Interview with Dr. David B. Zierler

Casey VanSise: Hello, everyone. This is Casey VanSise, current Thomas J. Davis Fellow at the Center for the Study of Force and Diplomacy (CENFAD) for the 2021-22 academic year for those who do not know me yet. This video is being recorded on November 17, 2021. We are speaking today with Dr. David B. Zierler, current director of the Caltech Heritage Project, who has also served as an oral historian for the American Institute of Physics from 2019 through 2021 – until July this year, I believe, if I am not mistaken – and then previously as one of the editors for the US State Department's Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS) collections from 2008-19. His first book, *The Invention of Ecocide*, was published by the University of Georgia Press in 2011, and that concerned the development of a US scientific movement against adverse human impacts on global ecology resulting from the use of Agent Orange and other herbicides during the Vietnam War. David Zierler is an alumnus of Temple University, having earned a PhD in History here from 2004-08, before which he acquired a Masters degree in History from the University of Montana in 2004, if I am not mistaken, and a Bachelor of Science in Media Theory from New York University in 2000. And while he was at Temple University, he served as the Thomas J. Davis Fellow as well for the Center for the Study of Force and Diplomacy during the 2005-06 academic year. So I would like to welcome him now.

Dr. David B. Zierler: Casey, thank you so much!

CV: Great! Wonderful, and we are so glad to have you here, and we are wondering—I guess my first question would be could you tell us a bit about what led you toward the academic trajectory that you ended up choosing, or being on in any case, and what drew you to working with oral history projects? What have been some of your most interesting experiences as an oral historian, and what drew you to that overall?

DZ: Well, I should say in the beginning that the prospect of working with Richard Immerman was what brought me to Temple, and I thought I was going to be a professor, being a diplomatic historian and continuing on that tradition. It was actually a notice in *H-Diplo*: a Masters student at the University of Basra in Iraq was asking for books on the Cuban Missile Crisis. And I thought to myself that this was—oh gosh, this must have been in 2006, 2007. The University of Basra's library had been destroyed during the war, and I just thought it was incredible that a fellow historian of foreign relations – in all places, of Basra – was interested in the

Cuban Missile Crisis, and had the ability to think about the Cold War in the middle of a warzone. I arranged, as a result, a book drive at SHAFR, at the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations, because everybody has probably one too many books on the Cuban Missile Crisis. I thought it would be a great opportunity to engage fellow diplomatic historians, and get some books over to this student. In the course of that, I met Dr. Chris Tudda at the Office of the Historian at the State Department. We got to talking, and the Foreign Relations series, of course, I had used extensively in my graduate work. I never gave much thought to the people who actually produced the volumes. And so we got to talking, one thing led to another, a position came open, and that, by the time I had defended my dissertation, was the most exciting prospect for me at that time. That immediately took me off of the traditional academic path that I thought I had placed myself on when I got to Temple.

CV: Wow! Very interesting, and that is definitely something that I wanted to address in our discussion because you have had such an interesting trajectory that, I think, does diverge from so many of the people who you would expect at Temple might become academic historians or follow, perhaps, a more—I will not say more traditional, but a more stereotypical path – not in a bad way or anything, as someone at this point aspiring to become an academic historian myself but perhaps not knowing what serendipitous turns lie ahead for myself, and I am sure many others find themselves in that position as well. So it is great to hear how you got into oral history, and cultivated that interest.

DZ: I would say a secret weapon for diplomatic historians in particular is that we have interests in areas of expertise that obviously are quite relevant to international affairs and all the things for which today diplomatic history and a historical perspective are relevant and useful. I do not want to say that what we do is more relevant or useful than other disciplines, either in the humanities or in history, but we certainly have exposure and relevance to a wider variety of things beyond the quote-unquote "stereotypical path" that most PhDs in the humanities would take.

CV: Yeah. Well, very interesting. And I guess I was wondering, to spring off of that and move on, perhaps, to your more recent research efforts – I just wanted to ask you what recent research you are engaged in? For instance, you were mentioning to me that—I understand that you are currently working on an oral history interview right now with Admiral Bobby Ray Inman, who was the former—

DZ: Yeah.

