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I sometimes tease my colleagues in history, English, and other traditional humanities disciplines that they have consistently undervalued the importance libraries have played in their own scholarly lives. To prove my point, I refer to *Name of the Rose*, an award-winning novel published in 1980 in which author Umberto Eco constructs a world of mystery and murder in a fictitious thirteenth-century European monastery. Contained in the monastery is an Aedificium, which houses one of the largest collections of multilingual book manuscripts in the then known world. At the conclusion of the novel, the Aedificium burns to the ground because a disgruntled monk worried that the contents of one particular book he was hiding there would change the world he knew. What if, I ask my humanities colleagues, that Aedificium had actually existed, survived to the present without loss of any materials, and was only recently discovered? Medieval studies would be significantly different; so would all historical studies that grew from it. This is an excellent example of what Michel Foucault calls the influence of the “archive” on “discourse.” Any collection of information materials preserved through the generations will inevitably influence how we interpret the past. Conversely, the absence of information material silences historical voices, which are then lost to history.

That really was the premise grounding my decision to ask Jim Danky in the fall of 2005 how he felt about being sent into retirement in 2007 with a symposium in Madison, Wisconsin, that assessed the influence of the collections he had amassed at that venerable institution, the Wisconsin Historical Society, where he had been employed since 1973. At first he hesitated; he has always been uncomfortable with praise, and he knew how academics like me could mix it into a thick frosting that masked what in his mind was considerably more important, the work he had accomplished at the Society. Before giving me his approval, he decided to consult his
most trusted advisor—wife Christine Schelshorn. She would know if this was a bad idea, he reasoned, that is, one that was more self-serving than productive.

A week later Jim said Christine approved the idea. Together, they authorized me to move ahead with the project as long as it concentrated on work Jim had done at the Historical Society. Together, Jim and I then crafted a plan for the symposium that would be entitled “Alternative Print Culture: Social History and Libraries.” On the one hand it would consist of presentations addressing areas of studies influenced by the collections Jim had put together as Newspapers and Periodicals Librarian at the Society, including women’s studies, African American history, Native American studies, radical and labor history, zines, and the periodicals and serials of the radical left and right. On the other hand, two essays would evaluate the influence of Jim’s own scholarly writings, and the Center for Print Culture History in Modern America, a joint project of the Wisconsin Historical Society and the University of Wisconsin–Madison that he helped establish and then codirect with me between 1992 and 2002, and after I left Madison in January 2003, he directed himself until October 2006, when Christine Pawley took over as his successor.

Finding authors for these essays was easy; they would be drawn from the scores of scholars who had come to Madison to study the very collections Jim had amassed, and whose own scholarship referenced these collections repeatedly. Not only were these scholars lifelong friends, they also knew how, as one scholar put it, “those odd periodicals and books” Jim had been collecting for decades gave voice to historically marginalized groups on the periphery of dominant cultures, and thus influenced the directions of scholarly study in their own research areas.

Once we put an initial plan together, I contacted the editors of Library Trends. With the understanding that the essays would concentrate on Jim’s work, they quickly agreed to publish the proceedings, to be co-guest edited by me and Christine Pawley. Christine had willingly joined our team of planners when she arrived on the Madison campus in September 2006, and in several months generated the funds necessary to bring speakers together for a “Dankyfest” on April 13–14, 2007. The volume you hold in your hand constitutes the proceedings of that symposium. In a sense, this is a story of the amazing “Aedificum” Jim built with limited funds at the Wisconsin Historical Society in his thirty-five-year career there. And although I’ve known Jim for more than two decades, in those two days I learned much more about how the unique collections of information materials he had collected at the Society have influenced historical research than I did from the many conversations we had over those years. That is testimony not only to Jim’s modesty, but also to the influence of his professional practice. By putting together this issue of Library Trends, Christine and I hope it will demonstrate to coming generations of library
professionals the quiet but awesome power library collecting practices can exercise on society in general, and scholarly study in particular.

James Philip Danky was born and raised in Los Angeles, and somehow found his way to Ripon College, where he graduated with a degree in history and philosophy in 1970. From there he gravitated to the University of Wisconsin–Madison Library School, where he received a master’s degree in 1973. Upon graduation he was hired by the Wisconsin Historical Society (then the State Historical Society of Wisconsin) and became Newspapers and Periodicals Librarian. In that position he has been awarded more than $3.8 million in grants, including five from the National Endowment for the Humanities that funded the United States Newspaper Project from 1982 to 1989, and the African-American Periodicals and Newspapers Project from 1989 to 2001. The latter resulted in *African-American Newspapers and Periodicals: A National Bibliography*, published by Harvard University Press.

Along the way Jim has also been awarded the Bowker/Ulrich’s Serials Librarianship Award in 1987 and the Isadore Gilbert Mudge–R.R. Bowker Award in 2002, both given by the American Library Association, was declared a “Media Hero” by the Institute for Alternative Journalism in 1993, was Resident Fulbright Scholar at the British Library in 1991, named a Fellow at the W. E. B. Du Bois Institute for Afro-American Research at Harvard from 1997 to 1999, elected a member of the American Antiquarian Society in 1996, and in 1994 was justifiably named Distinguished Alumnus of the University of Wisconsin–Madison’s School of Library and Information Studies.

**Note**
1. In 2001 the State Historical Society of Wisconsin changed its name to the Wisconsin Historical Society.
The Write Stuff: U.S. Serial Print Culture from Conservatives out to Neo-Nazis

CHIP BERLET

ABSTRACT
Insufficient scholarly attention has been devoted to alternative or “oppositional” serials from the political right, even though a number of scholars have used these materials as primary sources for studies in several academic disciplines. This overview reviews some of the terms used to describe these serials, explores the development of distinct post–WWII right-wing ideologies, and proposes that these serials usefully can be analyzed through a sociological lens as movement literature that both reflects and shapes different sectors through frames and narratives. How oppositional serials can play a role in constructing rhetorical pipelines and echo chambers to take movement grievances and push them into mainstream political policy initiatives is explored. The sectors defined and examined are the secular right, religious right, and xenophobic right. Examples from each sector are provided, with selected periodicals highlighted in detail.

Conservatives generally cannot tolerate neo-Nazis. The feeling is mutual. Much wood pulp is expended as they denounce each other in print periodicals. The great bulk of print material from the U.S. political right, however, is devoted to attacks on politicians, political liberals, and progressives. Just which perceived left-wing policies and programs are considered the primary subjects for denunciation depends on the sector of the political right doing the publishing. Conservatives, libertarians, the Christian right, neoconservatives, paleoconservatives, patriots, and the extreme right (folks who tend to dress up in white robes or black uniforms) all maintain distinct print subcultures.

Books, flyers, pamphlets, and posters are part of the right-wing print culture; but by reviewing serial publications in myriad forms we clearly
see that newspapers, magazines, and newsletters provide a lush forest for scholarly analyses of text and image. This study will review oppositional right-wing serials, with an emphasis on describing different print forms within competing political sectors during the post–WWII period. Danky (in press) observes, “Scholarly attention to America’s ideological conservatives, even reactionaries, to say nothing of racists and homegrown fascists, has been scant.” This began to change in the 1980s, as many of the citations herein demonstrate, but the situation is still lopsided.

A librarian will have no trouble finding anthologies of writing from liberal and left alternative serials (see for example Armstrong, 2005; Conlin, 1974; Streitmatter, 2001); or scholarly journal articles about these types of periodicals. A number of libraries collect alternative periodicals, but they are primarily on the political left (see Danky, 1974). The astonishingly detailed service *Alternative Press Index* covers progressive social and political movements. Finding information about alternative serials on the political right is another matter. From time to time someone compiles a list of groups on the political right and includes mentions of their serial titles, but these efforts are either sporadic or incomplete or both. It is difficult to locate scholarly material on the “history or impact of overtly conservative alternative media” (Streitmatter, 1999, p. 11).

Anthologies from mainstream conservative media exist, a specialty of *Reader’s Digest* as a magazine (and who can forget its “Condensed Books” series?). This study, however, is not looking at mainstream conservative serials such as *Reader’s Digest, Forbes, the Wall Street Journal,* or the *Washington Times;* it is looking at alternative conservative and right-wing serials. One such publication, *The Freeman,* produced anthologies from its pages in the 1970s, but this is a rarity among these periodicals. There are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of right-wing alternative serials. “The books and serial publications produced on the Right have a great variety,” explains Danky (in press), “and perhaps they are only united by their critique of mainstream politics.” Nevertheless, this “critique frequently forms an interior dialogue by which the reader’s world view is authenticated in print” (Danky, in press; see also Danky & Cherney, 1996, 1995). Public collections of right-wing serials are few, and collectors sometimes must scour basements and jimmie open dank archives to conjure up issues of older periodicals on their sinful wish list of historical artifacts; a sad state for society’s scholars. A few archives, however, do collect right-wing oppositional serials. (See online resource listed in unnumbered note.)

The collection of right-wing periodicals at the Wisconsin Historical Society is one of the largest and most current in the United States. Many of the serials were obtained by librarian James P. Danky, who explains that few libraries archive such materials because “most librarians are revolted at the racist stuff, perplexed by the narrow political stuff, and made uncomfortable by the religious stuff.” Some serials posed special challenges
for Danky. One rejected participation in what they called the “jew-com-mie banking system,” and required a money order. “The Massachusetts libertarians refused our check” from a state agency “because they did not want to receive funds that the state had stolen from the people through taxation,” recalls Danky, while another “refused any payment other than gold or pre-composite silver coins” (J. P. Danky, personal communication, March 13, 2007).

What Is This Stuff Called?
Librarians are faced with the problem of what to call serials from the rivulets, back eddies, and swamps of the political and intellectual spectrum. Various terms used have included alternative, dissident, oppositional, “ephemera,” “fugitive literature,” and “little magazines.” Danky (in press) prefers the term “oppositional press” as an umbrella way to refer to “non-standard, non-establishment publications which advocate social change through deed or idea.” He admits this is a “relational definition” in which the “oppositional press” is contrasted against “the mainstream press, the proclaimed voice of the majority.”

As ideological winds buffet the body politic, however, what were once oppositional serials sometimes move from the margins to the mainstream. This is clearly the case with the National Review magazine and the Human Events newspaper. Editors and writers for both publications now regularly appear on network news programs as political commentators, an idea that would have been considered alarming in the 1950s. Note that William F. Buckley’s Firing Line television program did not appear until 1966, two years after the Goldwater presidential campaign demonstrated that conservatives were not all vestigial troglodytes, despite the common characterization of them by many liberal periodicals and pundits at the time.

This migration also goes the other way. Consider the case of paleoconservative journalist Samuel Francis, booted from the nation’s capital and the Washington Times daily newspaper in 1995 and sent to the woodshed of the oppositional press for rhetoric deemed too blatantly white supremacist. Until his death in 2005, Francis continued publishing in a variety of right-wing oppositional serials, including Citizens Informer newspaper (Council of Conservative Citizens); Chronicles magazine (Rockford Institute); and Occidental Quarterly, a journal celebrating white culture. In a similar fashion, author Joseph Sobran was exiled from the National Review for antisemitism, and then he turned to writing for oppositional periodicals (“Dirty Dozen,” 2006).

A Brief Magical History Tour
There was a sharp break before and after WWII in the nature of the U.S. political right. “In the early twentieth century, there was no such thing in American politics as a conservative movement,” Judis (2001) explains.
“The right was an unwieldy collection of anti-Semites, libertarians, fascists, racists, anti-New Dealers, isolationists, and Southern agrarians who were incapable of agreeing on anything” (p. 142). It can be hard to imagine today, but as an example, John E. Edgerton, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, was so embedded in the normative white supremacist worldview in the 1930s that he saw no problem with describing southern wage earners as “almost wholly of one blood, one God, and one language. . . . No people on earth love individual liberty, or will make greater sacrifices for it, than . . . those proud Anglo-Saxon elements who constitute the working army of this homogeneous section of the nation” (Edgerton, 1930, p. 6).

Obviously there were right-wing publications prior to the 1950s, and some continued publishing across this transitional period, including *Human Events, The Freeman, The Cross and the Flag*, and others.

After WWII a number of conservative publications sought to avoid the rhetoric of overt white racism, and to distance and distinguish themselves from conspiracy theories, which were often antisemitic. Judis (2001) argues that it wasn’t until the mid-1950s that a coherent conservative movement emerged on the political scene:

Its intellectual voice was William F. Buckley, Jr.’s, *National Review* and its political champion was Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater. These conservatives were united by opposition to the New Deal, including Social Security, and to any accommodation with the Soviet Union, which they viewed as an immediate threat to America’s survival. (p. 142)

William A. Rusher was publisher of *National Review* and a leading architect of the new conservative coalition. Schoenwald (2001, p. 258) notes that Rusher wrote an article titled “Crossroads for the GOP” for the February 12, 1963 issue of *National Review* in which Rusher “urged fellow conservatives to take a risk” in order to “break the New Deal Coalition’s lock on the presidency.” Rusher predicted: “It will take courage; it will take imagination; it will compel the GOP to break the familiar mould [sic] that has furnished it with every presidential nominee for a quarter of a century—but it can be done” (as cited in Schoenwald, 2001, p. 258).

Conservatives rallied to the cause of propelling Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater into becoming the 1964 Republican candidate for president. Goldwater was supported by right-wing periodicals that helped network key activists, but the campaign failed to attract a voting block, and Goldwater suffered a stinging and lopsided defeat. The organizers of the Goldwater campaign, however, had laid the foundation for the New Right that emerged in the 1970s and crested into public view with the election of Ronald Reagan in 1980 (Diamond, 1995; Easton, 2000; Ferguson & Rogers, 1986; Himmelstein, 1990; Hodgson, 1996; Schoenwald, 2001).

The already existing right-wing serials gained new energy, readership, and mainstream attention; and a new crop of periodicals were launched
to surf the right-wing wave. In addition to Free Market ideology, some of these publications began to report on conservative opposition to the feminist movement, abortion, and the gay rights movement. These became major themes within the New Right (Faludi, 1992; Hardisty, 1999; Herman, 1997; Mason, 2002). A number of publications also adopted populist-sounding rhetoric to appeal to broader constituencies (Berlet & Lyons, 2000; Frank, 2004; Kazin, 1995; Lakoff, 2002). Genres can shift as the historic moment passes. The theme of anticommunism was popular in the 1950s and 1960s; now it is attacks on liberal secular humanism. Support for segregation has been displaced by opposition to multiculturalism.

Oppositional Serials as Movement Literature

For decades oppositional literature was dismissed by most scholars and librarians as the ranting of a “lunatic fringe.” When the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s garnered national headlines, it also began a process that gained the attention of serious scholars and archivists. Social movements began to be studied not as irrational mob action, but strategic organized attempts to change power relationships and norms in a society. While attention first focused on the political left, eventually it turned to inspect the political right (Danky & Cherney, 1995, 1996; Diamond, 1995; Hixson, 1992).

Social movements are built around some sense of shared grievances seen as justifying collective action such as public protests, meetings, or confrontations (Buechler, 2000; Gamson, 1990, 1995; Oberschall, 1973). According to McAdam and Snow (1997), a social movement is composed of a group of people acting collectively “with some degree of organization and continuity outside of institutional channels for the purpose of promoting or resisting change in the group, society, or world order of which it is a part” (p. xviii). When a social movement is involved in policymaking, legislative work, or election campaigns, it is working both inside and outside of institutional channels, and thus incorporates or allies with political movements (Gamson, 1990). In order to be effective, a social movement needs to construct coherent and compelling ideological arguments; frames of reference to portray a grievance as justified and needing resolution; and narrative stories that mobilize listeners into recruits, and recruits into active and loyal participants. All of these elements—ideology, frames, and narratives—are employed in the text circulated in serials and other movement literature.

Frames help translate ideologies into action by crafting culturally-appropriate perspectives from which to view a struggle over power (Gamson 1995; Oliver & Johnston 2000; Zald, 1996). According to Klandermans (1997), the “social construction of collective action frames” involves “public discourse, that is, the interface of media discourse and interpersonal interaction; persuasive communication during mobilization campaigns
by movement organizations, their opponents and countermovement organizations; and consciousness raising during episodes of collective action” (p. 45). Frames can be constructed to appeal to different audiences, including leaders, followers, potential recruits, and the public (Gamson, 1995; Johnston, 1995; Snow, Rochford, Worden, & Benford, 1997). Studying frames helps us understand how social movements attract attention and loyal followers in a society (Goffman, 1959, 1974; Johnston, 1995; Snow & Benford, 1988, 1992).

A narrative in a social movement is simply a story with a plot in which there is a protagonist, and antagonist, and a lesson. The study of narratives reveals much about how heroes and villains are identified by a social movement (J. Davis, 2002; Ewick & Silbey, 1995; Polletta, 1998). Several authors have studied framing in right-wing movements (Berlet, 2001, 2004a; Dobratz & Shanks-Meile, 1996, 1997). Lakoff (2002) links conservatives to a frame that is based on a *Strict Father* ideology, while liberals use a frame based on a *Nurturant Parent* ideology. Brasher has suggested that apocalypticism is a master frame used by a variety of groups, and it is especially prevalent in the Christian right (Brasher & Berlet, 2004).

In its most generic sense an “apocalypse” is some type of transformative cataclysmic event or confrontation that has historic significance and during which important hidden truths are revealed. People immersed in apocalyptic expectation often feel that time is running out and they must immediately alert the community so that proper preparations can be made (Boyer, 1992; Cohn, 1970, 1993; Fuller, 1995; O’Leary, 1994; Quinby, 1994; Strozier, 1994). Although it is not always the case, some apocalyptic movements (also called millennialist or millenarian movements) produce frames and narratives that involve demonization and scapegoating, often accompanied by conspiracy theories about sinister plots by secret elites (Barkun, 1997, 2003; Berlet & Lyons, 2000; Fuller, 1995; Lamy, 1996).

The resulting conspiracy theories have appeared periodically throughout U.S. history; and today are common in the Christian right and xenophobic right, especially in the subsector called here the *extreme right* (Barkun, 2003; Curry & Brown, 1972; D. B. Davis, 1972; Goldberg, 2001; Hofstadter, 1965; Pipes, 1997). This conspiracist worldview appears repeatedly in right-wing oppositional serials, ranging from muted suggestions, to text that palpitates with paranoia. During the twentieth century, it was common to find hyperbolic allegations that liberal elites were in league with communist or anarchist subversives (Kovel, 1994).

Here it is useful to cite one of the bedrock contentions of sociology, *Thomas’ Theory*, which states “situations defined as real are real in their consequences” (Thomas & Thomas, 1970, pp. 154–155). What this means is that if one read for years that liberals, homosexuals, and abortionists are agents of Satan devoted to the destruction of the United States and all that is holy—and one believed it to be true—one would not only vote based on
this belief, but carry it into one’s political activism and social interaction in your local community. This precise narrative is circulated in parts of the Christian right, but not in most parts of the political right. To understand the range of ideas in right-wing serials we will first have to agree on the terms we use to describe different categories, at least in this article.

**Differentiating Sectors of the Political Right**

How to categorize different sectors of the political right has been debated by scholars for many decades. Eatwell has proposed looking at different “styles of thought,” which he outlined as the reactionary right, moderate right, radical right, new right, and extreme right (Eatwell, 1990). In her study of right-wing politics in the United States, Diamond (1995) paid special attention to the Christian right, neoconservatives, and the racist right, including a chapter on “Americanist Movements and Racist Nationalism.”

Several authors see the terrain of the political right as divided into reformist and militant wings, with a dissident sector between mainstream conservatives and the extreme right (Berlet & Lyons, 2000; Betz, 1994; Betz & Immerfall, 1998; Mudde, 2000). Durham (2000, pp. 181–182) calls these three groupings conservatives, the radical right, and the extreme right. He suggests that too many observers lump various right-wing activists into the extreme right unfairly, or exaggerate the role of the extreme right within the broader political right (see also Mudde, 2000, pp. 5–24). Danky & Cherney (1995, 1996), in one of the few serious studies of right-wing publishing, divided their selections into “Family Oriented,” “Single-Issue Publications,” “Political Commentary with a Gold and Silver Focus,” “Constitutionalist Publications,” “Civilian Militia Publications,” and “Racist/ Anti-Semitic Publications.”

All of these lenses provide useful ways of categorizing the political right, and there is no one proper way to assign labels. Using sociological frames and narratives as a guide, I choose to discuss the following categories and highlight the primary grievance of the social movements with which they are allied. Table 1 is based on a Chart of Sectors developed by Political Research Associates (PRA), where I work.

The **secular right** is reformist and closest to mainstream institutions. Social movement activists within it are mostly seeking to increase their leverage as part of a political movement working within the Republican Party. The **religious right** is a more dissenting and oppositional social movement, but since the late 1970s has been influential in the Republican Party as part of a larger political movement. The **xenophobic right** is deeply suspicious of the Republican Party. The term **extreme right** will be used here to describe “militant insurgent groups that reject democracy, promote a conscious ideology of supremacy, and support policies that would negate basic human rights for members of a scapegoated group.” (Berlet, 2004b, p. 22).
Rhetorical Pipelines and Echo Chambers
Most secular right and religious right serials are related in some way to a specific electoral political movement. Among Christian theocrats, as well as in most of the xenophobic right, the more overtly oppositional and suspicious themes lead many away from active participation in the electoral or legislative institutional channels utilized by political movements. Some secular right and religious right serials are well-funded by foundations or wealthy individuals as part of a larger network of think tanks and media outlets (Callahan, 1999; Covington, 1997; Krehely, House, & Kernan, 2004). This has been especially true since the rise to institutional power of the new right. Schulman studied how right wing foundations subsidized their movement serials compared to the funding of leftist movement serials. Between 1990 and 1993 four influential leftist movement serials (The Nation, The Progressive, In These Times, and Mother Jones) received just under $270,000. In the same period four influential conservative serials (The National Interest, The Public Interest, The New Criterion, and American Spectator) received a total of $2.7 million in grants (Schulman, 1995).

To be sure, many serials on the political right depend on small individual subscriptions and/or donations (or are financed out of the pocket of the publisher, just like on the left), but the difference in foundation funding cited above plays an enormous role in amplifying the voice of the

Table 1: Selected Sectors of the Political Right

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>SubSectors</th>
<th>Primary Grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secular</td>
<td>Corporate Internationalists</td>
<td>State Intervention in Economic Realm, National Defense, Tradition, Law and Order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Nationalists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Libertarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Security Militarists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neoconservatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>Christian Conservatives</td>
<td>Gender, Sexual Identity, Sexuality, Morality, Marriage, Traditional “Family Values”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian Nationalists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian Theocrats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophobic</td>
<td>Patriot Movement</td>
<td>Elite Conspiracies, Political Corruption, Repression, Tyranny, Ethnic Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paleoconservatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Nationalists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme Right</td>
<td>Race, White Bloodlines, Jewish Conspiracies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
oppositional press on the political right. Outside funding helped create the network of conservative campus newspapers (Hardisty, 1999, pp. 59, 214). Even when underfunded or overlooked by the mainstream reader, however, oppositional serials can still play an important role in building cohesion in a social movement. And oppositional serials can help link the broad mobilization of social movement participants with the narrow electoral and legislative goals of political movement strategists by sending voters to the polls with a script that also can be used for constituent lobbying and letter-writing campaigns. In addition, rhetoric produced and refined in right-wing serials and other oppositional media can migrate into more mainstream outlets. According to Danky & Hennessy (1985), alternative right-wing serials have assisted “the general rightward movement in America” (p. 6).

An example began life as an article titled “Theocracy, Theocracy, Theocracy” by Ross Douthat in the August-September 2006 issue of First Things, a journal published by the Institute on Religion and Public Life, with Richard John Neuhaus as Editor-In-Chief. Douthat complained that liberal critics of the Christian right exaggerated the threat to democracy and demonized Christians. Mary Eberstadt picked up this theme in “The Scapegoats Among Us,” appearing in Policy Review (December 2006–January 2007), now published by the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, but founded as the journal of the Heritage Foundation in Washington, DC. Eberstadt cites and quotes from the article by Douthat in First Things, moving the message into the larger and more mainstream readership of Policy Review.

A more extensive example involves right-wing criticism of the environmental movement. The frame established by Free Market enthusiast Ron Arnold for the liberal and left environmental movement was that it was an irrational antibusiness and anti-industry operation run by cynical and well-funded nonprofit professionals and generating a core group of “eco-terrorists” (Berlet, 1998; Helvarg, 1994; Ramos, 1995). This frame is central to Arnold’s reputation and his role at the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise (CDFE) in Bellevue, Washington, a “Wise Use” advocacy group in which Arnold has long played a top leadership role. The CDFE Web site proudly cites an award Arnold received for his “8-part series The Environmental Battle,” and notes his “1983 investigative report for Reason magazine on EcoTerrorism remains the classic in the field” (CDFE, 2007).

This article firmly established the frame that highlighted the most militant environmentalist tactics for the decades that followed—with Arnold emerging as a frequently-quoted expert on the subject. The Wise Use movement was created at an August 1988 Multiple Use Strategy Conference held in Reno, Nevada, and sponsored by the CDFE, with Arnold playing a key role (Helvarg, 1994; Ramos, 1995). Almost immediately, the rhetoric used at the conference began to appear in oppositional periodicals.
In late 1988 right-wing movement, ideologue Merrill Sikorski described environmental activists as “blinded by misinformation, fear tactics, or doomsday syndromes” in an article in the *American Freedom Journal* (Sikorski, 1988–1989, p. 8). Picking up this theme, Virginia I. Postrel wrote “The Green Road to Serfdom,” for the April 1990 issue of the libertarian magazine *Reason*, in which she claimed underlying environmentalism was an ideology every bit as powerful as Marxism and every bit as dangerous to individual freedom and human happiness. Like Marxism, it appeals to seemingly noble instincts: the longing for beauty, for harmony, for peace. It is the green road to serfdom. (p. 22)

That same year Llewellyn H. Rockwell Jr. (1990) called environmentalism “an ideology as pitiless and Messianic as Marxism” in the *From The Right* newsletter published by Patrick Buchanan (p. 1). Edward C. Krug (1991) cited a higher power when he wrote in Hillsdale College’s *Imprimis* that “the core of this environmental totalitarianism is anti-God” (p. 5). This frame was circulated to mainstream daily and weekly newspapers in a syndicated column penned by Walter E. Williams and distributed June 4, 1991. Citing the Rockwell article above, Williams stated: “Since communism has been thoroughly discredited, it has been repackaged and relabeled and called environmentalism,” and that the “radical animal-rights wing of the environmental movement has a lot in common with Hitler’s Nazis” (pp. 3–4). The column swept back into the oppositional press in July when it appeared in *Summit Journal* (p. 3), but now instead of being an assertion from movement ideologues, it was the view of a mainstream columnist.

A similar process of rhetorical migration was decried by the Clinton administration, which traced the source of many attacks on the beleaguered president to a network of oppositional right-wing media, including print serials and websites. The office of the White House Counsel even prepared a memo titled “Communication Stream of Conspiracy Commerce,” which tracked specific lurid (and generally later found to be false) allegations (White House [Clinton administration], 1995; see detailed discussion in Berlet & Lyons, 2000, pp. 310–320). The right-wing watchdog group Citizens United, run by Floyd G. Brown, had a general newsletter, *Citizens Agenda*, but added a special focus newsletter, *Clinton Watch*. Jerry Falwell joined in, with attacks on Clinton appearing in his *National Liberty Journal*, and *The Falwell Fax*. Citizens for Honest Government, launched by Pat Matrisciana, published the serial *Citizen’s Intelligence Digest*, but the group became best known for its attack video, *The Clinton Chronicles*, which was followed by a book, cleverly named *The Clinton Chronicles Book*, edited by Matrisciana (1994). Lyons and I traced just a small part of this overlapping network, which included authors who regularly published in the right-wing oppositional press (Berlet & Lyons, 2000, p. 319). A number of alarming allegations against Clinton came from people funded or

When a social movement has a healthy and energetic set of media, including print serials, what is established is an interconnected set of rhetorical pipelines and echo chambers that amplify and repeat the messages and carry the ideology of the group into the mainstream society where it competes with other ideologies to become established as “common sense.” This is how President Franklin D. Roosevelt became the godfather of “Big Government” and “Tax and Spend Liberals.”

**Round Up the Usual Serials**

*Secular*

The flagship post–WWII secular conservative serial is the magazine *National Review*. While the country moved to the political right, *National Review* moved toward the center simply by not changing. Still, it remains oppositional in its editorial stance. *Human Events*, a newspaper, plays a similar role, although it is a rhetorical dirt bike to Buckley’s Rolls Royce. While these two serials are published independently, many publications are attached to the array of national and state think tanks and advocacy organizations that flourished as the political right gained power.

Some of the larger organizations maintain two serials, one from the political action arm and one from the nonprofit foundation arm. An example is *National Right to Work*, the newsletter of the National Right to Work Committee, and its sister, *Foundation Action*, the newsletter of the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation. Phyllis Schlafly, who founded the Eagle Forum, circulates the *Phyllis Schlafly Report*, but also publishes a topical serial, *Education Reporter*, that describes itself as “the newspaper of Education Rights” that “supports parents’ rights in education, as well as reports what’s happening in education across the country” (Eagle Forum, 2007). Reed Irvine, head of Accuracy in Media edits the *AIM Report* newsletter.

Publications range from the large circulation *America’s 1st Freedom*, official journal of the National Rifle Association; to the smaller magazine *The Federalist Paper* for the Federalist Society of conservative lawyers and law students; to secretive short-run missives like the Council for National Policy’s *The Five Minute Report* (red, white, and blue with black text and gold ink title). Often overlooked as a significant salvo in the culture wars was the *Family Protection Report*, a newsletter published starting in the late 1970s by the predecessor organization to Paul Weyrich’s Free Congress Foundation and edited by Connaught “Connie” Marshner, a skillful antifeminist organizer. An influential secular conservative magazine in the post–WWII period was *Conservative Digest*. Direct-mail guru Richard Viguerie started *Conservative Digest* in 1975 as part of his project of putting together a new
right electoral coalition. For ten years Viguerie published the magazine before turning over the reins in October 1985 to Colorado businessman William Kennedy.

The new direction for the publication was clearly enunciated when it began to run articles not only by writers such as Marshner, but also by Patrick J. Buchanan, and William P. Hoar, a frequent contributor to John Birch Society serials. Brought onboard as a senior editor was John Rees, also a contributor to JBS serials, and a researcher for the Western Goals Foundation run by JBS leader Congressman Larry McDonald. In addition to Rees and Hoar, other senior editors were Howard Phillips, Otto Scott, Cynthia V. Ward, and Weyrich. Reed Larson of the National Right to Work Committee was named a contributing editor, along with a long and broad list of secular and religious right luminaries including Jerry Falwell, George Gilder, Beverly LaHaye, Tim LaHaye, Gary North, Hans F. Sennholz, Llewellyn H. Rockwell Jr., Rousas John Rushdoony, and Phyllis Schlafly. The format went from a standard magazine to the size of Readers Digest, complete with a knockoff of the Digest’s table of contents on the cover. In December 1988, the magazine again changed hands, with the new publishers consisting of a triad: Larry Abraham, Robert H. Krieble, and Harry D. Schultz. Kreible dropped off after one issue. At this time, Weyrich was the lone senior editor with Hoar as executive editor.

In the January/February 1989 issue, Conservative Digest returned to standard magazine size. It ran an affectionate cover story on ultraconservative Senator Jesse Helms, which described the volatile and vituperative solon as “Stouthearted,” and a man of “courage, warmth, and wit.” In the May/June issue, Weyrich attacked the National Education Association in an article on education reform. There was also a full page ad for summer seminars run by the Old Right Foundation for Economic Education, publisher of The Freeman. James R. Whelan became Editor-In-Chief with this issue. The Coors beer company regularly bought full-page full-color ads in Conservative Digest. In political publishing, this is often a way for corporations to subsidize magazines by covering the cost of running other pages with full color, such as covers or inside illustrations. Funds from Coors company profits helped fund the new right, and were key to the creation of the Heritage Foundation and the Free Congress Foundation (Bellant, 1991). Another serial that borders the xenophobic right is the American Sentinel, a newsletter that was briefly renamed Pink Sheet on the Left, and printed on pink paper to recall the contention from the 1950s that some liberals were “Parlor Pink” sympathizers with “Red” communism.

Economic Libertarians Libertarians and Free Market enthusiasts are very unhappy with the Roosevelt administration, especially what is seen as unfair advantages given to labor unions. To this day they argue that labor disputes were pulled out of the court system and handed over to faceless bureaucrats in a federal agency, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB). In 1975,
these actions by Roosevelt still angered rightists, including Sennholz, who in *The Freeman* (1975) claimed the NLRB became prosecutor, judge, and jury, all in one. Labor union sympathizers on the Board further perverted this law, which already afforded legal immunities and privileges to labor unions. The U.S. thereby abandoned a great achievement of Western civilization, equality under the law. (pp. 212–213)

This serial quote from Sennholz was later picked up in a report by Lawrence W. Reed (1998) published by the Mackinac Center for Public Policy (p. 13). Many conservative serials echo some of the sentiments of libertarian serials, with the greatest overlap in the area of defending the free enterprise system and deriding Roosevelt. For example, in its July 2000 issue, *National Right to Work* featured a front page photo of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, portrayed as having nearly destroyed America by fostering the idea of big government.

Typical contemporary libertarian serials include *Reason* (“free minds and free markets”); and *Liberty* (“classical liberal review of thought, culture, and politics”). Serials affiliated with organizations include several from the Cato Institute including *Regulation* magazine, *Cato Journal*, *Policy Report*, and *Cato’s Letter*, both newsletters. *Liberty & Law* is the newsletter of the national Institute for Justice, while *City Journal* is published by the Manhattan Institute. A number of state-level libertarian policy institutes also publish a range of periodicals.

**Neoconservatives** The neoconservatives, according to PRA, believe the “egalitarian social liberation movements of the 1960s and 1970s undermined the national consensus” and therefore “intellectual oligarchies and political institutions preserve democracy from mob rule.” In terms of foreign policy, neoconservatives assert the “United States has the right to intervene in its perceived interests anywhere in the world” (PRA, n.d., Chart of Sectors; see also Gerson, 1997; Halper & Clarke, 2004). A leading neoconservative magazine is the glossy full-color *Weekly Standard*, which in 2001 and 2002 featured numerous covers promoting the idea that war in the Middle East was inevitable. The *Public Interest* is in the format of a bound 6x9 journal, while *First Things* has a journal flavor in a bound 8x11 size. *Commentary*, from the American Jewish Committee, started with a liberal outlook, but morphed toward the right, following the political trajectory of the neoconservative movement, which the magazine helped create. This shift prompted the creation of *Tikkun* magazine as “the liberal alternative to Commentary” (Lerner, n.d.).

