



AGREEMENT WITH THE
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE
AS TO ORAL HISTORY STATEMENT

I, Ernst Posner, of Zug, Switzerland, in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (44 U.S.C.397) and regulations issued thereunder (41 C.F.R. 101-110), hereby assign to the United States for administration by the National Archives and Records Service all my rights, title, and interest, including any literary property rights that I may have in them, in the statements dictated and written by me in response to questions submitted by Philip C. Brooks on behalf of the National Archives and Records Service, October 19 and early December, 1973.

It is agreed that the statements will be available under the regulations prescribed by the Archivist of the United States as soon as they have been deposited in final form in the National Archives. It is also agreed that only the National Archives and Records Service shall have the right to publish or authorize the publication of the statements in whole or in part, aside from quotation in the normal concept of "fair use", providing that I or my heirs, legal representatives or assigns retain the right to publish in other form the accounts or opinions set forth.

Signed Ernst Posner

Date Aug. 10, 1974

Accepted

Signed: James B. Rhoads
Archivist of the United States

Date: Sept. 16, 1974

NATIONAL ARCHIVES ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

Statement Dictated and Written By

ERNST POSNER

In Response To Questions Submitted By Philip C. Brooks

October-December, 1973

Major Biographical Information:

Born, Berlin, Germany	1892
Ph.D., University of Berlin	1920
Military Service	1911-1912, 1914-1918
Staff member, Preussisches Geheimes Staatsarchiv	1920-1938
Two months visit to United States	1938
Lecturer, The American University, Washington, DC	1939-1940
Adjunct Professor, The American University, Washington, DC	1940-1945
Professor, The American University, Washington, DC	1945-1961
Chairman, Department of History, The American University, Washington, DC	1947-1961
Director, School of Social Sciences and Public Affairs, The American University	1947-1957
Dean, Graduate School, The American University	1955-1957
Guggenheim Fellow, Fulbright Grantee, Rome, Italy	1957-1958
Retired	1961

For considerable additional biographical information, see Wolfgang Mommsen, "Ernst Posner, Mittler Zwischen Deutschem und Amerikanischem Archivwesen," Der Archivar, 20:218-230 (1967); and Paul Lewinson, "Introduction: The Two Careers of Ernst Posner," in Archives and the Public Interest: Selected Essays by Ernst Posner, Washington, DC, 1967.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

Statement of Dr. Ernst Posner
at the National Archives
October 19, 1973

At the outset I want to apologize for the inadequacy for what I am going to say today. We have just returned from Europe for a month's stay in Washington, and we are quite confused by the changed atmosphere that prevails in the city we used to know so well. However, I am going to try to do my best, addressing myself to the questions that Dr. Brooks has suggested.

My first contact with American scholars and the first knowledge I obtained concerning the status of archives administration in the United States goes back to the late 20's when I was on the staff of the Privy State Archives in Berlin-Dahlem. It is there that I first met Walter F. Dorn, who was studying certain aspects of Prussian administrative history in the 18th century. That, of course, was a field in which I was working myself, and our professional contacts developed into a close friendship. Later on I was privileged to assist Professor Samuel F. Bemis when he was in charge of the Library of Congress copying project in European archives and libraries. Both he and Mrs. Bemis were very kind to me at that time. I cannot remember now when I met Professor and Mrs. Eugene N. Anderson. They were the ones who were particularly helpful in making it possible for us to come to the States in 1939.

From Professor Bemis I learned a lot about the status of archival administration in the United States, which at that time was underdeveloped, to say the least. When I had to retire from the staff of the Privy State Archives in 1935, and was contemplating immigration to the United States, I began to concern myself seriously with archives administration in the United States, particularly at the State level, and I plowed conscientiously through the reports of the Public Archives Commission of the American Historical Association and through the minutes of the Conference of American Archivists. In that way I learned a good bit of what was going to stand me in good stead when I gave my first lecture in the 1939 course on the History and Administration of Archives, later printed in the American Archivist. I continued my studies of American archival development when after my emigration from Germany I spent a couple of months in Stockholm, capital of Sweden.

