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ARCHIVAL PROGRAMS IN THE SOUTHEAST: A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT*

Edie Hedlin

In February of 1981, the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC), a small federal funding agency located within the National Archives and Records Service, made a large bet on what Jimmy the Greek would surely have declared to be an archival longshot.

The commission decided to set aside $600,000 of its $2 million in records program grant funds that year to support one type of project to be conducted only by one type of applicant. Making grants of up to $25,000 available to its own State Historical Records Advisory Boards (SHRABS), the commission encouraged an intense information gathering and planning effort on the state level that would culminate in a published report of findings and recommendations. The commission titled these grants "assessment and reporting projects." Through a competitive process, twenty-seven states—including North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi—received funding for this yearlong project.

In spite of the modesty of the grant award, the commission's goals in supporting assessment and reporting projects were ambitious. NHPRC hoped, first of all, to encourage the creation of an information base about needs and conditions within

*This article is an expression of the personal opinion of the author. It does not represent a consensus and is not an official position of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, its staff, or the National Archives and Records Service.
each state that would allow the SHRABs to identify priority areas of concern for the archival community. Second, the commission hoped that through the process of conducting these projects, archivists within the state would develop stronger internal communications links, develop a set of mutually agreed upon goals, and persuasively articulate these to the non-archival public. In short, NHPRC sought to change the way archivists within a state related to each other, to their state board, to their major constituencies, and to society at large.

Throughout 1982, twenty-seven states carried out assessment and reporting projects. By spring of 1983, twenty reports were either complete or in draft stage. Taken as a whole, the reports documented the dire circumstances of archival programs throughout the country. Questions of process aside, the reports are a litany of archival woes. Although some states could report progress in some areas, the most common theme was one of great need and few resources.

According to grant procedures each state board was to investigate, report, and plan in four areas of archival endeavor: state government records programs, local government records programs, historical records repositories (which included all nongovernment archives), and statewide services and functions. This last category was intended to cover those activities that were of such broad interest to all archivists, like training or conservation services, that they cut across institutional or repository lines.

In order to assist both the project grantees and the commission itself in digesting the contents of the assessment reports, NHPRC asked four consultants to analyze each of the four sections respectively. Their comments shed light, offered insight, and suggested common themes. The consultants also pointed to deficiencies which were not articulated in the reports and suggested priorities for action.

Edwin Bridges, in his analysis of state government records programs, noted that the reports painted "a bleak picture of resource deficiencies on
one hand and program deficiencies on the other." He termed this condition a "cycle of poverty," akin to the plight of many underdeveloped nations. The cycle of crippling programs and undermining efforts toward improvement characterized far too many state archives.

In Bridges's view, the reports affirmed that state archives lacked appropriate legislation, authority, budget, and imagination. Most of all, perhaps, they lacked vigorous leadership. The problems generated by weak legislation, poor control over records in agencies, large processing backlogs, and narrow program bases were immense. Weakness in one area led to performance failure in another, creating a continuing cycle.

Problems of this magnitude, he believed, were susceptible to solution only through good administration. Bridges saw the shortcomings of archivists as administrators to be a major cause of their plight. He urged greater attention to the "basic managerial responsibilities" of planning, organizing, and leading as the ultimate solution to the problems of state archives.

The condition of local government records programs was no better. Richard Cox, who reviewed the local records portion of the assessment reports, noted that they uniformly identified "poor local storage, insufficient staff at both local and state institutions, and a poor legislative footing" as major problems. Citing the history of neglect of local government records, Cox urged greater attention to and concern for this part of documentary heritage.

Again, state archives leadership was needed but often not forthcoming. Cox identified the "unifying feature of the recommendations [to be] the understanding that state archival institutions must provide revitalized or new leadership in rectifying the neglect of local government records." He called particularly for strong efforts by state archivists to mobilize support among local government professional organizations.

The broad range and scope of repositories which
fall outside of government records programs was the focus of the third assessment area mandated by NHPRC. William Joyce, in analyzing this section of the reports, saw a "prevailing pattern...in which the majority of historical records repositories are barely capable of providing even the most rudimentary and basic maintenance of their holdings."6 Lacking public support, visibility, clear program goals, and adequate resources, historical records repositories are caught in their own cycle of poverty. Joyce alluded to a "circular effect" created by process of low use, which perpetuates "low funding which prevents repositories from upgrading the management of their collections."7 The extremely weak staffing level (often volunteer and untrained), caused by woefully inadequate funding and the absence of an institutional base of support, such as state or local government, may make the plight of historical records repositories the most dire. At minimum, the remedies seem more complex.

In considering cooperative approaches to the solution of their problems, the reports reflected an intense interest in education and training for archivists, in technical manuals and professional literature, in statewide guides and directories, in more and better conservation services, and in better communication links between and among repositories.8 Consultant Margaret Child, who analyzed this portion of the assessment reports, noted that in spite of the underlying assumption of the need to seek common, cooperative solutions to these problems, the reports reflected a lack of knowledge of what others had done or a desire to join hands with those outside their state to develop jointly what they might not be able to do alone.9

Child noted particularly the profession's unwillingness to use standard formats to describe holdings and predicted a forced change in this behavioral characteristic. Insisting that "unique" materials do not demand unique "descriptors, procedures, and mystique," Child noted that "in many respects, the archival community is a cottage
industry on the verge of an industrial revolution...." The need for standardization if the profession is to develop commonly shared communications networks "will impose many of the requirements of the assembly line on what has heretofore been a remarkably idiosyncratic profession."10

As has been noted, four southeastern states—Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia—participated in the first round of assessment and reporting projects. Do they fit the pattern described above? Are archives in the Southeast better off than, representative of, or falling behind the deplorable norm described by the consultants? Can these reports be used as the basis for assessing the problems and prospects for archives in the region served by Provenance?

Unfortunately one state, South Carolina, has yet to submit a report, which leaves a base of only three reports from which to generalize about conditions in seven states. Clearly, any assessment at this time would have to be preliminary. However, by blending general knowledge against the more detailed information in the available reports, some tentative evaluation can be made. The following must be viewed in this light.

State and Local Government Records Programs

In many respects the southeastern states' assessment reports reflect the traditional concerns of state archives. The most commonly articulated problem, for instance, is the shortage of storage space. The Mississippi report very specifically calls for the addition of two floors to its current structure as a short-term solution to an acute problem, and declares that the long-term solution is an entirely new building.11 The North Carolina report is less specific in citing solutions, but the need for additional space is forcefully stated.

More importantly, other themes of the reports as a whole apply to the Southeast. One can find evidence that state archives need better legal authority to take vigorous action, that the backlog
of unprocessed materials is mounting, that record schedules cover only a portion of the records generated or maintained by state agencies, and that those services the archives can provide are often not known to or used by government officials. Only Georgia, however, directly addressed the question of internal administration, citing the need to examine the organizational structure, to question the department's philosophy of records management, and to develop clear internal priorities. 

In comparing the Southeast's state archival programs to those of other regions, one should ask whether problems that are common elsewhere necessarily should characterize state programs in this region. Are there circumstances peculiar to the Southeast that set it apart from other state archives and that should, or could, affect their performance, perspective, and progress?

One significant distinction is the age of most southeastern state archival programs. The Alabama Department of Archives and History, founded in 1901, can rightfully boast of its status as the first state archives in the country. Tennessee and North Carolina, both of which trace their origins to 1903, closely follow suit. Only Florida, which did not pass legislation creating either a state archives or records management program until 1967, can claim relative youth.

Second, the overall size and scope of programs in this region tend to set them apart. Not every southern state archives carries program responsibility for records scheduling, record centers, microfilming services, field services, and conservation labs in addition to the core functions of acquisition, arrangement, description and reference, but most of them do. This differs significantly from many states where there is a split between the archival and records management functions, where there are few or no support services and where other related programs, such as historic preservation, are placed elsewhere.

With these programs go substantial budgets. The
North Carolina report cited a budget of almost $1.5 million for the Archives and Records Section in fiscal year 1982. Georgia, Florida, and other southeastern states appear to have roughly comparable figures. This contrasts sharply with resources of many state archives, especially in different regions of the country. North and South Dakota combined, or Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire combined, cannot approximate the budget of either North or South Carolina, or Georgia, or Alabama.

Similar observations can be made about local records programs. On the one hand, there is distressing uniformity between and among the states in this area, suggesting that no region excels in local records program development. On the other hand, historically, the South appeared to be ahead of the nation in this arena. One might question why such acute problems remain.

The Southeast began providing services to local governments long before many state archives even acknowledged a need for such activity. In North Carolina, for instance, legislation in 1959 and 1961 resulted in the establishment of a comprehensive local records program including records management, within the Archives and History Section. Tennessee focused heavily on microfilm services for county records in the 1960s and 1970s, a fairly common activity for state programs of the region. This early attention to local records, however, appears to have created more abundant accessions and rolls of microfilm, rather than systematic local records program development.

Ironically, one possible cause of this might be the willingness of the larger southeastern programs to assume too much of the burden for preserving local records. Many state archives traditionally accepted select series of local records into their repositories, developed strong microfilm programs for county records, housed the security copies in state archives' vaults, prepared manuals, reviewed disposition schedules, and laminated or rebound ledgers. In short, they retained the primary
responsibility for local records. When the state government resources were insufficient to support these ongoing services, the quality of service declined and progress ceased.

This pattern does not fit all southeastern states (some lacked the resources to attempt an ambitious program), but it is accurate for many. The impulse toward centralization argued against the need for program development on the local level. Concomitantly, as local government grew and state archival budgets failed to grow apace, the quality of service lessened. Of particular importance was the rapid emergence of municipal government. At a time when state programs were focused almost entirely on services to counties, the discrepancy between municipal government needs and the state archives' ability to meet these needs widened significantly.

The consequence of these trends was the Southeast's loss of ascendancy. Other states, many with fewer resources but with a philosophy that emphasized shared responsibility, cooperative approaches, and self-help for localities, sought other solutions. They developed regional network systems or model local records programs. Some states more vigorously addressed the question of municipal records or nontextual media such as computer files. In spite of their early lead, the southeastern states are now following examples, admittedly isolated, set elsewhere. More unfortunately, the region's approach to local records failed to develop a constituency within local government that would advocate stronger service programs on the state level.

At this time it appears that in both state and local records, the Southeast has most of the same problems faced by other regions. In spite of larger budgets, substantial holdings, imposing structures, and multiple programs, their progress recently has been unremarkable. The problems faced by state archives elsewhere are mirrored in the reports of state and local government records programs in the Southeast. The region is certainly no worse off, but unfortunately, it seems to be better off in
surprisingly few areas.

Historical Records Repositories and Cooperative Approaches

The litany of woes outlined in the state and local government portions of the assessment reports is even more evident among historical records repositories and statewide services and functions. North Carolina reports that "at the typical small repository a staff person is assigned part-time to archival matters and may well be a volunteer." Worse yet, the volunteer is unlikely to have any prior training or experience in the administration of historical records, and the institution is probably lacking a collecting policy, adequate storage facilities, or even rudimentary finding aids.

Two factors seem to be consistent throughout the Southeast: the absence of strong state historical societies and the lack of ties among the private, smaller repositories. Unlike the Midwest where large state historical societies often anchor a loose coalition of smaller local repositories, there is no natural leader for this segment of the archival community. Noteworthy also is the importance of university-based repositories within this context of poverty and isolation. Although often without adequate resources themselves, their condition is relatively prosperous compared to their non-academic colleagues.

Of some importance in the development of this pattern is the role of state historical agencies. Almost every state department of archives and history includes a manuscripts collecting function. Some have reduced their focus and the intensity of their acquisitions programs over the years, but their very existence has undoubtedly had an impact. Because the relatively wealthy state archives were also collecting private manuscripts, there was little chance that the smaller repositories could successfully compete for collections. On the other hand, the state historical agencies of the Southeast focused primarily on their government records responsibilities and neither sought nor accepted a
leadership role among private repositories.

The region's colleges and universities did not leap to fill this gap. Focusing on subject areas that were national in scope and operating within the framework of higher education, these programs often failed to identify with the state's archival community. Some excellent collections and well-managed repositories emerged from these efforts, but their leadership was by example only.

While these patterns are worth noting, they merely suggest how the problems for archival programs in the Southeast developed rather than connote substantially different results. The recommendations issuing from southeastern assessment reports are of a piece with the nation. Calls for archival education programs, short-term workshops, statewide guides to holdings, and improved conservation services are common. Other, less universally stated recommendations include the establishment of formal networks, microfilm cooperatives, written collecting policies, and disaster preparedness training.

The third and fourth areas of assessment are inexorably intertwined. Because of the diffuse nature of historical records repositories, their needs can be addressed only through cooperative action. A review of the section on statewide services and functions is almost always a recapitulation of those activities, recommended in earlier sections, that require inter-institutional cooperation.

Indeed, cooperation and leadership are basic themes for NHPRC and tenets of the records program. Although the fourth assessment area deals with specific activities requiring leadership and cooperation, the underlying intent of the project is to foster these concepts in all areas. The reports, then, and the process of identifying problems and formulating recommendations are successful in the degree to which they were cooperative efforts intelligently led by the projects' administrators. Any review of the archival condition in the Southeast through the perspective of the assessment projects
requires attention to these themes. Inevitably, one is brought back to the state archives and its role.

In almost every instance the dominant program on the state's archival horizon is the state-funded historical agency. Due to the efforts of cultural politicians like Thomas Owen in Alabama, H. G. Jones in North Carolina, Mary Givens Bryan and Carroll Hart in Georgia, and Charles Lee in South Carolina, substantial resources in traditionally low income states have been allocated to documenting and preserving the state's heritage. With diverse responsibilities and budgets far in excess of any other archival program in the state, these agencies appear as skyscrapers among a city of low-lying buildings.

In earlier years, many of these state agencies led both their state and the nation in the development of ambitious, professional archival programs. They were models against which others could measure progress and define goals. As they added new programs and provided new services, however, they grew as bureaucracies and developed an institutional approach to records preservation that was instilled in daily routines.