**Religious**
The religious right in the United States includes members of faiths other than Christian, but they are a tiny minority in this sector, and the focus here
is on conservative Protestant evangelicals and fundamentalists, and conservative Catholics, some of whom identify as evangelicals or “traditionalists.” The Christian right is a social movement drawn from Christian conservatives, nationalists, and theocrats, many of whom are also apocalyptic.

Christian Conservatives After WWII a number of evangelicals were networked through a print and radio subculture that escaped the attention of many Americans except when the Rev. Billy Graham surfaced in news reports. “Evangelical publications were important” to this religiously based social movement, explains Diamond (1995), especially since “television had not yet become the dominant medium” (p. 98). Diamond singles out two serials as especially significant: Christian Economics and Christianity Today (pp. 98–99). Graham started Christianity Today in 1956 and it “quickly became the flagship publication of mainstream evangelicalism” (Martin, 1996, p. 42)

Christian Economics was founded in 1950 and sent free to some 175,000 ministers. It was published by the Christian Freedom Foundation (CFF), a significant precursor to the contemporary Christian right. The Pew family of Sun Oil wealth was the primary funder of the CFF, with J. Howard Pew himself launching the group with a $50,000 grant. Hundreds of thousands of dollars poured into CFF from the Pew family, topping $2 million by the end of the 1960s (Diamond, 1995, pp. 98–99; Forster & Epstein, 1964; Saloma, 1984, pp. 53–54). The Pew Memorial Trust went on to be one of the top funders of the new right (Covington, 1997, p. 35). In his classic study The Protestant Ethic and the “Spirit” of Capitalism (1905/2000), Weber (2000) explored the symbiosis between the two. In CFF rhetoric, social security is described as “the older generation stealing from the younger,” the income tax is branded as “Communist doctrine,” labor unions are described as “stemming from Socialism,” and foreign aid is pilloried as subsidization of “Socialistic schemes and experiments” (Forster & Epstein, 1964, p. 267).

The connection between the Christian right and libertarianism can be illustrated by tracking how the work of influential libertarian philosopher Ludwig von Mises flowed among these two overlapping sectors of the political right. In 1946 von Mises, already a well-known economist became an American citizen and was made a staff member at the Foundation for Economic Education, publisher of The Freeman. He was also appointed to a National Association of Manufacturers commission on economics. For many years von Mises was a regular contributor to The Freeman. The work of von Mises first appeared in CFF’s Christian Economics in 1950, the same year he wrote an essay, “The Alleged Injustice of Capitalism,” for the publication Faith and Freedom, published by the Christian right group Spiritual Mobilization (Mises, 1950).

Roosevelt’s New Deal again was the target in this article, with von Mises asserting that what “made the United States become the most affluent country of the world was the fact that the ‘rugged individualism’ of the years before the New Deal did not place too serious obstacles in the way of enterprising men” (Mises, 1960). The Foundation for Economic Education then reprinted the von Mises article in their journal, The Freeman; and then included it in their book Essays on Liberty (Mises, 1960/1996).

The next year, von Mises addressed the spring meeting of the Christian Freedom Foundation, and continued to write articles for both Christian Economics and The Freeman for several years. He also wrote for Buckley’s National Review, American Opinion, (published by the John Birch Society), and The Intercollegiate Review (from the ultraconservative Intercollegiate Studies Institute). In this example we see how one author can write for the serials of two different sectors: the Christian right, and the libertarian wing of conservatism. In both sectors the movement serials are an important educational vehicle for social movement members and adherents. The Freeman remains the quintessential libertarian serial, launching volume 57 in 2007.

Carrying on this tradition from a religious perspective is the Mindszenty Report, a newsletter guarding the ramparts of civilized society against communism and atheism. Named after Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary, it is published from a Catholic perspective by a foundation run by Eleanor Schlafly, sister-in-law of Phyllis. Volume 59 began in 2007.


Abortion is a theme covered in many contemporary Christian right serials, with cover stories such as “25 Years, 35 Million Dead,” Focus on the Family (January 1998); and “Abortion’s 2nd Victim,” Family Voice, Concerned Women for America (January 1999). Sexuality is another common concern, with the cover story in Discipleship Journal for January-February 2007 on “Sex.” The September–October 2004 cover of the Promise Keepers magazine New Man was on “Why Gay Marriage Will Hurt America,”
sporting a photo of a wedding cake with two grooms. *New Man*’s cover in July-August 2006 featured three athletic outdoorsmen and the title “Edge-testosterone: Why God Wired You for Risk.” Sometimes these magazines stretch their boundaries. In November–December 1997 the *New Man*’s cover story was “Sexism: What Are the Feminists Trying to Tell Us?” Focus on the Family’s youth-oriented *Plugged In* featured a February 2007 cover story on the “American Idol” audition reality TV show.

**Apocalypticism** A surprisingly large number of Christian conservatives believe that Jesus Christ might return in his second coming during their lifetime (Boyer, 1992; Fuller, 1995; Strozier, 1994). They can subscribe to a variety of apocalyptic serials. Author Hal Lindsey set off much apocalyptic speculation in 1970 with the first of his many books on the approaching End Times, based on his reading of the prophesies in the Bible, especially the Book of Revelation. This theological viewpoint is called *Premillennial Dispensationalism*, and LaHaye’s variant involves the idea of a *Rapture* prior to the *Tribulation*, which means he expects devout Christians to be evacuated from Earth by God before the sinful are punished (Boyer, 1992; Lindsey, 1970). Tim LaHaye, a minister, family counselor, and author, has become a highly visible proponent of this view, into which he inserts a large dose of conspiracism. LaHaye is coauthor of the Left Behind series of novels. *Pre-Trib Perspectives* is a newsletter that essentially consists of two major articles in each issue; one from Tim LaHaye and the other by his associate, Thomas Ice.

President Roosevelt, according to LaHaye in *Pre-Trib Perspectives*, was part of a plot to subvert America with the help of Godless secular humanists who secretly manipulate the news media, the entertainment industry, the universities, and even the court system. These evil forces have turned the “American constitution upside down,” LaHaye (2003) asserts, in order to “use our freedoms to promote pornography, homosexuality, immorality, and a host of evils characteristic of the last days” (p. 2). “I have no question the devil is behind what the apostle Paul called ‘the wisdom (philosophy) of this world’ and controls many of our courts and other areas of influence,” writes LaHaye, who suggests the devil himself supervised the “crafty election of Franklin D. Roosevelt as president for twelve years” (p. 2). According to LaHaye (1999): “All thinking people in America realize an anti-Christian, anti-moral, and anti-American philosophy permeates this country and the world” (p. 1). In the issue of *Pre-Trib Perspectives* following the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, LaHaye (2001) wrote that they might “contribute to the fulfillment of several . . . end-times signs” (p. 3). A few months later he claimed “the religion of Islam has always been a terrorist religion” (2002, p. 1).

**Christian Nationalism** Some Christian-oriented serials project more nationalistic constitutionalist themes similar to those found in the Patriot sector. *Rutherford* magazine is published by the Rutherford Institute founded
The ideological theme and tone of the institute has migrated over time, always attempting to portray itself as more mainstream than it appears to its critics. The *Rutherford* magazine regularly runs broad-based articles to buttress its claim that it is merely the conservative mirror of the American Civil Liberties Union, just representing the interests of people of faith. The September 1996 issue (with a cover story titled “Politics & Religion: A Recipe for Disaster”) contains interviews with mainstream political commentators.

The August 1995 issue of *Rutherford*, however, was devoted to the theme of “A Nation on the Edge,” with an article claiming that the government response following the Oklahoma City bombing in April of that year “served to underline many Americans’ greatest fear: a strong-armed government moving the country toward a dictatorial state” (Chuvala, 1995, p. 9). That same issue features an uncritical interview with early militia leader Linda Thompson (“Corrupt and Criminal,” 1995).

While advising against violent dissent, Whitehead (1995), writing in the same issue, clearly indicates dissent is needed against current government practices, and is quick to find blame for government abuses of force: “Sadly, the specter of statist violence is now rearing its ugly head in so-called free nations, including the United States” (p. 13). Paul Weyrich rounds out the issue of *Rutherford* magazine with a litany of all the reasons he hates government under Clinton and his liberal allies. Claiming “Liberals have dominated politics in this country for more than sixty years,” Weyrich (1995) paints a paranoid picture of life in the United States where “God-fearing, law-abiding, taxpaying citizens” live under a statist globalist tyranny (p. 16). He suggests a government under this type of repressive liberal rule “will deserve the hatred of God and its people” (p. 16).

**Catholic Traditionalists** While Protestant evangelical serials often get the most attention, there are a number of ultraconservative Catholic serials, including the general interest newspaper, *The Wanderer*, *Crisis* magazine, and the topical *Human Life Review*. *Fidelity* magazine went through its own reformation, following the path of its founder, E. Michael Jones, who “began using the term ‘Kulturkampf’” to describe the struggle he perceived as necessary, “and after 15 years, *Fidelity* evolved into *Culture Wars*” (Culture Wars, 2007). Jones has a worldview that is both hard line and highly intellectual, not someone to dismiss lightly, although many will be troubled by his views.

Jones also has a knack for dressing up his articles with distinctive headlines: “God and Mammon at Notre Dame” (July, 1982); “Iphigenia at the Abortion Clinic” (December, 1982); “Music and Morality: Richard Wagner’s Adultery, the Loss of Tonality and the Beginning of Our Cultural Revolution” (December, 1992); “Odium Theologicum: Slouching toward SeculAasm with Their Pants Around Their Ankles” (November, 1992); and “The Sum-
mer of ’65: Or, How Contraceptives Cause Drive-by Shootings” (February, 1996). Jones also attracted a long list of luminaries as authors, including Connaught Marshner, “Family Politics” (July, 1984); Phyllis Schlafly, “Abortion and the Honor Code at West Point” (September, 1982); and R. J. Rushdoony, “Attack against the Family” (February, 1982).8

In 2006, the Southern Poverty Law Center charged that several Catholic traditionalist groups spread antisemitism, often tied to conspiracy theories about Jewish power. Singled out were several serials, including *Culture Wars*, *The Fatima Crusader*, *The Angelus*, and *The Remnant* (Beirich, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2006d; “Dirty Dozen,” 2006). Note that the ultraconservative *Crisis* magazine has long condemned this type of antisemitism. Some of these serials are hard to locate. When Actor Mel Gibson was accused of antisemitism, it was Danky who provided reporters with the clearly antisemitic traditionalist Catholic newsletter published by Mel’s father, Hutton Gibson, *The War Is Now!*, which could not be found in any other library (J. P. Danky, personal communication, March 13, 2007).

Christian Theocracy The late R. J. Rushdoony was the intellectual leader of a new reformationist tendency within Protestantism called *Christian reconstructionism* (Clarkson, 1997). It sparked a move toward *Dominionism* in the Christian right (Diamond, 1995). Serials in this Dominionist sector include *Crosswinds: The Reformation Digest*; *Chalcedon Report*; and *The Counsel of Chalcedon*.

Xenophobic Patriot Movement The largest subsector of the xenophobic right, the Patriot movement, is marked by a belief that “secret elites control the government and banks” and that the “government plans repression to enforce elite rule or global collectivism.” This sector produced the armed militias in the 1990s. They are suspicious of globalism and international cooperation (PRA, n.d., Chart of Sectors). They sometimes describe themselves as Americanist or Constitutionalist. Some have evolved complicated theories about gold, silver, and currency (Danky & Cherney, 1996, 1995).

The most significant organization in this sector is the John Birch Society (JBS), founded in 1959 by Robert Welch. As explained in the JBS magazine *The New American*, “Welch launched an unprecedented movement to expose and rout the worldwide collectivist conspiracy” (Jasper, 2003). Two earlier serials folded into *The New American* were *American Opinion*, a magazine aimed at a more general audience, and *The Review of the News*, a smaller magazine for a more committed audience. *American Opinion* itself sprang from a small sporadic newsletter published by Welch prior to founding the JBS and titled *One Man’s Opinion*. Robert Welch died in 1985, but the JBS rebounded after a period of decline, and today the organization continues its mission (Berlet & Lyons, 2000, pp. 177–185). Major targets of the JBS include
government regulations and labor unions. In the 1970s, articles in JBS serials sported titles such as “OSHISTAPO—Warning: It’s Against the Law to Have an Accident!” (American Opinion, October, 1975), and “Big Labor and the Congress” (The Review of the News, October 6, 1976). Both of these articles were republished as pamphlets. The JBS had a thriving reprint publishing enterprise, taking articles from its magazines and producing over five hundred different handouts.9

In 1984 Reed Larson, head of the antiunion National Right to Work Committee, gave an exclusive interview to the John Birch Society publication Review of the News. The interviewer was John Rees, a researcher and editor for the Western Goals Foundation. Described as a “Fighter for Worker Rights,” Larson picked up the New Deal theme and denounced union officials for using their power “on the side of collectivism, more government, less individual freedom, and greater control of the individual” (Rees, 1984, p. 39). Rees wrote numerous articles for Birch Society publications after being exposed as a right-wing snoop who infiltrated various left-wing groups and published lurid claims in his private intelligence newsletter, Information Digest. When President Ronald Reagan claimed the U.S. nuclear freeze movement was essentially a communist front, the president was forced to back down because reporters could find no evidence to support the alarmist claim, which it turned out had originated with a Rees article (Berlet, 1993; Rosenfeld, 1983).

The Birch Society is always on the lookout for conspiracies (Mintz, 1985). JBS serials were warning of a plot by liberal globalists to forge a “New World Order,” decades before that phrase was adopted by sectors of the right and left to summarize their concerns over foreign policy and overseas military excursions by the U.S. government. For example, in 1974, Gary Allen warned of “Rockefeller: Campaigning for the New World Order” in a reprint from American Opinion (February); and on February 26, 1991, The New American ran a two-page poster on President George H. W. Bush and his quotes featuring the phrase (1974, pp. 22–23).

Paleoconservative The subsector calling itself paleoconservative uses this term to signify their allegiance to the pre-WWII “Old Right.” Paleoconservatives can play a bridging role into the ideologies of the white nationalists and extreme right because they sometimes drift into rhetoric that invokes old white supremacist and antisemitic attitudes from the old right. Mintz argues that there was a longstanding symbiosis between the Patriot movement John Birch Society (JBS) and the extreme right Liberty Lobby around the nature of the conspiracy they both perceived. The JBS generally tried to resist the siren song of antisemitic conspiracism, but sometimes it crossed the line. The Liberty Lobby, on the other hand, tried to mask its essentially racist and antisemitic conspiracy theories. This made drawing distinction between the two groups more difficult (Mintz, 1985, especially pp. 141–162).
The Rockwell-Rothbard Report is a prime example of a paleoconservative serial. Murray N. Rothbard also helped create several journals, Left and Right, the Journal of Libertarian Studies, and the Review of Austrian Economics. When Rothbard died in 1995, the libertarian Ludwig von Mises Institute posted a cyber shrine to his work on their Web site, including an extensive bibliography that also lists articles Rothbard wrote for the Institute’s more benign serial, The Free Market. Llewellyn H. Rockwell Jr. founded and is the president of the Alabama-based von Mises Institute, and vice president of the Center for Libertarian Studies in California.¹⁰

The antipathy between neoconservatives and paleoconservatives is exemplified by an incident in 1989 in which the increasingly neocon writer Richard John Neuhaus was tossed out of his New York City branch office (his belongings were actually dumped curbside) after he criticized the increasingly paleocon editors of Chronicles, published by the Rockford Institute in Illinois, which funded Neuhaus’s work. Neuhaus had suggested the Chronicles editors be more sensitive to the appearance of xenophobia in the form of articles that appeared to invoke white supremacist or antisemitic themes (Rockford File, 1992; “Unpleasant Business,” 1989).

White Nationalism Patrick Buchanan is often seen as a paleoconservative, but he dabbles in white racial nationalism. In 2002 Buchanan joined Scott McConnell and Taki Theodoracopulos to found The American Conservative magazine. This serial is hard to classify because it mixes xenophobic themes from the Patriot movement, Paleoconservatism, and White Nationalism, along with appeals to progressive leftists to join the cause, especially in opposition to globalization benefiting large international corporations. Since one of their major themes is stopping the immigration of people of color (the editors would deny this), we place them in this sector. Other periodicals with a core racial nationalist theme include Citizens Informer; Occidental Quarterly; and The Nationalist Times, which in many ways is a veiled vehicle for extreme right views on race.

Extreme Right Serials on the extreme right are a diverse lot, yet in terms of their overt bigotry are more predictable and less collectable. Supplemental information is in the section on scholars using serials as primary sources (below), and in the online list (see unnumbered note). Extreme right groups are usually built around the concept of white supremacy, but most groups in this sector also use frames and narratives that portray Jews as involved in sinister conspiracies against the common good (Billig, 1990; Cohn, 1996; Postone, 1986; Smith, 1996). This antisemitism often invokes or echoes the infamous hoax document, the Protocols of the Elders of Zion (Cohn, 1996). White supremacy, conspiracism and antisemitism can be found in other sectors, but it is seldom a primary theme as it is in the extreme right (Berlet, 2004b; Mintz, 1985). (For an overview of the contemporary white supremacist movement, see Berlet & Vystosky, 2006.)
Various Ku Klux Klan units sporadically publish newspapers or other serials, with an example being *The Klansman* newspaper, published by the Invisible Empire, Knights of the Ku Klux Klan in the 1980s. George Lincoln Rockwell of the National Socialist White People’s Party founded the *White Power* newspaper in 1967, shortly before his assassination. The paper outlived Rockwell, circulating at least into the mid-1970s. *The Cross and the Flag*, started by Wisconsin native Gerald L. K. Smith in 1942, became the official magazine of the Christian Nationalist Crusade. It continued to circulate after his death in 1976 with his wife as publisher. The April 1977 issue celebrated its thirty-fifth anniversary with a “Literature List” including numerous antisemitic books and tracts available for purchase by mail order (pp. 18–21). In the mid-1960s, issues of *The Councilor*, a newspaper of the white segregationist Citizens Council of Louisiana, portrayed the civil rights struggle as just another chapter in the longstanding Judeo-Bolshevik conspiracy (see, for example, the issues of July 16, 1964; September 14, 1964; April 9, 1965; April 30, 1965; October 6, 1965; August 15, 1966). Similar antisemitic material appears in contemporary serials such as *The Truth at Last* and *Jew Watch*. In the 1980s, David Duke tried to mask overt bigotry in the *NAAWP News*, published by his group, the National Association for the Advancement of White People. Louis Beam is a former KKK leader who allied with Christian Identity Pastor Richard Butler, who founded the Aryan Nations compound in Hayden Lake, Idaho, the site of his Church of Jesus Christ Christian. Butler and Beam built a national white supremacist coalition and communications network in the 1980s (for background on this period, see Aho, 1990; Corcoran, 1995; on Christian identity, see Barkun, 1997). Beam first published the influential guerilla essay “Leaderless Resistance” in a 1983 issue of the *Inter-Klan Newsletter & Survival Alert* published from the Aryan Nations compound. Beam credits the idea to Col. Ulius Louis Amoss, editor of the serial *ISI General Report*, published by International Services of Information in the 1950s. Beam, in the early 1980s, was among the first extreme right leaders to see the benefit for the extreme right to use computerized online communications systems (Stern, 2000). Beam’s essays—“Announcing Aryan Nations/Ku Klux Klan Computer Net” and “Computers and the American Patrio”—about this wave of the future appeared in two 1984 issues of the *Alert*. Tom Metzger founded the White Aryan Resistance organization in 1983, and published a newspaper based on their acronym WAR during the 1980s and 1990s. After legal troubles in the mid-1990s, a new serial emerged with a new editor, under the name *The Insurgent*, which proudly proclaims it is “the most racist newspaper in the world” (http://www.resist.com).

*The Seekers* was a newsletter aimed at and sent free to prisoners, edited by the late Richard Snell. At first glance it appears to be a Christian right
serial of the apocalyptic genre. It was actually a recruiting tool of white supremacist and antisemitic prison organizers, some of whom worked with the Aryan Brotherhood. Snell was executed on April 19, 1995, by the state of Arkansas for the 1984 murder of black state police trooper Louis Bryant. Snell’s death (and several other events) was commemorated by Timothy McVeigh, who chose that day to blow up the Federal Building in Oklahoma City (Hamm, 1997, pp. 1–33; Pankratz, 1997). Another prison serial, From the Mountain, was published by Pastor Robert E. Miles from his farm in Michigan. Miles, a former Klan leader, was an influential white supremacist who worked closely with Aryan Nations. Fenris Wolf, a newsletter for the White Order of Thule, is one of several small serials circulated within the pagan neo-Nazi sector. Issue seven of Fenris Wolf carries a graphic of a farmer with a scythe, and the quasi-Nietzschean headline: “To give death and to receive it . . . that is the power of the Ubermensch!!! Hail Queen Hela! Hail Death!” Other extreme right pagan serials include White Sisters; Valkyrie (the “Journal of Tribal Socialism”); and Thule, aimed at Aryan prisoners.

Willis Carto created the Spotlight newspaper in 1975. In the 1980s it sought to obscure its penchant for condemning Jews and praising Nazi Stormtroopers. After a lengthy legal battle that began in the mid-1990s, the Spotlight ceased publication, but supporters of Carto reemerged with the American Free Press. Carto also lost control of the Holocaust denial serial IHR Journal (Institute for Historical Review); but soon the Barnes Review appeared on the scene with Carto again in the background (Berlet & Lyons, 2000, pp. 185–192). The Lyndon LaRouche network also tries to obscure its antisemitism and disjointed hybrid neofascist–neo-Nazi ideology, with serials that came and went, such as Campaigner and New Solidarity, and those that persist such as New Federalist and Executive Intelligence Review and more (Berlet & Lyons, 2000, pp. 273–276).

**Primary Research Using Serials**

Serials are an important source of primary information about social movements, no matter what spot on the political spectrum they appear. A number of authors have reviewed right-wing serials as a way to produce nuanced and detailed studies. D. B. Davis (1972) edited a compilation of material featuring right-wing conspiracy texts, including articles from the Dearborn Independent. In The Liberty Lobby and the American Right: Race, Conspiracy, and Culture (1985), Mintz not only read Liberty Lobby’s Spotlight newspaper, but also serials of the John Birch Society in order to be able to contrast the different ideological and political views of the two groups. In the 1983 book Architects of Fear: Conspiracy Theories and Paranoia in American Politics, Johnson cites American Opinion; Christian Vanguard; Spotlight; and Torch as primary sources. In addition, for his chapter on the Lyndon
LaRouche network, Johnson read a year’s worth of their unintentionally surreal newspaper, *New Solidarity*, and perused several other publications including the pricey *Executive Intelligence Review*.

For the groundbreaking *Roads to Dominion: Right-Wing Movements and Political Power in the United States*, Diamond (1995) read hundreds of serials, and included “A Postscript on Data Sources” (pp. 408–410) where she reported she had perused *Human Events* from 1940s forward; *National Review* from 1955 forward; *Christianity Today* from 1955 forward; and *Spotlight* from 1975 forward (p. 409). Diamond reviewed many other serials found in the University of Iowa Right-Wing Collection, and even when only sample issues of broken runs were found, she explained they allowed her to seek out the full collection elsewhere (pp. 409–410). Her bibliography of “Movement Publications” (pp. 411–412) lists thirty-four periodicals. In *Turning Right in the Sixties: The Conservative Capture of the GOP* (1995), Brennan (1995) lists *American Opinion*, *Human Events*, and the *National Review* among the serials she reviewed. For their books, Andrew (1997), Berlet and Lyons (2000), Burkett (1998), Easton (2000), Hardisty (1999), Herman (1997), Klatch (1999), and Schoenwald (2001) plucked juicy morsels from conservative and Christian right serials. Scholars have also used serials as primary sources to explore the extreme right, a sector that poses special problems for data collection, with leaders that are sometimes difficult to interview—a problem discussed by Blee (2002, pp. 198–204) and Himmelstein (1998).


Across the sectors of the political right, various authors have also used primary serial resources in writing chapters in edited collections, and the same is true with journal articles (see, for example, Marshall, 1998). The problem is that unlike information on serials on the left, there are no equivalent library resources for finding serials on the right or articles in those serials.
CONCLUSION: SERIALS, NOT SURREALS

It is a relatively recent idea that political right movement activists could publish serious and substantial serials that were not surrealistic escapes from sensible rational thought. As a progressive movement activist, journalist, and researcher (and sometimes autodidactic scholar), why do I care about right-wing serials? Why would I help create the entry “Alternative press (U.S. political right)” on Wikipedia?11 Why even write this article?

The obvious answer for me is that content analysis of right-wing publications, especially serials, can assist opposition research. Such efforts are sometimes predictive. At Political Research Associates we watch for trends in the development stage as they are refined in movement serials on the political right. An example was when the neoconservative Weekly Standard ran its covers in 2001 and 2002 building up support for military strikes in the Middle East.

There is a bigger issue, however. While familiarity may breed contempt, it can also help build collections. The right-wing oppositional press played an important role in framing issues that in today’s political debates are considered mainstream. The collection of right-wing serials can be “fraught with danger” for librarians, but it should be considered (Danky & Hennessy 1985, p. 6). Without access to oppositional serials of the political right and political left, library users will have their understanding of the history and current political struggles of the United States severely narrowed. That’s not good for libraries, and it’s not good for the type of vigorous and freewheeling debate that real democracy demands of an informed citizenry.

NOTES

Most of the serials reviewed for this article came from the archive at Political Research Associates, which includes periodicals from the original Public Eye Network of researchers and the Wisconsin Historical Society through an arrangement with James P. Danky, newspapers and periodicals librarian. Specific serials were obtained from Michael Barkun and Stephanie Shanks-Miehle. Additional research materials were provided by James P. Danky, Rodger Streitmatter, Special Collections and Archives at the Milton S. Eisenhower Library of Johns Hopkins University, and the Burlington (MA) Public Library. PRA intern Michelle Iorio helped with research.

To write this article I culled material citing right-wing serials from many years of journalistic and scholarly writing; and lest it appear I am egomaniacally obsessed with citing my own work, I have placed the titles in the bibliography, and refer to them in endnotes, generally by date.

To accompany this article, I have created an online research page that contains several resources, including: a list of serials ranging across the Political Right and the locations of physical archives where right-wing serials can be found. This is a partial list, and I welcome notifications of locations I have missed, and will add them to the online resource located at http://www.publiceye.org/research/directories/serials/index.html. 1. Portions of this section culled from my previously published material (Berlet, 2004a).
2. This journal article includes a useful selected bibliography with cites to reviews in a range of publications, pp. 49–53.
4. This section is drawn from material previously published in several forms, including my 1999 article “Clinton, Conspiracism, and the Continuing Culture War;” which later was
expanded into an online report stored at http://www.publiceye.org/conspire/clinton/Clinton2_TOC.html; with chunks parceled out into chapters in Berlet & Lyons, 2000.

5. See a critical collection of these covers online at http://www.publiceye.org/militarism/warmania2002/index.html.

6. The information in this section was obtained from the biography and chronological bibliography of von Mises work at the Ludwig von Mises Institute Web site, especially http://www.mises.org/misesbib/m1945.asp; http://www.mises.org/misesbib/m1960.asp; and http://www.mises.org/misesbib/m1965.asp.

7. See note 3.


9. Based on review of files from JBS HQ, including collection of reprints at PRA.


11. Citing Wikipedia is always dicey, but it is possible to cite a specific version of an entry. Start with the link here, because cybervandals have deleted the list on at least one occasion. For a reputable “permanent version” of “Alternative press (U.S. political right)” see: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/index.php?title=Alternative_press_%28U.S._political_right%29&oldid=107090129
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The Joy of Finding Periodicals “Not in Danky”

RANDALL K. BURKETT

ABSTRACT
This essay examines the seminal reference tool, African-American Newspapers and Periodicals: A National Bibliography (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), edited by James P. Danky. It provides background on the creation of this highly acclaimed volume and demonstrates its usefulness in building a research collection of rare periodical literature in African American history and culture. It also documents efforts to build such a collection at Emory University.

I met James Danky first by reputation some thirty years ago. My wife, Nancy Burkett, was at the time a librarian at the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, Massachusetts, and AAS was intensively engaged in a nationwide effort funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities to identify and microfilm every newspaper published throughout the country. This massive effort, the United States Newspaper Project, had decided to proceed on a state-by-state basis, and the Antiquarian Society, as the premiere repository for early American newspapers, was centrally involved. Their curator of newspapers served on the project’s national advisory committee.

Word filtered back to me of a troublesome presence on that committee—a young, cantankerous fellow from Wisconsin who insisted the approach being taken would result in a final product that, if not fatally flawed, would fail significantly in its goal of comprehensiveness. A policy decision had been made not to search specifically for “genres” of newspapers, for example, Irish, German, African American, or other group-based papers, as the project was working from the top down, through state and national institutions. The Wisconsin fellow argued this approach would dramatically underrepresent African American newspapers if special efforts were not made to search out holdings at historically black colleges and universities. These often understaffed institutions would not be able...
to respond effectively to written surveys, and many of them did not participate in OCLC, the national online library database. Further, the “mainline” repositories, whether state libraries or others, would never have collected much of this material in the first place, so even the most extensive of searches would not be sufficient to the task.

I don’t have access to the protests, appeals, and recommendations filed by this fellow, James Danky, but my understanding is that his nettlesome and well-thought-out critiques fell on deaf ears. “They” had a plan, and “they” had no intention of revising it. Naturally, I found this fellow to be quite interesting. I knew he was absolutely right about the difficulty of ferreting out such material. For the first fifteen years of my academic career, my primary interest was in the area of African American religious history. I had founded a newsletter to foster research in this field, and I knew how wide and deep one had to dig to secure the obscure pamphlets, periodicals, and newspapers published within and for the African American community since the early nineteenth century. Danky was soon one of my most faithful subscribers. He wasn’t particularly interested in religious history itself, I later found out, but he was very interested in newsletters. He collected mine and thousands of others, for that great research repository for American history in all of its dimensions, the Wisconsin Historical Society.

I first met Jim in Madison while undertaking research for a rather wacky project my wife and I had hatched in the early 1970s to index every sketch found in any pre-1951 book or section of a book that provided biographical information on people of African descent in North America. Our task did not seem daunting at the outset. All we had to do was locate every book, be it African Methodists of Mississippi or A History of Colored Baptists of Nova Scotia or Cincinnati’s Colored Citizen, that seemed to fit our criteria, then borrow or photocopy the biographical section, and create an index. For starters, we had not calculated just how difficult it would be to locate these volumes. Searching “Negroes—biography” in library catalogs would not identify all relevant items, and even the Moorland-Spingarn Research Library at Howard University and Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture Library catalogs would not be sufficient if we were to be thorough in our work. We decided we needed to go to as many repositories as possible, to search their catalogs and consult with their library staff, to see what obscure or otherwise neglected sources might be of help for our master list. Danky was intrigued by the project and immediately saw its potential. He not only helped identify volumes that, from their titles, would have appeared irrelevant, but he also gave us the names of key librarians around the country who were knowledgeable and would think imaginatively about potential sources. The result, some fifteen years later, was the multivolume Black Biography: 1790–1950, a cumulative index to biographical sketches and photographs of about 35,000 African Americans published in nearly 350 collective biographies.
That project was published under the auspices of the W. E. B. Du Bois Institute for Afro-American Research at Harvard University. It was the first research/reference tool published under the imprimatur of the institute, where I worked as associate director for more than a decade. It was the institute’s second research project that allowed Jim and me to form the much closer personal friendship that has lasted to the present day. The idea for the Harvard Guide to African-American History was conceived by the late director of the institute, Nathan I. Huggins. He wanted to show his colleagues at Harvard and around the country that there was much more to the field of African American studies than they imagined. We conceived an unwieldy structure that resulted, eventually, in selection of thirty-one leading scholars throughout the United States who would be responsible for the particular period or specific genre of material for which they were among the foremost authorities.

By this time, I was aware that Danky had committed himself to directing a massive effort to identify every African American newspaper and periodical for which original copies could be located and examined. With sustained support from the Wisconsin Historical Society and the University of Wisconsin–Madison, and with substantial funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Ford Foundation, and others, Danky had launched a major project to fill the “sluices and interstices” of one critical aspect of American history: the gap in our knowledge of the rich history of black newspapers and periodicals created within and for African American communities. With the capable assistance of Maureen E. Hady and a small army of assistants, he set out to visit virtually every repository that might hold original issues of African American newspapers and periodicals. It was critical, he knew, that the papers themselves had to be handled, one by one. So-called “complete” runs of newspapers would only be verified as complete if each issue was inspected separately. Title and editor changes could be identified, and confusing numbering and misnumbering accounted for.

Danky was, of course, the obvious choice to prepare the genre essay on newspapers for the Harvard Guide to African-American History. He came to our first planning meeting with no idea that that venture would stretch into a thirteen-year-long project. I shall only say, in reflecting on the pitfalls and peregrinations of that effort, that one should never conceive a plan for a reference work that entails the collaboration of thirty-one of your colleagues, flung across the country, with varying states of bibliographical skill, and with unknown work habits. Successful reference works are major feats of intellectual endeavor, organizational acumen, and sheer perseverance, and need at least one key member who has an authoritarian personality.

My own major “gift” to Jim Danky, I have no doubt, came through my introduction to him, in the course of these meetings, of our dear, now departed, friend and colleague, Richard Newman. Newman was not just
a brilliant bibliographer; he was an extraordinary raconteur, a talented mimic with a biting wit, and a man who loved learning, gossip, fine food, good wine, and the preservation and advancement of African American history. His powers of memory were extraordinary, and he was genuinely interested in the scholarship of others and in doing all in his power to assist folk in their scholarly work. He and Jim became fast friends, and on behalf of Danky’s bibliographic quest the two of them made many trips to small colleges throughout the United States but especially in the South, turning pages of newspapers by day, cajoling the staff into searching even further into back shelves to locate fugitive titles for the next day, and then retiring to the best dining establishment in the area to fortify themselves. Never has money from the public trust been better invested!

The result of his multiyear project was *African-American Newspapers and Periodicals: A National Bibliography*, edited by James P. Danky and Maureen E. Hady, and published by Harvard University Press in 1998. This impressive 740-page volume is a guide to in excess of 6,500 titles by and about African Americans identified, as the brief history of the project makes clear, “through direct examination of each issue of every title.” That phrase bears repeating: “direct examination of each issue of every title.” The project, over a ten-year period, took staff members to libraries and archives in over thirty states. The bibliography is comprehensive: it covers “literary, political, and historical journals as well as general newspapers and feature magazines. It includes titles that have long ceased publication as well as those which still appear.” The work is “the most extensive yet compiled,” and, I dare say, the most extensive that will be compiled; it represents virtually all phases of African American thought and action, “from the religious, abolitionist, and educational press of the antebellum era to the publications of nationalists, Hip Hop musicians, and business and professional groups that appear today.”

