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Dear Son,

We are ill with Thomas, and I like to know how I shall keep up my time and pleasure. I am surranded by Chinese, Mexicans, Indians, and every nation on the globe, and cut the time. Well begin the day, I am up by out of bed. The weather is fine, and the weather is fine. I am in the middle of the day. I wash the dishes and get ready for the table. I take tea by this time and get ready for the table. I wash the dishes and get ready for dinner. I wash the dishes and get ready for dinner. I wash the dishes and get ready for dinner. I wash the dishes and get ready for dinner.
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ARCHIVISTS AND THE NEW COPYRIGHT LAW

Carolyn A. Wallace

In October 1976 the Congress of the United States took a step of great importance for those who administer and use manuscripts when it placed unpublished literary materials under the coverage of the new copyright act. After careful study, and in response to many requests, the Congress made a change in the American system of copyright that will have far-reaching consequences.

Archivists manifested increasing concern for copyright in the years preceding passage of the new law, and their interest was enhanced by the news that Congress was considering legislation affecting unpublished manuscripts. Many archivists tried to study the existing situation, to keep up with the discussions preliminary to change, and, as soon as the law was passed, to learn its effect on their work. In contrast, a few archivists dismissed copyright problems as illusory, saying there is little probability of lawsuits arising over use of material in the custody of archives and manuscripts repositories. So far as the past is concerned, they are right; there have been few such cases. However, this is a litigious age. American citizens seem anxious to go to court at the slightest opportunity, often bringing charges that would not have been heard a few years ago. The lack of lawsuits should not give archivists a false sense of security. Staff members of the Southern Historical Collection in the Library of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill are aware of the possibility of litigation, for manuscripts in their custody have been the subject of a lawsuit charging infringement of copyright.

The suit grew out of the use of the Haskell and Gibran Series in the Minis Family Papers. The series includes letters between the poet-philosopher Kahlil Gibran and Mary Elizabeth Haskell, later Mrs. Minis, and Miss Haskell's diaries recording her meetings and conversations with Gibran. Gibran's works are now best sellers and the right to publish material by or about him is an important financial asset. To fervent admirers of Gibran,
on the other hand, any limitation on the use of his work is equivalent to restricting use of the Bible. These conflicting considerations make the Haskell and Gibran manuscripts extremely difficult to administer.

The lawsuit involving these manuscripts followed two separate publications. One was by Annie Salem Otto, a student of Gibran's work who acquired copies for use in research for a projected biography. A member of the Collection staff warned her, by letter and in person, that the copies were supplied for research only and should not be published without permission of the copyright owners, but Mrs. Otto concluded that editing and publishing the letters and excerpts from the diary was preferable to writing the biography. She met Mrs. Minis, talked by telephone with Gibran's sister Mary, and said that they gave her permission to publish. However, Mrs. Minis died before Mrs. Otto completed her work, and the executor of the Minis estate and the representative of the Gibran estate made arrangements for an edition of the letters that was published in 1972 by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., under the title Beloved Prophet. Mrs. Otto issued a two-volume edition privately published in Houston, Texas, in 1970. Both books were registered with the Copyright Office, and in 1972 the Gibran and Minis heirs and the Knopf firm sued Mrs. Otto for infringement of copyright. The applicable law was that of Texas and the suit was brought there, but because of diversity of citizenship the case was initiated in federal court. The plaintiffs did not sue the University or charge that the staff of the Southern Historical Collection was negligent. University lawyers approved the warnings given Mrs. Otto and thought them sufficient. Staff members were naturally concerned by the suit, but began to hope that it might bring some advantages. It appeared likely that the decision would answer some of the questions archivists had been raising about their responsibilities in regard to manuscripts and copyright. Here at last was a case that should clearly define the copyright status of manuscripts given to a repository without explicit transfer of copyright and might rule on the right of a repository to make copies of such manuscripts for purposes of research. The outcome was disappointing. Mrs. Otto, after filing an initial brief raising the first of these points, proved in the end unable to sustain the defense, becoming so upset by the case that she dismissed her lawyers and finally lost the suit on procedural grounds. Because of the way the case was settled, the decision that the defendant should destroy her publication and cease to have anything to do with the Haskell and Gibran writings clarified no points of law and furnished no precedent to guide future action by copyright owners, manu-
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scripts repositories, or judges. The case was not publicized, and the effect was restricted to the point of immediate dispute and to the staff of the Southern Historical Collection, who had learned from the experience that lawsuits over copyright are not merely a subject for speculation.

Most archivists have not had this object lesson in the dangers inherent in the administration of copyrighted material, but only a few are willing to dismiss the problem as theoretical. The risk of frequent suits is slight, but there is potential for controversy over the use of manuscripts in repositories, and there is a possibility that the next suit may be directed against archivists as well as authors, editors, or publishers. The litigious spirit of the age and the publicity given to copyright by the discussion and passage of the new law enhance the prospect of such controversy and impose on archivists a need for greater caution than they have exhibited in the past.

For the staff of the Southern Historical Collection, Gibran et al. v. Otto produced greater concern to understand and follow copyright requirements and to provide maximum protection for staff members and the University by establishing strict procedures for all use of manuscripts, especially photocopying. Staff members prepared new forms, gave formal warnings, and required signed statements of purpose before permitting copying of manuscripts. They followed the progress of the new law with special interest and great anxiety to learn its provisions. The new law is not completely easy to understand, and it leaves many problems unsolved. Nevertheless, all archivists have an obligation to study the new law and to follow its requirements to the best of their understanding.

Copyright affects the work of the archivist in three basic ways. Copyright questions arise during negotiations with donors, during use of the manuscripts for research, and whenever such research leads to a desire to publish all or significant portions of previously unpublished manuscripts. These ways are interrelated, and whenever a problem arises in any one of them an archivist needs to be as fully informed as possible about the total situation. All of these aspects of copyright are affected to some extent by the new law.

The new law made fundamental changes in the status of unpublished manuscripts, which will hereafter be protected by the federal statute rather than by the law of each state (usually unwritten common law) as was the case before 1978. The provisions of the new statute apply to literary materials from the moment they are fixed in tangible form, when the author
finished writing, typing, or recording. In most cases that copyright protection lasts for the life of the author plus fifty years, whether the material is published or not, unless the author in some way gives the material to the public. Furthermore, the law provides the new federal copyright protection for all unpublished manuscripts not already in the public domain, ending the former "perpetual until published" status for manuscripts protected by the common law on December 31, 1977, as well as for all of those written after the effective date of January 1, 1978. For manuscripts whose authors died fifty years or more before 1978, the law provides an interim period of twenty-five years before the expiration of copyright, and thus no unpublished literary work will enter the public domain as a result of the new law until after December 31, 2002, or 2027 if published in the interim.

This means that in 2003 a large quantity of unpublished manuscripts whose authors have been dead for more than fifty years will lose copyright protection. In the future this fact will have significant consequences for archivists and scholars, but few of the effects will be felt immediately, and perhaps some cannot even be anticipated.

An important feature of the new law is that it clearly provides that manuscripts may be placed in a repository for use by scholars without a surrender or violation of copyright. In preceding years, some archivists and copyright experts, notably Ralph Shaw and Seymour Connor, argued that donation or sale of manuscripts to a repository by the person who owned both the manuscripts and the copyright in them was equivalent to general publication and therefore terminated common law copyright without substituting statutory protection, thus placing the material in the public domain. Many archivists disagreed, insisting that ownership of the manuscripts as physical objects and ownership of copyright were two separate and distinct forms of property rights and that a transfer of physical ownership did not include a transfer of copyright unless there was an explicit statement to that effect. The staff of the Southern Historical Collection never believed that placement of manuscripts in the Collection terminated copyright, but they were disappointed that the judgment in Gibran et al. v. Otto was not decisive on this question. In 1976 the House Report on the pending new copyright law seemed to accept the Shaw-Connor theory as valid for past transactions, but with the statement that it would not be true under the new law. This opinion by the Judiciary Committee of the House on the copyright status of manuscripts transferred prior to 1978 was not written into the law, and many archivists will continue to doubt
that manuscripts given to them in earlier years entered the public domain when there was no explicit surrender of copyright. After all, the courts could decide that this opinion is incorrect, and it seems safer to assume that these manuscripts are still protected by copyright. Unless a court decision clearly rules on the matter, there may continue to be conflicting views on this point among archivists and the few copyright experts concerned with unpublished manuscripts.

The Shaw-Connor thesis seems to have so many advantages for archivists and scholars that it is rather surprising more did not accept it. That all did not do so may not be entirely because they thought it bad law. The thesis has a corollary — the contention that placement of manuscripts in a repository by a person who owns only the physical objects and not the copyright (for example, incoming letters) is also equivalent to publication and is illegal. Connor himself was unwilling to reject manuscripts including important incoming letters, even though he believed that in accepting them he was technically breaking the law. However true that may or may not have been in the past, the new law clearly permits archivists to acquire, and permit fair use of, manuscripts received from persons who do not own the copyright in them.

The new law poses two potential problems for the acquisitions archivist. One of these is the possibility that the owner of manuscripts who wishes to reserve the right of first publication for his heirs indefinitely may be unwilling to give them up. After all, even though copyright has expired, if no one can get access to the manuscripts or even learn of their existence, the persons having possession and physical ownership could still prevent publication or be the first to publish, of course without copyright. Retention may be the only way to keep control. The other potential problem is that owners of copyright in unpublished manuscripts are now permitted to register their ownership, and there are some advantages in doing so. Registration is a necessary preliminary to a suit for infringement, and prior registration of unpublished manuscripts is necessary for a suit requesting statutory damages. Owners may aid archivists in preparing a photocopy for registration and deposit a condition of gift, or may request such aid quickly if they should learn of infringement and wish to register in order to sue. Archivists may find it wise to process manuscripts by separating the materials the donor can register from those for which the donor does not hold copyright — again the difficult matter of incoming letters.
Should the archivist ask the donor to give copyright along with a donation of manuscripts? Many repositories do this routinely and their staff members say that it causes no problems. Others find donors unwilling to give up copyright and sometimes even unwilling to give the manuscripts themselves once the question is raised, so that they prefer to ignore copyright transfer rather than jeopardize a gift. For many groups of manuscripts, the donor can give little beyond physical possession. If the value of the group consists largely of incoming letters, it is pointless to ask the donor for copyright, and the same is true for the person who owns the manuscripts but is only one among many heirs to copyright. Most professional writers and their heirs are quite conscious of the value of copyright and determined not to relinquish it. The answer therefore depends on the circumstances. The archivist should probably seek copyright if the donor is clearly also the owner of literary rights and if the request will not jeopardize the gift. However, the archivist who regularly does seek copyright should be aware of a new feature of the 1976 act. The right of termination, established to protect an author whose work turns out to be much more popular and more valuable than anticipated, may mean that a transfer of copyright made after 1977 can be terminated by the author later, usually thirty-five years after the initial grant. Furthermore, unless the grant is made by will, stipulated heirs of a deceased author also have termination rights. It is unlikely that termination would be applied to manuscripts in a repository, but the possibility should be considered by an archivist who seeks a transfer of copyright.

Other questions likely to arise during negotiations with owners of manuscripts are those related to use — the reverse of the questions that arise in dealing with readers. What restrictions may a donor place on the use of material, sensitive or otherwise, and what use may a scholar make of unrestricted material? Two sections of the new law deal with these problems. Unless the archivist previously accepted the Shaw-Connor thesis, these two sections do not really change a great many ideas about use of manuscripts in a repository. However, sections 107 and 108 do clarify some aspects of use and photocopying for archivists, and it is a relief to have certain uses of manuscripts written into the law.

These two sections are conveniently reprinted, along with other pertinent material, in the Copyright Office’s Circular R21, Reproduction of Copyrighted Works by Educators and Librarians, issued in April, 1978. Every repository should have a copy and refer to it frequently, for the
provisions of these sections are complex and the details easily forgotten. Unfortunately, some of them are also difficult to understand.

Section 107 discusses what is called "fair use" of copyrighted material. Formerly a judicial doctrine not explicitly applied to unpublished works, fair use has nevertheless for many years been the justification many archivists and scholars have cited for using manuscripts in a way similar to what they thought the courts would consider fair for published materials. Therefore, the fact that the fair use of manuscripts is now clearly legal will not greatly affect the procedures of most archives. The statute does not define fair use, but it does say that reproduction, by photocopy or recording, for such purposes as scholarship and research is not an infringement and that in determining whether a specific use is fair, the factors to be considered include purpose (profit or nonprofit), the nature of the copyrighted work, the amount or proportion of the work that is used, and the effect of the use on the value and potential market of the work. Archivists may wish this section were more explicit, but it gives them clearer rights to assist scholars than did previous uncertainties. Congress understandably preferred to write general rather than detailed and limited considerations into the law.

Section 108, which relates to reproduction by libraries and archives, is the portion of the new law that seems on first reading to offer the fullest leeway to archivists who assist their readers and correspondents through supplying photocopies. It is a very complex section, and there is a possibility that archivists are interpreting it more broadly than they should. Subsection (a) states that it is not an infringement for a library or archives to supply no more than one copy of a work under conditions specified later in the section if the reproduction is not made for profit; if the collections of the library or archives are open to the public or to all persons in a specialized field, whether affiliated with the institution or not; and if the copy includes a notice of copyright. This sounds as permissive as any archivist or scholar could wish, but it must be interpreted in the light of conditions specified in other subsections. Subsection (b) applies specifically to an unpublished work and stipulates that a library or archives may duplicate such work from its own collection for purposes of preservation and security or for deposit in another library or archives that is open to the public. Subsection (c), permitting the replacement by photocopying of a lost or damaged copy if a new one is not available at a fair price, specifically relates, to published works. The fact that subsection (c) gives an archives as well as a library permission to replace an out-of-print book may cause the professional
archivist to wonder if the persons who drafted the law had in mind quite the same definition of an archives as that given by the Committee on Standards of the Society of American Archivists. 6

For the next two subsections, (d) and (e), the definitions of an archives and of the collection of an archives become crucial. These are the parts of the law that librarians feel give them the broadest rights to copy for individual users, and archivists have interpreted these to apply to archives also. They have good reason to do so, for the words "archives," "collection of an archives," and "copyrighted collection," which surely includes unpublished manuscripts, run all the way through the subsections.

According to subsection (d), it is permissible to supply "a copy, made from the collection of a library or archives where the user makes his or her request or from that of another library or archives, of no more than one article or other contribution to a copyrighted collection or periodical issue," or to supply "a copy or phonorecord of a small part of any other copyrighted work" under certain conditions an archives would have no trouble in meeting. Subsection (e) provides that it is permissible to provide a copy of an "entire work" or a "substantial part of it" if the "copyrighted work" cannot be obtained at a "fair price" and if conditions similar to those in subsection (d) are met. Since archival collections are chiefly unpublished manuscripts and not published works, and these manuscripts are often copyrighted materials not obtainable at a "fair price" or indeed at any price except through copies supplied by the archives, archivists had no hesitation in concluding that subsections (d) and (e) gave them great leeway to supply photocopies.

It therefore came as a shock to the large group of archivists attending a session of the Society of American Archivists in Salt Lake City in October 1977 when the Register of Copyrights informed them that the two subsections apply only to published materials. Copying of unpublished manuscripts for individual scholars, said Mrs. Ringer, must be justified by Section 107 on fair use and not by the provisions of Section 108. Archivists were grateful that Barbara Ringer, in the midst of preparation to put the new law into effect, took time to travel to their meeting and discuss their rights and responsibilities under the new law. Nevertheless, many of them left the session feeling more confused than ever and wondering whether the new law as interpreted by the Register of Copyrights had improved their situation. To some of the individuals who questioned her after the meeting, Mrs. Ringer, who apparently does not believe in the Shaw-Connor thesis, emphasized that
the law really makes no great change in what was permissible before its passage and that whatever a repository staff felt comfortable in doing before 1978, it should be able to do under the new law.

It was unfortunate that no archivist had a copy of the law at hand to ask Mrs. Ringer the meaning of specific words in subsections (d) and (e). Some of those who scrutinized the law later were still unconvinced that these passages apply only to published materials. It is true that the legislative history of the law shows that in these subsections Congress was chiefly trying to resolve the differences between publishers and librarians, but the language of the law itself encourages the belief that (d) and (e) are broad enough to cover manuscripts and that never-in-print materials may be copied under specified conditions as well as periodical articles and out-of-print books. Congress did not write the law hastily, and the care with which subsection (b) is explicitly confined to unpublished materials and subsection (c) is explicitly confined to published materials indicates that when Congress wished to exclude one or the other of these categories of copyrighted works, it took care to do so.

Dean L. Ray Patterson, of the Emory University School of Law, discussed copyright at a session of the annual workshop of the Society of Georgia Archivists in Atlanta on November 18, 1977, and during the question period offered encouragement to archivists. In response to a question on the interpretation of 108 (d) and (e), Dean Patterson relieved the audience by his opinion that these sections should not be interpreted narrowly to apply to published works only and his statement that he as a lawyer would be willing to take a case arising out of such conflicting interpretations.

The House Report on subsection (f) of 108 also gives encouragement to the belief that Congress recognized the nature of archival holdings and meant to include them in the permissive features of 108, for it referred to copying of "papers, manuscripts, and other works."

Subsection (f), however, affects copying rights only by inference, for the pertinent section is the stipulation that the rights given elsewhere in 108 do not relieve a library or archives of any "contractual obligation" made at the time of acquisition. The Report explained that an archives might promise a donor of manuscripts not to permit copying, and in such a case, whatever copying permission the new law gives will not protect the archivist who permits copying from being liable to a charge of violation of contract.

In spite of this support for a broader interpretation of 108 (d) and (e),
only a very rash archivist will place complete reliance on an opinion relating to copyright contrary to that of the Register of Copyrights. Except for the surer application of fair use, Mrs. Ringer's interpretation seems to leave archivists where they have always been, with the uncertain feeling that they are safe only until challenged, that a challenge may come at any time, and that such a challenge might be embarrassing and could prove dangerous. Under such circumstances, archivists could find safety in passing the responsibility on to users by setting up unsupervised self-copying equipment, displaying a warning of the obligation to observe copyright, and otherwise having nothing to do with photocopying. Such a procedure has some drawbacks and deficiencies. Not all archivists can provide such facilities, and those who do cannot assist correspondents by such means. Other archivists, even more concerned for the immediate physical safety of fragile manuscripts than for the remote danger of copyright infringement, are unwilling to subject manuscripts to unsupervised copying. If 108 (d) and (e) apply to published works only, archivists for whom unsupervised copying provides no solution must copy only for other libraries and archives or else look solely to fair use for guidance. To those who do this, another provision of the law offers some comfort, for Section 504 (c) (2) states that an individual employee of a library or archives will not be subject to statutory damages even if found guilty of infringement if he or she had "reasonable grounds" for believing the copying was warranted by fair use. To provide proof of such reasonable grounds, before filling any request for a photocopy, cautious archivists require a signed statement that the copy is requested only for fair use.

