

“ARCHIVAL POWER” AND THE FUTURE OF ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT HISTORY

James Longhurst

In the spring of 1998, I began work on a history of air pollution control policy, focusing on new mechanisms of local control that more actively included representatives of the public. In Pittsburgh, these new possibilities for local activism had contributed to the rise of the Group Against Smog and Pollution (GASP) in 1969. When I went looking for archival documents that could explain the history, demographics, rhetoric, and strategy of this environmental advocacy group three decades later, I found only strangely scattered pieces. By the late 1990s the leadership of GASP did not know if any material had ever been donated to any local archive; they were several generations removed from the original activists, many of whom had passed on, left the cause, or moved to Florida. Over the next twelve years, I attempted to chase down the records of individuals and the group. I swooped in to claim and sort discarded garbage bags full of paper when the group moved offices, and pursued material that some activists had donated to a library (which did not have any provisions for archival storage) without the knowledge of the rest of the group's

leaders (who did not know where the records had gone). The only point in time that all of the records I used to write my dissertation came together in one place, with professional archivists assessing, sorting, and organizing the material, was after I had finished the resulting book—thirteen years after the spring of 1998.¹

I take this experience as one piece of evidence that the archival records of environmental activism in the 1960s are only now becoming ripe for historians. After all, with the transformation in the archival status of GASP records over the last decade, I can safely say that the book I have just finished would be a very different one if I were to write it today. Simply acquiring and organizing the materials consumed most of my time in the dissertation research. Today, with the same materials now located in professionally managed archives, I could spend more time concentrating on the context in which this organization developed its political responses to changing legal and legislative opportunities. I would also have a significantly different perspective on these materials were I to encounter them as a chronologically or thematically organized set of records inside an archive. While these anecdotal observations feel logical, when I began discussing the point with other scholars I became unsatisfied with my own limited viewpoint. This article results from an attempt to test out these assumptions through journalistic interviews with archivists throughout the Mid-Atlantic region. In so doing, I hope to consider the ways that “archival power” has shaped, and will continue to direct, the future of environmental history in the Mid-Atlantic.²

Archival Power

At this moment in the early twenty-first century, the archival records of the modern environmental movement are ripening for use, creating a unique opportunity for new work on the history of environmental politics and policy in the Mid-Atlantic region. These records can be divided into at least three categories, including the documentary evidence of government decisionmaking, the materials produced by environmental organizing in the public sphere, and the records of corporate actions and deliberations. While internal corporate records of the late twentieth century remain comparatively rare, archival records in the other two areas are evolving into a new era of availability. Just as new sources, emphases, and concerns have worked to transform the political history of the civil rights era and of the social revolutions of the long 1960s, these same

forces could prompt significant change in the narrative of twentieth-century environmental history. Indeed, the future story of environmental politics and policy in the Mid-Atlantic region depends almost entirely upon the materials that are in the archives now or will be added in the years to come.³

Understanding the ebb and flow of archival preservation allows us to understand both the histories that have already been written and those that might be possible only now. Along these lines, historian and theorist Michel-Rolph Trouillot has contemplated the "archival power" or ability of formal institutions to shape history in preserving it. "Archives assemble," he writes, but "their assembly work is not limited to a more or less passive act of collecting. Rather, it is an active act of production that prepares acts for historical intelligibility."⁴ Trouillot is rightly concerned about the silences produced by unquestioned reliance on the purity of historical production, but an active understanding of the process by which records come into archives can also extend our comprehension of the narratives that have, and have not, been told.

In the case of environmental history, the impact of archival power on the historical narrative has created a significant silence concerning the political history of organizations and activists since the 1970s. Since a larger number of historians began writing about environmental concerns in the late twentieth century, the most attractive archival sources facing them were always about events predating the modern environmental era. The records of earlier movements and moments were always far more organized, accessible, and attractive to environmental historians than the comparatively inchoate records of the late twentieth century. This has obviously placed a constraint upon environmental history since its inception, a built-in aversion to writing the history of the politics and organizations of the modern environmental movement.

