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Some Reflections on the Soft Money Generation

CHARLES T. CULLEN

When I reflect on the state of our association after five years of existence I am pleased at what I see. We have been forced by circumstances to mature early—ours was a baptism by fire—and I think we have succeeded. The hopes expressed at our organizational meeting in St. Louis in 1978 and the goals set by the first councils have been realized in a short period of time. Our membership has grown steadily and increasing numbers of people have attended our annual meetings to exchange information and ideas and to participate in the program. The editing guide called for by the association has been written and steps are now being taken to get it published. This is a major accomplishment for Mary-Jo Kline and for the association at large. Our committee structure is quite large and strong, involving more and more people in the affairs of the association. And perhaps most impressively, through the leadership of a small dedicated group dear to us all, our association has helped stem the most recent tide of Reagan administration anti-intellectualism that threatened the extinction of the NHPRC and the health of most historical projects.

While things have improved for us as editors, the past several years have brought change, perhaps revolutionary change, to our profession. It has been some time now since the high-speed train that brought most of us historians into this work jumped its track. Even though the train is moving once again, albeit with an uncertain rate of speed, the nature of being an editor is not the same now, nor is it likely ever again to be the same. A new generation of editors has emerged in the midst of our troubled recent past, a development that has important implications for us all. When viewed in perspective the emergence of this new generation is a natural development, although many of us have not accepted it, if indeed we have even recognized it. How did this development occur?

By the time President Carter's budget office began to apply the brakes to what I have described as a relatively fast-moving train, documentary editing had already experienced radical change since Julian Boyd launched modern historical editing in 1950. In the decade of the 1950s, more than twenty-five projects had begun work with no federal funds but with a significant level of private support, particularly from the Ford and Rockefeller foundations, and from Time, Inc. Most editors in this first group of modern editors were part-time. They were typically professors who had special interests and/or ability in the subject of the project and who were given released time by their deans to direct its work. It was also at this time that the rather accidental but easily understood practice of establishing a project at an institution with a special interest in the subject began to emerge as an important characteristic of modern historical editions. The trend had its origins in the Adams project and then in Columbia University's final arrangements to edit the Hamilton Papers. The Universities of Kentucky and South Carolina also established projects to edit papers of two of their favorite sons. Today the uninitiated expect a project to be located at some "logical host institution," and when the location is not so neatly arranged there can be interesting consequences for a project.

Locating editorial projects at logical institutions was the key to the NHPRC's attempt to find financial support for most of those it wanted to see started. Seed money has always been more available from so-called logical institutions than from those with no clear identification with the subject of the edition. The Jefferson and Franklin papers find it impossible to convince their university administrators to match NHPRC grants or those from any other source, as do such newer and important projects as Robert Morris and Stanton-Anthony. The same is true for most of the "subject projects" (Ratification of the Constitution and First Federal Congress projects, to mention two) and for almost all the literary editions, which seem to be located at institutions by the rule that put the Jefferson and Franklin projects where they are—the project director wanted to do those papers, and began them on released time.

For a while just before the transformation from one generation to the next began, the NHPRC had lots of money to give away to historical projects. Grants were rising faster than inflation as the Commission tried to help editors employ the full-time staff they had been pleading for in order to make progress. Starting in 1974, the Commission was able to begin paying most of the costs of the priority projects which up till then
had been supported entirely by private funds. A program to train historians in the skills of editing was begun. Publishing subventions to presses—the thing that probably brought about the large increase in the congressional appropriation—were started at a time when publishers were beginning to question the wisdom of taking on these long-term projects. But the most important development was the creation of jobs that the first generation of editors filled quickly, bringing into the profession a bird of a different feather, those who would later become the second generation.

The differences between the experiences of these generations are the key to our present character as a profession. The second generation came into this work more accidentally than did the first. Most of the new editors were not already situated in tenured teaching positions when they joined an editorial staff. In fact, most did not have teaching positions at all. Many became editors “temporarily”—in a holding action until the teaching market improved. This group, like the first, earned graduate degrees to be historians or literary scholars, and the goal was a career teaching and writing articles and books, characteristics of the first generation before they took on the auxiliary duty of editing. The newer generation also had expected to continue the daily academic schedule it had enjoyed since childhood, teaching when classes were scheduled, and then working as the muse directed. The first shock to this generation was perhaps the editorial office schedule. Not only did it require adjustment to a daily office routine (nine to five, like business people) but also summers brought no change of pace. To make matters a bit worse, many of the new editors worked for the earlier type, while their bosses (another non-academic term) continued to teach and to follow more of an academic schedule than could they.

As time passed, many in this new generation became directors of their projects as the first generation either retired or gave up the frustrating attempt to be traditional academic scholars and editors and returned to full-time teaching, turning over the reins to the new breed. This was pleasing to the new generation. In some cases, they considered themselves the real professional editors anyway. Their primary, indeed in most cases only, loyalty was to their projects, not divided between two or three jobs. But the job now had a difficult, less secure, foundation from that enjoyed by the preceding generation. The most important change was from part-time partly funded editors, to full-time, fully funded editors. It became increasingly more common that no part of the project’s budget was anchored in hard money and full-time project directors had to fund their entire salaries as well as those for the rest of their staffs.

The time has now arrived when we must look squarely at the implications of the changes occurring in our profession. Change, especially fundamental change, produces stress, and it is the perception of one’s situation that determines what effect stress will have. What is the proper perception of our present situation? The emerging generation, the inheriting generation if you will, is different primarily because we are full-time editors, and we must come to terms with situations which, if they are not new, are at least perceived differently by those of us who have been full-time editors for most of our careers. We must evaluate our present condition, and those who remain from the first generation—historians as well as other editors—must study the lessons of these developments in order to help shape our future because its course is far from certain.

The long-range funding of a full-time staff is our most serious problem and the implications of this problem have much to do with our perception of our jobs. We are the soft money generation, faced with an enormous challenge—finding sufficient funds to do our jobs. If we take an objective look at the funding of documentary editing in the United States, money has always been hard to come by. The relatively large influx of federal funds, which helped bring in more local funds, has been unusual in our experience taken as a whole. While we believe it should continue, do we have any reasonable expectation that it will? If it may not, what does this mean to us who have become full-time editors dependent on such financial support? I have yet to meet a soft money editor who did not agree that our financial plight is a Catch-22 situation: we must have funds to hire a staff to edit our materials, yet the time it takes to raise funds takes away from the time we need to direct the work and to do some of it ourselves. The search for funds is hard, time-consuming work and I have never heard an editor say he enjoys the task as much as editing. What is the solution to this financial problem? It is time that we heard the message: there is no solution. We cannot expect money ever again to come as easily as it did in the early 1970s. Editors cannot write a concise proposal clearly justifying the need for 10 percent more money expecting it to be given by the NHPRC. Money from the NEH has never come that easily and it is safe to say it never will.