CV: Very good. He was the former Director of the National Security Agency from 1977-81 during the Carter administration, and then later served as Deputy Director of Central Intelligence under Reagan from '81-82. So I was curious, I guess, about that, and about what stage you are in of that, and have any interesting insights emerged from that at this point that you are at liberty to disclose at this time? And, yeah, I would just love to hear more about your recent research in general, concerning the interview with Admiral Inman or otherwise.

DZ: Yeah. Well, Casey, I should say that, you know, going all the way back to my dissertation research on Agent Orange and Vietnam, there was always a duality in my research with an interest in the history of science and the history of foreign relations. Obviously, when I was at the State

Department, I more fully wore the "diplomatic history/international affairs" hat, but because I always had that interest in science – the history of science, science policy, specifically the intersection between environmental issues like climate change and international security – that is what got me to the American Institute of Physics, where I directed the oral history program there. And because Caltech is still prominent in physics, that is where I developed connections which ultimately led me to Caltech, where I now direct the heritage program here, which is something that I made up all by myself – the Caltech Heritage Program – because I thought that Caltech should have a heritage program. I pitched that to the president of Caltech, and that is what got me here. And specifically to your question about Admiral Inman, Bobby Ray Inman is a trustee of Caltech. Very interesting, and it was an opportunity to—you know, I jumped at the opportunity to engage someone here at Caltech who is not—who does not have a background in science, but has a background, of course, in national security and international affairs. Bobby Ray Inman is a trustee of Caltech, and the origin story there was that, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, Caltech needed some guidance in managing its relations with NASA. Caltech is home to the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. The Jet Propulsion Laboratory is managed by Caltech, and it is a federally-funded facility under the NASA umbrella. And Bobby Ray Inman at that point had been out of government service for about a decade, and he had become quite accomplished in the broader world of government affairs but working from within the private sector. And so, Bob joined Caltech, and he has been central to guiding such a longstanding, successful relationship with NASA—between Caltech and NASA, in the thirty years that he has been there. So it was on that basis that I met him at a Board of Trustees meeting. He is ninety years old, so there is an urgency to capture his story. He is incredibly well-connected. His schedule is as busy as ever. And yet, amazingly, no one has ever really engaged him in oral history to the extent that I have. I did not want to just talk to him about his service to Caltech – I thought "this is a fantastic opportunity – let us go all the way back to World War II. Let us get all the stories about your interest in American military service, going from the Korean War and then the remarkable career he has had ever since." He shared so much – I am currently still in the middle of these discussions. We worked our way right up to the point in 1974 where he is named Director of Naval Intelligence. And so far—oh gosh, so many gems that stand out! He has told me some interesting information about Soviet naval maneuvers that worked their way up the chain of command that seem to have been quite important in how the Cuban missile crisis played out. There is so much written about this [that] I am going to have to go and look to see what is new and what has already been published, but that is something that I will be excited, once the transcript is out, to publicize that and have people look at that. He shared with me that, for some time, it was speculated that he was "Deep Throat" during the Watergate crisis – so that is one that I had not heard before, and I am not sure if he did not disclose that until it was revealed that of course it was—

CV: – Mark Felt. –

DZ: —Mark Felt, and not him. But that was an interesting historical nugget. And then, one of the real values, by the time we get to the Nixon administration and he is high enough up the chain of command—this is where, when he is named to direct naval intelligence in 1974, he is going to really

start to share with me some of the details – all, of course, in an open-source context – about how the intelligence community interacted. Because it is only when he gets to this level that he sees the intelligence community sort of at the "view from 35,000 feet," so to speak. So, in between, I take the opportunity to ask him about everything from the Cuban Missile Crisis to the Berlin Blockade to Gulf of Tonkin; his views on anti-war protests in the United States when he was abroad – when he was serving on ships; the Watergate crisis and the constitutional crisis that resulted because of that, particularly with how the military might have gotten involved; his thoughts about raising the DEFCON alert readiness during the Yom Kippur War; what happened with regard to the CIA in Chile in the early 1970s; and, now next, we will get into the ways that Congress, both Senate and House investigations, dealt with what one person famously called – I think it was Mike Mansfield – "the elephant out of control," the intelligence agencies and what they were doing in the mid-1970s. So, I am going to continue with all of this. It is really exciting to think that I am getting some information from him that has not yet been part of the historical record. And I get to do that all from within my position at Caltech, which, traditionally, I would never have this opportunity before. So I am having a lot of fun with that.

