OAH and the National Park Service

John A. Latschar

For those of us working in the world of "public history" at the National Park Service (NPS), there are two factors that influence our work tremendously, and present some interesting difficulties which I presume are not experienced by our colleagues in the academy. The first deals with authority: Who is allowed on the playing field of public history? That is, who sets the rules of engagement, and who keeps score? Unlike academics, there are no standards or qualifications to be met—such things as a professional degree, scholarly publications, or peer credibility. In our world, all you have to do to become an "expert historian" is to proclaim that you are one. As one of my academic colleagues—who was helping us deal with several of these self-proclaimed "experts"—wryly stated: "We haven't done a good job of defining our profession. Anyone who reads or writes a book about history is allowed to proclaim himself a historian. Could you imagine what the American Medical Association would say if anyone who had ever read or written a book about medicine proclaimed himself a doctor?"

This lack of definition becomes a problem when we enter public debates about how best to manage our battlefields, or how best to enhance our public interpretive and educational programs. Then all the "expert" amateurs come to the fore, sometimes bringing along two very potent and very under-educated institutions: the media and the Congress. Under the scrutiny of the third and fourth estates, our best professional opinions are not experienced by our colleagues in the academy.

First OAH Midwestern Regional Conference to be held in Ames, Iowa, August 3-6, 2000

Iowa State University will host the first OAH Midwestern Regional Conference this month. With over 180 participants presenting nearly 50 sessions on the latest approaches to historical problems and new teaching strategies, the conference is devoted to the practice of history both in the classroom and in public settings. For more information, visit the conference website.

Los Angeles Hosts 2001 OAH Annual Meeting

Los Angeles will serve as host city to the 2001 OAH Annual Meeting, 26-29 April 2001 at the Westin Bonaventure Hotel. The meeting's theme is "Connections: Broadening our Audiences." One of the many outstanding cultural attractions, the Museum of Tolerance at The Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles, is pictured above. For more information on the conference, please see page 18.

A Case of Censorship?

Historical Society Pulls Journal from the University of Georgia

Robert Cohen and Sonia Murrow

Few divorces have been more bitter than the one which occurred last February between the Georgia Historical Society (GHS) and the University of Georgia (UGA). For seventy-six years these two institutions partnered to publish the Georgia Historical Quarterly (GHQ), one of America's most distinguished state journals of historical scholarship, and a leading outlet for historians of the Peach State and the South. In this marriage both partners traditionally helped pay the bills, while the university's history department provided the editors and academic expertise needed to set the intellectual direction of the Quarterly. Over the past two years, however, Georgia Historical Society Executive Director Todd Groce strained the GHS's relationship with both the journal's editor, John Inscoe, and the University of Georgia history department by demanding that he have authority to determine the length and cost of the Quarterly, as well as the composition of half of its editorial board. Groce also sought to assert economic control of the editorship by insisting that future GHQ editors draw their salary from the GHS instead of the university. Critics charge that Groce made these demands because he had become agitated about funding a journal he regarded as too scholarly, voluminous, and critical of the South. When
Rebecca Sharpless: How did you first get involved with OAH?

Joanne Meyerowitz: Well, I've been a member of the OAH since I was a graduate student in the late 1970s and early 1980s. I got more involved a few years ago when I served on the Program Committee for the OAH conference, the one held in Chicago in 1996 [for the San Francisco meeting in 1997]. That was an important experience for me. It gave me a different angle of vision into the profession, and it gave me new insight into a wide array of subfields. I could see more clearly which subfields had come to the fore, and I was somewhat surprised by how many members of the profession seemed to feel that their subfields had been left behind or displaced.

RS: What was your take on that? What were some of those fields that were surging and some that were falling back?

JM: What I learned then was that historians in a number of subspecialties feel somewhat aggrieved, feel that 'they've been displaced from the center of the profession.' People who are doing early American history, the history of foreign relations, economic history, labor history, intellectual history, and I could go on, but there are historians in a range of subfields who feel that the emphasis in the past twenty years on social and cultural history had moved them to the margins. I was not fully aware of the sense of grievance or the language of grievance until I served on that committee.

RS: Is it possible that the profession of history for everybody is about to rise? Does one have to fall as one rises?

JM: Well, I think it's impossible for every field to come to the fore at once. There are complicated social, intellectual, and political reasons why some subfields come forward at a particular historical moment and recede at another. And yet I think that virtually everyone would agree that we have and will continue to have a wide variety of subspecialties and that we want some recognition of and representation for all of them.

RS: How did you first learn about the opportunity of editing the JAH?

JM: I saw the position advertised in AHA Perspectives, and it piqued my interest. I had edited an anthology and co-edited a special issue of the Journal of Women's History, and in both cases I had enjoyed the work. I enjoyed seeing what gems other historians had discovered in the archives and what new interpretations were emerging in the field, and I also enjoyed the process of helping colleagues sharpen their arguments and bring out the larger historical significance of their work. In the years before I saw the ad for the JAH editor position, I had seriously considered editing two journals, but the opportunity and resources for doing it just weren't there. I also had an interest in Indiana University, which is where the JAH and OAH are located. I had spent an academic year—1996-1997—in residence at the Kinsey Institute on the IU campus. The Kinsey Institute's library and archives hold the most important collections for my current research, and I was drawn by the possibility of living right next door. I'm also a fan of the history department at Indiana University. So, with regard to colleagues, research, and editing, the job looked like a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.

RS: And were you interviewed by committees?

JM: Yes, I was interviewed by the search committee at the American Historical Association conference in Washington, DC. Then they narrowed the list down to three candidates and brought us onto the campus of Indiana University and into the offices of the OAH and JAH. Much of the interview resembled any other academic job interview. I gave a talk on my research, and I met with members of the history department. And then I spent several hours talking to the staff at the OAH and JAH, and learning how they operate from the inside.
RS: What is the arrangement between the OAH and the Indiana history department?

JM: Indiana University provides space for the Organization of American Historians and the Journal of American History. It also provides other services and funding, including my salary. In return, the OAH hires graduate students to work in its office and as editorial assistants at the journal and generally enhances the national reputation of the university. With the history department, there's a mutual enrichment. The OAH and JAH benefit from the faculty and graduate students of a major university, and the history department benefits from having the professional organization and the journal right on campus.

RS: What will you be teaching in the history department?

JM: This coming fall I'll teach an undergraduate course on U.S. women's history, and in the spring I'll teach a graduate course on the history of sexuality. I've taught the U.S. women's history course for years now, and I'm looking forward to reshaping it on a new campus with a somewhat different set of students. I've taught the history of sexuality graduate course only once before, and I'm hoping to develop it in collaboration with the Kinsey Institute as well as the history department. I want to introduce the graduate students to the rich and underused archival resources on their campus.

RS: Okay, so two courses a year?

JM: Right. One course each semester.

RS: When you look at the JAH over the last five to ten years, what do you like about it?

JM: I think it's an excellent journal with an excellent staff. I have visions for how I might change the journal, but I'd also like to say first that I think it's a great journal right now, and I'm planning to keep it that way.

RS: What are some of the foundations that you're hoping to keep?

JM: Well, the Journal, I think, publishes the best of the best in scholarly monographic articles, and I plan to maintain that. It also highlights current historiographic concerns. I hope to continue the roundtables and forums that present the latest debates and trends in the field. We'll certainly be maintaining and continuing the new electronic initiatives. We've just started to publish current issues of the JAH online through a partnership called the History Cooperative. We're also beginning to move more of the production of the JAH into electronic form, and we'll be experimenting more with online supplements for journal articles. We're working right now on a cumulative online version of the Recent Scholarship section of the journal. And I'm also hoping to continue the internationalization that David Thelen started at the beginning of the 1990s. We have a board of international contributing editors who are based outside of the United States, and I want to keep that initiative going, bringing the perspectives of historians who study the United States but who aren't based in the United States into the pages of the journal.

RS: Okay. Are there other new directions that you want to take it in?

JM: I've been talking to friends and colleagues about the Journal for the past year, and one of the things that's struck me is that we're no longer talk on much about fragmentation and synthesis, which were buzzwords common ten or fifteen years ago. Back then, there was a sense that the plethora of subfields was undermining the overarching narrative of U.S. history or from the other side a fear that the dominant narrative was ignoring the rich historical scholarship in the new specializations. Today I'm sensing less concern about either fragmentation or synthesis. Historians seem to agree that subfields are the vitality of the profession and also agree that synthesis is an ongoing process, that as much as we may dislike a particular overarching narrative of American history, every time we teach a survey course or write a textbook or plan a museum exhibition we're going to have synthesis. So what I would like to do with the Journal is move away from the old debates on fragmentation and synthesis and attempt to create some kind of intellectual space that would allow historians from various subfields to perceive the journal as an umbrella that covers more subfields, within the limits of the pages of the Journal. I'm also hoping to encourage more dialogue among the subfields, and do have some specific plans for doing that. I'm commissioning some historiographic essays in which historians explain the most intriguing trends in their subfields to historians who aren't specialists in those areas. In the past, the JAH has done some surveys among historians, which have been found to gather more historiographic essays, that readers use such essays to teach and keep up on the field. I'm also planning to have roundtables or special issues in which historians from different subfields address a common topic or concept and engage in dialogue with each other. And I'm also hoping to push the authors of monographic articles to make their essays significant and interesting for historians outside their areas of specialization. The journal already does this, and it's been done for years, and now we'll do it more.

RS: Say more about the electronic formats. What's going on with that?

JM: The new History Cooperative is a partnership of the Organization of American Historians, American Historical Association, University of Illinois Press, and National Acadamy Press. The History Cooperative website is operating now, with current issues of the Journal of American History and the American Historical Review online as fully searchable text. Past issues of the Journal are still available online through JSTOR, but we're putting current issues online now with a more powerful search engine for research. We're just launching it now, and we're asking for feedback from people who use it to find out how we can make it better. Beyond that, the JAH has also in the past few years started to use the web to highlight some of the best articles. For example, the special issue on the Declaration of Independence had an online supplement with the Decla­ nation itself, and historically significant from other languages back into English. This turned out to be a useful teaching tool for all sorts of people who don't actually read the Journal of American History. So we want to do more of that. Sometimes we publish articles that would work well in the U.S. history survey or in high school history classes. We might use our website to offer guidance on how an article could work as a lesson plan and include documents or visual images to supplement what's in the print Journal. What we've found so far is that it's not just the readers of the Journal who go to the website. People who are web surfing end up at our site. We're hoping that some of them may go farther and move from the website to reading the Journal.

RS: How are the resources given to that? You have a paper journal to out. How its all the work getting done on all the electronic things, then? Making hyperlinks is time consuming.

JM: We have a specialist, Kristin Wagner, who devotes her time to the electronic concerns of the Journal, and her work has been indispensable. She is the person with the technical expertise to make this happen. We're delighted to have her on board. She's been helping us enter the electronic age. She redesigned our website, and she worked with our printer and our advisors from the History Cooperative project to convert the disks used in putting the Journal out in print to disks used for putting the Journal online. She's currently working on the Recent Scholarship database.

RS: How do you envision that the editor will interact with the editorial board? How does the actual work get done on the Journal, from the time that an article comes in till the time that it's published?

JM: There's a process of self-selection that goes on even before we see the manuscripts. Some historians read the Journal and think, "The Journal publishes the kind of work I do," and other historians read the Journal and think, the Journal doesn't publish the kind of work they do. As
**Parallel Narratives: Teaching American History to Canadians**

**Bruce Daniels**

Canada's nine English-speaking provinces look and sound remarkably like the northern regions of the United States. Other than the nuisance of a customs check, no exotic stimuli alert travelers from Minneapolis to Winnipeg that they have crossed an international boundary. Wars and diplomats, not geography, drew the line between the two countries; it is artificial and manifestly flies in the face of an economic reality that favors north-south communications over east-west ones. Political considerations created the Canadian-U.S. border, and political considerations, abetted by modern technology, are shredding it. In the years since World War II, Cold War politics, aggressive marketing, radio, television, computers, and the globalization of trade have dramatically reduced the barriers to the flow of goods, people, and ideas between the two countries. Canadians have always feared Americanization, but with the economic gates swung nearly open, fear may turn to fact. Canadian cultural distinctiveness lies in danger of being washed away by the relentless American tide surging north or dried up by the steady stream of Canadian talent draining south. Some Canadians perceive more danger than do others, but virtually all Canadians believe that there is something about Canada that is fundamentally different from the United States and that—whatever that something is—it is worth preserving.

Thus, Canadians view the United States through many more filters than the United States uses to see Canada. Americans glance northward only occasionally and usually like what they see; Canada does not figure prominently in American intellectual life and is seldom mentioned in the media. Canadians, on the other hand, stare southward, are bombarded with American news, and are extraordinarily conflicted about what they see. Feelings of admiration and contempt, superiority and inferiority, gratitude and anger, swirl ambiguously through Canadian perceptions of Americans. The United States not only plays a major role in the Canadian economy, it plays an equally important role in the Canadian mind. Canadians cannot avoid thinking about the United States and cannot avoid having opinions on American power, government, foreign policy, race relations, cultural institutions, and social problems. Canadians contemplate the meaning of America because doing so is necessary for contemplating the meaning of their own country—Canada is the not-America. And because English Canada looks so much like the United States, the process of discovering what makes Canada the not-America is difficult and hidden beneath the surface of the visible similarities. History becomes one of the best places to look for the elusive, deeper meanings of the two nations.

I began teaching American history at the University of Winnipeg in 1970 at the height of the student revolt in the United States and at the high tide of an invasion by American academics into Canadian universities. The department I joined was evenly divided—eight Canadians, eight Americans—not an unusual ratio for Canadian universities at the time although a decade earlier it would have been unthinkable. Anti-Americanism was rampant in the world, among Winnipeg students, and among many of the young American professors—including me. Ironically, students vented little of this hostility on the new American professors and tended to see them more as romantic expatriate radicals than as cultural imperialists. Also, ironically, classes in American history bulged with enrollments: students were fascinated by the threatening bully to the south who appeared to be coming apart at the seams.

Aside from the need to be sensitive to Canadian nationalism, I did not realize at first that the teaching of American history to these students required a different set of reference points than I had used as an instructor at the University of Connecticut. Like many American travelers, I had been misled by the similarity of sight and sound into thinking I was in familiar cultural territory.

---

**Teaching Canadian History in the United States: Problems and Possibilities**

**Scott W. See**

Like weather maps in American newspapers, with their bland white spaces where a country of thirty-million people should be, the history of the United States typically ends abruptly at the northern border. For many Americans, Canada invokes images of endless expanses of snow, fearsome hockey players, decent and affordable beer, scarlet-coated Mounties, and perhaps memories of a camping trip to a magnificent lake in British Columbia. These playful stereotypes provide an important segue to the serious business of teaching the history of Canada to an audience of American college students. Poorly understood and pock-marked by superficial impressions, Canada presents some rather daunting pedagogical challenges to professors south of the forty-ninth parallel. These will be distilled into two basic points in this brief essay. American students need to be convinced that carving three credit hours out of their college careers to study Canadian history is worth the binder, and they should see beyond the obvious—and useful—comparative value of Canada's past to gain an acceptance of the country's history on its own terms.