Another important difference is time. As more junior editors moved up, some did so thinking it might be possible to become more purely historians or literary scholars now, in the mold of their predecessors, i.e., we might teach part-time. However, the experience of the past several years has taught us that it is a rare editor who has time to teach, direct a project, edit, and raise funds, and to do all of it ably. Many project sponsors have recognized this in the past several years and when looking for a new editor have preferred one who could
devote full time to the task. The experience of most of the “soft money editors” contains at least one solution to the problem of time: the teaching must go. Accepting this condition is almost as difficult as accepting the premise that one must become more or less a permanent fundraiser. How many of us earned graduate degrees in our subjects to edit documents? I am constantly asked, have always been constantly asked, if I do any teaching. I am asked this by fellow editors as much as by teaching historians. At least two things are implicit in the question: 1) Since I only edit documents, perhaps I have time to do some teaching; and, 2) I must at least want to teach if I am a real historian. Certainly nothing is wrong with the attitude that professional historians can and might want to teach their subjects. What is wrong or at least troublesome is the attitude that unless we teach we are somehow less than whole. We hold that attitude as much as our colleagues who teach. And this attitude causes us many problems in our professional happiness. Given the trauma associated with the requirements of fundraising and our altered perception of our professional roles, perhaps the NHPRC should be asked to fill its next vacant staff position with a psychiatrist.

Those of us who are full-time editors on soft money are different from our predecessors and we must come to terms with that fact. We have all finally realized that modern editing takes much time. Our projects will last longer than originally thought. I am somewhat concerned that one reaction to this realization is that something must be wrong with modern editing if it takes so much time. Many projects started in the 1960s and early 1970s planning a small series and an early completion date. While some of these projects actually finished the job, most are taking longer than originally predicted, and I know of at least one that started in 1974 as a three-volume, five-year project that today, in 1983, has not yet published the first volume. My position is not that this is inexcusable, but that it should be recognized that the requirements of editing documents properly may make a fixed completion date impossible to establish early on, and that we, as the new generation of editors, must be aware of the implications of that fact from the beginning. We are frequently asked by our supporters how long our projects will last. We know that most fully funded, sizeable staffs can produce about two or at most three volumes a year barring any problems (which is itself impossible to do). The question becomes who will guarantee funding for the project for the next X number of years. And the pressure to produce seems greater now than it was in the early years of modern editing.

The first generation published many volumes of materials but the pace seemed to slow in the last decade. While the number of published volumes increased the number of projects in existence doubled as well. It is almost embarrassing to speculate that in real terms the pace slackened at about the same time money began to become more plentiful. The first generation editor hired new scholars—mostly new Ph.D.s without traditional jobs—as assistants to work full time. They had to learn the craft first, which took time, but they also
had to be paid and funds were beginning to tighten. The director had to spend more time finding money and less time editing and directing the editing, and what about the teaching duties? All of this took its toll on progress. And without progress, it is difficult to find continuing financial support. The harder it is to find funds, the more time it takes to look for them. Catch-22. No wonder some of the first generation have wanted to return to full-time teaching or to retire. What they expected the job to entail has changed dramatically. It is essential that the second generation take up the reins with both eyes open and that we do not have expectations that are unrealistic.

The more money our sponsors give us, the more they expect to see produced. This is a normal and probably correct assumption, but it is one that should present us with a clear choice rather than uncomfortable pressure. Our sponsors, including the NHPRC, the NEH, and foundations alike, have all put pressure on us to get the job done sooner, and this pressure will continue. Many of us have turned to technological innovations in hopes of achieving efficiency and progress. It is perhaps ironic that a group of scholars not noted for progressivism have been the real pioneers in this area. Whether this technology offers a significant solution to our problem remains to be seen, but it is at least another change that is likely to become fixed.

Pressure to adopt new limited editorial policies is likely to continue. These decisions are the responsibility of the editors and not the funding agencies, however. If the NHPRC has done much of this meddling it has not been sufficient to be talked about. The NEH, however, through its panels, has applied pressure on at least several occasions, "encouraging" editors to make alterations in their policies in order to obtain funding. And now foundations are applying similar pressure. I should like to quote from a letter written to a colleague by a prominent foundation officer this past summer: "The real satisfaction to be had from present achievement... is inevitably clouded somewhat by thoughts of how much remains to be done, and at what cost... You remember that one of the points raised during the discussions that preceded... our [grant] had to do with the prospects for greater selectivity in choosing materials to include in [your] letterpress edition. [This] matter will not go away, and it would certainly come front and center and be a critical consideration if there were any thought of applying again to the Foundation for support at the expiration of the current grant."

Were serious errors made when our projects were originally designed? It is good for us to ask this question, even to be prompted to ask it by our financial supporters, and to recognize that the answer may be no, but it may be yes. I do not think the answer is simple to arrive at, but we must all ask it. The comprehensive and inclusive nature of many projects' design might have come about primarily because it seemed money was plentiful and this policy was affordable. But we must ask the question honestly and come to the answer not unduly influenced by the pressures of those who hold the purse strings. I am willing to admit that the veritable baby boom of projects in the 1960s and early 1970s was just as unnatural as the ready availability of money that sustained them for a few years. And I suggest that the design of many of these projects was completed with the mistaken idea that what Julian Boyd was doing with the Jefferson Papers should be done with everyone's. I submit that our funding agencies are applying pressure on us to re-examine our project designs because few of us have done it on our own. Both sides are behaving improperly.

The initiative for re-evaluation must come from within the project itself. Once this step is taken and answers to the many questions are determined, we can then take another look at the seemingly endless nature of this period of editorial production. We can then more ably inform our sponsors how long the job will take and we can be more certain that our editorial policies are not going to shortchange those who use our edited materials. This is what new projects are doing. Those who have initiated projects in the past three or four years have few illusions about what they are doing or how long they might be doing it. They have made very careful decisions about editorial policy and they have accepted the responsibility of fundraising. Perhaps a third generation is emerging, from whom those of us in the transition generation might learn how to cope with our problems of identity and survival.