I got my first glimpse of American archival actuality during a brief stay in the United States in spring 1938. Having arrived in Washington shortly before Easter, Mr. Anderson put me in touch with Dr. Leland and Dr. Buck. From then on it was mainly Dr. Buck who saw to it that I got an impression of the budding National Archives and that I gave a lecture on German archival administration in the National Archives auditorium on Good Friday 1938. I had just 24 hours to prepare myself for that lecture, and it was one of the most embarrassing moments of my life when I stood on the platform of the auditorium addressing the distinguished staff of the National Archives. Needless to say, I was quite overwhelmed at that time by the magnitude and by the magnificence of the National Archives Building, and I was impressed by the qualifications of those members of the staff that I met--Dr. Lewinson, Herbert Angel, Marion Rice, Karl Trever, and last, but not least, Phil Brooks and Ed Leahy.

Having returned to Europe I was forced by events to leave Germany in January 1939 and to go to Stockholm where in June or July, shortly before the outbreak of the war, my wife and I obtained our visas to go to the United States. I think we arrived in New York on July 20, first stayed at Bronxville in the house of the Curti's and then came to Washington about the first of September.

As I pointed out before, my most important contacts at the National Archives were those with Dr. Buck. Dr. Connor I met only a few times, and when I met him he was always most kind and understanding. However, I was never close to him, and I don't think we ever discussed professional or National Archives matters. It was different with Dr. Buck. I think I saw him very frequently, particularly during the first year when he and I shared responsibility for the American University course on the History and Administration of Archives. I think I even had the use of a desk in the offices of the Publications Division, and I did little jobs, such as an essay on French methods of arrangement and description at the behest of Dr. Buck. I should also refer at this time to the many kindnesses my wife and I received from Elizabeth Buck, who became our dear and much admired friend.

In spite of the fact that during the first years I had many contacts with Dr. Buck, contacts that continued after he had become Archivist of the United States, I want to correct at this time a myth that seems to have developed, namely that I exercised any great influence on the evolution of the National Archives in the 1940's and 1950's. That was definitely not the case. My only somewhat formal participation in National Archives affairs occurred when I testified before the Committee on Finding Mediums

in 1941, a committee that exercised profound influence on the organization and functions of the National Archives. Apart from that I placed myself at the disposal of the National Archives when during the war it became necessary to provide information on archival institutions and their holdings in enemy and enemy occupied countries. It was my good fortune to cooperate in this task with Oliver W. Holmes to whose office I was sort of attached in this matter, and that contributed to the close friendship that we feel for the entire Holmes' family. My war-related activities, however, had relatively little to do with the evolution of the National Archives during those years.

These war-related activities might have led to my being used in our efforts to protect archival treasures in Europe. That, however, did not occur because after the attacks of Senator McKellar in 1942, I think, I became an untouchable as far as government service was concerned. Maybe that was all to the good, because I remained in Washington during the war continuing my courses at The American University and finally obtaining a full-time job on its faculty in 1945.

Turning now to the program of courses the University offered in cooperation with the National Archives, I do not look back on that program with great satisfaction. In terms of finances, buildings, and so on, the American University was not a strong institution, and because of the financial straits in which it found itself at that time, it was not in a position to give me complete leeway in developing a many-faceted program of courses in archives administration. Throughout my period of service on the University faculty I had to teach courses in European history for which I was not too well prepared, and I also had to assume administrative positions as Dean of the Graduate School or Director of the University's School of Social Sciences and Public Affairs.

If I were to give an estimate of that part of my time and energy that I could give to the archives field, I would say that matters archival constituted about 15% of my work. And so I think I have not done particularly well in developing that field. My major contribution in the archival field may have been the short courses or institutes which I tried for the first time in 1945. That, I think, was a successful venture, and now these institutes, so ably directed by Frank Evans, are doing much better than ever before. They have certainly contributed to acquainting great numbers of archivists and would-be archivists in all parts of the United States and Latin America with the main principles of archival administration and with the literature they should refer to if they wish to expand and intensify their knowledge. As regards the content and quality of the courses taught at the University, it is my feeling that they are superior to what they were

under my so-called leadership. Frank Evans has brought to these courses the tremendous intellectual energies so characteristic of him, his familiarity with the archival scene inside and outside Washington and his practical experience, none of which I possessed.

