In practice public figures and historical subjects have different "rights to privacy" from private citizens. But to what degree can we make this distinction? When we write biography, anecdotes and intimate details add flavor, color or personality to our subjects. What is the privacy of a public man?
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HISTORIANS, ARCHIVISTS, AND THE PRIVACY ISSUE

Walter Rundell, Jr., and Bruce F. Adams

Paradox, Reinhold Niebuhr has told us, lies at the heart of history. The issue of privacy, as it concerns historians and archivists, dramatically underscores his observation. Most of us affirm the need for personal privacy and applaud governmental measures to insure it. Yet if such measures interfere with the legitimate efforts of scholars to search into the past, our enthusiasm quickly becomes tempered. The other aspect of the paradox is the tendency for governmental agencies to blur the issue by assuming for themselves the privacy meant to protect private citizens. When such occurs, those scholars supporting the principle of privacy for persons reverse themselves to oppose the notion that governmental actions deserve the same protection afforded individuals. Historical scholars are likely to embrace the paradox by supporting privacy until it interferes with objective analysis of the past and by supporting it for the citizen but opposing it for the government.

Historians long have stood at the periphery of the increasingly vociferous controversy that roars about this issue. While they have looked on, events, which they have neither set in motion nor controlled, have placed the very sources of history in jeopardy. And now, instead of a ringsider, the historian must become a participant; for he is already a victim, squeezed between the seemingly paradoxical threats. The old, familiar antagonist—government secrecy and security classification—has weakened little, despite several recent executive orders ostensibly intended to limit its powers. And a newer force, also an enemy of government secrecy, has emerged recently as a potentially graver menace. This is the crusade to safeguard
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personal privacy.

The matter of government secrecy and the system of security classification have been debated for many years. Much of the drama of this debate has been public and is familiar to us all. The press and television have given wide play to statements by proponents of all points of view, especially their own, which, quite naturally, comes down on the side of free access. But both sides suffer from arguing over material which usually remains unknown; so the merit of the protagonists' claims, like the strength of a punch thrown in shadow boxing, is difficult to gauge. Unable to use specific weapons, they fight with slogans—"the free press," "the right of the people to know," the ominous and dependable "danger to national security." The media attack in editorials, government officials counter with somber talks and stubborn, but sincere, silences.

We expect newsmen to act in one way and government officials in another. To hear James Schlesinger talk like Daniel Ellsberg would surprise us all. We can even say that the foregoing slogans have become set pieces for familiar characters in traditional roles, but this is not to make light of them. It has been many years since Thurman Arnold pointed out so brilliantly in The Symbols of Government that our society thrives on precisely such drama. Surely we can not callously assume that the actors in this drama do not appreciate the importance and the validity of what their antagonists are saying. But just as we insist that a lawyer defend a guilty felon, so we must approve the strange forms this debate often takes. From the debate we hope for a compromise we all can work with. Until, of course, the continuous debate again alters the compromise.

In his years on the Supreme Court, Justice Potter Stewart has made decisions which more radical supporters of each side of this debate would deem contradictory. A fairer observer will realize, however, that his vantage point has given him an excellent view of the drama. Speaking at the Yale Law School's 150th year convocation last month, he said, "The press is free to do battle against secrecy and deception in government, but the press cannot expect from the Constitution any guarantee that it will succeed." Ingenuity, specific laws passed by Congress, what Justice Stewart called "the tug and pull of the political forces in American society," and not law suits based on the imprecise First Amendment are the tools the press must employ to root out information held by the government.
"There is no constitutional right to have access to particular government information or to require openness from the bureaucracy. The public's interest in knowing about its government is protected by the guarantee of a free press, but the protection is indirect. The Constitution itself is neither a Freedom of Information Act nor an Official Secrets Act." 2

The media are principally concerned with current events, with, if you will, history in the making. Historians in the last several decades have become increasingly concerned with recent history. At precisely the same rate their professional interest has grown, awareness of and frustration with the problems of the access debate have also developed among historians. Numerous stories circulate about individual historian's encounters with reluctant government officials, archivists, and gummy red tape. Serious questions have been raised about whether a democratic society can function properly without easy access to information generated by its government. Not too long ago the case was stated effectively: "Fundamental to our way of life is the belief that when information which properly belongs to the public is systematically withheld by those in power, the people soon become ignorant of their own affairs, distrustful of those who manage them, and--eventually--incapable of determining their own destinities." 3 When President Nixon said this in March, 1972, Watergate, those troublesome tapes, executive privilege, and the exposure of his brazen dishonesty (perpetrated, of course, in the name of national security) all lay down the road. But he was dead right. When the White House withheld information from the people, they began to distrust those in power and finally learned that the integrity of the Nixon presidency was nonexistent.

Nixon's efforts to maintain the secrecy or privacy of White House operations brought to general attention a problem that many scholars have had in getting access to government data. One of our graduate students at the University of Maryland has written a dissertation on James M. Landis' career. In the course of his research he needed to see some FBI records from 1940-1941 concerning Harry Bridges. These records totaled 2,839 pages, contained in three archives boxes, yet the searching and reproducing fee quoted by the FBI came to $1,498.90, something beyond the means of the average graduate student. 4 Another researcher--could his name have been Yossarian?--needed data from the Department of Agriculture. He described his problem thus:
"The only way that I could make my request specific was to get access to the indexes by which these files were recorded. When I asked for access to the indexes, I was told they were internal memoranda, and not available to me. Therefore, I had to make my request in a broad fashion and they came back with a bill for $85,000 which we regretfully had to turn down."

Such responses from governmental agencies belie any effort or intention of complying with the Freedom of Information Act and can only create in citizens distrust and cynicism for their government. Frustrated researchers have learned that despite tremendously improved storage, cataloging and retrieval systems, many sensitive, and therefore important, collections of archival papers remain inaccessible. Those areas of the past which are usually most shrouded in secrecy--administrative, diplomatic, and military affairs--are precisely the areas in which historians find they must reply upon federal statutes regulating access and upon the probity of government officials.

Some of these officials have been politicized. Their experience has made them part of the political process; their frustration has placed them in the drama. How they act in a politicized environment depends upon their background, conditioning, ambition, and philosophical outlook. Bureaucrats often find it easier to protect the interests of their agency by making access to its records difficult than to grant easy access to searchers. After all, what the researcher never finds out about the agency cannot hurt it. In this sense, the agency is maintaining its own privacy against unwanted intrusion. Career bureaucrats naturally harbor a proprietary feeling about their agencies and frequently seek to promote their welfare ahead of that of the public. From time to time, however, civil servants put the commonweal before particularism, and they become true heroes or heroines of our republic. Archivists can take great pride in the fact that one of their own recently qualified in the role of heroine. Mary Walton Livingston blew the whistle on President Nixon for backdating the donation of his vice-presidential papers to the National Archives. Her action proved that the ideals on which our democratic society was founded can shine through and prevail against the tawdriness of those in political power.

American liberal political tradition maintains that a democratic society must continuously inform itself about the functioning of its government. This is, of course, one of the stronger motivations to study and write recent
history. Constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech, assembly, and of a free press, which protect the idea that an informed society is a free society, symbolize this tradition most powerfully. Those among us grateful for the services of the National Archives and Records Service (NARS) and familiar with its history may feel that the difficulty J. Franklin Jameson encountered in persuading the government of the need for a National Archives denies these symbols. But Jameson's struggle can be seen as analogous to our own. Government does not always behave as its symbols suggest, and now as then government must be pressured to make itself accountable to the governed. The symbols and slogans are only convenience. They stand for our own beliefs and make them expressible if not eloquent, and they belong to us all to use as persuasively as we can. A very good recent book about part of this problem, entitled Classified Files: The Yellowing Pages, concludes that all forms of the Freedom of Information Acts ultimately depend on the "good will of officials responsible for interpreting and enforcing" classification. Can it be otherwise? In the drama we ought to demand more effective legislation, and we might get some. But legislation in such a blind area can do little more than create an atmosphere or a climate of opinion in which secrecy will be avoided where possible and classification sensibly limited.

There are too many intricate and delicate problems of domestic politics and international diplomacy to expect all closed doors to be immediately opened. In our own work on university committees and boards, we recognize the benefits of closed meetings, and surely we feel the pressures to open them. Congressmen in more candid moments admit they behave differently in the presence of cameras and work better at compromise out of the public eye. Yet more and more we insist they open their committees and caucuses, or at least the archival records of these meetings, while the participants are still alive and vulnerable. The paradox pervades our social life. Where the conflict flares is in the gray area, the nebulous line that we call "reasonable" limits of secrecy and security. We all have opinions about "reasonable" and excesses and abuses, and it is about this that we must join debate.

An issue has recently arisen on college and university campuses that underlines the conflict between the need for privacy in communication and the individual's right to know. Whether the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, the
so-called Buckley Amendment, offers a "reasonable" solution to the problem of students' access to information concerning them in the files of registrars' offices and placement services remains to be tested. But it certainly reemphasizes the paradoxical nature of the problem.

Students, as citizens, should have the right to confront and correct inaccurate information in their files. The privacy issue intrudes, however, when students get access to confidential letters of recommendation in their dossiers. Ironically, those letters got there through students' requests of faculty to write in their behalf, the professors writing with the explicit understanding that the communication was privileged and that the student would have no access to it. Such assurance was the only way a candid and therefore helpful comment could be made. With the Buckley Amendment becoming operative on November 19, 1974, no professor who wants to avoid litigation will henceforth write an uncomplimentary assessment of a student. As a result, admission and placement dossiers will become unreliable guides to a person's abilities and character. Though only the naive use them uncritically, the Buckley Amendment renders them virtually useless.

But what about students' access to those letters written under the assurance of privacy? If students now gain access to such documents, are not the legal rights of the writers compromised? And might not the writers be in a position to sue those institutions betraying their trust by granting access to the privileged information? Harvard University has solved this problem by requiring that graduates, who want their dossiers sent out, request a letter to the Harvard placement service, from references granting release of the statement. Naturally, some deponents might not want to give a blanket release, thereby enabling the subject of the letter to know what had been said. In such case, the writer would have the embarrassing task of explaining his unwillingness to the student he had written for. It would be fairly obvious that the writer had been less than glowing in his comments, unless he chose to stand on the principle of confidentiality alone. The necessity for any of the foregoing alternatives tragically highlights the absence of trust, concern, and responsibility that used to characterize higher education. Such absence is merely another aspect of the decaying fabric of American society.

Personal privacy, as distinct from government secrecy, is an issue older than man, so anthropologists tell us, and
one quite full of paradox. All animals and primitive humans show need for physical or psychological privacy of some sort. But conversely they also exhibit the social urge to reveal themselves to others and to know about these others. As with the "need" and "right" to secrecy, we are unable to set precise limits to privacy. But we do have attitudes about what is reasonable and excessive, perhaps even a double or multiple standard. Certainly we demand to know more about public officials—their voting record, the state of their physical and mental health, even their marital fidelity—than we would consider telling employers about ourselves.

At least one prominent public official has recently been amazingly willing to inform his fellow citizens of his extramarital shenanigans. His hijinks have been faithfully recorded on video tape from Washington's Tidal Basin to the stage of Boston's Pilgrim Theater. Mr. Mills manifestly has not sought the privacy most individuals would desire. His antics call to mind those of another Southern politician whose entire career was flamboyant, decidedly unlike that of Mills prior to the Tidal Basin debacle. Even when he sought privacy, Governor Earl Long of Louisiana attracted attention by his eccentricity. In one of his more aberrant moments in July, 1959, Ole Earl withdrew from persistent reporters by drawing a pillow case over his head before entering the leading Fort Worth hotel—attired normally otherwise. There was a man who treasured privacy!

When we write biography, such anecdotes and intimate details of private life add flavor, color or personality to our subjects. But what if our subject, or near relatives, are still living? What is the privacy of a public man? In practice public figures and historical subjects have different "rights" from private citizens. At least we treat them as though they have. But to what degree can we make this distinction? As historians and archivists interested in preserving the record of the past for its legitimate uses, recalling that Robert Todd Lincoln destroyed many of his father's personal papers reminds us of the fragility of the past. No way has been devised to insure against such occurrences, whatever the distress of those dedicated to preserving and interpreting the records of the past. Robert Todd Lincoln may be judged culpable, for he knew his father belonged "to the ages," as Stanton put it. What about someone like Willa Cather, who deliberately destroyed her personal records to prevent prying scholars from knowing more than she chose to reveal of herself in her fiction?
Not a public person, to be sure, yet because of her literary prominence did she have the artistic right to deny the world further access to her creative wellsprings? She thought she did, but she has left us the poorer. Her intense desire for privacy has denied us deeper understanding of the human condition, the ultimate aim of historical scholarship.

In the legal sense, privacy and its invasion are complex and changing matters regularly debated in the courts and legislatures. In the last several decades American jurists and legislators have declared more and more areas of citizens' private lives legally inviolable. At the same time privacy has also become a hot political issue.

In large part the rapid growth of concern for privacy is a reaction to the technological revolution that has occurred since World War II. A great variety of vastly improved eavesdropping and visual snooping devices offer law enforcement agencies, as well as private detectives and electronic voyeurs, unprecedented opportunity to invade the privacy of others. The illegitimate use of these devices creates a continual stir, while even authorized wiretapping emerges every few years for a political and legal airing. Only five or ten years ago, criminal cases frequently were thrown out of court for violations of privacy by the police, who often misused their new arsenal of surveillance techniques. It happens less frequently now, but only because civil libertarians and enforcement officials have debated the right and proper use of these techniques, as well as their abuse. Enforcement agencies have trained their personnel in the resulting legal compromises.

Since the 1960s another facet of this technological revolution—the computer—has become principal villain in the privacy drama. Specifically, the compilation and sharing of personal record data through computer systems has come under attack as a serious invasion of privacy. In 1974 several bills were presented in Congress to regularize the use of such records and to make them available to the individuals about whom they were kept. H. R. 16373, which billed itself the "Privacy Act of 1974," explained the problem clearly.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the privacy of an individual is directly
affected by the collection, maintenance, use and dissemination of personal information by Federal agencies;

(2) the increasing use of computers and sophisticated information technology has greatly magnified the harm that can occur from any collection, maintenance, use, and dissemination of personal information;

(3) the opportunities for an individual to secure employment, insurance, and credit, and his right to due process, and other legal protections are endangered by the misuse of certain information systems;

(4) the right to privacy is a personal and fundamental right protected by the Constitution of the United States; and

(5) in order to protect the privacy of individuals identified in information systems maintained by Federal agencies, it is necessary and proper for the Congress to regulate the collection, maintenance, use and dissemination of information by such agencies.

Incidentally, and apparently inadvertently, such privacy legislation, particularly H. R. 12206, seriously menaced the very functioning of NARS.

H. R. 12206, "A Bill . . . to provide that persons be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies," proposed to require that

(a) Each agency that maintains records, including computer records, concerning any person which may be retrieved by reference to, or are indexed under such person's name, or some other similar identifying number or symbol, and which contain any information obtained from any source other than such person shall, with respect to such records--

(1) refrain from disclosing the record of any information contained therein to any other agency or to any person not employed by the agency maintaining such record, except,
(A) with notification of the person concerned or, in the event such person, if an individual, cannot be located or communicated with after reasonable effort, with notification of members of the individual's immediate family or guardian, or, only in the event that such individual, members of the individual's immediate family, and guardian cannot be located or communicated with after reasonable effort, upon good cause for such disclosure, or

(B) that if disclosure of such record is required under section 552 of this chapter or by any other provisions of law, the person concerned shall be notified by mail at his last known address of any such required disclosure.

Agencies were also enjoined to:

(2) refrain from disclosing the record or any information contained therein to individuals within that agency other than those individuals who need to examine such record of information for the execution of their jobs;

(3) maintain an accurate record of the names and addresses of all persons to whom any information contained in such records is divulged and the purposes for which such divulgence was made;

(4) permit any person to inspect his own record and have copies thereof made at his expense, which in no event shall be greater than the cost to the agency of making such copies;

(5) permit any person to supplement the information contained in his record by the addition of any document or writing of reasonable length containing information such person deems pertinent to his record; and

(6) remove erroneous information of any kind, and notify all agencies and persons to whom the erroneous material has been previously transferred of its removal.

No statute of limitations exempted retired personnel files. No exception was provided for NARS. Frightened by the prospect of having to request permission of
Revolutionary and Civil War veterans at their last known address before opening their files to historians, the Archives staff mobilized to make Congress aware of what the archivists hoped was merely an oversight. They estimated that H. R. 12206, if enacted, would initially cost NARS almost one million dollars. Annual recurring costs, depending upon the interpretation given separate paragraphs, ranged between $340,000 and $2 million. Federal Archives and Records Centers faced expenses more than double these.

One-time costs of S. 3418, a similar but more comprehensive bill presented to the Senate in May, were estimated at over 5.5 billion dollars. S. 3418 required that every individual in every record system be notified of his right to see and petition to amend his file. The National Archives alone holds over one billion such files, and Federal Archives and Records Centers contain even more. Annual recurring costs under S. 3418 were estimated at almost $13 million for all of NARS. Even beyond the staggering expenses, delays forced by procedural requirements promised to render the system useless to historians.

