Journal for the Society of North Carolina Archivists

D252:-BEAUTIFUL SAND DUNES ALONG THE SOUTHERN COAST.

46811

Journal for the Society of North Carolina Archivists

Volume 16

TABLE OF CONTENTS

About the Cover

Postcard looking across the sand dunes out onto the water on the southern coast of North Carolina, with a boat in the distance, early 20th century. Eastern North Carolina Postcard Collection, J. Y. Joyner Library, East Carolina University.

Understanding the Archivist's Role in the Contextualization, Removal, and Relocation of Confederate Monuments at Cultural Heritage Institutions
by Caitlin Rivas Sullivan

1. INTRODUCTION

Should they stay, or should they go? This is a question hundreds of cities across the South are wrestling with as the legitimacy of their Confederate monuments is called into question. The national debate has garnered a wide spectrum of solutions: Relocate to a cemetery; remain, but with added context; rid of entirely; replace with a monument of something else. Many of these monuments are on the grounds of universities, public buildings, and other cultural heritage sites where hundreds of people walk under their shadow on a daily basis. In many instances, archivists are the silent stakeholders in these conversations: Though they have immediate access to and knowledge of the records, correspondence, and primary source documents that shed light on a monument's origins, archivists have not been considered primary consultants when it comes to making administrative decisions on the future of these controversial objects.

The purpose of this research study was to interview archivists at cultural heritage institutions where Confederate monuments or memorials have been removed or relocated and learn how archivists were involved in the process, as

well as their thoughts on what they believe their role may be as information professionals in the conversations around removal or relocation. The United Nations General Assembly has defined a cultural heritage institution as one that expresses and protects the tangible and intangible forms of human culture, and includes libraries, archives, museums, historic sites, religious institutions, and exhibition spaces, among many others.[1]

There has been little post-mortem research done on removed or relocated monuments – including how the decision was made to remove them, who was involved in making that decision, and the after-effects of the removal – let alone on those who become their new caretakers. This study is intended to bring archivists to the forefront of the national conversation on Confederate monument relocation and contextualization.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. *Historical context: Confederate monuments and the "Lost Cause"*

There has been substantial research on the "Lost Cause" over the last half-century in the scholarly community from historians, anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists. For the purposes of this research paper, a brief explanation of the Lost Cause is offered in the context of Confederate monuments.

The majority of Confederate monuments that exist today were installed across southern states in a widely cited ideological movement called the Lost Cause that sought to reframe the Confederate effort and subsequent defeat as valorous and noble.[2] For decades after the Confederacy surrendered to the Union in 1865, southern cities, townships, and counties erected monuments in public spaces to recognize and praise the Confederacy and those who had fought under the "Stars and Bars." In his succinct but well-researched history on the Lost Cause, Ian A. Isherwood states the ideologies of the Lost Cause shifted the focus from the Confederacy's defense of slavery and institutionalized social oppression to those of states' rights, protecting the U.S. Constitution, and the long-lost chivalric past. Nostalgia

played an important role in constructing the memory of the Old South, of which the idyllic southern plantation and its social harmony between plantation owners and slaves were the epicenter.[3] Furthermore, the Lost Cause myth assuaged and justified the bitter defeat Confederates suffered at the hands of their former countrymen: the loss could be chalked up to poor
equipment and "material hardship," despite the southern armies being "made up of better men than their Yankee counterparts" and not given a fair fight from the outset.[4]

It is no surprise, therefore, that Confederate monuments raised during this time period reflect the ideologies of the Lost Cause. In his analysis of over two hundred courthouse and cemetery Confederate memorials in Virginia and elsewhere, Timothy Sedore observes a common thread of "elegiac rhetoric" woven through the narrative of these structures: "an uplifted, idealized individual, often embodied in a prototypical sculpted figure standing at parade rest atop a pedestal" is the typical form for these memorials.[5] This form was widely adopted throughout the South, as evidenced by its proliferation in courthouses and parks across the southern states: As of February of 2019, the Southern Poverty Law Center had identified 1,747 Confederate symbols that remain, of which 780 are monuments.[6] Southern women in particular accelerated their activism as they established organizations specifically dedicated to fundraising and erecting Confederate monuments. In North Carolina, local Ladies Memorial Associations formed following the Civil War, and along with the United Daughters of the Confederacy they "claimed public space to erect their stone sentinels, they used the monuments and the dedication ceremonies to perpetuate the myth of the Lost Cause, attempt[ed] to impose order on an increasingly changing society, and honor[ed] their fallen heroes as paragons of civic virtue and true defenders of the Constitution."[7] The effort was swift, systematic, and widespread, with white, wealthy men and women driving it forward. Until recently, the majority of these monuments have remained where they were originally erected. At the publishing of this paper, however, the Southern Poverty Law Center reported that 114 Confederate symbols had been removed since the 2015 Charleston attack.[8]

2.2.   *Monuments and their constructed meaning*

While often used interchangeably in casual reference, there are subtle distinctions between monuments and memorials. The word "monument" is derived from the Latin verb *moneo*, which means to bring notice of, or to remind. "Memorial," derived of the Latin *memoria*, means to be mindful or remembering.[9] In their implicit act of commemoration, monuments advise, emphasize, prompt, warn, cue, and revive; memorials evoke, reminisce, recall, treasure, and relive. Monuments often serve as tributes to revered individuals, historic events, or widespread ideologies: they are triumphant, exultant, proud. By contrast, memorials honor the memory of someone or something, are introspective, and create a space for recollection.[10] A memorial can be a monument, but it need not be. In addition to form, space plays an essential role in defining a monument or memorial's meaning. Sabine Marschall argues that what makes memorials "arguably more powerful than other transitional objects is the combination of the object with the significance of the site. The memorial is a lasting marker of the site and it endows that site with added import."[11]

This paper deals specifically with monuments and memorials that represent, commemorate, or are related to some aspect of the Confederate States of America and its role in the American Civil War. In his paper "Archives, War and Memory: Building a Framework," Richard Cox suggests the practice of installing war monuments and memorials in postwar society is not only common, but also a basic and necessary way to negotiate residual trauma and dignify undignified loss.[12] Additionally, Russell Rodrigo claims that, in its response to death, "memorialisation serves two key needs, to maintain the memory of the deceased and at the same time to assist in accepting the reality of death and loss."[13] However, a memorial need not, and does not, remain a solemn site for mourners: Rodrigo cites cultural heritage scholar Mike Rowlands' idea that a memorial becomes a monument when "firstly the memorial acknowledges the death as a sacrificial act, secondly that the acceptance of death takes place in a context where loss is transformed into something positive such as devotion or passion, and thirdly that the dead are deified and become embodied in the idea of

the collective."[14] In other words, once the mourning process is complete the memorial transitions into a symbolic marker of the trauma. It assumes a new identity as a tribute to the memorial's subjects rather than a representation of the loss itself.

Despite their subtle differences, both monuments and memorials play a vital role in memory construction through representation of certain elements of war, and their omission of others. Cox looks to wartime journalist Chris Hedges' work on wartime psychology and memory: "War dominates culture, distorts memory, corrupts language, and infects everything around it…Even with its destruction and carnage it can give us what we long for in life…It can give us purpose, meaning…war fills our spiritual void."[15] It is with these complex emotions that war monuments are constructed, often with a simplified, streamlined, or biased artistic interpretation. In his critical analysis of Tel Aviv's Holocaust Monument, Maoz Azaryahu cites aesthetic decisions, artistic styles, and design strategies as invisible, mediating forces on a monument's meaning: "Though intended by their sponsors to embody and reify certain ideological messages, social values, and cultural norms, their meaning is constantly negotiated by individuals and society."[16] All monuments are selective representations of reality. For Sedore, "no memorial is truly objective; all are subject to artistic interpretation or symbolism that is often inflammatory, inappropriate, or inaccurate."[17] Therefore, monuments that commemorate some aspect of war – whether of an individual's effort or a national movement – abridge the representation of that thing, and in doing so construct our public memory of that moment in history.

Interestingly – and perhaps controversially – Rodrigo also posits that monuments actually *relieve* society members of memory work: "Once material form is assigned to memory, the need to remember is no longer required."[18] This argument is one we've heard before: it rings familiar with Plato's *Phaedrus,* in which the voice of Socrates says writing will "create forgetfulness in the learners' souls, because they will not use their memories; they will trust to the external written characters and not remember of themselves."[19] Like Plato, Rodrigo assigns the act of remembrance to material form. The Confederate monument is an exhalation of tragedy once inhaled, then expelled, to

make room for new memory. Once exhaled, it dissipates into the surrounding air, and, having rid the body of toxins, loses its function. If this is true, then monuments don't actually serve our *continued* memory: they've already defined the narrative, and now simply serve as cold reminders of that narrative. Their utility to us has changed, and the fact of the event is all that survives: it occurred.

2.3. *Understanding the national debate over Confederate monuments*

There is, of course, extensive and passionate debate nationwide about the fate of Confederate monuments. The 2015 killing of nine African Americans at the Emmanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina by a self-identified white supremacist catalyzed national conversation about these monuments and memorials, with some calling for their complete and swift removal while others claimed doing so would advance a revisionist agenda and expunge southern heritage from public memory.[20] The debate accelerated in August of 2017, when a violent Unite the Right rally in Charlottesville, Virginia targeted plans to remove a Robert E. Lee statue from a public park and left one counter-protestor dead and 30 others injured. Indeed, there does not appear to be a consensus among historians and scholars on a course of action. Ryan Andrew Newson argues "It is dangerous because to remove (certain) monuments in (certain) contexts may do little more than assuage white guilt, perpetuate a moral blindness whereby white people are less and less able to see the way current structural ills are continuations of sins of the past."[21] Is the call to purge public spaces of their Confederate watchdogs an attempt, whether subconscious or otherwise, to eradicate white guilt from the public eye? New Orleans Mayor Landrieu argued the opposite in his address on the city's removal of four Confederate monuments in 2017:

> "Another friend asked me to consider these four monuments from the perspective of an African American mother or father trying to explain to their fifth grade daughter who Robert E. Lee is and why he stands atop of our beautiful city. Can you do it?

Can you look into that young girl's eyes and convince her that Robert E. Lee is there to encourage her? Do you think she will feel inspired and hopeful by that story? Do these monuments help her see a future with limitless potential? Have you ever thought that if her potential is limited, yours and mine are too? We all know the answer to these very simple questions."[22]

Mayor Landrieu's passionate, emotional speech argues that the city's Confederate statues celebrate, rather than document, New Orleans' history as the largest slave port in the country. Though "History cannot be changed" and "what's done is done," Landrieu proclaims, "To literally put the confederacy on a pedestal in our most prominent places of honor is an inaccurate recitation of our full past, it is an affront to our present, and it is a bad prescription for our future."[23]

But while New Orleans was able to swiftly remove Confederate statues in the dead of night, some states face legal obstacles to removal. Following activist cries to act on North Carolina Confederate markers, the North Carolina General Assembly passed the Historic Artifact Management and Patriotism Act (also referred to as a Heritage Protection Act or HPA) in 2015, which prohibits the removal, relocation, or alteration of any monument located on public property unless temporarily removed for maintenance or restoration.[24] Other states with HPAs are Virginia, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, and South Carolina.[25] Each of these statewide Acts – all passed in the last five years – offer varying degrees of flexibility. The Tennessee Heritage Protection Act allows only historic organizations to petition the Tennessee Historical Commission to relocate a memorial with consent of the public entity that owns or oversees the memorial – individuals may not petition.[26] In Virginia – the state with the most Confederate symbols at 223, according to the Richmond-Times Dispatch[27] – there appears to be no course of action for petitioning or contesting the existence of a monument, though there have been state-level court cases contesting this law.[28] The Alabama Memorial Preservation Act of 2017 also prohibits movement or alteration of any kind, and enacts a hefty $25,000 fine on any entity that "has

relocated, removed, altered, renamed, or otherwise disturbed an architecturally significant building, memorial building, memorial street, or monument…without first obtaining a waiver from the committee."[29] At this paper's publication date, there was no evidence of amendment to HPAs in the abovementioned state legislatures.

