Sweeping out the Capitol: The State Archives and the Politics of Administration in Georgia, 1921–1923

Ciaran B. Trace

ABSTRACT

This article examines the history and rhetoric of administrative reform in Georgia during the Progressive Era, as it affected the operation of the State Archives. During this period, Georgia's governor, Thomas W. Hardwick (1921–1923), was part of a cadre of public officials, legislative committees, and state governors who led the charge to develop and perfect the "business management of their people's affairs."[1] As a result, organizations such as the Institute for Government Research of the Brookings Institute, the National Institute of Public Administration, and the Public Administration Service were commissioned to look into the operation and organization of federal, state, and local government. In Georgia, Hardwick hired the Chicago firm of Griffenhagen and Associates to make his case for proper efficiencies and economies in state government. In the process, the Georgia Department of Archives and History was almost swept away in the wake of Hardwick's program. In laying out this historical case study, particular attention is drawn to the larger cyclical political and social forces that, in promoting administrative reform, serve to undermine the survival of state archival agencies.

KEY WORDS

Information history, Archival history, United States history, State archives, Public administration, Administrative reform, State government, Efficiency experts

> This is why there should be a science of administration which shall seek to straighten the paths of government, to make its business less unbusiness-like, to strengthen and purify its organization, and to crown its duties with dutifulness.
>
> —*Woodrow Wilson, 1887*[2]

A system of state archives has been established in the United States over the past two hundred years. With parent agencies that include secretaries of state, state libraries, and state historical societies, these archives exist to "protect the legal, financial, and historical foundation for the state and its citizens."[3] The money to administer these programs is appropriated by the state legislature, approved by the governor, and borne by the citizenry. A 2014 Council of State Archivists survey found that expenditures on archives and records programs were "well below one-tenth of 1 percent of total expenditures by all state governments across the nation."[4] Yet, their relative cost compared to overall state expenditures has not spared archives programs as state governments have shrunk in times of fiscal constraint. Over the last fifty years, the search for efficiency and economy in state government has led to the threatened closure of several state archives, among them Maine (1973–1974), Colorado (1991), and Florida (2003).[5] Part of the ascendant policies of neoliberalism that have been in place since the 1970s, the state has been reimagined as a paragon of economic efficiency. In the process of trimming state government, agencies are increasingly forced to justify their existence in economic and market-based rather than social and cultural terms.

In this context, Georgia provides an interesting case study. In the wake of the economic downturn of 2008, the Georgia State Archives absorbed numerous budget cuts. By 2011, its opening hours were the lowest of any state archives in the country. In an effort to halt its decline, the Coalition to Preserve the Georgia Archives was established in fall 2011, bringing together archival, historical, heritage, and genealogical organizations to raise awareness and support for the Georgia Archives among the Georgia legislature; its parent agency, the secretary of state's office; and the public.[6] Despite some initial success, ongoing state fiscal problems, and the accompanying call from Governor John Nathan Deal to curtail state services, created a crisis for the State Archives.

Elected the eighty-second governor of Georgia, Deal took office in January 2011. In an address to a joint session of the senate and the house of representatives following his inauguration, Deal laid out his plans and priorities as governor. In noting the "lingering pain" in which the state had been engulfed because of the recession, he underscored the urgency of reexamining the role that government plays in the lives of its citizens. Noting that one of every ten

employable citizens was out of work, Deal reminded his colleagues of the need to "justify every cent" that the government extracted from the economy, and he urged legislators to concentrate their attention on "the core responsibilities of government." For Deal, these core responsibilities were security, education, and transportation, all areas for which improvement would help efforts to attract business to the state, build a better workforce, and provide jobs for Georgians.[7] Deal finished his speech with an admonition for economy and efficiency in state government: "Let us refocus State Government on its core responsibilities and relieve our taxpayers of the burden of unnecessary programs. Let us be frugal and wise. Let us restore the confidence of our citizens in a government that is limited and efficient. Together let us make Georgia the brightest star in the constellation of these United States."

Deal's call for efficiency and economy was no mere words. In 2012, the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget instructed the Office of the Secretary of State to reduce its budget for Amended Fiscal Year 2013 and Fiscal Year 2014 by 3 percent ($732,626). In September of that year, Georgia secretary of state Brian Kemp announced that in an effort to protect the services his agency provided in support of putting people to work, starting small businesses, and providing public safety, he intended to take the required cut solely from the appropriation of the Georgia State Archives. Kemp announced that, beginning November 1, 2012, the public would be allowed to access the archives by appointment only, with hours depending upon the schedule of the remaining employees.[8]

With the Coalition to Preserve the Georgia Archives, the Georgia Genealogical Society, and the Friends of Georgia Archives and History marshaling support from concerned constituents, a public stance was taken against the effective closing of the State Archives. The public was kept informed via social media and the press, and weighed in on the proposed closure via a letter-writing campaign, an online petition, and a rally at the state capitol. Meetings were also held with Governor Deal; Chris Riley, the governor's chief of staff; and Representative Terry England, head of appropriations for the Georgia House of Representatives. While the governor expressed his support for the State Archives, it was the meeting with Riley that began the conversation about how to secure the future of this state agency.[9]

In mid-October, the governor announced that the state would restore $125,000 to Kemp's budget to keep the State Archives open for the remainder of the fiscal year. In an effort to "find efficiencies," Deal and Kemp stated their intention of transferring the archives to the University System of Georgia, pending approval of the move by the general assembly. The transfer would include appropriations required for operations along with the assets of the Georgia Archives.[10] In anticipation of the passage of a bill, the Friends of Georgia Archives hired governmental consulting firm Joe Tanner & Associates to help

create a consistent message for the legislature (to support the transfer to the board of regents and to request an increase in operating funds for the archives) and to provide legislative advocacy training.[11] When the governor signed the bill on May 6, 2013, Georgia became the sole state archives administered by a state university system and one of only two state archives to operate outside of the state executive branch.[12]

While this case study underscores the importance of a well-crafted advocacy campaign to the survival of state archival agencies, as a story it is nevertheless incomplete. Missing is a historical analysis of the relationship that has existed between the State Archives, as an administrative unit of state government, and the State of Georgia. Such a historical perspective provides an opportunity to examine the recurrent forces that have undermined the place of archival institutions in state government since the turn of the twentieth century. Georgia's history shows that, in fact, from its inception, the State Archives has been entangled by various movements and ideologies to reform state administration.[13] The fact that the effectiveness of political systems rests to a substantial degree on the effectiveness of their administrative institutions means that the "design and control" of these bureaucratic structures has long been a "central concern" of the polity. That America's political system keeps returning to the idea of administrative reform also helps to shed light on the relationship between administration and politics, and on the operation of the political process, writ large.[14]

A historical study of state administrative reform also helps to identify countervailing rhetoric for how these efforts can be understood. One orthodoxy presents administrative reform as the objective pursuit of a program of effectiveness, efficiency, and economy. In this scenario, the rhetoric is of good government through managerial control, with the comprehensive redesign of administrative structures and procedures pursued along scientific and bureaucratic lines. In this frame of reference, the work and work processes of state agencies must be aligned with governance and management goals to survive. The other is an orthodoxy that presents administrative reform as unabashedly political. In this scenario, the rhetoric is of control, with administrative reform as one part of a larger political struggle among competing interests. In this frame of reference, state agencies must generally align with the political power or have strong constituent support to survive.[15]

This article examines the history and rhetoric of administrative reform in Georgia in the Progressive Era, as it affected the operation of the State Archives. During this period, Georgia's governor, Thomas W. Hardwick (1921–1923), was one of a cadre of public officials, legislative committees, and state governors who led the charge to develop and perfect the "business management of their people's affairs."[16] As a result, organizations such as the Institute for

Government Research of the Brookings Institute, the National Institute of Public Administration, and the Public Administration Service were commissioned to look into the operation and organization of federal, state, and local government. In Georgia, Hardwick hired the Chicago firm of Griffenhagen and Associates to make his case for proper efficiencies and economies in state government. In the process, as this article will show, the various orthodoxies in play held the State Archives hostage as part of Hardwick's push for administrative reform.

Administrative Reform and the Rise of the Efficiency Movement

In the United States, the search for economy and efficiency in the organization, function, and processes of federal government stretches back to the country's formation, with over two hundred administrative investigations conducted between 1789 and 1909.[17] The golden age of the efficiency movement took place against the backdrop of the Progressive Era (1890–1920)—a time when a push for reform in all sectors of political and social life was coupled with a desire to increase efficiency in operations through scientific methods. Public sector reformers viewed government as both a cause and a solution to the problems of corruption, patronage, and the system of political bosses.[18] As the reach of government expanded at the turn of the twentieth century, reformers sought improvements in the organization and method of its administration, including in the areas of budgetary process, spending, accounting, and personnel practices. One of the first areas of government administration to come under sustained scrutiny was that of political patronage (the so-called spoils system). The assassination of President Garfield in 1881 by a disgruntled office-seeker acted as a catalyst for reform and led to the creation of the civil service merit system.[19] The subsequent Pendleton Civil Service Reform Act of 1883 provided for a national Civil Service Commission to administer public employment and created a system in which the awarding of federal civil service positions was principally based on open competitive exams.[20]

Indeed, the Progressive Era ushered in a series of "increasingly comprehensive and methodologically searching explorations into the business and business methods of the Federal Government."[21] Such broad-scale investigations (encompassing congressional initiatives, public commissions, and presidential task forces) included the Cockrell Committee (1887–1889), the Dockery-Cockrell Commission (1893–1895), the Keep Commission (1905–1909), the Commission on Economy and Efficiency (Taft Commission) (1910–1913), the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Government Departments (1921), the President's Committee on Administrative Management (Brownlow Committee) (1936–1937), and the Senate Select Committee on Investigation of Executive Agencies of the Government (Byrd Committee) (1936–1937).[22]

At the state level, the rapid expansion of state responsibilities and the increasing cost of state services in the early twentieth century led to a concern that government was tackling its duties in a way that encouraged administrative bloat.[23] Additionally, the concern existed that the efficient operation of state services was being hindered by high turnover rates of public employees and by a government machinery that had created a system in which agency functions overlapped, administrative work was duplicated, inadequate provision was made for the supervision of staff, work processes were unstandardized, and unnecessary records were created.[24] Efficiency thus became the "watchword" of state government during the Progressive Era, with efficiency implying a "new level of rationality, planning, and expertise, which would ensure more effective services, preferably at lower costs."[25] Echoing developments at the federal level, the creation of civil service commissions at the state, city, county, and municipal levels increasingly tackled the issue of making government more efficient and businesslike.[26]

As part of the process of streamlining government administration, one area of emphasis was personnel reform including the "establishment of scientific classification of public employees, and on the establishment of adequate and uniform rates of compensation."[27] Taken as a whole, however, it was "tinkering with the administrative structure and rearranging departments and commissions" that was perhaps the "favorite pastime" of the state reformers.[28] Following on the heels of the Taft Commission, state commissions were created to investigate economy and efficiency, and between 1911 and America's entry into the Great War, fifteen states had established such investigations.[29] Although action was not always forthcoming consequent to these commissions, numerous states did pursue administrative reorganization in the form of statutory change and, less typically, in the form of constitutional revision.[30] Efforts to create clear lines of authority from the governor to newly reformed administrative agencies also accompanied the turn to efficiency. A key figure was the political appointee, holder of a higher-level agency position, involved in policy-making, and to whom the merit system did not apply.[31] With such a concentration of power within the state executive branch came the attempted curtailment of the reach of the state legislature, local governments, courts, and independent boards of trustees. Yet, such centralization of power did not happen without resistance. Special interest groups feared that a rotation of political appointees to head state agencies would actually hinder the continuity of state services and bring in a leadership lacking in requisite professional knowledge.[32]