I had Frank in my summer institute in 1958, at which time he was a particularly intelligent and somewhat obstreperous member of the group. In 1961 I retired from the University and it was then a matter of finding somebody to run the summer institute which had become an institution. Wayne Grover, in his sweet persuasive manner, asked Phil Hamer to direct the institute, and most reluctantly Phil accepted. Shortly before the opening of the institute, however, when Phil developed serious heart trouble, Bob Bahmer asked me who should be the director of the institute. I suggested Frank Evans, who was much surprised when out of a blue sky he was asked over the telephone by Bob to take over the institute. He accepted. However, since Pennsylvania did not want to pay him his salary, while in Washington, Dr. Bahmer arranged for him to formulate a program for the arrangement and description of the Ford motion picture collection just accessioned by the National Archives. This Frank Evans did, and it was the beginning of the successful career which he has had at the National Archives.

Now since then Mr. Evans has held any number of important positions in the National Archives. He has played an important role in the committee work of the Society of American Archivists, and he has broadened out into the area of international archival relationships, so that by now, in my opinion, his knowledge of the domestic and foreign archival scene is superior to that of most archivists in the United States. Needless to say, this broadening of horizons and his intimate knowledge of matters archival in all parts of the world must have contributed immensely to the quality of the courses he is teaching and to the training program of the National Archives which he is directing.

Although this interrupts the flow of what I really want to say, I want to return briefly to the so-called McKellar episode. From my point of view it was really more than an episode, because it had a profound influence on my professional career in the United States. I had been appointed executive secretary of the Committee on Libraries and Archives (this may not be the precise name) of the so-called Roberts Commission, working under Archibald Macleish, the Librarian of Congress, and I had been on the job for about eight days when the "McKellar episode" started. I still don't know all the ramifications of that episode. The way I understand it at the time, it was my relationship to Mr. Buck which was the center of the attack. And the attack, spearheaded by Mr. Preston, who

from the National Archives had returned to serve as Superintendent of the Press Gallery of the Senate, came out into the open in hearings before the Subcommittee on Independent Agencies of the Senate Appropriations Committee. It came as a complete surprise to Dr. Buck, whose relations with Congress hadn't been too happy, I was told.

There was a second hearing before the McKellar committee at which I had to be present. Now at that meeting my friends and Mr. Buck's friends in the Senate had been able to enlist some support on the committee through Dr. Leland and Dr. Abraham Flexner, father-in-law Dr. Paul Lewinson. It was particularly Senator Theodore Francis Green from Rhode Island who objected to the accusations to which I had been exposed, namely that as an agent of the Nazi government I was out to make it easier for enemy airplanes to destroy records of the United States Government in the National Archives by suggesting the change from metal containers to cardboard boxes, a perfectly ridiculous accusation. By the time of the second meeting of the Senate committee I had already been forced to resign from my post of executive secretary of one of the committees of the Roberts Commission, and that terminated my period of service to the Federal Government. I need not state that this turn of events shocked us a great deal because it made it impossible for me to be employed in a government job as long as Senator McKellar was there. Happily Mr. Leland made it possible for me to obtain an extension of a grant I had received from the Carnegie Foundation. And when that grant expired in 1945, I worked for about one fourth of a year for the American Council of Learned Societies until in July 1945 I obtained a full time position on the faculty of The American University.

That was the beginning of another period of education for me, inasmuch as before I didn't have a good understanding of the workings of American educational institutions, with the intricacies of the credit system, the operation of the university committees and the like. With all of these things I had to become acquainted, because I was appointed not only professor of history and archives administration but also dean of the Graduate Division of the School of Social Sciences and Public Affairs. In that position I had to evaluate student credentials, discuss academic programs with entering students, and generally speaking, have open house for everybody who wanted to see me. Not that I did not enjoy some of the aspects of my new job. I became very fond of our mature students, many of them government employees who decided to take courses or pursue programs at the University, and I do think that in the matter of student contacts I did a creditable job.

One of the highlights of my counseling activities at the University was the following: I was in my office late one day when an especially good-looking girl entered my office to discuss a possible program leading to a Master's Degree in history. We had a very good discussion, I prepared the requisite interview record and when I wrote down the name and address of the student, I said "My God, are you Senator Kennedy's wife?" It was Jackie Kennedy, and to my regret she did not come back to the University. At a later time when I looked for that interview record, that record could not be found. That was all in connection with my work at the University.

