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ABSTRACT
Jim Crow practices touched every aspect of southern life in the middle of the twentieth century. As surviving documentary evidence attests, archives and archivists in the South, particularly in the University of North Carolina system, were deeply implicated in upholding segregation. This article probes that dynamic relationship, stressing the courage of those African American scholars who challenged Jim Crow on quotidian and organizational bases. The history of segregation in archival repositories illuminates four themes. First, it underlines the agency and power wielded by archival professionals; the archives is never a neutral space. Second, it suggests how archival professionals conducted—or failed to conduct—outreach to attract users and to promote use. In this way they betrayed their professional mission by providing lesser forms of access and service to African Americans. Third, the story of Jim Crow archives shows the need for archivists to be held accountable in their record-collecting and recordkeeping practices; it also demonstrates the central importance of diversity in the profession, in the types of records retained, and in their content. Finally, it indicates the necessity of ensuring that a representative documentary trail remains for historians. In short, archivists affect the writing of history as much in the 2010s as they did in the 1950s. The legacy of Jim Crow’s “strange career” in the archives represents a valuable lesson for archivists in their pursuit of social justice.
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Nothing illustrated the absurdities of racial segregation better than Southern archives and libraries.

—John Hope Franklin

Archives have the power to privilege and to marginalize. They can be a tool of hegemony; they can be a tool of resistance.

—Joan Schwartz and Terry Cook

Shortly after the Supreme Court’s Brown v. Board of Education decision of May 17, 1954, the University of Virginia invited C. Vann Woodward, a professor of history at Johns Hopkins University, to give that year’s James W. Richards Lectures. Though he accepted the invitation, Woodward was apprehensive. He wrote longtime confidant Rupert Vance, “Have I got a worthwhile point to make? I am far from convinced myself, very far.” Three months later, the Arkansas-born Woodward lectured in Charlottesville to an unsegregated but heavily southern audience. “I was received respectfully,” he recalled, “but there weren’t any fireworks about it. I was just a visiting professor.”

However unremarkable the lectures seemed, they provided the material for what Martin Luther King Jr. deemed “the historical Bible of the civil rights movement”: The Strange Career of Jim Crow. In that slim 1955 volume, Woodward asserted, “laws are not an adequate index of the extent and prevalence of segregation and discriminatory practices in the South.” Segregation, Woodward maintained, governed southern life through the “compulsory conformity of ‘folkways’” and “often anticipated and frequently exceeded the law.” It left “deep festering sores on the American character and social order,” wrote African American historian Lawrence Dunbar Reddick. In the archives, that “crucible of human experience,” the color line proved just as intractable and peculiar as anywhere else Jim Crow despoiled.

The history of Jim Crow archives bequeaths a fourfold legacy. First, archivists and related professionals possess agency. The archives is never a neutral space; indeed, “the archivist, in subtle ways, tends to perpetuate the political and economic status quo simply by going about his ordinary business.” Second, the mission of professional archivists centers on providing access to sources and serving users. During the middle years of the twentieth century, archivists struggled to balance this professional article of faith with their personal and community mores concerning race. African American scholars received lesser degrees of access and lesser forms of service. Third, archivists must be held accountable in their records collection and records management practices. Accountability depends upon promoting diversity in the archival profession and advocating for the collection and retention of records diverse in form and
content. Finally, archivists and associated professionals influence the writing of history as much in the 2010s as in the 1950s.

Segregation, Scholars, and Archives

Race “shapes the cultural eye—what we do and do not notice, the reach of empathy and the alignment of response.” Segregation imposed isolation upon black scholars; it stripped them emotionally, physically, and intellectually. Of nearly two thousand history doctorates awarded by 1935, blacks received merely six; twelve more earned history PhDs by 1940. Not only did southern laws proscribe African American PhD students, but even in programs outside the South, many instructors believed black students intellectually inferior. This withholding of professional training hamstrung African American historians. “Understanding how history is made,” insisted Edward Soja, “has been the primary source of emancipatory insight and practical political consciousness, the great variable container for a critical interpretation of social life and practice.” W. E. B. Du Bois, the first African American to earn a PhD at Harvard University, testified, “History and the other social sciences were to be my weapons, to be sharpened and applied by research and writing.”

African American historians produced scholarship that debunked the dominant historiographical narrative, that “uniquely broad consensus that papered over the breaks and fissures and conflicts in Southern history with myths of solidarity and continuity.” White historians, by contrast, “rummaged in the past to find a history that would best serve the needs of the present, and professors and teachers went on to miseducate the next several generations in a prescribed version of reality.” As Reddick noted, southern history textbooks depicted blacks in pernicious terms: “As a slave he was happy and docile. As a freedman he was shiftless, sometimes vicious, and easily led into corruption. As a freeman his activities have not been worthy of note.” Historiographical correctives about “America’s neglected Native Sons” depended upon access to scholarly resources and, by implication, upon the “importance of unimportant documents.” African American historians read against the grain: papers of the rulers contained evidence of the ruled.

Thus African American historians faced a fundamental methodological challenge. Archival documents underpinned the late nineteenth-century apotheosis of “scientific” history. Subsequent generations of American historians and archivists, black or white, believed that controlling documents was tantamount to controlling history itself. As archivist and historian Lester Cappon explained, history as the written record of the past “comprehends all branches of knowledge associated with archival materials.” His colleague Solon J. Buck even argued that “civilization rests squarely on documents.” Black scholars learned a
brutal lesson, namely, “Effective democratization can always be measured by this essential criterion: the participation in and the access to the archive, its constitution, and its interpretation.” Second-class citizenship thrived in the archives.

Historian John Hope Franklin thought scholarly life under Jim Crow desolate. Born in 1915 in Rentiesville, Oklahoma, Franklin experienced the Tulsa race riots of 1921. He attended Fisk University, where he served as president of the student body, led an antilynching protest, and was graduated magna cum laude (1935). The first African American to matriculate at Harvard from a historically black institution, Franklin earned his doctorate in 1941. Two years later, the University of North Carolina Press published his dissertation as The Free Negro in North Carolina, 1790–1860. The archives, as Franklin knew, confers “a particular and modern form of loneliness.” He reflected, “Imagine the plight of a Negro historian trying to do research in archives in the South operated by people who cannot conceive that a Negro has the capacity to use the materials there.”

