanism. Correspondence about editorial matters should be addressed to Professor Fetter, Department of History, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, P. O. Box 413, Milwaukee, Wis., 53201. Subscriptions, $5 per year for individuals and $10 for libraries, should be sent to *Urbanism Past and Present* at the same address.

*Diplomatic History* is a new quarterly journal devoted to scholarly articles in the field of diplomatic history. The journal will include contributions that deal not only with the foreign policy of the United States but with the extensive foreign relations of the American nation—cultural, economic and intellectual. Priority will be given to articles that make a significant scholarly contribution either by presenting new evidence and exploiting new sources or by offering new interpretations and perspectives. Preference will be given to manuscripts that illuminate broad themes in the American diplomatic experience, but articles that deal extensively with specific historical events are recommended if they cast light on more central issues. All manuscripts should be submitted in duplicate, with the author’s name, affiliation and address on a separate cover page. If possible, the manuscript should be typed double-spaced on standard sized paper and the notes should be typed separately, in sequence, at the end of the manuscript. Pending the appointment of a permanent editor, references in the notes should follow the style of the *Journal of American History*. All manuscripts should be submitted to Professor Paul S. Holbo, Interim Editor, *Diplomatic History*, Department of History, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403.