

## THE SECOND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY OF AMERICAN ARCHIVISTS

SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS  
OCTOBER 24-26, 1938

THE Society of American Archivists held its second annual meeting in Springfield, Illinois, October 24-26, 1938. The occasion was of significance for several reasons. The newly completed archives building of the state of Illinois was to be dedicated during the meeting and the officers of the Society wished to call the attention of members, state and federal officials, and the public at large to this modern depository for state records and to pay honor to those responsible for its construction.

The Society of American Archivists is a young organization as counted by years, although it is sufficiently adult in membership, aims and activities. The fact that the majority of those who belong to it reside east of the Alleghenies, made the holding of a meeting at Springfield, Illinois, somewhat of an experiment. In other words it was a good test of whether or not it was advisable to schedule annual assemblies beyond a restricted area in the east.

It is pleasing to report that the membership did evidence their appreciation of the importance of the new archives building for Illinois and for other states, and their interest in the program generally, by attending the meeting from widely separated areas in many parts of the United States, and even Canada. The total registration was 102. Ten or fifteen others who did not register attended sessions. The varied character of the program offered, and the general degree of excellence of the papers read, undoubtedly contributed to the success of the meeting. Without question the interest of the members of the Society of American Archivists is such that the Society can hold its annual assembly anywhere in the middle west, as well as along the Atlantic coast, and still count on a sufficient attendance to make the occasion worth while.

Incidentally, those present at the sessions had their stay in Springfield made the more enjoyable by the kindly and efficient hospitality provided by the Committee on Local Arrangements. Noteworthy in this respect were the courtesies extended by Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Hughes, Miss Helene Rogers, Miss Margaret C. Norton, Mr.

Paul M. Angle, Mr. James A. James and Mr. Harry E. Pratt, and by the staffs of the Archives Division of the Illinois State Library and of the Illinois State Historical Library.

Lieutenant Colonel James M. Scammell, field supervisor of the Historical Records Survey, presided at the opening session of the meeting, a round table discussion on archival training. Mr. James A. Robertson, of the Hall of Records of the state of Maryland, the first leader of the discussion, prefaced his remarks with a brief résumé of the development and custody of the archives of Maryland up to the opening of the Hall of Records on October 1, 1935, with some comment on records obtained after that date. Calling attention to the fact that an important feature of the establishment of the National Archives was the increasing influence of this institution on archival practice in the states and elsewhere, Mr. Robertson said that on the whole he thought this was a good thing, although it should be kept in mind that the needs and resources of state archival establishments varied from those of the National Archives, and that accordingly the ideas emanating from that institution should only be followed in part. He then discussed the particular practices in vogue in the Hall of Records and indicated future plans for obtaining additional materials, such as filming certain existing archives and making sound recordings of old dialects and old songs distinctive of Maryland. In conclusion he emphasized the importance of public relations in archival administration and the desirability of maintaining an archival institution as a separate and distinct unit, whether in point of fact it stood alone or was operated in combination with a library, museum or historical institution. He thought that each archive should evolve the procedure which would produce the best results for its own records and that the most important prerequisite for archival administration was good common sense and freedom from dogmatism.

Mr. Samuel F. Bemis, of Yale University, next presented the preliminary report of the Committee on the Training of Archivists. The first portion of this report was concerned with an analysis of the thorough training of archivists in foreign countries, where much attention is given to historical erudition, scholarship, constitutional and legal history, and linguistic accomplishments, with relatively minor emphasis on knowledge of library science. This type of study was approved by the Committee for the Training of Archivists in the United States. Mr. Bemis stressed the point that it was unwise to turn over the custody of archives in this country to librarians unless at the same

time they were erudite and critical historical scholars. The second portion of the report recommended the training of archivists in the United States for two classes of positions. For the first class, candidates should be recruited from the level of training required for the degree of doctor of philosophy in American history and political science. Archivists of the second class should be obtained from those having the level of training equal to the master of arts degree in the social sciences with some acquaintance with library technique. Detailed training for archivists of both classes was then outlined with the suggestion that work in graduate schools should be added to or adapted, to provide special instruction respecting archival work and the fundamentals of library practice.

Mr. W. Edwin Hemphill, of the University of Virginia, the third leader of discussion, approved of the ideas suggested by Mr. Bemis and his committee. In addition he pointed out that as conditions existed, the future candidate for an archivist position must necessarily choose between training as a librarian or as a historian, in which case the latter seemed preferable. At present the instruction in the best library schools has largely to do with technique and method. Very little attention is given to the historical background necessary for the evaluation and interpretation of archival materials. If the Society of American Archivists should set up standards for training, in effect this would greatly influence the selection of archivists in various states. Virginia, where a library committee governs archival appointments, was cited as an example.