Having been asked to address the "problems and possibilities" of this exercise, I am tempted to trot out anecdotes accumulated through sixteen years of teaching Canadian history at the Universities of Maine and Vermont. Working in two Eastern border states has no doubt given me a certain perspective that might not be shared by colleague who ply their trade in Virginia or Idaho. Nonetheless, my activities with the Association of Canadian Studies in the United States has brought me into frequent contact with the surprisingly large number of historians who regularly teach some aspect of Canadian history at their institutions.

The first important dimension in coming to grips with teaching Canadian history in the United States is that in virtually every case an important "hook" is needed to bring a student into the course. The problem is almost the exact opposite of the one faced by Bruce Daniels, who points out that his Canadian students are perpetually inundated with American culture and ideas. In many cases, the students themselves provide the motivation that brings them to the threshold of Canadian history. Memories of a trip to historic Quebec City or the spectacular Banff National Park, family connections to Canada both distant and close, familiarity with television and radio programs from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and bits of information on Canada's interrelated history with the United States from a high school course: all can and do kindle an interest in exploring Canada's past among America's college population. Each semester I ask students to articulate the factors that brought them to pre- or post-Confederation Canadian history. After jettisoning the common "this was the only class available in the time slot"—a perfectly legitimate reason to take a course, in my opinion—I have gathered responses that run the gamut from insightful to frivolous. "I was curious about why Canadians didn't join in the Revolutionary War," an example of the former, shares space with "I want to know why they drive like hell in Quebec," an obvious illustration of the latter. Over the years my classes in Maine and Vermont have been populated by Franco Americans and students with English- and Scots-Canadian roots. Colleges and universities in the northern tier of states, as well as in Louisiana thanks to its Acadian heritage, are filled with students who have genealogical ties to Canada.

In the cases where students do not generate their own motivation for taking a Canadian history course it falls to the professor, and often the school, to provide the
Wong. Professors on both sides of the border whine about student ignorance of history, but I soon realized that all ignorance is not the same nor is it only students who are ignorant. Some—me, for example—were in the dark. Through a process of osmosis, people who have never taken a history course in their lives nevertheless learn a version of history that arises from other educational processes and popular culture. Events and people in the Americas past often commingle to Canadians that either had not occurred to me or which I had placed little emphasis on. Loyalists from the American Revolution were courageous nation builders who mutually pledged their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor to defend peace, order, and good government. The Canadian triumph in the War of 1812 handed the Americans their only defeat and preserved Canada from the fate suffered by Mexico thirty years later. A proud and respectable socialist tradition in Canada bespoke a tolerance that made McCarthyism seem all the more outrageous and xenophobic. And so it went—I became educated in Canadian history and on the effect that a different national identity had on Canadian perceptions of American history. Every topic I lectured on evoked comparisons that would not have occurred in an American classroom. It was thrilling. It also meant that a course in American history taught in Canada inevitably required a parallel narrative: what effect did the American Civil War have on the creation of an independent Canada? How did Canadian and American immigration differ? Is racism less or more virulent in Canada than in the United States? Undoubtedly, teaching American history as a foreign history anywhere in the world—or perhaps even in differing regions of the United States—also produces parallel narratives; but Canada’s history seemed uniquely positioned to offer a reasonable alternative to the development of the United States. If America’s history was Plan A then Canada’s was Plan B: the evolutionary model instead of the Revolutionary one.

Canadians are engaged in perpetual soul-searching for the state and fate of their national identity—a Sisyphean task that has informed every course I have taught in American history for thirty years. Not surprisingly, as the ongoing search looks in new places and under new circumstances, the parallel narratives get compared at new points. Pierre Trudeau’s decision to enshrine a charter of rights in the Canadian constitution provoked discussions that contrasted the effects of judicial review on American history to the effects of Parliamentary supremacy on Canadian history. In the Reagan years, the relative strengths of the two nations’ social safety nets were frequently compared as were the historical forces that allowed Canada to create a program of publicly funded medical insurance that became a national shibboleth, while the wealthier United States argued such a program would not work and was unaffordable. With the signing of the North American Free Trade Agreement, doomsayers among Canadian nationalists predicated that the two lines of historical development might not continue parallel but instead would meet and merge. As it turned out, they have not, but the two lines do seem less far apart and, once again, this fuels historical discussions and comparisons. Does the narrowed space reflect a trend or a cycle? Under the freeflowing traffic of NAFTA and in the absence of American Cold War posturing, Canada seems less preoccupied with the harmful effects of American power on Canadian sovereignty. Certainly, overt anti-Americanism, which grew into nasty proportions in the late 1970s, has receded into small constituencies. This waning of anger can be interpreted in at least three plausible ways: (1) Canada has matured intellectually and culturally and is sufficiently confident in its destiny that it no longer needs to beat the drum of false assurance; (2) Canada has become so Americanized that it now reluctantly resigns itself to a fate as a politically independent but culturally and economically dependent region of the United States; (3) Canada is in the cool part of an historical cycle that will again heat up under new circumstances. I place no bets on which of these or other alternatives is correct, but I will bet that Canadian students will be discussing them in American history classes.

Bruce Daniels teaches in the Department of History at the University of Winnipeg.

Please share your teaching ideas. The OAH Newsletter invites its readers to submit articles for the “Focus on Teaching” section. Please send them to: Gary W. Reichard, Office of Academic Affairs, California State University Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90840, or via e-mail to: reichard@csub.edu
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"hook." Teachers involved in Canadian Studies in the United States have long fancied themselves of the missionary ilk. My sense is that successful Canadianists probably have to put a little extra into the effort to capture and hold the interest of American students. Here I am not suggesting pandering to the students, nor am I encouraging the dilution of subject matter to heighten its appeal. Instead, I think that enthusiasm and creativity are especially important qualities for the professor of Canadian history to possess, or at least to acquire. After a great deal of experimentation I have fashioned a series of discussion groups (six to eight) that are dispersed throughout the semester. Each session targets a theme in Canadian history that is lively and important enough to have engendered a critical mass of contradictory historical interpretations. The role of Louis Riel in the Red River and North-West uprisings is one example. Another popular topic is Canadian anti-Americanism in the 1960s. Students receive a list of targeted readings in advance of the sessions, and each is responsible for an essay on a question that addresses the material at hand. To be sure not all of these discussion sessions have been smashing successes over the years, but on the whole they have been instrumental in keeping the students’ interests at an acceptable level. Institutions can also assist in providing the "hook" by steering students to Canadian history courses through international or multicultural curriculum requirements. Before American readers guffaw at the last point, consider the fact that Toronto was recently deemed one of the most multicultural cities in the world. Universities with comprehensive Canadian Studies programs are clearly at an advantage in this context. Still, even the smallest college can encourage students to take Canadian history courses by embracing them in the curriculum as a broadening experience.

The second essential challenge of teaching Canadian history in the United States is a bit trickier. Canada’s comparatively value looms large. If the professor is not careful, it will subordinate other subject matter and become the only important message in the course. Several dynamics contribute to the comparability issue that makes teaching Canadian history especially problematic, perhaps more so than one finds in courses on the Middle East or Italy. For one, American students often bring an inherent sense of superiority—which is, of course, a gift—to class-es in Canadian history. Typically they believe that if the United States is the sole remaining superpower, then Canada should be viewed favorably but nonetheless as a secondary player in a North American partnership. Canadian history is often quite familiar to Americans, even if they bring the proverbial blank slate to the exercise. Colonial conflicts, women’s issues, immigration patterns, ethnic peoples, Western development, labor struggles, the Great Depression: the list of themes that appear so strikingly familiar to American students is almost endless. This is both a blessing and a curse for the professor. The comparisons are both pedagogically sound and useful for maintaining interest levels. On the other hand, a danger lies in suggesting that Canadian history is a pale reflection of American history, or even worse, that it is only meaningful as a comparative tool. There is no easy way to avoid this pitfall. Constant attention to the distinctiveness of Canadian history, taking the country’s past on its own terms, helps to counterbalance the comparative impulse. Thus many topics, such as the treatment of Native peoples in the late nineteenth-century West, can be addressed by asking questions from what is familiar about the Canadian case as well as what is unique. This point is inevitably reinforced when Canadian-produced texts and materials are used in the course. It is a wonderful moment, for example, when American students are introduced to a Canadian interpretation of the Revolutionary War. The message of distinctiveness can be transmitted short of waving the Maple Leaf in class or reciting the wildly popular Molson’s advertisement known as "Joe’s Rant." One need not be a nationalistic or ideologue to get the point across about the intriguing characteristics of the Canadian saga.

The joys of teaching Canadian history, to even the most skeptical of American students who demand to know what—if anything—is worthwhile about studying their northern neighbor’s past, clearly trump the niggling problems. Indeed the perennial challenge of coming to grips with a nation, one that is at once both familiar in its North American orientation and so different in the ways in which its citizens have fashioned their lives, is an excellent way for history professors in the United States to revisit and test some of their most cherished notions and interpretations.

Scott W. See is the Libra Professor of History at the University of Maine.

Correction
We apologize for misidentifying the images of Mr. Walter Johnson and Mr. Timothy B. Tyson, co-winners of the 2000 OAH Frederick Jackson Turner Award (page 15, May 2000 OAH Newsletter). The correctly labelled images are:

Walter Johnson
Timothy B. Tyson
Can Ten-Year-Olds Learn to Investigate History As Historians Do?

Bruce A. VanSledright

Contrary to what many critics contend, students in U.S. schools are taught a fair amount of history. Beginning in early elementary school, history units are taught in conjunction with holidays such as Columbus Day and Thanksgiving, and Black and Women's History months. By fourth grade many students learn their state's history. In fifth grade, the social studies portion of the curriculum is devoted to a survey treatment of chronological American history, often beginning with Native American society and culminating with units on the Civil War and Reconstruction.

Typically, youngsters encounter history as if it were a compendium of putative facts to be memorized on their way to building some understanding of the "American story," a singular and ready-made narrative of questions, debates, interpretative arguments, and recursive revisions that so characterize what goes on within our discipline. The common justification for this approach is the largely unsubstantiated claim that elementary-age children are incapable of more sophisticated levels of thinking. In other words, many pedagogues claim that youngsters must master historical facts before they can reason about them, as though these were separate—even unrelated—tasks.

The authors of the National History Standards and a growing body of research literature have leveled a serious challenge to this stance. These reformers maintain that children should learn history with greater fidelity to the craft: analyzing primary and secondary sources, drawing inferences from sometimes thin and inconclusive data, plunging deeply into historical contexts, and creating narratives about the past. Unfortunately, few studies exist that can demonstrate whether, say, a ten-year-old is indeed capable of actually doing history in this manner.

As a former K-12 history teacher, I have long been troubled by the traditional view of history education, with its rote memorization of names and dates. I have joined rank with the reformers as an education researcher, performing a number of studies over the years. Recently, I decided to test the reform recommendations by creating a course in early American history that allowed two-dozen fifth graders to plunge into the craft. The data from my study suggest that children, with proper guidance, can become quite adept at historical inquiry.

Before teaching the course in January 1999, I selected eight students from the class of twenty-three who would serve as my principal informants in the study. I selected four boys and four girls, who represented the sociocultural, political, and educational backgrounds of the students. I then selected four boys and four girls, who represented the class of twenty-three who would do to enhance the performance of future high school and college students.

Overall, the performance of these eight students suggests that ten- and eleven-year-olds can learn how to practice history with some fidelity to the craft. This is encouraging for several reasons. First, it indicates that history education reformers are on target. It also suggests that teaching students to read, analyze, and interpret documents as historians do instills a powerful form of critical cognition and awareness in young people. It's not hard to imagine that, in a world now dominated by the flow of information, where it is increasingly difficult to discern supportable claims from the spurious, these children will have a distinct evaluative and cognitive advantage.

I can only begin to imagine what a steady diet of this type of historical thinking in grade school would do to enhance the performance of future high school and college students.

Endnote
1. For a list of references, see <http://www.oah.org/pub/nl/99feb/Oahbibl.htm>.

Bruce VanSledright <bruce1@umd.edu> is in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Maryland. The research reported in this article was funded by the Spencer Foundation. For additional details on this study, please contact the author. A more extensive treatment of this project is forthcoming in a book from Columbia University's Teachers College Press.
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countered by the sometimes eloquent opinions of the self-proclaimed experts, simply because NPS historians lack the credibility of academic historians. When that happens, complex issues get reduced to the level of a modern-day political campaign: the person with the best sound bite prevails.

The second phenomenon is merely that of our work environment, and all of the things we are expected (and need) to do besides history. At Gettysburg National Military Park (NMP), for example, we have 1.7 million visitors each year. Only 100,000 of those visitors are able to participate in ranger programs, since our staff consists of twelve full-time interpretive rangers supplemented by a handful of seasonal rangers. Another 250,000 can take the battlefield tour with our licensed battlefield guide corps. The rest of our visitors—all 1.3 million of them—are dependent upon our printed media (brochures) and our museum for their introduction to the Civil War and the Battle of Gettysburg. Our printed materials are reasonably up-to-date, but our museum is terrible.

However, the real point is that our twelve interpretive rangers are unable to keep up with current scholarship. In addition to preparing tours, they must staff the visitor center desk eight or more hours a day, seven days a week, 362 days a year. They must assist lost children, attend to scraped knees (or worse), clear traffic jams, explain why we don’t allow picnics in the National Cemetery, explain why we don’t allow metal detectors on the battlefield, and, above all, smile kindly and point the way to the restrooms hundreds of times each day.

And as their leader, I am in no better shape. I can readily discuss with you the nuances of management policies, or problems and contradictions in the Government Results Performance Act. I am aware enough of the myriad federal personnel and procurement rules to keep myself out of Fort Leavenworth. I can recite from memory the really important stuff, such as which member of Congress has the most influence on the NPS budget process, along with the name and phone number of their principal staff person. But I have difficulty finding the time to keep up with the literature of our field. Sadly, I know the regulations of the National Environmental Protection Act and the National Historic Preservation Act better than anyone should ever have to, but I have not had the time to finish reading The Story of American Freedom.

With that background, it is not difficult to describe the benefits of the partnership between the NPS and OAH. There are four major points:

1. Scholarly Credibility
   In 1998, we were in the midst of preparing a new, long-range general management plan for Gettysburg NMP. Part of such a plan, naturally, is a complete review and revision (as appropriate) of the park’s primary interpretive themes. I had read about the Cooperative Agreement between the National Park Service and the Organization of American Historians, and decided to pursue the opportunity to obtain expert advice from the academic world. Working with John Dichtl of the OAH staff, we recruited a marvelous team for a site visit to Gettysburg: Eric Foner of Columbia University, James McPherson of Princeton University, and Nina Silber of Boston University.