The first comprehensive administrative consolidation occurred in Illinois in 1917, backed by investigations by an efficiency and economy committee created by the general assembly four years prior.[33] Campaigning on the issue of state administrative reorganization, businessman turned Republican governor

Frank O. Lowden championed the passage of a Civil Administrative Code to consolidate the approximately 125 independent administrative Illinois agencies (including various offices, bureaus, governing boards, and commissions) into nine executive departments headed by gubernatorial appointees.[34] The legislatures in Idaho and Nebraska adopted similar civil administrative codes in 1919, and in California, Ohio, and Washington in 1921. The legislatures also put into effect administrative reorganization plans (either completely or in part) in Maryland, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Vermont in 1923, and in Minnesota and South Dakota in 1925. Reorganization plans involving constitutional revision came into effect in Massachusetts in 1919, in New York in 1927, and in Virginia in 1928.[35]

This move for efficiency went hand-in-hand with the search for expertise to help research, assemble, and render pertinent data with the goal of transforming the running of the state apparatus. These efforts included a push to professionalize the business of legislating, with a number of states creating state legislative reference services, where librarians were put to work to "gather information on policy issues and aid lawmakers in drafting statutes."[36] Politicians also drafted outside experts to their cause, with governors seeking "sound technical advice" on the operation and organization of state government.[37] In the search for administrative expertise, government reformers turned to a new cadre of university-trained experts, many of whom were already plying their trade in the private sector.

Administrative reform had taken on an academic hue by the late nineteenth century. Woodrow Wilson was one of the earliest American academics to take an interest in the field of government administration, introduced to him by economist and social reformer Richard T. Ely. In his touchstone article, *The Study of Administration*, Wilson decreed that the object of administrative study is to "discover, first, what government can properly and successfully do, and, secondly, how it can do these proper things with the utmost possible efficiency and at the least possible cost."[38] Wilson also weighed in on the perennial question of the relationship between administration and politics, clinging to the notion that while politics "set the tasks for administration," "its motives, its objects, its policy, its standards" should be considered bureaucratic and not political in nature.[39]

Wilson was on perhaps less contentious ground in his assertion that the field of public administration is akin to that of the field of business.[40] Yet, the principles espoused by both these fields of management science demonstrate their different theoretical and intellectual underpinnings. While the roots and principles of public administration were embedded in public law (constitution, statutes, and case law), the private sector had long embraced an entrepreneurial business culture, and associated corporate behavior theories, that proved

controversial when applied to government agencies and programs.[41] Yet, during the Progressive Era, a clear symbiosis existed between the two realms, with the business sector helping to bring private-sector habits into government work, including into the area of administrative reform.

In the United States, the rise of efficiency experts, and their associated work in state government, ties directly to the growth of various business disciplines including scientific management, management consulting, and cost accounting. Although related, each field has its own "professional and ideological origins."[42] Predominantly employed in the manufacturing sector, scientific management took hold in the late nineteenth century, lasting as a commercial enterprise up through the mid-1920s.[43] Early pioneer Frederick Winslow Taylor viewed scientific management as a "true science," with knowledge based upon a systematic study of work and of work practices, codified into "clearly defined laws, rules, and principles."[44] The result was the creation of volumes of scientific data that was then available to management for the planning process.[45]

Cost accounting formed the bridge between the fields of scientific management and management consulting.[46] From the turn of the twentieth century up through the late 1920s, cost accountants worked in tandem with industrial engineers to create benchmarks for manufacturing and thus minimize production and distribution costs. While the early practitioners of scientific management were primarily concerned with industrial relations, "problems of bureaucratic organization" were the purview of the early management consultants.[47] At the organizational level, the need for management consultants was tied to the perceived advantages to administration of bringing in independent experts who specialized in complex areas of knowledge. The growth of management consultancy was also tied to particular endogenous forces including the development of the American economy during the Progressive Era, as well as to New Deal regulatory changes (1933 Glass-Steagall Banking Act) that prohibited lawyers, accountants, and engineers from continuing to act as corporate consultants.[48]

Griffenhagen and Associates

Born in the heyday of the Progressive Era and aligned with the rise of scientific management techniques, efficiency experts sought to meld modern business methods to public administration, in the process creating a more "scientific government."[49] Prominent efficiency experts of the time were Chicagoans Edwin O. Griffenhagen and Fred Telford. Griffenhagen's and Telford's early professional careers were defined by their pioneering work as part of the Chicago civil service reform movement, their participation in the Progressive Era phenomenon of local government efficiency bureaus, and their association with the rise of a system known as the "Chicago plan." During the period 1907 to 1916,

a network of Chicago businessmen, professionals, academics, clubs, and reform and good government organizations fomented reform in response to the rapid rise in the city's population and the accompanying inadequacies of city services, the fragmentation of the power and authority of local government, and the endemic corruption of the city council and of city administration.[50] In particular, reform was pursued through the auspices of the City of Chicago's Civil Service Commission and in line with the "efficiency plan" devised by attorney Robert Catherwood. The plan proposed a staff of efficiency examiners to screen appointments, monitor employee performance, and study the organization of work within city departments.[51]

Griffenhagen became involved with reform work in 1910 at the age of twenty-four when he was hired as an "expert on organization" for the newly formed Efficiency Division of the Civil Service Commission.[52] With an initial operating budget of $23,000 and a staff of five full-time employees, the work of the Efficiency Division was channeled through a Clerical and Accounting Section (charged with "enhancing the professionalization of the city's personnel system") and a Technical Section (charged with "identifying inefficient operations in city agencies").[53] As the division set about reforming Chicago's civil service system and investigating the methods of city administration, the staff adopted the rhetoric and methods of scientific management as a means of bolstering credibility for their work.[54] In Griffenhagen's area of personnel management, the work of the division centered on regularizing public personnel administration (with an emphasis on transferring decision-making power from the "corrupt" line managers to the properly educated and trained staff of the Civil Service Commission), as well as on duties classification and on salary standardization.[55] While his colleague, Efficiency Engineer in Charge Jacob Lewis Jacobs, devised an efficiency rating for employees, Griffenhagen created a dictionary classification (classification by titles of positions) and salary grading system for city employees.[56] Griffenhagen left the Civil Service Commission in 1911 and briefly served as the superintendent of employment for the Civil Service Commission of one of Chicago's independent park districts (South Park), where he pursued similar reform policies.[57] Fred Telford continued Griffenhagen's work for the Civil Service Commission, hired as the assistant chief examiner in 1913, a position he held for about eighteen months. Telford later went on to study the classification, works, and methods of the seven commissions operating in Chicago at the time (the United States Civil Service Commission, the State of Illinois Commission, the City of Chicago Commission, the Cook County Commission, and the Lincoln Park, South Park, and West Park Boards).

While government efficiency bureaus pursued reform, management consultants were also eager to create a market for business-driven reform in both the public and the private sectors. The somewhat porous boundaries between

the public and private sectors at the time allowed businesses to absorb the skills and expertise of civil service staff. Along with J. L. Jacobs and Company, the preeminent Chicago firm of consulting engineers and employment advisers of the time was Arthur Young and Company. Scottish accountant and lawyer Arthur Young and his brother Stanley founded Arthur Young and Company in Chicago in 1906 as one of the first public accounting firms in the country. Rapid industrialization, the rise of corporate forms of ownership and corporate mergers, the creation of a distinct management class, and the introduction of federal corporate taxation helped to establish a market for professional accountants with accountancy work expanding from handling bookkeeping, bankruptcies, and liquidations to that of auditing corporate financial statements and establishing accounting systems to track revenues and expenses.[58] In 1911, Young organized a separate management and industrial engineering department to expand the services on offer to the corporate sector and hired Griffenhagen to run the department. Major clients included those in commercial, industrial, financial, and public utility businesses.[59] Griffenhagen and his colleagues slowly parlayed the firm's experience of working with private industry into government contracts, advertising that the firm could bring the best practices of "modern," "progressive" privately controlled businesses to the public sector.[60] Griffenhagen's department built its business primarily around personnel issues, with staff working to create duties classification and salary standardization for the public service.[61] The push for administrative efficiency during the Great War and the economic conditions that followed gave further impetus to the classification and salary standardization movement and thus provided further employment opportunities for the firm. Fred Telford joined Griffenhagen's department at the time when a number of civil service commissions hired Young and Company to handle the technical work of classification, including major projects for the Dominion of Canada, the City of Montreal, and the government of the United States.[62]

In 1920, while some of this work was underway, Griffenhagen and a number of his colleagues (including Fred Telford) had taken over the industrial engineering department of Arthur Young and Company. Operating under the name of Griffenhagen and Associates, Ltd., with premises at 116 South Michigan Avenue, the firm continued its role as industrial engineers and employment advisors for the private and public sectors.[63] For the private sector, the firm advertised its services (provided by an individual staff member or by a group) to any organization contemplating "improvements in organization or methods of procedure," and desiring "counsel or assistance in problems of management, business organization, industrial relations, production control, cost accounting, or office system."[64] With regard to public sector work, the staff were touted as bringing an "impartial, experienced, outside point of view, a thorough

familiarity of the best methods of privately conducted industry, an understanding of the problems peculiar to the public service, and a real enthusiasm for the cause of administrative reform."[65] Whether operating as counselors, advisers, directors of investigations or installations, or as a staff of technical assistants, the expertise of the firm could be engaged for a fixed payment or via a *per diem* or monthly fee.[66] In the first decade of its existence, the company reorganized numerous corporations, utilities, and banks and was responsible for tackling reorganization projects for various states (South Carolina, 1920–1922; Maryland, 1921; and Georgia, 1921–1922), and cities (including Montreal, 1919; Baltimore, pre-1922; Philadelphia, 1920; and Chicago, 1923).[67]

Georgia Politics in Play

Georgia was one of at least thirty-eight states that pursued administrative reform in the period from 1900 to 1937, with such reforms generally initiated by the governor.[68] The political conditions in Georgia that supported reform took time to develop. A form of representative government has been in existence in Georgia since 1751, with its legislative body, the general assembly, being in continuous operation since the state revoked its status as a colony of Great Britain in 1777.[69] While the legislature initially had the power to select a governor (constitution of 1789), the model quickly turned to that of a popularly elected head of the executive branch (constitution of 1798). While the state constitutions in place in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries curtailed the power of Georgia's governor, subsequent state constitutions and state statutes reversed that trend. In Georgia, the full-time nature of the governorship (compared to a part-time legislature), the degree of control the governor had over the state budget, and the provision of a portion of state revenues to the governor's discretionary budget strengthened gubernatorial power.[70]

Georgia had seen a succession of Democratic governors since the beginning of the Progressive Era: William J. Northen (1890–1894), William Y. Atkinson (1894–1898), Allen D. Candler (1898–1902), Joseph M. Terrell (1902–1907), Hoke Smith (1907–1909, 1911), Joseph M. Brown (1909–1911, 1912–1913), John M. Slaton (1911–1912, 1913–1915), Nathaniel E. Harris (1915–1917), Hugh Dorsey (1917–1921), and Thomas W. Hardwick (1921–1923). The political ambitions and associated political platforms of these governors shaped the development of state government, but none more so than Governor Hardwick's. Trained as a lawyer at the University of Georgia, Hardwick carved out a career in state and national politics as a state legislator (Georgia House of Representatives, 1898–1902), U.S. congressional representative (1903–1914); U.S. senator (1915–1919); and Georgia governor (1921–1923). Hardwick fit the mold of governors of the time, who campaigned "not primarily as nominees of a political party but as leaders of a

policy crusade."[71] Hardwick campaigned under the aegis of retrenchment and a "sweeping out the capitol" program that sought economy and efficiency in the running of state government.