In the general discussion which followed, Mr. Lester J. Cappon, also of the University of Virginia, said that he wished to emphasize the point already made that archival training should be along historical rather than technical library lines. He thought that the Society, through its prestige, should try to limit upon a geographical basis the number of institutions which would offer special training.

Mr. Solon J. Buck, of the National Archives, was then asked to describe the course in archival training which he was giving at Columbia University. In reply Mr. Buck said his was a special course on both archives and historical manuscripts, a part of a larger program of procedure, only tentatively worked out as yet, but for the most part similar to that advocated by the Committee on Archival Training. In general the course consists of a broad survey of the history, organization and activities of archival associations and agencies as well as those which have custody of manuscript collections throughout the

world. In the second part of the course special topics will be taken up, covering types of material and special techniques and phases of archival work, and also the literature of the subject, not only English, but foreign. Students would be required to read some of the literature in the original, particularly that in French and German. Those wishing to become professional archivists, in addition to working for the degree of doctor of philosophy in history or in one of the other social sciences, would be given an opportunity to take a practical course in the National Archives, where they would serve in the capacity of internes for a period of six months or longer. Mr. Buck said that at present there were fourteen students taking the special course which he was giving according to the seminar method.

The second session on Monday morning was devoted to the subject of archival journals, with Mr. Theodore C. Pease, of the University of Illinois, as the presiding officer. Miss Edna L. Jacobsen, of the New York State Library, in discussing American journals, stated that while *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST* was the only one in this country which devoted all of its pages to archival matters, a survey of other periodical literature in the United States indicated that a number of publications, chiefly those of state organizations, from time to time gave considerable space to purely archival or related topics. After analyzing past and current practice in certain periodicals with respect to the information offered, Miss Jacobsen came to the conclusion that much of it was worth while and that these and other historical publications would add to the interest and value of their content if they would either continue or adopt the practice. This opportunity was the more true because it was impossible for *THE AMERICAN ARCHIVIST* to obtain or print more than a limited amount of the information available. Data relating to particular localities was frequently of interest, but was not published as often as it should be.

Mrs. Olga P. Palmer, of the National Archives, who gave the next paper entitled "Continental Journals," presented a comprehensive and valuable analytical survey of the evolution of serial publications relating to archives in a number of European countries. As a supplement to her paper she distributed to the audience present a list of serial publications pertaining to archives in Continental Europe covering more than a hundred years, to which was attached a detailed chart giving the title of each serial and the years of publication. It was interesting to note that of the 101 serials given, approximately one-

fourth dealt with the archives of Russia. The general discussion which followed the reading of these two papers was limited because of the lateness of the hour.

The luncheon conference on Monday took place in the ball room of the Abraham Lincoln Hotel with the Reverend Gilbert J. Garraghan, research professor of history at Loyola University in Chicago, presiding. At the conclusion of the luncheon, Father Garraghan introduced Mr. Solon J. Buck, of the National Archives, who spoke on "European Archives." Mr. Buck, who had just returned from a European tour during which he visited archival establishments in various European countries, more particularly in England, Switzerland and France, presented an illuminating survey of the status of archival work in these countries. He described each establishment, covering such topics as the size of buildings and their physical equipment, the character and extent of records kept, practices followed in preserving and making records available, administration policies and the scholarly attainments of archivists. While Mr. Buck felt that not all of the archival procedure which he had observed was applicable to the care of archives in this country, he concluded that there was much to be learned from the experience of European archivists.

The afternoon session on scientific aids was held in one of the assembly rooms of the archives building. Mr. George A. Schwegmann, Jr., director of the union catalogue at the Library of Congress, who was chairman for the session, announced that he had just perfected a device which would photograph on film, catalogue cards in drawers or trays, each card being automatically turned over after exposure to the camera. The importance of this invention for copying card catalogues is obvious and Mr. Schwegmann deserves much commendation for his enterprise and ingenuity.

