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President’s Letter

LOOKING BACKWARD, LOOKING FORWARD

Michael Stevens

This year marks the thirtieth anniversary of the Association for Documentary Editing, and it is a time to both celebrate our past and look forward to new directions. I recently took a look at the first volumes of The ADE Newsletter (predecessor of Documentary Editing) to refresh my memory of the ADE’s first annual meeting. I was struck by how much has changed over the past three decades, as well as by how much has stayed the same.

I was a newly minted history PhD when I walked into the Nassau Inn in Princeton, New Jersey, for the ADE’s first annual meeting. I had been hired by the South Carolina Department of Archives and History to edit The State Records of South Carolina series. What I knew about documentary editing came from my experience working as a graduate student on The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution in Madison, Wisconsin. I also had attended Camp Edit under the tutelage of the faculty that included John Simon and Chuck Hobson.

A number of things stand out in my memory from that first ADE annual meeting in Princeton. Technology and its impact on documentary editing were at the forefront of the agenda. Larry Bland told a rapt audience about word processing equipment (he called it an editing terminal) that allowed editors to save versions of a manuscript and do searches and replacement of words. Larry also reported on one of the latest innovations: new systems that actually “check the words in a document against a relatively large dictionary for spelling accuracy.” David Chesnutt gave a paper on going electronic and noted that he was able to store 1,200 pages of typescript on only fifteen floppy disks. Although the dissemination of texts through the yet-to-be-invented Internet was beyond anyone’s imagination, ADE members focused on technological change from the very beginning.

In his presidential address, Arthur Link called for creation of a manual on documentary editing. Now, thirty years later, ADE members are served by Mary-Jo Kline’s A Guide to Documentary Editing, which will soon appear in a revised third edition, along with Steve Burg’s and my Editing Historical Documents. Other issues discussed at that meeting were threats to federal funding and career opportunities for young editors.

My most striking memory from the Princeton meeting was the easy collegiality and helpfulness found among the members that crossed disciplines, projects, and generations. I knew only a few people when the meeting started but left with the feeling of having acquired many new friends. Senior editors such as Lester Cappon, Arthur Link, and George Rogers were cordial and encouraging, and it was heartening to see that many bright, energetic younger folks, such as Charlene Bickford and Ray Smock, already were playing active roles in the organization. Many of the young editors from that first meeting (such as myself) are now as gray as the senior editors I remember, and sadly, a few, such as Larry Bland, have passed on.

Today, on the cusp of the organization’s thirtieth anniversary, we are no longer in awe of innovations such as spell check, but many of the fundamentals that made the ADE such a great organization are still present. Today’s ADE still provides a forum for networking and exploring issues that documentary editors...
share. It also is made up of caring and helpful individuals who are committed to their work and have a willingness to share their expertise with others.

On that note, I’d like to invite you to share your expertise and to participate in the ADE’s efforts to both celebrate its past and look forward to the future. *Documentary Editing* appears under the direction of a new editor, Kent Calder. I’d urge you to sit down at your ancient “editing terminal” or your new Blackberry and send Kent your recollections of the Association’s thirty years history. Kent is always looking for good contributions, but over the next month it would be wonderful if he could get material to include in a thirtieth anniversary issue of the journal.

I also invite you to visit the ADE’s new website. We have been generously hosted by the University of Virginia in recent years, but we now have our own site and our own domain name. Visit www.documentaryediting.org and see the fine work of the redesigned site prepared by webmaster Jennifer Stertzer.

I hope to see many of you at the ADE’s thirtieth annual meeting, to be held in Tucson, Arizona, October 23–25. Diana Hadley and the local arrangements committee have found a wonderful setting for us, and Cathy Moran Hajo and the program committee will have an interesting program. It will be a great opportunity for you, whether you are a thirty-year veteran of the ADE or a brand-new member.

The ADE is at an important crossroads. Much has changed in the documentary editing profession in the past three decades. New methods of publication have emerged; the era of large projects is diminishing; and the number of users of published historical documents has exploded as a result of the Web. Many more people are engaged in the practices that we call documentary editing (the selection, transcription, and explication of documents), but these same individuals don’t define their work or their profession as such. Scholars use new and changing tools to produce their work in ways that weren’t imaginable when the Association was formed in St. Louis in 1978.

This summer, the ADE planning committee will convene for a retreat in Madison to help plan for the organization’s future. In a recent letter to the membership I reported in some detail on our planning efforts. For a healthy future, the ADE needs to make sure that it is the essential group for anyone interested in publishing primary source documents.

The questions to explore are many. In light of new technologies, who is a documentary editor? Why should documentary editors join the ADE? What benefits does the ADE need to provide its members? What value do we add to make nontraditional members want to join us? Should we go beyond simply adding as members the small numbers of individuals working on projects like our own, and redefine what we have to offer a much broader community? Can we actively woo scholars whose work overlaps with ours, find archivists, public historians, and professors who are working on projects, both in traditional print form and in digital publication, and invite them to join, pitching the organization in a more broad-based manner that encourages such participation? What services do they need? What should our journal, *Documentary Editing*, become? How do we better educate documentary editors? How does the ADE get more financial resources to do what it needs to do? How can the ADE take advantage of federal and private grants to implement its mission? How do we continue to advocate for documentary editing projects?

I’d urge you to reflect on these and other questions about the future of the ADE and send me your comments (preferably before June 12 when the retreat begins) at michael.stevens@wisconsinhistory.org. I will share them with the full planning committee.

Those who founded the ADE thirty years ago knew that change was needed to promote documentary editing and created our organization. We believe that in that same spirit, this is the time to meet the challenges of our own time.
If You Have to Explain It, Is It Still Funny?

Beth Luey

Is editing humor different from editing political correspondence, personal letters, journals, and the materials that most documentary editors deal with? Transcription surely is the same, but what about annotation? When I asked three editors to present papers on the subject, they were reluctant to do so because they didn’t think they did anything differently than editors whose subjects are less funny. But it seemed to me that there would be differences. Humor is often topical and very much tied to its time: any script of The Daily Show resurrected fifty years from now would require a lot of explanation. Does the annotation need to provide more context than is needed for other kinds of documents? And if you do supply context, how do you keep it from bogging down the humor? We have all had the experience of hearing someone explain why a joke is funny, and that spells the end of any humor the joke might have had. The panelists—Ellen R. Cohn, editor of the Benjamin Franklin Papers; Robert Hirst, general editor of the Mark Twain Papers; and Steven Gragert, director of the Will Rogers Memorial Museums—answered these questions, as well as some that I hadn’t thought to ask.

I first wondered about this topic when browsing through Jewish American Literature: A Norton Anthology.¹ It includes a story by Leo Rosten from The Education of H*Y*M*A*N K*A*P*L*A*N, written and set in 1930s New York.² Mr. Kaplan is a student in a night class for immigrants learning English. His confidence far outstrips his language skills. In this story, “Mr. Kaplan and Shakespeare,” his teacher, the long-suffering Mr. Parkhill, has given up the usual practical speaking lesson for an adventure

in understanding Shakespeare. He writes on the board
   Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow
   Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
   To the last syllable of recorded time
   and so forth.

   At this point in the anthology, the editors insert a seemingly obvious
   note identifying the play, act, and scene. But is this such an obvious
   thing to do? I imagine that, in the undergraduate classes for which this
   anthology is in part intended, few students could supply that information.
   So at first blush it makes sense to identify the play. But what happens in
   the story is that Mr. Kaplan begins: “Ve mus’ tink abot Julius Scissor an’
   how he falt!” and goes on at great length to explicate the passage in the
   context of Julius Scissor. Unfortunately, the passage is from *Macbeth*, as
   Mr. Parkhill tells him after a bit. Undaunted, Mr. Kaplan goes on. So
   the note is unnecessary, since the text itself supplies the information, and
   this premature identification limits the possible readings. For readers who
   don’t know the source, the humor comes from the language and from Mr.
   Kaplan’s imaginative interpretation—until the truth is revealed and they are
   no longer sure they should be laughing at Mr. Kaplan. (Even Mr. Parkhill,
   with a grudging respect for “the fertility of Mr. Kaplan’s imagination and
   the power of his oratory…could not easily return to the world of reality.”)
   For the reader who knows the passage is from *Macbeth*, the humor is
   more along the lines of *Fawlty Towers*: a cringing, nervous feeling that
   comes from knowing that someone is making an ass of himself. In this
   case, the joke is not spoiled by too much information, but it is limited.
   This, I suspect, is the sort of problem that most of us would anticipate in
   annotating humor: the fear of telegraphing the punch line.

   In the same story, though, a joke is totally missed because there is no
   note. The first student to speak after Mr. Parkhill reads the passage aloud
   is Miss Carevello:
   “Da poem isa gooda,” she said slowly. “Itsa have
   beautiful words. Itsa lak Dante, Italian poet—”
   “Ha!” cried Mr. Kaplan scornfully. “Shaksbeer you
   metchink mit Tante? Shaksbeer? Mein Gott! . . . to me is
   no comparink a high-cless man like *Shaksbeer* mit a Tante,
   dat’s all.”
   Now, if you are of my generation and grew up among people with accents,
   you got the joke. Miss Carevello pronounces Dante as an Italian would,
with a short e at the end rather than a long a. And Mr. Kaplan hears it as a Yiddish speaker would, as “tante,” or aunt, possibly with a slightly negative implication. Certainly Shakespeare is not to be compared to one’s Aunt Sadie. But, again, most of today’s undergraduates have grown up without hearing an Italian or Yiddish accent. Without a note, that joke is lost forever.

This, it turns out, is a bigger problem than I thought. As Bob Hirst noted in his paper on Mark Twain, the editors have come precariously close on several occasions to missing a joke altogether, leading them to believe that they probably have missed a few more. The more subtle the humor, the more likely it is that a century or so down the road we won’t realize that the author was being funny. (Perhaps some contemporaries didn’t either.) One example Bob Hirst used was a group of apparently random letters and symbols that turned out to be a rebus. And Ellen Cohn noted that Benjamin Franklin was very fond of hoaxes, many of which he kept going for years and which remained undetected. His editors have tracked them down and provided annotation to explain what they were about, but they suffer from lingering fears that there are more out there, either undetected altogether or detected but not attributed to Franklin.

Of course, the fact that the editors came close to missing a joke means that readers most certainly would miss it. In these cases, annotation is essential. Crafting a note that alerts readers to the joke, explains it, but doesn’t spoil it is a skill that requires extraordinary dexterity on the part of an editor.

Contrary to my expectations, the vintage of the humor doesn’t necessarily affect the need to annotate. As Ellen Cohn pointed out, eighteenth-century joke books don’t seem very funny to us, but one of Poor Richard’s aphorisms can still bring down the house, in part because of Franklin’s careful choice of words. We might assume that Will Rogers, the most recent figure discussed, would be the most accessible, yet he was subjected to the heaviest annotation. Psychologists are probably better equipped than editors to explain which sorts of humor are timeless and why.

As the session title suggests, editors do have to worry about overexplaining. Readers of documentary editions, whether humorous or not, are annoyed by unnecessary notes. In another excerpt from the *Norton Anthology*, this one a story by S. J. Perelman, the editors interrupt the narrative to define “sweatshop,” to note that “The night before Christmas” is “the first line of the popular poem by Clement Moore,” and to explain
that “Beethoven’s Fifth” is “a symphony by Ludwig van Beethoven.” As Steve Gragert details in his article in this issue, Will Rogers’s first editor was heavily criticized for running jokes into the ground with heavy annotation.

Is editing humor different? In many ways, no. But the editor walks a fine line between spoiling the joke and missing it, a line that others do not have to navigate. And there is real danger in not getting the joke, as Woody Allen explains in his own version of the story of Abraham and Isaac:

    And so he took Isaac to a certain place and prepared to sacrifice him but at the last minute the Lord stayed Abraham’s hand and said, “How could thou doest such a thing? . . . I jokingly suggest thou sacrifice Isaac and thou immediately runs out to do it.”

    And Abraham fell to his knees, “See, I never know when you’re kidding.”

    And the Lord thundered, “No sense of humor. I can’t believe it.”

---

4 “The Scrolls,” in Chametzky et al., 320-23.
These apparently random letters and symbols from the Mark Twain Papers turned out to be a rebus. The top entry translates, “A little more than kin but less than kind”; middle, “A little darkey in bed with nothing over him”; and the next is “You undertake to overthrow my undertakings.” According to Bob Hirst, “Take a drink?” needs no explanation. From Notebook 7, Mark Twain Papers, the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
Humor and Its Hazards:
Editing *The Papers of Will Rogers*  

Steven K. Gragert

“Humor is a very delicate instrument. It must express its own subtlety, nuance, attitude and flavor. There is no one more deadly than the person who steps up to ‘explain’ the joke. And no one steps up more often than the editor.”  

The “voice” was that of Will Rogers, Jr.—known as Bill to family and friends—the eldest child of Will and Betty Rogers, a graduate of Stanford University, a former member of Congress, a decorated veteran of World War II, a player in California real estate, a man who bore his father’s name and lived in his immense shadow. The “editor” was Dr. Theodore L. Agnew, Jr., also a veteran of World War II, who after the war had earned a doctorate in American History from Harvard University, where he had worked with Arthur Schlesinger, Sr., and who joined the history faculty at what became Oklahoma State University, eventually rising to the rank of full professor.  

The “humor” in question belonged to Bill’s father, William Penn Adair “Will” Rogers, the Cherokee cowboy who parlayed the roping skills he learned on his father’s 60,000-acre spread in Indian Territory in the late nineteenth century into one of the country’s most successful careers in entertainment and communication of the first half of the twentieth century. In a lifetime cut dramatically short by an airplane crash in Alaska in August 1935, Will Rogers put an estimated two million words in print and produced thousands of newspaper and magazine articles and columns, as well as six books and scores of other writings. He ranked as the nation’s most widely read syndicated newspaper columnist, his weekly and daily

---

A page from one of Will Rogers’s original typewritten manuscripts shows editor’s markings and Rogers’s own strike-throughs in pencil. The full manuscript was published in the New York Times, January 21, 1923, as the sixth of his weekly newspaper columns. The series eventually reached about 500 newspapers and 40 million readers a week.
columns appearing in upwards of 500 newspapers throughout the country, including in every major city. His writings reached 40 million readers weekly.

He also dominated other sectors of media and entertainment. Not only was Rogers the nation’s leading newspaper columnist at the time of his death, by August 1935 he ranked second only to Shirley Temple as motion picture box-office star, enjoyed the highest rated Sunday evening radio program, and commanded one of the heftiest fees of any after-dinner speaker. Politics and current events were the bread and butter of his humor, and he used a mixture of homespun wisdom and insightful wit to make millions of people laugh at their own follies and dilemmas—and the country’s.4

It was through his writings, however, that Rogers achieved his greatest influence. Fortunately, most of them, in their original as well as published formats, survived through the years, thanks mostly to the farsightedness of his wife, Betty. Over the decades after Will’s death in 1935 and Betty’s in 1944, the family donated his original and published papers, as well as many of his films, audio recordings, artifacts, photographs, scrapbooks, and other materials, to the Will Rogers Memorial, a 22,000-square-foot native limestone museum built by the state of Oklahoma for $200,000 in the Depression year of 1938, three years after Rogers’s death. Located in Claremore, Oklahoma, Will’s adopted hometown, the museum eventually could claim the world’s largest collection of Rogers’s original handwritten and typewritten letters, telegrams, book manuscripts, radio scripts, stage routines, speeches, monologues, advertising copy, magazine articles, and newspaper writings.5

Almost from the opening day of the Memorial, discussion began about publishing Rogers’s collected works. An early one-volume effort appeared in 1949. Author and magazine editor Donald Day literally cut and pasted several of Will’s newspaper and other writings—retyped versions, fortunately—to produce the chronologically sequenced The Autobiography of Will Rogers, published by Houghton Mifflin. Other trade books and assorted academic studies came into print over the next several years, but no serious attempt was made to collect and edit his published works.


That is, until 1967. In March of that year, Paula Love, the curator of the Memorial since its opening, wrote to Dr. Raymond Knight, the secretary of the museum’s oversight body, the Will Rogers Memorial Commission, asking, “Can you give us any information on the contact you were making in regard to the editing project of Will Rogers’ works? Is there some way we could help push it along? Everything is just about ready and if it is going to be done in our life time, we’ll have to get started on it pretty soon.” More than twenty-eight years serving the Memorial along with husband and museum manager Bob Love, Paula had been a favorite niece of Will Rogers. He had taken a keen interest in her as a youngster when she was afflicted with infantile paralysis and later had provided the means for her to attend college, where she studied history and prepared to be a teacher. Her bout with polio left her frail for much of her life, but her mind was quick and sharp, honed by constant reading and a passion to maintain the Memorial to her uncle and to sustain his legacy. Not formally trained in museum work, she had virtually lived for the moment that her copious, meticulous work organizing, copying, footnoting, indexing, hole-punching, rubber-stamping, and binding the thousands of pages of Rogers’s writings in the Memorial’s collection could finally be assembled in book form.

Apparently, Knight’s “contact” proved fruitful. The Loves, members of the Commission, and officials at Oklahoma State University in Stillwater, including the school’s president, Dr. Robert B. Kamm, met a few months later to finalize a contract for OSU “to edit all of the published and unpublished works, letters, documents and other memorabilia pertaining to the late Will Rogers.” The document, signed by Dr. Kamm and by Morton Harrison, the chair of the Will Rogers Memorial Commission, stipulated that OSU would provide an editor, a staff, and office space; the Commission, at its expense, would make available for editing photocopies of documentary materials; OSU would proceed with diligence to complete the work and would issue periodic reports; its History Department would coordinate the project; the university would be granted the exclusive right to complete it; and the Commission would assist the school in obtaining

6 Love to Knight, March 20, 1967, WRMC Papers.
7 PWR, 3:194n.2; Morton R. Harrison to Royce Savage, May 9, 1968, WRMC Papers.
Rogers prepared a script in advance of nearly every public appearance, including his radio broadcasts. He would read through the prepared text once or twice and then deliver the remarks without notes. Audio recordings of his speeches confirm that he followed closely his scripted comments. This first page of his typewritten notes for a national broadcast on October 18, 1931, for President Herbert Hoover’s commission on unemployment relief reveals his usual style of strike-throughs, type-overs, and interpolations.

The remarks became famous as the “Bacon and Beans and Limousines” speech and were published in Radio Broadcasts of Will Rogers, a volume in “The Writings of Will Rogers” series by Oklahoma State University Press.
Rogers’s weekly radio show, *The Gulf Headliners*, ran from 1933 until his death in 1935, first on the National Broadcasting Company and then the Columbia Broadcasting System. Transcripts of all of the highly rated broadcasts survived, as well as audio recordings of a majority. Most have been reproduced in the edited, annotated series of Will Rogers’s materials published by Oklahoma State University Press and the University of Oklahoma Press.

necessary copyright authority for publication. Nowhere in the contract was mention made that any of the collected works would be published as a scholarly edition.8

Soon after signing the agreement, President Kamm wrote the Commission, “Oklahoma State University is looking forward to a long period of pleasant relations with the Commission in the accomplishing of this program.”9 A couple of days later, Bob Love typed a note to a member of his Commission who had been absent from the contract signing: “Dr. Knight of OSU [the chairman of the History Department and no kin to the Commission’s own Dr. Knight], estimated it will take at least five years to get the works ready for publication. At least we are on the road!” Hopes were high, but expectations seemed under control.10

The goals of the organizers were ambitious: to collect, edit, and publish all of the previously published writings of Will Rogers—estimated at the time at three million words—and to collect, edit, and publish others of his papers, including personal letters, telegrams, stage notes, speeches, and radio transcripts. Those who initiated the project were motivated by the thought that when completed it would make available for the first time to research libraries and the public the insights and humor of the favorite son of the state. They believed firmly that Rogers’s papers were vital to understanding the cultural history of the United States in the first three decades of the twentieth century.

Both parties, OSU and the Memorial, moved quickly. The university appointed Knight of the History Department to oversee the project and Dr. Ted Agnew, professor of American History, to serve as its editor at half-time, the remainder of his time to be devoted to teaching. In November 1967, Paula Love sent Agnew a batch of material, along with the encouraging words, “we approve of you in every way and my husband and I feel that you are the perfect person to carry-out the editing of Will Rogers’s works.”11 She was equally enthusiastic about all those at OSU connected with the project. After a meeting she and Bill Rogers attended at the university in early December, she wrote the History Department’s Dr. Knight, “I do not know when I have ever been so impressed with everything

---

10 Love to Earl Sneed, September 17, 1967, WRMC Papers.
and EVERYBODY.” She added that Bill “was so impressed with you gentlemen who will have this task of editing his father’s works [and] . . . I personally was so happy that I could not go to sleep that night but kept thinking of the fine, scholarly minds among the group.”

A Will Rogers Research Center was established by January 1968 on the third floor of a new addition to the university library, and a small staff was assembled. Dr. Agnew promised to have available in sixty days a full plan in printed form. He anticipated, however, that the immediate priority of “preparing and publishing a complete, accurate, and scholarly edition of the . . . writings of Will Rogers” would consume a span of time that would “likely last for several years.” The parties involved agreed that the immediate sixty days would provide the Will Rogers Memorial—that is Paula Love and the usual lone part-time assistant—with “ample time to assemble all of the Rogers material” and to deposit it at OSU’s newly formed Research Center.

From the outset of the project, significant focus was placed on a particular set of Rogers’s writings: his daily column, known commonly as the Daily Telegram because he had routinely sent it six days a week by telegram to the Western Union office in the Times building in New York, which then wired it to subscriber papers. Usually three or four brief paragraphs of topical commentary and humor, it was his signature piece, appearing usually on a newspaper’s front page, or in the instance of the New York Times, above the fold on the first page of Section B. Legend held that people were known to read first Rogers’s Daily Telegram, then the rest of the newspaper.

The column’s importance cannot be overemphasized. In a day when the masses depended almost exclusively on newspapers for information and upon columnists for insight and interpretation, Will’s daily column enabled him to mold public opinion. Indeed, he was in a position to wield more power than most other columnists who had to prepare copy two weeks in advance and had to use the post for delivery, a practice Rogers himself had to follow with his other syndicated column, the weekly article. Yet, Rogers rarely abused the power afforded him through his dailies. His telegrams

---

12 Love to Knight, December 5, 1967, WRRP Papers.
13 Notes, Will Rogers Publication Committee Meeting, December 12, 1967, WRRP Papers.
generally showed no malice but indicated his desire to be fair. Will supported Herbert Hoover early in his presidency, for example, but became critical after the depression began. When several other critics, however, became bitter and vituperative, Rogers gently reminded his readers that the depression was not Hoover’s fault and that no single person could cause a national economic catastrophe.\footnote{Yagoda, 248–51, 295–7, 301; Arthur Power Dudden, “The Record of Political Humor,” in American Humor, ed. Arthur Power Dudden (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 59–62; see also James M. Smallwood and Steven K. Gragert, eds., Will Rogers’s Daily Telegrams, Vol. 2, The Hoover Years, 1929–1931 (Stillwater: Oklahoma State University Press, 1978) and Vol. 3, The Hoover Years, 1931–1933 (Stillwater: Oklahoma State University Press, 1979).}

As the Papers project began to take shape at OSU, Paula Love and her limited staff at the Memorial worked feverishly to gather, prepare, photocopy, and ship to Stillwater reams of Will’s writings, some from his original handwritten and typewritten texts, others from the sheets issued by the syndicate office, the preponderance in the form of typescripts of Will’s daily columns as they appeared in various newspapers, including ones in New York, Boston, Tulsa, Oklahoma, and Kansas City, Missouri. The photocopying continued at such a pace, the Memorial wore out its machine.\footnote{Love to Agnew, February 1, 1968, April 15, 1968, WRRP Papers.}

In June 1968, three months after the original deadline, Agnew completed a draft plan for The Will Rogers Papers project. He outlined a “comprehensive edition that . . . should make available to readers all materials essential to understanding Rogers’s personality, his development, and his successive careers. In addition, they should be useful to scholars and students of American, and indeed world, history during the first third of the twentieth century.” The Papers would be presented in topical, not chronological order, in other words, grouped by series of works, such as his Daily Telegrams, Weekly Articles, and general writings. And, significantly, the editor decided the Papers would begin with the series “associated most directly with him in the eyes of the American people”: the Daily Telegrams. Estimating their total number at nearly three thousand, Agnew projected the telegrams—“chronologically arranged, properly annotated, with individuals and situations appropriately identified”—would comprise the first two volumes of The Papers, in other words, as Agnew figured, hundreds of telegrams per volume, plus annotations and descriptive matter. According to the editor, the completed project would consist of fourteen volumes of Rogers’s writings, including personal papers.\footnote{The Will Rogers Papers: A Preliminary Prospectus, (Draft of June, 1968), WRRP Papers.}
William Vann (Bill or Will, Jr.) Rogers speaking on “Will Rogers as a Literary Figure” during a special program at Oklahoma State University in February 1972. The occasion was Rogers’s presentation to the OSU library of The Will Rogers Papers, a bound booklet of his father’s original writings that had been declared the millionth volume acquired by the library.

Bill Rogers and Dr. Theodore L. (Ted) Agnew at Oklahoma State University, February 1972.
Whether Agnew ever produced the prospectus in final form or even shared the June 1968 draft with the Loves and the Memorial Commission is not known. Regardless, the first evidence of discord soon arose. In August 1968, Paula Love wrote the new chairman of her Commission, Dr. Raymond Knight, to express concern about “our sagging editing project.” Agnew had just paid a visit to the Memorial while en route to Illinois on a vacation trip with his family. He had mentioned that he planned to check for Rogers materials at libraries in Illinois, but Love thought that he might want to start his research at the Memorial, if not at OSU. “I get sick to my soul,” she said, “when I think of the time he has wasted and to date I can find nothing he has really done.”¹⁸ Love was not alone in her feelings. James Leake, a prominent television station owner in Oklahoma and a powerful member of the Memorial Commission, called the deal with OSU, “a first class headache. I hope we can do something to change it. I agree that what is to be done must be a first class job or we should not allow anything to be done.”¹⁹ Bob Love and a member of the Commission soon traveled to Stillwater to visit the Research Center. They “looked things over,” Paula Love reported to Chairman Knight, “and there was nothing there but the books we had sent and then not all of them. . . . Bob said he was not trying to make trouble but he wanted to know how they operated and why something tangible had not been produced. . . . The answer is nothing.”²⁰ It was September 1968; a year had passed since the signing of the contract to start The Papers project.