In the early 1920s, the Georgia Department of Archives and History was almost swept away in the wake of Hardwick's program, and every twist and turn in the saga was caustically laid out in a political satire, *The Ballad of the Broom*, written by Lucian Lamar Knight.[72] Knight (1868–1933) was a fellow student of Hardwick's at the University of Georgia. Like his cousin, newspaper man Henry W. Grady, Knight made a name for himself as an orator and as a historian and writer of popular rather than academic repute.[73] Like Hardwick, Knight had begun his professional life as an attorney (working in Macon and then in Atlanta) before taking up a position in 1892 as editorial writer and literary editor for the *Atlanta Constitution*. In 1902, he quit the newspaper to enter the Presbyterian ministry, completing theological work at Princeton University (where he was a pupil of Woodrow Wilson) and subsequently serving as an associate pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church in Washington, D.C. After a sojourn in California for health reasons, Knight returned to Georgia full-time in 1908, serving as associate editor of the *Atlanta Georgian*. In 1910, he became literary editor and vice president for the publisher Martin and Hoyt Company.

While Hardwick's professional energies were squarely directed toward politics, governing, and the law, Knight's seemingly peripatetic professional life coalesced around a love of Georgia and Georgia history, and a desire to preserve the documentary sources that could memorialize the history of the state and of southern (white) exceptionalism. The seeds of the establishment of the Georgia Department of Archives and History were planted in 1913 when an executive order from then Governor Brown appointed Knight to the position of compiler of state records.[74] The post, once held by former governors Allen D. Candler and William J. Northen, positioned Knight as preserver and publisher of the state's most important historical records of the colonial, revolutionary, and Confederate periods. Yet Knight had even grander ambitions for the office. In 1916, he began to work in earnest to get legislation passed to transform the Office of Compiler of State Records into a full-fledged Department of Archives and History, similar to institutions that had already been founded in Alabama (1901), Mississippi (1902), South Carolina (1905), North Carolina (1907), and Arkansas (1907).

While not a politician by training, temperament, or inclination, Knight understood that to keep his political appointment and to achieve his dream of founding a permanent historical agency, he would need to align certain constituents to his cause and to cultivate and develop the interest of key political power players in the state. To aid him in his plans, he helped found the Georgia Historical Association (GHA) in 1917. The association brought together

historians, leaders of women's patriotic organizations, and other interested parties to advocate for the collection and preservation of state records, and thus for the formation of a Department of Archives and History.[75] Knight first outlined his plans to create a permanent state archives (a place to preserve the state's "immortal things") in a letter to then-governor Nat Harris in June 1916. Noting that the cost involved would be negligible, Knight solicited the governor's support to start the ball rolling.[76] Later that year, he brought Senator Thomas Hardwick into the fold. Knight laid out his ambition to follow in the footsteps of North Carolina, Mississippi, and Alabama and found a central depository at the state capitol to preserve the important historical records of the state. Knight asked that Hardwick write a "friendly letter" endorsing the proposed legislation. Knight sought to hasten Hardwick's endorsement by noting that he already had the support of ex-Governors Brown, Slaton, and McDaniel, Governor Harris, and Governor-Elect Dorsey, as well as the backing of judges of the supreme court and court of appeals, of patriotic organizations (Daughters of the American Revolution and United Daughters of the Confederacy), and of Confederate veterans.[77] Hardwick responded in favor of the plan, letting Knight know that he could count on his help with the matter.[78]

With the entry of the United States into the Great War in April 1917, the plans to create the department could easily have been derailed. Yet, Knight continued to work behind the scenes to mobilize support for the cause of history and to gather information to help in the realization of his plans. Among his confidants was Thomas McAdory Owen, director of the Department of Archives and History for the State of Alabama, from whom he sought information about appropriations and the allotment of state funds.[79] Despite this progress, it was also a trying time for Knight as he dealt with rumors that in-coming governor Hugh Dorsey was preparing to remove him from the Office of Compiler of State Records.[80] In an effort to preempt such an outcome, Knight wrote to Dorsey laying out the crisis facing Georgia's historical records—a situation in which "old records are disregarded . . . sometimes crowded into dark corners . . . sometimes packed into boxes for storage . . . sometimes inadvertently fed to the furnace." Knight described his efforts to date to found a Department of Archives, noting that a bill was in place, along with a plan to bolster its chances of passing.[81] While acknowledging that Dorsey might have someone else in mind for the office, Knight made it clear that if his work was valued, he should be allowed to stay on as compiler of state records, a position that would help bring a Department of Archives to fruition.[82] Though noncommittal in his reply, Dorsey conceded that he had "not yet seriously considered the proposition" of appointing anyone else to the position.[83]

Knight's advocacy efforts appeared to pay off. On July 3, 1917, a resolution in the house led to the formation of a joint committee to inquire into the

conditions of the state archives and to recommend appropriate legislation.[84] Three weeks later in a speech to the assembly, Governor Dorsey tipped his hand and threw his support behind the formation of a state archives.[85] The following day, the joint committee presented its findings, recommending that a sum of money be appropriated so that important state records could be brought together and housed in the state capitol under the control of the compiler of state records. Following the report, a house resolution sought to appropriate $2,000 for the protection of Georgia's archives.[86] Yet, Knight himself quickly and decisively imperiled his best-laid plans. While the joint committee was at work, a letter Knight wrote under the auspices of the Georgia Historical Association had garnered much attention following its publication in the *Atlanta Constitution*. Addressed to Thomas Hardwick and Hoke Smith, the letter roundly criticized the senators for their lack of support for President Woodrow Wilson's war measures.[87] In clashing fiercely and publicly with the Georgia senators, Knight allowed the political momentum that he had so carefully cultivated to slip away.[88] Unrepentant of his defense of Wilson, Knight renewed his attack on Hardwick the following year in his annual address before the GHA.[89] Reflecting on the episode in his address, Knight argued that it was the duty of the association to concern itself not only with the past but also to "relate itself vitally to the present."[90] Despite this setback, Knight renewed his lobbying efforts in the offices and halls of the assembly during the legislative session of 1918. With the help of his usual cadre of supporters, a bill to establish a Department of Archives and History was finally passed.[91] Georgia's Department of Archives and History was formally authorized on September 10, 1918. A newly created State Historical Commission handled oversight of the department, with a membership including the governor, Hugh M. Dorsey, and the heads of departments that were to contribute records to the archives.

Out Comes the Broom

There was once a little Governor, who owned a famous broom,
With which to clean the capitol—to sweep out every room,
"First, I'll raid the grand old archives—I will butcher needless facts,
For, a real State historian, to me, of danger smacks
And besides I must admit it, in this good old Empire state,
It will cook my goose forever, if he keeps the records straight.
Yes, I dread the Truth of History, and, in truth, 'tis my conviction,
That, to guild my dark biography, I need a Star of Fiction."

—Lucian Lamar Knight, *The Ballad of the Broom*, 1922[92]

Operations of the Georgia Department of Archives and History began on January 1, 1919, in the state capitol building with a staff of three (Knight, a stenographer, and an African American porter, Charlie Justice) in addition to Knight's wife, Rosa, who worked as an unpaid volunteer. Knight faced significant obstacles in his first year on the job. Challenges included securing state funds to pay back a loan of $2,000 that Knight had taken out to outfit the archives, defending the department's allocation of $7,200 before the Georgia legislature (at a time when, as Knight noted, Wisconsin was appropriating $30,000 per annum for its Department of Archives), and getting an act passed in the general assembly to repeal a provision limiting the continuance of the department (approved August 18, 1919).[93] The election of Thomas W. Hardwick as governor of Georgia in 1921 was an important turning point for the fortunes of the Georgia Department of Archives and History. Sensing that trouble was on the horizon, Knight reached out to Hardwick upon news of his election but Knight's efforts to mend fences with the incoming governor, and ex officio chairman of his department, proved futile.[94]

Echoing earlier battles between historian Alexander Samuel Salley Jr. and Governor Coleman Livingston Blease over the fate of the nascent state archives in neighboring South Carolina, Knight and Hardwick engaged in a pointed struggle over the future of the department.[95] Entangled with the rhetoric of administrative reform, Hardwick and Knight put forth differing notions for how the effort to dismantle the state archives should be understood. Knight understood Hardwick's program of reform as a solely political act. Knight believed Hardwick to be driven by animus and self-interest, and to have little reason to help secure a historical record that might ultimately hold him politically accountable. In contrast, Hardwick hewed to the notion that his "sweeping out the capitol" program constituted the objective pursuit of effectiveness, efficiency, and economy in state government. In this scenario, state agencies could be impartially assessed in terms of their value to the state (the degree to which agencies aligned with the core responsibilities of state government) and the economy and efficiency with which they carried out their associated work.

On the surface, the political tenor in the state and the state's fiscal condition made it easy for Hardwick to campaign under the progressive notion of administrative reform. Hardwick's predecessor, two-time governor Hugh M. Dorsey, had championed the need for state fiscal reform, including the need to regularize the state system of budgeting.[96] As Dorsey stepped down as governor, Georgia was facing a prolonged period of fiscal contraction and deflation following the Great War. The agricultural sector in Georgia had been particularly hard hit, afflicted by falling commodity prices and the devastation caused to cotton crops by the introduction of the boll weevil. A growing deficit due to the failure to collect a large percentage of anticipated state revenue compounded the

state's financial distress. Meanwhile, state spending was on the rise. State agencies sought increased appropriations, while the state was increasingly responsible for financial obligations that included pension arrears to Confederate veterans and payment arrears to teachers in the state's common schools. In the meantime, Georgia was lagging behind other southern states in its support of a number of essential state services, including service in the area of higher education.[97]

Elected to the governor's office on November 2, 1920, Hardwick began his term on June 25, 1921.[98] In addressing the assembly barely two weeks into his gubernatorial term, Hardwick joined a cohort of governors whose messages resonated with "admonitions regarding economy; suggestions of the need of cooperation; comments on the state institutions, the burden of taxation, [and] the deserts of agriculture."[99] Hardwick set the stage by outlining the state's grave financial condition, which included a projected budget deficit of over $3.5 million. In an attempt to balance state income and outgoings, Hardwick called for an increase in revenue, accompanied by cutting appropriations to the bone. Hardwick also introduced his long-term plans to increase revenue, which included the introduction of a graduated state income tax system in place of the state tax on property. As a means of immediate relief, Hardwick proposed the creation of a special fund from discounted rental income from the state's railway property. In addition, he sought to levy a tax on receipts of bottlers and manufacturers of soft drinks, one cent a gallon on gasoline sales, and a poll tax on all newly enfranchised female citizens.[100]

When it came to unexpended appropriations, Hardwick recommended that the "pruning knife" be applied across the board with due regard to economy, maintaining the efficiency of state services, and eschewing any form of favoritism. Yet, favoritism there was, especially in terms of how Hardwick understood state governance and what were deemed essential and nonessential state services. Viewing fragmentation as the enemy of effective state government, Hardwick urged the legislature to consolidate certain "useless" state boards that had proliferated during the war years, or dispense with them altogether. He leveled particular criticism at boards and commissions in the educational, humanitarian, and charitable sectors, which Hardwick viewed as engaged in paternalistic activities unnecessary to the conduct of "legitimate and proper" state business.