FIGURE 1. John Hope Franklin (Rubenstein Library, Duke University)
Worse, southern white college campuses remained “hermetically sealed” to African American scholars. Rarely did repositories, professional organizations, or laboratories admit blacks. Often demanding a formal referral, white librarians usually granted access to black scholars only if the requested materials were unavailable at any Jim Crow library. Even requesting admission demanded preternatural courage. A “makeshift of whim and whimsy, truth, half-truth, and untruth, opportunism and necessity,” the ideology of segregation, in the archives as everywhere, was “never systematized, its paradoxes never resolved, its ultimate goals never reasoned through.”

The Kentucky-born son of two former slaves, Virginia Normal Industrial Institute historian Luther Porter Jackson earned his degrees at Fisk University (BA, 1914; MA, 1916) and at the University of Chicago (PhD, 1937). Joining the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute faculty in 1922, he wrote extensively on race and history in Virginia, spearheaded voting rights efforts in the 1930s and 1940s, led fund-raising efforts for the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (ASNLH) and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and helped establish the Southern Regional Council. In the thick of the Second World War, Jackson wondered:

Will the white people of the neighboring community, who control the necessary research materials, cooperate with a Negro in a research project? Will the white colleges extend their facilities to a Negro? Will they open their libraries or will other libraries admit such persons? Will public officials consent to have the records in their keeping used by them? And if the management does open its laboratories, libraries, and offices to Negro scholars, will the clerks and assistants on duty accord such workers courteous treatment?

In similar spirit, Reddick lamented “the present unfortunate state of so much research on the Negro.” Born in Jacksonville, Florida, in 1910, Reddick
received his BA (magna cum laude, 1932) and MA (1933) degrees from Fisk University. Prior to joining the faculty of Dillard University (New Orleans) in 1936, he collected 250 slave testimonies at Kentucky State College and interviewed former slaves in Kentucky and Indiana. He earned his doctorate at the University of Chicago in 1939 on the strength of a dissertation titled “The Negro in the New Orleans Press, 1850–1860: A Study in Attitudes and Propaganda.” Assuming curatorial duties at the Schomburg Collection of Negro Literature, Reddick moved to Atlanta University in 1948.\textsuperscript{35}

Reddick eloquently described the barriers to access African American scholars encountered in the South. “It goes without saying,” he noted, “that the doors to most private papers and collections are closed to black men.”\textsuperscript{36} Many tax-supported and philanthropic libraries as well as state and county archives and local historical societies refused service. State libraries adopted incoherent policies: Alabama’s, South Carolina’s, and Virginia’s made materials available and even permitted blacks to use their reading rooms—though staff seated blacks at different tables than whites. Tennessee’s hewed to the same path, though the library reserved only one table for African Americans. On the other hand, neither Florida’s nor Georgia’s adhered to clear-cut policies.\textsuperscript{37}

Reddick also stressed “the problem of sources. Sources unknown. Sources inaccessible. Sources imperfectly exploited.”\textsuperscript{38} Serving on the faculty of Bennett College in Greensboro, North Carolina, Frenise A. Logan found sources in the “most unsuspected places” or “scattered among bulky collections of ‘extraneous’ materials.”\textsuperscript{39} Black libraries’ scholarly materials were often inferior—if such materials even existed.\textsuperscript{40} Finally, black scholars faced the vandalism and even the disappearance of sources.\textsuperscript{41}

The first African American archivist at the National Archives and Records Administration (appointed 1942), Harold T. Pinkett earned both a master’s degree (University of Pennsylvania, 1938) and a doctorate in history (American University, 1953). Before serving in the segregated United States Army in the Second World War, he taught history at Livingstone College (North Carolina) from 1938 to 1939 and from 1941 to 1942.\textsuperscript{42} African Americans, Pinkett asserted, “have better funds of experience from which their achievements and potentialities may be evaluated, if they make and preserve written records of their experience.” Accounts of black achievements remained “fragmentary and inaccurate,” so preserving written evidence “may help to banish the long night of darkness that has rested over their great deeds and may hasten a new day of truth and justice.”\textsuperscript{43} Power inhered in the archives, in archival sources, and in the scholarship they enabled. No wonder whites often barred African American scholars from sources.\textsuperscript{44}

John Hope Franklin endured Jim Crow with indefatigable grace. C. Vann Woodward recounted “absurdly elaborate conspiracies to get Franklin
admitted—physically—into functions, conventions, and programs of his own profession in the South. . . . Apart from rules, customs, and prejudices of white professionals, that often came down to exclusion from restaurants, hotels, and toilets.”

Yet Franklin’s travails dated to his experience as an undergraduate at the Tennessee State Library. “If I had been able to use the same facilities in the same room with whites,” he reasoned, “it would have been the first such experience in my life and I am confident I would have remembered it.”

In 1945, Franklin visited the segregated Louisiana State Archives. Its director permitted Franklin clandestine access: the repository was closed in celebration of the United States’ victory over Germany and Japan. The Double-V
campaign—African Americans’ parallel efforts to defeat Jim Crow at home and the Axis forces abroad—faltered in the archives. Also that year, Franklin traveled to the Alabama State Department of Archives and History in Montgomery, where he realized it “quite impossible” to generalize about segregation policies.48

Though not sequestered in another room, Franklin faced another dilemma, namely where to sit among white scholars in the reading room. The attendant, elderly, white, and female, intervened when Franklin retreated to an unoccupied area. Telling Franklin he had chosen the warmest part of the room, she
redirected him toward a covey of white researchers clustered around a fan. She interrupted the white researchers’ work to introduce Franklin. He felt “downright lightheaded” at this collegiality.\(^49\) Soon Franklin requested the unprocessed papers of John A. Winston and thereby needed the imprimatur of the archives’ director. Marie Bankhead Owen was the first woman in Alabama to head a department of state government (assuming duties from her late husband) and Senator John Bankhead’s daughter. R. D. W. Connor later lauded Owen’s “courage and skill” in ensuring the repository’s “present triumphant success.”\(^50\) After behaving “graciously” toward Franklin (though she refused him a seat in her office), Owen inexplicably commented, “I hear there is a Harvard nigger here. Have you seen him?” Upon her secretary’s confirmation, Owen told Franklin, “You don’t look like a Harvard nigger to me!” Refusing to ascribe Franklin’s good manners to his Oklahoma upbringing, she insisted, rather, that they came from Franklin’s education at Fisk University—“in a good old Confederate State!”\(^51\) Though Owen never called Franklin “Mr.,” she stressed, “these archives are as much yours as they are mine. . . . Come again soon and often.”\(^52\) As in Alabama, local customs obtruded elsewhere. Library staff usually sequestered black scholars and brought requested materials to them. In other cases, black scholars were permitted use of repository materials but not the building—the space—itself. Reddick wrote, “A stirring chapter could be written on the ingenious devices employed to gain access to the necessary books and documents.” He elaborated, “The prize, no doubt, should go to the passionate devotee to enter into conspiracy with the Negro janitor (who alone knew the place of every book in the building). Every evening the required books were removed and returned early the next morning before the arrival of the political appointee (librarian).”\(^53\) Considering black historians’ limited access to documents, North Carolina College historian Helen G. Edmonds reflected, “The sociologist, the anthropologist, and the dramatist have far outrun the general historian in the treatment of the American Negro.”\(^54\) No wonder Roland C. McConnell contended, “The History of the Negro in the United States of America remains yet untold.”\(^55\) In the twentieth century, African American history traveled “a long, tortuous, and uncharted road.”\(^56\) Terribly few white historians, librarians, and archival professionals eased that passage.