CV: Yeah. Very fascinating stuff, and I am really looking forward to seeing the outcome of this when this is published, just because—particularly because the late 1970s and early 1980s are a time that fascinates me as well in my research. And I guess stemming from that—I mean, I notice that in your interview with Inman, obviously you have examined other periods throughout the mid- to late-twentieth century both in your interview with him and then in your earlier book, and just in some of the other research that you have engaged in – you know, the other oral history projects that you have done. But nevertheless, I could not help but notice that the late 1970s and early 1980s appears to be a time of interest for you as it is for me. For example, in addition to your interview with Admiral Inman, it also appeared that you edited several of the 1977-80 FRUS collections – Foreign Relations of the United States – when you were working at the Historian's Office of the US State Department. I noticed, for instance, that you edited the Afghanistan collection during that time period, dealing with the Saur Revolution and then, of course, the Soviet invasion in 1979, and then also Greco-Turkish relations with Cyprus. So those were the two I noticed. But yeah, I was curious – is that era an era of particular interest to you, and if so, what draws you to foregrounding that period in your research work? And maybe you could elaborate on some of the other work you have done concerning that period.

DZ: Well, one of the things I am particularly looking forward to when we get to the late 1970s—of course, as you mentioned, Admiral Inman was the Director of the National Security Agency. And my second volume that I worked on at the State Department was that Afghanistan volume – of course, this is the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. This is the first published volume – I did what turned out to be a trilogy of volumes covering the ten-year Soviet conflict in Afghanistan. So the first volume starts, of course, with the Carter administration – and just by way of context there, the Office of the Historian publishes foreign relations documents, give or take, about thirty or forty years in the past. And so when I joined the State Department in 2008, most of the Office was engaged in documenting the Ford and then the Carter

administrations. When I got to Afghanistan, I suggested – just because it would be most efficient to do so – that the programs that I needed to be read into were relevant both for the first volume and, of course, the two volumes that went into the Reagan administration. I said, "why don't I just do all three of them?" So I advocated that to the general editor at the time, and that is how we got to this trilogy of volumes. I believe right now the second volume, which covers the first Reagan administration through 1984, and then the [third] volume which goes from Reagan into Bush I – those are both in declassification review. So I am excited to push Admiral Inman to disclose as much unclassified information that he can, because, to state the obvious, the intelligence agencies were quite important for formulating US policy in a quite tense period in Soviet-American relations in the latter part of the Cold War. Let us see – in addition to those three volumes, my first volume at the State Department was on Greece, Cyprus, and Turkey – an area of the world that I knew next to nothing about. And so one of the fun things that the Office of the Historian is – it is almost like joining a baseball team where the manager needs to fill the rosters. So where there is a new historian, where there is fresh blood in the office, they throw a volume at you, and you go and get smart on the eastern Mediterranean. You learn all about NATO and the crisis with Turkey earlier in the decade, the Greek coup in 1980 [editor's note: it is unclear whether Zierler misspoke, and is referring to either the Turkish coup of 1980 or the Greek coup of 1967], and the longstanding and still unresolved conflict over the ultimate fate of the Mediterranean island of Cyprus, which has both Greek and Turkish Cypriots. So that was a lot of fun as my first project. And then, at the State Department, the two other volumes that I worked on—one was the Iran-Contra scandal, which was an extraordinarily difficult volume to work on for obvious reasons – who knows if that volume will ever see the light of day, but that was a lot of fun to work on that – and then the last one that I worked on was the breakup of Yugoslavia during the Bush I administration. So I was very lucky in my eleven years at the State Department to work on volumes spanning three presidential administrations. And, you know, during all of that time, because I was so interested in science and policy, whenever there was an opportunity to work on science-related issues from a historical perspective, I jumped at that opportunity. So, for example, in the Obama administration, the Special Envoy for Climate Change Todd Stern—I served as historical advisor and created a briefing packet that put all of the previous climate summits going all the way back to Rio and the Earth Summit of 1992 – I put them all in historical context for the briefing packet for preparation for the summit in Paris in 2016, which was billed at the time—and historians will debate this, if that was the most significant in all of these COP summits up to this point. It was experiences like that that encouraged me to think beyond the State Department. In federal positions, there is always the concern that when you get promoted enough, you stop doing the thing that you were hired to do and you start managing other people to do that job. And I was not ready to give up that much of my historian's portfolio, and that is where the opportunity at the American Institute of Physics became available for me.