In the world of rare books, the creation of a landmark bibliography earns its creator a great distinction. It quickly becomes the standard by which rare book dealers, collectors, and repositories judge the importance of material not found therein. In African American studies for much of the twentieth century, the standard test of rarity was Monroe N. Work’s massive *A Bibliography of the Negro in Africa and America* (1928). “Not in Work” was a designation that appeared in rare book catalogs and in other settings to indicate that the item was indeed unusual and considered valuable. Within a very few years of the publication of *African-American Newspapers and Periodicals*, the term “Not in Danky” became the accepted way to identify periodicals that possess special value for their rarity. The very day I received my copy of the bibliography I began examining my personal library of Afro-Americana to see if I owned newspapers or periodicals not listed there. It is the principal test I now apply, as curator of African American Collections at Emory University, in deciding whether to purchase periodicals.
My first “Not in Danky” (NID) acquisition for Emory University was an excellently produced periodical entitled *The Prospect: A Monthly Magazine for the Colored People of America* (Volume 1, Number 1, April 1898), published in New York for the Prospect Publishing Company (see Figure 1). This title turned up in a small collection of approximately twenty pamphlets we acquired, all of which had been owned by the distinguished educator, intellectual, and founder of the American Negro Academy, Alexander Crummell. This particular volume is not only Not in Danky, but it is, so far as I can tell, completely unrecorded. It does not appear in WorldCat, the global network of more than 57,000 libraries. Only one other publication appears to have been produced by its publisher, John Habberton’s *My Country, ’Tis of Thee; or Great National Questions. America’s Marvelous Development, and Boundless Possibilities*. That book was published in 1895, so the timing is right, though the catalog record of the item suggests (Chicago?) as the possible place of publication.

This issue of *The Prospect* was doubtless preserved by Crummell because it included an article he had written—very possibly the last that he wrote—as he died in September 1898, the year of publication. The periodical, according to its lead editorial, “will be an outlet for the pent-up literary talents of all aspiring Negroes.” Among the other notable authors whose work appeared in this issue, are Will Marion Cook, John Edward Bruce, and Maritcha Remond Lyons.

Emory also holds an apparently unique copy of *The Colored People’s Magazine* (Volume 1, Number 2, May 1910), published in Atlanta and edited by the poet Welborn Victor Jenkins. This title is reported in Danky, but he shows only one holding, at Howard University, of Volume 1, Number 5. Our earlier copy features an article by William Pickens, soon to be active on behalf of the NAACP, as well as short stories (including one by Jenkins) and numerous poems.

*The Liberator* is title to a dozen newspapers published between the one founded by William Lloyd Garrison in 1831 and a weekly established in New York City in 1996 (see Figure 2). Missing from Danky’s list, however, is any reference to *The Liberator: A Weekly Newspaper Devoted to the Cause of Good Government and the Advancement of the Negro*. Emory has two issues of this newspaper, produced in Los Angeles in April and May, 1913, edited by Jefferson L. Edmonds, Sr. and Jr., and published by “The Liberator Publishing Co.” at Broadway and Franklin Streets in Los Angeles, California. These are respectively Volume 12, Number 4 and Volume 12, Number 5, indicating that the paper had a substantial longevity. One issue announces a “grand reception and banquet . . . tendered Dr. Du Bois at Wesley M. E. Church,” and both issues denounce the candidacy of the former city attorney, a Mr. Shenk, for the position of city mayor. The paper also advertises for job printing done by the Liberator printing company: “We print everything from a visiting card to a family bible.”
From the estate of the late Richard Newman, Emory purchased three issues of a periodical titled *The Editorian* (Volume 1, Numbers 1, 2, and 5, for March, April, and July 1919). The first issue states that the periodical was published in St. Louis for the National Colored Young Mens (sic) League. This journal is not only "NID" but it is also not in *WorldCat*.

*The Postal Alliance*, published on behalf of the National Alliance of Postal Workers, is a periodical that appears in Danky, with an initial date
of publication as “1917?–?” but the first issue located in African-American Newspapers and Periodicals is Volume 14, Number 4, for the year 1929, held by Howard University. Of particular interest to me is that the Emory copy, “Volume 6, Number 2,” dated November 1919, was published in Atlanta. The editorial offices were at 164 Auburn Avenue, and the business manager is identified as Welborn Victor Jenkins. Jenkins was also editor of the Atlanta-based Colored People’s Magazine mentioned earlier, and he published
several volumes of poetry. *The Postal Alliance* was likely founded in Atlanta by one A. L. Green, listed as editor, who was residing in the city at 424 Houston Street (see Figure 3).

In Danky, *The Progressive March of the Negro* (see Figure 4) was identified as a “Monthly Magazine Published by John E. Patton.” Though this issue is identified as “Volume 9, Number 1,” and is dated 1920, there is no evidence, either in Danky or other bibliographical sources, of the existence of another issue of the periodical. It is conceivable that the “9” is a typographical error and, in fact, this was Volume 1, Number 1, and thus the only number published. The entire text appears to be poetry written by John E. Patton, identified as “of Chattanooga, Tenn,” and includes two rather inelegant illustrations. There are two pages of advertisements, all for businesses in Chattanooga. A handwritten note on the Emory copy, however, notes that this issue was “printed by J. P. Wharton 447 Lenox Ave., Lenox Ave, New York.” It is not clear why the editor would use a New York printer, and no biographical information has been uncovered for either Patton or Wharton.

Another Not in Danky periodical came to us as part of a large gift of the papers of William L. Dawson, the composer, conductor, and arranger who founded the School of Music at Tuskegee Institute. This is *Music and Poetry* (Volume 1, Number 1, January 1921) and was produced by Nora Douglas Holt (see Figure 5). The Chicago-born Holt (1885–1974) was herself a composer and served as president of the Chicago Music Association and cofounder and vice president of the National Association of Negro Musicians, organized in 1919 “for the purpose of furthering and coordinating the musical forces of the Negro race for the promotion of economic, educational and fraternal betterment.” The “centerfold” of this periodical (apparently the only issue published) contains the only musical composition of Holt’s that has been preserved. Though reportedly a prolific composer in her early years, none of her other works survives. She placed her papers in storage for more than a decade while she lived in Paris. When she returned to the United States, she discovered all of her manuscripts had been stolen, and she never returned to composition. Nora Holt has been described as “one of the most remarkable personalities of the Harlem Renaissance” (Bruce Kellner, *The Harlem Renaissance: A Historical Dictionary*, 1984, p. 172) and was, according to Kellner, the model for the steamy courtesan Lasca Sartoris in Carl Van Vechten’s 1926 novel *Nigger Heaven*. Three other libraries report holding a copy of this handsomely-produced periodical.

One of my personally most satisfying finds was a single issue of a proto-Garveyite periodical, *The Black Man: A Race Magazine*, published in Vicksburg, Mississippi, in 1921 (see Figure 6). This antedates the periodical of that same title founded by Marcus Garvey in Kingston and London, published between 1933 and 1939. Emory’s issue, NID and not in WorldCat, is identified as Volume 3, Number 1, and documents the penetration
of Garveyite thought in the deep South at a very early period. The editor and general manager was John James Morant, a Selma, Alabama-born journalist and minister of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. WorldCat notes the existence of a periodical by this title as a monthly, published in the years 1890–1902, but it notes no holdings as late as the early teens by which time, clearly, it had turned into a weekly newspaper.
Figure 4. The Progressive March of the Negro (1920)
Another of our unique Mississippi holdings is *The Afro-American Courier* [sic] published in Yazoo City, Mississippi. Although this title is listed in Danky, we appear to hold the only issue of Volume 1, Number 1, dated June 1, 1926. Danky points out that this began as a journal of the fraternal order, “Afro-American Sons and Daughters,” which was also an insurance company. Albert Banks is identified as president and one T. J. Huddleston as “Custodian.”
Figure 6. The Black Man (1921)
Yet another distinctive periodical holding, found in a stack of print ephemera from an African American communist bookstore owner, William Crawford, is *New ASPects* (Volume 1, Number 1, Spring 1952) (see Figure 7). This periodical, for which we have located no other copy, was published by the Philadelphia Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions to provide “a literary media of expression” for those “who would otherwise be denied their right to free expression of ideas.” In the statement of purpose, the (unnamed) editors describe the focus of the periodical to be “the struggle for recognition of the cultural and professional contributions of the Negro people, and of the other Americans who have been denied expression by deliberate exclusion from branches of art.” In this issue (alas, missing the final page), one finds articles by the artist Allan Randall Freelon, historian Arthur Huff Fauset, poet Lucy Smith, labor organizer Thelma Dale, and others. The cover bears a portrait of W. E. B. Du Bois drawn by the well-known artist Charles White.

A much later unique publication from Georgia, for which we have only a single issue, is *The Other Side*, Volume 1, Number 1, for July 1967. This is a four-page civil rights newsletter edited by Ed Bedford in Albany, Georgia, with Glen Pearcy listed as photographer and Rev. Charles Sherrod as among the contributors. This may be the only issue published, as no issue is reported in *WorldCat* or in Danky, but there was an avalanche of local publications such as this created within the movement throughout the South. Documentation for them is sketchy. This issue contains a photograph of a performance of members of the Free Southern Theater, founded by Doris Derby, Thomas C. Dent, and others. It also contains a photograph and profile of twenty-year-old Andrew James, an employee of the Lee County Manufacturing Company, who was planning to run for president of the local AFL-CIO union. “James,” as reported in the paper, “likes to argue, farm, and dance. He enjoys ‘psyching out’ the white people he works with at the plant. He says he spends a lot of his time in the plant office answering accusations made against him by whites. ‘These people are hard to understand,’ he says. ‘They even cuss out northern whites.’ James’ talent to win arguments has made him want to become a lawyer.”

Searching for obscure publications such as these is one of the pleasures of serving as a curator; finding the rare or unique title gives immense pleasure and a great sense of reward. Doing this “one issue at a time,” of course, is time-consuming, and entails much good fortune. Once in a great while, a gift of considerable rarities comes along. This happened a few years ago when I encountered the writer Thulani Davis, whom I had met briefly years earlier and who was speaking at Emory University. When apprised of my new position as curator of African American collections, she said “I don’t suppose you would be interested in a bunch of old newsletters, periodicals, and print ephemera I gathered during my student days at Barnard?” These had been turned down by several institu-
Figure 7. New ASPects (1952)
tions on the (as it turns out, incorrect) assumption that they already had them. Naturally, I was interested, and in a few weeks, I held in my hands numerous titles that—you’ve guessed it—are Not in Danky and not in WorldCat either. These include the following:


- **The Black Messenger: Dedicated to the Redemption of the Talented Tenth** (Volume 1, Number [?] hand-dated 1/69). Published at Barnard College.

- **The Black Voice** (Volume 1, Number 4, February 17, 1969; and Volume 12, Number 5, March 3, 1969). Published at Columbia University.

- **The Experiment** (Number 2, March, 1969), edited by Lawrence Aaron, with Oliver Louis Henry, editor-at-large. This nine-page issue includes reviews of major African American literary texts (Wright, *Native Son*; Ellison, *Invisible Man*; Johnson, *Autobiography of an Ex-Coloured Man*) as well as poetry and short essays.


- **Images: A Contemporary Newspaper for the Black Man** (Volume 1, Number 3, July 1975), published by Bob Low in Brooklyn, NY, with Carlos Russell, executive editor. It contains a “guest editorial” by Frederick Douglass, an editorial on contemporary black politics, and several columns on beauty culture.

- **Third World Media Letter** (Volume 1, Number 2, May 1974), published by the Third World Media Collective at the School of Arts, New York University.

- **Cosmic Colors: A Black Music Magazine** (Volume 1, Number 1, July 17, 1974) appears to have been published in New York in only one issue. George Edward Taite was publisher and editor, and this issue, with a beautiful, multicolor cover by Abdul Rahman, was created as a tribute to the late, great, John Coltrane. It included poetry, art work by Leroy Clarke, and photographs.

- **OO-sh’Bop: A Journal of Creative Black Culture** (Number 1, Spring 1977) (see Figure 8). This issue, apparently the only one published, was produced by “a fledgling organization of Howard University students deeply concerned with Black culture in all its permutations.” Calvin Reid was one of three co-editors, along with Greg Tate (who writes in the magazine pseudonymously as “Iron Man” and also as “I. M. Lost”), and Morris Campbell. Reid did the artwork for the cover, published several photographs, and wrote a critique of Langston Hughes and Roy DeCarava’s *Sweet Flypaper of Life*, as well as an interview (coauthored with Morris
Campbell) of the saxophonist, Oliver Lake. This issue also featured poetry and an essay on “Roach Embryo Blues” by Rick Powell. In a phone conversation with Calvin Reid, who now is a senior editor at Publishers’ Weekly, I learned that this was the only issue of the journal published. Reid recalls the period of the 1970s with great nostalgia and said there were perhaps a half dozen or more friends in and around the Washing-
ton area involved in publishing poetry and other “arty” periodicals in this period. He said they took turns helping one another in producing and hawking their publications.

- *The Journal* (Volume 1, Number 1, Winter-Spring 1984), by the Society for the Study of Black Philosophy in conjunction with the Minority Book Publisher’s Institute, New York, Alfred E. Prettyman, Publisher. Lucius Outlaw and Cornel West both published articles in this issue, the only one apparently published, along with Richard Popkin, Wesley Brown, LaVerne Shelton, and others.

The list of Emory’s Not in Danky African American periodicals could be extended and it will be extended every year. This is not a criticism of the stunning accomplishment that is represented by the signal work, *African-American Newspapers and Periodicals: A National Bibliography*. On the contrary, it is the highest compliment we can pay to a colleague who has labored hard in so many areas of American cultural studies to seek, find, identify, preserve, and make available to the scholarly and general public the obscure as well as the well known world of print culture. Jim once memorably described bibliography as “the humus on the forest floor.” It is the fertile soil from which scholarship grows. Jim has made an enduring contribution enriching that soil by documenting the diversity and richness of the printed word in American society. For his vision, his perseverance, and his passion, we are in his debt.

**Note**

All of the illustrations are courtesy of the Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University.

Abstract
In late April 1982, James P. Danky organized a conference titled “Native American Press in Wisconsin and the Nation,” an extension of the work Danky had been engaged in as newspapers and periodicals librarian at the Wisconsin Historical Society, which brought native editors and publishers together with academic historians. We were engaged in writing a historical reference guide to American Indian and Alaska native newspapers and periodicals, and we learned that Danky and colleague Maureen Hady were involved with a similar project. At the conference we all agreed to cooperate in our research and share information. Attendees reached consensus on a number of issues at that time: the Native press was under significant financial difficulty; press freedoms were often abused; a need existed for an association of native publishers and editors. Other issues came to light, including the need for a systematic, ongoing project to collect the products of the native press and report research on the subject as a means of documenting contemporary native life. Danky and Hady’s work helped to lay the foundation for this project that continues to this day at the Sequoyah Research Center.

Introduction
In late April 1982, James P. Danky organized a conference titled “Native American Press in Wisconsin and the Nation.” Sponsored by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin–Madison Library School, and University of Wisconsin–Madison School of Journalism and Mass Communication, the conference was an extension of work Danky had been engaged in as newspapers and periodicals librarian at the society.
It brought Native editors and publishers together with academic historians. From Wisconsin were Laurie Fish of the Menominee Tribal News, Paul DeMain of the LCO Journal, and Zoar Fulwilder of Zoar’s Weekly Information. From the nation were publishers and editors Antony Stately of The Circle, Joan Willow of the Wind River Journal, and Richard LaCourse of CERT Report. Scholars who spoke were James Murphy, Sharon Murphy, Barbara Leubke, Richard Joseph Morris, and the two of us, Daniel Littlefield and James Parins. Roger Philbrick was present but did not speak. We were not originally scheduled to speak, but were late add-ons to the program. Our being included had an element of “serendipity,” to use Danky’s term.

By a rather complicated chain of events, we learned that we, at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, and the Newspapers and Periodicals unit of the Wisconsin Historical Society were working on similar projects aimed at documenting the Native press. Starting in the late 1970s, we had gone a circuitous route from a failed attempt to publish a historical anthology of Native writers, to a two-volume bibliography of Native writers, to the rather ambitious goal of writing a historical reference guide to American Indian and Alaska Native newspapers and periodicals. At the time we heard about Danky’s project, our work was based on two steadily growing lists of titles of newspapers and periodicals established from 1828 to the present: one before 1924, one after 1924. In all, we had accumulated about one thousand titles, which we had already begun to circulate to both Indian and non-Indian scholars, inviting them to contribute publication histories for our projected reference guides. We had not reached the point in the project, however, that we needed to go to Madison to work in the massive collection of Native newspapers and periodicals that we knew the Historical Society held. Thus we did not know that Danky, with the assistance of project librarian Maureen Hady, was hard at work creating a descriptive bibliography and union list of Native newspapers and periodicals. Upon learning of one another, we were like Huck Finn discovering Jim’s campfire on Jackson Island. We thought we were alone. The revelation that we were not was momentarily staggering.

Danky learned about our project before we learned of his. In early 1982, apparently concerned that we were working at the same task, he contacted us. He informed us that his working list contained about 500 titles and that he had organized a conference on the Native press in Wisconsin and the nation. Our response was that if 500 titles were all he had, he was not even in the ball park. On April 1, we sent him a list of 728 post–1924 titles and audaciously asked to be included in the conference. Our work clearly impressed Danky. On April 13 he responded, “The breadth of your work in this area is most impressive and the serendipity that brought us together is something that I am most grateful for.” He enclosed an annotated copy of our list, correlating it to his. Of the 728 titles on the list, he had no information on 367. He asked our assistance in
locating those titles and invited us to the conference that we might meet and “compare notes and methods” (J. P. Danky, personal communication, April 13, 1982) A week later, we were in Madison.

During the two-day conference, discussion was lively, and debate was stormy at times, but it proved to be a watershed event. It described in bold relief the state of the Native press in Wisconsin and the nation in 1982, anticipated future developments in Native publishing, created an increased interest in scholarship about the press, and had significant implications for the building of library and archives collections of Native publications, press history, and related matters. Danky’s conference clearly assessed the state of the Native press in Wisconsin and the nation in 1982 and identified issues that have been significant in Native publishing since then.

**The Conference**

One major consensus of the conference participants was the uncertain financial status of most Native newspapers, whether urban or reservation based. Antony Stately was struggling to keep *The Circle* afloat in Minneapolis by revising his format and circulation practices to stretch his advertising and subscription dollars. The *Wind River Press* had struggled to survive on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming in 1976 and 1977, when it folded for lack of financial support. The future of its successor, Joan Willow’s *Wind River Journal*, begun later in 1977, was also uncertain because it was funded by a CETA (Comprehensive Employment and Training Act) grant, which was scheduled to run out. In 1982 the *Journal* staff was applying to the tribe to fill the financial void. The *Menominee Tribal News* at Keshena, Wisconsin, had also originally published using soft money and had suspended in 1979 for lack of funds. After that the tribe funded one half, and soft money provided the other. In 1982, Laurie Fish was attempting to make the paper self-sustaining through advertising, subscriptions, and sales, and she was under deadline to do so. Zoar Fulwilder’s little urban newsletter, *Zoar’s Weekly Information* in Milwaukee, had ceased publication for lack of money. And Paul DeMain, feeling restrained by tribal funding, had worked since 1978 to make the *Lac Courte Oreilles Journal* at Hayward, Wisconsin, self-sufficient; by 1982 he had reached 60 percent of his goal and had aspirations to make the paper independent (Danky, Hady, & Morris, 1982).

What the tribal editors described was not unusual, but was a common phenomenon that affected the survival rate of publications throughout Indian Country in 1982. What Paul DeMain described for the Great Lakes region is a good example. He estimated that there were twenty-eight thousand Indians in Wisconsin and some two hundred thousand in the Great Lakes area. “But there are basically only two publications left in Wisconsin to serve them,” DeMain said: “the *Menominee Tribal News* and the *Lac Courte Oreilles Journal*. . . . Zoar’s paper has been out of publication for a
while, Melanie Ellis, from Kahliwísaks, has had some problems with the
council, and they shut the newspaper down” (Danky, Hady, & Morris,
1982, p. 93). The newspapers in other parts of the region were surviving,
DeMain reported:

Nishnawbe News from Marquette, Michigan, which had a large circula-
tion at one time, is down to 800 copies as a quarterly publication. Circle
News is looking really good. There is also a newspaper from Sault Ste.
Marie [Win Aween Nisitstrom], which is looking pretty self-sufficient, is
regular, and has some good articles. So, we are making a lot of progress.
Yet, at this particular time, there are fewer and fewer of us. (Danky,
Hady, & Morris, 1982, p. 93)

For papers that survived, the limitations in funding clearly affected not
only how much news the paper could publish but how the editors did it.

A major factor in the financial woes of some newspapers was a lack of
editors trained in sound journalistic practices. The editors present at the
1982 conference were a fair representation of Native journalism at the
time. Antony Stately felt inadequate to his task and sought out the assist-
ance of mainstream editors. Joan Willow’s office had a copy typesetter
that sat idle for a long period because neither she nor anyone else in the
office knew how to use it. Laurie Fish was given the task of editing and
producing a newspaper with little knowledge of how to do it. She had a
darkroom and equipment, but no one knew how to use it (Danky, Hady,
& Morris, 1982). Only Paul DeMain, who had studied journalism at the
University of Wisconsin–Eau Claire, and Richard La Course were what
could be considered experienced journalists. While the others struggled
to hang on financially, DeMain was working toward independence, and
La Course was working on a prototype of a newspaper modeled after the
Wall Street Journal and devoted to tribes with energy resources.

Writing later in 1982 Vine Deloria, Jr., recognized the need for sophis-
tication in the Native press. The foundation of most contemporary pub-
lications was the desire and need of the tribal communities for informa-
tion, he argued. Although many began by simply reprinting information
from other sources, numbers of them testified to Native editors’ abilities
to tell the people what was happening. “One can only conclude that it has
not been access to news that has been the deficiency,” he said. “Rather it
has been the interpretation of the information that has been sadly lack-
ing. Indians seem to know what’s happening. However, they seem to be
badly handicapped in interpreting what events, policies, and personalities
really mean in their lives” (Deloria, 1983, p. xiii). If the Native commu-
nities could produce “a generation of people who can interpret the meaning
of events for their people, we will have made a very great stride toward
determining our own futures” (p. xiii).

A second consensus reached by the conference was that the lack of fi-
nancial independence resulted in a lack of free press guarantees. Stately
answered to an advisory board with censorship authority at the Indian Center in Minneapolis. They scrutinized items he intended to print and, without authority, he claimed, pulled those they thought harmful to the center or the Indian community. Laurie Fish submitted her material to the Menominee tribal chairman or someone else high in administrative circles for review, but did so willingly, she claimed (Danky, Hady, & Morris, 1982). As Michael Chapman said to Laurie Fish about her paper, “But until it is independent of the Tribal government, you cannot be critical of that program that supports you” (Danky, Hady, & Morris, 1982, p. 84). Paul DeMain reported similar oversight of his paper by the Lac Courte Oreilles tribal council, his resistance to that pressure costing him his job at one point (Danky, Hady, & Morris, 1982). Consensus of conference members was that Native editors should be able to print whatever stories they chose.

The conference had a strong advocate for free press in Richard La Course, veteran Yakama journalist. La Course had worked in recent years at defining freedom of the press in Indian Country under the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968 and had developed a proposed freedom of information policy for the Colorado River Tribes, for whom he had edited Manataba Messenger at Parker, Arizona (Danky, Hady, & Morris, 1982). He reported that 54 percent of tribal constitutions guaranteed freedom of the press, a fact that he found heartening: “There can be no oppression, no prior restraint, no censorship, no attempt or success at limiting data on those reservations where there are such constitutional guarantees,” he noted. “Freedom of the press is a burgeoning actuality within the legal documents of Indian tribes and it is proliferating at a very interesting rate up to today. I could not take more comfort in something if I had to” (Danky, Hady & Morris, 1982, p. 105). La Course urged his fellow journalists to use their freedom of information power against their own tribal governments if necessary.

A third consensus of the conference was the need for an association of Native publishers and editors. A void had been left by the demise of the American Indian Press Association, which had been active from 1970 to 1976 through the efforts of La Course, Charles Trimble, Rose Robinson, and others. There had been failed attempts to create and sustain regional associations throughout the 1970s. Paul DeMain believed that the solution to some financial woes rested in cooperation. In 1981, he had established the Great Lakes Indian News Bureau that served both non-Native and Native news outlets in Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, and Iowa (Danky, Hady, & Morris, 1982). “It is hard working in an urban setting,” Antony Stately said:

I’m sure it’s hard working in a reservation setting, where there’s hardly any money. Dollars are tight; we have to pull together. One thing I see as being important is that we all have to pull together in order to
survive. Urban newspapers and reservation newspapers are going to have to form a link, an association where we can give information back and forth. (Danky, Hady, & Morris, 1982, p. 43)

He continued, “I just can’t do all of it. I’m going to be working in the future to start a news association between reservations and urban newspapers, because it is important” (p. 43).

The generalizations that emerged from the conference regarding the need for financial independence, the struggle for freedom of the press, the need for an association of journalists bordered on prophetic.

**Developments in the Native Press after 1982**

Between 1970 and 1985 perhaps more than a thousand Native publications came into existence. The great volume of titles established in the 1970s was due to federal money pumped into Indian programs. As federal funds began to decrease in the late seventies and were slowly withdrawn from social programs in the eighties, the number of new titles decreased, and some existing titles went out of print. The impact of the reduction in federal spending on editors who attended Danky’s 1982 conference was clear. Large numbers of publications were short lived.

Still, the Native press remained strong. As Paul DeMain noted, there was a growing sophistication in the products of the press. Technical aspects of publishing changed significantly with the advent of the computer age. And in the 1980s more trained journalists began to work in the Native press. Though one national monthly newspaper, Wassaja, ceased in 1980, it was succeeded in 1981 by a weekly, The Lakota Times, which as of this writing is published as Indian Country Today. Paul DeMain reached his goal of making the LCO Journal a financially independent bimonthly paper that he now publishes as News from Indian Country. In fact, among the active papers whose editors were at the 1982 conference, only Richard La Course’s CERT Report failed. The others remain healthy as this essay goes to press.

Success of the Native American press since the 1980s has been due in part to the establishment of an association, called for by “Native American Press in Wisconsin and the Nation” in 1982. The Native American Journalists Association was established in 1984, and throughout the next two decades it invested heavily in training sessions for practicing journalists, workshops for high school and college journalism students, and scholarships and internships for students and practicing journalists. The association’s efforts have resulted in a stronger Native press. They have also led to a shift away from almost exclusive emphasis on print to include other news media which, through the years, have gained favor among young Native American journalists.

One major issue that fostered the establishment of the Native American Journalists Association was freedom of the press. Despite Richard
La Course’s optimism at the 1982 conference, the reality of a free press in Indian Country was, and still is, elusive. For example, Pueblo News was suppressed in 1984 for publishing a negative piece about the All-Pueblo Indian Council, Chickasaw Times was suspended in 1986 for what the tribal legislature considered one-sided reporting, and Navajo Times Today was shut down by tribal police in 1987 on orders of the newly elected tribal chairman, whom the paper had not supported (Newell, 1988). In 1987, Leslie Newell, in association with the American Native Press Archives at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, conducted the first major survey of Native editors regarding free press. Her results (1987, 1988) became the standard study of the state of free press in Indian Country for more than a decade. The struggle for press freedom continued throughout the 1990s. The editor of the Cherokee Advocate was fired in 1997 for reporting issues unpopular with the sitting chief (Agent, 1998), and Navajo Times came under fire again (Arviso, 1998) for publishing articles critical of the tribal government. Because of the controversy stirred by these two events, a major development occurred in 2000 when the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma passed an independent press act (“Cherokee Independent,” 2001). Then followed action by the Navajo National Council in 2003 to make Navajo Times an independent publication (“Native Press,” 2003). These developments testify to the growing sophistication of the Native press that grew out of its huge burst of publishing energy in the 1970s and 1980s and of the efforts of the Native American Journalists Association throughout the 1990s. The explosion of Native publishing in the 1970s and 1980s proved to be fruitful grounds for scholars, although their work would get off to a slow start.

SCHOLARS AND THE NATIVE PRESS
In the late 1960s and early 1970s the proliferation of Native newspapers and periodicals that accompanied the American Indian nationalist movement reflected an increase in Indian awareness and brought attention to the potential research value of Native newspapers and periodicals. However, much of the scholarly energy before 1982 had focused on the Cherokee Phoenix, the first tribally owned and published newspaper. Scholars Beckett (1934), Gabriel (1941), Martin (1947), Malone (1950), Holland (1956), Perdue (1977), Leubke (1972, 1979, 1981), and Riley (1976, 1979) provided exhaustive studies of the Phoenix and its famous editor, Elias Boudinot. Two other Cherokee editors, John Rollin Ridge and Edward Bushyhead, had received modest treatment (Dale, 1926; Foreman, 1936). Meanwhile, the Native press elsewhere had not received much attention. Vizenor (1965) had studied White Earth Reservation newspapers, Scullin (1969) had analyzed the Rosebud Sioux Herald, and Fogerino (1981) had studied the Tundra Times. Christensen (1974) had studied the American Indian Press Association. However, the Native press as an important
scholarly resource had not been recognized by most scholars. Only Murphy (1974), La Course (1979), and Murphy and Murphy (1981) had attempted to study the Native press systematically and present an overview of its history. Although the latter work was flawed, especially in its treatment of publications established before 1970, it was the first academic press publication of a book on the subject.

In 1982 Danky explained, in part, why scholarship relating to the Native press had been developing slowly when he said that a bibliography should be the foundation of analysis. He said, “Without an existing, high quality bibliography scholars are left with a random sampling of materials and a greater chance at a flawed sampling” (Danky & Hady, 1983, p. xviii). His statement explained why some scholarship, like the only book on the subject at the time, was riddled with errors. Murphy and Murphy, like other scholars, worked without sufficient bibliographic tools.

There had been a number of earlier attempts to create bibliographies of Native newspapers and periodicals. Those who attempted to list titles nationwide included Olson (1968); American Indian Historical Society (1972a, 1972b, 1974); Murphy (1974); American Indian Press Association (1974); Philbrick (1975); and Lehde-White, Murphy and Murphy (1978). Their lists focused primarily on current publications. Others such as Nottingham (1976) had created lists of titles from states, and others such as Bush and Frazer (1970) and Bullock (1977) had described holdings in collections. Comprehensive bibliographical coverage of the Native press from its beginnings to the present remained to be done.

The 1982 conference brought together the most active scholars, among a handful in Wisconsin and the nation, who recognized the value of the Native press: Danky, Sharon Murphy, James Murphy, Barbara Luebke, and the two of us. It occurred at a turning point in scholarship on the subject. It was an outgrowth of Danky’s developing scholarship on specialized periodical publications and a defining moment in ours. It helped push our combined comprehensive bibliographic work forward.

By 1982 Danky was a seasoned scholar in the field of specialized or alternative periodical publications. The Newspapers and Periodicals unit of the Wisconsin Historical Society had created bibliographies of underground publications (Danky, 1974), Asian American periodicals and newspapers (Hady & Danky, 1979), Hispanic periodicals and newspapers (Strache & Danky, 1979), and women’s periodicals and newspapers (Danky, Hady, Strache, & Noonan, 1982).

In 1981, Danky’s Newspapers and Periodicals unit received a grant from the state of Wisconsin for a project called “Native Americans: Library Resources in Wisconsin,” which Danky proposed to carry out in three phases: a conference on the Native American press in Wisconsin and the nation, a series of workshops for librarians and archivists in Wisconsin, and creation of an index of personal names in Native periodicals published
in Wisconsin (Danky & Hady, 1983). For Danky’s as well as our own scholarship in the field, the conference was the most important phase of the three. There emerged from it an informal but lasting cooperation between Danky’s project and ours in which we assisted each other’s efforts in identifying publications, locating copies, and gaining access to them.

Three important publications by Danky appeared during the next two years. *Native American Press in Wisconsin and the Nation*, proceedings of the watershed conference, appeared in the summer of 1982 (Danky, Hady, & Morris, 1982). Scholarly journals noted the significance of its contents (Danky & Hady, 1983; Wrone, 1985; Laird, 1985). In 1984 followed Danky and Hady’s *Native American Periodicals and Newspapers, 1828–1982*, a union list of American and Canadian titles, compiled from the collections in the Wisconsin Historical Society, questionnaires to libraries in the United States and Canada, and visits to repositories. Containing 1,164 titles, it was the first, and remains the only, comprehensive bibliography and union list of Native American periodicals and newspapers, which no scholars have chosen to supplement. Finally, in 1984, Danky and Barry Noonan published their *Index to Wisconsin Native American Periodicals, 1897–1981* in microform, which contained over forty-four thousand entries from thirty-one periodicals.

The Danky and Hady bibliography was the culmination of the project we had learned about in the early days of 1982. Vine Deloria Jr. had reluctantly agreed to write a foreword for the work, but after examining the bibliography, he praised its completeness and the efforts of the Wisconsin Historical Society to collect Native newspapers and periodicals (Danky & Hady, 1983). The bibliography was a signal publication for not only scholars of the Native press but of Native studies in general. They now had access to the vast repository of Native thought that rested in newspapers and periodicals in a way that they had not had access before. Danky kindly acknowledged our hand in its making through the close working relationship that had emerged between the Periodicals and Newspaper unit and us in the wake of the 1982 meeting by telling how we “provided assistance in identifying and locating titles” while working on our own scholarship. “Many materials were exchanged during the course of the project; but, beyond that, we reaped the benefits of both their scholarship and professionalism,” he said (Danky & Hady, 1983, p. xxii). We could say the same about Danky and his unit. He generously supplied a copy of the bibliography during its preparation stages, and during our research trips to the Historical Society, one of his staff members often dropped what he or she was doing to help us locate materials that were hard to find. This cooperative relationship greatly enhanced the quality of our work and made it go more smoothly.