Another position that has circulated scholarly debates is that Confederate statues can remain in public spaces with accurate, thorough contextualization. Following the North Carolina Heritage Protection Act in 2015, the North Carolina Law Review called for a provision where, at a minimum, plaques or other contextualizing materials could be added to monuments to present a more holistic, inclusive history.[30] Newson says that "thick description" of and at monuments – including when, why, and by whom they were erected – is an untapped opportunity to reshape public memory. He argues that in a society that often avoids addressing the structural power of whiteness, "such monuments may serve as physical locations where people can point to race's ongoing power, be reminded that black lives have *not* mattered in the construction of society, and even serve as locations where people can gather antiracist energy in a shared public space."[31] However, many scholars disagree with Newson's position. Marschall takes direct aim at this idea in her comprehensive research on apartheid monuments in South Africa, where she argues the presence of such statues validates unsaid political statements:

> "Not only do such arguments legitimate the preservation of existing monuments but, what is more, they encourage the conscious and persistent conjuring up of the past. The memory of oppression presumably triggered by such symbolic objects constitutes an important aspect of nation-building and validates the present socio-political order, especially as such memories are inextricably intertwined with those of resistance. The symbolic representations of the past are thus appropriated for the purposes of the new order."[32]

In other words, Marschall argues we cannot appropriate these monuments – all of which were erected with starkly different intentions – for the purposes of education and reform. Isherwood suggests it's far too late for reform – the

damage has already been incurred as evidenced by the epitaphs of and dedication speeches for many of the Confederate monuments. National heritage sites such as Gettysburg, he argues, remain sites of active learning for visitors, and thus the Confederate monuments and their epitaphs "carry weight beyond the stuff of stone and bronze in which they are written."[33] Their presence alone indemnifies the Lost Cause beyond any amount of thick description, no matter how well-meaning, accurate, or thorough.

Though there are many differing perspectives on the Confederate monument question, there appears to be some consensus that they are becoming exceedingly problematic: The majority of monuments still occupy their original site, piercing public spaces with Confederate iconography and needling a mythologic memory into the veins of American history. It seems as though most scholars agree the selected form of the individual soldier immortalized in bronze, unapologetically irreverent and perpetuating a duplicitous "official" position of history presents a prideful, unrepentant retaliation against the humiliation of defeat and the moral wrongs of slavery, and is deserving of our continued analysis and introspection.

2.4.   *The archive as a backdrop for contested monuments*

So, what do archives have to do with Confederate monuments and memorials? Several scholars argue that archives are an extension of monuments, and one cannot exist without the other. Monuments and memorials are not solitary creations. They generate a great deal of planning documents, correspondence, paperwork, and discussion. Historians who study controversial monuments and memorials often turn to archives for the transcripts of dedication speeches, architectural drawings, and planning records to better understand how and why a particular monument was created. Like a monument, the archive is a place for saving and shaping memory, and "play[s] a critical role in assisting communities and cultures to create an imagined past."[34] Cox argues that monuments themselves are an extension of an archive. "In the ancient world, stone monuments and their inscriptions were extensions of the

official archives," with the Vietnam War Memorial in Washington, D.C. – whose names of the deceased "read like an epic Greek poem," and became a repository of its own for families to leave personal documents and mementos – as a modern example of this principle in practice.[35] Jeannette A. Bastian also draws a close connection between archives and monuments, in that monuments borrow data from the archive and thus serve as its public counterpart.[36]

As repositories for the historical record, archives are important sources of documentation, but are often underutilized in supporting public discourse. In many ways, the archive is the authority – for better or for worse – on the written record and determines what is remembered, and what is forgotten. In her article "Truth and Reconciliation: Archivists as Reparations Activists," Anna Robinson-Sweet campaigns for more archivist activism and positions archives as a logical, even necessary space for race reparations in the United States. One might argue that the relocation of Confederate monuments from public spaces is in itself a form of reparations –to black Americans most specifically, but also to the public, whose official historic narrative has been whittled by whiteness for 400 years. The archives, therefore, are a natural location for the reshaping of memory because the evidence is right there: "In archives, there are countless whispers, even shouts, of racial injustice. These materials tell us of the victims and the perpetrators, and allow us to chart the system of violence that continues to permeate our society. Elevating these voices and stories is one way we can move toward a more just archives, an archives that fights for reparations."[37] In other words, the archives is a forgotten treasure chest, brimming with evidence that can enrich our interpretation of Confederate monuments. While no archive may be a truly objective representation of history – bias is inherent in all archival functions, from appraisal to description to deaccessioning, and has overwhelming documented the history of the white man's experience – it provides us the source material upon which we can build a clearer understanding of our past and identify collection weaknesses to better inform our future.

Furthermore, public archives provide access to state records which are critical in tracing the reasons for why and how certain decisions were made. State legislators' papers are often overlooked as evidentiary resources for

understanding history. Brian Keogh and Elizabeth A. Novara look to these as primary sources of information in which the changing landscape of constituencies and issues raised by them are laid bare. These papers could serve as an appropriate backdrop for monuments wrapped in controversy where legal heritage can be better traced.[38] If monuments are to be re-contextualized, it must be with utmost transparency and commitment to inclusivity. The archive is perhaps the only space where memory can (or should) be rewritten.

3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

a. How have archivists been involved in the monument removal or relocation process at their institution, if at all?

b. What challenges did archivists face during the monument removal or relocation process?

c. Do archivists feel that archives are appropriate locations for Confederate monuments?

d. Do archivists at cultural heritage sites feel they or their collections have a role to play in the monument removal process?

4. METHODS

4.1. Design and knowledge gap

This is an exploratory qualitative research study. The study employed semi-structured interviews with five archivists at cultural heritage institutions in the United States at which Confederate monuments have been removed or relocated. Interviews were chosen as the primary method for investigation because they fit the study's exploratory research goals.[39] Semi-structured, open question interviews are generally considered an avenue into specialized knowledge not easily accessed by other means, and can help uncover belief systems within an industry.[40]

The knowledge gap addressed by this study is the scarce research on the relationship between professional archivists and Confederate monuments, as well as archivists' involvement in the monument removal and relocation process. Because of this, the researcher determined interviews would open the door for future researchers to expand upon the study's findings.

4.2.   *Data collection and permissions*

The interviews were performed on a one-on-one basis and lasted approximately forty-five minutes. Four of the five interviews were conducted over the phone and one was conducted on-site at the archivist's workplace.

The interview questions were crafted in such a way that follow-up and tangential questions could be asked if needed. The researcher designed the interview questions so that the conversation would be structured, but interviewees would be encouraged to speak openly and honestly about their opinions. Each interviewee was asked the following questions:

1. Tell me a little about what you do here at [Institution].

2. Can you elaborate on why [X Confederate monument] was removed/relocated? Who were the key players in making that decision, and were you involved in any way?

3. Where at [Institution] is the monument now located? Is this its permanent location for the foreseeable future?

4. How have the archival collections at [Institution] been utilized (if at all) to contextualize the monument during the process – whether before it was removed, during the removal process, or after it was taken down?

5. What have been the biggest challenges you've faced, if any, since [X Confederate monument] was moved to your institution?

6. Can you discuss your thoughts on whether or not archivists have a role to play in discussions on removal and relocation of Confederate monuments?

The nature of the study was intended to serve other professionals confronting Confederate monuments at cultural heritage institutions. Interviews had two purposes: To understand archivists' experiences broadly, including their thoughts on archivists' roles in and/or around Confederate monument removal and to provide the field of archival science with a more specific "post-mortem" or "case study" approach to understanding how archivists have been involved in the monument removal process. There has been little published on the experiences of archivists at institutions where Confederate monuments were removed and so the researcher hoped this study would address that gap. Participant responses were considered anonymous unless they provided written permission to allow their name, job title, and institution name to be identified in the results. All five participants agreed to release this information and provided written consent. The researcher did not use direct quotations in the writing of this paper, but rather aggregate statements made by participants.

4.3.   *Timeline and analysis of data*

Interviews were conducted in January and February of 2019. Interviews were recorded on the researcher's iPhone and later transcribed. Recorded interviews were immediately transferred to the researcher's personal laptop; they were also protected with a 10-character high security password. Transcriptions were conducted over a two-week period in February and existed in a separate document on the researcher's personal laptop and were also protected with a 10-character high security password. Recorded interviews were immediately destroyed following transcription.

Analysis of interviews followed in March 2019. The researcher used iterative coding and comparative analysis as the methods for analyzing interviews. In the first round of coding, the researcher wanted to allow themes to emerge organically without imposing formalized concepts or structures on the data. The researcher read through each transcription, highlighting insightful comments and leaving a few comments of her own indicating why this information might be relevant to the study. In the second round of coding, the researcher reviewed the interview transcripts again and started to compile these identified statements into color-coded lists organized under general categories related to the research questions. These statements and lists were not identifiable by respondent. A third round of analysis followed in which the researcher rearranged statements by respondent to understand specific challenges associated with specific monuments. This facilitated the researcher's ability to report on both archivists' experiences more broadly as well as distinct and special circumstances that contributed to the archivists' viewpoints and opinions.

4.4.   *Limitations of study*

The researcher acknowledges the biases that exist in the research design and their potential to color analysis of the data. First, the researcher acknowledges her personal proximity to the illegal removal of a Confederate monument on campus at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in August 2018, which spurred substantial controversy and debate on campus. With this in mind, the researcher consulted two faculty members on the wording of her questions to acknowledge and attempt to diminish any implicit bias inherent to them. Other weaknesses inherent to the research design are the availability of archivists for the study and the participants' willingness to answer questions truthfully due to the sensitive nature of the subject matter. The researcher acknowledges the myth of objectivity in her interview design, and though she attempted to keep personal input at a minimum during the interviews, it is entirely possible that comments, verbal cues, facial or body language made during the interviews could have had an impact on the responses.[41]

5. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Five archivists who either currently work at or were previously employed at institutions with Confederate monuments were interviewed: Elaine Bachmann, Deputy State Archivist and Secretary of the State House Trust, Maryland State Archives; Lisa Broughman, Director of Lipscomb Library, Randolph College; Valerie Gillispie, University Archivist, Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Duke University; Brenda Gunn, Director for Research and Collections, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin; and Laura Hart, Technical Services Archivist, Wilson Special Collections Library, University of North Carolina atChapel Hill. All five institutions had removed a Confederate-era monument from their campus, but only the Briscoe Center at UT-Austin had relocated its statue to a new place of public display. Of the five professionals interviewed, four were still employed at the same institution while Brenda Gunn had recently accepted a new position at the University of Virginia and no longer worked at the Briscoe Center.

5.1. *Background and history of each monument*

Roger Taney monument, Maryland State Archives

The Roger B. Taney statue is a bronze monument sculpted by William Henry Rinehart and erected in 1872 on the Maryland State House grounds in Annapolis, Maryland. Taney (1777-1864) served as the fifth Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and is best known for his infamous ruling in the *Dred Scott v. Sandford* case (1857) that blacks and their descendants were not citizens and therefore did not have the right to sue in a federal court.[42] Said Taney in the majority opinion:

> "…The legislation and histories of the times, and the language used in the Declaration of Independence, show, that neither the class of

persons who had been imported as slaves, nor their descendants, whether they had become free or not, were then acknowledged as a part of the people...They had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations; and so far inferior, that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit."[43]

Taney also refers to slaves as "articles of merchandise" that consist of a "separate class of persons" and that the "distinguished men who framed the Declaration of Independence… understood the meaning of the language they used, and how it would be understood by others, and they knew that it would not in any part of the civilized world be supposed to embrace the negro race."[44]

Deputy State Archivist Elaine Bachmann cited decades of discussion and episodic controversy over the Taney monument and its location in the public square at the State House. Proposals came and went that called for the complete removal of the monument altogether, but never passed. Instead, the State House focused on adding context around the Taney statue which included plaques and additional signage in an effort to provide a more holistic perspective on Taney's career and its impact on American politics and social issues. In August 2017, following the Neo-Nazi and white nationalist rallies in Charlottesville, Virginia, the Maryland State Trust voted to remove the Taney statue overnight. It was swiftly removed and relocated to a storage facility where it will permanently reside.