Through the General Services Administration, the Archives presented its case on the Hill. At least one representative addicted to polka dots and broad-brimmed hats was heard to express the opinion that historians are busybodies, who have no more right to poke about in the private lives of the dead than the government has of invading the privacy of the living. Fortunately, this point of view did not prevail. Section 204 (b) of S. 3418 as revised August 26 now reads:

Federal agency records pertaining to identifiable individuals which were transferred to the National Archives of the United States as records which have sufficient historical or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the United States Government shall for the purposes of this Act, be considered to be maintained by the National Archives and shall be subject to the provisions of this Act . . . .

Several minor exceptions to this broad exemption follow, but they no longer endanger the historical services of
NARS. H. R. 16373, which replaced H. R. 12206, provides similar exemption for archival records. Both the Senate and House bills passed on November 21, 1974. A joint committee is expected to resolve differences between the two. [The differences were resolved and the measure signed into law by the President on December 31, 1974.]

This scare seems to have passed. But historians and archivists had best not relax too deeply. The problem promises to return. Our federal bureaucracy continues to grow, and it will continue to guard some information jealously. Computers and data systems are also here to stay, and the debate over their use and abuse will only grow stronger as the hardware and techniques improve. We will have to remind our government and ourselves that we do serve a function in this society, that the study of history, as part of a liberal education, does help us understand and deal with the complex forces of our political, social, and economic life. The rationalizations for the study of history are myriad. Our individual versions probably differ significantly. At base, however, many are embodied in the symbols of American political life. We should appreciate the antagonistic forces in the clash of secrecy, privacy, and the historian's need to know. But in the drama taking place, it is our part to use these symbols to continue to demand and provide access to the records of the American democratic experiment. By so doing, we can confirm that ours is indeed a free and open society where the government exists for the welfare of its citizens and not merely to aggrandize its own power. The concept of citizens' privacy is sacred, but the government must not use privacy to cloak dishonesty and other activities inimical to the public good. Historians and archivists should have little doubt about which government the sage had in mind when he said: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."
FOOTNOTES


7 Carol M. Barker and Matthew H. Fox (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1972).


Controversies raging around the collection and administration of documentary collections have been in large part caused by changing collecting policies of depositories themselves. There was a day not long ago when depositories considered their mission to be that of amassing materials which lent support to the consensus theory of history. Pioneer panegyrics were their bag, not the preservation of those materials which indicate that human progress is achieved through conflict and controversy. Now that our institutions are emancipated, they must expect not merely the limelight, but the ulcerous pressures brought about by notoriety. We commend to you certain principles which have proven in the long haul beneficial to our depository in Ohio.

The first principle is that a collecting organization should never bow to the expediency of the moment; it should not slay the goose in the hope of retrieving a single golden egg.

Ohio's experience is firsthand in this respect. To have fought for the retention of the Harding love letters would have won for the Ohio Historical Society the everlasting praise of the scholar, but would have dried up the lifeblood of our depository--incoming sensitive collections. Retention of a sensitive collection to which the depository has no legal claim, or a weak one, is institutional suicide. The acceptance of the Nixon vice-
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presidential papers by the National Archives on the basis of a reputedly postdated deed of gift, for example, has tarnished the image of that venerable agency.

The second principle is that of clearly identifying the publics which a depository serves and fashioning policies that suit each. The two main publics are donors on the one hand and researchers on the other. Of the two, donors are the more important. If donor agreements and requirements are not met, there will be no new sources for the researchers. Archivists and manuscript librarians are no longer the altar boys of researching scholars. Our profession has come of age. The old saw, that all which is created is in the public domain, or normally should be, is simple fiction. A scholar guards the exclusiveness of his notes for publication as jealously as does the creator of sensitive primary sources. There can be no double standard. The protection of a journalist’s sources as confidential applies equally to a public figure who desires to preserve for a suitable period the confidentiality of his creation. The Shadow of Blooming Grove still hangs over the Ohio Historical Society, but only in the minds of selfish scholars, not donors with whom we have kept faith.

The right to know is actually a privilege more easily abused than perceived. With privileges come responsibilities. When responsibility is abdicated, then privilege is circumscribed.

A third principle is to anticipate problems and formulate policies to serve as guideposts before a crisis develops, rather than after one occurs. The Ohio Historical Society recently adopted the following policy, for example, concerning sensitive materials.

The Ohio Historical Society is required to obey any court-issued subpoena for documents, tapes, or transcripts in its possession even though the use of such papers may have been offered to, and accepted by, the Society under terms of an agreement prohibiting their release or utilization unless with the permission of the donor, his heirs, and assigns.
In the event the Society receives a subpoena for such papers in its care, custody and control, the staff member responsible for the collection, in consultation with the Director, shall notify the donor and solicit his wishes with respect to compliance with the subpoena.

In the event the donor desires to question the subpoena, the Society will co-operate with the donor and his attorney in filing with the court a motion to suppress or modify the subpoena.

The Society shall not be liable for breach of contract for complying with a subpoena or court order.

In the event any member of the staff of the Society is charged by a donor, his heirs, assigns, or anyone for having breached the terms and conditions of an agreement pertaining to personal papers, which agreement the Society's Board of Trustees has approved and which is in effect, the Director shall invoke the pertinent provisions of the Society's personnel policy. In the event an investigation of the charges levied against any staff in this regard shall be found to be groundless and the staff so charged are found to be innocent of any intentional or negligent wrongdoing, the Society will furnish legal counsel and assist in defending the staff so charged. If any staff member is determined to be guilty of intentional or negligent wrongdoing in such instances, the provisions of the personnel policy will be implemented.
The final problem area worth mentioning is a current trend addressed by Bill Alderson, Director of the American Association for State and Local History, in the March, 1974, issue of History News. That trend is the reorganization of state government and its harmful effect upon the administration of historical activities at the state level. The North Carolina story has not been fully told. It goes deeper than the resignation of a capable state history administrator. The question is: can an archival and manuscript depository operate effectively, impartially, and correctly, can it be the recipient of politically sensitive collections, if it is administered directly by appointed politicians rather than by professionals independent of the whims of elected officials? I think not. If the trend, noted in several states, to fragmentize and politicize documentary collecting programs at the state level continues, the private depositories either will have to fill the breach or will themselves be tarnished by the state-level example. It behooves all of us to formulate strong positions in this respect and fight for them. The effort requires the overt support of the private agencies. The time has arrived to ask publicly whether or not secretaries of state and cultural affairs directors are indeed the proper directors of archival and manuscript programs. And it is also the proper time to determine whether professors or researchers are the proper directors of collecting programs in colleges and universities. I am a die-hard advocate of private depositories governed by lay boards and administered by professional staffs armed with clearly enunciated policies formulated by the staffs and promulgated by the boards—all entirely independent of partisan interests and governmental controls, but, where appropriate, with governmental support. It is not an unreasonable position to have. Moreover, it is a goal the attainment and maintenance of which will guarantee to future generations of scholars the sources they require to seek relative truths.
COLLECTING FOR CLIO*

PEANUT BUTTER AND SPILT MILK
A NEW LOOK AT COLLECTING

David B. Gracy II+

Collecting is the peanut butter and jelly sandwich of the archival profession. It is fun; it is nourishing; and it can be tedious and frustrating when it sticks to the roof of your mouth. Few other aspects of archival endeavor offer the warm satisfaction of bringing to light material previously lost to research. Collecting is as old as the preserving of information by man, and as innovative as the modern society it now serves. Just how innovative it must be to adapt to modern methods of record keeping, just how much change is taking place in collecting techniques and in the material being sought have drawn little comment from archivists, manuscript curators, and librarians who administer collections of records—all of whom, for our purposes, I lump under the term "archivists."

From the day the first record was systematically sought for permanent preservation in a repository of recorded information, archivists have collected under the "spilt milk" philosophy. The production of records was so meager, and the number of these documents that survived so scanty, that no one cried over what was lost, but rejoiced in what was

*This and the following two papers, by Steve Gurr and Tom Hill, were presented at the Society's Workshop on Archives and Records, November 22, 1974, in the opening session titled "Collecting for Clio: A discussion of the kinds of papers and records present-day archivists, manuscript curators, librarians, and historians should and should not be saving.--Ed.

+Dr. Gracy is Archivist at Georgia State University and Chairman of the Committee on Finding Aids of the Society of American Archivists.
saved. Each and every scrap of paper lit up one more dark recess of the past. Genealogists know this better than most. They scour courthouses and archives seeking a will, a deed, a receipt—anything—not to write a full biography, but for basic documentation of one human being's existence.

In the twentieth century, however, we have swung the pendulum to the other extreme. Groups formerly faceless now create records. Persons on welfare, in hospitals, with insurance, who apply for credit, who pay income taxes—all complete forms and are the subject of files. Governments alone produce and receive, use and store data by the ton. The production is so massive, the entirely new profession of records management came into being within the last three decades to cope with the glut. Records managers design record keeping systems to pack the most information into the least space, to provide for the retention of paper records in the most accessible but economical way, and to dispose of records after they have fulfilled their purpose. Heaven knows records managers are sorely needed. The Federal Archives and Records Center in East Point, one of eleven such centers in the country, houses seven acres of records stacked on shelves 14 feet high and 75 feet long—650,000 cubic feet of records under one roof, enough to build a wall 30 inches high all the way around Atlanta's perimeter highway. But only 22,000 cubic feet are in the archives branch, barely three percent. The rest are records of no enduring value that are scheduled for eventual destruction. The three percent figure, incidentally, is not out of line for the federal government generally, and probably is not far below the figure for other governmental agencies, businesses, perhaps for our society as a whole.

We face abundance, overabundance. And overabundance challenges the comfortable "spilt milk" philosophy. From collecting virtually everything, we have presently to re-orient our thinking to dispose of almost everything while searching out that valuable minority of records with enduring value.

The search is not as easy as it might have been either, because we have in this age greatly altered the form in which we create and store information, as well as our patterns of communication. Those who used to write letters revealing their feelings and recording their decisions now telephone, leaving no record more enduring than memory. Those who used to demand complete, thorough newspaper
reporting now flip on the television, whose record at best is a costly, difficult-to-obtain videotape that requires expensive hardware to play. With the computer we can manage, process and analyze information as never before, and we do. Who knows how much? The tape recorder gives us the capacity to capture the flavor and depth of events and personal involvement far more thoroughly than was possible with written memoirs. And some communication, like telephone conversations, can be captured to their fullest only on magnetic tape.

Perhaps the latest best example of the revolution in documentation is the resignation of President Nixon. Traditional documents in the form of memos, letters, and notes provided piles of evidence of wrongdoing in the Executive Department, but the "smoking gun" that linked the President with illegal activity was revealed in recorded conversations. Moreover, television provided far and away the best coverage of the resignation itself, including interviews, background reports, and the actual speech. I searched the newsstands of Atlanta for the traditional "extra" editions of newspapers normally published on such momentous occasions, and found but one.

If written history were the tracks of politicians, governments, and wars, as it largely was for so long, our search still would be rather straightforward. But during the past couple of decades historians have proliferated astoundingly, and likewise the subjects they have chosen to study, including such nontraditional areas as public health, urban affairs, the history of blacks and women in America, and organized labor, to name just five. Archives have responded to these demands for new documentation. A note in a magazine recently announced the founding of an archives of television commercials at the University of Arizona. Last February an archives of love letters appeared at the West Vancouver Public Library; before that a network of repositories collecting ephemera such as bumper stickers, buttons, handbills, napkins, menus, programs, and the like, gained national attention. Where there were no repositories devoted solely to organized labor fifteen years ago, there now are four.

The implications are many for the archival world. For one, the traditional approach of setting up a repository to collect like a vacuum cleaner within a given geographical area is unrealistic for twentieth century material. A
repository must establish for itself a manageable focus. New archives programs in Georgia certainly should not try to duplicate the work of long-established agencies—like the manuscripts division of the state archives, the special collections departments of the University of Georgia and of Emory University, the Atlanta Historical Society, and the Georgia Historical Society—by collecting traditional materials on Georgia politics and the Old South. Some may develop regional foci of concentration, such as Georgia State University which inaugurated a collection of Southern labor records three years ago. Others may build local or area collections of personal memorabilia or of business records. Just how fertile these fields can be and how much may be accomplished will be discussed in the papers to follow. There is room for more repositories—be they located in colleges, public libraries or historical societies—to collect in specific subject fields within designated geographic areas.

The program of the West Vancouver Public Library offers a good example of the new collecting. The library's archival enterprise began with a low-key effort to assemble some local history items. "One donation came from the widow of a turn-of-the-century high court judge," wrote the director. According to her journals from 1901 to the 1930s, "the lady... led a singularly boring existence—tea parties, bridge, and occasional horseback rides. One of the few lively events she recorded was a party at which the judge became hopelessly drunk! In retaliation she destroyed all his love letters. I mentioned the incident," he continued, "on a local talk show with the comment that it was a pity she kept the diary and burned the letters, which might have made better reading. The result was the donation to the library of a series of love letters (which incidentally, shed light on the early development of the Canadian railroad system). A short time later, the library issued a press release to the local papers announcing that the library was collecting love letters. The story was quickly syndicated by the wire services throughout the States and Great Britain," he concluded, and "the response has been overwhelming."¹

The response points too to the fact that a great deal of material is being created now that ought to be saved, but which either has not been saved before, or has not been saved systematically. Perhaps a better example than love letters is ephemera—advertisements, announcements, badges, invoices, bookplates, broadsides, bumper stickers, calendars,
greeting cards, stock certificates, invitations, labels, letterheads, menus, napkins, trade cards, souvenirs, tickets, and the like. Russell Benedict of the University of Nevada at Reno, and the founder of a network of collectors of ephemera, call this "the primary source material of our times, and," he adds, "collecting it is likely to be one of the most...important things a librarian can do." Others share his sentiment, because ephemera is a principal source of color and human interest for historians and writers on regional and local subjects.

Collecting of ephemera is not new. Indeed, many libraries that make no pretense of having an archival program have actively collected ephemera. Sadly, however, they have accumulated ephemera and treated it as a curiosity, a side show to their principal program. A survey made in July, 1973, of ephemera holdings in public, university, and historical society libraries revealed that most repositories did not accord their ephemera collection the attention—a adequate finding system—provided the book holdings.

What the survey revealed, basically, was that these repositories do not have an integrated program. They collect for the sake of collecting, not to process and make available for research. They are, in effect, merely transferring bones from one graveyard to another. A modern archival enterprise, on the other hand, must be a well-rounded operation that runs its collecting program in tandem with the other phases of the endeavor.

What is new in collecting ephemera, then, is the philosophy of collecting it as a serious attempt to better document a movement, a time, or a place. Benedict describes how that began:

In 1965 I became a retiree on Social Security. I had then been gathering material for this library on communism, civil rights, the radical right, organized labor, and other topics...[The] director of libraries...asked me to devote myself to the collection of ephemera, to document the times and their changes—as much for future research as for current use...Not only the prejudices of radicalism, but the moderate views should be on hand. One hitch: the project could
not be financed. No funds were, or are, available for this special work. Thus, material could not be purchased, and there could be no salaried assistants. 4

Benedict hove to his charge with zeal.

He finds his work "a continuing experience in human nature and motives." 5 No wonder. The focus of the collecting are women's groups, labor, the far left, gays, dissident students. One repository has "launched a program to interest the community in collecting clippings and pamphlets on items of local interest; hopefully, this program will enrich the collection of grass-roots political and educational systems, which in many ways are unique." 6 The philosophy of the public library member of the network is that "the alternative press is not the province of the researcher but can be made available to the worker, the drop-out, politician, single mother, high school student, and so on... While our collection can be useful, presumably, to those for or against the movements, no particular effort will be made to achieve a 'balance.'" 7

Ephemeraists echo Benedict too that collecting this type of material "is likely to be one of the most daring [and] difficult... things a librarian can do." Rather than building bridges to the organizations producing the handbills, posters, buttons, bumper stickers, and so on, the ephemeraists pick up items from street vendors, demonstrators, sidewalk speakers. One repository has made arrangements with the Congressmen from its district to place in the library all the suitable items the politicians receive. More remarkable than the individual collecting techniques is the sharing arrangement by which repositories exchange duplicates, each building thereby a larger, more comprehensive collection than any one of them could have done alone. Always with room for "one more," the network now numbers more than 20 college and public libraries from California to Connecticut. Only three are located in the South (at Tulane University, the University of Virginia, and the College of Charleston). The way is open and the time is right to inaugurate one in Georgia.

As sources, materials, and techniques for collecting change, so does the relationship of the collector to the collectee. In the past, repositories occasionally attempted
to influence the creation of records in the manner of one which placed blank diary books in the hands of appropriate high public officials. The hope was that records would appear where otherwise there would have been a barren slate. Few of those who accepted the diaries so cheerfully, however, wrote more in them than their names. And there are enough important persons who create inadequate records that the spilt milk philosophy always will have a place.