Although the conference members in 1982 reached consensus about several issues, the proceedings were at times stormy, and the exchanges
reached a high pitch. The editors, especially Richard La Course, differed with the scholars on matters of definition, such as what qualified as a Native publication, particularly those devoted to religion and reform, those edited by Natives but aimed at mainstream audiences, and those published by Native organizations but edited by non-Natives (Danky, Hady, & Morris, 1982). We had pondered most of the questions raised as we had assembled lists of publications in the planning stages of our ambitious project to write a reference guide to American Indian and Alaska Native newspapers and periodicals. Although we at times disagreed with the editors, sometimes intensely, we came away from the conference with a clearer understanding of what we wanted to do.

We shared a common goal with Danky and Hady: to identify as many Native publications as possible within the time allowed for our study. Their bibliography, which they supplied to us in the draft stage, was critical to our work. We adopted for our project the criterion they used, newspapers and periodicals published by and for Native Americans, to determine which titles we would study. By limiting our study to American Indian and Alaska Native titles, however, we differed from them. We included not only the United States titles in their bibliography but hundreds more because our study lasted four years, making it possible for us to visit more repositories and to include titles established between 1982, when theirs ended, and 1985. We chose to involve other scholars, whose tasks were to ferret out titles that we had not listed, research titles of their choice, and write publication histories of those titles. Ultimately, forty-one Native and non-Native scholars from fields such as library, archives, history, literature, and anthropology engaged in the work. In addition to their work, we spent four years visiting repositories in all parts of the country, studying periodicals, and writing the vast majority of the publication histories. The result was three volumes of historical reference guides to American Indian and Alaska Native newspapers and periodicals that included publication histories of about 1,800 titles in the periods 1826–1924 (Littlefield & Parins, 1984), 1925–1970 (Littlefield & Parins, 1986a), and 1971–1985 (Littlefield & Parins, 1986b). Along with the Danky and Hady bibliography, the Littlefield and Parins reference guides remain the most comprehensive reference works on the Native press.

By 1985, we believed that opportunity existed to advance scholarship related to the Native press. The Danky and Hady bibliography was in print, one of our reference guides had been published, and the other two were in press. In addition, the Native press was receiving new attention because of the establishment, in 1984, of the Native American Press Association, later the Native American Journalists Association. Having established a network of scholars in the field during our recent project, we also established the American Native Press Research Association (ANPRA) in 1984 and held our first meeting as a session of the Mid-America American
Studies Association meeting that year in Urbana, Illinois. Barbara Leubke from the 1982 conference spoke at the first ANPRA meeting, and Paul DeMain at the second. After Illinois, meetings were held in Arkansas, Alaska, Mississippi, and Wisconsin before the organization went defunct.

We also sought to foster research through the establishment of a scholarly journal devoted to the study of the Native press. We began *Native Press Research Journal* on a shoestring budget in the spring of 1986, and during the next four years we published eleven issues containing twenty-eight articles. Among the editorial consultants for the *Journal* were DeMain and Leubke. Though short-lived, the *Journal* proved a useful tool in ferreting out dead titles that we had not seen and informing us of new publications as they were established, and it became a vehicle for continuing our work of writing publication histories for another four years. By the time the *Journal* was established, however, our attention had already turned from producing scholarship about the Native press to following the Wisconsin Historical Society’s lead in collecting press resources for other scholars to use. Our belief was that there could never be too many archives and libraries.

**Creation of Library and Archival Collections**

Vine Deloria Jr. had been reluctant to write the foreword to Danky and Hady’s 1982 bibliography of Native American periodicals and newspapers. He was certain, he said, “that this effort would be another ill-prepared and incomplete listing—the kind that is done so often today in the name of communication and information” (Deloria, 1983, p. xii). His doubts came from first-hand knowledge of failed attempts by institutions to build representative, much less comprehensive, collections of Native newspapers and periodicals. He wrote:

> Sometime during the late sixties several universities began to collect copies of the extant Indian newspapers with the ideal of establishing a national Indian archives for the use by future scholars. Many of the universities that had entered the field of Indian newspapers so energetically suddenly and silently faded from the scene. Whether these institutions continue to add to their collections or have moved on to other fields now that the interest in American Indians has waned remains to be seen. (p. xi)

Indian organizations had tried it as well, but archiving or microfilming was too cost prohibitive. Some universities microfilmed what materials they had and stopped collecting. “Consequently,” Deloria said, “there are few places in the United States where one can find a collection sufficiently large to be useful to the student of contemporary Indian affairs” (p. xi). Deloria was correct. As the universities withdrew, the challenge was taken up by other institutions, the foremost of which was the Wisconsin Historical Society.
In 1982, Princeton University was the only university with what might be called a notable collection of Native newspapers and periodicals. Recognizing the ephemeral quality of many publications, librarians realized the need to preserve “contemporary, first-hand accounts written from the native point of view of an important era in their history” (Bush & Fraser, 1970, p. 3). In 1967 the Princeton University Library began collecting. In their guide to the collection three years later, Bush and Fraser said that when they began, “no library could be found which had taken upon itself the responsibility for preserving the entire range of these publications” (p. 3). Although the Princeton collection remains one of the country’s most significant, it has been eclipsed during the past two decades. As Deloria noted in 1982, interest had flagged in many universities; Princeton was one of those. Interest had waned considerably by the time we visited there in the early eighties. However, Princeton had made much of its collection accessible to researchers through its arrangement with Clearwater Publishing to reproduce many of the titles in microform.

As the universities withdrew from the field, regional collections developed in historical societies and other state entities. By 1982, institutions such as the California State Library, Arizona State Library, Arizona State Museum, Oklahoma Historical Society, and Alaska State Library had created modest to fairly comprehensive collections for their states. The work of the Wisconsin Historical Society, however, eclipsed all efforts. It was, in fact, the only institution in the country that had undertaken the task of systematically collecting the products of the Native press published throughout the United States and Canada. Under James Danky’s leadership, the Newspapers and Periodicals unit had built what was the premier collection of the Native press. Of the 1,164 titles Danky and Hady had described in their 1982 bibliography, the Society held slightly over 700.

Collecting contemporary Native newspapers and periodicals had become a part of the long-range plan of the Wisconsin Historical Society. Considering the society’s long history of newspaper collecting, Danky told the 1982 conference members:

> Today I hope the Society is making another step in the maturation process, that is, by trying to move from the antiquarian interest that has been a part of our work and to develop a sense of continuity with the past by documenting contemporary Native American life. The conference will, as it seems, create additional documentation through the speakers who will provide primary evidence about current publications. (Danky, Hady, & Morris, 1982, p. 10)

Since 1982, the Newspapers and Periodical unit of the society has continued to build its collection of Native publications so that today, in microform and hard copy combined, it is probably the nation’s largest. It is rivaled only by the collection of the American Native Press Archives in the Sequoyah Research Center at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock.
By the time Deloria’s comments about the desire for a national Indian repository appeared in 1983, the idea of such an institution had already begun to form in our minds. Completion of the Danky and Hady bibliographic project in 1982 contributed greatly to the thoroughness of our reference guide project as did the excellent collection of publications at the Society. After we had exhausted the holdings there, we traveled to repositories all around the country, ferreting out copies of titles we had not seen and additional issues of titles we had already studied. We meticulously recorded which issues of each title we examined in each repository.

What we encountered caused us to pause and look beyond our present project. Certain realities became clear very quickly. Most libraries held only scattered issues, those issues were not catalogued, and they were kept in vertical files or stacked in closets and only occasionally in library stacks. The significance of the efforts of the Wisconsin Historical Society to collect the Native press from throughout Indian Country loomed larger in our minds. Because collections were not catalogued, we frequently had to ask a series of questions before we were directed to vertical files or “Indian” files. After two years of such experiences, we thought that it might be helpful to create a clearinghouse of information on the Native press as a service to scholars and librarians. Because of our meticulous note taking, we could supply location information on hundreds of titles. Thus in 1983, we began the American Indian and Alaska Native Periodicals Clearinghouse.

No sooner had we done that than librarians changed the course of our thinking once more. Finding Indian newspapers and periodicals generally a cataloguer’s nightmare, librarians had frequently kept them in loose files. They were at times glad to weed them and, at times, give them to us. The first windfall came at the Arizona State Museum in 1983, when the librarian gave us, literally, a pickup truck load of weeded newspapers and periodicals to take back to Arkansas. Then came a similar shipment from the American Indian Studies Center Library at the University of California at Los Angeles. By 1985 we were calling ourselves an archive. Once we established the American Native Press Archives, other major weeded collections followed. In recent years such donations have come from Haskell Indian Nations University, the University of Tulsa, and the National Indian Law Library. In the 1980s, the Wisconsin Historical Society began to send us the hard copies after completing microfilming, and the Society has routinely sent its duplicate copies to us through the years. The Oklahoma Historical Society has a similar arrangement with the American Native Press Archives. The result is that the American Native Press Archives houses the world’s largest hard-copy collection of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Canadian Aboriginal newspapers and periodicals.

We took Danky’s new mission statement in 1982—“documenting contemporary Native American life”—and expanded it into the mission of the American Native Press Archives: to document contemporary tribal
communities through the words of the tribal peoples themselves. Thus we have not limited our collection to newspapers and periodicals but have included other materials related to the Native press. We archive the records of the Native American Journalists Association, which constitute a massive collection, and we have major collections for organizations such as MIGIZI Communications as well as for writers, editors, reporters, producers, and others associated with the Native press.

CONCLUSION

It is difficult for us to work long at the Sequoyah Research Center, which houses the American Native Press Archives, without being reminded in some way of James Danky and the conference “Native American Press in Wisconsin and the Nation” in 1982. We might see the familiar stamp of the Wisconsin Historical Society on a newspaper the Society has discarded and sent to us. We might have occasion to refer to the Danky and Hady bibliography or one of our own reference guides for answers to a patron’s question. We might have need to search for something in our massive Press History Collection, the Richard V. La Course Collection, the Paul DeMain Collection, or the *News from Indian Country* Collection. We might simply print a letter on letterhead for the Center, which bears DeMain’s name as one of our stalwart Advisory Board members, and causes us to remember that shortly before his death La Course had also agreed to serve. Everywhere are reminders of that meeting in 1982 that resulted in a cooperative relationship that led to the most complete bibliographic documentation and history of the Native press written to date and that contributed directly to the development of the nation’s two largest library and archives collections of Native press materials. To us it was a watershed event, of which we, Wisconsin, and the nation are still reaping the benefits.

NOTES

1. In a personal communication (January 5, 2007), James Danky brought us up to date on these participants as follows. James Murphy died in 1983. Sharon Murphy left Southern Illinois University and went to Marquette University, where she served as dean before moving to Bradley University, from which she retired. Richard LaCourse returned to his home reservation, where he was assistant editor of *Yakama Nation Review* for a number of years before his death in 2001. Zoar Fulwilder, a member of the Salt River Tribe near Phoenix, Arizona, is a consultant in computer technology and economic development. Dr. Antony Stately is at the University of Washington, where he directs the Honor Project, a six-city health survey of Native gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and two-spirited men and women. Barbara Leubke taught for a number of years at the University of Hartford and, since 1999, has been professor of journalism at the University of Rhode Island. Richard Joseph Morris is professor of communication studies at Arizona State University. Paul DeMain is CEO of Indian Country Communications, publisher of *News from Indian Country*. Laurie Fish Reiter went to serve in the Menominee Tribal Legislature and is now director of the Woodland Boys and Girls Club in Neopit, Wisconsin. Maureen Hady, who was librarian for the Native American Press project at the Wisconsin Historical Society is a catalog librarian at the Library of Virginia in Richmond. No information about Joan Willow is available.
2. Vine Deloria Jr., a member of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation, died in 2006. He was a well-known activist and spokesman for American Indian causes. In 1982, he was recognized as one of the leading voices for Indian Country and, as indicated later, he was often quite skeptical about mainstream academic projects relating to Indians and resources about them.

3. The 1982 conference had obviously been a memorable event for LaCourse. Only a few days before his death in March, 2001, he accepted our invitation to become a member of the advisory board for the American Native Press Archives. He wrote, “Your invitation concerning an ANPA board seat indicates one thing to me: Final forgiveness for my resistance in Madison in 1982. Accepted with deep pleasure” (R. V. LaCourse, personal communication, February 27, 2001). He referred to his intense, at times stormy, debate with us at the conference.
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Internationalizing Working-Class History since the 1970s: Challenges from Historiography, Archives, and the Web

Christiane Harzig and Dirk Hoerder

Abstract
In this essay the communication practices of labor migrants and their evolution from nineteenth-century print media to late twentieth-century electronic media provide the frame for a discussion of the limitations of national approaches to collection and interpretation. Multiple languages and knowledge of cultures of origin are required, cooperative library and research projects are necessary. On the basis of the Labor Newspaper Preservation Project it is argued that analysis of the bibliographic data by themselves, without going into the contents of the newspapers, revises current assumptions about processes of migration, acculturation, and internationalist class positions. The classic North American immigrant labor press came to an end in the 1970s. New patterns, feminization of migration and mobility to domestic and caregiving work, and new patterns of communication led to an ascendancy of electronic publications. Electronic publications and global rather than hemispheric migration will require different collecting strategies. These, like their printed predecessors, provide a perspective on migrants that differs from ethnicity and state-side approaches. Human rights rather than class struggles and migrant remittances rather the denationalization are the themes, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) rather than labor organizations are the publishers.

In the internationalizing research scene, the Wisconsin Historical Society, through its collections dating from the time of the labor relations studies of Richard T. Ely, Selig Perlman, John R. Commons, and others became an important resource. At the time of these scholars’ groundbreaking work,
disciplines were far more integrated than in the compartmentalized and fragmented academia of the present. Most of the reformers of the period were as much part of an Atlantic space of social reform and intellectual exchange as workers were of the labor markets of the Atlantic economies (see Rodgers, 1998). But under twentieth-century nation-state paradigms and powers of definition such transeuropean and transatlantic traditions had been relegated to the margins or, even, oblivion.

Rescuing working-class publications from this assigned place was a task assumed by James P. Danky, the newspaper and periodical librarian of the Wisconsin Historical Society. He inherited the responsibility for the largest collection of labor newspapers and periodicals in the United States. From the German press of Milwaukee’s socialists to the Italian American anarchists of Vermont, the society’s collections were a well-known source for scholars. In the political climate he needed energetic perseverance not only to prevent neglect of the collections in this field but, even more, to develop and expand them. He included new titles that reflected the changing demographics of the state and nation like, to give only one example, “UNITE!” published by the Blouse, Skirt, Sportswear, Children’s Wear and Allied Workers Union, Local 23–25. Even the union’s name suggests that the times of male-dominated work was past—but the women’s strike of 1909 had already set an early sign that neither AFL-leadership, nor pre-1960s scholars had fully understood.

The pathbreaking work of the Wisconsin scholars, and thus the holdings of the Wisconsin Historical Society, had been organized around concepts of labor relations and economics. Negotiating wages and organizing economic units were studied in the English language, and few scholars could read the many languages the laborers spoke and in which they published. To overcome limitations of language, culture, and state-centered archival collection as well as the nation-state focus of historical research, the authors of this essay developed the internationally cooperative Labor Migration Project (LMP).

A first step of the LMP was to establish in 1978 the Labor Newspaper Preservation Project (LNPP) for the non-English language labor press in North America from the 1840s to the 1970s. With Jim Danky, the authors discussed the use of North American databases; Danky became a cooperating scholar. The bibliographic information by itself, placed in chronological sequence and studied quantitatively, changed the interpretations of the impact and development of ethnocultural working-class groups in North America. Building on the newspaper preservation project’s broadly cooperative structure, Danky worked to provide a similar source basis for Afro-Americans. The African American Newspapers and Periodicals: A National Bibliography (Maureen E. Hady, associate editor; Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1998) was the result. Danky is internationalizing
the perspective in his current project “Newspapers and Periodicals of the African Diaspora.”

He thus helped to overcome a seemingly useful division of tasks among historians that involved a segmentation of working people’s experiences. In the U.S. context they were placed in compartments of the discipline separate from “labor history”: history of slavery and of African Americans, history of coolie labor and Asian Americans, and history of Chicanos or Mexican Americans. Following seemingly natural discourses that had racist origins but made sense in terms of source materials and approaches, most historians of the time divided the working classes according to the race-conscious categories or country of origin. As a result, their approaches were implicitly or even explicitly bounded by national language, institutions, and territorial borders. Nineteenth and early twentieth-century migrating men and women were thus entrenched in nation-state frames; they were seen as leaving the nation-state or entering another.

With today’s globally mobile work force, however, we can see different frames of reference. Though the nation-state is still responsible for many of the migration policies that so prominently implicate the migrants’ lives—making them legal or turning them into “illegal criminals”—do we best capture their life experiences by a national perspective? Or do we see, through their Web-based forms of communication, a globally connected diaspora emerging which retains aspects of national identity but functions in a regional, transcultural, and worldwide frame?

In this essay the authors consider the approach taken by the Labor Migration Project, in particular the Labor Newspaper Preservation Project (LNPP) to achieve bibliographic control over the non-English-language labor press in English- and French-language North America. The authors also look at more recent Web-based labor publications to consider changes due to electronically mediated communication and new patterns of migration. The authors believe the archival and research work that Danky has developed for periodical publications will need to assume new dimensions—as yet difficult to assess—to cover electronic periodicals.

The authors’ interest in labor can be traced to E. P. Thompson (1963), who had countered the organizational history of labor movements by his cultural and social history of class formation as women historians pointed to their male colleagues that the working class consisted of men and women (Tilly & Scott, 1978). In the United States, the three great figures of labor historiography, Herbert Gutman, David Montgomery, David Brody, and the generation of their students had begun to reconceptualize the history of labor movements—for most of which sources were easily accessible in union or party archives—to working-class history for which research was much more time-consuming and required new questions, new frames of reference, and new sources.
THE NON-ENGLISH LANGUAGE LABOR PRESS IN NORTH AMERICA

Thus the stage was set for the Labor Newspaper Preservation Project. Scholars from all European migrant sending cultures and from the two North American receiving cultures agreed to cooperate in a bibliographic project on the labor and socialist press. In a way, the labor press as a whole was an alternative press that fought the exclusionary powers of the middle-class dominated state. In Europe and North America, some of the press advocated a revolutionary change of existing structures, but the majority demanded inclusion of the working classes. This press was thus statist and even nationalist by demanding jobs in the nation’s economy, and by relegating in-migrating workers to inferior, even racially inferior status. At the same time it was internationalist in reporting and by intention and often was connected at least by sympathy to the First, Second, and Third Internationals. Numerous editors of North American newspapers and journals had previous editing experience in their European culture of origin.

Working-class formation, at this time, was a northern-hemisphere-wide experience with bound labor migrants, slaves, and contract workers coming also from African societies, Chinese regions, and India’s many cultural groups. The tension between statewide (or national) self-interest and international solidarity may be illustrated by an example from the press of the German trade union federation. In the 1880s, it counseled workers: “Your America is here”—workers should struggle for better conditions at home rather than depart for presumably better working conditions in other societies. The same newspaper, on its last page, published the farewell notices of workers leaving for the United States or, in relatively small numbers, Canada. The press also warned workers not to migrate to sites of strikes in neighboring countries and take jobs as strikebreakers. Self-interestedly it added, at least on one occasion, that—if the respective strike continued to be sustained—the capitalists might shut down the facilities and move production to a region in Germany where the respective skilled labor was available.

It might be argued that the labor press in Europe and in North America was oppositional, alternative, and nation-state supporting at the same time (Hoerder, 1981, 1988). Those with the power of definition and of determining wage levels placed working men and women in general in marginal positions in society. Thus we see struggles that were aimed at inclusion and which were geared to changes of the social and economic system, side by side. By bringing together scholars from many cultures and by fusing ethnicity-centered with class-centered historiographies, the Labor Migration Project sought to reconceptualize nation-to-ethnic-enclave migrations into complex interdependent migrations in the North Atlantic economies (Hoerder, 1985). A northern transatlantic space emerged that connected first western, then northern, and finally eastern and southern
European rural and urban neighborhoods to particular industrial locations in North America.

Within this multilingual North Atlantic context the authors looked at interaction between migrant working men (and women) and resident working class organizations *in Europe* and did find labor newspapers written for and by immigrants.4 Within Europe the labor-importing core, consisting of Germany, Switzerland, France, the Netherlands and Belgium, and Great Britain, attracted workers from the northern, eastern, southern, and western (i.e., Irish) periphery. From this analysis of the continent-wide regions of origin of the North America-bound migrants, the authors turned to the United States and Canada with the intention to provide “comprehensive annotated bibliographies of the non-English-language labor and radical periodical publications” in both societies (Hoerder, 1987, p. 3). This source compendium became the basis for scholars’ attempts to achieve “a comparative cultural history of the North American working classes whatever their social origin in their respective cultures of departure” (p. 3).

In view of the many-cultured and multiethnic European states as well as in recognition of the local/regional cultural origins of migrants, the emphasis was on *cultures* rather than *states* of departure. Migrants established transcultural connections and crossed borders easily, states developed the dividing and controlling passport and border-control systems only from the late nineteenth century on. The majority of connections relating cultures of origin and receiving cultures were not between countries, thus were not transnational, but rather between particular communities—defined locally, ethnoculturally, and by class and gender. Thus migration may be better understood as translocal, transregional, or transcultural (Hoerder, 2005).

This shifting of the frame from states to macroregions changed views of migrant men and women in terms of culture, class, and gender positionings. Similarly, the mere analysis of the bibliographic data of the labor and radical press in North America (and in Europe)—before even taking into account the contents and orientation of the periodicals—provided new perspectives. Quantitatively, the total number of non-English-language labor union and radical periodicals published in North America amounted to about 1,265 from the 1840s to the 1970s: 265 of West European immigrants of which 240 were German-language, 160 North European ones, 620 Southeast and East European ones, and 220 South European ones—in chronological sequence of first appearance. A large number were ephemeral, not surviving their first year of publication, though a “core” press, composed mainly of the organs of well-established labor unions, was published for decades.

Often the development of the press was related to long-term developments in Europe as well as to sudden changes in the cultures of origin. The volume of the German-language press is, to some degree, explained by the early arrival of German-language socialists and utopian thinkers,
the cooperation of German and Austrian workers, and the fact that among artisans and, subsequently, skilled workers in Central and East Central Europe, German had been and was the international language. As regards Yiddish-language publications, the failed revolution of 1905 in the Czarist Empire forced Ashkenazi Jewish radicals as well as those from the three Baltic territories to flee and, consequently gave impetus to their radical press in exile. The imposition of Hungarian (Magyar) culture on the Slovak people after 1867 resulted in publication of more Slovak-language periodicals in North America than in Slovakia.5

The decline of all of the German-language ethnic and ethnoradical press has often been assumed to date from the antagonism against German and Austrian Americans after the declaration of war in 1914 and, in particular, after the entry of the United States into the war. However, the publication data tell a more complex story. The volume of German transatlantic migration declined rapidly around 1893, when a deep economic crisis in the United States caused layoffs and when the new level of industrialization in Germany was sufficient to provide jobs. About a decade after the decline of German migration, the vibrancy of the U.S.-published German-language press declined. From the mid-1890s on, the annual number of newly founded papers took a downward slide, reaching a plateau from about 1910 to 1917. Only then did the wartime induced decline occur. The core press, too, had begun to lose impact a decade before the U.S. entry into World War One. This indicated that part of the viability of the ethnic and ethnic radical press depended on contacts to the society of origin mediated by continuous arrival of new migrants.6

Ever since the analyses of the Chicago School of Sociology, scholars have discussed migrants in terms of bordered ethnic groups. However, the press of the different Scandinavian-language groups indicated a pattern overlooked under the nation–to–ethnic-enclave paradigm that acted like a blindfold to screen out scholars’ awareness of interethnic connections and transcultural cooperations. Since relations between Scandinavian societies had been close, and since the number of migrants from each Scandinavian-language group was, at least at the beginning of the migrations, too small to support a press of its own, a pan-Scandinavian press emerged among migrants. Such cooperation has also been found in migration patterns of other cultural groups of people leaving Europe. From the mixed German-Polish territories Germans left first, Poles used the information about migration options sent back, and in the receiving localities, Milwaukee for example, interethnic German-Polish cooperation emerged. Similarly Slovaks followed Czechs, using the information sent by the earlier migrants, and both groups cooperated upon arrival in Chicago. Thus, before even looking at the content of the press, patterns of activities and interactions emerge from a quantitative analysis of the bibliographic data (Park, 1922).7
The ethnic press fulfilled a mediating, triple role in conveying information: It provided news from the society of origin deemed of importance to the migrants; it reported on the receiving society, that is, the temporary or new, permanent home; and it provided space for discussing affairs of the respective community. It constantly mediated and negotiated between the two cultures in the interest of migrants engaged in a trajectory between the two (see Hoerder & Harzig, 1987, 1:31–37). This leads to a question: may the decline of the labor and radical press be at least partly explained by its inability—the core press perhaps excepted—to fulfill all three functions? Its resources were often scant, its class-based readership smaller than that of the general ethnic press. And its emphasis on the unity of the working class prevented attention to regional cultural affiliations. The advertisement and announcement sections of the mainstream German-language American press carried large numbers of items from migrant organizations of a particular locality, like a district town, or a particular region, like Mecklenburg, or an earlier migrant settlement, like Germans in Hungary. These cultural affiliations were important for everyday life, and once again point to the transcultural rather than transnational experiences of migrant men and women. The emphasis on class and its common goal to improve wages and working conditions was certainly in the interest of working families but did not speak to their local and regional networks and belongings.

Questions need also to be asked about the internationalism of the working classes, the migrants among them, and the new working classes they established after migration or of which they became part. While some editors of labor periodicals, in particular European societies, migrated to North America and continued their editorial and printing activities there, labor migrants seem to have been internationally mobile rather than internationally conscious of capitalist and class alignments and struggles. Research on migration of unskilled workers indicates that the majority of them came from rural contexts and strata and thus brought peasant mentalities with them. As a result of their experiences as tenants, theirs could be a culture of resistance, but one that followed different experiences than those of urban workers. Contrary to Gutman’s (1976) assumption that these workers brought neither class consciousness nor factory-regularity in work habits, they did have notions of struggle and equity and they came with regular work habits, which they were forced to lose when industries stopped during economic downswings or factories laid them off for a few hours, a day, or longer because of a breakdown of machinery. Again, we may ask: did the labor press talk to workers whose class and ethnocultural background varied? Editors often had a national, urban, industrial focus and did pay little attention to cultural (regional/rural/urban) differences. This observation is not meant to diminish the importance of interethnic or interclass cooperations, or of cooperation between workers on
the shop floor and working-class families in the streets and in ethnic neighborhoods. It merely indicates that the interface between complex class compositions and ethnicity was not a primary arena of the labor press’s editors. This interface was also highly male-centered. Attention to women and families beyond calls for a “family wage” for men was almost non-existent.

Although the transatlantic ethnic labor and radical press was more vibrant and quantitatively far larger than had been taken for granted to the 1970s, by then, however, this press was coming to its end. At the same time, new publications, in particular in Spanish language, emerged. The transatlantic migration system was being replaced in both the Americas and Europe by south-north migration systems. In Europe, the “guestworkers” from the Mediterranean periphery were, in fact, labor migrants who more often than not settled and brought in family. In the Americas, the southern economies, which did not provide jobs in a number sufficient to permit sustainable lives of the working-age population; the refugee-generating regimes often supported by particular U.S. administrations; and—at the other end—the dynamism of the United States and Canadian economies, also resulted in large northbound migrations. Since the 1980s, these migrants increasingly use electronic means of communication and thus pose a challenge to historians and archivists. Thus communication and print culture underwent major changes.

The question that remains, however, is whether there is a legacy of working class print culture in today’s electronic world and if yes, what shape does it take? Can we recognize continuities to previous labor or working class migrants who created and controlled their own means of communication and by doing so participated in the prospects of a transcultural/acculturated identity, that is, sinking roots—on their own terms—in the new society? How do today’s migrant workers communicate beyond the microlevel of personal letters, phone calls and e-mails. Do we see a new, albeit different medium emerging that provides a forum to discuss issues of wider importance like working conditions, legal developments, prospects of organizing resistance against extreme forms of exploitation, and perhaps formulation of demands, that is, building of group identities?

Today’s labor migrants are faced with a number of different challenges when trying to build an identity based on media: on the one hand technology may help in composing and distributing various forms of media, printed or electronically; on the other hand the radius of communication has spread beyond the local, the regional, the national. Today’s “labor-paper editors” have to think globally, their readers are seldom concentrated in one city, one region, not even in one receiving state. So far, we know very little about the means of communication of modern global migrant workers.
Global (Female) Migrant Workers on the Web

Using the women migrating into domestic work from the Philippines as an example might help define future research challenges. Rhacel Parreñas, who has provided the most substantial analysis of female labor migration from the Philippines, showed that in the 1990s Filipinas worked in more than 130 countries, mainly in Europe. Despite their above-average education, two-thirds of them worked as domestics in “Western” households; their salaries being substantially higher than what they would earn as teachers or clerks in the Philippines (Parreñas, 2000, p. 560). In Europe alone, estimates place the Filipino migrant community at 500,000; 80 percent are women.8

Because of their worldwide distribution and their noticeable presence in Westernized households, foreign domestic workers from the Philippines have experienced both an extraordinary amount of scholarly and advocacy attention and the emergence of some self-identity as a group. They are the most likely of all global migrant groups to have developed and participated in a sense of self within the larger framework of migrant workers’ group identity, possibly experiencing a joint understanding of being abroad. In strong contrast to governmental attitudes to emigrating workers in the nineteenth century, this group identity is partly fostered by their “hero status” at home. In the late 1990s female overseas workers were constructed as “modern day heroes” by President Corazon Aquino, in reference to their contribution to the national economy. Their remittances facilitated “the nation-building project of the Philippines to enter the global market economy as an export-oriented economy” (Parreñas, 2001b, p. 1136). This attitude is also expressed in a number of media forums and publications that focused on their migration experience.

For the purpose of this brief, pioneering foray into the electronic presence of global (female) migrant workers, the Web publications can be grouped according to publishers and intentions. By far the most visible presence of online publications and newsletters relating to migrant workers stems from non-governmental organizations (NGOs), followed by labor union and government publications. Format and content of these publications tell as much about the group editing and in support of the newsletter as they provide information about issues concerning migrant domestic workers.

The newsletter published by the Committee for Asian Women—a committee “by women, for women, of women”—proclaims in its masthead: “We Demand Employment, Equal Labour Standards and Participation in Decision Making for All Women Workers.” Its content is not restricted to domestic workers—though they are most prominent—but addresses the concerns of all women workers in Asia. It points to the plight of female construction workers in India, publishes the demand of sex workers to
legalize prostitution, and sends labor day May 1 greetings to all its readers. The newsletter ends on the note: “Long Live Workers Solidarity.” The editors claim a network of thirty-nine related groups in fourteen countries. The website is professionally done and it recognizes an administrative support staff that is situated in Bangkok, Thailand, and acknowledges the support by German and Canadian groups. It does not have a national focus; rather, regional and global issues of gender and class are the most prominent organizing principles for the editors.

The Asian Migrant Centre, based in Hong Kong, proclaims in the masthead of its newsletter, *Migrant Forum in Asia*, that it is “Working to Help Migrants in Asia,” thus addressing general migrant workers’ issues, again however, with special emphasis on domestic workers. The newsletter reports on the various projects supported by the center—projects pertaining to health, human rights, and savings. At no point does it acknowledge national boundaries. Under the heading “Migrants say NO to WTO,” the newsletter of December 2005 reported on protest demonstrations against the WTO summit. The publication is conceived as a quarterly “for advancing migrants’ struggle for rights and justice” (*Migrant Forum in Asia, 2005*). It is unclear who finances the publication but it is very professionally produced and its scope is even more regionally encompassing than the newsletter published by the Committee for Asian women.

Another set of publications is supported by government agencies and by labor unions and organizations in the international migration regime, such as the ILO. The South African government is particularly skilled in making use of the Internet to inform the country’s large work force of migrant domestic workers about rights and obligations, best practices in employment situations, and the various educational and support programs. The Government of Singapore, in a newsletter published by the Ministry of Manpower, on the other hand, claims to announce “New Measures to Assist Foreign Domestic Workers (FDWs) and Their Employers.” However, the measures that are announced are almost exclusively in the interest of employers. They promote random interviews with newly arrived FDWs to check on their successful adjustment to the working conditions and they provide employers with full access to previous working histories of their employees.

Thanks to the Rachel Parreñas’ (2001a, 2001b) and Grace Ebron’s (2002) research we also know about *Tinig Filipino* (Voice of Filipinos). Since the magazine, which is published out of Hong Kong (and Italy), is not available online, the following account relies on their analysis. Published since the early 1990s, the magazine provides a forum for migrant women and their families to voice their insights and reflections about their living and working experience abroad. The contributions to the magazine are predominantly of high literary quality, indicating the level of education of the women who have taken a calculated, temporary socially
downward spin into domestic work. Besides recipes, advice columns, fashion and beauty tips, issues addressed by the women in *Tinig* are often immediate and personal, such as problems stemming from transnational motherhood or the difficulties of a love life in a life situation where citizenship is limited and truncated. Or they reflect about more general concerns such as their relationship to the homeland, the desire to return, their national identity, and their life in the diaspora. In this context it is easy to see how the personal is political and how the political has severe implications for the personal.

Parreñas also shows and argues convincingly how the magazine serves to create an imagined global community. “By constructing a community that transcends the nation-state and at the same time builds from their nationalist-based affiliation with those similarly displaced from their homeland, they foreground the formation of a contemporary female labor diaspora of migrant Filipinas in globalization” (Parreñas, 2001b, p. 1143). Self-positioning in this community, the group support, and the group identity enables them to negotiate the often conflictual relationship with the homeland and helps to tolerate the debasement and discrimination experienced in the work environment. Almost never, however, is the receiving society critically assessed and demands voiced:

*Tinig Filipino* has yet to begin a critical discussion of the partial citizenship of migrant Filipina domestic workers. Its contents offer neither direct critiques of exclusionary policies of receiving countries nor suggestions that migrant Filipina domestic workers are entitled to permanent settlement. Ironically, receiving countries are usually seen as benevolent nations that have provided “blessings” and “opportunities” that are not available in the Philippines and for which they believe they should be grateful. (Parreñas, 2001b, p. 1140)

Thus, the analysis of difficult working conditions, often expressed in the contributions to the magazine, is not translated into demands for better labor standards or the quest for fuller citizenship, which would include reproductive rights. Rather the Philippines are constructed as the mythical place of home where one ultimately wants to return.