Under the aegis of his retrenchment program, Hardwick singled out the Department of Archives and History for closure. In its stead, he recommended that the records and papers of the department be transferred to the state library and that its work be devolved to the state librarian.[101] In calling out the office as an "absolute sinecure," Hardwick placed the mission of the department, and Knight's work as its leader, at the periphery of state business. With Knight

out of the country on a three-month leave of absence, it was up to the press to provide the most vocal commentary on Hardwick's program. The *Atlanta Constitution* viewed the proposal to close the department as a "step backward," buying neither the argument of efficiency nor of economy. Instead, the press touted the importance of the department to the history of the state and deemed the proposed closure a "false economy" given that the department's annual appropriation amounted to only $7,200.[102] Failing to achieve much traction in the court of public opinion, Hardwick sought to pursue his platform of reforms with the help of the state legislature.

Established by virtue of law, the general assembly alone had the power to repeal the law under which the Department of Archives and History had come into existence. Thus, attempts to abolish the department played out in both the senate and the house during July of 1921. Bills were introduced to amalgamate the department with the state library, and, when these efforts failed, legislation was introduced to repeal the act that had established the Department of Archives and History.[103] When all efforts failed, Governor Hardwick stated his intent to veto the section of the appropriations act affecting the department.[104] Yet, the political tide remained against the governor, and the legislative session of 1921 ended with the defeat of an amendment to cut funding for the state archives in half.[105] Hardwick expressed his anger at the outcome to sometime political ally Senator Tom Watson, declaring that the legislature had "disappointed him woefully" in showing "no disposition to abolish useless boards and offices" and once again singling out Knight's job as a waste of state money. Defiant in defeat, Hardwick noted that friends in both houses were being rallied to continue the fight, and he urged Watson to cover the issue in his newspaper, the *Columbia Sentinel*. [106] Watson was a fair-weather friend at best. Not four months into Hardwick's tenure, Watson attacked Hardwick's administration for failing to live up to campaign promises to root out inefficiency and bring economy to state government. However, Watson did single out Knight as an "official deadbeat," noting that he was costing the state $8,000 per annum as holder of the office of keeper of archives. Echoing Hardwick's sentiments, Watson advised the public that the archives could just as easily be under the administration of Maud Cobb, the state librarian.[107]

The Arrival of the Efficiency Experts

So the engineer came to us—came out the West afar,
Aye, and up the stairs he mounted, like a brave young Lochinvar.
Now, the paid-guest of the Governor, he lengthened out his stay
And of all the state-house spaces, he did make a grand survey
Hold, there seems to be an error here! That statement might have fitted.

But the Governor's own department was from Freddy's list omitted.
"Politics!" in rage, the House declared. "Bunkum!" the Senate hinted,
And they both ignored the document;—it wasn't even printed.
Oh, it made the little Hamlet mad! But what was he to do?—
He was check-reined by the Solons, who could read him through and through.

—Lucian Lamar Knight, *The Ballad of the Broom*, 1922

In the fall of 1921 and the early months of 1922, the attacks on the department continued unabated, with rumors reaching Knight that efficiency engineers from the firm of Griffenhagen and Associates were being brought in from Chicago to bolster support for another attempt at merging the department with that of the state library.[108] Once again, Knight attempted to head off trouble by seeking appeasement with his main critics, Governor Hardwick and Senator Tom Watson. In a plea to the senator, Knight declared himself neither a sinecure nor a deadbeat, asking Watson to call off his dogs and to save his ammunition for "the real grafters and real enemies."[109]

With the state legislature failing to embrace his efficiency model, Hardwick moved to import outside experts in an effort to bring legitimacy and traction to his program of reforms. He did not have to look far to find experts with the right national and, indeed, international pedigree. Griffenhagen employee Fred Telford was already plying his trade in Atlanta, having been hired by Mayor James Key to help the city sanitary department create a more efficient and economical system of garbage collection.[110] However, the firm's work in the neighboring state of South Carolina likely convinced Hardwick of the efficacy of hiring outside experts to help shape his legislative agenda. In South Carolina, Griffenhagen and Associates had been hired in 1920 as part of a statewide tax reform movement led by State Senator Niels Christensen. Initially working as outside experts for a Joint Special Committee on Revenue and Taxation, the firm surveyed the structure and administration of South Carolina state government and endorsed new sources and forms of tax revenue. When the state's economic downturn turned public opinion against increased taxes and state appropriations, tax reform (and the associated work of Griffenhagen and Associates) was recast in the language of "economy and consolidation."[111] The firm (including staff members Fred Telford, Hugh Reber, W. T. Middlebrook, and G. R. Haigh) were rehired as technical experts, this time for the newly formed Joint Legislative Committee on Economy and Consolidation. The committee's charge was to study the organization, operating procedures, personnel, and expenditures of South Carolina state government, with a particular focus on the fifty departments, boards, institutions, and commissions that made up its executive branch. During the summer and fall of 1921, the firm operated as

the "investigate staff" for the committee, providing expertise in the area of "accounting and finance, office management, social welfare, institution management, education, engineering, and organization."[112]

On March 30, 1922, Hardwick announced that Griffenhagen and Associates (under the direction of Fred Telford and Hugh J. Reber) had been hired to survey a number of Georgia state agencies to determine if they were functioning properly and to prepare recommendations for improvement if deficiencies were found.[113] According to Hardwick, the survey was to lead to the establishment of a business system for the administration of state affairs that was "as economical and efficient as the business affairs of all successful corporations."[114] The governor tapped the state contingent fund to pay for the firm's services, a cost that would total over $3,500 after all salary, travel, and clerical expenses were paid.[115] Although Hardwick had to limit the survey to a small number of state departments, bureaus, and commissions, he declared his intention that funds would subsequently be appropriated to extend the survey to all state departments.[116] True to his word, he singled out boards and commissions in the educational, humanitarian, and charitable sectors for review (Department of Archives and History, Department of Public Welfare, Training School for Boys, Confederate Soldiers Home, Confederate Roster Commission, Academy for the Blind, State Library, and State Library Commission), along with certain key state agencies (Department of Agriculture, Department of Public Printing, and Department of Public Health). Reports were also to be made into the auditing and fiscal system of the state and on office space in the state capitol.

Telford's work began on April 10, 1922. By the end of the month, Hardwick was already touting the fact that early reports indicated that "substantial savings could be made in several departments without crippling their efficiency." While he reported that some departments needed drastic changes, Hardwick was no doubt pleased when Telford named the State Library as one of two state entities singled out for praise.[117] Eleven weeks into the process, Telford filed a partial report with the governor, where among his recommendations he called for a state auditing and accounting system to keep a check on public spending on personnel and procurements.[118] In seeking sweeping changes to the running of state government, he singled out the administration of the Department of Agriculture for its mismanagement and waste. The report accused the department of doing little in the way of planning and budgeting, with the result that it was spending $100,000 more per annum than necessary to carry out its duties.[119]

In response to the report, and a subsequent attack on the Department of Agriculture by A. O. Blalock (candidate for commissioner of agriculture and father of the governor's private secretary, Brack Blalock), Commissioner of Agriculture J. J. Brown went on the offensive. Brown declared that Griffenhagen and Associates was hired for "politics, not efficiency," claiming that its work was

"a subterfuge specifically for the purposes of trying to concoct campaign material" to get Blalock elected.[120] In his defense, Brown made public letters from the state treasurer (S. T. Carter) and comptroller general (Walter E. Duncan) of South Carolina denouncing the work of Griffenhagen and Associates in their state. Carter asserted that the firm's work had gotten little traction with the South Carolina state legislature. He questioned the firm's competency in carrying out the survey, accusing the staff of advocating radical changes despite spending little time getting to know the work of various state agencies or talking to key staff. Carter described some of the suggested changes to South Carolina state departments as "so absurd that the whole thing was looked upon as a huge joke." Duncan's letter dismissed Telford and Reber as "unworthy of confidence," claiming that their methods and services resulted in no cost savings to the people of South Carolina.[121] Hardwick fired back, releasing to the public the rebuttals from Telford and from the South Carolina chairman of the Joint Legislative Committee on Consolidation and Efficiency, State Senator Neil Christensen. Telford dismissed his South Carolina critics as showing a "surprising disregard of facts." While Christensen made the case that the state legislature had adopted the firm's work, achieving a net reduction in appropriations of around $750,000.[122]

The part of the report made public on the Department of Archives and History made clear that Griffenhagen and Associates had little ammunition with which to recommend specific economies. Instead, the firm focused on the question of whether the work undertaken by the department was worth the time and energy of the state. The report noted that Knight and his staff had already collected, classified, and indexed most of the historical materials in the possession of the state agencies, thus making the case that the department's primary duty had been met. Telford made clear that whether or not such work could continue to scale (to include the publication of these historical records, for example) depended on what value the state placed on the work and operations of the department. The report imagined three scenarios for the future of the Georgia Department of Archives and History. Given the fact that much material had already been assembled, the first option was to maintain the status quo, continuing the work of the department on a small scale, with a staff consisting of a director and an assistant. The second scenario was based on the premise that the state could not afford to support a separate Department of Archives and History. In this case, the report recommended that the records and the work of classifying and indexing the materials be turned over to the State Library (an agency the report declared to be effectively and economically managed), along with a "small outlay of clerical help" to aid in the process. Finally, the report imagined a scenario in which the state wished to build up and exploit

its historical collections and thus follow the example of Wisconsin and New England and provide greater financial support for the running of the archives.[123]

As the Griffenhagen reports continued to generate controversy in the Atlanta press, Hardwick went before the assembly and reminded Georgians of the dire economic condition of the state—"Agriculture is practically prostrate; business languishes; commerce is halted; the people everywhere, in city, in town and in the rural sections, are forced to apply the most rigid economy to their personal affairs."[124] With limited success in raising revenues and reducing state appropriations, Hardwick urged the legislature to maintain a "pay as you go" and "live within your means" mentality, and called for the establishment of a Department of State Auditing to hold state agencies accountable for planning and estimating costs and for expending state appropriations. In seeking to improve the state's financial well-being, Hardwick renewed his call for efficiency in state government through the practice of "rigid economy" and "drastic retrenchment" in public expenditure.[125] Seeking to give credence to the work being undertaken by Griffenhagen and Associates, Hardwick reminded the legislature that the state had hired "the greatest governmental engineering experts" in the country.[126] Declaring himself fully behind his efficiency surveyors, Hardwick touted the savings that the firm's preliminary reports had already identified.[127] Contending that the Department of Archives and History performed "no necessary function" for the state, Hardwick once again called for its demise. Opting for Griffenhagen's second scenario, Hardwick suggested that the department's records could be "well kept" in the State Library with any indexing carried out by a clerk at the cost of $1,500 per annum.[128]