George Morgan Jones monument, Randolph College

The George Morgan Jones statue was sculpted by Solon H. Borglum and erected in 1912 on the Randolph-Macon Women's College (now Randolph College) campus. The statue was commissioned by his widow, Mary Frances Watts Jones. George Morgan Jones (1824-1903) was a

Confederate soldier and Lynchburg businessman and philanthropist who helped develop the city of Lynchburg, Virginia and contributed land and funds to establish Randolph Macon Women's College. Upon his death, his widow had two identical statues commissioned of him – one at Jones Memorial Library in Lynchburg, and the other on the campus of the college. Perhaps the most controversial element of the statue is how Jones is depicted: though Jones only reached the rank of private and served as a cook in the Confederate army, his statue depicts him as a Confederate general – a decision made by his widow.

Lisa Broughman, Director of Lipscomb Library at Randolph College, said the statue evolved over time to become something more of a canvas for secret society pranks and traditions, with "General" Jones draped in feather boas or festive fare corresponding with events or celebrations on campus. Following the 2017 white nationalist rallies in Charlottesville, the Randolph College administration decided to remove the Jones statue before it became a serious security threat to the community.

Robert E. Lee statue, Duke University

Duke's Robert E. Lee statue, installed in 1932, is one of six statues that flank the entrance to the Duke University Chapel, along with Thomas Jefferson, Sidney Lanier, Girolamo Savonarola, Martin Luther, and John Wycliffe. The statue was sculpted by John Donnelly and Sons of New York. The statue's commissioning is not well documented, but can be attributed to the period of rapid building and expansion when the Duke endowment was established in 1924, and linked to correspondence from a Vanderbilt professor in the late 1920s who suggested the figures that exist today. Robert E. Lee (1807-1870) was one of the most influential figures in the Civil War. As a commander of the Confederate States Army, Lee led Confederate troops in battle from 1862 until his surrender in 1865. Many years after his death, Lee became an icon in the Lost Cause crusade that swept across the South during the early twentieth century. The Southern Poverty Law Center found that Lee was the most honored Confederate in the

United States, with 230 monuments and place names attributed to him.[45]

University Archivist Valerie Gillispie said the Lee statue was likely commissioned because he was considered an exemplary southerner at the time and a logical figure to place beside Thomas Jefferson and poet Sidney Lanier, who also served in the Confederate army. These three statues are opposed by the other three who were considered "greats" of Protestantism. Interestingly, Lee wears a Union belt buckle that says "U.S." Historians and Duke archivists are unsure whether this was a mistake or perhaps a small joke on behalf of the sculptor. The Lee statue had been a topic of contentious discussion among students and alumni over whether or not it should be removed. It had sustained some damage from protestors and vandals over the years who scratched out part of his uniform and took aim at his nose and face. The university removed the monument on August 19, 2017 following the white supremacy rallies in Charlottesville and the damage and removal of the Confederate Soldiers Monument in Durham, N.C. Ms. Gillispie shared that the space will remain vacant and the university will not commission a replacement statue.

Jefferson Davis monument, University of Texas at Austin

The Jefferson Davis statue at UT-Austin was erected in 1933 at the South Mall near Littlefield Fountain. The memorial fountain is named for George W. Littlefield, a prominent benefactor of the university in the early twentieth century. Littlefield commissioned sculptor Pompeo Coppini to create Jefferson Davis, Woodrow Wilson and five Confederate-Texans to dot the fountain (Littlefield's original vision was to "reunite the North and South" with the Davis and Wilson statues in close proximity to one another; he chose the two figures because he admired their leadership and felt they were exemplary figures in American history). Jefferson Davis (1808-1889) was the only President of the Confederate States, serving from 1861-1865. Davis is also known for his leadership in the Mexican-American War from 1846-1847. Like Robert E. Lee, Davis became a prominent

19

symbolic figure in the Lost Cause campaign, with 152 monuments and place names attributed to him.[46]

Brenda Gunn, former Director for Research and Collections at the Briscoe Center for American History, said there had been protests at the Davis statue throughout its history, and in recent years more concerted efforts to have the statue removed. A task force made a formal recommendation to add context to the Davis statue sometime between 2010-2015, but this approach was not adopted. In August 2015, the Jefferson Davis and Woodrow Wilson statues were removed from the South Mall. Ms. Gunn cited the shooting at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina as the catalyst for removing the statue. Shortly after the statue was removed, UT President Gregory Fenves announced the Davis statue would be relocated to the Briscoe Center where it would be in an educational setting and properly contextualized. UT President Fenves ordered the removal of the rest of the monuments on the South Mall in 2017, which were placed in storage along with the Woodrow Wilson monument.

Silent Sam monument, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

The Confederate Monument at UNC Chapel Hill, nicknamed "Silent Sam," was erected in 1913. The bronze statue was commissioned by the United Daughters of the Confederacy and approved by the UNC Board of Trustees in 1908. It was sculpted by John A. Wilson. The statue is not "of" anyone specifically, but instead a memorial "To the sons of the university who entered the War of 1861–65 in answer to the call of their country." Sam is "silent" because he does not have ammunition on his belt and therefore cannot fire his gun.

Controversy around the Silent Sam statue was episodic but consistent from the 1960s onward. In the early 2010s, Julian Shakespeare Carr's speech at the monument's dedication ceremony was discovered, digitized, and distributed among the community. Carr (1845-1924) was a local philanthropist who supported white supremacy, the Ku Klux Klan, and violence against African Americans. Said Carr in his dedication speech:

"The present generation, I am persuaded, scarcely takes note of what the Confederate soldier meant to the welfare of the Anglo Saxon race during the four years immediately succeeding the war, when the facts are, that their courage and steadfastness saved the very life of the Anglo Saxon race in the South – When 'the bottom rail was on top' all over the Southern states, and to-day, as a consequence the purest strain of the Anglo Saxon is to be found in the 13 Southern States – Praise God.

I trust I may be pardoned for one allusion, howbeit it is rather personal. One hundred yards from where we stand, less than ninety days perhaps after my return from Appomattox, I horse-whipped a negro wench until her skirts hung in shreds, because upon the streets of this quiet village she had publicly insulted and maligned a Southern lady, and then rushed for protection to these University buildings where was stationed a garrison of 100 Federal soldiers. I performed the pleasing duty in the immediate presence of the entire garrison, and for thirty nights afterwards slept with a double-barrel shot gun under my head."[47]

The overt white supremacist and racist language woven throughout Carr's speech shocked the public. Despite growing unrest over the presence of the monument on the UNC campus, UNC administration struggled to devise a strategy for dealing with the statue's controversial history. In August 2018, students and protestors pulled down the statue illegally. It was swiftly removed and relocated to an undisclosed storage location. In December 2018, the UNC Board of Trustees proposed a $5.3 million university "history center" to house the Silent Sam statue in a different part of campus. This proposal was met with intense criticism, with students, faculty, community members, and activists expressing extreme opposition to re-erecting a statue shrouded in racist sentiments and the use of state funds to re-install the statue on campus. Shortly thereafter the proposal was rejected by the UNC Board of Governors, which oversees all public universities in the state of North Carolina.

In January 2019 UNC Chancellor Carol Folt authorized the removal of the pedestal that remained in the statue's original location after it was toppled; she resigned and left the university at the end of that month. At the publishing of this paper, the UNC Board of Trustees had not yet shared a new proposal for the statue's final destination.

5.2. How the archives were used to contextualize monument removal or relocation

All five archivists interviewed cited using the archives at their institution before, during, and/or after the monument removal process. The archives were a particularly vital resource in the information-gathering stages prior to monument removal, as they held the original records documenting the monument's commissioning, funding, placement, design, and/or dedication ceremony plans. All five archivists discussed looking through their institution's records to find this information, with varying degrees of success.

Ms. Broughman said she went into Randolph College's archival collections to help the administration explain and justify its removal. Among the resources she consulted were correspondence from George Morgan Jones and his wife Mary Frances Watts Jones, correspondence between the university's first president and a donor about which sculptor to use for the statue, trustee minutes, and donation letters to better understand the monument's original intent and any evidence of the statue's legal right to remain. Due to the potentially contentious implications of her research, Ms. Broughman did her searching after-hours to preserve strict confidentiality. Though she found references to the statue in trustee minutes and some correspondence, there was no record of any legalities connecting the statue's financial provenance to its current locale. She shared her findings with Randolph College President Bradley Bateman, who took this information to the college's board of trustees and ultimately voted to remove the statue and place it in storage.

Technical Services archivist Laura Hart of UNC-Chapel Hill believed a direct line could be drawn between the UNC archives and the removal of Silent Sam. The statue

had been a point of controversy and protest for a few decades, and Ms. Hart had seen historians, faculty, and students use Wilson Library's Southern Historical Collection and North Carolina Collection for instruction and research related to Lost Cause-era monuments, including Silent Sam. However, it wasn't until 2009 that the speech given by Julian Shakespeare Carr at the monument's dedication was discovered in the archives in a series of "manuscript lessons for Sunday school classes taught by Carr in Durham, N.C., and addresses delivered by Carr on various occasions" unassumingly called "Sunday School Lessons and Addresses, 1896-1923 and undated."[48] This discovery dramatically reshaped the conversation around Sam: slowly at first – Ms. Hart said that, for a while, the discovery reverbed only in the rarefied air of academia – and then, it got louder, as the speech was digitized and disseminated, and student activists started citing the speech in their efforts to have the monument removed. Upon the discovery of Carr's dedication speech, Ms. Hart rewrote the collection's finding aid to include a description that more accurately reflected the language and tone of its contents. When the Silent Sam memorial was pulled down by protestors, the background of the statue was already well-researched and documented through the use of archival materials; activists had already staged the discussion through the excavation of archival resources.

Valerie Gillispie of Duke University also used the archives to research the provenance of the Robert E. Lee statue upon its defacement and subsequent removal, but unlike Randolph College and UNC, the administration did not come directly to the archives for this information. The decision to remove the Lee statue happened overnight, so there was not much time for research. Upon the statue's defacement shortly before its removal, Ms. Gillispie and her assistant university archivist Amy McDonald created an FAQ webpage about the statue to be used for internal information sharing and shared externally to the media and the public. They consulted the University Archives for presidential papers, the Duke Endowment Building Committee papers, board of trustee minutes, and other sources to provide an accessible history of the statue.

Elaine Bachmann at the Maryland State Archives had been using primary source documents from the archives

for about a decade before the Roger Taney statue came down in 2017. Ms. Bachmann discussed adding an interpretive layer to address the monument's controversial namesake, viewing the statue as a teaching opportunity for the public. This contextualization was in the form of plaques and signage around the Taney statue and throughout the Maryland State House to situate its presence against the backdrop of race relations in the nineteenth century and the deep impact his Dred Scott decision had on civil rights thereafter. Additionally, Ms. Bachmann cited consulting collections to demonstrate the original intent of why the statue was erected in the first place, as Taney was a Marylander and lived a life of public service as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, United States Attorney General, and Secretary of the Treasury. The statue was also contextualized – or so the Maryland State Trust felt at an earlier time – with the presence of a memorial to Justice Thurgood Marshall, the first African-American Supreme Court Justice and another Marylander, whose juxtaposition with Taney demonstrated the full arc of civil rights history from the nineteenth to twentieth century. However, after hearing consistent public testimony against the statue and witnessing the deadly riots in Charlottesville and the removal of monuments in Baltimore, Ms. Bachmann and the State Trust voted to remove the Taney statue and put it in storage.

Of the five institutions included in this study, only the Dolph Briscoe Center for American History at the University of Texas at Austin relocated a Confederate-era monument from its original location to a new place of display, due to a Texas law requiring legislative approval for complete removal of a monument. As Director for Research and Collections, Brenda Gunn felt that if the Jefferson Davis statue was to be relocated anywhere on campus, the Briscoe Center – which contains archival, artifact, and library collections, including George Littlefield's papers – was the best and only place where real contextualization could be added. Though she was not given a specific role in the conversations on the monument's relocation to the Briscoe Center, she did have the ability to design an exhibit that would do its best to confront the monument's difficult history. The monument moved to the Briscoe Center during a period of renovations and improvements to the facilities, so Ms. Gunn used that opportunity to have a small partition

wall built around the Davis statue so it would not be immediately visible upon entering the building, as well as a screen to play a continuous digital exhibit behind the statue. Ms. Gunn said that at first, others wanted exhibit material to focus more on the statue's origins at UT using the Littlefield papers, Board of Regents materials, and records from the sculptor, Pompeo Coppini; however, she felt this approach wasn't appropriate and advocated for the exhibit to address the more difficult and controversial elements of the monument. When the new building re-opened, the exhibit space surrounding the statue was centered on enslaved voices and the damaging effects of the Lost Cause era. That exhibit has since been collapsed into a digital exhibit that can be found on the screen behind the Davis statue, as the exhibit in the larger space will rotate with different items every few months.

