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Exhibiting a Campus’s Checkered Past: 
An Effort to Connect with Undergraduates

Tim West

Biff Hollingsworth

We have to weave the future from the fabric of the past, from the patterns of aspiration and belonging—and broken dreams and anguished rejections—that have made us.

—Timothy B. Tyson
Blood Done Sign My Name (1)

Introduction

It started as part of a growing sense that in today’s world our communal well-being is really only possible if our communal past is recognized, struggled with honestly, and pulled out of the darkness for all to see and examine. This is comparatively easy with the happy and courageous past. But when we and/or our ancestors behaved inhumanely by our current standards, it can be painful, though ultimately liberating. Many Germans now regret their country’s complicity in the Holocaust. Many white South Africans have stopped pretending that their government has treated their black countrymen justly. And in the United States, a veil is lifting, revealing the ugliness and bru-
tality of slavery and the racial oppression that followed upon it.

In fall 2005, staff of University Archives at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill mounted an exhibit, *Slavery and the Making of the University*. Unknown to many, but undeniable given the documents and other archival items displayed and interpreted, the University of North Carolina benefited substantially from the sale of human beings and the labor of enslaved people. The exhibit caused a stir—the Chancellor noted it in his University Day remarks, newspapers all over the country picked up the story, discussions in classrooms were stimulated. And a seed was planted.

That seed was watered by a set of articles, “A Challenge to the Old Order,” in the March-April 2006 Carolina Alumni Review, in which another of the University’s more troubling periods, the decade of the 1960s, was brought into public view. Could this seedling be cultivated by archival treatment? If so, how? What strategies might work to help the University community and others incorporate these events into their lives and perspectives? This past is affecting us whether or not we are fully aware of it. How, as archivists, could we help give it a life that could make a positive difference?

So, we began to consider an exhibit, to be drawn from materials in the Southern Historical Collection and University Archives, as a way to extend the Alumni Review’s presentation and make it concrete and
clearly and visually authenticated, to bring home the University's experience of the social and cultural flashpoints of the 1960s to today's campus and the surrounding community. We wanted to “release” documentation from the boxes on the shelves and present it to an audience that might well not seek it out either physically or digitally.

Defining the Scope
An early step involved seeking out some individuals—selected faculty and staff who knew the Chapel Hill and University community well—to get their perspectives on what would be engaging and their thoughts on strategies for “hooking” our potential audience. After a few interviews, a more focused audience began to emerge—university students, especially undergraduates. We began to think in terms of students as players in the social and cultural dramas of the 1960s, as viewers of the exhibit, and, importantly, as our consultants and as co-producers. Manuscripts Department staff had been campaigning to attract more student involvement with our holdings through various outreach efforts. Maybe this exhibit could be a strategic contribution to that effort as well.

A fortunate and, as it turned out, critical development was the arrival in August 2006 of Biff Hollingsworth, a first-year graduate student with a deep interest in the subject matter that we proposed to address and the skills needed to get this project done. Biff had a close understanding of student perspectives and the ability to connect with individual students and bring them to our table. One of his early assignments was to con-
sider titles for the exhibit. Our ad hoc think tank, which came to be known amongst ourselves as “Biff’s Justice League,” eventually settled on a variation of one of his proposals: “I Raised My Hand to Volunteer”: Students Protest in 1960s Chapel Hill. The title seemed to capture our focus nicely and we hoped it might draw students to what we were beginning to plan.

In September 2006, we began to talk about the logistics of the exhibit, set to open in January 2007. Because of the positive interest we were sensing from students and others on campus, we decided that when we mounted the exhibit we would rearrange our department’s limited public space to maximize its exhibit capacity. Bookshelves and other furniture would be moved away from walls, additional cases would be moved in, and walls themselves, and some windows, would be utilized. We also began to think about what might enhance and extend the impact of the exhibit itself—a catalog with printed and electronic versions, an opening, a series of panel discussions, and invitations to instructors to incorporate the exhibit into the work of spring semester classes. We could not, of course, fully envision how well any of this would work, but the cause seemed worthy of the investment.

**Research and Development**

With only four months to create the exhibit we began our work immediately, knowing that we had major challenges ahead if we were to achieve any or all of our lofty goals. Naturally, the bulk of our early developmental energies went into researching and compiling the materials to be exhibited. We knew
that no matter what we managed to pull together in the way of outreach and programming, if we had nothing useful or stimulating on view in the exhibit cases, we not only would fail to attract our target audience of undergraduate students, but we also would not draw other members of the university community, including alumni and our most faithful constituency, members of the Friends of the Library.

Following some initial research into the events of the 1960s at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, four main episodes stood out, and it became apparent to us that that they should define the four organizational subdivisions of the exhibit. Each episode was interrelated with the others, but had a character distinctive enough to merit the division.

The first episode we identified was a series of protests in 1963 and 1964 in which students and Chapel Hill citizens challenged the policies of town businesses that continued to discriminate on the basis of race. This period was marked by intense involvement and leadership from a small corps of UNC students and climaxed in January 1964 when the Chapel Hill Board of Alderman brought a public accommodations bill up for a vote that ultimately did not pass. Here was an instance when the town of Chapel Hill did not live up to its reputation as the bastion of liberalism in the state, a time when Chapel Hill revealed the underside of its collective identity. We felt that there would be a broad interest in this struggle, not just among students, but also throughout the Chapel Hill community.
While the town wrestled collectively with its identity during the process of integration, so too did a small group of student protesters who battled to live out their ideals, even in the face of great risk to their safety and to their future. Many paid high prices for their acts of civil disobedience. Some protesters were beaten, doused with ammonia, urinated upon, literally tossed out of segregated establishments, dragged, threatened, shunned, and ridiculed. In addition, they bore the brunt of harsh sentences imposed by the Orange County District Court, with some protesters even being exiled from the state of North Carolina. We hoped that these stories of courage would have students asking questions of themselves: “What would I have done?” or “Would I have risked what they did?”

Exhibiting this first episode involved mainly documents and a series of wonderful photographs found in the papers of John Ehle, who chronicled the Chapel Hill integration movement in his book *The Free Men* (Harper & Row, 1965). We were also fortunate to have some moving letters written by student leaders from jail. One letter of note was written on a paper towel by Morehead Scholar and activist John Dunne and smuggled out to his parents by fellow protest leader Quinton Baker. Other materials fell into place, including correspondence between university administrators about disciplining students who had been arrested, letters from the community both for and against integration, and even a letter from community civil rights leader Joe Straley inviting actor Paul Newman to assist the movement by appearing at a rally in Chapel Hill (and Newman’s enigmatic re-
The second critical episode we identified was the passage of the North Carolina Speaker Ban law and the ensuing events on campus and across the state. The controversy began in June 1963 with the quick passage by the North Carolina General Assembly of a bill that forbade individuals who were known to be members of the Communist Party or had invoked the Fifth Amendment in connection with congressional investigations of communist activities from speaking on the campuses of the University of North Carolina. One scholar, citing related incidents and reflections by participants, has suggested that the Speaker Ban emerged out of the racial unrest of the early 1960s as a complex debate between conservative Jim Crow-minded legislators looking to clamp down on perceived panic in the streets (embodied by the fiery editorials of then WRAL-TV commentator Jesse Helms) and the civil rights demonstrations then going on in Raleigh (driven by the former UNC student and noted activist Allard K. Lowenstein) (3). This episode cried out to be retold via exhibit.

We felt that this story would resonate with students who know well the ongoing debate surrounding freedom of speech and the use of common space on campus. Our prospective student audience had just witnessed a visit by former Attorney General John Ashcroft in September 2006 and the related protests surrounding his visit. Also, 2007 would see the removal of controversial campus fixture, Gary “The Pit Preacher” Birdsong, who was arrested for trespass for using aggressively homophobic speech directed at a
representative of a student gay and lesbian advocacy group. These incidents highlighted the questions of who should be given a place to speak on campus and where. In fact, for a few years, the university has set up “free speech zones” at key locations on campus, which raises questions about the limits of protection of free speech. Freedom of speech, intellectual freedom, freedom of movement and safety—all of these freedoms possess a hotly debated piece of ground in today’s Carolina students’ college lives.