However, this constraint on historical work may be changing, for three reasons. First, the records that are now becoming accessible in archives are the voluminous product of the post–World War II environmental era. The hallmarks of this period include expanding litigation and legislation, an increasing reliance on scientific expertise, and a proliferation of bureaucracies and agencies. All of these developments produced extensive documentation. New technologies of the information revolution—Xerox machines, IBM Selectric typewriters, and magnetic tapes—multiplied and expanded these sources into occasionally ridiculous mountains of jargon-filled 10,000-page reports, comprising what archivist Terry Cook has called an "avalanche of paper."⁵ All of this awaits the bleary-eyed historian.

Second, the material from the individuals and organizations comprising the modern environmental movement is itself just now becoming available. Apart from the bureaucratic reports of government agencies, the records of the environmental movement are more closely identified with individual activism and counterculture politics, and often consist of personal correspondence, mimeographed newsletters, and alternative newspapers that might not have made it into an archive through any official document-retention policy. Those historians who wish to work in this era must be part archivists themselves—the oral histories of the environmental actors and organizations have not necessarily been created, and many of the records of activists have yet to be guided into archives. This might mean that the political history of the modern environmental movement still awaits its scholar; it is not clear that anyone has successfully completed a synthesis of the nationwide movement based on the documentary records of environmental organizing, at least not since Sam Hays's formative *Beauty, Health, and Permanence*, published more than two decades ago.⁶

Third, there is a possibility that the modern environmental era fits into a unique moment in the development of the archival materials of the twentieth century. Michael Dabrishus, one archivist interviewed for this project, called it a lens of availability, but another way to think of it is as a python that has swallowed a pig: bulging in the middle, but narrowing at either end.⁷ There was a proliferation in paper records appropriate for preservation after World War II, and then a post-1980s decrease in archived deliberative correspondence due to the rise of electronic media practices and the deleterious effects of open records laws. In other words, the records of the environmental era coincide with a several-decades-long bulge in useful archived materials. This is both good and bad news: there is a clear increase in bureaucratic, technocratic, and legalistic records that continues into the present, but by the 1990s any personal correspondence or reflection is less likely to be archived due to various constraints, making the signal-to-noise ratio among archived materials particularly troublesome for environmental historians.

Speaking with Archivists

These observations concerning archives and the history of the environmental movement, of course, stem from my own experience as a researcher. However, the importance of the present moment for collecting the records

of environmental activism also became apparent in interviews with archivists and librarians, as illustrated by a story from Michael Dabrishus of the University of Pittsburgh. The story concerns Wyona Coleman, an environmental activist who finished donating her materials to the archives by 2005. Dabrishus noted that these papers document a long career “committed to issues like refuse disposal [and] coal mining; [as well as her] position as a representative of the Sierra Club,” and that Coleman had been “collecting this stuff all of her adult life.” While these materials originated in decades of activism, as Dabrishus observed, Coleman is “now in her seventies or eighties and only now making the decision to conserve her collections.” Indeed, the timing of this archival donation seems to be a pattern with environmental activists. Before the institutionalized environmentalism of the 1980s, these activists often worked out of their own homes and kept their own correspondence, and it is therefore up to them to decide when or if to donate these materials.

Similarly, Eben Dennis of the Maryland Historical Society observed that “there’s a major problem with advocacy; those people aren’t actively thinking about saving their materials,” as they are often caught up in the throes of the temporary crisis that might have brought them into environmental activism in the first place. This oversight is certainly understandable: Dennis, trained as an archivist, noted that while his own father was “general counsel for the Nature Conservancy for decades, and the basement [of his home] is filled with his papers,” it is still “ironic that I have not done anything with them.” Of course, he added, politically involved environmentalists are “very attached to [their papers] when they are active, *but they’re active throughout their lives*, so they only come to donating the materials from earlier decades now.” Cheryl Oakes of the Forest History Society thought this timing makes sense: “that lag time—40 or 50 years—is about the time that you get for any event; it takes a while to get” any documentary records into archival institutions.