Reporting on the governor's speech for the *Atlanta Constitution*, journalist James Holloman was among those who questioned the governor's motives in bringing the efficiency experts to Georgia. Holloman was especially critical of Hardwick's decision to bring in outside experts without legislative authority. While not against the hiring of experts per se, Holloman made the case that Hardwick would have encountered less resistance if he had authorized a general efficiency survey of all state agencies under the auspices of a joint legislative committee, with the committee empowered to hire outside experts as needed. Holloman also criticized the political undertones of the selection process and the tone of "political propagandering" in parts of the report. In particular, Holloman implied that Hardwick's political sagacity in going after the Department of Agriculture was suspect, given the "heated pre-election campaign" that had taken place for "the control of this powerful political organization." He also roundly criticized the decision to exempt the governor's office from the survey, given that a former executive secretary of both Governor Dorsey and Governor Hardwick was in jail on charges of embezzlement and larceny.[129]

Despite mixed reaction in the press to the report and its findings, Knight's anxiety about the future of the department compelled him to seek out further help from influential quarters. Former president Woodrow Wilson and former governor Hugh Dorsey were among those who replied with messages of support, although nothing in the way of promised action. Knight also received offers of assistance to help keep the archives open, including one from the president of the Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Frederick M. Hayes.[130] Knight's fears materialized on July 27 when Senator Frank C. Manson introduced Senate Bill No. 272 to repeal the act establishing the Georgia Department of Archives and History.[131] With Knight temporarily out of action due to illness, Rosa Knight and Charlie Justice sounded the alarm at the state capitol. With a successful effort to get the word out to supporters, and Knight's subsequent defense of the department before the judiciary committee, the bill failed to make it out of the Committee on Appropriations and Finance.[132] In an act of catharsis during the election season later that year, Knight published an epic poem about his battle with the governor, titling it *The Ballad of the Broom—A Political Satire*. In outlining the story of the governor's attempt to dismantle the state archives, Knight sharpened his prose to unmercifully attack both Hardwick's character and his political acumen.

Hardwick left office the following year, having largely failed to achieve his program of state economy and efficiency.[133] It was not the failure of this platform however, but his growing opposition to the Ku Klux Klan as a force in Georgia politics that saw him lose to Clifford Walker in the gubernatorial election. In his farewell speech before the general assembly on June 29, 1923, Hardwick persisted in his call for the Department of Archives and History to be abolished, calling it "neither useful nor ornamental."[134] Press reports of the governor's address deemed it "vigorous, characteristic, and generally good." Yet, in describing the attack on Knight, the press remained firmly on Knight's side. The governor's assessment of the department was characterized as "probably inspired by more prejudice than judgement," especially since the department was largely maintained at Knight's own personal expense.[135] Knight's personal response to Hardwick was swift and fierce. He issued a statement defending the usefulness of the department and characterizing Hardwick's position as "an outburst of personal venom." Seeking to discredit Hardwick's political efficacy, Knight claimed that the governor's own efficiency experts had recommended increasing his department's appropriation, a fact that Hardwick had chosen to ignore. Seeking to claim responsibility for any damage to Hardwick's political reputation, Knight declared that the publication of his ballad had made the outgoing governor "the laughing stock of all Georgia."[136]

The Aftermath

But here I pause in silence dumb—this is the time to weep
For that smooth report of Fred'rick's work, lies in the vault asleep.
Lies? Yes, lies. Tread gently then, 'twould be a monstrous blunder,
To wake the dead and start to life the Governor's campaign-thunder.
But—our thoughts now turn to Fred'rick. Where hath the expert flown?
Like the stubborn ghost of Banquo—this one question will not down.
To Chicago hath he sauntered back, his hungry soul well fed,
While, from Georgia's famished firesides, her children cry for bread.
With the Governor's well-earned "Bravo, lad" resounding through his brain
And with Georgia's good tax revenues, to swell his godless gain.
He's back in the grafter's paradise, with golden ducats blest,
Where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest.

—Lucian Lamar Knight, *The Ballad of the Broom*, 1922

Lucian Lamar Knight retired from the position of state historian and director of the Department of Archives and History in January 1925. Knight's reputation as a poet, orator, and chronicler of Georgia's history diminished in time as the era of the amateur or gentleman scholar gave way to generations of professional historians. It is his legacy as founder and director of the Georgia State Archives that endures to this day. Thomas W. Hardwick ran unsuccessfully for election to the U.S. Senate in 1922 and 1924, and then left politics to return to a career in the legal profession. Today, he is perhaps best known for appointing Rebecca Latimer Felton as the first woman to the U.S. Senate, following the death of the incumbent, Senator Tom Watson, in 1922.[137]

After leaving the firm of Griffenhagen and Associates in 1922, Fred Telford continued to develop the field of public personnel administration, working with the Bureau of Public Personnel Administration, the Works Progress Administration, and the consulting firm of Charles P. Messick and Associates.[138] While working for the Bureau in Washington, D.C., Telford served as the technical consultant for the American Library Association's Classification of Library Personnel Committee identifying duties and minimum qualifications for over 180 newly formed job classes.[139] Griffenhagen and Associates continued to ply its trade as consultant in the area of public administration, finance, and education reform. Over the next three decades, the firm's roster of clients highlighted the growing appetite for administrative reform among state, city, and local governments.[140] The firm also exported the American system of administrative reform worldwide, including to the Philippines (1954–1956), Jordan (1956), Venezuela (1959–1960), Nepal (1962), and Indonesia (1963–1964). The firm became a subsidiary of John Diebold and Associates in 1957 and merged with Louis J. Kroeger

and Associates to become Griffenhagen-Kroeger in 1960. The Griffenhagen name ceased to be associated with the firm by the late 1970s when then president Edward K. Hamilton (one-time adviser to President Johnson and deputy mayor of New York) founded a new firm of policy, financial, and management consultants, Hamilton, Rabinowitz and Alshule.

The powerful force that brought Knight, Hardwick, and the "Chicago boys" together in the 1920s was administrative reform. At the state level, the long pursuit of administrative reform helped to delineate a proper role for government and to show how administrative machinery needs to be applied in that context. As this article demonstrates, administration has long demanded the values of economy and efficiency. Hardwick brought in outside experts in the belief that they would provide him with a degree of political cover, help bolster public confidence, and provide legitimacy for what he saw as needed change. What Hardwick tried to conceal was the fact that the very nature of reform ensures that the "pure concept of efficiency" is always mitigated "in the light of the value scale of politics and the social order."[141] Thus, others viewed what Hardwick tried to portray as his rational criteria for administrative reform as tainted by politics and by local political rivalries. Accordingly, his reform efforts were seen primarily as a grab for administrative power and control. Knight's great failing was in understanding the reform efforts purely in terms of the local political landscape, rather than as part of larger cyclical political and social forces that call for government to engage in bureaucratic rationalization.[142] Addressing the symptoms and not the cause left the Department of Archives and History vulnerable to further administrative reform efforts, including those attempted during the tenure of Knight's successor, Ruth Blair.[143]

Writing in the 1970s, archivist Samuel S. Silsby asked us to consider why archival programs are "invariably the losers when streamlining or efficiency drives are unleashed in state government."[144] In seeking to answer his own question, Silsby stated that such a position will prevail if "government archival agencies continue to be seen as solely a cultural resource, administered as marginal luxuries, rather than as inherently fundamental government services."[145] Silsby thus sought to align the function of archives with that of core government services. This argument is not without precedent, having served as the core of Margaret Cross Norton's vision for the nascent archival profession in the 1920s, a vision in which she aligned the work of the archivist with that of "business efficiency," calling for the profession to be linked "more closely to centers of political influence and power and less to the scholarly world of the academic historian."[146] Notwithstanding the need to unpack this argument to examine whether an archives should exist as an administrative, economic, or social good, this historical case study suggests that an even more fundamental understanding is necessary. History shows us that efficiency is the mechanism (the "tool of

control") by which other values are implemented.[147] Thus, this study reiterates that archivists must be deeply engaged in the study of public administration (past and present) and the inherent ideologies that undergird it if we are to have any chance of understanding and meeting the political, social, and economic forces that often seek to undermine the survival of state archival agencies.[148]

Of primary concern is understanding how the ordained role that modern government is said to play in the lives of its citizens is constructed, a role that often privileges economic and market-based approaches over notions of accountability, responsiveness, and the social good. It is imperative that archivists understand that efforts at administrative reform are so "deeply embedded" in the "political culture and civic psyche" in the United States that they have been characterized as "natural experiments in governance";[149] that this process of renewal within the political system has roots in arguments first articulated during the Progressive Era, a time when solutions to government ailments were first linked to management theory and business values; that in the market for reform, the alliance between professional executives and hired experts endures, despite certain fundamental differences in values and goals between the public and the private sectors; that the motives for administrative reform are both political and bureaucratic, and that these competing interests can be uncovered and exploited if close attention is paid to the rhetoric of reform; and, finally, as archivists have long realized, that efforts to achieve such administrative reform will not always succeed, needing, as they do, sufficient political capital and public buy-in to bring them to fruition.[150]

Notes

This research has been supported by the School of Information at the University of Texas at Austin through the Governor Bill Daniel Fellowship.

1 Frank Bane, "On Governors," *Public Administration Review* 4, no. 2 (1944): 154.

2 Woodrow Wilson, *The Study of Administration* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1887), 201.

3 Council of State Archivists, "The Importance of State Archives" (March 2013), 3, https://www.statearchivists.org/files/9714/4837/8221/Importance_of_State_Archives.pdf.

4 Council of State Archivists, "The State of State Records (2015 Edition): A Statistical Report on State Archives and Records Management Programs in the United States" (September 2015), 15, https://www.statearchivists.org/files/3114/4837/2004/ARM_Report_Narrative_2014-15.pdf.

5 Samuel S. Silsby Jr., "Challenges to Archival Survival: Public Policy and Government Archives Administration," *Georgia Archive* 2, no. 2 (1974): 77–89; and Andrew Raymond and James M. O'Toole, "Up From the Basement: Archives, History and Public Administration," *Georgia Archive* 6, no. 2 (1978): 18–32.

6 Kaye Lanning Minchew, "Lessons Learned while Saving the Georgia Archives," *Provenance: Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists* 31, no. 1 (2013): 16–21.

7 State of Georgia, *Journal of the Senate of the State of Georgia, Regular Session 2011, First Session of the 151st General Assembly, Commenced at Atlanta, Georgia, Monday, January 10, 2011 and Adjourned Thursday, April 14, 2011* (Atlanta: 2011).

[8] The announcement from the secretary of state came on September 13, 2012. Seven full-time employees were fired on September 18, 2012, leaving only three employees: director, assistant director, and facility manager. Sanhita SinhaRoy, "Georgia Archives to Stay Open: Budget Restored for Remainder of Fiscal Year," *American Libraries*, October 18, 2012, https://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/2012/10/18/georgia-archives-to-stay-open.

[9] Minchew, "Lessons Learned."

[10] Governor Nathan Deal Office of the Governor, "Deal, Kemp to Keep Georgia's Archives Open," press release, October 18, 2012, https://gov.georgia.gov/press-releases/2012-10-18/deal-kemp-keep-georgia%E2%80%99s-archives-open.

[11] Minchew, "Lessons Learned."

[12] Council of State Archivists, "The State of State Records."