The final provision of Section 108 to affect manuscripts is subsection (g), which states that no copying privilege given in earlier sections applies to "related or concerted reproduction or distribution of multiple copies." This seems clearly to rule out microfilm or microfiche editing and publication without the consent of the copyright holder or holders and may affect some documentary projects whose editors have assumed that film is not publication.

A few details should be emphasized. Whatever rights of copying 108 may or may not give to a library or archives, it definitely does not give a user any rights beyond fair use. The copyright owner holds the right of concerted or systematic publication, and anyone reading manuscripts, taking notes on them, or acquiring photocopies, is still obligated not to exceed fair use personally or to permit use of notes or copies by others to an extent
exceeding fair use. Section 108 imposes certain obligations on a library or archives copying in accordance with its provisions; they are not difficult, but they should not be neglected. The archives should display a warning of copyright at the place where orders are taken and on all unsupervised copying machines and should include a warning of copyright on all order forms. Any reproduction made by a library or archives should include a notice of copyright. The Copyright Office has issued regulations establishing the wording of these notices and stipulating type size and method of use. These regulations are included in Circular R21 along with the text of Sections 107 and 108 and other useful information. This circular can be very useful to an archivist discussing photocopying and the specific related procedures of a library or archives with either a donor or a reader.

One aspect of the administration of manuscripts touched on slightly by the new law has been mentioned but deserves fuller consideration, and that is restricted access, the contractual obligations of 108 (f) (4). Copyright owners have in the past often used copyright to protect privacy, refusing to permit publication of materials they considered embarrassing to themselves or to others. They may still prohibit full publication if the potential publisher requests permission, or sue for infringement if the material is published without permission, but to sue they must be willing to place a deposit and registration copy of the material in the Library of Congress, with the possibility that it may be made available for use. Furthermore, their copyright protection applies only to the language of the manuscript, not to the information and facts in it. Owners of copyright who are not themselves owners of the physical manuscripts have no other recourse than to use copyright to protect privacy. It is now clearly not illegal for the manuscripts to be in a library or archives and for fair use to be made of them, unless such use may be considered contrary to state laws of invasion of privacy or libel. However, donors of manuscripts who are concerned to protect the privacy of themselves or others will have the right to impose restrictions on access as a condition of gift, and the archives accepting manuscripts with such conditions is obligated to observe the contract. Restricted access may mean complete closure for a term of years, no access without permission of the donor or some other specified person, or reading but not photocopying. It can often provide greater protection for privacy than does copyright. Archivists, whose purpose is to assist scholarship, try to ensure that restrictions on access are reasonable in duration and in other requirements but recognize that restrictions may sometimes be necessary to ensure later access or even preservation. When making such restrictions archivists
WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.
should consider the copyright status of the work as well as donor wishes; some students of the subject believe that restricted access cannot be enforced once copyright expires. The copyright law naturally does not cover such a matter, and any archivist would be wise to seek legal advice before accepting restrictions designed to extend beyond the expiration of copyright.

It is probable that the most urgent questions about copyright arise when a scholar wishes to publish materials he has seen in the course of his research. Usually, an order form stipulating that copies are supplied for research only and not for publication will screen out the person who requests copies knowingly intending to publish. The archivist should then refuse to supply copies until the question of permission by the copyright owner has been settled, for whatever permission to copy the new law may give applies only if the archivist has no reason to believe publication is intended. Archivists disagree as to whether the repository itself as the owner of the manuscript has the ethical right to refuse permission to publish, some contending that the holdings of an archives should be available on an equal basis to all users for all purposes. Others argue that the archives has a right and even an obligation to a donor, and often also to a parent institution, to ensure that the material, if published, is edited and presented in a scholarly and reputable manner. These persons further believe that an editor who embarks on a lengthy piece of documentary editing has a right to reasonable protection form competitive publication of the same material by another editor who begins later but works more hastily. Whatever opinion an archivist may hold on this matter, there can be no doubt that an archives must refuse to cooperate with any project dependant on copying that might damage the manuscript or on copying that the archives cannot undertake.

So far as copyright is concerned, however, the significant point about editing and publication is that even if the archives is quite willing for the publication to take place and ready to cooperate, permission of the copyright owner should be obtained before a copy is supplied to the editor or other arrangements are made. It is the responsibility of the editor to obtain this permission, but the archivist may give such information and assistance as is possible. It may be hard to determine and locate the copyright owner or multiple owners, and even when this has been done and the permission received, a cautious archivist will usually require the editor-publisher to assume all responsibility before supplying a photocopy, for publication may provoke conflicting claims to copyright.
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Questions about publication are more apt to arise when a scholar wishes to quote a small portion of a manuscript in a repository, one copied by hand while taking notes or one supplied with the understanding that only fair use will be made of it. Many archives require that permission to publish must be requested of them in all cases. Such a request prior to any publication gives the archivist the opportunity to check on the observance of any stipulated restriction, to verify or correct the citation, and to renew the warning that any use beyond fair use requires the permission of the copyright owner. The insistence on permission by the repository may prove advantageous, but so far as copyright is concerned it is usually worthless, and the archivist should be sure that no permission places legal responsibility on the institution.

Many scholars today, particularly young ones, are impressed with archival warnings about copyright and ask the archivist for more information. Few archivists are lawyers, and those who are not should guard against giving legal advice in specific cases. However, as professional people concerned with the use of archival materials, archivists should be able to give general information on the meaning and ownership of copyright and on fair use. Archivists may explain the considerations — privacy, prestige, or profit — which usually influence copyright owners and may suggest the method of approaching such persons. If called on by the owner for information or advice, the archivist should supply information but should not urge that permission be given. Whether the copyright owner is a donor or not, the archivist owes courtesy and cooperation as well as careful observance of the law and protection of all legal rights. The archivist may at times seem to be walking a tightrope between the demands of a user and those of a copyright owner interested in full protection. The reputation and safety of both the archives and the archivist may depend on how wisely the conflict is resolved.

The new copyright law leaves much unsettled, and without doubt there will be requests for revision. Congress was aware of this and provided for review of several problems. The Register of Copyrights will review library and archival photocopying in consultation with interested persons and report to Congress on the situation in 1982 and every five years thereafter. As was true when the law was passed, publishers and librarians will probably be the most numerous and most vocal interested persons, but the review will provide an opportunity for archivists to explain their needs. They may wish to ask for revision applying 108 (d) and (e) to manuscripts as well as
published materials so clearly that there can be no difference in interpretation.

If future Congresses give as careful consideration to revision of the copyright act as was given to its drafting and passage, there is reason to hope that problems of interpretation will be solved. Congress made great efforts to provide a just, reasonable solution to complex problems. It is now the task of archivists to use the new law to the best of their understanding, with due regard for their professional purpose of facilitating scholarship, their moral and contractual obligations to their donors, their legal obligations to all copyright owners, and their need to protect themselves and their institutions.

Archivists may take heart that few of the manuscripts they administer have such value that controversy over them is likely to arise. For the potential best seller, the possible rivals of A Diary from Dixie, Children of Pride, or Beloved Prophet, it is impossible to be too careful. Most archival holdings are more humdrum, a far cry from such exciting and popular works. The law does not discriminate because of value, but the copyright owner may. Most heirs would be delighted to see in print grandpa’s memoirs or Aunt Emily’s family history or a few ancestral letters to a prominent person. If some of these show up in a heavy scholarly work or a documentary publication, most copyright owners will either never see them, or else will be pleased by them, or at the worst will never realize they have a right to object.

This does not mean that copyright violation is legal because the writer was obscure or wrote on a subject of little interest to the majority of readers. It does account for the fact that many historians and editors have been exceeding fair use for years with impunity. They probably could not have functioned if they had not done so, and if they are willing to take the responsibility and run the risk, archivists may on occasion have to be bold and run some risks also. Archivists should be extremely careful about copyright but not paralyzed by it.

Finally, the new copyright law gives hope for the future. Younger archivists can look forward to a benefit their elders will never experience. On January 1, 2003, the large quantity of older manuscripts now under copyright will enter the public domain, and others will follow every year thereafter. Even if the new law promised no other aid to archivists and readers, the certainty that the perpetual feature of common law copyright will eventually end makes it all worthwhile.

Mary K. Gibran et al, v. Annie Salem Otto, United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division, Civil Action No. 72-H-123. The original complaint was filed on January 28, 1972, and the case was closed on July 10, 1974.
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In 1929 Margaret Cross Norton, Archivist of the state of Illinois, addressed the Conference of Archivists being held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the American Historical Association (AHA) on the subject of archives as an administrative function of government. The essential nature of public archives was legal, she said, and the archivist’s primary responsibilities were the promotion of administrative efficiency and the protection of individual rights, rather than the facilitating of historical scholarship. Although these remarks were greeted by the assembled historians with “stony silence,” they correctly foreshadowed the emerging differences between archivists and historians.\(^1\)

These comments on the nature and functions of government archives were made by way of explaining the slow pace with which public records programs had developed in most states. Although twenty-two states\(^2\) had developed nominal programs by that time, Miss Norton expressed the belief that only about a dozen states were giving systematic and sustained care to their records. The principal reason for this, she alleged, was the popular misconception that archives existed primarily to serve scholarly researchers. This opinion, she argued, made legislators reluctant to appropriate funds for programs which seemed to duplicate functions already being performed by state libraries and historical societies, and which seemed to them to be of only marginal importance in any case.

In retrospect, there are many reasons to explain the underdevelopment of the archival profession in the United States in the year 1929. The National Archives Act would not be passed by Congress until 1934, although $6.9 million had been authorized for a building in 1926. The Public Archives

Andrew Raymond is Assistant Director of the New England Document Conservation Center. James M. O’Toole is Archivist of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Boston. Both are formerly associated with the state archives and local records program of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
Commission of the AHA, the only real forum for the discussion of archival problems, had lost its financial support and momentum after World War I. No major book or manual on the theory and practice of archives had yet appeared in America.³

Today, in 1978 — nearly half a century since Miss Norton's speech — the archival profession remains underdeveloped and its identity still in doubt. To be sure, much has happened in those fifty years: the National Archives has been established, along with twenty-three new archival programs at the state level.⁴ Archival theory has benefited from publication of T. R. Schellenberg's Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques (1956), Thornton Mitchell's edition of Norton on Archives (1975), and a number of manuals prepared by the National Archives and Records Service, the Library of Congress, and the Society of American Archivists. Despite these achievements, the archival profession remains misunderstood by users of archives, by government officials, by the public at large, and by archivists themselves. Its growth during the mid-twentieth century notwithstanding, "the archival profession is still in the formative stage," concludes a report based on a survey of the membership of the SAA in 1970. "The bounds of the profession still remain undefined," say the authors of this report, "and the professional identity of the members is uncertain."⁵

Other recent examples of the lack of support for archival programs abound. In 1973 a management study team recommended the abolition of the Maine State Archives and the institution of a "crash program" by an outside contractor to "process and dispose" of the records generated by the state.⁶ The New York State Archives was forced to rely on an emergency grant from the federally-funded National Historical Publications and Records Commission to continue its basic inventory of government records after all state funds were cut off in early 1976, reducing the size of the archives staff to two. In Massachusetts, plans for a new state archives building, announced with great fanfare in April 1976, have met with open opposition from the governor, protracted inaction by the legislature, and a negative editorial response from the press.

Nor is this phenomenon confined to the Northeast. The State and Local Records Committee of the SAA reports that programs for the preservation, arrangement, and description of county and municipal records are hampered by a severe shortage of physical, financial, and staff resources
in nearly every state. A former President of the United States has recently argued that the Archivist of the United States is not the appropriate custodian for the public records of his administration. A justice of the Supreme Court has expressed his belief in the inability of archivists to "remain completely silent with respect to those portions of the [Nixon] presidential papers which are extremely newsworthy."

Why, in spite of the growth and progress of the archival profession, have such misunderstandings persisted? Why, in spite of the coming of a new generation of professional archivists, are archival programs still among the first to be marched to the fiscal chopping block? Part of the answer to these questions lies in the close association of archives with the study of history and the continuing influence exerted by academic historians on the archival profession. It is ironic that the historical profession, which has done so much to initiate and advance the cause of archives in America, may at the same time have unwittingly contributed to a misunderstanding of the primary function of archives. Archivists themselves have not succeeded in clarifying this misunderstanding. The historical and archival professions have become confused in spite of the developments that have separated them.

The archival profession in the United States grew directly out of the historical profession. Beginning with the establishment of the Public Archives Commission by the AHA in 1899, academic historians were in the forefront of efforts to survey, describe, and preserve state and local records. A Conference of Archivists was held annually in conjunction with the meeting of the AHA, beginning in 1909. Although some doubts would be expressed as to the need for a distinct professional group, the Society of American Archivists (SAA) was founded at the AHA meeting in Providence in 1936, followed by the first publication of its journal, The American Archivist, two years later. Thereafter archival interests found their organizational expression increasingly through the National Archives, the SAA, and for a brief period in the later 1930s and early 1940s, the Historical Records Survey of the Works Progress Administration.

Despite this growth of an independent archival profession, however, the ties between archivists and historians have naturally remained close. Although the two groups now see themselves as distinct professions, the distinction is not one that is readily perceived by the non-archival, non-historical community. Because the two remain related, the distinction seems a subtle one, considered by many to be a kind of "distinction without a difference."
There are some grounds for such a belief. Archivists themselves still come to their profession predominantly from history. A recent survey of the directors of state and provincial archival programs revealed that, of the forty-one with master's degrees, thirty-three obtained their degrees in history (the other eight were in library science). Of the eight archivists with doctoral degrees, six were doctorates in history. Only four of all the archivists surveyed held law degrees.\(^1\) Nearly 64% of all SAA members responding to Frank Evans and Robert Warner's 1970 survey reported holding graduate degrees in history.\(^2\) Such a close relationship between archives and history has led to a consistent blurring of the boundary between the two, a blurring that can be seen in subtle ways. The Library of Congress classification scheme for printed books, for example, lists archives as one of the "auxiliary sciences of history."\(^3\) Archives are still viewed as a branch of traditional, academic history. The view of the importance of archives, therefore, largely depends on the view of the importance of history, which by all accounts is not at the moment very great.

The archivist is therefore consigned to life in the basement. He is forced into a stereotype that is dark, dusty, unpleasant, and most of all irrelevant. In this image the archivist is seen as providing his services only for the scholarly historian and the genealogist. Such services may be desirable in themselves, but they are relatively esoteric and considered not important in the face of pressing political, economic, and social problems. Some lip-service may be paid to the vague notion that somehow the present grows out of the past, but that is too complex a process to be explored when immediate action is called for by governments. Faced with such a view of the nature and value of archives it is hardly surprising that increased financial support is withheld and reductions made at every opportunity.

None of this is to suggest that the association between archives and history is an improper one. Rather, it demonstrates the importance of considering the true nature of the relationship between the two disciplines. The leading theorists of archival science are not agreed on the ways in which archives and history should be related. Sir Hilary Jenkinson and T. R. Schellenberg start from a common point: archival records of public agencies are materials that have been created in the course of conducting the public business. Beyond that, however, the reason for preserving those records as archives is more controversial.

The disagreement between Jenkinson and Schellenberg on this latter
point arises from their differing notions of how archival records ought to relate to history. For Jenkinson, archival records are "preserved in their custody for their own information by the person or persons responsible for that transaction and their legitimate successors." Archives exist solely for their reference value to the individual or institution that produced them. Jenkinson considered such value to be of an essentially legal nature which, in turn, required that the integrity of the records be carefully preserved through an "unbroken chain of custody" for possible use in a court of law. The interests of any outside researchers such as historians were simply irrelevant in the preservation of archives.
A far different concept of archives was set forth by Schellenberg. For records to be archives, he maintained, they must not only be created in the transaction of public business by an agency or government; they must also be "preserved for reasons other than those for which they were created or accumulated." Records became archives when they were preserved for a reason other than administrative reference, "and this reason is a cultural one." Broadly defined, the interests of historical researchers were extremely relevant. At the same time, the archivist had to assist researchers by assuming responsibility for establishing the long-term "archival value" of records.

To determine archival quality, Schellenberg argued for appraisal of public records in terms of what he called both the "evidential" and "informational" value of their contents. By evidential value he meant the value of records as evidence of the organization and functioning of the agency or institution that created them. Such records would contain information of prospective value both to future administrators and outside researchers of varying interests, and would emphasize especially those documenting policies and the decision-making process itself. It is, of course, the evidential value of archival records which inheres in the theory of provenance: only in the context of the organization and activity of which they are the product can the value of such records be fully understood.

Schellenberg would also retain for their archival value records containing information of interest to a variety of outside researchers apart from their organic relationship to a specific agency or institution. In contrast to archival records containing evidence of governmental organization and function, those of informational value alone would be of interest mainly to outside researchers. The information contained in these records, gathered during the course of performing an official function, would relate to a variety of people, conditions, and situations. In other words, such information on a number of subjects would exist only incidentally to the performance of an activity to which the records as a whole related. Yet the very presence of such information would increase their value as archives.

These differing conceptions of the archival function as defined by Jenkinson and Schellenberg contain important implications for the role of the archivist. Jenkinson's archivist is relegated to an essentially passive role in which preserving the physical and moral integrity of the records in his custody is uppermost. He does not take part in the management of current
records; he leaves the problem of appraisal to the administrators, for whose benefit alone the archives exist; and he remains free of any outside research interest lest they compromise the impartiality and authenticity of the materials in his custody. On the last point Jenkinson was particularly blunt: "the Archivist is not and ought not to be an Historian." 18

The role assigned to the archivist by Schellenberg, on the other hand, is a broader and more dynamic one. For him, there exists an integral relationship between the administration of current and archival records; one naturally evolves into the other. For this reason the archivist cannot avoid involvement in decisions affecting the disposition of records. In fact, he brings much-needed perspective and knowledge, which the administrator lacks, to bear on that process. The importance of protecting records as legal evidence through a long and elaborate chain of responsibility must be deemphasized, given the conditions under which modern records are created and utilized. Only a "reasonable assumption" of their authenticity can be established by strict adherence to the theory of provenance and protecting them against all agents of physical destruction. 19 Above all, it is Schellenberg's insistence that archival quality is a function of value for purposes other than those for which the records were created or accumulated that separates him from Jenkinson.

Elements of both these definitions can be found in the writings of Margaret Norton, an anthology of whose essays was recently edited and published by Thornton W. Mitchell. 20 Miss Norton, who was trained as both a librarian and a historian, served as the State Archivist of Illinois from 1922 until 1957. Coming from such a broad background, it is small wonder that her writings on the subject of archives provide a useful synthesis of the divergent views of Jenkinson and Schellenberg and help illuminate the proper relationship between archives and history.

Norton's conception of archives as a basic function of public administration was first expounded in 1929 before the Public Archives Commission, a body which had for thirty years been trying to justify archives on scholarly grounds alone. Archival records acquire their primary value in relation to the administrative activity of which they are the product, said Norton. Any subject value they might have is entirely incidental to that purpose. The main task of the archivist, therefore, is to serve as "custodian of legal records of the state, the destruction of which might seriously inconvenience the administration of state business." 21 In other words, records are both created and preserved for use as archives in order to facilitate the conduct of the
public business. Jenkinson would wholeheartedly agree.