The need to fight for sustained resources during recessionary times and, therefore, to focus internally within state government rather than outwardly toward the profession came to characterize many of these programs. Eventually, the focus on internal operations and the belief that their problems were unique led many state archives into professional isolation. By the mid 1970s this process had gone full course in many southeastern states.

A series of events at that time, however, would eventually work against the trend. The establishment of NASARA (the National Association of State Archives and Records Administrators) and the addition of the records program to NHPRC created new roles for administrators of state archival agencies. The former provided a common meeting ground for all state archivists and unequalled opportunity to act in
concert. The latter created a defined role for the state archives within the state's archival community by designating the state archivist as coordinator of the State Historical Records Advisory Board (SHRAB).

In fairness it should be noted that neither NASARA nor the records program had an immediate or dramatic effect. In some states there has been relatively little change in attitudes or activities. Over time, however, several state programs have experienced a broadening of concern for and an interest in the welfare of all repositories within its boundaries. These factors, coupled with the growth of state and regional professional organizations, has created a climate that is conducive to change. The formation of SAARC (South Atlantic Archives and Records Conference) and especially the development of state archival organizations in Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee have greatly aided this process.

Moreover, the trend toward better cooperation and communication is continuing. Florida has just established a professional society, providing that state's archival community with an unprecedented opportunity to work jointly toward mutual goals. The North Carolina assessment report, noting the needs of historical records repositories and the absence of mechanisms to address them, recommended that a statewide professional organization be established. That recommendation is now in the process of being implemented.

Benefits have emerged already from the growth of archival organizations in the Southeast. They have established a framework for leadership by archivists in small repositories, have fostered a spirit of cooperation among institutions that previously had not communicated at all, and have provided a much needed program of education and training. In addition, they have demonstrated the commonality of interests that exist among archives, regardless of size, and permitted the exploration of a range of subjects. Perhaps most importantly, they have allowed the archival community to assert opinions as
a defined constituency. This has led to an understanding of the need for archivists to voice concerns and articulate goals to the non-archival public.

Finally, the assessment projects themselves should contribute to an improved situation for archives in the Southeast. Florida and Alabama are currently conducting projects, leaving only Tennessee without any experience in this process and South Carolina with a final report to write. Tennessee's failure to apply for an assessment grant is particularly distressing. Given the recent transfer of its archival functions to a more highly political agency, one responsible to the legislature, Tennessee may be the least likely state to make significant progress in the near future.

On balance, however, the situation for the Southeast appears to be hopeful. It is by no means an archival mecca. Indeed, quite the opposite. Just as repositories in other part of the country are trapped in a cycle of poverty, so are the archives of this region. The exception is the state archival programs, but as has been noted, even they have major problems and can be found lacking.

The challenge facing this region remains the same challenge issued by NHPRC. Will the southeastern states define, articulate, and work for goals established through a rational process of gathering information, seeking opinion, and analyzing findings? Will this process be inclusive, resulting in the building of constituencies within the archival community and the identification of allies who support archival goals? Will leadership roles be defined—and accepted—by those in the best position to lead? Will imagination and energy characterize future action rather than defensiveness or ambivalence?

Early indications suggest positive answers for Mississippi, which maximized the opportunity presented by the assessment projects, and for Alabama, which has embraced the challenge of the project fully. Georgia's somewhat stronger tradition
of cooperation between the state archives and the archival community bodes well for continued progress. The strengths of individual states aside, however, the Southeast as a whole is in a position to make great forward strides. With a surging economy and a strong sense of heritage among its citizens, the Southeast has an enormous opportunity to assume again the leadership role it once had. The results of such initiative would not only bring NHPRC a handsome return on its investment, it would benefit everyone.
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STATE AND REGIONAL ARCHIVAL ORGANIZATIONS SERVE THE SOUTHEAST

Virginia J. H. Cain

The Southeast may well claim to be home to more state and regional archival activity than any other region of the United States. Six state archival organizations are headquartered in the Southeast, while two others border on this area. Two regional archival organizations affect the Southeast, and the third oldest state organization and the oldest regional organization may be found here as well.

For purposes of this brief review, the Southeast will be defined as including Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi. Organizations described as state archival organizations will be those which are organized within and which focus upon a single state, while organizations called regional archival organizations will be those which are organized to encompass two or more states and which focus upon these broader areas. State and regional archival organizations are not mutually exclusive, but rather they frequently overlap, with a single state and individual archivists within that state involved in both a state and a regional group. In addition, no group prohibits individuals from other states or regions from becoming members or participants in some way in its activities.

The Society of American Archivists (SAA) was founded as the national professional organization for archivists in 1936, and thirty years later, the South Atlantic Archives and Records Conference (SAARC) brought to the Southeast the first organized archival activity that was not specifically a part of the more national focus of the SAA. Only one other non-national archival organization, the Michigan
Archival Association, founded in 1958, had been established prior to this pioneering effort by SAARC in May 1966. Covering those states along the southern Atlantic coast, SAARC involves Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida.1

SAARC has no constitution or bylaws, no formal officer structure, and no ongoing organization. It exists as an annual conference or meeting held each spring in a member state on a rotating basis. The original purpose of SAARC was to provide archivists, especially those new to the profession and those unable to attend SAA meetings, with a regular opportunity for professional development. Until 1981, a SAARC newsletter was circulated from the Archives Division of the Virginia State Library.

Responsibility for hosting the meeting and planning the program usually falls to the state archives in the host state, and conference programs frequently focus on the management of public records.2 Not all programs, however, have been exclusively for archivists in state or other public archives, but have also included sessions on reference service, microform standards, disaster planning, and other topics that are of use to a broader audience of archivists. Recent programs have also provided a forum for the exchange of information on the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) Needs Assessment Grant projects in SAARC states.3

The other regional archival organization which touches the Southeast is the Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference (MARAC). Founded in 1972, MARAC claims members from Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, and the District of Columbia. MARAC meets twice yearly, has a formal slate of officers, state representatives, and representatives-at-large, and publishes a quarterly newsletter, The Mid-Atlantic Archivist. The state of Virginia finds itself in a position unique among the eight states of the Southeast in that it is allied with two very
different regional archival organizations, SAARC and MARAC.

The six southeastern states which are home to state archival organizations are Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Tennessee. The bordering states of Arkansas and Kentucky are also home to state archival organizations. Of these eight states, four are involved in regional archival organizations and four are not. Florida, Georgia, and North Carolina have ties with SAARC, while the border state of Arkansas is included in the geographic area covered by the Society of Southwest Archivists (SAA). Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and the bordering state of Kentucky have no affiliation with regional organizations. The other Southeastern states of Virginia and South Carolina are involved with SAARC but have no individual state archival organization. South Carolina archivists, however, have organized under the aegis of the state library association.

The Society of Georgia Archivists (SGA) was founded in 1969. Governance of the society is vested in a president, vice-president/president-elect, secretary/treasurer, archivist, newsletter editor, and two directors. All officers serve a one-year term with the exception of the directors who hold office for two-year terms, with one director elected each year. Balloting for officers is by mail prior to the fall annual meeting.

The society meets twice yearly: a fall workshop, traditionally held in Atlanta, and a spring meeting, traditionally held elsewhere in the state, provide educational and informational sessions for participants. The annual business meeting of the society is held in conjunction with the fall workshop. The SGA publishes a quarterly newsletter, SGA Newsletter, and a semiannual journal, Provenance (formerly Georgia Archive).

The SGA was the third state archival group organized in the United States. Only the Michigan Archival Association, founded in 1958, and the Society of Ohio Archivists, founded in 1968, are
older. It was to be eight years before another state archival organization was to be formed in the Southeast. In those intervening years, only the organization of MARAC in 1972 was to have a direct effect on the Southeast.6

The year 1977 was the high water mark of archival organizing in the Southeast: the Society of Alabama Archivists (SALA) was formed in April, the Tennessee Archivists in September, and the Society of Mississippi Archivists in November.

The Society of Alabama Archivists is led by a president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, newsletter editor, and three directors. An archivist is appointed by the executive board. The directors serve staggered terms of one, two, or three years, and all other officers serve for one year. Candidates for office are announced to the membership by mail, and the officers are elected by the society members present at the second semiannual meeting of the SALA. The society meets twice yearly, once in the spring and once in the fall, and publishes a newsletter entitled Access.7

Officers of the Tennessee Archivists are president, vice-president/editor, secretary (also serving as archivist), and treasurer. Unlike many other state archival organizations, officers of the Tennessee Archivists serve two-year terms. An officer may not succeed himself or herself in office, a retiring officer may not hold another office until at least one two-year term has elapsed, and no more than two officers serving at one time may come from the same institution.

The Tennessee Archivists meet annually in the spring of each year. The articles of incorporation, which serves also as the constitution and bylaws of the Tennessee Archivists, further specifies that this meeting be held at a middle Tennessee location. Members are notified by mail of the names of nominees for office, and elections and other business matters are decided by a simple majority vote of members present at the annual meeting. Additional meetings may be held to conduct workshops or other business,
and an occasional newsletter is published by the Tennessee Archivists. The leadership of the Society of Mississippi Archivists includes a president, vice-president, treasurer, executive director/secretary, newsletter editor, and four directors. A unique feature of this organization is the existence of the office of executive director, which also serves as secretary of the society. Executive directors are quite uncommon among American archival organizations, with only the SAA utilizing such a position. The Society of Mississippi Archivists meets annually in April and publishes a quarterly newsletter, The Primary Source.

The year 1977 also saw the formation of the Kentucky Council on Archives (KCA), one of two archival organizations in states which border on the Southeast. Governed by a chairperson, secretary-treasurer, and four administrative council members, the KCA meets twice yearly, in the spring and in the fall. The annual business meeting is held in the spring. The KCA began in 1979 to publish a regular newsletter, The Kentucky Archivist.

No new state archival organizations were to come to the Southeast until 1983, but in 1979, another bordering state formed such an organization. The Arkansas Archivists and Records Managers, unique in that it specifically names an allied profession in the title of the organization, is led by a president, vice-president/president-elect, treasurer, and secretary. The organization meets annually for a fall workshop and publishes a quarterly newsletter.

The Society of Florida Archivists (SFA), formed in 1983, has as its leaders a president, vice-president/president-elect, secretary-treasurer, and two executive board members. Officers serve for a term of one year and are elected by a mail ballot. The annual business meeting of the SFA is held in the spring of each year and includes a program of general interest for SFA members. After Florida archivists attending the annual meeting of SAARC in St. Augustine, Florida, in the spring of 1982
expressed their desire to organize, the organizational meeting of the SFA was held in conjunction with the 1983 meetings of the Florida Historical Society and the Florida Historical Confederation. A newsletter, SFA Newsletter, is planned as a regular publication to send to members and to exchange with other archival and related organizations.

The newest archival organization in the Southeast is the Society of North Carolina Archivists. Organized in March 1984, the Society of North Carolina Archivists is the result of lengthy and careful planning under the leadership of the North Carolina State Archives and of a steering committee of archivists. Formation of a group such as this had been among the recommendations of the North Carolina Historical Records Advisory Committee at the conclusion of an NHPRC Needs Assessment Grant project in the state.

The officers of the new society are a president, vice-president, secretary-treasurer, and two members of the executive board. All but the secretary-treasurer serve one-year terms; the secretary-treasurer serves for two years. Candidates for office are announced by mail and elections are held at the annual business meeting. The society meets twice each year, once in the spring and once in the fall. The annual business meeting is a part of the fall meeting.

The state of South Carolina, meanwhile, has followed a different course. At the fall meeting of the South Carolina Library Association (SCLA) in 1980, interested members formed the Archives and Special Collections Round Table (ASCR). Officers are a chairperson, vice-chairperson/chairperson-elect, and secretary. A regular meeting is scheduled in conjunction with the annual meeting of the SCLA, and SCLA members may join ASCR as one of their two round table choices included in basic memberships. Officers are elected at this regular meeting, and a newsletter, ASCR News, has been published since 1981.
archival organization yet exists in South Carolina, archivists in that state have found a forum for some of their activities through the statewide organization of a closely allied profession.

State archival organizations in the Southeast obviously share many similarities and many differences. Whatever the history, organizational structure, or the number of meetings and publications for each organization, a number of common aspects, themes, and questions can be examined. Among these are the use of newsletters to communicate with members, the definition of membership and the process of officer election, and the broad goals and objectives of the societies.

Five of the six archival organizations in the Southeast publish a newsletter. All newsletters carry news of and announcements from the particular archival organization publishing the newsletter, and many carry news of individual repositories and members, accessions, position announcements, and notes and articles of broad interest to readers. Newsletters also frequently include news and announcements national in scope, including reports on SAA meetings and on SAA section activities and announcements of SAA-sponsored activities and publications.

Recent issues of the Tennessee Archivists newsletter (summer 1983; winter 1984); of *Access*, the newsletter of the SALA (October 1980; May 1981); and of the *SGA Newsletter* (December 1983) have provided members with information about such national issues as the appointment of the Archivist of the United States, budget cuts under the Reagan administration as they affect historical and archival programs, and legislation proposing the independence of the National Archives and Records Service (NARS) from the General Services Administration (GSA). Tennessee and Georgia newsletters also quoted extensively from the comments of members of their respective congressional delegations made in response to letters from the archival organizations in those states concerning the separation of NARS from GSA.
Another identifiable trend in recent issues of southeastern archival newsletters is the increasing exchange of information among state archival organizations. Whether these items are brief notes, short calendar items, general notices, or longer articles, newsletter editors are more frequently looking beyond their own state borders and even beyond their own regions for news of interest to readers. The lengthy article "Disaster in Mississippi" (reprinted with the permission of author Franklin Walker, Jr., Hattiesburg City Archivist, and of H. T. Holmes, editor of *The Primary Source*, published by the Society of Mississippi Archivists in a recent issue of the *SGA Newsletter* (August 1983) exemplifies this effort to exchange information. While the particulars of the Mississippi flood would be of most interest to residents of that state, archivists in any setting can be more informed about archives-related events in other states and can learn from this tale of disaster and recovery.