There is an interestingly ambivalent story here. While some of the papers of the environmental era clearly are not making it into the archives, there are tantalizing examples of useful material for historians in the ones that are preserved. At the University of Pittsburgh’s Archives of Industrial Society, the papers of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy—a group with a hand in seemingly every regional environmental issue in the last fifty years—have only recently become fully accessioned. Similarly, John Suter of the New York State Archives reported significant success from an organized effort to encourage preservation of the records of environmental activism throughout



FIGURE 1: A new accession of the Sierra Club, Maryland Chapter archives, is inventoried and reboxed in Special Collections at the University of Maryland, College Park, in June 2012. To view a research guide of archival collections related to the environment at the University of Maryland visit <http://digital.lib.umd.edu/archivesum/rguide/enviro.htm>. (Photo courtesy of Elizabeth A. Novara.)

the state, noting that the state has funded efforts “to concentrate on the Storm King controversy; that material is now all at Marist College—building it into a center of archived materials on *Scenic Hudson* in only the last five years.”⁸

As a part of the same project, SUNY Albany has received funding to collect materials of local environmental organizing, resulting in significant collections from environmental activism in recent decades—for example, sizable collections of records from the Atlantic States Legal Foundation (120 cubic feet), the Citizens’ Environmental Coalition (44 cf), Environmental Advocates of New York (91 cf), and New York City journalist Matthew Reiss’s Urban Documentation Project (30 cf).⁹ At the Maryland Historical Society, the records of the turn-of-the-century Fresh Air Society of Maryland were a recent surprise donation, and were rushed to the top of the processing queue. As Eben Dennis noted, although “we have a ten to fifteen year backlog of unprocessed materials, the Fresh Air Society is a high priority because it fills an underrepresented gap in our collection.” Due to both increased

donations and meaningful efforts on the part of institutions to collect environmental materials, the records of environmental activism thus might be more accessible and prominent for future scholars.

Dennis's comment on the backlog of processing also indicates a complication: the moment that records of environmental activists might be coming into the archives is also a time of economic austerity for all. As Elizabeth Novara of the University of Maryland archives put it, “we have not actively been pursuing this area for numerous reasons, including reduction in staff and resources.” Similarly, Dennis noted that “at historical societies, we're chronically underfunded: we need to keep the lights on and keep patrons happy—and while we do limited outreach, we don't actively seek out collections.” This ill-timed financial pressure might make it unlikely that historical societies will be broadly successful in guiding the records of aging activists into archives at this time. Indeed, the late twentieth-century environmental movement was driven both by activists and by academics, and several archivists indicated concern that even the papers of these professionals were not being actively prepared or sought for preservation. Maryland State Archivist Ed Papenfuse lamented that “most major institutions don't pay attention to the working materials of their professors” and thus lose the opportunity to preserve the very work that takes place on their own campuses. Archival institutions are rarely top budget priorities, but the early twenty-first century is obviously a time of increased peril; it is simply ironic that records of the modern environmental movement are ripening at this precise moment.

Another anecdote from my own research indicates the precarious nature of this transition period for the records of the environmental era. An important find for my project was a 1972 Allegheny County court case pitting the giant U.S. Steel Corporation against local governments and activists attempting to regulate emissions from the infamous Clairton Coke Works. However, gaining access to the primary documents in the case file was a byzantine nightmare as they were held by an obscure county row office intended to provide access for lawyers, not for historians. While I knew these papers existed, getting even a brief look at them took me years, and some scheming. I finally got a few days to read and take notes from these papers in 2009, but since then the county government office that holds them was renamed and reorganized. I recently contacted the office and have been told not only that this case file does not exist, but also that they do not track pre-1980 civil complaints, and that no files were donated to any archive. So the records related to a very important case in Pittsburgh's environmental history are missing in action.

There is no guarantee that they will ever make it into an archive and every reason to think that they will not.¹⁰

In comparison to Allegheny County and Pittsburgh municipal government records of the 1960s, the Pennsylvania State Archives appears quite a bit more organized, indicative of the type of state-mandated documents preservation schedule also evident in Maryland, New York, and Virginia. Nearly every public hearing on successive state environmental statutes in the last half of the twentieth century was collected in the Pennsylvania State Archives, and they preserve the names, organizations, and statements of the public in absolutely exhausting detail. While this is certainly commendable, it is also evidence of the near-overwhelming bulge in bureaucratic paper records. There are fewer records before the late twentieth-century information revolution and environmental legislation that required public hearings, produced lengthy impact statements, and spawned litigation. This mountain of useful and available paper reaches a peak by the early 1990s and then trails off. That peak is difficult for archives to handle, leading to some lag between donations and availability: the “bureaucracy of the twentieth century leads to massive collections—they take up space, and that costs money” to both process and store, Dennis explained. Because of those financial constraints, he notes, “we’re still working on processing the masses of paper from the twentieth century.” John Suter from New York described how quickly these demands upon resources can appear, seemingly out of nowhere: “A few years ago, the Department of Environmental Conservation in New York moved their offices, and there was a sudden and intense interest on their part to donate materials to us.” The resulting massive donation demanded significant financial and logistical resources on very short notice.