The first paper of this session on "Fumigating, Cleaning and Repairing Archival Material" was prepared by Mr. Arthur E. Kimberly, of the National Archives, and read by Mr. Philip C. Brooks. It described in detail the type of room used to fumigate books and manuscripts in the National Archives, the chemicals employed for the purpose and their operation; it outlined the procedure in removing dust and dirt with an air pressure device and gave the method by which loose-leaf manuscript and printed records were flattened and creases taken out by exposing the materials, placed in an air-tight vault, to moist heat. Various processes for repairing manuscripts were explained as was the lamination process of pressing sheets of cellu-

lose acetate into the texture of a document by means of a hydraulic press, the leaves of which were electrically heated. Mr. Kimberly gave interesting statistics on the cost of the latter process, the speed with which manuscripts could be laminated and the quantity which was being currently handled at the National Archives. Photographs of the various machines used were distributed and added to the value and interest of this paper. Mr. Kimberly cited the cost of the hydraulic press used in the National Archives as one of the main obstacles to a wide adoption of the lamination process of repairing manuscripts and predicted this would be overcome shortly by the invention and manufacture of smaller and less expensive presses, a problem on which he had been working for some time.

Mr. M. Llewellyn Raney, director of the University of Chicago Libraries, next ably presented a paper on "Microphotographic Equipment." He declared public familiarity with motion pictures was paving the way for acceptance of reading machines for films. In discussing the present status of films he pointed out the superiority of cellulose acetate over cellulose nitrate as a film base, and the advantages and disadvantages of known emulsions as contrasted with the new Ozaphane process. A full mechanization in one continuous process at a moderate price he thought was much needed. This is now being worked out. At present large scale operators have hand-built machines in which the film is driven by motor through the various solutions and baths at fixed rates of speed and then delivered into a drying cabinet. The control is automatic. Mr. Raney suggested a non-perforate contact printer should be constructed. A design has been found and one will be built in 1939. A satisfactory enlarging mechanism for advancing film and paper automatically was likewise desirable. Experimental work on this was now being carried out. The fact that films can be treated so as to accept ink and thus form a printing surface means that the photo-offset process can be applied to the film of a newspaper. Duplicates can also be made as fast as the crank can be turned and will then be ready for use at once.

The speaker thought reproduction was farther along than utilization means. At present he said we have the reading machine, paper enlargement, wall projection and the magnifying glass. Two reading machines are available and both are required to read all types of film. The Recordak Library Projector, Model IX, manufactured by the Recordak Corporation, is useful for newspapers. The Argus

Micro-film Reader, built by the International Research Corporation, is designed especially for periodicals.

Another device is the Argus Projector made by the Society for Visual Education in Chicago. This is operated with a screen three or four feet away. The full mechanization machine is well illustrated in the one built by Dr. Rupert H. Draeger, of the Medical Corps of the United States Navy, and used in the Biblifilm Service. In the meantime the majority of institutions use the Folmer Graflex Corporation machine, the Photorecord, which gives partial mechanization and is portable. Mr. Raney said he was indebted for a portion of his data to Mr. Herman H. Fussler, head of the Department of Photographic Reproduction of the University of Chicago. A quantity of illustrative matter which Mr. Raney displayed contributed to the value of his paper. Representatives of several camera companies also had samples of their machines set up for inspection by the audience.

Following an animated discussion of these papers, in which Mr. Brooks, Mr. Raney, Mr. Herbert A. Kellar, Miss Margaret C. Norton, and others participated, those present were taken on a tour of the archives building. The plan and design of the structure as a whole as well as special features, such as the separation of the storage space allotted to various state departments from that provided for the permanent keeping of state archives, the apparatus for cleaning and fumigating records, microphotographic equipment, stack fixtures, and administration facilities, aroused keen interest and commendation.

Through the courtesy of Mr. Edward J. Hughes, the dinner on Monday evening was held at the Illini Club situated in a suburb of Springfield. Mr. A. R. Newsome, the presiding officer, presented Mr. Edward J. Hughes, who welcomed the members of the Society of American Archivists to Springfield. Following Mr. Hughes's remarks Mr. Newsome introduced Mr. Douglas C. McMurtrie, national director of the American Imprint Survey, who spoke on "Printed Materials in Manuscript Archives." This address delivered with great eloquence was one of the notable occasions of the meeting. Mr. McMurtrie, who had been called upon at brief notice, pointed out the common misconception on the part of archivists and scholars dealing with manuscript materials that anything printed was widely distributed and could readily be found in a number of libraries. On the contrary of many pamphlets and broadsides, of which a respectable number were printed, only a single copy could today be found, and

of others no copies could be located. He stressed the point that printed material of which only a single copy survived ranked in rarity with original records in manuscript form. Much rare printed material was to be found only in manuscript archives; and archivists could render a distinct contribution to historical source materials by making note of printed items encountered in their collections and bringing these notes to the attention of those engaged in recording issues of the press.

He detailed the work of the National Imprints Inventory, begun two years ago under the direction of Mr. Evans, of the Historical Records Survey, involving a nation-wide effort to list all books, pamphlets and broadsides printed anywhere in the United States before 1877 and in eight western states before 1891.