Professional associations and organizations in which North Carolinians held positions of leadership endorsed Jim Crow. Franklin recalled, “Academic organizations did not accommodate black members, access to research materials required a fight, and refereed academic journals and publishing houses were hardly bias-free.”\(^57\) Reddick decried white scholars’ “indifference and occasional opposition.”\(^58\) He proclaimed:
All scholars, in the South particularly, should be called upon to require that some arrangement be established and maintained whereby the Negro scholars shall have the benefit of the increasing deposits of data in the semi-public and private institutions of the region. If Southern white scholars, who are so frequently bemoaning their own difficulties, are not scholars enough to support actively such an effort, then they should be condemned.59

Reddick’s challenge fell on deaf ears.

Though in 1936 the American Library Association resolved to boycott segregated cities, at least for its annual conventions, this gesture insulated the association from criticism. In line with the stratagem of “states’ rights,” the ALA framed segregation as a local matter. A quarter-century later, its members finally amended the Library Bill of Rights: “The right of an individual to the use of a library should not be denied or abridged because of his race, religion, national origins or political views.”

Even the ALA’s tepid efforts surpassed those of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association (MVHA), the Southern Historical Association (SHA), and the Society of American Archivists (SAA).60 Established in 1914, the MVHA only published a black scholar’s work in 1945, and Franklin was the first black to speak at the organization’s annual meeting (1951). The organization slated its 1952 annual meeting for New Orleans, but the hosting hotel refused service to blacks. Eventually, the association relocated the meeting to Chicago—a mean victory. The MVHA’s executive committee recommended the association hold meetings only where all members could participate in official functions. But they tabled the matter of segregated lodging. Black scholars received equal lodging in Lexington, Kentucky, the next year, but only in the spring of 1954 did the membership vote (albeit only 673–567) for equal treatment.61 Compromise instead of secession prevailed.62

The Southern Historical Association also abetted capricious local laws and customs, whether in Birmingham in 1946, Jackson in 1948, Williamsburg in 1949, Montgomery in 1950, or Knoxville in 1952. Hosts demanded African Americans enter through kitchen or back doors, find alternate lodgings or eating arrangements, or sit in back of or upstairs from whites. Asked by Woodward to read a paper at Williamsburg, the first black scholar so honored, Franklin represented an “unsought and unwished-for problem”: “where I would stay, where I would eat, even where I would stand when reading my paper.”63 In Montgomery a year later, conference hosts relegated blacks to the balcony of the Alabama House of Representatives during a session, no less, on Jefferson Davis. In Knoxville, the host hotel’s management agreed to desegregated sessions but at the last minute reneged; Woodward and others relocated the event.64

Prodded by Woodward, the SHA’s executive committee resolved in 1954 that the SHA would convene only at hotels that treated blacks equally. But the
resolution was toothless; thus Franklin refused to attend the 1955 conference in Memphis. “Once again my participation would have demanded unique housing and eating arrangements, again would require creativity in getting to the conference and around the city, again would have meant overcoming or ignoring the passive to active resistance of conference attendees.” The issue remained contested for nearly another decade, though Franklin became the SHA’s first African American president in 1971 and the MVHA’s in 1974.

The Society of American Archivists’ leadership and membership overlapped considerably with the MVHA and SHA. Like the historical profession, the archival profession hardly distinguished itself on matters of race—unless by its silence. The SAA’s constitution did not proscribe women or blacks: “Individual membership shall be restricted to those who are or have been engaged in the custody or administration of archives or historical manuscripts or who, because of special experience or other qualifications, are recognized as competent in archival economy.” From its inception, the organization positioned itself as a “sounding board” for members, and it rejected no applicants during its first decade. But discussion of some issues remained shrouded in euphemism or even impermissible. No archivist-heroes emerged.

The archival profession rhetorically promoted access to and encouraged the use of archives. Carolinian A. R. Newsome, class of 1915 valedictorian and Phi Beta Kappa inductee as well as Carolina faculty member since 1923, served as the SAA's first president. Newsome insisted that archivists had "vital obligations" to users. “Archivists,” he exhorted, “must never cease to merit and cultivate public good will,” lest they seem “antiquarians hoarding their precious records, protecting them from exploitation, or even resenting their extensive use.” He prognosticated, “By increasing the availability and use of archives, the archivist extends and enriches his services to archives and the public . . . and contributes to the development of the archival profession as an indispensable publicly supported agent of American scholarship and culture.” But archival professionals did not always embrace Newsome’s message—much less the mission it embodied. Though he, too, framed archives as a “public trust,” Philip C. Brooks lamented in 1951, “In none of the fields of archival relations have our hopes been met.”

Christopher Crittenden, “a slender, nervous blond” Carolinian who served as state archivist for thirty-three years, characterized archivists as public servants. He declared: “we believe in using every trick in the bag, in not pulling our punches, in bringing out every weapon in the arsenal, in order to sell our state’s history to our people.” Without irony, William D. McCain professed: “we are ever mindful of the fact that State agencies in Mississippi are created to serve the people and that the salaries of public servants come from the pockets of the taxpayers.” Still another SAA president, Ernst Posner, encouraged archivists
to be “effective salesmen” and to combat stereotypes of themselves as “lapdogs that society could easily dispense with.”⁷⁴ Professional success depended upon service to users.⁷⁵ In denying or otherwise circumscribing service to African American scholars, archivists failed to live up to a foundational tenet of their profession.

