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Extending Archives: Folklife, Social History, and the Work of R. Henderson Shuffler

Matthew S. Darby

Introduction

R. Henderson Shuffler set the historical record straight. Throughout his career, this self-proclaimed “myth-killer” urged Texans, and anyone else who would listen, to reconsider what it meant to be Texan and how to study Texas history. As curator of the University of Texas’s Texana Program and later as the first director of the Institute of Texan Cultures in San Antonio, Shuffler expanded the traditional scope of Texas history beyond political, economic, and military achievements and presented a more complete, unbiased picture of the state’s heritage that included groups previously underrepresented in historical and public discourse. At a time when academia was witnessing a significant methodological shift toward a new social history, Shuffler implemented his own unique approach to documentation, access, and public
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education, combining aspects of social history and folklife studies in an attempt to create a new public image for Texas's historical resources. From the early 1960s to the mid-1970s, he helped shape these two institutions into first-rate repositories and exhibits of Texana and folk culture. With an emphasis on making history personally relevant to the public, Shuffler devised innovative ways to entertain, engage, and—most importantly—educate, striking a balance between archives and traditional museums. This article will discuss the implications of Shuffler's approach for archivists working today and will explore the impact of social history and folklife on the archival profession.

Accuracy and Activism

Shuffler was, more than anything else, an activist in his support and promotion of Texas history, regardless of the conventions he rejected. He readily admitted that he lacked any formal training as an archivist or historian, and despite holding a prominent position at the University of Texas, Shuffler never concealed his contempt for the academic world. Some academics, he believed, did history a great disservice in the name of "serious" scholarship. Their elitism, what he referred to as "put-on intellectualism," too often alienated amateur historians, making it seem fruitless to pursue their own research.² Shuffler instead advocated the importance of personal historical inquiry, regardless of how such research measured up by the standards of professional scholars. "History," he contended, "is the product and property of the people."³ Shuffler led by example, distinguishing

²Ibid.

himself as a proficient amateur historian and a member of the Texas State Historical Association (TSHA), an organization of scholars and non-academics alike. The results of his intensive research appeared in TSHA’s *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, as well as other publications.

More often than not, Shuffler discovered a great rift between popular belief and fact, perpetuated not only by historians but also through literature, exhibitions, textbooks, and the popular media. Although he appreciated the merits of folk legends and myths, Shuffler’s research led him to surmise that Texans “have been the subject of more powder-burned fiction and phony folklore than any group in history,” and he expended a great deal of time and effort correcting deeply ingrained misconceptions. Nothing was beyond investigation, including the most sacred of the state’s celebrations, Texas Independence Day. “The height of emotion with which this anniversary is observed,” Shuffler wrote in 1962, “is matched only by the depth of ignorance about the original event and about the surroundings in which it occurred.” Contradicting staunchly held popular beliefs, Shuffler demonstrated with documentary evidence that the Texas Declaration of Independence was signed not on March 2 but the following day, not in a town called “Washington-on-the-Brazos” but in the “Town of Washington,” and not in a blacksmith shop

---


provided by a local patriot but in a commercial house rented for the occasion. These findings might seem like minutiae with no significant bearing on the spirit of the day, but Shuffler was deeply troubled by the fact that people were willing to accept just about anything without question when evidence to contradict this and other myths existed at the Texas State Library, in the records of local historical organizations, in small-town newspapers, and in the hands of private individuals.

A First Step: The Texana Program

Shuffler's crusade for historical accuracy proceeded for three decades while he also pursued a full-time career in journalism. In 1940 he started his own newspaper, the Odessa American, where he was still working as editor and publisher in 1961 when his "pungent public comments" on Texans' lack of historical awareness garnered the attention of Harry Ransom, president of the University of Texas (UT).8 The university was in the process of establishing its new Humanities Research Center, and Ransom offered Shuffler the curatorship of the UT Texana collection.9 The president considered Shuffler to be the only candidate for the job: "First, he is widely and profoundly knowledgeable regarding the history and lore of Texas. Second, he has a really rare—almost unique—interpretation of the total Texas culture, and finally, he has been a major influence in the develop-

---

7 Ibid., 312.


opment of further collections of Texana, not only at the University of Texas, but elsewhere in public and private collections.”