Turning to the question of the definition of memberships for these archival organizations, the Society of Georgia Archivists's constitution states that "individual memberships shall be open to any person interested in the field of archives, manuscripts, special libraries, or a related discipline." A number of other societies define membership in a similarly broad way. The Articles of Incorporation of the Tennessee Archivists, on the other hand, recognizes two distinct and more tightly defined categories of membership:

There shall be two classes of membership—regular and associate. Regular members are those persons who are full-time employees or workers in an archives, manuscripts, or records management area; or who devote half their time to working with archives, manuscripts, or records management. Associate members are those interested persons in allied disciplines or those who do not qualify for regular memberships; they shall enjoy all the
privileges and benefits of membership except holding office and voting. 18

While defining membership in a much more detailed way, the Tennessee Archivists nonetheless allows, through the definition of associate members, involvement in its organization by individuals representing a broad spectrum of archival and related activities and interests.

As with many voluntary or professional organizations, southeastern state archival organizations deliberately have not made membership restrictive, but rather have opened memberships as much as possible. This provides a larger pool of individuals from which to seek members and, whatever related organizations may exist in a state, encourages individuals in related professions or of related interests to participate in archival organizations. 19

A more specific issue related to the trend towards defining membership broadly and towards attracting members from varied disciplines is the question of the method of selecting officers. Most organizations have nominating committees and announce nominees to all members by mail. Alabama, North Carolina, and Tennessee elect officers by voting at the annual business meeting, while Georgia and Florida conduct their elections by mail prior to the annual meeting.

Voting at the annual meeting might have two completely opposite results: it rewards those in attendance with the power to make the election decision, but at the same time, it prevents participation in the election process by those who, for whatever reason, are unable to attend the annual meeting. Voting by mail, on the other hand, offers an equal voice in elections to all members of the organization whether or not they can attend the annual meeting. Unanswered questions relative to voting by mail would be whether this actually has an effect on the attendance at the annual meeting and whether the number of returned ballots equals or exceeds the number of votes that might be expected to
be cast in person at the annual meeting.

A final broad question which must continually be faced by state archival organizations is that of their role as organizations for archivists. Some answers to this are hinted at in the various statements of purpose, goals, and objectives found in the constitutions of some state archival organizations. Encompassing the ideals of cooperation among the archivists and related groups and individuals, the Society of Florida Archivists offers this definition of its purpose:

The purpose of the Society of Florida Archivists is to promote cooperation and exchange of information among individuals and institutions interested in the preservation and use of archival and manuscript materials; to disseminate information on research materials and archival methodology; to provide a forum for the discussion of matters of common concern; and to cooperate with organizations and professions in related disciplines. 20

Other statements of purpose, goals, and objectives sound similar themes.

In practicality, what do these goals mean in the focus, operation, and programming of the organizations? Do these organizations look inward, concentrating on professional development for archivists? Do they look outward seeking to share some of the concepts of archival theory and work with experienced, inexperienced, volunteer, and part-time archivists as well as with non-archivists? Are these organizations a substitute or a supplement to membership or activity in the Society of American Archivists?

The relationships between local, state, and regional archival organizations and the SAA have been discussed and analyzed elsewhere in archival literature. Suffice it to say here that professional development and activity within a local, state, or regional group can indeed thrive without
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automatically including or excluding professional involvement on the national level. While local, state, or regional groups may be the only arenas of involvement available to some participants for whatever reason, others participate fully in archival activity on more than one level at the same time.  

Programs from meetings of various state societies provide some insight into one way in which archival organizations strive to serve their members and others. These programs include a wide range of participants and subject matter. Speakers and panelists are drawn from among archivists, librarians, records managers, professors of history or English or political science, researchers, graduate students, administrators from government or from information agencies, and others. Sessions vary widely from workshops on such basic archival concepts and techniques as appraisal, arrangement and description, reference, conservation, and automation to more formal presentations of papers addressing such topics as education for the archival profession, historic preservation in urban settings, and the view of archival work held by society.  

It would appear from a review of selected programs that at least some southeastern archival organizations are trying to look both inward and outward. Archival cooperation, archival development, and archival work seem to remain at the center of much of their activity, but they are trying to educate archivists and to provide for their continuing development. They are also trying to introduce non-archivists and new archivists to the archival profession and to furnish a local forum for the discussion of issues common to archivists and to others.  

Planning and programming is never a simple matter, especially for any organization with a continuously evolving membership and with these members representing many varied levels of experience. Organizations must attract members and, then, must serve them and respond to their needs as
these members grow, yet these same organizations must also serve and be responsive to the needs of newer members and possibly also potential members. Operating harmoniously under circumstances which differ from state to state and serving diverse and constantly changing memberships are certainly major challenges facing archival organizations at this time of growth and change in the archival profession and in society as a whole. With six state archival organizations and two regional archival organizations at work in the Southeast, this region will most certainly continue to take a leading role in the training of and professional development for archivists, in the promotion of archival work, and in the ongoing growth of organizations responsive to the special situations in their own areas and to the needs of their many constituencies.
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As archivists in Georgia, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Kentucky began to automate in the early 1980s, most found microcomputers much more to their liking than main-frame computer systems or book-oriented network systems. Few archivists in the region were using computers before microcomputers were developed in the mid-1970s. The smaller computers that were marketed during this period allowed users in the region to adapt programs easily to their individual needs at minimum cost. However, the limited capacities of the first microcomputers have pushed archivists, as they move into the 1980s, to buy larger microcomputers or small minicomputers.

This application required archivists to learn about computer technology because procedures could not be spoon-fed from a manual devised by a network. Such expertise can be an advantage to archivists who may acquire machine-readable records generated by the personal computers of donors. In fact, archivists who braved this field can pride themselves in being part of what Alvin Toffler calls the "techno-rebels" of the "third wave." They have thus contributed to the "demassified information revolution" which Toffler feels provides an alternative to industrial society.

At present, standardization for archivists on the national level, despite the efforts of the National Information Systems Task Force (NISTF), may be more idealistic than practical. Furthermore, it may not be demanded by automation. Microcomputers can provide the advantages of automation without all of the demands for standardization and the problems
of integrating into a network. It should be noted that some standardization will occur when systems are developed from the same software packages or when archivists borrow ideas from one another, but this need not detract from the argument that microcomputers provide a certain flexibility that network-based, main-frame computers do not. For example, small computers provide for administrative and processing functions, such as form letter writing, label production, and report generation, that are not built into network systems.4

It seems likely that archives in large universities will be required to provide data for book-oriented information networks. This idea is in the preliminary stages in many southeastern states. While archivists at such institutions should plan for this development, it need not conflict with the current use of microcomputers. Some network systems will use microcomputers to access network systems. It is likely that machine-readable information, particularly if it follows NISTF standards, can more easily be converted to use by networks than data that is not in machine-readable form. Current projects to convert SPINDEX to a MARC format may demonstrate the feasibility of conversion projects.5

The use of a microcomputer by a project in Georgia proved that the smaller computers are less expensive to operate and more flexible than main-frame computers. In 1982 as part of a National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) Needs Assessment Grant, the Manuscripts Task Force of the Georgia Historical Records Advisory Board funded a survey and directory of archival repositories in Georgia. The task force received bids from the computer department of a state university and the author who had just bought an Apple II+ microcomputer for his in-the-home business. Even though the microcomputer needed additional hardware to complete the job, the author's bid was $1000 less than that of the computer center at the state university whose staff was planning to write a program specifically for this application. The task
force also recognized the advantage of having a knowledgeable archivist inputting the data, particularly when interpretation was required.6

For an archivist to undertake the directory project with very little training in computers meant that problems were inevitable. However, the success of the project indicates that the problems were not insurmountable, chiefly due to the relative simplicity of the microcomputer. The author selected a software package that allowed some statistical compilation, indexing, and formatting for publication. Lower case printing was not required. The package that met these specifications was a data management system called Personal Filing System (PFS) written in Pascal. The task force required that a letter quality printer be used. This added to the cost of the project and limited selection to the only low-cost, letter quality printer on the market at the time. The printer was so new that it had no proven service record; when it malfunctioned, no one could offer an effective diagnosis. In addition, in order to create the desired indexes, a second disk drive was needed.7

Formatting data proved to be crucial, particularly in the production of printed output. This factor was not readily apparent when the project began, and at first, there was no easy way of changing the format without re-entering the data. Fortunately, part way through the project, PFS introduced an updated system which permitted shifting and lengthening of data fields and reading from one data disk to another.8 The update also contained added search capabilities and a measurement of the space left on the data disk. The data, which was gathered from a four-page survey of over one hundred fifty respondents, was so extensive that some thoughtful formatting was required in order to fit all the information on one disk.

Data fields and field names had to be limited in length and, thus, necessitated the use of abbreviations. The abbreviations made the printed output more workable though somewhat less
Comments by the task force on abbreviation of field names were helpful. These are some of the same problems faced by institutions in networks, but with a microcomputer controlled by a small group, accommodation to the particular situation was less arduous. Though abbreviations were necessary, lengthy explanations of quantified answers to questions were recorded on the computer as appended pages to each form. This added feature of PFS demonstrated its adaptability to this unique situation.

The project's first output was a statistical compilation. The percentage figures which were easily and quickly tabulated by the computer were so numerous that more man-hours were spent interpreting the figures than in generating the statistics. The process indicates possibilities for social research in archives and the impact of computers in such a study. For example, the questionnaire found that about half of the respondents expressed "great interest" in computers. Using a Boolean logic function, it was determined that those with the greatest interest in computers came from the Atlanta and Macon (Georgia) areas. Though these calculations might have been done more easily on spreadsheet software like VisiCalc, PFS performed well without quantifying all fields.

Indexing and data editing were the most advantageous aspects of PFS in creating the Directory of Georgia Archives and Manuscript Repositories. The four alphabetical and eleven numerical indexes that went into the directory were sorted and printed in column style by the PFS Report package. The main body of the directory, to which the indexes referred, was organized and printed by the PFS package in two different formats (with and without field headings) similar to the NHPRC's national directory. Data editing required by proofreading, last minute changes, and additional information from follow-up phone interviews was facilitated by the search and organizational capabilities of the computer. Unlike SPINDEX, PFS
allows direct access to any record by searching one or more fields with whole or partial words and ranges of numbers. A plus was the ability to print mailing labels from the data in order to distribute copies of the directory.

Another Georgia project using PFS and PFS Report is the indexing of slave bills of sale by the Afro-American Family History Association. Using software that was deposited in 1983 for future updates of the archives and repositories directory, the association plans to create indexes similar to those in the directory and, in addition, use a keyword function to alphabetize names filed as multiple entries in a single data field. Statistics that can be generated on PFS by comparing fields such as sale price with age, location, etc., could prove valuable to econometric studies of slavery. The project's use of PFS was facilitated by recording data on control sheets with well-defined fields.

The projects that have been described show that the PFS data base management system coupled with PFS Report provides versatile software. Though it lacks word processing capabilities such as right-hand justifying and indented margins, the system does permit centering and margin-setting so that camera-ready copy can be produced. While it has some statistical functions and a complementary graphics package, it lacks many functions and cannot be used in conjunction with other software.

The recently established archives for Troup County, Georgia, used a Lanier E-Z 1 to prevent a backlog of recordkeeping which developed when its small staff was initially faced with processing a relatively large amount of governmental records, maps, and manuscripts. Though Lanier computers are designed primarily for word processing, the E-Z 1 has a data base management package that permits searching and sorting easily within a limited scope. The computer, which has a daisy wheel, letter quality printer and a five megabyte hard disk, was chosen primarily for Lanier's service reputation and the willingness of the local retailer to train and
suggest procedures to the archives' staff.\textsuperscript{12} The word processing functions, which include a spelling checker, enabled the archive to produce camera-ready copy for numerous, sophisticated newsletters, brochures, and press releases to publicize the new facility. Correspondence, particularly form letters, was easily handled by the computer. Mailing lists have been stored for use in mass mailing. Reports were generated on the computer with statistics compiled by the machine. Each of the procedures was easily learned and applied because the microcomputer and its manual were designed with these in mind. Such features as right-hand justification, proportional spacing, centering, limited searching, and many others found only in expensive word processing packages are built into the system. The repetitive tasks of generating folder and box labels also were made less tedious by use of the word processor.\textsuperscript{13}

The Data Manager software was used to create several files. Since the Troup County Archives is the repository for local governmental records, the staff had to inventory quickly over seven hundred volumes of county records which included deed and tax information eagerly desired by genealogical patrons. The records were grouped together by the computer rather than on the shelf, thereby saving valuable staff time in physical organization. Using the sorting function of the software, an accession register was created for these records. The computer also assisted in the records management program by scheduling destruction and recording documents which had been pulled for use by the local agency.\textsuperscript{14}

Though it has limitations, the Data Manager system has been used by the archives staff to track accession and administrative information, as well as to develop indexes for intellectual control of their records. Such data can be searched on-line using exact or partial match information. Tabulation of such figures as total volume accessioned or processed can be periodically compiled. Shelflist, donor list, accession record, and other administrative files can
be generated regularly by the computer, but they are not stored on disk as separately arranged indexes.

To provide information for patrons, a holdings list was created including collection title, size, record, type, processing status, brief description, existence of a guide, and inclusive dates. However, the program's limitation of field lengths printed on one line (one hundred and forty characters total per record) has made the prospective product unacceptable for patron use. Much of it had to be put in coded form which is not easily read. A more usable software package is being sought by the archive. Because the computer can support software written for CP/M operating systems, their options are many, but they will need one that is compatible with the Lanier word processing system. With an improved system, the archives staff hopes to produce name and subject indexing as well.15

The only major mechanical problem encountered by the archives was a defect in the hard disk. Due to proper floppy disk backup procedures, a potential loss of information was prevented. The storage capacity of the microcomputer is more than adequate for this newly developed archives. In fact, the large capacity of this relatively expensive microcomputer has tempted the staff to consider developing it as a multi-user system.16 The computer seems well suited to Troup County Archives' present needs.

At the University of North Carolina at Charlotte a data management package named Data Factory has been used on an Apple II computer to manipulate several of the university archives' files. University publications are entered as they are accessioned and then searched in one of as many as twenty fields or printed alphabetically in one of four different ways. The university archives' accession register, plus a list of its record groups and series, are also kept in the computer using Data Factory. Searching and printing lists of record groups, subgroups, and series numbers can be performed, as well as compilation of statistical analyses of these
categories. Monthly circulation and reference statistics for the archives are kept using the Data Factory which can do math functions in two fields.