Given this starting point, it is not difficult to understand Norton's emphasis on the primary use of archival materials in defining and protecting the rights of the people and the government in relationship to each other. For this purpose, she identified two broad categories of public records to be retained permanently. The first included those records that document the rights of individuals and property, such as records of vital statistics, census records, naturalization records, records of court actions, wills, and deeds. The second and much broader category included records that document the actual functioning of a given agency or institution, a definition which, on one level or another, could include virtually any public record. Meeting records, office manuals, rules and regulations, attorney general's opinions, and correspondence or other documents relating to office policy exemplify this type of archival record. These are records that contain what Schellenberg would call "evidential value," and they are perfectly appropriate for inclusion in Norton's archives.

To preserve the authenticity required by the legal nature and function of archives, Norton believed with Jenkinson that it was necessary to demonstrate "an unblemished line of responsible custodians." More specifically, she said, the archivist must be able to certify the authenticity of records in his custody for possible use as legal evidence. Precise rules for the processing, handling, and servicing of archival records were designed with that purpose in mind. In fact, Norton asserted, "the necessity for acceptable certification is the basis for the adoption of provenance as the basis for the classification of archives."

Although Norton argued repeatedly against the unfortunate consequences of the traditional association of archives with history, she was still, with Schellenberg, keenly aware of the historical and informational value of archival materials. Taking care of records because of their historical value was "an important service no one can deny, since government records form the only source materials for early American history." The inverse relationship between the age of records and the frequency of legal and administrative reference to them only served to reemphasize the connection between archives and history. The archivist could not be indifferent to the historical value of the records under his care, as Jenkinson would prefer. At the same time, however, the archivist could not succumb to the historian's temptation to rearrange archival collections so that all materials related to a certain
subject could be placed together. The archivist cannot be separated from the historical process and the work of the historian, said Norton, but he must recognize that the way in which archivists and historians viewed the same records was different. While historians were “interested in archives primarily from the subject side,” the archivist never forgot the importance of maintaining his collections in the order and condition in which they were created by the government.24

This middle ground established by Norton is the only position from which the archivist can deal with the problems of modern public records management. The leading role played by historians in organizing the archival profession and the regular use made of archival collections by historical researchers suggest the inevitable role of the archivist in the historical process. More specifically, the appraisal function requires the archivist to make decisions that will largely determine the materials from which future history can be written. The preparation of finding aids is designed to facilitate access by researchers who are more interested in the meaning than in the organizational sources of the records. To this extent, the connection between archives and history is unavoidable.

But is the confusion between the two, and the attendant lack of support, also unavoidable? If archives are defined solely in terms of their relationship to history, the answer must unfortunately be yes. If involvement in the process of historical research is the only justification for the existence of archival programs, there can be little hope for their expansion or even continuation. The surge of enthusiasm brought on by the Bicentennial notwithstanding, interest in history is simply not as great as it once was; increased attention is now focusing on other social sciences, especially psychology, sociology, and economics. As any unemployed Ph.D. can readily attest, history is having a difficult enough time trying to support itself. For archivists to expect the historical profession to support and justify them as well is utter folly.

The confusion between archives and history, and the problems of misunderstanding and underdevelopment that have resulted, can be avoided only if archivists begin to emphasize that there is more to their profession than involvement in historical research. Archivists must place comparable emphasis on their involvement in the process of public administration itself. At least a partial redefinition of the nature and importance of archives, in which their use as a practical aid to efficient government
management is stressed, will be required. Norton’s declaration of 1929 that archives have an important role to play in the conduct of public business must not meet with the same “stony silence” today if archivists are to change the patterns of underdevelopment and lack of support.

It is not enough, of course, simply to assert that archives can provide a real service to the public administrator. An exclusive association of archives with history gives that assertion a hollow ring. Can archivists honestly expect that assertion to be taken seriously if they confine their training and experience to the historical profession? Can government managers be expected to believe that some relevant service, one that reduces costs and increases efficiency, can be provided by an agency that calls itself a department of “Archives and History,” the parent agency for the state archives in fourteen states? The relationship between archives and public administration must be described and emphasized — just as the relationship between archives and history has been heretofore — if the archivist’s claim to relevance is to carry any weight.

This shift in emphasis from history to administration is best accomplished by stressing the concept of the “life cycle” of a record. The life cycle is a way of describing the four stages of creation, use, storage, and disposition through which all records pass. Administrators responsible for the management of records seldom possess such a coherent perspective on them. Records are generated in order to accomplish a specific administrative or legal task, and are generally forgotten once that purpose has been achieved. The responsibility for a record throughout the various stages of its life cycle is frequently fragmented among a number of agencies and individuals, among whom there is little or no communication on the subject of record-keeping itself. The obvious result is a failure on the part of most administrators to recognize the many ways in which records can better complement, rather than compromise, their conduct of the public business.

In order to understand fully the concept of the life cycle, it is necessary to realize the extent of the interaction among the various stages. Any action, or inaction, with respect to one stage cannot but affect one or more of the others. The archivist, who is by definition interested in retaining records of permanent value, for example, cannot properly identify such records without becoming actively involved in determining the disposition of all records, most of which will not be archival in nature. The archivist who has taken an active hand in the management of current records will
also find it much easier to prepare finding aids for the records which eventually will be accessioned into the archives. Although widely acknowledged in archival literature to be desirable, these expanded functions are often ignored in actual practice. With a proper understanding of the life cycle and its implications, however, the archivist will be able to develop the unified perspective the administrator lacks.

As the archivist becomes more involved in every phase of record-keeping, it will become increasingly possible to bring the resulting information to bear upon both the records themselves and the larger administrative activities to which they relate. By thinking through the expected life span of a given record before it is created, many problems of the future can be avoided. Records of archival value, for instance, can be created on permanent and durable paper or other appropriate medium, thereby helping to save the cost of expensive restoration at a later date. Regular implementation of disposition schedules is essential to making optimum use of available storage space and equipment. Decisions made in designing a new form of a record will, of course, also determine the physical requirements for storage. The increased efficiency to which these factors all contribute can be obtained only by a thorough knowledge of these interrelationships between the stages of the life cycle.

The benefits of increased record-keeping efficiency are, of course, not limited to the records themselves, but extend to the very heart of the administrative process. First and most obvious is the elimination of unnecessary costs in labor and equipment devoted to the storage and maintenance of records. Just as records seldom command the attention they require, so too the related costs go uncontrolled. The piecemeal way in which these expenses are incurred further obscures the administrator's grasp of the problem, and thus compounds it.

Second, the archivist will inevitably acquire through his involvement in the life cycle of records an invaluable knowledge of the administrative activities of which those records are the product. Perhaps because of the way in which archivists are perceived by administrators, this knowledge remains unexploited by them, relegated to the basement along with the archivist himself. Instead, it should be used by administrators to facilitate access to information needed to solve problems of current management, not just those of academic or antiquarian interest. The use of archival records for purposes other than those for which they were created or maintained
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need not be confined to outside researchers only. If the administrators could better control and use the information already at their disposal, they would reduce their need to gather more.

Finally, good record-keeping bears directly on the accountability of public officials to the people, a subject of increased popular interest in recent years. This accountability of elected and appointed officials requires the preservation and accessibility of the records containing information on their conduct in office. Increased demands to use records for this purpose have led to the passage of freedom of information and privacy laws at the federal and state levels. The archivist's understanding of the frequently contradictory provisions of these laws enables him to make a unique contribution to their successful implementation.

In order to achieve this greater impact on public administration, the archivist will first have to change his own perception of his professional responsibilities and relationships. Archivists have moved away from their formal organizational ties with historians and have established their own society and journal, but they have not made corresponding efforts to move closer to administrators. Only an insignificant number of SAA members are also members of the Association of Records Managers and Administrators (ARMA). Joint committees and meetings of the SAA with associations of professional public administrators and organizations such as the American Management Association are virtually nonexistent. Archivists must begin, through the SAA and individually, to establish such formal contacts as a way of demonstrating to administrators the seriousness of their intent to exert an influence on the operation of modern government. The exploration of topics of mutual interest with professional managers can help archivists overcome their stereotypical association with academic historians and can begin to convince unbelieving public officials that good archival management does indeed have some relevance.

The archivist will also have to reconsider what constitutes an appropriate education for his work. The debate over whether archivists should be trained in graduate history departments or in schools of library science needs to be deemphasized. Concentration must be placed instead on the potential for professional training of archivists in public administration. Highly specialized training in history, particularly at the doctoral level, has of itself little to do with the ability to care for public records. Formal training in public administration will in many cases prove to be more helpful. Considering
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government management problems as records management problems can bring a new perspective and new insights for the public administrator. We know that one of the fundamental things that government now does is create records; uncontrolled "paperwork" has become a central feature of modern bureaucracy. The peculiar talents of the archivist address themselves to precisely that condition and, if properly applied by archivists with formal training in public administration, they can be made to yield significant results.

The result of such a shift in emphasis toward public administration will be to bring the archivist up from the basement. The belief that archives are a mere luxury, provided for the benefit of scholarly researchers, divorced from the central concerns of the government and the public, will no longer be supportable. The value of archives beyond the interests of the academic world will be demonstrated. The importance of archives in the management of the public business will be made clear.

Only after such a new conception of archives has taken shape and been reinforced by the activities of archivists will the decline of support for archival programs be checked. The correction of misunderstandings concerning the nature and function of archives will provide the basis for their continued and expanded support. Public officials who hold the purse strings will not begin to provide archives with the financial and staff resources that are required until they are convinced that archives have some relevance to the management of government. A new emphasis on the relationship between archives and public administration can do much to establish a balance with history, and can help break the pattern of misunderstanding, underdevelopment, and lack of identity that has plagued the archival profession in the past.


3 Birdsall, "Two Sides of the Desk," AA, 38 (1975), 164, 167. The Public Archives Commission published The Preservation of Archives in 1930, but this volume dealt only with the historian's concern for preserving materials of research value and not with the administration of records programs.
4 Kinney, *Directory of State and Provincial Archives*, Table 8.


9 This was not the case in Europe, where archives were created and preserved solely for the use of administrators. It was not until the French Revolution that archival collections were found to be of use to historians as well, and therefore opened for private scholarly research. For a discussion of these developments and of European archivists' involvement in government administration, see *Archives and the Public Interest: Selected Essays by Ernst Posner*, ed. Ken Munden (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1967), especially Part I, Chapter 1 ("Some Aspects of Archival Development Since the French Revolution") and the four essays of Part III ("The European Example").

10 The first report of the Commission, published as the second volume of the AHA *Annual Report* for 1900, is a good example of this kind of inventory.


12 Kinney, *Directory of State and Provincial Archives*, Table 10.


14 Books on archives are classified under "CD." Still, the Library of Congress scheme is kinder to archives than the Dewey system. The latter makes no provision at all for archives, and classifies manuscripts in the 090s as one of a number of "Generalities."


17 Schellenberg's discussion of archival appraisal is found *ibid.*, 139-160.
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AN EMERGING ARCHIVAL INSTITUTION: 
THE SOUTHERN LABOR ARCHIVES

Robert Dinwiddie and Leslie Hough

There are now many emerging archival agencies in the region and nation. Each new archives requires certain actions on the part of the archivist for its firm establishment and the promotion of growth. One such repository is the Southern Labor Archives. This article presents a brief history of the Southern Labor Archives, allowing an analysis of some influences common to the development of emerging archival agencies.

The Southern Labor Archives at Georgia State University was the second labor archives generated by the influence of the Association of Southern Labor Historians (ASLH). A group of historians concerned about the lack of academic attention to the southern working class came together during the 1966 meeting of the Southern Historical Association and organized the ASLH. The group intended to stimulate study of the southern trade union movement by collecting union records and by presenting papers on labor history at meetings concurrent with those of the Southern Historical Association.

Dr. George Green of the University of Texas at Arlington returned home from this meeting and began a series of conversations with Texas-Arlington faculty and administrators, as well as Texas labor leaders. These discussions led to the creation of the Texas Labor Archives at Arlington in 1967.

That same year, academics and labor officials in Pennsylvania initiated a similar archives at Pennsylvania State University. These two emerging archives joined the labor archives of Detroit’s Wayne State University as the only research centers in the nation dedicated exclusively to preserving and making available the historical records of the American labor movement.

Mr. Dinwiddie is a graduate student in history at Georgia State University and is on the staff of the Southern Labor Archives.
Dr. Hough is Archivist of the Southern Labor Archives.
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Dr. Green reported on the progress of the Texas Labor Archives at the SHA convention in December, 1968. His favorable report encouraged Dr. Merl E. Reed, a labor history specialist at Georgia State University, to wonder if such an archives could be established at Georgia State University. As Dr. Green had done earlier, Dr. Reed introduced the idea to university and labor officials. His timing was fortuitous; Atlanta labor leaders informed him that a committee was already at work searching for an appropriate way to honor veteran labor attorney Joseph Jacobs. Reed suggested to the committee that it consider providing the initial endowment for the "Joseph Jacobs Labor History Archives" to be established within the Georgia State University Library. Reed's idea was that the university would provide space, staff, and all supplies necessary to operate the archives.

The Labor Awards Committee decided to inaugurate an annual "Labor Man of the Year" award and name Mr. Jacobs the first recipient. This award was to be presented at a banquet, the profits from which would be donated to GSU as seed money for the labor archives. The first banquet was held on May 1, 1969; it raised $3,800 for the archives. This success encouraged the committee to make the banquet an annual affair, both as a way of honoring a person with a distinguished labor union career and as a source of constant funding for the archives.

A committee of Georgia State University administrators and faculty presented a draft contract to the Labor Awards Committee in August, 1969. After gaining the committee's approval of the contract, they then submitted it to the University System Board of Regents in March, 1970; it was subsequently signed in April, 1970. This contract stipulated that the archives would be placed physically and administratively within the GSU library and would be named the Southern Labor Archives instead of the Joseph Jacobs Labor History Archives, as it had been discovered that a state law forbade naming buildings or facilities in state-supported schools for living persons.

The search for an archivist began in September, 1970, after Dr. Philip Mason, Director of the Archives of Labor History and Urban Affairs at Wayne State University, visited GSU as a consultant and recommended that the position be advertised in national archival, library, and historical journals. David B. Gracy II, a recent Ph. D. graduate in history from Texas Tech University with archival experience in that school's Southwest Collection and in the Texas State Archives, was hired in July, 1971.
Dr. Gracy acquired the first significant collection — the records of Atlanta Typographical Union No. 48 — before he had shelf space available or a staff assembled. In fact, by the time physical space and a small staff of catalogers were acquired in March, 1972, Gracy already had acquired several substantial manuscript collections. By the spring of 1972, Gracy was able to present the SLA’s first “List of Holdings” to those persons attending the Fourth Annual Labor Awards Banquet.

The Southern Labor Archives differed from the labor archives at Wayne State University and Pennsylvania State University in that it sought to collect the records of all labor organizations in a stated geographical area — the Southeast — while they concentrated on the records of one or more international unions. Emphasizing this regional interest, Gracy sought and received the official blessings of several state AFL-CIO councils in the
South. The Georgia State AFL-CIO was the first such organization to endorse the work of the Archives. It also boosted the Archives' credibility by donating its non-current records to the Archives. The state AFL-CIO councils of Florida, Virginia, and South Carolina soon made similar endorsements. These actions ratified the accomplishments and goals of the Archives.

The creation of the Southern Labor Archives inspired labor scholars and active unionists in the Atlanta area to seek a more stable forum for the discussion of southern labor history. This common concern led to the planning of the Southern Labor History Conference, bringing together active unionists, scholars, and others interested in the subject. The same Labor Awards Committee that had been so instrumental in creating the Archives liked the idea and offered to sponsor the event in cooperation with the Archives. Subsequently, the first annual Southern Labor History Conference was held April 1 - 3, 1976, coinciding with the Seventh Annual Labor Awards Banquet.

The concept of the Southern Labor History Conference, however, as the concept of the Archives itself, can be traced to the Association of Southern Labor Historians, which during its existence issued an infrequent newsletter and conducted sessions on labor history as part of the annual proceedings of its parent organization, the Southern Historical Association. The 1976 Conference participants decided to resurrect the ASLH as the Southern Labor History Association, and appointed a committee to begin work on the second conference, which was successfully held in May, 1978. The name of the new association was changed during the period between the two conferences to the Southern Labor Studies Association, in order to reflect more accurately the broad interests of the membership, all focusing on the study of the labor movement in the South.

While the Southern Labor Archives has always been committed to activity beyond the preservation of historical research materials, the development of its manuscript holdings must rank as the most important factor in the growth and maturation of any repository. A partial list of manuscript collections retained by the Archives includes the records of the United Textile Workers of America; the Southern regional offices of the International Woodworkers of America and the Service Employees International Union; the AFL-CIO state councils of Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina; the central labor unions of Augusta, Atlanta, Asheville, Jacksonville, Savannah, and Chattanooga; Carpenters union locals of Macon, Savannah, Tallahassee, and Newport News; Typographical union locals in Atlanta,
Birmingham, Tampa, and Jacksonville; Machinists union locals in Atlanta and Anniston; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers of Macon; labor attorneys Joseph Jacobs, and Adair, Goldthwaite, Stanford and Daniel; and the AFL-CIO Civil Rights Department, Southern Office. Significant bodies of records deposited in the Archives but not yet arranged and described are: AFL-CIO Region 8 (Knoxville); Atlanta Public School Teachers Association; and records of the Georgia, South Carolina, Maryland, and Kentucky Nurses Associations.

These collections from state nurses' associations reflect an increase in collective bargaining activity by some professional associations and thus a natural impetus for the broadening of the collecting activities of the Southern Labor Archives in order to document this trend. Collections like the state nurses' associations also help to document the changes in a profession made up predominantly of women, a growing proportion of America's work force and a group whose participation in our nation's economic life is the object of increasing scholarly attention. Just as the records of nurses' associations are useful for research on women's history as well as the history of the working class, so too can many of the collections in the Archives be helpful in researching subjects relating to the political, social and economic history of the South.

The experience of beginning and developing the Southern Labor Archives reveals several factors important to ensuring the strength and permanency of new archival agencies. For emerging institutions like the Archives at Georgia State University, it is crucial that supportive relationships are established and maintained with their three principal constituencies: administrators in the sponsoring agency, researchers, and patrons.

The most important supporting element for an archives is the parent organization and administrative unit within which the archives is positioned. It is crucial that the administrator of an archival agency constantly educate his or her administrative superiors on the value of the archival function. The most effective means of documenting a record of accomplishment to these top administrators is to quantify such performance as the significance, size, and number of collections acquired, those arranged and described, and the types and numbers of researchers served. Through the periodic, usually annual, report the archivist can transmit the highlights of progress made and suggest goals for the future to her or his superiors. At least as important to this educational process between archivist and administrator is a frequent, steady flow of communication from the archivist to
the administrator on important developments and current needs of the archives. Face to face meetings are usually the best setting for this communication process. This policy of close consultation has enabled the Southern Labor Archives to command a generous and increasing share of the resources, staff, space, and equipment in the Library at Georgia State University.