Exhibiting the second episode brought about two early challenges. The Speaker Ban was a very complex, at times legally technical, episode in North Carolina history. It was an emotionally-charged issue that played itself out over a period of five years. The life of the Speaker Ban traced a convoluted path that wound through the offices of three UNC chancellors, the chambers of two special committees of the North Carolina General Assembly, the lives of thousands of UNC students, and finally landed on the docket of a federal appeals court in Greensboro. How could we present every facet of this story in three medium-sized exhibit cases (or approximately fifty documents or less)? Second, how would we stand up to the challenge of presenting the story within the scope of UNC student involvement? There were very few materials created by students on this topic. To further complicate things, there were even fewer photographs pertaining to this episode. We knew that photographs were essential to reach our intended audience of undergraduate students.

The third exhibit episode focused on two 1969 strikes
by non-academic employees of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. (4) The strikes were led by foodworkers but spearheaded and sustained by the staunch support of a newly formed student group called the Black Student Movement (BSM). The goal of the BSM was to push the university into the next stage of affirmative action: to increase the enrollment of African American students, to ensure more rights for black students on campus, and to increase the standing of African Americans throughout the town of Chapel Hill. The BSM saw non-academic workers, whose grievances with the university were longstanding, as their closest link to the surrounding black community. The BSM and the workers joined forces to organize a strike that effectively shut down on-campus dining in February and March 1969.

The wounds of this episode are perhaps the freshest, especially for non-academic workers at UNC and their student supporters. In the past few years, non-academic workers have continued their attempts to unionize due to ongoing grievances with their employers. The workers’ link with students is also just as strong as it was in 1969. A group called Student Action for Workers (SAW) was formed in 2003 to support the efforts to unionize and to advocate for workers’ rights. In 2005, SAW led a protest of more than four hundred students calling for the reinstatement of a dining hall employee (and vocal supporter of the union) who was fired for giving away meals to some students.

The standing of minority students and workers continue to be interrelated issues that are relevant to cur-
rent UNC students’ lives. New initiatives for diversity, for example, especially for African American students, have become much more widespread and successful. In 2005, the Chancellor created a new office for Diversity and Multicultural Affairs to define and communicate the importance of a diverse student body at UNC-Chapel Hill. The Autumn 2006 issue of the *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* reported that UNC-Chapel Hill has enrolled the largest percentage of black freshmen among the highest-ranking universities in six of the last eight years.\(^{(5)}\) We felt that current students would be interested in learning about the historical foundations of these struggles for diversity and workers rights at UNC.

This episode was perhaps the most challenging in terms of locating engaging materials for the exhibit. To start, the archival footprint of this episode’s history was much more clearly documented on one side of the debate. We discovered a great deal of correspondence in the files of UNC-Chapel Hill Chancellor J. Carlyle Sitterson and UNC President William Friday, but there was a dearth of materials created by or about the foodworkers and students, with the exception of a series of interviews made several years after the events unfolded. We wanted to use these interviews, but our exhibit space was not equipped with listening stations.

The fourth exhibit episode addressed the anti-Vietnam War protests that took place on campus beginning in 1963 and continuing through the early 1970s. The climactic event of this period was the Kent State tragedy of May 4, 1970, and the subse-
sequent May 7, 1970, general walkout of more than nine thousand UNC-Chapel Hill students. Without a doubt, this episode offers the most tangible connections to current students’ reality. The current Iraq War brings up many of the same issues that were debated by the students of the Vietnam War era. Both generations of students are familiar with concepts such as preemptive war, containment of fundamentalist ideologies, even the U.S. military’s right to recruit on college campuses. Current students are holding protests and peace rallies just as their 1960s counterparts did. Students for a Democratic Society at UNC-Chapel Hill, a group that had all but disappeared nationwide after the troop withdrawals from Vietnam, was revived in 2006, and in fact, initiated a walkout during the run of our exhibit. The flyers for the March 2007 walk-out referenced the May 7, 1970, walkout of thousands—hoping to draw masses of students again. Though we cannot be sure, we like to think that the historical reference on the SDS flyer reflected current students taking notice of the histories presented in the exhibit.

We found evidence of the 1960s anti-war protests in letters from students and the community in the records of the chancellor and president of the university. Also, a set of files labeled “Disruption” in the records of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs yielded a number of interesting documents that revealed the amplitude and frequency of students’ actions. The challenge here was to make good choices among a multitude of engaging possibilities.

Outside Help
We weighed our options. Should we create an exhibit entirely of manuscript and other archival materials found only in the holdings within the department, and possibly fall short of the mark in engaging students? Or, should we use whatever means and sources necessary to pull together a stimulating exhibit? We chose to operate under the latter option, as far as we could take it with our limited time and resources.

Our first fallback resource for visually interesting materials was the *Yackety Yack*, UNC-Chapel Hill’s student yearbook. There we found several striking images of both the foodworkers’ strike and the Vietnam era walkout that we were able to scan and reproduce with a fair amount of success. We also used enlarged copies of ads in local newspapers, placed by supporters and opponents of local integration efforts. Some of these loaned to us, along with a few photographs, by the Chapel Hill Museum. Another of UNC-Chapel Hill’s special collections, the North Carolina Collection, kindly provided a range of visually appealing items from photographs to a pristine, dust-jacketed copy of John Ehle’s *The Free Men* to originals and copies of official transcripts of Jesse Helms’s “Viewpoint” editorials, which Helms delivered on WRAL-TV in the 1960s and 1970s.

A major contribution to the exhibit’s visual interest developed from our efforts to gain permission from photographer Jim Wallace to use protest images from his UNC-Chapel Hill student days that are included in the John Ehle Papers. Mr. Wallace not only easily gave us that permission, but also told us about many hundreds of other images he had that he had made at
those events in the early 1960s. He sent us scans of many of his negatives and we were able to choose especially evocative ones to enhance our presentation with photographs “never before available to the public”!

We also got some help from new donors. We had in mind from the beginning that this exhibit would function as a collecting tool. We actually began using it in this way early in the planning phases. That we were planning an exhibit on the 1960s protests in our area seemed to impress some potential donors of our commitment to this subject. During this period, for instance, we acquired the papers of a leading Chapel Hill left-wing journalist/publisher and a Greensboro politician involved in integration battles. We incorporated a few items from newly acquired materials into the exhibit.

In addition to needing a great deal of support in compiling the right materials, we also needed a great deal of assistance with mounting the exhibit. The curators of the previously-mentioned exhibit Slavery and the Making of the University, University Archivist Janis Holder and University Archives Processing Supervisor Susan Ballinger, were crucial to leading us in the right direction based on their experiences. They offered endless advice and support on how to navigate the exhibition of painful periods in our history. They were also important in leading us through aspects of the design and construction of the exhibit. It is the perennial challenge for the archives exhibit designer to create an exhibit that looks professionally produced while doing so on a shoestring budget. The
Slavery exhibit curators were able to give us invaluable, detailed advice about such things as how to regulate the high cost of enlarging and printing photographs and techniques for applying documents to backing boards and walls, as well as guidance with the exhibit catalog. They also contributed by writing overview pieces for two of the four episodes for the catalog.

Exhibit Design
In the course of developing the exhibit design we found yet another opportunity to engage current students with the exhibit. We contacted faculty members in the UNC-CH Department of Art to ask if they knew of students who would be interested in the subject matter and willing to volunteer some of their time in working on the aesthetic aspects of the exhibit, specifically with poster and publicity mailer design and with the layout for the catalog. Within several hours we had responses from four students who were surprisingly eager to raise their hands to volunteer.

We invited them to the department to share ideas about aesthetics. The art students would act as our ad hoc focus group for design. After some great discussion, they asked to be given responsibility for individual tasks. One student said that he would design a poster for the exhibit. We provided him with some images and some general ideas about style, and told him of the required “branding” elements of the library. He came back to us with several sketches and drafts of designs. Finally, we decided on a design incorporating four photographs from the collections, showing students protesting, on a background made
to look like a cardboard sign, and with hand painted letters—like a quickly constructed protest placard.

A second student, an undergraduate art major, began working with us to develop a layout for the exhibit catalog. Her contributions were significant, especially given that she had never worked with Microsoft Publisher before. She put together the skeleton of the layout. However, we had, perhaps unfairly, asked her to produce a catalog before we had actually produced all the text for the catalog. After laying the foundation for the design she stepped away from the project, but she was still enthusiastic and involved with giving general design input after that.

The exhibit catalog was a great challenge. We wanted the catalog to stand up as a research tool so that our research work would not merely evaporate after the exhibit was brought down. We did not want merely a document list. We were determined to include and describe many more documents than were displayed in the exhibit cases. We felt this was necessary to explain the nuanced histories that we could not fully tell with only the materials selected for the exhibit cases. We hoped that students would even be able to use the catalogs as texts in their coursework. The cost of printing such a large exhibit catalog came as a shock to us, and proved to be our greatest expense overall. We ordered 500 copies originally. These ran out about two months into the four-month run of the exhibit. We had to order 250 additional copies.