The limitation of the system is the 48K memory of the Apple II. The computer, which was purchased in July 1982, has been superseded by the more powerful Apple IIe. For example, a comprehensive list of folders could not be handled by this small system. However, plans have been made to obtain an Apple with more than twice the memory to overcome this problem. Data Factory is quite flexible in that field lengths and format can be changed without deleting data. Files can be merged and multiline print formats can be defined. The program can read text files created by other Applesoft BASIC programs but cannot be exported to other systems. In addition, the eighty-eight page manual is sometimes unclear and contains no index.

An Applewriter word processing package has been used by the University of North Carolina archives and the manuscripts department to produce printed collection descriptions and box lists. Archivists with limited typing skills find they can input the information, edit, and have the computer print final copy without having to wait for clerical assistance from a typist. It is also hoped that subject and name indexes can be produced for the collection descriptions. However, a more sophisticated word processing package would be necessary to produce these indexes.

At the University of Kentucky in 1983, the Modern Political Collections Unit used an Apple II+ to print camera-ready copy for a guide to a governor's papers which included name and subject indexes. Box lists were also generated from the data keyed-in for the guide. The program used was ScreenWriter II, a word processing program that right-hand justifies, tabs, and generates page numbers and headings. The software alphabetized designated terms from the text and folder titles found in the guide, printing them automatically in an index which indicated the page on which the term was
found. The 48K memory of the microcomputer limited the practical amount of full text in one file to about eight pages, single-spaced. However, files can be printed consecutively with the pagination, headers, and format preset for the entire document. The memory capacity also limits the number of terms in each of the two indexes to about one hundred terms from about twenty-five pages of text. 19

In 1984 the Modern Political Collections Unit at Kentucky has also used an IBM PC with 512K memory and double-sided disks to create box lists, folder labels, subject indexes, and a guide to the photographs in a large collection. The software used, named PC-File, is a freeware data base management package with capabilities beyond more expensive software. For example, PC-File allows regularly used terms to be stored and then recalled for insertion by pressing two keys simultaneously. Field names can be changed quickly, and reports can be printed from fields in any order. Permanent indexes can be generated by copying a file and sorting it by any field. However, with eighteen fields and four hundred records per file, only a few files can be stored on one double-sided disk. 20

A dot matrix printer has been used for box lists and folder labels, but access to a letter quality printer will be sought for printing the subject indexes and guides because they will be more regularly used by patrons. The thirty-page manual, which can be printed from the PC-File disk, is clear but rather brief. Files can be exported to other IBM software such as Wordstar, Mailmerge, VisiCalc, and Multiplan through a Data Interchange Format (DIF) file. Terms can be searched with partial match and linking of terms (and/or), though patron use of this capacity will be limited for the near future. The software makes excellent use of the PC's function keys. Special provisions in PC-File are made for the printing of labels for folders and mailing lists. 21

The Microcomputer Archives and Records Management System (MARS) developed at Archives of
Appalachia, East Tennessee State University, was intended as a prototype archival system. With grant money received during 1980 and 1981, the archivist there planned to develop a "turn-key" or ready-to-use, integrated computer system for archives. A programmer, a consultant and literature searches helped the archivist plan for a system with three subsystems, "Accession," "Administration," and "Query Collection." When it proved too difficult to write a program for this application, a commercial data base management package was purchased along with an Apple II+ computer with 48K memory and two disk drives. DB Master, the program that was purchased, permits a more customized system than any of the data base managers previously mentioned without altering the source code. However, the plans or the system far exceeded that which was developed.22

Unlike PFS, DB Master offers multi-diskette file handling, automatic data "packing" for increased disk capacity, password file protection, and "dynamic prompting" for designing instructions for the user on the screen. With these capabilities, an accession record was developed which tracked such information as accession number, title, date received, donor, record type, processing status, size, span dates, and location. At present, this preliminary record is the nearest the archives has come to having a complete record of its collections on disk. The file presently fits on one disk, though it is possible for DB Master to read two disks of the same file at one time. The file can serve as a shelflist and a donor's list as well as accession record.23

The Query Collection subsystem, which would permit a patron to use partial-term and Boolean searches with as many as twenty terms to locate a full record of the collection, has yet to be developed. While DBMaster will permit such searches and can be structured for patron use, it will not allow information from the accession record to be read into the Query Collection format. This limits the system's intended capabilities as an integrated package, for many of the same fields will have to be
keyed-in on separate disks. Subject authority standards were curiously neglected when the system was first established, despite elaborate precautions to standardize procedures in anticipation of automation. This will be corrected in the plans for the new system which may offer the patrons a list of subjects by type and subheading.24

The Administrative subsystem was intended to keep track of staff work schedules, supply orders, budgets, and researcher registration. The files that actually were created were a lead file (tracks correspondence), a fund-raising file, and a researcher registration record. The computational and list handling capabilities of DB Master give these files a potential for handling some administrative duties. The registration file includes coded information on name, address, institutional affiliation, research interest, date, time, collection examined, and seat location. Much of the data for these files has not yet been converted from a paper format to machine-readable form.

A change of administration at the Archives of Appalachia has perhaps delayed the full use of the system. However, the new personnel also brought to the situation a desirable re-evaluation of a partially developed computer system. An additional use of the computer planned by the new administration is a grant-funded project to print a directory of Appalachian archives similar to the Georgia project that used PFS. The archives staff has been hampered in its production of usable printouts by a low quality thermal printer and hopes to acquire a better printer soon.25

The treasurer of the Tennessee Archivists has developed software for use with his personal Commodore 64 computer to handle the mailing and membership lists of that society. The Society of Georgia Archivists has also used a microcomputer to handle its mailing list. The program was designed to print both in alphabetical and zip code order. The former was for a list printed in their newsletter.
The latter helped meet post office requirements for bulk mailing. The chief problem was the absence of a tractor-feed on the letter quality printer. Without frequent attention the slick mailing labels slipped out of position in the friction-feed mechanism.26

The Kentucky Department for Libraries and Archives has developed a hybrid SPINDEX system for the grant-funded Kentucky guide project, an attempt to gain intellectual control of manuscript collections, as well as state and local governmental records, throughout the state. Through the use of a WANG OIS computer which telecommunicates with an IBM 360, the department can combine the capacity of the main-frame with the flexibility of a "super-microcomputer." The WANG, which is known for its word processing capabilities, has been used to handle correspondence, finance, and reports; but its most creative use has been text editing in conjunction with a SPINDEX program stored in an off-site, main-frame computer.27

SPINDEX, a program developed by the National Archives and Records Service (NARS) in the 1970s, must be run on a main-frame IBM 360 or larger. Thought it has undergone several revisions designed mostly to enhance the electronic photocomposition and indexing capabilities, it is rather difficult to access the data files. With the addition of the WANG, the department can edit and update the master file much more easily than the previous antiquated batch procedures. While the WANG does not make SPINDEX an interactive system whose files can be searched on-line by a patron, the microcomputer helps the archives diagnose the many bugs in the system and correct problems without printing all the data from beginning to end. This is particularly necessary for SPINDEX because of the poor system documentation furnished by NARS.28

The telecommunications package for the WANG also helps overcome some, if not all, of the handicaps of using an off-site, main-frame computer. Copies of the disk packs which store the master list of data are kept in the archives and at the main-frame site.
Once data is loaded at the computer center, the WANG can access it directly using little time on the main-frame. The telecommunications software should also permit the department to receive and transmit machine-readable information from other parts of Kentucky, but the details of this procedure have yet to be completed. The capability of dial up data bases in the state has also been an option.

The system allows entry of data in over nine hundred fields, only eighty of which have been used. The fields include as many as ten entries each for subjects, corporate names, personal names, media types, and geographical area. The terms can be integrated into a single index with cross-references and inversion of hyphenated terms. The limits of this system are not in its capacity to store and manipulate data. SPINDEX is designed to accommodate even item level description. Yet, the amount of time it takes to create the descriptions and type them into the machine will prohibit this kind of access except on a limited scale. Still, the project represents the use of a microcomputer toward development of a national data base. Early in 1984, the project had printouts for much of the state archives and thirty-five other repositories in Kentucky, thus showing progress on input for an estimated five thousand collections statewide.29

The current trend among archivists in these four southeastern states is to buy microcomputers with greater memory and more sophisticated data base management programs. Typical of this trend was the recent purchase of an IBM XT (with a hard disk) and D Base II program by the photographic archives at the University of Louisville. D Base II, a very popular package, enables the archivist to create an elaborate system of indexes from a single input. This powerful program requires the user to memorize what amounts to a language of commands, but its advantages are worth the effort to archivists like those in Louisville who had been using a main-frame computer.30

Many challenges face archivists who are using microcomputers. There is a need to find software
that can integrate the various functions required by archives. Few inexpensive microcomputer packages presently have compatible word processing, data base management, and spreadsheet software, though designers are beginning to market these. Despite the potential of the microcomputer for developing an interactive system, not one of the previously mentioned applications have in place an on-line system for patron use. However, archivists cited have found many useful functions for microcomputers. It is hoped that from simple steps such as those outlined that archival institutions will adopt microcomputers as a regularly applied tool and gradually build usable systems.31

NOTES

1 Two exceptions are the SELGEM program at the University of Louisville Photographic Archives and the SPINDEX program at the Kentucky Department for Libraries and Archives in Frankfort. Both now use microcomputers. Western Carolina University in Cullowhee, NC, uses a minicomputer for a manuscripts project. Apologies are due to appropriate projects that were left out of this study.
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4 SPINDEX, the most widely used archival system allows users some flexibility. OCLC and RLIN, book systems that specialize in distributive processing, allow local fields, but have rigid MARC standards and high start-up costs. There have been RLIN and SOLINET (OCLC) workshops on manuscripts, but development has been slow. Nancy Sahli, "Prospectives from Archivists," in Automating ed. McCrank, 237-39, outlines the problems of networks for archivists.

5 "Newsreels," Provenance: The Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists 1,1 (Spring 1983): 69, had a report that Duke University was planning to input manuscript data to OCLC. SUN Newsletter, September 1983, back page, had a description of the grant-funded RLIN to MARC conversion at Stanford, Yale, and Cornell.

6 Since the author was setting up a new business many hardware costs could be written off his taxes. Thus, in this situation it was as advantageous to use budgeted money for hardware as for labor costs. However, this meant start-up costs were sizeable.

7 It is believed that the problem stems from the printer's or interface card's inability to deal with a software package that is written in Pascal. The printer has no such problem printing the contents of Applesoft BASIC text files. PFS requires 48K memory and is also available for Apple IIe and III, plus the IBM PC, XT and compatibles.

1981), 18, notes the value of variable length fields for archives. In 1983 the data base part of PFS became known as PFS: File.

9 Multiline fields (over 40 characters) were printed in an unreadable way, and a single sided disk held less than 150 three-page records. Therefore, the text had to be abbreviated.

10 The Boolean logic function "and" searches the file for records with specified retrieval information in two or more data fields. The "not" function will retrieve all records that do not have what is specified in a particular data field. Thus Macon "and" Atlanta could be compared with all that were "not" from these cities.

11 Hickerson, Automated Access, 32.


13 Kaye Lanning, Micro PC User Survey conducted by Peter E. Schinkel and Glen McAninch (Fall 1983). The SGA Newsletter in 1983, as well as the newsletter for Troup County Archives, was compiled by Lanning on the Lanier computer.

14 Lanning, "Starting," 41; idem, spring meeting of the Society of Georgia Archivists, St. Simons Island, 26 May 1983.

15 Lanning, "Starting," 41.

16 The system costs approximately $16,000 and has 256k of internal memory.

17 Robin Brabham to Glen McAninch, 26 October

18 Brabham to McAninch, 26 October 1983; Screenwriter II for the Apple allows a limited amount of indexing of designated terms.

19 Screenwriter II is a powerful program that is complicated and sometimes awkward to use. The program itself requires much of the computer's memory.

20 PC-file version 9.1 requires only 96k memory and a single-sided disk but handles larger files with more memory and a double-sided disk drive. The latest version, PC-File III, works even faster than 9.1.

21 Douglas Clapp, "For What It's Worth," *PC World*, I, (6 September 1983): 154-59. The "freeware" software is designed to be copied with the provision that $35 be sent to the author, Jim Button. Clapp finds PC-file comparable to Visifile and Easyfile.


24 Kesner and Hurst "MARS", 13-15; Conversations with Archives of Appalachia staff, February 1984.

25 The archives has a word processing program
called Easywriter, which gets little use. There has been no attempt to integrate this with a DB Master.

26 Conversation with Mark Winter, October 1983.

27 Conversation with Thomas Converse 23 August 1983. The WANG OIS has 2.6MB memory and coordinates seven terminals each with 64K, a disk pack drive, several printers, a telecommunication package, and several other types of software. The computer, software, and peripherals cost about $40,000. In Washington, Oregon, and elsewhere WANGs and Kaypros are being used in similar SPINDEX applications according to the SUN Newsletter, 5 (1983). The Kentucky project also contributed to the identification of 20 percent of the state archives holdings which could be discarded.

28 Hickerson, Automated Access, 27-29.

29 Conversation with Thomas Converse, 23 August 1983; Thomas Converse, "Kentucky Guide Project", Kentucky Council on Archives Newsletter 5, 1 (Spring 1983) and 1, 2 (Fall 1979).


31 Many integrated packages like Lotus 1-2-3, are number oriented. See also SAVY for Apple II and the Incredible Jack. PFS:Write became available in late 1983 with the ability to incorporate mailing lists into form letters, but not the ability to reformat data files for publication. This is the same orientation as many recently available systems. VisiCorp and Microsoft are developing expensive integrated software. The use of DIF software and conversion of files to ASCII characters may be the best way to integrate software. Some operating systems allow integration.
The Appalachian Oral History Project: Then and Now

John R. Williams and Katherine R. Martin

Narration is ageless. The impulse to tell a story and the need to listen to it have made narrative the natural companion of man throughout the history of civilization. Stories are able to adapt themselves to any local and social climate. They are old and venerable, but they are also new and up to date.¹

The Appalachian Oral History Project (AOHP) is a product of its time, resulting from the social unrest during the Vietnam war, the Kennedy-Johnson war on poverty, and the growing awareness of grass roots history. History from the mouths of the people, as academicians and laymen alike were becoming aware, detailed events and perspectives different from those generally found in history textbooks. Political and economic events on a national or international scale often assumed an insignificant status in people's everyday lives. It was the personal event or achievement which held true meaning and historical impact for those who cared to recall.