The OAH visit to Gettysburg NMP in the summer of 1998 came at a crucial time. We were proposing to move our visitor facilities off of the actual Union battlelines of 2 and 3 July, 1863 onto less historically significant ground. In addition, we planned to fundamentally change our interpretive programs at the park. We wanted to move away from traditional (and safe) descriptions of battle tactics, tales of individual and unit courage, and sentimental narratives of the veteran reunions in the postwar years, toward discussions that would put the Gettysburg campaign into the context of the political, social, and economic environment of the mid-nineteenth-century United States. In other words, we wanted to introduce discussions concerning the causes and consequences of the Civil War.

Our sound bite (because that is what we had to boil it down to) was that we wanted to move from descriptions of “who shot whom, where” into discussions of “why were they shooting at one another?” Now that may not sound like much, but you had better believe that it was more than enough to bring us under attack for aban-
Are We Saving the Right Records?

John W. Carlin

At the most critical statutory responsibility I have as archivist of the United States is to approve Federal records’ dispositions that is, how long records must be kept to protect individual rights, ensure accountability in Government, and document the nation’s historical experience.

During the 20th century, the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) developed policies and process appropriate for the primarily paper records of the time. The reality at the beginning of the 21st century is that most records are created electronically and are maintained in many media. In fact, they are routinely converted from one medium to another, and may exist in multiple formats. Does this mean we need to change the ways in which the Government appraises records and schedules their disposition?

As I have explained to leaders of historical organizations, we are going to find out. NARA has developed three connected projects relating to the changing Federal recordkeeping environment.

The first is a study of current recordkeeping and records use in the Federal Government. Its purpose will be to give us a better understanding of practices and problems in agencies’ management of their records today, covering creation, use, maintenance, and disposition. And this study will examine how new technology actually is affecting records creation, recordkeeping, and records disposition. We will share the final report of the study with the Federal Government and with interested members of the public. And the report from project one will inform projects two and three in our plan.

Project two will be a policy analysis of legislation, regulations, and guidance pertaining to records disposition in the Federal Government. Among other things the analysis will cover the impact and implications of litigation involving records and relatively recent legislation such as the Freedom of Information Act and the Government Paperwork Elimination Act. Out of this analysis will come recommendations for any changes that may be needed. We assume some will be desirable, but we have no preconceptions about what they are. This project will begin as information becomes available from project one, but the analysis will not conclude until project one’s investigations and its report are complete.

Completion of the third project will await the conclusion of both project one and project two. Project three will analyze and redesign, to the extent necessary, the process by which records are appraised and scheduled in the Federal Government. Project three will cover all four major parts of the process:

- Inventorying by agencies to identify records to be scheduled
- Submission by agencies of disposition recommendations and draft schedules to NARA and the Government Accounting Office for approval
- Appraisal by the Archivist of satisfactory appraisals determinations and disposition recommendations
- Subsequent review and updating of approved records schedules

One major goal of this project is to make the process for determining the disposition of records more effective and efficient, regardless of medium, and to reduce dramatically the time it takes to review and approve schedules for the disposition of records. Because new technologies may be useful for speeding and improving the disposition process, an additional major goal of project three is to determine how such technologies might be applied.

The ultimate outcome of these three projects, we believe, will be policy and process revisions that increase our confidence in the Government’s ability to preserve records as long as needed for protecting rights, ensuring accountability, and documenting the national experience. That includes strengthened assurance that records genuinely needed by historians, current and future, will safely reach the National Archives for permanent preservation.

At points along the way, we will ask historians among other members of the public to assist us in making these judgments. And we invite you to follow our progress through the records management section of our web site: <http://www.nara.gov/>.

Short-Term Residencies for U.S. Historians in Japanese Universities, Spring and Fall, 2001

The Organization of American Historians and the Japanese Association for American Studies, with support from the Japan-United States Friendship Commission, are pleased to announce the fifth year of a competition (pending funding approval) that is open to all OAH members. OAH and JAAS will send three U.S. historians to Japanese universities in the summer and fall of 2001.

Historians will offer lectures and seminars on the subject of their specialty. They will enter the collegial life of their host university, consulting with individual faculty and graduate students, and contributing to the expansion of networks of scholars in the two nations. We hope to foster international and cooperative work among historians in both nations, who will remain in contact with each other over the years.

Participants in previous competitions are encouraged to update their application materials and re-submit them, indicating interest in and availability for one or more of the new university residencies.

The award covers round trip airfare to Japan, housing, and modest daily expenses. Dates, and topics for 2001 will be announced soon at <http://www.oah.org/activities/japan/>. The host institutions participating are:

**HITOTSUBASHI UNIVERSITY, Tokyo**

**RIKKYO UNIVERSITY, Tokyo**

**OSAKA UNIVERSITY OF FOREIGN STUDIES, Osaka**

**Application Procedures**

Each application letter should include the following:

- A two-page curriculum vitae emphasizing teaching experience and publications.
- A two-paragraph statement of teaching and research interests.
- A personal statement, no longer than two pages, describing your interest in this project and the issues that your own scholarship and teaching have addressed. Please devote one or two paragraphs to why you understand this residency to be central to your own development as a scholar in the world community. You may include comments on previous collaboration or work with non-U.S. academics or students. If you wish, you may comment on your particular interest in Japan.

Applications must be postmarked by 15 December 2000, and sent to:

**Selection Committee**

OAH/JAAS International Residencies

112 N. Bryan Avenue

Bloomington, IN 47408-4199

Application materials may be sent in the body of an electronic mail message, before midnight 15 December 2000, to <japan@oah.org>. Applicants must be current members of the OAH.
Insoe and UGA refused to meet his demands, the small GHS executive committee dominated by Groce unilaterally dissolved the Historical Society's partnership with the university, leaving the Quarterly temporarily homeless. Groce contends that he made numerous attempts to keep the Quarterly at UGA, but felt that with Inscoe leaving to assume the position of secretary-treasurer of the Southern Historical Association there was not an appropriate candidate in the UGA history department to edit the journal. According to Inscoe, however, UGA's history department had always been opposed to the GHS's move to exercise more control over the journal, believed that the reviews linked local history with national history, and at that time a member of the Georgia Historical Society's Board of Curators, sent an open letter to GHS members and "friends of the Georgia Historical Quarterly" accusing Groce—and ally Lisa White, who was then President of the GHS—of spearheading a "movement to censor" the Georgia Historical Quarterly. Eskew's letter charged that the GHS's leaders were "meddling in the editorial structure" of the journal by attempting to seize from the University the power to "select the [GHQ's] editor," requiring that the editor allow the GHS's executive leadership to "preview the Quarterly before it went to press," and taking from the editor the power to appoint half the editorial board. These moves were, according to Eskew's letter, "designed to give" the GHS leaders "censorship control over the content of the Quarterly. It will jeopardize the academic freedom that currently exists and destroy the scholarly integrity of the journal." The University of Georgia's history department concurred in this estimation and voted unanimously to oppose the Society's attempt to assert these new controls over the Quarterly.

Groce and White deny that they were interested in either censoring the Quarterly or violating the academic freedom of its editors. They contend that their attempts to change the journal were motivated by a desire to make it more efficient financially. Economic arguments were clearly the initial wedge for the Historical Society's apparent assault on the autonomy of the Quarterly. Tensions between Groce and Inscoe began back in May 1998 when Groce complained that the journal's book review and news sections "took up almost 90 pages," and that he needed to find ways to "reduce GHQ to a more affordable product." In response to such complaints Inscoe did move to reduce the size of the journal, agreeing to keep all future issues under 230 pages. Nonetheless, Groce persisted in complaining about the cost of the journal, prompting James C. Cobb, chairman of the UGA history department and Phinizy Spalding Distinguished Professor of History, to write Groce in July 1999 asking him "to curtail what is starting to look more and more like a campaign of harassment directed at the Editor of the Georgia Historical Quarterly." But Groce held that his leadership powers over the Quarterly entitled him to make complaints and changes in the journal because "The Georgia Historical Quarterly belongs to the GHS. We've always paid the bills."

Cobb and Inscoe challenged the veracity of Groce's economic complaints. In their September 1999 memo to the Georgia Historical Society's Board of Curators, Cobb and Inscoe noted that based upon available figures the journal's "total cost per issue this year is about the same as it was in 1989." They also pointed out that in relative terms, the financial burden that the journal placed upon the GHS was shrinking: the Quarterly absorbed 8.1% of the Historical Society's budget in 1989, but only 4.9% in its most recent budget. Groce's critics also wonder if, he was truly seeking to save the GHS money in publishing the Quarterly he was willing to risk and ultimately lose UGA's sizable financial contribution to the journal—which annually amounted to at least $94,000—by requiring that the editor work directly for him as a salaried employee.

These figures led historians close to the controversy to dismiss Groce's economic arguments as a smoke screen. One former member of the GHS Board of Curators charged that the attack on the Quarterly was part of a broader campaign by Groce to limit the influence of professional historians in all aspects of the GHS; he pointed out that during Groce's five-and-a-half year tenure as director of the GHS the percentage of academic historians on its Board of Curators declined dramatically, from roughly 25% to close to zero. By limiting the involvement of historians in the GHS and replacing them with business figures and other non-academics, Groce, according to his critics, hoped to raise more money for the Society and consolidate his authority within GHS, since non-historians tend to be less active and less critical. Board members who say they do not understand what is in the GHQ, for example. This issue featured a historical painting depicting the exploitation of southern textile workers that were highly critical of the Confederacy and the segregated South. According to several Georgia history professors, the Confederates in the Attic review essay by W. Fitzhugh Brundage made waves because it started with an anecdote suggesting that Civil War re-enactors could "achieve greater authenticity and perform a public service if they used live ammunition" in their mock battles. Thus one Georgia historian Groce interviewed for the GHQ editorial position was not surprised when Groce mentioned that among the first changes he wanted to make in the journal was the elimination of review essays. This historian had heard that there had been "substantial complaints" about the Confederates in the Attic essay, and had also learned before Groce interviewed him that some vocal GHS members were irate that, as one of those members put it, "all we see here [in the GHQ] is women and niggers." Ironically, it was the review essay feature which helped to distinguish the Quarterly from most state historical journals. William McFeely, a Pulitzer Prize winning historian who canceled his subscription to the GHQ after being "dismayed" by the GHS takeover of the journal, believed that the reviews linked local and regional concerns to larger historical questions, and "made it one of the best state quarterlies."

Groce denies that ideologically-charged factors played any role in his campaign to change the Quarterly. The GHS executive director contends that, as a historian himself, he desires that articles submitted to the journal "not [be] looked at from their political perspective but their scholarly value."

When word of the dispute over the journal reached historians on the Internet via H-South, letters and e-mails came pouring in to the GHS both from individual historians...
Capitol Commentary
Bruce Craig, Director of the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History

Transition Completed at NCC

On Friday, 16 June, former executive director Jon Putnam Miller and I completed a multweek executive director “transition” by finishing the chore of culling the NCC files, packing the last of Page’s books, and, in my case, learning the intricacies of NCC’s computer systems. This week, as Page is literally on the road, moving to South Carolina, I find myself alone here in the NCC’s cozy office located on the top floor of the Capitol Hill Victorian house that serves as headquarters for the American Historical Association in Washington, D.C., writing this—my first installment of “Capitol Commentary” for the NCC Newsletter.

In the coming weeks and months, as the NCC Board of Directors begins to review the NCC’s past activities and prepares to meet the challenges of the future, you probably will notice some modest changes in the way the NCC conducts its activities and delivers its services. For example, the NCC’s webpage (http://www.h-net.msu.edu/-nee/) will be updated and hopefully will evolve into a “cyber center” for our advocacy efforts.

Plans are also in the works for the creation of an “advocacy network” where recipients of our “Legislative Alerts” (which are sent to those of you who subscribe to the NCC on-line newsletter, “NCC Washington Update”), may be asked to take rapid action by calling, e-mailing, or writing Senators or Representatives to advance the cause of history. And, you will notice some changes in what is reported in the “Capitol Commentary”—for example, cultural resource and archival issues may figure a little more prominently than they have in the past.

But rest assured that NCC’s mission is not changing. It continues to focus on advocacy—the support of historical programs, teaching, research, and public programming; the promotion of greater access to historical records and government information, and support for federal humanities programs. We will also continue to address issues relating to copyright and historic preservation. As always, I invite your comments, suggestions, contact me at <rbcraig3@juno.com>.

FY 2001 Interior Bill Passes House and Senate

On 18 July the Senate passed a $15.514 billion Interior and Related Agencies appropriation bill that includes recommended funding levels for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) of $120.26 million; for the Office of Museum Services, $24.9 million; for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), $105 million; and approximately $44.3 million for the Historic Preservation Fund. The Senate recommended funding levels are approximately $1 billion less than the Clinton Administration wanted for parklands and for Bureau of Indian Affairs programs. The Senate measure passed by a vote of 97 to 2. (Senators Paul Wellstone [D-MN] and Russell Feingold [D-WI] voted no on the bill. The one senator who did not vote, Paul Coverdell [R-GA], was ill at the time and has since died.)

During the Senate debate which stretched over several steamy July days, numerous amendments were offered. The Senate version of the Interior Appropriations bill in its present form, such legislation faces a cause of history. And, you will notice some changes in the legislation.

Passage of the Senate version of the Interior appropriations bill follows on the heels of many long months of work by the Senate appropriations staff and supporters of the NEH, the National Park Service, and other cultural institutions. The Senate approved legislation includes modest increases over both the House passed version of the Interior appropriations bill and current FY 2000 funding levels which stand at $98 million for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and $115.3 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH).

Over current funding levels, the Senate recommended a $7.4 million increase for the NEA, a $5 million increase for the NEH and a $0.6 million increase for the Office of Museum Service (OMS) at the Institute of Museum and Library Services. If the proposed increases survive the House-Senate conference, the NEH budget will become $120.3 million. According to the Senate report, the $5 million in additional funds allocated to the NEH would be divided as follows: $1.5 million for state humanities councils, $1 million to the public programs division, $800,000 to regional humanities centers, $1 million to the research programs ($500,000 for administrative support, and $200,000 for the challenge grant program.

The Senate pegged the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) at $44.347 million some $30.4 million below FY 2000 levels and $27.7 million below the President’s FY 2001 request. The Senate bill allocates $53.37 million to the NEH and $41.347 for the HPF. To the chagrin of many, no funding was provided in the Senate passed measure for the “Save America’s Treasures Program.” Historic preservationists, however, vow to attempt to restore some funding for this program when representatives from the House and Senate meet in conference to reconcile the differences between the House and Senate passed measures. With the passage of the Senate bill, conferees from the House and Senate will now meet to resolve differences between the respective appropriations bills.

Budget Recommendations for NARA, NHPRC

During an evening session on 11 July, the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriation Subcommittee made its proposed recommendations for the FY 2001 budget for the National Archives and grants programs of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). The House subcommit-

tee proposed that the National Archives receive $201.171 million with the NHPRC being allotted $6 million, the same as the President’s proposal.

