The Public Historian
Editorial Policy

The Public Historian, a quarterly journal sponsored by the National Council on Public History 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:

- Public Policy Planning and Policy Analysis
- Museum and Historic Site Administration
- Exhibition, Interpretation, and Public Engagement
- Institutional History and Archives
- Cultural Resources Management Services
- Litigation Support and Expert Witnessing
- Federal, State, Local, and Organizational History
- Oral History
- Historical Editing, Publishing, and Media
- Archival, Manuscript, and Records Management
- Historic Preservation
- Contracting and Consulting
- Philanthropy and Sponsorship
- History and Civic Engagement
- Public Memory Studies
- Historical Interpretation
- History's Publics/Audience Studies
- Public History Education
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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 no more than thirty pages, including footnotes. Essays are reflective commentaries on topics of interest to public historians. Their length varies, but they are ordinarily no longer than 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 no more than fifteen pages and may include footnotes to relevant material.

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, performances, and archival and manuscript collections.

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. We do not accept unsolicited reviews or essays.

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 is inconsistent with the conventional standards of scholarly discourse expected in a historical journal.

Please submit manuscripts and letters to the editors electronically at the address below.

Editorial Offices:
James F. Brooks, Editor; Sarah Case, Managing Editor; Patrick Ettinger, Review Editor Department of History, University of California Telephone: 805/893-3667; Fax: 805/893-7522 Santa Barbara, California 93106-9410 E-mail: scase@history.ucsb.edu
Letter to the Editor

As the author of California Dreaming: Boosterism, Memory, and Rural Suburbs in the Golden State, I understandably take special notice of published reviews, such as the recent one in TPH (May 2015). Although I thank the reviewer for kudos overall, a number of factual errors appear. I am accused of not using the term “exurb,” but I do so on page 3 with a footnote providing citations to more works related to it. The places I studied were patently not exurbs, however, so the term does not appear again, nor does garden city, satellite city, and many more. In fact, I discuss why in detail for about a third of the introduction, though I am faulted for dismissing them too quickly. The review claims I made the “unfortunate mistake” of defining “metropolitan” as outside of a central city (citing 62–63) rather than encompassing both city and suburbs. The conclusion is that this “makes it harder to fully accept . . . [Sandul’s] new term [i.e., “agriburb”] to the lexicon of suburban studies.”

On the cited pages (62–63), I discuss US Census definitions, and although I could admittedly have been more precise there, I directly or indirectly say that “metropolitan” encompasses both city and suburbs more than twenty-five other times throughout the book. I note that several geographers have since accepted the term “agriburb” and use it to guide their research (absent full citations, see Newman and Nixon, SAGE Open, 2014; Newman, Powell, and Wittman, Journal of Rural Studies, 2015). Ultimately, both good and bad book reviews are a part of academia, but the mistakes in this particular review—not all are mentioned—are hard to leave entirely uncorrected.

Paul Sandul
Stephen F. Austin State University

Reviewer’s response:

I welcome the further discussion with fellow urban historian, Paul Sandul, and am thankful for his letter to the editor. This is an interesting case in which the definition of terms needs to be carefully established, and, at the same time, the narrative needs to allow for the fact that the meanings of these terms have some give within them. The definition of “city” differs from scholar to scholar and nation to nation. Suburban forms are exponentially more complex. I continue to believe that Sandul’s work would have benefited from a more direct, more sustained, and more nuanced evaluation of the existing terminology. At the same time, the author might have made an allowance for the fact that some elements of the existing terms may help us understand these particular California communities.

Lisa Krissoff Boehm