Although every instance of monument removal and relocation investigated in this report varied greatly, it is clear that resources from the archives were significant to understanding each monument's history and were woven into the removal process whether through educating the public, informing internal decisions, or re-thinking the successful outcomes of monument contextualization. Four out of the five archivists interviewed emphasized that, through their experiences, they came to believe that contextualization was not an effective enough means to confront the history, legacy, or implied ideologies of Confederate monuments. Ms. Bachmann expressed it well: If the presence of these monuments in public spaces make even one person feel bad about themselves in any way, then our efforts to contextualize have failed and there's no question that that monument does not belong in a public square.

5.3. *Challenges archivists faced in the removal process*

In addition to thinking critically about contextualization, all five archivists identified several challenges they faced with the removal and relocation process. Archivists spoke of personal challenges specific to their position at their institution, as well as broader challenges the archival profession must confront as more and more Confederate monuments are called into question. The

most frequently cited issue was that of safety. All five interviewees shared that the safety of the public was a top concern for them, and four of the five believed that the monument at their institution should not be re-installed because the threat of violence was too great. Interviewees shared that the special collections library and archives were, at one point or another, a top contender for relocating the monument; all were strongly opposed to this idea due to the contentious atmosphere that surrounded the statue on the grounds of their institution and in the local community. Security was a related concern, and one that had grown since the Charleston shootings and Charlottesville riots. The interviewees felt their facilities could not offer or sustain the security needed to protect the item once it was re-displayed, and voiced concerns over vandalism, defacement, and irreparable damage to both the monument and facilities.

   The logistics of monument preservation was also cited as a major challenge for archival repositories where many of these statues were proposed to be stored. The sheer size and weight of a 10-foot-tall solid bronze monument, plus its stone or marble pedestal, requires more conservation care and storage space than the typical archive is equipped to handle. As a result, the Silent Sam, Robert E. Lee, and George Morgan Jones statues were moved to offsite storage facilities. The Maryland State Archives had the facilities and tools to successfully move the Roger Taney statue into its storage facility, and the Jefferson Davis statue was moved to a permanent exhibit space at the Briscoe Center. Ms. Gunn cited plans for a new off-site storage facility for the Briscoe Center (which is facing a space crisis); she believed this might be Davis's final destination. Three of the five archive professionals interviewed were not explicitly consulted before administrative decisions were made (nor were their archivist colleagues). All five interviewees cited actively advocating for proper conservation of the monuments and educating administration and governing bodies on their repository's ability or inability to meet minimum requirements. Several interviewees expressed it was not feasible to offer the monument as an artifact of study in their reading room, noting how arduous it would be to exhume the monument from the stacks and wheel it out to a patron.

   The interview subjects also identified thinking deeply about the emotional impact of having a Confederate

monument inside their building. Ms. Gunn shared a vignette about how she noticed that, on tours of the new facility, some students of color averted their eyes when they reached the Jefferson Davis statue and looked physically uncomfortable in its presence. This observation made her question whether the Briscoe Center had done the right thing, and wonder whether Davis is still glorified in his new space despite the surrounding exhibit of archival documents and artifacts. Anyone using the reading room at the Briscoe Center will see the statue as they walk through the building. Ms. Bachmann reflected on a similar sentiment. After hearing community members speak at public forums on how the Taney statue made them feel unwelcome or question the values represented at the state house, she determined that if the presence of a Confederate monument makes even one person feel lesser in any way, there is no reason for it to remain – any conceived educational value is exceeded by the emotional harm inflicted on public viewers. Ms. Gillispie shared these concerns, and noted that if the Robert E. Lee statue was moved into a public space at the Rubenstein Library, it would likely go in a secure exhibit room that contains other items the library is proud to display, such as an oak writing desk that belonged to Virginia Woolf. This room is a problematic context for an item such as a Confederate monument, however, as its grandeur suggests that all items within it are sacred and inviolate. Ms. Gillispie said properly situating a Confederate monument in this setting would be a difficult undertaking.

In addition to safety and logistical issues, several archivists discussed a broader, profession-wide challenge of confronting the persistence of whiteness in archives. "Whiteness" in the archival context is defined as the overabundance of records, manuscripts, papers, and artifacts that only chronicle the history of majority white populations and a gaping void of records that document non-white and minority peoples.[49] To summarize in overly simplistic terms, the disparity arises from several points of exclusion: Exclusion of minorities at places like universities and government offices (outright until roughly sixty years ago, and more discretely in recent decades) where official records are generated; exclusion of minority-focused outreach and partnership in curation efforts; and exclusion of non-"significant" or "first to ___" minorities in collections.[50]

Whiteness can also be considered to include the infrastructures archivists place on information that make it findable.[51] Ms. Hart of UNC-Chapel Hill provided an example of an enormous collection at Wilson Library of correspondence, transaction histories, diaries, and records from the Cameron family of Orange and Durham counties – one of the state's largest landholders and slave holders.[52] The original language in the finding aid read more like a ledger of the family's business transactions and timeline of births, deaths, and marriages than an exposé about a massive undocumented population of enslaved workers. Ms. Hart has since facilitated the Conscious Editing Project at Wilson Library where she and other library colleagues unearth and edit finding aids whose language could help direct researchers to new discoveries by highlighting the presence of underrepresented voices in traditionally "white" records. This example relates to monuments because, in addition to bearing the responsibility of outputting information and context, an archive's accessions can legitimize a particular narrative or ideology. Several archivists were concerned that accepting a Confederate monument into its repository and/or putting it on display might reaffirm a "whitewashed" narrative of the archive continuing to collect and dedicate resources to preserving a history centered around the white experience, and that no amount of contextualization or supporting documentation would challenge that monument's representative history. Ms. Gillispie said that archives and cultural heritage institutions at large have to be careful about what it symbolizes to their community when a Confederate monument is taken in. What kind of investment – time, money, and otherwise – is appropriate to maintain these problematic figures?

5.4. Archivists on the future of Confederate monuments in archives

Though all five interviewees expressed concerns with housing and exhibiting Confederate monuments in their repositories, some believed there might be a future time and place where the statues could be used as educational tools to facilitate productive conversations about slavery, race, and public history. Ideas for placement included museums, graveyards, academic departments, and historic homes;

however, the archivists expressed that there is no "one-size-fits-all" approach to monument relocation. Ideas for using statues as productive educational tools included faculty-led classes or discussions around the monuments, loaning the statues to institutions that have strong curatorial and archival resources for temporary exhibit, or using the statue in innovate ways to re-think their figures. Ms. Gunn offered an interesting example: Before the Davis statue was re-installed in the Briscoe Center, she had conservators take a three-dimensional image of the monument, including residue graffiti paint and dings from vandals and protestors. This three-dimensional image is also being preserved at the Briscoe Center, and could be used by future students to project their own graffiti over the monument. Despite their ideas for future use, storage in an appropriate facility was the unanimous preference for the current and foreseeable future of these items. Ms. Hart cited serious doubts over whether a scenario might exist in which Silent Sam could return to campus without implying support of its racist and charged history. Ms. Gillispie said that putting a statue in context is difficult, and felt there were other projects in the archives that warranted greater financial and administrative support. Despite her personal feeling that the George Morgan Jones statue did not belong in Randolph College's archival repository, Ms. Broughman said she could understand an argument for keeping the statue as the repository has the most extensive collection of his papers. The interview subjects emphasized that they did not want to make a blanket statement about all Confederate monuments, but four of the five felt strongly that in most cases they do not belong in the public square or on display on university campuses at the present moment. The exception was Ms. Gunn, who had seen a monument through its relocation process and expressed uncertainty about whether or not Confederate-era monuments could be effective learning tools in public spaces. Interestingly, in all five instances of removal the administration or governing body decided not to replace the removed monument with a new one. Several interviewees echoed the belief that removed monuments need not be replaced with something else.

5.5. Archivists' roles in monument contextualization, removal, or relocation

All five interviewees expressed strong beliefs that archivists have an important role to play in the removal and/or relocation of Confederate monuments. Two of the five archivists interviewed cited having some kind of influence on administrative decisions about monuments, whether through performing research for administrators or having conversations with decision-makers on an appropriate course of action. On the other hand, three of the five archivists interviewed did not have the opportunity to provide direct input despite being information experts in their field, having a firm understanding of research surrounding Confederate monuments, having access to and knowledge of essential records and contextualizing artifacts at their institution, and keeping a pulse on public interest through research requests in their reading rooms. Those who were not given a voice in these conversations expressed feelings of dissatisfaction and frustration, particularly at institutions where the archive was deemed the likely recipient of the monument. Ms. Gunn said she wished she and other archivists had been given more of an advising role in the decision-making process before the Davis statue was ordered to be removed and placed in the Briscoe Center, and believed a different outcome may have resulted had they been involved earlier. Ms. Gillispie noted that archivists and librarians have been thinking about these issues for a long time and can be excellent sources of information about the context and proper handling of an artifact. They also know the limitations of their repository, which are just as important to communicate to decision makers. Ms. Broughman, who advised the Randolph College president on removing the George Morgan Jones, felt that the decision to remove a monument is ultimately administrative, but that librarians and archivists could be valuable sources of information to support the removal decision either from a contextual standpoint about Confederate statues in general, or specifically related to the history of an institution.

Another common point of discussion throughout the interviews was that of the activist archivist. Ms. Hart verbalized a belief that archivists can be activists in their communities in two ways. First, they can call out

problematic issues they see in their collections every day. Second, they can reimagine how we understand and interpret information in the archives. This should extend to issues present in the community, including debates over Confederate monuments. She wondered what items still laid undiscovered in the abyss of the stacks – if we only discovered the Julian Shakespeare Carr speech less than a decade ago, what other evidence might we discover tomorrow? To use the archives as an agent of change is perhaps unexpected, she said, but when one considers the potential stored in archival materials, it makes a lot of sense: Looking at primary source documents can be an incredible way to build empathy and deepen our connection to those who came before us. Ms. Gunn reiterated similar sentiments, noting that archivists are experts not only in the data contained in their repositories but also in promoting productive, information-centered discussions. They also understand how their researchers and patrons approach their spaces and why an object such as a Confederate monument can have a deep impact on this. Archivists should continue to find their voice and speak up to administration when they have the opportunity.

Ms. Bachmann also said that archivists should be essential participants in the Confederate monument debate, noting that archivists can help shape the questions that need to be asked and excavate the information on why any particular monument was erected in the first place. She noted that it was a different generation that gave the fiery white supremacist speeches at the dedication ceremonies of these monuments, but the vestiges of the Lost Cause era remain where these bronze soldiers stand. She believes the confusion between the statues as representing history versus representing Lost Cause ideologies arose in part because the records that exposed the intent behind many of the statues have been buried under the dogma of neutrality in public history. She believed archivists are one of the only professionals who truly have the resources and knowledge to provide a more holistic understanding of the histories, perceptions, and impacts of these monuments in their communities.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The findings from this study indicate that archivists have had different levels of involvement in the removal and/or relocation of Confederate monuments at their institution. Despite their level of involvement, however, all five interviewees cited the archives as an important resource for finding documentation on a monument's origins and legal right to remain, understanding a monument's place in their institution's history, informing the decision to remove a Confederate monument, and/or framing public conversations on the Confederate monument debate both locally and nationwide. This supports the notion of the archive as a space for tracking the changing landscape of communities as they engage with certain issues over time.[53] The monuments themselves proved to fit the rhetorical stereotype of typical Confederate monuments as described by Sedore and Isherwood, with many monuments featuring historical inaccuracies, such as the commemoration of George Morgan Jones as a general instead of a private. Several archivists identified the nostalgic past[54] as a primary element of the monument at their institution, which motivated their efforts to use the archives as a place for fact-finding, evidence compilation, and documentation of both historic and current conversations about the monument.