President Clinton had proposed a FY 2001 total budget reduction of $45.35 million for the National Archives, a $56.733 million increase over the FY 2000 level of $222.622 million. He requested $6 million, the current level, for competitive grants for the NHPRC. The major new spending initiative in the President’s budget was $88 million for the renovation of Archives I on the Mall. The proposed work would include correcting mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and fire safety deficiencies, upgrading storage conditions to meet modern archival standards, providing increased exhibit and public meeting spaces, and constructing new encasements for the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. The House subcommittee did not allot any funds for the proposed renovation. The House subcommittee recommendation did, however, cover all the Archives fixed costs and provided sufficient funds to transfer President Clinton’s papers to the Clinton Library in Little Rock. The House also earmarked funds to accelerate the processing of veterans records and provided start up monies for the electronic records project.

Historic Preservation Fund Reauthorized

On May 26 President Clinton signed H.R. 834 into law (PL 106-208) thus extending the reauthorization of the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation through FY 2005. The HPF is the mechanism used by the federal government to channel grant money to the states and certified local governments for a wide variety of historic preservation related activities. The Advisory Council, in cooperation with other federal and non-federal entities, provides leadership in the preservation of the nation’s historic and prehistoric resources.

The HPF had been without an authorization since FY 1997 which served to create a cloud of uncertainty over the federal government’s continued commitment to historic preservation activities. The new law authorizes $150 million annually for the HPF and $4 million for the Advisory Council. The legislation also clarifies that the National Trust for Historic Preservation may receive grants from the Department of the Interior “consistent with the purposes of its charter and this Act.”

“Peopling” Theme Study Receives Senate Hearing

On 27 April, Senator Daniel Akaka (D-HI), for himself and Senator Bob Graham (D-FL), introduced legislation S. 2474, “The Peopling of America Theme Study Act,” authorizing the National Park Service (NPS) to conduct a theme study to identify, interpret, and preserve sites relating to the migration, immigration and settling of America. On 11 May, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee conducted a hearing on the legislation.

During the hearing, Akaka noted that “All Americans were originally travelers from other lands. Whether we came to this country as native peoples, English colonists or African slaves, or as Mexican ranchers, or Chinese, 300 years ago and in the 19th century we were all people transformed us from strangers from different shores into neighbors unified in our inimitable diversi-
rarians and history departments praising the Quarterly and demanding that its independence and high-quality scholarship be preserved. Eight leading history departments in Georgia passed resolutions in support of the Quarterly.

Among the more suggestive of the individual letters of protest sent to the GHS was one by Joan C. Browning, a GHS member who had edited the Greenbrier Historical Journal, a local history journal in West Virginia. Browning had hoped this publication could "earn respect from scholars" and foster critical scholarship on this area. She changed the publication's focus and tone, taking it beyond its traditional contribution, which was, in her words, the "European settler puff piece cum genealogical resource."

Browning converted it into a journal containing thoughtful, well-researched articles that put local history into a broader context, including some on "that significant [nonwhite] segment of the area's population that had remained invisible." Under her stewardship, the journal made its first major venture into African American history, winning praise from historians, but not Browning, noted, from the Greenbrier Historical Society's Board. "My tenure as editor," Browning wrote, "came to an abrupt end." In her view, the journal returned to its "previous fare": lists of deeds and marriages, and extolling the virtues of European settlers. Browning noted that the Society instituted an educational program called "Tea and Manners" to "show our multilingual populace the grandeur of the white upper class in Greenbrier's past."

Browning's letter suggests that the controversy over the GHS is not some peculiar Georgia feud, but is rather symbolic of a larger dispute over how much of a say professional historians—promoting critical history—should have over the publications traditionally subsidized by state and local historical societies. Such conflicts are linked to the fact that, as James Cobb noted, "some non-scholars resent the critical and theoretical, exotic—what nature of what they read in the [regional and local historical] quarters and seek a version of history with which they feel comfortable...[they are] headed in a direction of softer history," which avoids the tough issues and unflattering questions about the American past.

If Browning and Cobb are correct, then, these historical society/historical quarterly disputes are regional manifestations of the kind of cultural wars fought (and lost) by historians on the national level—the highly controversial Etola Cay exhibit in the Smithsonian, for example.

The fate of the Georgia Historical Quarterly is uncertain. Under Incsoue, the journal had thrived, recently winning an award from Georgia's governor and praise from such distinguished southern historians as the late C. Vann Woodward. John Boles, the Journal of Southern History's managing editor, in his e-mail message of protest to Groce, said that during Incsoue's tenure the GHS "...emerged as the absolutely best state history journal in the nation." With Incsoue gone and the old relationship with the University of Georgia's Office of Groce left himself with the unenviable task of finding a new editor and home for the journal after alienating so many leading Georgiana historians. Rumors abounded that Groce was out to, as Boles put it, "downgrade or 'popularize' this premier journal," converting it from a publication devoted to historical scholarship to some kind of glossy antiquarian magazine. Thus Groce reportedly had great difficulty hiring a new editor with academic credentials, and it was turned down by several historians before finally hiring Anne J. Bailey, a Civil War historiographer from Milledgeville's Georgia College and State University.

In the wake of this backlash by historians, Groce has promised to grant Bailey editorial control of the journal and maintain its devotion to serious historical scholarship. "I have a contract that provides me with complete editorial freedom...In fact, I worded the clause myself," Bailey explained. "I am independent of Savannah...My hope is that you won't be able to tell there is a different editor," she said, referring to the shift from Incsoue to her. But with the funding of the journal now solely in the GHS's hands and the book review and staff members coming out of the GHS office in Savannah, many historians are already speaking of the old, independent Quarterly in the past tense. It is somewhat fitting that the last GHS issue to appear out of the University of Georgia, published this month, had on its cover a historical etching of a cemetery.

Robert Cohen, director of NYU's Social Studies program, is a historian who formerly served on the Georgia Historical Quarterly's board of editors. Sonia Murrow is a historian who teaches in NYU's Department of Teaching and Learning.

**Justice and Nixon**

Estate Settle Case on Records

On 12 June, the Justice Department and the estate of former President Richard M. Nixon reached an out-of-court settlement and concluded over twenty years of litigation relating to the White House tapes and papers that the government seized from Nixon shortly after his resignation in 1974. The government agreed to pay $18 million for the collection. While this is a fraction of what Nixon's estate had originally sought—more than $200 million when adjusted for twenty-five years' worth of interest—nevertheless, it is more than the government initially had hoped to pay. The government took possession of Nixon's presidential materials in 1974 and placed them under the custody of the National Archives. Nixon's release in 1980 claiming that he deserved compensation for his tapes and records. Government lawyers originally contended that because the documents had been created by public officials, at public expense, on public equipment, the Nixon Estate should receive no compensation.

It is expected that more than half of the $18 million will go to lawyers' fees, estate taxes and unpaid interest on back claims with the remaining amount probably going to the Richard Nixon Library in Yorba Linda, California. The records of the Nixon presidency will remain as a special collection at the National Archives facility in College Park.
Building a Common Place

In the past decade, and especially in the last few years, critics have complained again and again about the gap between the history historians write and the history the public wants to read. And the complaint is not without cause. Even as academic and trade presses have been forced to cut back their history lists and bookstores stock fewer scholarly titles, millions of Americans eagerly tune their televisions to A&E’s Biography series and PBS’s Antiques Roadshow, not to mention flocking to theaters to watch Mel Gibson’s ponytail bob as he rides his horse through the swamps of South Carolina in The Patriot.

No one doubts that a gap exists, but what’s to be done about it? Beginning this September, an innovative solution will be offered in the form of a new web journal, Common-Place: The Interactive Journal of Early American Life (www.common-place.org). Common-Place aims to embrace both scholars and the public by building a common place for exploring and exchanging ideas about early American history and culture. A bit friendlier than a scholarly journal, a bit more scholarly than a popular magazine, Common-Place speaks—and listens—to scholars, museum curators, teachers, hobbyists, and just about anyone interested in American history before 1900. Common-Place is a common place for all sorts of people to read about all sorts of things relating to early American life—from architecture to literature—from politics to parlor manners. And it’s a place to find insightful analysis of early American history as it is discussed not only in scholarly literature but also on the evening news; in museums, big and small; in documentary and dramatic films; and in popular culture.

Each issue of Common-Place consists of several features, well-crafted essays based on original scholarship, investigative reporting, or reflections on the historian’s craft; Reviews of recent scholarly books, historical novels, dramatic and documentary films, and interpretive websites; and five regular columns: Talk of the Past, commentary on recent stories about early American history that have made it onto the evening news; Ask the Author, in which prominent, award-winning authors answer probing questions about their work; The Common School, in which a schoolteacher tells of a particularly inspiring or troubling classroom experience; Object Lessons, in which a museum curator tours a new exhibit or ponders a curatorial issue; and Tales from the Vault, in which an archivist leafs through a repository’s recent acquisitions or wrestles with an archival problem. Finally, a central place on the site is reserved for The Republic of Letters, an on-line message board system where readers can reply to Common-Place contributors, and to one another.

Common-Place’s eclectic, accessible content will be well illustrated with its inaugural issue this September. Features will include literary and cultural historian Scott Casper’s meditation comparing Edmund Morris’s Dutch to Parson Weems’s Life of Washington; as well as an excerpt from Michael Bellesile’s new book, Armimg America (Knopf, 2000), arguing that early Americans owned fewer guns and cared about them even less; and a roundtable discussion of Fred Anderson’s Crucible of War (Knopf, 1999). Among the Reviews, James Kloppenberg will evaluate Jon Butler’s provocative new synthesis, Becoming America (Harvard, 2000), and, in Common-Place’s regular columns, Richard Slotkin answers a question posed by Ask the Author editor John Demos: “What can you do as a novelist that you can’t as an historian—and vice versa?” While Richard and Irene Quenzler Brown will share the riveting tale of their work tracking down a case of incest in Tales from the Vault. Meanwhile, high school teacher Peter Lapienex examines the challenges of teaching gender to young teenagers in The Common School and Alice Nash’s Object Lesson takes readers on a tour of the Mashantucket Pequot Museum.

Common-Place is the brainchild of Editors Jill Lepore (Boston University) and Jane Kamensky (Brandeis University) and is overseen by a thirty-three member Editorial Board consisting of academics, filmmakers, journalists, secondary school teachers, and museum professionals, including Gordon Wood (Brown), Gary Nash (UCLA), Margaret Drinan (The American Experience), Philip Morgan (William and Mary), and Robert Archibald (Missouri Historical Society). It is funded by the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, Massachusetts and the Glider Lehrman Institute in New York, and receives additional support from the Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History; the John Nicholas Brown Center, the McNeil Center for Early American Studies, the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, and the Organization of American Historians.

Read. Talk back. Submit.
The Ninety-fifth Annual Meeting of the Organization of American Historians and the twenty-second Annual Meeting of the National Council on Public History will be held at the Renaissance Washington Hotel in Washington, D.C., 11-14 April 2002. The program committee invites proposals from members of the OAH, NCPH, affiliated organizations, and scholars in related disciplines. In keeping with the OAH's tradition of encouraging and supporting excellence in historical research, interpretation, and publication, the program committee has selected the theme *Overlapping Diasporas: Encounters and Conversions*. The theme, broadly and creatively defined, is potentially fertile ground for the presentation of research by scholars focusing on cultural, political, economic, military, social and diplomatic history. The conference location, Washington, D.C., presents expansive opportunities to include and engage historians beyond the academy in federal programs and public history venues. The committee encourages panels, workshops, and roundtables which may lead to submission of proposals addressing the theme through topics such as those listed below.

- The creation of American society
- Reconceptualizations of American society
- Encounters and conflicts among migrants, immigrants, and American Indians
- Political policies
- Economic interactions
- War, diplomacy, and international relations
- Conflicting interpretations in conversations and literature
- The fluidity of diasporas (confluences, re-formulations)
- Comparative cultures in American society
- Socialization and change in American history
- Community building and identity formation in diaspora
- Cultural longevity and continuity in diaspora
- Memory and diasporas

Although we encourage proposals for entire sessions, the program committee will accept individual proposals and make conscientious efforts to place those papers on the program.

Complete session proposals must include a chair, participants, and one or two commentators. We discourage consecutive presentations by the same panelists; however, participants may serve as chair or commentator one year and presenter the following year. All proposals must include five collated copies of the following information: 1) cover sheet (see sample below) including a complete mailing address, phone number, and affiliation of each participant; 2) abstract of no more than 500 words (not required for single paper proposals); 3) prospectus for each paper of no more than 250 words; and 4) a single-page vitae for each participant. **Proposals sent with less than five collated copies will be returned.**

We welcome volunteers to act as chairs or commentators as assigned by the program committees. All proposals must be postmarked no later than 15 January 2001 and sent to:

**2002 Program Committee, Organization of American Historians**
112 North Bryan Avenue, Bloomington, Indiana 47408-4199

**No electronic or faxed submissions will be accepted.**

---

**PARTICIPATION IN CONSECUTIVE ANNUAL MEETINGS**

The program committee discourages participation as a paper presenter in consecutive annual meetings. The 2002 program committee will try to avoid placing a presenter from the 2001 Annual Meeting program as a presenter on the 2002 program. A person may serve as chair or commentator one year and a presenter the other.

---

**AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS**

By OAH policy, the program committee actively seeks to avoid gender-segregated sessions; the committee urges proposers of sessions to include members of both sexes whenever possible.

The committee likewise will work to follow the OAH policy and guidelines of having the program as a whole, and individual sessions to extent possible, represent the full diversity of the OAH membership. We strongly urge proposers of sessions to include ethnic and racial minorities, as well as junior academics, independent scholars, public historians, and American historians from outside the U.S., whenever possible. The OAH Executive Board has set aside a small sum of money to subsidize travel to the annual meeting for minority graduate students appearing on the program.

All participants must register for the meeting. Participants specializing in American history and who support themselves as American historians are also required to be members of the OAH (by 1 October 2001). Participants representing other disciplines do not have to be members.
National Council for History Education Cosponsors Conference

A conference entitled “History Matters: New Ideas in K-16 History Education” is being co-sponsored by the National Council for History Education (NCHE), National History Day, Colonial Williamsburg, the Smithsonian’s National Museum of American History, and the California Department of Education. It will be held in the Sacramento, CA Convention Center on 27-28 October with pre- and post-conference events held on 26 and 29 October. The conference will highlight successful strategies, historical content, and tactics for history education. NCHE has a limited fund of monies available for partial travel assistance for precollege classroom teachers attending this conference, based on need. Check the website <http://www.history.org/nche> for the preliminary conference program; deadlines for pre-registration and for travel assistance grants; and for travel and lodging details. Or contact the NCHE Office for a Conference Flyer. The National Council for History Education, 26915 Westwood Road, Suite B-2, Westlake, Ohio 44145; (440) 835-1776; (440) 835-1295 (fax) <NCHE19@mail.idt.net>

State of Candidates 2001 OAH Election

President: DARLENE CLARK HINE, Michigan State University

President-elect: IRA BERLIN, University of Maryland at College Park

Executive Board (Paired): JOHN DITTMER, Depauw University
HELEN LEGO WITZ HOBOWITZ, Smith College

PAGES P. MILLER, University of South Carolina
CONSTANCE B. SCHULZ, University of South Carolina

KATHLEEN COCHRANE KEAN, Nicolet High School, Glendale, Wisconsin
TED M. DICKSON, Providence Day School, Charlotte, North Carolina

Nominating Board (Paired):

NEIL FOLEY, University of Texas at Austin
KENNETH W. GOINGS, University of Memphis

BETH BAILEY, University of New Mexico
SUSAN E. HIRSCH, Loyola University of Chicago

MAUREEN MURPHY NUTTING, North Seattle Community College

JAMES J. LORENCE, University of Wisconsin-Marathon County

Rutgers Center for Historical Analysis invites applications for senior and post-doctoral fellowships from individuals engaged in research on topics related to

Industrial Environments: Creativity and Consequences

In the academic year 2001-2002, the Rutgers Center for Historical Analysis will enter the first year of this two-year project. The first year will focus on the changing relations during industrialization among technological development, the environment, and public health from the last decades of the 18th century through World War II. Participants will explore industrialization’s implications for world systems, as well as for national, regional, and local places. Individual projects should address some aspects of the complex interaction between technology, environment, and health. Through weekly seminars and annual conferences, fellows will explore the relationship between these three dimensions of history. Applicants need not be U.S. citizens. AA/EOE. For further information and fellowship applications, write to:

Professors Susan R. Schrepfer and Philip Scramont, Project Directors
Rutgers Center for Historical Analysis
Rutgers-- The State University of New Jersey
88 College Avenue
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901-8542 USA

Closing date for applications for 2001-2002 fellowships is December 15, 2000. Those interested in giving a paper in 2001-2002 should also write to Professors Schrepfer and Scramont.