Perhaps a feeling of defensive pride also underlay the desire to begin a project of this kind, since the war on poverty had neglected the more positive aspects of Appalachian culture. So in 1970, the project began with a small staff and the help of students at Alice Lloyd College, Emory and Henry College, Lees Junior College, and Appalachian State University as well as grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Rockefeller Foundation. The project was designed to collect and preserve some of the region's personal histories and memories and to encourage students to appreciate and
promote the rich history and folklore of the Appalachian people.

When William John Thomas coined the term folklore in 1846, after years of studying popular antiquities, he never dreamed that someday scores of students brandishing tape recorders would sally forth up the hollers of Appalachian Kentucky, Virginia, and North Carolina in search of the folk. Thomas and the early folklorists witnessed the vast societal changes affected by the Industrial Revolution and sought to collect the oral traditions of an agricultural society which was rapidly being rendered obsolete. To the earliest folklorists, including such notables as the brothers Grimm, not everyone was a part of the folk. Indeed, only the peasants were considered bearers of oral traditions, and folklore was viewed as a mysterious remnant of quaint and curious pagan rituals.

This elitist view of the folk, based on a faulty syllogism, established a dichotomy which influenced the definition of folklore for at least a century. The syllogism goes something like this: Only folk possess folklore; the folk is peasantry; and therefore, only the peasantry possess folklore. Today, many folklorists consider almost any group as the folk and their expressive culture as lore. Thus, folklore is a dynamic part of all people's lives. It is generated, preserved, and changed through the communicative process. As social institutions change, folklore changes, and in areas where traditional institutions remain relatively unaltered, so does folklore.

The basic institutions of Appalachia had certainly experienced alterations by 1970 when the Appalachian Oral History Project began. The agrarian society rooted in a barter economy had rapidly given way to industry. Logging, mining, tourism and other industries had replaced farming as the economic mainstay of the region. Family farm traditions were no longer functional in industrialized Appalachia. New cultural patterns were replacing the old. Nevertheless, the generation which remembered the
self-sufficient agricultural traditions was still alive and had important stories to tell.

Since the major focus of the AOHP was to educate students, primarily students from Appalachia, about the cultural diversity of the region and to instill in them an appreciation for Appalachian culture, each student designed his own interviewing project. Often they chose to interview grandparents, relatives or friends from their own communities. Thus, many of the interviews in the collection are general in nature, made up primarily of personal narratives concerning work experiences and social customs in the mountains.

The second goal of the project was to use the collected material in a published social history of Appalachia, thereby providing a framework for the project. The book, *Our Appalachia: An Oral History*, was published in 1977 and contains portions of forty-seven interviews. It is divided into three sections. Part one, "A Simpler Time," relates the stories about Appalachia before the major industrial changes. Part two, "A Culture Under Attack," takes the people from the farms to the coal camps. Part three, "Digging In," raises questions about the future of Appalachian culture.

Each section required a different set of questionnaires, and the content of each section dictated the scope of the interviews. Section one relied upon general, rather straightforward questions about various family and social customs. However, sections two and three required a more complicated line of questioning. Some of these more complex social issues were better handled by staff members than undergraduates, and the more difficult interviews had to be carried out by staff members.

Whether by students or staff, the interview itself was always a complicated process. Murphy's law generally applied, that is, anything that can go wrong will! Usually an informant, who had been notified well in advance, was prepared for the interview, but it was the interviewer's responsibility to set up the interview, to put an
informant at ease about the interview and to eliminate background noise if possible. The tape recorder had to be properly set up, using a/c current and an exterior microphone. The best interviewers asked pertinent questions and allowed the informant time to respond completely, without interruptions.

One of the project's major problems was legal release agreements (figure 1). Although it is best to have the release signed immediately after the interview, in many instances this aspect of the interview was neglected, and in at least one case, project staff later had to obtain agreements from the surviving relatives of an informant who unfortunately died shortly after the interview.

The mechanics of preserving the materials became more complicated as the number of taped interviews grew. Each tape had to be labeled, copied, outlined, indexed, and transcribed. Since every hour of tape requires five hours or more to transcribe, a large backlog of tapes developed, and project staff had to resort to a rating system. Tapes which were to be published in the book or tapes of very articulate speakers received top priority and were transcribed first.

The question of how to go about transcribing is an important one. How do you indicate body language? What about laughter or other sounds (children, chain saws, barking dogs)? What constitutes a sentence, a paragraph? When portions are not transcribed, how can omissions be noted? Is the transcript of a conversation an integrated whole or a series of segments which can be cut and pasted or word processed to fit particular needs?

Accurate phonetic transcriptions were almost impossible without using a detailed phonetic alphabet and indicating various suprasegmentals such as pitch, stress and juncture. This process requires a great deal of training, and few researchers would be able to use the finished product. We discussed a modified phonetic transcription such as that used by novelist Harriet Arnow, but several of the staff members were concerned that this transcription would reinforce the
negative Appalachian stereotype. So, the staff opted to use standard spelling and make selective grammatical changes in the published edition of the transcripts.

By 1984 the project (now housed at Alice Lloyd College) held close to two thousand taped interviews, six hundred of which had been transcribed. Most were conducted in the eight counties surrounding Knott County in eastern Kentucky. The collection covers a wide range of subjects—family and county histories, the Great Depression, farming methods, early education, home remedies, politics, and others. The greatest amount of material is on the subject that has served as the area's financial underpinning—coal. The older miners' recollections of the early days of mining are particularly poignant.

Today the status of the project office at Alice Lloyd College is more that of an archive rather than an active collecting agency, and only three part-time students and a part-time director are currently employed. This staff collects between five and ten new interviews a year and publishes an annual edition of *Mountain Memories*, which includes edited versions of some of the project interviews along with appropriate photographs. The journal is the staff's top priority, and many of the office's operations center around each succeeding issue. The project's second priority is cataloging its collection.

Cataloging has gained precedence over gathering new interviews because of the imbalance between the time required to transcribe, edit, and type each interview and the limited research use of the collection. Scholars and students using oral history materials often face an insurmountable task when trying to locate data. Many interviews are cataloged only by interviewee and have no subject access to their content. Immediate comprehensive cataloging of each interview by interviewee, interviewer, location, tape number and, most importantly, subject has become the only answer. This is time-consuming, particularly when cataloging
is done from a tape rather than a transcript, but it is a crucial task nevertheless.

When a taped interview is accessioned, it is immediately given a consecutive number which is written on the cassette cover before storage. A card with this accession number is typed and placed in the shelf list file. The next step, depending on the potential value of the interview to researchers, is either to transcribe the interview as soon as possible and then catalog from the transcript, or to catalog immediately from the tape and save transcription for a later time. Very often, because of the large number of interviews, a tape is transcribed only when a researcher requests a transcript.

Since the project office has a fairly rapid turnover of student help, standardized forms control cataloging. Whether working with a tape or a transcript, students use an "Information for Catalog Cards" sheet on which they record all data (figure 2). This sheet is then used to type index cards (figures 3, 4, and 5). All information sheets are kept as a record of the subject headings used for each interview. The project office plans to computerize its cataloging system, thereby increasing its ability to assist researchers.

Fourteen years after its creation, the Appalachian Oral History Project is a small one, with limited growth in the number of interviews done each year. But during those fourteen years, the value of the project to students has been immense. Transcribing exercises enabled students to envision the difference between written and spoken English, and this understanding led to valuable discussions about the social significance of Appalachian dialect and mainstream English. Discussions about Appalachian cultural change, based on the collected stories about past and present customs, led to an understanding of the relationship between language and culture.

Most important has been the impact of the project on the self-esteem and cultural awareness of
the students who participate in the project. Hester Mullins, an early student interviewer at Alice Lloyd College, says in her critique of her experiences: When I started working for oral history, I began to appreciate the qualities the people did have, their fellowship, their rapport. I couldn't believe so many people could open their hearts to me.... I was ashamed of the fact that Grandpa had made moonshine, but when I started interviewing Grandma I found out he once had been a magistrate, he ran a store, he had been a schoolteacher, he could repair all kinds of tools, he built barns for people, cleaned ground. I realized he was the type of man who did what he had to do to make a living. In his boots I would have done the same thing.

Then I began to feel glad because I felt I can be proud of my heritage because they fought to survive.
APPALACHIAN ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

INTERVIEWEE'S DEED OF GIFT AGREEMENT

I, __________________________, hereby give my oral history interview with __________________________, which Interviewer (please print) was conducted on ______________, to the Appalachian Oral History Project.

It is hereby agreed between myself and the Appalachian Oral History Project that all rights, title, and interest in the tape recording or transcript (verbatim and edited) belong to the Appalachian Oral History Project.

The following restrictions are to be placed upon and will govern the use of the interview:

In full accord with the provisions of this Deed of Gift, I Hereunto set my hand.

_________________________  __________________________
Donor                        Date

Figure 1
INFORMATION FOR CATALOG CARDS

Narrator's Name:

Birth and death dates

Occupation

Location (State, County, City):

Address (Box no., etc if different from above):

Tape number:

Subject headings (List a heading only if real information is included):

Abstract (Limit to 26 words or less. Full sentences are not necessary):

Date of interview:

Interviewer:

Tape length:

Pages (To be listed only after final transcript is typed):

Legal Agreement: Yes____ No____

Figure 2
SUBJECT CARDS

MARRIAGE AND COURTSHIP - WEDDING

1779 MARTIN, ELVA (12/16/16- ) Housewife

Parents' names, birthdates, occupation;
April 7, 1941—met husband; finished school in 1932; presents and decorations at Christmas; black children; black miners; facial make-up.

See Shelf List Card

EDUCATION - Schools and Schooling

1779 MARTIN, ELVA (12/16/16- ) Housewife

Parents' names, birthdates, occupations;
April 7, 1941—met husband; finished school in 1932; presents and decorations at Christmas; black children; black miners; facial make-up.

See Shelf List Card

PARENTS

1779 MARTIN, ELVA (12/16/16- ) Housewife

Parent's names, birthdates, occupations;
April 7, 1941—met husband; finished school in 1932; presents and decorations at Christmas; black children; black miners; facial make-up.

See Shelf List Card

Figure 3
### INTERVIEWEE CARD

**MARTIN, ELVA (12/16/16- ) Housewife 1779**

Parents' names, birthdates, occupations; April 7, 1941—met husband; finished school in 1932; presents and decorations at Christmas; black children; black miners; facial make-up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Box 24; Hueysville, Ky. 41640</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Interview:</td>
<td>July 5, 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer:</td>
<td>Susan Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape Length:</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Agreement</td>
<td>Yes____ No____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SHELF LIST CARD

**1779 MARTIN, ELVA (12/16/16- ) Housewife**

Parents' names, birthdates, occupations; April 7, 1941—met husband; finished school in 1932; presents and decorations at Christmas; black children; black miners; facial make-up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Box 24; Hueysville, Ky. 41640</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Interview:</td>
<td>July 5, 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer:</td>
<td>Susan Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape Length:</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Agreement</td>
<td>Yes____ No____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4
LOCATION CARD

Kentucky - Floyd County - Hueysville

672  SHEPHERD, DELLA (1921-    ) Farmer
1779 MARTIN, ELVA (12/16/16-    ) Housewife
1780
ABC  HAYES, RONDAL E. (7/19/15-    ) Merchant
1793 GEARHEART, FRONA (11/2/01-    ) Housewife

Figure 5
NOTES


2 Other activities which grew out of the project include *Recollections*, a journal of selected interviews and photographs, a slide/tape presentation documenting the project, and a catalog of the better transcriptions.

3 On the average, the project has had no more than ten requests for material per year.

4 Subject headings have been listed in Appalachian Oral History Project Union Catalog published in 1977.

5 Another member of the Appalachian Oral History Project, Lees Junior College, has already begun to put its interviews on computer, including interviewee's name, the subject, abstract, interviewer, tape number, length, date, quality, and legal status. Mary McLaren, Lees' librarian, used Peach Text 5000 by Peachtree Software which allows three hundred interviews to be put on a single text. Alice Lloyd College is also considering Superfile by FYI, Inc., which would enable staff to write abstracts of interviews in conjunction with a word processing program and then index the interviews by a series of key words. Choice of a program will depend on ease of use for both the technician entering the data and the researcher retrieving it.

Southern Archives: A Distinguished Past—A Bright Future

As the twenty-first century approaches it is accompanied by dramatic changes for the South. Southerners have been inundated with demographic, technological, and social developments which have exercised and will continue to effect dramatic changes in the traditional southern life-style. Once sleeping villages have become busy cities complete with shopping malls and burgeoning industry. All white public schools, businesses, and even churches have yielded to pressures for social equality and racial integration. An equable climate and multitudinous recreational and retirement opportunities have magnetized millions of Americans from the Northeast and Midwest, luring them to the Southland. All of these developments will, or at least should have far-reaching implications for southern archives and professional archivists for years to come.

As the last vestiges of a unique way of life disappear, southern archives will play an increasingly important role as they preserve the documentation of that life-style, making it available to the scholarly community and the general public. Significant records retained in many repositories will themselves reflect the evolving nature of the South as its distinctive character disappears and becomes supplanted by a sunbelt culture much more similar to the pluralism recognizable to a majority of Americans. Increased population should provide a larger tax base and/or greater charitable resources
for the development and improvement of archival facilities. A variety of new regional repositories have already made an impact through aggressive outreach programs and publicizing collecting policies. New and imaginative graduate programs in archival administration (not always identified by that name) will enable the South to remain at the forefront of professional education. Finally, the growth of newly organized regional professional organizations will provide the opportunity for continuing education among archivists and the kind of stimulating dialogue necessary to promote continued interest in professional growth.