As Shuffler and Ransom began developing the Texana Program, they both agreed that part of its mission should be to safeguard Texas culture by keeping valuable collections in Texas. Due to an increased interest in Texas and the West at this time, many significant Texas history collections already had gone to Yale and Stanford Universities. As curator, Shuffler would be responsible for expanding the collection and widening the scope of new accessions, selecting materials for both their informational and artifactual value as well as for their value in teaching Texas history at the university. Shuffler did not want to duplicate the work of the Eugene C. Barker Texas History Center, a repository established in 1945 to house the university archives and collections on Texas political history, so he concentrated on collecting underrepresented areas of Texas history such as business, education, medicine, and religion, in addition to Texas folklore. In accordance with Ransom’s goal of establishing a more aggressive collecting, cataloguing, and bibliographic pro-

---


11 Harry Huntt Ransom, “The Impact of the University on Texas Culture,” 22 February 1962, R. Henderson Shuffler to Harry Huntt Ransom, 2 December 1960, General Correspondence: President, Vice-President/Provost, Harry Huntt Ransom Papers, CAH (hereafter cited as Ransom Papers).

12 Harry Huntt Ransom to President Wilson, Academic Affairs Committee, 12 June 1959, General Correspondence: President, Vice-President/Provost, Ransom Papers.

13 “UT will Expand Texana Program,” Austin Statesman, 5 August 1962, vertical files, CAH.
gram, Shuffler ultimately wanted to create an index of Texana to make the collection more widely known and accessible.14

Say Goodbye to Cowboys

In the spring of 1962, while Shuffler was hard at work with the Texana program, San Antonio civic and business leaders were contemplating HemisFair ’68, an international fair emphasizing cultural, scientific, religious, and industrial developments in the U.S. and Latin America. Texas Governor John Connally recognized immediately the potential benefits of such an event at a time when Texas was struggling to develop its tourism industry. HemisFair would pump millions of dollars in tax revenue into the state’s floundering economy. Because other American cities, such as Seattle, had staged successful international fairs in the past, Connally enthusiastically supported the endeavor.15 In 1965 the state legislature lent its support to the governor by enacting a bill that outlined the fair’s administration and appropriated an initial $4.5 million to see it through.16

Despite HemisFair’s obvious historical and cultural relevance, the agency charged with implementing these plans was not the Texas Historical Commission but the Texas Tourist Development Agency.17 Besides providing a location for the fair,

14“Texana Facts.”


16Eckerman, “Special Anniversary Issue.” 1; HemisFair officials would eventually ask for and receive an additional $5.5 million appropriation to complete the expanded exhibit area proposed by Shuffler.

17The Institute of Texan Cultures: A Program Development Plan (San Antonio: Institute of Texan Cultures, 1978), 1.
Texas would also sponsor its own exhibit, tentatively called the Texas Pavilion. As the legislation ambitiously prescribed, the Pavilion was to include exhibits dealing with the history of Texas, biographical exhibits pertaining to outstanding Texas leaders in history . . . , the military history of Texas, the geology and natural resources of the state, Texas cities and recreation areas and the resources contained therein, the arts, crafts, and literary achievements of the state, and Texas contributions to hemispheric progress. 18

Furthermore, Connally believed the Pavilion should demonstrate the “conservatism and excellence” of the Lone Star State with exhibits highlighting “the cowboy, cotton culture, agri-business, the oil saga, industrial and urban development, and the space age.” 19 When Connally handpicked Shuffler as a research consultant to HemisFair’s project committee in April 1966, 20 Shuffler saw the project as a challenge worthy of a leave of absence from the Texana Program.

Because HemisFair had the potential to draw a great deal of attention to the state (it attracted over 6 million visitors by the time it closed), Shuffler recognized a unique opportunity to “abandon the threadbare cowboy and Indian theme,” 21 and present a more genuine image of Texas culture and history. He further envisioned transforming the Pavilion into a permanent facility that

---

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid., 1–2.