The State University of New Jersey RUTGERS

Please join us in thanking the following contributors to the St. Louis Special Fund:

- Anne Aby
- Gretchen A. Adams
- John H. Akers
- Anonymous Donation
- Elayne G. Archer
- Susan M. Armény
- Peter Bardaglio
- Matthew Basso
- Gail Bederman
- David F. Brown
- Stephanie M.H. Camp
- Nancy C. Carnevale
- Julian J. DelGaudio
- Kathleen E. Diffley
- John Dittmer
- Michael J. Dunin
- Arthur P. Dudden
- Lane Fenske
- Eric Foner
- Lee W. Formwaître
- Peter J. Frederick
- Leo V. Graff, Jr.
- William Grebeiner
- Steven Hahn
- William Harris
- Nadine I. Hata
- Don Hata
- Wendy W. Hazard
- Nancy A. Hewitt
- Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham
- James A. Hijiya
- Lisa E. Holland
- William R. Hutchison
- Anna R. Igra
- Marc Jahn
- Winston James
- Laura Kalman
- Stephen D. Kantrowitz
- Kojiie Kawaishima
- Hartmut Keil
- Alice Kessler-Harris
- Bert Knittow
- Emma Lapsansky
- Mark H. Leff
- Glen M. Leonard
- Karen J. Leong
- Leon F. Litwack
- Sherei R. Mershon
- David Nasaw
- Carl H. Nightingale
- Mary Beth Norton
- Edward O’Donnell
- Barbara Oberg
- Gale E. Peterson
- Kimberly L. Phillips
- Lawrence N. Powell
- Emily Rader
- Ann Woodson Ramsey
- Michael Regoli
- Robert Shaffer
- Nayan B. Shah
- Paul L. Silver
- Thomas S. Smith
- Lawrence Squeri
- St. Louis Historians
- Against Racism
- Marc R. Stein
- Shelton Stromquist
- David Suissman
- David V. Tucker
- Washington University in St. Louis
- Lysa Wegman-French
- Marsha L. Weisger
- Steven C. Wheatley
- Robert Weifl
- Yale University
- Li Ping Zhu

Middle Tennessee State University Murfreesboro, Tennessee

Dr. Steven J. Ross Strickland Visiting Scholar

The History Department at Middle Tennessee State University announces Dr. Steven J. Ross as the Strickland Visiting Scholar in Fall 2000. This annual program is funded by the Strickland Family in memory of Dr. Roscoe Lee Strickland, Jr., long-time professor of modern European history at MTSU. Dr. Ross is professor of history at the University of Southern California, specializing in social history, labor history, film history, and popular culture.
For twenty years outstanding scholars have given one lecture each year on behalf of the organization.

Invite award-winning historians of wide experience—teachers, researchers, writers, filmmakers, public programmers, advocates, museum specialists, archivists—to your institution today.

an expanding list of distinguished speakers

www.oah.org/activities/
lectureship/
Meet us in Los Angeles!

Mark Your Calendar for the 2001 OAH Annual Meeting
April 26-29 • Westin Bonaventure Hotel
Los Angeles, California

**Connections: Rethinking our Audiences**

In organizing the annual meeting, the program committee was informed by the opportunities of its location in Los Angeles and the longstanding commitment of Kenneth T. Jackson, OAH president, to engage audiences beyond the academy. The committee especially encouraged proposals reflecting a broad appreciation of the work of history.

Highlights include:

- A session on writing biography featuring Blanche Wiesen Cook (Eleanor Roosevelt), David Levering Lewis (W.E.B. DuBois), and Donald E. Worster (John Wesley Powell)
- A session on American survey course textbooks featuring David M. Kennedy, Mary Beth Norton, and Edward Ayers
- Several sessions assessing the works of prominent historians, including Peter Novick, Kevin Starr, Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, and Richard White
- A session chaired by John Milton Cooper, Jr., bringing together three generations of Theodore Roosevelt’s biographers (William H. Harbaugh, H. W. Brands, and Kathleen Dalton)
- A conversation, moderated by Judy Yung, on Japanese American history between Roger Daniels and Gary Okihiro
- Joel Williamson will preview his forthcoming biography of Elvis Presley
- Two sessions on the history of disabilities
- Multiple sessions on the history of American foreign policy
- Multiple sessions on the history of Southern California and Los Angeles
- Multiple sessions on history and film (e.g., Westerns, the role of Hollywood, etc.)
- Easy access, via chartered transportation, to the Getty Museum
- An evening reception, via chartered transportation, to the Huntington library and Gardens
- Top-flight entertainment

Ric Burns, director of nationally televised series such as *New York* (1989), *The Way West* (1995), the *Donner Party* (1992), and *Coney Island* (1991), will participate on a panel assessing his craft.

Arianna Huffington, syndicated political columnist and author, will participate on a panel taking a retrospective look at the presidential election of 2000. Joining her will be Susan E. Estrich, William E. Leuchtenberg, and James T. Patterson.

William R. Ferris, chair of the National Endowment for the Humanities, will deliver the meeting’s keynote address, entitled *Connections: Rethinking Our Audiences.* A panel of past presidents of the OAH will offer comments.

Sharon Robinson, Director of Educational Programming for Major League Baseball and the daughter of Jackie and Rachel Robinson, will participate in a roundtable with Jules Tygiel and other historians to discuss Tygiel’s new book *Past Times, Baseball as History* (Oxford University Press, 2000).

**The 2001 Program Committee is:** Michael H. Eimer, Lake Forest College, Chair; Carol O'Connor, Utah State University, Co-chair; Lillus Johnson Edwards, Drew University; Helen Lenkowitz Honowitz, Smith College; Russell Lewis, Chicago Historical Society; Robert J. McMahon, University of Florida; Kevin Starr, State Librarian of California; and David Vigilante, National Center for History in the Schools.

**The 2001 Special Events and Publicity Committee is:** Robert C. Ritchie, Huntington Library, Chair; William Dewberry, California Institute of Technology; Lynn Dumain, Occidental College; Gloria E. Miranda, El Camino Community College; Eric Monkkonen, UCLA; and Mollie Selvin, Los Angeles Times.
Common Effort for the Future of History
Lee W. Formwalt

My recent travels have reinforced for me just how critical it is for the OAH to bring together all practitioners of American history both in and outside the academy. In Boston, three OAH staff members met with several historians, including the Massachusetts co-chairs on the OAH Membership Committee, to discuss the situation of precollege teachers in New England. I went into that conversation hoping to learn something of the state of the profession in the Northeast, the nature of collaboration between high school and college historians, and what OAH could do to help promote American history there. What I did not anticipate was the truly depressing and overwhelming account of life on the precollege front lines, especially at the elementary and middle school levels.

One of the things that struck me was how we regularly talk about precollege teachers from grades K (sometimes now, even pre-K) through 12, but we really mean high school teachers. We have largely neglected teachers who cover history in the elementary and middle school classrooms. Teachers at those levels need the expertise of college and university historians more than ever, particularly as states implement standards. Many of them have no history training. Meanwhile, our organization is known around the world for disseminating the finest American history scholarship through the Journal of American History, now under the able direction of editor Joanne Meyerowitz (see her interview on p. 3).

For fifteen years, the OAH has been making the most recent scholarship accessible to high school teachers through its Magazine of History, a teaching tool that college and university professors have also found very useful. Our colleagues in Massachusetts suggested that we should take the next step and make some portion of the Magazine of History accessible to middle and elementary school teachers. At the very least we can create a teaching page on our website and perhaps offer a session or more for elementary and middle school teachers at the annual meeting.

It would be fair to say that many of us at the college and university level know little about what is happening in precollege classroom teaching. Yet, it behooves us to learn quickly. Without high quality history teaching at the K-12 level, university historians may soon find themselves with fewer history majors to mentor. As Bruce A. Vansledright suggests, we can show elementary teachers and students that history is more than a collection of facts. College, university, and public historians need to demonstrate how we "do" history (see page 7). Some of us are already leading or participating in summer workshops and institutes designed to enrich K-12 history teaching.

I had the privilege of once again participating in the Fannie Lou Hamer Institute on Citizenship and Democracy, an outgrowth of the 1997 NEH Summer Institute on Teaching the History of the Southern Civil Rights Movement. The Hamer Institute brings scholars from around the country together with high school teachers and students in the Jackson, Mississippi, area in an effort to enrich the social studies curriculum there. As a student of the Albany Movement, I was able to discuss with teachers how to enhance their students' understanding of the civil rights movement by using the Freedom Songs as a capstone to the study of the civil rights movement in the South was about. As a representative of OAH, I explained to them how the various thematic issues of the Magazine of History provide them with new and different ways to teach the past. Yet the institute was not just a one-way process. All of the institute faculty (movement participants, public historians and college and university professors alike) learned more about the high school classroom—both the struggles and the accomplishments. I was impressed once again by what the collaboration between precollege teachers and professional historians has been able to accomplish.

From Jackson, I flew to Houston where I spoke to my former colleagues on the Council of Historically Black Graduate Schools at their summer meeting. Our experience with the Adam's Marker early this year led the OAH to examine its own record on minority membership and it is clear that we have our work cut out for us. Currently, we have 210 African American members, only three percent of the total membership. More astonishing, less than a dozen of these members are at the more than one hundred historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). Once again, collaboration can help both OAH and HBCUs. As more members from these institutions join OAH, the organization and all it does will reflect better the diversity of our society. At the same time, American historians at HBCUs will benefit from the access to scholarship and the connections to colleagues that membership in our national organization provides.

Our struggle to improve diversity in the OAH must also include efforts to bring in greater numbers of Latino/a, American Indian, Asian American, and gay and lesbian historians. At the same time we cannot neglect the concerns of our many colleagues who find themselves trying to negotiate the growing dependence on adjunct and part-time positions in colleges and universities around the country. In response, OAH is actively involved in the Coalition on the Academic Workforce. This summer, OAH members collected in an NEH-supported survey of history and other academic departments around the country. In the meantime, we have joined the AHA in a joint AHA-OAH committee on adjunct and part-time teaching. The leadership of both historical organizations has made this issue a priority.

As we prepare for our upcoming meetings in Ames and Los Angeles our collaborative efforts are very much front and center stage. Professional development was a priority for the Midwestern Regional Conference program committee, which planned a series of state-of-the-art sessions throughout the meeting. However, some of us at all levels will be updated on the last twenty years of historiography in various fields of American history. Traditional sessions on different aspects of Midwestern history will present the latest scholarship in this field. Public historians from historical societies, government, and other venues will also participate and share their experiences as professionals outside the academy.

Another group of American historians underrepresented in OAH are those who practice in community colleges and other two-year institutions. More college students take the American history survey course in two-year colleges than in any other institutions of higher education. Yet American historians at community colleges comprise a mere five percent of OAH membership. OAH has recognized the value and importance of community college historians, recently publishing Community College Historians in the United States, but we have a long way to go. As we prepare for our annual meeting in Los Angeles, we will make an extra effort to encourage community college historians, particularly those in the extensive California community college system, to join OAH and attend the annual meeting next April.

We all benefit from the various kinds of expertise we bring to the table. As university researchers learn more about the state of history in the K-12 classrooms and as precollege teachers develop a better understanding of the past through their connection with university professors and public historians, we will all be better prepared to combat the growing historical illiteracy in our society.

This historical illiteracy, highlighted in a recent survey taken for the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, has grabbed Congress's attention. As we go to press, we learn that the U.S. Senate has just approved, 98-0, Robert Byrd's appropriation bill amendment providing $50 million "to develop, implement, and strengthen programs that teach American history (not social studies) as a separate subject within school curricula." Already in Massachusetts the effort is underway to replace social studies in the precollege curriculum with history.

As more precollege teachers look to professional historians for help, it is imperative that the OAH, as the professional organization and the learned society for American historians, welcomes all practitioners of the discipline into the fold. Together we will be much more effective in helping all Americans—in and out of the classroom—gain a deeper understanding of their past.

The Dangers of CIA and Other "Hidden" Sponsorship of Historical Scholarship

At its 2000 spring meeting in St. Louis, the OAH Executive Board discussed an issue raised by OAH member Paul Buhle of Brown University.

Professor Buhle requested that the board officially encourage research into the ways in which the CIA affected the scholarly agenda in the 1950s and 1960s. The executive board acknowledged the importance of understanding the implications of the hidden sponsorship of research and agreed to encourage dialogue on the subject by asking members to contribute articles about hidden sponsorship to the OAH Newsletter.
Correspondence

Responses to 'Respecting Diversity'

Dear Editors,

When I first read E.J. Pollack's "Respecting Diversity," I was surprised that a scholar would so openly express his anti-Catholic prejudice, yet I was dismayed that the OAH Newsletter would publish it. But on second thought I realized that Professor Pollack's call for tolerance of diversity made me see the 2000 OAH meeting in a new light.

Not only did the OAH Board ignore Professor Pollack's complaint about meeting at a Jesuit University; they willfully scheduled the conference in a city named for a Catholic saint. On every piece of conference literature OAH members were assaulted with the Catholic symbol "St." Much worse than a Pius XII library on a campus is the power of Professor Pollack's call for pro-choice members to meet at a university whose core institution memorializes Pius XII particularly honored by the church for opening the whole genocide against Indian peoples. The conference city's name forced the OAH to align itself with genocide and religious intolerance.

Respect for diversity was further flaunted by asking pro-choice members to meet at a university whose medical school will not teach abortion procedures. Nor did St. Louis University make the slightest effort to prevent the numerous flowering trees on campus from blooming, even though there were OAH members who suffered from allergies. But these were mere minor irritations to the offensiveness of a city that takes pride in being the "gateway" to western expansion. Before St. Louis was given its Catholic name, the area was known as "Mound City," because of all the American Indian earthen architecture found at the site.