[13] Ciaran B. Trace, "Atlanta between the Wars: The Creation of the Georgia Department of Archives and History, 1918–1936," *Information & Culture: A Journal of History* 50, no. 4 (2015): 504–53.

[14] James G. March and Johan P. Olsen, "Organizing Political Life: What Administrative Reorganization Tells Us about Government," *The American Political Science Review* 77, no. 2 (1983): 281–82.

[15] March and Olsen, "Organizing Political Life," 281–96.

[16] Bane, "On Governors," 154.

[17] Bess Glenn, "Search for Efficiency in Federal Record Management: Introduction," *The American Archivist* 21, no. 2 (1958): 159–62.

[18] Mordecai Lee, *Bureaus of Efficiency: Reforming Local Government in the Progressive Era* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2008).

[19] Richard A. Bowers, "*Decentralization of Position Classification in New York State*" (MSPA thesis, Sage Colleges, 1978).

[20] Arthur Procter, *Principles of Public Personnel Administration* (New York: Appleton and Company, 1921).

[21] Glenn, "Search for Efficiency," 160.

[22] Glenn, "Search for Efficiency"; and Harvey C. Mansfield, "Reorganizing the Federal Executive Branch: The Limits of Institutionalization," *Law and Contemporary Problems* 35, no. 3 (1970): 461–95.

[23] Charles E. Woodward, "The Illinois Civil Administrative Code," *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science in the City of New York* 8, no. 1 (1918): 7–17.

[24] Procter, *Principles of Public Personnel Administration*.

[25] Jon C. Teaford, *The Rise of the States: Evolution of American State Government* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 11.

[26] Procter, *Principles of Public Personnel Administration*.

[27] Procter, *Principles of Public Personnel Administration*, 8.

[28] Teaford, *The Rise of the States*, 76.

[29] Teaford, *The Rise of the States*.

[30] Albert Gorvine, *Administrative Reorganization for Effective Government Management in Nevada* (Carson City: n.p., 1948).

[31] Procter, *Principles of Public Personnel Administration*.

[32] Teaford, *The Rise of the States*.

[33] Walter Fairleigh Dodd, "The Illinois Legislature of 1917," *American Political Science Review* 11, no. 4 (1917): 711–17.

[34] Bryant Putney, *Reorganization of State Governments*, *Editorial Research Reports 1938*, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 1938); and Teaford, *The Rise of the States*.

[35] Dodd, "The Illinois Legislature of 1917"; Woodward, "The Illinois Civil Administrative Code"; Brookings Institution, Institute for Government Research, *Report on a Survey of the Organization and Administration of State and County Government in Mississippi, by Institute for Government Research of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., At the Instance of the Research Commission of the State of Mississippi* (created by Act of the Legislature May 8, 1930) (Jackson: 1932); Putney, *Reorganization of State Governments*; and Teaford, *The Rise of the States*.

[36] Teaford, *The Rise of the States*, 77. Georgia created a state legislative reference service in 1914.

[37] Bane, "On Governors," 153.

[38] Wilson, *The Study of Administration*, 197.

[39] Wilson, *The Study of Administration*, 210, 217.

[40] Wilson, *The Study of Administration*.

[41] Ronald C. Moe and Robert S. Gilmour, "Rediscovering Principles of Public Administration: The Neglected Foundation of Public Law," *Public Administration Review* 55, no. 2 (1995): 135–46.

[42] Christopher D. McKenna, "The Origins of Modern Management Consulting," *Business and Economic History* 24, no. 1 (1995): 52.

[43] Christopher D. McKenna, *The World's Newest Profession: Management Consulting in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

[44] Frederick Winslow Taylor, *The Principles of Scientific Management* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1911), 8.

[45] From an administrative perspective, scientific management sought to bring employer and employee into a more beneficial relationship. Employers were to use the tools of scientific management to maximize capacity and, with the increase in production, to garner more profit. Workers were to accept an increase in the efficiency and output of their labor in exchange for an end to conditions of underwork, overwork, and underpay.

[46] McKenna, *The World's Newest Profession*.

[47] McKenna, "The Origins of Modern Management Consulting," 52.

[48] McKenna, *The World's Newest Profession*.

[49] Charles J. Pellegrin, "Louisiana Progressivism and the American Reform Experience: Administrative Reorganization in Louisiana, 1940–1948," *Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association* 37, no. 2 (1996): 201–15.

[50] Alasdair Roberts, *So-called Experts: How American Consultants Remade the Canadian Civil Service 1918–21* (Toronto: Institut d'administration Publique du Canada, 1996); and Lee, *Bureaus of Efficiency*.

[51] Roberts, *So-called Experts*.

[52] Griffenhagen and Associates, "Memorandum Respecting the Work of Griffenhagen and Associates, Ltd.," 26 March 1926; File 51, General Correspondence, January–May 1926; Series 2, Mayorality Papers, 1923–1927; William E. Dever Papers, 1884–1943; Chicago History Museum Archives, Chicago.

[53] Lee, *Bureaus of Efficiency,* 98–99.

[54] Roberts, *So-called Experts*.

[55] Roberts, *So-called Experts*.

[56] Griffenhagen's work was one of the first instances where the concepts underlying position classification were carried out outside of the federal government. United States, *Reclassification of Salaries, Joint Hearings before the Committees on Civil Service, Congress of the United States, Sixty-seventh Congress, First Session, Relative to the Reclassification of Salaries. May 17 to June 16, 1921* (Washington, D.C.: Govt. Printing Office, 1921); Roberts, *So-called Experts;* and Lee, *Bureaus of Efficiency*.

[57] Roberts, *So-called Experts*; and Lee, *Bureaus of Efficiency*.

[58] Charles W. Wootton and Carel M. Wolk, "The Development of 'the Big Eight' Accounting Firms in the United States, 1900 to 1990," *Accounting Historians Journal* 19, no. 1 (1992): 1–27.

[59] Clients in the financial industry included Northern Trust Company, Greenebaum Sons Bank and Trust Company, Bank of Montreal, National Bank of Kentucky, and First National Bank of New York. Industrial clients included Pullman Company, Yellow Cab Company, Rand McNally and Company, Massey-Harris Co. Ltd., Wells Bros. Construction Company, John Schroeder Lumber Company, and Novo Engine Company. Clients in the public utility area included Commonwealth Edison Company; Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company; Public Service of Northern Illinois; Chicago, North Shore, Milwaukee Railroad; and Chicago Surface Lines. Commercial clients included the Boston Store of Chicago; Montgomery, Ward, and Company; and Consumers Company. See Griffenhagen and Associates, "Memorandum Respecting the Work of Griffenhagen and Associates, Ltd."

[60] Griffenhagen and Associates, "Memorandum Respecting the Work of Griffenhagen and Associates, Ltd."

[61] In fact, in his first year with the company, Griffenhagen had helped to install a classification system for the state of Illinois. United States, *Reclassification of Salaries*.

[62] Glenn A. Bishop and Paul T. Gilbert, *Chicago's Accomplishments and Leaders* (Chicago: Bishop Pub. Co., 1932); Griffenhagen and Associates, "Memorandum Regarding the Professional Record of Messrs. Arthur Young and Company and Griffenhagen and Associates, Ltd., 23 August 1921"; Series 2, Correspondence: 1920–1921, Volumes 13–58; Volume 19 (File 38, Civil Service-Reorganization), pp. 10725–32. Microfilm Reel: C-3221; Arthur Meighen Papers, 1874–1960; Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa, http://heritage.canadiana.ca/view/oocihm.lac_reel_c3221/1?r=0&s=1; and United States, *Reclassification of Salaries*.

[63] Civil Service Commission, "Dft [Draft] Agreement with Griffenhagen & Associates Ltd. for Reorganization of Departments"; Central Registry, Numbered Central Registry Files (R188-39-8-E), 1920/06–1920/08, File No. 1920-1361; Department of Justice fonds (RG 13); Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa; and Griffenhagen and Associates, "Memorandum Regarding the Professional Record."

[64] "Griffenhagen and Associates, Ltd," *Iron Age* 105, no. 6 (1920): 1139.

[65] Griffenhagen and Associates, "Memorandum Respecting the Work of Griffenhagen and Associates, Ltd."

[66] Griffenhagen and Associates, "Memorandum Respecting the Work of Griffenhagen and Associates, Ltd."

[67] Griffenhagen and Associates, "Memorandum Respecting the Work of Griffenhagen and Associates, Ltd"; and United States, *Research: A National Resource* (Washington, D.C.: United States Govt. Print. Off., 1938).

[68] United States, *Research: A National Resource*.

[69] Chris Grant, "Georgia General Assembly," *New Georgia Encyclopedia* (December 11, 2015), http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/government-politics/georgia-general-assembly.

[70] Scott E. Buchanan, "Governor," New Georgia Encyclopedia (December 11, 2015), http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/government-politics/governor.

[71] Jon C. Teaford, *The Rise of the States*, 20.

[72] Lucian Lamar Knight, *The Ballad of the Broom—A Political Satire* (Atlanta, n.p., 1922). Details about Knight's life can be found in Evelyn Ward Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight: The Story of One Man's Dream* (New York: Vantage Press, 1967); and Lydia F. Knight, "Lucian Lamar Knight (1868–1933)," *New Georgia Encyclopedia* (August 15, 2013), http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/arts-culture/lucian-lamar-knight-1868-1933.

[73] Among his published works are *Reminiscences of Famous Georgians* (Atlanta: Franklin-Turner, 1907); *Georgia's Landmarks, Memorials, and Legends* (Atlanta: Byrd Print. Co., 1913); *A Standard History of Georgia and Georgians* (Chicago: Lewis Pub. Co., 1917); *Memorials of Dixie-land: Orations, Essays, Sketches, and Poems on Topics Historical, Commemorative, Literary and Patriotic* (Atlanta: Byrd Print. Co., 1919); and *Woodrow Wilson, the Dreamer and the Dream* (Atlanta: The Johnson-Dallis Co., 1924).

[74] The position was continued under the new governor, John Slaton.

[75] Proceedings and Address of the First Annual Meeting of the Georgia Historical Association, Atlanta, April 10, 1917; File, Georgia Historical Association Minutes, 1917–1920; Series, Correspondence 1919–1922; Box 1, Folder 7; Robert Preston Brooks Papers—Georgia Historical Association; MS. 38; Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia Libraries. The support provided by the Georgia Historical Association was short-lived. Academics whose interests lay in creating a more robust venue for the presentation and publication of historical research soon dominated the association. That Knight did not fit within this new academic vision for the association was made clear by Robert Preston Brooks, who had served as a member of the Georgia Historical Association organizing committee, along with Knight, Mildred Rutherford (Historian General of the United Daughters of the Confederacy), and others during 1916 and 1917. In a letter from Brooks to Professor Percy Scott Flippin (Department of History, Mercer University, Macon, Ga.), Preston stated that he "would be very sorry to see either Mr. Knight or Miss Rutherford on the program" [of the GHA annual meeting]. He declared that "neither of them has the true historical spirit," and "they would add nothing to the program." Furthermore, he stated that it would be "extremely embarrassing to have to publish anything that they might present." Copy of a letter from Robert S. Brooks to Professor P. S. Flippin, February 22, 1921; File, Correspondence

1921; Series, Correspondence 1919–1922; Box 1, Folder 5; Robert Preston Brooks Papers—Georgia Historical Association; MS. 38; Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia Libraries.