Discontent continued to build with the Loves and among members of the Memorial Commission. Despite an understanding from the start that at least five years of preliminary work would need to be accomplished before the first volume was published, expectations of a book in print had escalated rapidly. The Loves complained of a lack of substantive communications from OSU, especially from Agnew, and described him as “totally unfit to edit Will Rogers.”²¹ After the Loves finally received a status report from Agnew in January 1969, Bob characterized it as “nothing but a play on words,” with no solid evidence of any work having been accomplished.”²² Commission members corresponded and met repeatedly over the issue. Bill
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¹⁸ Love to Knight, August 5, 1968, WRMC Papers.
¹⁹ Leake to P. M. Love, September 19, 1968, WRMC Papers.
²⁰ Love to Knight, September 22, 1968, WRMC Papers.
²² Love to R. W. Knight, January 13, 1969, WRMC Papers.
Rogers weighed in with his concerns that “it was time for the Commission to take definite steps” to move the project forward.\textsuperscript{23} The conciliatory remarks of one commissioner—“it frequently takes researchers and historians a long time to complete work”—failed to bring calm.\textsuperscript{24}

Finally, Agnew, armed with a letter of endorsement of \textit{The Papers} project from Dr. Oliver W. Holmes, executive director of the National Historical Publications Commission, met with the Loves in early October 1969. He was accompanied by his department chairman, Knight, and he brought for the Loves and the Commission a nine-page outline of the contents of the first volume, “The Daily Telegrams, 1926–1930,” and samples of four edited telegrams, showing the text as consolidated from various sources, with textual variants and explanatory footnotes.\textsuperscript{25} Apparently not lost on the Loves was the fact that the projected first volume was to contain more than thirteen hundred telegrams. They had been afforded a review of just four. “[T]his is \textit{it},” Paula Love wrote her chairman with emphasis included.\textsuperscript{26} She also quickly got a letter off to Bill Rogers and enclosed a copy of Agnew’s document. “[A] plan for editing the \textit{Daily Telegrams},” she wrote her cousin, “[a]t least we have something on paper that he intends to do.” She added no commentary about the quality of the editing; she wanted Rogers to analyze it with an unbiased mind.\textsuperscript{27}

Despite their misgivings about the work of the editor, the Loves desired the project to go forward. They even offered to finance the publishing of the first book out of their own pockets, “whether it costs $5,000.00 or $10,000.00.”\textsuperscript{28} They continued to send OSU shipment after shipment of photocopies and typescripts of articles and other materials and microfilm of original documents.\textsuperscript{29} Letters appeared to flow constantly between Claremore and Stillwater, Paula Love discoursing at length in hers about Will Rogers’s writing style, travels, habits, eccentricities; the dating and origin of various pieces of his writing; the vagaries of newspaper editors; the relative worth of various researchers and writers; and myriad other issues. From the start of the project, she had shown a willingness to share from her immense trove of knowledge and understanding of her famous uncle and his work. But her respect for Agnew diminished as the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23} R. W. Love to Earl Sneed and Argene Clanton, September 16, 1969, WRMC Papers.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Sneed to R. W. Love, September 18, 1969, WRMC Papers.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Agnew to Oliver W. Holmes, September 23, 1969, and Agnew to P. W. Love, October 2, 1969, with attachment, Brief Summary of First Publication (as projected October 1, 1969), WRRP Papers.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Love to Knight, October 3, 1969, WRMC Papers.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Love to Rogers, October 3, 1969, WRMC Papers.
\item \textsuperscript{28} R. W. Love to R. W. Knight, November 10, 1969, WRMC Papers.
\item \textsuperscript{29} P. M. Love to Agnew, October 8, 1969, P. M. Love to Agnew, November 9, 1969, and Agnew to P. M. Love, December 22, 1969, WRRP Papers.
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Left to right: Dr. Joseph A. (Joe) Stout, Jr., editor of “The Writings of Will Rogers”; Dr. Odie B. Faulk, chair of the Department of History, Oklahoma State University; and Dr. Homer Knight, former chair of the department, in the office of the Will Rogers Research Project, third floor, Oklahoma State University Library. Stout became editor of “The Writings” in 1973 shortly after Dr. Ted Agnew resigned the position and returned to full-time teaching in the History Department.

With a schedule of seven syndicated newspaper columns a week, Will Rogers took advantage of whatever free minutes arose in his daily life to peck out 100-700 words on a small manual typewriter that he often had to balance on his knees. Here he grabbed a moment in the front seat of his car on the studio lot of Fox Films in the mid-1930s.
months passed and no substantive results appeared. In late May 1970, President Kamm of OSU visited the Memorial and Paula Love told him that Bill Rogers was not pleased with the progress of the project; in fact, “he is disgusted,” she told Kamm. She and her staff had reviewed all of the material they had sent to Agnew and all of the correspondence she had had with “that man,” as she referred to him, and they could not see that they had erred. Nothing had been accomplished at OSU, she told Kamm. “That man will never get anything done. If he cannot produce something in almost three years, then he cannot do it and we all feel he is incapable. You will have to assign someone to the work who is at least interested.” As harshly as she spoke about Agnew, Paula Love was not about to terminate the relationship with OSU. She talked at length with Kamm about creating a full-blown Will Rogers Research Center in the university’s library; it would hold much of the original archives then on deposit at the Memorial. Nothing would be moved to Stillwater, however, if OSU handled the originals as poorly as it had treated the materials already placed there. As to The Papers, she said, “[T]here was not much time left in which to get things moving.” Kamm agreed.30

Interestingly, within a few days of Kamm’s visit to Claremore, Agnew produced a chart showing a comparison of time invested in nine nationally recognized papers projects, including several presidential ones. His study revealed that an average of almost eight years elapsed between the year a project began and the publication of its first volume. At the bottom of the table, he noted that the contract for the Will Rogers project was signed in 1967, he received appointment as editor in 1968, and the first volume was projected for 1971, a span of just three to four years.31 For him, expectations in Claremore may have seemed unduly inflated.

Criticism continued to mount, as well as the pressure, not just from the Loves, but also from Will Rogers, Jr. In their minds Agnew should not have started with the Daily Telegrams. He had failed to consult with recognized authorities on Rogers. He had refused to submit copy to the Memorial Commission for review. He had little experience as a writer, none as a scholarly editor.32 Paula Love even took her complaints to the governor

31 Table, Oklahoma State University, The Will Rogers Papers Project, June 1, 1970, WRRP Papers.
Paula McSpadden Love, the first curator of the Will Rogers Memorial and a niece of Rogers, accepts a gift to the museum from the president of Optimist International in March 1972, shortly before her death. Jo Davidson’s full-figure bronze of Will Rogers was the first display item in the Memorial when it opened on November 4, 1938, Rogers’s birthday.
of Oklahoma, who passed them to President Kamm with the message to “look into this and see that matters are expedited.” 33 Agnew responded in a deliberate fashion. The Memorial Commission and OSU had decided jointly to begin with the telegrams: those documents show Rogers’s “breadth of interest, his strength of character, his versatility.” He also noted that the editorial staff had listened to concerns voiced and had restructured the telegrams. They now would be spread over three volumes, not two, and the thrust of the introduction would be broadened and expanded. Moreover, OSU was increasing the size of the project’s staff. Thus, work on The Papers was expected to accelerate. 34

Over the next six months the pace did quicken, so substantially that in January 1971, Oklahoma State University Press, which had been formed essentially just to publish The Papers of Will Rogers, produced an initial full set of galleys of a new book titled Daily Telegrams of Will Rogers: Volume 1: 1926–1928. Set on a linotype machine at the university’s printing office, the galleys consisted of about 280 thirty-six-inch long sheets of newsprint on which were printed 43 pages of fore matter and almost 800 telegrams with textual variants and footnote annotations. In total it ran about 500 printed pages. 35

It was his read of those long-awaited galleys that had prompted the aforementioned lament of Will Rogers, Jr.: “Humor is a very delicate instrument. It must express its own subtlety, nuance, attitude and flavor. There is no one more deadly than the person who steps up to ‘explain’ the joke. And no one steps up more often than the editor.” 36 His critique came in an eight-page letter addressed to President Kamm, other officials at OSU, including Drs. Knight and Agnew, and the Will Rogers Memorial Commission, including the Loves. Rogers did commend the editor and his staff for their research. He found it “copious and complete,” but the lack of an editorial review board, according to Rogers, led to “a pedantic [and] archaic system of annotation [that] overpowers the text, kills the humor, and makes impossible that continuous reading which is essential to an understanding of the philosophical approach of Will Rogers’s humor.” The editor also had allowed himself “the most amazing editorializing. ‘WR

35 WRRP Papers.
exaggerates . . . WR enjoys making a sly parody . . . WR is apparently unhappy that . . . WR accomplishes two things at once . . . WR gently and with a touch of wry distaste. . . .”

“Poor WR,” his son wrote. “He cannot get a word in edgewise. The editor is right there to stop him. WR is not permitted to make his own point. The editor must do it for him.” To Bill Rogers, that first effort revealed an obvious lack of scholarly editing, an absence of editorial control, and a failure to provide oversight. No one outside the editorial staff had read the manuscript before it went into type, and only one outside person, Bill Rogers himself, a month earlier, had seen the galleys. Once he had reviewed them, he had insisted they be shared with others. Reading the galleys had convinced him that editing the Daily Telegrams was a more difficult job than anyone had imagined three years earlier. He did not blame the editor and staff. They had not been given adequate and proper outside guidance and advice. He called for the establishment of an editorial board and a commitment to collect and publish his father’s writings in line with accepted documentary editing practices.37 He told Paula Love that if OSU attempted to publish the book without alteration, the university “would be the laughing stock of the editorial world.” The Loves had been among those denied a chance to review a manuscript or set of galleys.38

A few weeks after the release of Bill Rogers’s critique, Agnew passed a small sample of proofs to Oliver W. Holmes of the National Historical Publications Commission for his review. In his response weeks later, Holmes pointed out the uniqueness of the Will Rogers project. “[I]t is so different from any the Commission has hitherto had any connection with,” he wrote Agnew. All other editorial efforts at the time involved eighteenth or nineteenth century figures; even the Woodrow Wilson papers had yet to reach the twentieth century. Unlike other documentary editors of the day, the Rogers editor had to write annotations for a generation or two that lived the period, as well as for younger generations interested in learning of the past and for generations to come. The older group might say, “I already knew that” and may not always concur with the editor’s notes. The problem could be exacerbated, Holmes noted, when the older generation includes

37 Ibid.
38 P. M. Love to David R. Milsten, March 22, 1971, WRMC Papers.
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the writer’s son, to which Holmes certainly could have added niece. An immediate relative’s knowledge base would likely be far greater than anyone else’s. 39

Another major difference between the Rogers papers and other Commission projects was that Rogers had a place in American history, as well as a significant place in American letters. Projects at the time involving William Cullen Bryant and Washington Irving were similar to the Rogers effort, but Holmes and the Commission had nothing to compare because the other projects had yet to produce a published work. Significantly, Holmes noted that the Commission had “practically no guidance in editing the texts of a humorist of the first order. Some, perhaps much, of Rogers’s humor is certainly lost on the present generation without some explanation, and, yet, to have to explain humor destroys it to some degree. To really enjoy it the reader has to catch the subtle point himself. He doesn’t appreciate having to be told why a thing is funny.” The editor, Holmes added, “is caught in a quandry [sic] and . . . no one can envy him.” 40

Although Holmes did not feel qualified to comment on the preliminary editorial work—he and other members of his commission believed that they should not get involved in such detail but should hold their assessments until the work was published—he told Agnew that his footnotes tended to overwhelm, “intrude” on the brief text of the individual telegrams. “Let Will Rogers speak for himself more,” Holmes wrote, “without someone always following behind to say what he means.” Holmes did not usually recommend placing notes in the back of a book, but he thought the rear of the volume would be best in dealing with literary texts, so that “readers who do not want them will not have to be bothered by them.” Scholars and interested students could still access them if desired. 41

Like Bill Rogers, Holmes questioned the apparent absence of an active editorial board. In looking for guidance, an editor should turn to his editorial board, but on this point, Holmes questioned Agnew on the structure at OSU. “Is there or isn’t there” an editorial board for The Will Rogers Papers? Agnew had mentioned one in his editorial plan, but Bill Rogers and others had stated that none existed. 42 Actually, two review

39 Holmes to Agnew, June 1, 1971, WRRP Papers.
40 Ibid.
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bodies were in place for The Will Rogers Papers. Early in the project, an Advisory Committee had been formed of key members of the faculty and administration. More recently, a three-person Editorial Review Committee had been assembled from the English and History faculties at OSU and the University of Tulsa. One was a recognized scholar of Rogers’s humor. The same three men, plus the editorial staff of the Will Rogers project at OSU, comprised the Editorial Review Committee.43 In contrast with OSU’s structure, however, both Holmes and Rogers suggested an editorial review group with greater representation from outside the university.44

The flurry of criticism following the release of the first volume galleys in early 1971 proved the beginning of the end of Agnew as editor of The Papers of Will Rogers. He continued, however, to consult with Oliver W. Holmes and Bill Rogers and to publish and distribute new timetables and editorial policies and plans.45 In March 1972, he submitted a manuscript of the Daily Telegrams of 1926 showing significantly revised textual presentation, textual variants, and footnotes. He also offered examples of alternative methods of annotation. Publication of the first volume was rescheduled for December 1972. A staff remained in place in the project’s office, but their numbers and work hours had been severely reduced because of budgetary constraints. Although Paula Love, as well as others, was convinced that “OSU will never be able to do the work,” the chair of the Memorial Commission and a few of its members held out hope that changes at OSU would occur. Commission members, especially Will Rogers, Jr., increased the pressure on President Kamm and the OSU administration to change editors or face termination of the project.46 The Commission and the Rogers family held an important trump card: the copyrights to Rogers’s writings.

By June 1972, Dr. Knight had retired and Dr. Odie Faulk had succeeded him as chairman of the Department of History. Dr. Ted Agnew had already submitted his resignation as director of the Will Rogers Research Center and editor of The Papers. In July he returned to full-time teaching in the History Department. With his and Knight’s departure from the project, Faulk became director and immediately began a search

42 Ibid.
43 Agnew to Holmes, July 8, 1971, WRRP Papers.
44 Holmes to Agnew, June 1, 1971, WRRP Papers; Rogers to Kamm, et al, February 28, 1971, WRMC Papers.
for a new editor. He did not look far. He hired Dr. Joseph Stout, a former student of Faulk’s, who had earned his doctorate from OSU a couple of years earlier and had been teaching at a community college in Missouri.47

Bill Rogers and the Loves were relieved to hear of the changes. “I think the best thing is to continue with O.S.U.,” Paula Love wrote a Commission member. With Agnew and Knight gone from the project, “I feel certain that we are at least going to get something done.”48 All members of the Memorial Commission were equally pleased. They met in July and gave OSU a vote of confidence. Faulk and Stout’s proposal to put the Daily Telegrams aside for the time being and focus instead on preparing for publication the six books of Will Rogers won wide endorsement. A six-person board of editorial consultants was soon formed that included scholars in American literature and history from five universities throughout the country, and steps were taken to involve in the proofing process Bill Rogers, Paula Love, and other recognized Rogers experts. The project’s new staff also made several significant editorial policy changes, including the placement of annotations at the back of each volume. When informed that OSU was ready to go to press in January 1973 with the first book in the series, Ether and Me or “Just Relax,” Rogers’s humorous account of his very serious gallstone operation in 1926, the Memorial Commission and the Rogers family responded positively: They provided OSU with the previously withheld license to publish, and Bob and Paula Love forwarded a personal check for $5,000 to help cover printing costs.49

When completed in 1983, sixteen years after it began, the renamed The Writings of Will Rogers comprised twenty-one volumes in six series, plus a cumulative index. All but one book, Radio Broadcasts of Will Rogers (1983), were of Will’s previously published writings. No edited and annotated personal papers were included. Over the years, four individuals held the position of editor of the project, none for more than five years. The Memorial Commission and its successive directors continued to play key roles. When the project ended, OSU assigned all copyrights to the Commission and transferred almost all of the remaining unsold books to the Memorial Museum in Claremore.50

47 P. M. Love to Collins, June 16, 1972, WRMC Papers.
48 Ibid.
50 See file, Contracts, Legal Papers, Oklahoma State University, Copyrights, 1972–1986, WRMC Papers.
The first volume of the Daily Telegrams was published in 1978, seven years after Dr. Agnew’s controversial first set of galleys. Projected initially by him as a two-volume set, the Daily Telegrams ended up being published in four volumes over a two-year span. Much credit for the fast pace, however, went to Agnew and his staff for the enormous amount of preliminary spade work they had produced. Reflecting hard lessons learned and expert advice given, no note numbers appeared in the text of the new Daily Telegrams, and textual descriptions, variants, and annotations were published at the back of each volume, keyed to the respective number of the telegram. As with all books in The Writings series, explanatory notes were generally limited to two or three sentences of essential information. Significantly missing from the annotations in the Daily Telegrams, indeed in all of The Writings of Will Rogers, were any attempts to explain the man’s humor. The new editors had learned the hazard of editing a humorist.

A sad postscript: Paula Love, the niece who guarded so closely her uncle’s legacy, died on April 28, 1973, at age seventy-one. The last few years of her life had taken a toll on an already frail health. The first volume of The Writings of Will Rogers came off the press shortly before her death. It is not known whether she was well enough at the time to be aware of its publication.
Yet Another George Washington Website: The Digital Edition and the Future of Documentary Editing

Jennifer E. Stertzer

Why Create a Digital Edition?

In 2005, work commenced on what has become The Papers of George Washington Digital Edition. A small team was assembled, and the process of converting legacy volumes to XML began. For the past two years we have been busy entering corrections and changes, linking documents, tackling consistency issues, and correcting errors introduced by our conversion vendor. Though much of the work has been tedious, the resulting digital edition, released earlier this year, is an important milestone for the project. But it’s more than just another George Washington website. This site contains all the features of the print edition, but it is also a tangible representation of how to get the most out of a digital environment.

Given the success of the print edition, one might ask, “Why create a digital edition?” The answer is twofold. First, users expect to find what they are looking for online. Using any search engine reveals the ever-expanding presence of humanities-related websites. Google any historical figure or event and see what you find—maybe links to the Library of Congress, archives that hold pertinent documents, and pages created by enthusiasts, with varying levels of accuracy. While not all scholars initiate research this way, numerous others do, whether they are middle school students writing reports or genealogists investigating their ancestors. As editors, we must recognize and respond to this trend and determine how best to add documentary editions to the mix.

The second reason for creating digital editions is far more important. In an age of information overload, it’s easy to quickly search and find historical facts and opinions. But what about original manuscripts, rich annotation and contextualization, and meaningful search tools? Reliable and authoritative content and context are much harder to come by and are exactly what documentary editors have to offer.
Quantitative Benefits

The benefits of going digital can be divided into two categories: quantitative—which includes characteristics that are intrinsic to digital scholarship such as accessibility, capacity, and flexibility—and creative, such as searchability, interactivity, mutability, and interoperability.

Accessibility

Accessibility is perhaps the most important quantitative quality. It determines visibility, audience, use, and by way of these things, effectiveness. Traditionally, documentary editions were mainly available at research libraries only. Proximity to these libraries, or access to interlibrary loan, determined an edition’s availability. The World Wide Web, however, has not only drastically changed the way information is gathered and used, but more importantly, it has increased awareness of what’s available. Simply stated, the Internet is more accessible than libraries, in both a geographic and material sense. Anyone with an Internet connection has the ability to access digital editions, albeit there could be costs associated with some types of licensed sites. Digital editions are also the most effective way to reach diverse audiences, such as historians, students, teachers, genealogists, and the general public. And what of these research libraries, that, in addition to their printed holdings, now also have digital edition site licenses? Access becomes multidimensional—numerous people can use the edition simultaneously, at the library, in the classroom, off-campus, from home, or from anywhere that has a wireless connection.

The most rewarding outcome of increased access lies in how these documentary editions will influence research and exploration, at all levels. Dan Cohen and Roy Rosenzweig, in their book Digital History, ask: “How might our history writing be different if all historical evidence were available? The instantaneous access to primary and secondary connections—the ability to very quickly make and test out intellectual connections—will likely alter historical research and writing in ways that we haven’t yet imagined.”¹ This statement certainly rings true for the scholarship we have the opportunity to make available.

Increased capacity and greater flexibility of digital editions allow the publishing of complex documents. George Augustine Washington, April 7, 1792, Farm Report. Image courtesy of the Library of Congress, Manuscript Division.
Capacity
The traditional volume editor is aware of the space limitations of letterpress editions. These limitations influence document selection, length of annotation, and images used. Online, however, space is cheap and seemingly infinite. That's not to say that we need or should digitize every last scrap of paper, but it does alleviate some of these considerations. In the case of the Washington Papers, the amount digitized is incredible—the five main series contain over 18,500 documents; the Diaries, 6800 entries and over 50,000 footnotes. The consolidated index is impressive in size as well: over 35,000 main entries, 98,000 subentries, 25,000 sub-subentries, and 1,000 sub-sub-subentries. These numbers contain just the first fifty-two volumes of the Washington Papers. Considering we have yet to add the remaining volumes, estimated at about thirty-eight, as well as additional documents, these numbers will grow exponentially.

Flexibility
Increased capacity also gives us greater flexibility, such as the option of publishing more complex documents. Good examples are Washington’s financial records and farm reports. While some of these documents have been included in the letterpress edition, they are much better suited for a digital environment. Charts and tables such as these are hard to format for the printed page; online, screen space is expandable, only requiring the user to scroll. Adding images of the original documents is also feasible.

Creative Benefits
Accessibility, capacity, and flexibility are inherent to the digital medium—resulting from the decision to pursue a digital edition, as well as to what degree. On their own, these quantitative qualities are certainly reason enough to digitize. But stopping here, we run the risk of creating merely an electronic book—not really the best way to present a resource such as the documentary edition. This is where creativity, enabled by XML, becomes a factor. This next set of qualities—searchability, interactivity, mutability, and interoperability—are areas in which editors have the most options and influence, as well as the opportunity to develop standards.

2 The five main series (Colonial, Confederation, Revolutionary War, Presidential, and Retirement) are comprised of forty-six volumes, while the Diaries were complete in six volumes.
Here, decisions are informed by target audience and desired use, but are also a product of time, expertise, and money.

Searchability

While access is one important component, it’s searchability that allows users, once at a site, to get the most out of an edition. It’s rare to find a user who will read the volume cover to cover, or in the case of the digital edition, chronologically, page by page. Instead, users depend on the medium’s supplied search features. In a print edition, the index defines important people, places, and ideas. The index is a crucial component of the digital edition as well; however, numerous other search tools can be made available, requiring varying levels of time and resources to implement. In the case of the Washington Papers digital edition, we preserved the traditional navigational tools of the letterpress edition, such as the table of contents and the index, and added the essential search page.

The consolidation of fifty-two individual volume indexes proved to be a time intensive, difficult task. Once combined, differences in indexing practice over the years and between different series and editors were revealed and had to be reconciled. Currently, a corrected and regularized master list of main index entries is the basis of the single consolidated index. Each main entry gathers all page references and subentries contained in the separate volume indexes; reconciliation of differences at this level continues and will most likely be informed by future volumes. Eventually, the index will be searchable either by keyword or main and subentry selectors. Bob Rosenberg, in his article in *Documentary Editing*, summarizes the importance of the digital index: “the . . . index . . . is a sophisticated intellectual tool that maintains and arguably increases its strength when applied to electronic texts. Full-text searching can help find specific text known to exist, but it is at best a marginally effective way to explore a body of information. A good index not only provides direction to implicit meaning in the text, but it reveals to the user what may be found in the work. In print volumes an index is often used as a browsing aid; online, where the scope and depth of a work is harder to judge, such an aid is that much more valuable.”

Interactivity
The digital medium changes the relationship between the user and the edition. With numerous searching tools at their disposal, users can shape their experience and how they interact with the edition. For example, when searching a specific date, results not only contain documents from a particular series, but also the diary entries for that time period. Additionally, users can choose to look only at documents to or from someone or restrict searching to just annotation. Of course, the documents can still be accessed in the traditional way, navigating by print edition series and volumes. In the future, users will also be able to search by document type and repository and to limit searching to documents only.

Mutability
As editors, we are always concerned with accuracy. The digital edition is mutable—we can quickly make changes, corrections, and additions that are available to our users immediately. Over the years, editors at the Washington Papers kept records of errors in the transcriptions, annotation, and indexes. One of the first tasks of the digital edition team was to record these things into a master set and create an error database. This database contains correction ID numbers, series, volume, and page number information, original and corrected text, initials of editor responsible for correction, and columns for confirmation of entry and double-checking. This database corresponds to information we enter into the XML file. What’s visible to the user is the corrected text that, when moused over, displays original text. This version transparency is important for those who use both the letterpress and digital editions.

Interoperability
The digital environment also makes collaboration much easier and more effective. This capability not only benefits editors, but it also benefits the user. Consider the usefulness of creating biography and geography databases accessible by numerous projects, or linking across editions, allowing users to quickly follow information lines. A good example is Rotunda, the electronic imprint of the University of Virginia Press, which has been working on the American Founding Era. Currently comprised of

the George Washington and Dolley Madison digital editions, the collection will eventually include the Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, and Adams papers, as well as others. Interoperability of these editions will present numerous opportunities for internal referencing as well as information sharing.