The second major constituency of an emerging archives is researchers. The archivist's responsibility to the researcher does not end when he or she sets adequate hours and convenient procedures. A serious problem of many archival facilities is the failure to report newly-processed records or manuscript collections to the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections, scholarly journals, or other appropriate media. As another means of assisting researchers, several prominent archival facilities have established programs for the payment of stipends to persons for research use in their collections. Sponsorship of conferences, scholarly or otherwise, giving researchers an opportunity to present an exposition of their results, is an excellent tool for the archivist to encourage the work of researchers. The Southern Labor Archives has made use of the Southern Labor History Conference, as mentioned earlier, for these purposes.

Patrons, the third constituency of a new archives, may also find a conference to be an attractive forum for learning more about their field of interest. Moreover, such meetings strengthen the patrons' ties to the sponsoring archival agency. The patrons of an emerging archival agency will usually have had some essential role in the founding of the repository, although they may or may not be interested in actually using the material collected by the archives. In the case of the Southern Labor Archives, the patrons have been southern labor historians, many of whom are also researchers in the collections, and leaders of organized labor in the South, who are concerned primarily with the preservation of the history of organized labor in the region. Genealogical societies, local historical agencies, scholarly associations, or other special interest groups may form the patron constituency for other repositories. Creation of a specialized association or friends group that can serve to stimulate interest in a repository is not always justified, based on the large commitment of time involved. Nevertheless, patrons can perform a vital role in forming a base of support for an archival agency while its collection is being built. This support can take tangible form when patrons supply funds or services that may well be unavailable from the organization sponsoring the repository. Perhaps more important
is the influence, political or otherwise, that patrons can exert on the governing body of the sponsoring organization. Such help from patrons can be essential in gaining the support needed for building an archival facility of the first rank.

The effort to increase the involvement of both patrons and researchers has been carried one step further by the Southern Labor Archives with the creation of the Southern Labor Studies Association. The Association provides an organizational framework within which patrons and researchers can be brought into the process of planning future conferences, and can help in the publication of selected research results and comments from expert patrons. The Association plans to publish a newsletter that will keep researchers and patrons abreast of developments in the Archives and in the general subject field.

Use of the specialized media of patron groups can also be a most effective method of encouraging research and support from potential patrons of an emerging archival facility. Supplying appropriate articles for publication in the journals and newsletters of patrons or related interest groups is often an excellent alternative to developing a journal or newsletter for an understaffed new archives. The Southern Labor Archives has cultivated such an arrangement with the Journal of Labor, published by the Georgia AFL-CIO; articles and announcements are thus presented to many of the patrons of the Archives within the ranks of organized labor in Georgia.

Each of these tools for building support for a new or reinvigorated archival facility should be examined in light of the unique circumstances of each repository. A recounting of the potential techniques that archivists can use to stimulate the support and interest of their constituencies could continue at greater length. Such programs are certainly not exclusively applicable to emerging archival agencies. Yet, ultimately our ability to fulfill the mission of documenting our society's heritage will depend upon educating the specialized publics that we serve on the importance of that mission.

2 The Georgia State University Committee: Dr. William Suttles, Dr. George Manners, Dr. Joseph Baylen, Dr. William Pullen, Dr. Dugald Hudson, and V. V. Lavroff. Dr. Charles Vail, Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, also played a key role.
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Masthead illustration from The Southern Cultivator, vol. 51, 1893. Courtesy, Georgia Department of Archives and History.
FOOD FOR THOUGHT:  
RESCUING OUR AGRARIAN HERITAGE  

Ronald E. Raven  

I always welcome an opportunity to discuss two of my favorite topics: history and farming. History, of course, is the study which allows every nation to use the other countries’ past record as an alibi. Farming I need not define, as each of you knows what it means. Perhaps that is just the problem we are to discuss. You know what farming is, you practice it; but fewer and fewer others do.

This problem was first brought to my attention when I was in the 7th grade. It was in Math Class and the lesson involved using a story to set a problem. It went like this: If a farmer had a cow which gave 10 pounds of milk per milking, how much milk would he get in a week? The solution was, of course, simple: 2 milkings/day x 10 lbs. = 20 lbs./day x 7 days = 140 lbs./week. However, when the teacher asked for answers, only two students had it right. The remainder of the class was split evenly between two different answers. Half of the class insisted that the answer was 70 lbs. They didn’t know a cow was milked twice a day. The other half insisted on 100 lbs. They knew that cows gave milk twice a day or 20 lbs. However, living in a suburb, they believed cows, like everyone else, worked a five day week.

That example of ignorance is not too unusual. As people have gotten away from the farms, the knowledge of the farming industry is being lost. Our Agrarian Heritage is not being passed on to the bulk of our people. When the children of this country can’t tell a cow from a deer, there is little hope that the role farming plays in our country or economy will be understood or appreciated. Soon the knowledge of farming may be as specialized as that of engineering, and our children will have grown away from land and nature.

Part of rescuing our agricultural heritage must be an understanding of how it came to be in danger. The reasons for the demise of general agrarian
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knowledge within the country are well known. The twin influences of urban migration and farm mechanization increased production and left fewer people in contact with farming. As a result, the farm population has steadily declined. A century ago, in 1870, over 50% of the population worked on the farms raising food. By 1910, within the memory of many people living today, that population had dropped to 35%. By 1960 only about 8% of the people were working on farms, and today barely 4% earn their living from farming.

During the same period of time, a technological revolution swept agriculture. At the turn of the century, it was estimated that one farm worker produced enough to support seven non-farm laborers; by 1960, the output of the individual farm worker supported nearly 26 non-farm persons. Today this ratio is even higher. This high degree of industrialization has also added to the disappearance of a number of farms. The new machinery was best suited to large operations, and its cost was such that only the larger producers could invest the sizeable capital required to buy and maintain the machinery.

Consequently, the number of farms steadily decreased while their size increased. In 1930 there were over 6,500,000 farms. Today, there are barely 2,500,000, but their size has correspondingly increased. In 1950 the average farm had 216 acres; today it is about 400 acres. Even more important in showing this trend is the fact that farms of more than 1,000 acres account for over half of today’s farmland.

In light of these trends, it is no wonder our children don’t know that cows work a seven day week. Most have never been in contact with one and probably couldn’t even identify one if it weren’t for TV westerns. The progression of planting the seed, harvesting the grain, milling the flour and baking the bread has only textbook familiarity for our children. Their experience tells them only that bread is produced, sliced, and put in plastic bags in some factory and sold in a food store. The heritage of living, growing agriculture is not being passed on.

What use is this knowledge of skills we don’t use every day? It is the knowledge of today and the research of tomorrow that will keep us fed, employed and happy. This I believe is a dangerous attitude.

We cannot afford to lose knowledge. Much of the basic knowledge of the sciences was discovered by the Greeks. Facts such as the size and shape of the earth and all of our fundamental geometric and mathematical prin-
Ciples were known to ancient civilization, yet this knowledge was lost precipitating the "Dark Ages" because it was not valued as something precious to be preserved. Fortunately, this knowledge was appreciated by the Arab inheritors of the Mediterranean lands and assisted them to expand their culture and power throughout the known world. It is curious that the great "discoveries" of the Renaissance, that the world was round, its size and continents, and its relationship to the universe, were all part of a body of knowledge over 1,000 years old. How much time had been wasted through ignorance and neglect.

There are other practical reasons for preserving the knowledge of the past. There were, among the Inca Indians, some eighty varieties of potatoes. Some were used as main courses, others as desserts. A number of them were delicate, others were bred hardy for long storage. With the coming of Conquistadores, the knowledge of how to grow all of these excellent foods was lost because the conquerors viewed the skills as unimportant. These same people had cross-bred grasses until they produced maize, a process of development that was also lost. Neither of these agricultural secrets has ever been rediscovered.

Knowledge is a precious thing and should not be lightly discarded, or man may suffer while he goes back to rediscover it. Although maybe it is a good thing that this continent was not "discovered" earlier. When white men arrived, there was no pollution, no taxes, no crime, and the Indians had a social system where the women did all the work. Those brave white men were foolish enough to think they could improve on that system. Sometimes I'm not sure how far we have come.

It was Abraham Joseph Ryon, a Civil War poet, who once observed, "A land without historical records is a land without memories — A land without memories is a land without liberty." Giving a people a history is important as it provides a sense of self.

Without knowledge of our past and that of others, a deeper understanding of people is possible. Too often hostility is based on fear of the unknown. The recent TV special "Roots" and its impact on the country is dramatic proof of the yearning people have for a sense of where they come from, for the knowledge of what forces shaped their lives and how their families came into being. We cannot afford to let the heritage of who we are and what we stand for be eroded or forgotten. That heritage is the compass that guides our people and government in seeking a path to travel with pride.
With the preservation of bodies of knowledge comes the opportunity to do research. Research is today, as it has always been, the key to progress. But all research must start with records created in the past. It is the writings of an established scientist, economist, or politician which gives the aspiring one a place to begin. How slow progress would be if each scientist had to rediscover the laws of gravity or each political thinker had to reinvent the democratic process. Research depends not just on published works, but on the notebooks of experiment observations, the diaries of farmers, the letters of political leaders and thousands more kinds of records which transmit raw knowledge.

Many times ordinary information from the past assumes great importance when viewed through a researcher’s eyes. For example, in colonial times, rice was a major cash crop which was planted extensively even around the city of Savannah. At the same time Savannah had the reputation of not being a very healthy place to live as official reports of the period complain. Ultimately, the city authorities sought the land for expanding the town and took over and drained the rice paddies abandoning the culture of rice as a staple crop. As a result, reports of Savannah’s unhealthiness gradually died down, though these events were not associated at that time. The same symptoms cropped up again in the 1950’s. Savannah was again having health problems. In researching the old records, officials noted the connection between ill health and the presence of stagnant water around the city, and began investigating potential sources for this. They found serious problems with drainage and mosquito infestation in the marshlands surrounding the city. After establishing a mosquito eradication program, officials noted the same health improvement as had been seen in colonial times.

Let us turn our attention from the lessons of the past to how we can preserve our heritage. The first important step is to collect records documenting a period of time and its activities. This is the work of an archives. The basic functions of archival work are to identify, collect, preserve, and make available for research the recorded evidence of our past. This documentation comes in many forms: letters of individuals telling of their lives and businesses, catalogs showing products, diaries revealing attitudes and feelings, pictures capturing personalities and events, magazines, books and tape recordings of the times, all add to our picture of the past.

Present recordings of events remembered called oral history has particular value for agrarian history. Farming, because of the long hours of physical labor required, is not well documented in paper records. However,
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there are lots of life-long farmers available to talk for the purpose of recording their collections. A good example of how important these recorded documents can be for the history of agriculture is found right here in Georgia. For over a century, cotton was the crop around which the life of Georgia and the entire south revolved. Even in 1920, 68% of all farm income was derived from cotton. This means that all other crops and livestock combined accounted for only $1 in $3 of farm income. However, today cotton accounts for only about 5% of farm income; it has been replaced by other mainstays of the rural economy such as commercial broilers, eggs, and peanuts. Cotton and the economic empire it built are no more, and all because of one little bug, the boll weevil, which invaded Georgia about 1918 feeding on the buds of ripe cotton or bolls. By 1925 the entire State economy was a shambles. For the next two decades Georgia farmers struggled to find alternate crops to support their families and worked to develop new markets. This effort led to the widely diversified agriculture we have today, and to an economy that is on a much stronger footing. In the space of one man’s lifetime, one way of life died and another was born. We have the bones of the story, the bare facts, but where is the flesh that makes it a human event?

It is the generation of my grandparents that has the full recollections of this time, but since the events were just “ordinary living” then, no particular attempt was made to document this era with written records. But we do have a fleeting opportunity to recapture what cotton and the boll weevil meant; we can talk to the old farmers, but we must do it quickly while they are still available to lend you their memories of the drama and poignancy of this era when a farmer was the master of his own spread and faced nature and the Depression alone. They will not remain with us long, and the knowledge they have to offer with its lessons must be recaptured now, before it passes on with them.

Once documentation is collected and preserved, the heritage can be passed by a variety of methods. Research for textbooks can be done. Studies of how the crops evolved can be passed on, and a basis for new research developed. The skills required to work the land can be taught. This is particularly important today when many of our young people are seeking a return to the land. For small farming, simple equipment and time-tested methods are often perfectly suited. A farmer doesn’t need to plan an egg factory for his dozen chickens.

There are two additional methods that can be effective media for
educating our children and passing on our heritage. These are the Restoration and Recreation of historic sites. Both are aimed at creating an environment in which the person becomes submerged in a former time. All that he sees about him relates to a past period and place. Having a person stand and walk in a living past is an enormously effective way of teaching. The most famous example of this type of experience is probably colonial Williamsburg. Thousands of our citizens have a much clearer picture of the origins of the country and revolution thanks to their visits there.

*Restoration* involves taking what remains of an historic site and restoring it to its original condition. This work requires extensive documentation of the physical remains and of the people associated with the particular place and the time period it reflects. The problem with restoration is that seldom does a site exist in the setting of its era. Often later alterations intrude upon the effect to recapture the illusive atmosphere of the past.

*Recreation* of an historical setting offers a greater opportunity for total environmental reconstruction, but requires even stricter attention to advance planning and solid research. Gathering surviving pieces and then constructing a suitable environment around them is the soul of historical recreation. Research must be done on what sort of sites did exist and what they might have contained. The planner designs what he wants and gives it back to the researcher to find out what each part looked like. This too requires an extensive documentation basis.

Very little historic preservation work has been done in agriculture. More often such efforts have been addressed to historical buildings such as Independence Hall, or the home of a famous citizen in the case of Mt. Vernon. In Georgia, we have two agricultural preservations currently underway.

The first, Jarrell Plantation, is an historical restoration. It was acquired by the State in 1973. Jarrell is unique among agricultural sites in that it was remarkably intact. The same family ran this isolated farm in Jones County for 130 years, during which they never threw away any implement or altered or destroyed any buildings. Of further importance is that the Jarrell Place functioned as a technology center for the surrounding county. The family built and operated a steam-powered sawmill, cane grinding operation, cotton gin and grist mill, as well as an implement and blacksmith shop, in addition to their subsistence farming activities.
The second, an heritage preservation project called the Georgia Agrirama, is located on the property of the State Agriculture Experiment Station at Tifton. It is the recreation of a South Georgia farm and adjoining village from the 1880's and 1890's. Buildings of this era have and are being collected and moved to the site to create a living museum. The site is being worked by the old methods for demonstration and has a farm with livestock, printing press, church, grist mill, and cotton gin. It is now about one-third complete and is open to the public. Preservation efforts like Jarrell Plantation and the Agrirama are only a small part of the picture. In fact these depend on and draw nourishment from something far more basic and essential — a program to increase public appreciation for our agricultural heritage through the preservation and use of records of all types. Without these source documents, photographs, and artifacts, it would not be possible to know our past, much less to reconstruct it.

It is, I believe, important that we make a concerted effort now to preserve our agrarian heritage. Remember, only what is preserved today will be known tomorrow. Farming groups must be encouraged to work with state and local governments, colleges, and libraries to establish and support archives and historic sites important to agriculture. These agencies are dedicated to preserving the heritage for this state, and need practicing farmers' cooperation to identify, obtain, and preserve historic documentation and sites. Let's get together; we will all enjoy the exchange.

In closing, I will leave you with this little story.

It seems a new farm hand was awakened at 4 a.m. by the farmer who announced they were going to cut oats.

"Are they wild oats?" the hand asked.

"No, why?" the farmer replied.

"Then why do we have to sneak up on them in the dark?"

That is the way you have to approach the preservation problem. You need to get up early in the morning with a solid plan or the remaining evidence of the past may slip away from you.
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AFRICANA ARCHIVAL AND MANUSCRIPT MATERIALS
AT PREDOMINATELY BLACK INSTITUTIONS
IN THE AMERICAN SOUTH

Leon P. Spencer

There is little question these days that links between Africans and black Americans have been extensive and that the influences of the one upon the other have been widespread. These interactions transcend the period of the slave trade and slavery to include the American freedmen of the nineteenth century, the twentieth-century African under colonialism, and of course the independent African and the black American of the civil rights and post-civil rights eras. These ties find significant expression through the historic black educational institutions of the American South: in the official interests and activities of the institutions, in the African students enrolled there, in the activities of alumni, and in the unsolicited initiatives of Africans who have sought for various reasons to establish contact with these learning centers. It is natural, therefore, for Africanists to expect to find archival and manuscript materials housed at these traditionally black colleges and universities. It is especially important for Africanists, as well as archivists, in the South to express interest in the issues that confront these custodial institutions—questions of acquisition, preservation, and access.

There are more than one hundred predominantly black institutions of higher education in the United States. Although no thorough effort has been made to secure information about their Africana manuscript and archival materials, we have a taste of what may exist in many of these institutions through knowledge of what does exist at a few. This knowledge comes from a variety of sources. Peter Duignan's *Handbook*¹ includes references to seven black institutions, including Atlanta University, Fisk, Hampton, and Howard, though the information they supplied was dominated by published works. In 1970 the *Directory of Afro-American Resources*² polled 120 predominantly black educational institutions and other black
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organizations. Thirty-four reported no archives or manuscripts; 3 fifty-two indicated that they possessed archives and manuscripts but did not mention any African content; and eight made specific reference to original sources of Africana. That same year, Kenneth King reported the existence of Africana documents found while working on his thesis describing links between African and black American education. King’s list included seven institutions. 4 Aloha South’s effort to compile a new guide to American archival and manuscript sources relating to Africa polled fifty-eight black institutions. Only four answered positively; ten schools reported no holdings. 5 On their own initiative several black colleges and universities have publicized their manuscript holdings, including a number of African-related documents. 6 Yet only six have submitted information to the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections (NUCMC); four refer to Africa. 7

Despite the small sampling, one cannot help but be intrigued at the research potential they display. The records reported contain vital data documenting the reactions of African students to the United States, and of black missionaries in Africa. Some materials reveal insights into pan-Africanism in its economic, political, and philanthropic aspects. 8 Physically, the record items run the gamut from slave manumission reports and slave ship manifests at Xavier University in New Orleans, to the reports of the Liberian interests of the Pennsylvania Colonization Society at Lincoln University; from the papers of Thomas Clarkson, the British abolitionist, at Atlanta University, to those of J.E.K. Aggrey on file at Livingstone College. Other outstanding collections include materials concerning black American missionaries housed at the Stewart Missionary Foundation for Africa, the Gammon Theological College, and the Interdenominational Theological College in Atlanta; the Campbell and Hoffman papers on African agriculture at Tuskegee Institute; the private papers of American Board missionaries in southern Africa at Talladega College; the James H. Robinson papers at the Amistad at Dillard University; the Holtby papers concerning the “rights for black South Africans” at Fisk University; and the Cartwright papers regarding the formation of the University of Nigeria at the Amistad Research Center. Howard University, Morehouse College, and Hampton Institute, in particular, note holdings documenting the experiences of African students in the United States. 9

These materials represent only a fraction of what may be Undescribed in black college libraries. Of course some schools would have been more interested and involved in African affairs than others, but the unexpected
discovery of a letter from Harry Thuku, the Kenya protest leader, to Secretary of the Tuskegee Institute10 and a holograph from Julius Nyerere, now president of Tanzania, to Arthur Gray of Talladega College11 leaves one with at the least a reasonable hope that valuable historical records are extant but largely unknown at many black institutions. There is, moreover, clear evidence of real potential for the acquisition of important Africana manuscripts in private hands by black colleges and universities. Experience has demonstrated genuine interest among black Americans in depositing their records with black institutions. It may be valid to assume that black potential donors have pretended to support a professionally-run manuscript program in a black institution over one in a white university or state agency, especially in the South. Experience also suggests that few Americans prominent in African affairs, black or otherwise, have been approached with regard to their records. Even the large organizations such as the major mission societies, whom one would expect to be sensitive and concerned for the preservation of the private papers of their personnel, have seldom been approached. Given the absence of organized collection competition and donor receptivity to appeals from black institutions, there is indeed real potential for substantial acquisition.