Like related professional organizations, the Society of American Archivists held its annual meetings in segregated cities such as Washington, D.C. (1937, 1946, and 1956), Annapolis (1939 and 1951), Montgomery (1940), Richmond (1942), Raleigh (1948), Lexington (1952), Williamsburg (1954), and Nashville (1955). Organizational leaders dealt clumsily with racial issues. In his 1940 presidential address, Waldo G. Leland claimed, “no place in the United States

FIGURE 5. Robert Diggs Wimberley Connor (North Carolina Collection, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Library)
could be more appropriate for this Society to meet than Montgomery, where the trail [has] been blazed for future archivists.” Leland ministered to his audience: thirty-six of sixty-nine attendees hailed from southern states, and another seventeen traveled from Washington, D.C. The demographics of SAA factored into its silence about race, as did the nascent professionalization of archivists. Karl L. Trever charged *The American Archivist* with shoring up unity among SAA members, and Lester J. Cappon deemed the periodical both a “textbook” and a “barometer.” In this regard both men said more than they knew.

*The American Archivist* remained nearly silent on race. Historian, archivist, Carolinian, and UNC graduate, Robert Diggs Wimberley Connor was described as “a gentleman in every sense of the word,” a “remarkably humble and unpretentious man” showing a “genuine interest in his fellowman.” Connor served as the first North Carolina state archivist, as the first archivist of the United States (1934–1941), and as president of the Society of American Archivists (1941–1943).

In his 1942 presidential address in Richmond, Connor characterized archivists as “the custodians of the accumulated evidences of those traditions and ideals of democracy and freedom for which we fight and without which . . . no such peace can be established or maintained in the world.” Balancing his hortatory rhetoric, he made light of the challenges he faced in defining “archives” and in determining the responsibilities of an “archivist” when he arrived in Washington, D.C.:

> It was really quite embarrassing until help came like manna from heaven. At a cocktail party at my apartment, my Negro servant who had come to Washington with me from Chapel Hill, busily circulated among the guests distributing canapés of anchovies and hugely enjoying his first Washington party. One of the guests, who had also recently come from Chapel Hill, having a certain amount of cocktail safely stored under his shirt and another glassful in his hand, in a happy frame of mind and at peace with the world, approached the servant and reaching for an anchovy, said: “Henry, what are these things?” With a grin, Henry replied: “Deed, suh, I don’t eggsactly know, but I thinks dey’s archives.” That was one definition Washingtonians never failed to comprehend.

Perhaps Connor’s message was unsurprising. Apropos of the “Tragic Era” of Reconstruction, Connor argued, “The granting of political power to the [N]egro, without making provisions for training him in its proper exercise, lowered the whole tone of Southern politics, while the attempt to force the forms of democracy upon a people ignorant of its essence made the practice of democracy impossible. The white South believed itself justified in saving its civilization by any method, and Ku Kluxism followed in the wake of [N]egro suffrage.” Neither Connor’s scholarship nor his behavior hinted at a belief in racial equality.
Thomas D. Clark, another highly esteemed southern historian, earned his PhD at Duke University in 1931; subsequently he served as president of both the SHA (1947) and the MVHA (1956). Clark nearly accepted the position of director of the Southern Historical Collection in 1949. Addressing the Friends of the University of North Carolina Library in 1951, he recalled seeking manuscripts at a southern mansion:

[A] slickly shined black boy came out, dressed in a white coat drawn over work clothes, and asked me abruptly what I wanted. I told him I wished to see his mistress, and he replied, “Does you really want to see her?” When I said I really did, he took me around back of the house and up an outside set of stairs and into a bedroom where I found the good lady in a somewhat more than partial state of undress. This was the first day the boy in the housecoat had served as houseman and he was terribly ignorant of the subject of white folks’ social amenities.

Only a half-century later, in his memoir, My Century in History, did Clark reflect, “For me the passage of time and the court decisions that have erased so many of the old barriers, including the wrenching one of racial prejudice, have forced me to labor to clear my own soul in this area.” How many repented? More important, how many did not?

Jim Crow’s North Carolina

North Carolina furnished the Society of American Archivists with three of its first six presidents. The state embraced “a reputation for enlightenment and a social reality that was reactionary.” In matters of segregation, North Carolinians were far from innocent. The linchpin of interpersonal relationships, civility was “what white progressivism was . . . a way of dealing with people and problems that made good manners more important than substantial action.” Parents and community leaders ensured black and white children “grew up Jim Crow.”

Though praising the “spirit of mutual respect and confidence” governing race relations since 1900, R. D. W. Connor thought race “the most perplexing, the most difficult, the most all-absorbing problem . . . that any people ever had to deal with.” “The race question sets the South apart,” Connor continued, “it permeates every phase of Southern life; it is . . . the one thing in the South from which even the casual visitor cannot escape.” Only North Carolina (of the thirteen states that enforced segregation) mandated segregation in its state library. Inexplicably, Director Christopher Crittenden blithely insisted: “we have no rules to bind and perhaps to hamstring researchers”—or at least white ones. The North Carolina legal system potentially insulated archivists from confronting moral choices.
John Hope Franklin experienced the disjuncture between the state’s reputation and its reality. The first African American to visit the repository, he generated “a panic and an emergency among the administrators that was . . . an incident of historic proportions.” Crittenden converted an exhibition room to a reading room for Franklin’s use. Possessor of a “private office,” Franklin received keys to the stacks so that white pages would not be forced to serve him. Ironically, white researchers castigated such “discrimination” and demanded similar privileges. Separate but equal could cut both ways. The perverse logic of Jim Crow could convert tragedy into farce.

Recalling his three years as a doctoral student in the 1930s, C. Vann Woodward characterized Chapel Hill as an “intellectual crossroads of the South.” But Jim Crow besmirched the community, its university, and the university’s libraries. The university rejected its first black applicant—on a specious technicality—in 1933. Questions regarding the use of the University Libraries by African American scholars followed. In 1938, a Shaw University scholar sought to use research materials at UNC. Sociologist Howard W. Odum asked University Librarian and Professor of Library Science Robert Bingham Downs whether the library maintained a “regular plan” for dealing with “colored” students. A native of rural North Carolina and a University of North Carolina graduate (AB, 1926), Downs replied, “Our regular arrangement . . . is to give them stack permits and assign them carrels in the stacks.” Sequestered in the stacks, black scholars would not disturb whites. “There is usually some objection when such visitors are permitted to use the reading rooms,” warned Downs. He felt no need to elaborate who “such visitors” were.

Other library staff also faced delicate questions. Olan Victor Cook was born in rural North Carolina in 1905. After a stint at the Baptist-affiliated Mars Hill Junior College, Cook received his BA (1929) and BS (1932, Library Science) from Carolina. (He undertook graduate training in 1935 at the University of Chicago Graduate Library School.) Employed by the University Libraries upon his graduation, Cook worked first as an education librarian, then as a documents librarian, and finally as head of the Circulation Department. Promoted to assistant librarian in 1940, a post he occupied for nearly a decade and a half, Cook was then promoted to associate librarian for his “long and faithful service beyond the call of duty, his remarkable devotion to the University and its Library, and his superior performance.”