Nevertheless technology has sprung to the archivist's aid. The tape recorder gives us the tool we have needed to be able to acquire basic information in the absence of a written record, or supplementary to it. But is this the archivist's job, ought he to be influencing the creation of records he keeps? At least in the case of oral history, the answer seems to be affirmative. Only the archivist can know where gaps exist in a collection or between collections. And few individuals are better placed to know inter-personal relationships revealed in papers, which oral history can enhance. If the archivist does not get the interview, chances are good that the respondent will be unavailable by the time a researcher seeks the information. The caution every archivist must exercise is to insure that he does not divert so much of his precious resources to oral history that the manuscript material under his care languishes, or potential collections slip away.

By collecting from contemporaries who can be taped and who donate their own records, are we influencing the preservation of information in a more subtle way? In other words, are the records doctored by persons giving their own files because the donors are conscious that the deeds recorded among their materials will be open to the scrutiny of the ages? Before this century, precious few persons dreamed of the possibility that their letters, diaries, and similar routine communications would end up in an archives. If they did think of others reading their handiwork, doubtless the consideration was more in the form of one love letter writer of the 1890s, who scrawled that she was "writing in pencil so that it should fade, preventing it reaching strange hands." That letter, incidentally, remains as legible today "as the day it was written." All collecting archivists can tell you stories of "the ones that got away," of collections that families or organizations, apparently in fear of some embarrassing disclosure, would not make available for research. We have not forgotten L. Patrick Gray's admission of destroying Watergate evidence. But I know of
no case where records were falsified before deposit in an archives for the purpose of misleading future generations of researchers. Classic destruction, I believe, continues to be far more common than falsification.

The legal sharks in the archival sea have not really changed either, but they surely have become more evident. Most of us grew up in an archival world in which collecting was simple. One went out, took physical possession of a collection, processed it, and opened it subject only to donor-imposed restrictions. Few worried about forms transferring legal title, thought about the literary rights in the material or knew that such rights were separate from physical possession. The records most archives collected and serviced were so old that the issue seemed largely academic. But now as the information we are saving comes closer to the present, the archivist must recognize the inherent problems and know his position before he ever begins to collect.

There are three separate but intertwined issues here: 1) libel, 2) literary rights, and 3) privacy. Libel, of course, is defamation of character in written form. Archives become involved when a researcher quotes from the collection of one person a statement detrimental to another. The archives is party to the matter because it holds libelous material, not because it has published the statement. Normally the trouble can be avoided by imposition of suitable restrictions allowing adequate time for tempers to cool and the matter to change from a contemporary to a historical controversy.

Literary rights are the common law rights of any individual to first publication of his writing. Thus, a person who donates his collection to an archives gives physical possession of the carbons of his outgoing letters and the originals of the letters he received. But he himself can give the rights to publish—to print—only half of that: to his own writings (his carbons). A researcher, then, does not have the freedom to quote from just any materials he finds in an archives, rather only those whose literary rights the archives holds.

To spell out the situation as plainly as possible to all concerned, as well as to protect the repository, an archives, and especially one dealing with contemporary material, should draw and have an attorney approve a deed-
of-gift form. By his signature to it, a donor can formally transfer to the archives physical possession of a collection and all the literary rights he owns in it. To further protect itself, the repository also should develop a form on which each researcher recognizes that he must obtain permission to quote from material in the archives. The purpose is not to discourage research and publication, but to require the user to listen to and understand both his privileges and the rights of others.

The right to privacy protects a person—or gives him recourse—from use without his consent of information about him. Where literary rights protect only a person's own words from being used without his permission, the right to privacy protects him from disclosure of the information in any form, whether in his words or someone else's. Medical, social welfare, and credit bureau records, as well as labor grievances, fall obviously into this category. As this century has advanced, the private information in this sort of file has grown tremendously. Some feel that because of the volume alone the files should be destroyed in as short a time as possible. Yet these files have value collectively as well as individually. Like statistical information in the census, data from them demands compilation and analysis. The lead article in last fall's issue of GEORGIA ARCHIVE, as well as the first two articles in the July, 1974, American Archivist, deal with these very issues. This is a frontier for most archivists. But all agree on one point: discretion cannot be left to researchers or donors. Archivists must define their position before the material is ever collected, must collect on their terms, and must have their position in writing clear to all.

Collecting brings to mind the two little boys coming upon an escalator for the first time. One turned to the other and asked, "What are they going to do when the basement fills up with steps?" It just doesn't happen that way, collecting is never finished. But it should never be started until the repository has a definite purpose and goal, understands its relationship with donors and researchers, and knows its position on the legal issues.
FOOTNOTES


5 Ibid., 236.
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COLLECTING FOR CLIO

THE PERSPECTIVE OF AN HISTORIAN/ARCHIVIST

Steve Gurr

In the summer of 1973 an ambitious, but in many respects ill-defined, project was begun at Georgia Southwestern College. The project, the Southwestern Historic Inventory, was the outgrowth of a proposal designed to join local historical society interests, national funding sources for local historical society projects, undergraduate and graduate students interested in local history and what appeared to be an obvious local need for the location, cataloging, and collecting of the resources in the field of local history.

The Southwestern Historic Inventory sought to draw out and to make available information on and locations of the historical sources for the eight southwestern Georgia counties comprising the Middle Flint Area Planning and Development Commission. Georgia history students, assigned in groups to individual counties, were to seek out sources of historical data—maps, photographs, manuscripts, local printed histories, as well as church records, official county and city documents, data on historic sites, and legends and folk tales—whatever might help document the past of any given community. The Sumter Historic Preservation Society made a generous grant for the project with the understanding that efforts for Sumter County would include building a local collection in Americus for the Society. A local history archive then became an important secondary goal.

Having determined in general terms what to look for, methods were formulated for reaching the desired objectives. During the summer of 1973 student teams were assigned
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Photos - Post Cards - Letters - Maps - Etc.

Information about especially the downtown area and the Windsor.

The Sumter Historic Preservation Society and the Southwestern Historic Inventory are seeking the above items which illustrate what Americus was like in the past. We do not want to keep these items but are interested in making copies for our collections about the history of the area.

We would be most interested in interviewing people who have special recollections about the city or the county. If you have items or information about items that we might examine please contact:

Steve Gurr
Phone: 924-6111, ext. 264
Or write % Division of Social Science
Ga. Southwestern College
Americus, Ga. 31709

counties with lists of suggested types of materials to investigate. When feasible, students personally visited communities, but in some instances individual students made inquiries through correspondence with county officials and with state-level sources such as the state archives. In two of the counties students made photographs of historic sites and copied manuscripts and other photographs. Elsewhere, community citizens were concerned about materials being taken outside the community.

For every county, certain specific categories of information could be reported with a high degree of regularity and finality. It was possible to check off the location of extant microfilm copies of newspapers, printed local histories, public library holdings in local history, and official county and city records, all of which were housed in repositories or offices open to the public. A similar situation existed for church records, although there were instances of lost records or hearsay evidence that could not be definitely corroborated. As expected, it was the private holdings which most frequently eluded the search teams. A few old photographs surfaced, copies of letters were occasionally shared, and tips on individuals who had or knew of important sources were forthcoming. For the most part, however, in the good old southern tradition, the prominent family of the community kept to itself, reluctant to share or even to acknowledge its hidden treasures.

In Sumter County, a public request for records was made through a newspaper advertisement in hopes of bringing privately-held sources to the surface. The attractively designed and prominently displayed appeal in a small, widely read local newspaper resulted in but two responses. In retrospect, the impersonal nature of the appeal may have done more harm than good for the project effort. The personal identification of the project director seemed to be the most effective means of unearthing fugitive materials in Sumter County. No amount of impersonal solicitation could do the work of a short conversation between the director and local sources.

In the end, results from the several counties were uneven, leading to some confusion on the part of the student participants, and thus, no doubt, weakening our effectiveness. At present only a cursory compilation of our findings for three of the four counties of the study has been made. More attention, however, has been given to the fourth, Sumter.
County. This attention derives from the peculiar relationship of Sumter County to the project.

A major adjunct to the initial project became the effort to establish an archive of local history for the Sumter Historic Preservation Society. In this connection, attempts were made to secure photocopies of materials relating to the history of the county as they were uncovered in the larger survey. The meager beginnings of the archives have fallen into two major categories: archival materials relating to the Society itself, being the "self-creating" portion of our collection, and the local history collection, encompassing a wide variety of materials, but as yet lacking significant depth. Through the cooperation of Georgia Southwestern College, these materials are housed in the rare book and map room of the James Earl Carter Library.

The "self-creating" category includes clippings files of newspaper accounts of Society activities and projects, copies of the newsletter, legal documents relating to the incorporation of the Society and the securing of its tax-exempt status, by-laws, certificates of recognition for Society activities, awards and plaques, and finally, correspondence files and minutes of meetings. This portion of the archive is obviously the most manageable and complete, and in the long run may well be the Society's most significant archival effort.

With its interest in local history, the archives has accumulated an interesting assortment of "remembrances of things past." The major divisions of the local history collection are: manuscripts, tapes, color slides of existing and recently-demolished sites, maps, historic publications, photographs, local publications revealing of the past, history oriented clippings, and two special family collections—the Stephen Pace Collection, donated by the widow of the late Congressman from the Third District, and the Eldridge Collection, a gift of Eldridge descendants in the community. Both of the family collections include a variety of photographs, manuscripts, memorabilia, and printed materials. These are considered unified collections, and the components are not housed in the various physical subcategories of the general collection.

A portion of the archival holdings includes items that fit somewhere between "self-creating" and local history materials. Among these are research notes on a booklet.
history of the Windsor Hotel, a local turn-of-the-century landmark, as well as research files for the homes of our annual spring tour of homes. Tour brochures and copies of the Windsor booklet are included in this section.

The survey project and the effort to establish an archive generated problems which should be discussed for the benefit of those considering similar efforts. As the project unfolded, the participants were both impressed and dismayed to find that solutions to problems often led to yet other problems. The entire process unfortunately became an exercise in trial and error. Six of the problems proved to be especially difficult.

1. Basic was the task of getting hidden sources out in the open. The project, for the most part, did not call for the surrender of valued family treasures or imagined treasures. Searchers simply wanted to locate and establish the existence of materials in an effort to help others avoid needless duplication in the quest for research materials. Privately held materials proved extraordinarily elusive, even an acknowledgement of their existence.

2. Burdensome was a lack of expertise in the handling of an unusually wide variety of physical objects which turned up. Both phases of our project brought out materials such as silk shawls, stick pens, tintypes, and parchment, which demanded the attention of a person knowledgeable in conservation.

3. Storage and maintenance of materials, closely related to the preceding problem, created questions of its own. For example, after the technical issue of initial treatment and care of the materials had been solved, the real problem of storage remained, involving security and accessibility as well as space.

4. Cataloging of both ordinary and unusual materials in the collection presented a challenge. The difficulty was one of reaching a decision that must be lived with, perhaps forever.

5. Conflicts in holdings caused concern. Even in a small community situation involving strictly local items, conflicts needed to be minimized with other community efforts--library, church, school, civic club—all seeking to perform service similar to that of the archives. State, regional, and national
conflicts could compound the problem.

6. Finally, limits on the collection had to be considered. Where does the collector draw the line in accepting materials when, for instance, one rejection of a "worthless" item may jeopardize future prospects for obtaining important items?

Collectors will have to find their own effective solutions to these six problems. But our experience offers the following suggestions:

A. Rely upon personal contact. Find a readily available individual who is willing to put in many hours before civic organizations, clubs, high school students, groups of all kinds. In communities the size of Americus, and in those smaller, there is a distinct advantage to having a person readily identified in the community who is highly visible, patient, grateful, personal and personable, and is available for small talk. This person can be your major asset in uncovering those hidden sources.

B. In-house problems, such as physical treatment, storage, maintenance, and cataloging require detailed and patient attention, preferably by one or two individuals who will be associated with the project efforts for the foreseeable future. We have found considerable aid in the publications available through the American Association for State and Local History. These provide well-written instructions on museum management, as well as technical information on the treatment and cataloging of manuscripts and on the ephemera that gathers in most collections of this type. Manuscript appraisal, the treatment of paper, wood, and textiles, and display tips are among the many topics covered by AASLH publications.

C. In dealing with most of the problems mentioned above, it is a good idea to establish a proven method or routine, whether in the gathering, storage, cataloging or use of the collection. Routine procedures will expedite collection management and help in establishing a reputation for stability and dependability, both important in securing additions to the collection. Look into the suggestions offered by AASLH, the Society of American Archivists, and the Georgia Department of Archives and History. Discuss alternatives with your board members and make decisions that will be lasting and workable for your situation.
D. The problems related to conflicts with other collections and decisions about limiting the nature of your collection are central. Locally, try to reach understandings with other collecting agencies. If they are already engaged in a particular project, carefully consider the possible effects from competing with them. Let them know what you are contemplating. Such caution could well gain a valuable ally instead of creating a serious enemy. Seek out the opinions of archivists and collectors beyond the community. Consider seriously the negative implications of a local collection. Does the retention of local materials conflict seriously with the aims of a major state project or university effort? Faced with a real problem of having potential donors unwilling to deposit except in a local collection, permission eventually may be secured for copies to be deposited elsewhere. If the local collection unearths otherwise buried materials, it could be of great service by making the existence of the material known. Establish a policy of reporting on your accessions to the major collections in the state and to those publications which inform the public on the status of collections. GEORGIA ARCHIVE and the Georgia Historical Quarterly should receive regular reports on additions to holdings.

E. A final and critical concern is whether or not to limit the collection by drawing lines as to what will be accepted. For the present no limits have been placed on our collection in Sumter County. Given the experience of almost two years, we believe that the rejection of any materials would not have improved our collection and in fact very likely would have generated attitudes which the project has sought to overcome. By the same token, the archives could not in some cases accept all offers. For example, the Harrold Papers, recently given to Emory University, were physically too voluminous for local storage. Nonetheless, each offer must be considered on its own merits to avoid the very real danger of encouraging the continued hoarding of materials by private sources.

The newly installed president of the American Association for State and Local History, Richard D. Williams, said in an editorial in the October, 1974, History News:

"Time has come . . . to redefine and to reassess old, slightly derogatory ideas about a "professional" vis-a-vis an "amateur." Unless we do reexamine our
preconceptions, we may misunderstand relationships influenced by events in the last twenty-five years: the remarkable increase in America's educational level, the intense specialization in knowledge and professions, and the very success of the AASLH's program in increasing standards of performance. At the turn of this century, professional historians with Ph.D. degrees and training in Germanic methodology dismissed local history by amateurs as "antiquarian"—lacking perspective and critical rigor. As with other traditional relationships—husband-wife, employer-employee, teacher-student—the professional-amateur dichotomy needs new insights.

Dr. Williams' remarks have special relevance for those involved in collecting for the local historical society, who must develop a thoughtful perspective on the archivist-citizen dichotomy.

What should a particular society be collecting? That depends on its purpose. It can determine its purpose partly by looking at the efforts of others. Let others know what is being attempted and why. What should not be collected? Consider carefully those items which may be more valuable on deposit elsewhere. Be receptive and flexible within a framework of established purposes and goals.
The role of the local historical society in collecting is quite different from that of the national or state archive, even of a college manuscript collection, the former being the official depository of government and the latter having, at least, the prestige of the college or university to help in collection. Both also have the advantage of a trained staff, adequate budgets, hopefully, and outstanding facilities.

The same cannot be said of local historical societies. One can count, virtually on the fingers of one hand, the number of societies that have a full-time staff and an archival program. According to the Directory of Historical Societies and Agencies published by the American Association for State and Local History, there are only six historical societies listed in Georgia outside of the cities of Atlanta and Savannah, each of which have two. Two of the six are located in a college or university, another in the U.S. Army Infantry Museum in Columbus, and a fourth is Westville Historic Handicrafts, Inc., the largest historical village recreation in the state. The remaining two are local historical societies. Not all of these six even have archival programs.

There are many good reasons for the lack of archives on the local level, the main one being shortage of money. Undoubtedly, due to rather enormous costs, the average small, rural areas never will have the budget, staff, or facilities to start an archives. It takes hundreds of man-hours even to make an inventory of what material is available. After it is found, and owners are willing to part with it, there
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is the storage problem. A lot more is involved than finding a room in an old house. The collections must be protected, particularly from humidity, temperature, and fire. One prime consideration must be whether the collection is safer where it is than in the storage area the society might provide.

In order to better explain what the Thomas County Historical Society is attempting to save and not to save, it should be noted that the holdings are divided into six main divisions: (1) Official Files of the Society, (2) Visual Art Materials, (3) Newspapers, (4) Maps, Plats, and Land Abstracts, (5) Papers of Corporate Bodies, and (6) Papers of Individuals.

The Official Files of the Society include ledgers and annual audits, membership lists, reports to the members, newspaper clippings of actions of the Society, correspondence of the Director, the charter and by-laws, as well as the minutes of the Executive Board and the Society. These are files which will expand as the Society grows.