As a complement to the catalog, we began to conceive of an online version of the exhibit. We hoped
that this would help us to save some money in that we could offer the catalog virtually, saving us from printing even more copies. We saw an online version as a means to extend the effects of our hard work indefinitely. We also hoped that it would present the exhibit through a medium more attractive and accessible to undergraduate students, and that it would be a gateway offering incentives for undergraduates to visit the department to further explore its physical holdings. We quickly learned that to produce a quality virtual parallel to the exhibit would take a great deal of time. It required expertise that neither of us possessed at the inception of the idea, but were determined to gain eventually. An online version would also require a process of obtaining copyright permissions from photographers and document creators. Finally, the implementation of a Web version would require special access to library servers as well as editorial approval of the site content from the library’s Web team. This project was put on the backburner as other wheels (namely programming, special patron requests, and collecting tasks) began to squeak. We did return to it, however, and readers of this article should now be able to find it online.(6)

More Student Involvement
As noted earlier, we strove for as much involvement as possible in this exhibit by current UNC-Chapel Hill students. We thought that recruiting students to work on the exhibit would help give it a certain “student aesthetic” that would appeal to our target audience. Participation by students in exhibit construction and installation and in publicity graphics and catalog design has been mentioned. We considered a
student advisory board, but the closest we came were consultations with students who were to be panelists in the programs associated with the exhibit. We identified these students by contacting university staff in positions to know particular undergraduates who would be capable and interested—the director of the Campus Y, the coordinator of the Honors Program, and the Associate Provost for Diversity and Multicultural Affairs. Each was enthusiastic about what we were doing and led us to students who made wonderful commentators on our panels. They turned out to have very busy student lives with many other priorities, however, and so were not often available to talk about the exhibit as we put it together.

We were able to bring quite a few students, graduate and undergraduate, into our exhibit workforce by assigning jobs to students who were already on the library payroll. Graduate student assistants did important research on contemporary protest coverage in the *Daily Tar Heel*, the student newspaper, while other students pored over University Archives record series for pertinent items. Also, in the final days before the exhibit opening, several graduate student assistants dropped other projects to lend a hand with mounting the exhibit. They spent many hours cutting mat board, applying photo and document corners, affixing reproductions to foam board, aligning documents in cases and on walls, eyeing, leveling, fussing, and straightening. Some undergraduates also provided this kind of physical support, but we never managed to get them as invested in working with us on conceptualizing, choosing content, or organizing the exhibit.
We made other efforts to stimulate student interest. We emailed student leaders whom our contacts had identified, encouraging them to spread the word about what we were doing. Each of us attended a meeting of the Black Student Movement to tell them about the exhibit, especially since it featured founders and early members of their organization. We contacted faculty members, suggesting that they might incorporate content from our exhibit into their spring semester classes. This latter step evoked little direct response, but we later found that a number of classes were assigned to view the exhibit and a few instructors actually arranged with us to bring their classes for guided tours of it.

Once the exhibit was complete we made efforts to engage many more students with it. Our publicity posters, with their rather raw counterculture sixties feel, went up around campus. A press release got the exhibit featured in the student press, local newspapers, TV, and radio. We also sponsored four programs on four successive Tuesday evenings in January and February, timed to be convenient for students to attend. These programs had general appeal, but we had students in mind as we planned and promoted them. A first event, marking the exhibit opening, featured a presentation on sixties protesters by Peter Filene, a UNC-CH history professor who had been present for some of the events documented in the exhibit. Three panel discussions followed, each focusing on one of the exhibited episodes. Each panel included someone who had been directly involved as a student in the desegregation sit-ins, the Speaker Ban
repeal efforts, or the foodworker strikes, respectively, and others who had played parts. Each also involved a current student leader-activist to comment and help bring the issue into a current context. We purchased ads each week in the Daily Tar Heel, featuring compelling images from the particular episode to be discussed, and we sent out notices to student leaders and others asking them to spread the word.

We were very pleased with the quality of this programming and the size of the crowds that we drew. A fair number of students did attend each one, and we considered that aspect of the effort moderately successful. Students had a chance for direct contact with such notable actors in these events as Karen Parker, the university’s first black female graduate; state legendaries such as William C. Friday, who was at the center of the Speaker Ban controversy from beginning to end, and former North Carolina Central University Chancellor Julius Chambers, who defended students arrested as part of the foodworker strike protests; a civil rights protest leader from outside the University; a faculty protester from the Speaker Ban era; and one of the foodworkers involved in the strikes. We must admit that some voices were missing, however, because of our failure to locate or gain involvement from some 1960s activists who seemed still quite unreconciled with the university. Students in attendance heard direct testimony that the issues that sparked action forty and more years before were worth remembering and pondering as new actions were considered.
Conclusion
So, was all this worth the effort? The responses we have gotten to the exhibit itself, the catalog, and the programming have been overwhelmingly positive. Many of the affirmative comments have come from individuals involved in these 1960s events or those otherwise connected with them. These people seem to appreciate our featuring these painful times when people took risks for what they considered important social and political causes. But numerous others have expressed appreciation as well. We have taken some criticism—for “dredging up” the unpleasant past on the one hand, and for not being critical enough of the university administration on the other. This might have been expected for an exhibit featuring controversial events that are fairly fresh in memory and still represented by living actors. But memories have been evoked, lessons for today suggested, and people with current concerns reminded of how things have gone in earlier instances of campaigns to bring change. This exhibit may not have been a favorite of the library’s Development Office, at least initially, and it was not a particularly easy one to publicize succinctly, but we were able to host a reception for potential donors after one of our programs and financial contributions to our “Documenting Social Change Fund” have been received.

And what of UNC’s current students? Many were involved in the exhibit, as explained above, in one way or another (certainly to their ultimate benefit!)(7) Many viewed the exhibit—a small percentage of the entire student body, surely, but enough that we feel that our work made some significant impact and
planted some useful seeds. Some students, like the authors of *Daily Tar Heel* features stimulated by the exhibit, seemed very much personally engaged by it.

In the semester during which the exhibit was displayed, instructors assigned the exhibit to be viewed and as the basis for class work of various kinds. We hope that other instructors will use the electronic version of our catalog in future semesters, and that it will continue for a long time to be an instrument that will make a particular contribution to our overall archival effort to support communal well-being and help “weave the future from the fabric of the past.”

3. See, for example, William J. Billingsley, *Communists on Campus: Race, Politics, and the Public University in Sixties North Carolina* (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 2003). For other discussions of the tendency of civil rights movement opponents to invoke anti-communism, see, for example, Taylor Branch, *Parting the Waters: America in the King Years, 1954-63* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988), 853-856 and passim.
4. The term “non-academic worker” is used to refer to employees at the University who were not involved directly in administration, teaching, or research. Striking workers included dining hall employees, groundskeepers, housekeepers and other support staff employed by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The term was used during the strikes and is a term that appears throughout the archival records of the president and chancellor of the university. The term
“foodworker [strikes]” is often used to describe these events; however, the term is not as inclusive as “non-academic worker.” Also note that later use of the term “employer” signifies three different employers throughout the history of labor disputes at UNC-Chapel Hill. At the beginning of the first strike in spring 1969, the university was in control of the business operations of campus dining halls. After the first strike, the university transferred control to a private company called SAGA, Inc.—the second “employer”. Finally, in 2001 the university began contracting ARAMARK to provide campus dining services on campus.


6. Shortly after this article was completed, the online version went live. See http://www.lib.unc.edu/mss/exhibits/protests/.

7. We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of the following students: David Huyck, who designed the poster for the exhibit; Ellie Pierson, who assisted with the layout of the catalog; Noah Huffman, Jessica Sedgwick, Ellen Whisler, Amy Morgan, Maggie Dickson, and Devon Lee, for their assistance with research and exhibit mounting; Erika Stallings, Stephen Lassiter, and Renae McPherson, for appearing as student panelists; and many others who offered additional support.

Preserving Information: Disaster Planning, Recovery, and Steps Needed to Preserve Libraries and Archives

Gerald Joseph Judd

This essay is from a paper written by Gerald Judd, a student at the School of Library and Information Sciences at North Carolina Central University. This paper won the Gene J. Williams Award.