In its field workers made out title slips for both catalogued and uncatalogued imprints within these date limits; these slips were sent in to a national clearing office in Chicago to be filed by place of printing and date.

Titles for one state at a time were then worked over and perfected by a competent editorial staff and the resulting check list issued in mimeographed form. Already check lists of the imprints of Missouri through 1850, Minnesota through 1865, Arizona through 1890, and Chicago for 1851-1871 had been published. Editorial work on lists of imprints of Alabama, Kansas, Kentucky, Ohio, Oregon and Rhode Island was well advanced. In all cases the locations of the imprints were indicated so that scholars interested in any titles might know where to find them. Judging from past experience, publication of lists stimulated discovery of additional titles which could be brought to light in no other way, enabling the issue of revised and amplified lists of still greater value in the future.

Following the dinner, the members of the Society were entertained at a reception and smoker at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Hughes.

The first session on Tuesday morning took place in the palm room of the Abraham Lincoln Hotel. Mr. Luther H. Evans, national director of the Historical Records Survey, acted as chairman. The general subject was state archives. The first paper entitled "State Archives on the Pacific Coast" was presented by Mr. Charles M. Gates, of the University of Washington. Mr. Gates, who in recent years has done much research in the archives of western states, devoted his attention to Washington, Oregon and California. He gave a well-

rounded picture of the archival establishments in these states, indicating evolution of the custody of records, extent and character of the documents, location and nature of buildings in which they were housed, types of filing equipment, the custodians and their staffs and finally offered pertinent suggestions for improving the status of archives in each state.

Mr. Edwin A. Davis, archivist of Louisiana State University, next presented a paper on "State Archives in the Lower Mississippi Valley." Mr. Davis, in a well organized discussion, analyzed the history of archival establishments in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Arkansas, covering much the same subjects as Mr. Gates in the previous paper, but in a different manner. Mr. Davis' paper was particularly valuable for the clear exposition he gave of the evolution of archival knowledge and its application to the respective situations in these southern states.

The third and final paper of this session was given by Miss Harriet Smither, archivist of the Texas State Library. Her subject was "The State Archives of Texas." Miss Smither, who has had long familiarity with the records of her state, read a detailed account of its archives from their earliest origin through numerous wars, changes of custody, fires and other vicissitudes to recent times. Listening to Miss Smither's recital, one wondered that any of the earlier archives of Texas are still in existence. However, it is evident that many of value have been preserved and also that in recent years an increasing number of these early documents have come to light. As a special feature of her paper Miss Smither noted many publications relating to the archives of Texas.

The second session on Tuesday morning devoted to classification and cataloguing was presided over by Miss Margaret C. Norton, superintendent of the Archives Division of the Illinois State Library, who gave an informal report for the Committee on Classification and Cataloguing, calling attention among other things to the pamphlet entitled "Illinois State Library, Catalog Rules: Series for Archives Material" which had recently been sent to members of the Society and was virtually the work of the committee. Miss Norton felt that up to the present time cataloguing rules for archives are still too experimental and that we did not know enough about classification. Accordingly, she suggested that the time of the session be largely devoted to discussing classification. In her opinion the two most important considerations were to preserve the principle of provenance

and to make the material available for use. Application of series was possible, but there was not entire agreement as to the meaning or application of that term. The main question was what are we going to do with various groups of records in a department.

The first leader of discussion, Mr. David C. Duniway, reading a paper for Mr. Roscoe R. Hill, of the National Archives, said that once records had been allocated to an office of deposit, classification was more or less arbitrary depending on the series created by the original office. The call number used for finding the particular document and for the purpose of arrangement in some kind of group was largely an individual matter. He thought that records were so varied according to office that it would never be possible to have the same type of call number in every office. Mr. Hill agreed with Miss Norton that any classification plan for records of a governmental agency should reflect the organization of that agency and also that the records should be placed on shelves in such order that they could readily be consulted both by governmental officers and by scholars. He emphasized that relative location rather than fixed shelf location was desirable. Cross-references are, of course, necessary for this type of filing. Classification according to size or binding, or lack of it, is not advisable. If disarrangement of records has occurred prior to transfer of the documents to the archives, they should be restored to primitive order where possible. A series is originally created for administrative purpose and may be large or small in bulk. In planning a classification scheme the use of symbols is necessary and Mr. Hill concluded his paper by explaining those used in the National Archives.