At the beginning my life at the University was not a pleasant one since I had to deal with a volatile and unpredictable superior, President Paul F. Douglas. His regime was characterized by arbitrary decisions, sudden changes in his attitude toward persons and problems, the influence of two strong willed women, namely his mother and his sister, Mrs. Haldeman, who lived with him in the presidential villa on the uptown campus. His lack of tact is exemplified by his decision to appoint Mrs. Haldeman provost of the University. It was said of her that she was snooping around in student dormitories to discover empty beer bottles. I can't vouchsafe for the accuracy of that story.

Organizationally and financially the position of the University was very weak, and it was severely criticized in a report of the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Accrediting Association in 1951. Happily that report led to the resignation of President Douglas and when in 1952, I think, Hurst Anderson, President of Hamline University, became President of The American University, there began a period of normalcy and soundness at the University which made the life of an administrative official far more pleasant. My personal relations to Dr. Anderson were very happy indeed. I still admire the courage he showed when he accepted the position of President of The American University and admire the wisdom he displayed in reorganizing the University and putting its operations on a sound financial basis. Personally speaking I am much indebted to Dr. Anderson for his many kindnesses and for the support he has given to the programs of the History Department of which, in addition to being Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Public Affairs, and, later, the Graduate School, I was also in charge.

Returning again to my war-time activities I want to say a few words on my mission to Germany in 1949 when, after Senator McKellar had disappeared from the scene, the Civil Affairs Division of the Department of the Army was able to appoint me as a visiting expert on archives in the American Zone of Occupation. It was very strange indeed to return to a Germany still in ruins after an absence of 10 years and to be involved in

the cultural activities of OMGUS in Bad-Nauheim. My good and valued friend Lester K. Born served as archives officer of the Archives-Library Section of the Cultural Affairs Division of OMGUS. We worked together beautifully, and Lester saw to it that I could discharge my mission with a modicum of success.

I visited the major state archives in the American Zone of Occupation, and I delivered lectures on American archival development in two places, in Marburg where the new archives school was just being opened, and in Stuttgart. My mission was a mission of good will, and so my contacts with my former German colleagues were quite happy indeed. The final report I prepared must be available in the OMGUS records, possibly also in those of the National Archives, and it may have had some bearing on the problem of restituting captured German records to the new government.

When I was in Germany the Federal Archives in Koblenz had not yet been established. In fact, in 1952 I was sounded out by the German federal government as to whether I wanted to be considered for the job of director of the new federal archives to be established. Neither my wife nor I wanted to return to Germany, and so with an expression of appreciation I declined the offer. Had I accepted the offer and had I been appointed, I would not be dictating to Mrs. Kidd these recollections of mine, because in the turbulent post-war scene neither Dr. Winter, nor later on Dr. Bruchmann, survived the rigors of that office. They died at a relatively early age.

Looking back upon this German experience of mine, I must say that in our relatively limited field of archival care for Germany's records we Americans did a creditable job, and that is mainly due to the open-mindedness and fine personality of Lester K. Born. I don't think that in the minds of German archivists there is anything like an image of the ugly American, and this must be true because our relations with the Federal Archives in Koblenz and with German archivists in general have always been most cordial and pleasant.

I would like to say a few words on what was the most interesting and satisfying phase of my American years. It began in the summer of 1961 at about the time I resigned from my teaching position at the American University. I had planned to return to my work on the history of archives administration, which I had started during my Fulbright-Guggenheim year in Rome in 1957-58. At that time my good friend Phil Hamer, President of the Society of American Archivists, had obtained from Verner W. Clapp, Executive Director of the Council on Library Resources, a promise to make funds available for a survey of American state archival institutions. With the approval of the SAA Council, Phil decided to offer to me the position

of director of that project.

So one day in July 1961 we assembled in Phil's office, sitting around the table at which I am sitting right now, with Mr. Clapp, probably Dr. Bahmer, and some others, to discuss the project. The offer came quite unexpectedly to me and in spite of my age (I was 69 years old at that time) I was only too pleased to accept it. At a luncheon meeting of the Society of American Archivists on December 28, 1961, Dr. Bahmer, who had succeeded Phil Hamer as President of the Society, announced that the necessary grant in the amount of some \$60,000 had been made to the Society, omitting, incidentally, the fact that I had been appointed to do the job. The National Archives kindly made it possible for me to use Room 302 next to Dr. Hamer's office as my Washington base of operations, and I was fortunate in being able to obtain the services of Mayfield Bray as secretary of the project.