The Visual Art Materials include such items as paintings, slides, still photographs, and movies. Many pictures in this file were received independently, but most came from manuscript collections. Photographs are removed from manuscript collections only if they are not integral to the collection, and are always replaced by a separation sheet. About the only pictures the Society declines to take are those of unidentified people since 1920. Photographs of some unidentified people prior to that time are saved for costumes alone, but are filed separately. The Society always tries to obtain and preserve the original, although some pictures can be gotten only by copying. Therefore, the Society needs a good camera with a micro-lens.

One major collection that all societies should try to collect and save is the back files of the local newspaper. No other one source will give such a panoramic view of an area. Newspapers constitute by far the smallest area of holdings in Thomas County. With the exception of some few very important issues, such as the Golden Jubilee Edition of the Thomasville Times-Enterprise, put out in 1939, which contains an enormous amount of historical information, no newspapers of the twentieth century are collected. There is little need since the local library and the University of Georgia have nearly complete runs of the local paper from 1889 on microfilm, which is supplemented each year. The
Society does collect any local paper published anywhere in the county that is not on microfilm, most of which antedate 1900.

The Map division has virtually no limitation except geographical. Any map from the area will be preserved, even if found in Atlanta or elsewhere, mainly because there are so few. Of course, duplications are avoided, as are contemporary maps of Thomasville published by the Chamber of Commerce.

The Papers of Corporate Bodies include selected records of the various branches of local government, institutions, societies, business corporations, schools, and churches. Since official records rarely come to a historical society without solicitation, attempts have been made to make the Thomas County Historical Society the official depository of certain county and city records. The first step involves making a determination of what records are produced and which ones should be retained. Obviously, it is impossible to save all the records produced, even in one courthouse, much less seven municipalities. Three criteria have thus been set up. Are the records (1) historically important, (2) unsafe where they are located, and (3) not being saved already by the state or federal government. Once the decision is made to save certain records, the very last step is to go to the county Board of Commissioners. It is imperative to know what to ask for before going.

The Tax Digest is a very good example of a record not saved or solicited by the Society, even though every town in the county uses the same digest, the state archives receives a copy. For the Society to save the record, it must meet all three of the criteria, which the digest does not since a copy is preserved in the state archives. Voter registration information dates back before 1900, and for genealogical information it is invaluable. But it is kept in a fireproof vault in the courthouse. It is as safe there as where the Society would put it. Furthermore, the county intends to keep it indefinitely. Consequently, the Society has not asked for this type of information.

The only records at the courthouse not stored in a fireproof vault, or kept by the State, are in the office of the Clerk of the County Commission. That office contains: the minutes of the Commission, paving projects, payroll records, accounts payable and receivable, disbursements,
contracts, resolutions, tax digest, and general correspondence of the Clerk. Though no disposition has been provided for any of these records, the only ones the Society has solicited are the minutes of the Commission through 1945, paving projects, disbursement records (which comprise the other financial records), and the noncurrent general correspondence of the Clerk.

There are seven incorporated towns now in existence in Thomas County, plus one that no longer has a charter. The City of Thomasville has a separate clerk and treasurer, as well as a city manager. Their records are formidable. Many are now being placed on microfilm and saved by the City. Because of space limitations, the Society will not seek these records as long as they are maintained by the City. The only records the Society wishes to have for the sake of consolidation with the other city records are: the yearly budget and audit on four of the five main funds (one is federal revenue sharing), minutes of the city commission to 1945 with annual additions, business licenses through 1950 in increments of 50 years, some very old tax digests, cemetery records, the original paving assessments once they become noncurrent, as well as noncurrent correspondence of the city manager.

The other six towns have only a city clerk to keep all their records. The Society is very eager at this time to consolidate all the important papers of these towns, for they meet all the criteria. The State does not have copies, the files are important, and they are stored almost anyplace. As with Thomasville, the Society is seeking in each case minutes of the city commission to 1945 with annual additions, business licenses through 1950, receipt and disbursement books (either compiled or separately), cemetery lot records, and noncurrent correspondence of the clerk.

The state archives has evidenced an interest in these records, which causes apprehension. Experience has shown that consolidating the records, even within the county, will be a minor miracle, much less taking them to Atlanta.

Under Institutions and Societies, do not overlook the civic clubs, as well as other groups, such as the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Daughters of the American Revolution. Moreover, inform them of the types of information needed, such as: press releases, minutes, reports of committees, telegrams, newspaper clippings, contracts,
financial reports, and any correspondence exchanged in setting up the yearly project. The Thomasville Entertainment Foundation scrapbooks, 1943-1971, for example, are an invaluable source of information on the cultural life of that city.

The single best place for information on the overall business life of the community is the Chamber of Commerce. Its annual report should be saved, as should newsletters and scrapbooks. Most important, the correspondence of the director should be preserved, since there one can find information on business moves or failures to move into a community.

There are two separate public school systems in Thomas County, the Thomas County System and the Thomasville City System. Both are storing their valuable records in fireproof vaults with humidifiers. Unless this policy is changed, the only public school records that the Society should save are the County Superintendent's personal correspondence file. To supplement the written record, however, the Society plans an oral history project to document issues settled "over the desk" in the two most important confrontations in which the superintendent has been involved—consolidation and integration. Five private schools operate in the County, and the Society is attempting to save their important records. The minutes of the executive boards and parent-teacher organizations, personnel files, financial records and correspondence will be, perhaps, one of the most important sources of information regarding integration in the South.

Churches are more than can be handled at this point. There are thirty-eight in Thomasville alone, with at least that many more in the County. The Society is considering taking a selected sample, including the largest city and rural church, smallest city and rural church, the oldest churches, and Black churches.

Papers of Individuals include any material acquired from an individual source. It is here, that the local archives differs more than in any other area from the other archival programs. The Society feels it more important to document the little man, the average man, than the important individual. Besides, the important collections will go to some college, as perhaps they should.
One last list of materials to collect, suggested by Robert S. Gordon in his very fine article on organizing the local society holdings ["Suggestions For Organization and Description of Archival Holdings of Local Historical Societies," American Archivist, 26 (January, 1963), 19-39--Ed.], includes:

1. Correspondence: letters received, copies or drafts, and letter books;
2. Personal Papers: birth certificates, school reports, diaries, scrapbooks, marriage certificates, death certificates, wills;
3. Land Papers: all documents pertaining to ownership and transfer of land;
4. Legal Papers: especially ones executed between two or more parties, as contracts, deeds, bonds;
5. Occupational Papers: items related to earning a living;
6. Civil and Military Offices: voluntary, elective, or appointed;
7. Societies and Organizations: papers relating to offices held;
8. Accounts and Receipts: vouchers, receipts, and commercial papers; and

The most active customers of a local historical society will be genealogists, and the society must collect for them. Such things as family bibles and tombstone inscriptions are important for these patrons, as well as telephone books and city directories.

As Steve Gurr has said, finding local private collections is very hard, about the only thing harder is talking somebody out of one. Do not expect to win all the time. Every local society collector will come across situations, as happened in Thomas County, where one of the oldest families in town recently closed its ancestral home, lived in for over 100 years, sold all the furniture at public auction, and burned the papers because they were "too personal." No amount of pleading on the Society's behalf convinced the family that what was "too personal" today would not be 100 years from now.
In seeking private collections, the Bicentennial is made to order for stirring local interest in the past and future. A society administrator should get on the local history committee and make it a "Bicentennial Goal" to preserve the past. Secondly, he could start a local history course in the local high school. Students will come up with materials the society could find no other way.

If the society collects the right things and builds its program to the point that people will leave things on the doorstep, the organization will have not only the thanks of future humanity, but also an enormous pride in a work well done.
General knowledge of Georgia journalism history rests heavily on two figures, Henry Woodfin Grady and Ralph Emerson McGill; yet, resources are available to add more meaningful information to both the scholarly and popular literature of mass communications. Though no one archive holds material sufficient to reveal the entire story, there are excellent resources in Georgia for students and scholars wishing to add to, or to reinterpret, knowledge in this area.

This article will outline some of the major holdings in mass media history available around the state. The information was distilled from correspondence and (in most cases) a personal visit to the archive in question. In general, the search was limited to those manuscripts and other holdings related to Georgia journalism and journalists. Thus, writers whose work was wholly in the field of fiction were excluded; those whose work straddled the line between traditional journalism and other literary fields were included.

This article devotes little space to extensive detailing of microfilm or hard copy holdings of newspapers. It is an obvious statement to say that most Georgia newspapers are represented to one degree or another at one of the major universities or at the state archives. Ulrich's Guide and other standard references are useful in that respect, but an updated, master, consolidated list of holdings of Georgia newspapers by those institutions would be useful to both librarians and library users.

Mr. Eberhard is Assistant Professor of Journalism at the University of Georgia. The author is seeking to assemble as complete a file on sources for Georgia media history as possible, and thus would appreciate hearing from persons who know of files not included in this list.
Small but useful collections of items from Atlanta-based journalists are available at the Society, along with a variety of newspaper holdings. Collections include material from the following: Ernest Rogers, Atlanta Journal columnist; Frank L. Stanton, poet and columnist; W. A. Hemphill, early Atlanta Constitution stockholder; Jack J. Spaulding; and Captain Evan P. Howell, early Constitution owner. Also, several journalism-related organizations—the Atlanta Writer's Club, the Georgia Writers Association, and the Society of Professional Journalists, Sigma Delta Chi—have donated materials. Newspaper collections include some holdings of early Atlanta newspapers, such as the Daily Intelligencer, with good runs for 1867-1868 and 1871. In addition, there are scattered issues from many Atlanta and Georgia newspapers too numerous to list here, dating from the early nineteenth century. A collection of unpublished manuscripts and the Society's library provide additional background for Atlanta media history.

EMORY UNIVERSITY

Unquestionably some of the most interesting archival collections of Southern journalists are to be found in the Special Collections Department of the Robert W. Woodruff Library for Advanced Studies at Emory. Papers related to the greats and near greats in the field are to be found there. The fact that much has been written about some of them (e.g. Ralph McGill and Joel Chandler Harris) does not diminish their utility for more studies.

Nearly 18,000 pieces cover the long career of Julian LaRose Harris, son of Joel Chandler Harris. He worked at the Constitution, as editor of the short-lived Uncle Remus Home Magazine, Sunday editor of the New York Herald, general manager, then editor of the Columbus Enquirer-Sun when that paper won the first Pulitzer Prize ever given a Southern newspaper, executive editor of the Chattanooga Times, and correspondent for the New York Times. The papers are well organized into major topical areas: journalistic life and times, post-journalistic life, family life and interests, literary manuscripts, miscellaneous, and diaries and scrapbooks. They fill 33 boxes and 24 bound volumes. There are 727 letters to his wife Julia—also an author and journalist—as well as 3,018 items of other correspondence.
The short, full and eventful career of Henry Woodfin Grady, noted Constitution editor and spokesman for the New South, is covered in 5 boxes and 14 scrapbooks of correspondence, photographs and clippings, including 10 scrapbooks kept by Grady himself, 1869-1887. There is some early Grady family correspondence from the 1820s, as well as a number of photographs. The Constitution's founder, Carey W. Styles, is represented by 200 pieces of correspondence, 1860-1894. There is half a box of items related to William Arnold Hemphill, another early owner of the Constitution.

The career of Joel Chandler Harris, author of the Uncle Remus tales and a writer/editor for the Constitution, is well represented in the Emory Library holdings. A memorial room in the Special Collections Department houses four cabinets which include books, book manuscripts, personal and literary correspondence, clippings, photographs, and originals of Uncle Remus illustrations. There is little from his early days on the Constitution, but otherwise these holdings on Harris are extensive.

The career of Clark Howell spanned most of the gap between the editorships of Henry Grady and Ralph McGill, and there are three boxes of items related to that career, as well as some books. There are six letters from his father, Evan P. Howell, in a separate folder.

Thanks to a secretary who had a sense of history, the Ralph McGill Collection numbers more than 40,000 pieces, ranging from correspondence to speeches to photographs and scrapbooks. While McGill thought there was little to be gained in saving copies of his correspondence (both incoming and out-going), his secretary believed otherwise, and because of that the record of his career is extensive. Now cataloged and arranged, materials dealing with the following and outgoing), his secretary believed otherwise, and general correspondence, 1929-1971; work on committees and foundations; writing, both for the Constitution and the many books and articles, including correspondence with publishers, drafts and proofs; speeches; travel records; business and legal papers; memorabilia; an extensive photograph collection; correspondence from readers; 40 scrapbooks; notebooks and engagement books, and awards. Unfortunately only one folder of correspondence survived from the early part of his journalistic career (1929-1944). The amounts increase substantially with the passage of time from the 1940s into the 1960s and with his rise to national eminence as a writer and civil rights moderate.
Two members of the distaff side of Georgia journalism are well represented in the Emory special collections: Emily Barnelia Woodward and Mildred Woolley Seydel. (Mrs. Seydel used the spelling "Seydell" for her journalistic work.)

Miss Woodward was the editor/publisher of the Vienna (Georgia) News, 1918-1930, as well as a contributor to the Atlanta Journal. She was twice president of the Georgia Press Association and founder of its annual Institute. She also lectured in America and abroad for the United States Department of State. The collection includes about 1,300 letters from 1918-1966, 68 manuscripts of lectures or articles, clippings, and correspondence with various state and national leaders.

The collection covering Mrs. Seydel's career numbers nearly 31,000 items, filling more than 57 boxes. A native of Atlanta, she was a columnist for the Charleston, (West Virginia) Gazette and then the Atlanta Georgian. She traveled widely, covering such diverse subjects as the Scopes trial and Benito Mussolini. Her activities on behalf of the National Women's Party, 1931-1945, may be of special interest. The collection includes extensive correspondence, as well as clippings and photographs.

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The impact of unionism on mass media is a sadly neglected area of mass media history. The extensive holdings of the Southern Labor Archives at Georgia State offer a chance for scholars to begin to remedy that weakness, at least in regard to the South.

The Atlanta Printing Pressmen and Assistants Local 8 has placed records for the 1940s through the 1960s in the archive, amounting to 8 boxes of records of that union's activities. Atlanta Typographical Union No. 48 is especially well represented by more than 14,000 items ranging from minutes and correspondence to financial records and management agreements, covering the period 1895-1939 and 1948-1960. Additionally, Edmund Torbush has donated approximately 7,000 items relating to the union, including various local and international pamphlets, newsletters, constitutions, directories and photographs. The activities of Birmingham Typographical Union No. 104 are covered, 1894-1950, in more than 1,000 items, chiefly minutes. More than 50 years of
Jacksonville Typographical Union No. 162, 1920-1972, is recorded in 8,036 items of correspondence, financial documents, minutes and contracts. Some items of the Florida Typographical Conference for 1945-1968 are in this collection. Manuscripts in collections of individuals include about 550 pages of material, chiefly magazine articles, pamphlets, and clippings, as well as a few poems and essays, 1919-1952, of Wayne Walden, a member of the Industrial Workers of the World. Paul L. Styles, Sr., who started his labor career as a member of the Huntsville Typographical Union, has a large body of papers covering his service on the National Labor Relations Board, 1950-1953, and as chief labor relations officer with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

The Special Collections Department of the University of Georgia Library also holds substantial materials of use to mass media historians. These are quite extensive in biographical resources, but also useful for economic and social history of the media. The holdings are listed by their title in the Special Collections index, with the number of the holding in parenthesis after the title, for those who wish to make further inquiries or examine specific materials.

Ashantilly Press Collection (702): 88 items dated 1961 from a private press in Darien, including manuscripts and proofs. Additions are made periodically.

Athens Daily Banner Record Book (112): One ledger, 1879-1890, showing subscription lists and charges, with a few notes on 1872-1874 accounts.

Joseph E. Brown Papers (85, 95): Includes correspondence of this governor with Henry Grady and other notables, 1851-1932.

Carlton-Newton-Mell Collection (59): 4,230 items, including correspondence, and papers of Henry Hull Carlton (1834-1905), an Athens editor, lawyer, state representative, senator, and congressman.

George Washington Carver Letters (336): 18 reproductions of letters, mostly from Carver to Mrs. Julian Harris of Columbus, daughter-in-law of Joel Chandler Harris.
Civil War Editorials from Northern Newspapers (58): 2,472 negative photostats of editorials from Northern newspapers concerning the beginning of the Civil War, arranged alphabetically by states.

Telamon Cuyler Diary (461): Copy of a diary recording a trip to Texas in 1888 by fifteen-year-old Cuyler, then in company with Henry Grady, his son, and many others in a private railroad car.

Camillus J. Dismukes, Colonial Georgia Newspaper Notices (518): A 44-page, typed manuscript by Dismukes quoting advertisements in full and in part from the Georgia Gazette, 1763-1776, giving a picture of life in that time.

William Thomas Dumas (849): One scrapbook of letters, clippings and poems, including communications from Joel Chandler Harris, Henry Grady and others.


Milton Luther Fleetwood Collection (193): 958 items of correspondence, printed materials, pictures, and other items by and about Fleetwood (1892-1966), publisher of the Cartersville Tribune-News.

Goldsmith Gift. One volume of the Southern Banner for 1832, complete.