While the flood of paper records from bureaucratic sources is noticeable, the trailing-off of useful materials is also noteworthy. As Pennsylvania State Archivist David Haury said, since archivists now know that historians are interested in environmental matters, if records are not being collected “it’s about business practices or electronic media.” In other words, agencies conduct a great deal of day-to-day business on email, but efforts to capture these correspondences are rarely attempted and generally difficult. Haury notes: “I think the shift became pronounced in the mid-’90s. Before then, you didn’t have email—the documents were created on computers in the ’80s, but then they were printed out and distributed on paper.” It is only with a 1990s-era increase in electronic-only distribution and correspondence that the paper records disappeared entirely. Archivists have been discussing this transition

to what they call “born digital” records for quite some time, with both hope and trepidation. Ed Papenfuse of Maryland flatly declared the great fear of archivists and the problem for future historians: “There are no records management policies for email,” he observed, at least not in comparison to the extensive and established policies for paper records of government agencies. However, it is not just the shift to email that has had the effect of bleeding archives of significant records. As one archivist said, for currently operating government agencies, “anything that is pre-decisional or deliberative is not a public record. [Pennsylvania’s] three-year-old right-to-know law excludes those, and requires access only to the final policy or action.” In other words, archives in the new century might lose the ability to preserve records that will be of particular use to historians of environmental politics and policy, even as the quantity of all archived materials increases.¹¹

This structuring of the archives does not change the fact that environmental topics are very much on the minds of individuals working in primary sources at this very moment. One Pennsylvania archivist noted that “we are totally inundated with researchers . . . interested in Marcellus shale—we have people going through William Penn’s records trying to figure out mineral rights.” Furthermore, “legal teams for extractive resource companies have been in our papers for months looking to figure out mineral rights cases.” Michael Dabrishus said that “big companies, like Consolidat[ion] Coal, just this year transferred to us some of their earliest files,” which had been kept elsewhere. Multiple new sources on extractive industry are becoming available, including records on the 2002 Quecreek mining disaster.¹²

Alexis Smith Macklin of the Heinz History Center in Pittsburgh explained another ongoing transition in archives that will structure future work, noting that archivists are currently working to relabel and tag records that might be of interest to environmental historians. She used the records of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, a reform-minded business group, as an example: “To say that there isn’t an environmental record isn’t true—but the . . . collection hasn’t been tagged as an ‘environmental’ theme” and so researchers—particularly those searching using online finding aids—would not find it. “Even though this is a processed collection, an environmental historian wouldn’t know that,” she said, using the archivists’ term of “a hidden collection” to describe the holdings. But as archivists recatalog what is already available, these hidden collections might suddenly appear on the radar of environmental historians.

The Future of Environmental Movement History

To understand the likely impact of these ripening archives on future work, it is instructive to consider the origins of the project of writing a political history of the modern environmental era. Samuel P. Hays's *Beauty, Health, and Permanence* is the seminal work in the study of the environmental politics of the late twentieth century, but considering its methodology and archival legacy can also help us to understand the future of the field.¹³ It is a popular legend amongst Pittsburgh-area historians that Hays's method in preparing that work was to subscribe to the publications and newsletters of every conceivable environmental organization throughout the nation from the late 1950s on, and to use these sources to trace environmental language, philosophy, and strategy. When Hays retired, he carefully made arrangements for those publications to be accessioned in the University of Pittsburgh's archives, forming a nucleus for an expanding collection related to environmental history. It is logical to assume that unlike *Beauty, Health, and Permanence*, which came out of a personal collection of ephemera, future work will be based on materials organized and made accessible by archivists. That is to say, current and future histories of the environmental movement will be based on archival records, unlike much that has come before, and it is likely that the difference in sources will result in distinctively new approaches and concerns in the narrative.