What is required, of course, are sufficient staff and equipment to meet these opportunities. Here the problems of black institutions are hardly unique. Administrators of all financially-pressed colleges and universities often consider archival programs as luxuries. Where archivists are appointed, they are frequently librarians without archival training who are asked to sandwich archival duties in among full-time library responsibilities. Others serving as de facto archivists are largely untrained, and may fail to grasp either the conceptual or practical manifestations of their tasks. Grant support, such as that to eight predominantly black institutions through a consortium, the Alabama Center for Higher Education (ACHE), may initiate archival programs of real accomplishment, but even then the previously-mentioned personnel difficulties persist, along with the more serious question of what happens to these programs when grant funding ceases.

Fifty-two institutions may well have reported to the Directory of Afro-American Resources that they maintained archives, but this should not be taken to mean that there were active archival and manuscript programs or even that there were archivists or systematic records management efforts. In fact many institutions do not know what they have. Furthermore, those records that have been preserved may not be properly housed. Files on
African students of a half-century ago can languish unattended— with their value to Africanists unrecognized—in a corner of the registrar’s office. If such circumstances continue, Africana materials at black institutions will remain unknown, and opportunities for Africana manuscript acquisitions will pass untaken.

While it is vital that Africanists and archivists make a joint commitment to improve this critical situation, what is to be done is not at all clear. Archivists cannot be placed at many institutions without significant financial support from outside sources. Grant support appears to offer a partial answer, but it is short-term and must limit its focus to existing records that can be arranged, processed, and made available to researchers within the duration of the grant. In any case, a host institution must provide for the new repository and agree to assure support for the program as grant funds recede. An effort at archival consciousness-raising is certainly long overdue. The more active archival programs at black colleges and universities, or cooperative structures modeled after that of the Institute for Services to Education, might sponsor education programs for administrators, librarians, historians, and other faculty to stimulate a concern for preservation of records and a search for solutions to practical dilemmas hindering preservation. One would anticipate the active participation of the Archives/Library Committee of the African Studies Association and of Africanists associated with the Society of American Archivists in such an effort. Regional and statewide organizations of Africanists and of archivists would prove useful channels for constructive efforts at the local level. Working in close cooperation with black institutions, these professionals could assist with thorough personal surveys of Africana, and provide consulting services for institutions which cannot now maintain full-time archival and manuscript programs. Doubtless there are other possibilities.

This paper, then, is not meant to be an exercise in negativism but in realism. It stems from a basic excitement generated by the realization of the immense possibilities open to black institutions and by a recognition of the natural prerogatives of these institutions to seek to contribute, through the preservation of records, to our understanding of Africa and of African-black American interrelationships. We have only to recognize the obstacles, and to accept them as challenges.


3 This is probably a deceptive figure. Archival materials probably exist but are not being preserved systematically, nor has staff been designated for that purpose. It is likely that there is considerable overlap between those stating that they had no archives and the fifty-two which indicated the existence of archival materials.


5 Those replying positively included Dillard, Livingstone, Talladega, and Tougaloo; she visited Atlanta University. Personal communication from Ms. South, 28 July 1977.

6 See, e.g., Guide to Manuscripts and Archives in the Negro Collection of Trevor Arnett Library, Atlanta University (Atlanta, 1971); "Manuscript Collections in the Amistad Research Center," (New Orleans: Dillard University, Jan. 1974), mimeo.; "Original Resources in Black Studies" (Talladega: Talladega College, 1972); and "A Guide to the Special Collections and Archives" (Tuskegee Institute, 1974).

7 Amistad Research Center, 76-1796 and 76-1801; Fisk, 76-1447; Howard, 62-4286 and 62-4291; and Talladega, 72-1284.

8 King, p. 419.

9 For details about the manumission reports, see Schatz, p. 133; about the slave ship manifests at Xavier, the Pennsylvania Colonization Society, and the papers of Thomas Clarkson, the British abolitionist, see Duignan, pp. 132, 52 and 5 respectively; about J.E.K. Aggrey and black American missionary efforts from the Atlanta theological programs, see King, p. 424; for African agricultural materials in the Thomas Monroe Campbell and John Wesley Hoffman papers, see "A Guide to the Special Collections and Archives" (Tuskegee Institute); for American Board missionaries in southern Africa, the James H. Robinson papers, and the Winifred Holtby papers, see the NUCMC, 72-1284, 76-1801, and 76-1447; for the Marguerite Dorsey Cartwright papers, see "Manuscript Collections in the Amistad Research Center." For information about the African student records at Howard, see Duignan, p. 33; at Morehouse and Hampton, see King, pp. 423-4. It is worth noting that the Amistad Research Center provided microfilm copies of the records concerning the formation of the University of Nigeria for Nigerian archives; this was of particular importance after the destruction of many of those records during the Biafran war.
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10 Thuku to secy., Tuskegee Institute, Sept. 8, 1921, rpt. in Kenneth J. King, “The American Background of the Phelps-Stokes Commissions and Their Influences in Education in East Africa, Especially in Kenya,” (Diss, Edinburgh Univ., 1968) pp. 405-8.

11 Nyerere to Arthur Gray, Jan. 4, 1957, TC/Adm. 4/14/2/31/2, Archives of Talladega College, Talladega College Historical Collections, Talladega, Alabama.

JOIN THE SOCIETY OF GEORGIA ARCHIVISTS

The Society of Georgia Archivists invites all persons interested in the field of archives to join. Annual memberships effective with the 1977 membership year (beginning January 1) are:

- Regular ................ $ 7.50
- Contributing ............ 15.00
- Sustaining ............... 30.00
- Patron ................... More than $30.00
- Organizational
  Subscriptions ............. 7.00

Memberships include GEORGIA ARCHIVE, the SGA Newsletter and notice of the quarterly meetings. ALL MEMBERSHIPS ARE TAX DEDUCTIBLE.

To join and receive GEORGIA ARCHIVE, return the application brochure enclosed.
THE ACT SURVEY ON PROFESSIONAL ISSUES

Archie Motley

In the spring of 1978 a questionnaire was distributed to 125 archivists by ACT, an informal caucus within the Society of American Archivists. The survey was designed to elicit responses on a number of important issues facing the profession today, including certification of archivists, accreditation of archival education programs, minority employment, the status of women in the profession, and grants. A total of 44 persons responded to the survey. A summary of the responses follows.

CERTIFICATION OF ARCHIVISTS:

Q. Should archivists be certified? Why?

29 respondents favor certification; 7 oppose it at this time; 4 others oppose it outright.

Respondents favoring certification felt that it was an essential step towards full recognition as a profession. Lacking certification and established standards of competence, archives can only claim professional status.

29 respondents feel that formal education should be a factor in the certification process; 1 that perhaps it should; 1 did not feel it should be a factor.

17 archivists favor a rigorous examination for archival certification; 1 a rigorous exam eventually; and 2 favor a less-rigorous test. 22 respondents feel the SAA should administer the examination.

Q. If archival certification becomes a reality, should there be a "grandperson clause" to confer automatically certification on all current working archivists with a specified period of work experience?

20 archivists feel there should be some sort of "grandperson" clause in the certification process that would automatically confer certification on an

Archie Motley is Curator of Manuscripts at the Chicago Historical Society and a longtime member of ACT, an informal caucus of "activists" within the Society of American Archivists (SAA). He served as editor of the ACT newsletter for 1978.
archivist with a specified amount of on-the-job experience; 8 others favor such a clause if other specific conditions are met; 12 respondents oppose a "grandperson" clause.

Q. Who should determine the criteria for archival employment?

27 respondents feel employers should set the criteria for archival employment in their shops, with a number of people noting that employers will always do so no matter what the certification criteria are. 22 feel the SAA should determine the criteria for archival employment. 4 feel the educational training institution should have a say in the matter. (Several respondents stated that both the employer and the SAA should have a voice in the matter, with the SAA establishing criteria and employers adapting them to suit their own operations if necessary.)

15 archivists feel that professional positions should be open to non-certified archivists; 3 others feel they should be open only for the time being. 16 respondents feel that professional positions should be closed to the non-certified.

Q. If archival certification standards are established, should they apply equally to all archivists whether they work for the university archives, private historical societies, church or business archives, state or municipal governments, the National Archives and Records Service, etc.?

32 respondents feel that the same certification standards should be applicable to all archivists; 6 do not; 2 others would make allowances in special instances.

Q. Should archivists form professional or trade unions?

27 respondents feel that archivists should not form their own trade or professional union; 9 feel they should; 4 others that perhaps they should.

ACCREDITATION OF ARCHIVAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS:

Q. Should archival education programs be accredited? Why?

Q. Who should accredit archival education programs?

42 people favor accreditation; 2 are opposed at this time; 38 feel that the SAA should be the chief accrediting body.
Q. How would you prefer to see archival education programs established?

Q. What would you care to see offered in archival education programs?

24 people favor Archival Science as a separate academic curriculum, although a number question its practicality in a university structure; 4 oppose archival science as a separate curriculum.

34 would like to see Archival Science as part of a graduate program in History; 1 would not want to do this necessarily.

22 respondents would care to have Archival Science as part of a graduate program in Library Science; 3 would perhaps like this; 6 objected to such a program.

Q. If archival education programs are accredited, should professional positions be open to people who have not completed an accredited program?

18 archivists feel that professional positions should be open to those who have not completed an archival training program; 15 feel that these positions should not be open to such people; 8 archivists feel that some professional positions should be open to people who have not completed an archival training program.

18 respondents feel that competent sub-professionals should be permitted to advance to professional positions even if they have not completed an archival training program; 9 feel they should be allowed to so advance if they pass a certifying examination; 7 archivists feel that sub-professionals should not be allowed to advance to professional positions if they have not completed an archival education program.

25 archivists see no elitism in barring people with less than graduate degrees from archival professional positions; 14 respondents see an elitist danger in this respect; 2 others see a possible danger.

36 respondents favor certification and accreditation because they would improve the caliber of people employed in the profession and the quality of service offered the public; 3 do not favor C & A for this reason.

25 archivists favor C & A because they would be a useful bargaining factor
as regards improvements in wages and working conditions; 4 do not favor C&A for this reason.

10 favor C&A as a means to establish a professional class of archivists who have met certain education and examination requirements; 15 do not favor C&A for this reason. (In the three cases above, some respondents answered "yes" or "no" to more than one possibility.)

MINORITY EMPLOYMENT:

Q. In light of the very few Black, Latino, Oriental, and so-called "third-world" archivists in the U.S. and Canada, what should the SAA and other archival organizations do to improve this situation?

The term "special efforts" employed in the questionnaire doesn’t quite meet Descartes’ standards for clarity and distinction, but 25 people responded that archival education programs should make "special efforts" to recruit minority people for their programs; 2 gave this goal a qualified endorsement; 3 opposed making "special efforts" in this area.

16 respondents feel that a certain number of archival education program scholarships should be set aside for members of minority groups; 3 others favor this action conditionally; 13 oppose such a move, chiefly on the grounds that to do so would constitute reverse discrimination.

THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE PROFESSION:

Q. Do you feel that women are currently getting a fair shake in the archival workplace and in professional archival organizations? (Elaborate.)

18 archivists feel that women are getting a fair shake in the profession at this time; 21 do not, many noting unfairness in the top levels of employment and in salaries. (Many respondents gave qualified answers to this question.) 11 women feel women are not getting a fair shake, 5 feel they are. 10 men feel women are getting a fair deal, 9 do not. 4 anonymous respondents all feel women are getting a fair deal at this time.

Q. Should the SAA follow the lead of the growing number of major professional organizations who have refused to hold their national meetings in those states which have not ratified
the Equal Rights Amendment, and move the SAA's 1979 annual meeting from Chicago to a city in a state which has ratified this proposed constitutional amendment?

21 archivists would like to see the SAA move its 1979 convention out of Chicago to protest Illinois’ failure to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment to the U. S. Constitution; 17 replied that the convention should remain in Chicago, several declaring that such a political protest should not be introduced into the matter of annual meeting site selection; 5 regard the question as moot. 10 women feel the convention should be moved, 5 women do not, and 1 woman regarded the question as moot. 11 men were opposed to moving the convention, 8 favor moving it, and 4 men regard it as a moot question.

GRANTS:

Q. What suggestions do you have for the kinds of grants to be awarded?

18 respondents were generally satisfied with the grants that have been issued so far; 6 archivists expressed some reservations and suggestions.

Q. Since they are taxpayer supported, should both the NEH and the NHPRC also issue regular reports on the total number of proposals not funded as well as on those funded, specifying the kinds (processing, field work, publication, conservation, etc.) of proposals involved; the kinds of institutions (historical societies, universities, etc.) submitting them; the geographic areas of the country from which all proposals have been received; and the total amounts of money requested and the amounts actually funded in the various categories of archival work and in the various regions of the country?

26 people feel that the NEH & the NHPRC should issue reports not only on the number and kinds of proposals funded but on those proposals not funded as well, so as to provide a better picture of the grant-proposal situation to those institutions that plan to submit grants. 2 others feel that perhaps information on grants not funded should also be disseminated. 4 archivists feel that the NEH and the NHPRC should not report on proposals not funded.

Q. Should the NHPRC be decentralized so that money would be
allocated directly to various regions of the country so that the final money-awarding decisions (actually the whole ball-game) would be made on the local rather than the national level?

19 archivists oppose the decentralization of the NHPRC; 4 feel the NHPRC should be decentralized; 4 others feel that the agency could be decentralized in some instances.

13 respondents feel that the NEH should have more grass-roots people on its final review board; 2 feel that perhaps the agency should do this; 5 feel the NEH final review board is fine as is.

12 respondents saw possible dangers in having a relatively small number of people on the NEH final review board that makes grant decisions affecting the entire country; 1 felt that perhaps there could be problems in this regard; 9 respondents saw nothing wrong with the present setup.

Q. It has been suggested that if it is at all possible, grant proposals should be for more than one year’s duration to provide archivists with employment for a longer period of time. Do you favor this approach as a means to assist the floating group of archivists who now have to find another job after only one year’s work?

To provide grant-paid archivists longer terms of employment, 17 archivists favor the awarding of grants on a two-year rather than one-year basis whenever practical. 9 oppose this, some of them stating it would lead to submission of inflated grant proposals; 5 said the matter depends on the goals of the projects in question.

15 respondents feel that some archival institutions will curtail their own budgets to rely on grant money for the performance of their archival operations; 5 others feel this may be the case. 12 archivists feel this will not transpire.

12 archivists said that those institutions known to have reduced their own archival staff should be eligible to receive grant money; 8 others feel that they probably should be allowed to receive such funds. 7 respondents feel such institutions should not receive grant money; 3 others noted it would be highly impractical to prove whether an institution had reduced its archival budget and/or to enforce a grant-denial sanction on them.
Editor's note: A summary of the findings shows that the respondents strongly supported certification of archivists, accreditation of archival education programs, and "special efforts" to increase minority employment in the profession. The issues "Status of Women" and "Grants" did not achieve a similar consensus. The respondents were almost evenly divided on the matters of discrimination against women in the archival profession and whether the 1979 convention should be moved from Chicago. Finally, the respondents were evenly divided concerning grants, except feeling strongly that the NHPRC should not be decentralized and that both NHPRC and NEH should report on grant requests turned down as well as on those funded.
BOOK REVIEWS


As noted by President Jimmy Carter in his foreword to A History of Georgia, dramatic changes have come to the state since the 1930s when E. Merton Coulter first published his classic study.* The purpose of this new multi-author survey of the state's past is to update the perspective and coverage of Coulter's work and to present a balanced account of the chief eras and trends in Georgia's history. Treatment of the period prior to 1820 has been markedly reduced, while discussion of the period since 1890 has doubled, and the work gives more adequate treatment to economics and blacks. The list of sources, as well as textual coverage, is updated from that in Coulter. The bibliography is enriched with annotations lacking in the older work, and includes unpublished dissertations but no reference to the location of major manuscript repositories.

In this new history of Georgia one can find interesting accounts of colonial recreation and medicine, the Indian agent Return John Meigs, the humorist Bill Arp, the convict leasing system, the story of Coca-Cola, and the growth of Atlanta. The book includes an outstanding treatment of the Civil War era, which fills gaps left by Coulter regarding black life under slavery and the home front during the war. The work also deals dramatically with the impact of the New Deal on Georgia, twentieth-century developments in education, and recent economic trends. The reader will have to go elsewhere, however, for details on Henry Grady, Rebecca Felton, and Ralph McGill; for adequate treatment of Indian culture, Georgia lifestyles, and the role of women; and for sufficient explanation of constitutional changes and the influence of the Progressives.

Varying in writing style and emphasis, six highly qualified scholars have surveyed the major periods of the state's history: Phinizy Spalding (colonial period); Kenneth Coleman (1775-1820); F. N. Boney (1820-1865); Charles E. Wynes (1865-1890); William F. Holmes (1890-1940); and
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Numan V. Bartley (1940 to the present). Within a broad chronological framework, all but the first section of the work is organized by topics such as economics, politics, society. The chapters providing economic coverage are among the strongest, best-written in the book. The topical approach is effective, making it possible to follow trends and make comparisons as well as to understand each time period as a whole, and the arrangement will facilitate use of the book by readers and teachers. Though at some points the presentation becomes disjointed, imprecise, or judgmental, for the most part the book is characterized by a solid and interesting narration of past events.

After an impressionistic overview of Georgia topography, the historical narrative begins with Phinizy Spalding’s account of trustee and royal rule. Particularly interesting is the detailed description of the voyage and arrival of the first group of settlers in 1733 who, contrary to tenacious myths, were the result of “the most selective winnowing process of any British colony in America.” Conditions under trustee rule are judged to have been not as “bleak” as has sometimes been claimed, and by 1750 “a marked upturn in trade, population, and affluence” had taken place. This turning point in the colony’s prosperity, Spalding emphasizes, was passed before the colony was turned over to the crown.