Henry W. Grady letter (619): Reproduction of a letter from Grady to Professor W. H. Parkinson, University of Virginia, August 29, 1889.

Henry W. Grady Scrapbooks (96): Two scrapbooks of clippings, including obituaries.

Henry W. Grady and Jefferson Davis Obituaries (97): One volume of obituaries of the two men.

Selena Armstrong Harmon Papers (768): 309 items including correspondence, articles, biographical material, manuscripts, pictures and clippings on the career of a feature writer for the Washington (D. C.) Times, and later free lance writer, ca., 1898-1912.
Corra Harris Papers (734): 39,682 items of correspondence, clippings, pictures and manuscripts from the life of a well-known Georgia novelist/journalist, 1906-1944.

Joel Chandler Harris Collection (498): 18 items, chiefly letters and cards.

Clark Howell Papers (818): 1,055 items from the life of the longtime Constitution editor and president, including correspondence, clippings, and photographs. Some papers included from his father, Evan P., and son, Clark Jr. (See also entry under Emory University above.)

Ward Morehouse Collection (687): 5,787 items including correspondence, plays, souvenir booklets, programs, manuscripts, and reviews from a Georgian who became a noted drama critic for the New York Times.

Edward Padelford Letters (365): 28 items, 1841-1842, from Padelford to Ira Peck of Marion, interesting because they are written on the inside pages of two small newspapers, the Savannah Republican Prices Current and the Savannah Shipping and Commercial List.

Medora Field Perkerson Papers (3014): More than 3,000 items, 1914-1960, from the career of a Georgia columnist and book author (White Columns), including manuscripts, printed material, pictures, and correspondence.

Virginia Polhill Price Collection (34): 6 record books, one of which is a subscription book for the Louisville (Georgia) News and Farmer, edited and published by R. J. Boyd, 1877-1882.

Jewell B. Reeve Papers (271): 88 items, 1860s, mostly manuscripts of articles and stories by her for the Calhoun Times.

Hoke Smith Collection (155): 33,882 items covering much of the career of this Georgia editor (Atlanta Journal), governor, Secretary of the Interior and U. S. Senator.

The Spokesman (572): Reproduction of the Spokesman, inmate publication at Georgia State Prison, Reidsville, along with brief history of the publication.

Stone Collection (135): 28 items including photograph of Stone's print shop, subscription list of the Athens

Emily Barnelia Woodward Collection (62): Ms. Woodward founded and was twice president of the Georgia Press Association. She also founded its annual Institute, served as a Democratic Party officer, and traveled and lectured throughout the world. The collection includes correspondence, speeches, printed materials and pictures.

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES AND HISTORY

The state archives in Atlanta has several items of interest to a student of the history of media economics.

One ledger (microfilm 186-18) records the income for two Lumpkin County newspapers, the Signet and Spy and the Miners Record and Spy in the West, published at Aurelia and later Dahlonega, by Milton H. Cathraight. The entries reveal the principal sources of advertising revenue for the two papers.

Six ledgers (accessions 97-102) from the Southern Recorder, a newspaper published in Milledgeville, offer the opportunity to write a fairly complete economic history of a small-town weekly in the mid-1800s. Day books for 1853-1861 and 1861-1871, advertising ledgers for 1839-1850 and 1850-1858, a subscription ledger, and related data would make it possible to reconstruct the financial well-being of that newspaper for an extensive time period.

In addition, the archives has a sizeable collection of Georgia genealogies and county histories useful for building background on media in the state. A number of letters are held in the archives, including a few from Sarah Hillhouse, the state's first woman publisher, and many other persons prominent in Georgia journalism history.
WHAT PRICE ORAL HISTORY?

Nancy H. Marshall

Oral history, oral history
How do your programs grow?
With leaps and bounds of recorded sound
And Mylar tapes all in a row!

From modest beginnings less than twenty-five years ago, oral history's infinite potential has lured over 230 programs into its fold. The expansion of projects has been dramatic, and the field continues its rapid growth. It appears, however, that too often programs have been undertaken without adequate preparation, particularly in the area of finance. Who pays, when, for what, how and how much are valid considerations to be explored.

The problem of funding oral history is not new. Lyman Copeland Draper and Hubert Howe Bancroft, two nineteenth century historian-collectors who used oral history techniques to obtain historical information, found the costs, even then, to be burdensome.1 Most, if not all, of the modern programs that have mushroomed since Allan Nevins' Oral History Experiment at Columbia University became a reality in 1948 have, at one time or another, experienced financial drought.

Although the published literature of oral history has expanded as the programs have increased, it has skirted the economic aspects of the business. In 1965, Donald Swain, an oral historian, commented that "Satisfactory published answers [regarding costs] are a singular omission in our professional literature."2 Today, the
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situation is virtually unchanged. With few exceptions, the literature contains indefinite expressions such as "remarkably expensive," "very costly," and "highly prohibitive." These phrases are expressive, but tell nothing of the actual costs involved. What makes oral history the expensive discipline everyone concedes it to be?

Swain states that the basic technique employed by oral historians, that of interviewing, is a remarkably expensive method of doing research. "Not considering background research, but including time for preparation, travel, transcribing, and editing, the ratio of man-hours to actual interview time may be conservatively estimated at 40 to 1. In other words, an average of 40 hours will be required for every hour of taped interview. Translated into dollars, this means a large investment. One can expect to spend more than originally estimated for an adventure in oral history."³

There have been a few attempts to determine oral history costs, but the investigators found it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain meaningful data for any comparative analysis of unit costs. A 1965 report on the John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Project explained that the "National Archives combines oral history, manuscript collections and other functions to the point where it is impossible to isolate oral history costs. This is a functional and efficient system for the Presidential Libraries, but one which makes National Archives experience difficult to compare with that of Columbia and other centers."⁴

At the first National Colloquium on Oral History in September, 1966, Adelaide Tusler of the Oral History Program at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) distributed a survey questionnaire to participants, who represented established oral history programs, in an attempt to make certain comparisons. The survey revealed that the "majority of programs (29) could give no estimate of the finished product's cost; on the basis of few responses, it ranged from under $100 per hour of tape (11), to between $100 and $200 (3) and over $200 (1)."⁵

Another attempt was made to obtain unit costs the following year at the Second National Colloquium. A group meeting on financial problems reached a "general consensus ...that their cost of production ran somewhere
in the range of $6 to $9 per page of finished product. Louis M. Starr of the Columbia University Oral History Research Office estimates that one hour of tape is equal to approximately 27 pages of transcript. Even at the minimum rate of $6 per page, this would come to $162 per hour of processed tape; the maximum rate of $9 per page would produce a figure of $243. The "general consensus" reached by this group is illustrative of the cost variance characteristic among oral history programs.

To attempt both to ascertain the cost of establishing and maintaining an oral history program and to bring clarification to the economic problems involved, the author prepared and submitted a questionnaire to sixteen selected oral history programs. The majority were ongoing programs which had demonstrated high quality, some were projects recently initiated, while others had already been completed. The questionnaire was designed to elicit the following data:

1. a breakdown of the cost of the various operations involved in the interviewing and transcribing processes,

2. a comparison of total program costs in the first years of operation with the same expenditures in 1970,

3. the costs outside the interviewing and transcribing processes,

4. an examination of sources of funding, and

5. the practitioner's perception of the basic economic problems concomitant with oral history.

Ten questionnaires were returned (62.5%). But only seven respondents were able, or chose, to provide information. Unfortunately, both the manner in which the questions were interpreted and the small number of responses obtained precludes any detailed or meaningful analysis of each question. Despite this lack of comparable data, however, the responses do shed light on the economic problems associated with oral history and add to our knowledge of this difficult-to-pin-down area.
The lack of comparable data for unit costs, underscored in previous studies, received documented support from the data collected. The processing phase of oral history, i.e., transcription of the tape to the final typescript, is far from a fair-traded item. James V. Mink, Director of the UCLA Oral History Program, gave a rough estimate of $125-$150 total cost per hour of processed tape. The John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Program reported its processing costs close to $100 per hour of tape, broken down as follows:

Transcribing:

13 hours of work per hour of tape, at $2.99/hr. $38.87

Proofreading:

9 hours of work per hour of tape, at $4.00/hr. 36.00

Read for final typing:

1 hour of work per hour of tape, at $4.00/hr. 4.00

Final typing:

5 hours of work per hour of tape, at $2.99/hr. 14.95

Proofread after final typing:

2 hours of work per hour of tape, at $2.99/hr. 5.98 TOTAL $99.80

Unfortunately, such a detailed breakdown of costs could not be obtained for most of the other projects. A former member of the Kennedy Program emphasized the difficulty in obtaining such data: "Costs of various oral history operations are difficult to estimate, but I have analyzed government sponsored projects which are costing approximately $500 per completed interview hour. Approximately $100 of this expense was directed toward processing, but often processing was falling far behind..."
This lack of cost accounting procedures for most programs makes it difficult, if not impossible, to arrive at any meaningful unit cost figures. Willa K. Baum, Director of the Regional Oral History Office at the University of California at Berkeley, admits that "our records are not kept in such a way as to render retrievable the information you request. I believe the diversity of our operation makes such a questionnaire more difficult than it will be to most offices; however, it points up the great problems in finding any way to compare unit costs on oral history." 8

Mrs. Baum's experience proved to be the rule rather than the exception. It seemed to be difficult, if not impossible, for most of the respondents to give more than rough estimates of unit costs. 9 How can so many oral history programs continue in operation without knowledge of the costs of operation? Perhaps the answer lies in an honest comment from one respondent: "If accurate cost figures were available to administrators at several institutions of which I am aware, I expect that the oral history programs might be considerably cut back. It is a very expensive undertaking." 10

The logical question that follows is: where is the money spent? Administrative decisions determine where funds are allocated, what phases of a program reap the greatest benefits, and which parts must, therefore, scrimp along with inadequate financing. The comparisons between cost of interviewing and transcription within programs, as well as between programs, point again to the diversity of priorities in oral history endeavors.

The Annual Report of the Columbia Oral History Research Office for 1969-1970 showed an expenditure of over $57,000. Aside from $25,000 for administrative salaries, the largest portion—$12,300—went to the initial transcription of tapes. The expenses involved in the interviewing of subjects followed close behind at $10,500. Conversely, both the Cornell Program in Oral History and the John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Program spend nearly twice as much money on interviewing of subjects as on transcription and editing of tapes. The costs for these two programs are as follows:
One respondent underscored the true meaning of these statistics, and questioned current priorities: "At the inception of a project, 95% of planning and financing seems directed toward interviewing. I have experienced great difficulty with several projects which I have advised, ever convincing those planning the work that processing will be very costly, often tedious, and a burden to be contended with long after the glamorous job of interviewing is completed. Too often, even after a project has been long in existence, policy is determined or heavily influenced by interviewers, and processing is still not adequately financed."

This conclusion was reinforced by responses to the questionnaire's items seeking to identify those phases of programs considered most, and least, adequately financed. Again, there was no consensus. Two programs (Kennedy Library and the Ohio Historical Society) indicated that the interviewing phase was most adequately financed; one (Cornell Program in Oral History) reported that salaries for administrators fell in this category; and one (Columbia's Oral History Research Office) stated that "none is adequately financed; would like more for every part of the process." Three did not respond to this question.

The Kennedy Library Program and the Ohio Historical Society responded that the processing phase needed more financial assistance, Cornell identified travel and employing interviewers as least adequately funded, while Columbia stated: "All phases need more financing, scrimping all along the line. Perhaps worst is lack of funding for in-depth preparation." Three again did not comment.

These results receive additional support from the Survey on the Status of Oral History in the Archival
Profession conducted by the Society of American Archivists' Committee on Oral History. In response to the item "Please indicate the three areas that are presenting the greatest problems for you," the 345 respondents checked the following most frequently:

1. Obtaining adequate financing - 104 (30%)
2. Establishment of an oral history program - 70 (20%)
3. Transcribing tapes and editing transcripts - 56 (16%).

The overriding economic problem, as evidenced by all the surveys, papers, reports and studies, is one of processing of tapes. This phase, for the majority of programs, seems to be oral history's Waterloo. The extent of this problem is documented in Oral History in the United States: A Directory, which shows, graphically, the growth of programs from 1965-1971, with their corresponding output:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Projects</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Planned</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Interviewed</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>23,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Recorded</td>
<td>17,441</td>
<td>52,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages of Transcript</td>
<td>398,556</td>
<td>704,543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Directory points out that "Less than half of all the known hours of tape recorded...have been transcribed." And it adds, "Studies of the use of oral history over the last decade have shown time and time again that transcripts edited by the oral authors, rather than tapes, are what scholars want. Lack of funds for transcribing...constitutes a major hindrance...the fact [remains] that for all the interest it has generated, oral history remains critically underfinanced."13

An analysis of the programs in the 1971 Directory reveals that a majority have been foregoing transcription, either partially or fully. Though admittedly incomplete, the Directory statistics disclose that only 50 programs transcribe all, or nearly all, of their tapes, while the remaining 180 programs transcribe one-half or less. Significantly, 35 of these do no transcription at all.
If oral history is a valid technique in an age of diminishing funds, if it is a needed additional source of documentation for modern man, if it is an enlightened answer to the deterioration of the informational quality of today's written records, if it is worth the time, effort and money that have already been expended over the past twenty-five years, then an alternative to complete transcription must be developed, at least for most institutions.

One alternative is an Oral History Register. Admittedly, this is not a panacea. But it does offer a partial answer, a half-way measure between a full scale program of transcription and none at all.14

This oral history register would be similar to registers developed by archivists in processing manuscript and archival collections. It would include:

1. a brief biographical sketch of the subject, name of interviewer, date and place of interview;

2. technical data indicating type of tape, number of tracks, speed, length of interview, etc.; and

3. an index of the tape, with footage measurements indicating location of information on the tape.

For those institutions which cannot afford the luxury of transcription, a register would serve three purposes: (1) much of the considerable expense incurred by transcribing and editing of tapes would be eliminated; (2) search time for scholars would be cut, as they would be spared listening to an entire tape to find a few items of information; (3) a master tape from which any number of duplicates could be made would facilitate dissemination and interlibrary loan.

Objections will be voiced that scholars and researchers will not use tapes, that they are used to and prefer the written word. This argument is not entirely valid, since the age of multi-media is already upon us and we obtain information in a variety of forms, including computer printouts, punched tapes, and microforms of considerable variety themselves. What scholar or researcher
will refuse to listen to a tape if it is the only source for the information he is seeking? A further argument for transcribing is that the oral author should have the opportunity to edit, and editing tapes is not as easily accomplished as editing transcriptions. This may be true, but perhaps we lose a great deal by allowing memoirists to edit to their own satisfaction. Another objection is a technical one, that of rewinding the tapes every six months to prevent the development within the spools of magnetic fields that could adversely affect the recorded sound. This is a valid objection, but as one respondent to the questionnaire stated: "Perhaps this is a small price to pay for escaping from transcribing."

To the argument that oral history is not so much for today's researchers as for tomorrow's, one need only observe the demand on Columbia's collection. To put off transcribing indefinitely until finances are available seems a false economy and a great waste of valuable sources of information. Oral history's main, perhaps only, reason for being is to promote and encourage scholarly use. Excluding the major programs in the country, which disseminate their collections through catalogs, publicity, reports, inclusion in the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections (as of 1971), and a recent exploration into micropublication, one wonders if the majority of institutions which list themselves as having oral history programs really care about the problem of dissemination. If they do, perhaps they will test the Oral History Register with the same courage Allan Nevins displayed when he inaugurated modern oral history, thereby securing for himself and others a place in the sun.


3 Ibid., 65. The Dulles Oral History Project at Princeton University echoed this sentiment, writing the author that "costs are always considerably higher than anticipated, especially for the editing of transcripts."


7 Ann Campbell (National Archives, San Francisco) to N. M., December 12, 1971.

8 Willa K. Baum to N. M., November 4, 1971.

9 Columbia's Oral History Research Office is able to give total yearly expenditures for processing, but it keeps unit costs confidential, believing that to reveal such figures in a fluctuating economy could haunt it during contract arrangements with a potential sponsor for a project. For an informative explanation of Columbia's percentage figures for income and expenditures, see Louis M. Starr, "Financing Oral History," Second National...

10 Campbell to N.M., December 12, 1971. At least one program has suffered such a fate and ceased altogether.

11 Ibid. Wayne State University's Labor History Archives acknowledged that interviewing was considered the key activity, but processing the recorded interview constituted the bulk of its work.


14 Although tape indexing has been proposed in the literature, very few programs seem to have seriously considered it as an alternative. The University Archives of the University of Illinois has done some work in this area, even preparing an alphabetical index to one interview. For a model of how a tape index might appear, see William G. Tyrrell, "Tape-Recording Local History," Technical Leaflet 35 in History News, v. 21, no. 5 (May, 1955).

When asked to address this body concerning career opportunities in archives, I immediately reacted fearfully. I have been an archivist for less than three years and do not consider myself qualified to incisively examine the issue of career opportunities in this young, but rapidly growing profession. I imagined an appearance before an auspicious group of wily professionals, eager to attack every word uttered with "can you substantiate that?"