This transformation is growing increasingly visible. The availability of the records of twentieth-century wildlife organizations, conservationists, and environmental activists is chronicled in the pages of the journal *Environmental History*. The Forest History Society maintains a database of environmental records, and additions are regularly reported under "New Scholarship" in the journal. The Forest History Society notes both when archival collections of environmental concern are being made available, and also when extant holdings are being re-labeled as being of interest to environmental scholars. Since the database is created by independent scholars who review the available materials of archives, these outside observers occasionally discover "hidden collections." As Cheryl Oakes of the Forest History Society noted, "it's one of the reasons that we continue to slog away at the archival guide, because we always recognized the topic even if the holding institution did not." These "hidden collections" might continue to be overlooked by the archives even after the Forest History Society points them out: "Many times the repositories don't know that we're providing this service to researchers,"

observed Oakes. No matter how scholars locate these materials, it is clear that increasing numbers of records from recent environmental activism are becoming available: in the January 2012 issue the archival guide noted the New York State Library's recently accessioned papers of the Wilderness Society from 1977–83, and the 1980s papers of the Catskill Interpretive Center. Likewise, the University of Maryland announced an enormous collection of papers from seventy-five years of the Baltimore Environmental Center, and two others related to the Maryland Conservation Council and the Maryland Environmental Trust.¹⁴ These materials offer extensive and unprecedented opportunities for future scholars to write histories of environmental activism based upon solid bases of primary evidence.

Still, the news is not all good as trends in the preservation of legal records demonstrate both promise and risk. On the one hand, the many attempts to digitize legal records focus on case law and lack any archival provisions for evidence, testimony, or archival disposition. Ed Papenfuse was particularly concerned about the future of digital case management, observing that “the question is if there is any systematic effort to appraise and preserve those court records, and the answer is ‘no’ . . . the chances that there is any preserved public record is minimal.” But on the other hand, the proliferation of online databases of case law indicates opportunity. Digital case management services like PACER (Public Access to Court Electronic Records), Hein Online, and LexisNexis are all busily making the obscure legal records of the twentieth century available with the stroke of a key, and public.resource.org and edu-punk groups like it are committed to making records freely available.¹⁵ The situation is unclear—will more digitized legal records be better for historians, or will they simply be more numerous while failing to preserve useful information?

The most compelling finding from this analysis, however, concerns the aging of the cohort who witnessed or led the modern environmental movement. As the participants of World War II aged, for example, one last scramble to preserve oral histories and manuscripts was needed to capture that generation's contributions. In a similar fashion, it seems that now is the time to reflect on the modern environmental movement, and to actively guide the records of that era into archives in a meaningful way. To do so, strangely, is an act of environmental advocacy, as well as an example of Michel-Rolph Trouillot's “archival power.” Preserving the records of environmental action serves to legitimize environmental concern at a moment when new challenges face us; and this task clearly falls to environmental historians.

As Maryland State Archivist Ed Papenfuse put it, “academics for the most part are exploiters of the records, they are not preservers of the records. . . . The people that see the most value in environmental topics aren’t making the case for the preservation and support of the archival project.” It is clearly time for historians and other environmental scholars to make that case.

NOTES

Thanks are owed to the individual archivists named below, the members of the University of Wisconsin—La Crosse History Authors Writing Group (HAWG) and Allen Dieterich-Ward who provided extensive editorial suggestions. A previous version of this essay was presented at the Pennsylvania Historical Association’s 2011 conference, and many ideas herein were developed in correspondence with Vagel Keller, Edward K. Muller, and Allen Dieterich-Ward.