Throughout history, libraries and archives have been subjected to both man-made and natural disasters. From the burning of the library in Alexandria by Roman troops to the flooding of Florence’s Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, disasters destroy accumulated, sometimes irreplaceable knowledge, denying that information to the public. Disaster planning is a vital but often neglected process that is necessary to preserve information and continue services to patrons. This neglect in disaster planning is evident in either the lack of or inadequate emergency planning by repositories. By creating a disaster plan that incorporates planning, preparation, reaction, and restoration, repositories can formulate an emergency response plan that meets their unique needs, will preserve information, and helps to restore services. (1)

Importance of Disaster Planning

The majority of articles and books on disaster planning usually have been written in response to a disaster that has already devastated institutions, with the
The author, Gerald Joseph Judd, is a student at the School of Library and Information Sciences at North Carolina Central University. The Gene Williams Award is to recognize excellence for a paper on an archival topic written for a graduate-level course by a student in North Carolina. This award honors the late Gene J. Williams, archivist at the North Carolina Division of Archives and History and at East Carolina University, and charter member of the Society of North Carolina Archivists.
quickly, even in the absence of leadership, to take the steps necessary to preserve materials in their collection.

The disaster plan also creates procedures that allow the restoration of patron services in a timely manner. It takes into account a repository’s assets, branch locations, sister institutions, and virtual repositories, and designs a way to restore patron services, even if limited. This has been demonstrated with special and academic libraries relying on the Internet and sister colleges to resume limited public services within hours and days of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.\(^4\)

Repositories must create a written plan to handle the multitude of emergencies that could arise in their facilities, whether a broken pipe or a tornado. Although it is a time-consuming process, it is worth the time spent, as it will save critical time as an institution’s staff responds to an emergency situation. The plan should cover these four stages of disaster response: planning, preparation, reaction, and restoration.

**Stage One of Disaster Planning and Recovery: Planning**

The most important step in the disaster planning and recovery process is the actual planning stage, for without it no procedures are established, no roles are assigned, and chaos ensues when an emergency strikes.\(^5\) Aspects of the planning phase include: making team assignments; creating a priority list; conducting building surveys; establishing an alternate facility; de-
veloping plans for different disasters; implementing computer backup procedures; contacting insurance companies; and coordinating with security and facilities staff.

A disaster team responsible for preparing the repository, organizing a response to the disaster, and implementing recovery procedures should consist of staff who are widely representative of the institution, so that all departments stay informed about the disaster planning process. This team should create the disaster plan, review it annually, train library staff, and assume command in an emergency.(6)

The disaster team should assign roles and responsibilities to the members who are best capable of performing the job. The director or associate director of the library or archive deals with the commissioners, insurance agents, and outside consultants. The director is also responsible for staff morale and offering food, drinks, and rest periods, but otherwise is not involved in the actual disaster preparation and recovery process. The disaster team leader is responsible for disaster planning, preparing the facility, organizing the staff’s response to the disaster, directing recovery operations, and implementing the restoration process. If the facility has a chief financial officer, this person is responsible for handling finances during the emergency. Other team members could include the public information officer for communicating with the media, the information systems administrator for dealing with technology matters, the facilities director who maintains the physical safety of the buildings, and a
security director to prevent theft during the emergency.(7)

Once a disaster team is created, its next task is to prioritize what materials and information needs to be recovered and in what order. This process is similar to medical triage in a disaster: deciding what to save immediately and what to recover later. This list should include administrative information, manuscripts, periodicals, papers, and information technology materials. Although factors specific to each institution should determine the prioritization of materials, some general factors include: rarity of items, cost of items, importance in reestablishing services, and patron demand for items. For example, an archives or manuscript repository would most likely focus on irreplaceable or very rare items. A research library might focus on reference works or technology that would cost the most to replace, while a public library would focus on most requested items. Once the disaster planning team creates a priority list, it should be reviewed and updated every year.(8)

With a priority list in hand, the disaster team should conduct a building survey. The survey’s chief purpose is to identify potential problems with the building’s structure. The survey should also identify and mark on the building’s floor plan signs of past damage, location of emergency exits and equipment, the status of safety equipment, and location of priority items. An assessment of the building’s roof is also suggested. Once team members conduct the survey and identify obvious problems, a second survey should be performed with maintenance staff to identify potential
structural problems. These potential problems should also be marked on the floor plan. Also, the location of turnoff switches for electricity, natural gas, and water should be identified and marked, and turnoff procedures reviewed and recorded. A final building survey should be conducted with security personnel to identify and mark potential security problems such as broken windows and doors that do not shut properly. In addition to the building survey, this is also the time for team members to review coordination plans with both the facilities and security staff. Once potential problems are identified, they should be fixed if possible. If the problems cannot be resolved, staff should use the floor plans to identify high priority items that should be relocated to safer areas within the library or archives.\(^9\)

Once the building survey is completed, the disaster team should begin looking for a remote facility to operate from during the emergency. As each repository is different, so are the options: a public library may move operations to a branch; a university library may move to a sister university; or a state archive may be moved to other government facilities. The key is to identify locations where materials can be stored and accessed and from which patron services can be resumed as soon as possible. Considerations in selecting an alternate site include office and storage space, electrical and telecommunications access, environmental conditions for damaged material being restored at the facility, and public accessibility to the new location. In some cases, limited services can be reinstated from employees’ homes via the Internet.\(^10\)
The next step of planning is to determine which emergencies are possible in the facility and create a written plan to handle them. Begin by planning for small building disasters, as they are the most common. Some examples include power outages, construction or renovation problems, mold, fire, and pipes bursting. Then plan for municipal and area disasters, focusing on those common to your geographical location. Examples of these disasters would include flooding in New Orleans or earthquakes in Los Angeles. Finally, plan for regional disasters affecting large numbers of libraries. The latest example of a regional disaster is Hurricane Katrina, which devastated libraries and archives in three states. The final disaster plan should provide step-by-step directions on how to respond to specific disasters, handle damaged materials, and restore library services.\(^{(11)}\)

Once potential disasters and procedures are discussed, planning should focus on technological infrastructure. With the increasing reliance on automation, routines need to be established for backing up all automated systems on multiple storage devices stored at several locations accessible in case of an emergency. Examples of data to be stored include administrative records, personnel files, order forms, contact information, online catalog, and web site data. Having current information backed up and stored will not only decrease recovery time, but also will allow staff to offer limited patron services while the facility is closed. Several special and academic libraries restored limited Internet services while their facilities were still closed after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in New York.\(^{(12)}\)
The next stage of planning is contacting and coordinating with the parent agency’s risk management department and insurance company. Using the repository’s most recent statistics, review with the risk management department the insurance policy covering the collection. This is key because most people, including some professionals, do not realize the costs involved in reestablishing a repository after a disaster. Library materials have to be replaced; additional staff and consultants will need to be hired, emergency equipment and supplies purchased; and services like interlibrary loan will be needed during the reaction and restoration stages of the disaster. When reviewing the policy, make sure that the insurance will pay the full replacement value of destroyed materials. This can be calculated with this formula:

\[(\text{Base Value} + \text{Processing Cost}) \times \text{Inflation Index} = \text{Replacement Valuation}\,.(13)\]

Another type of insurance to consider is called “business interruption insurance.” This insurance will help recover lost revenue from fines, inter-library loan, and commissions from vendors. Once the risk management consultation is completed, changes to the insurance policy should be made and copies of the policy stored at the library and at off-site facilities.(14)

The final step in planning is the writing of the disaster plan. This should result in a comprehensive manual given to all staff members, the parent institution’s risk management staff, and the facilities and security representatives. Also, two copies should be stored at off-site facilities. In addition to the information discussed
above the manual should include vital information such as an updated staff roster that includes home, work, and cell phone numbers and work and personal email addresses. Contact information for major book preservation companies also should be listed. Another item for the manual is the list of emergency supplies and their locations in the repository. Again, directions for handling damaged materials should be included in the manual because they can prevent permanent damage or destruction caused by mishandling in the reaction stage. Once the manual is written, it should be reviewed periodically and updated as needed.\(^{(15)}\)