The way we operated the project has been told in the preface of the volume American State Archives, later published by the University of Chicago Press. I was lucky in the composition of the Advisory Committee that was to take the project under its wings, particularly in the advice of the committee's chairman, my friend Morris L. Radoff. We started operations in February 1962 and then for a period of a year and two months I was travelling in the United States to visit archives in the various states with the exception of Alaska, spending the intervals between trips in Washington, DC, and working up the material for the next trip I was to take. Looking back upon that period I still think it was the most challenging, the most interesting, and the most satisfying period of my life. And I am still indebted to Mrs. Bray for the excellent job she did as secretary and later assistant to the project.

After completion of that project I returned to work on the history of archives administration which I had started in Rome in 1958. Happily I was able to pursue my work at the Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, whose library, staff, and faculty were of inestimable help to me. That was a happy period too because I was able to indulge in the antiquarian kind of work that was so much to my liking. Once again my friend Verner Clapp came to the rescue when it was necessary to obtain financial help for the completion of the work. Also the Archivist of the United States was kind enough to assign me office space in the National Archives in Room 20W next to the Territorial Papers, where later on I was able to put the finishing touches on the manuscript and to see the volume through the press once it had been accepted by the University of Harvard Press for publication in 1972. At this point I wish to recall my gratitude to Mrs. Julia W. Stickley, my kind office mate who was good enough to take care of my telephone calls when I was absent, to provide me with writing materials, and to have

xeroxing done for me, which the Archivist of the United States made possible.

Summing it up, I think that the period from 1961 on has been a particularly happy period of my life because I was able to concentrate completely on things close to my heart. I might add that at one point I had come to the conclusion that it would not be feasible to cover the entire sweep of western archival history in one volume. So little work had been done on the archives of the ancient period that I found it necessary to dig far more deeply in the literature on that period than I had expected. I also recognized that at the pace at which I was progressing, I could not hope to write a complete history of archives administration in the Western World, and so, also realizing my age, I decided to try to publish a book on the archives of the ancient period. In spite of its limitations I do hope that it has been a useful addition to the literature on archival history in that it has thrown some light on the noteworthy achievements of our predecessors in the countries of the Mediterranean world. My article on archives in the Moslem world accepted for publication by the American Archivist has been an attempt to continue the story into the Middle Ages, and as long as I can, I hope to produce some articles on medieval archives. However, the idea of aiming at a continuation volume I have abandoned for obvious reasons, although the Humanities Division of the Harvard Press has kindly invited me to submit such a volume for their consideration.

Library facilities in Switzerland, where we now reside, and the possibilities of visiting and working in archival institutions rich in medieval material would seem to facilitate my studies of medieval archives. But then, of course, age and other problems have been bound to restrict my scholarly activities, and I can't say how successful I shall be in producing anything worthwhile. Time will tell.

Addendum to Dr. Posner's oral history statement

Sixty years ago, I had an academic experience that helped me to understand the American scene. Before World War I, American history was not taught at German universities, except at the University of Gottingen, a natural there because of the Hanover-England relationship in the 18th and 19th centuries. During the Summer Semester 1914, Otto Hintze, one of the greatest German historians of the period, offered a seminar on the Constitution of the U. S. at the University of Berlin. The few students who took it--for at that time not many could use sources and literature in English--had a unique opportunity to study the colonial period, the early constitutions of the States, and the genesis of our Constitution. Having that experience equipped one with a rudimentary knowledge of American colonial and Federal history, was an experience on which later on I could build.

The seminar came to an abrupt end when World War I broke out, and so, on August 4, 1914, I found myself in a trench on the East Prussian frontier.