All five archivists expressed a strong belief that archivists should be consulted in the conversations around removing or relocating Confederate monuments due to their expertise as information professionals, direct access to primary source documents, and extensive knowledge of their institution's repositories. The concept of the activist archivist[55] and her role in mining collections for undiscovered information was supported through archivist vignettes such as the recent discovery of the Silent Sam dedication speech in the UNC archives. Ms. Gunn and Ms. Bachmann similarly assumed "activist" positions by leading efforts to contextualize the Jefferson Davis and Roger Taney monuments in their space through inclusion of diverse voices in exhibits. However, all five archivists expressed varying degrees of doubt over the efficacy of contextualized monuments, which contradicts Newson's argument that thick

description can radically change their public perception.[56] Ms. Gunn expressed this most directly in her observations of how students of color appeared to be physically uncomfortable in the presence of the relocated Davis statue, despite the thorough and extensive exhibit of contextualizing materials surrounding the statue. These findings align more with Marschall's supposition that monuments to oppressors result in "conscious and persistent conjuring up of the past" and cannot be re-engineered to fit new social or political motives, however well-meaning.[57]

It is clear through this research that all five archivists were directly impacted by the decision to remove or relocate a Confederate monument, and identified facing several challenges through the process, which included advocating against relocating monuments to their repositories for safety and security concerns, grappling with and communicating the emotional impact Confederate monuments might have on their patrons, and confronting the reality of whiteness in archives. All five interviews revealed that archivists actively engaged with related collections during the removal and relocation process, supporting the notion that monuments and archives are truly entwined, with the monument acting as an extension of the archive.[58] Four of the five archivists interviewed communicated firm convictions that Confederate monuments do not belong in the public square, with the slight exception being Ms. Gunn who oversaw the relocation of Jefferson Davis at UT-Austin and still expressed uncertainty as to the efficacy of the contextualization of Davis in his new space. All five were uncertain about the future of existing monuments and whether they could be re-displayed publicly at a time in the future, but were hopeful that a time might come when they could be used as productive education tools. Overwhelmingly, all five interviewees strongly supported the notion that archivists have an important role to play in the removal and/or relocation of Confederate monuments due to their proximity to primary source records and their training as information experts, again underpinning the archivist as well-positioned to assume more activist roles in community issues.[59]

The implications of this research point towards a void of archivist voices in conversations around Confederate monument removal. This omission is particularly painful

when an archive is considered a potential repository for a monument, as most archives facilities are unwilling and/or unable to take on the safety, security, and logistical risks that would result. Despite this absence of archivist expertise, archivists are eager and willing to engage with administration and decision-makers on these issues. Archives professionals can lend two distinct kinds of expertise: that of what's in their repositories, which can sharpen the blurred lines of a monument's history; and that of information sharing and delivery, which can facilitate productive discussions on why a monument should or should not be removed. Another major finding from this study is that archivists are deeply affected by the presence, removal, and/ or relocation of these monuments, whether through their interactions with archival holdings or the ways in which they respond to internal or external inquiries about them. Prior to their removal, some archivists had made LibGuides to compile information about Confederate monuments, worked with faculty to develop lesson plans for relevant courses, and consulted with countless patrons and researchers who sought their counsel on related collections. As more cultural heritage institutions consider removing controversial monuments from their grounds, this study suggests that administration should include archivists early and often in the process. They should consider archivists to be their greatest untapped resource and begin to work more directly with archives professionals as consultants in all stages of the process.

7. FUTURE RESEARCH

This study was intended to explore the archivist experience with Confederate monument removal. Future research might explore specifically how archival materials have been used to contextualize monuments in their current space or reframe discussions around their removal, as well as the efficacy of archivist involvement in these processes. Additionally, it would be helpful to have data on administrators and the major factors, influences, and thought processes that are involved in making the difficult decision to remove or relocate a Confederate monument, to better understand how archivists can complement the process.

Further research into the issue of contextualized Confederate monuments might target public perception of these efforts and whether or not they are effective. Finally, more archivist voices should be elevated at institutions with Confederate monuments. Despite her best efforts, the researcher could only procure five interviews for this study; due to time and requirement constraints, there was not enough time to invest in recruiting more participants. Future research could collect more data and compare against the conclusions drawn from this study. The relationship between archivists and Confederate monuments is in constant flux and warrants continued awareness, advocacy, and critical analysis.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the five archivists who so respectfully and eagerly participated in this study: Elaine Bachmann. Lisa Broughman, Valerie Gillispie, Brenda Gunn, and Laura Hart. I am very grateful for their generosity of time as well as their forthcoming and honest responses throughout the interviews.

Disclaimer

The opinions and experiences expressed by the five interviewees in this paper are uniquely their own, and do not in any way reflect the official positions of their institutions.

Caitlin Rivas Sullivan recently graduated from the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill with a concentration in Archives and Records Management. She was selected as one of three student finalists to present her paper at the Society of American Archivists 2019 Annual Meeting in Austin, Texas. Caitlin received the C. David Jackson Memorial Scholarship from SNCA in 2018.

NOTES

1. United Nations. "United Nations Year for Cultural Heritage." Last modified 2002. Accessed October 15, 2018. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127155eo.pdf

2. Horton, J. O. "Confronting Slavery and Revealing the 'Lost Cause.'" *National Park Service.* Accessed October 15, 2018. https://www.nps.gov/resources/story.htm?id=217

3. Isherwood, I. A. "Monumental Fallacy: Memorials to the Lost Cause at Gettysburg." *Association of Graduate Liberal Studies Programs* 13, no. 2 (2010): 102-115.

4. Isherwood, "Monumental Fallacy," 107.

5. Sedore, T. S. "'Tell the Southrons We Lie Here': The Rhetoric of Consummation in Southern Epitaphs and Elegies of Post-Civil War America." *Southern Quarterly* 41, no. 4 (2003): 144-162.

6. "Whose Heritage? Public Symbols of the Confederacy." *Southern Poverty Law Center.* Last modified February 1, 2019. Accessed April 1, 2019. https://www.splcenter.org/20180604/whose-heritage-public-symbols-confederac

7. Vincent, T. "Evidence of Woman's Loyalty, Perseverance, and Fidelity: Confederate Soldiers' Monuments in North Carolina, 1865-1914." *The North Carolina Historical Review* 83, no. 1 (2006): 63.

8. "Whose Heritage?" Accessed April 1, 2019. https://www.splcenter.org/20180604/whose-heritage-public-symbols-confederac

9. Rodrigo, R. "Preserving Memory/Displacing Memory: Historical Shifts in the Understanding of the Agency of Monuments and Memorials." *The International Journal of the Arts in Society: Annual Review* 7, no.1 (2013): 59-68. doi:10.18848/1833-1866/CGP/v07/36451

10. Rodrigo, "Preserving Memory," 59-68.

11. Marschall, S. *Landscape of Memory: Commemorative Monuments, Memorials and Public Statuary in Post-Apartheid South Africa.* 2009. https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.lib.unc.ed

12. Cox, R. "Archives, War, and Memory: Building a Framework." *Library & Archival Security* 25, no. 1 (2012): 21-57. doi:10.1080/01960075.2012.657945

13. Rodrigo, "Preserving Memory," 62.

14. Ibid, 60.
15. Cox, "Archives, War, and Memory," 26.
16. Azaryahu, M. "Public Controversy and Commemorative Failure: Tel-Aviv's Monument to the Holocaust and National Revival." *Israel Studies* 16, no. 1 (2011): 131. doi:10.2979/ isr.2011.16.1.129
17. Sedore, "Tell the Southrons We Lie Here," 148.
18. Rodrigo, "Preserving Memory," 63.
19. Plato. *Phaedrus*. Accessed November 20, 2018. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1636/1636-h/1636-h.ht
20. "Whose Heritage?" Accessed April 1, 2019.
21. Newson, R. A. "Epistemological Crises Made Stone: Confederate Monuments and the End of Memory." *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics* 37, no. 2 (2017): 136.
22. "Transcript of New Orleans Mayor Landrieu's address on Confederate monuments." *Pulse Gulf Coast.* Accessed November 20, 2018. https:// pulsegulfcoast.com/transcript-of-new-orleans-mayor-landrieus-address-on-confederate-monuments
23. "Transcript of New Orleans Mayor Landrieu's address." Accessed November 20, 2018.
24. "General Assembly of North Carolina Session 2015: Session Law 2015-170 Senate Bill 22." Last modified 2015. Accessed November 20, 2018. https://www.ncleg.net/Sessions/2015/Bills/Senate/ PDF/S22v5.pd
25. Subberwal, K. "Several States Have Erected Laws to Protect Confederate Monuments." *Huffington Post.* Retrieved November 20, 2018. https:// www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/state
26. "Tennessee Heritage Protection Act." Accessed November 20, 2018. https://www.tn.gov/ environment/about-tdec/tennessee-historical-commission/redirect---tennessee-historical-commission/tennessee-heritage-protection-act.htm
27. Bryan, A., & Rupcich, C. "What Virginia law says about removing Richmond's Confederate statues." Accessed November 20, 2018. https://

wtvr.com/2017/08/17/what-virginia-law-says-about-removing-richmonds-confederate-statues

28. "Memorials for war veterans." Accessed November 20, 2018. https://vacode.org/2016/15.2/II/18/3/15.2-1812

29. "Alabama Memorial Preservation Act of 2017." Accessed November 20, 2018. http://arc-sos.state.al.us/PAC/SOSACPDF.001/A0012128.PD

30. Wahlers, K. E. "North Carolina 's Heritage Protection Act: Cementing Confederate Monuments in North Carolina 's Landscape." *North Carolina Law Review* 94, no. 6 (2016): 2176-2200. Accessed November 20, 2018, from https://scholarship.law.unc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=4882&context=ncl.

31. Newson, "Epistemological Crises," 146.

32. Marschall, *Landscape of Memory,* 33.

33. Isherwood, I. A. "Monumental Fallacy: Memorials to the Lost Cause at Gettysburg." *Association of Graduate Liberal Studies Programs* 13, no. 2 (2010): 112.

34. Cox, "Archives, War, and Memory," 36.

35. Ibid, 36.

36. Bastian, J. A. "The records of memory, the archives of identity: Celebrations, texts and archival sensibilities." *Archival Science* 13, no. 2-3 (2012): 121-131. doi:10.1007/s10502-012-9184-3

37. Robinson-Sweet, A. "Truth and Reconciliation: Archivists as Reparations Activists." *The American Archivist* 81, no. 1 (2018): 35. doi:10.17723/0360-9081-81.1.23

38. Keough, B., & Novara, E. "Public or Private? Reconsidering Ownership and Value of State Legislators' Papers." *Archival Issues* 35, no. 1 (2013): 21-36.

39. Wilson, V. "Research Methods: Interviews." *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 7, no. 2 (2012): 96-98. https://doi.org/10.18438/B89P5

40. Potter, A. "Managing productive academia/industry relations: The interview as research method." *Media*

Practice and Education 19, no. 2 (2018): 159-172. doi:10.1080/25741136.2018.1464716

41. Dilley, P. "Conducting Successful Interviews: Tips for Intrepid Research." *Theory Into Practice* 39, no. 3 (2000): 131-37. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip3903_3

42. Schumacher, A. J. "Roger B. Taney." *Encyclopedia Britannica.* Accessed March 15, 2019. https://www.britannica.com/biography/Roger-B-Tane

43. "Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393 (1857)." *Cornell Law School.* Accessed March 15, 2019. https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/60/393#writing-USSC_CR_0060_0393_Z

44. "Scott v. Sandford."

45. "Whose Heritage?"

46. Ibid.

47. Green, H. N. "Julian Carr's Speech at the Dedication of Silent Sam." Accessed March 15, 2019. http://hgreen.people.ua.edu/transcription-carr-speech.htm

48. Finding Aid, "Julian Shakespeare Carr Papers, 1892-1923." *UNC University Libraries,* 2018. Accessed March 15, 2019. https://finding-aids.lib.unc.edu/00141/#d1e53

49. Joseph, N., Crow, K., & Mackey. "Interrogating Whiteness in College and University Archival Spaces at Predominantly White Institutions." *Topographies of Whiteness: Mapping Whiteness in Library and Information Systems* (2017): 60-62.