The modern city and its Jesuit University literally are built on the bones of a Native American civilization. Of course, the OAH chose to overlook this history and the larger issue that a Catholic, Christopher Columbus began the whole genocide against Indian peoples.

I strongly recommend that the OAH Council consider holding no further meetings until they can guarantee that their members will not be subjected to cultures, ideas, and histories that may be in any way offensive. Perhaps the cultural vacuum of cyberspace can provide the hermetic environment necessary to protect Professor Pollack's [sic] sensibilities and prejudices.

Until that time I think the OAH Board, the Catholic Church, and the Society of Jesus should join in intoning for his benefit, max culpa, max culpa, non maximum culpa.

The May 2000 issue of the OAH Newsletter was truly shocking. It printed a "Viewpoint" from four members of the OAH that was hate mail, no more, no less. The authors of this "viewpoint" criticized the OAH for moving the convention to St. Louis University because it is a Catholic institution. The authors gave all sorts of reasons to justify their stance, but when all is said and done, they are bigots who dislike the Roman Catholic Church. They have insulted all OAH members who are Roman Catholics and/or alumni of Catholic institutions.

I will not demean myself by refuting their attacks. I see no reason why they are apologizing for being a Roman Catholic who attended a Catholic college (Fordham) and a Jesuit high school. To be drawn into a debate is like a Black having to justify himself when attacked by racists.

Intelligent bigotry always disguises itself. It looks to the sciences or to "Americanism" or to fashionable views for justification. The authors of the "Viewpoint" point to diversity to justify themselves. They point to their Jewish background, their sense of victimhood, to justify their lack of tolerance.

Their insensitive "viewpoint" shows that bigotry is not the exclusive property of hooded yahoos or of a white Christian hotel owner. The remarks of the four authors of the "viewpoint" are proof that hate can come from any part of the multicultural mosaic.

This is an unpleasant truth that all Americans must recognize as we enter the new millennium.

—Lawrence Squeri
East Stroudsrg University

E.G. Pollack responds:

Unfortunately, neither letter writer engages with any of the issues raised in my Viewpoint piece, "Respecting Diversity in the OAH." One letter is jejune; the other lacks context. Both represent precisely the kind of insensitivities I hoped to highlight.

To label us "bigots" for protesting the Church's long history of lethal antisemitism is sophistry. To equate the discomfort some might feel at seeing alcohol being served at several social functions, which one need not attend, with being, in effect, forced to speak beneath a centuries' old symbol of aggressive antisemitism if one were to participate in any of the sessions at the convention, is not only to use a spurious analogy, but to trivialize the history of antisemitism.

To ask why we did not complain that the OAH "willfully scheduled the conference in a city named for a Catholic saint honored by the church for leading a crusade against Islam" is to substitute a puerile and—specious—form of mockery for argument. Aside from the letter writer's failure to understand the difference between holding sessions in rooms adorned with what to us are antisemitic icons, and the abstraction of meeting in a city named for whomever, it is notable that he never mentioned that Saint Louis was, in fact, renowned for his particularly virulent antisemitism. Indeed, William of Chartres commented of Saint Louis, "Jews he hatred so much that he could not bear to look on them." He even confiscated and "burned all copies of the Talmud he could lay his hands on." One historian has observed, "Despite, or perhaps because of, his cruel and violent attitudes and actions toward Jews, Louis was canonized a martyr twenty-seven years after his death.

It is a truth that we, the letter writer proceeds to chastise the OAH for daring to hold its convention in a city "built on the bones of a Native American civilization," and for overlooking "that a Catholic, Christopher Columbus began the whole genocide against Indian peoples." But would the letter writer ever mock those who protest meeting beneath a centuries' old "symbol of aggressive antisemitism" if one were to participate in any of the sessions at the convention? Here was an opportunity to stand up in defense of historical truth, even as an act of solidarity, to call for the opening to scholars of the Vatican Archives for the study of the "purification not for memory—but for the recovery of memory. As one analyst wrote, "the past is not to be recovered," but "disarmed." And although the Vatican has now responded to the outcry of Jewish organizations worldwide against its attempt to elevate Pius XII to sainthood by agreeing to the appointment of six eminent historians, three "Jewish historians" and three Catholic ones, to assess his record during the Holocaust, they can examine only the eleven volumes of published Vatican materials. Given this, I concluded that for historians to convene at a school whose centerpiece is the Pius XII Memorial Library, without raising any of these issues—with only the leadership's fulsome praise—was, in effect, to participate in the cover-up. Here was an opportunity to stand up in defense of historical truth, even to call for the opening to scholars of the Vatican Archives pertaining to the Holocaust—not to remain silent or to celebrate, betraying the historian's central role.

—E.G. Pollack

In Search of Traditional Medicine

Dear Editors:

The emergence of modern science has affected the lives of many people in ways we might think of as improving their lives for the better. But science is not the only way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind. There are other systems that are far older and wider than science. For example, in Southern Africa, science is not a system, but a way of solving problems of mankind.

Many historians and healthcare providers seem not to be aware that in African traditional-medical knowledge and practice, there is a vast sea of knowledge opportunities, which all along await their exploitation, articulation, and use in new-drug preparations. In widening the scope and horizon of other thinkers and their potential resources of knowledge, I am eagerly inviting personalities from different persuasions across the globe to come and share noble ideas and experience, skills pertaining to the "Doctrine of Signatures," traditional wisdom that states that all native medicinal and aromatic plants resemble the diseases and ailments that they treat. Really, historical study cannot be simply made to stand on its head. Direct inquiries in confidence to No. 20-15th Cress, Warren Park 2, Harare, Zimbabwe.

—Leon Mungofa

The May 2000 issue of the OAH Newsletter was truly shocking. It printed a "Viewpoint" from four members of the OAH that was hate mail, no more, no less. The authors of this "viewpoint" criticized the OAH for moving the convention to St. Louis University because it is a Catholic institution. The authors gave all sorts of reasons to justify their stance, but when all is said and done, they are bigots who dislike the Roman Catholic Church. They have insulted all OAH members who are Roman Catholics and/or alumni of Catholic institutions.

I will not demean myself by refuting their attacks. I see no reason why they are apologizing for being a Roman Catholic who attended a Catholic college (Fordham) and a Jesuit high school. To be drawn into a debate is like a Black having to justify himself when attacked by racists.
Yale University gives OAH $10,000 toward Meeting Move Costs

Yale University, with the help of immediate OAH Past President David Blight, contributed $10,000 to OAH to help defray the expenses of moving the 2000 OAH Annual Meeting from the Adam's Mark Hotel to Saint Louis University. Montgomery, professor emeritus at Yale, received support from the university throughout his tenure as OAH President. At Montgomery’s request, Richard G. Levin, President of Yale University, agreed to assist the organization, which has already incurred expenses in excess of $94,000. In a letter to Montgomery, Levin wrote, “Because of the extraordinary circumstances surrounding the need to relocate the conference, I believe your request is most valid, and I would be pleased to have you donate these funds in Yale’s name.” OAH has received $20,000 in donations and life memberships from individuals on the OAH Executive Board, and $42,000 from members and other contributors. OAH also raised $8,000 at the Presidential Address at Christ Church Cathedral in St. Louis.

On 13 February 2000, the OAH Executive Board decided to move the annual meeting to a new location after the U.S. Justice Department and other groups sued the Adam’s Mark hotel and its parent company HBE for practicing racial discrimination against hotel guests. One week before the OAH annual meeting, the hotel chain settled out of court with the litigants to the amount of $8,000,000, but admitted no wrongdoing.

Freedom Gets a Forum

What have terms such as “freedom” and “liberty” meant in the American past? What are the legacies of the American Revolution? A month before the release of Mel Gibson’s new summer movie, The Patriot, which parades such questions in front of mass audiences while obscuring meaningful answers, the National Park Service hosted a history symposium in Boston that shed much light.

On 2 to 3 June 2000, the NPS’s “Changing Meanings of Freedom” symposium marked the 225th anniversary of the American Revolution. It brought together more than 300 precollege teachers, college/university faculty, NPS staff, and other historians to examine the “contested terrain” of freedom and how it has been constantly created and recreated.

Eric Foner’s 1998 book The Story of American Freedom was the inspiration for the symposium. Conference organizer Marty Blatt, historian and chief of cultural resources at Boston National Historical Park, arranged a stellar cast of speakers for the two-day event and coordinated the support of the Boston 2000’s Boston Freedom Award, The History Channel, Suffolk University, Massachusetts Historical Society, Freedom Trail sites, the National Park Service, OAH, and others.

Evidence of the symposium’s success was abundant. Despite a violent thunderstorm, a crowd of 450 turned out for David McCullough’s opening address at Old South Meeting House. His discussion of his forthcoming joint biography of John and Abigail Adams drew a standing ovation—a rare accolade for a historical talk—and set the tone of enthusiastic engagement that characterized the rest of the symposium. Eric Foner’s presentation on The Story of American Freedom kicked off Saturday’s sessions, which took place at Suffolk.

Thank you!

OAH Lectureships support the mission of the organization and provide revenue for new initiatives. We’d like to thank the following lecturers who spoke at the following locations during 1999-2000:

JOYCE APPELY — Peppardine University
THOMAS BENDE — University of Tulsa
IRA BERLIN — Lycoming College
DAVID BLIGHT — Boise State University
ROBERT BEENTJES-TOLPIN — Loyd College
SUSAN HARRMAN — Ohio Northern University
PHILIP DELORIA — College of Staten Island
ROGER DANIELS — College of Staten Island
SARA EVANS — Kent State University
CLAYBROOKE CARSON — Utah Valley State College
CARL DREZLER — Johnson Community College
ANN LAM — Auburn University
ALAN BRINKLEY — Fordham University
GEORGE FREDRICSON — Otterbein College
WALDO MARTIN — University of Memphis
LINDA K. KERBER — University of Akron
DAVID KENNEDY — Western Illinois University
LLOYD GARDNER — Spring Hill College
WILLIAM CHEER — Southern Arkansas University
PETE DANIEL — University of Cincinnati
DAVID ROEDIGER — University of Kentucky
SHAUN HAYDEN — University of New Hampshire
FRED HOUDE — Central Washington University
ALICIA KISSER-HARRIS — Temple University
ROY D. MEADOWS — Youngstown State University
HAROLD HYMAN — Southwest Texas State University
JACQUELINE JONES — Univ. of Texas, San Antonio
MARY BETH NORTON — University of North Texas
VICKI RIEF — DePauw University
JOHN MURPHY — Washington University, St. Louis
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John A. DeNovo

John A. DeNovo, retired Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin, died on 26 January 2000 in Madison at the age of eighty-three. One of America’s leading scholars of U.S. relations with the Middle East in the twentieth century, he left a significant legacy to the historical profession and to the universities at which he spent most of his career—Wisconsin and Pennsylvania State.

Before arriving at Yale to work with Samuel Flagg Bemis in 1945, John received a B.A. from Knox College and an M.A. from the University of Minnesota. He served as an officer in the U.S. Navy from 1941 to 1945. He then received his Ph.D. in 1948, and in that same year married a Knox classmate and fellow historian, Jeanne Humphreys. The DeNovos spent the next sixteen years at Pennsylvania State University, where John advanced from Instructor to Professor of History.

In 1964, the DeNovos moved to the University of Wisconsin, together with their daughter Ann, and son Jay. For the next seventeen years John taught at Madison, specializing in U.S. Diplomatic History: a dedicated teacher and scholar, John became a fixture in the History Department both as a faculty colleague and as a mentor to his graduate students. A summer cottage on Blue Lake in northern Wisconsin served as an escape and refuge for family and friends.

John’s Ph.D. dissertation, “Petroleum and American Diplomacy in the Near East, 1908-1928,” in time grew into his best-known publication, American Interests and Policies in the Middle East, 1900-1933, published in 1963 by the University of Minnesota Press. It won a Prize Award in Phil Alpha Theta’s biennial national book competition. He also published significant chapters and articles, with two of the latter appearing in the Mississippi Valley Historical Review and one in the Journal of American History. During his career John participated in numerous invitational conferences and symposia. He studied at Harvard and at Johns Hopkins on a Ford Foundation fellowship for study of the Middle East in 1956 to 1957, and twenty years later he was a visiting scholar at the U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration (now the Department of Energy). He was a founding member of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations and a long-time member of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association/Organization of American Historians and the American Historical Association.

John retired in 1981 and remained active (learning Italian, continuing to play the piano, etc.) until suffering a debilitating stroke in 1992 that forced him to spend most of his time in a wheelchair. Though physically limited and living in a nursing home, he remained alert and in touch with others.

John DeNovo was both a distinguished scholar and a true gentleman. He cared about people and was viewed in the History Department as a model of integrity, someone who always was trying to find, and helping others to find, common ground with those of different views.

John cared especially about his graduate students, to whom he was both mentor and friend. Between Penn State and Wisconsin together, he directed thirty-four masters theses and more than fifteen doctoral dissertations. He was thoughtful and painstaking in his own scholarship, and he was no less insightful and painstaking in the caring for and helping of the work of his students. Such interest coming from some major professors, sors might have been daunting, but it was not for John’s students. He lightened this potentially demanding load by bringing his students to his home for a friendly dinner, and sometimes for a year-end get-together. Though physically limited, he kept his intellectual energy and humor. His fondness for puns was legendary.

On 25 March a memorial service was held in Madison to honor John DeNovo. Speaking on that occasion were a number of his former Ph.D. students, from both Penn State and Wisconsin, as well as family members, faculty colleagues, and others, who cared for him as a teacher, colleague, mentor, friend, father, and model human being.

Richard Hume Working
U.S. Naval Academy
Gerald K. Haines
U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.
a result some people send manuscripts to the Journal, and some people send manuscripts elsewhere. One of my goals is to change the process of self-selection so that more historians see the Journal as a place where they should submit their work. That aside, historians submit manuscripts to the Journal, and we read them in the Journal office. The associate editor reads the manuscript first and writes a report on it. The editor reads the report and the manuscript and then chooses outside reviewers to serve as referees. We usually include a member of the editorial board among the outside referees.

RS: How many?
JM: In the past, it has been quite a few. Manuscripts have been sent out to five or six readers, which many authors find excessive. We may well reduce those numbers with the hope that we can cut the time taken to reach a decision. Once the reviewers’ reports come in, the editor, associate editor, assistant editor, and other staff sit down together to go over reports on the more promising pieces and decide jointly what would improve each manuscript. Then the editor writes a letter to the author with a decision and with specific suggestions for improving the piece. I have to say here that I haven’t actually started working as editor yet. The acting editor David Nord and the current associate editor Wendy Gember are now doing the job quite well. So what I’m talking about is not what I’ve done but what has gone on in the past.

RS: As you were talking, I was just thinking about that process of self-selection. Journal has kind of an interesting role, because so many times each subfield has its own journal. How do you make a decision to send something to the Journal rather than to the Journal of Southern History, the Journal of Women’s History?