CV: Well, wonderful. And that is a wonderful opportunity to, I guess, segue more into that, and your work with the American Institute of Physics, since we have not discussed that yet. And, of course, as you were saying, another major thematic trend in your work is the role of science in

mid- to late-twentieth century public policy, particularly foreign relations obviously, and diplomatic history. So I guess my next question from that is what motivated your interest in that subject matter, and with the American Institute of Physics, what sort of opportunities did you have to explore that? And yeah, we can start from there, I guess.

DZ: My dissertation centered around conducting oral histories of the key scientists who protested the use of Agent Orange in Vietnam. You know, the funny thing about oral history is historians generally are not trained in oral history. Even though there is the Oral History Association [and] even though there are such things as "best practices" in oral history, it is sort of "trial by fire," and you just sort of go in and you meet these people, you bring your recorder with you, and you ask the questions that you want to ask. It was sort of a—for me, it was a great opportunity, because almost all of the key scientists who were involved in the protests against Agent Orange in Vietnam were still alive, so why not engage them and ask them about their work, get it from their perspective – you know, straight from their own recollections? So that had always loomed large. And then at the State Department, there were certain opportunities to engage in oral histories. For example, I was part of the planning committee for the Clinton administration. So once you are wrapping up one presidential administration, then a committee is formed to figure out what volumes are we going to cover in the next presidential administration. That was an enormous amount of work for the Clinton administration because it is the end of the Cold War, it is a revamping of the entire American foreign policy establishment, and it is an opportunity to engage officials from the Clinton administration – the National Security Advisors, Departments of State, really high-ranking people—to engage them in oral histories, not full-life autobiography-level oral histories, but oral histories about their time in the relevant presidential administration. Because those transcripts are then really valuable for figuring out "okay, what are the volumes? How should we organize them? What should be the emphasis? Should we have more thematic volumes, should we have more bilateral volumes, should we have more regional volumes?" So I got to do several oral histories. So between my original research as a graduate student to the oral histories that I had done at the State Department, the Niels Bohr Library, which is the largest physics library in the world housed at the American Institute of Physics, they were looking to create an original content program. So what I mean by that is, the Niels Bohr Library goes back all the way, I believe, to 1962, and it has an oral history collection, but that collection was almost exclusively passively accepted – meaning that when scholars of—historians of physics – when they would conduct interviews, just like I did for my dissertation—when they conduct interviews and they write their books or articles, they have their tapes, they have their transcripts, they want to do something with them – the Niels Bohr Library would be a place that would serve as a long-term repository. In addition to that, as I learned later on, in the scientific community at annual meetings for whatever your sub-specialty is – meteorology, particle physics, whatever it is—at these annual meetings, scientists like to interview other scientists – which are great. The challenge is, is that they are very, as you can imagine, they are very technical, they are very "inside baseball," and they are not done in a way where there is a tremendous amount of concern for how enjoyable or relevant they might be to a broader audience, right? And so the American Institute of Physics was