**Conclusion**

So what does this mean for our field? Documentary editing is a creative scholarship, and the digital edition presents yet another opportunity to engage ourselves in developing materials for the future. We are not the first, nor will we be the last, to apply scholarship to this medium. Consider Google, currently digitizing library collections from the University of Michigan, the University of Virginia, and numerous other universities, or online journal collaboratives, as they navigate the waters of accessibility and continued print subscription viability. Those in the field of documentary editing will not only tackle the same kinds of questions, but also will contend with a unique set of issues. Ours is a different resource that will require innovative thinking and inventive methods to make best use of the digital medium. We need to all take part in this process, developing standards for and applying our time-tested editing methods to this new frontier.

---

Long Before the NHPRC: Documentary Editing in Nineteenth-Century Virginia

Brent Tarter

In 1791 Thomas Jefferson wrote a letter to congratulate Ebenezer Hazard, of Pennsylvania, on the publication of the first two volumes of his *Historical Collections*, the first documentary edition of the public records of a state or colony. Jefferson’s letter is often quoted for its rationale for documentary editing. “Time and accident,” he wrote, “are committing daily havoc on the originals deposited in our public offices. The late war has done the work of centuries in this business. The lost cannot be recovered; but let us save what remains: not by vaults and locks which fence them from the public eye and use, in consigning them to the waste of time, but by such a multiplication of copies, as shall place them beyond the reach of accident.”

When it came to lost texts, Jefferson certainly knew what he was writing about. He had long been collecting and preserving scarce documents of Virginia’s early history, and when he was governor of Virginia late in the American Revolution, British raids on Richmond caused the loss or destruction of most of the archive of the colony’s executive branch. Later, when the Confederate government evacuated Richmond in April 1865, the state’s courthouse burned to cinders, destroying virtually all of the records of the colony’s highest court and the records of the state’s appellate courts. Victorious Union soldiers also carried away or destroyed other records housed in the Capitol.

The Revolutionary-era losses led directly to a combination of public and private publications of several pioneering and valuable documentary editions of historical records of Virginia. The first was William Waller Hening’s thirteen-volume *The Statutes at Large: Being a Collection of All...*
the Laws of Virginia, From the First Session of the Legislature in the Year 1619 published between 1809 and 1823. The editor was a protégé of Thomas Jefferson, and it was in fact at the joint urging of Jefferson, Jefferson’s old law teacher George Wythe, and another Jefferson protégé, James Monroe, that Hening obtained the sanction of the General Assembly to compile and publish the colony’s laws, largely for the stated purpose of making readily available the statutory records that protected the rights of the planter class to their landed estates. Because Virginia had no printing press before the 1730s, many of the early laws had never been published or were published in scarce abridged editions only.3

The first volume of Hening’s edition of the laws followed by five years the publication of the first full history of the colony of Virginia, by John Daly Burk et al.4 The next large-scale history of Virginia, of which Charles Campbell published the first edition in 1847,5 was substantially different from Burk’s in large part because Campbell, unlike Burk, had access to the extremely valuable information in Hening’s edition of the surviving seventeenth- and eighteenth-century statutes. Hening fully appreciated how much the narrative of colonial history would be changed by the availability of the critically important texts. Throughout his edition of the colonial statutes, he included notes about historical events associated with the documents, and in his first volume he included some nonstatutory records of the General Assembly during its formative years that enriched historians’ understandings of the evolution of the body into a colonial mini-Parliament.6 In that, he made some valuable contributions to understanding the historical record. His long note about the records of Sir William Berkeley’s resumption of the governor’s office in 1660 after the restoration of the monarchy7 was particularly important.

On the other hand, Hening’s identification of the acts passed at the June 1676 session of the assembly as “Bacon’s Laws”8 was particularly misleading. Perhaps seduced by Burk’s history that interpreted the whole of

4 John Daly Burk, History of Virginia, vols. 1–3 (Petersburg, VA, 1804–1805), and Skelton Jones and Louis Hue Girardin, vol. 4 (Petersburg, VA, 1816).
5 Charles Campbell, Introduction to the History of the Colony and Ancient Dominion of Virginia (Richmond, 1847); 2d ed., rev., History of the Colony and Ancient Dominion of Virginia (Philadelphia, 1860).
the colonial period as a preparation for independence and Nathaniel Bacon’s Rebellion of 1676 as a rehearsal for the American Revolution that began in 1776, Hening supplied an anachronistic and misleading title to the laws of a session of the assembly that Bacon did not even attend and from which, in fact, he extorted a general’s commission at gunpoint to wage war against the Indians. Hening’s mislabeling misled several generations of historians into believing that what looked like reforms in those laws were evidences of Bacon’s reforming intentions.

On that same topic, some of Hening’s contemporary Virginians even edited the landscape. People in and around Surry County, in the southeastern portion of the state, began referring about that time to one of the old local brick buildings as Bacon’s Castle, and it has been known as Bacon’s Castle ever since, and the nearby post office is also called Bacon’s Castle. But Nathaniel Bacon was never there. The building was there at the time of the rebellion, and some of his followers holed up there after their leader died, but it was not ever Bacon’s, and it is not even a castle. The romance of a failed rebellion precisely a century before a successful one had many such manifestations in the written histories and in the folklore and mythology of Virginia. Anybody thereafter could, and many people did, characterize Bacon’s rebellion as a revolt against high-handed royal misgovernment, and they pointed to Bacon’s Laws and to Bacon’s Castle to prove it.9

The nineteenth century was the great age of the gentleman amateur, of the antiquarians who assembled and published documents for their amusement and enlightenment. Chief among them in Virginia was Alexander Brown, whose two-volume *Genesis of the United States*, published in 1890, and his *First Republic in America*, published in 1898,10 included documentary texts, long excerpts from original documents, and English translations of documents from Spanish archives that enriched the available documentary record of the first decades of the colony of Virginia. A man of no great means, Brown worked from transcriptions and translations that other people prepared, and so his published texts are at least two generations removed from the best copytext; and he was convinced that

---


10 Alexander Brown, *The Genesis of the United States*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1890), and *The First Republic in America; An Account of the Origin of This Nation, Written from the Records then (1624) Concealed by the Council, Rather than from the Histories then Licensed by the Crown* (Boston, 1898); see also *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, 2:279–280.
Captain John Smith was a liar and a scoundrel, so it may be prudent to have a salt cellar at hand when consulting his books.

The first documentary editions of the Founders' writings appeared in the nineteenth century. In 1829 Thomas Jefferson's grandson, Thomas Jefferson Randolph, published a modest, four-volume edition of Jefferson's work. That same year, he also published a set of case reports that Jefferson had compiled during his short career at the bar of the General Court late in the 1760s and early in the 1770s. Biographies of the great men of the Revolutionary period also appeared in abundance throughout the nineteenth century, and some of those volumes contained extended excerpts from their subjects' private correspondence, speeches, and state papers. William Wirt's *Sketches of the Life and Character of Patrick Henry*, which was first published in 1817, may be the archetype of that genre, even though most of the texts of Henry's speeches that appear in it are in fact synthetic recreations by Henry's auditors, some of them written down for the first time forty or fifty years after the fact. (Talk about copytext problems and questions of authorial intention!) Patrick Henry's grandson, named William Wirt Henry, as it happens, published a classic of the life and letters genre in his three-volume 1891 *Patrick Henry: Life, Correspondence, and Speeches*. Lyon Gardiner Tyler, one of the many sons of President John Tyler, outdid W. W. Henry in the publication of letters as part of a life by giving letters primacy of place in the title of his three-volume work, *The Letters and Times of the Tylers*, published between 1884 and 1896. Kate Mason Rowland's two-volume biography of her ancestor, George Mason, first published in 1892, was in the same vein, as indicated by its subtitle: *Including His Speeches, Public Papers, and Correspondence*.

It is easy to overlook the life-and-letters biographies when thinking about documentary editions, but we should not forget them. The early ones often contained the first printed texts of important private letters, of important orations, or of neglected state papers. Many or most of those books were by descendants or by warm admirers, which is how the authors gained access to original correspondence that in many instances had not previously been published. Those books, then, are not only biographies,

---

11 Thomas Jefferson Randolph, ed., *Memoir, Correspondence, and Miscellanies, From the Papers of Thomas Jefferson* (Charlottesville, Va., 1829), and *Reports of Cases Determined in the General Court of Virginia*, from 1730, to 1740; and From 1768, to 1772 (Charlottesville, VA, 1829).
they are also selective documentary editions—some of them very selective. We are entitled to be skeptical or questioning about the decisions the authors/editors made about what to include and what to exclude and also about whether or to what extent they silently improved on their subjects’ spelling and syntax and prose style or silently elided out displeasing passages or whole documents.

Political objectives as well as personal and family ties were often in play in those volumes. Thomas Jefferson wrote an autobiographical introduction to his documentary record of the Washington Administration to justify his opposition to some of Washington’s policies,16 and James Madison composed memoranda to accompany an edition of the notes that he took at the Constitutional Convention of 178717 to set the record straight about how that convention wrote the Constitution. Such motives were also apparent in a small number of other documentary collections that Virginians produced during the nineteenth century, including the first compilation of The Works of John C. Calhoun, which a Virginia journalist and states’ rights advocate, Richard Kenner Crallé, published in six volumes between 1853 and 1856.18

For the historically curious, rather than for the politically partisan alone, the establishment in 1832 of the Virginia Historical and Philosophical Society was an important event. The society issued its first publication the following year, a slim volume that contained the long address of the first president of the society and two historical texts, a memoir of late eighteenth-century frontier conflicts by a participant and the known surviving documents in the 1706 Grace Sherwood witchcraft prosecution.19 Between 1848 and 1853 The Virginia Historical Register and Literary Advertiser acted as organ of the society. The miscellaneous contents of the six volumes of that small-format periodical included, among other things, brief excerpts from important public documents of the colonial period and from the papers of several important public men. Among the men whose writings appeared in excerpted form were Captain John Smith, William Strachey, William Byrd II, William Fitzhugh, George Washington, Richard Henry Lee, George Mason,

19 Collections of the Virginia Historical & Philosophical Society (Richmond, VA, 1833).
and Lieutenant Governors Alexander Spotswood, Hugh Drysdale, and Sir William Gooch. The Virginia Historical Society issued a second series of historical documents between 1882 and 1892. It included a two-volume edition of letters of Alexander Spotswood, a two-volume edition of the letters of Robert Dinwiddie, a volume of documents relating to the early eighteenth-century Huguenot settlement in central Virginia, and one volume that included more Huguenot documents, the 1672 text of the charter of the Royal African Company, and army records of two Revolutionary War officers and two Civil War officers.

The Virginia Historical Society also took part after the Civil War in assisting the secretary of the commonwealth in the selection of documents and the publication between 1875 and 1893 of the eleven-volume Calendar of Virginia State Papers and Other Manuscripts, 1652–1869 gleaned from the remnants of the colonial and state archives in the ransacked state capitol. Those volumes marked the entry of the state government into documentary publication. Most of the records published in those volumes are in fact abstracts or calendar entries rather than full-text transcriptions, but of the more interesting documents, the Calendar often contains full texts. Those documents, in addition to the Virginia Historical Society’s publications, enabled students of the state’s colonial and early national history to enrich their insights with new original material and to rewrite their narratives and take into account a wider range of topics.

At almost the same time, the state government commissioned several men to obtain transcriptions of important colonial-period records from the Public Record Office and the British Museum in London. Beginning late in the seventeenth century, the British bureaucracy required that copies of important executive and legislative documents be made and sent to London, so a significant portion of the colonial government archive could be reassembled through transcription and calendaring of copies in England. The General Assembly’s Joint Committee on the Library commissioned William Noel Sainsbury, who was then engaged in founding the great and

---

20 William Maxwell, ed., The Virginia Historical Register and Literary Adviser, 6 vols. (Richmond, VA, 1848–1853).
justly celebrated Calendar of State Papers series, to oversee the transcription of more than 5,100 British archival documents dating from 1606 to 1720. They fill twenty large volumes. At the same time, three other men acting under similar commissions produced ten volumes of transcriptions of more than eight hundred additional seventeenth-century archival records, and another man prepared a small volume of fourteen important documents concerning Bacon’s Rebellion from manuscripts in the British Museum. From a private collection of records that was on sale in the London market in 1890, the state acquired transcriptions of nineteen documents concerning colonial treaties with the Cherokee Indians. The state also obtained copies of three volumes of transcriptions of mid-eighteenth-century and Revolutionary period documents that Jared Sparks had prepared.23

The thousands of transcriptions in those volumes were not then published, but students of Virginia’s colonial and Revolutionary history consulted them in the library in the capitol or, after 1895, in the library’s new building next door, and during the first decades after the transcriptions were made the editors of the Virginia Magazine of History and Biography published some of the texts in the state’s principal historical journal of record. They texts were by then at least two removes from the best copytext, but together with Hening’s Statutes at Large, the Library of Congress’s publication beginning in 1905 of the four volumes of Susan Myra Kingsbury’s Records of the Virginia Company of London,24 and the Virginia State Library’s own new publications program, also begun in 1905 with the first of thirteen volumes of the Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia,25 they enabled students of Virginia’s first two centuries, working in the early years of its fourth century, to write its political and military history with some thoroughness and accuracy for the first time and to make some tentative forays into social and economic history.

How good were those nineteenth-century documentary editions?

The volumes in the life-and-letters genre have all been superseded by better biographies and also by better documentary editions, some of them edited and published outside Virginia and some of them even before the end of the nineteenth century, such as the first collections of the works of

23 The documents are calendared in John P. Kennedy, Calendar of Transcripts, Including the Annual Report of the Department of Archives and History (Richmond, VA, 1905), 118–640.
Virginia founders Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, and George Washington that have themselves since been superseded. None of the original editions or their first substitutions would pass muster by current standards, either for completeness or thoroughness or accuracy of transcription or adequacy of annotation or quality of index. Nevertheless, those imperfect editions informed much valuable and influential scholarship during the latter part of the nineteenth and the first part of the twentieth century, and in that way their imperfections biased the scholarship based on them and also the scholarship that was based on the first scholarship that used them. Even though scholars seldom take those incomplete editions off the library shelves any more, they may still work mischief because it was those very old and out-of-copyright editions that first got mounted on the Internet a decade or so ago and that unwary folks will stumble on now and forevermore, if the Internet lasts that long, and mistakenly think that the have found the real thing and all that they may need.

The unpublished volumes of transcriptions and the published volumes of Hening’s *Statutes at Large*, the *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, and the Spotswood and Dinwiddie letters have not been superseded or replaced by improved editions in print. The two-volume editions of the Spotswood and Dinwiddie papers were well executed by the standards of the time, and the transcriptions are, so far as I have had a few occasions to check, pretty reliable. The manuscript transcriptions of British archival records enabled historians seventy-five or a hundred years ago to consult at one remove a portion of the executive record of the colony’s government. The same cautious things that have to be said about the selection and rendering of texts in the nineteenth-century printed editions also apply to those manuscript transcriptions and the early printed versions of some of them. But because the original documents from which those transcriptions were made and many thousands of other records were microfilmed under the auspices of the Virginia Colonial Records Project beginning in the 1950s, today’s younger historians are often unaware that the manuscript volumes even exist, and any potential problems or omissions resulting from selection

---

or transcription policies are now moot. Still, I always advise researchers to consult and cite or quote from the originals to be on the safe side of accuracy.

I make the same suggestion to researchers who use the Calendar of Virginia State Papers. There are transcription errors in that edition, and the abstracts or calendar entries are not always detailed enough for safe reliance. What was included and what not, what was transcribed in full and what in abstract, can be traced to the opinions of the men who did the selection, and they certainly did not include everything. Almost all of the documents that those eleven volumes treat still survive in the state’s archive and can usually be located with no more than a moderate amount of archival sleuthing. I have used those collections extensively and for many years and never rely on or quote from the published volumes. I use the books as a finding aid, but even then I sometimes discover that the documents are not what the published description promises. A misrepresentation in the Calendar of a letter from the 1780s that uses the phrase “lynch’s law” kept researchers who relied only on the published volume from learning that the phrase was actually used by one of the two earliest people named Lynch who have been identified as the namesake of the loathsome practice.27

Returning to and concluding where we began, with William Waller Hening’s Statutes at Large, it pays to recall that the editor was a practicing attorney and sometime clerk of court and author and compiler of guides to the practice of law in the courts of Virginia; and that his primary purpose was to make public the laws that governed property rights; so, he was keenly aware of the necessity to publish correct transcriptions. I admit that I have checked but very few of his published laws against his copytexts, but I have checked some, and they are good. He also noted variant readings when he had access to more than one copy of a law, and he printed titles of statutes for which he did not have texts but only evidence of enactment or the style of the statute. In those respects, his work was extremely good for its time.

His search for texts was good for the time, too. There are still extant only three sets, so far as I know, of seventeenth-century session laws that

were recorded in county record books that he did not know about and therefore missed. He also did not know about or could not find such a large number of other statutes, mostly of a private nature, from the first half of the eighteenth century that in 1971 the Virginia State Library published a supplementary volume of almost 500 pages. Hening’s editorial method was, by contemporary standards, sometimes too heavy-handed, as in his gratuitous and erroneous identification of the acts of June 1676 as “Bacon’s Laws.” He imposed typographical uniformities throughout nearly 175 years of texts taken from original manuscripts, handwritten copies, and printed versions, and he sometimes added chapter headings to portions of statutes. He also, as lawyers then did, added new marginal index headings. Some early laws look much more like modern codified statutes in Hening’s edition than they do in manuscript. That made his edition easy to use as a law book, but the reader cannot always tell from the printed page what portions of the text were original and what were additions, or even that there were additions

You can tell the difference if you look at the manuscripts from which Hening worked, many of which are in the Thomas Jefferson Papers at the Library of Congress. The marginal index notations are in Hening’s own handwriting and right on the original documents! I suppose that Hening had the originals transcribed for the printer’s use and that the marginal notations and the occasional bracket with the word “Omit” next to non-statutory material were instructions to his copyists. Those omissions cast a cloud over part of the assembly’s early history, its work as a court of appeals, and ill-served historical scholarship.

Omissions, either deliberate or as a consequence of ignorance of the location of texts, are the principal weakness of the various classes of documentary editions that Virginians prepared or commissioned or published during the nineteenth century. Whenever I read, even in recent scholarship, the evasive words, “there is no evidence that,” I cringe for fear


29 Waverly K. Winfree, comp., The Laws of Virginia; Being a Supplement to Hening’s The Statutes at Large, 1700–1750 (Richmond, VA: The Virginia State Library, 1971).

30 Thomas Jefferson Papers, ser., 8, vols. 5–12.

31 E.g., Hening, Statutes at Large, 2d ed., rev., 1:427: “Here follow in the Rand. and Bl. MSS. a number of decisions in civil actions, and of petitions from individuals for compensation relating to the late expedition against the Indians; but they are not of sufficient interest to merit insertion.”

that somebody has mistaken an absence of conveniently available evidence for an absence of evidence or for evidence of an absence.

Some of the early editors’ omissions can seem almost egregious, but that is so only if we fail to appreciate how much we all owe to those who laid the ground work and to recall that they worked an editorial high wire without an Internet. They found and printed texts that have since disappeared and discovered and preserved texts that would have otherwise been lost. We all stand on the shoulders of those who went before us, and if we can see more than they saw it is only because of the work that they did. It ill behooves us when standing on their shoulders to kick them in the teeth—except on a few occasions when they deserve it.
Balancing Public and Private Lives in the Letters of Lucretia Coffin Mott and Florence Kelley

Beverly Wilson Palmer

Despite their obvious differences, Lucretia Coffin Mott and Florence Kelley share some striking similarities. As prominent women reformers, they embraced three passionate concerns. First, they battled injustice to women. Lucretia Mott (1793–1880) helped organize the historic Woman’s Rights Convention at Seneca Falls in 1848 and constantly spoke out for women’s rights, not only at the ballot box but in marriage, courts of law, and the workplace. Florence Kelley (1859–1932) likewise fought for both political and economic equality for women. She worked for the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment giving women the right to vote, and throughout her career as director of the National Consumers’ League, she lobbied for better working conditions for women and children. Second, both women worked for equal rights for African-Americans. In 1833, Mott helped organize the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society, regularly organized antislavery petitions to Congress, and later petitioned Congress for suffrage for all “colored people of this Nation.”1 Kelley joined others to found the NAACP in 1909, fought for Congressional antilynching laws, and sought equal funding for Southern black schoolchildren. And third, they were ardent peace advocates. As a Quaker, Mott naturally abhorred war; in the antebellum years as a member of the Non-Resistance Society, she shunned all forms of violence and was active in the American Peace Society. Florence Kelley met with other peace advocates in 1914 and issued a manifesto opposing World War I, and after that war attended meetings of Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom in Zurich and Vienna.

1 Selected Letters of Lucretia Coffin Mott, ed. Beverly Wilson Palmer; Holly Byers Ochoa, associate editor; Carol Faulkner, editing fellow (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 414.
Although both women were wives and mothers, their family lives present a decided contrast. Married at eighteen, Mott enjoyed a long and happy marriage to James Mott, who encouraged her in all her reforming efforts. Of their six children, five (four daughters and one son) survived to adulthood; Mott remained closely involved in the daily lives of her children and grandchildren, all of whom lived either in or around Philadelphia and New York City. Kelley, on the other hand, had a troubled early domestic life. While studying in Switzerland she married a Russian medical student, Lazare Wischnewetzky, and they quickly had two sons and a daughter. They moved to New York City in 1886, but her husband’s medical practice never flourished. Late in 1891, she left Wischnewetzky, taking the three children with her and shortly thereafter ended up in Chicago at Jane Addams’s Hull House. In her divorce proceedings against Wischnewetzky, she testified to his abuse of her. Florence Wischnewetzky soon gained custody of her children, and she and they adopted her maiden name, Kelley. Thereafter as she struggled to support the children, she frequently lived apart from them. Her appointment as chief factory inspector for the state of Illinois in the 1890s required extensive travel throughout the state. These travels continued when she moved to New York City to head the National Consumers’ League and to continue her campaign against sweatshops and for a ten-hour workday. Consequently, her children lived at Hull House, attended boarding schools, or were cared for by friends.

Scant documentation exists about Mott and Kelley’s relationships with their spouses. Since Lucretia and James spent most of their married life together, only a few letters between them apparently exist. No letters between Florence and Lazare have survived; during the Wischnewetzkys’—albeit short—married life, they were rarely apart. Thus the family life of both women is reflected in the letters they wrote to their siblings and children. And selection and annotation are crucial in balancing public and private lives in a documentary edition.

It was a challenge to give equal space to Mott’s reforming career, because more than half of the surviving letters, mostly in the Mott papers at Swarthmore, are to her sisters or her daughters (interestingly—and perhaps

2 A selected letter shows the couple’s devotion to each other: “Forty years that we have loved each other with perfect love . . . How much longer the felicity is to be ours, who can tell?” (Mott to James Mott, c. 19 June 1849, Selected Letters of Lucretia Coffin Mott, 188).
significantly?—few letters to her son, Thomas, exist) and concern family matters. Although we know she wrote to Frederick Douglass, apparently no letters survive. Of the five surviving letters to William Lloyd Garrison, we included three. Mott’s infrequent business correspondence contains short, formal letters such as those to Garrison in 1851 about the fugitive slave law and the forthcoming women’s rights convention in Worcester. Mott often added news of the family to other reformers, such as the Irish Quakers Richard and Hannah Webb, along with discussions of religious differences with orthodox Quakers and Charles Dickens’s visit to Philadelphia. Moreover, every family letter contains many domestic details, sometimes with only a frustratingly brief comment on John Brown’s raid on Harper’s Ferry or Lincoln’s Second Inaugural Address. Often letters in the volume are joint letters Mott called “a family sheet” to be circulated to sisters, children, or a favorite niece.

Many letters we selected are to Lucretia’s sister, Martha Coffin Wright. Like Mott, Wright was a well known woman’s rights advocate; a Seneca Falls organizer, she was president of the National Woman Suffrage Association at her death in 1875. Although fourteen years apart in age, the two shared many interests, and their letters, with their abrupt changes of topic, code words, and abbreviations, often read like a conversation. Typical is one in September 1867 when Mott mentioned, in this order, laundry, conversion of Camp William Penn to a residential neighborhood, her dyspepsia, the funding needs of the American Equal Rights Association, building construction at Swarthmore, a Pennsylvania Peace Society meeting, carpet making, family visits, and Maria Child’s recent novel, Romance of the Republic. Amid all this she apologized: “You may not make head or tail of this sheet—and tis of no consequence that you should—I have just written on as if I had been talkg to my dear Sister here in this Library.”

Selection for our Mott volume proved difficult for we would find a trenchant comment on Lincoln’s slavery policy: “Petitns. shd. now be poured in from all quarters—so that poor Abe, McClellan & the others, may see how unavailg. all their proslavery conservatism is” amid details

4 Mott to Martha Wright, 3 September 1867, Selected Letters of Lucretia Coffin Mott, 393-397.
5 Mott to Martha Wright, 5 December 1861, Selected Letters of Lucretia Coffin Mott, 318.
of recipes for puddings and train travel from Philadelphia to upstate New York. While some scholars argue, and argue persuasively, that these domestic details have their own merit (and indeed I hope they have for students of nineteenth-century life), we were not publishing the letters of a public figure as important as Mott solely for her views on child rearing and other aspects of her private life.

Abridging or excerpting Mott’s letters was, by the principles of documentary editing, out of the question. Two solutions, however, helped highlight Mott’s public career in letters filled with details of family comings and goings and children’s illnesses. Through annotation we could refer, for example, to Mott’s many speeches. In an 1843 letter to fellow Quaker Nathaniel Barney, Mott briefly mentioned a sermon she delivered at a Unitarian Church in Washington, D.C., “on woman’s duties and responsibilities.” Selections from this sermon can then be quoted: “There has been a great advancement among the people with regard to woman . . . she is already regarded in a very different light from that assigned to her from the dark ages; and she should come also to appreciate herself and be seeking to something higher than she has formerly done.”