With its focus on the personal experience of domestics, the content in *Tinig Filipino*, as determined by the working women themselves, not only differs from nineteenth-century labor newspapers, but also stands in sharp contrast to what is published and reported in the various online newsletters. As can be expected, the labor union and many of the NGO papers demand the compliance with fair labor standards and better working conditions (though no higher wages). The NGO papers also emphasize the recognition of human rights. A consensus emerges that migrant workers’ issues are best addressed not through nationally-based labor legislation but rather through an international recognition of human rights. Unlike the labor migrants of the nineteenth and early twentieth century,
who constructed their identities and affiliations on a regional and local basis rather than in a national framework, these modern global migrants operate on the basis of a supranational approach. When it comes to working conditions and employment rights, the similarities are more prominent than the national particularities. All these newsletters, including the ones published by governments, seem to operate under the assumption that knowledge about rights is the best means of protection against abuse and exploitation.

A number of themes are noticeably absent from the online publications. The various nationally different immigration policies, though of vital importance to the living and working conditions of migrant workers, are a nonissue. It seems as if the editors all agreed on a policy of non-intervention. Thus, despite the claim for international human rights, the right of a state to determine its own policies remains unquestioned. The same is true with regard to implementing the demands for human rights and better working conditions. No advice for organizing and for collective resistance strategies is provided, no counsel given as to how to leave the isolation of the home and enter the sphere of labor activism. Unlike their nineteenth-century labor newspaper counterparts, these newsletters do not have a universal concept of resistance, whether the strength of working-class organizing or the ideology of socialism, to fall back on for analysis and action.

Gender issues are another noticeable absence. This does not mean that women are not recognized. To practitioners working in the area of Asian international migration gender is obvious. Up to 60 percent of the migrants are women and most of them are domestics. But these women are treated like any other group of migrants, without specific reference to their gender. There is no mention of transnational motherhood or limited reproductive rights; sexual assault issues are usually discussed under the heading of trafficking. On the one hand, this lack of appeal to “maternalism” and the complete absence of a victimization approach is refreshing, since it acknowledges the equal working potential of men and women and is in keeping with the recognition of the earning potential of migrant working women and their value to the state economies. On the other hand, it ignores an important dimension of the female migration experience as indicated by the discussions in and contributions to Tinig Filipino.

A large-scale global research project is needed to assess media communications and their implications for today’s global migrant workers. While a LNPP framework made it possible to obtain comparatively complete coverage, it is impossible to provide statistical information about numbers, publications, editors, and readership of today’s print and electronic publications. Without continuous global monitoring such data will never become available. James P. Danky’s new project on the publications
of the African diaspora may be a challenging test case. Complete coverage may still be the goal of the scholar-archivists, but would require a global collecting policy and the necessary facilities.

The same holds true for online publications. The Web is too wide and too fleeting to generate informational completeness. By the same token, online publications that so boldly assume “to know is to resist” (exploitative working conditions) do not reflect on the question of their accessibility. Given the ingenuity in self-organization we may assume that many domestics do have access, but we do not know how often and how regularly. To write the history of today’s global migrant working class through the lenses of online publications would be a lopsided, if not futile, endeavor, unless, of course researchers would discover similar publications such as *Tinig*.

As to transculturality in the global migrant media world, the authors detect continuities and distinctly different approaches. Online publications foster a decidedly transnational and transcultural approach. National politics (of receiving countries) need to be negotiated but rarely appear as a hindrance to a person’s migration trajectory. Cultural differences seem negligible in light of class and gender issues and the transnational status of the workers. In seeking remedies for abuse, international human rights, not national labor laws, are promoted. The problems of global migrant workers—male and female—cannot be solved within the confines of the nation-state.

But the nation-state is not totally absent from the picture. Rather, it has a strong grip on its workers, as we have seen in the case of the Philippines. In the discourse fostered by online publications, migrant (female) workers are no longer branded as the wanderers without a country as was often the case in nineteenth-century European publications. Today’s migrant workers are neither accused of leaving their country behind, nor of not adequately fulfilling their motherly functions. On the contrary, for their contribution to the national economies of their societies of origin, they are constructed as male and female heroes.

**Notes**

1. When I (D.H.) first visited the State Historical Society of Wisconsin to meet the “Newspaper and Periodicals Librarian.” I expected to find a past midlife threshold scholar given that I knew the number of this person’s publications James P. Danky turned out to be far younger than I had guessed from his record of activities.

2. See also Bakan & Stasiulis (1997); Parreñas (2001a); Chang (2000).

3. See also Cordillot (2002).


5. This section is based on the “Introductions” to each of the three volumes of *Hoerder & Harzig* (1987) 1:1–47, 69–81, 2:1–28, 29–52, 3:1–11, 209–222.


To obtain adequate, gender differentiating numbers about migration from the Philippines would be a research project in and of itself.

Often FDW contracts explicitly prohibit getting pregnant or having family members follow.

The one published by the South African government provides information about rights and duties; the Indonesian government is rather apologetic about its policies in light of accusations of inadequate labor protection.
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Reconstructing a Life: The Archival Challenges of Women’s History

Honor R. Sachs

ABSTRACT

The field of women’s history emerged and developed through the joint efforts of scholars, librarians, and archivists. When the field emerged in the early 1970s, the combined labor of individuals in these academic disciplines unearthed otherwise obscure archival evidence, shaped a new framework for research, and fueled dynamic inquiry into the historic experiences and modern understandings of women’s lives. Despite such collaborative origins, historians do not always incorporate a broad understanding of library and archive practice into their scholarship. By illustrating efforts to reconstruct the life of one eighteenth-century woman on the Kentucky frontier, this essay illustrates how knowledge of archival collection and provenance provides vital perspective on historic experience. Given the long tradition of collaboration between librarians, archivists, and women’s historians, this essay suggests that renewed attention to such relationships will provide important new opportunities for future research.

The work of women’s history brings the ordinary, the forgotten, the pedestrian, and the subtle realities of experience into sharper focus. By filling in silences and challenging basic narratives, scholars over several decades reshaped what we consider historically important. Scholars dug into archives to uncover the plodding regularity of housework, the private acts of reading or writing, the everyday acts of resistance, the hidden histories of sex and sexuality. Through dogged efforts to navigate archives designed to obscure such topics, women’s historians located such evidence and explored its significance. Although the methodological approaches that framed such projects changes significantly with each generation of
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scholars, the basic impulse to dig deeply into archives and revive elusive evidence remains constant.

The work was not always easy. Locating evidence for any minority population in archival resources requires a certain level of suspicion. Searching for a needle in a haystack was part of the job. Scholars must reconcile the fact that certain subjects were not deemed historically important or worthy of preservation for many generations of scholars. Given such shortcomings, scholars learned to “read against the grain” of documents to tease out hidden stories or to point out the ubiquity of things so ordinary they are rarely seen.

Even today, searching for such evidence is not always a clearly marked endeavor and, as a result, an essential part of research in women’s history involves creative collaboration with librarians and archivists. Doing such research involves reading the subtexts of card catalogs and online database entries for evidence of what they conceal. It means reading finding aids for what they gloss over more than for what they reveal. It involves seeking out the collections and documents that are deemed unimportant or uninteresting. Most importantly, it involves a level of reliance on librarians and archivists to provide roadmaps to rich and complex collections.

The importance of collaborations between scholars, librarians, and archivists cannot be understated. When the emergence of feminist politics in the late 1960s inspired historians to question assumptions about women’s past lives, so too did librarians and archivists revisit the conventions of their own profession. The ways that libraries and archives sort, value, and present collections today is deeply connected to the efforts inspired by the social revolutions of the 1960s. Research institutions revised their card catalogs, finding aids, and collections in order to tell a new story. They began to change what they collected, how they structured guides, and how they conceived of and presented collections. They created a new landscape that contained valued, rather than obscured, documents by and about women.

Despite the centrality of archivists to the historian’s craft, few seriously engage their work today. There is little scholarship about how the changes within libraries and archives facilitated more effective research in women’s history. When women’s historians talk about documents, they focus primarily on creative ways to read documents. Scholars discuss, for example, how to think about law as narrative, or how to read diaries as self-consciously constructed documents, or how to consider material objects as embodiments of cultural moments. They seldom question the broader processes by which such evidence came to be saved, placed in an archive, cataloged by a professional, and listed in a card catalog.

In this essay, I suggest that a fuller understanding of archival history and practice can help provide scholars with a richer understanding of their own subjects. I describe how my own efforts to reconstruct the life
of one eighteenth-century woman, Anne Henry Christian, sent me into un-
expected questions about provenance and documentation that fundamen-
tally changed how I understood her life specifically and women’s history 
broadly. Understanding “Annie” Christian’s life, I discovered, was contin-
gent upon understanding why her material survived, who collected it, and 
how it was cataloged. Tracking down the history of her collections led me 
to larger questions about the way we value documents by and about women 
and how such values have changed over time. Ultimately, I suggest here 
that historians take a closer look at their long-standing collaborations 
with librarians and archivists and use the knowledge of such relationships 
to help better navigate source material and understand its shortcomings.

Historians could learn important lessons from archival practice. Archi-
vist Susan Grigg, for example, claims that a better understanding of archi-
val provenance would open valuable avenues for historical research. She 
criticizes the “juridical” model of research that most historians engage. In 
this model, the historian acts as “judge” over the “testimony” contained 
in documents. It is a binary relationship in which the historian is focused 
solely on the narrative contained within the text of their evidence. This 
approach, she argues, fails to take into account the concept of provenance 
that traces the broader circumstances in which a document was produced 
and saved. Taking such issues into account illuminates “the growth of [ar-
chival] collections has been as much a historical process as the events they 
document and the scholarship they foster” (Grigg, 1991, p. 234).

I would have appreciated a fuller understanding of such issues when 
I began my research into the lives of women in eighteenth-century Ken-
tucky. When I told archivists that I was researching women on the eigh-
teenth-century frontier, they would apologize and tell me that there was 
simply not much material. There is much better material for nineteenth-
century women, they explained. Have you considered moving your proj-
ect forward in time? Then they would point me to the “w” section of their 
card catalog and inform me that that is where I would find the women. At 
the time, the “w” section of the card catalog seemed like a natural enough 
place to look for women’s documents.

When I first began work in the archives, however, I had not considered 
that I entered a highly constructed world with a history all its own. In hind-
sight, my project would have been much better served had I entered the ar-
chives with a better understanding of how, why, and when women’s records 
got relegated to the “w” section of the card catalog in the first place and 
how the meaning of who constituted a legitimate “w” changed over time. 
As my research soon revealed, not all women are represented in the “w” file 
in the card catalog. Historically, the women represented within this par-
ticular file were, for the most part, upper-middle class white women who 
engaged in nineteenth-century reform movements. As feminist activists 
and scholars drew greater attention to the ways that race, class, ethnicity,
and sexuality marked differences between women, the language of those represented within the “w” file became increasingly diverse.

Despite such changes, card catalogs could not possibly document all women. Entries in card catalogs represent, in many ways, small historic documents themselves. Before the advent of online databases and search engines transformed the way we locate documents, the card catalog was the primary resource for scholars. Their content describes the kind of source, the author, the date, and sometimes the location in which it was produced and brief note about content. Although the content of such cards can be cross-listed to cover multiple topics, the medium privileges literate authors of particular narrative forms. I therefore found many more sources on women in the “w” file from the nineteenth century, after women’s educational opportunities expanded literacy rates and letters and diaries became more narrative in style. Eighteenth-century women on the Kentucky frontier, in contrast, were comparatively less literate and were more likely to appear within documents written by male authors—as customers in account books, as witnesses to transactions, background figures in letters. Such women rarely got their own cards.

Although questions about provenance and cataloging are quite central to the historiography of the new social history that emerged in the 1960s, few teach or write about such relationships. Throughout my training in women’s history, for example, I was always aware of the founding relationship between women’s history and second-wave feminism. Like many related fields of social history, women’s history sought to remedy the silences of the past. The emergence of feminism inspired scholars to identify and revise assumptions about women’s experience that were pervasive in the traditional historical narrative.

What I did not know about were the ways that such political transformations similarly affected archivists and librarians to rethink their own professional conventions. I did not know, for example, about the intense collaborations that took place during the early 1970s between women’s historians and archivists that fundamentally changed the ways that people engaged in all kinds of historical research. The publication of Andrea Hinding’s massive two-volume collection, *Women’s History Sources* in 1979, for example, represented such a collaborative effort. Although Hinding’s document guide crucially shaped scholarship in women’s history throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, as student conducting research in the new millennium, I had never heard of it. Trained in an era of digital databases, searchable texts, and online libraries, I never had reason to use *Women’s History Sources*. Raised in an age in which access to information is taken for granted, I never learned about the exhaustive and collaborative labor that helped unearth such information from obscurity in the first place.

Although all historians rely crucially on their experiences in the archives, they tend to diminish or obscure such experiences in their schol-
A Life in Documents

The importance of provenance and archival practice became crucial to my research into the life of one eighteenth-century woman, Anne Henry Christian. Reviving “Annie” Christian’s life from obscurity would have been impossible without the combined efforts of scholars and archivists. Almost all the existing documents about Annie Christian ended up together through the work of numerous different people over the course of many decades. Her material changed hands multiple times throughout two centuries of occasional care and regular neglect. Some of her writing was preserved by distant family members, while the ephemeral material of her daily life was stored by kin who simply did not know what else to do with it. That any of her material ended up in archives at all is the result of serendipitous decisions and indirect choices.

Yet, the story of how decisions shaped Annie Christian’s material past has significantly shaped how we remember her. Her material past—by which I mean the provenance of document collections and the specific histories of collected evidence—is as much a part of her broader history as any actual events of her past. In other words, her remembered experience is not just a series of linked moments, frozen in time. It is, rather, a series of moments written down, then saved or discarded, stored or neglected, bought or sold, auctioned or bequested, valued or forgotten. The particular ways that the material of her life has emerged over many decades in various hands, in different archives, for diverse scholars has shaped very distinct portraits of her personality.

I first found Annie Christian mentioned in the work of other scholars interested in eighteenth-century western expansion (Fischer & Kelly, 2000; Terry, 1992; Teute, 1988). The basic outline of her experience is clear. In 1785, Annie Christian left her Virginia family to settle land claims in Kentucky owned by her husband, Colonel William Christian. William had acquired land in Kentucky as payment from Virginia for his service during the Seven Years’ War. William and Annie moved with their children and slaves to the Beargrass region of Jefferson County, Kentucky, near present-day Louisville. The Christians were part of a much larger migration of Easterners heading west to Kentucky after the end of the American Revolution seeking to settle or acquire land and fortune on the new frontier.
Most of what scholars know about her life comes from her regular letters home to Virginia, most of which resides at the Virginia Historical Society (VHS) as part of the Hugh Blair Grigsby Collection. She wrote regularly to her sister-in-law Anne Fleming, her mother-in-law Elizabeth Christian, and to her more famous brother, Patrick Henry. Her letters trace the family’s passage to Kentucky and describe their life there. From her letters, we learn that her husband, William, died shortly after their arrival in Kentucky and left her with considerable financial burdens. After William’s death, Annie wrote regularly to his friends and business associates—most often Caleb Wallace and William Fleming—for assistance in settling debts.

The voice that emerges from the particular letters stored at the Virginia Historical Society is one filled with conflict and hardship. Her letters describe the physical difficulty of frontier life, her despondence after her husband’s death, and her struggle to understand his finances. In 1785, for example, she wrote home to her sister-in-law Anne Fleming about her passage and arrival in Kentucky. As her family “came through the wilderness,” she observed how “the roads are bad beyond any description & the weather so violently hot & such great scarcity of water.” Both she and William were unhappy with rough conditions and Kentucky. Shortly after her arrival, Annie confessed to her mother-in-law that she “never saw any trouble until I came to this country.”

The personality that emerges from the particular letters in the Hugh Blair Grigsby Collection is a beleaguered, dependent victim of a zealous husband’s decision to move west. Several scholars have mined this material for evidence of women’s experiences in the early West and many have used her to illustrate women’s dependence on their husband’s economic and physical protection on the frontier. Historian Gail Terry described the marriage between Annie and William Christian as “mostly traditional,” citing as evidence Annie’s lack of “influence on the decisions-making process” during her marriage and her “need for a male protector” after William’s death (Terry, 1992, pp. 196, 204, 200, 221). Similarly, historians David Hackett Fischer and James Kelly found in Annie’s correspondence a “litany of woe” that reflected how frontier women were “devastated by breaking home ties” in the process of migration (Fischer & Kelly, 2000, pp. 220, 221).

Although the content of Annie Christian’s letters certainly does give the impression that her life in Kentucky was marked by hardship and struggle, the provenance of the collection that houses them helped shape this characterization. Her collection of letters is far from complete, due to the fact that they were collected in no particular order. The letters at the VHS came together through the efforts of nineteenth-century collector, Hugh Blair Grigsby. Grigsby, an early president of the VHS, had no particular family connection to the Christians. Rather, he was an avid collector.
of material about the American Revolution and the constitutional period with particularly strong interests in Annie’s brother, Patrick Henry, her brother-in-law, William Fleming, and her friend, Caleb Wallace. Grigsby collected Annie’s letters, therefore, because of who she wrote to rather than who she was.

This was not unusual during the period when Grigsby collected. As the revolutionary generation began to die off during the 1830s and 1840s, collectors and antiquarians sought to preserve their memory of the nation’s origins. The result was the creation of significant historical societies that portrayed a particular kind of political history. The men who founded the VHS in 1831, for example, included among them John Marshall and James Madison—men invested with preserving a narrative of the political significance of the founding era. Similarly, the seminal documents of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin came together largely through the efforts of one man, Lyman Copeland Draper, who sought to collect the dying memories of early frontier settlers. Draper sought out stories of military exploits and frontier adventure. Such collection efforts largely obscured the social and cultural history that women’s historians would later seek to recapture.

Annie Christian’s letters, thus, survived because of Hugh Blair Grigsby’s collection interest in particular and important figures of the Revolutionary era, not because of his interest in Annie Christian. Annie wrote most regularly to Anne Fleming, whom she considered her closest confidant. She leaned as much on her friend Caleb Wallace, her closest advisor on financial matters. This particular set of correspondence, therefore, represents letters written to the people she trusted most with her emotional and financial problems. Their content, therefore, reflects a particular slice of Annie Christian’s frontier experience, one in which personal and financial struggles ring through with particular honesty and poignancy. A personality emerges from these letters because a collector chose these particular documents for specific reasons and placed them side by side in an archive. Annie’s characterization in scholarship is as much a product of the process of archival collection as it is the result of her own words.

A contrasting set of documents that came together for very different reasons surfaced in the archives only recently. Annie Christian’s lived experience became far more complex when her descendents released new material about her in the 1990s. Annie’s daughter, Priscilla, married a prominent early Kentuckian named Alexander Scott Bullitt. In the 1790s, Bullitt built an impressive estate just outside Louisville that he called Oxmoor, which has remained the family home ever since. After the death of an elder Bullitt heir in 1991, the trustees of the Bullitt estate opened up the family papers for archival review. Archivists from the Filson Historical Society in Louisville, Kentucky went into Oxmoor and began to catalog the new material.
As archivists began to search through the Oxmoor library—as well as the basement, attic, desk drawers, closets, and anything else they could think of—they discovered that bits and pieces of the family history had been saved and organized by various members of the Bullitt lineage over the past two centuries. A Bullitt heir and avid genealogist, William Marshall Bullitt, compiled the bulk of the material in the early twentieth century. Bullitt was, by all characterizations, obsessed with his family history. He wrote to distant relatives for information, bought related materials at auctions, copied letters from archives and created individual files for each of his ancestors. Tragically, the pride of his collection—his grandfather’s Civil War material—perished in a fire in 1943. Most of the eighteenth-century documents, fortunately, remained locked in a safe and unscathed in the family library.

Not everybody in the Bullitt family shared William Marshall’s passion for history and genealogy. After William Marshall Bullitt died in 1957, his son inherited the massive collection of documents. The son, however, had no interest in the material. He emptied the materials out of their resting place in the library safe, stuck them in a filing cabinet and placed them in the basement. There they remained, subject to leaking pipes and flooded floors for the next several decades until archivists came to appraise the collection in 1991.

When this new document collection became available at the Filson Historical Society, they revealed an entirely new side of Annie Christian’s experience. This was due largely to the fact that the material stored by the Bullitt family was particular in scope. The documents that William Marshall Bullitt compiled and organized survived because they related to wills and estates. They addressed financial matters, land purchases, business accounts, and related correspondence. Most of the material relating to Annie Christian in the collection reflects such matters.

The Oxmoor collection describes Annie Christian as a financially active woman deeply engaged in the frontier economy. After Annie’s husband, William, died in 1786, for example, she inherited a salt manufactory on the family property. The Bullitt’s Lick saltworks was one of the largest and most important early industries in Kentucky. Salt was a vital commodity on the early frontier. Settlers used it to preserve food through the winter months. Militia units required salt to store and carry food over long forays into the Northwest Territory. It was so important that settlers often used salt as a form of cash. Annie Christian, for example, paid the many workers at the saltworks in bags of salt and used it to settle her accounts with local merchants.3

Annie’s correspondence describes her efforts to legally secure the saltworks for her son’s inheritance. During the short period of time that Annie controlled the saltworks, the ownership of the property was not entirely secure. Her son-in-law, Alexander Scott Bullitt, wanted to control
the saltworks himself and made gestures to take management away from her. Bullitt went over her head and complained to Elizabeth Christian, Annie’s mother-in-law, about her management. Annie’s letters describe the tensions that developed between she and her son-in-law and her efforts to maintain a firm grip on her business. She explained Bullitt’s gestures as “highly ungenerous,” as he endeavored “to throw the blame upon me in deceiving him, which would have been in fact the highest Injustice in me, and an Action most detestable.”

By far the most interesting part of the collection, however, is not the correspondence. Rather, the executors of the Bullitt estate managed to keep track of many of Annie Christian’s receipts of orders placed at the saltworks. It is impossible to know if the collection of receipts is comprehensive—it is incredible that they survived at all. They are little more than small, torn strips of paper. They were folded and refolded many times and passed through many hands en route to and from the saltworks. They said very little and merely dictated business matters to the men and women working at the salt pits. The work orders were simple and direct: “Madam—Please let Capt Hord have 4 bushels of salt on my Account. Annie Christian,” or “Sir—Please let Major Grays boy have 6 bushels of Salt. A. Christian,” or “Please to let Mrs Lusk have two of the old kettles at the Lick that is out of use—I am, Annie Christian.”

The receipts saved within the OXmoor collection reveal Annie Christian’s economic life specifically because her records related to management of the family estate. Reading through her business records gives the impression that she devoted much of her time and mental energy to the management of her inherited industry. This impression is the direct result of the shape and purpose of this particular collection. The kinds of documents collected, the reasons they remained together, the care with which they were saved all concerned estate planning. As a result, we get a very different impression of Annie Christian from the OXmoor collection than from her correspondence alone. Her business papers reflect the mundane and ordinary cycles of her daily life in ways that her correspondence does not. The personality that shines through these financial records takes shape because the family compiled this particular collection for a specific reason.

Other forces shaped the OXmoor collection as well. William Marshall Bullitt’s interests in genealogy also guided the way the documents survived. In his quest to track down his ancestors, Bullitt added a considerable amount of material to the estate papers and organized them in the way he saw fit. He purchased correspondence at auctions. He collected and transcribed stories from elder family members. Often, Bullitt would travel to archives and copy down material that he could not otherwise collect or purchase. When he copied letters and other documents, he would readily edit material according to what he found valuable. Some letters,
copied in his own hand, condense large portions of text to a simple declaration that the author reported “nothing but gossip.”

Although such editorial moments are utterly frustrating to the historian, they are fundamentally part of the larger story that the collection reveals. Despite the limitations—or more accurately, because of them—the documents from the Oxmoor estate give us a specific perspective on one woman’s personality. It is, however, a selective and constructed personality produced over a long period of time during which values about collection and preservation changed dramatically. The woman that emerges from the Oxmoor documents little resembles the financially helpless, emotionally exhausted woman that emerges from the Hugh Blair Grigsby letters in Virginia. Personal matters did not appear on receipts. Homesickness was not revealed in business transactions. “Gossip” did not register as important.

The recently released documents from the Oxmoor estate do far more than just add another level of complexity to Annie Christian’s eighteenth-century life. Considered within the larger universe of her material past, they tell us as much about the dynamic experience of her memory. As I began to look through her collections, I found that the way she has been portrayed by historians was contingent upon the ways that her material was compiled and arranged. Archivists and collectors took different kinds of documents and organized them in different ways and such choices produced distinct historic narratives. I could not separate—nor even truly distinguish—her lived experience from the material past of her life in the archives.

The full memory of Annie Christian’s life cannot be found within the text of her writing alone. Rather, the experiences that emerge through the provenance of her collection are equally important. The static content of her writings and receipts provides us with isolated snapshots of her life. We can only speculate and make educated, highly researched assumptions about the context in which such snapshots occurred. The dynamic context of her collections, in contrast, explains the place of these snapshots within her broader legacy. Approaching documents as living artifacts whose history as material objects continues long after the events they record took place can, ultimately, provide new perspective on the ways that we remember, shape and understand the past.

Collaborative History

My experiences researching Annie Christian’s life brought to light many of my own methodological shortcomings about how to approach the archive. Although all historians deal with archives at some point in their research, few have much formal knowledge or training in archival practice or methodology. Similarly, few give significant credit, if any, to the collaborative process between archivists, librarians, and scholars. At the most basic level, it is these processes that form the foundations of historical scholarship. In ways that are both obvious and subtle, the combined
efforts of historians, librarians, and archivists have created important new opportunities for research.

Nowhere were such collaborations more valuable than in the development of the field of women’s history in the early 1970s. For the first generation of women’s historians, the process of discovering records otherwise buried in archives was crucial. The work involved rethinking the nature of what existed in the archives and how it got there. In order to locate women’s presence in documents, they needed to work closely with archivists and librarians to locate, shape, and understand the history of women who had been obscured by historical assumptions about their contributions.

As a small universe of scholars began to publish new titles in women’s history during the late 1960s and early 1970s, their efforts reflect a struggle against limited archival resources. Before the field emerged in the late 1960s, the narrative of women’s history focused on the story of women’s suffrage. Some limited work existed on women’s involvement in other reform movements and a handful of famous women or wives of famous men had received attention from biographers. For the most part, historians before the late 1960s valued the appearance of women in scholarship based on a conceptual framework that privileged a very limited spectrum of male political, social and economic activity.

As a result, these initial forays into writing women’s history were in dialogue with existing understandings of women’s historical significance and focused on the political reforms and collective actions of middle-class white women. Faced with archival resources organized around women’s formal political activity and important individual figures, historians set out to understand such records with new perspective. Foundational titles such as Gerda Lerner’s *Grimke Sisters from South Carolina: Rebels Against Slavery* (1967), Anne Firor Scott’s *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830–1930* (1970), William Chafe’s *American Woman: Her Changing Social, Economic, and Political Role, 1920–1970* (1972), and Kathryn Kish Sklar’s *Catherine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity* (1973) came about as the result of scholars’ efforts to mine existing resources and scholarship for a new understanding.

The archival resources that scholars had to work with were organized along similar understandings of historiography. Before the social movements of the 1960s helped to radically shift thinking about what defined historical significance, archives approached the collection, organization, and preservation of women’s source materials with attention to important figures and formal political activities. A few archives were entirely devoted to resources on the history of women, most notably the Arthur and Elizabeth Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America at Harvard University and the Sophia Smith Collection at Smith College. These collections, however, focused their collections on an understanding of women’s history that associated women’s historical impact with nineteenth-century reform movements.
At the time that scholars began to research and write women’s history, the very idea of a special collection on the history of women was considered by some to be anachronistic. According to Barbara Haber (1978), who joined the Schlesinger Library in 1968, many critics thought that the very existence of a women’s archive was merely a “mental holdover from the nineteenth-century suffrage movement” (p. ix). Given the dearth of existing scholarship in women’s history before the 1970s, the library largely acquired books to complement manuscript collections. Collection policies focused on manuscripts of important women as well as popular magazines like *The Ladies’ Home Journal*, *McCall’s*, or *Vogue*. Books on the history of women were largely supplemental.

The impact of the women’s movement changed the collection policies and practices of such libraries substantially. The number of book and periodical titles grew dramatically with the emergence of feminism. As a result, the landscape of possibility for future research changed in fundamental ways. At the Schlesinger Library, for example, revised collection policies helped document feminism through the acquisition of papers and periodicals by activist groups. Collectors actively sought out new periodicals such as *Off Our Backs*, *Ain’t I a Woman*, and *No More Fun and Games*. At the same time, feminist criticism opened up whole new areas for possible research and collection. As the politics of the 1970s helped create the intellectual foundation of women’s studies, libraries began to seek out new literature widely dispersed across fields such as art history, literary criticism, sociology, psychology, and anthropology.

Collections devoted exclusively to the history of women, however, were by far the exception rather than the rule. Most historians interested in studying the lives of women ventured into large research institutions that offered little guidance to women’s varied experiences within their finding aids, card catalogs, and bibliographies. They found that libraries had a limited lexicon with which to catalog women’s varied experiences. Card catalogs did not contain enough relevant headings to point scholars toward women’s resources. The “w” file was fraught with what librarian Sandy Berman called “prejudices and antipathies.” Berman critiqued the biases and assumptions in such subject headings and suggested revised alternatives. He suggested that headings like “sexual perversion” be removed from entries on “homosexuality” or “lesbianism,” and that new headings such as “Women’s Liberation Movement” be updated alongside existing labels on “rights of women” (Berman, 1971, pp. 182, 178).

In the early 1970s, several scholars combined their research interests with similarly inclined archivists to remedy such deeply entrenched research obstacles. They conceived of an ambitious project to survey archives nationwide for source material on women. In doing so, they intended “to advance intellectual control over primary sources that serve as a base for research in women’s history” (Hinding & Bower, 1979, p. 178).
They sent out surveys intending to locate and describe sources based on seven major areas of importance: (1) papers of a woman; (2) records of a women’s organization; (3) records of an organization, institution, or movement in which women played a significant but not exclusive part; (4) records of an organization, institution, or movement that significantly affected women; (5) groups of materials assembled by a collector around a theme or type of records that relates to women; (6) papers of a family (in which there are papers of females members); and (7) collections with “hidden” women (collections that contain significant or extensive material about women but whose titles or main emphases do not indicate the presence of such material (Hinding & Bower, 1979, p. x).

The resulting guide transformed the nature of research for the next generation of women’s historians. Published in 1979, the massive, two-volume Women’s History Sources: A Guide to Archives and Manuscript Collections in the United States represented a monumental effort by archivists nationwide to rethink their holdings concerning women. The editors surveyed more than eleven thousand repositories and documented over eighteen thousand different manuscript collections. Organized by city and state, the guide described the holdings of major research institution as well as small, lesser-known repositories. The publication of Hinding’s Women’s History Sources brought such efforts to a national audience.

At the same time, large research institutions also began to rethink their collections and provide finding guides to women’s resources. In 1975, for example, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin (SHSW) published its first edition of Women’s History Resources, a small volume intended to help the growing number of scholars and students interested in women’s history navigate their archival resources. Compiled by James P. Danky and Eleanor McKay (1975), this small publication captures some of the early ways that large research libraries began to rethink and reshape the role of their institutions alongside the changing academic climate. A similar effort to create a union list of women’s periodicals emerged from Wisconsin in 1982. Also edited by James Danky, the resulting Women’s Periodicals and Newspapers from the Eighteenth Century to 1981 remains the largest, most comprehensive effort to catalog existing women’s newspapers. Through such efforts, librarians and archivists participated in broader scholarly efforts to consider sources beyond those of elite, white, politically active women. Rather, they described the society’s holding in labor history, mass communication, local history, photography, and film (Danky et al., 1982).

At the same time, a handful of librarians began to survey the first decade of the field and published bibliographies that complimented the work of archivists. Also in 1979, Esther Stineman and Catherine Loeb published Women’s Studies: A Recommended Core Bibliography that described books appropriate for college libraries. Similarly, in 1978, Barbara Haber

For scholars, the publication of comprehensive document guides, combined with thorough bibliographies, transformed the field of women’s history in several ways. First, such guides provided access to countless new topics of research. They highlighted previously obscure local repositories and provided access to women who had never before registered as historically significant. Second, the sheer size and number of resources contained by the guides vividly illustrated the ubiquity of resources on women and the variety of stories they contained. They opened the door to a revision of the field and its intentions. Finally, the sheer variety of resources listed in Hinding’s guide forced scholars to think about their own assumptions about who constituted the category of “women” in the histories they wrote. The publication of this and subsequent research guides, thus, provided the foundation for the field to expand and develop.

At the same time, however, the very expansion of the field fostered by such archival projects forced scholars and archivists alike to challenge assumptions about the ways they constructed the history of womanhood. Increasingly, historians and librarians called attention to the ways that race, class, ethnicity, and sexuality complicated what defined “women” and complicated the assumptions of early feminist scholars. At the University of Wisconsin–Madison, for example, librarians actively fostered and embraced the emerging complexity of the feminist movement in their own work. In the first volume of *Feminist Collections*, a UW publication dedicated to exploring library issues and women’s studies, librarians addressed the tensions between ethnicity and gender when archiving source material. In a 1980 issue, for example, editors Linda Parker and Catherine Loeb described their research efforts in Chicana women’s history and pointed out how card catalog language hindered research. “Sources *must* exist,” the editors claimed, but “just as materials of Anglo women’s history or black history, these sources will remain invisible until we . . . learn the relevant questions to ask” about what qualifies as source material and where to find it (p. 2).

The processes by which historians and librarians learned to ask relevant questions did not occur in a vacuum. Both fields were crucially linked together in their academic pursuits. Scholars brought new questions to source material while librarians and archivists invented new ways to identify and present documents. As a result, the contents of the “w” file became increasingly qualified and complex. Each professional impulse occurred within a shared political climate that facilitated new directions for academic work. Through collaboration and collective experience, scholars and archivists learned how to ask questions about the very nature of archival practice in ways that helped create a radically new understanding of the past.7

In the 1990s, the field of women’s history again changed dramatically in ways that forced scholars, archivists, and librarians to rethink defini-
tions of source material and possibilities for research. Central to this change was the 1988 publication of Joan Scott’s *Gender and the Politics of History*, which argued that identity was a construct articulated through relationships of power. Scott’s work argued for a shift away from “women” as an exclusive subject of historical research to “gender” as a primary category of analysis. The scholarship that emerged from women’s historians in the decade after Joan Scott’s work reflected a radical shift away from the traditional conceptual frameworks of social history. New research reflected an increasing commitment to interdisciplinarity as historians drew from areas such as cultural studies, literary analysis, and material objects for new perspectives on women’s past experiences.