Kenneth Coleman terms Georgia’s participation in the American Revolution “inevitable,” with “most” Georgians favoring independence by the spring of 1776. Coleman believes that the Revolutionary War had a salutary effect on Georgia, speeding up political and economic change and bringing more democracy. The War of 1812 gave further impetus to the rapid growth of the Georgia economy. The westward expansion of Georgia brought wild land speculation and such episodes as the Yazoo land fraud, which is well explained by this account. Coleman notes one major flaw: the lottery system adopted in 1803 enabled land to go as cheaply as ten cents an acre and produced little income for the state.

During the antebellum period, as F. N. Boney points out, Georgia continued to experience rapid economic expansion, both in agriculture and in industry. Boney presents a favorable view of plantation agriculture and states that “the planter elite was composed primarily of hard-headed businessmen skilled at managing a flexible, profitable system of slave labor.” On the eve of the Civil War, Georgia led the South in textile manufacturing and prospects seemed bright indeed in the prosperous state. This author does an admirable job of leading the reader through a political maze he
describes as "fluid, inconsistent, and rather illogical." Noting that "the politicians were much more excited about the sectional struggle than the voters," the author claims that Georgians were moderate and basically unionist and thus not unified in the step to secession.

The Civil War cut short cultural and economic progress in Georgia and brought about what Charles Wynes describes as a "revolution in labor" but not in land ownership. The new class of sharecroppers were "little more than serfs" and the new factory workers "coughed out their lives in the lint-filled atmosphere of the cotton mills." Reconstruction is presented as a mild experience for Georgia and as less significant for the state's development than the Bourbon years. The Bourbons, with their "chamber-of-commerce mentality more popularly known as the 'creed of the New South,'" saddled the state with a one-party system, the white supremacy issue, and an unwillingness to spend state funds for public services.

The 1890s brought hard times to the state, and William Holmes describes the agricultural picture as a bleak one with cotton now an economic "ailment." Generating little but excitement, the Populists failed in their efforts to create an interracial coalition on the basis of shared farm problems. By the 1920s Georgia farmers again faced a crisis. Governor Eugene Talmadge showed little insight into the farmers' problems and vigorously opposed the New Deal. Though New Deal programs could not eliminate many of the long-standing problems, they did produce "profound" changes in the state's agricultural system.

Since World War II, Georgia has undergone more basic change than in any other time during her history as a state. Numan V. Bartley quantified this process of modernization and through his statistics effectively tells the story of Georgia's transition from a rural to an urban, industrial state. Since 1945, farm tenancy has collapsed, industry has grown rapidly, and Atlanta has emerged as the "banking, financial, and administrative hub" of the southeast. The state's voters have been left "disoriented" by the "seismic shocks" to the political system, such as the abolition of the county-unit system, the reapportionment of the legislature, and the emergence of an opposition party. Bartley emphasizes the conflicts that occurred as Georgians tried to adjust to the vast economic and political changes. He views Georgia as a paradox, committed to the future but clinging to the past, and concludes that by the 1970s "the material environment had changed more fundamentally than had Georgians themselves."
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It is to be hoped that other governors will encourage such historical enterprises as this latest history of Georgia. This work allows the reader to draw conclusions about the state’s status and should prove useful to those charting the course for the future. A History of Georgia supplements but does not replace the book by Coulter. The two works belong together in libraries as indispensable reference books for those investigating Georgia’s past.

Louisburg College

George-Anne Willard


This book by the counsel to the Bowker Company, a subsidiary of the Xerox Corporation, “is intended primarily for use by publishers, libraries, educators, and authors, who regularly, or from time to time, have need for direct access to information about” the Copyright Act of 1976. It is the most comprehensive and useful work on the subject that this reviewer has seen. Clearly written, with a welcome absence of legal obfuscation, the book analyzes the provisions of the new law for the benefit of concerned laymen.

After an introductory overview, Johnston devotes thirteen chapters to fuller discussion, covering different aspects of the new law in each. Those of greatest interest to archivists are on copyrightable subject matter; registration; ownership, transfer, and licenses; exclusive rights of copyright owners; copyright infringement remedies; copyright duration; fair use (section 107); and library reproduction (section 108). Useful appendices include the text of the new law; the text of the 1909 law with amendments and notes; fair use and library reproduction guidelines developed concurrently with the congressional discussion of the new law; a table of limits on exclusive rights; cross-references between the 1909 and 1976 laws; application forms for copyright registration; and selected copyright office regulations. So much essential information in convenient format would make the book a worthwhile addition to the staff reference shelf of any manuscript repository even without the author’s valuable exposition of the law.
The notes and reference section provides citations to the hearings and reports preceding passage of the law, explains and supplements statements in the text, and refers the reader to other literature on certain aspects of copyright. Many readers will wish that the author had included a full and up-to-date bibliography on copyright in general. Such a reference aid would have been an appropriate addition further enhancing an already valuable work.

Archivists may wish that the author had specifically addressed their problems and brought together in one convenient section all discussion pertaining to unpublished materials, but it is understandable that Johnston chose to serve a wider audience. Archivists must therefore use the book as they use the law itself, seeking information applicable to manuscripts in all pertinent sections. In a few cases archivists may justly criticize the author for not specifying how the law applies to unpublished materials. At a minimum, at points where the law is ambiguous, the author’s statement of that fact and his enlightening discussion of probable interpretation and effect would have been welcome.

The sections of the 1976 law of most immediate concern to archivists in their day-to-day work are 107 and 108, pertaining to fair use and to the photocopying of materials administered by libraries and archives. Here, like the law itself and almost all persons who write on the subject, Johnston does not specifically discuss the problems archivists face in handling unique materials. The ambiguities of several paragraphs of section 108, particularly the question of how much of that section applies to manuscripts, are a major concern of archivists. Johnston does not, as do some authorities, specifically interpret paragraphs 108 (d) and (e) to apply only to published works, but neither does he make it clear that he considers manuscripts to be covered by these paragraphs.

There is a significant omission in the chapter on ownership, transfer, and termination. Johnston did not mention two important provisions, one permitting an author to transfer copyright by will and the other stipulating that such a transfer is not subject to the new right of termination. He discusses termination rights at some length, particularly the complicated problem that could arise if the designated heirs to the rights of a deceased author (the surviving spouse and children) were not the persons the author would wish to have own these rights. He speculates that timely re-negotiation of transfer contracts could prevent or moderate termination but did not consider whether a provision in a will could solve the problem. Clarification
and understanding of these details may be important to archivists who normally acquire copyright for their repositories along with gifts of the manuscripts as physical objects and Johnston’s failure to discuss the effect of wills is unfortunate.

Until a later work provides both a complete exposition of all aspects of the new law and a full discussion of its effect on unpublished manuscripts, archivists will find Copyright Handbook an invaluable aid in spite of its disappointing silence on some points of special archival concern.

Southern Historical Collection
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Archives and Manuscripts: Arrangement and Description. By David B. Gracy II. (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1977. Pp. v, 49. Bibliography, index. $4.00 members. $6.00 non-members.)


Having standard works which have become so generally accepted as Lucille M. Kane’s A Guide to the Care and Administration of Manuscripts and Kenneth W. Duckett’s Modern Manuscripts, one wonders why manuscript librarians and archivists feel the need for additional introductory manuals providing basic instructions in processing, preserving, and servicing collections of personal papers. Apparently lacking the security that their colleagues in academic libraries and historical societies find in consistent application of the prescribed methodologies of librarianship, however, archivists and manuscript curators continue to seek guidance in organizing manuscript collections. Two of the more recent additions to the corpus of professional literature related to the operations of manuscript repositories were issued in response to such requests for assistance. Although neither provides fresh insights nor new information, each of the two new manuals is an adequate and concise instructional guide which, had not the work of...
Kane, Duckett, Theodore R. Schellenberg, Ruth Bordin and Robert M. Warner preceded it, would be considered a major contribution to systematizing the techniques of manuscript librarianship.

Two years before the publication of Duckett’s treatment of the administration of personal papers, the Society of American Archivists appointed an ad hoc committee to evaluate the areas of greatest need for additional archival publications. In response to solicitations for advice the committee gave high priority to a series of manuals related to archival functions. Funding from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission enabled the Society to publish the Basic Manual Series under the general editorship of C. F. W. Coker. David B. Gracy was given the task of preparing Archives and Manuscripts: Arrangement and Description: a brief manual devoted to evaluating and describing various methods of processing both archival groups and manuscript collections.

The Society is to be commended for undertaking its publication series and Gracy for the solid work which he prepared in response to the need identified at the time his manual was begun. Noting in his preface that numerous articles have been published in professional literature describing procedures followed by individual repositories, Gracy indicates that he tried to resist the temptation to pick and choose what appeared to him to be the best of these procedures. Rather than construct a model system, he recognizes that local conditions may preclude uniformity of practice and attempts only to present a basic guide which can be adapted to local situations. His readers, however, profit by the fact that Gracy is more discriminating than he apparently intended to be. Whereas other manuals concentrate on telling their readers what should be done, Gracy’s has the added feature of identifying certain procedures which may be especially inappropriate in dealing with specific types of collections and reference needs.

The Manuscripts Collections Processing Manual prepared by Susan Beth Wray, Vesta Lee Gordon and Edmund Berkeley, Jr., of the Manuscripts Department of the Alderman Library at the University of Virginia is an unbound, in-house staff training manual completed in 1976 and copied for sale in response to numerous requests from archivists seeking information on how the outstanding material housed in this major repository is administered. Conversational in style, the manual is intended for the novice processor assigned to organize, describe, clean, and box personal papers. Except for a good description of the admirable preservation procedures that
the University of Virginia has developed, the authors of this manual offer little information not found elsewhere. However, they have done an excellent job of stating basic procedures and instructions in language those new to work with manuscripts can understand. Their comprehensive glossary, comprising more than half of the manual, defines professional jargon in terms even the layman can appreciate.

Unlike other printed sources intended as guides for the professional manuscript librarian and administrator, this training manual appears to be directed to student assistants or new employees with little or no previous exposure to working with fragile, unique research materials. Since it seems to assume that its readers have at best only a passing knowledge of archival procedures, the manual initiates new employees into the technical mysteries of processing and preserving primary source material. Other repositories would do well to orient their staffs so thoroughly.

As manuscript repositories expand their holdings with the acquisition of large, twentieth century collections, they are more and more frequently encountering problems long faced by archivists who have dealt routinely with masses of records too bulky to permit the intensive item by item treatment that manuscript curators have cultivated. Since, as Duckett and Gracy point out, archivists and curators now share the inventory as their basic approach to processing and describing modern material, it seems appropriate and timely that rather than devote additional efforts to the preparation of manuals describing local practices or instructing professionals in general processing techniques, prospective authors should pay due respect to the works that already exist in these areas and direct their attention to considering ways to improve cooperation among those dealing with primary source materials and to refine the standardization so needed in the preparation of useful inventories.

Both the traveling researcher and the uncertain archivist or curator would profit if the profession were to establish a mutually applicable and acceptable descriptive methodology. The Society of American Archivists has moved in this direction by issuing a manual on inventories, but the profession’s diverse membership must be willing to support and adhere to cataloging and processing guidelines before such standards can become normative. That it is often much easier to find an obscure printed pamphlet than an important block of unpublished material indicates that something is amiss in archivy. One wonders if the fault can be traced to a profession lacking sufficient instructional material, or to individual archivists and...
curators unwilling to conform to standards which, though possibly needing modification, are already at hand and adequately described in several readily available texts.

Virginia State Library

Paul I. Chestnut

Technical Leaflet Series. (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History. Author, title, pages vary. $.40 to members, $.50 to non-members.)

Over the last several years the American Association for State and Local History has published a series of technical leaflets "for the purpose of bringing useful information to persons working in the state and local history movement." The series, which includes one hundred and two leaflets, covers ten basic categories: historical societies and programs; publicity and public relations; administering collections; historic preservation, restoration and interpretation; collection conservation; history museum exhibits; audio-visual programs; publications; historical and genealogical research; and crafts. In the limited space available in a pamphlet format, these leaflets offer a good introduction to the principle and practice of the work involved.

Several of these categories relate directly to the major activities of archivists who, regardless of the nature and function of the institution employing their skills, have traditionally been involved with "Historical Society Records," "Manuscript Appraisal," "Conserving Local Archival Materials," "Rare Book and Paper Repair," "Microfilming Historical Records," "Filing Photographs," "Cataloging Ephemera" and the accompanying problems solved by a "Glossary of Legal Terminology," "Security" and "Securing Grant Support." Even the experienced archivist, facing new types of materials for the first time, perhaps photographs or one of the innumerable varieties of ephemera, will find several of these brief but descriptive essays extremely helpful for a beginning.
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"Use of Social Statistics," "Methods of Research," "Genealogical Research" and other leaflets concerning research methodologies and genealogical research (particularly the lineage charts) are of immense value to the many amateur historians who frequent the archivist's precincts in search of their own heritage, familial or communal. How helpful it would be to have a brief guide to hand the novice so that he or she might better focus the essential questions before beginning work.

These technical leaflets are of most benefit to the archivist in precisely those activities for which archivists do not expect to be called upon and for which they have received little or no training in library schools or archival workshops. This holds particularly true for those working in institutions of a smaller scale than state departments of history and archives or large state-wide historical societies which have diversified staffs and departmentalized operations. The lone, needy archivist, toiling away in local societies, public libraries, and smaller academic institutions, will surely find a helpful pamphlet a friend indeed. The technical leaflets' aid and comfort is immeasurable, a ready reference for the early stages of a project and a bibliographic source for locating further assistance. Admittedly some of these areas are familiar to some of us, but what is one person's on-going project is another's learning experience. And while deferring to experts is not always the wisest choice, the experienced practitioner's advice may often provide us with a first, halting step.

Clearly, all possibilities are not covered. Yet a number of the more interesting, if not innovative, projects are topics of detailed discussion: "Tape-recording Local History," "Photographing Tombstones," "Cemetery Transcriptions" and "Collecting Historical Artifacts." With acquisition comes the tasks of "Documenting Collections," "The Appraisal of Objects in Historical Collections," and "Storing Your Collections."

Ultimately, though, collecting, description, and conservation are of limited value if the collection's existence remains unknown to the public. Scholar and concerned laymen alike will profit greatly from careful "Exhibit Planning." "Preparing Your Exhibits" requires attractive "Designing" with thoughtful consideration given to case arrangement and the materials used and to providing "Exhibit Labels" that clarify the materials shown by placing them within the context of a cohesive narrative.

Without publicity, "Reaching the Public" becomes impossible. To make the world outside the institution aware of an exhibit and of the wealth
of materials not shown will involve "Publishing," for which the leaflets dealing with "Making and Correcting Copy," "Spotting Mechanical Errors in Proof" and the financial benefits of "Phototypesetting" are most instructive.

The job of the archivist is an increasingly more varied one, often requiring the practitioner to be something just short of a Renaissance person. In fulfilling this many-faceted role, the technical leaflets offer helpful guidance for the ubiquitous archivist-in-training.

Robert Scott Small Library
College of Charleston

Ralph Melnick
Declassification of about 600 million pages of federal government documents is expected in the next decade as a result of Executive Order 12065, signed by President Carter June 29. The new order requires classification review after 20 years, instead of the 30 years called for under the previous order, issued by President Nixon in 1972. The National Archives will seek additional funding for fiscal year 1979 for the accelerated declassification effort.

* * *

The House Committee on Government Operations reported legislation to the full House in July which would make presidential records public property, while allowing the outgoing chief executive to control access for up to ten years. So far, the White House has not supported the bill, preferring a fifteen-year period of presidential control.

* * *

The International Council on Archives is sponsoring International Archives Week in the fall of 1979. The national week in the United States is tentatively scheduled for November 4 - 10. Suggested activities include special meetings, exhibits, publications, dedications, and open houses. Activities will be coordinated by the Society of American Archivists.

* * *

The National Museum Act Advisory Council will accept grant applications from: museums; academic institutions offering courses in museum theory, practice, and skills; nonprofit professional museum-related organizations, institutions and associations engaged in activities designed to advance museum training, studies, and practices; and individuals employed or sponsored by the organizations described above. The National Museum Act of 1966 is administered by the Smithsonian Institution. Its objectives are to make possible continuing study of museum problems and opportunities in the United States and abroad, to encourage research on museum techniques, and to provide support for training career employees in museum practices. Additional information can be obtained from National Museum Act, Arts and Industries Building, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560. The telephone number is (202) 381-5512.
The Historic House Association of America was founded in March 1978 to assist private owners of historic houses, commercial buildings, churches, and other properties to solve the problems they face. A two-year study by the National Trust for Historic Preservation discovered that many of these owners were unaware of the availability of federal and state grant assistance geared to the problems of maintaining historic buildings. For further information write: Historic House Association of America, 740 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, DC 20006.

* * *

The National Conservation Advisory Council has endorsed recommendations urging that high priority be given to the needs of document preservation during the energy crisis. The NCAC emphasized the need to maintain stable levels of temperature and humidity. The American Association of Museums has prepared a review of energy management manuals and the NCAC advises archival repositories to consult these for further information.

* * *

The Rochester Institute of Technology is presenting a seminar March 5 - 7, 1979, entitled "Preservation and Restoration of Photographic Images." The purpose of the seminar is to provide instruction in the preparation, processing, storage, and restoration of photographs of archival interest. Cost of the program is $195, which includes tuition, supplies, and special reference material. Those interested in the seminar may obtain registration information from William D. Siegfried, Training Director, College of Graphic Arts & Photography, Rochester Institute of Technology, One Lomb Memorial Drive, Rochester, NY 14623.

* * *

Twelve editors of National Historical Publications and Records Commission-sponsored projects met at the Franklin Roosevelt Library in April. Following discussion of a number of topics relating to editorial practices, the participants adopted a resolution appointing an ad hoc steering committee to investigate the possibility of creating an association of documentary editors. The steering committee invites suggestions concerning the nature and purpose of such an association. Suggestions should be sent to John Y. Simon, Editor, Papers of Ulysses S. Grant, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois 62901, or to Linda Grant DePauw, Editor, Documentary History of the First Federal Congress, George
Washington University, Washington, DC 20052. Frank G. Burke, Executive Director of NHPRC, has noted that with over 100 historical editing projects currently underway in the United States, there are editors numerous enough to support and justify such an association.

* * *

_The National Archives: America’s Ministry of Documents, 1934 - 1968_, by Donald R. McCoy, has been published by the University of North Carolina Press (437 pp., illus., $19.00). This is the first detailed history and analysis of the National Archives to be published since H.G. Jones’ _The Records of a Nation_.

* * *

The Society of American Archivists has moved to new headquarters in Chicago’s Loop. For the first time in the Society’s 42-year history it will be renting its own suite of offices, rather than occupying donated space. In a letter to members, SAA President Walter Rundell, Jr. noted that the Society’s need for space exceeds “what we can expect to receive as a donation from any single institution.” The new address is Society of American Archivists, 330 S. Wells Street, Suite 810, Chicago, Illinois 60606. The new telephone number is (312) 922-0140.