Cook’s service and devotion involved upholding segregation. Thus, in a 1941 letter, Cook reiterated Downs’s point obliquely. He noted to a colleague at Emory University, “All the collections, except those under seal, are available for serious research workers who come up with some sort of identification as to who they are and for what purpose they want to use the manuscripts.” Therefore, librarians-cum-archivists had considerable discretion in granting access.
A. F. Kuhlman, director of the Joint University Libraries in Nashville since 1936, also needed advice. He queried University of North Carolina director of libraries (appointed 1941) Charles E. Rush about serving black researchers. “Our practice and procedure are a bit difficult to state specifically and logically,” the Indiana-born Quaker Rush confessed, not admitting to his colleague that UNC had no written policy. “Each case is handled according to its own needs and merits,” Rush explained. On “warranted and infrequent occasions,” African American scholars were vouchsafed temporary stack permits, access to catalogs and indexes, and temporary use of carrels and seminar rooms. Better still, these (undocumented) procedures ensured that blacks would not occupy tables in the reading rooms. Nonetheless, nettlesome problems emerged. “Lack of sufficient lavatory facilities cause us some difficulty at times,” Rush admitted. Yet decorum triumphed: “One of the small, closed lavatories is used on occasions by Negro women.” No doubt Kuhlman was reassured. Civility superseded civil rights.

The university resisted integration more fervently than southern state institutions such as the University of Virginia and the University of Louisiana. In 1948, North Carolina College law students Harold Thomas Epps and Robert David Glass applied for admission to the University of North Carolina law school.
Declared qualified but for their race, Epps and Glass filed suit. The doctrine of separate but equal demanded the inequality between the two institutions’ law schools be redressed. Though Judge Johnson Hayes upheld the state’s case against Epps et al., the United States Court of Appeals overturned Hayes’s decision in the spring of 1951.101

Meanwhile, a special admissions committee of UNC trustees disingenuously recommended that applicants be considered irrespective of race, but only if the state’s black schools failed to offer the program in question. The full board adopted the proposal 61–15. North Carolina’s flagship university showed its tar heels once again.102 Nonetheless, five African Americans entered the university to pursue the LLB degree in the summer of 1951. Few Carolina administrators, archivists, or librarians were receptive. Gordon F. Gray proved a case in point.

Born in 1909, Gordon F. Gray grew up in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, scion of the R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company. Class valedictorian at the University of North Carolina (BA, 1930) and inducted into Phi Beta Kappa, Gray earned a law degree from Yale three years later. Though he dabbled for two years in law, he returned to the South and purchased two newspapers and a local radio station. The Episcopalian and Democrat Gray served three terms as a state senator (1939, 1941, and 1947).103

Refusing a commission, he enlisted as a private and advanced to captain during the Second World War. President Truman first appointed Gray assistant secretary of the army, then undersecretary, and finally, in 1949, secretary. Representing the army in its negotiations with the President’s Committee on Equality and Opportunity in the Armed Forces, Gray favored not only maintaining segregation, but also preserving the army’s recruitment quota of African Americans at 10 percent. Given his pedigree, his legal training, his administrative experience, and his anti-Communist and anti-integrationist racial views, Gray seemed an ideal choice for the presidency of the university. Assuming his duties in the spring of 1950, he soon wrote, “I am firmly committed to segregation” in public education.104

A “soft-spoken, shy, and serious man,” Gray was a “hard-working perfectionist” possessing “the dignity of a gentleman, the intelligence of a scholar, courage of a battle-tried soldier, enthusiasm of a young man, mature wisdom of an experienced administrator, sympathy, tolerance and simplicity of one who from conviction rather than expediency practices democracy in his daily life and the humility of a Christian.”105 He was “universally regarded as a model public servant.”106 Though Gray was “disarmingly quick to admit his limitations in the field of education,” the New York Times noted, “One may be sure he has already established a rapport with [the University’s] past, and that its future will be safe in his hands.”107
But Gray felt rather differently about his duties. He confided to John W. Hester, “This is a post which I did not seek or for which I did not think myself qualified and which I should be happy indeed to relinquish to someone else. Whether the Trustees made a mistake in electing me or I made a mistake in accepting, remains to be seen.” As his administration unspooled, Gray likely felt no small regret for taking on the office.

The furor surrounding desegregation at Carolina in the late 1940s and early 1950s affected each university library in the University of North Carolina
Consolidated System. Just as Chapel Hill sought to expand Wilson Library in the late 1940s, so too did North Carolina State College and the Woman’s College in Greensboro inaugurate library building projects. In 1951, the Southern Historical Collection, under the aegis of the University Library since 1930 and described as “a great national American project” by its founder, University of North Carolina historian J. D. de Roulhac Hamilton, came under scrutiny. Responsibility devolved to James Welch Patton, a Tennessee native and Vanderbilt University graduate who earned his PhD at Chapel Hill (1930) and subsequently taught at North Carolina State College between 1942 and 1948. A “loyal son of his native

FIGURE 8. James Welch Patton (North Carolina Collection, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Library)
region and of his adopted state,” he then returned to his alma mater to serve as director of the Southern Historical Collection.¹¹⁰

Future president of the Southern Historical Association (1956) and Fellow of the Society of American Archivists, Patton reported to Cook in 1951 that at most five black scholars had requested access to the SHC in the previous calendar year. “In every instance since I have been connected with the Southern Historical Collection,” Patton wrote, “the Negro users have been mature persons, mainly advanced graduate students at the State College in Durham or teaching in the various Negro colleges in North Carolina.” “Except for skin coloring,”

FIGURE 9. Robert B. House [North Carolina Collection, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Library]
they had “not differed in any respect from comparably situated white scholars.” Patton reminded Cook, “Our present policy is to make no distinction between the services rendered by the SHC to white scholars and to Negro scholars.”\footnote{111} Patton had no need to elaborate all the ways distinctions were made among black and white researchers, from campus restrooms and drinking fountains to eating establishments and quite possibly to reading room tables. In matters of racial language, less was more.

Cook next contacted Chancellor Robert B. House, another product of rural North Carolina. Valedictorian of the class of 1916 (Phi Beta Kappa), a Democrat, and a Methodist, House took his MA at Harvard in 1917 before enlisting in the American Expeditionary Force and rising to lieutenant of infantry. Archivist for North Carolina’s Historical Commission between 1919 and 1924, he next was executive secretary of the North Carolina Historical Commission, managing editor of the \textit{North Carolina Historical Review}, and executive secretary of the State Literary and Historical Association. House served as executive secretary of UNC between 1926 and 1934, as dean of administration between 1934 and 1945, and as chancellor between 1945 and his 1957 retirement.\footnote{112} A “man of robust mind and eloquent tongue,”\footnote{113} House maintained “an abnormal ability to remain calm and serene under the most irritating pressures.”\footnote{114} Segregation constituted one of those most irritating pressures.