[76] Lucian Lamar Knight, letter to Governor Nat Harris, June 13, 1916, in Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*, 298.

[77] Lucian Lamar Knight, letter to Thomas W. Hardwick, November 11, 1916 in Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*, 308–10.

[78] Thomas W. Hardwick, letter to Lucian Lamar Knight, November 18, 1916 in Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*, 310.

[79] Information contained in a letter from Thomas M. Owen to Lucian Lamar Knight, June 9, 1917; Owen, Thomas M. (file); File II Reference Services (series 46); Public Reference/Research Section (subgroup 2); Georgia Department of Archives and History (record group 4); Georgia Archives.

[80] Knight laid out his concerns about Dorsey in a letter dated May 10, 1917. The letter was addressed to his friend and former boss, Clark Howell, the editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*. The text of the letter is contained in Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*, 320–21.

[81] The plan was to call for a joint resolution in support of a preliminary investigation into the condition of the state's archives.

[82] Lucian Lamar Knight, letter to Hugh M. Dorsey, May 17, 1917 in Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*, 323–24.

[83] Information contained in a letter from Hugh Dorsey to Lucian Lamar Knight, May 21, 1917; Dorsey, Hugh (file), File II Reference Services (series 46); Public Reference/Research Section (subgroup 2); Georgia Department of Archives and History (record group 4); Georgia Archives.

[84] The committee consisted of W. T. Davidson, Seaborn Wright, and William F. Jones (a member of the Georgia Historical Association) from the house and H. R. DeJarnette and R. A. Denny from the senate.

[85] The speech took place on July 25, 1917.

[86] State of Georgia, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, Regular Session of the General Assembly at Atlanta, Wednesday, June 27, 1917* (Atlanta: Index Printing Co. State Printers, 1917); and State of Georgia, *Journal of the Senate of the State of Georgia, Regular Session at Atlanta, Wednesday, June 27, 1917* (Atlanta: Index Printing Co. State Printers, 1917).

[87] In doing so, Knight was following the lead of the American Historical Association and its call for affiliated organizations to urge their representatives in Washington to support President Wilson's policies. Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*.

[88] "Senator Smith Makes Charge of Injustice," *Atlanta Constitution*, July 24, 1917, 5; and "Knight, in Reply to Senator Smith, Puts Him and Hardwick in Same Boat in Blocking the Administration," *Atlanta Constitution*, July 25, 1917, 6.

[89] Support Pledged to the President," *Atlanta Constitution*, April 7, 1918, 7.

[90] In his address, Knight declared: "It is not our wish to enter politics; to take sides in any mere contest between individuals. God forbid. We shall heed no summons to partisan strife, but we shall answer like patriots, every call to patriotism. It is the duty of a State Historical society, while conserving the materials of the past, to look with forward vision to the future, and to relate itself vitally to the present. We are not merely lookers-on in Vienna. We are neither invertebrates nor fossils. We are not skeletons strung with wire, to rattle in a museum of dry bones. We are not hirelings or slaves to stand in awe of any master's whip. We are not mere pens or puppets, but men of independent minds, Georgians true, and Americans all." Knight, "Where Does Georgia Stand?," in *Memorials of Dixie-Land*, 66–67.

[91] On July 12, Representative Burwell of Hancock (a member of the Georgia Historical Association) introduced House Bill 760 to create the Georgia Department of Archives and History. Referred to the General Judiciary Committee, the committee reported back on July 23 and recommended that the bill pass. The bill was read a second time that day and a third time on July 29. Following the passage of an amendment removing an annual appropriation for the salary of the state archivist, a roll call vote was held with a tally of seventy-two ayes and fifty-eight nays. Having failed to receive the requisite constitutional majority, the bill failed. Exasperated in failure, Knight was censured after a very public outburst against Representative Grantland of Spaulding County who had accused Knight of trying to coerce him into supporting the bill. Following an impassioned apology in front of members of the house (in which Knight linked the ardor of his protest to his

love for Georgia and her history), Knight turned his attention to the bill making its way through the senate. On July 23, Bill No. 269 to establish a Department of Archives and History was introduced by DeJarnette and referred to the Library Committee whose members recommended that it pass. On August 7, word reached the house that the senate had passed Bill No. 269. The bill was referred back to the General Judiciary Committee of the house. On August 13, the bill, with an amendment limiting the tenure of the department to no more than three years, came up for a vote. On a vote of 112 to 7, the bill passed in the house. The story of the passage of the bill and the obstacles Knight faced along the way are detailed in Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*; State of Georgia, *Journal of the House of Representatives at the Regular Session of the General Assembly at Atlanta, Wednesday, June 26, 1918* (Atlanta: Byrd Printing Company, State Printers, 1918); and State of Georgia, *Journal of the Senate of the State of Georgia, Regular Session of the General Assembly at Atlanta, Wednesday, June 26, 1918* (Atlanta: Index Printing Co. State Printers, 1918).

[92] Lucian Lamar Knight, *The Ballad of the Broom—A Political Satire* (Atlanta, 1922).

[93] Lucian Lamar Knight, letter to Governor Hugh M. Dorsey, January 9, 1919, in Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*, 352–53; Knight, "In Defense of the Department of Archives," in *Memorials of Dixie-Land*, 203–12; Georgia, *Acts and Resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, 1919* (Atlanta, n.p., 1919), 234.

[94] Lucian Lamar Knight, letter to Thomas W. Hardwick. Dorsey, October 11, 1920, in Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*, 367–68. Part of the letter states: "If we have now and then differed, we have oftener still agreed, and between us there is more than enough in common to keep us what we have been for twenty years—good friends."

[95] Charles H. Lesser, *The Palmetto State's Memory: A History of the South Carolina Department of Archives & History, 1905–1960* (South Carolina State Documents Depository, 2009).

[96] In 1918, a State Budget and Investigating Commission (composed of the governor, the attorney general, the superintendent of education, and the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the house and the senate) had been enacted with the role of gathering data on the financial needs of the departments and institutions of state (and the various laws relating to their operation). The data were to be used to recommend the apportionment of the state's revenues through the vehicle of a general appropriations bill placed before the legislature. State of Georgia, *Report of Budget and Investigating Commission and Governor's Transmittal, July 8, 1919* (Atlanta: Byrd Printing Co. State Printers, 1919).

[97] See outgoing governor Hugh Dorsey's message to the Assembly in State of Georgia, *Journal of the Senate of the State of Georgia, Regular Session of the General Assembly at Atlanta, Wednesday, June 22, 1921* (Atlanta: Foote & Davies Co. State Printers, 1921).

[98] His term ended on June 30, 1923.

[99] The address took place on July 6, 1921. Ralph S. Boots and Walter F. Dodd, "Governor's Messages," *The American Political Science Review* 17, no. 2 (1923): 231.

[100] James A. Hollomon, "Governor's Fiscal Message," *Atlanta Constitution*, July 7, 1921, 8; "Hardwick Urges Graduated Income Taxation System," *Atlanta Constitution*, July 7, 1921, 9; State of Georgia, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, Regular Session of the General Assembly at Atlanta, Wednesday, June 22, 1921* (Atlanta: Foote & Davies Co. State Printers, 1921).

[101] State of Georgia, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, Regular Session of the General Assembly at Atlanta, Wednesday, June 22, 1921*; and "Hardwick Urges Graduated Income Taxation System," 9.

[102] James A. Hollomon, "Governor's Fiscal Message," 8. Knight was on a leave of absence from August through October of 1921. The leave was for health reasons and to allow Knight to take a research trip to Europe with his wife, Rosa. See Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*.

[103] On the day of the governor's speech to the assembly, July 6, 1921, Frank C. Manson introduced Senate Bill No. 69 to create a Department of Library, History, and Archives. The Committee on Public Library, under the chairmanship of O. K. Jones, took up the bill for consideration. A week later (July 13, 1921), Jones reported back to the senate with the recommendation that the bill not pass. Manson immediately got permission from the senate to withdraw the bill from the Committee on Public Library and had the bill read a second time and recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations and Finance. Manson's machinations were soon undone, when, over his objections, a member of the Committee on Public Library (R. W. Campbell) got the consent

of the senate to recommit the bill to its original standing committee. By July 15, 1921, attempts to disband the Department of Archives and History were dead in the senate. Meanwhile, things were still in play in the house. On July 14, 1921, Troupe County representatives Lee B. Wyatt and J. B. Daniel introduced House Bill No. 301 to create the Department of Library, History, and Archives. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Public Library, chaired by T. S. Mason. On July 20, 1921, Mason reported back from the committee with the recommendation that the bill not pass. On July 22, 1921, Wyatt and Daniel took another tack, introducing House Bill No. 430 to repeal the act that established the Department of Archives and History, and the bill was referred to the Committee on General Judiciary. On July 29, 1921, the committee declined to report favorably on the bill. State of Georgia, *Journal of the Senate of the State of Georgia, Regular Session of the General Assembly at Atlanta, Wednesday, June 22, 1921*. State of Georgia, *Journal of the House of Representatives, June 22, 1921*; "Would Keep State Archives Department," *Atlanta Constitution,* July 29, 1921, 14.

[104] "Assembly Enters Crucial Period," *Atlanta Constitution*, August 7, 1921, 5A.

[105] "$2,000,000 Reduction for Veterans' Funds," *Atlanta Constitution*, August 5, 1921, 2; "1921 Legislative Session Was Featured by Passage of Important Legislation," *Atlanta Constitution*, August 11, 1921, 12.

[106] Thomas Hardwick, letter [copy] to Senator Thomas E. Watson, July 30, 1921; File 7, Correspondence with Thomas Watson, April–September 1920; Series 1, Political, 1908–1944; Thomas W. Hardwick Papers; Richard B. Russell Library for Political Research and Studies, Athens, Ga.

[107] "Hardwick Will Answer Attack," *Atlanta Constitution,* October 22, 1921, 4.

[108] Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*.

[109] Lucian Lamar Knight, letter to Governor Thomas W. Hardwick, October 29, 1921; Lucian Lamar Knight, letter to Tom Watson, October 29, 1921; Lucian Lamar Knight, letter to Governor Thomas W. Hardwick, February [13], 1922, reprinted in Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*, 382–84, 389.

[110] "Cost of Removing Atlanta Garbage Low, Says Report," *Atlanta Constitution,* October 1, 1921, 14; and "Garbage Report Made by Telford: Expert Thinks Motor Trucks Should Be Used in Collecting the Waste Material of Atlanta," *Atlanta Constitution,* October 2, 1921, 9.

[111] Janet G. Hudson, *Entangled by White Supremacy: Reform in World War I–Era South Carolina* (Lexington, Ky. University Press of Kentucky, 2009), 249.

[112] State of South Carolina, *Report of the Joint Committee on Economy and Consolidation Appointed by the General Assembly Session of 1921* (Columbia: Gonzales and Bryan, State Printers, 1922), 31. Information about the firm's work in South Carolina can also be found in Griffenhagen and Associates, "Memorandum Respecting the Work of Griffenhagen and Associates, Ltd."; Neils Christensen, "Government of South Carolina Studied," *National Municipal Review* 11 (July 1922): 221–22; and Hudson, *Entangled by White Supremacy*.

[113] "Department Survey Planned for State," *Atlanta Constitution,* March 31, 1922, 5.

[114] "State Department Survey Announced," *Atlanta Constitution,* April 11, 1922, 6.