We can hope that this is true because I know of no one with a neat group of solutions for us. We must search for them together, and if we are to find valid, usable solutions to these problems, they will come from open discussion involving all of us. This association provides the forum and the talent for intelligent consideration of the future of documentary editing. We must recognize that just a few years ago there was no editorial profession. Thanks largely to the efforts and funds of the NHPRC and the NEH, there is one now. The Association for Documentary Editing exists so that scholars who choose to edit materials for publication can seek common goals through discussion and cooperation. Much hard work remains in order to answer the hard questions. It is a challenge that faces us now and one that we—first and second generations, project directors and project assistants, fundraisers and scholars—must accept if the tremendous achievements of modern documentary editing are to continue.
Booker T. Washington: 
The Labyrinth and the Thread

LOUIS R. HARLAN

I am living proof that an editor can be a biographer. Whether an editor should be a biographer, or vice versa, depends on the person and the subject. I cannot speak for everyone faced with that dilemma, but for me as editor and biographer the double life proved that much richer. As a biographer focusing on the thread of biographical narrative I had the advantage of collaborating with an editor, a co-editor, and a corporal's guard of editorial researchers who explored the geography of the labyrinth—the historical context, the principal associates of my central figure, and even what Tom Clark called “the once-at-bat characters” in my story. Colleagues surrounded me who knew the meaningful—and sometimes the meaningless—details as well as I did. Academia these days is such a lonely crowd of specialists that it is a real pleasure to be in such a workshop. As a biographer, I could shed light on the behavior and unfolding character of my protagonist which the editing project could use and had to consider. Editors tend to assume that their own steady focus on the documents and their more exhaustive annotation research give them more complete and certain knowledge than any biographer. It is harder to be smug in that assumption when a biographer is in the house. He knows where the thread leads, which is also crucial knowledge.

It was biography rather than editing that I had in mind at first. While I was a graduate student doing research for my doctoral dissertation I got my first exciting look at the huge mound of Washington’s papers, recently acquired by the Library of Congress from Tuskegee Institute. It was a remarkable treasure of black history and American social history: more than a million items of correspondence, speeches, writings, inter-departmental memos, minutes of the faculty council, thirty-nine scrapbooks of newspaper clippings, and many items of dubious biographical importance, such as a daily report of the menu of students and faculty for twenty years, daily reports of the swine herd and poultry yard, a tomato label from the Tuskegee cannery, a package of dried beans from a black farmer, and a letter from Jesus Christ from his temporary headquarters in upstate New York—he said he wrote in English as it was the language of the Hebrews before the tower of Babel.

It was by far the largest record of any black individual in American history, and it still is so with the possible exception of Martin Luther King. Equally to the point, it revealed a much more complex character than historians had imagined, and opened a window through the veil that had always screened the private lives of blacks from white view. For the last twenty years of Washington’s life, he and his shrewd, faithful private secretary Emmett Scott saved every scrap of the record, apparently in the conviction that when it was all revealed, even including his dirty tricks, history would vindicate him. Despite my biography, or maybe because of it, the jury is still out on Booker T. Washington. But the biographer must be grateful for the sense of destiny or whatever motive that caused them to save everything, and also for the reasons, whatever they were, that caused those in charge of Tuskegee Institute in the 1940s to let the papers go to one of the great manuscript repositories.

It was more than ten years after the first glimpse before I returned to Booker T. Washington. Thereby hangs another long tale that I’ll forbear telling here, except to say that I spent nine years in cultural exile in a teachers’ college in a small Texas town that resembled Tuskegee. Having grown up in the Atlanta suburbs, I needed that long immersion in the rural South before I could have understood Washington’s experience and the outlook that grew out of that experience. I began serious work on a Washington biography in 1961, spending my retirement money one summer, then getting summer grants and finally a fellowship for a whole year, exploiting my wife as a research assistant, and digging away at the mound of evidence until I gradually distinguished the meaningful details from the trivia. I came to know the man I had been studying. All this was taking years, because although I was obsessed by my subject I was not driven. As my notes piled up, I began to realize that only a small part of the life and times of Booker T. Washington could be incorporated into the themes of a biography.

At this moment Oliver W. Holmes of the National Historical Publications Commission approached me with an invitation to edit Washington's papers. He had his own reasons for the suggestion, stemming at least partly from a growing criticism of his federal agency from American historians who called for history "from the bottom up" and decried the elitism of the NHPC's almost exclusive focus on the Founding Fathers. Bottoms-up history has been demanded more often than it has been written or edited over the past twenty years. But Ira Berlin's Freedom History project, David Katzman and William Tuttle's Plain People, and Thomas Frazier's The Underside of American History are a few recent indications of an emerging history of the American people. At any rate, Dr. Holmes thought an edition of Washington's papers would help move American historical editing away from concentration on the Great White Fathers. Of course, Washington was another elite character, one of the great black fathers of black history. Maybe I did not sufficiently clarify that fact for Dr. Holmes, for I was already thinking how an edition—a highly selective edition—of Washington's papers would solve some of my dilemmas as a biographer.

Washington was a challenge to the biographer not merely because his private papers were so voluminous but because he was so complex, and it seemed to me in 1966 when I began the editing project that it would be a good showcase for illustrating this complexity. Washington was not complex the way I imagine an intellectual is, with most of the contradictions ultimately resolvable into some sort of unity, intellectual integrity, or consistent outlook. Maybe I have inaccurately idealized the intellectual by that description, but my purpose is to show what Washington was not. He was a man of action and a politician, not an intellectual, and he both despised and feared the black intellectuals of his day. His contradictions were unresolvable because they represented the various roles an all-purpose black leader had to play in white America.

Given such a complex character, and given the biographer's obligation to tell the truth—the whole truth—about his subject, it seemed to me and still seems to me that one of the best ways to do it would be to present the documentary evidence, not merely cite the evidence. Publicly Washington acquiesced in the disfranchisement and segregation of blacks, whereas his private papers make clear that he initiated, guided, and secured financing for court cases challenging the grandfather clause, denial of jury service to blacks, Jim Crow railroad cars, peonage, and other forms of black subordination that he publicly accepted. He did all of this subversion of white supremacy in the deepest secrecy, and only a handful of intimates had any idea of it during his lifetime.