The body here gathered certainly is an auspicious one. Nevertheless, the longer I pondered what to say, the more I realized perhaps there was something constructive I could say. As one who is not a career archivist, I can perhaps be somewhat more objective in examining several of the problems which the archivist must face in order to expand career opportunities.

When I began thinking about the topic, the first word that came to mind was "job." The second word was "money." What jobs were available in the profession? How might more be created? Why are salaries in some areas so low? How can they be raised to competitive levels?

We all realize the importance of such questions, especially in a society where the costs of living are enormous. Thus, my first reaction was that these questions would be the obvious ones among which to dwell. I could assemble a mass of statistics, conduct surveys among other archivists, tell everyone how job opportunities were improving, new areas of scholarship emerging, new opportunities for women and the minorities, new status for archivists.

Mr. Cook is on the staff of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History. He read this paper at the South Atlantic Archives and Records Conference in Atlanta, May 3, 1974.
Yes, things are improving. The archivist is finally getting his foot in the door of professional status. Yet, when speaking of career opportunities in archives, is professional status most basic? Should not the advances I have mentioned occur as the result of something far more fundamental?

What is a career? The opportunity for what? Is the traditional concept of career, complete with the trappings of financial gain, power, prestige and status a correct one? Or does "career" contain broader implications than personal or professional gain; is it not an idea—that of lifelong service to the community and its inhabitants?

Archives is a young profession. Only now is it beginning to achieve the recognition that it should. It possesses a strong and ever growing professional organization, the Society of American Archivists; regional organizations, such as this one, attribute to the move toward professionalization. Today the idea of professional training of archivists is not disputed. On the other hand, does this profession want to follow the beaten path of professionalization which other emerging professions have chosen? Associations, academic status, prestige, a language not discernible to the laymen—these are all worthwhile for what they are; they are to a degree essential for the profession to retain credibility. However, does the archivist choose to become so involved in the fact that he is a professional and that his profession is unique that he fails to recognize his principal responsibility and discern the obvious opportunities which lie before him?

What are archives, but the recorded embodiment of societies and communities of the past? Through archives, if we possess a perceptive eye, we can view a complete cross section of any society or community—its laws, its politics, military actions, civil strife, scientific and technological retreats as well as advances, its intellectual maturation, its art, music and literature—in essence its people.

As archivists, we are charged with the care, arrangement and service of this powerful research and resource tool. That fact places us in a unique position of opportunity, which few other emerging professions can claim. For the development of all of a society's profes-
sions, as well as the development of a society itself, are documented in the records for which we care. The way we interpret, at the local level, how this resource tool is to be utilized, either for the benefit or ill of the community which we serve, is critical. Therefore, if we are to meet our basic responsibility, so that this powerful resource can be used for the benefit of the entire community, clearly the concept of "career" must transcend traditional interpretation. If we are to seize the initiative and capitalize on the opportunity presented to us, traditional career expectations must remain only a consequence of community service, and not an end in themselves.

As archivists, we must recognize and exploit the fact that we are a functional segment of the community, whatever the physical or political boundaries. We must assist the community in whatever way possible and, in turn, the community must assist the archivist in order to benefit itself. There must be continual mutual exchange between the archivists and all segments of the community in order for the "total community" concept to be effective.

The community concept has rapidly disappeared in America. Enormous advances have made us no longer dependent upon one another, and thus less motivated to communicate. With technology has come the need to professionalize in order to obtain status for one's particular occupation. Ironically, however, this organization into many professional groups has resulted in little communication among them. Each occupation clamors to be a profession, and once it is, usually becomes an elitist group which is overly sensitive to criticism and resistant to internal change. The standard retort is "we are in the best position to judge ourselves." A poor analogy of the situation might be that of a neighborhood consisting of twenty or thirty households within two blocks. Each household advertises its occupants and painstakingly organizes internally. Once this has been completed, however, all doors to each house are locked and the occupants never venture outside again.

There is an urgent need to revitalized the community concept, to renew the idea that everyone is part of a community and that the community, like humans, must give as well as receive in order to mature. In that regard, all professionals, while recognizing the goals and ambitions of their own professions, as well as of themselves, must still seek a higher goal, that of service to the community and to
each other.

The youthful archival profession can seize the initiative. Despite its growth and strides toward the achievement of status in the professional world, it remains capable of self-renewal, and the possessor of the opportunity to lead the way in the revitalization of a dormant community spirit. The local archival agency can and should supply the vital link among all professions within the community, as well as other segments of that community.

How? The local archives can be a major tool in the solution of community problems. It can be a principal contributor in the establishment of a sense of community pride, tradition and realism about its past. It can substantially augment the development of the community's desire to learn, to question, to pursue knowledge about itself—its geography, politics, technology, its people.

These should be the basic goals of the archivist in the service to his community. He should do his part to instill community awareness. He is custodian of a major community resource, and it is his responsibility not only to be proficient in that custodianship, but to do all possible to insure that the resource is fully utilized by all segments of the community. This establishes the archivist's role as an active and not passive one.

What specifically can the archivist do to revive the idea of community awareness and vitality? How can the archival profession implement the basic principles I have mentioned? Fundamental change must occur primarily at the local level, and it is the responsibility of the community archivist and local archival agency to effect it. Reform within the professional hierarchy is indeed worthwhile; however, for the community concept to experience rebirth, the local community must play the major role. The archivist must be a key figure in the process of change. Secondly, the program for change at the local level must be twofold. We must reach out, while reforming from within; there must be convergence, not diversity.

Externally, the archival role is a weak one indeed. What part of the local community utilizes archival resources? What part are even aware of the existence of archives and their services? How fully do the professions use this
resource in their work? How far do we go in meeting their needs or even knowing of them?

We are all aware that every community is part of a larger community that is made up of a great number of smaller communities within it. These subcommunities have no formal boundaries, continuously overlap, and retain their own uniquenesses. Yet, they are all a vital part of the well-being of the larger community and, if properly motivated, can meaningfully contribute to its ability to mature.

An integral part of the academic community, it is there that the archivist must initiate action. This group, composed generally of universities, professional schools, technical training centers, libraries and archives, has one common purpose, the dissemination of knowledge to the community. Its role, to function as the primary source of expertise regarding the character of the community, demands the pursuit of every avenue to make that expertise available to all. Yet, often we encounter the incredible situation where the community's academic elite, who take pride in the pursuit of knowledge, fail to even informally communicate with their professional colleagues, perhaps only a block away. Petty jealousies, conceit and unawareness of the benefits of productive exchange often completely stifle growth of the community concept within the intellectual subcommunity. Having no example to emulate, how then can that concept be expected to thrive in the community at large?

Why cannot all segments of the academic community work together as one in the common purpose of community service? Each possesses vast resources and offers a multitude of services which could be extended more effectively through joint program planning and cooperation. The local archival agency should supply the initiative for the formation of formal multi-agency associations and informal academic groups within the community. The Governor of South Carolina recently issued an executive order deeming it "in the best interests of the State to encourage joint ventures among and between State and other agencies in the pursuit of comprehensive development programs." With that theme in mind, the archivist should press for the establishment of a formal association comprised of representatives of all segments of the local academic community. Such an association would be dedicated to the principles of joint planning and development to meet common objectives. A few possibilities which
might result from the application of this principle include:

(1) joint goals,
(2) the mobilization of technical services offered,
(3) joint public exhibits,
(4) joint seminars and workshops for the exchange of information and techniques and for the training of personnel of all members,
(5) utilization of technical expertise of each member by all,
(6) use as a means for exchanging information with the various professions,
(7) use as a combined research network for government,
(8) use of combined resources as a teaching device in colleges, universities and professional schools.

The creative mind undoubtedly would find many more. The formal and informal organization of the local academic community would result in a medium for exchange between that community and the professional world. The lawyer could exchange ideas with members of the academic community through the law professorship, as could the physician through a representative of the medical school. The archivist would obviously benefit in his own work from such mutual exchange, and in turn, would be better prepared to meet the research needs of the professional world.

What about the non-professional and culturally deprived? How does the archivist reach that segment of the community who did not attend college or is functionally illiterate? These groups have little awareness that the archives even exists or that it or other segments of the academic community are anything more than taxpayer burdens. Such ideas must not perpetuate if the community concept is to be revitalized. The entire academic community must jointly find methods to sensitize the non-college
and functionally illiterate segment of the populace to the needs for community awareness and the benefits of the community concept.

Little action has yet been taken in this direction. This is where mutual exchange between the academic and professional worlds would be extremely useful. Archivists, as well as other members of the academic community, need to reach out to the worlds of sociology, education, and psychology, among others, in attempting to grapple with this difficult problem. It will require a great deal of innovation and creativity to solve it.

A valuable concept in achieving the goal of community awareness among the non-college and functionally illiterate populace is a meaningful paraprofessional program. While the archivist has made strides in the development of effective public relations programs, the idea of "selling" the archives as an institution is not enough. The pursuit of knowledge is not a gimmick game. Instead, we must make the entire community sensitive to the benefits of an awareness of itself.

The paraprofessional program could greatly aid this effort. The archivist, as well as other members of the academic community, should actively recruit non-college-educated personnel for service as paraprofessionals. Not only would this make the academic community aware of the needs of this group and the best methods for meeting those needs, it would, more importantly, allow wider community participation in program planning.

The establishment of a working relationship between the academic world and agencies which aid in the educational and vocational motivation of the culturally deprived is the initial step. In the development of a paraprofessional program, designed to stimulate community awareness among the culturally deprived, it is vital that the academic community be made aware of the problems and needs of this subcommunity, in order to prevent intellectual condescension. Only too often academics have failed miserably in relating to those of less education. On the other hand, the problem of overcoming inferior feelings toward job superiors, which the culturally deprived may possess, must also be dealt with.

If those planning the paraprofessional program consider and can overcome the human relationship problems
inherent in the employment of the culturally deprived, such a program could augment the development of community consciousness within this group. The paraprofessional, who receives sufficient on the job training, and is not viewed as a lower echelon clerk by job superiors, can serve his community as well as a person possessing a college degree. Furthermore, a primary source of exchange between the academic community and the culturally deprived would be created.

One step further would be the contribution of the archivist to adult basic education programs, as well as other programs that attempt to aid the undereducated adult to achieve functional literacy and high school equivalency. The archivist could work closely with these programs to assist in providing job opportunities through the paraprofessional programs as well as utilizing the paraprofessional in the recruiting efforts of all agencies involved. The true role of the archivist in the community could best be conveyed to the undereducated adult through his peers. One's peers can do more to nurture awareness of the community consciousness concept and its relationship to the archival role than any posters or brochures ever could. Furthermore, use of the archives and its resources could be encouraged in the development of adult education curricula. The development of a sense of community awareness and sensitivity, certainly already emphasized in adult education programs, would be enhanced if only more exchange between the archivist and the adult educator were to occur.

What of the high school and elementary student in our public school system? Here, obviously, is the greatest opportunity for community consciousness and the total community concept to be instilled during the development years of youth and adolescence. Yet, the archivist has failed to recognize this opportunity or at least to do much about it. While it is true that most of our archival institutions conduct tours of their facilities for elementary and high school students, is this enough? Whirlwind tours, especially if school children must come from afar to the state capitol and be forced to see several facilities in one day, may even produce a negative reaction later. Today, ask people who went on archival tours years ago what the archives is, and they will probably answer that it is "something sort of like a museum."
No, simple exposure to our school children is not the answer. We must relate that it is beneficial to them to be conscious of their community and that the archivist can contribute much to the development of that consciousness.

Naturally, reform in the educational structure must shoulder much of the burden. However, the archivist, himself an educator, as well as other members of the academic community, must do his part in effecting such reform. We can begin by establishing close relations with the department of education and local school boards. The use of educational television can be expanded.

Also, research projects, for the high school students, jointly sponsored by the local academic community and offering college scholarships as incentives, might be another possibility. Research in the central archival institution might be a logistical problem for many students. However, the archivist, working through the county records program, and with local school officials, could provide for research projects for the high school student, using local archives or the county courthouse as a practical alternative to the central archives. To reemphasize the point, we must do more than expose our institutions to our school children if the seed of community awareness is to be planted. We must allow them to see for themselves how archival resources can be used for their benefit as well as for the benefit of the community as a whole.

So much for the external community. What of ourselves and our own community? Before successfully reaching outward, we must be assured that we are healthy internally. I do not speak of our professional organization. Others, far more able than I, can and will do that. I choose instead to talk of the need for reform at the local level.

The same basic principles which I have applied to the community at large are equally apropos of the archival community. For "career" to have the true meaning that it should, local archives personnel should feel happy, productive and responsible in what they are doing. Any effort to cultivate community consciousness among the community at large is ultimately doomed to failure, if those who are to exercise leadership in this effort, the archival community, are racked by dissension from within.
Just as the community at large, the local archival community must possess an awareness of itself. There must be a consciousness among all its members of fundamental goals in relation to the community at large; there must be productive internal exchange; there should develop a feeling among all members of the local archival community that they are part of a joint effort and that "career" implies meaningful contribution to that effort.

Obviously, we do not have time here to deal with the issue of internal reform in great detail. Yet, there are several basic questions which I should pose, and ask that you who are career archivists, and those who are not, consider them in the context of "career" as I have defined it. I will simply raise the questions, offering no pat answers to them.

(1) Are local archives becoming massive bureaucracies, which thrive on petty "problems" instead of dispensing of them with the attention they deserve?

(2) Is the true concept of career, professionalism and the "community concept" stressed within the local archival institution? Are all staff members made aware of their role in service to the community?

(3) With this in mind, has the local archival agency established fundamental objectives aimed toward determining community needs, meeting them and cultivating community consciousness? Who determines these goals and are there adequate means of evaluation so that the staff member is aware of his or her contributions?

(4) What is the relationship between the agency administrator and staff members?

   a. Are all staff members able to contribute ideas and suggestions and are there effective means for incorporation of these into policy planning? Or are all decisions made "behind closed doors" and by a few?

   b. Do staff members have academic freedom? Are their professional decisions supported? Are staff members encouraged to pursue personal research and is scholarship and furtherance of education encouraged?
c. Are staff members encouraged to make contacts with other members of the academic community and across agency lines?

d. Are all members treated fairly and indiscriminately in hiring and promotion? Is promotion based upon merit, political expediency or favoritism?

e. Are there means for fairly adjudicating employee grievances?

f. Does the agency administrator have formal training in effectively relating to employees?

g. Does he seek employee respect? Does he get it?

h. Are there standards of professional competency? Are these standards maintained? Is there an adequate mechanism for the agency administrator to remove incompetents or are they simply tolerated?

(5) Basically, is the local archival agency a community in the true sense of the word—where all segments of the archival community feel a close part of it, where each is aware of contributions to its strength, where its strength is recognized as a source of strength of the larger community of which it is an integral part?

In conclusion, I have stated my concept of career opportunities in archives. There are unlimited opportunities if "career" is applied in its true sense of service to one's fellow human beings. The archivist at the local level must reach out to his academic colleagues in the community. Together, they must seek to show every man, woman, and child in the community, that it is to their advantage, that it is to the community's advantage, to be aware of itself in all stages of its development.

The archivist can lead the renewal of effort to make the idea work in the local community. He has two advantages. First, his profession is a young one. Thus, the archivist can still function effectively in the move for change. Second, many of today's young people, emerging from high schools, technical schools, colleges and universities, are increasingly aware that there is more, much more, to life and career than salaries, professional recognition, and accolades. While true that many possess
the desire to serve only self, others are coming forth completely willing to give of themselves. We must seek them out, convince them that the archivist truly believes, just as they, in the strength of a self-renewing community; at the same time, we must thoroughly examine ourselves and find ways to strengthen those beliefs.

This is the question that the potential career archivist must ask himself, "Am I willing to give my all to the entire community so that the community might be more aware of where it has been and where it is going?" Likewise those already in the profession must ask: "Has service to the community been the most basic aim in my concept of career?"

The question, then, should not be what career opportunities in archives today are; the answer to that is obvious. The real question should be, are we as archivists willing to capitalize upon the multitude of opportunities which lie before us?
During the annual convention of the Society of American Archivists last October in Toronto, I met and listened to archivists and researchers from the United States and Canada discuss their work, the problems they are encountering, and their plans or hopes for the future. At first their specific circumstances and challenges seemed myriad, but on reflection these boiled down to a few key issues. The concerns archivists who attended the meeting expect to face during the next few years—or decades—include:

**ACCESS:** Archival holdings are for use; their value does not consist exclusively in adding to the accession statistics of archival repositories. Transfer to archives might prevent some deterioration of materials and the breakup of collections, but what is the real advantage of this if the documents are no more available for research in the depository than they were formerly?

**COLLECTING:** Cooperation must replace competition for acquisitions in all subject areas. We cause needless expense, and we frighten away potential donors, when we engage in open or clandestine war for materials. We must not substitute the passing glory of a "prize catch" for the permanent accomplishment of handling less sensational but equally important materials.