The theoretical changes that forced scholars to revise traditional models of social history and incorporate new understandings of gender were equally important to librarians and archivists. In some ways, such new theoretical frameworks made the work of archivists and librarians considerably more difficult. Unearthing women from collections of historical documents can be difficult, but is not impossible. Archiving relationships of power, in contrast, is a much different pursuit. New scholarly attention to gender created formidable challenges for the librarians and archivists who tried to meet and anticipate their demands.

At the same time, however, such intellectual shifts proved liberating to the method and practice of collection acquisition and presentation. As scholars began to expand the universe of documents for evidence of women’s experience, it opened new possibilities for archivists and librarians to expand the nature of their collections. The most recent set of collection policies for the Schlesinger Library, for example, reflects the full impact of such new possibilities. The library now seeks to collect books and manuscripts on such diverse topics as environmentalism, masculinity, technology, teenagers, parenting, aging, and spirituality in addition to the traditional subjects like reproductive rights, social activism, workplace and household issues.

The work of women’s historians, librarians, and archivists has been contingent and complementary since the field emerged four decades ago. The work of women’s historians has been fundamentally shaped by the ability to access documents and question what qualifies as source material. Such inquiry would have been impossible without the collaboration and commitment of those in libraries and archives. As women’s history continues to evolve, scholars would benefit from looking at the practical and intellectual relationships between documents, the archivists and librarians who organize them and the academics that read. As my own experiences in the archives suggest, a broad understanding of archival practice and history can help create a richer understanding of the past. Researching the archival history of Anne Henry Christian’s material past illuminated how the collection and preservation of sources can shape historic memory.
Although collaborations between scholars, archivists, and librarians are not so obvious today within women’s history as they were in the early 1970s, they remain no less important. More important, understanding such relationships can provide a valuable point of departure for new directions in thinking. Looking at the origins and the history of the “w” file, in particular, suggests the need to revise both the conceptual framework and the archival practice of women’s history. When the field emerged in the late 1960s, the meaning of womanhood seemed obvious to historians, archivists, and librarians alike. Cataloging women’s records meant simply placing a card in the “w” file. As the field matured, however, scholars in women’s history and library sciences found that defining “women” was a very complex project. “Women” in the card catalog became qualified by an increasing number of defining features—race, religion, sexuality, profession, ethnicity, family status, just to name a few.

The original clarity of the category has become so fuzzy over time that it is often hard to weed through the layers of qualification to decipher primary significance. While both scholarship and archival practice have underscored the diversity of women’s lives, such efforts remain framed—or possibly, confined—by their place in the “w” file. Future scholarship will benefit by rethinking both the material and the historical landscape in which we place women’s experiences. It may be time to release “women” as a primary category in order to see the full complexity of women’s historically contingent experiences more clearly. Rethinking this landscape will ultimately help us to shift our focus beyond the “w” file and potentially renew the dynamic collaborations between women’s historians, librarians, and archivists that crucially shaped the field as we know it today.
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Newspapers/periodicals librarian James Danky does collection building wherever he goes and with whomever he communicates, it seems. Thanks to his efforts, the Madison-based Wisconsin Historical Society collects materials from categories other librarians usually overlook, including zines (homemade periodicals, produced for reasons other than to make money, usually photocopied and published irregularly), something he compares to “other print forms that served the same purposes”—radical handbills of the 1880s, poetry pamphlets of the 1950s, and underground newspapers of the 1960s. Danky also collects Wisconsin-based periodicals, no matter how small their circulation, nor how esoteric their content, from Cheese Reporter to Clothed with the Sun; prison publications; and military, embassy, and consulate publications. WHS is the only institution in the United States collecting military base publications, a genre full of racy-sounding titles like Shoot 'Em Down and Danger Forward. These magazines and papers provide unique, close-up views of soldiers’ lives, or at least a glimpse at the culture in which they work.

Give me . . . the wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!
—Emma Lazarus

In libraries wherever I go, I’m heartened and disheartened. All too often I’m aggravated when I see exclusionary library polices and unhelpful practices that go against librarians’ stated basic principles. But at the same time I’m cheered by lively and unusual collections, exhibits, books,
and special items new to me. Often the latter are the result of one innovative, thoughtful, energetic, passionate librarian. When I look at union catalog holdings for alternative press titles—for the likes of *Cometbus* and *Carbusters*—I often find just a few owning libraries, and immediately can name (and mentally picture) the individual librarians responsible for collecting them. One is Jim Danky.

**Zines**

How many librarians correspond professionally with people named Barney FreeBeer and Aaron Cometbus? Danky does. Here’s a letter, representative of countless similar letters Danky has sent in his career, this to the editor of *Free Beer*:

> Mr. FreeBeer:  
> *The Library of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin has been negligent in not including your important publication in our permanent collections earlier, so please send one copy each of your work. Quite the publishing hotbed is West Bend evidently (new editor of the Wisconsin State Journal formerly labored on WB’s newspaper). If we need to pay you, and we are poor of course, then please enclose a modest invoice. Lastly, do you know of other zine publishers in Wisconsin, that I should know about? I bought my copy of your work at Rainbow Books in Madison.*  
> *All the best.*  
> James P. Danky

Jim Danky does collection building wherever he goes and with whomever he communicates, it seems. Thanks to his efforts, the name and address of the Wisconsin Historical Society (WHS) often appears in lists of zine libraries, on Web sites and in print, with small, grassroots projects the likes of JustabunchoKids Community Library and the Long Haul Info-shop. As a result, people like Barney FreeBeer write him to donate their homemade publications. Danky says that the publisher of *Rats* (“Newsletter for the rodently inclined”) delivered each issue himself (J. P. Danky, personal communication, November 14, 2006). “When he brought in the final number, I asked him why he was stopping. He said that he’d said all that he wanted to about rats.” Twenty-six issues of the newsletter were published from 1993 to 1997.

For items such as *Free Beer* and *Rats*, reviews are rare. Regardless, and no matter the publications’ production values or writing quality, Danky acquires all Wisconsin-made zines that come to his attention. The WHS holds over a hundred that can be found by searching the library’s catalog (Madcat) under “Fanzines—Wisconsin,” a heading further subdivided by the name of the Wisconsin community in which each is published.

By *zines* I refer to homemade periodicals, produced for reasons other than making money (many out of some mania or passion), usually photocopied and published irregularly. Danky was acquiring zines for the Wis-
consin Historical Society long before the term *zines* was commonly used as a contraction of *fanzines*. The society holds eight issues of punk fanzine *Catholic Guilt*, for example, the first three issues of which date from 1982. That same year Mike Gunderloy started *Factsheet Five*, a tiny mimeo publication for his friends, that would by the early 1990s become a full-fledged review magazine that fostered cross-pollination between zine publishers on the one hand, and helped raise awareness of zines in the mass media on the other. Thanks partly to Gunderloy, we now have self-identified “zine librarians” and such books as *From A to Zine: Building a Winning Zine Collection in Your Library* (Bartel, 2004). Danky’s practice of collecting all sorts of unclassifiable underground press publications, however, predates this.

Danky’s advocacy of alternative press collecting, in such works as *Alternative Materials in Libraries* and *Alternative Library Literature*, are another reason we now have “zine librarians” and “zine libraries.” As early as the 1970s Danky was showing librarians the how and what (if not always the why) of alternative acquisitions in a newsletter called *Collectors’ Network News*, which reviewed such publications such as *The New Age Harmonist* (1978) and *Doing It! Practical Alternatives for Humanizing City Life* (1977).


A writer interviewing Danky for a Milwaukee newspaper recently labeled him “the Godfather of Zines” (Becks, 2006). The appellation recognized his role catalyzing the Madison Zine Fest, an annual event started in 2004 by Danky protégé Alycia Sellie, at the time a University of Wisconsin–Madison library school student. “From my perspective,” Danky notes in the interview, “zines produced in Wisconsin are important because they constitute one of the authentic voices that would otherwise be lost.” Viewing zines through a long historical lens, Danky sees them with “other print forms that served the same purposes”—radical handbills of the 1880s, poetry pamphlets of the 1950s, and underground newspapers of the 1960s.

New York–based librarian Jenna Freedman acknowledged Danky in an article about zine collecting published in *Library Journal* (Freedman, 2006). The founder of a zine collection at Barnard College, Freedman notes on her library’s Web site over a dozen kindred zine collections in academic libraries, and nearly twice as many more in public and “volunteer” libraries. Most—if not all—are indebted to Danky, whose own collection has been a model in taking strange things seriously.
WHS owns more than thirty zine titles produced in Madison and Milwaukee, Wisconsin’s two largest cities, including *Bored and Violent*, *Candles for Girls*, *Disorderly Conduct*, *Harry Cletus*, *Hot Sex*, *Math Club Porno*, and *Raw Goof*, all from Madison, and *Allah Makes My Ass Tired: And Other Names I Didn’t Use For My Very First Zine*, *Crème-Filled*, *Dumpstered Ivan*, *Holywickedflyingjesus!*, *Nantucket Bucket: The Journal of Dirty Limericks*, *Revolution of None*, and *Secret Life of Snakes*, from Milwaukee.

Why collect such apparent oddities, low-circulation photocopied items the likes of which few have seen? Simply this: because they are a part of Wisconsin’s culture and history. Let’s not attempt to sanitize our culture, Danky might say, but let future historians see for themselves the true diversity of interests and modes of expression that thrived for a time. After all, imagine being able to read a list of titles, but not being able to examine them. The vaunted freedom to read means nothing if the things we want or need to read are unavailable.

Zines are source material waiting to be mined. Scholars began to recognize this in the early and mid-1990s. *A Zine-ography: An Annotated List of Books and Articles about Zines* (Dodge, 1998) notes, for example, two chapters on fanzines in Camille Bacon-Smith’s *Enterprising Women* (1992), a paper on “queer punk fanzines” in *Journal of Communication Inquiry* (Fenster, 1993), a 1994 conference paper on using zines in the classroom (Hudson, 1994), and Thomas McLaughlin’s “Criticism in the Zine” in his book *Street Smarts and Critical Theory* (1996).

Stephen Duncombe’s *Notes from Underground* (1997) was the first book-length critical work about zines. A revision of his City University of New York 1996 doctoral thesis, Duncombe’s research was aided immeasurably by the New York State Library’s collection of zines whose provenance was *Factsheet Five* editor Mike Gunderloy. Had Duncombe been based in the Midwest, he would have relied heavily on WHS collections.

As zines have become more widely known as a genre, so have they been taken seriously in academia, if sometimes because the authors of scholarly works were once zine editors themselves. Those skeptical of the research value of *Math Club Porno* and *Dumpstered Ivan* should take note of Daniel Brouwer’s “Counterpublicity and Corporeality in HIV/AIDS Zines” in *Critical Studies in Media Communication* (2005), which examines *Diseased Pariah News* and *Infected Faggot Perspectives*. While it is too early to say just what role zines in WHS collections will play in scholarship, the question is moot. Without such zines, there would be no scholarship.

Libraries are full of books published in New York, but print culture is produced almost everywhere humans live. Certainly it is produced not just in large cities where wealthier libraries are based and where more librarians are likelier to spot new publications, but also in small cities, towns, and rural areas. The WHS zine collection reflects this, providing a map of Wisconsin. Witness: *A Muse on the Mound* (published in Blue Mounds),
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WHS zines are integrated into the periodical collection as a whole. There is no separate “zine collection,” and the corresponding catalog records reflect this. The record for *Rats*, for example, has a single subject heading (*Rats—Periodicals*) while *Guinea Pig Zero*, a zine devoted to the topic of human medical experimentation warrants three (*Drugs—Testing—Periodicals*, *Clinical trials—Periodicals*, and *Human experimentation in medicine—Periodicals*). Neither, however, is assigned “Fanzines” as a genre heading. It should also be noted that the Library of Congress has now established the subject heading “Zines”; LC waited for the word to appear in multiple dictionaries before doing so.

LC catalogers could have asked Danky. A few years ago I published a chapbook (*Hello James*, 2003) reproducing “selections from letters by the editors of zines, mini-comics, newsletters, tracts, and other self-published periodicals in response to a postcard from the Wisconsin Historical Society.” In it I wrote:

For the past umpteen years, James P. Danky has been collecting alternative library materials. In his role as Newspapers and Periodicals Librarian since 1976 . . . Danky has grown a collection that represents the range of human endeavors more fully than most libraries. The *Milwaukee Sentinel* noted nearly a decade ago—in a piece titled “Visionary Librarian Guards Free Speech”—that “to take the pulse of contemporary America, Danky subscribes to 8,500 newspapers and magazines annually,” resulting in a mailbox “stuffed with papers published by religious extremists, anti-environmentalists, nudists, prisoners, disgruntled CIA dropouts and other people living on the fringe.”

This representation of marginal voices is no accident. “I love libraries, but I am frequently disappointed by them,” Danky (1994, p. 3) said in remarks on being selected University of Wisconsin School of Library and Information Studies Distinguished Alumnus for 1993:

I sympathize with their financial limitations, but I am increasingly intolerant of their personal biases of class, of race, of religion, of national origin, of sexual preference. I have devoted myself to bringing as wide a variety of viewpoints as possible into the library in the hope of capturing the ephemeral nature of today’s society. That I fail at this goal bothers me only a little, and I do determine to redouble my efforts. If I had but one single wish for libraries, it would be that each one would collect all of the materials published in their service area. That single and not particularly profound step would do more to create a bibliographic universe of unparalleled diversity that would fulfill the goal of fairness than anything else I can imagine. (pp. 3–4)
Wisconsinalia, Prison Publications & Miscellanea
Unparalleled diversity, indeed. Besides zines, the WHS collection includes myriad other Wisconsin-based periodicals, no matter how small their circulation, from *American Bowler* (official membership journal of the American Bowling Congress) and *Frames & Lanes* (publication of Women’s International Bowling Congress) to *The Informer* (publication of Oil Jobbers of Wisconsin), *The Trapper and Predator Caller*, *Wisconsin Woman*, and the *Zor Zephyr*, publication of the Zor Shrine, mysteriously labeled A.A.O.N.M.S. A 1989 article about Danky and the WHS periodical collection published in the weekly Madison *Isthmus* (Forman, 1989) notes such holdings as *Cheese Reporter* (“Serving the world’s cheese industry since 1876”), *Catholic Guilt, Clothed with the Sun*, and *Cap City Creosote Times* (“a quarterly newsletter for patrons of the Capital City Chimney Sweep Company), all published in Wisconsin.

Wisconsin periodicals cover a cultural gamut, including glossy city magazines, African American and Native American papers, business publications (the likes of *Wisconsin Architect*), historical journals, little magazines (small press poetry), hobbyist publications (such as the newsletter of the International Fire Buff Associates), women’s magazines and newsletters, environmental magazines, and publications from hate groups. “It is often impossible to review a publication without reviewing the organization that publishes it,” a review of *Posse Noose Report* notes (Danky & Cashin, 1986, p. 154). “In the case of *Posse Noose Report*, there is little choice. The poor production values and varying sizes of issues are meaningless because no one interested in extremist politics would consider these to be pertinent features . . . Not for everyone, but for those with an interest in the authentic voice of the radical right the PNR hits the mark” (p. 154).

“Think globally, and collect locally,” Danky used to say. Not that he limits himself to Wisconsinalia. WHS holds selected zines published outside Wisconsin, some based on a publication’s perceived significance (such as *Comethus*, a longstanding and influential punk music culture zine) and some based on other areas in which Danky collects, such as radical politics. I’m not sure why WHS holds *Ant Spoiem, Bovine Gazette* (“Official Publication of the Holy Church of Moo”), *Fat!So?, Kinetic Skookum, Primeval Salamander, Quickdummies*, and *Turd-filled Donut*, but I’m glad to know that some library does.

In the British *Library Association Record* in 1991, Danky notes that WHS collections closely reflect his personal and professional travel schedule: “better for Chicago than Indianapolis, more Honolulu imprints than Nebraska titles.” But he added, “I have overcome this geographical bias, in part, by sending letters to specialized bookstores in various cities asking that they send me samples” (“Serial Thrillers,” 1991, p. 679). When Danky was in the United Kingdom on a Fulbright scholarship in 1991, he shipped back three boxes of periodicals to the States, treasure troves
of British alternative tabloids, radical and ethnic publications, and zines. (I know—I saw them first and described some of them in several issues of *MSRRT Newsletter*, publication of the Minnesota Library Association’s Social Responsibilities Round Table, and still remember some of my favorites, *Schnews* and *Do or Die*, to name two.)

Besides being creative in his collection building, Danky is tireless and persistent. That his aspirations are both comprehensive and focused has long been apparent. For years Jim sent me large boxes of printed matter representing duplicates, sample copies, things sent him by colleagues (sometimes things *I’d* sent him that made their way back to me), and items he’d picked up on his travels—some hand-picked with me in mind because he knew so well my interests in radical and esoteric publications. These boxes also regularly included signs of another of Danky’s collection building tactics: photocopies of pages of reviews and periodical lists from every source he could find, dutifully checked against WHS holdings. Jim would even send me copies of the publication that I edited, *MSRRT Newsletter*, marked up and clearly used in this way.

In the “Danky boxes” (as I came to call them) I found newsletters by and for collectors of toothpick holders, Abraham Lincoln impersonators (*Lincarnations*), and an Andy Griffith fan club; trade magazines for funeral home directors and clergy; contemporary Japanese and Russian language papers from North American cities; genealogical periodicals of all sorts (from *The Middle Tennessee Journal of Genealogy & History* to *Mishpacha: The Jewish Genealogy Society of Greater Washington*), and dozens of other unique and sometimes nearly uncategorizable titles.

An article about the WHS collection that appeared in the now defunct *Lingua Franca* in 1992 mentions *Just for Openers* (a publication for collectors of bottle and can openers), *The Christian Conjurer* (official publication of the Fellowship of Christian Magicians), and *Fighting Woman News*, a magazine for female martial artists (Rigby, 1992). “All these specialized kinds of publications will be of interest to historians in the future,” Danky says in the *Isthmus* profile (Forman, 1989, p. 12); “I know that because I am familiar with the kinds of things historians are presently interested in that we’ve gathered before—and the things that we all wished we had which don’t exist anymore.”

Such as prison publications. “In the mid-1970s I had considered doing a bibliography on prison papers and have tried to subscribe to as many as possible,” Danky reports (J. P. Danky, personal communication, February 26, 2007). “These are hard titles to acquire for obvious reasons.” The prison press thrived in the 70s, says a 2005 report in *Counterpunch* magazine,

when, according to Jim Danky, Librarian of the Wisconsin Historical Society, which is home to the nation’s largest collection of prison newspapers, highly politicized prisoners brought “the ethos of the 60s inside with them” and cranked out enough radical rags to fill a library. Among
these were *The Iced Pig* edited by Weatherman and Attica prisoner Sam Melville and the *San Quentin News*, known for its censored report on bird excrement in the prison cafeteria. (Caldwell, 2005)

**Military, Embassy, and Consulate Publications**

Thanks to Danky’s efforts, WHS continues to be the only institution in the United States collecting military base publications, a genre full of racy-sounding titles like *Shoot ‘Em Down, Danger Forward*, and *Bulldogs on Five*. These magazines and papers provide unique, close-up views of soldiers’ lives, or at least a glimpse at the culture in which they work. “Researching the role of the military in history without using military newspapers would be as absurd as researching the history of American politics without newspapers,” Danky has said (Wisconsin Historical Society, n.d.).

Since no one else does, WHS holds *Hawaii Army Weekly*, a newspaper “serving the 25th Infantry Division (Light) and U.S. Army, Hawaii;” *The Tankard*, newspaper of the 128th Air Refueling Wing, Milwaukee; *American Fighter Aces & Friends*, magazine of the American Fighter Aces Association in conjunction with The Museum of Flight; *Front Range Flyer*, magazine of the 302nd Airlift Wing, U.S. Air Force Reserve Command, Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado; and *Mountain Messenger*, from the Mountain Warrior Recruiting Battalion, Beckley, West Virginia.

The WHS began collecting armed forces periodicals in the nineteenth century, but the bulk of it dates from late 1979 when the society began acquiring them from an avid collector named Walter S. Dougherty, a Floridian who had started his collection during World War II. The WHS also holds some less parochial military titles, including *The Jewish Veteran* (“Jewish soldiers in Iraq”—official publication of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States); *Marines* (“The Corps’ Official Magazine”); *Spokesman* (from the Air Intelligence Agency), and *Recruiter* (“The Magazine of the Air Force Recruiting Professional”).

An article in the *Wisconsin State Journal* (Martell, 2004, p. D1) described this part of the WHS collection, including such titles as *Sand Script*, containing an article about “skyrocketing suicide and accidental death rates” among military pilots, and *Tallil Times*, with “tips on how to react to ambushes.” “The publications are not just being saved for historians,” writer Chris Martell notes. They are also for the families of veterans. “With luck the veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan will all become old,” the article quotes Danky:

A few will have saved some of these publications but most will not. Libraries are created as a source for common memories. The veterans, their children and grandchildren will be able to look at these newspapers someday and see what their ancestors were doing in the war. I’m always surprised at how the major media doesn’t look at these small publications. There is disdain and ignorance of them among the major
media. But if they are ignored, there are things about the war in Iraq and Afghanistan that will never be understood. (p. D1)

Embassy and consulate newsletters represent another related category of noteworthy but overlooked publications Danky has collected at WHS: “the only documentary record of American diplomatic activity from the grass roots,” he says.

The society developed this collection to complement its national collection of military newspapers and periodicals only after determining that no library or archives in the country was already engaged in these activities . . . Dating from about 1990, these 400 titles arrived at the library from every country the United States has diplomatic relations with. The titles are frequently the only publication in English from smaller, less developed countries, especially when published at consulates distant from the capitals. From current up-to-the-moment perspectives on diplomatic life to the routines of thousands of Americans in the foreign service, these newsletters have already been utilized by anthropologists and sociologists on both the Madison campus and beyond. In 2002 the State Department determined that the Library could no longer receive the newsletters due to security concerns following 9/11. (J. P. Danky, personal communication, April 10, 2003)

If no one else will, Danky will collect esoteric religious periodicals, from Mormon Focus and Lutheran Women Today, to The Sacred Name Broadcaster (Assemblies of Yahweh), The Whole Truth (The official magazine of the International Church of God in Christ), and The A.M.E. Church Review. Thanks to Danky, I think, I’ve seen a trade publication by and for ministers, just the sort of item he’d know and care about.

Again: Why bother to collect such things? In November 2006, Danky wrote to a West Coast acquaintance who in the late 1970s had gone “to the People’s Temple garage sale, after the Kool-Aid,” where he’d acquired one issue of People’s Temple News and then sent it to Madison, knowing Danky would appreciate it. “Later the Graduate Theological Library at Berkeley,” Danky told his friend, “working with Stanford, found some additional issues, and asked to borrow ours, which was the only known copy. In any case, your perceptive grab helped make all of the later work, including the new documentary on Jonestown, possible in a way” (J. P. Danky, personal communication, November 27, 2006).

Careful attention to acknowledgments in books and documentary films will show that “Wisconsin Historical Society” is frequently used as a research source. Within a few days of writing that last sentence, I was reading Ewen & Ewen’s Typecasting: On the Arts and Sciences of Human Equality (2006), a history of “science in the service of prejudice.” Deep within its pages I came upon a reference to Freedom’s Journal (“the nation’s first African American newspaper”), then saw on the next page a graphic reproduction “from the collection of the Wisconsin State Historical Society” (p. 331).
The same sort of acknowledgment can be found in reference to cultural productions dealing with labor history and radical politics of all kinds. Maybe even in histories of collectibles. Yes, if no one else will, Danky will collect publications by and for passionate collectors, the likes of *The Train Collectors Quarterly*, *North South Trader’s Civil War*, *Knife World* and *The Pony Express* (the official newsletter of the Mustang [car] Owners Club International). Who better than a collector to identify and collect publications about collecting?

Danky wrote in an email missive to Wayne Wiegand in 2005:

When I was hired in 1973 I knew a tiny bit about the collection but nothing like the last years have taught me. No library has our breadth, though a number collect in the same depth in some areas . . . For Wisconsin titles there is no competition, unfortunately. Too bad, as we don’t see all that much from outside Dane County, and for, say, Milwaukee, there is no real way to do a good job unless you are there, on the ground gathering up the stuff. The changes at Milwaukee Public Library mirror those of nearly all public libraries . . . [t]hat is, they do not see themselves as repositories for their own community’s past or at least not much beyond the daily/weekly newspaper. Most publics in Wisconsin do not even purchase the microfilm we produce of their own newspaper, preferring to rely on us for [interlibrary] loan if it is requested. So I am pretty sure that there is no institution [that] would pick up any slack if the Society did not continue doing what we do today, unfortunately. (Some evidence of this is the very high percentage, say 60–90%, of current serial titles that are unique to OCLC. This is across all subject areas, so you would think that if another institution was interested that we would find their cataloging, but that has not been the case in my tenure.)

But I am optimistic. All it requires is that the Library get someone with intelligence and lots of energy, organizational skills, and the ability to listen to colleagues and patrons and the collecting can proceed . . .

(J. P. Danky, personal communication, September 9, 2005)

In an op-ed piece in the *Anchorage Daily News*, Michael Carey (2004) wrote about the difficulty he experienced finding a good home for “a pile of alternative newspapers from the ’60s and early ’70s” (p. B4). At last he was put in touch with the right institution, and the right person. The WHS collections are so extensive that “when the Alaska State Library wanted copies of early Alaska papers, its librarians contacted the Madison organization,” Carey noted (p. B4). And how did the WHS obtain so many anti-war papers from the Vietnam War era in the first place? “We subscribed,” Danky told him.

Someone find another Jim Danky, please, for the next generation.

**Note**

dodge/collecting the wretched refuse
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An Alternative Vision of Librarianship:  
James Danky and the Sociocultural Politics of Collection Development

Juris Dilevko

Abstract
The work of James P. Danky, longtime librarian at the Wisconsin Historical Society, is situated within the intellectual context of collection-development practices. Danky’s belief in the value of alternative periodicals—and the lengths that he went to identify and acquire them—may be interpreted as a rejection of increasingly mechanical and generic ways to develop library collections. Reliance on centralized selection procedures, approval plans, and serials vendors was not only tantamount to the “disintegration of librarians as sources of expertise,” but also structurally privileged books and serials from mainstream publishers. The biennial Alternative Library Literature (1982–2001), which Danky coedited with Sanford Berman, is compared with the annual Library Lit.—The Best of (1970–1990) to illuminate the way in which contrasting philosophical approaches to the selection of anthology articles may be interpreted as a microcosm of larger issues in collection development.

In the middle and late 1960s, three structurally intertwined events altered the practice of collection development in public and academic libraries in the United States. Taken together, these events moved collection development away from the realm of what could be described as item “selection” on a title-by-title basis by subject specialists into the realm of item “purchasing” (Harris, 1970, p. 53). First, many large and midsized public libraries with multiple branches instituted the practice of centralized selection, whereby relatively low-paid paraprofessionals in consolidated acquisitions departments adhered to a demand-driven philosophy embodied in the phrase “Give ’Em What They Want,” which had its origins at the Baltimore County (Maryland) Public Library (BCPL). Second,
many academic libraries outsourced their monograph purchases to vendors who provided them with books through approval plans, defined as “an acquisitions method under which a library receives regular shipments of new titles selected by a dealer, based on a profile of library collection interests, with the right to return what it decides not to buy” (Nardini, 2003, p. 133). Third, academic and public libraries increasingly entrusted their periodical purchases to serials vendors or subscription agents, thus avoiding direct contact with publishers of journals and magazines. As these changes became normative throughout the last three decades of the twentieth century, they contributed to a situation whereby alternative books and periodicals from small presses were not easily found in many American libraries.

Throughout his more than thirty-year career (1973–2007) at the Wisconsin Historical Society as an Order Librarian; Newspapers and Periodicals Librarian; Assistant Librarian for Research and Development; and founding codirector of the Center for the History of Print Culture in Modern America, James P. Danky looked askance at the philosophies associated with serials vendors, monographic approval plans, and the “Give ’Em What They Want” approach, believing that they significantly impoverished the cumulated written record available at the nation’s libraries by overlooking material that was not readily available through convenient channels. Danky’s academic interests were primarily historical—an effort to extend, deepen, and thus problematize the public’s awareness of neglected historical sources that told a story that ran counter to received wisdom in many fields. As coeditor of volumes such as Women in Print: Essays on the Print Culture of American Women from the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries (Danky & Wiegand, 2006); African-American Newspapers and Periodicals: A National Bibliography (Danky & Hady, 1998); The German-American Radical Press: The Shaping of a Left Political Culture, 1850–1940 (Shore, Fones-Wolf, & Danky, 1992); and Native American Periodicals and Newspapers, 1828–1982: Bibliography, Publishing Record, and Holdings (Danky & Hady, 1984), he displayed meticulous scholarship and an abiding passion for opening new perspectives on American life and culture. But underlying his historical pursuits was the recognition that collecting contemporary alternative and small-press publications was key to providing an in-depth picture of current social, cultural, and political issues and debates (e.g., Campbell, Bowles, & Danky, 1984a, 1984b; Danky, 1974, 1982, 1986, 1989, 1991, 1996a; Danky & Hennessy, 1986; Danky & Shore, 1982; Hady & Danky, 1979; Hunter & Danky, 1986). For him, these publications represented not only the cornerstone of any informed historical portrait of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century written in the future, but also the essence of librarianship, since they alone were capable of interrogating mainstream publications that comprised the bulk of materials available at libraries. In short, collecting alternative materials was the
responsibility of all librarians if they wanted to give full meaning to concepts such as equality, diversity, and substantive neutrality. If only mainstream publications were collected, Danky felt, substantive neutrality was impossible because, while such publications ventured to the left or the right of conventional wisdom on any given topic, they never went beyond a safe middle range of opinion that represented a consensus status quo. Collecting alternative materials—those on the margins of accepted contemporary discourse—was therefore a necessary part of librarianship’s commitment to substantive neutrality. It was difficult work that obligated librarians to look beyond serials vendors, approval plans, and BCPL-inspired rhetoric.

**Debates in Librarianship about Collection Development**

Danky’s views about collection development were grounded in the social activism of the 1960s and early 1970s. It was a time when “hundreds of American librarians and library school students became involved in championing socially related change in librarianship . . . and in so doing brought the library profession into the social protest movements of the time” (Bundy & Stielow, 1987, p. 1). Discouraged with what they perceived as an ossified American Library Association (ALA) and with library leaders who retained “comfortable illusions” about the profession, many practitioners worked “to make good [librarianship’s] intellectual freedom and other ethical commitments, to recognize and do something about the inequalities in [library] services, to withhold . . . support from still segregated library associations, and to take a position on . . . the war in Vietnam and police repression at home” (Bundy & Stielow, 1987, p. 5). One area of concerted effort was women’s rights: “women librarians became aware of the wide spectrum of ideas being addressed by the women’s movement and began to discuss such issues as salaries, promotional opportunities, and sexism in library materials” (Cassell, 1987, p. 21). Other areas of focus were: serving minority populations and the disadvantaged; heightening the relevancy of library education; and integrating library schools and the profession as a whole (Axam, 1987; Haro, 1987; Josey, 1987; Owens, 1987; Williams, 1987).

Some of these concerns were summarized in the “Friday the 13th Manifesto,” an outgrowth of the 1969 Institute on Library Service to the Black and Urban Poor, which stated that the priorities of public libraries were skewed toward “the articulated needs and demands of the power structure and have not extended to the unarticulated needs of those outside the power structure” (qtd. in Bundy & Stielow, 1987, pp. 186–187). Librarians therefore needed to engage in “a philosophy of advocacy” on behalf of the excluded (qtd. in Bundy & Stielow, 1987, pp. 186–187). This mindset animated the founders of the Social Responsibilities Round Table
(SRRT), which from its inception in 1969 saw itself as “the ‘conscience of ALA’ and as a pressure group within ALA” whose mission it was to engage the ALA in “intellectual confrontations” so as “to define the role of the library in society” (qtd. in Bundy & Stielow, 1987, p. 193). As Toni Samek (2001) shows, SRRT soon became “the largest ALA round table with 1013 members,” an indication of widespread frustration with current practices of the ALA (p. 70).

Perhaps the most searing confrontation was about intellectual freedom. If libraries were to better serve individuals outside the power structure, they should collect materials that reflected those hitherto excluded voices. Libraries could no longer afford to be neutral in a “hands-off liberalism” sort of way, since such neutrality was not substantive neutrality (Samek, 2001, p. 46). Intellectual freedom was therefore a collection-development issue. As Sanford Berman (1976) argued, if libraries wanted to be venues for “liberation”—the “single keyword or rubric [that] encompasses the multitude of overlapping movements and ideas that within the past decade have forcefully emerged among blacks, students, Jews, teachers, Chicanos, women, the young, Asian-Americans, servicemen, Indians, ecophiliacs, still-colonized peoples, workers, the impoverished, homosexuals, and even some psychiatrists, athletes, retirees, sociologists, and librarians”—it was incumbent that collection-development specialists acquire materials that spoke to the various impulses for “liberation” (pp. 345–346).

Moreover, once acquired, these alternative materials should not fall prey to the traditional “condescending, curator-like, rubber-gloves-and-forceps-mentality” that consigned them to “glass cases” and “padlocked vaults,” effectively relegating them to archival status in the same way that “intriguing cadavers [were] gathered and then pickled and frozen for later study by anatomists” (Berman, 1976, p. 346). Instead, they should be placed on “open shelves” because the “articles in Radical America, Women, and Tricontinental Magazine are just as fitting and citable for term papers and dissertations as material culled from Foreign Affairs, Time, and Business Week” (Berman, 1976, p. 346). Finally, libraries should avoid relying on the “pathetic” bibliographic data supplied by the Library of Congress or the Online Computer Library Center to catalog purchased alternative materials, since this data lacked “sufficient subject headings and other added entries”; failed “to adequately and helpfully indicate special features or content-elements not discernible from the title alone”; and omitted “subject terms that faithfully and precisely express the content of the work in familiar, unbiased language” (Berman, 1982, p. 31).

Properly understood, collection development was a multifaceted concept that included the selection of items, their display, and appropriate cataloging. All these elements needed to be approached from a “dynamic, responsive” (Berman, 1976, p. 349) perspective the goal of which was substantive neutrality, which would meaningfully expand the conformist
boundaries of what Alan Nadel (1995) referred to as “containment culture” (p. 4). Only in this way could libraries show that they had “opt[ed] for people, participation, compassion, and engagement” (Berman, 1976, p. 344)—the kind of values that informed Synergy, one of the first North American publications devoted to alerting librarians about alternative-press books and magazines. Founded in 1967, Synergy not only excoriated librarians for being “passive” and soporific consumers in an “information marketplace” controlled by “big publishers” who only paid attention to “alternative press related topics” when they “sensed profit,” but also informed them about how the tools that they ordinarily used to select books and magazines were “rear-view mirrors” that had little connection with actual user interests (Samek, 2001, p. 47).