Mr. D. L. Corbitt, of the North Carolina Historical Commission, who followed Mr. Duniway, based his comment on the practice in North Carolina, where the majority of archivists classified according to series and subject and arranged archives chronologically. Mr. Corbitt suggested the importance of thoroughly studying the office of origin and its functions as well as the material transferred. Disorganized correspondence should be filed chronologically. The size of staff of an archive establishment largely governs the extent to which classification is carried out. The department of origin is the department or office in which archives develop in course of business. Thus in North Carolina, correspondence of the governor and the enrolled laws should respectively be assigned in filing to the Executive Department and that of the secretary of state. No call or catalogue

number is satisfactory for the country as a whole, each agency must work out its own system. Mr. Corbitt then explained the letter and number system used in North Carolina, and covered in some detail the custom of the North Carolina Historical Commission concerning materials acquired by gift, cross-indexing, personal papers and collections.

The last leader of discussion was Mr. Robert H. Slover, regional director of the Historical Records Survey, who approached the subject of classification and cataloguing from the point of view of the practical experience of the Historical Records Survey in classifying and arranging state and county archives, particularly the latter. He said that from the beginning the problem of classification had been difficult. Not only did the representatives of the Survey have to deal with the principles of classification when making an inventory of county archives, but frequently they had to rearrange the records before they could be surveyed. Then when the field survey was sent to the Editorial Division, the problem of classification again arose. By way of exemplification of various types of problems, Mr. Slover gave specific instances. Should records be arranged under subject headings by subjects with subheadings under types of records, or should they be arranged under type and allow the subheadings to take care of the subject of the different records? Again there was the question of separation or non-separation of miscellaneous archives, or the combination in one volume of different types of licenses. What should be done with miscellaneous voucher records? One of the most difficult things to deal with was the question of series. How far may a given record differ from one of a similar kind and both still remain in the same series? Mr. Slover discussed in considerable detail various problems of classification arising through variations in series. He said that changes from the bound or unbound form, or the reverse, frequently involved alteration in the character of the record which made classification difficult. Reorganization in government likewise tended to change the continuity of certain records. The overlapping of records where one or more counties are formed from a parent county created difficulty. The questions advanced by Mr. Slover aroused much interest as they were pertinent to the formation of any uniform system of classification.

General discussion followed these three papers. Miss Norton asked Mr. Herbert A. Kellar to give his views respecting the rearrangement of collections. In reply the latter spoke briefly of his experience

with private collections and the relation of the principle of provenance to business records. He thought this principle might well be applied to journals, day books, collection records, letterpress copy books, etc., which naturally fell into series. With respect to loose-leaf business correspondence in large masses, the best line of procedure was not so clear. The most satisfactory arrangement which he had found was to arrange this large group of loose-leaf material according to geographical origin—by states and foreign countries and within the states, by cities and counties. Breaking up these large units into smaller ones in this way made them available for handling in a practical way. Left in a mass, they were difficult to use. Printed items found with the documents were separated and placed in separate files, but only after leaving a notation on the letter as to where the separated item was to be found and on the printed item a record of the letter in which it was inclosed.

Mr. Solon J. Buck, of the National Archives, said that in his opinion there should be no reason for any confusion on the question of provenance where a letter was written by one officer and received by another. Applying this principle, archives are associated with the agency or officer who created the body of records. With respect to the distinction between papers and collections he thought that they were quite different. A man's papers have an archival character and should be kept together. If a man collected other papers than his own and thus established an artificial collection, Mr. Buck thought that since the ultimate users of the varied items would approach them from different points of view he saw no reason why such artificial collections should not be broken up. Mr. D. L. Corbitt thought it was permissible to disarrange an artificial collection if there was no stipulation in the acquisition of the collection not to do so. In many instances such an injunction was present and there was little that could be done about it.

On Tuesday noon the Society was tendered a complimentary luncheon at the Leland Hotel by the Illinois State Historical Society, with Mr. Paul M. Angle presiding. At the conclusion of the luncheon Mr. Harry E. Pratt, executive secretary of the Abraham Lincoln Association, gave an interesting talk on the "Village of New Salem" which the members of the Society were to visit in the afternoon. Mr. Pratt briefly outlined the history of the original New Salem in the late eighteen twenties and thirties and the various steps in recent years which have led to its restoration and the opening of the site as an

Illinois state park. His intimate knowledge of New Salem, conveyed on this occasion, made the trip to the village the more interesting and worth while.

Taking busses, thoughtfully provided by Mr. Hughes, who had brought them down from Chicago for the trip, the members of the Society left Springfield about 2:30 P.M. At New Salem several guides took the members in groups through the village. The courtesy, enthusiasm and intelligence of these guides was remarked upon at the time and subsequently. They contributed much information.