* * *

The SAA has received a grant of $31,038 from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for the preparation and publication of six new basic archival manuals. The subjects are administration, automation, exhibits, public programs, cartographic records and architectural drawings, and reprography. C. F. W. Coker, former editor of _The American Archivist_, will serve as editor for this series, as he did for the original five-manual series. _Georgia Archive’s_ editor Ann Pederson is preparing the manual on public programs and welcomes information from readers regarding “outreach” activities under way in their institutions.

The first five manuals: _Surveys_, by John Fleckner, _Appraisal and Accessioning_, by Maynard Brichford; _Arrangement and Description_, by David B. Gracy, II; _Reference and Access_, by Sue Holbert; and _Archival Security_, by Timothy Walch, are available from the SAA. The set of five is $12.00 for SAA members, $16.00 for others. Individual manuals are $3.00 for members, $4.00 for others. Order from the Society of American Archivists at the above address.
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SAA's Sixth Annual Archives Study Tour, Archives in the South Pacific, is scheduled for February 1979. Visits to public and private archives in Australia, New Zealand, and the Fiji Islands will be featured. All SAA members will receive a special mailing with tour details; others interested in the tour may write to the Society for information.

The Atlanta-based African-American Family History Association celebrated its first anniversary July 29, 1978, in Savannah. Organized to promote interest in black genealogy and family history, the Association has begun to expand its activities and is currently developing an exhibit, in conjunction with the Phoenix Arts and Theatre Company, of records, photographs, household items, textiles, implements, and any other items which relate to African-American life. The exhibit will be presented early in 1979. Persons with items to contribute are urged to contact Joann Martin, (404) 346-1287. The address of the Association is 2077 Bent Creek Way, S.W., Atlanta, GA 30311.

The Society of Georgia Archivists' slide/sound production, "A Very Fragile Resource: Our Documentary Heritage" has been reprogrammed and now has new narration and music. The narrator is Lynda Moore, News Director of WZGC-FM, Atlanta. Original guitar music, composed and played by Liz Getz, accompanies the narration. A grant from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission supported the development of the show, which takes viewers inside 20 of Georgia's leading archival institutions and explains the essential part records play in our lives, the types of work and responsibilities archives and libraries undertake in caring for historical materials, what community leaders and citizens can do to help preserve historical documents and support archival programs, and explores state and federal sources of technical and financial assistance for records preservation.

The presentation is available either for purchase or loan. A single projector version (viewing equipment not included), rents for $8.00 for one week and can be purchased for $78.00. This version, accompanied by a tape player and Carousel projector, can be rented for $28.00 as a convenience for those who do not have their own viewing equipment.
The slide/sound presentation is an excellent means to familiarize community groups with the problems, responsibilities, and accomplishments of archival institutions. Additional information on "A Very Fragile Resource" can be obtained by writing SGA Slide/Sound Presentation, Society of Georgia Archivists, Box 261, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

A new regional archival association was formed early this year in Alabama. Meeting in Birmingham in February, the Society of Alabama Archivists (SALA) elected permanent officers: President, Marving Whiting, Birmingham Public Library; Vice President, Leon Spencer, Talladega College; Secretary, Miriam Jones, Alabama State Archives; and Treasurer, Elizabeth Wells, Samford University. Three directors were also elected, to serve on the Executive Board along with the above-named officers. They are Alice Berta, Alabama State Archives; Joyce Lamont, University of Alabama; and Bill Sumners, Auburn University.

Membership in SALA is open to any person or institution interested in archives, manuscripts, or related fields. Dues are: $10.00 institution, $5.00 individual, $2.50 student. The Society reported 40 members and will publish an occasional newsletter, Access.

The Library of the University of Georgia reports that it has been victimized by an enterprising thief who takes advantage of interlibrary loans. Known variously as the Technologico Corteza, Instituto Technologico Americano, or the Universidad Anglo-Americano, using a post office box number in Mexico City, this "institution" is collecting a library specializing in automobiles and aviation. The interlibrary loan request slips are filled in by someone obviously familiar with interlibrary loan procedures. Most of the books lost by the University of Georgia, Reed College, Purdue University, USAF Academy, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology, and other academic libraries are out-of-print items.

The Richard B. Russell Memorial Library of the University of Georgia has completed processing and indexing 140 reels of film, 18 video tapes, 76 record discs, and 97 audio tapes documenting the political career of Richard B. Russell. The collection is now available for research and includes...
material used in the preparation in 1970 of a three-hour television documentary production.

* * *

A limited number of copies of *The Papers of William and Helen Sunday – 1882 [1888-1957] 1974*, n.d., *A Guide to the Microfilm Edition*, are available from the Archives of the Billy Graham Center, C.P.O. Box 607, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois 60187. The cost of the *Guide* is $4.00 plus forty cents postage. The microfilm edition of the Sunday Papers consists of 29 reels containing over 33,000 positives, including copies of correspondence, sermon transcripts, notes, and newspaper scrapbooks. The papers were filmed through a joint effort between the Billy Graham Center and Grace Schools, which houses the original documents.

* * *

The R.J. Taylor, Jr. Foundation has announced the publication of the second volume in its Colonial Records Series, *Abstracts of Georgia Colonial Book J., 1755 - 1762*. Compiled by George Fuller Walker, this volume contains bonds, bills of sale, deeds of gift, powers of attorney, contracts, shipping agreements, and many other types of documents relating to colonial life. The R.J. Taylor Foundation was founded in 1971 for the purpose of researching and publishing documentary materials relating to residents of pre-1851 Georgia. Other volumes available from the Foundation are: *Abstracts of Georgia Colonial Conveyance Book C-1, 1750 - 1761*, compiled by Frances Howell Beckemeyer (Colonial Records Series, Number 1); *Indexes to Seven State Census Reports for Counties in Georgia, 1838 - 1845*, compiled by Brigid S. Townsend (Census Series, Number 1); and *An 1800 Census for Lincoln County, Georgia*, compiled by Frank Parker Hudson (Census Series, Number 2). Publication this fall is anticipated for *1850 Federal Census: Gilmer County, Georgia* (Census Series, Number 3). Additional information can be obtained by writing to the R.J. Taylor, Jr. Foundation, P. O. Box 38176, Capitol Hill Station, Atlanta, Georgia 30334.

* * *

The Georgia Studies Symposium, a multi-disciplinary gathering interested in the people and culture of Georgia, will meet next at Georgia State University in Atlanta in February, 1980. The program committee invites proposals for sessions.

In order to present a broad and diversified program, each session
will be limited to seventy-five minutes and preferably include only two papers.

Please send all proposals to the chairman of the program committee:

Harvey H. Jackson
Department of Social Sciences
Clayton Junior College
Morrow, Georgia 30260

* * *

The 1978 Session of the Louisiana Legislature approved the appropriation of $7,000,000 to be used by the Secretary of State to construct a new Archives building in Baton Rouge. Representatives from the Office of the Secretary of State and from the Division of Administration met in the Office of Facility Planning to prepare for the purchase of a proper building site and to obtain an architect to draft necessary plans for the new Archives building. It is anticipated that construction will begin during fiscal year 1979-1980.

* * *

The University of South Carolina Press announces the publication of *The Papers of John C. Calhoun*, Volume XI, 1829-1832, edited by Clyde N. Wilson. The Calhoun Papers project is a joint venture of the South Caroliniana Society and the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, for whom the University Press serves as publisher.

* * *

Eight new rolls of computer output microfilm indexes to records in the South Carolina Archives are now available for research in the Search Room. Five rolls contain 150,000 selected index references and about 39,000 separate names, locations, and topics, most of which deal with land. A second temporary (partial) index to legislative papers, on three rolls, contains 90,000 selected index references to 14,000 separate names, locations and topics from petitions and reports from 1782-1830.

* * *

Fifty-nine people representing thirty states attended the National
Association of State Archivists and Records Administrators (NASARA) meeting in late July. The members elected their officers and new Board as follows: President — Samuel S. Silsby (Maine); Vice-President — F. Gerald Ham (Wis.); Secretary — Sandra Haug (N. Mex.); Treasurer — John Newman (Ind.); New Board member — Edward Weldon (N.Y.). Continuing Board members are: Louise H. Manarin (Va.), Cleo Hughes (Tenn.), James D. Porter (Ore.) and Charles E. Lee (S.C.), immediate past President.

* * *

Ron Chepesiuk, archivist of Winthrop College, announces the publication of A Guide to the Manuscript and Oral History Collections in the Winthrop College Archives and Special Collections. The publication features descriptions of a number of collections available for the study of women's history in South Carolina, particularly the history of home extension services and home economics. The guide sells for two dollars, payable to Winthrop College, and may be obtained by writing Guide, Archives and Special Collections, Dacus Library, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina 29733.

* * *

The Manuscripts Section of the Georgia Department of Archives and History has published a guide to a selection of its holdings related to women in history and contemporary society.

Women's Records: A Preliminary Guide was prepared in cooperation with The Women's Records Project of Georgia, Inc., (WRPG), a local organization which seeks to promote the preservation of historical materials relating to women in Georgia and the southeast. Dr. Darlene Roth, Director for Historical Research of the WRPG, originated the idea of the Guide and contributed her time as chief compiler. The illustrated, 88-page publication describes materials held in the Manuscripts Section of the state archives utilizing the format developed by the Women's History Sources Survey, a national project conducted by the University of Minnesota with funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The Guide will encourage the use of little-known materials documenting the roles of women as accomplished public individuals, as centers of domestic situations, and as part of social history in general.

Virginia Shadron, also of WRPG, served as co-compiler and indexer.
of the Guide. Archives staff members Peter Schinkel, Jeanne Thomas, Richard Bell, and Carl Erlicher shared the editorial, design, and layout responsibilities required to convert the manuscript into print.

The publication may be obtained for $2.00 pre-paid to the Georgia Department of Archives and History, 330 Capitol Avenue, S.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30334.

* * *

The Georgia Association of Historians welcomes new members. Dues are $4.00 per year ($2.00 for graduate students). The Association is concerned with all areas of historical endeavor. Members include junior college, college, and university professors, high school teachers, archivists, librarians, journalists, graduate students, and others involved in historical study. Send name, affiliation, interests, and dues to:

Dr. S. Fred Roach, Jr.
Secretary-Treasurer, GAH
History Department
Kennesaw College
Marietta, GA 30061

* * *

Since its inception in late 1975, through June 1978, the NHPRC has formally considered 316 records grant proposals, and recommended funding in whole or in part, for 155 of them. Applications totaling $8,194,427 have been considered by the Commission, with total funds recommended of $3,127,970. The amount of the average grant proposal was $26,000, while the average grant recommended was $20,200. Of the 316 proposals received, 267 were state projects, 21 regional projects, and 28 national projects. The Commission has funded slightly over 25 percent of the funding requested for national projects, about 33 percent for regional projects, and almost 40 percent of the state funding requests.

To facilitate applications for records grant projects, the Commission has recently prepared a new and expanded booklet, "Suggestions for Applicants." The pamphlet includes a discussion of records program application procedures, advice on the preparation of the proposal, a sample budget and cover sheet, a bibliography, and other information pertinent to the application process. To obtain a copy of this useful booklet, write Director, NHPRC, National Archives and Records Service, Washington, DC 20408.
Mississippi recently enacted legislation to protect libraries, museums, and archives from theft and vandalism. On July 1, 1978, it became a misdemeanor to "mutilate or unlawfully remove" any materials in the custody of public or private depositories. An employee of such an institution may detain and question a suspect if the staff member acts in good faith and in a reasonable manner. Testimony and advice on the legislation was provided by several staff members of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History.

A new study of electronic security systems for libraries was published in the July 1978 issue of *College and University Libraries*. "Evaluating the Effectiveness of an Electronic Security System" by James Michalko and Toby Heidtmen demonstrates the cost-effectiveness of such systems. The rate of loss of newly acquired items in the Van Pett Library of the University of Pennsylvania was reduced by 55 percent and overall collection loss was reduced by 39 percent. For every dollar the system cost, approximately $1.73 in benefits was returned. At that rate the system would be paid for in thirty-eight months.

Georgia Governor George Busbee has appointed four new members to the Heritage Trust Commission. Ms. Myrtle R. Davis and Dr. Marvin Goldstein of Atlanta, Mrs. Adelaide W. Ponder of Madison, and Ms. Anne G. Stroud of Albany began terms with the Commission on May 30, 1978.

The Local Assistance Grants Program of the Heritage Trust is seeking to expand its program for the years 1980-1984. The increased funding, if approved by the state legislature, would provide for the preservation of natural areas and the development of recreational opportunities, in addition to its present program of grants for the preservation of historic sites.

This spring the National Endowment for the Humanities decided to establish its own newspaper bibliographical and preservation program that will build upon the work accomplished over the past few years under the OAH's auspices. The U. S. Newspaper project is now in the process of preparing final reports to the NEH about the status of newspaper programs in each state.
The Endowment will soon be drafting the guidelines for its new newspaper program and these will become available for distribution sometime during the fall. To keep abreast of developments in the USNP under the NEH's aegis, contact Dr. George H. Farr, Jr., Assistant Director, Division of Research Grants, National Endowment for the Humanities, 806 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506; telephone (202) 724-1672. The Newspaper and Gazette Report, published by the Library of Congress under the editorship of Imre T. Jarmy, Newspaper Microfilming Coordinator, will continue to be an important source of information about developments in the national program as well as activities in the various states. In addition, the Organization of American Historians will retain a lively interest in the progress of the Endowment's program in establishing a national effort to bring newspapers under bibliographical control and promoting their preservation. Any comments you may wish to make about the new program as it evolves can most effectively be directed to Dr. Peterson, who is chairman of the OAH's Committee on Bibliographical and Research Needs, at his Cincinnati address: Eden Park 45202; telephone (513) 241-4622.

* * *

Georgia’s State Historical Records Advisory Board of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) has recently been reconstituted by order of Governor George Busbee. With a base of three ex-officio members: Carroll Hart, Historical Records Coordinator and State Archivist; Edwin Bridges, Director of Administrative and Support Services Division, Georgia Department of Archives and History; and Anthony Dees, Director, Georgia Historical Society; the new Board now includes Gayle Peters, National Archives and Records Service; Minnie Clayton, Southern Regional Council; Phinizy Spalding, University of Georgia; Les Hough, Georgia State University; Steve Gurr, Georgia Southwestern University; and William Pressly, Atlanta Historical Society.

* * *

GEORGIA ARCHIVE invites contributions for its “News Notes” section, especially items reflecting new program developments, awards of grants for archives projects, conferences and meetings, and issues of professional concern. Send materials to: David Levine, News Notes Editor, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Social Change, 671 Beckwith Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30314.

* * *
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RECENT ACCESSIONS

Georgia Repositories

*Americus*

**Special Collections**
Lake Blackshear Regional Library


*Athens*

**Richard B. Russell Memorial Library**
University of Georgia Libraries

AUDIO-VISUAL Collection, 1931-1978: Includes films, video cassettes, audio tapes and cassettes, and phonodiscs covering Senator Russell’s appearances on radio and television as well as numerous privately recorded speeches and Russell-related presentations; 334 items. Name, chronology, and subject indexes in repository.

JOHN W. DAVIS Collection, 1957-1974: Correspondence, press releases, newspaper and magazine clippings, speeches, radio scripts, House bills, committee reports, and appointment books of a U.S. Representative from Georgia’s seventh district, 1960-1974; 148 lin. ft. Inventory available in repository.

POLITICAL CARTOON Collection, 1936-1969: Framed cartoons given to Senator Russell by cartoonists (many autographed) covering civil rights, MacArthur hearings, national defense, 1952 presidential campaign, and politics; 94 items. Subject card index available in repository.

SCRAPBOOK Collection, 1932-1971: Includes news and magazine feature stories, editorials, cartoons, and pictures, as well as various mementos covering Senator Russell, some of his relatives, and other Georgia politicians; 143 vols. Inventory available in repository.
Special Collections
University of Georgia Libraries

CARTER BARRON Collection, 1920s-1940s: Georgia Tech football player, theater executive and manager of several theaters in Atlanta and Washington, D.C.; 7 items, 2 scrapbooks.

JOHN ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL Collection, 1865-1911: Assistant Secretary of War for the Confederate States, member of Hampton Roads conference, 1865; includes typescripts of Campbell’s opinions of the conference and correspondence, news clippings; 2 scrapbooks.

CHAMPION FAMILY Letters, 1816-1869: Jasper and Chatham Cos., Ga.; social, political, and economic situations in Ga. in the antebellum period; 65 items.


GEORGIA HIGHWAY DEPT. I-75 CONSTRUCTION Collection, 1971: Typescript of reports, correspondence, plans, material concerning investigation of alternate routes for Interstate 75 in Cobb, Cherokee, and Bartow Cos.; 31 items.

GEORGIA ORNITHOLOGICAL SOCIETY Collection, 1896-1975: Scrapbooks, photographs, membership records, correspondence, publication materials, records of bird sightings, and goals of the Society, its companion organizations and predecessors; papers of ornithologist Earle R. Greene; 1, 117 items.

JOHN B. GORDON Letters, 1901-1903: Business correspondence between Gordon and his Atlanta associate Henry F. Emery relating to taxes in Atlanta, land speculation in Ga. and Fla.; 7 items.

MARION HEARD Collection, ca. 1865: Oglethorpe Co., Ga.; songbooks; 2 items.

LILLA L. MANKIN HITCHCOCK Collection, ca. 1870-1978: Bound accounts of Mrs. Hitchcock and her mother, Columbia Jefferson King Mankin, of their years in the Missouri Ozarks and later, Athens, Ga.; 4 items.

LUFFMAN FAMILY Letters, 1840-1847: Relate to antebellum shipping, travel, and coastal events in Southern ports, such as St. Mary’s, Savannah, and Charleston; 32 items.

https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/georgia_archive/vol6/iss2/12
CHARLES F. MCCAY Collection, 1839-1930: Prof. McCay held the chair of mathematics at the University of South Carolina, 1833-1853, and taught philosophy, civil engineering, and mathematics at the University of Georgia; 26 items.

PORTERFIELD FAMILY Papers, 1855-1891: Primarily receipts for state and county taxes paid in Madison Co., Ga.; 34 items.

RHIND-STOKES Collection, 1788-1919: Early business and commercial history of Augusta, Ga.; ledgers, cash books, and letterbooks, 1788-1901; business correspondence and Confederate records consisting of requisition forms and pay vouchers issued in Atlanta; 5,276 items.

ROBERT E. WILLIAMS Collection, 1872-1898: Black photographer who operated small studio in Augusta, Ga.; photos depicting blacks in area of Richmond Co., Ga.; 81 glass negatives and 81 positive prints.

Atlanta

Atlanta Historical Society

ADAMS-CATES COMPANY PLAT Files, 1900-1960: Plat diagrams, property located in Land Districts 14 and 17 filed by Land Lot numbers; notebook of property listings, 1935-1936, includes location, lot size, improvements, income, expenses and price; 6 cu. ft.