Our second solution may be singular to the Mott volume but could prove useful to others editing family letters. Lucretia often wrote one long letter over several days, especially to Martha. We decided we were justified in printing an entire letter dated on, say, 4 February 1871, but omitting the continuation of that letter dealing only with family matters, stating instead “letter continues dated 5 February.”

Certainly Lucretia Mott’s letters amply reflect her family concerns as opposed to the activism her deeds and speeches reveal. However, with their blend of the personal and the public, these letters represent her determination to eradicate as many evils from the world as she possibly could.

By contrast, there are few domestic details in Kelley’s letters because, after her separation from her husband in 1891, she had virtually no domestic life, or at least one that is extensively documented. She never owned a home until she bought a summer house in Maine in 1907; instead

---

6 Mott to Nathaniel Barney, 14 February 1843, 121, 123; Mott to Martha Wright, Selected Letters of Lucretia Coffin Mott, 456.
she lived at Hull House, at Lillian Wald’s Henry Street settlement in New York City, or in various furnished apartments in that city until she died.

With the exception of letters to close friends like Jane Addams and Lillian Wald, Kelley's letters to colleagues, congressmen, and Consumer League officials concentrated almost entirely on her reforming efforts. Writing about the Zurich peace conference in 1919 to an old friend, she exclaimed, “It is an indescribably wonderful spiritual experience. To see 25 Englishwomen sitting between 12 German and three Irishwomen, all passionately absorbed in finding ways to get the [Versailles] treaty and the League of Nations modified—and that quickly—was a thing to gladden the courage and strengthen the hope of a whole lifetime.” Her optimism rarely flagged, even after the Supreme Court in 1923 invalidated a Washington, D.C., minimum wage law for women workers. Kelley wrote Julia Lathrop: “However, this half century having already given us Suffrage and prohibition can safely be counted upon to give us further blessings! Chief among ’em a modern Constitution and a modern minded Supreme Court.”

Most of Kelley’s letters to colleagues like these are exclusively professional. In contrast to editing Lucretia Mott’s letters, we had no difficulty in presenting the public side of Kelley’s life.

Nevertheless in a volume of letters, it’s important, even crucial, to represent the whole person: Florence Kelley as woman, sister, mother, as well as intrepid reformer. So we turned to her letters to her brother and her children. Unlike the voluminous correspondence between Lucretia and her sister Martha, there exist only about forty letters from Kelley to her younger brother, Albert, and even fewer to her older brother, Will. These letters indicate that despite her busy professional life, and friends like Jane Addams with whom she had more in common, Kelley remained devoted to her two siblings and their families. Two letters to Albert appearing in our volume combine discussions of right-wing attacks on her and other reformers with excitement over her niece’s budding journalistic career.

While Lucretia Mott had as her confidante her sister Martha, Kelley’s oldest child, Nicholas, provided a similar outlet. He was always and emphatically her favorite, and Kelley called him “Ko” and encouraged him

---

8 Kelley to Albert B. Kelley, 24 May 1927 and 17 September 1927, *Selected Letters of Florence Kelley*.
in his scholarly efforts. Ko fulfilled his mother’s expectations, graduating from Harvard and later Harvard Law School. A dutiful son, he saved virtually all of his mother’s letters, even those he received while traveling in Europe. He faithfully answered her—at times daily—letters to him; not surprisingly, she also kept these. Their surviving correspondence runs to more than 1,300 letters. In fact, from 1902 to 1912 Kelley’s letters to Ko are almost the only letters that exist to tell the story of her reforming efforts. When Nicholas moved to New York City and lived near Kelley, the correspondence naturally dwindled. Throughout her son’s adult life, Kelley regularly asked his advice, and he became her closest male companion.

Nicholas in turn regarded his mother as a role model; when practicing law in New York City he wrote her: “There is nobody at all like you in the world. I am so proud of being your son I do not know what to do. But at the same time it makes me feel dreadfully second-rate. I am always hoping that I will speed up and improve, but I do not seem to do it.”

Kelley’s letters to her oldest child far overshadow her letters to her two other children. Even when these two younger children were away at boarding school in the early 1900s, they apparently did not retain their mother’s letters. Kelley’s daughter, Margaret, died suddenly at the age of eighteen, during her first week at Smith College. As a young girl she had written Kelley from various boarding schools, plaintively seeking responses from her mother and frequently asking for funds. References in Margaret’s letters make clear that Kelley replied regularly, but only four letters survive from Kelley to her daughter. Included in the Selected Letters of Florence Kelley is probably her last letter to Margaret: “It runs in our blood to be leaders. . . . The future of this Republic depends largely on the college student of to-day; and my children owe it to their grandfather, and to me, and to themselves, to line up on the right side now.” After Margaret’s death in September 1905, Kelley received hundreds of condolence letters, and, in a note to the letter announcing Margaret’s death, we selected a few passages from some of these to indicate this outpouring of sympathy. The Selected Letters treats Kelley’s reaction to Margaret’s death in a letter—appropriately—to Ko, then a senior at Harvard: “I have been thinking since
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you left that, if it had been you instead of Margaret, the old College, and the Union, and the bandar log would all have had to stagger along without you! Now your first duty is to me that it shall not be you too! So please undertake the following duties, for my sake:—

1. Refuse appointments to places of responsibility;
2. Break or cancel engagements;
3. Leave hulking aspirants to get their own jobs;
4. All for the purpose of being in bed nine hours every night. I do not mean merely 63 hours in the week, but nine hours every night.”

Since there are so very many letters, and good ones, from Kelley to Nicholas, it was hard to keep him from dominating her personal life. The two discussed issues ranging from Marx’s concept of class struggle to miscegenation. For example, Kelley wrote Nicholas in July 1930: “The conference of the N.A.A.C.P. was by far the best yet held. It was a fitting coming of age party, and promises a lesson to Mr. Hoover in November wherever the Negro vote forms the balance of power. One reason of my hope that this may follow is the adoption of my resolution that the women of the auxiliaries to the branches be urged to make a house to house canvass, to assure the registration of Negro men and women in every district.”

If Ko was the good son, then John, two and a half years younger, was most decidedly the wayward son. From John’s early school years, Kelley expressed her concern about this recalcitrant student and moved him from schools in Wisconsin, to New York City and later to board with a friend in Pittsfield, Massachusetts. She frankly wrote Ko in July 1903: “I went out to Andover and decided against it because it did not offer what John most needs, supervision. This I can give him when I am here and secure for him, I think, during my absences. He would be almost as free, at Andover, as he was at Hillside, from pressure to do daily work daily. You see, I have learned, at last, the lesson that John was not up to the freedom of this last year.”

Kelley must have written to John too, but no manuscript letters survive after 1901, when he was thirteen. Carbon copies of a few dictated

11 Kelley to Nicholas Kelley, 4 October 1905, Selected Letters of Florence Kelley.
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letters exist, including one from 1930 inviting John to a Consumers’ League dinner in New York City. The missing letters to John are not surprising, given John’s nomadic life: he moved from New York to Seattle, to Canada, to Phoenix, to Los Angeles. The distribution of Kelley’s letters to each child is highly uneven. The correspondence between Florence and Nicholas presents the only opportunity, unfortunately, to construct a dialog with her children.

Like the other two children, John wrote his mother frequently. There are hundreds of letters from him, beginning with childish scrawls from Hillside through his checkered life, as he moved from one boarding school to another, tried Harvard for several semesters (his mother must have exerted considerable influence to get him admitted), worked as a ranch hand in Montana and as a hotel clerk in Phoenix. Because we don’t know what Kelley wrote him, his travels and his travails must consequently be documented through annotation. While lecturing in Los Angeles in 1917, Kelley wrote her colleague Edith Abbott: “Meanwhile I have this peaceful afternoon with John at work and no lecture on.” Thus a remark in a recent letter from John can be included in note 1: “John had written that he had found a job as an investment banker in Los Angeles at $20 a week and was determined to ‘plug along with the crowd,’ although he was not interested in industrial stocks and bonds. He wrote of Kelley’s upcoming visit: ‘I honestly believe it will be up to me to prove I can make good and then I can begin to be like Ko.’” Later, Florence referred to John’s sailing his yacht across the Atlantic in 1921, and again this son can have his voice. He urged his mother not to worry about him: “I seem forced to do things calculated to disturb people who love me and people whom I love.—but God knows I don’t do them for that reason. My curse or blessing is that I am fascinated by the seemingly impossible.” From incoming letters Kelley’s relationship to this troubled son can, therefore, be inferred. John’s love of and dependence upon his mother clearly represents another aspect of Florence Kelley’s personal life.
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Any edition of letters should present the whole person: wife, mother, sister, aunt—or in the case of men, son, uncle, husband—as well as the public figure. Where family concerns predominate in the letters of Lucretia Mott, annotation (i.e., references to other letters and to her speeches) emphasizes the public side of this reformer, her leadership in the antislavery and women’s rights causes. Conversely, in a situation where the writer left an extensive paper trail of her activism, the inclusion of Florence Kelley’s letters to her family show a loving sister and mother, a contrast from the brusque and hard-nosed crusader reflected in her professional correspondence. Documentary editing requires editors to research all aspects of their subjects’ lives as they balance the relationship between the public and the private.
On December 15, 2007, *The Washington Post* published an article by staff writer Jeffrey H. Birnbaum titled “In the Course of Human Events, Still Unpublished: Congress Pressed on Founders’ Papers.” This article focused on complaints that the editions publishing the papers of Founders John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Washington, collectively known at the Founding Fathers Papers (FFP), which noted historian David McCullough called “as worthy as any publishing effort that I know of,” take too long to finish and are not accessible enough in the electronic age of free online resources. Comments from Rebecca W. Rimel, president of the Pew Charitable Trusts, and Daniel P. Jordan, president of the Thomas Jefferson Foundation, even left the impression that the editors of these projects were somehow purposefully refusing to adopt technology that would allow them to make faster progress. The article gave little notice to the recent progress that the projects have made on electronic publication. Also, when citing projected finish dates, the article did not mention the number of volumes remaining to be published.

Directors of the projects publishing these editions were surprised to learn that Rimel had retained former Congressman Michael A. Andrews (D-TX) to “organize an effort to persuade Congress to provide more oversight for the projects and scare up more funding for them.” The article also revealed that Rimel and Andrews had assembled a “heavyweight group of advocates.” In addition to McCullough and Jordan, supporters of the effort include Richard Moe, president of the National Trust for Historic Preservation; Archivist of the United States Allen Weinstein; and Deanna B. Marcum, an associate librarian of Congress who represents Librarian of Congress James H. Billington on the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC).
The full text of the testimony given at the Senate Judiciary Committee’s hearing on the Founding Fathers Papers is available online.

Efforts by Founding Fathers Papers projects to provide electronic access to editions through the University of Virginia Press’s Rotunda project and other means are seldom mentioned by recent commentators.
Responses to the criticisms by Rimel and her supporters were sought, and Princeton University Professor Stanley N. Katz, chairman of the Papers of the Founding Fathers, Inc., and the American Historical Association’s representative on the NHPRC, is quoted as saying: “This is not an industrial process, this is a skilled process. Scaling up would be difficult for us if we are to maintain the general character of the volumes that we have now.” The painstaking work of documentary editing, particularly the annotation, is briefly described in the article, though the ubiquitous example of the snippet of a document accompanied by a much longer footnote is presented as the norm. Papers of George Washington (PGW) editor Theodore J. Crackel spoke for the editors when he commented on the possibility of speeding production, saying, “We would love to have the volumes done and would love to do them more quickly, but physical and fiscal constraints indicate that’s not likely to happen.” In fact, the PGW, which has been organized by series from its inception and has an enviable publication record of two volumes per year, has long been considered a model of expeditious publication, and the fifty-two published volumes of that series are available online through the University of Virginia Press’s Rotunda. A cooperation between the press and Mount Vernon has also made a free online version of the published Washington Papers without the editorial apparatus available on Mount Vernon’s website. Washington’s published diaries are available on the Library of Congress’s website “American Memory.”

The article neglected to recognize this and other progress that has been made in the realm of digitization, particularly neither the outstanding work being done by the Rotunda project, in cooperation with Founding Fathers editions, on digitizing the large corpus of existing volumes and presenting them online on a sophisticated, cross searchable, and accessible site, nor the availability of all the texts of Franklin’s writings and correspondence through that project’s website. And it gave no recognition to the fact that the editors of these projects do not run closed shops but are frequently engaged in efforts to reach out to the wider community through project websites, cooperative ventures with historic sites such as Mount Vernon and Montpelier, participation in teacher-training institutes, assistance with exhibits, and more, in addition to assisting scholars such as McCullough.

The general sense of the editorial community was that the article, while it conveyed a clear recognition of the importance of these
editions, presented a story line and cost and production figures (some of them inaccurate) that would raise red flags with Congress and the Administration. And, it was not long before these concerns were borne out.

At the time that the Washington Post article appeared, Congress was struggling to come up with a final agreement to fund the federal government for FY2008, including the two federal funders of these editions, the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and the NHPRC. The constituency’s high hopes for a large increase in the NEH’s appropriation had been dashed, but things were more encouraging on the NHPRC front. Though the Bush Administration defended its decision to zero out both the NHPRC grants program and the funds to administer the work of the Commission for the third year in a row, the Democratic chairs and Republican ranking members of the newly created House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Financial Services and General Government reacted favorably to having both the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) and the NHPRC under their jurisdiction and supported not just restoring, but substantially increasing, funding for the grants program. Though the full Senate had never acted upon the proposed Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill, it was clear from the bill passed by the House and the decisions of the subcommittee and full Senate Appropriations Committee that there was a commitment to increasing the grant funding for NHPRC to at least $8 million in FY2008. Eventually the negotiations over the final omnibus appropriation for the whole federal government resulted in a final figure of $7.5 million, a 36 percent increase over FY2007 but still 15 percent less than the level of grant funding in FY2004, the high water mark for NHPRC funding in actual appropriated dollars.

This much welcomed increase in funding was accompanied by the following committee report language:

The Appropriations Committees are concerned about the lengthy amount of time currently required to complete the publication of the Founding Fathers historical papers projects. These projects began in the 1960s and are expected to continue two or more decades until completion. Mindful of the technologies and tools currently available, the Committees believe the Archivist should accelerate the process for delivering the papers of the Founding Fathers to the American people. Therefore,
the Archivist is directed, as Chairman of the NHPRC, to develop a comprehensive plan for the online electronic publication, within a reasonable timeframe, of the papers of the Founding Fathers and to submit this plan to the Committees on Appropriations no later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act.

This commentary and directive to the Archivist of the United States surprised those who had been advocating for NHPRC funding and clearly resulted from the work done by Pew’s hired lobbyist and the team of advocates working with him and sent the message that the appropriations committees had been influenced by their arguments.

On January 20, 2008, the Philadelphia Inquirer took up the issue, publishing an article entitled, “Founders Letters Lag in Delivery: Slow Publication Vexes Scholars” by staff writer Edward Colimore. The online version of the article was illustrated with a video prepared at the offices of the Jefferson Papers at Princeton University, providing viewers with a glimpse into the work of an editorial project.

The Inquirer reporter demonstrated understanding of the enormity of the task facing the FFP and sought the viewpoints of the editors. Ellen Cohn, director of the Franklin Papers, is quoted as saying: “Most people who haven’t actually seen what we do don’t have any idea how intricate it is and how easy it is to make mistakes—and how spectacular it is when we do it well.” John Stagg, director of the Madison Papers, makes the point that the current staff of these editions remains saddled with the publication expectations set in the mid-twentieth century, before the enormity of the task was understood. Encouragingly, the author of the Inquirer piece gives at least a passing mention to the time that the directors of these editions must spend raising money.

As was the case with the Washington Post piece, the article focuses upon speeding up what is seen as too slow a process, and Rimel is quoted as saying that the delay in publication is “a national embarrassment, though I’m not blaming the people who have been toiling in the vineyards for so long.” A proposal is mentioned by Stan Katz that an unannotated version of the papers be put up online, which he contends “can be done relatively quickly,” while the annotated volumes for serious researchers could be produced on a longer timetable. McCullough calls for “better organization and more money” and is quoted as saying, “You can tell a lot about a society from how it spends money. If this society is unwilling to spend it
on something of such immense and colossal importance, then something is seriously wrong.”

Less than a month after the final passage of the FY2008 appropriations package, word was received that another congressional committee had decided to take an interest in the FFP. Perhaps at the behest of David McCullough, Senate Judiciary Committee chair Patrick Leahy of Vermont scheduled a full committee hearing. Since the Judiciary Committee has no jurisdiction over either the authorizations or appropriations for the two federal agencies that have provided funding for the FFP, this hearing could be characterized as a quite unusual nonjurisdictional oversight hearing.

The February 7 hearing drew roughly forty interested public attendees, most from the historical/archival community, including several ADE members, staff from the NEH, NHPRC, and the National Archives, AHA Executive Director Arnita Jones, National Coalition for History Executive Director Lee White, and a representative from the National Humanities Alliance. In addition to Chairman Leahy, Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts and newly appointed NHPRC member Senator Benjamin Cardin of Maryland were in attendance. Every other senator on the committee sent a staff member to the hearing, an indication of a relatively high level of interest.

Chairman Leahy opened the hearing by noting his personal interest in the topic and commenting that it was a pleasure not to have to swear in the witnesses.1 His opening statement included a strong endorsement for the importance of the FFP and the need to improve public access to them. Stating that “the works of our Founding Fathers are part of the identity and heritage of every American, and we should do everything possible to make certain that these Papers are available, accessible and affordable to the American people,” he expressed concern that the editions were unfinished and the volumes were not widely accessible. His stress was on increasing availability through electronic access:

   Countless Americans have gained valuable insights and developed important connections to our national heritage

---

1 The hearing testimony plus a webcast of the hearing can be found at: http://judiciary.senate.gov/hearing.cfm?id=3077.
by simply viewing the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights on display at the National Archives. For this reason, I support the prompt digitization of all of the Founding Fathers’ Papers, so that this information can be made available to all Americans via the Internet. If Jefferson, Adams, Hamilton and Franklin could pipe into this discussion today, we all know that they would ask, “What are you waiting for?” Harnessing the exquisite power of the Internet to preserve and proliferate the Founders’ papers is a marriage made in Heaven.

The committee had invited David McCullough, Allen Weinstein, Deanna Marcum, Rebecca Rimel, Stanley Katz, and historian Ralph Ketcham to testify. McCullough went first, and his statement contained the following ringing endorsement of the work of the FFP to date:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you for the chance to speak before this committee in support of the Founding Fathers Project. What has been achieved thus far with the publication of the papers of the Founders is all of an exceedingly high order. I want to attest to that emphatically, as one of the many—the countless number of historians, biographers, scholars, and students—who have drawn again and again on the great wealth of material to be found in these incomparable volumes. Their value is unassailable, immeasurable. They are superbly edited. They are thorough. They are accurate. The footnotes are pure gold—many are masterpieces of close scholarship.

Over the past twenty years and more I have worked with—depended on in particular—the volumes of Washington, Adams, and Jefferson papers. I could not have written my last two books, *John Adams* and 1776, without them. I know how essential the papers are to our understanding those great Americans and their time.

Just this past week, for my current project, I wanted to find out what all was contained in the 80-some crates that Thomas Jefferson shipped back home to Virginia, in the course of his five years of diplomatic service in
France—all the books, art and artifacts, the scientific instruments, and the like. The range and variety of the inventory would, of course, reflect much about the mind of the man. So I turned to the Jefferson papers hoping there might be something. And, sure enough, there it was, in Volume 18, the whole sum total in a footnote that runs nearly six pages in small type. I know what work had to have gone into that footnote, the care and attention to detail. There have been times when I’ve spent a whole day on one paragraph just trying to get it right, to be clear and accurate.

The men and women who have devoted themselves to the publication of the papers are not skilled editors only, they are dedicated scholars. Their standards are the highest. Their knowledge of their subjects often surpasses that of anyone. I have worked with them. I know them. I count them as friends. Several in particular have guided and helped me in ways for which I am everlastingly grateful.

They are the best in the business and the high quality of the work they do need not, must not be jeopardized or vitiated in order to speed up the rate of production. There really should be no argument about that.

McCullough’s expressed concern was for more expeditious publication without any loss of the “close scholarship” that he has come to depend upon. He employed a Berlin Airlift analogy, citing the fact that when one airfield was not enough to handle the number of planes needed to deliver the needed food and other supplies, they built another airport. Suggesting that this two airport solution already existed with the Jefferson Papers and at the Adams Papers, he called for more resources for similar efforts at other projects. Given the structure of the editions mentioned, McCullough’s “two airport” solution apparently applies to both projects that have series under way at two locations and those with more than one series in progress at the same location. In that case, McCullough could have also recognized that both the Madison and Washington Papers are divided into series, with staff for each series.

Archivist Weinstein followed McCullough and began with a history of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission’s long-
term role in first encouraging the creation of the individual Founding Fathers projects and, beginning in 1964, serving as one of the funders for FFP projects. Revealing his thinking as he worked to comply with the directive in the report accompanying the FY2008 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, he stated:

This important work must be completed at an accelerated pace, and we must find ways to partner with others outside the federal government in new and creative ways to reach this goal and achieve the most cost-effective solutions.

With the advent of the Internet, on-line versions of the documentary editions are both possible and desirable. Without sacrificing work on the scholarly editions, the National Archives’ NHPRC hopes to develop a plan to produce on-line editions of all major published and unpublished collections of the Founders’ papers at the earliest possible moment. Achievement of this goal will require cooperation among all of the scholars and university presses involved, as well as steady support from the Congress on a time-table geared to early completion of the on-line editions.

Some projects have already begun to work toward this goal. For example, the project to publish the papers of Benjamin Franklin has made available on-line the complete collection of its printed volumes, as well as unpublished transcripts of Franklin’s papers. The online materials are freely available to the public.

Stating that the NHPRC would make “public access” a requirement for the FFP in future grants and work with the FFP editors to establish “meaningful benchmarks” for progress, Weinstein said that the “NHPRC would need to negotiate an agreement with the project sponsors to release and post on-line unannotated transcripts of the raw materials for future printed volumes.” Weinstein did not stipulate whether or not these unannotated transcripts would also be unverified.

The archivist discussed the issue of the rights held by the several university presses that have published the FFP volumes for decades and admitted that these institutions had considerable investment and financial interests in these editions, but he suggested that the new model for open
access requires a different way of thinking about how these materials are distributed and at whose expense.

Significantly, Weinstein concluded by saying: “Only the closest cooperation among the main actors in this process—the National Archives’ NHPRC, the documentary editors, and our congressional supporters—will produce the desired outcome: timely and cost-effective on-line editions of the Founders’ writings and the finest scholarly editions possible in our lifetime.” Unfortunately he could not mention the fact that the Administration had again zeroed out the NHPRC and certainly could not be expected to support a proposal for increased grant funding.

Deanna Marcum used her testimony to highlight some of the digital efforts of the Library of Congress, including the digitization of the Manuscript Division’s collections of the papers of presidents Washington, Jefferson, and Madison and to propose that the library become involved in providing digital access to the FFP volumes and unpublished materials. She cited the example of the American Newspapers project to show how a cooperative venture to digitize the FFP, where the Library of Congress would host the content, might work, saying:

Digital technology gives us the ability to deliver content—of all types—to the users’ digital devices. To take the content we have preserved and sustained over the years to our users, we must convert it to digital form and deliver it to the devices preferred by our users. NEH, as part of its We the People initiative, decided to provide grants to states to convert selectively their microfilmed newspapers to digital form. NEH asked the Library of Congress to assume responsibility for hosting the digital content, preserving it, and making it accessible to today’s and future users. The specifics of our memorandum of understanding are quite simple. NEH uses its grant funding to support the states’ conversion of microfilm to digital files. The Library of Congress has funded staff to develop the specifications for digitization, software tools for production, a user interface to the content, and the long-term preservation of the digital resources. NEH has provided a scaled administrative fee to support these Library activities.
Marcum’s testimony ignored the interests of the university presses that are and have been publishing the FFP for decades at considerable expense and little or no profit. The work under way at the University of Virginia Press to digitize both FFP and Founding Era volumes, the digitization of the Adams Family volumes at the Massachusetts Historical Society, and the Franklin Papers’ presentation of transcripts on its website before publication went unrecognized as well. Instead, she offered the Library of Congress as a digital publisher concluding: “The raw materials of history should be instantly and freely accessible for all. The Library of Congress would be honored to play a role, assuming a combination of appropriated and private funding, in providing that access.”

Rimel’s testimony began with a strong endorsement of the importance of the Founding Fathers Papers as “American scripture” and argued that “completing the effort to publish the writings of the Founding Fathers and ensuring that they are made readily available to every American—and people around the world—are vital to understanding our past and to navigating our future.” She cited studies that proved the high interest in the Founding Fathers in this country and around the world. But the bulk of Rimel’s statement dealt with what she contended was unacceptably slow progress and the lack of “accountability” and “transparency” in the operation of the FFP projects. At the same time that she asked the Judiciary Committee to provide congressional oversight of the FFP projects and ways to speed their progress, she urged:

*When it comes to documents as significant as these, from a time as distant as the 18th century, enlightenment requires more effort than simply acquiring and reading the original journals, correspondence and other writings. As this committee looks to speed access to the papers, I urge you not to abandon the essential steps of research, historical editing and annotating. This important scholarly work provides the critical context that enables us to determine the meaning of our founders’ words. The editing and annotating process is essential to our understanding of history.*

Rimel gave the committee the following advice:

*To be successful, a new approach will be necessary, one that includes an accelerated publication schedule and increased public access to the ideas and thoughts of*
our nation’s founders. I respectfully recommend three objectives for a congressional oversight plan:
First, Congress should draft a plan for completion of this project and conduct regular oversight until it is finished. The Senate Appropriations Committee has directed the Archivist to submit a plan by the end of March to make these materials available online, and these recommendations should be carefully considered.
Second, expeditiously complete the letterpress projects. The original goal of the Congress more than 50 years ago is still valid today. This scholarly work is important. Sufficient funding, coupled with appropriate reporting requirements, will be necessary to complete the projects in a timely manner. More accountability, transparency, efficiency and effectiveness must be introduced to this process. The handling of the Jefferson papers should be carefully reviewed as a model of how the ongoing projects might become more efficient.
Finally, the published volumes should be digitized—along with the original, unannotated documents—and placed on a single, easily accessible and searchable Web site, such as that of the Library of Congress. Access should be free, available to anyone who can access the Internet.