50. Joseph, Crow, & Mackey, "Interrogating Whiteness," 63-64.

51. Ramirez, M. H. "Being Assumed Not to Be: A Critique of Whiteness as an Archival Imperative." *The American Archivist* 78, no. 2 (2015): 339-356. doi:10.17723/0360-9081.78.2.339

52. Finding Aid, "Cameron Family Papers, 1757-1978." *UNC University Libraries,* 2018. Accessed March 15, 2019. https://finding-aids.lib.unc.edu/00133

53. Keough, B., & Novara, E. "Public or Private? Reconsidering Ownership and Value of State Legislators' Papers." *Archival Issues* 35, no. 1 (2013): 21-36.

54. Isherwood, "Monumental Fallacy."

55. Robinson-Sweet, "Truth and Reconciliation."

56. Newson, "Epistemological Crises."

57. Marschall, "Landscape of Memory," 33.
58. Cox, "Archives, War, and Memory."
59. Robinson-Sweet, "Truth and Reconciliation."

Conscious Editing of Archival Description at UNC-Chapel Hill
by Jackie Dean

The article is based on the author's presentation at the 2019 Society of American Archivists Research Forum.

Abstract

Archivists at UNC-Chapel Hill are engaged in "conscious editing" of archival description. We aspire to re-envision our descriptive practice so that whiteness is no longer the presumed default, language in description is inclusive and accessible, and description does not obscure collection material that documents the lives of enslaved people. This article describes early efforts to remediate legacy archival description, particularly reworking the text of the finding aid abstract for the Julian Shakespeare Carr Papers. A new descriptive practice of including racial identities for all people and families in archival description is also discussed.

Archivists at UNC-Chapel Hill are engaged in "conscious editing" of archival description. We aspire to re-envision our descriptive practice so that whiteness is no longer the presumed default, language in our description products is inclusive and accessible, and our description does not obscure collection material that documents the lives of enslaved people. This paper describes our early efforts to remediate and repair legacy archival description and to develop a new descriptive practice.

We have been influenced and inspired by the conversation happening around ethical archival description in the profession and have based our approach on the writings and presentations by Jarrett Drake, Gloria Gonzalez, Jasmine Jones, Michelle Caswell, Annie Tang, Dorothy Berry, Kelly Bolding, Rachel Winston, and Nathan Sentence.[1] Princeton University archivist Kelly Bolding's presentation at the Midwest Archives Conference (MAC) in 2018 titled "Reparative Processing: A Case Study in Auditing Legacy Archival Description for Racism" particularly influenced our efforts.[2]

Her clarity and thoroughness in this presentation gave us a road map for how to begin remediating description. Her presentation provided the encouragement to start where we are in this work. And we really needed to start.

UNC-Chapel Hill's Wilson Special Collections Library is renowned for documentation of the American South. The main manuscript collecting unit, the Southern Historical Collection, was founded in 1930. The founder, a white history professor, travelled around the South collecting letters, diaries, ledgers, and account books from white families to build the collection at UNC. The early work of the Southern Historical Collection, like that of most early state archives in the Southeast, glorified the experiences of white antebellum southerners and obscured or ignored the lives of enslaved people.

Much of the legacy finding aid description is written with a white supremacist point of view and this is manifested in patterns and trends that exist through the corpus of finding aid text. While sometimes acknowledging slavery, much of the language in the finding aids softens the role that white southerners played in the system of racial oppression. For example, the term "planter" is used extensively throughout the collection:

> *Legacy description:*
> Cameron family of Orange and Durham counties and Raleigh, N.C. Among antebellum North Carolina's largest **landholders and slave holders**, the Camerons also owned substantial **plantations** in Alabama and Mississippi. Prominent family members included Richard Bennehan (1743-1825), merchant; Duncan Cameron (1777-1853), lawyer, judge, banker, and legislator; and Paul C. Cameron (1808-1891), **planter, agricultural reformer**, and railroad builder. The bulk of the collection consists of correspondence, financial and legal documents, and account books. In addition, there are speeches, writings, printed material, pictures, and miscellaneous other types of personal papers. Included is extensive information about Richard Bennehan's store at Stagville, N.C., and the Stagville and Fairntosh

plantations, including crop and slave records. Family correspondence details the familial relationships and social behavior of a **wealthy planter family**, particularly the women.

The legacy description does not acknowledge the well-known white supremacy of manuscript collection creators. For example, the biographical note for the William Laurence Saunders Papers does not mention that he was chief organizer of the Ku Klux Klan in Chapel Hill, N.C.

> *Legacy description:*
> William Laurence Saunders (1835-1891) of North Carolina was a lawyer; colonel of the 46th North Carolina Regiment, Confederate States of America; editor of the *Colonial Records of North Carolina*; secretary-treasurer of the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina; and secretary of state of North Carolina, 1879-1891.

The archival description exhibits a presumed whiteness; it usually describes the racial identity only of non-white creators.

> *Legacy description:*
> Roberta H. Jackson (1920-1999), African American professor of education at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, was married to Blyden Jackson (1910-2000), African American professor of English and dean of the Graduate School at Southern University in Baton Rouge, La., and professor of English at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
>
> Fred Hobson is an English professor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill who specializes in Southern literary history.

In 2017, we began the work of identifying and seeking to disrupt these patterns and descriptive practices. We use the term "conscious editing" to describe our inclusive description efforts in reference to the *Conscious Style Guide*,[3] a website that collects style guides and articles cov-

ering terminology from marginalized communities. In the summer of 2019, the Wilson Special Collections Library charged a steering committee of staff from across the UNC Libraries to guide our remediation work.

When we began our conscious editing efforts, we piloted an approach that included an online form for library staff to suggest changes to archival description, a chat channel open to anyone interested in discussing these issues, and in-person case study discussions to talk through more complex description issues.

One in-person case study discussion focused on updating the description of the Julian Shakespeare Carr Papers. Carr was a white southerner active in business. A building on campus is named after him, as is Carrboro, the town immediately west of Chapel Hill. Carr was also a leader in 1890s white supremacist political campaigns in North Carolina and spent much of his later life working on Confederate memorialization. In his speech at the 1913 dedication of the Confederate monument on the UNC-Chapel Hill campus, he boasted about a violent attack he had made on an African American woman on campus. The Carr papers include a transcript of this speech.

For this case study, we specifically wanted to update the abstract section of the Carr finding aid. Finding aids for collections at UNC-Chapel Hill consistently contain an abstract that briefly describes the creator or creators of the materials and the scope and content of the materials themselves. The abstract appears in the finding aid as well as the catalog record for the collection in the library's catalog and WordCat. The legacy abstract for the Carr papers was originally created in in 1988 and was updated in 2010 to highlight the existence of the dedication speech for the Confederate memorial on UNC-Chapel Hill's campus.

Legacy description:
Julian Shakespeare Carr (1845-1924) of Chapel Hill and Durham, N.C., was a manufacturer of tobacco products with interests in a wide range of other businesses, including banking and textiles. Carr was also active in the Methodist Church, the Democratic

Party, and several Confederate veterans' organizations, including the North Carolina branch of the United Confederate Veterans, which he served as commander. He was also a strong supporter of various institutions of higher education in the state. The collection includes letters, telegrams, printed announcements, programs, and pamphlets, business and legal documents, maps, and newspaper clippings pertaining to Carr's business and personal affairs. The letters chiefly concern banking, farming, and family matters, but also reflect Carr's interests in the Civil War and the United Confederate Veterans and in the Methodist Church. Also included are printed and manuscript addresses and Sunday School lessons given by Carr. Of special note is a series of speeches discussing the race problem in North Carolina and throughout the South. One address, 2 June 1913, given at the dedication of the monument later known as "Silent Sam" on the University of North Carolina campus. Business topics are also represented. Included are seven volumes of Carr's diary containing brief entries, 1907-1917, and letter books, 1919-1922. These volumes chiefly document Carr's personal life, particularly his travels and family associations. Also included are a wedding album, 1895, of Carr's daughter Eliza, and a family history, 1991, by Joseph Julian Carr. Photographs are chiefly of Julian S. Carr.

The legacy abstract was rewritten in 2018 based on the in-person case study discussion with UNC Libraries staff.

2018 revision:
The papers of white businessman and public figure Julian Shakespeare Carr (1845-1924) of Chapel Hill and Durham, N.C., document his financial interests in tobacco, textiles, and banking; affiliations with the Methodist Church, the Democratic Party in North Carolina, and organizations commemorating the Confederacy; and philanthropic support of institutions of higher education, particularly the University of North Carolina (UNC). Papers include letters, printed items, business records, legal docu-

ments, diaries, photographs, lessons for Sunday school, and addresses written and delivered by Carr. The rhetoric in many addresses reflects Carr's positions on what he and his contemporaries called "the race problem." In keeping with white supremacy movements in North Carolina at the turn of the twentieth century, Carr defended the institution of slavery, claiming it had been beneficial to the enslaved, and argued for denying full citizenship rights to African Americans. Included are Carr's 1899 speech supporting an amendment to the North Carolina constitution that disenfranchised African Americans and his address at the 1913 dedication of the Confederate monument later known as "Silent Sam" on the UNC campus.

In the revised version, the description contextualizes the phrase "the race problem" rather than assuming that researchers are familiar with that phrase.

Legacy description:
Of special note is a series of speeches discussing the race problem throughout North Carolina and the South.

2018 revision:
The rhetoric in many addresses reflects Carr's positions on what he and his contemporaries called "the race problem."

The revision also makes clear that Carr actively supported the Confederacy and that the monument known as "Silent Sam" on UNC-Chapel Hill's campus was a monument to the Confederacy.

Legacy description:
Carr was also active in the Methodist Church, the Democratic Party, and several Confederate veterans' organizations, including the North Carolina branch of the United Confederate Veterans, of which he served as commander.

2018 revision:

> The papers … document his financial interests in tobacco, textiles, and banking; affiliations with the Methodist Church, the Democratic Party in North Carolina, and organizations commemorating the Confederacy; and philanthropic support of institutions of higher education, particularly the University of North Carolina (UNC).

The 2018 revision directly addresses Carr's white supremacy.

> *2018 revision:*
> In keeping with white supremacy movements in North Carolina at the turn of the twentieth century, Carr defended the institution of slavery, claiming it had been beneficial to the enslaved, and argued for denying full citizenship rights to African Americans.

Finally, the 2018 revision identifies Carr's racial identity as white.

> *Legacy description:*
> Julian Shakespeare Carr (1845-1924) of Chapel Hill and Durham, N.C., was a manufacturer of tobacco products with interests in a wide range of other businesses, including banking and textiles.

> *2018 revision:*
> The papers of white businessman and public figure Julian Shakespeare Carr (1845-1924) of Chapel Hill and Durham, N.C., document his financial interests in tobacco, textiles, and banking; affiliations with the Methodist Church, the Democratic Party in North Carolina, and organizations commemorating the Confederacy; and philanthropic support of institutions of higher education, particularly the University of North Carolina (UNC).

In addition to working through case studies, we instituted a new descriptive practice that we intend to apply across all finding aids. As noted earlier, legacy finding aid description labels or marks underrepresented racial identities

for creators and subjects in Wilson Library's collections. This longstanding practice developed because researchers are keenly interested in materials created by or about identities that are underrepresented in Wilson Library Special Collections, such as African Americans or indigenous people. Legacy finding aid description does not include a label for creators or subjects who are or were white. This reflected the assumption that whiteness was our default for collection creators or subjects.

> *Legacy description:*
> Harry E. Groves (1921-) is a Colorado-born African-American lawyer and professor of law, with special interests in constitutional law, particularly of newly formed nations.
>
> The Jesse E. Oxendine Papers, 1860s-2015, consist of letters, scrapbooks, photographs, and other materials of Jesse E. Oxendine (1926-2017), a Lumbee Indian from Pembroke, N.C.
>
> Papers of lawyer Neil G. McBride document his work with the Coal Employment Project, a non-profit focused on gender equality and discrimination issues in coal mines
>
> The Nancy Dols Collection consists of video recordings created by ethnomusicologist and musician, Nancy Dols Neithammer

Starting in 2017, we began to experiment with labelling the racial identity of all people in archival description. We include these labels for creators in new finding aids and add them when we update existing finding aids.