looking to create a new oral history program where I would be conducting the oral histories, and I would be conducting them not as a physicist, not even as a historian of physics, but as somebody who has a good nose for oral history, a good nose to engage scientists in their craft, and to create themes based on branches of physics – themes like diversity in physics, themes like the Cold War in physics, just to name a few. So I was hired in the American Institute of Physics in November of 2019, and maybe you could tell where the timing is going with this. I was just getting started after getting the lay of the land and figuring out all of the things that I wanted to do, and then, of course, in February 2020, the pandemic hit. Now, for any oral historian, your gameplan before the pandemic is, you identify people that you want to interview, and then you go by car, by train, [or] by plane with your little audio-recorder, and you sit across the table from them, and you do your interview. So when the pandemic hit, all of a sudden I said to myself, "my goodness – what am I going to do now?!" And then I realized – like so many other people realized with their own craft, with their own discipline – Zoom, I can do this over Zoom! And what happened there was, it really revolutionized what I was able to do, because between how expensive it is to travel, how time-consuming it is to travel—where I thought I would do maybe thirty or forty interviews a year, now I could do, like, one a day, right? And so over the course of the pandemic, I feel so privileged that I was able to interview almost—the exact number is 494 physicists: almost every living Nobel Prize winner; physicists who are university presidents; former directors of the National Science Foundation; Secretaries of Energy – both President Obama's Secretaries of Energy, Ernie Moniz and Steve Chu, are physicists. So it was a great opportunity to engage all of these really interesting and important people in their career, their life, [and] their educational trajectory. And over the course of that—one thing, again, I always look for opportunities to look for the intersection between physics and science and international affairs. One of the opportunities there was talking with, in particular, directors of the national labs – Livermore Lab and Los Alamos, of course. These are the weapons labs in the Department of Energy. Lots of great stories, lots of great insight about the development of the US nuclear program and its obvious impact on the Cold War and US foreign policy. And then the other thing, as I mention later—because of Caltech's prominence in physics and astronomy and in astrophysics, I kept on getting this sense that Caltech was this really special place where there might be opportunity to do what I am doing at the American Institute of Physics, which is all of physics – specific to physics – I pitched the president of Caltech, Tom Rosenbaum, who is an eminent condensed matter physicist in his own right. And I said, "Tom, why don't I come to Caltech and do this in-house, not just for physics, but for all the incredible research that is going on?" And that it what led me to Caltech, and as you mentioned, I joined Caltech in July of this year. So it was really both a pandemic story for what I was able to accomplish at the American Institute of Physics, and because of the pandemic, because my kids were remote-learning, it was an opportunity for adventure to say, "let us all go to southern California and see what that is like for a couple of years." So here I am, and I am in the middle of it now!

CV: Well, wonderful. And I mean that brings up an interesting question—just your speculation, I guess, on where do you see the profession moving forward – you know, the historical profession? Do you think that oral history, inasmuch as it has not already been a major kind of methods approach for

historians—do you see that becoming more prominent because the barriers of entry are lower at this point, arguably, with Zoom and other things of that nature? Do you see oral history having a greater prominence of place among historians than it has so far?