JM: We have many first-rate journals that cover specific sub-specialties within U.S. history. The Journal of American History is especially interested in the kinds of articles that speak across subfields, that address larger questions in U.S. history, or that alert historians to the cutting edge in subfields other than their own. Some articles are more suited for a specialized journal. But sometimes an author has a manuscript that would fit perfectly into the Journal, and she or he decides not to send it to us. Like all editors, I want authors to send us their manuscripts. We’ll treat them all fairly, and we’ll make our decisions as quickly as possible.

RS: A lot of us look at the articles, but what we really go for are the book reviews. How do you see the book reviews in the role of the Journal?
JM: Well, the book reviews are central to the Journal. The Journal is the journal of record for American history, and we make it our goal to review the original scholarly books in the field. We now publish more than six hundred book reviews each year. That’s a central part of the Journal, and that’s a part of the Journal I’ll certainly maintain.

RS: When a book comes out now, a review shows up on H-Net within a period of months, whereas it takes years literally for the book reviews to come out in print. How do you see the interaction between the H-Net reviews and the Journal reviews?
JM: Well, most books are reviewed more than once, and that’s a good thing. Unfortunately, because of the requirements of print technology, we can’t present reviews to our readers as quickly as H-Net can. It’s possible that at some point in the future we may start posting some of the reviews on our website as soon as they’re edited, but we’re not quite at that point yet. So I think that we could say that H-Net offers a quick review that comes out earlier, and we offer a review that comes out a little bit later but that undergoes a more rigorous process of editing and has a certain kind of permanency that comes with appearing in print. The print volumes will be in libraries for decades to come, or so I hope.

RS: You are at the National Humanities Center this year, right?
JM: Yes, I’m on leave this year at the National Humanities Center in North Carolina. I’m completing a draft of my book on the history of transsexuality in the United States. It’s tentatively titled, “How Sex Changed.” I’m starting in the early twentieth century with the early sex change experiments on animals in Europe, and then moving to the United States and tracing out the social, medical, and cultural history of transsexuality up to the present. I see this history as a way to explore changing conceptions of sex, gender, and sexuality.

RS: What have I not asked you about that you want to talk about with the OAH readers?
JM: I might be wrong here, but I think there is still some agreement among historians about what constitutes good history. We write on different topics and we have political differences, but I believe we generally share similar standards of evidence and notions of valid argument. In the classrooms, textbooks, or museums, most of us address a broad range of U.S. history, not just our own specialties. I’m hoping that the Journal serves as a place where historians find the best of the best in all of the subfields of U.S. history and learn about specialties other than their own. I’d also like to say that all of my thoughts about where the Journal might go are still in the process of formation. I’m just starting the job, and nothing is yet set in stone. I welcome any suggestions from members of the OAH.

Joanne Meyrowitz can be reached at: jmeyrow@indiana.edu.
Both comprehensive and balanced, America's History is also the most explanatory textbook available for the U.S. survey course. The authors tell what and why through a narrative that traces social, economic, and cultural themes as clearly as political developments and compelling writing that emphasizes causes, connections, and consequences.

- Unique narrative structure. Each of six parts begins at a crucial turning point in history, such as the American Revolution or the cold war; chapters within parts explore the dynamic forces that created new conditions of life at the time.

- U.S. history in a global context. The text encourages students to understand what is comparable and what is distinctive about the American experience by revealing the interactions between America and the wider world.

- Rich array of features. The narrative is reinforced by American Voices (primary-source excerpts), American Lives (brief biographies), and new Voices From Abroad (primary-source views of the U.S. by outsiders) — plus twice as many New Technology boxes.

- New Epilogue. The first textbook to treat explicitly the problems historians face in dealing with current events, the fourth edition closes with "America and the World at 2000: How Historians Interpret Contemporary Events and Their Legacy to the Future."

Based on the highly successful survey text, The American Promise: A History of the United States, the new Compact Edition retains all the color, pedagogy, and narrative strengths of the original version at two-thirds the length — for a complete text that can be assigned alone or with outside readings. Condensed by the authors themselves, the Compact Edition avoids extraneous facts in favor of full, vivid discussions of major political, social, economic, and cultural changes.

- "Big picture" approach highlights the most important events and themes of the American past.

- Integration of political and social history in a structure that students can negotiate with ease.

- Highly acclaimed art program has over 300 images — many in full color — and extensive captions retained from the full-length text. Over 100 full-color maps reinforce and extend the narrative.

Free Supplements Offer

- If instructors wish to offer their students material more closely correlated with the textbook, Bedford / St. Martin's will package the Student Guide to Accompany America's History, Fourth Edition or the Study Guide to Accompany The American Promise, Compact Edition free with each new copy of the text purchased.

  Note: These two offers are not valid in combination.

  Student Guide to Accompany America's History, Fourth Edition:
  Volume I (0-312–25066–5) or
  Volume II (0–312–25061–4).

  Study Guide to Accompany The American Promise, Compact Edition:
  Volume I (0–312–25066–5) or
  Volume II (0–312–25061–4).

- Alternatively, adopters of America's History, Fourth Edition or The American Promise, Compact Edition are eligible to select one of the 53 American history titles in the Bedford Series in History and Culture FREE with every new core text purchased. To see a complete list of series titles, visit our online catalog at www.bedfordstmartins.com.

For more information about these special offers, please contact your local sales representative or email facultyservices@bfwpub.com.
A DOCTORATE WITH A DIFFERENCE

WHERE: GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY in Fairfax, Virginia—15 miles from downtown Washington

WHEN: ADMITTING OUR FIRST CLASS IN FALL 2001

WHAT: DISTINCTIVE FEATURES

- New Media and New Technology: GMU's Center for History and New Media has established an international reputation as an innovative leader in applying new technology to the study, presentation, and teaching of history. Work in history and new media and technology will be significant in the training of all students in this program.

- Public and Applied History: Building on a successful M.A. in applied history as well as the unparalleled resources of the Washington metropolitan area, the doctoral program will offer training for students interested in working in public history as well as for those already employed in applied areas.

- Openness to A Mix of Traditional and Non-Traditional Students: The GMU program specifically accommodates older students and students with full-time professional careers by offering flexible scheduling and making extensive use of electronic media of communication. We are particularly interested in attracting students who have established careers but want the further professional development offered by a doctoral program.

- A High Quality Faculty and Individualized Attention for Students: Students benefit from a nationally renowned faculty whose publications have shaped their respective fields. A small size program provides individual attention to all students who will have flexibility in shaping their program. Substantial financial support is available.

WHO:
Shaul Bakhash (Middle East)
Lawrence Butler (Byzantine Art)
Ben Carton (Africa)
Jack Censer (France)
Jane Turner Censer (U.S.)
John Cheng (U.S.)
Martin Cohen (U.S.)
Dina Copelmon (England)
Robert DeCaroli (Asian Art)
Marion Beshmukh (Germany)
Sheila Folliott (Art)
Sumaiya Hamdani (Middle East)
Joseph Harsh (U.S.)
Robert Hawkes (U.S.)
Peter Henricks (U.S.)
Mack Holt (France)
Ronald Jensen (Russia)
Matthew Karush (Latin America)
Alison Landsberg (U.S.)
Lawrence Levine (U.S.)
Randolph Lytton (Ancient)
Carol Mattusch (Ancient Art)
Barbara Melosh (U.S.)
Maureen Miller (Medieval)
Mike O'Malley (U.S.)
Brian Platt (Japan)
Roy Rosenzweig (U.S.)
Suzanne Smith (U.S.)
Peter Stearns (Global/Social)
Jeffrey Stewart (U.S.)
Ellen Todd (U.S. Art)
Rex Wade (Soviet)
Roger Wilkins (U.S.)
Rosemarie Zagarri (U.S.)

HOW:
Contact: Ph.D. Coordinator, Department of History & Art History MS 361, George Mason University Fairfax, VA 22030-4444; 703-993-1250. E-mail: history@gmu.edu Web site: http://history.gmu.edu
dening "military history" in favor of "politically correct history." Moreover, owners and operators of fast food restaurants and wax museums (across the street from our current location) bitterly opposed our proposed move of the visitor facilities, and their criticisms captured the attention of both the media and the Congress. In fact, the Secretary of the Interior received 1,100 postcards from a portion of the Civil War constituency, calling for my resignation if not removal, and protesting our plans to "modify and alter historical events." They wanted the NPS to "return to its unsigned and apolitical policies of the past, presenting history, not opinions."

The site visit from the OAH team took place in August 1998, and the written report from the team reached the park in September, just as the public debates over these issues was reaching its peak. The few days that professors Eric Foner, James McPherson, and Nina Silber spent with us in the summer of 1998, were sometimes, despite our best efforts, it takes the eyes of outsiders to really see what we are doing. The follow-up report that they prepared was worth most important findings of the team was that Gettysburg's interpretive programs had a pervasive southern sympathy. Professors Eric Foner, James McPherson, and Nina Silber agreed that in the southern point of view, and primarily emphasizing the heroism and sacrifices of the soldiers. But we said very little about why they fought each other.

Tackling their advice we have changed our theme—our sound bite, if you will. Now, instead of emphasizing the battle itself, we stress the meaning of the battle. That meaning, of course, was eloquently captured by President Lincoln in the Gettysburg Address, and our new interpretive theme is "A New Birth of Freedom." From that simple change we have refocused the entire tone of our interpretive programs.

3. Teaching Tips

NPS historians and interpreters, like academics, depend on texts to impart understanding. Again, the OAH team left us with much good advice on how to use our language more precisely and more effectively. As just one example, as soon as we proposed moving our interpretation away from exclusive discussions of military tactics and toward "contextual" history, we found ourselves caught up in "the causes of the Civil War" debate. You might think this had been settled by now, but you should know that a large segment of our Civil War constituency is still hotly arguing the case, as recently as the last issue of The Civil War News.

The challenge is to discuss such a complex issue in a relatively brief presentation without getting bogged down in endless debates with our watching "experts." The OAH team gave us the key to the solution; although it may be problematical to state that slavery was the cause, or the primary cause, of the Civil War, no one can argue against the statement that "slavery was the cause of secession, and secession was the cause of the war." That simple advice has given our rangers both the courage and the means to tackle the subject.

4. Professional Development

My final point is probably the greatest compliment to Professors Foner, McPherson and Silber. Their visit was so stimulating, that, at the staff's request, we have invested time and money in several follow-up sessions with other scholars. These have ranged from short staff seminars to explore particular problems or topics, to our "summer scholar" program, where we brought in Pete Car- michael (Western Carolina University) to spend three weeks with us during the height of our busy summer season. The reason we chose Pete as our first "summer scholar" was that he had worked his way through graduate school as a seasonal ranger at several Civil War battlefields, so he had first-hand experience with the joys and toils of public history. Pete conducted daily seminars for our interpretive staff, presented several public lectures in the evening, and left us with a reading list that few of us have yet conquered. It was a delightful experience, and we are determined to provide similar professional development opportunities for our staff every year.

Other initiatives and benefits that can be directly traced to our relationship with OAH include the symposium on interpretation at Civil War parks held at Ford's Theater in Washington this past May. Without the new spirit of involvement and cooperation, I doubt that we would have been able to attract such a brilliant collection of speakers to that symposium. The benefits of that seminar to all the Civil War parks, as well as the NPS, is obvious.

Finally, at Gettysburg, we are getting ready to build a new museum—the first professional museum Gettysburg NMP has ever had. It is our once-in-a-lifetime chance to enhance the awareness, the education, and the understanding of 1.7 million people each year. Naturally, we need help to make sure we do it right, so we are now recruiting an advisory panel of historians and museum specialists to help us out. I am pleased and very proud to say that when we began looking for help, Drs. Foner, McPherson, and Silber were the first to say, "Yes."

In conclusion, the partnership has done several things for NPS. It has reconnected us to our professional field, provided us access to both scholars and scholar- ship; presented professional development opportunities for our staff, and is helping us move in the right direction with our programming. What is it doing for the OAH? On an organizational level, the OAH is helping the NPS provide better educational opportunities to the millions of people who visit national parks each year. And I hope that on a personal level, the scholars on the site review teams went home knowing that they have made a difference.

John A. Latscher <jahlatscher@nps.gov> is superintendent of Gettysburg National Military Park in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

---

Harvard-Newcomen Postdoctoral Fellowship in Business History

$46,000

The Harvard Business School and the Newcomen Society of the United States announce a postdoctoral fellowship for the academic year 2001/2002. The purposes of the fellowship are to enable scholars who within the last ten years have completed the Ph.D. in history, economics, or a related discipline to engage in research that will benefit from the resources of the Harvard Business School and the larger Boston scholarly community and to provide training and experience in teaching.

Application: Interested persons should request a Fellowship information sheet and application from Karima Abdel-Meguid at the address below. Applications for the upcoming academic year must be received by November 1, 2000.

Stipend: $46,000 for 12 months plus travel and book funds and administrative support.

Contact: Professor Thomas McCraw
c/o Karima Abdel-Meguid, Morgan Hall 270, Harvard Business School, Boston, MA 02163 email: Kabdelmeggid@hbs.edu

University Law School, located along Freedom Trail in downtown Boston. This comfortable facility also housed a complementary museum exhibit, and the law school bookstore, which had stocked a large number of books by program participants, had bare shelves by the end of the day.

John A. Latscher <jahlatscher@nps.gov> is superintendent of Gettysburg National Military Park in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.
Announcements

"Professional Opportunity" announcements should represent an equal opportunity employment guarantee; they must contain all requested words; $90 for 101-150 words; over 150 words will be edited. Application closing dates should be after the end of the month in which the announcement appears. Send announcements to Advertising Director (advertise@oah.org). Deadlines for receipt of announcements are: 1) January for February issue; 1 April for May; 1 July for August; and 1 October for November. Announcements will be edited. Positions appearing here will also be listed on the OAH web page: <http://www.oah.org/>

Professional Opportunities

University of Houston

The University of Houston invites nominations and applications for the position of Director of African American Studies. Preference will be given to candidates at the associate professor level. Successful candidates must possess a Ph.D. in African American Studies or a closely related field. Review of applications will begin immediately and will continue until the position is filled. For additional information, please contact: Dunlap 4.26 in person, or Dunlap 4.26 at (713) 743-5656.

Activities of Members

Gretchen A. Adams, University of New Hampshire, received the Kate B. and Hall J. Peterson Fellowships for her work, "The Spectrum of Violence: Race, Resistant Mobility, and the American South," published in Civil War History: A Journal of the Civil War, 1861-1865, Volume 46, No. 3, September 2000, Chicago History Museum.
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Institute Postdoctoral NEH Fellowship 2001 - 2003

The Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture offers a two-year postdoctoral fellowship in any area of early American studies, to begin July 1, 2001. A principal criterion for selection is that the candidate's dissertation or other manuscript have significant potential as a distinguished, book-length contribution to scholarship. A substantial portion of the work must have been written by the time of the application. Applicants may not have previously published or have under contract a scholarly monograph, and they must have met all requirements for the doctorate before commencing the fellowship. Those who have earned the Ph.D. and begun careers are also encouraged to apply. The Institute holds first claim on publishing the appointed fellow's completed manuscript. The Institute's scope encompasses the history and cultures of North America's indigenous and immigrant peoples during the colonial, Revolutionary, and early national periods of the United States and the related histories of Canada, the Caribbean, Latin America, the British Isles, Europe, and Africa, from the sixteenth century to approximately 1815.