The annual dinner of the Society, which took place in the ball room of the Abraham Lincoln Hotel, was presided over by Robert D. W. Connor, archivist of the United States. Mr. Connor in presenting Mr. A. R. Newsome, took occasion to give a well deserved tribute to Mr. Newsome for his active and able services in promoting interest in the status of American archives. Mr. Newsome gave the presidential address on the subject "Uniform State Archival Legislation," which was a thorough and well worked out analysis of the character of archival laws in the various states, concluding with some suggestions as to further desirable legislation. It was evident to all those listening that a great deal of painstaking and laborious research had preceded the making of this address. The remarks of Mr. Connor about Mr. Newsome were amply corroborated by the character of this valuable study.

The business meeting of the Society immediately followed the conclusion of the annual dinner with President Newsome in the chair. Extended comment on this session is not necessary here as the report of the secretary, Mr. Philip C. Brooks, given at the business session is published elsewhere in this number. Attention, however, should be called to the excellent work which has been done by the officers of the Society and also by a number of the committees. Following a report of the Nominating Committee, the following officers were elected for 1938-1939: Mr. Albert R. Newsome, president; Mr. James A. Robertson, vice president; Mr. Philip C. Brooks, secretary; and Mr. Julian P. Boyd, treasurer. In addition Mr. R. D. W. Connor was elected a member of the council.

The first session on Wednesday morning, held in the palm room of the Abraham Lincoln Hotel, was presided over by Mr. Lester J. Cappon, archivist of the Library of the University of Virginia. The general subject under discussion was "Supplements to Archival Knowledge." Mr. Randolph G. Adams, of the William L. Clements

Library of the University of Michigan, was unable to be present, but his paper entitled "The Character and Extent of Fugitive Archival Material" was read by his associate, Mr. Howard Peckham. Mr. Adams after noting the fact that many important documents originally in archival establishments are now preserved in other institutions, such as libraries and historical societies, said he wished to discuss four types of records not contained in archives. These included archival material which has vanished; archival material which has never come to archival establishments; archival material which has been separated from official custody; and the status before the law of archival estrays. In illustrating these several classes of material, he cited the known evolution of custody of a number of important documents not in official repositories. Of special interest were his researches into the attitude of the courts toward attempts to reclaim records which were no longer in official custody. In view of the considerable amount of archival material not present in archival establishments, but which can be found in libraries, historical societies and other institutions, as well as in private hands, he thought the distinction which has been made between archives and collections of historical manuscripts was somewhat artificial. Furthermore it seemed to him that archivists of official records should feel grateful to those individuals and institutions who in the past have preserved archives which have gone astray, and who will probably continue to perform a similar service for other archives, which the federal or state governments will have neither the authority nor the funds to obtain.

The second paper, "The Relation of Historical Manuscripts to Archival Material," was presented by Mr. Curtis W. Garrison, of the Hayes Memorial Library, at Fremont, Ohio. Mr. Garrison commented on the close relationship between archives and manuscript collections and thought custodians were likely to experience difficulty in keeping a clear distinction between these types of records. Acceptance of the definition of archives given in the *Third Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States*, causes the personal papers of government officials, such as the presidential papers now in the Library of Congress, to present a problem. By accident or design many documents in these papers are of official character or pertain to the formation of policies which have to do with the issuance of official documents. In research the historian must use both the private papers of officials and also corresponding archives, but in treating of such

records he should criticize them differently. Mr. Garrison suggested that since historical manuscripts may be defined to cover every type of manuscript other than those in official archives, which the historian is likely to find useful, it might be helpful to subdivide them into first, manuscript collections of business concerns and social organizations, and second, private collections. The relation of historical manuscripts to archives depends on the nature and practice of government. Wherever government touches private lives, manuscripts and official archives meet. As an example, activities of government have reached deeply into civil life in times of war. The records of such by-product activities are close to being official archives.

Discussing the physical relationship of historical manuscripts to archival material, the latter are better organized, concentrated and specific. Manuscripts are unorganized, scattered and general. While the two groups should be kept physically separate, wise custodians will co-operate to preserve both. Manuscripts of business concerns or social organizations are actually archives, and private manuscripts may also contain much of business, social or public affairs. A single item in a collection should not be interpreted without considering the correspondence around it, nor should a good manuscript collection be regarded as an entity in itself without consideration of background. It is a distinct function of a manuscript collection to give a feeling of the times, and in this way it actively complements archival material. Archives are likely to have more continuity than manuscript collections, are easier to evaluate and archivists frequently exercise their own judgment when they keep or do not keep archival records. Historical manuscripts are less easy to judge as they are not all of equal value, but in large collections an attempt should be made to separate the chaff from the wheat, and in this way facilitate research by historians. Finally, Mr. Garrison thought the real relationship between historical manuscripts and archives could be brought out more clearly by adopting the principle of provenance in arranging collections of manuscripts. Information about a collection was needed and valuable for an interpretation of its content.