**FUNDING:** Archivists have long been famous and admired for their ability to perform wonders of service with virtually no resources. As operations and staff become more expensive

*This issue of GEORGIA ARCHIVE inaugurates as a regular feature timely comment by David E. Horn, Archivist at DePauw University, Chairperson of the SAA Committee on Terminology and Uniform Statistics, and former editor of The New Archivist. The Editors invite reader response in order to stimulate dialogue on current challenges facing our profession.
and as the public demand for archival service grows, we must develop equal skill in obtaining adequate financing for our work.

PERSONNEL: Many archivists feel overwhelmed by the magnitude of their tasks and the scarcity of workers. To make the archives field attractive there must be a concerted and sustained effort to encourage women and minority group members to join our ranks by assuring equal opportunity for employment and advancement. Another important aspect of this is improved conditions for non­professionals in archival work. They need proper training and compensation.

PRIVACY: Archivists must be particularly concerned with all government action on access to records. We can see such proposals in proper perspective and can provide leadership in maintaining a balance of rights.

PROCEDURES: New kinds of records require new procedures. New approaches to research require new finding aids and, perhaps, new ways of processing collections. New emphasis by researchers change our criteria for what we acquire or keep. And we must continually question whether rules developed for large government collections should be applied to other records.

PUBLIC RECORDS: Archivists are aware of the problems of ownership of, and access to, the papers of government officials. Recent Watergate-connected interest in these problems gives archivists new opportunities to press for careful disposition of Presidential and other papers.

PUBLICITY: Archival institutions cannot be merely storehouses of collections or research centers for the elite. They must attract people who ought to utilize their resources by giving proper notice of collections acquired and processed, and by maintaining regular contact with potential users.
RECORDS NOT IN ARCHIVES: There are, and will continue to be, extensive manuscript materials that are not in archival institutions or under the care of trained archivists. Much of this material rests in public and smaller college libraries. Archivists should cooperate with and assist the curators in appreciating, preserving, and making available these historical materials.

USE: New publishing programs and increased requests for photocopying raise questions about the proper uses of our materials, especially those received from private donors. Recent federal and state legislation provides some guidelines in balancing the right of access with the right of privacy, but archivists are the experts. We must continue to exercise our professional judgment as we strive to open research materials to a greater variety of users.

These and other topics will be treated in detail in later columns. Suffice it to say in conclusion here that the size and complexity of the tasks before us is matched by the enthusiasm of the workers. An eagerness to plunge into the work characterized the archivists I encountered in Toronto. They gave me the comforting certainty that I am not alone.
No issue has so stirred the public, its elected representatives, and the archival community as has the question of ownership of the files created by public officials in office. Does the President of the United States have the right to retain and destroy his files? Would public ownership curtail the production of documentary evidence of public acts? How can a public official's private life be separated or protected from unnecessary public disclosure? The matter is one we archivists can sidestep neither as citizens nor as professionals.

The lead presentation of *Manuscripts*, XXVII (Winter, 1975) addresses the question "Who Owns Presidential Papers?" and provides historical background on the controversy, as well as current opinion on the answer.

John Berry editorialized in *Library Journal* of November 1, 1974, that "Librarians ought to be in the vanguard of a movement for legislation to insure that the public and scholars have access to 'public' documents. . . .We need a national program to insure the collection and preservation of the record, and access to it. After all, it's our history, not the President's."

The movement toward legislation was well underway by then. Following the signing on September 6, 1974, of an agreement that would allow former President Nixon full ownership of his papers while in office, including the right to destroy the tapes, Congress acted. Representative John Brademus of Indiana and Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island introduced in Congress complementary measures to protect the existence of the materials. Neither addressed the issue of ownership. Hence, Representative Brademus included in his proposal a provision to establish a commission to study that matter and the disposition of the papers of federal officials.

In response to the move, the Society of American Archivists and the Midwest Archives Conference both adopted the following resolution:
That the organizations "support the principle of public ownership of the official records of elected or appointed public officials. Considering that careful attention must be given to policies regarding: (1) defining these records, (2) determining their appropriate place of deposit, (3) respecting the confidential nature of some records, (4) establishing reasonable and proper access policies that preserve the rights of privacy, and (5) resolving related issues," the organizations "believe, therefore, that it is essential that such policies be set in consultation with qualified archivists.

In December, the Senate accepted Brademus's proposals, and on December 9, President Ford signed into law a bill protecting the Nixon Presidential Papers and providing a study commission. The new 17-member commission will be composed of representatives of Congress, the President, the Cabinet, the Judiciary, the Library of Congress, the Society of American Archivists, the American Historical Association, and the Organization of American Historians. Archivists and the public have won this round in the struggle for public ownership of records of the public business.

This is no time for resting on laurels. The issue of public ownership and of privacy in files of public officials lies at the heart of the efforts of archivists to document the political activity of the twentieth century. If the records of top federal officials belong to the public who placed the persons in office, the same will hold true, sooner or later, of public officials on the state and local levels. If the files belong in their entirety to the individuals, the ability of the public to know could be severely circumscribed. We as archivists, the persons who keep the records, who already bridge the gap between creator and user, we must take a stand, for or against, and make our views known to the commission. Write the Editor of GEORGIA ARCHIVE, and/or the Executive Director of the Society of American Archivists, Box 8198, Chicago, Illinois 60680.

The National Historical Publications and Records Commission bill (see GEORGIA ARCHIVE, Summer, 1974, pp. 123-124), adding a national records preservation program to the old National Historical Publications Commission, was signed into law by the President on December 22. But funding of
the expanded program remained at $2 million instead of the 
$4 million requested, which merely dilutes an existing 
program.

A proposal to raise funding to $4 million is before 
the House Subcommittee on the Treasury, Postal Service and 
General Government, on which Georgia Congressman John J. 
Flynt, Jr., sits. The National Historic Records program, a 
project initiated by the Society of American Archivists for 
the benefit of the entire country, deserves our continuing 
support.

The Joint Committee on Historians and Archives, whose 
members represent the Society of American Archivists, the 
American Historical Association, and the Organization of 
American Historians, has issued a statement condemning both 
the imposition of fees upon users of archives and manuscripts 
and proposals that access at educational institutions be 
limited to the faculty and students of the institution. 
"There should be no privileges in the world of scholarship 
except those based on demonstrated merit and ability. 
Privilege based on income or place of residence can in the 
long run only be harmful to the professional goals of both 
the historian and the archivist," the statement concludes.

"The way things are going on the campus," Louis Tucker 
said in his presidential address before the American Asso­ 
ciation for State and Local History, "the historical agency 
historian [rather than the teaching historian] will soon be 
regarded as the Elect. In New York State, for example, a 
movement is underway to have colleges and universities 
offering graduate history degrees broaden and restructure 
their curricula, so that students can receive training in a 
variety of career opportunities, from teaching to archival 
management to historical society administration. This is the 
wave of the future across the nation, and our profession 
stands to benefit from this development."

Georgia is not lagging the step of the movement. Fort 
Valley State College is working to implement a curriculum in 
historical agency work; internships in archival administra­ 
tion are available at both the state and federal repositories 
in Atlanta; and study programs are open to students at Georgia
State and Atlanta universities.

The repository we have discovered most recently in Georgia is the Navy Supply Corps Museum located in land-locked Athens. Established in the old Carnegie Library Building, a classic Greek revival structure complete with carved oak lintels and graceful columns, the museum houses old ship lanterns, fog horns, navigational instruments, and memorabilia and uniforms of retired Supply Corps officers. Moreover, reports Curator Helen Johnson, "A historical manuscripts collection will be available for the use of serious researchers who wish to delve into the history of the Corps." Books, documents, newspapers, photographs and government forms will constitute the heart of the collection. "Supply Corps history is also found in Navy Training films," she adds, "and an audio-visual center to be located in the museum will include a complete collection with facilities for viewing them. An oral history of the Corps is planned with the assistance of retired and active duty personnel, some able to remember the Supply Corps at the turn of the century."

Although not yet open to the public on a regular basis, the Navy Supply Corps Museum is usually open to visitors from 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M. Monday through Friday, and special arrangements can be made for visits at other times.

Rarely do archivists encounter a bird nest on the ground. But here is one.

Archival Photographic Services has announced a grant-in-services in the amount of $150. Archives, libraries, and other agencies with collections of photographs are invited to apply to the firm, explaining the extent and nature of their need for the photographic preservation service. The institution demonstrating the greatest need will be awarded $150 of work at no cost.

Archival Photographic Services was created with the institution in mind, and, writes founder Alan Clark, "I am hoping that by offering services, archivists will become more aware of the services we offer and of what can be done to preserve their collections."
Applications must be received by May. To apply, or to obtain further information, contact Alan Clark, Archival Photographic Services, 1112-B Virginia Avenue, Atlanta 30306.

---

The Preservation Research and Testing Laboratory of the Library of Congress reports its tests of Xerox Micro Sphere Paper show the paper to be highly acidic. Thus, items xeroxed on this paper should be intended for short term use, and the paper should not be stored for extended periods with less acidic, more permanent documents.

---

Is your microfilm stored under optimum conditions? Last May, the Library of Congress issued the following guidelines. "The relative humidity should not exceed 40%, the temperature should not exceed 70° Fahrenheit, and the rapid cycling of humidity or temperature should be avoided. High temperature and high humidity normally encourage fungus to attack film emulsions as well as causing other chemical deterioration problems. Extremely low relative humidity, below 15% or 20% for instance, for extended periods of time can result in extreme film brittleness. Such film should be conditioned to higher humidity before use." Clean both the film and the reader regularly to minimize damage from scratching.

---

From the Midwest Archives Conference Newsletter's "Dear Archivist: I Need Help" column, we extract items about post cards and mylar folders.

Q) I have a collection of picture postcards, some in color and some in black-and-white. Should these be stored separately?

A) From all information I can find on the subject, there seems to be no reason why colored items should be stored separately from black-and-white. An exception to this might be in the case of postcards made from photographs. These undoubtedly should be treated as carefully as regular photographs, giving special attention to possible abrasion from removal or insertion in their containers. Most postcards are made of non-rag card-board and should, of course, be stored apart from
items on rag, or acid-free, paper so they will not infect that purer stock.

Q) Are mylar folders sufficient protection for non-acid material in a collection containing items on newsprint or non-rag paper?

A) Yes, mylar folders serve very well as a barrier, but be sure to remove from the folder the sheet of black paper which comes with it in many cases. While this may make a prettier arrangement, especially if two items are housed back-to-back, the black paper is extremely acid and will undo what you are trying to accomplish.

[But do not use the mylar with documents written in pencil as the static electricity built up by the mylar will lift the graphite off the paper.]

---

--- Interleaf, Inc., Division of the Campbell-Logan Bindery, 2300 E. 26th Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55406, is marketing a paper that, when inserted between every 50 or 75 pages of manuscripts, or of a book, will accomplish deacidification. The price is reported to be reasonable.

--- Criterion Micrographics, Inc., R.D. #2, 354 Wilmington Pike, Chadds Ford, Pennsylvania 19317, offers for sale a handheld microform viewer. It operates on either batteries or a converter accessory, and is designed for use with aperture cards and 18X through 48X reduction microfische.

--- Mita Copystar America, Inc., 158 River Road, Clifton, New Jersey 07014, is marketing a machine that will copy a newspaper-sized page 17" x 24" in 20 seconds at a cost of 8¢ per copy. The Copystar A-2 measures 14-1/2" high by 24-1/2" deep, weighs 154 pounds, operates on 110 volts, and can be used on a desk or table. The unit uses standard electrostatic papers and toner, and requires no warm-up time.

--- A new file unit is on the market for organizing and housing unframed pictures, study prints, charts, maps, posters, and other oversize items up to 18" x 24" in size. The manufacturer includes with each unit a manual explaining his system for processing and organizing the pictures by subject area, devoting a separate bin for each topic, and classifying
each picture by a unique call number. Pictures are laid openly in the bins and can be accessed readily. Each unit, which stands 85" high, contains 19 bins which will house approximately 2,000 flat pictures, is constructed of birch and finished in either natural or light walnut stain, and costs $250. Write Dale E. Shaffer, Library Consultant, 437 Jennings Avenue, Salem, Ohio 44460. Incidentally, Shaffer provides a catalog listing several hundred sources for free pictures, charts, posters, and maps!

-- The Society of American Archivists has issued a Report on the Status of Women in the Archival Profession prepared by an ad hoc committee chaired by Mable Deutrich. The publication may be purchased for $2 from the SAA Publications Sales Officer, 108-114 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106.

-- The handling of photograph collections, a perennial topic of concern among archivists, has received more attention than usual in current literature. William Saffady, "Microfilm Equipment and Retrieval Systems for Library Picture Collections," Special Libraries, 65 (October/November, 1974), 440-444, discusses the advantages of placing large photograph collections in microform to facilitate retrieval, to contribute to the permanent preservation of the original, and to improve the capacity for quality reproduction. Renata V. Shaw, "Picture Professionalism," ibid, 421-429, 505-511, discusses the concept of "picture librarianship." The points Ms. Shaw makes concerning acquisition and servicing of collections are not so new as is the concept that photographs, like records, merit their own professional handlers.

-- Paul John Rich, III, "Manuscripts As The Museum Orphan," Manuscripts, XXV (Fall, 1973), 261-265, discusses more in conceptual framework than in detailed procedures the exhibiting of manuscripts, particularly in a museum environment. This is a fine primer for those whose responsibilities include displays.

-- The Fall, 1974, issue of Manuscripts contains an 11-page report on the recent tour of South American archives conducted by Frank Evans of the National Archives. Excepting Brazil, the archives of the countries all face the space
problem common to North American institutions. But there the resemblance ends. In Peru, the director of the archives told the visitors that neither space nor conservation were his most difficult problem, though they were pressing. "Historians are the worst enemies of the archives," Dr. Guillermo Durand Florez is quoted as saying. He explained that "he meant that historians distort the facts contained in archives in order to further their own view of history." In the recent overthrow of President Allende in Chile, the country lost its Declaration of Independence, which had been removed from the archives to the Presidential Palace, where it was destroyed by fire. And in Argentina, "all public papers are classified and not open to the public for thirty years after they are written."

-- The periodical of the North West Georgia Historical and Genealogical Society continues to excel as a publication of interest to genealogists, historians, and archivists in their common pursuit of knowledge about, and understanding of, the past. In addition to the list of names common to genealogical publications, this one regularly prints histories, reminiscences, and photographs that put the meat of history on the basic bones of genealogy.

The periodical may be ordered from Mrs. Jewel Dyer, Editor, 607 North College, Cedartown 30125 for $6 per year.

-- The Historic Preservation Section of the Department of Natural Resources has issued a second, and expanded, edition of its fine Historic Preservation Handbook: A Guide for Volunteers. A two-page chapter surveys sources and methods for research, and encourages the uninitiated to become involved in searching out information on historic sites. If its injunction to local preservationists--"Document research is fascinating. Try it!"--is heeded, archivists can expect many additional patrons of our repositories and allies in the search for new collections of enduring value.

Mary Jewett, former director of the Georgia Historical Commission, is devoting her prodigious energies to the recently-formed Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation. The Trust was founded "to assist local, state and individual efforts toward the preservation of the physical evidence of
Georgia's past; to acquire, operate and hold desirable historic properties; to disseminate knowledge; to engage in research; and to foster, encourage and develop appreciation and understanding of accomplishments of early Georgians." This organization offers a real opportunity for archivists in Georgia to contribute to the knowledge and understanding of our history by working with Trust members in the location and interpretation of historic sites. For further information, contact President Jewett at Box 1454, Decatur 30031.

---

Upcoming on June 8-13, Case Western Reserve University is offering two workshops on College and University Archives. One will be an advanced workshop for practicing archivists to cover selected topics in depth. The other will be the traditional introduction to archival administration designed for librarians who have been assigned to develop archival programs and for administrators concerned with records problems. For further information, contact Mrs. Ruth Helmuth, University Archivist, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio 44106.

---

The annual Archives Institute of the Georgia Department of Archives and History will be offered July 28-August 22. For further information, contact Ann Pederson, State Archivist, Georgia Department of Archives and History, Atlanta 30334.

---

The Third Annual Society of Georgia Archivists Workshop on Archives and Records has been scheduled for November 21-22 at Georgia State University. The 1975 workshop chairperson is Jean Buckley, who may be contacted at the Historic Preservation Section, Room 703-C, Georgia Department of Natural Resources, 270 Washington Street, Atlanta 30334.

---

SGA Treasurer's Report

Balance on hand, January 11, 1974 $545.55
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Dues ........................................ $460.00
Subscriptions ................................ 328.50
Advertising ................................ 30.00
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy Charges</td>
<td>$669.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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Balance on hand, December 31, 1974.  