Throughout the twentieth century the South has benefitted from the presence of fine archival institutions, both public and private as well as several world renowned manuscripts repositories. Due, in part, to the continuing efforts of the personnel of these institutions, both by the examples they have set in the development of and care for their collections and their aid in establishing other important regional institutions, archival institutions, and the profession will continue to grow and to play an increasingly significant role not only within the region but on the national scene as well.

Jerrold Lee Brooks
Historical Foundation of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches

Is There Anything Unique About Archives/ Archivists in the Southeast?

As I sat and pondered this question, I recalled my first Society of American Archivists meeting held in Philadelphia in 1975. I arrived in Philadelphia with only the most basic training in archival techniques, little or no experience in the real world of archives, and almost no practical knowledge of the
problems of other archives and archivists.

At this early stage in my new career (I had been a librarian for the previous twenty years), I was somewhat intimidated to be amongst this austere and learned group of real archivists. I went to Philadelphia perfectly secure in the knowledge that my situation was unlike any other and that my archives and I were unique. Little did I know what surprises I would encounter during the course of that meeting!

As I attended various sessions that I felt might be of help in solving my many dilemmas, I realized that others had the same types of problems. How could this be? I was firmly convinced that no one else could have the same problems and situation that I had, but they did, and many other problems that I had not yet encountered. My paranoia began to subside as I realized that these archivists were from every region and represented every type of archival repository. I found new friends who understood and could discuss these problems in a meaningful and helpful way. Suggestions were made, solutions were offered, and I felt rescued from certain failure.

I returned home much encouraged by my newfound friends and colleagues that I could cope with this new career that was not governed by cataloging rules, established educational requirements, and accreditations as my former career had been. Provenance was the order of the day!

As I came to the realization that my archives and I were not unique, I also realized that none of the other archivists and the archives they represented were unique either. Only the records and manuscript collections in our archives are unique as we as individuals are unique.

Joyce Lamont
University of Alabama
"All good families are very much alike," remarks a character in one of Rudyard Kipling's stories. The archives (and archivists) of the Southeast—meaning by that the tax-supported state archival institutions—all being good, are very much like good archives everywhere, devoted to good archival principles, practicing good archival techniques and procedures, and pursuing good archival goals. But each of these archives (and their archivists) are also unique, doing things in different ways and with different styles. After all, South Carolina is not Tennessee; Mississippi is not Florida; Alabama is neither Georgia nor North Carolina.

The thrust of the question is, however, whether these good southeastern state archives, considered together, display common characteristics which distinguish them from the good archives of other states. The answer is "Definitely yes"—especially if we add to the company listed above their fellow Confederate states, so willfully excluded from consideration by the editors of Provenance in this special issue.

No, I don't mean that we are different because we speak with southern accents or because we have a heritage of wonderful records for the black history. I mean we are still, deep in our bones (shades of William Lowndes Yancey!) passionate believers in states rights—which means we believe in the federal union and that the national government should be kept in its place and state boundaries and ways of doing things preserved.

We think of ourselves (and are thought of) as state agencies, vital components of state governments—essential to their functioning and well-being. Our primary responsibility, then, is for public records not private records—our basic loyalty is to the community to which all citizens belong, not to special groups, not even to historians, professional or amateur, although we count them as our friends.

This concentration of effort and attitude
probably lets us do a better job with government records than do the archival institutions of nonsouthern states—better even, perhaps, to make only one invidious comparison, than Wisconsin, which hardly knows whether it is a historical society, a government agency, or a cultural adjunct to a university. It also lets us neglect with easy conscience a variety of endeavors and activities which Wisconsin and similar institutions undertake, and we probably should, but don't.

In a nutshell, we stress government and neglect culture. They stress culture and neglect government.

Benedetto Croce said, "The past is inevitable; the future never is." Rather than predicting, one should strive to make the future what he wants it to be. As more and more human activity, including record-keeping, becomes present oriented, momentarily experienced and, after the instant replay, permanently forgotten, we archivists have to make herculean efforts to master the new technologies so that we make them history-preserving rather than history-destroying. Otherwise—maybe not twenty years from now, but not many years away—there will be no archivists, for there will be no records to preserve; and mankind will be trying to live without a usable past.

Charles E. Lee
South Carolina Department of Archives and History

A Southern Archive of Business

The Archives of Appalachia at East Tennessee State University is a very promising endeavor. The common denominator of "Appalachia" gives a wide range to the subject areas of the collection. The South has too few such undertakings. There is the Vanderbilt Television News Archive in Nashville; there are special collections in all the larger academic libraries which contain mixtures of
manuscripts, rare books, and some archival material. No southern university except the University of North Carolina, to my knowledge, has developed a real university archive. The National Archives and Records Service has a regional depository at East Point, Georgia, outside Atlanta, which slowly receives the records of government agencies in this region. But there is no concerted effort to collect the business and industrial records of the South.

Fortunately many towns and cities, not knowing what else to do, have turned their city records over to the local public library. Some counties have done the same. More of this needs to be done. But most public libraries were built with minimum square footage to begin with and no expectation of receiving anything as large as the city or county archives. Furthermore, most buildings are now at least twenty years old and can't hold the book collections much less the added burden of archives.

Some religious denominations have had southern archives for some time. The United Methodist Church has such a facility at Lake Junaluska, North Carolina; and the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches have a large archive at Montreat, North Carolina. The University of the South at Sewanee, Tennessee, has collected much material on the Episcopal Church in the South. The Baptist sects are hindered in such record gathering by their emphasis on local organization.

All of these archival undertakings are fine, and their number should increase. But we still need something similar to Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation at Greenville, Delaware, which began with the DuPont Company records and became the depository for many other large corporations. The great advantage which Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation has is that one large, reputable, and old company offers archival services to other companies. There is, without doubt, some distrust by industrial and commercial officers of the interpretation academic users might give to company records if they were opened to the public in an academic situation. This
fear is minimized when DuPont is the receiver.

The South ought to have such a depository because the history of southern industrial development in particular is different in many respects from that of the rest of the country. The relations of labor and management, labor and unions, industry and agriculture—these have had different histories in the South. The dependence from the beginning on outside capital is another difference. There are many more. All are legitimate reasons for saving corporate records for study and analysis. We need an archive for southern business.

Jesse C. Mills
Tennessee Valley Authority

Business Archives in the South

Any attempt to describe the current state of business archives in the region is tempered by the definitions applied to such collections. Both the quality and quantity of historical records preserved by southern business firms will vary widely, ranging from the single file drawer of newspaper clippings and ephemera to well-organized collections that provide useful insights to the corporation's unique characteristics. Similarly, the corporate perspective of the archival function and evaluation of services rendered to the business directly affect the level of support accorded to the archives. The uneven character of those collections termed archival by their parent bodies suggests the need for greater professional, educational efforts in this area, but the encouraging sign is that a number of firms have assumed responsibility for their own history and have taken some steps to preserve it.

Within the seven state archival region served by Provenance, the number of business archives has never been large, but it has remained relatively constant, comprising between 4 and 5 percent of all entries.
compiled in national surveys. In the first edition of the Directory of Business Archives, published in 1975, eight firms reported the existence of an archival program,¹ while a recent, unpublished survey conducted by the Business Archives Section of the Society of American Archivists received only six responses.² The two compilations provided brief descriptions of the diverse holdings of three consumer products companies, two transportation firms, two banks, a trade association, religious organization, newspaper, mill, sorority and insurance company. In cumulative terms, Georgia claimed five entries; North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee, two each; Alabama and Florida, one apiece.

The most distressing element in comparing the two surveys is the lack of continuity in business archives programs. Only the Coca-Cola Company listing appears in both directories. The seven institutions proudly claiming archival facilities in 1975 have either abandoned them or chosen not to publicize them to the broader archival community.³ While this type of extreme archival displacement is unusual in the business archives arena, it underscores the vulnerability of programs that do not contribute in measurable terms to the firm's business objectives.

On a more optimistic note, several of the firms listed in a new survey carefully investigated all of the ramifications of an archival program before committing corporate finances and staff support to it. With a fuller understanding of the archival mission within the corporate structure, management support for the function should be longer lasting. A number of other business enterprises are currently in the preliminary stages of analyzing their needs for historical documentation. The South will never be a major center for business archives programs, but some small growth in this discipline can be anticipated over the next decade as skilled archivists apply their craft in the business environment.

Philip F. Mooney
The Coca-Cola Company
NOTES


2 Unpublished Business Archives Survey conducted by the Business Archives Section. Society of American Archivists. 1983. The research data is as developed through a telephone conversation with Claudette John, Archivist for the Insurance Company of North America and compiler of the data.

3 In the 1975 Directory, Blue Bird Body Company, Ft. Valley, Georgia; First National Bank of Atlanta; Union Planters Bank (Memphis); Eastern Air Lines (Miami); National Cotton Council of America (Memphis); News Observer and Raleigh Times; Spring Mills Inc. (South Carolina) and the Coca-Cola Company had listings.

In 1983 Womens' Missionary Union of the Southern Baptist Convention (Birmingham); Georgia-Pacific Corporation (Atlanta); Alpha Delta Pi Sorority (Atlanta); R.J. Reynolds (Winston-Salem); Liberty Corporation (Greenville, SC) and the Coca-Cola Company were represented.

The Need for a Southern Regional Organization

The archival profession in the Southeast is at a pivotal point in its development. We have established in past decades many major and specialized archival institutions, and we have created in more recent times state archival associations and societies throughout the region. We must now take the next step—to organize a regionwide Southeast Archivists Society (SEAS).
The South has long appreciated its heritage and valued its records: Alabama's state archives was a pioneer establishment; the state archives of Georgia, North and South Carolina, and Tennessee have been leaders in the archival world for many years. Florida, Mississippi, and Kentucky, as well as Alabama, have put forth significant energy to create or revitalize their state archives. Additional institutions devoted to preserving records of labor, public and private leaders, places, phenomena, events, and groups throughout the South have proliferated, all staffed with professional archivists and manuscripts curators.

Add to that phenomenon the growth of archival associations in the South—from the trail-blazing efforts of the old tri-state (now the South Atlantic) Archives and Records Conference (SAARC) and the significant contributions of the Society of Georgia Archivists (SGA) to the younger but no less dedicated organizations in Alabama, the Carolinas, Tennessee, and elsewhere. The archival profession in the South has come into being in response to the needs of the society we serve; it has trained itself, renewed itself, and usually, acquired respect and appreciation for its knowledge, its dedication and its service. At this point, few areas of the Southeast have no professional organizations for archivists.

These statewide societies serve a valid and worthy purpose—that of creating a supportive infrastructure at a level capable of assisting in meaningful and real ways with archivists sharing common goals, problems and environs. The local associations have come into existence and have survived because they fill a real need, one to which the national organization is not designed to respond.

A regional organization, in the fullest sense of the word, would reflect the strengths of these state societies: the closeness, the shared problems, environs (both social and physical) and goals, and the community created by respected colleagues who are also friends. At the same time a regional
organization would possess characteristics of the national group: resources, expertise, size, and presence before the public and governmental bodies. Potential rewards are there in ample array, if we can organize a truly regional presence from Virginia to the turf staked out by the Society of Southwest Archivists and the Midwest Archives Conference. While individual southern archivists have possessed enormous stature, and while southern institutions and societies have garnered acclaim, there simply is no such thing as a southern spokesman to voice our shared concerns and offer our collective solutions and help. We are a cipher on the national professional scene and on the southern political scene. A state organization of twenty, fifty, or a hundred archivists is one thing; a regional organization of several hundred professionals is something else again.

Consider four obvious advantages: training, publication, preservation, and education. Training produces cross-fertilization not only between individuals and institutions, but also among states—states with different needs and resources, yet sharing a common heritage and environment. Resources of expertise, of approach, of problems faced and solved (or unsolved) would expand enormously; this strength of the SAARC could be greatly increased as the new organization comes into existence.

In publication, a real opportunity exists for a valuable and significant program to augment the Society of American Archivists. The SGA's Provenance could very well be a flagship of such a program, with an expanded newsletter and instructional series program to accompany it. Not only letterpress, but microform and video could be produced.

As to preservation, it is certainly within the realm of possibility that a Southeast documentation conservation center could be established, with support funds being channeled from several institutions through SEAS. The object, of course, would be a self-sufficient operation doing work for
SEAS members at a cost plus level and also accepting preservation work from other institutions and individuals.

In the area of education, the regional group could become a powerful voice for the preservation of records and the proper role of archivists and manuscript curators, educating public officials at all levels (budget officers, chief executive officers, appropriations committees and law-making bodies). This includes the public at large, from school children to businessmen to besieged taxpayers, about the contributions of archivists and the advantages of professional care of records. It could provide a ready source of expert consultation and advice to any southern entity requesting it.

There are several organizational models that could be examined for suitability; there will certainly be divergent opinions over proper goals and activities of such a regional group. A lot of time, energy, and thought will be needed before this envisioned regional society will achieve reality. Hard questions about the already existing societies and the SAARC vis-a-vis their relationship with the new group need to be asked and answered. Funding, conferences, membership, location—all will require good faith, good effort, a deep sense of cooperation and enlightened self-interest.

But the basic question "Should There Be a Southeast Archivists Society?" should not be a point of concern. Every month without such an organization to speak for all of us is a month we can ill afford to let slip.

Gayle Peters
Federal Archives and Records Center
East Point, Georgia

The Archival Profession in the Southeast
Since the southeastern states have been in the
forefront in developing state archives, manuscript repositories, and leaders in the archival profession, the area is unique in those respects as compared to some other sections of the United States. It was in the Southeast that the archival profession was born thirty-three years before the National Archives was established in 1934. Largely through the efforts of Thomas McAdory Owen, Alabama established the first state archives in 1901 under the name of Department of Archives and History. Similar crusading by Dunbar Rowland of Mississippi led to that state following Alabama's example the next year by establishing an archival agency with the same name, and with Rowland as its director. In 1903 the North Carolina Historical Commission (presently the Division of Archives and History) was created. Historian Robert D.W. Connor was appointed its director but with the title of secretary. His success in administering that agency for eighteen years, his understanding of the historical importance of archives, and his reputation as a historian led to his appointment as the first archivist of the United States in 1934. One of the founders and the first president of the Society of American Archivists was Albert Ray Newsome, professor of history at the University of North Carolina.