JOHN W. GEARY Letters, 1858-1865: Union General prominent in Civil War Atlanta campaign. Electrostatic copies of original letters, privately held; includes some letters of his brother Eddie, 1861-1863; 394 letters, .4 cu. ft.
ANNA RAUSCHENBERG JORDAN Letters, 1864-1868: Varnell's Station, Covington and Cuthbert, Ga.; describes war hardships, treatment by Union soldiers and reestablishment of their homes; 10 items.


RABUN GAP-NACOCHEE CLUB Records, 1959-1978: Organized in support of Rabun Gap-Nacoochee School; minutes, president's correspondence, financial records, photos, project files; 3 cu. ft.

STUDENT AID FOUNDATION Records, 1908-1977: Charter, minutes, reports, correspondence, financial statements, and scrapbooks; 4 cu. ft.

Special Collections
Robert W. Woodruff Library
Emory University

JAMES V. CARMICHAEL Papers, ca. 1935-1975: Scrapbooks, correspondence, photos, campaign materials, memorabilia, and business records relating to Carmichael's business and political career; ca. 30 cu. ft.

COLE (R. D.) MANUFACTURING COMPANY Records, 1886-1900: Ledgers and miscellaneous records of the Cole Company of Newnan, Ga., manufacturers of sawmills, corn mills, and boilers; 8 vols.

COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF THE ATLANTA AREA, INC., 1960-1974: Minutes, reports, correspondence, and general files relating to social planning and social agencies in Atlanta; ca. 32 cu. ft.

ENTERPRISE MANUFACTURING COMPANY, AUGUSTA, GEORGIA, 1878-1930: Ledgers, cashbooks, accounts, and reports of a textile firm operating in Augusta; the firm was taken over by the Graniteville Company in 1930; ca. 30 vols., and 3 cu. ft.

FEMINIST ACTION ALLIANCE Records, 1974-1977: Brochures, correspondence, and agenda of the Atlanta-based women's organization; ca. ½ cu. ft.

FANNIE LEE LEVERETTE Scrapbooks (microfilm), ca. 1910-1940: Four scrapbooks kept by this teacher and journalist from Eatonton, Ga., relating to her career and to the history of Putnam Co.; 1 reel.
QUARTERMAN FAMILY Papers (photocopies), 1881-1932: Letters, clippings, genealogical materials of the Thomas L. Quarterman family of Liberty Co., Ga.; 44 items.

SIBLEY MANUFACTURING COMPANY, AUGUSTA, GEORGIA, Records, 1880-1930: Textile manufacturing company; records included ledgers, cashbooks, financial reports; ca. 20 vols., and 3 cu. ft.

Georgia Department of Archives and History
Governmental Records Office

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE: Office of the Commissioner, Commissioner's General Subject File, 1974 (8 cu. ft.); Animal Industry Division, General Subject Files, 1974 (1 cu. ft.); Commodities Promotion Division, Commodity Commissions Files, 1972-1977 (16 cu. ft.); Consumer Protection Division, General Subject Files, 1974 (2 cu. ft.); Fuel and Measures Division, General Subject Files, 1974 (1 cu. ft.).

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL: Regulatory Laws Division, Insurance Company Annual Financial Statements, all companies, 1976 (93 cu. ft.).

COURT OF APPEALS: Case Files, Numbers 51735 through 52999, 1976 (129 cu. ft.).


GENERAL ASSEMBLY: Journals, Bills, and Resolutions, 1978 (9.5 cu. ft.); Office of the Legislative Counsel, Summary Committee Reports, 1977-1978 (.5 cu. ft.), Reports of Standing, Interim, and Special Committees, 1978 (2.5 cu. ft.).

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR: Governor's Intern Program, Intern Study Report Files, 1977 (2 cu. ft.); Executive Center (Governor's Mansion), Fine Arts Committee Subject Files, 1976 (4 cu. ft.).

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES: Division of Physical Health, Director's Subject Files, 1976 (9 cu. ft.); Family Health Services Section, Director's Subject File, 1976 (5 cu. ft.); Division of Family and Children Services, Director's Subject Files, 1969-1976 (6 cu. ft.); Division Director's Subject Files, 1976, (4 cu. ft.).


DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE: Property Tax Division, County Property Tax Digests, all counties, 1976 (94 cu. ft.).


STATE SCHOLARSHIP COMMISSION: Office of the Executive Director, Executive Director’s Subject Files, 1965-1973 (4 cu. ft.).

SUPREME COURT: Case Files, Numbers 28221 through 28872, 1973-1974 (48 cu. ft.).


More detailed finding aids are available to the researcher in-house. Contact the Georgia Department of Archives and History, 330 Capitol Avenue, S.E., Atlanta, Georgia 30334. (404) 656-2351.
Manuscripts Section

JOHN M. BANKS (b. 1797) Diary, 1830-1865: Born in Elbert Co., Ga., Banks saw action in the War of 1812, taught school, and, in 1840, moved to Columbus, Ga., where he became president of the Howard (textile) Factory. Diary begins with a review of his life before 1830, followed by intermittent entries until late 1865; latter part of the diary is concerned with the effects of the Civil War on his business, his life, and on the Columbus area; 1 vol.

JAMES APPLETON BLACKSHEAR (1841-1867) Diaries, 1862-1867: Born in Sumter Co., Ga., Blackshear served as an artillery and conscription officer for the Confederacy and taught school in Sumter Co. and Claiborne Parish, La., after the war; includes names of soldiers in his unit and children he taught; 4 vols.

CAMP-REYNOLDS FAMILY Papers, 1854-1930: Coweta Co., Ga.; Civil War letters — execution of John Brown, Battle of Vicksburg, siege of Jackson, Miss.; correspondence and published articles — temperance, Creek Indians, social and political history of Newnan, Ga.; family histories, photos, picture postcards, scrapbooks, published novels and songbooks; 250 items.

HANCOCK FAMILY Papers, 1854-1930: Civil War letters — battles near Atlanta, June and July, 1864; legal papers and land records from Colquitt, Lowndes, and Thomas Cos., Ga.; 41 items.

JACKSON SISTERS FAMILY Papers, 1847-1935: Six sisters operating a farm near Hillsboro, Ga., during the post-Civil War period; correspondence, legal and business papers, medical remedies, photos, picture postcards, artifacts; 466 items.

JOHN B. JOHNS Papers, 1775-1973: Lincoln, Wilkes, and DeKalb Cos., Ga., and Va.; correspondence, business and legal papers of Johns, Dabney, and Trammel families and of Rehobeth Church, Tucker, Ga.; Civil War and slave documents; 317 items.

Southern Labor Archives
Georgia State University

ATLANTA LABOR COUNCIL Records, 1964-1975: Correspondence, minutes, financial statements, news releases, and a wide range of printed material; relates to local political affairs, various community development projects, and labor-management disputes; reflects deep involvement of the Council in many aspects of community life in the Atlanta metropolitan area; 3+ lin. ft.
HARRY T. BARBER Papers, 1966-1973: Correspondence (primarily with Charles Gillman, Oliver Singleton, and James Sala, Directors of AFL-CIO Region 6; William Kircher, AFL-CIO Director of Organization; Barney Weeks, President of the Ala. Labor Council; and B.C. Barker, President of the Hillsborough Co. (Fla.) Central Labor Union), minutes, legal documents, and printed items related to Barber’s career as Field Representative of the AFL-CIO in Ala. and Fla.; in 1970, Barber was AFL-CIO representative on the Disney World Services Trade Council; 2 lin. ft.

J.W. GILES Papers, 1920-1977 (predominantly 1959-1977): Correspondence, legal documents, financial statements, minutes, photos, and printed items relating to Giles’ work as Business Manager of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 84 (Atlanta), Secretary of Ga. State AFL-CIO, Chairman of the Atlanta Labor Council’s Organizing Committee, Secretary-Treasurer of Ga. Electrical Workers Association, Director of District Council No. 14 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees and Liaison Officer of the U. S. Dept. of Labor-Occupational Safety Health Administration; 4+ lin. ft.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL 175 (CHATTANOOGA), Records, 1944-1977: Primarily financial documents and minutes relating to Radio & Television Workers Local 662, which was absorbed by Local 175 in the mid-1970’s, and Local 662’s contract and grievance dealings with several Chattanooga area radio and television stations, some of which resulted in one or both parties filing charges of unfair labor practices with the National Labor Relations Board; 3 lin. ft.

JOURNEYMEN BARBERS, HAIRDRESSERS, COSMETOLOGISTS AND PROPRIETORS INTERNATIONAL UNION LOCAL 630 (AUGUSTA, GA.) Records, 1942-1973 (predominantly after 1952): Correspondence (primarily between Local 630 and BHCIU headquarters, the Ga. State AFL-CIO, the Ga. Assn. of Barbers, other unions, and members of Local 630), financial documents, membership data, and printed items; covers charge of mismanagement of the union’s pension fund against the BHCIU General Secretary in 1970, and Local 630’s declining membership after 1970; 2 lin. ft.

RICHMOND (VA.) TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION NO. 90 Records, 1886-1974: Correspondence, minutes, financial records, photos, tape recordings, and printed items of one of the earliest labor organizations in the South (chartered 1866); includes names of unfair employers, contract terms sought and obtained, political alliances, and chronicles changes in wages and hours; 5+ lin. ft.
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS LOCAL 256 (SAVANNAH) Records, 1899-1977 (predominantly 1899-1956): Minutes (constitute bulk of records and incorporate two other locals that were absorbed by Local 256 in 1929 and 1939, also those of Carpenters District Council No. 1, 1910-1913), financial and legal documents, correspondence, and printed items. Reflects concern with employment at the Savannah Gypsum Plant, the Savannah airport and shipyards, and at Parris Island; with a 1943 attempt by the War Manpower Board to freeze carpenters in their jobs; with a 1945 plan by the War Manpower Board to use German prisoners of war in Savannah plants; and with a 1945 attempt to establish a state-wide wage scale for carpenters; 2 lin. ft.

Unpublished inventories to these collections are available in the repository.

Augusta

Richmond County Historical Society, Inc.
Augusta College Library

ACADEMY OF RICHMOND COUNTY, MINUTES OF THE TRUSTEES, 1783-1961: Minutes, correspondence, investments, and check stubs; 6½ cu. ft.

GLOVER BAILEY, 1920s-1970s: Railroad agent; correspondence, clippings, and records, especially of the Louis L. Battey American Legion Post; 2 cu. ft. Finding aid in repository.

BERKMAN, BLOUNT, BOWEN, CATLET, COLEMAN, EMANUEL, HAYNE, HARRIS, JENKINS, LANGDON, MAHONE, RONEY, STARK, TWIGGS, AND WARREN, 1800s: Correspondence and records by members of these families; 1½ cu. ft. Finding aid in repository.

COLONEL FULKERSON Papers, 1861-1862, with a few letters from 1850s: Orders, reports and letters of Col. Samuel V. Fulkerson, 37th Regiment Virginia Volunteers, Army of the Northwest, later part of Jackson's Army of the Valley; 125 items, 225 pp. Finding aid in repository.

MAJOR STORRS Papers, 1862-1865: Official correspondence and reports of Major George S. Storrs' Light Artillery Battalion, French's Division, Polk's (or Stewart's) Corps, Army of Tennessee, CSA. Most is from Battles of Chickamauga through Atlanta; ¼ cu. ft. Finding aid in repository.
BOYKIN WRIGHT Papers, 1906-1932: Augusta lawyers (1852-1932); correspondence, clippings, legal and personal records; 3 cu. ft. Finding aid in repository.

Columbus Archives
Columbus College

DEIGNON-KUNZE-DANIELL Collection, 1864-1932: Letters, legal documents, and real estate transactions; 200 items. Inventory in repository.

FREE KINDERGARTEN ASSOCIATION, 1895-1941, AND GOODWILL COMMUNITY CENTER, 1941-1976, Collection: Minutes, letters, scrapbooks, and photos of a voluntary organization that funded the city's first kindergartens and later supported a settlement house; 13 items. Inventory in repository.

G. GUNBY JORDAN Collection, 1884-1939: Columbus entrepreneur (textiles, railroads, and banking); Railroad Commissioner of Georgia, 1894-1901; President, Ga. Immigration Association, 1907; Muscogee County Commissioner, 1920s; letters and records relating to business and political career and correspondence with French orphans he supported; 407 items. Inventory in repository.

FRANK SCHNELL Collection, 1861-1929: Civil War letters and diary, 19th century riverboat schedule, and ledger books (4) from the Southern Overall Company; 22 items. Inventory in repository.

East Point

Federal Archives and Records Center
Executive Departments and Agencies
Textual Records

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD Records, 1971-1975: Unit Logs of Coast Guard Cutters, Shore Unit Logs, and Unit Logs for ground installations (34 cu. ft.).

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS Records: Gulf of Mexico Division, 1934-1935 (1 cu. ft.); Districts (in the Southeast) – Mobile and Montgomery, AL, 1884-1935 (78 cu. ft.); Jacksonville, FL, 1807-1943 (163 cu. ft.);

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE Records: Shiloh National Military Park and Cemetery, 1895-1938 (12 cu. ft.); Vicksburg National Military Park and Cemetery, 1865-1949 (40 cu. ft.). Correspondence, financial records, records relating to acquisition of land for these parks and construction of the parks, funeral records and visitors records; document federal government’s early involvement in conservation and historic preservation.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR: Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Closed investigation files from various Southeastern locations and Puerto Rico, 1951-1973 (328 cu. ft.).

NAVAL DISTRICTS AND SHORE ESTABLISHMENTS Records, 1950-1959: Includes several naval air stations in Fla. and Ga., the Charleston Naval Shipyard, and the Sixth Naval District, Charleston, SC (217 cu. ft.). Some of these records are under National Security restriction.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION Records, 1941-1950: Deals with the management and disposal of property related to the war effort; (713 cu. ft.).

WAGE AND SALARY STABILIZATION BOARDS OF THE ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY Records, 1951-1953: Enforcement control cards, wage-hour control cards, and wage data cards (11 cu. ft.).

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION Records, 1951-1953: Deals with price ceilings (13 cu. ft.).

Microfilm Holdings


DEPARTMENT OF WAR: Adjutant General’s Office, Indexes of Compiled Service Records: Revolutionary War, Soldiers who served in the American Army for the states of Ga. and the Carolinas (16 rolls); War of 1812, Volunteer Soldiers from North Carolina/South Carolina (12 rolls); Civil War, Volunteer Soldiers from Ala./Fla./Ga./Miss. (4 rolls); War with Spain, Volunteer Soldiers from North Carolina (2 rolls); Collection of Confederate
Records, Index to Compiled Service Records of Confederate Soldiers who
served in organizations from the state of Florida (9 rolls); Bureau of
Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands, Assistant Commissioner for
the states of Alabama/Mississippi/North Carolina/South Carolina, 1865-
1870 (155 rolls).

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE: Letters Received by Dept. of Justice from
South Carolina, 1871-1884 (9 rolls); Immigration and Naturalization
Service, Passenger Lists, Passenger Lists of Vessels Arriving at Savannah,
1906 (1 roll).

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY: Journal of John Landreth on an Expedi-
tion to the Gulf Coast, 1818-1819 (1 roll).

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Letters of
Tench Coxe, Commissioner of the Revenue, Relating to the Procurement of
Military, Naval and Indian Supplies, 1794-1796 (1 roll); Records Relating to
Enrollment of Eastern Cherokees by Guion Miller, 1908-1910 (12 rolls).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE: Bureau of the Census, Non-population
Schedules, 1850-1880, Florida (9 rolls); Federal Population Census, 1790-
1900, and Soundex Index, 1880, 1900 (18,739 rolls).

JUDICIARY: District Courts of the United States, Confederate Papers of the
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, 1861-1865
(1 roll).

Savannah

Georgia Historical Society

BRUNSWICK, GEORGIA, Map, ca. 1780: Manuscript map showing lot
owners; 1 item.

CHILDREN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, GEORGIA, Scrapbooks,

CHILDREN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, COL. HENRY LEE

CHEVES FAMILY Papers, 1819-1896: Family correspondence, Civil War
letters (mostly typescript copies); 27 items.

COMMISSIONERS OF PILOTAGE, PORT OF SAVANNAH, Minute Book,

AMORY DEXTER Diary, 1861: Family and farm matters; 1 vol.


HARDY EVERETT Papers, n.d.: Deed of gift; Screven Co. property and slaves; 1 item.

HIBERNIAN SOCIETY, SAVANNAH, Collection, 1978: Materials relating to President Jimmy Carter’s appearance at the Society’s banquet March 17, 1978; 4 items.

SIR PATRICK HOUSTON Letter, 1773: ALS to John Houston; 1 item.

INSURANCE POLICIES, 1850s-1860s: Policies on various coastal area properties (photocopies); 23 items.

RICHARD MALCOLM JOHNSTON Paper, 1880: Memorial on the death of Edward Adam Soullard; 1 item.


GORDON SAUSSY Paper, 1922: Typescript of “The Death of Toney McAlphin”; 1 item.

SAUSSY FAMILY Papers, 1839-1970s: Family correspondence and ledgers of Dr. J. R. Saussy; 8 doc. boxes.

SAVANNAH ART ASSOCIATION Minutes, 1921-1977: Organization activities; 12 items.

SAVANNAH BICYCLE CLUB Minutes, 1884: Club activities and social history; 1 vol.

SAVANNAH PARK AND TREE COMMISSION Papers, 1890s-1950s: Unsorted.

TAIS/TA (SCHOONER) Logbook, 1870-1872: Daily record of progress, activities, weather; 1 item.

ABRAHAM TWIGGS Papers, 1807: Land grants; 2 items.

J. VAN BUREN Paper, 1867: Scuppernong grape culture; 1 item.
Out-of-state Repositories

**Florida**

Pensacola Historical Museum

CONFEDERATE SOLDIERS Letters, 1861-1865: Typescript letters written to a Miss Jennie Smith by and about members of Company E, 20th Regiment, Georgia Volunteer Infantry; part of miscellaneous manuscript collection; 33 pp.

**North Carolina**

University of North Carolina at Greensboro

CHARLES DUNCAN MCIVER Papers, 1860-1906: Southern Education Board Correspondence, 1901-1906; includes correspondence between McIver, President of the Southern Education Board, and Hoke Smith, a Georgia lawyer, publisher, and politician, pertaining to Board activity in Georgia; 3 lin. ft.

**Tennessee**

Vanderbilt University Nashville

VANDERBILT TELEVISION NEWS ARCHIVE, 1968-present: Videotape network evening news broadcasts from August 5, 1968 to present date (4500 hours); special news broadcasts, including presidential speeches and press conferences; political conventions 1968, 1972, 1976; Watergate hearings; House impeachment debates; etc. (1500 hours). Collection is built by off-air taping, and is added to each day. TELEVISION NEWS INDEX AND ABSTRACTS is published monthly as the finding aid for the evening news portion of the collection. Finding aids for special broadcasts are located at the archive.
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