But the call for what Berman (1976) identified as “dynamic, responsive” libraries that gave priority “to the people” (p. 349) was interpreted by others in the 1960s in an entirely different way. This was particularly true when it came to collection development. For the BCPL, responsiveness was conceptualized as a “Give 'Em What They Want” approach, a philosophy that at first glance appeared to have much in common with Berman’s prioritization of “the people,” but when all was said and done turned out to be its antithesis. As described by BCPL’s senior administrators, Charlie Robinson and Jean-Barry Molz, “Give 'Em What They Want” dispensed with attempting to create a “good” library—“We soon saw that [trying to do so] was ridiculous. It was insane”—in favor of buying multiple copies of bestsellers (Pearl, 1996, p. 136). For the BCPL, responsiveness meant being “the best seller library, or the bookstore library” (Pearl, 1996, p. 136). Making circulation statistics the main criteria by which to judge a book’s value, Robinson spoke caustically about libraries’ responsibility to serve anyone else but middle-class users interested in “maintaining their lawns” and “heat pumps” (Pearl, 1996, pp. 136, 137). If such materials were what customers wanted, “what was the point of giving them what they didn’t want?” such as “every book about the Vietnam War ever published . . . [which] sat on the shelf” or sleep-inducing “great literature” (Pearl, 1996, pp. 137, 138). Disdainfully noting that “the library profession is full of closet social workers” who had studied impractical “philosophical issues” in graduate library degree programs, he also remarked that “libraries can’t do anything about” such “quality-of-life issues” as “jobs, housing, and education,” much like McDonald’s can’t do anything about “those people who can’t afford its hamburgers” (Pearl, 1996, p. 138).

Because of the BCPL’s emphasis on bestsellers, Robinson and Molz saw little need to retain collection-development specialists who were responsible for a specific subject area or branch library. Instead, they instituted centralized selection, which was carried out by paraprofessionals trained to perform rote tasks at a “cost benefit” to the BCPL (Pearl, 1996, p. 138). Implicit in this procedural transformation was the notion that
the selection of books was a simple one-size-fits-all mechanical procedure, since it involved ordering multiple copies of bestsellers and other popular books that received widespread attention in the mass media. And because selection was now an easy, deskilled task that did not require broad-based subject knowledge, it could also be remunerated in such a way as to generate financial savings for the library system. Giving the people what they wanted had become a rationale for implementing a collection-development strategy for public libraries based on market imperatives. It was a far cry from providing the type of liberating materials Berman had in mind.

**Library Vendors and Homogenized Collections**

Libraries’ almost universal reliance on approval plans to purchase monographs reinforced the homogenizing tendencies set in motion by the “Give ’Em What They Want” ethos. Indeed, approval plans were justified in much the same terms as BCPL procedures: they not only assisted libraries “in containing operating costs,” but they also “speed[ed] up and streamline[d] the acquisition of in-print titles in the interest of providing an improved service to . . . users” (Abel, 1995, p. 47). As described by Richard Abel (1995), the originator of the approval-plan concept, the economic basis of approval plans rested on vendors and wholesalers obtaining sufficiently large “discount schedules” from book publishers, typically “30–35 percent” below list price (p. 54). The larger the publisher and print run of a book, the larger the discount schedule given to a vendor, with trade books typically discounted “40 percent to 50 percent” (Miller, 1992, p. 22). Vendors bought large quantities of books at discounted rates, warehoused them, and then shipped individual titles to library customers based on library-created purchasing profiles, which included desired subject parameters; nonsubject delimiters such as language, price, or place of publication; and publisher inclusions and exclusions (Nardini, 2003, p. 134). Vendors’ ability to make a profit depended on the difference between the discounted price they paid a publisher for a book and the price at which they sold that book to a library: the greater the difference, the greater a vendor’s profit. To increase profit margins, vendors also provided libraries with value-added services such as full cataloging records for purchased books, as well as “physical processing” of bought volumes so that they were “fully shelf-ready,” in which case items were not returnable (Nardini, 2003, p. 135). Arguably, approval plans were the beginning of outsourced collection-development work.

Because many alternative publishers could not generate “economies of scale” due to small print runs, unpredictable publication schedules, small advertising budgets, and lack of reviews in popular reviewing outlets (M. Eldredge, 1996, pp. 53–54), they could not afford to offer vendors discounts, let alone the type of appealing discount schedules that vendors needed to be profitable. Vendors were therefore reticent about
buying nondiscounted books from alternative publishers because small-press titles, along with “highly specialized societal publications,” were “a direct financial liability for an approval vendor to handle” (M. Eldredge, 1996, pp. 53, 54). Procuring hard-to-locate items from alternative publishers negatively affected the “increased efficiency” that vendors needed to remain profitable—the type of increased efficiency that came with the bureaucratic and “standardized procedures” characteristic of the “large publishing operations” that vendors preferred to deal with (M. Eldredge, 1996, p. 54, 53). If vendors did make an effort to supply alternative publications to libraries, high service charges were frequently added to the price libraries were asked to pay for these not-discounted-to-the-vendor titles so that vendors could cover their unit transaction costs and show a profit. This was especially true of those vendors who preferred “each title to pay for itself rather than gamble on a high volume of trade titles” and those that adopted “cost-plus pricing” (Miller, 1992, p. 22). When financially constrained libraries evaluated vendor performance at the end of a fiscal cycle or upon receipt of a shipment, it was logical that vendors would be questioned about high service charges for specific items. Libraries, after all, were interested in receiving the maximum discount possible from vendors on their overall orders. If a library’s approval-plan profile included many alternative publishers, its overall discount on its purchases from the vendor was relatively low. In these circumstances, libraries rethought their “publisher mix” so as to receive “a deeper discount from the vendor,” which ultimately meant expanding their profile “to include lots of books from publishers that give [the] vendor a 30 percent or 40 percent discount” (R. Anderson, 2004, p. 38). While rethinking “publisher mix” was financially beneficial for libraries, it nevertheless disproportionately affected nondiscounted titles published by alternative presses, which were usually the first to be eliminated in the interests of securing “a deeper discount.”

As Charles Willett (1998) bluntly noted, academic libraries that put their faith in approval plans often failed to provide adequate coverage of alternative materials that challenged “conservative” and “authoritarian” policies, which in turn reinforced “a biased set of ideas in support of élite beliefs and goals” (p. 93). Instead, they invariably bought “the same general core collection” of books from vendors who dealt with “well-known” publishers (p. 93). If libraries wanted to ensure that their collections contained a substantial number of alternative materials, they had to bypass “mainstream distribution channels” and take time-consuming (and expensive) steps to systematically identify and order alternative publications (e.g., Minneapolis Community & Technical College, n.d.). As acquisitions budgets became tighter in the last decades of the twentieth century, only the most persistent libraries systematically collected monographs published by alternative presses (Lee, 2002), choosing instead to spend their
budgets on what they perceived to be more reputable core items from mainstream presses. Even a strong supporter of approval plans such as Robert F. Nardini (2003) commented that one of the unresolved “objections” to them was that “vendor concentration on mainstream, profitable books would produce library collections that were too much alike, without the collective richness resulting from local selection in support of local needs” (p. 133). Summarizing her previous research, Anna H. Perrault (1999) observed that “there was an increase in homogeneity in the acquisitions of the group of member libraries of the ARL [Association of Research Libraries] in 1989 from that of 1985” insofar as “there was a decrease in foreign language acquisitions, a decrease in the percentage of unique titles to the total in many subject areas, and an increased concentration on core materials, indicating less diversity and more homogeneity in academic library collections in the future” (p. 51). Although a cause-and-effect relationship cannot be demonstrated between the growth of approval plans and the homogenization of collections, the economic realities faced by vendors often worked against the sustained inclusion in approval plans of monographs published by alternative presses.

Just as the widespread adoption of monographic approval plans ensured low holding rates in libraries of alternative and small-press books, the increased reliance by libraries on serials vendors to purchase periodicals was not a positive development for their holdings of alternative journals and magazines. Because many publishers of alternative periodicals faced the same structural disadvantages as publishers of alternative monographs, their relationship with serials vendors paralleled the relationship of approval-plan vendors with publishers of alternative monographs. Alternative-periodical titles were difficult to procure, causing time-consuming inefficiencies for vendors. If serials vendors managed to procure these periodicals for libraries, they added high service charges to their non-discounted base prices, which did not endear alternative periodicals to libraries caught in the throes of persistent budget crises. When skyrocketing journal prices in the 1980s and 1990s decimated serials budgets, many academic libraries embarked on extensive journal cancellation projects. Journals were cut “by a set percentage . . . across all disciplines” or according to “likelihood of future use as predicted by . . . objective criteria” (Gorman, 2003, p. 461). As a result, core journals with well-established reputations or large impact factors were retained while less-well-known journals were cut. These trends were not favorable to alternative periodicals. For example, using the list of 220 periodicals contained in the Alternative Press Index (API), Rita A. Marinko and Kristin H. Gerhard (1998) examined “the holding rates of alternative press titles” (p. 363) in 104 ARL libraries in the United States. They found that 69 of these libraries had holding rates “below 40 percent” of API periodicals, and that “only thirty-seven [API] titles (17% of the total 220) were held by 70 percent or more
of the libraries studied, whereas 139 of the 220 titles (63%) were held by less than 40 percent” of the applicable libraries (p. 368). Observing that titles categorized as leftist/Marxist politics, gay and lesbian, labor, education, and ecology were “underrepresented” in ARL library holdings, they concluded that “alternative views” were often unable “to contribute to the democratic discussion” in American society (p. 370).

Marinko and Gerhard’s (1998) findings suggest that, while the social activism of the 1960s and 1970s brought some gains on the question of alternative-press publications, librarianship’s sense of professionalism—embodied in the traditional belief that they should be “providers of a neutral forum” in which all sides of a question were accorded a respectful hearing instead of advocates and “partakers of the struggle to save society from itself”—eventually triumphed (Peattie, 1987, p. 52). For all intents and purposes, professionalism came to mean “hands-off liberalism” (Samek, 2001, p. 46). Many librarians accepted David Berninghausen’s (1972) argument that SRRT-like advocacy on behalf of social and political issues such as “racial injustice and inequities,” environmentalism, and antimilitarism went beyond their professional mandate (p. 3675); that “divisions of opinion on [these] out-of-scope issues” were causing irreparable harm to librarianship as a whole and to the ALA in particular (p. 3676); and that there was little justification for attempts “by some librarians to try to ‘educate the people’ by giving them access only to publications judged ‘correct’ by librarians” (p. 3681). If the concept of intellectual freedom was to remain viable, Berninghausen explained, librarianship’s central goal should be “to maintain balanced collections of facts and opinions and theories concerning all issues” (p. 3681). For him, neutrality was acceptable, but substantive neutrality was not. By the late 1970s, the ALA had co-opted SRRT, “incorporat[ing] and contain[ing] it within its institutional focus, bureaucracy, and organizational structure” (Samek, 2001, p. 139) in a way that was reminiscent of what Herbert Marcuse in One Dimensional Man called “repressive tolerance” (as cited in Samek, 2001, p. 5). Accordingly, while librarians may have “preserved [their] neutrality and professional integrity,” such preservation came “at the cost of both radical and conservative groups outside the profession—thus placing professionalism above human needs” (Peattie, 1987, p. 56).

In this environment, the purchase of alternative books and periodicals by libraries was viewed as an act of social advocacy that had little place within the traditional framework of intellectual freedom and professionalism. For collection-development specialists, this implied that their primary task was meeting short-term user needs, all within the context of cost containment, streamlined operations, and speedy service. Reliance on a “Give ’Em What They Want” philosophy, approval plans, and serials vendors meshed perfectly with the idea of library professionalism as managerialism, a term used by education scholars to signify an emphasis
on “productive efficiency” and “allocative efficiency” in decision-making processes (Fitzsimons, 1999). Rather than searching out alternative publications that addressed thorny issues from viewpoints that challenged conventional ways of thinking, collection-development specialists allocated scarce resources as productively and efficiently as possible in order to meet “explicit standards and measures of performance in quantitative terms” (Fitzsimons, 1999). It was both sad and ironic that one of the most important legacies of the 1960s for librarianship was convincing itself that the “Give ’Em What They Want” philosophy empowered people.

Given these developments, it was only a matter of time before a for-profit entity such as Library Systems & Services (LSSI), described as the “the first company to offer full outsourcing (or privatization, to some) of public libraries,” appeared (Oder, 2004, p. 36). Contracted to manage about twenty financially tenuous public libraries in the United States by the middle of 2004 (Oder, 2004, p. 38), LSSI generated profits “by paying lower salaries and benefits, hiring fewer librarians, ... choosing less-educated employees” (p. 37), spending less on materials, and increasing the hours worked by volunteers (pp. 38–39). According to Vice President for Business Development Steve Coffman, its aim was to make libraries “more like bookstores” (Oder, 2004, p. 40), an approach that was not unfamiliar to one of the key members of LSSI’s Advisory Board, Charlie Robinson, the originator of the “Give ’Em What They Want” philosophy (Oder, 2004, p. 39). Any pretense that collection development was an intellectual endeavor carefully conducted by knowledgeable subject specialists was gone, gradually eroded by the implacable forces of deskilled centralized selection and approval plans. Libraries had indeed become “dynamic” and “responsive,” as Berman had hoped, but they emphasized the economic aspects of that dynamic responsiveness instead of its sociocultural and knowledge-building aspects.

The Rejection of Outsourced Collection Development

Danky (1994a) rejected the outsourced vision of librarianship, believing that it was an “ubiquitous” and tragic “abandonment of expertise” on the part of librarians (p. 3). Echoing the insights of Wayne A. Wiegand, he traced the origins of “this disintegration of librarians as sources of expertise” to Melvil Dewey, who “sought outside academics to aid in the selection of appropriate books for the collection” (Danky, 1994a, p. 3). Once the fundamental task of book selection was outsourced to others, Danky (1994a) felt that librarians “doom[ed] themselves to a subservient position, one where they deny their abilities [and] their power to affect their own professional world” and the community around them (p. 3). Librarians’ reliance on centralized selection, approval plans, and serials vendors to develop collections was only the latest manifestation of the outsourcing
process started by Dewey. Outsourcing robbed the librarian of subject-specific knowledge, resulting in a situation “where the librarian [who] knows about the materials in the collection has become something relegated to special collections, to rare books and other smaller, less central parts of library service” (Danky, 1994a, p. 3). It was understandable that librarians were given scant respect: they had been “socialized” not to “know books,” but rather to “know how to apply the standards dictated by conventional canons that have been developed outside the profession” (Wiegand, 1986, p. 395) and to spend their time on managing and organizing collections using “new technology and improved methods of administration” (p. 397).

To help solve this problem, Danky asked future librarians to take it upon themselves to know “something, anything” by choosing their “own subject to become an expert on” (Danky, 1994a, p. 3). And once they had become experts—defined as being “steeped in the literature, knowing the authors or creators of new works of value” and being able to “offer informed opinions”—they would invariably contribute to strengthening their libraries’ “commitment” to an active “social role” (Danky, 1994a, p. 3). Librarians with in-depth subject expertise were therefore the building blocks of any library “where all ideas, regardless of form or source, can find a home and where the curious, or desperate, can [subsequently] find” those ideas (Danky, 1994a, p. 3).

Perhaps the most important consequence of subject expertise was that librarians were never satisfied with their current state of knowledge and constantly strove to discover new sources with which to expand and deepen their existing knowledge in the belief that “all ideas, regardless of form or source” should be available at libraries. Discovering new sources was exactly what Danky did during working trips to far-flung cities. In London, England, he scoured numerous bookstores such as Compendium Books, New Beacon, Freedom Books, and Gay’s the Word for alternative periodicals, enriching the Wisconsin Historical Society by more than two hundred titles, including “British National Party literature” and “an antiracist Leeds United supporters’ fanzine” (Danky, 1991, p. 678). An even more compelling illustration of Danky’s commitment was his experience in Miami during a visit in the mid-1990s. The Miami-Dade Public Library (MDPL) claimed that it had taken great strides in bringing library services to diverse populations, but Danky, in the midst of compiling “a national bibliography of African-American newspapers and periodicals,” discovered that the claim was exaggerated (Danky, 1998, p. 4). The small number of African American periodicals at the central location of MDPL and the nonexistence of Haitian American periodicals at an MDPL branch purportedly serving the Haitian American community was a revealing statement about the true extent of MDPL’s “accomplishments” (Danky, 1998, p. 5). The dearth of Haitian American periodicals at the MDPL branch
in question was all the more inexplicable insofar as Danky unearthed no less than “27 new [Haitian American] titles” at a bookstore situated about “125 feet” past the MDPL branch and “a different mix of titles” at a “second bookstore, a mile or so away” (Danky, 1998, p. 5). Even more incomprehensible was that none of the titles he purchased was “held by an OCLC library” (Danky, 1998, p. 5). The physical distance Danky traveled to purchase these titles was small—125 feet and, subsequently, another mile. But the psychological, intellectual, and symbolic distance traveled was immense—a striking indicator of the distance between two different visions of collection development.

Danky’s MDPL trip served as a touchstone for his view that librarianship in general and collection development in particular had become deskillied: “We check off the books sent on centralized approval plans, replicate the cataloging others have done (frequently without the complete book in hand), and then answer our patrons’ questions with information from commercial databases” (Danky, 1998, p. 6). MDPL showed him the end result of woefully incomplete collection-development procedures relying on centralized selection, approval plans, and serials vendors: existing collection-development practices in libraries were too involved in promoting “the adoration of the mainstream, the corporate mainstream” (Danky, 1998, p. 6). Not only were “radical/progressive/left titles” underrepresented, but so too were “conservative/traditional/right” journals such as The Liberty Lobby’s Spotlight, the Phyllis Schlafly Report, and the Limbaugh Letter (Danky, 1998, p. 5). How else to explain collections consisting of “more and more of the usual stuff, stuff that doesn’t address the burning questions in libraries or in the rest of society” (Danky, 1998, p. 7)? How else to explain that libraries order “hundreds of copies of books” just “because Random House announced it will spend $50,000 on hyping the new [John] Grisham or Mary Higgins Clark novel or Marcia Clark memoir” (Berman, 1998, p. 8)? On the other hand, if collection development was undertaken by librarian-experts who possessed in-depth knowledge about specific subjects, they could identify numerous gaps in existing holdings and thus move collections beyond “the usual stuff” produced by “the corporate mainstream” to include items that grappled with “burning questions” in terms of “race, class, gender, or sexual orientation” (Danky, 1998, p. 6).

**Alternative Periodicals and “Increased Understanding”**

From its beginnings, Danky’s career testified to the belief that the words “dynamic” and “responsive” should be construed in terms of sociocultural liberation based on subject-specific knowledge. These values were clearly on display when Danky began writing a column entitled “Alternative Periodicals” in Wilson Library Bulletin (WLB). The column first appeared in May of 1975, and over the next two years it was published nine times,
initially with Susan M. Bryl as coauthor and then with Michael Fox. Each column had a distinct thematic focus: radical labor (Bryl & Danky, 1975a, pp. 631–633); Asian Americans (Bryl & Danky, 1975b, pp. 29–33); religion, cults, and faiths (Bryl & Danky, 1975c, pp. 217–221); peace, amnesty, and the GI underground (Bryl & Danky, 1976a, pp. 474–479); Chicanos (Bryl & Danky, 1976b, pp. 628–633); radical Christianity (Danky & Bryl, 1976, pp. 137–141); Native Americans, part I (Danky & Fox, 1977a, pp. 481–485); Native Americans, part II (Danky & Fox, 1977b, pp. 662–666); and alternative library periodicals (Danky & Fox, 1977c, pp. 763–768).

Drawing upon the knowledge he had gained as editor or coeditor of *Undergrounds: A Union List of Alternative Periodicals in Libraries of the United States and Canada* (Danky, 1974); *Asian-American Periodicals and Newspapers* (Hady & Danky, 1979); and *Hispanic Americans in the United States: A Union List of Periodicals and Newspapers* (Strache & Danky, 1979), Danky used the tribune afforded him by the WLB to call attention to journals, magazines, and newsletters whose voices he thought “should be heard and collected by libraries interested in broadening the points of view represented in their collections” (Bryl & Danky, 1975a, p. 631) insofar as they “challenge[d] many commonly held beliefs” (Bryl & Danky, 1975b, p. 29).

Referring to alternative library literature in the final column of the WLB series, Danky wrote that, “even if the reader is not converted to the ideas espoused by the creators of these publications, the increased understanding will contribute to her/his professional performance” (Danky & Fox, 1977c, p. 763). It was no doubt a sentiment that he felt could be applied to all of the alternative periodicals he annotated in the WLB. Even if an individual didn’t agree with their contents, “increased understanding” on the topic in question would inexorably result. Although the logical corollary of this statement was left unsaid, it nevertheless imbued all of Danky’s efforts: the central purpose of libraries was to increase understanding. No matter how difficult it was to get the materials that led to increased understanding, that effort must be made to ensure that points of view were broadened and that substantive neutrality was achieved.

LLTBO came into existence to combat what Eric Moon called the “proliferation” of “appalling” articles in the library press (Katz & Schwartz, 1971, p. vii; Moon, 1969, p. 4104). It was meant “to purify by elimination,” thereby providing a welcome “shortcut for librarian, student and layman” (Katz & Schwartz, 1971, p. vii), especially because “there are at least three times as many library periodicals in this country as we can afford or are necessary” (Moon, 1969, p. 4104). And while LLTBO was intended to be “the crystallization of all that is exciting and progressive in our profession” (Katz & Schwartz, 1971, p. vii), it selected its articles through a jury system, which meant that it was the result “of compromise, of give and take between the jurors and the need for an anthology of this type to be representative not only of the best, but of the field as a whole” (Katz & Gaherty, 1974, p. v). Juries typically included three to five individuals, yet over the course of the twenty-one LLTBO editions, there were only thirty-one jurors—a tight-knit circle of leading figures in the library world (Hannigan, 1992, pp. xv–xvi). In sum, LLTBO attempted to define a core collection of articles for librarianship that was “a painless, even pleasant overview of libraries and librarianship” (Katz & Klaessig, 1973, p. v). It thus reflected Katz’s (1980) advice in Collection Development: The Selection of Materials for Libraries that “a high degree of selectivity” is mandatory when choosing serials (p. 184; qtd. from Texas A&M University Library System). Here he advocated the formation of a “core collection,” which could primarily be determined by use studies, circulation statistics, citation studies, and inter-library loan data (Katz, 1980, pp. 188–191). Emphasis should not be “on casting a net to take in all the journals but on formulas that will allow the library to function with a minimal number of essential titles” (Katz, 1980, p. 181). From a structural perspective, Katz’s words paralleled Richard Trueswell’s (1969) 20/80 rule, which claimed that “approximately 20% of any library’s collection could generate 80% of its overall circulation” (J. D. Eldredge, 1998, p. 496).

As shown in Table 1, of the 633 reprinted articles appearing in LLTBO, 267 articles (42.18 percent) originally appeared in the top 10 (core) journals from which LLTBO drew articles. In fact, just three journals—Library Journal, Wilson Library Bulletin, and School Library Journal—supplied 154 articles, or 24.33 percent of the total. As shown in Table 2, LLTBO drew on 169 journals for its 633 articles. Thirty journals, representing 17.75 percent of the total number of journals, each provided at least five articles, which cumulatively represented 63.35 percent (401 articles) of the total number of articles that appeared in LLTBO. Conversely, 88 journals, representing 52.07 percent of the total number of journals, provided one article apiece, which cumulatively represented 13.90 percent of the total number of articles that appeared in LLTBO. In other words, a relatively small core of journals supplied the bulk of the articles in LLTBO. And while the percentages adduced here do not meet Trueswell’s (1969) ratio, they nevertheless follow Joseph Juran’s 1954 observation—from which Trueswell
likely derived his ratio—that “‘a vital few’ of any population or group often exert [a] disproportionately larger effect than the ‘trivial many’ in the same population or group” (J. D. Eldredge, 1998, p. 496; Juran, 1954).

For Danky, the many were anything but trivial; in fact, they were at the heart of things. The biennial Alternative Library Literature (ALL) was therefore conceived by Berman and Danky as a response to the selection philosophy animating LLTBO (Berman & Danky, 1984a, 1986, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2000, 2002a). It functioned as an antianthology, a “deliberately unbalanced collection” that spanned the years 1982–2001 in ten volumes (Berman & Danky, 1984b, p. 1). Unlike LLTBO, ALL was proudly nonjuried, with articles “arbitrarily” chosen by Berman, Danky, and the recommendations of coworkers (Berman & Danky, 1984b, p. v). In its ten editions, ALL contained 613 articles: 562 reprinted articles from other periodicals and 51 original contributions. Articles were typically arranged in thematic sections such as “People/Work”; “Censorship/Human Rights”; “Service/Advocacy/Empowerment”; “Women”; and “Multiculturalism/Third World” (e.g., Berman & Danky, 1996, pp. v–vi). In nine of the ten ALL volumes, there was also a separate thematic section entitled “Alternatives,” which provided insight into both the theory and practice of building strong collections of nonmainstream materials.

Berman and Danky did not claim that the selected articles were the best of library literature. Rather, articles in ALL dealt with topics “usually overlooked or minimized in standard library media”; as such, they “truly represent[ed] the major out-of-the-mainstream concerns, viewpoints, and creativity” with which all librarians should be familiar (Berman & Danky, 1984b, p. v). Readers should not just be presented with purified library literature, as in LLTBO. Such an approach was disingenuous, especially because “[c]onventional library literature describes a world that does not exist, one of conventional people working in standard-issue environ-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Number of articles drawn from this journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Journal</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Library Bulletin</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Library Journal</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Libraries</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; Research Libraries</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Building</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Libraries</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top of the News</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Library History (Libraries &amp; Culture)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Academic Librarianship</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ments,” where more attention is given to “personal aggrandizement” than to “participatory democracy” (Danky, 1994b, p. viii). In a library world “where . . . jobs are increasingly deskilled and demeaning,” library workers should “turn back to a world of ideas” from “many places” (Danky, 1994b, p. viii; 1996b, p. viii). Only in this way could libraries assume real “value” for the “millions of people who are denied access to all other governmental institutions save prisons, welfare and asylums” (Danky, 1994b, p. viii). The diversity of sources from which ALL took its articles can thus be interpreted as a trenchant response to a “standard-issue” working environment where professionalism was equated with narrow specialization and the type of “restrictive procedures” (Danky, 1994b, p. viii, 1996b, p. viii) that ensured the domination of “corporate and conservative views of what librarianship is all about” (Berman & Danky, 2002b, p. 1).

As shown in Table 3, the top 10 journals from which ALL drew articles supplied 24.14 percent (148 articles) of its total contents of 613 articles, or 26.33 percent of its 562 previously printed articles. As shown in Table 4, ALL drew on 240 journals for its 562 previously printed articles. Twenty-seven journals, representing 11.25 percent of the total number of journals, each provided at least 5 articles, which cumulatively represented 45.20 percent (254 articles) of the total number of previously printed articles that appeared in ALL. On the other hand, 162 journals, representing 67.50 percent of the total number of journals, provided one article apiece, which cumulatively represented 28.83 percent (a plurality) of the total number of previously printed articles that appeared in ALL. Compared with LLTBO, ALL drew on more journals for its reprinted articles (240 titles, as opposed to 169 titles for LLTBO) and took a significantly smaller percentage of its reprinted articles from a core set of journals (26.33 percent, as opposed to 42.18 percent for LLTBO). The percentage
of articles that ALL reprinted from journals that supplied it with one article (28.83 percent) was more than twice as large as the percentage of articles that LLTBO reprinted from journals that supplied it with one article (13.90 percent). The titles alone of many of the 162 journals that were sourced only once by ALL bear witness to Berman and Danky’s multidimensional view of librarianship: Adbusters, Asian American Justice Watch, Black & Ethnic Minority Workers Group, Central America Connection, Essays in the Philosophy of Humanism, Human Rights Interest Reporter, Social Anarchism, Tikkun, and Whole Earth Review.

In addition, other than Collection Building, there were no overlaps between the top ten journals sourced by LLTBO and ALL (Table 1 and Table 3). And, as shown in Table 5, the core titles that appeared most frequently in LLTBO hardly ever appeared in ALL, again with the exception of Collection Building.
Building. Viewed from another perspective, 38.55 percent of the articles appearing in LLTBO (244 articles) were taken from the twenty most prestigious journals as determined by directors of ARL libraries (Kohl & Davis, 1985, p. 42), while only 3.91 percent of the articles appearing in ALL (22 articles) were sourced from this same set of twenty prestigious journals (Table 6). Finally, seven of the top ten journals from which LLTBO drew its articles also appeared among the twenty most prestigious journals as determined by ARL directors, while none of the top ten journals from which ALL drew its articles appeared among this same set of twenty prestigious journals. The core titles used most frequently by LLTBO as sources of its “best” articles to a great extent mirrored the titles deemed most prestigious for tenure and promotion purposes by ARL library directors.

LLTBO and ALL were therefore two very different compendia: the former sourced its articles from well-established and well-known journals; the latter went much further afield to encompass a wide range of alternative periodicals. Not only was ALL a new kind of anthology, it also provided a blueprint for the way that libraries should develop their collections of books and periodicals. If librarians included alternative publications in their libraries, the resulting collections would be richer than if they had been put together under the auspices of centralized selection, approval plans, and serials vendors. In ALL, Danky formalized what he had known for years: the “trivial many” were in fact the “useful many,” something that Juran admitted almost forty years after his initial statement about the “trivial many” (J. D. Eldredge, 1998, p. 500). If librarians read ALL, their professional performance and general understanding of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Journal</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Library Bulletin</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Library Journal</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Libraries</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; Research Libraries</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Building</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Libraries</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top of the News</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Library History (Libraries &amp; Culture)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Academic Librarianship</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the interdisciplinary nature of librarianship would increase. Articles from alternative publications were therefore highly useful. Libraries that developed strong collections of alternative periodicals and books were similarly useful because such alternative publications increased the understanding of patrons about any given topic.

In some ways, Danky anticipated Chris Anderson’s (2006) “Long Tail” thesis, which argued that continual focus by producers and retailers on the 20 percent of consumer goods (the “Short Head”) that constituted 80 percent of demand (“and usually 100 percent of the profits” [p. 7]) led to a mainstream and “hit-driven” “lockstep culture” (p. 27) that disadvantaged individuals who wanted access to “the hidden majority” of choices lying “under the current waterline” (p. 26). This “hidden majority” of choices was termed the “Long Tail.” Although demand for each of the items in the Long Tail was confined to “a mass of niches,” collectively those niches were a powerful cultural force that could produce profits for online retailers,
especially those offering books, music, and films (C. Anderson, 2006, pp. 52–53, 5). And while the Long Tail “is indeed full of crap,” “it’s also full of works of refined brilliance and depth,” a dual phenomenon necessitating sophisticated information filters that allow individuals to find suitable items (C. Anderson, 2006, p. 116). Because Anderson was writing about how online aggregators (“hybrid retailers” such as Amazon and “pure digital retailer[s]” (p. 90)) could benefit from a Long Tail economic model, he envisioned filters as “recommendations and search technologies” (p. 122).

Danky was convinced that libraries—the type of bricks-and-mortar entities that did not have the limitless space of large online aggregators—could also benefit by stocking Long Tail items, which in their case were alternative publications. Not only did these publications represent “the hidden majority,” but they could also act as a much-needed counterweight to library collections that were becoming increasingly homogenized through the type of material they received from centralized selection departments that often worked closely with approval-plan and serials vendors. For Danky, the ideal filter was the librarian with vast subject-specific knowledge—someone who could enrich library collections by finding the “works of refined brilliance and depth” in the Long Tail. His work on ALL was an example of what was possible when the universe of possible choices was expanded such that the items at the furthest reaches of the Long Tail (e.g., the 162 journals from which ALL reprinted one article apiece) constituted a plurality of all included items. ALL was a model for how library-wide collection-development practices could be reinvented so that alternative publications would be significantly represented on library shelves.

Conclusion

Danky knew that it was pusillanimous to invoke time-honored collection-development principles such as “suitability of subject and style for intended audience,” “reputation or significance of the author and publisher,” “popular appeal,” and “number and nature of requests from patrons,” since these criteria frequently excluded publications produced by alternative presses (B. Anderson, 1999, p. 12). Similarly, it was folly to limit the range of materials made available to readers by defining a “best of” (or core) collection because definitions of “best” often excluded views that were radical and controversial, settling for the “painless” and “pleasant.” Instead, items should be collected based on “insight into human and social conditions,” “relevance to the experience and contributions of diverse populations,” and “representation of a minority point of view” (B. Anderson, 1999, p. 12). Only then could a library aspire to “a collection that approaches comprehensiveness” (Atton, 1996, p. 18). Librarians should therefore consider alternative publications as an “inevitable” part of their collections because the alternative press, freed from the constraints imposed upon its mainstream counterparts to realize significant
“commercial gain,” can provide “interpretations of the world which we might not otherwise see” (Atton, 1996, p. 18).

As Danky’s career attests, developing comprehensive collections was an arduous process that could not be outsourced to approval-plan and serials vendors, nor could it be performed in centralized selection departments where paraprofessionals mechanically bulk-ordered copies of best-sellers and other popular books. If outsourcing occurred in libraries, not only did it risk homogenizing collections, but it also doomed librarians to be non-experts in numerous subject fields—a troubling development for anyone wishing to bring “as wide a variety of viewpoints as possible into the library” so that “principles of fairness, of equity” apply (Danky, 1994b, p. 3). Instead, collection development must be undertaken by librarians who are subject experts and who are prepared to spend time identifying obscure, alternative, and controversial items that, once found and made available to patrons, are the best testimony of libraries’ embrace of substantive neutrality. After all, approval-plan and serials vendors were businesses driven by the profit motive, not substantive neutrality. John R. Secor and Gary M. Shirk (2000), senior administrative officers at YBP Library Services, asserted that it is the goal of “full-service academic book vendors” (p. 106) in the 2000s and beyond to go “from razor-thin margins to five percent” pretax profit, a level which “is considered minimally necessary for continued corporate vitality” (pp. 107). And, as pointed out by Dan Tonkery (2001), a wave of mergers among approval-plan and serials vendors in the late 1990s and early 2000s consolidated control of the library vendor marketplace in the hands of “fewer than 10 major companies” (p. 47). Because these companies are part of “major corporations” whose “management teams” must deliver ever-higher “shareholder value,” they are “held to very demanding standards for measuring growth, ROI [return on investment], and profitability” (p. 50). For example, Crispin Davis, the Chief Executive Officer of Reed Elsevier, a major publisher of scholarly serials, stated in 2002 that one of his “key” priorities was to bring about “above-market revenue growth and double-digit earnings growth” after his company had acquired Harcourt General (qtd. in Black, 2006, p. 133).