> *Legacy description:*
> Thomas Francis Price was a farmer from Rutherford County, N.C., serving in the 56th North Carolina Volunteers. He was married to Sarah Harrill Price.
>
> *2017 revision:*

Thomas Francis Price and Sarah Harrill Price were married white farmers from Rutherford County, N.C. Thomas Francis Price served in the 56th North Carolina Infantry.

We focused on race rather than any of the other aspects of identity such as ethnicity, gender, sexuality, religion, or physical ability. This focus was not meant to diminish any of these aspects of identity; rather, it is a recognition that racial identity is especially significant for the collections and context at UNC-Chapel Hill. Our hope is that we can look to other repositories for guidance on these other aspects of identity.

2017 revision:
- Scattered materials documenting the Civil Rights movement in the American South, chiefly 1966-1969, collected by **Wayne Hurder, a white man of Raleigh, N.C.,** then a student at the University of North Carolina who worked as the Selma, Ala., bureau chief for a weekly newspaper in the summer of 1966 and was involved in providing support to the Civil Rights movement on campus when he returned to school.
- Farm journal, 1853-1866, kept by **George Wesley Johnson, a white merchant, postmaster, farmer, landowner, and enslaver in Davie County, N.C**.
- **White linguist Connie Clare Eble** joined the faculty of the Department of English and Comparative Literature at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1971, retiring from the department in 2018.
- The Catherine Peck Collection contains oral histories and field recordings created by **white folklorist Catherine Peck.**
- Audio recordings, 1985-1986, of country music performed by **white singer and guitar player Loy Gordon** in Graham, N.C. and at his home in Burlington, N.C.

- Scrapbook of **James Alexander Gray (1920-2003), a white college student,** documenting his time at the University of North Carolina, 1937-1941, including the visit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to Chapel Hill in 1938.
- The Eben T. Rawls Papers, 1917-2005, document the **arc of white businessman Rawls'** career from an office job with a sugar company in Preston, Cuba, in 1917-1918, to the founding of the Rawls-Dickson Candy Company in Winston-Salem, N.C., in 1926, and finally the success of his sales group, Eben Rawls Associates, Inc., in the 1960s.
- The Chris Stamey Collection consists primarily of audio recordings related to **Chris Stamey, a white musician and record producer,** who was a member of the American pop rock groups, the Sneakers and the dB's.
- The Charles Maurice Redfern Papers document a **white U.S. Navy lieutenant's** experiences while stationed in the South Pacific during World War II.

Ideally, going forward, we would privilege the creator's self-identification over any other evidence. Technical services archivists are working with curators to develop practices for soliciting identity information from donors. Here we are building on the "Life History Form" used by the Southern Oral History Program,[4] whose interviews and administrative files are housed in Wilson Special Collections Library, to solicit contextual information about interviewees.

Even with the example of the Southern Oral History Program, consistently including identity information in finding aids presents issues and complexity. Because of the nature of the collections at UNC-Chapel Hill, we are using "white" much more frequently than any other label. For legacy finding aids, we are often making educated guesses and end up with labels that are not very nuanced.

To promote transparency, we developed a processing note that we include in every finding where the collection creator is an individual or family:

> Since August 2017, we have added racial and ethnic identities for individuals and families represented in collections. To determine identity, we rely on self-identification; other information supplied to the repository by collection creators or sources; public records, press accounts, and secondary sources; and contextual information in the collection materials. Omissions of identities in finding aids created or updated after August 2017 are an indication of insufficient information to make an educated guess or an individual's preference for ethnicity to be excluded from description. When we have misidentified, please let us know at wilsonlibrary@unc.edu.

While we have begun de-centering the white supremacist point of view and presumed whiteness in the finding aid description, we have significant work to do around confronting our failures of care around marginalized people in the archive. Reflecting on Bergis Jules 2017 keynote at the National Digital Stewardship Alliance meeting,[5] we are following his suggestion that archivists take an honest assessment of the collections in our home institutions to determine how they silence, erase, and distort the legacies of marginalized people. We believe the silencing, erasing, and distorting is happening in the finding aids for the 500-plus collections held in Wilson Library that contain sources of information about enslaved people.

We have an illustrative example with the finding aid for one of our most heavily used manuscript collections: The Cameron Family Papers. Before the Civil War, the Camerons enslaved approximately 1,000 people on extensive plantations in North Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. Financial and legal documents and volumes found in the collection contain information about the people that the Camerons enslaved, including their names, ages, where they worked, and their illnesses.

Unsurprisingly, the arrangement of the collection as "family papers" and the finding aid description, which was composed in the late 1980s, is concerned primarily with the white family members. The lengthy biographical note provides an in-depth history of all the family members detailed to the extent that it mentions by name the Cameron daughter's favorite governess. The note talks about the family members as owning "land and slaves," but contains no information about the people enslaved by the family.

The entirety of the collection is thoroughly described in the finding aid and because of this, the finding aid description does surface documentation of enslaved people.

Fig. 1. Screenshot of a contents list which includes materials related to enslaved people

However, the description of these materials, the lists of enslaved people, deeds, indentures and grants documenting the transfer of enslaved people, the bills of sale and appraisals, the daybooks reflecting purchases by enslaved people, are embedded in and obscured by the family papers framework and are only briefly mentioned in the finding aid's abstract.

Legacy description:
Cameron family of Orange and Durham counties and Raleigh, N.C. Among antebellum North Carolina's largest landholders and slave holders, the Camerons also owned substantial plantations in Alabama and Mississippi. Prominent family members included Richard Bennehan (1743-1825), merchant; Duncan Cameron (1777-1853), lawyer, judge, banker, and legislator; and Paul C. Cameron (1808-1891), planter, agricultural reformer, and railroad builder. The bulk of the collection consists of correspondence, financial and legal documents, and account books. In addition, there are speeches, writings, printed material, pictures, and miscellaneous other types of personal papers. Included is extensive information about Richard Bennehan's store at Stagville, N.C., and the Stagville and Fairntosh plantations, **including crop and slave records**. Family correspondence details the familial relationships and social behavior of a wealthy planter family, particularly the women. In addition to documentation about Duncan Cameron's legal career, there is also information about the State Bank of North Carolina and the banking industry, the education of the Cameron children at various schools, the development of the University of North Carolina, the state militia, the Episcopal Church, railroads, and state government.

We have begun the conversation at UNC-Chapel Hill about how to reposition, surface, and amplify the description of materials about enslaved people and have some initial ideas. We recognize that we will not develop an effective way forward without working together with colleagues inside and outside the profession and with the communities we hope to center in these descriptions. The approaches described here are not intended to be solutions; they are merely first steps toward what we hope will be description that is more accurate and more inclusive.

Jackie Dean works in Archival Processing in the Special Collections Technical Services department in Wilson Special Collections Library at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

NOTES

1. Jarrett Drake, "RadTech Meets RadArch: Towards A New Principle for Archives and Archival Description," Paper presented at Radcliffe Workshop on Technology & Archival Processing, Cambridge, MA, April 2016. Accessed December 5, 2019. https://medium.com/on-archivy/radtech-meets-radarch-towards-a-new-principle-for-archives-and-archival-description-568f133e4325

   Gloria Gonzalez and Jasmine Jones, "Access and Diversity: How to Create Practical and Ethical Minimal Archival Description," Presented at Intersections: Technology and Public Services in Special Collections Symposium, State College, PA, August 2017

   Michelle Caswell, "Teaching to Dismantle White Supremacy in Archives." *The Library Quarterly* 87, no. 3 (July 2017): 222-235. https://doi.org/10.1086/692299

   Annie Tang, Dorothy Berry, Kelly Bolding, and Rachel Winston, "Towards Culturally Competent Archival (Re)description of Marginalized Histories." Presented at Society of American Archivists Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., August 2018

   Nathan Sentence, "Maker unknown and the decentring First Nations People." *Archival Decolonist* (blog). 2017. Accessed December 5, 2019. https://archivaldecolonist.com/2017/07/21/maker-unknown-and-the-decentring-first-nations-people/amp/?__twitter_impression=true /

2. Kelly Bolding, "Reparative Processing: A Case Study in Auditing Legacy Archival Description for

Racism" Presentation at Midwestern Archives Conference, Chicago, IL, March 2018. goo.gl/uwjQpg
3. "Conscious Style Guide." Accessed December 5, 2019. https://consciousstyleguide.com/articles/
4. Southern Oral History Program at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. "Interview Forms." In *A Practical Guide to Oral History,* 16. March 2014. Accessed December 5, 2019. https://sohp.org/files/2013/11/A-Practical-Guide-to-Oral-History_march2014.pdf
5. Bergis Jules, "Confronting Our Failure of Care Around the Legacies of Marginalized People in the Archives," Keynote address presented at National Digital Stewardship Alliance, Pittsburg, PA October 2017. Accessed December 5, 2019. https://medium.com/on-archivy/confronting-our-failure-of-care-around-the-legacies-of-marginalized-people-in-the-archives-dc4180397280

REVIEWS

Norman A. Mooradian. *Ethics for Records and Information Management*. **Chicago: American Library Association, Neal-Schuman. 2018. 191 p. Table of contents, introduction, appendices. $75.00 (nonmember); $67.50 (member).**

As archivists, our ethics provide us with an understanding of collecting, donor relations, and access for the researcher. With paper collections, the rules regarding restriction of personal information can be clearly outlined through best practices and easy-to-spot identifiers and easily followed. However, as archivists and records managers tread into the territory of born-digital materials, we must develop ethics that address the many challenges of these materials. This is the problem Norman A. Mooradian attempts to tackle in *Ethics for Records and Information Management*. Mooradian, who holds a PhD in Philosophy from Ohio State University, seeks to provide records and information management professionals with an ethical framework for handling electronic information and materials. Along with his education and teaching experience at San Jose State University and Cal Poly Pomona, Mooradian also serves as a senior solutions analyst a Senior Solution Engagement at Konica Minolta's Enterprise Content Management ECMDivision, allowing him to frame philosophical concepts within real-world examples that can be applied across disciplines. The early chapters of this book provide various ethical frameworks to orient the reader, from the larger concept of moral good to the nuances of professional ethics. Mooradian begins the book with the principle that records and information management ethics are defined by the issues the field faces and the responsibilities it recognizes. This sets the stage for an exploration of how our own personal morals can be applied to our professions.

The book begins with personal ethics and expands outward, covering a series of specific situations. The first chapter focuses on the idea that records and information management professionals have to adhere to the fundamentals of morality. Mooradian draws on his philosophical education to provide an introduction to the ethics that influence us as humans. In this first chapter, Mooradian states that "a records professional gains his or her ethical responsibility

from three areas: (a) ethics in general, (b) professional ethics, and (c) organizational ethics. These obligations come from the fact that the records professional is a person, and hence a moral agent" (1).

The ultimate thesis of this book is that records management revolves around an ethical core that mandates the profession to create, maintain and preserve the records of an organization. Mooradian touches on the issue of conflict of interest that plays into the everyday lives of records and management information professionals and archivists. Throughout the book, Mooradian presents case studies that make the reader investigate their own ethics and explore every possible outcome to an ethical conflict. The frameworks and case studies provide the reader with tangible instances that they can apply to their own professional life and institutions.

One of the most interesting and timely chapters focuses on the concept of whistleblowing. Here, Mooradian makes the case for and against whistleblowing as a records professional. Mooradian defines the act of whistleblowing as unique in that it produces both a personal ethical dilemma and one that holds professional stakes for the whistleblower. The author explains that whistleblowing may be politically or socially motivated and informed by an individual's personal ethical framework. With this lens, Mooradian has perfect opportunity to discuss the most famous case of whistleblowing in recent memory: Edward Snowden. Using Snowden as a case study, the author takes the reader behind the headlines and breaks the story down into the ethical frameworks in which Snowden exists as both a records and management information professional and as a person with morals.

Along with the discussion of the ethics that records and information management professionals employ in practice, Mooradian raises the idea that information creators and providers are also involved in the ethical aspect of records and information management. Mooradian proposes that when we participate in providing information electronically, we are establishing our autonomy as a person and entrusting records and information management professionals with our personal data. This description makes the electronic data that we all encounter seem more human, and its safety incredibly dependent on our abilities as records managers or archivists.

