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The Public Historian, a quarterly journal sponsored by the National Council on Public History and the University of California, Santa Barbara, with the support of Rutgers University–Camden, and published by the University of California Press, is the voice of the public history movement. It emphasizes original research, fresh conceptualization, and new viewpoints. The journal’s contents reflect the considerable diversity of approaches to the definition and practice of public history.

The Public Historian provides practicing professionals and others the opportunity to report the results of research and case studies and to address the broad substantive and theoretical issues inherent in the practice of public history. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive look at the field, publishing articles relating to the following sectors, among others:

- Exhibition, Interpretation, and Public Engagement
- Public Memory Studies
- Public History Education
- Museum and Historic Site Administration
- Cultural Resources Management Services
- Institutional History and Archives
- Litigation Support and Expert Witnessing
- Federal, State, and Local History
- Oral History
- Historical Editing, Publishing, and Media
- Archival, Manuscript, and Records Management
- Historic Preservation
- Contracting and Consulting
- History and Civic Engagement
- History's Publics/Audience Studies
- Public Policy Planning and Analysis
- Philanthropy and Sponsorship

The Public Historian publishes a variety of article types: research articles, essays, and reports from the field. Research articles deal with specific, often comparatively framed, public historical issues. They are based on documentary or oral historical research; in some cases, however, findings from interviews, surveys, or participant observation may supplement historical source materials. These articles should be around thirty pages. Essays are reflective commentaries on topics of interest to public historians. Their length varies, but they are usually about twenty-five pages. Reports from the field are intended to convey the real-world work of public historians by highlighting specific projects or activities in which the author is directly involved; these articles may describe new or ongoing projects, introduce or assess new methodologies, or bring in-the-field dilemmas (methodological, ethical, and historical) into print. Reports from the field should be fifteen to twenty pages.

In its review section, The Public Historian assesses current publications by and of interest to public historians, including government publications, cultural resources management reports, and corporate histories, as well as selected scholarly press publications. The journal also reviews films and videos, digital and electronic media productions, exhibits, and performances. We do not accept unsolicited reviews but we do welcome suggestions for material to review. If you are interested in becoming a reviewer, please visit our Reviewer page: http://tph.ucpress.edu/content/reviewers.

The editors welcome the submission of manuscripts by all those interested in the theory, teaching, and practice of public history, both in the United States and abroad. We are looking for manuscripts that make a significant contribution to the definition, understanding, and/or professional and intellectual progress of the field of public history. We conceive of the term public history broadly, as involving historical research, analysis, and presentation, with some degree of explicit application to the needs of contemporary life.

Research articles, essays, and reports from the field are subject to blind peer review and revisions will be suggested, if necessary, before the editors will accept an article for publication.

In general, only manuscripts not previously published will be accepted. Authors must agree not to publish elsewhere, without explicit written consent, an article accepted for publication in The Public Historian.
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The Public Historian encourages letters to the editor that expand the discussion of topics covered in the journal. If a letter specifically concerns an article or review published in TPH, the author or reviewer will be invited to respond. Letters responding to reviews may not exceed 250 words; letters responding to articles may not exceed 750 words. The editors reserve the right to refuse to publish any letter whose tone or content are inconsistent with the conventional standards of scholarly discourse expected in a historical journal.

Please submit manuscripts and letters to the editors by e-mail to the address below.
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Tiffany Rhoades’s review of my book *Leading the Historical Enterprise: Strategic Creativity, Planning, and Advocacy for the Digital Age* in the August 2016 issue of *The Public Historian* accurately summarizes several themes in the book and acknowledges several of its strengths, but seems to misread others.

First let me note that the reviewer misrepresents me as a professor of history at Syracuse University; rather, I hold a PhD in history from Syracuse.

More substantively, I question the assertion that the book “reverts to traditional models of historical organization.” In contrast, the book advocates being proactive in creating strategic leadership and innovation in historical programs. It is based heavily on analysis of model historical programs as well as sources for leadership and institutional innovation from beyond the field. Chapter 7, “Strategic Planning,” and chapter 8, “The Historical Enterprise in Action,” describe some of the most innovative programs in the nation and the novel approaches they are taking to forge new directions.

Further, much of the book is about how to integrate new approaches into historical programs, and the model programs featured in chapters 7 and 8 have a robust digital presence. Chapter 5, entitled “Digital Engagement,” covers what it takes to succeed in the social media environment. The whole book is about operating in this new era when we are faced with a challenge, and an opportunity, to engage digitally. It was therefore astonishing to read, “Dearstyne is dismissive of the importance of the digital age.”

The book presents strategic approaches, based on what successful programs are doing. There are dozens of sets of principles, strategies, plans, examples, and stories of model programs here. The reviewer comments, as a criticism, that readers are left to sort out which solutions may be best for their unique needs. That seems to miss the point. Of course readers will want to do exactly that, selecting and customizing what works best for their own programs.

Bruce W. Dearstyne