The task of providing a more complete picture of the difficult, painstaking, and time-consuming work that goes into creating a documentary edition, and the current status, publication records, and work plans of the FFP fell to Stan Katz. Katz’s sixty-seven page written testimony, complete with a short history of modern documentary editing, a publication history for the FFP (207 volumes to date), and information about the digital efforts and substantial progress already made by the FFP sets the record straight on the history and current status of the five ongoing projects. Lists of published and projected volumes with details about publication dates, material covered, and number of pages are provided for each project. These lists reveal that the publication record for volumes of the FFP has improved in recent years, during the same period that these projects have also been involved in planning for or implementing electronic publications.
Copies of representative difficult documents, including monetary reports in Jefferson’s tiny script and a digital photograph of an almost invisible document, are supplied, along with the edited versions from printed volumes. A letter from Penelope Kaiserlian, director of the University of Virginia Press, enclosing a report on the very impressive progress of their efforts to digitize Founding Era documentary histories was also submitted for the record, along with a report on the research assistance provided by and educational efforts of the FFP.

Perhaps the most interesting part of Katz’s submission is the letter written by Adams Papers director James Taylor to Thomas Lindsay, director of the NEH’s *We the People* program, in 2006 in behalf of himself and the editors of the Washington, Adams, Jefferson, and Madison Papers. The text of the letter, which was accompanied by statements of work to be done and budgets from each of the project directors, is as follows:

The editors of the founding fathers projects and Stan Katz have requested that I collect from them the information you requested concerning our ideas and cost estimates for producing verified and encoded transcriptions of the first four presidents’ papers for an NEH digital publication. We have exchanged ideas and generally agree on several points that you will see in the enclosed narratives. Below is a summary of some of those points.

1. We are considering for selection all documents not yet published in the modern editions, through the presidencies of each man. The inclusion of the papers created during the long retirement periods of some of the men would extend the project far beyond five years. It is understood that a retrospective digital edition of all the published volumes will be completed as part of the Rotunda Project by the University of Virginia Press.

2. The estimated number of documents ranges from a low of 7,500 for the Adams Papers to 17,000 for the Washington Papers.

3. The editors insist that the documents presented in digital form must maintain the highest standards of accuracy as represented in the print editions.

4. The regular ongoing work must not be interrupted by the digital project.

5. Office space will be a problem and some projects may need to move work off-site. This presents management as well as cost issues.
6. Each project will need some time and funding for preparation. Hiring appropriate staff, completing document management systems and finishing document searches, as well as other preliminary, work will take several months.

7. There must be coordination among the projects to determine XML encoding standards.

8. The combined estimated budget for the four projects is $13,319,875.

At the time, the chairman of the NEH, Bruce Cole, was engaged in a stealth, but unfortunately unsuccessful, effort to put together a funding package for digitizing both the published volumes and unpublished materials of the FFP. Stan Katz’s testimony is highly recommended to all readers of *Documentary Editing*.

Syracuse University Professor Emeritus of History Ralph Ketcham provided the final say from the panel on the issue. He led off his testimony with the statement: “The Founding Fathers Project has become the most lasting and significant effort to preserve the national heritage of the ideas and institutions upon which our political system rests.” Ketcham related the history of the FFP and the origins of the longstanding coalition of private and public supporters and praised the high standards set by the earliest editors of the modern generation and continued by their successors, stating that they developed methods and benchmarks of thoroughness and accuracy for documentary publication that were so path-breaking that all previous such publication was rendered inadequate and incomplete, and all subsequent such publication has had to try to live up to those standards.

As the volumes have came out—well over 200 in all by now—the projects themselves became legendary, and were seen as in a class by themselves for every scholarly and other public purpose.

Ketcham went into his own observations on the work that goes into editing documentary volumes and expressed doubts that the quality of the editorial enterprise could be maintained if publication was speeded up.

I do not think that the present rate of publication, with present staff and funding, and providing that the focus of the staff remains on gathering, validating, editing, and preparing for publication of those papers according
to the long-established and widely approved standards noted above, can be much hastened. Efficiencies and improvement of technique can, as they have often in the past, probably speed things up some, but the projects already do very well on that score; even new technologies are unlikely to be major factors.

In contrast to other speakers, Ketcham argued against online presentation of documents prior to publication.

Even if it were possible to present the editorial files to the public in some fashion, what might be presented? What form, and what part of the file on any given document could be offered? In any case, there would seem to be no possibility of presentation that would not require large amounts of highly skilled work—probably only doable by the editorial staff deeply familiar with the documents—time, then, taken away from the demanding work of preparing the documents for publication, which would further delay that essential process. All of this raises serious questions about any proposal to give the public immediate or quicker access to the “treasured documents.”

All three senators present then engaged in asking a few questions of the panelists, and all stated their support and appreciation for both the papers of the Founders and the editions that publish those papers. Senator Kennedy related his experience as one of the readers of the letters between John and Abigail Adams at a program in Boston’s Faneuil Hall, which the Adams Papers staff played an instrumental role in producing. Senator Cardin commented that he was proud to have been a supporter of the establishment of and funding for the Carroll Family Papers. The senators were unanimous in their belief that the American people, and particularly students, need to be exposed to and familiarize themselves with the writings of our Founders. Though the senators didn’t offer any concrete proposals for how the goal of free electronic access could be achieved, they did indicate that they would continue to pay attention to this issue and take an active interest in Archivist Weinstein’s upcoming report.

On February 18, a third major U.S. newspaper chose to cover this issue when the Los Angeles Times published “A Tussle over the Founding Fathers’ Words” by Sarah D. Wire. Wire begins by contending that
“the names and public acts of the founding fathers are familiar to many Americans, but their thoughts have remained a mystery.” Considering the wealth of thoughts revealed in the surviving documentary record, the more than two hundred volumes of the FFP already published, biographies, earlier editions, volumes of selected writings, at historic homes and other Founder-related sites, and the numerous sources of information on the Internet on the Founders, this statement is puzzling and clearly inaccurate. Despite this questionable start, the article does a credible job of describing some of the steps editors take to prepare documents for publication.

The article focuses on digitization and quotes Brian Lee, a spokesman for the NEH, as saying that it is crucial to make the FFP available online and that the quickest way to do that is “in the form of nonedited papers.” It cites the 2006 letter from the editors of the ongoing FFP proposing to make all the papers available online through a single searchable database in five years with an investment of $13 million.

Wise also checked into the efforts already under way to digitize and present the FFP volumes and interviewed Penny Kaiserlian, about Rotunda. Kaiserlian described a sliding scale one time only fee system for access to Rotunda under which the price for individuals and high schools would be roughly 10 percent of the cost for large research libraries. Such pricing could definitely increase access at public libraries and schools. According to Kaiserlian, “Once a library buys it, they have it forever.” This idea is countered by the Deanna Marcum argument that the cost would prevent the public from accessing the documents and that the Library of Congress should become the home for the digital FFP.

Some participants in the March 4 Congressional visits made for Humanities Advocacy Day (HAD) were questioned about the publicity and issues relating to the FFP and the charge to the archivist to come up with a plan for electronic publication. In at least one office visited it was clear to HAD advocates that the Pew team of Rebecca Rimel and Mike Andrews had already made their case and sought support.

As the writing of this article was concluded, the Archivist of the United States had obtained an extension of the deadline to report a plan for completing the digitization of the volumes and digitizing the unpublished Founding Fathers Papers to the Congressional Appropriations committees. Given the fact that the Bush Administration, which rather ironically had twice recognized the work of the Papers of George Washington at White House ceremonies, chose to zero out the NHPRC for the third year in a
row, it seemed unlikely that any plan calling for increasing federal resources for the FFP would pass muster with the current Office of Management and Budget and be passed on to the Congress. Congress could, of course, decide to take action on its own without a recommendation from the Administration.

Most in the editorial community who work on book editions have difficulty envisioning how online publication of the yet-to-be-published documents could be accomplished quickly without the risk of sacrificing both reliability and true intellectual access to the documents, as well as slowing the production of the volumes. The question is one that documentary editors have already spent years struggling to resolve, and it remains the central issue of the ongoing debate over the Founding Fathers Papers. All federally funded editions could feel the impact of its resolution.
Down a Potholed Road

Documentary editing, though not the Founding Fathers this time, again made the news in the January 22 New York Times article by Motoko Rich, “Editing of Frost Notebooks in Dispute.” The article quotes David Orr, who reviewed The Notebooks of Robert Frost, a one-volume compendium edited by Robert Faggen of Claremont McKenna College, for The New York Times Book Review, as saying “Any Frost reader will benefit from Faggen’s thoughtful introduction and be intrigued by the way in which concepts from these largely aphoristic journals animate the poems and vice versa.” Orr’s comments are quoted as typical of the favorable reviews that the volume had received, but Rich then goes on to describe a brewing controversy over the reliability of the transcription of the notebooks. In a review published in the October 2007 issue of Essays and Criticism James Sitar, now archive editor at the Poetry Foundation, critiqued Faggen’s work, claiming that his own comparison of the transcriptions with the originals of just four of the forty-seven Frost notebooks Faggen worked with turned up “more that one-thousand errors.” Most of the examples cited in the criticisms by Sitar and those from a forthcoming review by William Logan in Parnassus: Poetry in Review center on Faggen’s interpretation of Frost’s spelling. Logan contends that the errors make Frost look like “a dyslexic and deranged speller” who often “made no sense.”

An excellent February 8 article, “The Impossible Art of Deciphering Manuscripts” by Megan Marshall, in the online publication, Slate, opens a window on the complicated issues faced by documentary editors as they struggle to decipher the papers written by and to their subjects. The author recognizes that the five years that Faggen spent transcribing and editing the Frost volume “pales in comparison with the number of years many scholars—and teams of scholars—have devoted to making sense of the hard-to-decipher handwriting of authors from Thoreau to Henry James to the less-well-known but no less prolific 19th-century American diarist Caroline Healey Dall.” Marshall interviewed both Elizabeth Witherell, director of the Thoreau Edition, and the editor of Dall’s diaries, Helen Deese. A couple of selected quotes provide a taste of the substance of this article. Readers of Documentary Editing will immediately recognize the truth of Beth Witherell’s statement that “human beings are not meant to be consistent. Every time we force ourselves into consistency, we fail.” Her description of reading and transcribing Thoreau’s journals as “like driving down a deeply potholed road—you read along and when you come to a word you can’t understand, you back up and run at it again with the force of what you do know” certainly evokes similar experiences with the “deeply potholed” roads of individual handwriting. The Slate article is highly recommended.
The Risks of a Mammoth Edition: The Example of *The Complete Letters of Henry James*

Kevin J. Hayes


Editing is a selfless act. This truism is never more apparent than when it comes to a mammoth edition of correspondence that will fill dozens of volumes, an edition so extensive that the founding editors cannot possibly live long enough to see it to completion. A mammoth edition is like a Gothic cathedral, a work that takes generations to finish. The medieval stonemasons had their devout religious beliefs to sustain them. Besides a deep commitment to the project and a profound belief in its importance, what keeps editors of such huge documentary projects motivated? The answer is their imaginations. They keep going because they imagine the completed edition as it will appear fifty or seventy or maybe a hundred years hence: each uniformly bound volume standing shoulder-to-shoulder on the shelves of every major library in the nation.

With *The Complete Letters of Henry James,* general editors Pierre A. Walker and Greg W. Zacharias have undertaken such a mammoth task. In their editorial introduction to the first volume, which has been released simultaneously with the second, they explain that by the time it is finished the entire edition will fill at least 140 volumes. If the editors can maintain their two-volume-a-year pace—in itself quite ambitious—simple division tells us that it will take seventy years to finish the project. *The Complete Letters of Henry James* is one of those cathedral-like works whose editors will not live long enough to see the final product. They can only imagine what it will look like.

This edition marks an advance over the fullest previous collection, Leon Edel’s four-volume *Henry James Letters,* which contains only 10
percent of James's known letters. Edel never made any claims to inclusivity, however. He looked forward to “further collections in the years to come.”

*Complete Letters* demonstrates how much work still remained after Edel finished his edition. Its first two volumes contain fifty-two previously unpublished letters. Despite its inclusivity and its thoroughness, I cannot help but think that there is something seriously wrong with the approach the editors of *Complete Letters* are taking. Surely, James's letters need not fill 140 volumes. A comparison: *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin* will top out at fewer than fifty volumes and will have taken less than sixty years, ten years fewer than the estimate for *Complete Letters*. Franklin's *Papers* contains his correspondence (letters to and from) and his published writings. *Complete Letters* will contain James's letters only.

What have the editors done to make this edition so huge? To answer that question, let's take a closer look at their editorial method. In their introduction, Walker and Zacharias explain that they faced three basic options as they decided how to edit the letters: clear text, plain text, and genetic text. They rejected clear text, which Leon Edel had used for *Henry James Letters*, because it would omit too much information from the manuscript letters. They also rejected genetic text, arguing that a genetic edition requires its readers to memorize an elaborate set of symbols before mastering the text. Deciding against a genetic text, Walker and Zacharias made a good decision. Readers often meet symbol-laden texts with belligerence. Consider the animosity that met Emerson's *Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks* when its early volumes appeared. Since genetic text editions can be difficult to use, they are best reserved for intricate literary works, works whose critical interpretation can turn on the meaning of a single word, works like Herman Melville's *Billy Budd* or Benjamin Franklin's *Autobiography*.

The plain text method was pioneered by the editors of *Mark Twain's Letters*. When the University of California Press published the first volume of this edition, reviewers hailed its plain text method as a great advance in documentary editing, something far superior to the genetic text method. Jeffrey Steinbrink, for one, found it “gratifyingly free of the arrows, angles,
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and other gewgaws that fetter the older methods of transcription it ought
to supersede.” Walker and Zacharias decided that a plain text method of
editing would best suit their purpose; that is, to make James’s printed letters
closely resemble his manuscript originals.

The method devised by Twain’s editors does not precisely suit James’s
letters, however. Here’s why: Twain’s training as a printer helped make
his manuscripts crisp and clear. He punctuated his letters as if he were
preparing copy for the press. If he wanted italics, he would underline. If he
wanted small caps, he would double underline. The editors of Mark Twain’s
Letters have followed their subject’s built-in directions. Since James’s
directions are less explicit, Walker and Zacharias have had to make many
more decisions on their own. The result is a text that is not nearly so plain
as its editors claim it to be. Open the first volume of Mark Twain Letters at
In comparison, the so-called plain text of James’s letters looks more like
a genetic text. Before reading its editors’ introduction, I thought this new
edition of James’s letters was a genetic text.

Several editorial decisions contribute to the cumbersome look of
Complete Letters. Though the use of printed italics to represent manuscript
underlining is universal, Walker and Zacharias use underlining in the
printed text to make it mimic James’s manuscript. There’s nothing
technically wrong with this, I suppose, but there is something aesthetically
wrong. Underlining uglies up the page. Italics would have been more
graceful. Their decision to avoid italic text to represent James’s underlining
frees it up for another use. They always place italic text in brackets, where it
denotes conjectural readings where the original manuscript is illegible. The
italics are redundant: brackets are sufficient to set off the text in
these instances.

The editors’ treatment of cross-outs is what really makes Complete
Letters resemble a genetic text. Again trying to make the printed text
resemble manuscript, they use the same number of horizontal lines to strike
out a cancelled passage of text that James used. Where James crossed out
a word with one line, the editors cross out the word with one line. Where
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James used two lines, the editors use two. Where James used three, so do the editors. And where James completely blotted out words to make them illegible, the editors print big, ugly black blotches: pock marks on the face of the printed page.

The editors supply additional cross-outs of their own. In what may be their goofiest editorial decision, they devise what they call a “conceptual solution” to treat overwritten text. Here’s an example showing how this conceptual solution works. In one instance, James accidentally wrote the word “disappointment” where he meant to write “disappointed.” Upon realizing his error, he corrected it by overwriting “-ment” with “-ed.” A clear text approach would simply print “disappointed.” Walker and Zacharias transcribe the entire word, “disappointment,” cross it out with a horizontal line, and then provide the intended word, “disappointed.” To complicate matters even further, every time they correct an overwritten word in this manner, they append a textual note to the letter to explain what they have done. Every time.

Besides the underlining, cross-outs, and blotches, the only other nonverbal symbols in the text of Complete Letters are diamonds and carets. The diamonds designate illegible characters for which the editors have no conjecture. For illegible words that James crossed out, they place a line of diamonds roughly equal to the length of the passage and strike through it with one or two or three lines. Roger Waters might call these crazy diamonds. A caret indicates the start of an interlinear passage of text; a bracketed caret usually indicates the end of an interlinear passage of text. In an effort to avoid excessive symbols to designate the textual eccentricities of each letter, the editors provide much additional explanatory material in the notes: too much. Take James’s misspellings, for example. James was a good speller, not a great one. Thankfully, the editors avoid the bracketed “sic” to signal a misspelling, but their solution is scarcely an improvement. Every time James misspelled a word, the editors provide a textual note explaining that James misspelled the word. Every time. All these superfluous notes make the editors look insecure. With each note they seem to be saying, “This misspelling is not our mistake. James did it. Not us.” One sentence in the editorial introduction explaining that James’s misspellings have been retained could have eliminated every single textual note about the misspellings.

With all their special features, Walker and Zacharias gave the designers at the University of Nebraska Press quite a challenge. Nebraska’s
award-winning designers rose to the occasion to create a page layout that is
absolutely luxurious: a narrow page width, wide margins, generous leading,
and plenty of extra white space to enhance legibility. But the designers
seem to have forgotten one crucial aspect of this edition: its profound scope.
Their luxurious layout would be fine for a one- or two-volume edition,
but for an edition that will run into dozens of volumes, it is inappropriate.
By conserving white space, the designers could reduce the total size of the
ingition by several volumes.

Let’s not make the designers too culpable: the editors’ special features
demand way too much space. The carets, especially the bracketed carets,
require much more leading than would otherwise be necessary. With so
many textual and historical notes, the editors decided against cluttering the
letters with superscript note numbers. Instead, they place line numbers on
each page of text. These distracting line numbers take up precious space,
further narrowing the already narrow page. The unjustified right margins
further minimize the amount of text a page can hold. These margins suit
the editorial purpose—that is, they help make the printed text more closely
resemble the manuscript letters—but they are misleading. The editors
make no attempt to preserve the integrity of James’s individual lines, but
the unjustified margins make it seem as if the printed text is preserving the
original lines. Overall, the narrow page width, unjustified right margins,
and line numbers combine to make the text look more like poetry
than letters.

Taken together, the editorial complexities, luxurious design, and
extensive notes mean that each volume of Complete Letters can include a
fairly small number of letters. The first volume, which fills a total of 469
pages, contains only 83 letters! The second volume is even more decadent.
It fills 556 pages and contains only 80 letters. In other words, the letters
receive an average of more than 6 pages each. With more than ten thousand
surviving James letters, no wonder Complete Letters will take 140 volumes or
more to complete.

Walker and Zacharias justify devoting so much space to each letter
because they want to provide as much information as possible. Take the
cross-outs, for example: James used different cross-outs for different
reasons. Using only a single line to strike through a word, he left the
cancelled word legible, letting his correspondent read the word and
allowing himself to use the cancellations for humorous purposes: double
entendres and the like. To prove their point, the editors offer an example of a
Jamesian joke resulting from a cross-out in their introduction. The example takes too much explanation to repeat here. Besides, it is not even very funny. Worst of all, the letter they use for the example comes from 1894. The second volume of *Complete Letters* only goes through 1872. In other words, the editors must skip ahead more than two decades to find a good example to make their point. While their impulse to preserve the maximum amount of information is well intended, it is simply not worth the effort.

The whole situation comes down to a matter of minimizing risk. From the perspective of Walker and Zacharias, it is better to make the letters long and cumbersome than to risk losing information. They could save much space by editing the letters in clear text and simply explaining the jokes in the notes, but even this approach they find too risky. They apparently do not want to run the risk of missing the jokes themselves. Better to print the cross-outs and avoid the risk of missing anything.

While avoiding these little risks, Walker and Zacharias unwittingly run a much greater risk. Though, as I have suggested, editors of mammoth editions stay inspired by imagining how the completed edition will look once it is finished after their deaths, the future of a mammoth edition can be imagined in other, less optimistic ways. Imagine what happens as the two-volume-a-year pace slackens: The original publisher loses interest in the edition and withdraws its support. Future editors must find another publisher. The later volumes do not approach the quality of the earlier ones. The bindings do not quite match. The cloth is coarser, and the dyes are noticeably different. Inside, the paper is not so creamy, the typeface not so crisp, the margins not so wide. The edition gets finished, but the final product is not nearly as nice as the founding editors imagined.

Even this scenario is fairly optimistic. There is another possibility: The edition sells few copies, and the original publisher discontinues it. Future editors lack the profound commitment to the project shared by the founding editors. They cannot find another publisher willing to undertake the project. The edition languishes for a time and is ultimately abandoned. Imagine its appearance in the library stacks then. It fills a couple shelves but ends two or three decades before the author’s death, before even getting to the period of his greatest works. Devoting so much attention to minutiae, editors run the risk that their mammoth edition will never make it to completion—which would be a shame. Cognizance of this risk should guide their editorial decision making.
With the format of *The Complete Letters of Henry James* now established upon the release of the first two volumes, Walker and Zacharias may be reluctant to make any changes, but I sincerely hope they will consider the risks they face and reconsider their editorial approach. Several modest, reasonable alterations would improve the edition greatly. Their plain text format just does not work; it is not very plain at all. They need to switch to clear text. Doing so would make the letters more readable and save much space. Eliminating the carets would allow them to reduce the leading considerably. The clear text would minimize the textual notes and thus render the line numbers unnecessary, saving more space and making the page look more elegant. Justifying the right margins would save further space and eliminate the illusion that this edition preserves the integrity of James’s individual lines.

The editors’ extensive historical notes should be trimmed, too. These explanatory notes are so lengthy that they give the illusion of being exhaustive; they are not. James’s considerable literary knowledge and his ability to toss off oblique references with aplomb means that many of his allusions are lost even to today’s most sensitive and knowledgeable readers. Already others are starting to identify allusions the editors of *Complete Letters* missed. By trying to annotate James’s letters fully, as Leon Edel suggested, “one could end up writing a history of all civilization.” There is no reason the notes need to be exhaustive. The emphasis of this edition should be on getting the letters into print. For future volumes, the editors might follow a method of annotating established by the editors of the *Selected Correspondence of Bernard Shaw*, which provides a single eloquent explanatory paragraph after each letter.

If Walker and Zacharias really feel strongly about preserving all the underlining, cross-outs, and overwritten passages and including all the textual and historical notes, then they should arrange with the University of Nebraska Press to put the plain text version online at a later date. Or, even better, they could do an online project along the lines of the excellent *Family Letters Project: The Correspondence of Thomas Jefferson’s Family Members*, which presents facsimiles of the letters and plain text.
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transcriptions. This online project promotes itself as a companion to the printed edition, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Retirement Series*, published by Princeton University Press. Now that online projects serving as adjuncts to published editions are both possible and acceptable, there can be no justification for a 140-volume edition of Henry James’s letters.

When it first announced plans to publish James’s letters in 1997, the University of Nebraska Press said the edition would take thirty volumes and be completed in fifteen years. Now that Walker and Zacharias have announced that the edition will take 140 volumes or more, others have simply accepted its gargantuan proportions. Peter Kemp, for one, ended his enthusiastic review of the first two volumes of *Complete Letters* saying, “The sooner the next 138 or so volumes appear, the better.” I cannot accept so easily the idea of such an unwieldy, costly, and time-consuming edition. I would like to see the editors of *Complete Letters* revert to their original thirty-volume plan. Leon Edel averaged more than 250 letters per volume, and his volumes were comparatively small. By making the changes I have suggested, *Complete Letters* could average more than three hundred letters per volume, instead of the paltry eighty-one and a half it is averaging now. The ten thousand surviving James letters *could* fit into thirty volumes. In professor–years, Walker and Zacharias are both still young men. If they are willing to scale back their editorial apparatus, they will not have to imagine what the finished edition will look like after their deaths. They could live long enough to see *Complete Letters* finished. And wouldn’t that be sweet?

---

The Pitfalls of *Digital History*

David Spiech


With *Digital History*, Dan Cohen and Roy Rosenzweig have attempted to boost scholarly authors and editors into the wild world of web publishing, even those who have tried to maintain a conservative academic distrust of electronic media. They write engagingly and frankly, addressing the reader as a colleague who knows historical material well but needs comprehensive background about every facet of digital access and presentation.

Not surprisingly, as historians, they provide details from the short history of computerized research, data analysis, and Internet publishing. What makes this volume valuable is that they go beyond the historical background and give practical, somewhat current advice about managing digital publishing projects and preserving digital materials. Obviously drawing on their own experience with the Center for History and New Media (CHNM), the authors are not shy about treading in controversial areas such as copyright law and digital archiving. The most helpful parts of this work are found in the practical details that can be known only from actually trying to use or present online historical materials. They carefully counter the traditional historian’s fears that contextual information will be lost, as well as overstated claims for the permanence and broad distribution of digital materials.

For the academic historian who may be familiar only with the front end of web and database applications, they provide an appendix with an introduction to database programming and XML markup. They
skim quickly over SGML and TEI (Chapter 3: Becoming Digital), while making clear that the most useful future work will require TEI compliance and the use of some form of contextual markup, such as XML.

By bringing the reader up to speed on various cultural and technological developments pertaining to the World Wide web and digital media yet stopping right at the brink of complex XML implementations, the authors succeed in presenting web publishing as a worthwhile venture for the independent or underfunded historian.