Among the most noted and early developers of major manuscript repositories in university libraries were Professors J.G. de Roulhac Hamilton of the University of North Carolina and William Kenneth Boyd of Duke University. As chairman of their respective history departments, they also became extraordinary collectors of historical materials. Both had been trained in German historical methodology which required that graduate theses be based on research in original sources. Another such historian was Robert Lee Meriwether, founder and long-time director of the famed South Caroliniana Library. Without the untiring labors of another South Carolinian, Archivist Charles E. Lee, support for the preservation of historical records might never have been added to his responsibilities of the former
National Historical Publications Commission, since 1975 the National Historical Publications and Records Commission.

The continuing development of manuscript collections and university and college archives are the best indication that, increasingly, academicians are recognizing the importance of preserving our documentary heritage, but unfortunately, legislators and budget officials are not yet showing the same kind of recognition when it comes to providing financial support for such preservation. Perhaps there is not an archives or manuscript department in the Southeast that has anything approaching adequate funding and staffing. The public in general is also slowly becoming more aware of the significance of historical records. This may be due more to the aging of the population and its consequent interest in family history and genealogy and the rising level of the public's education than to the publicity coming from historical records repositories. That publicity needs to be increased, but so do the processing, describing, and conservation of records. The ongoing expansion and upgrading of archival education and training in the Southeast as well as elsewhere in the country give encouragement that those activities will be increased and improved, but inadequate budgets for staffing, equipment, supplies, and expanded storage will no doubt be ever thus.

Individual state archival organizations as well as the South Atlantic Archives and Records Conference provide the avenues through which increased awareness of the importance of historical records can continue to be made. If the whole preservation movement in the country does not decline within the next twenty years, and given the strides that are being made by the archival profession, even with budgetary restraints, there should be continual advancement throughout the Southeast in preserving our documentary heritage.

Mattie U. Russell
Duke University
Archives in the Southeast

When I was asked to write a brief essay on the questions: "Is there anything unique about archives and archivists in the Southeast?" and "Where are we going in the next twenty years?", I was tempted to take the easy way out and write my shortest essay ever: "Not really, and I don't really know!" However, upon reflection I decided that such flippancy, while gratifyingly easy, was too simplistic.

In many respects archivists nationwide are similar. We are all in a profession that lacks widespread public attention. We are all very dedicated to our craft. And we all take budgets that won't buy spare parts for the front wheel of a jet fighter and do miraculous things.

While there are things about archivists in the Southeast that are unique, explaining them is difficult. The best way I know is to point to our only regional archives "organization," the South Atlantic Archives and Records Conference, or SAARC. I use the term organization loosely because SAARC has no president, no officers, no board of directors, and no publications. Without this structure, it has managed to have an annual meeting for each of the past seventeen years, and the programs that rival any Society of American Archivists annual meeting I've ever attended. That such an entity can continue to flourish in these times when organizing seems to be an obsession, says something for archives and archivists in our region of the country. In spite of the fact that the number of archives professionals in the South has almost doubled in the last ten years, we have managed to keep our informality and still maintain a free information exchange.

The nature of archives in the Southeast is also somewhat different from that of the rest of the country. While some of our southern states are among
the oldest in the nation, they are also among the fastest growing. The rush to the sunbelt has put southern archives in the position of having to care for some of the oldest records in the country while trying desperately to gain control of the overwhelming volume of current information being generated by big governments. Florida, on the other hand, has a history going back to the mid-1500s, but very little recorded evidence of that period remains in the state today. The preponderance of the Florida state archives' major records holdings are less than twenty-five years old.

This phenomenon of historical records holdings becoming more and more current leads me to the second question; "Where are we going in the next twenty years?" Twenty years ago none of us would have imagined the geometric expansion of information and resultant technological records keeping innovations that we have currently seen. And this expansion will continue. We have moved into an information oriented society in which the role of the archivist as information scientist is going to become more and more crucial. While this change will increase our workload considerably, it may also prove to be our salvation. We can no longer be considered by the general populace as mere collectors of interesting old documents, but as a vital link in the information chain. I feel this recognition will translate into increased funding potential for our programs and facilities. While this trend is inevitable, it is up to us as archivists to become more aggressive in establishing our place in this new information society.

Edward J. Tribble
Florida Department of State
Division of Archives, History, and Records Management
Some Thoughts on Archival Trends in the Southeast

Traditionally the holdings of southeastern repositories have been regional in nature. During the next twenty years this characteristic will not disappear; however, changes in demographics and in areas of research interest should result in archival collections which have national significance while continuing to reflect the history of the region. In appraising and collecting documents, archivists should consider several trends in historical research which have special relevance for the Southeast.

The study of social history continues to grow, particularly in the examination of groups such as blacks, women, and the poor which for the most part have not held power in the past. Efforts to document the history of minority and underprivileged groups in the Southeast have intensified substantially during the past twenty years, but much work remains to be done. Additionally, recent immigration, such as the enormous increase in the number of Latin Americans moving into the Gulf region, has had a dramatic impact on the region and should spur research interest. Differences in language and culture should present special challenges to the archivist attempting to document these groups.

As the metropolitan areas of the Southeast grow in size and number, the study of urban history should have increased relevance. Population shifts from the Northeast and Midwest to the Sunbelt, combined with immigration and the movement of people from rural areas to the cities, promise to alter substantially the distribution of people in the Southeast and to result in new urban areas. The development of cities in the Southeast should be the focus of much study.

A related area is the growth of business and industry in the Southeast, which should present new opportunities for research in business history. As recent business records are accessioned, the archivist most likely will encounter a high percentage of records produced by computer. In order to handle these records the archivist might have to add computer literacy to the multilingual skills needed to document social history.
One final trend in historical research is the study of the World War II period, which is rapidly increasing in interest to a wide audience. While papers pertaining to the Civil War, a time of traditional southern fascination, have become scarce and difficult to collect, a wealth of documents concerning the home front and the battlefields of World War II are available but have not been collected. Many individuals with significant memories of the period could make good participants in an oral history program, but efforts to capture their recollections should not be delayed. Of additional significance is the fact that a high percentage of the officer corps of the armed services during the war came from the Southeast.

Anne S. Wells
Mississippi State University
Guides to Manuscript Collections in the Southeast: A Bibliography

W. Tony Coursey and Robert D. Bohanan

The seven state groupings listed below include all the published manuscript guides found to exist in the southeastern United States. Four months were spent contacting more than 700 institutions throughout the region, verifying holdings and locating published or printed guides. Of those institutions contacted, approximately 120, or one-sixth, claim to have manuscripts but have no guides available for distribution to researchers. Many have only in-house catalogs.

The kinds of institutions which most frequently have published guides are state, federal, public, and college libraries. Occasionally, historical societies, museums, and large businesses have printed inventories. There is little predictability for this generalization, even as far as quality. Sometimes a small historical society has more to offer than a college library.

The best aid for locating manuscript collections among various kinds of institutions throughout the Southeast is Howell (q.v.). Listing major holdings under corporate name and arranged as a directory, it is the first source to be checked for locating manuscripts in a particular area—especially those collections without guides. Other sources which cover several states are listed with Howell in a regional category below. For these and other guides, the most current pricing information is provided.

Downs, Robert B. Resources of Southern Libraries. Boston: Gregg Press, 1972. 370 p. Reprint of 1938 edition based on the activities of the ALA Committee on Resources of Southern Libraries. Section on manuscripts contains 32 pages and is out-of-date, but can be a useful introduction to major repositories and collections of older material.


Howell, J. B., ed. Special Collections in Libraries of the Southeast. Jackson, Miss.: Howick House, 1978. 423 p. A special committee of the Southeastern Library Association made a comprehensive survey of all special collections in ten southeastern states. Chapter arrangement is by state and town, including libraries, businesses and various societies and associations, briefly describing major manuscript holdings and other research materials. Includes three indexes -- geographical, corporate name, and general (subject). What Moore (q.v.) is to South Carolina, Howell is to the Southeast. This guide should be consulted before any others.
ALABAMA


List of manuscripts, official documents, church records and other sources, primary and secondary, located throughout the state with indication of holding institution. Not indexed.


The guide includes a biography of Dent and a description of his manuscripts and other documents. Indexed.

FLORIDA


Supersedes 1972 guide (The First One Hundred). Descriptive entries arranged alphabetically by collection title, most of which relate to West Florida history. Accession numbers provided. Includes name-subject index.


Index to collections acquired through the Florida Baptist Historical Society and housed at Stetson University Library, relating to Baptist history in the state. Revision needed.

Tribble, Edward J. Catalog of the Florida State

GEORGIA


Guide to Manuscripts and Archives in the Negro Collection of Trevor Arnett Library, Atlanta
A guide to twenty major collections at Atlanta University, the Countee Cullen Memorial Collection (approximately 4800 volumes) and such notables as Langston Hughes, Alex Haley, and Frederick Douglass. Provides a name-subject index.


John Hill Hewitt: Sources and Bibliography. Atlanta: Emory University, 1981. 42 p. $5.00 Well-done guide to a major collection in the Special Collections Department, Woodruff Library. In addition to the inventory, it includes biographical note, "Materials in Other Repositories," and bibliographies. Not indexed.

Mendelson, Johanna, comp. Mary Letitia Ross Papers: A Descriptive Inventory. Atlanta: Georgia Department of Archives and History, 1979. 168 p. Detailed item inventory of the papers of a Georgia historian, geographer, and naturalist whose primary research interest was the impact of Spanish culture upon the early history of Georgia. Indexed.

Roth, Darlene R., and Shadron, Virginia, comps.


Windham, Diane E. "A Guide to Manuscript Sources in the Special Collections Department for Atlanta, Georgia." Mimeographed. Atlanta: Special Collections Department, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University, 1978. 41 p. A guide to sources that relate to Atlanta. The Department also issues such subject guides for "Women's History," "Methodism," "China, Japan and Korea." All have descriptions arranged alphabetically, without index.

MISSISSIPPI

Henderson, Thomas W., and Tomlin, Ronald E., comps. Guide to Official Records in the Mississippi Department of Archives and History. Jackson: Mississippi Department of Archives and History, 1975. 115 p. Arranged mostly by agency or office name within state government, with no detail on records or distinction of record type. Not an effective guide to manuscript holdings, though correspondence or other types of papers may be spotted occasionally in descriptions.

Originally published in 1907, as the Fifth Annual Report, Department of Archives and History, state of Mississippi. Includes information on manuscripts and other historical documents relating to the history of Mississippi. Indexed.

NORTH CAROLINA


Supersedes the 1941 guide. Describes the five million manuscripts in about 3900 groups. Indexed by title, name, place, and subject.


A revision of the 1942 and 1964 guides. Offers detailed descriptions of the archives' holdings. About one-fourth of the volume constitutes a name-subject index.


Finding aid with brief descriptions of the English records in the state archives, ca. 1585-1783. Not indexed.


Cumnock, Frances. Catalog of the Salem Congregation

85
Detailed, comprehensive guide to one of the largest and most important Moravian collections. Includes indexes.

With more than 6000 group entries, the bulk of which relates to the nineteenth century South, this guide supersedes the 1947 Tilley-Goodman guide. One third of the volume comprises an extensive index which includes proper names, geographic locale, subject, and time period.

Detailed, thematic index-guide to a famous collection of Moravian musical manuscripts, all of which are available on microfiche.

Pertains to public documents and correspondence, not private collections which are included in the department's 1964 guide. Detailed descriptions of holdings are intended as a finding aid to the department's shelf arrangement. Indexed by subject and name.

The results of the Historical Records survey in North Carolina, this guide is now superseded by Blosser and Wilson (q.v.).

Includes brief descriptions. Well indexed with cross-references and table of contents. Though dated, still useful.

Useful in its time, now superseded by Cain et al. (q.v.).

A supplement to Blosser and Wilson (q.v.).

Lists and describes state, county, and miscellaneous records, including private papers. Not indexed.

Detailed, comprehensive guide to a Moravian manuscript collection. Includes indexes.


Originally published in 1947, it was a fine guide in its day. Now superseded by Davis and Miller (q.v.).

**SOUTH CAROLINA**


Photocopy of the in-house index to manuscripts, other documents, and books in one of the country's largest collections of black history.


Includes papers, correspondence, minutes, docket, and journals of various state agencies and offices. Indexed by name and subject. Updated by Chandler and Wade (q.v.).


A growing collection, recent acquisitions are usually printed in the *South Carolina Historical Magazine*. A radical reformatting of this guide, with new material, is expected in 1985.

Chepesiuk, Ron. *A Guide to the Manuscript and Oral History Collections in the Winthrop College*
Brief descriptions of 146 manuscript collections, many of which relate to women or to the Upper Piedmont region of the state. Arranged alphabetically with subject-name index.

Begun in 1975, the collection is described through its acquisitions to 1980. Arranged alphabetically by title, without index.

Brief descriptions of the holdings of the college are arranged alphabetically, without index.

Descriptions of the society's manuscript holdings are arranged by accession number. Microform copies of most are available for purchase. Not indexed.

Descriptions of the society's manuscript holdings are arranged by accession number. An excellent index based on Sears List of Subject Headings is included.

"Recent Accessions to the Manuscript Division." South Carolina Historical Magazine.
Not alphabetically arranged nor indexed.

Only brief mention of manuscript holdings, but does list the primary holdings of the University of South Carolina and the Carolina Historical Society. Index includes institutional names and subject entries. This is an excellent guide for locating manuscript collections within a particular area.

Issued as a supplement to the *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 83, 3. Includes a history of the collection, its scope, and finding aids. Over 2600 collections are listed by accession number and described. Well indexed, with personal and corporate name, geographic and subject references.

**TENNESSEE**

Briefly describes the archives' audiovisual collection and the individual tapes found in each
collection. Indexed by speaker and performer, song title, and subject.