$570.61

### RECENT ACCESSIONS AND OPENINGS

#### GEORGIA REPOSITORIES

**Athens**

**SPECIAL COLLECTIONS DEPARTMENT, ILAH DUNLAP LITTLE MEMORIAL LIBRARY, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA**

**ATHENS MODEL CITY PROGRAM** Records, 1968-1973: includes correspondence, minutes, surveys; 305 pcs.

**BOGARDUS-ALLGOOD FAMILY** Papers, 1800-1944: contains letters, records, and other family materials; 189 pcs.

**E. L. FORRESTER** Papers, 1951-1964: contains congressional office files on post office appointments; 1,903 pcs.

**JOY BRIGHT HANCOCK** Papers, 1918-1972: (captain, WAVES, during and after World War II) contains information on women in the naval services; 2,529 pcs.

**JUDSON LARRABEE HAND** Papers, 1870-1871, 1890: papers relating to his college career; 30 pcs.

**WALTER BARNARD HILL** Papers, 1818-1941: includes letters, accounts, diaries, pictures; 11,419 pcs.

**MARCUS JOHNSTON** Papers, 1837-1861: includes letters, lists of slaves, accounts; 12 pcs.


**STEPHEN PACE** Correspondence, ca. 1937-1951: concerns post office appointments; 1,812 pcs.

GUSTAVUS WOODSON SMITH Letters, 1858-1863: relating to Civil War; 329 pcs.

JOHN DONALD WADE Papers, 1857-1963: (first editor, Georgia Review) includes correspondence with authors; 8,252 pcs.

GEORGE WAGNER Collection, 1862-1868: includes Civil War material; 316 pcs.

Atlanta

ATLANTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EDWIN K. LARGE Collection: (Atlanta postmaster, 1926-1931) clippings, some correspondence; 11 flds.

EMILY JANE WINKLER BEALER Diary, 1876-1886: relates to Atlanta.

SARAH MARTHA COBB WHITNER Scrapbook, 1880s: predominantly newspaper clippings concerning Cobb and Whitner families.

A. B. SIMMS Collection: copies of 105 Civil War letters.

CLIFFORD L. NEAR Scrapbook: primarily clippings and rotogravure photos relating to his association with the Atlanta Journal, 1890-1932.


SAMUEL SPENCER Letters, 1864-1865: copies of Civil War letters; 57 its.

ANNA ELIZA ELLINGTON WINSHIP Scrapbook, 1850s: relates to her attendance at Wesleyan Female College.
WILLIAM L. FUNKHOUSER, JR., Collection: includes photos and documents relating to Emory Unit and 43rd General Hospital, U. S. Army, 1942-1945; 170 its.

ATLANTA TRANSIT COMPANY Collection: 400 photos, 1880s-1950s, of equipment and personnel, and blueprints and specifications, 1900s, for cars.

JACKSON P. DICK Collection, 1938-1948: scrapbooks, correspondence, photos, and clippings relating to his activities on behalf of war effort.

DAVIDSON FAMILY Collection, 1880s-1973: photo album, scrapbook, and correspondence relating to family and to Western and Atlantic Railroad; 13 its.

REMSEN P. KING Collection: correspondence, photos, and military orders related to his World War I service, 1918; 50 its.

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS DEPARTMENT
ROBERT W. WOODRUFF LIBRARY, EMORY UNIVERSITY


MALCOLM HONORE BRYAN Papers, 1923-1967: addition, 1923-1964, including correspondence, speeches, and clippings relating to his career as Georgia banker and economist, ca. 300 its.

WARREN A. CANDLER Papers, 1870-1946: addition, 1870-1942, including personal correspondence, photos, sermons, financial papers; 42 its.


JULIAN LaROSE HARRIS Papers, 1874-1967: addition, 1921-1967, personal correspondence between members of Harris family, primarily Julia Collier Harris, and Loretto Lamar ChapPELL of Columbus; 110 its.

http://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/georgia_archive/vol3/iss1/14

HAROLD H. MARTIN Papers, ca. 1900-1927: (author, journalist) includes papers relating to career with Saturday Evening Post and Atlanta Constitution, and as author of books, personal papers, and papers of Martin and Lokey families; ca. 20 ms. boxes.

CHARLES F. PALMER Papers, 1914-1972: addition, ca. 1955-1972, relating primarily to Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial in Washington, Roosevelt archives, Palmer's career in urban housing; ca. 8 cu.ft.


EDWIN EVANDER ROSE Papers, 1873-1928: addition, 1880-1920, includes 34 volumes of "pastor's notebooks" recording daily life and work of itinerant Methodist minister of South Georgia conference.

FEDERAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS CENTER
EAST POINT BRANCH

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION (RG 207), Atlanta Regional Office, Records, 1941-1950: consists of legal files, correspondence of regional director, and real property files; 713 cu. ft.

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS (RG 21), Middle District of Georgia (Macon), Records, 1943-1948: consists of bankruptcy, civil action, and criminal cases; 100 cu.ft.

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS (RG 21), Southern District of Georgia (Savannah), Records, 1943-1948: consists of admiralty, bankruptcy, civil action, and criminal cases; 60 cu.ft.

U.S BUREAU OF CENSUS, 1900 Census and Soundex: Alabama through Pottawattamie County, Iowa; 2,297 rolls; restricted.
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES AND HISTORY
STATE RECORDS SECTION


COURT OF APPEALS: Case Files, 46001-47000, 12/30/70-1/12/72, 99 cu. ft.


DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES: Office of State and Local Affairs, Public Information Files (Publications), 1927-1974, 6 cu.ft.; Mental Health Division, Director's Subject Files, late 1960s-1972, 82 cu.ft.; Benefits Payments Division, County Department of Family and Children's Services, Annual Report File, 1968-1972, 2 cu. ft.; Physical Health Division, Midwifery Certification Application Case Files, 1934-1972, Appling-Worth Counties, 6 cu.ft., and Midwife Annual Statistical Files, 1938-1972, Appling-Wilkinson Counties, 2 cu.ft.; Division of Community Services, Director's Subject Files, 1972, 18 cu. ft.; Physical Health Division, Maternal Health Section, Family Planning Unit, Director's Subject Files, 1972, 3 cu.ft.; Physical Health Division, Dental Health Section, Director's Office Subject Files, 1957-1970, 6 cu.ft.

METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY: Assistant General Manager's Subject Files, 1972, 2 cu.ft.; Atlanta Transit Company, Engineering and Scheduling Division, Central General Subject File, 1930s-1960s, 106 cu.ft.; Finance and

http://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/georgia_archive/vol3/iss1/14
administration, Director of Procurement, General Administrative Records, 1972, 1 cu.ft.

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES: Earth and Water Division, Publication Record Set, 1 cu.ft.; Environmental Protection Division, State Water Control Board, Executive Secretary, General Subject File, 1966-1972, 5 cu.ft.; Office of Planning and Research, Special Projects Issues and Areas File, A-Z, 8 cu. ft.; Parks and Historic Sites Division, Park Directors' Subject File, 1968-1970, 3 cu.ft.; Groveland Lake Developmental Authority Operation Files, 15 cu.ft.; Game and Fish Division, Fisheries Section Operation Subject File, 8 cu.ft.


DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY, Staff Services, Director's Subject File, FY 1970-1972.

SECRETARY OF STATE: Correspondence concerning the sale of land in the Okefenokee Swamp, 1800s-1900s; 1/2 cu.ft.; General Services Division: Records of the 1973-1974 session of the General Assembly; includes Journals, Enrolled Acts, and original working copies of bills and resolutions; 27 cu.ft.; Records of the 1974 general, primary, and primary run-off elections; ca. 73 cu.ft.


DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS SERVICE: State Board of Veterans Service, Minutes, 1945-1972, 2 cu.ft.; Publication Record Files, Bulletins, and Annual Reports, 1 cu.ft.

NOTE: To use these records, call in advance, 656-2383 or-2384.

SOUTHERN LABOR ARCHIVES
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

ATLANTA TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION NO. 48 Records, 1895-1938: concern union activities in Atlanta; 13,130 lvs.


OPERATING ENGINEERS LOCAL 926 Records, 1927-1971: relate to activities in Atlanta and the Southeast; 15,025 lvs.

PAINTERS UNION LOCAL 193 Records, 1905-1972: relate to activities in Atlanta; 1,878 lvs.

PAINTERS UNION DISTRICT COUNCIL 38 Records, 1940-1969: relate to activities in Atlanta; 2,754 lvs.


SERVICE EMPLOYEES, SOUTHERN REGION, Records, 1962-1970: relate to organizing in the South; 5,137 lvs.


E. LEON STAMEY Papers, 1951-1972: relate to AFL-CIO organizing in the Atlanta and Macon areas; 1,389 lvs.


AFL-CIO CIVIL RIGHTS DEPARTMENT, SOUTHERN REGION, Records, 1963-1972; relate to equal opportunities; 3,894 lvs.
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LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, SIMPSON DIVISION 210 Records, 1884-1918: relate to activities in Macon area.

Savannah

GEORGIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

GEORGE N. SAUSSY Papers: include several letters from Jefferson Davis, Grover Cleveland, and George Washington Custis Lee.

Valdosta

VALDOSTA STATE COLLEGE LIBRARY

EMORY P. BASS Papers, 1940-1970: primarily pertain to the establishment and re-activation of Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta.

OUT-OF-STATE REPOSITORIES

California

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES, MANUSCRIPT DIVISION
STANFORD

AMBROSE BIERCE Sketchbook, ca. 1864: kept at Kennesaw during the Civil War; 1 vol.

North Carolina

SOUTHERN HISTORICAL COLLECTION
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHAPEL HILL

JOHN MACPHERSON BERRIEN: addition, letters, 1825, 1841, to Georgia Attorney General Richard Henry Wilde, about state and national politics; 2 its.

MARK FOSTER ETHERIDGE (1896- ) Papers, 1931-1969: (managing editor, Macon Telegraph, 1931-1933) includes correspondence, speeches, and writings created during editorial career; 190 flds.

The more things change, the more they remain the same. This adage is well borne out by Ernst Posner's Archives in the Ancient World. Dr. Posner has made a study of the ruins of ancient civilizations along the Tigris-Euphrates and Nile river basins in which he looked particularly at the records and records keeping practices. He describes the tablets, parchments and papyri that have survived. He relates these records to the bureaucracies that created and maintained them. The striking conclusion one arrives at is that a modern administrator would quickly feel right at home were he to be transported by a time machine to ancient days and find himself a governmental official then.

Throughout the book Dr. Posner continues to show that the organizational structures, the administrative functions and even the building floor plans of the ancient governments must be understood in order to comprehend the archival operations. Some readers might conclude that the archivists of those days really were not archivists at all but records managers, inasmuch as the extant evidence seems to indicate that these records custodians were primarily concerned with serving the administrative needs of the government. At the same time, however, the archivists obviously devoted much attention to the preservation, inventory and description of their older records, that is, those records that had outlived their administrative usefulness. We can, therefore, realize a renewed appreciation for the fact that the archivists and the cultures they served had a sense of their own history.

The understanding of the archives of the ancient world which Dr. Posner has given us helps us to widen our knowledge of ancient history. We also learn something about the history of archaeology. Dr. Posner justly laments the fact that until fairly recently archaeologists were not sufficiently aware that the records they uncovered contained a wealth of information and insights that could only be captured if the records were studied in their original archival context. Consequently, the principle of provenance...
was ignored. The archival integrity of the record groups and series was destroyed, probably beyond repair.

Dr. Posner is an eminent historian as well as an archivist—probably a necessary combination for the author of a book of this type, and the reader is the beneficiary. Particularly does the twentieth century archivist benefit, because he can, after studying ancient practices, see himself from a new perspective.

Georgia Department of Archives and History

J. Harmon Smith


Most of the information in Library and Archives Conservation, the volume which grew out of the Boston Athenaeum's Seminar in 1971 on the application of Chemical and Physical Methods to the Conservation of Library and Archival Materials, will be of great help to conservationists throughout the world. But there are many erroneous statements which this reviewer, a paper conservator with over thirty-two-year experience, cannot overlook.

In opening comments, Frazer G. Poole of the Library of Congress rightly suggests caution in accepting commercial products and services. "There are many waiting in the wings, so to speak, to jump on the preservation bandwagon," he writes. The rule that "nothing should be done that cannot be undone" in restoration procedures must surely be followed. Today we have, in my opinion, too many on this so-called bandwagon who have no formal training in restoration procedures.

The article by James E. Kusterer of the W. J. Barrow research laboratory leads one to believe the Barrow methods of deacidification and lamination were the first and foremost. It is stated also that heat sealing lamination originated at the Bureau of Standards in 1936. But the "Summary Report of Bureau of Standards Research on Preservation of Records" by A. E. Kimberly and B. W. Scribner, issued in October, 1933, describes successful tests of the heat sealing process of lamination with cellulose acetate foil. The National Archives is mentioned at the close of this publication, stating that the wood hydraulic
press was installed in 1935. This process was in use at least one or two years before Dr. Barrow, in 1936, "became aware of the need for a restoration process that would be effective for more than the approximately 20 to 30 years" which was generally the limit for the processes in use at that time.

The papers on the New England Document Conservation Center were very impressive, and one would hope that the proposal to establish similar centers in other parts of the country will be implemented. Congressional appropriations could inaugurate centers either in state archives or federal records centers. These conservation units could work on both federal and state records within their boundaries, as well as materials from libraries and historical societies.

The other papers submitted at this seminar were well written and contain very valuable information for administrators as well as conservators.

It was unfortunate that the National Archives in Washington, D. C., was not represented at this seminar. We continually train archivists and conservationists from almost every country in our restoration procedures.

National Archives and Records Service
Wilbur G. Poole


The Michigan American Revolution Bicentennial Commission sponsored the publication of this small volume as a part of that state's celebration of our nation's two hundredth birthday. In a message from the chairman of the Michigan commission, the hope was expressed that this booklet would "provide basic guidelines and suggestions on publishing county histories ... and that it ... would serve to stimulate a number of significant projects which will have lasting value." The commission should be commended for these aspirations and this particular effort, and author and archivist John Cumming is to be congratulated for his offering.

While brief in its length, the guide provides many useful suggestions in areas which are important to the
successful research, writing, and publication of local history. There are no chapter divisions per se, but rather brief sections devoted to specific concerns. Among the more than twenty topics are: historical libraries, printed documents, the national archives, oral interviews, pictorial resources, note taking and photography. While the several topics are not uniform in their value, they point out the areas where special care and thought should be exercised in work in the field of local history. In what he calls "Self-appraisal," Cumming wisely cautions careful consideration of one's qualifications as "town historian." Having recommended caution in beginning a local history publication effort, the author proceeds to plot a path which, if carefully followed, should help in the successful completion of the project.

Cumming's treatment of historical libraries applies, of course, to those of Michigan, but his pointers on using these facilities will be useful to Georgians as they approach Georgia collections. The author suggests consideration of such matters as the specialized nature of collections and finding aids available in a given location. The treatment of manuscripts and records is likewise specifically informative for Michigan but also thought provoking for any researcher. One of the more helpful treatments is that of the community newspaper as a source of local historical research. Here one finds tips on locating newspapers, as well as a good, short introduction to the style and contents of pre-Civil War newspapers, changes in newspaper style, and the value of advertising to research.

The author is most candid in his appraisal of the value of personal papers. While most appealing, they are all too frequently little more than collected "weather reports." In an area which has recently been promoted as especially valuable for local research—oral history—the author is disappointingly general in his comments. There are a number of very fine technical publications on the business of oral history which might have been noted. The American Association for State and Local History offers several.

The treatment of maps, atlases and gazetteers is among the most informative in this volume. It includes several good ideas as to what maps reveal about local history. For Michigan the author includes a helpful list of where and when the "birdseye views" (panoramas) were done.
These panoramas were common to most areas of the nation, having been in vogue in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and are especially helpful in depicting the looks of towns in that period.

A large portion of this work is devoted to the writing of local history and the physical details of publishing. While the portions having to do with writing—note taking, determination of the scope of the project, and the like—are especially worthwhile, there is some question as to the need for the great detail about the printing of a work.

The author's bibliographical appendix includes a number of valuable sources and guides, and his use of attractive local history illustrations throughout the work is in itself a source of many good ideas for those approaching the research and writing of local history.

Hopefully, other states will make such guides available as part of their Bicentennial efforts.

Georgia Southwestern College

Steve Gurr
JOIN THE SOCIETY OF GEORGIA ARCHIVISTS

Founded in 1969 to promote the knowledge, understanding, and use of archival agencies, the Society meets quarterly in February, May, August, and November, and publishes the semiannual journal, GEORGIA ARCHIVE. Individual memberships and institutional subscriptions are $5 annually.

To join and receive GEORGIA ARCHIVE, clip and return the application blank below.

THE SOCIETY OF GEORGIA ARCHIVISTS
MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

NAME ____________________________

ADDRESS ____________________________

CITY ____________________ STATE ________ ZIP ___

POSITION ____________________________

WHAT ASPECTS OF ARCHIVES PARTICULARLY INTEREST YOU? ______

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIPS (WHICH INCLUDE A SUBSCRIPTION TO GEORGIA ARCHIVE) AND INSTITUTIONAL SUBSCRIPTIONS ARE $5.00 ANNUALLY. MAIL APPLICATION AND REMITTANCE TO:

The Society of Georgia Archivists
Box 261
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303