One of the unique aspects of this volume is that the authors have, in a sense, followed their own advice by publishing the volume itself online in a straightforward HTML presentation. However, it has suffered some of the pitfalls that the authors themselves warn about regarding format changes, conversion to web presentation, and the stability of Internet links.

**Online Edition Compared to Print Edition**

The University of Pennsylvania Press agreed to allow Cohen and Rosenzweig to post their book online, with free access. However, the online edition contains errors that are not in the print edition, possibly from rekeying and reformatting, or perhaps the online text is from a preprint version of the text.

The online edition features a home page that functions like a preface, as well as an “About the Authors” page that has not been updated since the death of Roy Rosenzweig. The online edition also includes a “Buy the Book” page with links to the University of Pennsylvania Press, Amazon, and Barnes & Noble, which unhelpfully shows that the press’s page is out of date: it gives the publication date as 2005 rather than 2006, the number of pages as 325 rather than 316, and the number of illustrations as 45 rather than 43.

The online edition uses no chapter numbers, and some chapter and section headings are different. Every section online begins with a nice faux-Renaissance-style illuminated drop-cap that is not in the print edition. Notes in the online edition are presented as footnotes that cross-reference to the permanent “Links” page, whereas notes in the print edition are endnotes. Along with the placement of the table of contents as a hyperlinked sidebar, these differences represent improvements made to accommodate the web presentation.
Some clues suggest most of the online edition was implemented after the print edition was completed, or else done separately with less editorial skill. All of the illustrations online are presumably the “original” images, since they sometimes contain more information than in the print edition. However, they vary in sometimes showing less than the images in the print edition, sometimes showing completely different images, and sometimes showing a different screen-capture frame.

For example, some screenshots of webpages contain different embedded images (Figures 5, 7, 9), indicating that they were captured at a different time than the print images. Usually this is irrelevant to the point made in the text or the caption, but sometimes the discrepancy causes an egregious error in presentation.

For Figure 11, the screenshot is from the wrong day, so that the online image doesn’t match the caption. To compound the problem, the text links to a note that links to a cached PDF version of the site that is different from the image accompanying the online text and the print image! Therefore, the correct image found in the print edition is completely lost to the online reader.

Figure 25 presents two images for comparison, yet the online text presents the wrong first image, so that comparison is more difficult for the online reader. The purpose of the example is to show how a specific text can be reformatted using design principles. Yet, because the authors have substituted a screenshot image with a different text for the initial appearance, the point is lost. This might seem trivial unless you had seen the print edition, which makes the point clearly. That discrepancy reveals that the online version was done carelessly.

For Figure 42, the text discusses the image of a user agreement, but the online image shows a different version from the print image. Notably, all of the captions online must have been rekeyed, because they contain many errors and edits compared to the print captions. Capitalization errors, typos, and transpositions are typical, but some errors are more problematic.

For example, Figure 1 includes a copyright statement in the print edition, but this statement is missing in the online edition. Half of the caption for Figure 19 is missing in the online edition, cut off in midsentence.

For Figure 23, the link provided in the caption is presented as a live link, but it is not; furthermore, following the note link provided in the text
(for note 12) leads to a useless assortment of links on the Links page: the Live Site link is actually to the *Digital History Links* page itself, the Cached link yields a 403 Forbidden error from the CHNM web server, and the PDF link yields a Page Not Found error from the CHNM web server. The URL is provided nowhere in the online or print edition, so it is completely lost to the reader.

Several problems with links can be found with a brief examination. For example, in the Introduction, note 11, the text references 2004 statistics; the note cites a Technorati page from 17 February 2005; but the cached page is from June 2005, giving different stats.

In the text, the online edition includes one hypertext link that has no corresponding note in the print edition: http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/%7Ewww_sd/jrd4.html (http://chnm.gmu.edu/digitalhistory/exploring/4.php). This appears to be the only live link added to the online edition other than internal cross-references; because it is a hyperlink, it is not in the print edition at all. Curiously, whereas the online edition has several apparent problems with its clever system of crosslinks and external links, in a few places it includes URLs in the text that are not live links and not included on the designated Links page.

In the chapter, “Getting Started: Naming Your Site and Presenting It to the World,” the page contains a URL in the text that is neither hotlinked online nor footnoted—and not included in the list of updated/cached links: a Chinese Culture page by Paul Halsall at http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/core9/~phalsall/. There is a new Halsall Chinese culture page at http://acc6.its.brooklyn.cuny.edu/~phalsall/index.html, but Cohen and Rosenzweig fail to link to Halsall’s permanent site, as suggested by Halsall in the image they show. Cohen and Rosenzweig also give as a “current” URL for Halsall www.unf.edu/~phalsall/, which is now obsolete, since Halsall had left UNF by the time the print edition went to press.

**Inadequacy of Both Editions**

The introduction to the Notes section provides one rationale for having the text online, in that it enables the authors to keep an updated list of web addresses there. To facilitate this, they use a system of numbering the links by chapter and then referring to this number within the printed note. The authors state that if they find that a link has disappeared, they will provide the best available reference for the material. However, I found that several of the online links were no longer valid. In response to this
problem, the authors provide cached versions of the original Websites in HTML or PDF format, or both. However, the embedded images in the cached HTML webpages are hotlinked to the original sites, so these images tend to still change.

This method of providing web references only online requires the authors to continuously check and update their reference list, so that theoretically they could update it after the main text is obsolete. On the other hand, at some point they will presumably either stop updating their web references and simply allow them to reflect the most current links available at a particular point in time, or they will revise the main text itself, making the old web reference list unusable.

In either case, the printed book would then become thoroughly obsolete, since there would no longer be an updated web reference list corresponding to the printed text. Moreover, since the printed notes provide none of the URLs themselves, but merely cross-references, without the online key list none of the web references can be reconstructed. Since many of the web references are web-only and give only an author name or document title, the lack of online resources would make these notes superfluous and invalid.

Of course, one could argue that by the time the authors revise the online text or give up on updating the online reference list, the content of the printed book would be irrelevant anyway. However, given the current rate of technological change, it calls into question the whole enterprise of printing a physical book, especially one that is not self-contained with regard to references.

Conclusion

This volume represents an adequate summary of advice for the novice web publisher, or for any author or editor who has felt too intimidated to attempt web publishing. It is particularly good for acquainting a traditional historian with the most recent developments in web culture and technology and in warning about some of the possible problems. The online edition will probably be the most useful for this purpose, assuming it is readily found by a novice using a search engine. The print edition is like an introduction to the online edition or a handy desktop reminder of the basic points, rather than being a standalone volume.
For that reason, a library would be better served by not purchasing the print edition at all but rather providing a link to the Website or a cached version of it; and the University of Pennsylvania Press would be better served by charging significantly less for the print edition. If the online edition were edited properly and regularly updated, it might serve for several years as a good introduction to web publishing.

However, if applications developers succeed in making web publishing more user-friendly for academic authors and editors, the technology could change quickly, making the entire work obsolete except as a historical summary. Interestingly, that describes the history of older digital publishing technologies: as processes are simplified and the technical workings are hidden behind more intuitive user interfaces, the technical knowledge previously considered necessary becomes irrelevant. In their analysis of the history of digital publishing, Cohen and Rosenzweig may have foreshadowed the fate of their own work on digital publishing.
Birth control advocate Margaret Sanger (MS) was, and still is, both revered and reviled for her efforts to move contraception out from the shadows of illegality and obscenity into the light of widespread acceptance. During her radical activist days (1910s–1920s), MS honed her leadership, networking, and speechmaking skills and often depended on direct action to further her cause. By 1930 she had departed from her radical cohorts but continued to employ her broadening network of contacts. The Selected Papers of Margaret Sanger, Volume 2: Birth Control Comes of Age, 1928–1939 covers the efforts and life of MS during this era. In addition to speeches, conferences, and correspondence, in the 1930s MS took her struggle to the halls of Congress, the sound waves of radio (406), and the emerging media of film (19–20). As in her early years, her personality destroyed some alliances and cemented others. Through it all, she never forgot the women for whom she was fighting, often replying to those who wrote to solicit her assistance (123–24, 195). Refusing to settle into a comfortable middle age, MS instead shifted her tactics and her focus.

This book represents the second volume in a proposed series of four, with the last to cover the international work of MS. Created in 1985, the Margaret Sanger Papers Project (MSPP) at New York University, directed

1 See The Selected Papers of Margaret Sanger, Volume 1: The Woman Rebel, 1900–1928, edited by Esther Katz; Peter Engelman and Cathy Moran Hajo, associate editors; Amy Flanders, assistant editor (Urbana Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2003).
by Esther Katz, sought, collected, arranged, and filmed documents of MS before choosing from that imposing archive the selections to include in the printed series.² The Selected Papers of Margaret Sanger, Volume 1: The Woman Rebel, 1900–1928 (2003) was previously reviewed for this publication.³

Birth Control Comes of Age takes the story of Margaret Sanger’s life and activism through the stock market crash of 1929, the Great Depression, and the New Deal, from the departure of MS from the birth control organization that she had founded during her congressional lobbying days to the critical One Package court decision. The reader not only learns about the depth of MS’s commitment to the cause but also about her relationship with her second husband, Three-in-One Oil magnate J. Noah Slee, and with other men in her life, and about her interpretation of eugenic principles, to name only two of the many themes of this period in her life.

As in the previous volume, the editors concentrate here on the actual words of MS. About 88 percent of the documents in Birth Control Comes of Age are letters, mostly written by MS. The other selections represent journal entries, a few speeches and articles, and congressional testimony given by MS. The editors faithfully reproduce the original text, complete with underlining, capital letters used for emphasis, words crossed out or inserted, and misspelled words (xxix, xxxi).

The editors cite forty manuscript collections and repositories as sources for this work. This volume is sixteen pages longer than the first, but it covers only eleven years, while the first volume covers twenty-eight. The present work includes the same type of detailed and helpful index as does Volume 1 and the same meticulous documentation, with source notes for each selection and what one reviewer calls “heroically comprehensive footnotes.”⁴

The editors have indeed “heroically” attempted to identify in the endnotes for each document every person mentioned therein, with birth and death dates and information about their connections to MS. Brief explanatory headnotes precede most documents. Each volume features a chronology of the years covered, and the one in Volume 2 adds a few key entries (births, deaths, marriages, etc.) that occurred before 1928, to better orient the reader (xxxix–xl). Arranged chronologically, the collection is divided into

---

² The collection of Sanger documents contains approximately 120,000 items (xxix). See the two-series microfilm, The Margaret Sanger Papers [microform]: Smith College Collections and Collected Documents Series (Bethesda, MD: University Publications of America, 1996, 1997) and The Papers of Margaret Sanger [microform], Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
eight chapters, with a short essay introducing each chapter. Two sections of photos, graphics, and other illustrative material, each ten to twelve pages long, add appeal and hint at Sanger’s charisma and charm.

In Chapter 1, “Vying for Control,” the reader gets a sense of the conflict between MS and the American Birth Control League (ABCL), conflict that resulted in Sanger’s resignation from her posts as editor of The Birth Control Review and director of the ABCL (18). Documents in this chapter also tell of the 1929 police raid on MS’s Birth Control Clinical Research Bureau (BCCRB) in New York City and of MS’s reaction (23-24, 29-32). The raid made MS and birth control front-page news (not for the first time) and marked a turning point in the attitude of the medical profession toward contraception.

Many physicians, while not necessarily birth-control advocates, were appalled that the police had seized the patient records of the BCCRB. In her exuberant style, MS wrote to friend and supporter Juliet Barrett Rublee, “The whole raid has brought people to us by the thousands & now the Doctors are considering taking over the Clinic!” (30). To her mentor and sometime lover Havelock Ellis, she wrote of the raid, “It put us ten years ahead,” in part because physicians testified to the favorable impact of spacing pregnancies two to three years apart (33). While it would be another eight years before the American Medical Association gave its official nod to contraception, MS was correct. In 1929 some doctors did see a need for medical supervision of birth control, heretofore relegated to drugstores, barbershops, and black-market entrepreneurs. While the professionalization of contraception as a medical matter may have added credibility, feminist historians of the twenty-first century look back and see it as detrimental, as pushing the movement away from its roots in direct action.6

The next few chapters depict MS as a lobbyist. While Ellen Chesler’s biography, Woman of Valor, includes a chapter on MS’s lobbying activities, the documents in Birth Control Comes of Age more fully demonstrate the tedious nature of almost a decade of work by the National Committee on Federal Legislation for Birth Control (NCFLBC).7 MS founded this

---


organization in April 1929, only a few months after she resigned from the ABCL (xxxix). She employed it not only to push for new legislation favorable to the cause but also to keep that cause—and her leadership of it—in the public eye (59–60). By May of the next year, the NCFLBC had succeeded in getting a bill introduced into the U.S. Senate. Supporters hoped that the proposed law would clear the way, on a national level, for physicians to legally order, receive, prescribe, and dispense contraceptives (xxxix). But getting a “doctor’s only” bill passed in either house of Congress, let alone both, presented a mighty challenge, as the documents in this and the next few chapters reveal.

Chapter 2, “Bills to Write, Bills to Pay,” focuses on Sanger’s decision to begin this legislative effort as well as on the struggle she and her financiers faced to keep the BCCCRB and the NCFLBC afloat at the beginning of the Great Depression. Chapter 3, “Mrs. Sanger Goes to Washington,” begins with MS’s move to Washington, D.C., in 1931, better to supervise the lobbying endeavor. The documents in this chapter detail the daunting yet determined attempts by a broad network of NCFLBC committee members to convince congressional leaders to sponsor or support a birth-control bill. Between 1930 and 1937, the NCFLBC got nine such bills introduced into Congress. Few got out of committee; none came close to becoming law (xxix–xl). One of the difficulties was religious opposition to the very idea of birth control.

Late in 1930 Pope Pius XI had issued a special encyclical to clarify the position of the Roman Catholic Church on contraception. The Pope called anything that prevented the natural generation of life “an offense against the law of God and of nature,” and warned that “those who indulge in such [acts] are branded with the guilt of a grave sin” (149). Many legislators expressed fears about the repercussions of backing birth control among their constituents, especially Catholics in their districts (124, 126–27). Meanwhile, Catholic women flocked to the BCCRB and other birth control clinics of the era along with their Protestant and Jewish counterparts (151n1). Sanger reacted to the Pope’s declaration with some cynicism and ranted against Catholic opposition when she got a chance (146–54, 166).

8 See also, for example, Meyer, Any Friend, 104.
While MS led the fight for legislative action, she pitched birth control as a reform worthy of FDR’s New Deal, although she got no direct support from the White House (203–04, 293, 294n7). MS was also setting in place a challenge of a different sort. Two documents in Chapters 4, “A New Deal for Birth Control,” and 5, “Hard Times,” tell of the U.S. Customs seizure of a shipment of pessaries (also called diaphragms) from Japan designated for the BCCRB. The Customs Office held them as “immoral articles” under the Tariff Act of 1930 (210). To test the tariff regulation’s boundaries, MS ordered one package of the same objects to be sent from Japan to Dr. Hannah Stone at the BCCRB. Would it be acceptable for a physician to receive such “immoral articles” if they were intended for a medical purpose? When the package was again detained, MS worked with an attorney to present this as a test case (231–32, 353–54). On January 7, 1936, a staff member telegraphed, “JAPANESE CASE VICTORY. CONGRATULATIONS” (355). The judge had held that the law could not be taken literally and offered an exception for items intended for medical purposes (355). The decision was upheld on appeal later that year (357, 388–89).

The One Package case, MS believed, took away the necessity for further legislative action, and the NCFLBC soon disbanded (356–57). MS’s work continued, however, as related in Chapter 6, “A New Day Dawns for Birth Control.” She organized a medical conference and focused on the BCCRB. After the AMA finally recognized birth control as a legitimate medical concern in 1937, Sanger told a radio audience, “Birth control, twenty years ago outlawed, reviled, has won its place in the sun” (406). Birth Control Comes of Age includes a photo of Sanger’s journal entry for that day, “Newspapers headline A.M.A. at Atlantic City endorse BC!! Good resolution covers all we hoped for.”

MS’s next task was to unify the movement that had split almost a decade earlier. In Chapter 7, “A Common Cause,” and Chapter 8, “Creating a World of Tomorrow,” the documents tell of the merging of the ABCL and the BCCRB into the Birth Control Federation of America (BCFA), of MS moving to Tucson and passing on the gavel, and of the shift in the movement’s emphasis from birth control or family limitation to “family planning” (470). The BCFA used the theme of the 1939 New York World’s Fair for its fundraising dinner that year, “Creating the World of Tomorrow” (470). The outbreak of World War II, however, soon dashed the hopes for a bright world of tomorrow, at least in the short term.
Birth Control Comes of Age continues the important story begun by Volume 1 of this series. It brings to print for the first time documents that are valuable for the tales they tell about activism and advocacy, as well as about the life and work of MS. In this day of quick, do-it-yourself publishing, it’s reassuring that scholars such as Katz and her editorial team continue to pay close attention to detail and historical context in order to present a factual and objective collection of primary sources. And, luckily for us, as the book’s acknowledgments state, “it’s not over yet!” (xxi)
2007 ADE Award Recipients

The Association for Documentary Editing is pleased to announce its 2007 Award Recipients. The awards were presented at the 29th Annual Conference in Richmond, Virginia, November 17, 2007.


**Lyman H. Butterfield Award**: Beth Luey, for significant contributions to the ADE in the areas of documentary scholarship, service, and teaching.

**Distinguished Service Award**: Philander D. Chase, for his long service to the ADE, including serving as Treasurer (1994–97) and his dedication lobbying Congress for NEH and NHPRC funding, and for contributions such as his “Guide to Planning the Annual Meeting” and his report entitled “Institutional Relationships and Support of Documentary Editing Projects.”


**Life Service Award**: John P. Kaminski, for almost forty years of distinguished scholarship as well as dedicated service to the ADE since 1979.
Gary E. Moulton: Julian P. Boyd Award

Presented by Roger Bruns

My first memories of Gary Moulton are from the NHPRC’s Editing Institute held in Columbia, South Carolina, in 1977. The Institute coincided that spring with the release of the film *Star Wars*. I remember Gary returning from the film fired up, energized. He loved it. Later, someone told me that his love of the film was not surprising; that Gary had a personal interest in the martial arts. I never knew whether that was true. All I knew was that I was going the extra mile to get along with him. Of course, I never had to go any distance at all. He was and is a true Jedi editor.

At the time, Gary was at the University of Oklahoma beginning a project to edit the Papers of the Cherokee Chief John Ross, later published in two volumes by the University of Oklahoma Press. In 1979, he accepted the position as editor of the “Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition” at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln. He completed the thirteen-volume edition in 1999. He also completed an abridged, single-volume edition of the journals titled *The Lewis and Clark Journals: An American Epic of Discovery* published in 2003. In the words of one scholar, these editions are “one of the major scholarly achievements of the late twentieth century.”

Gary’s work has bridged the gap between the scholarly and popular worlds. He has given many presentations in connection with his work on the Lewis and Clark journals. For example, in the summer of 2005 he lectured at the Keelboat Symposium as part of the commemoration of the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark expedition. Stephen Ambrose remarked that without the Lewis and Clark Journals, his own work, *undaunted Courage*, would have been impossible.

He was a consultant to the 1977 Ken Burns documentary, *Lewis and Clark: The Journey of the Corps of Discovery*. The success of the film was gratifying. But in addition, Gary and Faye Moulton were invited, along with others who worked on the film, to the White House. They stood in the East Room, the place where two centuries earlier Meriwether Lewis quartered while he was Thomas Jefferson’s secretary prior to the expedition.

He has been honored with numerous awards such as the 2005 Sower Award in the Humanities from the Nebraska Humanities Council; the Award of Meritorious Achievement from the Lewis and Clark Trail Heritage Foundation, and the J. Franklin Jameson Prize for Outstanding Editorial Achievement from the American Historical Association. Gary has
been a very active and valuable member of the Association for Documentary Editing, nearly from its beginning. He served for a time as its Treasurer.

“From the top of the mound, we beheld a most beautiful landscape. Numerous herds of buffalo were seen feeding in various directions. The plain to the north, northwest and northeast extends without interruption as far as can be seen.”
—The Journals of Lewis and Clark, August 25, 1804

For keeping alive words such as these, for enhancing historical understanding through superb scholarship and for advancing that understanding to the public, and for meritorious service to the Association for Documentary Editing, I am honored, on behalf of the Julian P. Boyd Award Committee, to announce that the Committee has voted unanimously to present the award to Gary Moulton.

Beth Luey: Lyman H. Butterfield Award
Presented by Elizabeth M. Nuxoll

In the interests of suspense, I am temporarily withholding the name of the recipient of the 2007 Lyman H. Butterfield Award, presented annually to an individual, project, or institution for recent contributions in the areas of documentary publication, teaching, and service. The award is granted in memoriam of Lyman Henry Butterfield, whose editing career included contributions to The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, the editing of the Adams Family Papers, and publishing The Letters of Benjamin Rush. However, since our awardee has a long history of involvement with the Association of Documentary Editing, I think only a few clues will be needed before you have solved the puzzle.
Our awardee served as president of the Association from 2002 to 2003. For five years she was editor of its journal, Documentary Editing, for which she received the 2002 Distinguished Service Award. She served on numerous ADE committees, including the nominating committee, the education and information committee, and the council. She has contributed articles for publication to the association's journal and has been an enthusiastic advocate for the profession. She served as a resident instructor and lecturer at the NHPRC’s Camp Edit. From 1980 to 2006 she directed the program on Scholarly Publishing at Arizona State University (ASU) where she has also taught courses on historical editing and scholarly publishing. She is the author of numerous journal articles and three valuable books: *Editing Documents and Texts: An Annotated Bibliography*, *Handbook for Academic Authors*, and *Revising Your Dissertation: Advice from Leading Editors*. She has also served as president of other scholarly organizations including the Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publishing, and the International Association for Publishing Education. She also chaired one of the most entertaining sessions on the 2007 conference program, indeed any year's program: “If You Have to Explain It, Is It Still Funny,” on annotating humor in documentary editions.

By now all present have recognized that our Butterfield Award winner is your friend and mine, Beth Luey. But here are some points highlighted in her nomination letter that many of you might not know. “Beth, perhaps more than any other member of the ADE, has most profoundly influenced a generation of younger scholars to think seriously about editing, and she has served to mentor them and encourage their pursuits. Some of the ADE’s recent new members and junior committee members are a direct result of Beth’s personal welcome and invitation to join us in this endeavor and to become active in the work of the ADE.” Although she has retired from ASU, Beth will no doubt continue to encourage other editors and remain active with this association. In the areas of scholarship, service, and teaching, Beth Luey has proven herself a dedicated friend of the ADE and a deserving winner of its 2007 Butterfield Award.
Philander D. Chase: Distinguished Service Award

Presented by Christine Patrick

The ADE is pleased to present a distinguished service award this year. While the recipient has been a very skilled and productive editor for many years, it is for his dedication to documentary editing as a profession, and to the ADE in particular, that we honor him tonight. As one person wrote, Phil Chase has been “at the center of the work of the ADE” for many years. From 1994 until 1997 he served as ADE treasurer, and surely no one could have been more conscientious in the performance of his duties. And when he left this office, he graciously shared his knowledge and expertise with his successor, who says “I am sure that I am not the only junior member of the ADE to benefit from Phil’s advice and wisdom that he is always ready to share.”

Phil also shared his knowledge of documentary editing by reviewing documentary publications in prominent periodicals and speaking on editing practices at numerous symposiums and conferences. He has also spread “the word” to nonprofessionals as well. As someone who has served on both the meetings committee and on a local arrangements committee, I can personally attest to the value of his how-to manual on annual meetings, which he created in 1999. According to one member’s description, “every possible action to be performed by the local arrangements committee is set out in detail with a calendar listing how far in advance each step should be taken.” I personally like to think of this report as the “ten commandments for a successful meeting,” with potentially dire consequences for those who fail to follow its guidelines.

Another magnum opus produced by Phil was last year’s report from the ADE state policy committee, of which he was chair. Hours of work
went into this very detailed and thoughtful twenty-four-page document on “Institutional Relationships and Support of Documentary Editing Projects.” This important report provides a baseline for evaluating future developments and helps to clarify some of the challenges facing many projects. While perhaps not the most scintillating read, it is essential reading not only for those within the profession, but, perhaps more importantly, for those institutions who support these projects. If you haven’t read this report, you can find it on the ADE web site.

Finally, since the beginning of the Humanities Advocacy Day almost nine years ago, Phil has been a strong leader in lobbying for NEH and NHPRC funding. To do this effectively, he developed his own list of supporters in Congress. He regularly “passes along information and his own recommendations for action” to persons on this list. His influence and persuasive abilities even achieved the near impossible when representative Virgil Goode, a key member of the House appropriations committee and a noted “budget hawk,” supported full funding for the NHPRC when it was zeroed out. As one ADE member wrote, Phil’s “career as a scholar and ADE member stands as a model for other editors to emulate.” And another member summed up Phil’s contribution by noting that “the ADE has benefited greatly from his persistent attention to detail, willingness to consult until consensus is reached, record keeping for his successors, and advocacy for the profession.” Now, after almost thirty-five years as an editor on the Papers of George Washington, Phil will be retiring soon, but I know that I speak for many others when I say that we hope he won’t retire from active involvement in the ADE.