20 Ibid., 2.

21 Travis, “In Memory,” 1.
would continue to serve Texas after HemisFair closed.\textsuperscript{22} Shuffler proposed creating the Institute of Texan Cultures (ITC), a facility incorporating a series of exhibits "explor[ing] the amazingly cosmopolitan background of [the state's] people and culture,"\textsuperscript{23} emphasizing nearly thirty ethnic and cultural groups. Although Shuffler suggested the theme for the ITC, he did not intend to play a role in its implementation and operation, being quite eager to return to the UT. In May 1967, however, Governor Connally convinced Shuffler to stay on as the ITC's first director. After quickly assembling a staff of over fifty college students, folklorists, historians, and others with "weirdly assorted backgrounds and qualifications," Shuffler was ready to make the ITC a reality.\textsuperscript{24}

Expanding History

It was Shuffler's distinct historical sensibility, the particular stories he wanted to tell, that characterized his work at the ITC. He had discovered through his own research the terribly one-sided nature of Texas history. Historians, he believed, had "too long told the Texas story only in terms of the Southern Anglo-American who came [to Texas] as a planter, a cowboy, or just looking for a fight."\textsuperscript{25} Shuffler was interested in more than that, in revealing not only how various groups arrived in Texas and contributed to progress, but also how they lived, the traditions

\textsuperscript{22}HemisFair was open to the public from 6 April to 6 October 1968; \textit{Institute}, 2.

\textsuperscript{23}Travis, "In Memory," 1.

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., 6.

\textsuperscript{25}Eckerman, "Special Anniversary Issue," 2.
they brought with them and developed—in short, “an account of individual response to the rich opportunities” found in Texas.26

In the context of these groups, Shuffler and his staff would consider the “language, customs, religion, the foods they eat, the clothes they wear and the houses they build—all the characteristics of the heritage of a people that distinguish them from other peoples.”27 He considered the omission of these diverse experiences to be an inexcusable inaccuracy, and his position was increasingly representative of a new wave of thought developing at that time.28

The 1960s witnessed scholars and society at large beginning to embrace the notion of cultural pluralism, a movement folklife researcher Don Yoder has called the “re-ethnicizing of America, . . . a denial of the old ‘melting pot’ concept of American history.”29 Academia in particular was welcoming the study of both social history and folklife. Instead of concentrating on “formalized political and economic institutions and the lives of the prominent,” social history was concerned more with social processes and structures and the lives of ordinary people, examining the common experiences and the social and economic events


that affected groups of people over time.\textsuperscript{30} Folklife would be an appropriate complement, focusing specifically on traditions that emerged from a particular way of living and covering the breadth of folk culture, not just material culture.\textsuperscript{31} As defined by the American Folklife Preservation Act in 1976, folklife is the “traditional, expressive, shared culture of various groups . . . familial, ethnic, occupational, religious, and regional.” Expressive culture includes “a wide range of creative and symbolic forms, such as custom, belief, technical skill, language, drama, architecture, music, play, dance, ritual, pageantry, and handicraft . . . learned orally, by imitation, or in performance and maintained or perpetuated without formal instruction.”\textsuperscript{32} The ITC would incorporate aspects of both social history and folklife studies.

\section*{A Plan for Documentation and Access}

The question that confronted Shuffler and his staff was where to locate relevant documentation. Shuffler was quite familiar with a variety of public and private collections throughout Texas. This unique knowledge would prove invaluable as he began collecting materials. Overall, Shuffler’s approach resembled a kind of documentation strategy for dealing with the subject of Texas’s ethnic and cultural groups. Because the ITC initially focused more on education than historical research, Shuffler’s goal

\begin{quotation}

\textsuperscript{31}Shuffler, “Talk,” 1.

\end{quotation}
was not to accumulate materials and build permanent collections, but to “bring together, on loan, fragments of Texas history now scattered helter-skelter” throughout the state. In this manner he hoped to create a more vivid, complete, and accurate portrayal of Texan cultures. To achieve this objective the ITC cooperated with other Texas institutions rather than compete for materials and funding, developing an informal sort of statewide consortium. As the “coordinating force for the educational work” of Texas archives and history centers, the ITC extended the capabilities of Texas’s historical resources, “pulling them together, strengthening them all.”

In the early 1960s archivists had yet to begin collecting to any great degree the materials that Shuffler’s approach required. Archives and manuscript collections reflected the dominant historical methodology, the kind of history being written. Shuffler himself, despite his often adversarial relationship with academics and his criticism of the old school, had written articles in the same vein, traditional history with its emphasis on specific events or the contributions of prominent individuals, rather than focusing on social trends affecting groups of people. Social history and folklife were disciplines not yet fully entrenched in American universities. Archivists were understandably a bit leery of

---


making drastic changes to collecting policies. While archivists invariably consider the needs of users, many at the time considered it imprudent to get caught up in a still emerging trend. 38 No one had yet established any parameters for social history’s continuing development as a field of study. Until that criteria was met, archivists could not begin to develop any consistent strategy for obtaining materials or standards for appraisal. 39

Consequently, what Shuffler discovered in planning the ITC was an inconsistency of materials available in public collections and tremendous difficulty locating material in private hands. Although large repositories such as the Barker Texas History Center and the Texana Program provided important materials on loan, Shuffler realized that to tell the story of Texas from the “bottom up” he would need to get closer to the people to find the most illuminating documentation. Shuffler and his staff focused their attention on small communities, where they found some items in the hands of local historical societies. More often than not, however, the trail led Shuffler and his staff to materials maintained by individuals as their own personal papers. 40

A Change for Archives?