Mr. Douglas C. McMurtrie was to have read the third paper at this session. However in accordance with the request of the Program Committee it had been given, in expanded form, at the dinner on Monday evening.

At the second morning session on Wednesday entitled "Special

Type Archives," Mr. Russell H. Anderson, curator of the Department of Agriculture, Textiles and Forestry, at the Museum of Science and Industry, acted as chairman. The first speaker was Mr. William W. Sweet, of the University of Chicago, who read a paper on "Church Archives." Mr. Sweet said that for many years church archives in the United States had not received serious consideration. Only in recent times has church history as such been recognized as a valuable subject by the cult of historians. He indicated that the major churches were no longer satisfied with the accounts written by amateur and denominational historians who until recently had been almost the sole exponents of this type of history. The speaker referred to the vast number of church archives throughout the country, enumerating the varieties of records which are to be found in every church and diocese, among benevolent societies and religious orders, including journals of general assemblies, and general conferences and conventions, not to speak of the private papers of ministers and independent religious agencies in the United States. He pointed out that as a source of information concerning the state or any portion of the state, the church had been a steadying influence in support of government and the economic, social and educational well-being of the people. Of pertinence in studying church archives was the wide area over which these records were scattered and the difficulties which would be encountered in trying to survey or assemble them. As an offset to this situation Mr. Sweet said that when information was sought it was generally available to accredited scholars. He then gave a report on the principal depositories where a serious attempt has been made to assemble church archives for the purpose of serving the cause of history, commenting on the records maintained by various denominations, such as Baptists, Catholics, Congregationalists, Disciples, Episcopalians, The Friends or Quakers, Lutherans, Mennonites, Methodists, Moravians, Presbyterians, Reformed bodies, Shakers, Unitarians and Universalists, and the collections found in state historical societies and university libraries. He said that the survey of church records now being carried out by the Historical Records Survey had rendered unnecessary the enterprise started some years ago of making a card catalogue of church archives in historical society collections.

"Some Problems in the Preservation of Business Archives," the second paper at this session, was given by Mr. William D. Overman,

of the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society. Presenting a brief history of business, Mr. Overman first showed how little thought the business man of the frontier had for the preservation of his records, and second, stressed the growing need for such data since legislation and regulating measures had made the existence of these documents imperative for tax and other purposes. He then quoted from Dr. Hower's article on "Preservation of Business Archives" to the effect that business had been unable to defend itself in the last decade because of a lack of accurate data. Mr. Overman felt strongly that business should have archival materials and that histories should be written based on these records. The deplorable present day practice in many large concerns of destroying vast accumulations of their records, especially the general run of daily correspondence, to create more filing space, and preserving only directors' minutes, corporate papers and some executive correspondence was discussed in some detail. Mr. Overman then presented a brief account of a large corporation with which he had been associated during the past year, analyzing the general policy of the company with regard to its papers and indicating what data had been retained. He concluded his paper with a plan for the classification and preservation of the existing company records and outlined a new general policy of filming records customarily destroyed, for the purpose of keeping them for use by posterity.

The third paper of this session, "Agricultural Records, Their Nature and Value for Research," was read by Mr. Everett E. Edwards, of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture. Mr. Edwards said that farming together with accompanying rurality has been the main way of life in America until comparatively recent years. Forces and conditions which have entered into the evolution of rural life constitute a central theme in the history of the American people. Any analysis of rural life must be derived from basic records, such as documents originating with the individual farmer, records of organizations in the community in which the farmer lives, and of the forces in the nation which have tended to mold and develop the farm and rural community. Under personal records of the farmer, the speaker discussed diaries and account books, letters and memoirs or reminiscences, noting their value for economic and social data. Mr. Edwards said that while farm diaries seldom traced the operation of the farm and the activity of the family in suf-