1. James Longhurst, *Citizen Environmentalists* (Medford, MA: Tufts University Press, 2010). Significant consolidation of GASP records and other materials related to environmental politics in the region has taken place in the University of Pittsburgh’s Archives of Industrial Society.
2. All quotations from archivists in this essay come from telephone interviews and email exchanges with the author on these dates in 2011: Edward C. Papenfuse, Maryland State Archivist, December 16; John Suter, Documentation Coordinator at the New York State Archives, December 16; Eben Dennis, Special Collections Librarian at the Maryland Historical Society, December 12; Michael Dabrishus, Assistant University Librarian, University of Pittsburgh Archives of Industrial Society, September 28; David Haury, State Archivist and Director of the Bureau of Archives and History of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, October 5; Alexis Smith Macklin, Director of the Library and Archives at the Heinz History Center, October 21; Elizabeth A. Novara, Curator, Historical Manuscripts, University of Maryland, December 15; Cheryl Oakes, Librarian/Archivist, Forest History Society, December 20, and others who wish to remain anonymous. Follow-up discussions occurred in May 2012.
3. For comparable developments within civil rights and sixties historiography, see Steven F. Lawson, *Civil Rights Crossroads: Nation, Community, and the Black Freedom Struggle* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2003) esp. 3–30; Steven F. Lawson and Charles M. Payne, *Debating the Civil Rights Movement, 1945–1968*, 2nd ed. (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006); Emilye Crosby, ed., *Civil Rights History from the Ground Up: Local Struggles, A National Movement* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011), esp. 1–42; M. J. Heale, “The Sixties as History: A Review of the Political Historiography,” *Reviews in American History* 33 (March 2005): 133–52.
4. Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon, 1995), 51–57; cf. Terry Cook, “The Archive(s) Is a Foreign Country: Historians, Archivists, and the Changing Archival Landscape,” *Canadian Historical Review* 90, no. 3 (September 2009): 497–534, especially 520–24.
5. Cook, “The Archive(s),” 529.
6. Samuel P. Hays, *Beauty, Health, and Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States, 1955–1985* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989). This is of course a remarkably limited claim; specifically I am arguing that historians have not written document-based narrative histories of the

local and national political organizations and actions that made up a new environmental movement in the late twentieth century. There are many historians who have contributed significant studies that either explore one aspect of modern environmentalism, or have come very close indeed to offering wide-ranging narratives of the organizations and agencies that make up the political events of the modern environmental movement: see Adam Rome, *The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Sprawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Robert Gottlieb, *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 1993).

7. Michael Dabrishus referred to the concept as a “lens,” while I described it as a “bubble” in the same discussion. In a more literary vein, it is like the child’s sketch of an elephant that has been swallowed by a boa constrictor as drawn by the narrator of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry’s *The Little Prince* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1943).
8. The decades-long Storm King Mountain controversy, culminating in a landmark U.S. Supreme Court case known as *Scenic Hudson*, began in the early 1960s with a plan to build a hydroelectric power plant into a mountain on the Hudson River, not far northwest of New York City. For more, see <http://library.marist.edu/archives/mehp/scenicdecision.html>; Oliver A. Houck, *Taking Back Eden: Eight Environmental Cases that Changed the World* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2011), 7–22; Robert Douglas Lifset, “Storm King Mountain and the Emergence of Modern American Environmentalism, 1962–1980” (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2005).
9. New York’s statewide initiative is described at http://www.archives.nysed.gov/a/research/res_topics_env_docproj.shtml, while Albany’s implementation is at <http://library.albany.edu/speccoll/conervation.htm>
10. In my own research, I cited these materials as “Papers related to docket 1550, April term 1972, Civil Division, *County of Allegheny vs. United States Steel*, Prothonotary’s Office, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.” As this office of county government no longer exists by this name, it is unclear where or even if these records might be found. Good luck, future researchers.
11. There are many scholarly treatments of the promise and peril of “born digital” archival materials. Overviews include Dorothy A. Warner, “Libraries, Archives, and Digital Preservation: A Critical Overview,” in *Information Technology in Librarianship: New Critical Approaches*, ed. Gloria J. Leckie (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2008), 261–80; Patricia Cruse and Beth Sandore, “Introduction: The Library of Congress National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program,” *Library Trends* 53 (Winter 2009): 301–14. For historians, the most trenchant analysis is from Roy Rosenzweig’s “Scarcity or Abundance? Preserving the Past in a Digital Era,” *American Historical Review* 108 (June 2003): 735–61.
12. Consolidation Coal is now known as CONSOL Energy, and many early records of this company are now at the University of Pittsburgh’s Archives of Industrial Society. The Quecreek incident, which occurred in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, in July of 2002, captured national attention when nine coal miners were stranded underground, but later rescued. See Peter J. Boyer, “Rescue at Quecreek,” *New Yorker*, November 18, 2002, 57–73.
13. Hays, *Beauty, Health, and Permanence*.
14. Available online at <http://foresthistory.org/Research/biblio.html>.
15. In fact, public.resource.org’s RECAP is promising free and public access to as many PACER documents as possible. <https://www.recapthelaw.org/>.