**Stage Two of Disaster Planning and Recovery: Preparation**

The preparation stage consists of preventing disasters and preparing for them. This can include making changes to the facilities, gathering and storing supplies, and reviewing or practicing the disaster plan. Prevention begins with analyzing the problems discovered in the building surveys conducted with the disaster team, facilities staff, and security staff. Rectifying these problems should occur as soon as possible, even before the planning stage is completed. Solutions could be as simple as having drains periodically cleaned, or more ambitious, such as installing a new sprinkler system that uses less water. Other examples of disaster prevention include installing fireproof safes for rare or valuable collections, installing shatterproof glass, and repairing roofs. If nothing can be done to fix a facilities problem, rearranging the facility’s collection to minimize damage may be the
only option. While these recommendations may seem costly or time consuming, preventing problems before they occur will save both time and money in both the reaction and restoration stages, allowing the repository to continue meeting its goals of collecting and storing information for use by the community.(16)

Implementing computer backup routines is another form of prevention and preparation. By having computer files backed up, copied, and stored in multiple sites, minimal computer data is lost in case of an emergency. This allows the library to respond quickly after an event and provide limited services via the internet. It also allows staff access to information vital to preserving the collection and restoring library services. Again, examples of this abounded after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in New York. Other examples exist of repositories restoring limited services via computer after more mundane disasters such as pipes bursting or renovation disasters. How often backups should be made depends upon the individual library or archive. Some repositories can rely on weekly backups, while others need backups periodically throughout the day.(17)

The next step is to gather, store, and renew any supplies such as fire extinguishers and first aid kits. Additional supplies necessary for a disaster include rolls of newsprint, tape, dehumidifiers, thymol or another disinfectant, crates for storage and transport, and rolls of plastic sheeting. As previously mentioned, the location of emergency supplies should be marked on the facility’s floor plans. Furthermore, the supplies should be checked periodically to make sure they still exist
and that supplies with expiration dates are still current. Nothing is more frustrating than going to get needed supplies in an emergency and discovering they have been used already or are no longer effective because they have expired.(18)

Training the repository’s staff is the next essential step in the preparation stage. At the annual staff training, each staff member should receive an updated manual and attend a manual review session. During the session, staff should discuss their roles in an emergency, the procedures for reacting to an emergency, and any changes to the manual. Time permitting, a mock disaster could be used to further train staff. In either case, questions should be answered and clarifications made. If the mock disaster does occur, a staff debriefing should occur immediately afterwards to review staff responses and make recommendations to improve the plan.(19)

**Stage Three of Disaster Planning and Recovery: Reaction**

The reaction stage occurs when the repository responds to an actual emergency. While the primary concern during this stage is getting patrons and staff to safety, following the procedures written in the disaster plan will help save part or all of a repository’s collection, preserve information, and allow for the return of patron services.(20)

In the first part of the reaction stage, key members of the disaster team must communicate that there is an emergency at the institution. Depending upon the size and type of emergency, it may be handled with only
the present staff on duty, need additional off-duty staff, or need outside assistance. A small fire or power outage may only require the on-duty staff to safely evacuate patrons and respond to the emergency. A hurricane headed in a repository’s direction may require all staff members to come to work prior to landfall to secure materials with plastic sheeting, board windows, or move materials to alternate locations. A major pipe bursting overnight and flooding a collection will not only require all available staff to aid in the recovery of damaged materials, but also calls for the use of outside sources that specialize in book recovery. Staff should also contact vendors to inform them of the situation and suspend shipping temporarily. Other agencies that may be of assistance during and after disasters include the Library of Congress, the National Archives and Records Administration, the American Library Association, the Society of American Archivists, and The Institute of Museum and Library Services. Contacting the necessary people as soon as a disaster occurs speeds along the rescue and recovery process, increasing the likelihood of preserving the collection. 

Assessing damage to the collection is the next part of the reaction stage. The disaster team leader should survey the situation and assess which materials are undamaged, which materials are recoverable, and which materials need major preservation work. The disaster team leader uses the disaster plan’s priorities list in order to avoid emotional, spur-of-the-moment changes in the plan. Staff should assess items of high priority first and assign an appropriate level of treatment, then continue on to less critical items, and fi-
nally non-critical items. All items should be tagged, logged, and processed. (22)

Once staff have assessed the items, they can move on to rescue and recovery. Undamaged items may be rescued and stored until needed. The disaster manual should have directions on how to treat various materials in the collection, which must be followed to avoid irreparable damage due to mishandling in the recovery process. Those staff members assigned to conducting such “first aid” treatment as drying books, rinsing microfilm, or freezing periodicals must follow directions and act as swiftly as possible to avoid further damage. In cases of widespread damage to a collection, library staff may stabilize materials until a professional conservator takes over recovery operations. (23)

Stage Four of Disaster Planning and Recovery: Restoration

In addition to collecting and preserving information, libraries and archives are also responsible for providing access to information through patron services. Restoring patron services is one aspect of the restoration stage. Another aspect is restoring the repository’s operations. Finally, evaluating and revising the disaster plan takes place in this stage. (24)

With the increased use of the Internet in the United States, restoring some patron services can begin while rescue and recovery operations are being conducted. Other patron services will be unavailable until relocation to an alternate site occurs, while some services will not be available until the affected facility is reopened. No matter what the situation is, restoring
patron services is one of the goals of the disaster plan. If data has been routinely backed up and systems are still functional, some services such as online database access and reference services can resume almost immediately. Again, the feasibility of resuming online service was demonstrated after the September 11, 2001, attacks. With an alternate site operational, some undamaged or locally restored materials can be made available to the public again. Items either lost or in the preservation process can be acquired for patrons through an interlibrary loan service at the alternate location. Normal facility operations can also resume with the establishment of an alternate location. Vital functions like ordering, cataloging, and processing can resume concurrently with ongoing recovery operations. This has several benefits: the collection continues to expand despite the recent disaster, information continues to be accessible to patrons, and the resumption of normal operations provides a needed psychological boost to employees.

The final step in the restoration stage is the evaluation and review of the disaster plan. This step should be completed after everything has returned to normal: the facility is operational, the collection is salvaged or replaced, patron services are fully restored, and staff have resumed normal duties. A thorough evaluation by the disaster team and repository staff should focus on what went right, what needs improvement, and what can be done to make the entire situation better next time. The disaster team should review the de-briefings, evaluate the effectiveness of proposals, and revise the disaster plan accordingly. Experiencing a disaster will expose the disaster plan’s flaws and weak-
nesses, and the best time to revise the plan accordingly is while memories and experiences are still vivid. (27)

With the destruction of numerous libraries and archives by hurricanes Katrina and Rita, library and archival professions will experience a resurgence of interest in disaster planning and recovery. Disaster planning often suffers from benign neglect because managers tend to focus on immediate priorities, postponing disaster planning until it is too late. Hopefully, the resurgence of interest in disaster planning and the numerous articles and books written in response to the Hurricane Katrina disaster will make librarians and archivists realize the importance of disaster planning, and will create a desire to implement a disaster plan for their own repositories.


2 Seven cited works are in response to a specific emergency. One cited work was written after a survey was conducted. Four cited works, the archival ones, go into the importance of disaster planning without citing a specific event that caused the work to be written. Also, this paper is a direct result of Hurricane Katrina and the problems encountered in Louisiana and Mississippi.
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REVIEWS


Contemporary archival literature, professional standards and continuously evolving education modalities in the archival profession are leaning increasingly to-
wards a worldview that places digitization and technology at the epicenter of archival theory and practice. So it was truly a pleasure to reassess and contemplate the origins, history and present day development of the archival profession through the keen lens of archival philosopher, teacher, and practitioner Ernst Posner. Although today’s younger generation of archivists may be more apt to discuss archival practice from the standpoint of encoded archival description (EAD), metadata, and digitization best practices, this book reminds us of the importance of adhering to the historical and theoretical constructs of archival management.

Originally published in 1967 for Posner’s seventy-fifth birthday, the 2006 edition contains a new and insightful introduction by Angelika Menne-Haritz and an index, while maintaining the spirit of the 1967 text by including the original foreword and introduction. The book is a compilation of sixteen scholarly writings and lectures that took place between 1939 and 1960. The book focuses on three principle themes throughout: archival traditions, training and education, and the significance of records management in archival repositories from European and American perspectives.

The first theme deals specifically with the origins and development of provenance in the French and German archival traditions. Posner’s reflections on provenance and European archival principles are the first two brief chapters of the book entitled “Aspects of Archival Development since the French Revolution” and “Max Lehmann and the Genesis of the
Principle of Provenance.” These essays were initially a talk given before professional archivists and a published article in *Indian Archives* (1950) respectively. Posner’s mentor and predecessor at the Prussian Privy State Archives, Max Lehmann, (who is sometimes overlooked in the European archival literature but better recognized in the American literature) is highlighted for his contribution and role that led to provenance becoming an archival standard. The chapter on Max Lehmann and provenance whet the reader’s appetite for more about the historical underpinnings of provenance.