ficient detail for any continuous period, nevertheless, they did convey the atmosphere of farm life and an appreciation of its struggles, hopes and defeats. Among farmers' letters he particularly called attention to the communications written by Scandinavian and German immigrants which have been obtained in Europe, and to letters written from the frontier to older settled parts of America. Of interest in this last connection are the letters assembled by Mr. John Ise, of the University of Kansas, published under the title *Sod-House Days*. Reminiscences and memoirs, granting their limitations, have value for background and atmosphere and should be assembled where possible. Documents connected with institutions and organizations in a rural community, such as account books and correspondence of country stores, mills, elevators, stock yards, tobacco warehouses, cotton gins, etc., are basic sources of much value, furnishing information on a number of phases of rural life. Rural newspapers, metropolitan newspapers with a large rural circulation, proceedings of local agricultural clubs and the archives of towns and counties also contain important data. Among the forces of the nation which have reacted on the farmer and his community are colonization and settlement, land policies and systems of land holding and labor, farm equipment, marketing and financing, political activities and agencies which have disseminated knowledge of improved methods of agriculture and rural life. Mr. Edwards offered penetrating comment on these phases of life and the records which throw light upon them. This paper was notable for the value of its pertinent interpretative suggestions for the preservation and use of the various types of agricultural archives.

The luncheon on Wednesday was held in the Lincoln room of the Abraham Lincoln Hotel with Mr. Christopher B. Coleman, director of the Indiana State Library, acting as chairman. This luncheon was a pleasant affair, at the conclusion of which the members of the Society listened to a speech of welcome to Springfield by a representative of the mayor of the city, Mr. John W. Kapp, Jr. Mr. Newsome and Mr. Coleman both replied in kind and the concluding address was given by Mr. C. Herrick Hammond, of Chicago, the architect of the archives building. Mr. Hammond's account of his connection with the edifice was most interesting and gave some degree of insight into the problems which had to be solved in constructing it.

The first afternoon session on Wednesday was devoted to local archives with Mr. William D. McCain, director of the Department

of Archives and History of the state of Mississippi, serving as chairman. Lieutenant Colonel James M. Scammell read a paper by Mr. John C. L. Andreassen, of the Historical Records Survey, entitled "The National Survey of County Archives." Mr. Andreassen reviewed the inception and development of the survey of county records, in its relation to WPA, explained the manner in which the work of the county inventories was organized, and outlined the substantial progress that has been made. Various aspects of the survey work, including functions of regional directors and editorial staffs, problems of the latter, and particularly the legal research and writing involved in the publication of inventories, were all discussed in some detail. Attention was called to the content of the inventories which included a legal essay covering the organization and development of the county, a historical sketch, responsibilities of offices, housing and care of records, a classification and general listing of records, maps, charts and comprehensive subject and chronological indexes. He concluded with statistics on the production of county archives and the surveys of imprints, church records and manuscripts and welcomed suggestions for furtherance of the Historical Records Survey work.

The last session on Wednesday afternoon was the dedication of the new Illinois State Archives Building. Much interest on the part of the general public had been aroused by this event and when the members of the Society assembled for the exercises they found somewhat to their surprise a traffic jam at the entrance to the archives building.

Mr. Carl B. Roden, librarian of the Chicago Public Library, presided over the session. Secretary of State Edward J. Hughes spoke on "What the Illinois State Archives Building Means to the State of Illinois." He emphasized the fact that the building was no mere museum but an actual and essential tool for the state official and for the student of history,—a place for the safe-keeping of public records that would insure against the recurrence of past losses of muniments of the state's history whose value is evidenced by the precious fragments that survive.

Mr. R. D. W. Connor, archivist of the United States, spoke on the subject "The Necessity for Co-operation between State and National Archives." He contrasted the long history of European archive establishments with the recent establishment of the National Archives of the United States. He pointed out that certain states had led the way

in the scientific care of archives, until now thirty-three states have archival establishments, and urged the necessity of close co-operation of state and federal archives.

Mr. A. R. Newsome, president of the Society of American Archivists, spoke on "What Next in Archives?" After citing the remarkable record of archival achievement in the last five years, Mr. Newsome indicated in some detail what seemed to him the probable lines of advance in the next few years. Summing these up he said: "Perhaps the most significant trends will be enlarged public support in the form of appropriations and legislation; improved archival administration with trained archivists and service to administrators and more extensive use of archives by scholars." In conclusion he stated that the Illinois State Archives Building was "ample in extent, beautiful in design, scientific in plan, modern in equipment," and "is a deserved recognition of the splendid record of Illinois archival achievement, an evidence of public spirit and intelligence."

Following the dedication those present were conducted on a tour of the building after which they attended a tea and reception given by Mrs. Edward J. Hughes.

Mr. Luther H. Evans, national director of the Historical Records Survey, called a regional meeting of the executives of the Historical Records Survey in the middle western states, to coincide with the meeting of the archivists at Springfield. The attendance of these people, a number of whom are members of the Society, contributed materially to the success of the occasion.

The Illinois State Library Association began a three-day assembly in Springfield on the last day of the meeting of the Society of American Archivists.

HERBERT A. KELLAR