There was also a less attractive, more feral side to Washington's secret life. He presented himself to the world in his autobiography and other writings and speeches as a social pacifist who turned the other cheek and adjured blacks to prepare themselves for future opportunities by self-improvement. In fact, most of his public utterances were grab bags of Sunday-school platitudes. In secret, however, he treated his black and white critics as enemies and used ruthless Machiavellian methods against them. He hired spies to infiltrate all the organizations of his opponents and not only forewarn him of their actions but serve as provocateurs and saboteurs of their plans. He bought black newspapers to sing his song, and publicly lied about it. He secretly hounded some of his more vulnerable opponents until they sought safety in obscurity. If I may
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borrow Blake’s phrase, what better way to frame the fearful asymmetry of this tiger than an edition of his letters, with full but not exclusive attention to his secret life?

It would probably have been harder to edit Washington’s papers after completing the biography, because then the temptation would be hard to resist simply to select the documents that illustrated the interpretation and themes of the biography. I published the first volume of the biography simultaneously with the appearance of the first two volumes of the papers, and I deliberately avoided in that first volume any effort to say the final word on Washington’s character and personality. The editing project undoubtedly slowed the pace of the biography. Editing can be endless, laborious, and often downright boring work at times. My co-editor Ray Smock and I took turns reading aloud through the photocopies and typescript of every volume, and in the final reading of the galley proofs we had four people taking turns aloud. One pair of eyes was on the photocopy, one on the typescript, and two on the galleys. This may not have been mind-boggling, as I am sure many in the audience have done the same galley-slavery, but it was certainly mind-deadening. It was impossible to go home and write after a day of that.

So it took me ten years to write the first volume of the biography, and ten more years to write the second volume. It was easier to edit every day than to write every day, though neither is easy work, and it was also more necessary. The editing project was on released time and involved an obligation to staff members, to the university, and to the outside sponsoring agencies. I felt somehow more of an obligation to put out an edited volume every year than I felt about “doing my own thing.” I must confess that throughout both enterprises I thought of the editing as a team effort and the biography as my own. This is not to deny the help of Ray Smock and others on the biography, but simply to explain my mental compartmentalization of the two scholarly enterprises. What the editing did for me as a biographer was allow me a leisurely second look at all the evidence, and a chance to see what each bit of evidence signified not only to me but to my fellow editors. Every interpretive theme could be tried out on an informed and critical audience before it found its way into print in my biography.

The biography also benefited in interpretation and general tone from its long contact with editing. In Washington’s case it cannot be said that to comprehend all is to pardon all. His “dirty tricks” and his mealy-mouthed moderation in the face of racial injustice do not look any more attractive when thoroughly examined. But my original purpose was to write a much more detached, ironical, satirical biography. Sustained contact with the documents, and their fuller explanation of how Washington’s experience dictated the course he took, changed that approach somewhat. A biographer cannot understand his subject if he keeps him forever at arm’s length. The editing helped me to understand more and sit in judgment less. Now that it is all done, in spite of all my efforts I missed the quintessence of Booker T. Washington, the wizard of Tuskegee, but I believe that that is because he had no quintessence. His personality disappeared into the roles he played. So I end with a critical portrait of Washington, but I hope one that is more compassionate and understanding of a black leader born in slavery and flourishing during the age of segregation.

I think that obviously the work on the biography helped in the editing. I was always reading ahead, so to speak. At least, it helped me to win some arguments with Ray Smock about inclusion of one document or another, on the ground that the particular document was part of a chain of evidence on some facet of Washington’s life that would assume greater importance later. Comprehensive knowledge of Washington’s entire life was definitely a help in the selection, the problem of which was magnified by the disparity between the million items in the collection and the less than ten thousand, or one percent, in the selection.

We have had no serious cause for regret about what we selected or what we omitted. It is true that one reviewer on two separate occasions faulted us for omission of favorite letters cited in my articles, arguing that “what ‘author’ Harlan finds significant enough to quote in his Washington monographs ‘editor’ Harlan should consider sufficiently significant to include in his Washington Papers.” Another reviewer also reproved us for omitting a document. The biographer of another black man, George H. White, the Reconstruction politician, complained that we had omitted a letter that proved that his subject had significantly differed with Booker T. Washington’s conservative racial policies. What we found on rechecking the letter was that White agreed with Washington to the point of sycophancy, and we also concluded that we had been right to omit the letter as relatively insignificant.

Near the end of the project we decided to guard against errors of judgment in the selection process by going systematically through the scholarly books and articles touching on Booker T. Washington’s life and citing his papers, to see if we might have omitted significant documents. We found that we had omitted several hundred so cited. But when we checked these, we found that our original judgment in omitting them had been correct, for cause. Most of the omitted documents contained nothing significant not already in some included document. Often they were simply links in a chain of correspondence in which we had selected
the more informative or better stated letter. It is inevitable in a highly selective edition that only the meatiest of a series of letters will be published. In some thirty cases, on second or third thought, we have decided to include a formerly passed-over document. That is a good batting average, but it says more about the editorial process and Ray Smock’s insistence that we double-check and our editorial team’s ability to separate the wheat from the chaff than it says about a biographer being in the house.

The symbiosis of editing and writing on the Booker T. Washington project resulted in a lot more editorial self-restraint than has been true on some other projects. That is not to say that editorial restraint is universally appropriate. Maybe if Julian Boyd were also a Jefferson biographer he would have dealt differently with annotation, but since he was not, maybe his methods were right for him and his circumstances and his subject. Editing is an art, not a science, and we ought to avoid universal rules about the amount and kind of annotation that is suitable. If Boyd was not our model, we did have the example before us of a distinguished biographer and editor, Arthur Link, and more often than we have admitted before, when faced with an editorial quandary we turned to his volumes for guidance. Needless to say, he is responsible only for our virtues, not our editorial sins.

We wanted the edition to have a separate existence, rather than merely illustrating the biography or proving by amplification of the evidence that the biographer was right on all counts. We hoped, for example, that the edited volumes could treat subjects beyond the range or depth of the biography—such themes as industrial education at Tuskegee, the relationship between town and gown and between black schools and white philanthropy, the black politics of the era, black tenant farm life, and the life and concerns of the black bourgeoisie. We wanted to deal with these subjects without tendentious annotation or overinterpretation that would take its tone from Washington’s own social philosophy. Obviously, our selection process itself, taking one out of a hundred documents, was a form of interpretation, but we did not want to compound this by taking a monumental approach by which the documents would add up to a larger-than-life representation of Booker T. Washington. So we aimed at spare annotation, identifying or explaining the documents rather than exhausting the subject. As time passed, we found ourselves driven more than we intended toward the biographical by the very nature of the collection. Our resistance to this, however, our effort to study the labyrinth as well as follow the thread, we think helped us avoid an edition subservient to the biography. Of course, it helped also to be dealing with a historical figure who was often less than heroic.