In trying to tie all these disparate stories together Shuffler foreshadowed what was to come in the archival profession. As historians became more interested in primary sources that document social history, new archival programs developed around sub-

38 Miller, “Social History,” 115.


jects such as minorities, women, and organized labor. Social history forced archivists to reconsider how they manage archives in terms of appraisal, processing, and reference. Collecting policies that emphasized institutional records or the personal papers of prominent individuals suddenly became less relevant when the focus shifted to average citizens and their interaction with these institutions, not merely the institutions’ administrative functions. Because his training and much of his experience lay outside the archival profession, Shuffler’s mentality toward collecting and access was unencumbered by conventional wisdom, allowing him to think beyond the confines of provenance and a creator-centered methodology. Complete, discrete collections, rather than an accumulation of materials for thematic presentations, would have been counterproductive to his purposes. As Fredric Miller suggested nearly twenty years ago, providing access to information is the ultimate duty of the archivist. In the case of social history, provenance becomes a less important way of structuring that information.41

Don Yoder argued in his “folklife manifesto” of 1963 that the folk-cultural approach to history could “revitalize, even revolutionize” community archives, local history centers, and museums by connecting people to history through recognizable remnants in folk culture and the lives of everyday people.42 Documenting folklife, however, introduces a different set of challenges for archivists, and after nearly four decades the profession has yet to reach a consensus on the appropriate response to these challenges. Unlike social history, which depends for the most part on documentation already created, folklife studies often in-

41 Miller. “Social History.” 122.

42 Yoder, Discovering American Folklife, 37.
volves fieldwork, firsthand observation of traditional cultures in the present.43 Instead of reconstructing the past, folklife researchers study what is alive, traditions as they happen.44

Shuffler originally had no intention of making the ITC a center engaged in original research, but he quickly recognized problems inherent in documenting folklife merely by collecting existing records. Of the more than two dozen ethnic groups that Shuffler would eventually include in the ITC’s exhibits—from Norwegian to Lebanese, from Indian to Greek—some groups proved more difficult to document than others. For example, Chinese Texans were a small group compared to German Texans, the largest European ethnic group in the state. The Germans had established many prosperous communities throughout south central Texas and, as a result, had a more visible presence in the collections of regional archives and historical societies. Where documentation on Chinese Texans did not exist or had not survived, Shuffler’s staff was forced to create documentation, depending on personal recollections captured through interviews and photographing members of this and other small ethnic groups. As much as possible, he wanted their own voices to speak through the ITC’s exhibits.45 By presenting items such as letters, photographs, and other objects within the context of a particular tradition, ITC exhibits provided a sense of immediacy, detailing how they or their ancestors had arrived in Texas, what life was like in

43 Bartis, Folklife, 3.

44 Yoder, Discovering American Folklife, 51.

45 "Institute of Texan Cultures Staff," undated, Henderson Shuffler file, ITC Archives.
their minority neighborhoods, and how these circumstances influenced the traditions they brought with them. 46

Throughout Shuffler’s tenure as director of the ITC, he and his staff continued to expand the public’s knowledge of Texas diversity through education, outreach, and collection development. In 1971, following the ITC’s successful cosponsorship of 1968’s inaugural Festival of American Folklife in Washington, D.C., Shuffler organized the first Texas Folklife Festival. This now annual event, which attracts thousands to the ITC each summer, gives visitors the opportunity to observe the many folk traditions that still exist today. Under Shuffler’s supervision, the ITC staff continued projects begun during preparations for HemisFair, the most significant being their ongoing work to copy photographs documenting Texan families and communities that are held by private individuals, newspapers, and other institutions. During this period the ITC published dozens of books and pamphlets on particular ethnic and cultural groups and other topics. The ITC’s educational programs flourished, producing curriculum guides and multimedia presentations, such as filmstrips and slide shows, which have since been seen by thousands of schoolchildren across the state. As a testament to Shuffler’s early success, the ITC became part of the University of Texas System in June 1969 and was renamed the University of Texas Institute of Texan Cultures at San Antonio. 47

46 Exhibits file, ITC Archives. Providing a sense of what those first exhibits were like, this file contains exhibit instructions and images of items used in the installations.