House thought the African American freedom struggle showed a “great deal of sincere spiritual searching.”\footnote{115} On the other hand, he caviled, “There is no immediate answer to the Negro problem. If newspapers didn’t have to get up a story, there would be nothing sensational in the whole thing.”\footnote{116} So, House reassured an alumnus, “the natural good taste of white and black always seems to take care of the situation in the natural way.”\footnote{117} Daily life pivoted around common spatial and racial rituals, and House showed little eagerness to upend them.

Similarly pragmatic, Cook predicted, “With the addition of more natural and normal facilities for individual study and research in both the Main Library and the Law Library, continued use of the collections by qualified Negro patrons will not be as seemingly segregated as before, but should be perfectly satisfactory for all concerned.”\footnote{118} “Keep me informed about of problems [sic] in this field,” House ordered Cook, “and ask for ruling.”\footnote{119} Among the University of North Carolina’s three campuses, only Chapel Hill demanded this vigilance. Both House and Cook exploited civility; they foreswore civil rights.

Cook soon informed House that a graduate student at North Carolina College, James Peace, wanted to consult newspaper files on the development of North Carolina highways since 1930. House vouchsafed his blessing: only Carolina could provide the documents.\footnote{120} Lubricated by etiquette, the system again worked.
Weeks later, Cook passed on another request, this time from North Carolina College historian Helen G. Edmonds, who first visited the collection in 1944. Born in Lawrenceville, Virginia, in 1911, Edmonds earned her degrees from Morgan State College (BA, 1933) and The Ohio State University (MA, 1938; PhD, 1946). In 1940, she joined the faculty of North Carolina College. She remained there for thirty-six years, producing more than ten books and articles; she served as the first female African American graduate school dean in the United States. In the preface of her 1951 monograph, *The Negro and Fusion Politics in North Carolina, 1894–1901*, Edmonds wrote, “I am grateful for the cooperative and courteous services rendered me personally” by staff members at Duke University, North Carolina College for Negroes, the University of North

**FIGURE 10.** Helen G. Edmonds (James E. Shepard Memorial Library Archives, Records and History Center, North Carolina Central University)
Carolina at Chapel Hill, North Carolina State College, and even North Carolina’s State Library. Edmonds astutely used civility to her advantage.

Seeking a return to the Southern Historical Collection that spring, Edmonds conceded, “I could not have made it into the present published work had it not been for your library, and especially the Collection of Southern History.” House subsequently noted to Gray, “I think we can give [Edmonds] courteous non-controversial attention. But in line with our clearance policy I send this for your information and advice.” Gray jotted back, “Please handle as you see fit.” The diligent Cook no doubt did. The “clearance policy,” with its Cold War connotations, was not taken lightly.

Edmonds also wrote to House, emphasizing her southern origins and her educational and professional credentials. Edmonds placated the chancellor, “I do not wish to create or present a racial problem at the University of North Carolina in view of the present tension.” Shrewdly aligning her request with separate but equal, she professed “no desire or intention of matriculating at the University of North Carolina.” “It is only through scholarly production of research that I can be a better teacher in our graduate program here, and at the same time give to North Carolina College at Durham some of the recognition which other writers are giving to their Negro Colleges,” she explained.

House granted Edmonds access to the SHC—but she was denied the use of the restrooms. Described as “a kind, gentle lady” and as the “very soul of the Library,” Georgia Faison was a North Carolina native, Woman’s College graduate, and head of the Reference Department (appointed in 1931). She crisply informed Edmonds that restroom “arrangements” had been made in Morehead Planetarium. It is not a short walk.

* * *

The two other University of North Carolina campuses faced similar racial dilemmas. The Woman’s College in Greensboro both hired a new chancellor and completed Jackson Library in 1950. Born in 1911 in Chapel Hill, son of the university’s president and nicknamed “Sonny” by the students, Edward Kidder Graham Jr. earned his AB (1933) and AM (1934) degrees at the university before completing a PhD in medieval history at Cornell University. He served as the assistant to Cornell’s president between 1937 and 1940 and then as the secretary to the university between 1940 and 1947. He moved on to Washington University, becoming dean of faculty. In 1950, with Gordon Gray backing Graham’s candidacy, the trustees voted unanimously to install Graham as Woman’s College chancellor. The Greensboro Record called the choice “happy and wise”; one Woman’s
College trustee affirmed, “I believe he’s the one man who can please 25,000 women.”

Like Gray a Democrat and an Episcopalian, Graham clarified his feelings on race in April 1951. Graham characterized race and education as “the most delicate [issue] in our State today.” He applauded Carolinians’ “good conscience”: “we have carried forward our program of public education with a commitment to the principle that facilities for the education of whites and Negroes shall be separate and equal”—a policy with which Graham fervently agreed. “Making North Carolina and the South the best place for our people to live,” Graham concluded, “cannot be accomplished by grimness, by aggressive and uncritical presupposition of right, by weeping over what has not yet been done, by pointing the finger of blame, or by any amount of breast-beating under the Confederate or Northern banner.”

That same spring, Graham demanded a policy statement from University Librarian Charles Adams. Born in 1907 in North Dakota, Adams recalled, “I grew up with no blacks, so I could say there’s no prejudice in my background.” Educated in the North at Amherst College (BA) and Columbia University (BS and MA, Library Science), Adams was reference assistant at the New York Public Library (1934–1937) and assistant to the director of libraries at Columbia (1937–1945) before his Woman’s College appointment.

Adams’s relationship with Graham remained tense. Graham, Adams remembered, “Accused me of . . . accused me of everything. Only one thing was true that I admitted a black to walk in the front door—I had done this without his permission.” Adams elaborated: “I felt I didn’t need this. And I said, ‘None of the other things I would have checked him on.’ To permission to walk a black from A&T College, or the library science, I could admit. I felt this was in my prerogative as the librarian.” Adams was “very involved” in the integration of the Woman’s College. To a party in the Reference Room celebrating the dedication
of Jackson Library in 1950, “we invited . . . the blacks there also . . . we had to have a party . . . so they could—that a black could come.” Adams’s actions drew criticism from Woman’s College faculty members and at least one trustee.