[115] State of Georgia, *Report of the Comptroller General of the State of Georgia for the Year Ending December 31, 1922* (Atlanta: Byrd Printing Co. State Printers, 1923).

[116] "State Department Survey Announced," 6.

[117] The experts considered the State Library well managed with excellent facilities for serving the legislators, courts, and administrative officers. "Report Possible State Economies," *Atlanta Constitution,* April 30, 1922, 6A.

[118] The report was filed on June 24, 1922.

[119] "Drastic Changes in State Departments Urged: Hundreds of Thousands in Savings Promised," *Atlanta Constitution,* June 25, 1922, 1–2, 4.

[120] "Brown Replies to A. O. Blalock," *Atlanta Constitution,* June 25, 1922, 8.

[121] "Brown Attacks Experts' Report; Welcomes Probe," *Atlanta Constitution,* July 2, 1922, 1.

[122] "Economy Expert and Christensen Reply to Brown," *Atlanta Constitution,* July 29, 1922, 8.

[123] "Drastic Changes in State Departments Urged: Hundreds of Thousands in Savings Promised," *Atlanta Constitution,* June 25, 1922, 1–2, 4.

[124] Hardwick's speech was given on June 29, 1922. State of Georgia, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, Regular Session of the General Assembly at Atlanta, Wednesday, June 28, 1922* (Atlanta: Byrd Printing Co. State Printers, 1922), 47.

[125] State of Georgia, *Journal of the House of Representatives, June 28, 1922*, 36.

[126] State of Georgia, *Journal of the House of Representatives, June 28, 1922*, 62.

[127] State of Georgia, *Journal of the House of Representatives, June 28, 1922*, 62.

[128] State of Georgia, *Journal of the House of Representatives, June 28, 1922*, 48–49.

[129] As Holloman stated, any such survey cannot be done successfully "unless it starts with the governor and ends with the janitor." James A. Hollomon, "Governor Is Firmly behind His 'Efficiency Surveyors,'" *Atlanta Constitution*, June 30, 1922, 4.

[130] Woodrow Wilson, letter to Lucian Lamar Knight, July 1, 1922; Knight, Lucian Lamar (file); File II Reference Services (series 46); Public Reference/Research Section (subgroup 2); Georgia Department of Archives and History (record group 4); Georgia Archives; and Hugh Dorsey, letter to Lucian Lamar Knight, July 10, 1922; Dorsey, Hugh (file); File II Reference Services (series 46); Public Reference/Research Section (subgroup 2); Georgia Department of Archives and History (record group 4); Georgia Archives. Knight's secretary [Ruth Blair], letter to Mrs. J. E. Hays, July 27, 1922, reprinted in Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*, 393.

[131] State of Georgia, *Journal of the Senate of the State of Georgia, Regular Session of the General Assembly at Atlanta, Wednesday, June 28, 1922* (Atlanta: Byrd Printing Co. State Printers, 1922).

[132] Gay, *Lucian Lamar Knight*.

[133] Hardwick left office on June 30, 1923. In a parting shot, the outgoing governor sought to curtail the department's budget. The Investigating and Budget Commission created by an act of the legislature the preceding year, and of which Hardwick was chair, recommended keeping the department's total appropriations for 1924 and 1925 steady at $6,000 per annum, rejecting the request to increase the biennial appropriation to $15,724. State of Georgia, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, Regular Session of the General Assembly at Atlanta, Wednesday, June 27, 1923* (Atlanta: Foote & Davies Co. State Printers, 1923).

[134] State of Georgia, *Journal of the House of Representatives, June 27, 1923*, 117.

[135] "Hardwick's Message," *Atlanta Constitution*, June 30, 1923, 6.

[136] "Hardwick Denounced by Dr. Lucian Knight," *Atlanta Constitution*, June 30, 1923, 6.

[137] The appointment was a ruse on Hardwick's part to keep the position out of the hands of a competitor until he himself could be elected in Watson's place. See David B. Parker, "Rebecca Latimer Felton (1835–1930)," *New Georgia Encyclopedia* (August 16, 2016), http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/history-archaeology/rebecca-latimer-felton-1835-1930.

[138] Telford's biography is outlined in the finding aid for the Fred Telford—Charles Polk Messick Papers, 1913–1972, available from the Special Collections Department, University of Delaware Library, http://www.lib.udel.edu/ud/spec/findaids/telford2.htm.

[139] Richard Rubin, "A Critical Examination of the 1927 Proposed Classifications and Compensation Plan for Library Positions by the American Library Association," *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 57, no. 4 (1987): 400–425.

[140] States included Kentucky, 1924; Ohio, 1929; Minnesota, 1931; Texas, 1933; Wyoming, 1933; Kentucky, 1933–1934; Tennessee, 1935; New Jersey, 1935–1936; Virginia, 1937; Ohio, 1938; Colorado, 1938–1939; Louisiana, 1940–1941; California, 1941; Montana, 1942; Kentucky, 1947; Rhode Island, 1947; Arizona, 1949, 1952; Vermont, 1951–1952; South Dakota, 1953–1954; and South Carolina, 1956. Cities included Worcester (Mass.), 1938; 1939–1940; Houston, 1939–1940; Kansas City (Mo.), 1940; Grand Rapids (Mich.), 1942; Cleveland, 1947–1948; Battle Creek (Mich.), 1948; Columbia (S.C.), 1948; Medford (Mass.), 1948; Boston, 1948–1949; Milwaukee, 1949–1950; New York, 1951; Providence, 1951; Tulsa, 1951–1952; Buffalo, 1952; Chicago, 1952 and 1953; Rockford (Ill.), 1954; and Los Angeles, 1956. Local governments included Illinois, 1932 and 1954, and Tennessee, 1940.

[141] Luther Gulick, "Science, Values and Public Administration," in *Papers on the Science of Administration*, ed. Luther Gulick and L. Urwick (New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937), 192–93.

[142] In Knight's defense, he had neither a national system of state archivists nor a national professional association for which to turn for help. Our sister profession of librarianship better understood

these forces. Organizing in 1876, under the auspices of the American Library Association, the profession was well established by the time that Progressive Era reforms came into vogue. A national debate was thus at least forthcoming over whether and to what degree the profession supported Progressive notions of a more efficient library system. To some, the move toward adopting business and scientific methods in the running of libraries was considered "uncultured" and antithetical to the more humanistic principles and practices of librarianship. Yet, several key leaders of the era, including Melvil Dewey (of the public library movement) and Charles McCarthy (organizer of the legislative libraries movement in the early twentieth century), supported the ideas imbued in modern scientific management, embracing utilitarian ideas such as automation, standardization of library positions, and simplified work processes and workplace efficiency. McCarthy embraced the use of efficiency experts in his own work for the Legislative Reference Library in Madison, Wisconsin, to "put government on a more scientific and utilitarian basis through the use of the library's enlightening information." Marion Casey, "Efficiency, Taylorism, and Libraries in Progressive America," *Journal of Library History* 16, no. 2 (1981): 268, 271.

[143] The reorganization and consolidation of state government was also a central platform for Lamartine G. Hardman during his two terms as Georgia governor (1927–1931). Hardman appointed a Commission on Simplification and Coordination made up of seventeen men (state legislators and prominent businessmen) to plan for the reorganization of state departments, agencies, boards, and commissions. When the commission's findings failed to gain acceptance in the legislature, Hardman brought in the efficiency experts. This time, the business engineers Searl, Miller and Company of New York were hired to survey state government and to create a plan for state reorganization. With Hardman laying the groundwork, it was left to his successor Richard Russell Jr. to successfully implement large-scale state reorganization. On January 1, 1932, a law (Acts, 1931, pp. 7, 38) went into effect to consolidate Georgia's 102 departments, agencies, and boards into 18 principal state agencies. Under the reorganization act, the agency formerly in control of the Department of Archives, the State Historical Commission, was abolished, and the powers, duties, and functions of the commission were transferred to the office of the secretary of state. Under Governor Eugene Talmadge (1933–1937), efforts were also made to place the department wholly under the purview of the secretary of state. In fighting these changes, Blair drew up contingency plans to move the department from the control of the secretary of state to the Board of Regents of the Georgia University System. Cullen B. Gosnell, "Reorganization of the State Government of Georgia," *National Municipal Review* 20 (February 1931): 117–18; "Drastic Revision in State System Urged by Experts," *Atlanta Constitution,* December 2, 1930, 1; Cullen B. Gosnell, "Georgia Consolidates Its Administration," *National Municipal Review* 20 (November 1931): 681–82; and Trace, "Atlanta between the Wars." The larger cyclical forces of economy and efficiency were also to ensnare other state archives during this time, including Alabama's. In the early 1930s, then-governor of Alabama, Benjamin M. Miller, commissioned the Brookings Institution to look into the running of state government. Among its recommendations was that the Alabama Department of Archives and History be abolished. See Robert J. Jakeman, "Marie Bankhead Owen and the Alabama Department of Archives and History, 1920–1955," *Provenance, Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists* 21, no. 1 (2003): 36–65.

[144] Silsby, "Challenges to Archival Survival."

[145] Silsby, "Challenges to Archival Survival," 79.

[146] Randall C. Jimerson, "Margaret C. Norton Reconsidered," *Archival Issues* 26, no. 1 (2001): 41. The push back against Norton's vision for the profession is documented in articles such as George Bolotenko, "Archivists and Historians: Keepers of the Well," *Archivaria* 16 (1983): 5–25; and Patrick A. Dunae, "Archives and the Spectre of 1984: Bolotenko Applauded," *Archivaria* 17 (1983): 286–90. An overall discussion of the various functional responsibilities of state archives since their inception (culture and education, administration and management, and information and communication) can be found in Victoria Irons Walch, "State Archives in 1997: Diverse Conditions, Common Directions," *The American Archivist* 60, no. 2 (Spring 1997): 132–51.

[147] Jennifer Karns Alexander, *The Mantra of Efficiency: From Waterwheel to Social Control* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), 169.

[148] The case for the importance of the study of public administration has been made at least since the late 1970s. See Raymond and O'Toole, "Up From the Basement."

[149] Lee, *Bureaus of Efficiency*, 211; and James G. March and Johan P. Olson, "Organizing Political Life: What Administrative Reorganization Tells Us about Government," *The American Political Science Review* 77, no. 2 (1983): 282.

[150] Efforts to fight back against forces, such as neoliberalism, that are seen as detrimental to the work and ethos of cultural institutions have recently been articulated in the archival profession. See Marika Cifor and Jamie A. Lee, "Towards an Archival Critique: Opening Possibilities for Addressing Neoliberalism in the Archival Field," *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies* 1, no. 1 (2017).

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Ciaran B. Trace is an associate professor at the School of Information at the University of Texas at Austin, where she teaches courses on archives and records management. She holds a PhD in library and information science from the University of California, Los Angeles. Her research is driven by an interest in studying what constitutes a literate society and the role that people play in creating and sustaining literate environments. Using a variety of methods (historical, qualitative, quantitative, and experimental), Trace studies the nature of information objects, the history of information institutions and information work, the use and deployment of information in everyday and in professional settings, and the impact of information on the daily lives of individuals and of members of social groups. Spanning the period from the Progressive Era to modern times, her research has illuminated the information worlds of disparate communities, including southern state archival agencies, 4-H Clubs, and humanities scholars. Trace currently serves as editor of *Information & Culture: A Journal of History*.