Throughout the book, Mooradian builds up an ethical bedrock that gives new meaning to the purpose of records and information management professionals. Mooradian uses his expertise in philosophy to dig deeper into the issues of accessing electronic records, how technology has shaped our own concepts of privacy, and ideas about the information we give to various organizations throughout our daily lives. The author provides a solid foundation in ethics as well as instruction in developing specific professional ethics. The case studies that Mooradian highlights provide the reader with interesting examples that feel timely and applicable to different records and information contexts. Another helpful aspect of this book is the various appendices that Mooradian provides, which allow for the reader to refresh their memory regarding ethics in the professional workplace. I found the appendices to be incredibly useful when tackling the sweeping ethical concepts found in the first chapter, and came back to them when trying to build my understanding of records and information management ethical frameworks. This book provides a thorough theoretical understanding of ethics for archivists and records management professionals as it applies to electronic records and access issues, but should not be considered an everyday handbook.

Randi Beem
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Caroline Brown (editor). *Archival Futures*. London: Facet Publishing. 2019. 156 p. Table of Contents, Introduction. $99.

The challenges posed to archivists by developments in technology cause much professional concern. *Archival Futures* seeks to imagine the future of archival repositories, the archival profession, and the very concept of "archives" itself. While "attempting to predict the future is always risky," (58) this work examines current practice and evaluates trends in order to provide a plausible conception of the future of archives.

Archival Futures consists of nine chapters written by fourteen authors who work in four countries (seven in the United Kingdom, four in Australia, two in Canada, and one in the United States). The chapters are arranged in an engaging manner, where each chapter deals with an important aspect of archives or the archival profession and is written by

an experienced professional. Rather than focus on the minute details of emerging technologies, these chapters form a work that takes a "big picture" approach.

Archival Futures employs the language of evolution and takes a positive outlook in examining the future of the archival profession. The editor, Caroline Brown, sets the tone by writing that archivists' skills are needed, and will continue to be valuable, but technological developments require archivists to "be adaptive and … embrace new circumstances and challenges" (XIX). Rather than resist technology, the authors continually encourage the intended audience— fellow archivists—by noting the necessary skillset of these professionals.

Chapter 1 maintains the positive tone set by the introduction, examining the skills on which the profession must focus now and in the future. Kate Theimer, the author of this chapter, asserts that interdisciplinarity and contextualization are the keys to professional survival in the new paradigm characterized by automation and innovation. As computers subsume more and more activities previously conducted by archivists, the unique ability of archivists to engage in "narrative, storytelling, meaning-making, [and] context providing" (13) will continue to be valuable. These aspects of the archivist's skillset are often referred to as "sensemaking" throughout the book. Theimer struggles to set forth a convincing rationale for why these particular skills would not enter the purview of computer systems, or artificial intelligence. However, the conclusions reached are plausible, particularly in the short-to-medium range.

In addition to archivists' "sense-making" in areas previously addressed primarily by the fields of education and public history, survival of the archival profession through interdisciplinarity involves understanding the field of information technology. Chapter 2, written by Luciana Duranti, examines archivists as custodians of records and proposes that the profession can educate people to "evaluate and assess sources of evidence" (26). In chapter 3, Victoria Lemieux focuses on blockchain technology to further explore the paradigm shift to decentralized and automated processes. A new "trans-discipline" is needed in which archivists understand coding and technologies such as blockchain, and IT professionals understand archival principles and concerns (41).

Perhaps the most intriguing chapter is Chapter 4, Geoffrey Yeo's "Can We Keep Everything? The Future of Appraisal in a World of Digital Profusion." In a profession currently hounded by the exponential growth of digital material and corresponding concerns about storing this material, Yeo challenges the preconceived notion that archival repositories *cannot* keep everything. Yeo argues that, due to automation and the increasingly sophisticated abilities of computers, the human side of appraisal will change significantly. Rather than become unnecessary, archivists' appraisal actions would focus "on those aspects of curation that depend on personalised advocacy or … sense-making" (56). Rather than conduct standard appraisal actions, the profession must evolve with a focus on selecting material from the vast amount of digital records to engage society through contextualization (sense-making).

Jenny Bunn in chapter 5 focuses on the future of processing while Sonia Ranade in chapter 6 examines how providing access will, and should, evolve. Both chapters stress the unique ability of archivists to engage in sense-making activities and that distinctions between related professions are often ignored by evolving use preferences and patterns (89). Ranade continues the book's positive attitude toward the future of the archival profession. She writes: "The shift to digital is not a threat, but a real *opportunity* for the archival profession to re-examine our assumptions, *embrace* relevant technologies and *re-invent* what it means to provide access to digital archives [emphasis added]" (79-80).

Chapter 7, written by Barbara Reed, Gillian Oliver, Frank Upward and Joanne Evans, highlights the complex issue of rights management in the digital context and notes the place of archivists in the "richness of interdisciplinary approaches" to this issue that "allow[s] differences to inform practice and creativity to thrive" (105). Michael Moss, David Thomas, and Craig Gauld in the last two chapters take a step back and consider the very concept of the "archive" itself. In a new paradigm defined by the inability to preserve an "organism" like the internet (124), opportunities exist for archives to capitalize on an increasing demand for "re-contextualization" (150). Gauld, author of Chapter 9, posits that "an increased validation of the archival role with a move to re-contextualisation, with the digital environment and its myriad of avenues … [leads] to greater demand for re-

intermediation, involving contextual framing and the archival intermediary" (150).

At some points in *Archival Futures* archivists from the United States may struggle with certain references that are more readily understood by British information professionals. While technology-related tools are mentioned, this is not a book for those seeking technical information. The book's strength is its big-picture look at trends and how the profession should evolve to meet the challenges posed by the paradigm shift brought about by advances in technology. This book is a worthy read for archival professionals and students in the information sciences. Bunn sums up the vital importance of sense-making to archives, noting that it is "a skill we should celebrate and develop. Relearning this skill in respect of the new material we deal with, and the new tools and vastly increased processing power available to us, is the future of archival processing" (76). According to the authors of *Archival Futures*, learning skills from other disciplines and developing the ability to contextualize material through sense-making are key to the survival of archival repositories, the archival profession, and the very concept of archives itself.

Jonathan Lawler
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

Tanya Zanish-Belcher and Anke Voss. *Perspectives on Women's Archives.* Chicago: ALA Editions. 2018. 502 p. Author biographies, notes, indexes. $70 (non-member); $63 (member).

In *Perspectives on Women's Archives*, editors' Tanya Zanish-Belcher and Anke Voss selected diverse authors to share various historical and archival experiences, giving insight into the struggles, successes, strategies and challenges faced in the saving and sharing of new women's history. The book includes an overview of the articles and brief biographies to become familiar with the authors' backgrounds. The book also includes an index and notes to use as a reference point. The eighteen essays cover varied topics ranging from feminism and its impact on women and archival history, race and underrepresented groups, community, sexuality, workplace outreach, religion, reproductive justice, and the challenges and future of women-related collections. The

book encourages all historians and archivists to collect, collaborate, describe, and preserve the history of women in totality. The editors' goal in writing this book was to highlight neglected collections focused on women or other gaps in archives, and challenge others to continue to ask questions to broaden the future of women-related archives and scholarship. The book not only benefits historians and archivists but can also serve as a 'resource on women's history, as it discusses in historical context the rise of women, and the ways various movements and organizations positively impacted women's studies.

In the introduction, Zanish-Belcher and Voss discuss three main themes of importance facing women-related collections and the archival field. The editors suggest historians' and archivists should work to increase collaboration, accessibility, and the development of community archives to help build and preserve these collections. Some of the recommended approaches to grow and save collections include joint grant writing, utilization of better descriptive language for discoverability, and archival training to support community archiving for grassroots and citizen archivists.

Throughout the book the historian and archivist are compelled to face many questions, such as whether biases of race, gender and sexual identity are a roadblock in collecting women's history. In the 1980 essay "Sources for the New Women's History" by Eva Mosely, she called on her professional colleagues to recognize that history is about all sexes, races, and classes and archives should reflect that fact" (92). Even though important strides have been made towards addressing societal biases, one can question if historians and archivists still struggle with these same issues today, therefore marginalizing and silencing the history of the underrepresented women's experiences.

The book has four sections of essays: "Reclaiming our Past," "Locating Women in Archives," "Documenting Women's Experiences," and a conclusion. In "Reclaiming Our Past" authors discuss scholarship of the late twentieth century. The articles show how women-focused history developed and expanded throughout the years, especially during the women's movements of the 1960s. This led to a key turning point at which archives began seeking and preserving increased documentation of women's history and placing emphasis on the importance of women's experiences. Of

note, Gerda Lerner is considered a trailblazer in women's history and her 1975 essay, "Placing Women in History: Definitions and Challenges," confronts the status quo of collecting male-dominated historical records. In addition, the essay "No Documents-No History: Mary Ritter Beard and the Early History of Women's Archives" by Anke Voss-Hubbard details the importance of historian Mary Ritter Beard's concerted effort and initial work to create an international women's archives. Although it was deemed unsuccessful, Beard's later collaborations with Radcliffe and Smith College during the 1940's expedited the growth of women's collections.

The 1970's and 1980's proved to be important decades as historians and archivists produced women's history guides and surveys, resulting in combined resources for women's studies. Resources such as the massive *Women's History Sources* survey, compiled listings of women's collections throughout the United States, and the *Black Women in*

the Middle West project reflected the often-forgotten history of African American women.

The essays of "Locating Women in the Archives" concentrated on the necessity of locating women's collections and demonstrating the significance of the experiences of women. These articles reveal the many intricacies of women's experiences and show they require a space in the annals of history. Fernanda Perrone's essay focuses on the religious female experience, while Mary Caldera's centers on community archives and lesbian identity, along with Karen Mason and Tanya Zanish-Belcher examining the Iowa Women's Archives of rural women. In addition, Susan Tucker's essay explores the extraction of hidden women's history from family collections, and lastly, Zanish-Belcher discusses research on human reproduction. These types of collections present different challenges for historians and archivists to overcome, especially confronting issues of privacy in the collection of human experiences.

In "Documenting Women's Experiences," the authors' present different approaches to documenting women's collections. Mosely shares traditionally, Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) have collected historical primary source materials of African American women and provided access of the collections to researchers. Danelle Moon's essay discusses the regional gatherings by San Jose State University of collections on politics and organizations as well as social movements of women in the South Bay region. In comparison, Virginia Corvid's essay documents various zine collections as primary source materials which reflect diverse viewpoints of women throughout the country. Equally as important is the essay of Janice Ruth, detailing the collaborated effort of the Library of Congress staff to produce a public symposium to publicize its women's holdings by using technology, subject guides, detailed cataloging, and creative partnerships'. The authors' essays describe various unique women's collections, their importance, and ways to promote the collections and sustain women's history.

In the concluding section, Lerner argues in her essay "Holistic History: Challenges and Possibilities" there are more spheres of women's history we have not documented, and Elizabeth Myers in her essay "I am My Sister's Keeper: Women's Archives, a Reflection" agrees, archivists must seek out all-encompassing women's collections.

Perspectives on Women's Archives shows woman-kind over the centuries have recorded and organized documents to connect their communities and develop their identities as women. It also shows women have been an integral part of history since the beginning of time, but the question remains: how can history and archives document the wide-ranging cultural, societal, and historical collective impact of women?

Netta S. Cox
North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University

Submissions and Subscriptions

The *Journal for the Society of North Carolina Archivists* seeks to support the theoretical, practical, and scholarly aspects of the archival professions by publishing articles and reviews related to curatorial issues (e.g., collection management and development), technical services (e.g., cataloging, processing, digital collections, EAD, preservation, conservation, etc.), and public services (reference, instruction, outreach) for special collections and archives.

The *Journal* accepts a range of articles related to research, study, theory, or practice in the archival professions. All members of the archival community, including students and independent researchers, are welcome to submit articles and reviews. Contributors need not be members of SNCA or live in the state of North Carolina. The *Journal* will not reprint or republish articles submitted to and accepted by other publications. Full manuscript submission requirements can be found at*: http://www.ncarchivists.org/publications.*

The Journal is open access and can be viewed at *http://www.ncarchivists.org/journal-of-the-society-of-north-carolina-archivists-j-snca/.* For additional information concerning *J-SNCA* , please contact the Publications Chair at publications@ncarchivists.org.