DZ: That is a great question. So what I would say—and I should preface that by explaining that, as opposed to being a "historian of dot-dot-dot," where oral histories are part of the larger resource base that you use to write your books or your articles, I should specify that here at Caltech, it is as much institutional history as it is oral history. So what I mean by that is when I was coming up with this idea that I did with Tom Rosenbaum, he had the great notion to put me in the office of the vice-president for strategy implementation, and direct reports – her name is Diana Jergovic. And the idea there is that, in strategy implementation, Diana is involved in all aspects of the operations and strategy of Caltech. That means Caltech's relations with the federal government. It means Caltech's relationship with its efforts to promote diversity and inclusivity on campus. It means Caltech's relationship with its benefactors – some very significant benefactors who give to Caltech on the order of hundreds of millions of dollars. It means engaging with Caltech's alumni. And so the way I look at it is that I am using these oral histories both as an end product in and of themselves—Caltech archives has a longstanding oral history collection. So I am partnering with the archivists and the oral historians in the archives. The oral histories that I do will ultimately live in the archive, just as any other oral historian in the archive would do. So that is their ultimate destination. The difference is, I am using these oral histories for their operational value, for their value in telling the story of all of the things that Caltech has done. So I mean so many examples there. One, just briefly, that is recent in my memory – I completed a series of interviews with Charles Elachi. Charles is the former director of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory – twenty-four hours of audio I did with Charles, just the largest, most incredible transcript I ever did! And in these stories, there is just so many amazing historical nuggets. Just two of which are—for example, I asked him about the importance of outreach and engagement – doing open houses, having wonderful websites that people can visit. And I said to him, "Charles, it is so important, obviously, to have these outreach experiences, but what are the feedback mechanisms that you would rely on to know it is all worth it – it is expensive, it is so time-consuming. What is worth it in JPL's strategic interests to be able to do these outreach activities?" So he shared with me one – on a blind date, he took his wife to JPL. She was in animation. This is Los Angeles – she was in movie animation at the time. There was a scientist working on what would become the Voyager mission, and he was working on computer animation. This is, like, thirty years ago – this is a long time ago already. He was working on computer animation to figure out ways to best visualize what the Voyager mission was doing. Charles Elachi's date Valerie, who would become his wife, turned to Charles and said, "Charles, this is going to put the animation business out of business in Hollywood – it is all going to become computer animation!" And that, actually, is the beginning of Pixar and Disney Imagineering. He also explained to me that the phones that now have amazing aperture – our iPhones and our Androids, where you have—how do you have these flat devices that can take such incredibly clear pictures with zoom capability? That was technology that was developed at JPL, having nothing to do with

phones, for one of JPL's telescopes. It was a result of outreach efforts where they publicized their research where somebody figured out "this would be amazing technology to have in a phone!" So these are vignettes that only come out of the casual and enjoyable and spontaneous conversation, and long-form conversation, that is really only possible as a result of these oral history discussions. That is an example of many, many, many opportunities to look at what is the research that has been done at Caltech, capture them in these oral histories, and then that becomes whatever it can become – it can become a documentary, it can become an opportunity to engage with alumni, for development, for benefactors, or really just for the sense of pride at Caltech and its research. So that is where I would say the benefits of these oral histories is really—it is a celebration of all of the work that has been done at Caltech, but it really is helpful in the day-to-day operations. That is something that I do not think is unique to Caltech. I do not even think it is unique to universities. I think—what I hope: as what I am doing gains greater visibility, that other institutions recognize the institutional value in doing these oral histories. Because that is the place where the real stories come out – because in that spontaneous, judgment-free zone of good conversation, people really say what is on their mind. And being able to transcribe it make it a transcript that can be accessed from a scholarly point of view. And it is something where history can be applied to daily operations, whether you are a university, whether you are a corporation, [or] whether you are a think-tank. So to get back to this idea of low barriers of entry, I think people should embrace Zoom. I think it is a wonderful medium – as we are doing now, of course – for engaging in these kinds of discussions. And I hope that more and more people recognize and employ historians in a variety of fields.

CV: Well, very good. And it is really great to see that you are making so many subjects that you would not expect accessible to more people through the practice of oral history, and through your ability to do that at a greater scale than you were before! And that is fascinating what you were saying about Pixar and all of these other sort of innovations – smartphones – that people do not often realize come out of public-private—you know, these kind of public-private scientific collaborations or, you know, DARPA and so on. And so it is fascinating to hear your insights on that! I know we do not have a ton more time, but I was wondering—I had one final question, which was how did your time as Davis Fellow contribute to your academic and professional career? And then if you received any other CENFAD opportunities – in which case, just in general, how did you feel that working with CENFAD while you were at Temple may have benefitted or furthered your professional and research interests? Obviously, you discussed your dissertation earlier, but I would love to hear how CENFAD, and being the Davis Fellow in particular, was pretty formative in what you are doing now?