For all the before-mentioned actions and attributes, and for much more, it is with great pleasure that the ADE presents Phil Chase with its Distinguished Service Award.
John P. Kaminski: Life Service Award  

*Presented by Richard Leffler*  

John Kaminski has been an editor on the Ratification Project for thirty-seven years; he has been project director for twenty-seven years. So far, he has twenty volumes to his credit, and the current one at press may be the greatest: it will change the way we understand New York’s ratification of the Constitution. As a scholar, beyond documentary editing, he has written a superb biography of New York governor George Clinton, which is also a rare insightful treatment of the Confederation Period. He has written “chapbooks” on George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Tom Paine, the Marquis de Lafayette, and Abigail Adams (forthcoming). His *Quotable Jefferson*, published by Princeton University Press, has captured the complexity of America’s great Renaissance man. He has also charmed us with his *Jefferson in Love: The Love Letters of Thomas Jefferson and Maria Cosway* and sobered us with the terrible history of slavery in the era of the American Revolution with *A Necessary Evil? Slavery and the Debate over the Constitution*. Since the passing of E. James Ferguson, John may be the only person on earth who truly understands the finances during the entire Confederation Period, and his dissertation on the subject was published as *Paper Politics: The Northern State Loan Offices During the Confederation, 1783–1790*. It’s good, but not as exciting as *Jefferson in Love*. John is currently compiling a database on what the Founders said about themselves and each other: when it is published in book form and online (it is now the equivalent of about 6,000 pages), it will revolutionize our ability to understand the founding generation.

John believes in teaching; be it children or adults, fifth graders or United States District Judges. He believes in sharing the great knowledge he has. He collaborated with me on a college-level reader, *Federalists and
Antifederalists, and on a series of newspaper-published documents on ratification that was published as Creating the Constitution. He has taught at numerous teacher institutes around the country under the auspices of the Center for Civic Education. He has recorded programs for Wisconsin Public Radio that are now available on CDs on subjects like Thomas Jefferson, the Founding Fathers, Madison and Hamilton, Abigail Adams, the Ratification of the Constitution, etc. You get the idea. He has taught seminars at the University of Wisconsin, during which he co-edited a book with one of his students on what George Washington's contemporaries thought about him. Another of his students had his term paper published by New Hampshire History. He has made several hundred presentations to public schools all around Wisconsin, from Racine on the shore of Lake Michigan to La Crosse on the Mississippi, and he has for years helped coordinate and judge the “We the People” contest for high school students in Wisconsin and nationally.

As for service to the ADE: he brought the annual meeting to Madison in 1981; he was secretary-treasurer from 1982 to 1985. He was president in 1986–1987, nicely in time for the bicentennial of the Constitution. He served as councilor-at-large, 1990–1992, compiled the index to Documentary Editing from 1979 to 1983, and has served on the Boyd Award Committee, the Membership Committee, the Butterfield Award Committee, and the Federal Policy Committee. He was a convention speaker in 1989, 2001, 2002, and 2004. He has served the greater editing community by serving on the boards of editors of several projects and as a major participant in the annual Institute for the Editing of Historical Documents (Camp Edit) since 1979. He eagerly shares his knowledge and experience with editors whenever they need help. In short, John Kaminski has already performed a lifetime of service to his profession and to the people of this country; in the eighteenth-century sense, to make a people happy. And, as my mother used to say, “God willing,” there is much more to come and more awards to be received. On a personal level, I have been lucky enough to have known John for forty years and to have worked with him for thirty-four years. And so, I say: My dear friend, thank you for all you have done for the profession and for me. I am honored to have been asked to present to you the ADE Life Service Award.
Recent Editions

Compiled by Linnéa Caproni

This semiannual bibliography of documentary editions recently published in the fields of American and British history, literature, and culture is generally restricted to scholarly first editions of English language works. In addition to the bibliographical references, Internet addresses are provided for the editorial project or the publisher. To have publications included in future lists, please send press materials or full bibliographic citations to Kent Calder, Editor, Documentary Editing, Arizona State University, P.O. Box 874302, Tempe, Arizona, 85287–4302 or email: kent.calder@asu.edu.


http://www.ucpress.edu/books

news of John Q. Adams’s journey from St. Petersburg to The Hague.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN HISTORY. *Voices of Emancipation: Understanding Slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction through the U.S. Pension Bureau Files.* Edited by Elizabeth A. Regosin and Donald R. Shaffer. New York University Press. 2008. 232 pp. $65.00 [cloth]. ISBN: 9780814775868. $22.00 [paper]. ISBN: 9780814775875. The case files of the U.S. Pension Bureau contain the pension records and interviews of black Union veterans and their survivors in the post–Civil War decades. The files are essentially firsthand perspectives on slavery, emancipation, black military service, and freedom. The editors introduce the words of former slaves topically to include their slavery recollections, military service experiences in the Civil War, transition to freedom, and thoughts on marriage and family before and after emancipation. Since these interviews occurred shortly after the Civil War, they are among the earliest sources of ex-slaves’ reflections.

AMERICAN SOUTH. *Dearest Hugh: The Courtship Letters of Gabrielle Drake and Hugh McColl, 1900–1901.* Edited by Suzanne Cameron Linder Hurley. University of South Carolina Press. 2008. 224 pp. $34.95. ISBN: 9781570037146. *Dearest Hugh* offers a window into courtship during the early twentieth-century South through approximately three hundred love letters exchanged between Gabrielle Drake and Hugh McColl, 1900–1901. The collected letters illustrate the hopes and sacrifices of an upper-class couple forging a marriage in a small Southern town, and provide a glimpse into what romance and marriage meant in the South at the dawn of our modern age. The editor’s introduction places the correspondence into the broad context of recent scholarship on courtship rituals and changing educational and social status for women in early modern and American life.

AMERICAN WEST. *Dear Medora: Child of Oysterville’s Forgotten Years.* Edited by Sydney Stevens. Foreword by Willard R. Espy. Washington State University Press. 2007. 168 pp. $24.95. ISBN: 9780874222920. Medora, the oldest child of Washington State senator and dairy farmer Harry A. Espy, endured long months of separation from her parents at various times throughout her life, especially from her mother. Yet whenever they were apart they wrote letters. Practical and sensible yet also full of laughter and heartache, the contents of these almost daily communiqués lend insight into the customs and beliefs of one Western American farm family during the early twentieth century. The lively correspondence and diary entries, interspersed with family photographs and background on the times and the Espy
household, bring the Oysterville of those forgotten years into sharp focus.

**ANHALT, ISTVAN.** *Eagle Minds: Selected Correspondence of Istvan Anhalt and George Rochberg (1961–2005).* Edited by Alan M. Gillmor. Wilfrid Laurier University Press. 2007. 469 pp. $85.00. ISBN: 9781554580187. *Eagle Minds* presents a selection from the correspondence between Canadian composer and scholar Istvan Anhalt and his American counterpart, George Rochberg. Beginning in 1961 and spanning forty-four years, their conversation covers not only music and art but politics, philosophy, religion, and mysticism. As the two men record their individual responses to musical modernism, changing political and social realities, and their Jewish heritage, an intellectual tension and deepening friendship emerges. This selection allows an intimate look into their private lives and thoughts, and it is a valuable resource for scholars of North American composers in the late twentieth century and anyone interested in the socio-cultural history of that era.

**AUDEN, W. H. W. H.** Auden: Prose, Volume III, 1949–1955. Edited by Edward Mendelson. Princeton University Press. 2008. 816 pp. $49.50. ISBN: 9780691133263. This latest volume of W. H. Auden’s prose contains works from 1949–1955, including little known essays that exemplify his range, wit, depth, and wisdom. It includes the complete text of Auden’s first separately published book of prose, *The Enchafèd Flood, or, The Romantic Iconography of the Sea*, plus more than one hundred essays, reviews, introductions, and lectures and a questionnaire (complete with his own answers) about the reader’s fantasy version of Eden. Two unpublished reviews that Auden submitted to the *New Yorker* magazine and aphorisms previously published only in a French translation are now printed here in English. This volume also includes a long account of the composition of his poem “Prime,” with his comments on its early rejected drafts.

**BEALES, JOHN CHARLES.** See TRANSLATED WORK. *John Charles Beales’s …*

**BLISS, ZENAS R.** *The Reminiscences of Major General Zenas R. Bliss, 1854–1876: From the Texas Frontier to the Civil War and Back Again.* Edited by Thomas T. Smith, et al. Texas State Historical Association. 2007. 750 pp. $39.95. ISBN: 9780876112267. The “Reminiscences,” or memoirs, of Major General Bliss provide a remarkably detailed account of his army service in Texas before and after the Civil War. The memoirs cover Bliss’s graduation at West Point in 1854, his antebellum service at Fort Duncan, Camp Hudson, and Fort Davis, his return to the Texas
frontier in 1870, and his duties at Fort Davis in 1876. They also describe his capture by Texas Confederate forces in 1861, his tribulations as a prisoner of war, and his subsequent Civil War experiences as a Union regimental commander at Fredericksburg, Vicksburg, and Petersburg, where he served in the battle of the Crater and received the Congressional Medal of Honor for his gallantry.

http://www.tamu.edu/upress/
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BOURKE, JOHN GREGORY. The Diaries of John Gregory Bourke: Volume Three, June 1, 1878–June 22, 1880. Edited by Charles M. Robinson III. University of North Texas Press. 2007. 576 pp. $55.00. ISBN: 9781574412314. John Gregory Bourke kept a monumental set of diaries beginning as a young cavalry lieutenant in Arizona in 1872 and ending on the eve of his death in 1896. Volume 3 begins in 1878 with a discussion of the Bannock Uprising and a retrospective on Crazy Horse, and includes three other key events during this period: the Cheyenne Outbreak (1878–79), the Ponca Affair (1879), and the White River Ute Uprising (1879). This volume is extensively annotated and includes a biographical appendix on Indians, civilians, and military personnel named in the diaries.

http://web3.unt.edu/untpress/

BUTLER, PIERCE. The Letters of Pierce Butler, 1790–1794: Nation Building and Enterprise in the New American Republic. Edited by Terry Lipscomb. University of South Carolina Press. 2007. 440 pp. $39.95. ISBN: 9781570036897. This first major publication of Senator Pierce Butler’s writings covers his first three U.S. Congresses, placed in context by editor Terry Lipscomb’s biographical sketch of Butler’s rise to prominence as an Irish-born officer in the British army who married into the low-country Middleton family. Enlivened by Irish humor, the letters illuminate Butler’s constitutional constructionist viewpoint, his advocacy of religious liberty, and his admiration for the French Revolution and reveal a political figure who favored transparent government actions. The collection includes his
correspondence with contemporaries such as George Washington, John Adams, and George Mason and offers a new perspective on one signer of the Constitution who participated in the early years of the Senate.

http://www.sc.edu/uscpers/

CHAPMAN, SAMUEL F. See MOBYS, JOHN SINGLETON.

CIVIL WAR. Go If You Think It Your Duty: A Minnesota Couple’s Civil War Letters. Edited by Andrea R. Foroughi. Minnesota Historical Society Press. 2008. 296 pp. $32.95. ISBN: 9780873516006. During the Civil War, James Madison Bowler and Elizabeth Caleff Bowler courted, married, became parents, and bought a farm. They attended dances, talked politics, and confided their deepest fears. However, the war forced them to experience all of these events separately, sharing them through hundreds of letters from 1861 to 1865 while James served in the Third Minnesota Volunteer Regiment, with which he fought in the Tennessee Surrender and the Dakota War of 1862. These letters reveal their fear for and frustration with each other, providing a window into one couple’s Civil War experience.

http://shop.mnhs.org/mhspress.cfm


http://utpress.org/

offer subtle commentary on the status of black women, their role in black society, and the position of African Americans in an overwhelmingly white society. The editors recover more than Coleman’s complete collected short fiction in this book—they also present her road map of African American life in the Southwest and West during the glory days of the Harlem Renaissance and its far-reaching success in sharing ideals across a nation.

http://www.ttup.ttu.edu/

CUNNINGHAM, ADMIRAL SIR ANDREW. *The Cunningham Papers, Volume II: the Triumphs of Allied Sea Power, 1942–1946*. Edited by Michael Simpson. Navy Records Society Publications, distributed by Ashgate Publishing. 2006. 472 pp. $165.00. ISBN: 9780754655985. Admiral Sir Andrew Cunningham was one of Britain’s great sailors and a worthy successor to and admirer of Admiral Horatio Nelson. Volume II of Cunningham’s papers covers the period 1942–1946, during which he was summoned to replace the dying Pound as First Sea Lord. He held this position until his retirement from active service in June 1946, presiding over the Normandy invasion, Mediterranean operations, the sinking of the Scharnhorst and Tirpitz, the defeat of late U-boat activity, and the British Pacific Fleet. This volume includes official documents, letters to his family and brother-officers, and his diary entries from April 1944 onward.

https://www.ashgate.com/

DESEGREGATION. *Race, Politics, and Memory: A Documentary History of the Little Rock School Crisis*. Edited by Catherine M. Lewis and J. Richard Lewis. University of Arkansas Press. 2007. 270 pp. $19.95 [paper]. ISBN: 9781557288578. $59.95 [cloth]. ISBN: 9781557288561. In 1957, nine teenagers were caught in the middle of the racial tension of desegregation at Little Rock Central High. The local black and moderate white community desired social justice but was hindered by the different lenses through which President Eisenhower and Arkansas Governor Faubus viewed desegregation of Little Rock. The newspaper articles, political cartoons, excerpts from oral histories and memoirs, speeches, photographs, and editorials collected in this book cover the period 1900–2006 and illustrate this local conflict, which became a national and international cause. Each document reveals something significant, and sometimes unconventional or unexpected, about the event and its aftermath.

http://www.uark.edu/~uaprinfo/

political prisoners from the Australian coast through firsthand accounts of the men on the Catalpa. John Devoy's records, the ship's logbooks, and the diaries, letters, and reports from Devoy and his men reveal a crew intact and a spirit unfettered, belying the audacious nature of the enterprise that came to be known as one of the most important rescues in Irish American history and that allowed millions of fellow Irishmen and American-Fenians to draw courage from the newly exiled prisoners.

http://www.nyupress.org/

EDUCATION. American Higher Education Transformed, 1940–2005: Documenting the National Discourse. Edited by Wilson Smith and Thomas Bender. Johns Hopkins University Press. 2008. 544 pp. $80.00. ISBN: 9780801886713. This important sequel to Hofstadter and Smith’s classic anthology American Higher Education: a Documentary History presents 172 edited documents that record the transformation of American higher education over the past sixty years. It includes seminal documents on ethnic and economic composition of student bodies, expanding social and gender membership in the professoriate, the growing dependence on federal and foundation financial aid, and definitions and defenses of academic freedom.

http://www.press.jhu.edu/

FILISOLA, GENERAL VICENTE. See TRANSLATED WORK. General Vicente Filisola's

FOULK, GEORGE C. America's Man in Korea: The Private Letters of George C. Foulk, 1884–1887. Edited by Samuel Hawley. Lexington Books. 2007. 288 pp. $70.00, ISBN: 9780739120989. America's Man in Korea is the story of America’s initial involvement in Korea as told through the private family letters of U.S. Navy ensign George Clayton Foulk, Washington's representative in Seoul in the mid-1880s. Korea was just emerging from centuries of self-imposed isolation and struggling to establish itself as an independent nation amid the imperial rivalries of China, Japan, England and Russia, antiforeign violence, and strife within the Korean government as King Kojong cast about for help. Foulk, fluent in Korean and the foremost Western expert on the country, was an astute observer of this country's transformation. In his private letters, published here for the first time, Foulk recount his struggle to represent the U.S. and to help Korea in the face of State Department indifference.

http://www.lexingtonbooks.com/
FOULK, GEORGE C. Inside the Hermit Kingdom: The 1884 Korea Travel Diary of George Clayton Foulk. Edited by Samuel Hawley. Lexington Books. 190 pp. $60.00 ISBN: 9780739120965. In 1884, U.S. Navy ensign George Foulk made a 900-mile journey through southern Korea carried in a sedan chair in the manner of a Choson-dynasty government official. During the journey he kept a detailed record of everything he observed and experienced. This travel diary, part of the Foulk collection in the Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, presents an account of a trip no Westerner had ever undertaken before or would ever experience again. Containing his private thoughts, penned in the heat of the moment, Foulk’s diary lays bare his experience in the pristine Choson kingdom before outside intrusion.
http://www.lexingtonbooks.com/

FRANKLIN, BENJAMIN. Not Your Usual Founding Father: Selected Readings from Benjamin Franklin. Edited by Edmund S. Morgan. Yale University Press. 2007. $16.00 [paper]. ISBN: 9780300126884. Historian Edmund Morgan draws on lifelong research in the vast Benjamin Franklin archives to introduce the man himself: a sociable, good-natured, and extraordinary human being with unting curiosity about the natural world and a vision for what America could be. The editor assembles writings that show insight into this founding father’s thinking and organizes them around four major themes covering his personal tastes and habits, his inexhaustible intellectual energy and scientific discoveries, his devotion to serving the American people and to advancing his democratic vision. This book reveals Benjamin Franklin’s human side—his enthusiasms and his devotion to democracy and the people of the United States.
http://yalepress.yale.edu/yupbooks/

FRYE, NORTHROP. A Glorious and Terrible Life with You: Selected Correspondence of Northrop Frye and Helen Kemp, 1932–1939. Edited by Margaret Burgess. University of Toronto Press. 2007. 480 pp. $75.00 [cloth]. ISBN: 9780802097651. $35.00 [paper]. ISBN: 9780802094766. The correspondence that Northrop Frye exchanged with his first wife, Helen Kemp, which he bequeathed to Victoria College at the time of his death, reveals an intimate picture of this famous intellectual. The editor presents a selection from that correspondence that reflects the essential narrative at the heart of the communiqués: the couple’s formative experiences as they chronicle their growth and discovery. It also includes family photographs and original graphics by Helen and by her father, S. H. F. Kemp, dating from his own student days at the University of Toronto. The letters enliven the interactions of Northrop and Helen with their families, friends and colleagues, as well as the significant cultural and historical currents of the 1930s.
http://www.utppublishing.com/
FRYE, NORTHROP. *Northrop Frye's Fiction and Miscellaneous Writings, Volume 25: Collected Works of Northrop Frye*. Edited by Robert D. Denham and Michael Dolzani. University of Toronto Press. 2007. 640 pp. $100.00. ISBN: 9780802093028. This final volume of previously unpublished writings by the late Northrop Frye, renowned literary critic and professor of English at the University of Toronto, retrieves materials from the Frye archives—holograph notebooks, typed notes, and typescripts—that have been largely hidden until now. The volume also includes autobiographical reflections, short stories, an unfinished novel, writings on a wide range of topics from Canadian culture to religion, and all of his fables and dialogues plus notes on speculative fictional forms.

http://www.utppublishing.com/

GAVIN, JAMES M. *The General and His Daughter: The War Time Letters of General James M. Gavin to his Daughter Barbara*. Edited by Gayle Wurst. Fordham University Press. 2007. 224 pp. $27.95. ISBN: 9780823226870. James Maurice Gavin left for war in 1943 as a colonel in the 82nd Airborne Division—America's first airborne division and the first to fight in World War II. In 1944, at the age of thirty-seven, “Slim Jim” Gavin, as his troops called him, became the 82nd’s youngest Army officer to become a major general since the Civil War. This first-time publication of more than two hundred letters Gavin wrote home to his young daughter Barbara between 1943 and the December 1945 victory parade in New York presents the American experience in World War II through the eyes of one of its most dynamic officers. The letters capture the daily realities of combat and Gavin’s personal reactions to the war, and they provide a self-portrait of the man who would become one of the greatest U.S. generals in war and peace.

http://www.fordhampress.com/

GREY, ZANE. *Dolly and Zane Grey: Letters from a Marriage*. Edited by Candace C. Kant. University of Nevada Press. 2008. 472 pp. $34.95. ISBN: 9780874177497. Popular Western writer Zane Grey was a literary celebrity during his lifetime and the center of a huge enterprise based on his writing. Yet he did not create this enterprise alone. His wife, Dolly, guided and managed Grey’s career. She edited and sometimes revised his handwritten manuscripts, negotiated with publishers, oversaw contracts, directed arrangements with movie studios, and skillfully managed the fortune derived from these activities. Much of their married life was spent apart, sustained largely by correspondence. Zane and Molly Grey’s letters from their first meeting in 1900 until Grey’s death in 1939 reveal an unorthodox couple with a complex partnership.

http://www.nebooks.nevada.edu

Publications/USA. 2007. 800 pp. $110.00. ISBN: 9780881353907. In this final volume of The Papers of Joseph Henry, winner of the 2007 Ferguson Prize of the Society for the History of Technology, Henry emerges as the leader of American science and the nation’s foremost proponent of funding for basic scientific research. During this period, he served simultaneously as secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, president of the National Academy of Sciences, and chairman of the United States Light-House Board. The volume includes a lengthy introduction, extensive annotations, and a comprehensive index.
http://www.shpusa.com/

HENRY, JOSEPH. Papers of Joseph Henry, Volume 12, Cumulative Index. Compiled by Kathleen W. Dorman and Sarah J. Shoenfeld. Smithsonian Institution with Science History Publications/USA. 2008. 320 pp. $49.95. ISBN: 9780881353914. This cumulative index represents the essential contents of the previously published eleven volumes of the Papers of Joseph Henry. It is the final volume in the series begun four decades ago.
http://www.shpusa.com/

HIMES, CHESTER. Dear Chester, Dear John: Letters between Chester Himes and John A. Williams. Edited by John A. Williams and Lori Williams. Wayne State University Press. 2008. 256 pp. $24.95. ISBN: 9780814333556. This collection serves as a window into the personal lives of John Williams and Chester Himes, two writers who met in 1961 and who would later receive international acclaim for their work, among them Himes’s Harlem detective novels featuring Grave Digger Jones and Coffin Ed Johnson, and Williams’s major novels The Man Who Cried I Am, Captain Blackman, and Clifford’s Blues. This collection presents nearly thirty years of letters containing the two authors’ assessments of each other’s work, reflections on U.S. and international society, and discussions about the challenges they faced as African-American writers in the publishing world.
http://www2.wsupress.wayne.edu/

JACKSON, ANDREW. The Papers of Andrew Jackson, Volume 7: 1829. Edited by Daniel Feller, et al. University of Tennessee Press. 2007. 856 pp. $79.00. ISBN: 9781572335936. This seventh volume of The Papers of Andrew Jackson documents Jackson’s first year as President after achieving victory over incumbent John Quincy Adams in the 1828 campaign. Still mourning the sudden death of his wife Rachel, Adams assumed the presidency with the objectives to purge the federal bureaucracy of recreant officeholders and to remove Southern Indian tribes westward. While pursuing these goals, he became seriously diverted by the Peggy Eaton affair—a scandal that pitted the President and his Secretary of War John Eaton and the latter’s vivacious wife against the Washington guardians of feminine propriety. This first presidential volume reveals all these stories and more, through more than
four hundred full-text documents gathered from libraries, archives, and individual owners, and through Jackson’s intimate exchanges with family and friends, his private notes, formative drafts of his public addresses, and letters from diverse people across the country.

http://utpress.org/

JEFFERSON, THOMAS. *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Retirement Series: Volume 4: 18 June 1811–30 April 1812*. Edited by J. Jefferson Looney. Princeton University Press. 2008. 808 pp. $99.50. ISBN: 9780691135656. Volume Four includes the period of June 18, 1811, to April 30, 1812, during which a new president is installed and Jefferson returns to Virginia. Its 581 documents cover Jefferson’s resumption of correspondence with John Adams, the dismissal of the batture litigation, Jefferson’s antipathy to dogs and love of gardens, his management of his plantations and disciplined record-keeping, and his colorful but largely negative memo of Patrick Henry. This volume also includes one of the most detailed descriptions of life at Monticello by a visitor and one of the earliest descriptions of Meriwether Lewis’s death.

http://press.princeton.edu/

JEFFERSON, THOMAS. *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Volume 34: 1 May–31 July 1801*. Edited by Barbara B. Oberg. Princeton University Press. 2008. 816 pp. $99.50. ISBN: 9780691135571. Volume 34 continues the story of Jefferson’s first presidential administration. To quickly implement his objectives of economy and efficiency in government, Jefferson requests that the War Department prepare a list of commissioned army officers for his secretary Meriwether Lewis, who will label them with descriptors such as “Republican” or “Opposed to the administration.” In this volume, Samuel Smith, interim head of the Navy Department, arranges for surplus warships sales in line with the Peace Establishment Act; Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin suggests improvements to tax collection methods; and, Jefferson delivers an eloquent policy statement on removals from office to the New Haven merchants who had objected to his dismissal of their port collector, making it clear that while his inaugural address declared respect for the minority it did not imply that offices would not change hands. Volume 34 also details the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Fourth of July, when Jefferson entertains about one hundred citizens, including a delegation of five Cherokee chiefs.

http://press.princeton.edu/

KEMP, HELEN. See FRYE, NORTHROP. *A Glorious and Terrible Life with You …*

LINCOLN, ABRAHAM. See STODDARD, WILLIAM O.
LITERATURE. You Work Tomorrow: An Anthology of American Labor Poetry, 1929–41. Edited by John Marsh, Foreword by Jim Daniels. University of Michigan Press. 2007. 248 pp. $65.00 [cloth]. ISBN: 9780472070008. $22.95 [paper]. ISBN: 9780472050000. This first-ever anthology of American labor poetry of the Great Depression presents the remarkable but largely forgotten poems published in union newspapers during the turbulent 1930s. Members of all unions wrote thousands of poems during this period about their working, living, and political conditions. Selecting from this wealth of material, editor John Marsh presents poetry both aesthetically appealing and historically relevant, dispelling the myth that labor poetry consisted solely of amateur slogans. He provides an outline of the cultural and political significance of this poetry in his introduction, followed by a foreword by contemporary poet Jim Daniels.

http://www.press.umich.edu/

LYMAN, LT. COL. THEODORE. Meade’s Army: The Private Notebooks of Lt. Col. Theodore Lyman. Edited by David W. Lowe. Foreword by John Y. Simon. Kent State University Press. 2007. 512 pp. $45.00. ISBN: 9780873389013. Published here for the first time, the private notebooks of Lt. Col. Theodore Lyman, Gen. George Meade’s aide-de-camp from September 1863 to the end of the Civil War, present the keen observations of this Harvard-trained natural scientist who penciled notations into his dispatch books during combat, including exact times when Meade issued orders and when units deployed. He later transformed his notes into a coherent historical narrative, incorporating his sketches and hand-drawn maps showing the positions of the army after every significant movement. Meade’s Army is an invaluable source on the day-to-day experiences of a staff officer during the last campaigns of the Civil War.

http://upress.kent.edu/

MAYS, DAVID J. Race, Reason, and Massive Resistance: The Diary of David J. Mays, 1954–1959. Edited by James R. Sweeney. University of Georgia Press. 2008. 320 pp. $39.95. ISBN: 9780820330259. This volume comprises excerpts from the diary of David J. Mays between 1954 and 1959. In his private writing, Mays, a prominent attorney, Pulitzer Prize-winning biographer, and member of Richmond’s political and social elite, offers his insider’s view of Virginia’s increased defiance of school desegregation after the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education ruling. For most of this period, Mays counseled the commission charged with formulating Virginia’s response to federal mandates concerning public school integration. Thus, many leading Virginians of the time appear in Mays’s diary, with details of their roles in the desegregation battle as it was fought in the media, courts, polls, and government back rooms.

http://www.ugapress.uga.edu/
MEADE, GENERAL GEORGE. See LYMAN, LT. COL. THEODORE.