This new edition supersedes the 1975 and 1978 editions. The microfilm holdings relate to state history, though copies may be of collections that are located outside the state, such as the Draper papers in the Wisconsin Historical Society. The guide is arranged by accession number and indexed by significant names and subjects.


Presented to the public library in Knoxville in 1921, the private library of Calvin Morgan McClung (1855-1919) focuses upon the southeastern United States and the area west of the Appalachians to the Mississippi River. Bibliographical entries are arranged alphabetically by author or by key word of the title. Not indexed.


Descriptive entries of the personal papers and records of the society held in the Memphis State University Library. Indexed.

Archives, 1969. 70 p. 
Intended as a finding aid for the repository, this describes the basic contents of 123 record groups. The forty-five page index "is primarily a proper name index with selected subjects listed."

Register to the Church Family Papers located in the Mississippi Valley Collection, Memphis State University Libraries. The Churches were a wealthy black family active in business and politics in West Tennessee, ca. 1870-1960. The majority of the collection spans the dates 1912-1952.

Describes scope and content of twenty-five manuscript collections which relate to local and regional materials of historical and genealogical nature. Surname index, bibliography.

Major collections include George Gershwin, Langston Hughes, and Scott Joplin. Descriptions arranged alphabetically. Revised list (November 1983) available.

Arrangement of descriptions by five sections: Library, Manuscripts, Newspapers, County Records, and Archives. Five separate indexes, apparently by name, but with no explanation as to use.

This booklet describes the major depositories in the state with their size of holdings and major collections. Indexed. Out-of-date.
In Spite of its direct impact on archival science, the concept of entropy has never been assimilated into the rich body of archival theory. This is undoubtedly the result of its apparent negative impact on archival activities. Entropy, according to a physicist friend of Ben Ross Schneider (author of *Travels in computerland*), "means...that you can't win, you can't break even, and you can't get out of the game...." And the game is "man versus chaos."

The chaos that greets archivists in their daily work is more than sufficient without suggesting that there is no way to get ahead of it. It is the Second Law of Thermodynamics which rules in this case. Briefly, the second law states: In a closed system, energy always goes from active to still, from hot to cold. This has two parts: first, that the system is closed, complete in and of itself, with no opening, no entrance, no exit; Second, a process takes place which always goes in one direction, from hot to cold. At the end of the process, when everything in the system is at the maximum level of cold, entropy is at its greatest.

If the system examined is the total universe, then entropy is the heat-death of the universe.
Since the average temperature (a measure of energy) of the universe is a bare degree or so above that of absolute zero where all molecular motion stops (about 460 degrees below zero Fahrenheit), it is apparent that any temperatures above that are purely local aberrations. And, according to the second law, the tendency is for those local aberrations to slow, to cool, to stop, to die, and, thus, to join the common level of expended energy.

For instance, energy expended to construct a building is stored in that structure until it collapses, falls, and its molecules separate and go their respective ways. Raising the structure decreases entropy, its decline and fall increases entropy. Over the whole system, however, these are only local increases and decreases; the level of energy (the entropy level) throughout the whole system is both constant and very, very low. Therefore, it is common to speak of an increase in entropy as the running down of the universe.

However, if the universe is running down and entropy is increasing, then we have neglected to consider it as a purely closed system. If the system is indeed closed, the level of entropy is and always will be the same; the decrease in the energy of the universe, its "running down," is a purely local phenomenon. However, we must not overlook the possibility that the universe is an open system and that some new source of energy will be introduced and, so to speak, wind things back up again. This is considered highly unlikely.

The entropic running down of the works applies equally well to the natural tendency of things to go from organization to disorganization, from order to chaos. For instance, the building mentioned earlier went through a sequence of disorder (a pile of lumber), order (the building), and disorder (a pile of scrap wood). An ordered entity requires a quantity of energy to create and maintain itself as an entity. Once it reaches an ordered state, it will, without further infusions of energy, gradually become disordered. From high-energy order it moves
in the direction of low-energy disorder. This is sometimes referred to as the law of home ownership.

There are two basic ways of applying this concept to the world of archives. The first is to the physical material, the paper (or other) product; the second is to the informational content of that physical product. With paper, a quantity of energy is expended to push certain chemicals and assorted fibrous products together into a nearly two-dimensional surface for the reception of informational marks. Most papers today contain a quantity of unstable molecules which have more than just a slight tendency toward disorder, toward that lower energy level. Unfortunately, the lower energy level they are seeking is, when fully attained, no longer what we would call paper. The state of higher organization that is useful as paper is but one step in a long complex process from cellulose in tree fibers to compost.

It has been discovered that the deterioration of paper resulting from its inherent acidity can be hindered if not reversed. The process involves a massive infusion of additional energy, first to stabilize the breakdown and, second, to buffer it against further deterioration.

From where does this energy come? We tend to act as if it is available in an open system, that is, that the energy is freely available. The Earth, for example, is an open system; an outside source, the Sun, constantly pours additional energy onto the surface of this planet, and we use it in many (but not sufficiently enough) ways. Our dependence on fossil fuels is possible because we have been able to mine stored energy from the Sun. An archives is also an open system; the energy it consumes is supplied by its organizational macrosystem.

If, instead, we isolate it as a closed system we find that a balanced energy input/output requires that for there to be order here, there must be disorder there. In terms of paper deterioration, a closed system with no outside source of energy would mean that the action of deacidifying a piece of paper
would take energy away from another piece of paper. The system must remain in balance—the total quantity of available energy is the same.

What is true of the materials of archives is also true of the intellectual content. Information is stored energy. The creation of information requires an energy expenditure. The filing of information entails an energy expenditure. The maintenance of the file requires an energy expenditure. All of this must be outside energy, energy from outside the local system.

For archivists, then, it is extremely important to keep in mind the relationship of their responsibilities to their sources of energy. During periods of declining budgets—itself perhaps entropic in nature—archivists must carefully conserve their expenditures of energy, time, equipment, and funds. Considering archives as institutionally closed systems, with no (or few) internal sources of energy, then the outlook is grim. The principal input to the archival system is not high-order energy but nearly always disordered masses of paper at very low energy levels. They have expended the bulk of the energy originally invested to place them in order.

The control of energy expenses is most commonly effected by limiting the activities involved in processing the records. The decline of calendaring as a method of description was just this sort of conservation of resources.

Nevertheless, the whole scope of energy inputs and expenditures must be recognized and evaluated. The magnitude of the problem can best be demonstrated by preparing a chart of inputs and outputs. On one side list the source and quantity of inputs (usually accessions and budgeted dollars) and on the other side list expenditures (staff, equipment, supplies, overhead, etc.). In addition, these can be listed by activities: appraisal, arrangement, description, reference, exhibits, donor relations, etc.

In each case it is necessary to compare and evaluate the relationship between income and outgo. For instance, providing reference service to
administrative staff or outside scholars requires an expenditure of energy in describing the material for access, shelving and unshelving the material, and providing facilities for its examination. In addition, the researcher expends energy in examining and analyzing the material. This can be considered a closed minisystem. The researcher and the archives exist in a system in which the level of energy expenditure is static, but the amount expended by the researcher and by the archives is inversely proportional: that is, the research cost of the researcher can be decreased by an increased expenditure by the archives and, contrariwise, increased by decreased archival expenditure.

Those archives closely integrated with records management functions are in a better position to take advantage of out-of-system expenditures; they are able to reduce the energy loss the records endure on their way to the archives. The original creation and organization of a file of records is an expense borne by the originating office. As the records decline in use and are slowly shifted away from the care and attention of the office staff, they begin the inevitable cycle of neglect and decay. Properly scheduled records, administered by an experienced records manager, have been identified for disposal or preservation long before this point has been reached. In an efficiently run office system, records of archival value are shipped off to the archives before too much entropic decline has set in. The shipping of the records--boxing, labeling, transportation--is an energy expense which may or may not be charged to the archives.

Unfortunately, this is most often the area in which the archivist has the least control and the least potential for energy savings. And, as well, the potential savings may not make more than a slight dent in the long-term energy expenditure of storing and servicing the records.

If we step back to a broader societal perspective, we can consider the energy expended by the archives as a channel for a certain quantity of
energy dispensed by the society as a whole. Civilization has developed on the foundation of its written records. However offhandedly, archives are considered a greater societal good and, as such, are worth the expenditure of some (albeit small) portion of the society's total energy store.

The existence of almost three thousand functioning archival repositories2 is at least an indication of the value our society places on the role of archives. The fact that the level of support has not kept pace with requirements of the archival system is another matter entirely.3

If we step back even further to a galactic point of view, we can see that for each expenditure of energy to organize a body of records, somewhere in the universe that amount of energy is being taken from records already organized. If we increase order here by arranging records, somewhere in the closed-system universe a similar quantity of records is being disorganized; the Second Law of thermodynamics requires that the galactic energy equilibrium (its entropy) be maintained.

Terry Abraham

NOTES

1 Ben Ross Schneider, Jr., Travels in computerland (Reading, Addison-Wesley, 1974), 218.
The Mississippi Department of Archives and History has received a grant of $93,171 from NHPRC to arrange and describe its newsfilm collection and to develop a computerized finding aid. New software for the project will be developed in consultation with the Library of Congress, the CBS Television Archives, and others.

Project director is William Hanna, a department manuscripts curator, and the computer consultant is Patricia K. Gallaway, special projects officer for the department. For more information contact Mr. Hanna at P.O. Box 571, Jackson, Mississippi, 39205.

* * *

The Auburn University Archives announces that the Alabama Forestry Association (AFA) Records, 1949 to 1978, are available for research. The AFA is a nonprofit association founded in 1949 to represent the interests of the forestry industry. The records—correspondence, memorandums, newsletters, newspaper clippings, financial records, inspection records, and audio reports—document the history of the forestry industry in Alabama and the nation, as well as the history of the AFA. The collection provides information on numerous concerns including ad valorem taxes, capital gains taxes, right to work law, air and water pollution, and fire control. The papers were deposited by J. Hilton Watson, the executive vice-president of the association, in cooperation with a National Endowment for the Humanities grant-funded project to collect material documenting Alabama's agricultural and rural past. For additional information, contact Jeff Jakeman, Auburn University Archives, 143 R.B.D. Library, Auburn University, Alabama 36849.
Program plans are nearly complete for the nineteenth annual Oral History Association meeting to be held at the Marriott Resort Hotel in Lexington, Kentucky, 20-23 September 1984. The four-day conference will offer presentations on Appalachian subjects, as well as media offerings and roundtable sessions on a variety of topics. The conference's printed program, including registration and other information, will be mailed to OHA members in late spring. Other persons wishing a copy should write to Ronald E. Marcello, NT Box 13734, Denton, Texas 76203.

★ ★ ★

The General Commission on Archives and History of the United Methodist Church recently obtained a $50,000 grant for an ethnic history project to identify, organize, and publish materials relating to the history of the church's association with Asian-Americans, blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians. The commission has also renewed its women's history project. Brief histories on Methodist activities with each group will be generated from the project.

★ ★ ★

The Zebulon Baird Vance Papers publication project is being restarted by the North Carolina Division of Archives and History. The project is seeking letters, documents, and manuscripts pertaining to Vance's political career as governor, congressman, and U.S. Senator or his private life. For more information, write Professor Gordon McKinney, Department of History, Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC 28723.
The Atlanta Historical Society is seeking obscure photographs, etchings, paintings, or sketches depicting life in Atlanta and elsewhere in the South before the Civil War. The appeal is based on requests from textbook publishers all over the country. The society would also like to add architectural drawings of Samuel Inman Cooper (1894-1974) to its current manuscript and book holdings for the architect.

* * *

Earl H. Henner, Jr., Mississippi Department of Archives and History, has been awarded the Colonial Dames Scholarship for the January, 1984, Modern Archives Institute at the National Archives. The scholarship is funded by the Colonial Dames of America, Chapter III, and awarded by SAA.

* * *

The Bureau of Records and Information Management (BRIM), Florida State Archives, will sponsor a basic archival workshop and workshops for local government officials on scheduling and disposition, forms design, files management, and microfilm design. For more information, contact Gerard Clark, Florida State Archives, Division of Archives, History and Records Management, Tallahassee, FL 32301.

* * *

The McKissick Museums at the University of South Carolina in Columbia will use a $20,400 grant from the Folk Arts Program of the National Endowment for
the Arts to research the cultural context of quilt patterns and the social attitudes of quilters in that state. The project will focus on privately owned historical quilts and quilting traditions in Richland, Charleston, and Greenville counties. It will culminate in an exhibit that will travel throughout North and South Carolina and Georgia. For information, write George Terry, Director and Archivist, McKissick Museums, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208.

* * *

The American Association for State and Local History, Nashville, Tennessee, has announced the following grants in the Southeast. Donald W. Curl, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, to study architecture and society in Palm Beach, Florida, 1872-1941, $2,550; David J. Garrow, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, to study the long-term impact of the civil rights movement at the local level, focusing on Albany, Georgia, over the past two decades, $3,000; Kermit L. Hall of University of Florida, Gainesville, to analyze the intellectual foundations, operation, and impact of popular election of judges, specifically focusing on the state appellate court benches of California, Ohio, Tennessee, and Texas between 1850 and 1920, $1,419; Harry A. Kersey, Jr., Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, to interview Florida Seminole elders regarding their New Deal era experiences and to access the impact of federal policies on the tribe's acculturation, $2,800; James C. Klotter, Kentucky Historical Society, Frankfort, to work on a comprehensive study of Kentucky in the twentieth century, $1,677; Loren Schweninger, University of North Carolina-Greensboro, to examine the extent and regional variation of black property holdings in the U.S. during the nineteenth century, $2,556.50; University of Alabama in Birmingham and Sloss Furnace National Historical Landmark, Birmingham, to produce
an oral history project focusing on the experience of Sloss Furnace's workers and their families, $3,000.

The Library/Learning Resources Center at Shaw University (North Carolina), under the directorship of Clarence Toomer, has received a grant for $34,176 from the National Endowment for the Humanities. This grant has been given to the library for the arrangement and description of the university archives. The archives, an integral part of the university, will eventually become a source of research for students, faculty, and historians throughout North Carolina, the Southeast, and the nation.
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