I want to conclude by answering a few general questions that seem to arise out of the intertwining of biography and editing. Could another biographer come along now and do as well as I by looking only at our
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thirteen volumes? The answer is no, because any biographer worth reading has to try to know and understand all he can about his character, how he acted as a key to what he thought and felt as history washed him along. On the other hand, our edited volumes discovered facets of Washington's life that I did not know when I wrote the first volume of the biography, so the edition would be a good place to begin.

What are the audiences I see for the biography and the thirteen edited volumes, are they the same, different, or overlapping? To that I have to give the classic answer, that's a good question. Obviously, they are not the same. In the present-day book market, people buy biographies and libraries—a relatively small number of libraries—buy editions. Furthermore, monographs are almost exclusive as products of graduate-school workshops, and most of the scholarly books published every year are these monographs evolving from graduate study. There is a powerful vested interest in the monograph as the primary form of scholarship recognized and approved by the scholarly professions. We may deplore this and hope to change it, but it is a fact. In my opinion, letterpress editions are most valuable in providing broad information for the student and teacher rather than as specialized research materials. I have faith, that in the long run, this type of service to scholarship and learning will gain in recognition, as documentary history rather than as an aid to history.

A related question is, which will be useful longer, the biography or the edition? I hate to have to answer this, because I feel a greater proprietary claim on the biography. More of my own art went into fashioning its image of Booker T. Washington. It is mine, whereas the edition is ours. Nevertheless, I believe any biography is a thing of its season. It is impossible to write a definitive biography of any historical figure as protean and deliberately deceptive as Washington. On the other hand, more than one generation will find meanings in the published documents that even we the editors did not see. If we editors do our work well and with fidelity, our work will be readable and will be read decades from now, while the monographs of today will collect dust like the leaves of yesteryear, their provocative interpretations ignored or merely points of departure for twenty-first-century perspectives.

To turn to a final question, you have often heard the expression, "If you could walk a mile in my shoes, you would understand and approve of what I have done." My co-editor Ray Smock and I have often discussed the question—and let me take this opportunity to thank him for some of the better features of this paper. He may seek to hide behind his congressional immunity, but he cannot stop me from acknowledging his help. If we could have walked a mile in Washington's shoes, maybe we would have suspended criticism. But we could never go more than half a mile before our feet hurt and our critical faculties returned. We found many cases of Washington being traduced by his enemies, but also found him vilifying his critics. Many contemporaries and later scholars stereotyped Washington contrary to the evidence we found, but we also found him a power-hungry political boss and a self-contradictory actor who could publicly say one thing and secretly do the opposite. His character was such that we could explain him without feeling an undue temptation to defend him.

These questions are intended to provoke discussion and stimulate other questions.

---

Minutes of the ADE Annual Business Meeting
Baltimore, Maryland
October 7, 1983

The meeting was called to order by President Charles Cullen at 11:20 A.M. The reading of the minutes of last year's meeting was waived. John Kaminski announced the election results (146 ballots were cast). Elected were Jo Ann Boydston, President-Elect; Carol Orr, Director of Publications; John Kaminski, Secretary-Treasurer; and a Nominating Committee composed of Mary-Jo Kline (Chair), Kenneth Bowling, David Greetham, Peter Shillingsburg, and Dorothy Twohig. John Kaminski presented the treasurer's report which was accepted.

Mary-Jo Kline moved a resolution honoring the late Lyman H. Butterfield for his contribution to American history through documentary editing. Richard Showman seconded the resolution, which was unanimously passed.
Charlene Bickford reported from the Federal Policy Committee that the Senate had just passed Senate Bill S. 1513 to reauthorize funds for the NHPRC at levels of $4, $4, $5, $5, and $5 million for each of the next five fiscal years. The House of Representatives had previously passed an authorizing bill but with lower levels of funds. It is hoped that the Senate figures will be incorporated into the final bill.

Charlene said that the appropriation bill for the NHPRC had not yet been passed, and that, until the 10th of November, the Commission would operate under the provisions of a continuing resolution based on last year’s funding level. The House subcommittee, however, had marked up the appropriation bill allocating only $1.5 million for NHPRC. It is hoped that the entire House Appropriations Committee will restore the $1.5 million cut by the subcommittee.

Senate Bill S. 905 calling for the removal of the National Archives from the General Services Administration has forty-one co-sponsors, and Senate action on this bill is expected by this summer. Jack Brooks and Glenn English have introduced an Archives independence bill (H.R. 3987) in the House of Representatives. ADE members were asked to write their congressmen urging them to co-sponsor or support this bill. Letters to congressmen should emphasize that the Archives independence bill creates no new government functions or agencies, but merely makes existing operations more efficient.

Charlene Bickford proposed a resolution of thanks to those senators and representatives who have assisted in efforts to fund the NHPRC and to gain independence for the National Archives. Nathan Reingold moved that the resolution be accepted; Connie Schulz seconded the motion. Daun Van Ee asked for the names of those individuals who would receive this resolution. Charlene said that the list was fairly long and would include those legislators who assisted the Coalition to Save Our Documentary Heritage. The resolution was unanimously accepted.

Charlene Bickford moved another resolution expressing the ADE’s support for the independence of the National Archives from the GSA. She explained that this resolution would become part of the official hearing record on the independence bill. Michael Richman seconded the resolution. Ray Smock proposed some slight changes in the wording, and the resolution passed unanimously.

Charles Cullen expressed the appreciation of the ADE to Charlene Bickford and Michael Richman for their continuing efforts on the Federal Policy Committee. He also encouraged ADE members to write to their congressmen about matters that concern the editing profession.

Charles Cullen then summarized the actions taken in the Council during its meetings on October 5 and 6. The Constitution and By-laws Committee had reported a number of proposed changes in the ADE constitution and by-laws. Most of the changes cleaned up the language or eliminated ambiguities, but several amendments did offer substantive changes: committees would be appointed by the ADE president with advice from the Council; committees would no longer be limited to a membership of three; the Council would nominate the nominating committee; individuals could be nominated for office by a petition process; and a change was proposed in the method of amending the constitution.