Fellows devote most of their time to research and writing, work closely with the editorial staff, and participate in colloquia and other scholarly activities of the Institute. In addition to a beginning stipend of $40,000, the fellowship provides office, research, and computer facilities as well as some travel funds for conferences and research. Fellows hold concurrent appointment as assistant professor in the appropriate department at the College of William and Mary and teach a total of six semester hours during the two-year term.

Institute fellows also have the option of spending a summer at the Huntington Library on a full grant within five years of their residency in Williamsburg.

For the calendar year 2002 the fellow will be supported principally by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Stipend is $40,000.

Institute - Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral Research Fellowship 2001 - 2002

The Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture invites applications for a one-year Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral Research Fellowship in any area of early American studies, to begin July 1, 2001. The award carries a year's support to revise the applicant's first book manuscript and the Institute's commitment to publish the resulting study. The Institute's scope encompasses the history of the western United States, the northwestern United States, and the six North American nations with whom the United States was at war during the colonial, Revolutionary, and early national periods of the United States and the related histories of Canada, the Caribbean, Latin America, the British Isles, Europe, and Africa, from the sixteenth century to approximately 1815.

The principal criterion for selection is that the candidate's manuscript have significant potential for publication as a distinguished, book-length contribution to scholarship. Applicants must submit a completed manuscript and may not have another scholarly monograph under contract. They must have met all requirements for the doctorate at least twelve months prior to commencing the fellowship. The Institute will hold first rights to publishing the revised study. The application should reflect a thoughtful program for revision. Persons who have previously participated in the Institute-National Endowment for the Humanities postdoctoral fellowship competition may apply, but former recipients of that fellowship will not be eligible. Those who qualify may apply simultaneously to both programs.

A year-long residency at the Institute is recommended; however, flexible arrangements are possible. No other employment may be held during the fellowship. Fellows are expected to devote their time exclusively to research and writing and to work closely with the editorial staff. The fellowship provides a stipend of $45,000 and a comprehensive benefits package; in addition, office facilities at the Institute and some travel funds for conferences and research are available.

The Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral Research Fellowship will be open to all eligible persons equally, including foreign nationals. It is made possible by a generous grant to the Institute by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and will be the same amount over the next three years. The Institute is a National Endowment for the Humanities-designated Independent Research Institute; is cosponsored by the College of William and Mary and the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation; and is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer. Members of underrepresented groups, including persons of color, persons with disabilities, Vietnam veterans, and women are encouraged to apply.

Further information and application forms may be obtained by writing to Institute-NEH Fellowship, OIEAHC, P.O. Box 8781, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8781. E-mail: ieachc@wm.edu Website: http://www.wm.edu/oieahc/fello.html Application deadline is November 1, 2000.
For 94 years, OAH members have told America’s stories.

Last year, we honored nineteen historians for their efforts in telling these stories.

Where is your application this year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>2000 - 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC-CLIO Award</td>
<td>for scholarship in journal literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnouw Award</td>
<td>for media production in U.S. history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billington Prize</td>
<td>for outstanding book in American frontier history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binkley-Stephenson Award</td>
<td>for best article published in the JAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craven Award</td>
<td>for most original book on the Civil War era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curti Award</td>
<td>for American social and intellectual history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-Language Book Prize</td>
<td>for U.S. history in a foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawley Prize</td>
<td>for American political history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huggins-Quarles Award</td>
<td>for minority graduate students' research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lerner-Scott Prize</td>
<td>for best dissertation in U.S. women's history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill Travel Grants</td>
<td>for young scholars in 20th century political history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelzer Award</td>
<td>for best graduate student essay in U.S. history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawley Prize</td>
<td>for history of American race relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudwick Prize</td>
<td>for racial and ethnic minority history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tachau Award</td>
<td>for excellent teaching in K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelen Prize</td>
<td>for best foreign language article on U.S. history</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turner Award: Best first book on American history

Hurry! Most of our deadlines are 1 October!
The John Nichols Brown Center is accepting applications for its Research Fellowship, open to scholars at all ranks, excep- tionally talented, and independent scholars. The Fellowship supports scholarship in American topics, and offers office space, access to Brown University resources, and a stipend of up to $8,000 for a six month residence term. There will be two award cycles: January-June, and July-December. Application deadline is 1 November 2000. Contact: Joyce M. Botelho, John Nichols Brown Center, Box 1880, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912; <jbotelho@brown.edu>

The Harvard Business School and the Newcomen Society of the United States announce a postdoctoral fellowship for the academic year 2001-2002. Stipend is $46,000 for the year, plus a travel allowance, and supplementary administrative support. The purposes of the fellowship are to enable scholars to continue work on a project they have completed the PhD in history, economics, or a related discipline to engage in research that will benefit Harvard Business School and the larger Boston scholarly community. Deadline: 6 November 2000. For application information and instructions, contact: Newcomen Society fellowship information sheet and application from Karima Abdel-Meguid at: Morgan Hall 270, Harvard Business School, Boston, MA 02163. The Newcomen Society is a non-profit organization of the United States is announcing its new Western Front Association Annual Undergraduate Essay Competition. The essay may address virtually any aspect of the American experience during the years 1910-1924, and must be within the scope of the impact of World War One on this country. Deadline is 31 December 2000 and first prize winner is to be contacted by Paul Cora at sq174@al.com.

The Committee on Lesbian and Gay History of the OAH invites applications for the first annual Jefferson Davis Award, to be presented biennially for the best book-length narrative relating to the Confederate period, and the first Jefferson Davis Award will be presented at the OAH Annual Meeting in New Orleans, March 15-18, 2001. The award includes $4,000 and a plaque for a monograph. Deadline is 1 March 2001. Contact: Dr. John M. Cosper, Department of History, University of Richmond, 2801 East Clay Street, Richmond, VA 23229; <library@moc.org>

The Rockefeller Archive Center, 15 Dayton Avenue, Pocantico Hills, Sleepy Hollow, New York 10591, invites applications for its 2001-2002 residential Fellowship Program. At least three fellowships are available for up to two semesters in residence, at any time of year. The fellowship is open to scholars in any field, who are engaged in research that requires use of primary materials and support the Center's program of residencies for research at Rockefeller Archive Center for the year 2000. Stipend is $5,000. Stipend is $5,000, will be given annu- ally at the Autumn Meeting for the next five years. Deadline is 1 December. All manu- scripts are subject to review before being consid- ered by the Society's editorial board. Contact: <caroleaps@amphilsoc.org> <www.rockefeller.edu>.

The Bicentennial Commission of the United States is accepting nominations for its 31st annual book awards competition. The award, the Millennium Award, for the best book on lesbian/gay history written in English by a North American citizen. The Millennium Award is presented biennially for the best book-length essay nominating for its 31st annual book awards competition. The Jefferson Davis Award is pre-

The Southern Association of College and University Resist- enced by the Florida Historical Society, invites submissions for its annual book award competition, the Percy G. Adams Prize. The book award is open to any author writing in English, and the book must be a monograph. Deadline is 31 August 2000. Authors must be mem- bers of SEASCS. Articles may be submitted only once in any given year. The prize is awarded by the judges on behalf. Submit articles in triplicate by 1 De- cember 2000 to Heather McPherson, Department of History, 113 Humanities Building, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama 35294.

The American Historical Association invites applications for its 2001-2002 Residential History Fellowship Program. Approximately twenty-five fellowships will be awarded. NEH appointments, 4-12 months at $2,500 per month; dissertation fellowships, $650 per month; and general grants, 1-3 months at $1,500 per month. Fellowship support is presented at the Society's editorial board. The American Historical Association Annual Meeting in New Orleans, March 15-18, 2001. The award includes $4,000 and a plaque for a monograph. Deadline is 1 March 2001. Contact: Dr. John M. Cosper, Department of History, University of Richmond, 2801 East Clay Street, Richmond, VA 23229; <library@moc.org>

The Rockefeller Archive Center announces available funds to support short-term research in the field of American history designed for the general public, the arts, and related communities. At least three fellowships are available for up to two semesters in residence, at any time of year. The fellowship is open to scholars in any field, who are engaged in research that requires use of primary materials and support the Center's program of residencies for research at Rockefeller Archive Center for the year 2000. Stipend is $5,000. Stipend is $5,000, will be given annu- annually at the Autumn Meeting for the next five years. Deadline is 1 December. All manu- scripts are subject to review before being consid- ered by the Society's editorial board. Contact: <caroleaps@amphilsoc.org> <www.rockefeller.edu>.

The Shelby Cullom Davis Center for His- toric Research, Princeton University, announces a short-term fellowship for one or two semesters in revision or expansion of the book on lesbian/gay history written in English by a North American citizen. The Millennium Award is presented biennially for the best book-length essay nominating for its 31st annual book awards competition. The Jefferson Davis Award is pre-
The 2001 Program Committee for the Western History Association invites proposals for papers for its 41st annual conference, held in Reno, Nevada, on 16-19 November 2001. The theme for this year is "Community and Change in the Twentieth Century," which invites proposals on all aspects of the history of health and healing - from the institutional to the grassroots. In keeping with the theme, the conference will focus on American history from the perspective of women, African Americans, and Native Americans. Applications are encouraged to submit proposals for papers on all aspects of the history of health and healing, including but not limited to the following topics:

- The history of public health in the United States
- The history of medicine and health care in the United States
- The history of medical education in the United States
- The history of medical research in the United States
- The history of medical ethics in the United States
- The history of medical technology in the United States
- The history of medical politics in the United States
- The history of medical law in the United States

The conference will take place at the University of Nevada, Reno, and will feature keynote addresses by leading scholars in the field of American history. The conference will also include a number of panel discussions, workshops, and exhibitions related to the theme. Applications are due by 1 October 2000. Please submit proposals via email to Professor Joseph A. Hofstadter, Chair of the Program Committee, at Hofstadter@unr.edu. Deadline for submissions is 15 October 2000. The conference will be held on 16-19 November 2001, at the University of Nevada, Reno.
Meetings and Conferences

The fall meeting of the American Institute of Architects Historic Resources Committee will be held in conjunction with Restoration and Resilience on 7-9 September 2000 at the Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center in historic downtown San Antonio. Detailed information can be obtained on the AIA web site at www.egiexhibits.com or by contacting EGI Exhibitions at (800) 982-6247 or shop@egiexhibits.com.

The Plains Indian Museum of the Buffalo Bill Historical Center in Cody, Wyoming, will host its 35th annual Indian Seminar, 15-17 September 2000. The conference will address the theme, “Sacred Lands.” For more information, contact Jillian Tullman, Coordinator, at Buffalo Bill Historical Center, 720 Sheldon Avenue, Cody, WY 82414; (307) 578-4026; cprograms@wavecom.net.

The National Park Service, National Conference on State and Local History and the Louisiana Association of Museums will join together, 20-23 September 2000. The meeting will bring together colleagues from all over the United States and Canada to examine the theme, “It’s A Matter of Trust: The Past, The Present, and Historical Reconciliation.” For more information, contact Aubrie Solomon, Conference Coordinator, at the AASHL office at (615) 320-5203; ahistory@aanl.org; http://www.tln.org/.

The Textile Society of America will hold its seventh biennial symposium in Santa Fe, New Mexico, 21-23 September 2000. This year’s theme, “Approaching Textiles, Varying Viewpoints,” will emphasize the ways in which different cultures and historical eras use textiles through a wide range of methods, theories and perspectives. For more information contact Thomas H. Broman, past council chair, at (203) 407-7920; tbr@academy.udmj.org; http://www.textilesofa.org.

The California Council for the Promotion of History is planning its 20th annual conference, 21-24 September 2000. The conference will be held at the California State University at Fullerton. Contact Leslie R. Fryman, (916) 737-3000 ext. 3451; <lryman@cstufull.edu>.

The Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, will host “Agents of Social Change: Celebrating Women’s Progressive Activism Across the Twentieth Century,” a two-day conference, 22-23 September 2000. The conference marks the opening of a research of eight major manuscript collections of women activists for peace, civil liberties, socialism, civil rights, labor reform, and feminism. For more information, contact Joyce Foller, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, MA 01063; <jollef@aims.smith.edu>.

The Program in the Carolina Lowcountry and the Atlantic World will sponsor an international conference/workshop on Manuscripts in the Atlantic World at the College and University of Charleston, 6-8 October 2000. The conference is open to all interested scholars. For more information see <www.cofc.edu/atlanticworld/> or contact Dr. Rosemary BrunaShute, History Dept., College of Charleston, 66 George St., Charleston, SC 29424; (843) 953-5711; <branashuter@cofc.edu>.

Research Assistance

Retrials are available from the Library of Congress. Research contracts for continued support to institutions and individuals are available. Engineers may fax bibliographies for an estimate. In its twelfth year of practice the American Institute of Architects offers research contracts for sustained assistance through university departments and now has other projects to be offered. For more information contact Dr. Marilyn C. Kranz, 431 Fifth Street NE, Washington, DC 20001; (202) 393-1132; fax (202) 393-1723; mckranz@ais.org.
WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS
FELLOWSHIPS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars announces the opening of its 2001-2002 Fellowship competition. The Center awards academic year residential fellowships to men and women from any country with outstanding project proposals on national and/or international issues. Projects should have relevance to the world of public policy.

Fellows are provided offices, access to the Library of Congress, computers or manuscript typing services, and research assistants.

The application deadline is October 1, 2000. For eligibility requirements and application guidelines, please contact the Center or visit our web site at:

http://www.wilsoncenter.org

SARAH LAWRENCE COLLEGE

Sarah Lawrence College, a small Liberal Arts College close to New York City, invites applicants for a tenure track position in African History, beginning in August 2001. We seek an innovative teacher-scholar whose teaching will complement our current offerings in Anthropology, Literature, and Political Science. The successful candidate will teach survey courses in African History, as well as more specialized courses in his or her own areas of interest. The topic and region of specialization are open, but we welcome comparative approaches that might include attention to migration and African diaspora, to histories of space and place, and to questions of gender. Teaching experience, and a PhD in hand by August 2001 are highly desirable.

Applicants should submit a letter addressing their approach to teaching and their scholarly interests; a curriculum vitae; three letters of recommendation; a writing sample; and two course descriptions (one for a survey course, and one for an advanced undergraduate seminar on a topic of their choice) by October 15th, 2000 to Ms. Barbara Hickey, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, NY 10708.

Some interviews will be conducted at the African Studies Association meetings in Nashville, November 16th - 19th, 2000. An Equal Opportunity Employer, Sarah Lawrence College encourages applications from minorities and women. For more information about Sarah Lawrence College’s distinctive approach to teaching, which stresses small seminars and individual tutorials, please go to http://www.slc.edu.