DZ: Yeah, absolutely. So I should say that coming to Temple, my Masters degree was—it studied *détente*, Soviet-American relations, specifically during the Yom Kippur War. And the thing that I looked at there was, in the early 1970s, you have Nixon and Brezhnev, all of these agreements, all of these summits. And what they are all designed to do is improve communication, relax tensions, and to negate the possibility of anything approaching the Cuban missile crisis and anything close to a future nuclear war. And so then you have the October war, the Yom Kippur War, between the Arabs and the Israelis. And it was, in many ways, a real

test of *détente*. Would this become the classic, textbook case-study where a local conflict with its Cold War sponsors – of course, the United States supporting Israel, and the Soviet Union supporting the Egyptians and the Syrians—would this be something that preserved *détente*, or would it prove that all of these agreements, all of these negotiations, [and] all of these understandings really were not worth much of anything? And it could have actually spilled into something quite more dangerous. So that is all to say that circa 2002-03, I was unabashedly interested in diplomacy, in international affairs, and in the Cold War. Now, the political environment then and now in higher education was one that was distinctly shifting away from those interests. That is, there was much more interest, there was much more support, there were many more graduate students and professors working in cultural history, political history, subaltern studies, and all of that. My view on this is that, that is all fine, but I think it had one negative component, and that it was that diplomatic history was not as important. It was not considered as important, or to the extent that history and the historical discipline is subject to trends and fads like so many other aspects of life are, diplomatic history was not so "in" during that time, right? And so Temple – and this goes back, of course, to the late Russell Weigley and Richard Immerman – was a place that was unabashedly "we love diplomatic history! We are proud of the fact that we have military historians and diplomatic historians, and we not going to just say we are going to dismiss things as saying 'oh, that is [editor's note: indecipherable] and bugle history,' or things like that!" And, of course, CENFAD, the [Center for the Study of Force and Diplomacy], that was the centerpiece for making sure that that statement, that sentiment that we are proud of our heritage in diplomatic and military history – that that would be the basis to do that. And so that was really what attracted me to Temple to work with Richard Immerman, one of the most eminent historians of US foreign policy of the twentieth century. And CENFAD was wonderful! Specifically, the Davis Fellowship—you know, I mean, the Davis Fellowship was my first academic prize, and as such, it was probably the first time that I thought to myself "oh, I might be good at this. People might value what I am doing." Both in terms of my scholarship, but because also – as all graduate students get to know – so much of being a professor is not just the research and writing and teaching. It is also your administrative service. And so it was an enormous confidence boost, not just in terms of recognizing what I was doing as a graduate student purely in the classroom and in the archives, but recognizing that maybe I had some capability to put together a speakers program, or put together ideas around which CENFAD could operate on a semester basis. So on that basis, Casey, it was enormously valuable because I thought to myself "I am in graduate school because these are the things that I am interested in," but being a Davis Fellow was probably the first time that I thought "you know, maybe I could just make a career out of this!" So it was enormously important to me. It was of great value in terms of, like I said, my confidence. And it was something where I got to know so many of my fellow graduate students, so many of the professors in Temple, and then all of the wonderful people that you have a chance to meet. You know, when you are in your twenties and you are a graduate student, and maybe you are not so confident about getting out there and being a productive member of society, when I was a CENFAD fellow, I got to email people – important people, high-ranking military and foreign affairs officials – and say, "would you come to Temple and

talk?" And it was my first opportunity not just to read about important people in the archives, but to interact with them, and to figure out how to hold your own, how to have confidence in talking to these people. And I guess it is, as we say now – I do not think the term was in use then – but it was probably the first way of getting over the "impostor syndrome" that we always feel. And that when you look at an important person who is respectful to you and takes you seriously, there is no better professional training than that, I would say!

CV: Absolutely. Yeah. And just in my experience as a Davis Fellow so far, I can attest to what you are saying – obviously having not served a full semester yet, but, you know, having a preliminary kind of experience. And, yeah, we have had some great speakers so far, and it looks—from what we are seeing, this next semester, we are going to have many more great speakers! Anyway, I definitely—I just wanted to thank you for your time, David, for being here, and I really appreciated just all of the insights you gave on oral history and your general research interests and where you see the profession going. It was great to hear your insights on all of those subjects! And thank you so much for joining CENFAD, and I look forward to seeing this published in *Strategic Visions*!

DZ: Well, Casey, it has been my pleasure! I am so glad that we connected, and most importantly, congratulations to you on being a Davis Fellow, and I wish you and CENFAD all the best!