Charles Cullen explained that none of these amendments would be voted on at this year’s business meeting; but, in accordance with the ADE constitution, all proposed amendments would be sent to the membership at least ninety days before the 1984 convention. The proposed amendments would be discussed at the 1984 business meeting, and, if approved by the meeting, the membership would vote on the proposed amendments by a mail ballot. There were no questions from the floor on the proposed amendments.

Charles Cullen announced that the Meetings Committee had recommended and the Council had agreed that the 1984 ADE convention be in Providence, Rhode Island, from 18 to 20 October. Nashville, Tennessee, was chosen as the site for the 1985 convention and Charlottesville, Virginia, for the 1986 convention.

John Kaminski gave the results of the questionnaire on the subject of meeting sites for future conventions. A total of 146 questionnaires were returned. Most people were concerned about monetary factors and accessibility in the choice of convention sites. Seventy-five percent of the membership wanted the ADE to continue holding its convention independently of any larger organization’s convention. Almost 90 percent of the responding members favored rotating the location of the convention but only thirty-three members said that they would attend a convention held on the West Coast. (Another sixty-nine were uncertain whether or not they would attend such a convention.) The responses indicated that a large number of members planned on attending the Providence convention in 1984. Other preferred sites for future conventions were (in order of most times listed as a preference): Washington, D.C., Boston, New York City, Charlottesville, Nashville, Charleston, Chicago, New Haven, Atlanta, New Orleans, San Francisco.

Charles Cullen summarized the activities of the Membership Committee, thanked the members of that committee for their efforts, and asked for people to volunteer for this committee assignment.

Charles Cullen said that David Hirst reported that the Job Placement Office had good results during the past year. Twelve jobs were listed with the office.
Thomas Jeffrey, chairman of the Education Committee, explained that the ADE by-laws provide that the Education Committee should compile a list of institutions in the United States and Canada that teach documentary editing. In an attempt to obtain this information, the Education Committee drafted a questionnaire on the subject which was distributed to the members at the meeting. Copies of the questionnaire will be disseminated to the entire membership through the Newsletter in December.

Charles Cullen announced that the Council had decided that it would be advantageous to have a permanent editor of the Newsletter rather than changing editors every year as has generally been the case. Sharon Ritenour, assistant editor of the George C. Marshall Papers, has been selected as the new editor. It was also announced that the Newsletter would be renamed the ADE Bulletin. This name change, it was believed, would more adequately describe the contents of the association's publication. Lastly, it was decided that the ADE Bulletin should be published in March, June, September, and December.

Charles Cullen reported on the progress of the ADE manual. Revisions have been made by the author, Mary-Jo Kline; and a publisher will soon be approached.

The Council is going to explore the possibility of obtaining affiliated status with a number of other scholarly associations.

Charles Cullen again asked for volunteers to serve on ADE committees.

OLD BUSINESS. Robert Rutland expressed concern about the high cost of postage and asked why the association did not use bulk mail rates. Charles Cullen explained that the use of bulk rates would further delay the delivery of the Newsletter to the membership, and John Kaminski said that postal officials had informed him that they would not guarantee the delivery of bulk mail. Therefore it was thought prudent to pay the regular postage.

NEW BUSINESS. Charles Polzer proposed a resolution that in consideration of the upcoming 500th anniversary of the discovery of the New World in 1992, the ADE should make government officials in the United States and in the Americas aware of the existence of Spanish documents dealing with the discovery and colonization of the New World so that these governments would act to preserve and utilize these documents. The resolution was seconded by Ray Smock and was unanimously carried.

Dorothy Wartenberg of the National Endowment for the Humanities reminded the ADE membership that the NEH Division of Research Programs has a program that supports cataloging and archival projects. She said that the budget for the Editions Program will be about the same this year as it was last year, and she encouraged editors to submit grant applications. Dr. Wartenberg also announced that the NEH was planning a computer workshop next spring. Scholars and publishers would be invited primarily from projects already receiving NEH grants.

The meeting adjourned at 12:23 p.m.

—John P. Kaminski
Secretary-Treasurer

Treasurer's Report
Fiscal Year July 1, 1982 – June 30, 1983

INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Boyd Award Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received from former treasurer</td>
<td>$2,176.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues</td>
<td>4,344.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPRC—for ADE Manual</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters (back issues)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>183.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,739.45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boyd Award Fund</th>
<th>Boyd Award Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received from former treasurer</td>
<td>$1,738.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>69.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,133.54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Boyd Award Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADE Manual</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters (two issues)</td>
<td>966.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and telephone</td>
<td>583.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to NCC</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery and supplies</td>
<td>172.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial services</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank charges (checks)</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,629.86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net worth end of fiscal 1982 | $3,874.53
Net worth end of fiscal 1983 | $7,242.93
General Fund | $5,109.59
Boyd Award Fund | $2,133.54

John P. Kaminski
Secretary-Treasurer
October 7, 1983
RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were passed at the ADE business meeting, October 7, 1983.

I. The resolution honoring Lyman H. Butterfield is printed at the right.

II. Resolution of thanks:

The membership of the Association for Documentary Editing, gathered in Baltimore, Maryland, for the Association’s annual meeting, expressed its desire to recognize the contributions of certain members of the Congress of the United States to the preservation of our documentary heritage. These members have been instrumental in preserving the federal participation in the preservation and publication of documents relating to the history of our nation through their support for the continuation of the grants program of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). They have also worked for adequate funding for the National Archives and Records Service (NARS) and reestablishment of NARS as an independent agency.

Therefore, the ADE officially and enthusiastically commends these legislators and thanks them for their efforts in behalf of our nation’s documentary heritage.

III. Resolution supporting independence of the National Archives:

Whereas, The membership of the Association for Documentary Editing is concerned about the future of our National Archives and believes that its current organizational placement within the General Services Administration does not give the National Archives sufficient prestige or authority for the successful accomplishment of its mandated mission or the protection that it should have from political influence; be it therefore

Resolved, That this organization again expresses its support for any legislation that would separate the National Archives and Records Service from the General Services Administration and reestablish it as an independent agency; and be it further

Resolved, That this organization urge the Congress of the United States to act favorably on such legislation.

IV. Resolution recognizing the value of manuscripts regarding discovery of the Americas:

Recognizing the unique value of historic manuscript collections regarding the discovery and settlement of the Americas on the occasion of the 500th anniversary of the discovery of the New World, the Association for Documentary Editing urges the governments of the Americas to assist in the preservation and utilization of all such collections through their various concerned and appropriate agencies.