In his missive to Adams, Graham eschewed responsibility; he was “unwilling to make a specific statement on what should or should not be done.” “In reply to your comment that segregation would be ‘embarrassing’ to effect,” Graham remonstrated, “I told you that if the use of reading tables was involved, it might be necessary to direct Negro visitors to specific tables set aside for
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Graham further rebuked Adams, “The immediate issue is not to determine the relative merits of separate or joint use of our facilities by Negroes and whites,” but “to get a determination as to whether or not what we are doing is acceptable under Trustee policy as interpreted by the President of the University and, if it must be changed, in what respect it must be changed.”

Aware of his predicament, Graham noted to Gray, “A policy question that could have been settled without recrimination when we moved into the Library several months ago could very easily become a burning issue now.” Graham elaborated: “Because a practice has already been established, if we change it we shall be in the position of reversing ourselves for reasons which some quarters will be at pains to ascribe to racial prejudice. If we do not change it, we shall conceivably be in the position of running counter to University policy and the desires of the Trustees and the people of the State.”

The Woman’s College library adhered to an unwritten policy. It had not been revised in three years, for “no problems have arisen since the procedures were last agreed upon.” Adams clarified. “The use by Negroes has never been large,” Adams noted. “We have kept no statistics but since we moved into the new building there appears to me to have been some increase.”

Only six or seven users visited the library each week. Blacks could borrow books and use interlibrary loan services, the public catalog, and reference services. On the other hand, the Woman’s College withheld stack privileges and proscribed use of both the General Reading Rooms and the Reserve Reading Room. Space and race were inextricable.

The board of trustees discussed African American use of the consolidated UNC libraries in the early 1950s. In March of 1952, Gray demanded a “definitive” updated policy statement from Adams. The library’s holdings had been “available with certain restrictions to Negroes for a great many years,” Adams noted. Three African Americans used or borrowed books in September 1951, four in October, none in November, and two in December. The library served five African Americans in January 1952, three in February, and four in March. Adams wrote, “We have preferred not to have faculty or students work in the Stacks nor in the Reserve or General Readings rooms on the second floor.”

The most frequent visitors, librarians from Bennett College and Agricultural and Technical College (A&T) seemed “very professionally minded.”

These scholars acted with “complete decorum.” They viewed the use of the library as “a privilege which they have only asked for . . . when the materials needed were not available in their own libraries.” Once more Adams reassured Graham, “With the good background of cooperation and understanding which has been established, I foresee no growing problems in the use of the Library by Negroes.” Better still, A&T continued its construction on a new library. This would lead, Adams predicted, to less use of the Woman’s College library by
African Americans. In turn, Graham informed Gray, “No controversy or special problem [has] been presented by Negro borrowers.” He further affirmed, “There has been no disposition on the part of Negro users to request use of facilities on the campus not open to them through State law or through policies and procedures observed in accordance with the established customs of the state and region.”

Like Chapel Hill and the Woman’s College in Greensboro, North Carolina State College upheld but mitigated segregation. The university allowed visitors to use library resources in the building, but blacks could not remove books from the library. Similar to Greensboro and Chapel Hill, “very few” African Americans used the library each month—Librarian Harlan C. Brown estimated five or six—and most were staff or students from nearby Shaw University. Like observers at its sister campuses, North Carolina State University staff characterized black users as “discrete, very well mannered, and more than cooperative about rules and regulations.” Longtime chancellor Colonel John William Harrelson told William C. Friday, Gray’s assistant, that requests from African Americans were “next to negligible” and that staff had experienced not “one moment’s trouble with any colored person.”

In Chapel Hill, Charles Rush and James Patton monitored African American use. A memorandum for “information and file” as well as “appropriate action” from Rush to both Patton and House revisited current policy. The chancellor approved each request (approximately one per week), then staff provided “courteous, non-controversial attention to the particular needs of each case.” Policy hewed to a familiar pattern: African Americans, Rush reported, “are granted use when desired of the catalogue and indexes, are given temporary stack permits if need is proved, [and] are assigned temporarily to a special carrel or small study room if continued study is essential.” As in other North Carolina archives, these scholars proved “cooperative in following advice relative to limited facilities.”

The executive committee of the board of trustees reconvened in the spring of 1952. After President Gray’s briefing, Laura Weil Cone spoke up. A “civic leader and humanitarian,” “one of the chief builders of the Consolidated University of North Carolina,” Cone devoted twenty-two years to the UNC board of trustees and nearly thirty to the Bennett College board of trustees. Despite her philanthropic activities, however, she moved, “the Executive Committee is satisfied that the use of the libraries by Negroes is properly restricted and conducted at the three institutions.” Her motion was seconded; it carried.

Two weeks later, Gray retrenched. Abashed, he wrote to Governor W. Kerr Scott, “It was clear after very considerable discussion that the resolution would not use the word ‘Negroes,’ but would refer to use of the libraries by other than faculty, staff, and students. It was also clear that the word ‘restricted’ would not
Gray had not served as a lawyer and as secretary of the army without learning a lesson or two about bureaucratic language. Fellow trustee Edwin Pate, a “great citizen” but also a “mild and unassuming man” who remained “actively interested in everything which affects the progress and general welfare of State College,” stressed, “I do think it is important that the minutes show clearly the intent of the Committee, which was to eliminate the words ‘Negroes’ and ‘restricted.’” A Carolina graduate (BS, 1930; JD, 1933), the board’s secretary, Arch T. Allen, suggested anodyne wording for the record: “After full investigation, the Executive Committee is satisfied that the use of the libraries by persons other than faculty, staff and students is properly regulated at the three institutions.” Gray added a final touch, explaining to Allen, “I suggested to Miss Curtis that we change the word ‘regulated’ to ‘conducted’. . . . Otherwise, the language seems fine.” And there, at last, the matter rested: literally whitewashed and impeccably civil.

In the summer of 1952, Frenise A. Logan requested access to the Southern Historical Collection and the North Carolina Collection. Born in 1920, Logan was graduated from Fisk University (BA, 1933) and Case Western Reserve (MA, 1946; PhD, 1953). An instructor at Bennett College since 1948, Logan knew the protocol. He assured Olan Cook, “In the past two months I have been accorded every courtesy and assistance by the staff members of the above two Collections, and I trust that you will grant my request for the continued full use of these excellent facilities.” But Logan wanted to use materials that could not be removed from the repository. Cook devised a solution; he suggested to House, “we can arrange for Logan to use an individual study or a carrel off the beaten track yet so located as not to cause trouble for staff or other patrons.” House presumably approved. No record remains.

The documentary trail peters out. What more history can we write? The archives leaves us with terrible and maddening and ghostly silence. Clio suffocates.