MORRIS, MARY LOIS. *Before the Manifesto: The Life Writings of Mary Lois Walker Morris, Volume 9: Life Writings of Frontier Women series*. Edited by Melissa Lambert Milewski. Utah State University Press. 2007. 656 pp. $34.95. ISBN: 9780874216448. *Before the Manifesto* recounts the life of Mary Lois Walker Morris, Mormon convert, milliner and active community member, who, as a polygamous wife to a prominent Salt Lake City businessman, challenged American ideas about marriage and the U.S. legal system. This account of her life begins in England, where her family joined the Mormon Church, and follows her journey across the American plains to life in Utah in the 1880s. Mary Morris’s memoir frames her 1879–1887 diary with reflections on earlier years and passages that parallel entries in the day book, providing readers with an understanding of how she viewed her life retrospectively.

http://www.usu.edu/usupress/

MOSBY, JOHN SINGLETON. *Take Sides with the Truth: The Postwar Letters of John Singleton Mosby to Samuel F. Chapman*. Edited by Peter A. Brown. University Press of Kentucky. 2007. 220 pp. $40.00. ISBN: 9780813124278. During the Civil War, Confederate John Singleton Mosby led the Forty-third Battalion of the Virginia Cavalry, known as Mosby’s Rangers, in many daring operations behind Union lines. After the war, Mosby stayed in touch with several of his closest confidants, including former captain and Baptist minister Samuel Forrer Chapman. *Take Sides with the Truth* is a collection of more than eighty letters written by Mosby to Chapman, published now in their entirety for the first time. They reveal Mosby’s inner thoughts on subjects such as his severe criticism of General Robert E. Lee’s staff officers and his crusade to clear the name of his friend and mentor J. E. B. Stuart in the Gettysburg campaign.

http://www.kentuckypress.com/


http://www.siu.edu/~sispress/
NATIVE AMERICAN HISTORY. *Long Journey Home: Oral Histories of Contemporary Delaware Indians*. Edited by James W. Brown and Rita T. Kohn. Indiana University Press. 2007. $25.00. ISBN: 9780253349682. These oral histories cover the story of the Lenape Indians (Delaware Tribe) through seven generations. The history of the Lenape is one of survival despite forced displacement from the eastern seaboard into Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, Kansas, and the Indian Territory. The Lenape members interviewed for this book now call the area around Bartlesville, Oklahoma, their home. The oral histories span the post–Civil War era through to the present, narrating personal and tribal events as they unfolded over time and place. The stories of their long journey have been handed down and now form part of the tribe’s collective memory, bringing immediacy to the tale of the Lenape.

http://www.iupress.indiana.edu/

NAVAL HISTORY. *Submarine Stories: Recollections from the Diesel Boats*. Edited by Paul Stillwell. U.S. Naval Institute. 2007. 352 pp. $36.95. ISBN: 9781591148418. Culled from many previously unpublished narratives and oral histories conducted through the U.S. Naval Institute, Submarine Stories presents nearly five dozen firsthand accounts from men involved with gasoline and diesel-powered submarines during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The story of these boats—and their technological evolution and tactical value—is also the story of the men who went to sea in them, as their accounts illustrate the human aspects of serving in diesel boats, such as training, operations in peacetime and war, liberty exploits, humorous asides, and the special bonding and camaraderie among shipmates.

http://www.usni.org/

NIGHTINGALE, FLORENCE. *Florence Nightingale on Social Change in India: Collected Works of Florence Nightingale, Volume 10*. Edited by Gérard Vallée. Wilfrid Laurier University Press. 2007. 976 pp. $150.00. ISBN: 9780889204959. *Social Change in India* reflects the shift of focus from top-down reform to proposals for self-government that occurred during Florence Nightingale’s more than forty years of work on public health in India. This collection of her works includes sections on village and town sanitation, the condition and status of women, land tenure, rent reform, and education and political evolution toward self-rule. Nightingale’s publications on these subjects appeared increasingly in Indian journals, and her correspondence reinforces her work behind the scenes, pressing viceroys, governors, and Cabinet ministers to support sanitary reform. This collection also features long-missing letters to Lady Dufferin, wife of the viceroy 1884–88, on medical care and health education for women in India.

http://www.wlupress.wlu.ca/
OLMSTED, FREDERICK LAW. *The Papers of Frederick Law Olmsted: Parks, Politics, and Patronage, 1874–1882. Volume 7*. Edited by Charles E. Beveridge. Johns Hopkins University Press. 2007. 784 pp. $85.00. ISBN: 9780801883361. This latest volume of the *Papers of Frederick Law Olmsted* presents the record of Olmsted’s last years of residence in New York City. It includes reports on the design of Riverside and Morningside parks and Tompkins Square in Manhattan, as well as his comprehensive plan for the street system and rapid transit routes of the Bronx. It records his continuing work on Central Park with his final retrospective statement, “The Spoils of the Park,” and an annotated version of the journal in which Olmsted recorded political maneuverings and patronage politics in the years before his 1878 dismissal from the New York parks department. Later documents chronicle his early planning of the Boston park system and his commentaries on issues such as federal Reconstruction policy and civil-service reform.


RELIGION. *The Moravian Springplace Mission to the Cherokees, 1805–1813 (Volume I), and 1814–1821 (Volume II)*. Edited and with an introduction by Rowena McClinton. Preface by Chad Smith. University of Nebraska Press. 2007. 1282 pp. $99.95. ISBN: 9780803232662. This edition of the diary of Anna Rosina Gambold includes the entire translated text of her diary (1805–1821) kept while she and her husband John lived among the Cherokees in the Moravian Springplace Mission in (present-day) northwestern Georgia. Editor Rowena McClinton’s translation from German script makes these primary eyewitness accounts, of both Cherokee and Moravian culture and history, available in English for the first time. Volume I includes a preface, an introduction, and diary entries from 1805 to 1813, and Volume 2 includes diary entries between 1814 and 1821, the editor’s epilogue, and name and subject indexes for both volumes.

of the North Carolina Office of Archives and History. 2006. 564 pp. $25.00. ISBN: 9780865263246. This new volume of edited church diaries and minute books kept by Moravian ministers covers a momentous period in North Carolina history—the aftermath and recovery from the Civil War and Reconstruction. Topics include how whites and blacks adjusted to new roles following the end of slavery, the tattered postwar economy, the renewed growth of Salem and Winston, and the incorporation of Kernersville. The volume also contains a foldout map of Salem and Winston in 1876. Appendixes record births, baptisms, marriages, deaths, and burials.

http://www.ncpublications.com/

RELIGION. Volume XI, The Church of England in North Carolina: Documents, 1742–1763. Edited by Robert J. Cain and Jan-Michael Poff. The Historical Publications Section of the North Carolina Office of Archives and History. 2007. 643 pp. $55.00. ISBN: 9780865263222. This second of three volumes in the Colonial Records of North Carolina [second series] to address colonial North Carolina’s established religion includes correspondence and reports by Anglican clergymen and royal governors, instructions, letters, and journal excerpts from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, vestry minutes, and other materials depicting the condition of the church in mid-eighteenth-century North Carolina. Many of the documents focus on the work of individual clergymen, but writers also comment on and describe the governor, legislature, local government, and parishioners and parish geography.

http://www.ncpublications.com/

ROCHBERG, GEORGE. See ANHALT, ISTVAN.

RODNEY, GEORGE BRYDGES. The Rodney Papers: Selections from the Correspondence of Admiral Lord Rodney: Volume II, 1763–1780. Edited by David Syrett. Navy Records Society Publications, distributed by Ashgate Publishing. 2007. $124.95. 750 pp. ISBN: 9780754660071. The second of three volumes encompassing the correspondence of George B. Rodney covers the admiral’s life from the end of the Seven Years War in 1763 until August 1780. During this eventful and controversial period, Rodney went from successful admiral, Member of Parliament, and Governor of Greenwich Hospital to debtor’s exile in France, finally emerging as victorious admiral and national hero. This new volume permits reassessment of this British admiral of the American War of Independence for a new generation of historians.

http://www.ashgate.com/

http://www.usni.org/

SCHALLER, COL. FRANK. *Soldiering for Glory: The Civil War Letters of Colonel Frank Schaller, Twenty-second Mississippi Infantry*. Edited by Mary W. Schaller and Martin N. Schaller. University of South Carolina Press. 2007. 216 pp. $24.95. ISBN: 9781570037016. This collection from the correspondence of Confederate colonel Frank Schaller—German immigrant to the United States in 1855 with military experience from the Crimean War—offers firsthand perspectives of military life, culture, and courtship in the U.S. Confederacy, as witnessed by an immigrant eager to find personal success and glory in America. The editors’ selection from Schaller’s correspondence in the 1860s follows his battlefield experiences, his machinations for advancement, and his courtship of Sophie Sosnowski of a prominent Columbia, South Carolina family. Despite his peripheral place in the great conflict, his writings reveal a great deal about military actions and the inner workings of the Confederate officer corps.

http://www.sc.edu/uscpress/

SHEFFEY, CAPTAIN JOHN. *Soldier of Southwestern Virginia: The Civil War Letters of Captain John Preston Sheffey*. Edited by James I. Robertson, Jr. Louisiana State University Press. 2007. 256 pp. $17.95. ISBN: 9780807132876. Edited by James I. Robertson, Jr., this collection of John Preston Sheffey’s Civil War letters represents the first published correspondence by a member of the 8th Virginia Cavalry. Sheffey’s writings record daily details with a larger insight into the dynamics of men, terrain, supplies, and protocol—making this collection unique and invaluable as a picture of sociomilitary affairs in the overlooked western and southwestern regions of the state.

http://www.lsu.edu/lsupress/

Documentary Editing 30 (1 & 2)


http://www.siu.edu/~siupress/

THOREAU, HENRY D. I to Myself: An Annotated Selection from the Journal of Henry D. Thoreau. Edited by Jeffrey S. Cramer. Yale University Press. 2007. 528 pp. $35.00. ISBN: 9780300111729. Written between 1837 and 1861, shortly before the author's death, and with more than two million words, Thoreau's journal spans a period of twenty-five years. Handwritten, it began humbly but grew in scope and ambition to function as a record of Thoreau's interior life and as a source for his books and essays. Critics now recognize Thoreau's journal as an important artistic achievement. Making selections from the entirety of the journal, the editor presents all aspects of Thoreau—writer, thinker, naturalist, social reformer, neighbor, and friend—offering a rare, full picture of Thoreau's life and work.

http://yalepress.yale.edu/

TRANSLATED WORK. General Vicente Filisola’s Analysis of José Urrea’s Military Diary: A Forgotten 1838 Publication by an Eyewitness to the Texas Revolution. Edited by Gregg J. Dimmick. Translated by John Wheat. Texas State Historical Association Press. 2007. 360 pp. $29.95. ISBN: 9780876112243. This obscure eyewitness account of the Texas Revolution by Gen. Vicente Filisola has been translated into English for the first time. Filisola, commander of the Mexican soldiers remaining in Texas after the defeat of Gen. Santa Anna by Sam Houston’s Texans, became the scapegoat for all that went wrong in the Texas campaign in 1836. When Filisola’s major critic, Gen. José Cosme Urrea, commander of one of the Mexican divisions in the campaign, published a book on the campaign in 1838 entitled The Military Diary of General José Urrea, Filisola published an immediate response. Especially critical of the role of Urrea’s division in the actions of the Mexican army, his work is biased and at times unfair, but Filisola makes valid points for reconsidering the respect Texas scholarship has accorded Urrea.

http://www.tamu.edu/upress/

9780876112342. This collection of letters written by Eduard Ludecus, a young German colonist in Dr. John Charles Beales’s unfortunate colony Dolores, provides an almost daily account of the colonists’ journey to the Rio Grande from New York City harbor. In his letters, Ludecus recounts their labors to establish a settlement on Las Moras Creek, their attempts to provide protection from Indian attacks, and their life of deprivation in the colony.

http://www.tamu.edu/upress/

TRANSLATED WORK. La Gazette Françoise, 1780–1781: Revolutionary America’s French Newspaper. Translated by Eugena Poulin and Claire Quintal. Salve Regina University Press, distributed by University Press of New England. 2008. 174 pp. $45.00. ISBN: 9781584656630. This text offers a historical look into the lives, politics, and opinions of French soldiers living in Newport, Rhode Island, under the command of General Rochambeau during the Revolutionary War. These French soldiers began printing a newspaper with the press they carried on board ship, issuing the first edition of La Gazette Françoise, on November 17, 1780, and concluding after six issues and a supplement in early 1781. The original intent of this newspaper was to educate French soldiers about their American counterparts, but the editors and translators of this annotated edition of La Gazette show that the content of the newspaper, when juxtaposed with the English newspaper articles upon which it was based, reveals a unique perspective on naval customs of Revolutionary America and on the political and social mood of Newport at the time.

http://www.upne.com/


http://www.oupress.com/

URREA, GENERAL JOSÉ COSME. See TRANSLATED WORK. General Vicente Filisola’s...
VIETNAM WAR. *Hanoi Journal, 1967. Carol McEldowney.* Edited by Suzanne Kelley McCormack and Elizabeth R. Mock. University of Massachusetts Press. 2007. 200 pp. $80.00 [cloth]. ISBN: 9781558496040. $22.95 [paper]. ISBN: 9781558496057. This text is a rare account of an American political activist’s wartime trip to North Vietnam. In 1967, Carol McEldowney, a twenty-four-year-old community organizer, left Cleveland and traveled illegally to North Vietnam with colleagues from Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). McEldowney documented her experiences in the journal reproduced in this book. Her words reveal a political ideology that connected the struggles of poor America to war-torn Vietnam, and though her journal displays little of the feminist consciousness exhibited later in her political activism, she recorded her observations of North Vietnam clearly aware that she was an outsider—a woman not subject to the military draft or married to a soldier, and without the heartache of a close friend serving in the war.

http://www.umass.edu/umpress/

WASHINGTON, GEORGE. *The Papers of George Washington: Revolutionary War Series, Volume 17, 15 September–31 October 1778.* Edited by Philander D. Chase. University of Virginia Press. 2008. 784 pp. $85.00. ISBN: 9780813926841. Volume 17 of the Revolutionary War Series opens with Washington moving his army north from White Plains, New York, into new positions along West Point to Danbury, Connecticut. Despite the remote location of his new headquarters about seventy miles north of New York City near Fredericksburg, Washington remained as busy with important tasks during the fall of 1778 as during any other period of the war. The delicate transition for the new Franco-American alliance and British strategists’ unwillingness to concede defeat, plus British raids and breakdowns of discipline and morale within the Continental army facing the coming winter, required Washington to exercise the mental agility he had demonstrated during the early years of the war.

http://www.upress.virginia.edu/

WASHINGTON, GEORGE. *The Papers of George Washington: Presidential Series, Volume 13, June–August 1793.* Edited by Christine S. Patrick. University Press of Virginia. 2007. 720 pp. $85.00. ISBN: 9780813926346. Volume 13 of the Presidential Series documents the period from June 1–August 31, 1793, when Washington focused his presidential efforts to maintain U.S. neutrality during the war between France and Great Britain. The greatest challenge came from the presence of both British and French privateers in U.S. ports. At Washington’s request, the president’s cabinet met frequently to produce a series of cabinet opinions delineating a policy of neutrality for America—toward which American
opinions varied. Though Washington received numerous letters of support from municipal and civic organizations in the maritime states, his administration failed to solicit the Supreme Court for an opinion on a neutrality policy and unsuccessfully attempted to prosecute American citizens who enlisted for service on French privateers. Other issues of national concern included Washington’s approval of additional foreign loans and the administration’s preparations for a peace treaty with hostile Indians in the Northwest Territory.

WILLIAMS, JOHN A. See HIMES, CHESTER.

WORDSWORTH, WILLIAM. *The Excursion*. Edited by Sally Bushell, et al. Cornell University Press. 2007. 1,256 pp. $99.95. ISBN: 9780801446535. This Cornell Wordsworth volume presents the first scholarly edition of Wordsworth’s epic poem, *The Excursion*, in half a century. The action of this dramatic poem advances largely through debate among four main speakers: the Poet, the Wanderer, the Solitary, and the Pastor. It was Wordsworth’s second long poem, his public attempt at a “Great Poem,” and his only work of any length to be read by most of his contemporaries. Sally Bushell and editors include all the manuscripts of the poem produced under the poet’s direction, separately and completely transcribed in this edition. An introduction, a manuscript history, lists of printed verbal and nonverbal variants, extensive editors’ notes, and selected photographs now make it possible to follow the complete evolution of the epic.

WRIGHT, JAMES. *A Wild Perfection: The Selected Letters of James Wright*. Edited by James Wright, et al. Foreword by Anne Wright. Wesleyan University Press, distributed by the University Press of New England. 2008. 672 pp. $27.95 ISBN: 9780819568724. *A Wild Perfection* collects the inspiring letters of Pulitzer Prize-winning poet James Wright and his many friends—fellow poets such as Donald Hall, Theodore Roethke, Galway Kinnell, James Dickey, Mary Oliver, and Robert Bly. They touch on many subjects both poetic and personal, from Wright’s creative process to his struggles with depression and illness. Wright’s descriptions about his travels and the natural world are witty, gallant, and passionate, forming an epistolary chronicle of a significant part of midcentury American poetry renaissance and the clearest biographical picture now available of this major American poet.
President Ron Bosco called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. The minutes of the 2006 business meeting were approved.

The president thanked the Local Arrangements Committee: Brent Tarter (chair), John R. Barden, Sara Bearss, and Sandra G. Treadway. He expressed the ADE’s appreciation to the Library of Virginia and the Library of Virginia Foundation for their sponsorship of the Friday evening reception. He thanked the University of Virginia Press, Rotunda; Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Retirement Series; and the Papers of George Washington for their sponsorship of the Cash Bar and President’s Receptions. He thanked the Program Committee: Michael Stevens (chair), Charlene Bickford, J. Kent Calder, John Fierst, J. Jefferson Looney, Beth Luey, Susan Perdue, and Ze’ev Rosenkrantz.

Brent Tarter welcomed the members on behalf of the local arrangements committee. He explained the logistical details of the reception at the Library of Virginia and noted that small group tours will be available to view selected manuscripts and rare books in the library’s collection.

**Treasurer’s Report**

John Lupton reported that the ADE had a surplus of $1,716 in the general budget, giving us unrestricted assets of nearly $63,000. The major change this year was in the management of the Boyd and Boydston Award Funds. With the approval of the finance committee and the council, Mr. Lupton opened money market accounts for each fund, rather than investing the money in CDs. With interest rates currently at 5 percent, both funds have become self-sufficient.

The ADE requested an extension of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) grant to produce the third edition of a *Guide to Documentary Editing*. The grant was due to expire at the end of July 2007,
but the NEH granted a one-year extension. The project has remained under budget, but should expend all of its grant funds at completion.

He presented the members with a revised proposed budget for 2007–2008, with a total expenditure of $40,400. The revised budget was approved unanimously by the members.

**Secretary’s Report**

Christine S. Patrick reported that the ADE had 334 members as of November 8, 2007; the membership stood at 337 on October 2, 2006.

She announced the results of the 2007 election: Richard Leffler and John Lupton have been re-elected to their respective positions as publications chair and as treasurer. Cathy Moran Hajo will be the president-elect, Lisa Francavilla the secretary, and Helen Deese the councillor at large. The nominations committee will consist of Kevin J. Hayes, Gregg Lint, Christine S. Patrick, Mary Lamb Sheldon, and Kenneth H. Williams (chair).

**Publications Committee Report**

Chair Richard Leffler reported that work on the manuscript for the third edition of the *Guide to Documentary Editing*, by Mary Jo Kline and Susan Purdue, was sent to the University of Virginia Press on August 1, 2007, and that details for the electronic edition are being finalized. The membership brochure has been completed and sent to the membership committee for distribution.

He announced that the Council had accepted the resignation of Marianne Wokeck as the editor in chief of *Documentary Editing* and had expressed its appreciation for her work on the journal. He reported that the Council had accepted the offer of J. Kent Calder to serve as the new editor in chief and his proposal to move the publication to Arizona State University, where he is the director of the university’s Scholarly Publishing Program. The Council instructed Calder to publish volumes 29 and 30 of *Documentary Editing*, using combination issues for 2007 and 2008 so that our publication record will be up to date by the end of the calendar year 2008. Consideration of a new model for *Documentary Editing*, beginning with volume 31 in 2009, will be explored by the publication committee and the Council, and members are urged to share their ideas with the committee and Council. The committee will also consider negotiating a formal agreement with the university press at Arizona State University.

Mr. Leffler reported that past issues of *Documentary Editing* have been scanned in preparation for eventual publication on the ADE website.
or perhaps on the Open Journal publishing platform at Arizona State University. This is a work in progress and a number of details still need to be resolved.

**Travel Funds Committee Report**

Chair Catherine Kunce introduced this year’s recipients of ADE travel grants of $500 each: Lois More Beckman (Correspondence of Samuel Beckett), Geoffrey E. Gagen (Santayana Edition), Joseph F. Darowski (Joseph Smith Papers), and Roderick S. Speer (Richard Carswell Papers). Beginning in 2008, the allocation of travel funds will be the responsibility of the program committee, to encourage the presentation of papers by individuals who have not participated in previous years or who do not have access to funding from their employer.

**President-Elect’s Report**

Michael Stevens reported that next year he and Cathy Moran Hajo, the new president-elect, will implement a long-range planning project. Next year will be the thirtieth anniversary for the ADE, a good time to review the current status of the organization, taking into account the tremendous changes in our profession that have occurred since the ADE was founded. To do this a series of task forces will be established to consider the following questions:

1. Who are documentary editors, and why should they join the ADE?
2. How do we better educate documentary editors?
3. How does the ADE get more financial resources to do what it needs to do?
4. How do we continue to advocate for documentary editing projects?

To succeed, the committee will need contributions from ADE members. Mr. Stevens will send a letter to every member explaining the goals of this project and inviting suggestions, and to keep every member informed about the process, information and suggestions from the task forces will be posted on the ADE website to encourage member participation.

**Federal Policy Committee Report**

Charlene Bickford, chair of the federal policy committee, thanked everyone for their support in lobbying for funds for the NEH and NHPRC and noted that a larger percentage of ADE members participate in National Humanities Day than members of any other group. She reported that the proposed funding for the NEH and the NHPRC in the appropriations
committees of both houses of Congress is very encouraging, with the NHPRC having been allocated $10 million. If the president vetoes the appropriations bill, however, the NHPRC will revert to its current budget of $5.5 million. She reported that funding for the NHPRC is now under the House Financial Services Committee, and not the Transportation Committee.

President Bosco thanked Ms. Bickford and other members of this committee for their long-term commitment to this crucial task.

Meetings Committee Report

Mary Hackett, chair of the meetings committee, reported that the 2008 meeting will be in Tucson, Arizona, October 23–26, and that the 2009 meeting will be in Springfield, Illinois, October 15–17 and will coincide with the 200th anniversary celebration of Abraham Lincoln’s birth. Volunteers are needed to host the 2010 and 2011 meetings.

New Business

Mary Gallagher, the chair of constitution and bylaws committee, introduced two resolutions from the committee.

1. To change Article 6, Section 2 of the Constitution to read: “The at-large members shall be elected by the association’s members in the same manner as the officers of the association. Each at-large member shall serve for a three-year term. At-large members shall be eligible for re-election.” Passed unanimously. This change must now go to the entire membership for a vote.

2. To change Article 2 of the Bylaws to read: “Compensation of Officers or Committee Members: Officers, committee chairmen, and committee members shall serve without salary or other financial compensation. Reimbursement for actual expenses of travel, food, and lodging for persons on official business shall be determined by the council on a case-by-case basis.” After much discussion, it was moved and seconded to table this recommendation. Passed, with two abstentions.

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine S. Patrick, ADE Secretary
Website News

The ADE website has changed addresses. The Association site can now be found at this address: www.documentaryediting.org

Please send all job listings, news items, and content suggestions to Webmaster Jennifer Stertzer (jes7z@virginia.edu).

Also, since there will no longer be a printed member directory, members should update their listing. Please let Secretary Lisa Francavilla (lfrancavilla@monticello.org) or Jennifer Stertzer know if you would to add or update information to the online directory.
Make Plans to Attend!

The Association for Documentary Editing

Annual Meeting

October 23–26, 2008
Westward Look Resort
Tucson, Arizona

Set high in the foothills overlooking Tucson and warmed by an abundance of desert sunshine, Westward Look is a rejuvenating resort inspired by the beauty of its pristine natural surroundings. With sparkling swimming pools and a prize winning chef, the site for the 2008 meeting is an excellent place to meet with friends and colleagues.

The Thursday evening reception will be held at the Arizona State Museum, the oldest museum in the state, with a behind-the-scenes tour of exhibits.

Field trip: “Four Thousand Years of History on the Santa Cruz River: A Guided Tour of Archaeological Sites and Historic Architecture in the Tucson Basin.”