The second theme tackled is archival training and education. Posner’s writings show him to have been very passionate about the issue and believed, as do many archival educators today, that a well-trained archivist should undergo specialized theoretical coursework of the graduate school variety and practical fieldwork with hands-on training. Part II, *The Training of Archivists*, consists of two chapters that were published as articles in 1941 and 1954, respectively. Posner is able to distinguish the differences between European and American archival training authoritatively because chapter three, “European Experiences in Training Archivists,” was written two years after he had emigrated from his native Germany, while chapter four, “Archival Training in the United States,” was penned during his experiences as a professor at American University and employee of the National Archives in Washington, D.C. The two models, systematic university coursework and employer preparatory classes with hands-on training and an examination, are recognized as valid standards today. Though
Posner believed archival students should have practical training, such as describing and processing of records, he was of his era and thought the archivist’s calling was first as an historian dedicated to using stringent historical research methodology.

A useful mechanism in Part II that contextualizes the similarities and differences between European and American archival training are summary lists found at the end of chapter three and course listings from American colleges and training institutes. This summation is necessary in the chapter on European archival education because of the “variety of archival schools established and programs offered” (p. 56). Recognizing the possibility for subjective bias and wanting to be a credible, objective observer, Posner states that he is “on his guard lest he be partial to the institute [Prussian Privy State Archives] to which he devoted part of his work or consider it representative of a common European development” (p. 56).

Posner pays homage to the North Carolina archival education system, a longtime leader and supporter of archival education and public archives services rendered to its citizenry, by providing an overview of the “regional” cooperative established by Meredith College and the Department of Archives and History of North Carolina in 1948. From this particular chapter it is apparent that Posner is impressed by the American system’s attempt to provide theoretical training, as he also takes several pages to describe the curriculum of American University, Columbia University, the University of Wisconsin, and others.
The third theme in this compilation is the significance of records management in European and American archival traditions. Posner analyzes from numerous perspectives in the course of the eleven chapters that comprise Part III, The European Example; Part IV, The American Experience; and Part V, Archives in Wartime. He notes in chapter six, “The Role of Records in German Administration,” the historical impetus of the Registratus, the German administrative office “that controls the flow of incoming and outgoing correspondence and preserves, arranges and services those parts of it that remain with the agency until they can be transferred to archival custody” (p. 87). He contrasts this approach with the one used in America at the National Archives in Washington, D.C., where “records management had been neglected with disastrous consequences,” causing it to “become a no man’s land governed by no law and controlled by no responsible authority” (p. 134). Of the three primary themes covered in this volume, the issue of records management and its place in archival practice seems to cause Posner the most trouble intellectually. What are the differences between managing records in the creation phase and in the archiving phase? Posner’s background in the European archival tradition appears to make him slightly wary of archivists handling the duties of the registrar, i.e., the records manager. He ultimately takes the middle road by saying “neither of them can succeed if he does not have a complete understanding of the other’s functions and problems” (p. 65).

The strength of Archives and the Public Interest: Selected Essays lies in Posner’s breadth and knowledge of both
American and European archival history and theory. Books such as T.R. Schellenberg’s *The Management of Archives* and Richard Cox’s *Closing an Era: Historical Perspectives on Modern Archives and Records Management* also explore historical and theoretical antecedents in the archival profession, but *Archives and the Public Interest* is bolstered by Posner’s lively, personal stories and his international experiences as an archivist. The primary shortcoming of this text is the thematic arrangement of the essays, which make for a chronologically rambling book. However, the overall book was insightful and informative and will prove invaluable to archivists, historians and librarians desirous of understanding the lineage of American archival practice.

*Carter B. Cue*

*University Archives*

*Winston-Salem State University*


Archives collect, preserve, and make available to the general public details about individuals’ lives. Diaries collect private thoughts, letters contain private conversations, records track activities, and images record likenesses. Because of this basic practice of exposing the lives of others to the public, archivists are keenly aware of and concerned about invading the privacy of
those who had no say in the disposition of their private materials. Along with the ethical motivation to protect privacy, there is a legal one. Privacy is protected by law, and by law certain types of records must be kept confidential.

*Privacy and Confidentiality Perspectives: Archivists and Archival Records*, edited by Menzie L. Behrnd-Klodt and Peter J. Wosh, presents sixteen essays on the topic of managing privacy and confidentiality issues in relation to archives. The articles are extremely diverse; they are historical, descriptive, prescriptive, and philosophical. With the exception of the articles by legal experts Samuel Warren, Louis Brandeis, and William Prosser, all of the authors are involved with archival collections. The articles cover a variety of different types of archives: personal, medical, governmental, corporate, and religious. The essays are divided into four groupings: Legal Perspectives, Ethical Perspectives, Administrative Perspectives, and Institutional Perspectives. The editors' introduction provides a history of how the topic has been handled in archival literature up to this time. Following the essays, there are appendices that reprint U.S. Constitutional amendments and federal statutes related to privacy. The appendices also contain brief explanations of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and of legislation affecting medical records in the United States, Canada, and Europe. Both are by volume editor Menzie L. Behrnd–Klodt.

“Legal Perspectives” opens the volume and this section reprints two historical articles related to privacy. “The Right to Privacy,” Samuel Warren and Louis
Brandeis' 1890 article from the *Harvard Law Review*, is significant because it represents the first definition of the legal right of privacy for individuals. William Prosser's 1960 article “Privacy,” originally published in the *California Law Review*, defines the four aspects of the right to privacy: inclusion upon seclusion or solitude; appropriation of name or likeness; publicity given to private life or disclosure of public facts; and publicity placing a person in a false light. He writes, “Today with something over three hundred cases in the books, the holes in the jigsaw puzzle have been largely filled in, and some rather definite conclusions possible” (p. 34).

The historic articles are followed by one in which Behrnd-Klodt applies the legal right of privacy to archives. Behrnd-Klodt addresses Prosser’s four aspects of privacy and concludes that archivists most likely need only concern themselves with publicity given to private life or disclosure of private facts. Behrnd–Klodt emphasizes that archivists could be held liable for negligent conduct if they “affirmatively assume legal obligations that may be difficult to complete, and which may be problematic if the obligations are ignored or negatively fulfilled” (p. 59). She elaborates on this cautionary note and this particular section, though brief, is particularly helpful in clarifying how the actions of an archive could be interpreted by the courts.

Like Behrnd–Klodt's article, others in the volume present concrete advice to the working archivist dealing with matters of privacy and confidentiality. Sara S. Hodson’s article “In Secret Kept, In Silence Sealed:
Privacy in the Papers of Authors and Celebrities” focuses on the administration of the manuscripts of well-known authors. She outlines what makes these materials especially susceptible to privacy concerns. Her examples of the administration of sensitive materials in various literary collections such as James Joyce, Sigmund Freud, and John Cheever make for engrossing reading. Hodson lets us in on her thought process as she grapples with the issues surrounding the papers in her care at the Huntington Library. She concedes there are no easy answers for most situations, but argues for clear policies. Timothy D. Pyatt’s article, “Southern Family Honor Tarnished? Issues of Privacy in the Walker Percy and Shelby Foote Papers,” also deals with modern literary manuscripts. Pyatt uses the example of the Percy and Foote papers in the Southern Historical Collection at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to explain the significance of a good working relationship with a collection’s donor when dealing with sensitive material. Pyatt suggests informing the donor about repository policies on copyright and permissions, consulting with the donor about sensitive material that comes to light during processing, and sending the donor copies of the inventory.

Shifting from literary manuscripts to university records, Mark A. Green and Christine Weideman’s article “The Buckley Stops Where? The Ambiguity and Archival Implications of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act” provides the contours of the FERPA legislation and pinpoints the two as yet unanswered questions about the legislation that render it confusing for archivists. They outline steps that
should be taken at the national and repository level so that student records can be used for research while privacy is maintained. Finally, a second article by Behrnd–Klodt describes attorney-client privilege and provides instructions on dealing with attorneys’ papers in archives.