Resolution Honors

Lyman H. Butterfield

The following resolution honoring Lyman H. Butterfield was adopted by the Association for Documentary Editing, in Baltimore, Maryland, on October 7, 1983.

Whereas, Until his death in April 1983, Lyman Henry Butterfield gave freely four decades of his life to documentary editing, beginning with his pioneering work as compiler of the Letters of Benjamin Rush, continuing with his years as Associate Editor of the Jefferson Papers in fruitful collaboration with Julian Boyd, and culminating in his masterful direction of the Adams Papers edition at the Massachusetts Historical Society; and

Whereas, Lyman Butterfield served as patient and untiring counsellor and teacher to two generations of documentary editors and historical and literary investigators, sharing his wisdom and common sense, his knowledge of the human condition, and his faith in his colleagues’ capacity to match his own energy and insight; demonstrating that generosity of spirit even his last years, when he never failed his own sense of duty both to other scholars and to the peculiar, demanding, intellectual discipline that he had helped create and to which he devoted his life; and

Whereas, Documentary editors and the international scholarly community recognize Lyman Butterfield’s special contribution to their investigation of our American heritage; be it therefore

Resolved, That the Association for Documentary Editing, its members, its officers, and its Council, take this opportunity to acknowledge their debt—and the debt of a host of others—to Lyman Henry Butterfield, his work, and his example; and the Association makes use of this occasion to rededicate itself to the standards of personal integrity and scholarly excellence that Lyman Butterfield exemplified; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the Association for Documentary Editing is hereby directed to convey this resolution to the Butterfield family and to the officers and staff of the Massachusetts Historical Society and the Adams Papers project.
Education Committee Prepares Questionnaire

According to ADE by-laws, the Education Committee is responsible for maintaining a current listing of all courses of instruction in documentary editing and for developing standards of instruction in the principles and methods of editing. The committee feels that it cannot discharge its responsibilities as long as it lacks basic information about where documentary editing is being taught, who is doing the teaching, where the students are coming from, and what different kinds of methods are currently being used.

As a means of obtaining answers to these and other questions relating to the teaching of editing, the Education Committee prepared a questionnaire which was distributed at the October meeting in Baltimore. A copy of the questionnaire is also enclosed in this issue of the Newsletter. The committee urges all those who have not yet completed the questionnaire to do so and to return it, along with the membership dues, to the secretary-treasurer. Those members who have not taught courses in documentary editing are requested to complete the first part of the questionnaire, so that the committee might determine how large a percentage of the membership is currently involved in the teaching of editing. The collected information will be analyzed and a report of the committee's findings will be presented at the next annual meeting in Providence.

The Education Committee is also collecting syllabi, course descriptions, bibliographies, and other material relating to the teaching of documentary editing. This material will be made available to those members who are teaching, who are planning to teach, or who are interested in learning about current editing programs. Course materials should be sent to Thomas E. Jeffrey, Associate Editor, Thomas A. Edison Papers, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903.

—Thomas E. Jeffrey, Chairman
John P. Kaminski
Robert C. Leitz
Richard N. Sheldon

1983 ADE Meeting — Baltimore

Members enjoyed a tour of the Inner Harbor aboard two tankers owned by Vane Brothers Ship Chandlers of Fells Point. They were provided through the courtesy of Chuck Hughes, president of Vane Brothers and husband of Betsy Hughes—a member of the Eisenhower Papers project. The ADE members extend a warm thanks to Chuck and Betsy Hughes for their wonderful hospitality.
John Y. Simon
Receives Distinguished Service Award

John Y. Simon, editor of *The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant* at the University of Southern Illinois in Carbondale, received ADE’s Distinguished Service Award, which was presented to him at the annual meeting in Baltimore. Ray Smock, in presenting the award, spoke of Simon as “one of our founders and our guiding light” for all of his contributions to the success of the association. Simon, a former president of ADE, has been tireless in his efforts to promote the cause of documentary editing not only through his work as an officer and council member of ADE, but also through his testimony before Congress on behalf of issues related to the well-being of the profession.

Harold C. Syrett
Receives Julian P. Boyd Award

The Association for Documentary Editing awarded its second Julian P. Boyd Award to Harold C. Syrett for his distinguished contribution to American history and culture through his editing of *The Papers of Alexander Hamilton*. The award is presented every three years to one who has made an outstanding contribution to American history and culture through documentary editing; and it carries a $500 check and a certificate from the association.

As editor of the Hamilton Papers from the inception of the project in 1955 until its completion in 1979, Harold C. Syrett was a pioneer in the field of modern historical editing in this country. In spite of heavy academic and administrative burdens during these years, he became not only one of the nation’s foremost Hamilton scholars but also remained deeply involved in the editing and production of the volumes and unflaggingly generous in making the resources of the project available to other scholars. Mr. Syrett has been the editor’s editor par excellence.

Unable to attend the ADE meeting in Baltimore, Mr. Syrett, in a September letter to Charles Cullen, president of ADE, wrote the following:

“I am delighted and overjoyed to accept the Julian P. Boyd Award from the Association for Documentary Editing. I feel particularly pleased not only because of the honor, but also because of Julian’s distinguished reputation, because he helped me in many significant ways, and because he never failed me in my repeated requests for assistance. He was always willing to stop his own work to get me over a rough spot or to suggest a solution to what at the time seemed to me an insoluble problem. He was, in short, both my mentor and my friend, and I miss him very much. I am more than proud to accept an award in his name.”

1984 Editing Institute

The thirteenth annual Institute for Historical Editing is scheduled for June 17–29, 1984, in Madison, Wisconsin. Jointly sponsored by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and the University of Wisconsin, the institute will provide detailed theoretical and practical instruction in documentary editing. Applicants should hold a master’s degree in history or American civilization. A limited number of study grants are available. For information and application forms, write to NHPRC, National Archives, Washington, DC 20408. Application deadline is March 15, 1984.
**“House” Historian Appointed**

Raymond W. Smock, president of the Association for Documentary Editing and formerly an editor of *The Booker T. Washington Papers* at the University of Maryland, has been appointed Historian of the Office for the Bicentennial of the U.S. House of Representatives. Smock will plan and coordinate the House celebration of its 200th anniversary in 1989. The office will also function as the first historical office of the House of Representatives. Among the projects under consideration are a new edition of the *Biographical Directory of Congress*, a guide to the manuscript collections of House members, and a short history of the House. Anyone who has suggestions for appropriate projects related to the history of the House of Representatives is urged to contact Ray Smock at: Office for the Bicentennial, Cannon House Office Building, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515.