In the 2000s, profitability meant “productive efficiency,” especially for serials vendors. Many of them turned into Web-based full-text aggregators offering “product bundling” (Covi & Cragin, 2004, p. 314) when libraries undertook a large-scale migration to electronic journals as a result of “patrons’ preference for online access” and “budgetary constraints and reductions” caused by soaring print journal prices (Watson, 2005, p. 200). Yet full-text coverage of alternative publications remained low in many of the aggregated databases to which libraries subscribed, hovering between 6 percent and 12.3 percent of API periodicals (LaFond, Van Ullen, & Irving, 2000). One reason for this was that electronic aggregators tried to make their bundles as attractive as possible for libraries (and as profitable for themselves) by
concentrating on titles recommended by “standard sources” such as *Magazines for Libraries*, “journals represented in important secondary databases, such as CINAHL, EconLit, ERIC, INSPEC, MEDLINE, MLA International Bibliography, and PsychINFO” (Chambers & So, 2004, p. 186). Alternative publications did not comprise a large percentage of such “standard sources.” As collection-development specialists devoted much of their time to facilitating access to bundled electronic resources packaged by aggregators, they diminished their libraries’ “independence with regard to collections” (Covi & Cragin, 2004, p. 313). This change “decreased the power of subject specialists to enhance collections” (Covi & Cragin, 2004, p. 312). From one perspective, it was even difficult to call them “subject specialists” any more, since they were overwhelmed with negotiating licensing arrangements and forming consortia in order to distribute the ever-increasing cost of access to online resources across many institutional budgets.

The loss of subject expertise among collection-development specialists worried Danky because he was convinced that extensive subject expertise was a vital prerequisite for informed collection development. The prevalence of electronic aggregators was another instance of outsourcing that prevented libraries from “think[ing] globally, collect[ing] locally” (Crohan, 2000, p. 374), thus impoverishing collections by restricting them to the kind of juried “best of” model found in *LLTBO*. Conversely, the non-juried long-tail distribution model found in *ALL* was a stinging rejection of a collection-development approach in which only those items that gave “a painless, even pleasant overview” of a given topic were deemed worthy of inclusion in an anthology and, by extension, a library collection (Katz & Klaessig, 1973, p. v). For Danky, it was important to include what others might consider to be “inadequate, anti-intellectual, [and] downright distasteful documents” (Katz & Klaessig, 1973, p. vii). *ALL* was therefore an eloquent invitation to collection-development specialists to reorient their practices so that they no longer conceptualized professional expertise in terms of excluding works based on artificial criteria, but in terms of including as much overlooked material as possible. Exclusionary practices were embodied by outsourcing, as manifested in centralized “Give ‘Em What They Want” selection, approval plans, and serial vendors turned electronic aggregators. Inclusionary practices were symbolized by non-outsourced collection-development activities performed by librarians who had not abandoned their subject-specific expertise in the name of “productive efficiency” and “allocative efficiency,” who deployed that expertise by purchasing hard-to-find (alternative) materials, and who understood that library collections containing alternative materials were the only ones that would lead to “increased understanding” and socio-cultural liberation. These were the kind of librarians who welcomed each issue of *Counterpoise*, a journal founded in 1997 by Charles Willett, because of its
ability to “concentrate information” about alternative and hard-to-find materials in one place (Dilevko & Dali, 2004, p. 73). These were also the kind of librarians who strove to convince administrators to emulate the library at the Minneapolis Community & Technology College (MCTC), which allocated first 10 percent and later 15 percent of its materials budget to alternative-press resources (Eland, 2000; MCTC, n.d.).

Invoking the spirit of George Orwell’s *The Road to Wigan Pier*, a book where Orwell “concluded enigmatically that we (meaning all of us) would solve the problem of poverty when we chose to” (Danky, 1996b, p. viii), Danky believed that it behooved each librarian to confront the lack of alternative publications in libraries with “initiative,” “energy,” and “tenacity” (Danky, 1996b, p. viii). Becoming an expert in “something, anything” was the first step in a process that would inevitably lead individual librarians to include alternative publications in their institutions. The more one knew about a topic, the more one realized how many gaps existed not only in one’s knowledge of that topic, but also in the library collections that symbolized knowledge of that same topic. Alternative publications could help fill those numerous gaps.
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“Success on a Shoestring:” A Center for a Diverse Print Culture History in Modern America

Christine Pawley

ABSTRACT
In 1992 James Danky, Wayne Wiegand, and Carl Kaestle founded the Center for the History of Print Culture in Modern America at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. The study of print culture was then a new field represented by scholars from many disciplines, including American studies, history, library and information studies, and literary studies. Stimulated by initiatives of the American Antiquarian Society and the Center for the Book at the Library of Congress, most research covered the northeast of the United States in the period before 1876, but Wisconsin’s new center aimed to encourage research into more recent time periods, and broader areas, as well as into the print culture of marginalized groups whose gender, race, class, creed, occupation, ethnicity, and sexual orientation have historically placed them on the periphery of power. Under the directorship of Danky and Wiegand, the center hosted conferences, sponsored lectures and colloquia, and introduced a new publishing series titled “Print Culture History.” Over its fifteen-year history, the center has influenced a general shift in print culture studies from texts to readers of all walks of life, and has helped move the field, as Danky argues, from “questions of aesthetics and technique” into social history.

In the late 1980s James Danky, Wayne Wiegand, and Carl Kaestle were holding conversations at the University of Wisconsin–Madison about print culture history, a relatively new area that each found attractive. Despite their common interest, the three were coming to the subject from somewhat different perspectives. Carl Kaestle, William F. Vilas Research Professor in the departments of History and Educational Policy Studies, had arrived on campus in 1970, and by the late 1980s enjoyed an international
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reputation as a historian of the American education system, and of literacy. Author of several books and many articles, he was working with a group of graduate students on an edited volume, *Literacy in the United States* (Kaestle, Damon-Moore, Stedman, Tinsley, Trollinger, 1991).

Wayne Wiegand had been a professor in the School of Library and Information Studies since 1987. He came to Madison from the University of Kentucky already well known as a library historian. But Wiegand brought more to Madison than an interest in library history, long a marginalized field within library and information studies, and largely ignored by historians. He read widely outside the narrow boundaries of LIS research, and could see that finding ways to interest librarians in print culture studies and print culture scholars in libraries might breathe new life into the historical perspectives on libraries. He also took an unconventional approach to standard LIS courses. In the late 1980s, his course on collection development, for instance, included a unit on reader response and reception theories, in which he introduced graduate students pursuing professional studies in librarianship to the theories of German scholars Wolfgang Iser and Hans Robert Jauss. Looking around for inspiration from outside the field of LIS, he was finding cultural studies to be full of possibilities.

Like Kaestle, Jim Danky had been a long time on campus. He had worked at the Wisconsin Historical Society (WHS) as a librarian since 1973, and had made a considerable name for himself in the area of what was in the 1970s becoming known as the “alternative” press. At the WHS he had been building research collections of books, newspapers, periodicals, and “ephemera” that represented the print culture of the African American press, marginalized ethnic groups, feminist and other women’s publishing, the gay and lesbian press, left- and right-wing political groups, and the literary “underground.” In 1982, with Elliott Shore (at that time librarian at Temple University), Danky had published a guide that introduced librarians to the concept of alternative materials (Danky & Shore, 1982). In the years that followed, he became especially well known for his work on successive projects that provide bibliographic control and access to important but neglected newspaper and periodical resources.²

Interest in print culture and the history of the book had been building steadily since the 1950s, with the publication in England of Richard Altick’s *The English Common Reader* in 1957 and in France of *L’Apparition du Livre* by Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin in 1958 (Febvre & Martin, 1976). Yet, in the late 1980s, this was still a new field in which many elements of the usual scholarly infrastructure were still developing. An early instance of institutional support occurred in 1977, when Librarian of Congress Daniel J. Boorstin asked John Y. Cole to become the founding director of the new Center for the Book in the Library of Congress (LC). In this way, Boorstin hoped, the Library of Congress would both stimulate public interest in reading and at the same time foster study in
the history of books and print culture. Over the next three decades, Cole encouraged states to establish their own Centers for the Book that would stimulate local reading and literacy programs. At the same time, the LC Center for the Book also gave an impetus to scholarship in April 1978, when librarians, scholars, publishers, collectors, and editors met to discuss contributions the new center might make to the history of books, printing, and libraries, and to print culture studies. Lectures, conferences, and publications began almost immediately, and in 1979 historian Elizabeth Eisenstein became the center’s first resident scholar. In 1994, the center won an award for its contribution to book and printing history from the American Printing History Association (Cole, 2003).

Another early institutional innovator in the field was the American Antiquarian Society, whose director, librarian, and bibliographer Marcus McCorison, and others initiated plans for a Program in the History of the Book in American Culture in 1983. Over the next few years, the AAS sponsored conferences, publications, seminars, and research fellowships that made use of the extensive collections at its facility in Worcester, Massachusetts (Gura, 2004). Many of those who later became leading figures in print culture history were initiated through the AAS Program, including the historian David D. Hall, who became its first chair. Funded by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, in 1993 the AAS started work on a multivolume A History of the Book in America under the editorship of Hall and Hugh Amory that Cambridge University Press initially agreed to publish, and that was later adopted by the University of North Carolina Press. The first volume, The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World came in out in 2000, volume three in 2007, and volumes two, four, and five are planned to appear in the next few years. This large-scale undertaking, initially envisaged as consisting of three volumes ending with the first century of the American republic in 1876, was later revised to five volumes. These later volumes (the fourth to be edited by Kaestle and Janice Radway, and fifth by Michael Schudson, David Paul Nord, and Joan Shelley Rubin) will bring the history up to the twentieth century.

In 1991, with encouragement from the Library of Congress and the AAS, historian Jonathan Rose helped launch the Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publishing (SHARP), an association of scholars from all over the world that held the first of its annual conferences in New York City in 1993, and the second at the Library of Congress Center for the Book the following year. SHARP produces a quarterly newsletter and maintains an electronic discussion list (SHARP-L) and published the first annual issue of its journal Book History (edited by Rose and Ezra Greenspan) in 1998. Calling for a broad definition that included “book history, printing history, the book arts, publishing education, textual studies, reading instruction, librarianship, journalism, and the Internet,” Rose (2001a) proposed to teach “all these subjects as an integrated whole.” Book
studies, as he envisaged, would include “everyone concerned with the exploration of script and print.” By the twenty-first century, it was evident that his SHARP “big tent” strategy was working, as its membership, drawn from twenty countries, now stood at over one thousand.

While the early AAS initiatives provided a clear inspiration and practical impetus for research in the history of the book, their scope also carried a limitation that Danky, Kaestle, and Wiegand saw as a disadvantage. The AAS collections, the basis for many of the field’s early publications, focus on materials published through 1876. As a result, scholarship tended to concentrate on white people living in the northeast, mostly before the Civil War. Recognizing the enormous impact of print in the period after 1876 not only through books but also through newspapers, periodicals, manuals, and all sorts of ephemera, including materials that together constitute the alternative press—the kinds of materials that Danky’s own career had been devoted to collecting at the WHS—Danky, Kaestle, and Wiegand talked about ways to fill the temporal, geographical, and diversity gap.

In 1992, these discussions resulted in the founding of the Center for the History of Print Culture in Modern America (CHPC), a joint project of the University of Wisconsin–Madison and the Wisconsin Historical Society (WHS). “The conversation,” Danky later explained, “grew out of a sense that the traditional history of the book was too limited as it did not account for the reader as well as the larger social processes of texts” (Danky, n.d.). Defining “modern” as the history of the United States since 1876, the center set its sights on providing a multidisciplinary focus for scholars from fields such as literature, sociology, political science, journalism, publishing, education, reading and library history, the history of science, and gender and ethnic studies (Wiegand, 1997). The term print culture history seemed more appropriate than book history for the great range of types of texts that the center’s founders envisaged as the topic for study.

Wisconsin was an especially suitable place for such an undertaking. Not only were its university libraries rich in collections of scholarly periodicals and monographs, but the WHS library and archives were an extraordinary resource of international renown, made more so by Danky’s own collecting practices that had added thirty thousand titles to its newspaper and periodicals collection. Danky and Wiegand were especially interested in uncovering the reading practices of those in whose lives this wide variety of texts was central. The library of the School of Library and Information Studies held primary source material in bibliography, collection development, and the history of libraries. Children’s materials could be found in the Cooperative Children’s Book Center of the School of Education. In these various collections could be found the newspapers, periodicals, advertising, printed ephemeral materials, and books (including school and college texts, children’s literature, trade and scholarly monographs, and mass market paperbacks) that could form the foundation for
the investigation of print cultures of those at both the center and the peri-
iphery of power in the United States from the late nineteenth century on. Moreover, Wisconsin’s geographical location in the Midwest symbol-
ized the center’s emphasis on areas outside the northeast.

By encouraging scholarship on print culture that employed theoretical di-
mensions of class, race and ethnicity, and gender, the center would complement the work of the AAS, and encourage SHARP members to broaden the scope of their work to cover not only more modern historical periods, but also the print culture of those whose records were less likely to have been collected in East Coast archives, such as immigrants, women, African Americans, and indeed anyone living west of the Appalachians. It would also prompt participation in print culture studies of scholars from a wide range of disciplines, including literature, journalism, publishing, education, reading and library history, economics, sociology, the history of science, political science, and gender and ethnic studies (CHPC, n.d.). Like SHARP, the CHPC envisaged a big tent for print culture.

The new center was set up with Danky and Wiegand as joint directors, and Kaestle as chair of an advisory board whose membership was designed to bring together scholars and librarians with an interest in print culture from all over campus. However, they had to do it without the kinds of fi-
nancial resources available to the AAS. In the early 1990s, the University of Wisconsin’s budget did not encourage new initiatives that might draw on university funds, and the then Chancellor, Donna Shalala, was looking for ways to close down centers, rather than approve new ones. However at a meeting of the University Academic Planning Council at which Kaestle and Wiegand, along with SLIS director Jane Robbins, made a pitch for print culture, Shalala must have been impressed. After hearing them out in silence, she turned to Robbins and asked simply, “Will these guys do what they say?” When Robbins assured her they were indeed men of their word, and once everyone had pledged that the new center would cost the university nothing, she gave her assent. Thus in May 1992, the University Academic Planning Council gave the CHPC the official nod, with the pro-
viso that the center would report to the Director of the School of Library and Information Studies.

The new center would have to make do on a shoestring, however. Hiring assistants, let alone an extensive and experienced staff of full-time professionals, was out of the question. Any activities would have to be fea-
sibly run on very little money by individuals already fully employed, with the help of student volunteers. Lectures and colloquia fell into this cat-
egory, and in 1992, Ian Willison (coeditor of *The History of the Book in Great Britain*, and formerly of the British Library) gave the center’s first Annual Lecture. Although attendance at the first annual lectures tended to be small, as the center’s reputation grew, so did the lecture audiences. It helped that Wiegand and Danky worked with, first, the Friends of the
In 1994, Kaestle suggested that the center hold a conference on “those odd periodicals and books that Jim collects,” referring to the diversity of the collections that Danky was fostering at the WHS. Discussing this idea in an early advisory board meeting, Danky pointed out that there were a number of themes that the center could use in biennial conferences that included labor (what the worker read), women’s print activities, religion, and education. The only caveat, he felt, was that these seemed such obvious topics that by the time the center got around to doing them some would have already been covered by others—perhaps by other centers that Wiegand envisioned being created as he traveled around the United States giving lectures on print culture studies. However as it turned out, “No one did them and we did,” Danky later reflected (J. P. Danky, personal communication, February 4, 2007). The result was the 1995 conference, “Print Culture in a Diverse America.”

Neither of the two home institutions could provide direct financial support for the conference, but LC’s John Cole helped promote, publicize, and underwrite it with a generous gift of one thousand dollars. On May 5 and 6, 1995, thirty contributors who came from all over the United States as well as from Canada, presented papers on topics that ranged from late nineteenth-century immigrant cookbooks to World War II Japanese American camp newspapers, to the late twentieth-century StreetWise, Chicago’s newspaper to empower the homeless. This small-scale venture into scholarly communication was to have much larger ramifications. First, it provided the basis for an edited volume of the same title, consisting of eleven essays based on conference papers (plus an introduction by Wiegand), that Danky and Wiegand edited and the University of Illinois Press published in 1997. In 1999 this volume won the journal Multicultural Review’s Carey McWilliams Award for an outstanding scholarly or literary work related to the U.S. experience of cultural diversity. Second, it turned out to be the first of a series of (roughly) biennial conferences that were to become a standard fixture on the calendars of print culture scholars.

In 1995 Carl Kaestle left the University of Wisconsin for the University of Chicago, and his place in the chair of the Center’s Advisory Board was taken by another renowned scholar, Merle Curti Professor of History Paul Boyer, author of many books on cultural and intellectual history, and in the print culture context of Purity in Print: The Vice-Society Movement and Book Censorship in America, first published in 1968. Now, at the advisory board’s fall meeting that followed the successful May 1995 conference, Boyer moved to approve that the second conference would focus on the reading of children and young people. Board members Rima Apple (Human Ecology and Women’s Studies), Anne Lundin (children’s literature
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In May 1997, the center’s second two-day conference took place on the theme “Defining Print Culture for Youth, Children and Reading since 1876.” Twenty-five scholars from as far afield as Hawaii in the west and Georgia in the east presented papers, while Anne Scott McLeod of the University of Maryland gave a keynote address entitled “Children, Adults, and Reading at the Turn of the Century.” Conference sessions reflected a similar emphasis on diversity to the 1995 conference, with titles like “Constructing Images; African Americans in Print,” “Communists and Consumers,” and “Heroes and Villains: Reading Masculinity.” A contingent from the University of Iowa contributed a panel devoted to “Reading Nancy Drew,” and other sessions discussed, for example, the world of children’s publishing, and texts geared toward schoolchildren and girl scouts. As in 1995, Wiegand and Danky planned that a volume of selected papers should emerge from the meeting. In fact, two sets of papers made it into print. Three articles appeared in a special issue of *The Library Quarterly* in 1998 edited by Anne Lundin, and in 2003, Libraries Unlimited published *Defining Print Culture for Youth: The Cultural Work of Children’s Literature*, also edited by Lundin and Wiegand.10

The ten papers chosen for this collection, whose authors hailed from a wide variety of disciplines, covered periods from the late nineteenth century onward, and included not only children’s literature as conventionally understood, but also manuals, schoolbooks, scrapbooks, comics, journals, and mass-market books (Lundin, 2003). As Lundin herself put it, “The central question that unites these essays asks what a more elastic and dynamic discourse—including multiple perspectives and formats as well as the long-standing traditions—means for the definition of children’s literature” (p. xvii). Rather than reinforce the “canons of classical children’s fiction and privileged imaginative works,” these essays, she argued, show how “cultural institutions and their subjectivities are shaped by print formations” (p. xx).

The successes of their publishing efforts pointed to a logical next step: the creation of a publishing series devoted to print culture history. Although other university presses were also developing series related to book history broadly conceived, notably the University of Massachusetts Press (Studies in Print Culture and the History of the Book) and the University of Toronto Press (Studies in Book and Print Culture, founded in 2001), Danky and Wiegand were eager to foster the publication of works that not only focused on America after 1876, but facilitated research into
the print culture history of groups whose gender, race, class, creed, occupation, ethnicity, and sexual orientation (among other factors) have historically placed them on the periphery of power, but who have used print sources as one of the few means of expression available to them. It was board member and cartography historian David Woodward who suggested they contact the University of Wisconsin Press, an idea that ultimately resulted in the series Print Culture History in Modern America. The first publication was a new edition of Paul Boyer’s *Purity in Print*, brought up to date with two new chapters. In 2003, the series published a new edition of another influential book that had long been out of print: Dee Garrison’s controversial *Apostles of Culture: The Public Librarian and American Society, 1876–1920*.11

In developing a national identity the center occasionally moved outside the geographic and time restrictions it had set for itself. Among its annual lecturers the celebrities of “mainstream” book history, like Elizabeth Eisenstein and Adrian Johns were well represented. In October 2003, SHARP founder Jonathan Rose gave the center’s annual lecture on the topic “Classic Books and Common Readers,” in which he discussed his recently published prize-winning book *The Intellectual Life of the British Working Classes* (Rose, 2001b). But the Center also hosted lecturers who embodied its emphasis on diversity and more recent time periods, like Barbara Smith of the Kitchen Table Press, and Rodger Streitmatter, author of *Voices of Revolution* (2001), and *Unspeakable: The Rise of the Gay and Lesbian Press in America* (1995).

By the end of the 1990s, Danky and Wiegand were taking advantage of their networking activities with other groups involved in print culture and the history of the book. In 1999 the center joined forces with SHARP to host a joint conference that met in Madison. In April 2001 it hosted the annual conference of the Mid-America American Studies Association (MAASA) Conference that took as its theme “The Library as an Agency of Culture.” Essays from this conference later appeared in a special issue of the journal *American Studies*, edited by Wiegand and Thomas Augst, that was later republished in its entirety as part of the Print Culture History series (Augst & Wiegand, 2003).12

The year 2001 promised to be a busy one, for in addition to MAASA a third center conference with the title “Women in Print: Authors, Publishers, Readers, and More Since 1876,” was also scheduled to be held on September 14–15, with Barbara Sicherman, Kenan Professor of American Institutes and Values at Trinity College, scheduled to deliver the keynote address. But when the terrorist attacks of September 11 grounded commercial flights over the United States, Danky and Wiegand had no choice but to cancel the event. Plans for a publication went ahead, however, and in 2006, *Women in Print: Essays on the Print Culture of American Women from the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* appeared in the Print Culture History
success on a shoestring” series, edited by Danky and Wiegand. A foreword by sociologist Elizabeth Long and an introductory paper by Sicherman ushered in ten other essays that featured women like Marie Mason Potts, editor of *Smoke Signal* (a mid-twentieth century periodical of the Federated Indians of California), Lois Waisbrooker, publisher of books and journals on female sexuality and women’s rights in the decades after the Civil War, and Elizabeth Jordan, author of two novels and editor of *Harper’s Bazaar* from 1900 to 1913. This volume broke new ground in other ways, too. Simultaneously with the paper volume, the University of Wisconsin–Madison libraries published an online electronic version as part of an Open Access initiative that made available downloadable chapters at no cost. Reviewers were highly positive. Wrote one, “It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of *Women in Print*. . . . [It] is, quite simply, an essential text for anyone interested in the lives and work of women in American literature” (Whitt, 2007, p. 247).

*Women in Print* owed at least part of its success to the very rigorous editing process that began with *Print Culture in a Diverse America*. Aware of the potential for skepticism from scholars confronted with a new term, Danky and Wiegand were both conscious that scholarship in an emerging field like print culture history needed to be especially sound, as well as creative. “We felt it was our responsibility, shared with others of course,” explained Danky, “to make sure that the work we put out was as excellent as we could make it. Thus . . . we often asked for, and received, up to four revisions of a paper before we sent it to the publisher” (J. P. Danky, personal communication, February 4, 2007). Although the “Women in Print” conference never actually met, it set a pattern that the following two conferences, on religion (2004) and education (2006), also followed, of publishing a selection of essays in a collection published as part of the Print Culture History series.

In addition to adding to the stock of publications on print culture, the conferences provided valuable opportunities for graduate students to practice presenting and to receive feedback on their work from knowledgeable researchers. The Center did not contribute directly to the university’s slate of courses, but in 1998 it helped SLIS establish a PhD minor in print culture that allowed students to design a curriculum around the historical study and sociology of print culture within their general PhD studies. The PhD minor was an example of the multidisciplinary approach that the Center has emphasized from the outset. The first student to complete the print culture minor was Andrew Wertheimer, whose dissertation studied the camp libraries that Japanese Americans established during World War II (Wertheimer, 2004). Students not enrolled in the minor also found encouragement and inspiration through the Center. For example, Joanne Passet’s PhD dissertation in history examined eleven sex radical periodicals between 1853 and 1910 that, she argued, not only raised grassroots
women’s consciousness about their rights to control their own bodies but also created a sense of unity and shared identity among them. Many of these overlooked but influential periodicals, like *Lucifer the Light Bearer*, were to be found in the collections of the Wisconsin Historical Society (Passet, 1999). Other students volunteered their help on various projects, contributing much needed labor, but receiving valuable experience and contacts in return.

Early in 2003, Wiegand left Madison for a named chair in Library and Information Science and a joint appointment as professor in American Studies at Florida State University. By now, Rima Apple was chair of an advisory board that included members from a wide range of departments (as well as librarians from Special Collections and the WHS): Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Policy, English, History, Library and Information Studies, and Religious Studies. After Wiegand left Madison, he and Danky continued to collaborate on editing the Print Culture History series, but Danky took sole charge of the Center, steering it through the next two major conferences, and overseeing the lecture and colloquium schedule. Wiegand’s leaving coincided with budget cuts at the WHS that deprived Danky of two full-time coworkers. Nevertheless, he soldiered on, focusing on maintaining what he later modestly described as “a minimalist program that mimicked some of what Wayne and I had done together” (J. P. Danky, personal communication, February 4, 2007).

Whether or not they were indeed “minimalist,” the center’s activities continued to stimulate innovative scholarship on print culture history. On September 10 and 11, 2004, the center hosted its conference, “Religion and the Culture of Print in America,” inviting scholars to consider the “world of print in which religions and religious practices were inherited, constructed and promulgated over the last 125 years” (CHPC, 2004). Studies dealing with religion and class, regionalism, feminism, immigrant groups, racial and sexual minorities, radicals, etc., were especially welcomed. As possible topics, the call for papers suggested:

- Protestantism (in its many manifestations, including revivalism and missionary outreach), Roman Catholicism (both the official church and grassroots phenomena such as Marian visitations), Eastern Orthodox churches, Mormonism, Judaism (all varieties), Islam (both immigrant and native originated), and indigenous religions, as well as new or less-well-known religious movements. (CHPC, 2004)

Prospective speakers were encouraged to consider the interaction between the reader and printed materials (e.g., books, Bibles, periodicals, newspapers, church bulletins, hymnals, tracts, etc.) aimed at or produced and read by religious individuals and groups. “We’re interested in the reaction of the reader to a whole host of printed materials, including books, newspapers, magazines, advertisements, comic books—and now, for religious publications,” Danky told a reporter (“Conference Examines,”
Print plays an important role in popularizing religion, he argued, pointing to the apocalyptic book series Left Behind by Tim LaHaye and Jerry B. Jenkins which, although among the top best sellers of the past decade, often went unnoticed by “mainstream” literary commentators (“Conference Examines,” 2004).

Paul Boyer (now professor emeritus of history) and Charles Cohen (director of the Religious Studies Program and professor of history at University of Wisconsin–Madison) started the conference off with keynote presentations, followed by a variety of sessions featuring over thirty presenters, and focusing on such broad topics as readers of religious publications, print and the construction of religious communities, and missionary uses of print. At the reception, Randall K. Burkett, Curator of African American Collections at Emory University, gave a special illustrated presentation “Sparkling Gems of Race Knowledge Worth Preserving: Collecting African American Religious History.” Boyer and Cohen subsequently edited the resulting volume, *Religion and the Culture of Print in Modern America*, in the Print Culture History series, a collection of essays scheduled to appear early in 2008.

The most recent conference, “Education and the Culture of Print,” followed a similar pattern to the conference on religion. Organizers called for papers that “illuminate the interaction between authors, publishers, readers, and printed materials at any level of education—public and private, formal and informal, from preschool to elementary, secondary, post-secondary, and adult—since 1876,” and hoped that the conference would “showcase new research concerning the history of literacy,” suggesting as examples such topics as the production and use of textbooks, the history of child-rearing manuals, the history of school libraries, and the use of print sources as political propaganda in schools (CHPC, 2005). The conference opened on September 29, 2006, with keynote addresses from Adam Nelson of Wisconsin’s departments of History and Educational Policy and Robert Orsi of the Harvard Divinity School. These papers are slated to appear in a volume as part of Print Culture History series resulting from the conference, edited by Nelson and John Rudolph, his colleague in Curriculum and Instruction. Later, Carl Kaestle gave the third keynote address on “Print Culture and Education in a Time of Rapid Social Change,” based on examples from the volume of *A History of the Book in America* that he and Janice Radway were in the process of editing. Over the next two days, thirty-six papers were organized into twelve panels that covered the relationship of education and print with labor, Native Americans and ideas of race, children’s librarianship, textbooks, black print, and the roles of television, radio, and film.

Funds would continue to be in short supply, though Danky and Wiegand found ingenious and even self-sacrificing ways to provide themselves with discretionary cash, often funding activities out of their own pock-
ets. Several speakers and authors, including Wiegand, Willison, and Boyer donated honoraria and royalties. In 1999, Danky donated money from an award (given by the library supply company DEMCO) he won as the Wisconsin Library Association’s Librarian of the Year. In 2002 he won the Reference and User Services Association’s Isadore Gilbert Mudge–R. R. Bowker Award, which recognizes distinguished contributions to reference librarianship. “Mr. Danky’s work has centered around efforts to give historical voices to those who have traditionally resided outside the dominant cultures in America: African Americans, Native Americans and women,” commented award committee chair Denise Hoover. “Without his efforts, entire segments of our national history would be unfindable.” (“Notables,” 2002). The Mudge-Bowker award also came with $5,000 that immediately went into the CHPC pot. Royalties from the Print Culture History series and other publications helped augment these funds, occasionally supplemented when conferences more than broke even. “Success on a shoestring” is how Wiegand described their efforts, which were bolstered in 2006 when SLIS Director Louise Robbins committed to providing a regular budget for a part-time assistant for the following five years.

But though financial support might have been thin during these years of state and university financial stringency, the center was never short of generous intellectual collaboration and support from the many individuals from campus and elsewhere who contributed lectures and colloquia, as well as committee time, and from the departments who regularly co-sponsored the center’s events. In fifteen years between 1992 and 2007 the center acquired a national presence in the larger scene of print culture and the history of the book. “We have carved out a distinct national reputation . . . in the field of print culture studies, one that complements the work of our colleagues and friends at AAS, and in SHARP too,” comments Danky (personal communication, February 4, 2007). While his work at the WHS may have focused on the collection of often overlooked texts, it was his work at the center that encouraged researchers to concentrate on the people who produced, distributed, and, above all, read those texts. In this way, the center was part of a general shift in print culture studies from texts to readers of all walks of life. Says Danky:

The Center was explicit in bringing race, class, gender and sexual orientation among them to a discussion of print. While not prescriptive, we have influenced much of the dialogue about print and its meaning (or so I like to think) and have fully wrenched book history from questions of aesthetics and technique and placed it in social history. (J. P. Danky, personal communication, February 4, 2007)
NOTES

1. Unless otherwise noted, the sources for this paper are located in the Center for the History of Print Culture Archives, supplemented by personal communication with James P. Danky, Wayne A. Wiegand, and others closely associated with the center.

2. For example, with a grant from the Library Services and Construction Act, his Native Americans: Library Resources in Wisconsin Project produced three major publications, including Native American Press in Wisconsin and the Nation. Another venture, the United States Newspaper Project funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, involved the cataloging of the WHS’s extensive newspaper collection. This project also produced Newspapers in the State Historical Society of Wisconsin: A Bibliography with Holdings. The African-American Periodicals and Newspapers Project, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the University of Wisconsin System, the Ford Foundation and other private foundations, produced African-American Newspapers and Periodicals: A National Bibliography (Harvard University Press, 1998), a comprehensive, cooperative finding aid for African-American serials.

3. By coincidence, both McCorison and Danky were graduates of Ripon College, a small liberal arts school in central Wisconsin.


5. Chapters by Danky appear in Volumes IV and V, and by Wiegand in Volume IV.

6. Initial members were Carl Kaestle (Chair, History), Rima Apple (Consumer Science), Dale Bauer (English), Sargeant Bush (English), John M. Cooper, Jr. (History), Ken Frazier (Director, General Library System), Robert Kingdon (History), Ginnie Moore Kruse (Director, Cooperative Children’s Book Center), Nellie McKay (Afro-American Studies), Paul Boyer (History), Jane Collins (Sociology), and Anne Lundin (SLIS) had joined the board, bringing the total to fifteen.

7. In hosting lectures and colloquia, the CHPC has received generous financial assistance on an ad hoc basis from such bodies as the University Lectures Committee, and the Friends of the UW Libraries. Willison’s Lecture, on October 26, 1992, was titled “The History of the Book in Twentieth Century Britain and America: Perspectives and Evidence.” The second Annual Lecture, by David Nord of Indiana University took place on September 20, 1993, and was titled “Newspaper Readers in the Early 20th Century.”

8. Attendance at that first lecture (held in the capacious WHS auditorium), Wiegand remembered, consisted of four board members and their spouses. However, this poor showing did not deter Willison from generously returning to give better attended lectures on subsequent occasions.

9. In April 1994, for instance, Wiegand had chaired a meeting at the University of North Carolina’s School of Information and Library Science, attended by twenty-three scholars, to discuss strategies for setting up a print culture center at UNC.

10. Authors of the three essays (which appeared in The Library Quarterly, 68(3), July 1998) were Christine Jenkins, Christine Pawley, and Rebekah E. Revzin.

11. This new edition included an introduction by Christine Pawley.

12. American Studies, 42(3) (2002). Contributors were Thomas Augst, Ari Kelman, Elizabeth Jane Aikin, Ronald J. Zboray, Mary Saracino Zboray, Christine Pawley, Juris Dilevko, Lisa Gottlieb, Jean L. Preer, Jacalyn Eddy, Benjamin Hufbauer, and Emily B. Todd.

13. Elizabeth Long had recently published Book Clubs: Women and the Uses of Reading in Everyday Life (2003). Contributors to Women in Print (in addition to Long and Sicherman) were Jane Aikin, Kristin Mapel Bloomberg, Terri Castaneda, Michele V. Cloonan, June Howard, Christine Pawley, Sarah Robbins, Toni Samek, and Nancy C. Unger.

14. The director of the UW-Madison Libraries, Ken Frazier, was an impassioned advocate of the Open Source movement, an attempt to counter the crippling rises in the subscription price of commercially-produced serials.

15. Based on this dissertation is the monograph Sex Radicals and the Quest for Women’s Equality (Passet, 2003).
16. Student “Research Coordinators” included Christine Pawley, Erin Meyer, and most recently, Irene Hansen.
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