Jim Crow’s Shade

When might civil rights have trumped civility in the archives? With *Brown v. Board of Education* Gordon Gray hoped not, writing, “I hope that the Supreme Court does not outlaw segregation in the public schools or at the undergraduate level in universities.” He tendered his resignation from Carolina in June of 1955; the trustees instead gave Gray a leave of absence. In November, however, the board accepted his resignation. Gray wriggled out of academia with an appointment as assistant secretary of defense for security affairs under Dwight Eisenhower.
In a 1955 speech, Edward Kidder Graham argued that Brown had been “long foreshadowed” and “should have surprised no one.” “What the Court has stated,” Graham explained, “is that segregation under the law is at an end, get started, and show that you mean business. Whether or not this is palatable is beside the point: the important thing is that it happened.” He assured his audience, “the present leadership of the State, both in the administrative and the legislative branches of our government, have given eloquent testimony that they believe that separate and equal education is in the best interest of all of our races. They have done everything within their power, consistent with law and with conscience, to protect this principle which the State has followed throughout its history.” At least Graham stopped short of advocating that officials shutter the public schools; in that case, he noted, “All we should have to worry about is the state of our own soul.”

On the other hand, John Hope Franklin recalled, “the reaction against the decision [Brown] was so fierce that the Court sought to rein in the notion of rapid desegregation by requiring compliance ‘with all deliberate speed’ [Brown II].” “The word ‘deliberate,’” however, “permitted a great many to do little or nothing at all.”

C. Vann Woodward, too, called such “speed” “so deliberate as to appear glacial or illusory.” Speaking in similar language but from a quite different perspective, Edward Kidder Graham noted, “What constitutes ‘deliberate speed’ in Plymouth, Massachusetts may be rash and precipitate haste in Plymouth, North Carolina. Similarly, the dimension of the problem within North Carolina is going to vary with the density of the Negro population.”

Soon to be elected president of the North Carolina Library Association, Olan Cook embarked upon a rearguard action in 1955. Governor Luther Hodges thanked him, “I appreciate your expression of confidence, and I will be grateful for anything that can be done to help make successful this program of voluntary separate school attendance.”

Perhaps a year later, in 1956, when Carolina faced what the New York Times Magazine called “another trial of integration”? Perhaps not; administrators were “obeying the letter of the law, but not . . . offend[ing] political opinion by observing its spirit.” Segregated in their living quarters—a “special” section of one of the dorms—blacks were relegated to a “special” section for the opening football game. But unofficial segregation reigned. Neither fraternities nor campus social clubs admitted black students. Chapel Hill restaurants, movie theaters, and the Carolina Inn remained off-limits.

After the sit-ins at the Greensboro Woolworth’s in 1960? After the series of public library sit-ins in the South in 1960 and 1961? Another UNC alumnus, House’s successor as chancellor Edward Brantley Aycock noted in 1961, “There are no special rules and regulations setup by the University for Negro students.” In 1963, when Aycock wrote to an alumnus, “The University has
no policy against integration” or when Governor Terry Sanford proclaimed, “Our adversities and mistakes of bygone days help us chart our course for the future”? After the Civil Rights Act of 1964? After the Voting Rights Act of 1965? Once African American history had “come into its own” in the 1970s?

Where are the records? What is missing? What was never collected? What policies were followed? What resources, if any, were earmarked for records management?

Records must exist to ensure accountability. They must be complete, authentic, reliable, accessible, and usable. A record’s meaning emerges from “a combination of its content, structure and context, from its relationship with the other items as part of a larger body of unified records, created or received by the same creator over time and understood in the context of the whole, not as a discrete and isolated part.” The loss of a record vitiates the larger context of the records collection.

North Carolina enacted its first Public Records Law in 1935. The state deemed public records the “chief monuments” of North Carolina’s history, “invaluable for the effective administration of government, for the conduct of public and private business, and for the writing of family, local and state history.” Even then, however, the law admitted to “untold losses.” These losses no doubt continued.

Initially, the University of North Carolina deposited its records at the Southern Historical Collection. But by the end of the 1950s, these records’ bulk compelled their sequestration from the SHC’s private papers. In 1973, the university at last established the position of university archivist (though only in 1978 did the university recognize the University Archives as the official repository for university records). That year, the North Carolina Archives and History Act named the Department of Cultural Resources the official archival agency for the state and invested it with the authority to conduct a records management program for the benefit of all state agencies. No public records could be destroyed without its imprimatur. Even so, university records management efforts remained tentative. Records scheduling debuted only in 1985; the university established a formal records management program six years later. In 2002, the University Archives assumed control of the records management program, succeeding the Provost’s Office.

University Archives constitutes “the official repository for the historically valuable, unpublished records of both the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the major administrative offices of the UNC System headquartered in Chapel Hill.” Its mission is “to collect, preserve, and make accessible the records generated by all segments of the campus community,” including executive correspondence and committees’ agendas, minutes, reports, and correspondence. Records Management Services seeks “To provide guidance to
UNC campus offices and departments in organizing current records, disposing of unnecessary records, and transferring records of historical or legal significance to University Archives. . . . To identify records of permanent value that document the university’s history or serve as evidence of its activities; [and] To ensure university compliance with state and federal regulations governing public records.” Unfortunately, their resources remain incommensurate with their responsibilities.

Chapter 132 of the North Carolina General Statutes holds: “The public records and public information compiled by the agencies of North Carolina government or its subdivisions are the property of the people . . . the people may obtain copies of their public records and public information free or at minimal cost unless otherwise specifically prohibited by law.” Perhaps future researchers will not confront gaps in the record. Perhaps a more diverse range of voices may be heard. Perhaps a greater variety of sources will survive. Perhaps accountability can be assured. Archivists’ daily work should represent an unwavering commitment to social justice.

Race and ethnicity is a “somewhat uncomfortable” topic addressed “sometimes effectively and sometimes not so effectively” by the Society of American Archivists. SAA’s diversity committee coalesced in 1970. Over the next decade, moreover, special subject repositories came “very much in vogue.” The SAA’s Task Force on Diversity noted, “We view the achievement of diversity not only as a making right of past wrongs but also as a means to improve our capacity to pursue our missions, including our roles in facilitating the widespread use of the historical record and encouraging its preservation.” Elizabeth W. Adkins characterized diversity as a “front-and-center priority.”

Archivists must promote accountability, open government, diversity, and social justice. Archivists must embrace their “archival being” as they engage in “responsible and accountable” archival activism. We cannot abstain from moral judgment—and from moral action. Nor should we be able to, as the history of Jim Crow archives reminds us.
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