**Hamer Award Presented**

Robert E. McCarthy, associate editor of *The Papers of General Nathanael Greene* at the Rhode Island Historical Society, has been selected by the Society of American Archivists as the recipient of its Philip M. Hamer Award. The award is presented annually to an outstanding junior editor working on an NHPRC-supported documentary editing project. McCarthy received B.A. and M.A. degrees from Providence College and a Ph.D. from Harvard University. He was appointed assistant editor of the Greene Papers in 1973 and has held his current position since 1977.

**NHPRC Fellowships**

The fellowship program of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, which has sponsored from three to seven fellows per year since 1967, has been funded for 1984-85. At its October meeting, the Commission voted to reserve sufficient funds to provide for three fellowships for 1984-85. The uncertainty of funding for the program, expressed in announcements that have appeared or will appear in various journals and newsletters over the coming months, has therefore been removed. The Commission will offer three fellowships of $15,000 each, plus fringe benefits, to persons interested in the profession of historical editing. Fellows will spend ten months, beginning between July 1 and October 1, 1984, at a documentary editing project. The participating projects are:

- *The Marcus Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association Papers*, University of California, Los Angeles
- *The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant*, Southern Illinois University
- *The Papers of General Nathanael Greene*, Rhode Island Historical Society

Applicants for fellowships should possess a doctoral degree in American history or civilization or have
completed all requirements for the degree except the dissertation. Further information and application forms are available from the NHPRC, National Archives, Washington, DC 20408. Application deadline is March 15, 1984.

**Editorial**

**Wanted: Suggestions and Assistance**

As those of you who attended the ADE meeting in Baltimore already know, the Council decided to rename the *Newsletter* the *ADE Bulletin*, to be published the first of March, June, September, and December. The new name is effective March 1984 with the publication of volume six.

In order for the *ADE Bulletin* to meet the needs and mirror the interests of you the reader and the association, please send me your suggestions for possible articles, topics, and reviews of recently published volumes, as well as news items.

Send information of interest regarding both the documentary editing profession and your specific project. Our projects are preserving and making available the documentary heritage of a wonderful variety of individuals and groups. Share the interesting, the thought-provoking, and the amusing. Consider interesting transcription problems, typographical errors, quotations, handwriting, interesting holographs, cartoons and caricatures, photographs and illustrations from your project. Send news of seminars and conferences of interest to documentary editing, and don’t forget to send news about your project and its members. Also share published noteworthy reviews and articles of interest that you encounter. Please send information of timely nature no later than one month prior to publication date—earlier if possible.

I look forward to hearing from you and working with you in editing our *ADE Bulletin*.

—Sharon R. Ritenour

**In Memorial**

W. Edwin Hemphill, editor of *The Papers of John C. Calhoun* from 1959 until his retirement in 1977, died on September 5 at the age of 71. Dr. Hemphill edited volumes 2 through 9 of the Calhoun Papers, and at the same time edited volumes of the South Carolina Provincial Congress and House of Representatives journals as well as other works. Clyde N. Wilson, current editor of the Calhoun Papers, states that Dr. Hemphill “was a truly dedicated and indefatigable editor.”

**ADE 1984 Program**

Jo Ann Boydston, program chairwoman for the 1984 ADE meeting in Providence, Rhode Island, on October 18–20, would like to hear from anyone who has suggestions for the program. Please forward your suggestions to her at the Center for Dewey Studies, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois 62901, or call (618) 453-2629.
Editors and Their Work

Dennis M. Conrad, who received his doctoral degree in American Colonial and Revolutionary History from Duke University, has joined the Rhode Island Historical Society to serve as editor of the Southern Campaign of General Nathanael Greene. As part of the staff of the Greene Papers, Conrad will be working on this aspect of the project, which is expected to take up approximately four volumes on this phase of Greene’s life, when he served as commander in chief of the Southern Army from mid-October 1780 until the end of the war in 1783.

Tamara Moser Melia, formerly a graduate assistant on The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant, joined the Naval Historical Center in October 1982 and is assisting in the editing of the two series Naval Documents of the American Revolution and The Naval War of 1812: A Documentary History.

Positions Available

The Adams Papers

The Adams Papers is seeking an assistant editor, to begin in September 1984. Requirements: Ph.D. in American or European history, or in American Studies. The work will include the textual editing, annotating, proofing, and indexing of diaries, family letters, public papers and diplomatic correspondence from the years 1780-1815. Applicants must be prepared to work with word processors. Salary range $18,000-$22,000, depending upon qualifications and experience. Send a one-page letter and brief resume by March 1, to the Adams Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, 1154 Boylston Street, Boston, MA 02215. Do not send recommendations. An Equal Opportunity employer.

The Papers of Thomas Jefferson

The Papers of Thomas Jefferson has an opening for a documentary editor. Graduate history degrees, experience at an editorial project, and a career commitment to documentary editing are prerequisites for consideration. Experience with computers and a working knowledge of French are also desirable. Beginning date, salary, and rank are negotiable. Please apply by January 1, 1984, to Charles T. Cullen, Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Princeton University Library, Princeton, New Jersey 08544. Princeton University is an Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action employer.

Project News

Volume 3 of The Papers of General Nathanael Greene will be published in late December 1983 or early January 1984 by the University of North Carolina Press. The staff was hard at work this spring and summer proofing and correcting galleys and page proofs as well as compiling an exhaustive analytical index and finalizing work on maps and illustrations. Volume 3 covers the period 18 October 1778-10 May 1779.

The Writings of Henry D. Thoreau, an NEH-sponsored editorial project which had been at Princeton University since 1972 has moved to the Department of English at the University of California at Santa Barbara with its editor-in-chief, Elizabeth Withrell. Volumes of the edition will continue to be published by Princeton University Press.

The recipients of the 1983-84 NHPRC fellowships in documentary editing and the sponsoring projects are Alison Hirsch (The Papers of William Penn), M. Philip Lucas (The Papers of Andrew Jackson), and Walter Moore (Documentary Relations of the Southwest).

Job Placement

The ADE offers placement assistance to members who may be seeking positions. If you have a position available or if you know of an opening in which an ADE member might be interested, please send such information to:

David W. Hirst
The Papers of Woodrow Wilson
Firestone Library
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08544
Telephone (609) 452-3212

Members who wish to use this service should send 10 copies of a résumé (not to exceed 5 pages) and include a covering letter with additional information for the placement officer.