Another group of articles describe situations in which the balance between privacy and access has been negotiated. Judith Schwartz tells how the Lesbian Herstory Archives administers access to the potentially sensitive materials in its collection by having donors write their own access policies, specifying if the donation should be kept under seal or even listed publicly. L. Dale Patterson writes about how the United Methodist Church’s strong belief in accountability has resulted in relatively open access to the Church’s archives. Martin Leavitt’s article about a web site on eugenics created by the education division of the James D. Watson Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory discusses the ramifications of making controversial material available over the Internet. These articles articulate the negotiations between privacy and access in action, and the strategies used in these case studies provide helpful ideas about managing access to sensitive materials.

Elena Danielson’s article “Privacy Rights of Political Victims” and “Balancing Privacy and Access: Opening the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission Records” by Sarah Rowe-Sims, Sandra Boyd, and H. T. Holmes both concern files kept on individuals by government surveillance programs, namely the records of the East German State Security Office (also
known as the Stasi) and the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission, a state agency which existed from 1956 to 1977 whose primary activity was to collect information on civil rights activists. These articles narrate the events and developments that resulted in the files of both organizations being preserved and made accessible. The access policies in both situations took into account the privacy of the individuals represented in the files. In the case of the Stasi files, victims of surveillance are allowed access to their own files but not to the files of others. Interestingly, the identity of their informants is not suppressed. Before the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission files were opened to the public, individuals who suspected that they were the victims of surveillance were permitted to request copies of their files and apply to have information redacted. The authors of both articles expertly articulate the series of events that resulted in these policies and describe the role archivists played in their implementation. These articles affirm the significance of the archival record in exposing past injustice to the light of day and they should not be missed.

Government surveillance also comes up in Heather MacNeil’s article “Information Privacy, Liberty, and Democracy.” She writes, “the collection, processing, and sharing of personal information by such large bureaucratic organizations as governments are sources of unease because they render citizens vulnerable to an insidious system of impersonal observation and control against which they are largely defenseless” (p. 71). MacNeil likens the collection of personal data by governments to a panopticon, a type of prison de-
signed so that prisoners may be observed without knowing who is observing them. MacNeil argues that this form of surveillance discourages independence and thoughtfulness in individuals and, therefore, is detrimental to democracy. MacNeil provides suggestions for administering access to records containing personal information for archives that have custody of government records. Articles in the volume by Barbara L. Craig, Paul C. Lasewicz, and Mark J. Duffy and Christine M. Taylor also take this more theoretical approach to issues of privacy and access in medical, corporate, and religious archives respectively.

The two articles about the surveillance files in East Germany and Mississippi should be required reading for every archivist. Practicing archivists looking for strategies, advice, and words of wisdom in dealing with privacy issues would find much that resonates in the articles by Hodson, Pyatt, Weideman and Green, and Behrnd-Klodt. The articles describing the balance between openness and restriction in the cases of the Lesbian Herstory Archives, the archives of the United Methodist Church, and the virtual eugenics exhibit contribute to a body of knowledge on the topic of privacy in archives. The more theoretical articles in the volume, especially MacNeil’s, challenge us to think beyond immediate circumstances to the larger concepts surrounding privacy in archives.

In addition to the content of the articles, a strength of Privacy and Confidentiality Perspectives: Archivists and Archival Records is that it gathers these writings together between two covers, allowing readers the easy ability to
see commonalities and differences between them. We can compare the administration of the Stasi files with that of the surveillance files in Mississippi and then think about both of those situations in light of MacNeil's panopticon. Hodson calls on Warren, Brandeis, and Prosser in her article and connects their writings on privacy to curators of modern manuscripts. Pyatt’s case study approach can be juxtaposed with the more philosophical work of MacNeil and others. The diversity of articles included here testifies to the permeation of privacy issues throughout the profession. This volume can serve not only as a resource for archivists but also as reassurance. We are not on our own in our attempts to find the balance between access and privacy in our administration of the details of the lives of others.

Jackie Dean
Manuscripts Department
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill


Most archivists have an almost inherent understanding of the larger importance and power of the records in our custody. Records of government, in particular, provide the very foundation of accountable democracy and the rule of law. The integrity and authenticity of those records undergird our very identities as citizens while also communicating the narrative and evidence of government activity. Thus, when external
forces seek to distort or unfairly influence archives, we are concerned—certainly as archivists—but also as citizens.

American archivists may be excused for taking a more immediate and parochial view of the problem of political pressure on archives, given what seems to be a nearly continuous series of assaults over the last six years against the sanctity of the record and, more broadly, on the public’s right to know. These include specific provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act; the attorney general of the United States issuing a memorandum to government agencies declaring that requests under the Freedom of Information Act may be officially resisted, essentially turning the act on its head; an Executive Order-based attack on the Presidential Records Act; a former mayor of New York City (currently a candidate for President) and a former governor of Texas (currently President) both trying to subvert local and state records law in the disposition of their official papers; and, more recently, the reclassifying of long-declassified government records. It is a difficult time to be an American archivist.

However, as this compelling collection of essays clearly demonstrates, the impulse of government officials to suppress, alienate, distort, and otherwise apply inappropriate pressure to archives is certainly not uniquely American, nor is it a mark of the peculiar, post-9/11 times in which we live. In July 2003, the Liverpool University Centre for Archives Studies organized a conference on the theme of “Political Pressure and the Archival Record.” Participants were invited from around the world to give presentations on
various aspects of this theme and the papers in this book are drawn from those presentations—in some cases revised and edited for publication.

The sections of the book are organized along the topics of “The Historical Legacy”; “Access and the Public Interest”; “Ethical Dilemmas in the Public Service”; “Governments Under Pressure? Threats and Responses”; “At War: Records and International Conflict”; and “Modelling the Future.” There are papers here for almost any interest and, contrary to the normal rule of thumb for such collections, nearly all are of high quality. Clearly, the editors’ oversight and guidance here has been salutary. Beyond this, however, Margaret Proctor, one of the editors, has provided a thorough and informed introduction that, at the most basic level, provides useful definitions along with a thoughtful analysis of the topic that clearly establishes the context for each of the topics.

In fact, if pressed to select my favorite essay in the volume, I believe I would select the introduction. Ms. Proctor presents such comprehensive introductions to each of the organizing sections and so meticulously summarizes the essays in their context that one almost needs read no further, but for filling in the details.

But, of course, the significance is in the details. The essays in this volume will appeal to a wide audience with a variety of perspectives. While aimed perhaps primarily at archivists, there is much of interest here for historians, political scientists, lawyers, and public ethicists. Of particular significance for me (understanding that others will have different per-
pectives) were the essays by Jackie Esposito on the USA Patriot Act and Tom Connor’s analysis of “Information Lockdown” under the current Bush administration. Though these are topics with which I have considerable working familiarity, it is always interesting to read other opinions, and both of these authors have expanded my knowledge and understanding. Beyond the familiar, however, I found Masahito Ando’s article on “The Asian Pacific War and the Fate of Archives” especially fascinating—not only for the light it sheds on the fate of supposedly “lost” records, but also for his discussion on a particularly naked case of political manipulation of the historical record, which even today is playing out in the newspapers in the Japanese government’s adamant refusal to acknowledge their responsibility with respect to the “comfort women” in World War II. The title of Chris Hurley’s article, “The Role of the Archives in Protecting the Record from Political Pressure,” may seem innocuous and straightforward. Do not be fooled. It is in reality an intriguing first-person account of a particularly notorious episode of government interference in archives for political purposes. The fact that Mr. Hurley was the archivist involved in this case and that he was fired for essentially doing his job makes this story all the more compelling and, dare I say, shocking. This is as close to tabloid sensationalism as it gets for archives. I am delighted to finally be able to read a full account of this affair from his perspective.

Other articles of special interest to me were Trudy Peterson’s “Archives in Service to the State,” which could almost stand on its own as the definitive text on the subject; and Malcolm Todd’s treatise on the spe-
clial challenges of electronic records management and
the potential to influence the record. As I say, others
will find something of their own in this enormously
interesting and important volume. In fact, I would
urge all archivists to do just that: read these essays and
find those that speak especially to you. Expand your
understanding of the threat that politics, government,
and special interests pose to the truth that lies within
the records in our custody that you might gird your-
selves to better meet your
responsibilities.

Steve Hensen
Duke University

_Understanding Archives & Manuscripts._ Archival
Fundamentals Series II. James M. O’Toole and
Richard J. Cox. Chicago, Ill.: Society of American

Imagine the year 1990. You did not have the World
Wide Web and you more than likely did not have
email. September 11 was just another day and you
did not have to worry about law enforcement request-
ing your records in the name of national security and
the USA PATRIOT Act. There was no such thing as
a HIPAA violation and corporations were not wor-
ried about the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. There was no
Encoded Archival Description (EAD) and very little
dialogue about how to preserve digital records. In-
deed, the archival profession has undergone many
changes and encountered new challenges since James
M. O’Toole’s original _Understanding Archives and Manu-

scripts appeared as part of the original Archival Fundamental Series seventeen years ago, even though various aspects of the profession have changed little over time.