47 Mulvany, “Folklorist,” 1. In February 1973 the University of Texas System placed the ITC under the auspices of the University of Texas at San Antonio.
Shuffler’s conundrum presaged the dilemma faced by many archivists from the 1970s to the present as they struggled to adapt their methodology to serve the new interest in social history and folklife studies. The central questions remain the same: Are archivists merely the collectors and custodians of documentation that others create, or should archivists be in the business of creating documentation where it does not exist? Many archivists already manage ongoing oral history projects, recording reminiscences to supplement what the archival record does not provide. If the archival profession aims to document society in its entirety, as social historians suggest, should they not be capturing folklife as well? Shuffler’s success in uncovering these stories and traditions and incorporating them into the documentary heritage preserved through UT’s Texana Program and the ITC suggests that archivists should.

Shuffler’s accomplishments in promoting broader public participation in the documentation and study of Texans’ cultural heritage further suggest that archivists should expand their role from being mere collectors and caretakers to being active promoters of public interaction with that heritage as well. Archivists cling to the notion that their duties are to “select, preserve and make available documentary material of long-term value,” enormous tasks in and of themselves, but should they not be doing more to serve not only users but also the records in their care? The basics of archival theory presume access, but this notion often implies a transaction in which users approach archives for information. More can be done to enhance the archival image and to stress the value of archives to the public. In an age when many people are content to find information on the Internet, despite its often dubious reliability, archivists must be more assertive in placing documentary heritage in the public’s view, in putting history to work. By employing innovative and even unorthodox methods, archivists can, as Shuffler did, bring history out
of the archives and increase visibility. The ITC served as "a communicating device, a center for telling the Texas story dramatically, simply, effectively, in terms the public would understand and remember." Shuffler transformed static collections into dynamic presentations utilizing various means of communication—audio, video, text, and photography—to produce enduring effects on patrons. In keeping with his philosophy of institutional cooperation, Shuffler believed other archives and history centers throughout the state would benefit greatly from exhibits created by the ITC staff. These "histowalls," as Shuffler called them, would incorporate many of the same concepts conveyed through the ITC's exhibits, chiefly the diversity of Texan cultures. By using information derived from materials borrowed by the ITC, these archives would receive exhibits with a local focus, thus illuminating their own collections.

Shuffler believed this exposure to historical documentation would not only educate the public about Texas history but also illustrate the importance of documentation itself. He hoped that after allowing the ITC to place examples of individuals' family papers and objects on display, they would be more likely to donate these materials to an appropriate institution, bringing new acquisitions to archives and history centers throughout the state, thereby adding to the historical record.

---

48 Institute, 2.

49 Ibid.


Henderson Shuffler recognized that not all Texans shared his strong connection to history, and he dedicated a significant portion of his life to making them more aware of their cultural roots. He created a place where people encountered, perhaps for the first time, the role ordinary people played in history and, by association, their own role in history as well. At a time when America was embroiled in the Civil Rights movement, Shuffler believed this approach could ultimately foster better understanding among individuals of every ethnic and cultural background by presenting exhibits in which all groups were shown contributing to the progress of their society.\(^52\) Jack Maguire, who became ITC director upon Shuffler’s death in 1975, praised his predecessor for presenting, “for the first time in this country, an educational tool for working with this problem of cultural conflict rationally and objectively, establishing a base for understanding and unity rather than suspicion and division.”\(^53\) Shuffler’s success should inspire today’s archivists to engage the public and extend archival work beyond the collection of records toward an active pursuit of documentation for segments of society that might otherwise remain absent.

Matthew S. Darby is a M.L.I.S. candidate in Archival Enterprise at the University of Texas at Austin’s Graduate School of Library and Information Science. This article is a revised version of a paper written for Dr. David B. Gracy’s course, Archives and Records in the Modern World, and later presented at the 1999 annual meeting of the Society of Southwest Archivists.

\(^{52}\) Ibid., 3.

\(^{53}\) Ibid.