In the updated Understanding Archives & Manuscripts—part of the Archival Fundamentals Series II—O’Toole and Richard J. Cox provide a well-written overview of the archival profession, beginning with the history of record keeping in ancient times and ending with the challenges archivists face in the present time. Knowing that the book does not cover any topic in much depth, O’Toole and Cox include a bibliographic essay describing books for further reading. Although the book’s target audience is “archivists, general practitioners and specialists alike, who are performing a wide range of archival duties in all types of archival and manuscript repositories” (p. vii), it is perhaps the most useful to archivists who are new to the profession. One can easily imagine instructors assigning the book to students enrolled in introductory archives classes in public history and library science programs.

The book is divided into five chapters: “Recording, Keeping, and Using Information,” “The History of Archives and the Archives Profession,” “The Archivist’s Perspective: Knowledge and Values,” “The Archivist’s Task: Responsi-bilities and Duties,” and “Archivists and Challenges of New Worlds.” The authors succinctly chronicle the history of the topics presented in each chapter, from the earliest relevant instance to the present. Although some chapters have overlapping themes, the authors do a good job
of organizing topics into logical groups. A major theme that runs throughout the book is change over time, carefully balanced with how the profession has stayed the same. For example, the authors explain that the reasons for recording information have not changed, although the manner in which we record it has. Another theme, best outlined in “The History of Archives and the Archives Profession,” is how archivists’ goals and values have largely remained the same despite changing attitudes about professional training, new technologies, and professional identity.

In a book that successfully brings its predecessor into the Internet age, it is ironic that the authors make few references to sources available on the World Wide Web. This omission is deliberate, as O’Toole and Cox state that the lack of web references in the bibliographic essay is “both because these [sources] tend to change so often and because some parameters were needed to manage the discussion” (p. 192). Whereas it is commendable that O’Toole and Cox are striving to write a book that will stand the test of time (or at least until the Archival Fundamental Series III hits the shelves sometime in the undisclosed future), they seem to go a bit too far. The same phenomenon occurs when referring to digital initiatives. Other than mentioning the Library of Congress’s American Memory project in the chapter “Archivists and the Challenges of New Worlds” and a few references to the InterPARES project in the notes and the bibliographic essay, the authors choose to gloss over specific references to the many digital projects that archivists have initiated since 1990.
To be fair, covering digital initiatives in excessive detail is not the goal of the book, and readers should not shy away from it thinking that it does not cover current issues. The authors do address digital recordkeeping, however briefly, as well as the challenge of living in “Internet time,” where researchers expect instant answers and digital copies of everything. Likewise, they address other recent topics such as postmodernism, ethics and security, and new technologies. The book also does not shy away from controversial topics. In their description of professional training in the chapter “The History of Archives and the Archives Profession,” O’Toole and Cox explain that history programs and library and information science programs provide the best graduate-level education for budding archivists. They go so far as to say that public history has done “little to strengthen the educational preparation” of archivists and that Certified Archivists exams have “had only limited effect.” (p. 77-80). Such statements will certainly fuel professional debate for some time.

To be sure, the fundamentals of archives and its history are not likely to change anytime soon, and *Understanding Archives & Manuscripts* provides an excellent crash course for introducing new archivists to the profession. Readers should be able to grasp the core concepts about record making, record keeping, and professional values and challenges. It is a stepping stone to the other books that make up the Archival Fundamentals Series II, enticing readers to discover the profession in more detail.
Photographs: Archival Care and Management.

The Society of American Archivists has recently made available the much-anticipated update to its 1984 Administration of Photo Collections: the essential new manual Photographs: Archival Care and Management. A must-have for all cultural heritage institutions with photographic holdings, this comprehensive guide covers virtually all topics necessary for understanding and caring for photo collections—from currently accepted management and preservation methods to the history of the medium to its largely digital future. Though presented from an archival perspective and of obvious classroom use, anyone interested in photographs as objects will find this an indispensable resource.

Those familiar with the 1984 version of the manual (until the 2006 update, one of the only resources of its kind available) likely appreciate its relatively thorough coverage of historical processes, appraisal and collecting, description, preservation, legal issues, and copy services. The much-improved 2006 revision expands on and updates these core discussions and
adds valuable new chapters on visual literacy and photographic research, integrating preservation into regular archival activities, photos in the reference room, digitization, outreach, and fundraising activities.

The 2006 update is clearly and precisely written, as well as pleasingly designed. Gray stand-out boxes containing “tips” and “terminology” are good for quick reference, as are the shortcut highlights titled “When Resources are Limited” (though I found these somewhat ironic—how often are resources unlimited?). The more than three hundred illustrations are impressive, more numerous and diverse than in the 1984 version, and in most cases well-selected and nicely tied in to the text. The manual also contains a veritable treasure trove of appendices, including sample forms and workflow checklists, up-to-date lists of vendors, funding sources, and training opportunities, and a huge bibliography of further reading.

The book’s first three chapters—on photos in archival collections, photographic history, and appraisal and collecting—have survived largely intact from the previous edition (for better or for worse). Some will object that the chapter on historical processes is not more detailed and practically useful. Users trying to identify specific nineteenth-century formats, for example, may come away frustrated. I would assert that the chapter serves as an excellent overview and introduction, and that those routinely needing to handle and identify a variety of formats should seek out more specialized sources and (especially) hands-
on training. An expanded discussion of and/or separate chapter on appraisal would have been welcome, especially given the current emphasis on minimal archival processing or “processing lite.” As less and less work is done on archival collections, assessing the informational and monetary value of visual materials up front will become more important, as will identifying preservation concerns.

Meanwhile, the new additions to Photographs are timely, useful, and well-developed. Especially valuable are those segments that emphasize the important differences between visual and textual materials in the realms of processing, cataloging, and research. I was very glad to see the authors explore the “meaning” of photographs—how to “read” images, conduct contextual research, and communicate photographic meaning via descriptive cataloging.

Helena Zinkham, Library of Congress photographic cataloger extraordinaire, provides insightful guidance on these topics as well as exercises to improve visual literacy and observation skills. New chapters that deal with incorporating preservation and security into all stages of the “archival life” of photograph collections—from accessioning to scholarly use in the research room—are clear and practically informative. Diane Vogt-O’Connor’s thorough discussion of legal issues related to ownership, access, and usage of images goes far beyond copyright, considering national security, privacy rights, cultural concerns, and other ethical issues often overlooked by repositories. Vogt-O’Connor’s chapter on outreach is equally appreciated, supplying ideas for fundrais-
ing and public programs centered on photograph collections, but giving fairly light treatment to web-based initiatives.

By far the most fundamental change in photography and photographic archives since the 1984 SAA manual was published has been the advent, and virtual takeover, of digital technology. As of early 2007, Kodak (pioneer of the modern film industry and inventors of the first camera for consumers) is considering entirely cutting off the traditional film wing of its business. Archival repositories have come to rely on digital duplication, and film-based copying is becoming more difficult and expensive, while many larger institutions have already dismantled or are considering dismantling their wet darkrooms. At the same time, archives of all sizes are realizing the incredible potential of digitization and the web for improving visibility and outreach, finding new audiences, and forging previously unimagined connections between repositories and collections.

Ritzenthaler, et. al. meet the digital transition head-on, delving into accessioning, processing, and describing digital and born-digital photographic holdings, devoting an entire chapter to digitization standards and procedures, and at least introducing the idea of web-based projects. While the authors provide great overviews of all of these topics, I would again caution users against relying solely on this resource for new or large-scale digitization and/or web initiatives; training, experience, and outside research are necessary in those cases. One rather glaring omission that must be rectified is in the area of digital preservation—aside from noting that digital pho-
tographs “present new problems” and “must be managed” (p. 212), the authors overlook this crucial, and confounding, consideration.

With technology changing as rapidly as it is, the portions of Photographs: Archival Care and Management devoted to digital images, digitization, and the web are those most in need of expansion and regular updating—hopefully, we won’t be waiting another twenty-three years for that to happen.

Elizabeth Arnold Hull
Technical Services Archivist
Forest History Society, Durham, NC