[encl. in letter of 2/17/74 to OWH]

Supplement Written in Zug, Switzerland, in early December 1973

As I am reviewing what I dictated to Mrs. Kidd, the following occurs to me:

1. From a memorandum calendar I kept in 1940, it appears that, until he was appointed Archivist of the U. S., I saw more of Dr. Buck than I was aware of. I went quite often to his office as Director of Publications to consult with him on matters of the class in the History and Administration of Archives we were teaching together, and Dr. Buck worked with me in compiling "Selected References on Phases of Archival Administration," (Staff Information Circular No. 12). Also, there were certain studies I did for him, such as the one on French methods of arrangement and description (Folder No. 71 of my papers in the N.A.). Dr. Buck also gave me the benefit of his advice when I wrote (1) my piece on "The Role of Records in German Administration" (Staff Information Circular No. 11), which was later used against me by Senator McKellar; (2) the paper on the Protection and Preservation of Local Records; and (3) a study of the Joint Association of German Historical and Antiquarian Societies (Gesamtverein der Deutschen Geschichts-und Altertumsvereine). This last study which I did at the behest of Dr. Christopher Crittenden, formed the basis of an oral exposition at the Christmas meeting of the AHA in New York in 1940 and made a small contribution at that time to the organization of the American Association for State and Local History. I recommended particularly that membership in the association to be formed be open to individuals as well as to societies (Folder No. 18 of my papers in the N.A.).

Summing up my contacts with S.J.B., I think that I was of certain value to him as a source of information on European archival practices and on their possible applicability to the problems of the National Archives. I never felt, however, that I had any real influence on what was being done about them. What may have impressed Dr. Buck particularly was the fact that in Germany and in certain other countries the functioning of archival agencies was facilitated by the existence of a good system of pre-archival record keeping in the agencies. As a result, as early as 1940 Dr. Buck began to turn his thoughts to ways and means of improving record administration practices in the agencies. He asked me whether my wife could possibly teach a course in record administration, which, of course, she could not. The first course in the field ever offered in the U. S. was one taught by Helen L. Chatfield in the spring of 1940. It was intended for employees of the U. S. Treasury Department, and it dealt exclusively with alphabetical filing. In 1941, I believe, we began to provide courses in record administration at The American University. To ascertain precise information on the development of the University's record administration program, one should consult "Miss Chatfield's List of Courses in Archives Administration and Related Fields offered at

The American University, 1939-1958," which is Folder 70 of my papers in the National Archives. Needless to say the courses taught by Miss Chatfield were "conservative" in character and did not enter into the area of record creation.

2. When we were in Washington in October 1973, Dr. Holmes gave me xerox copies of certain pages of his diary, March 5-8, 1945. Reading them has recalled to my mind certain facts of a period in which I worked closely and harmoniously with Dr. Holmes on all aspects of the use and protection of records in countries to be liberated and to be occupied. Dr. Holmes refers to the possibility of my getting my "War Department appointment" at a time when we were announcing our first (1945) Summer Institute in the Preservation and Administration of Archives. I understood at that time that the War Department attempted to clear the appointment with Senator McKellar. He threatened to cut off all appropriations for the U. S. Army if I were appointed, and so the matter was dropped.

One further thought occurred to me: Since OSS was to be concerned with training military government officials for the duties they had to carry out in occupied countries, it should have been apparent that some familiarity with their record keeping practices was indispensable to them and that information about them should have been provided in the training programs offered at Charlottesville, Va., and other places. Historians on the staff of OSS who had worked with German records--Walter L. Dorn, Eugene N. Anderson and others--should have been aware of this necessity. Apparently, they were not. Documents we prepared at the National Archives, such as The Administration of Current Records in Italian Public Agencies (1943) and Military Government Information Guide: Information on German Records (1945) should have been used in preparing MG officers for their jobs, and their preparation should have been supported by government appropriations. Retrospectively, it may seem unfair that I was using up my Carnegie Institution grant for purposes alien to my real task.

I shall now address myself to some of the general and more searching questions Dr. Brooks has formulated, although I may not deal with all of them.

Dr. Buck was indeed the prime mover in the developments that resulted from the recommendations of the Committee on Finding Mediums, 1940-1941. I testified before the Committee and I probably argued in line with the doubts and reservations I had expressed in my Stockholm talk on "Archival Administration in the United States" (Archives and the Public Interest, pp. 123-125). Mr. Buck, who was much interested in the printed essay, had it translated by Paul Lewinson when I received proofs of

Drei Vorträge zum Archivwesen der Gegenwart (Stockholm, 1940), and my modest criticism of the early organization of the National Archives may have reinforced his own doubts. I do not think that my testimony before the Committee entered into the discussion and adoption of the record group concept. It may have had something to do with the much-criticized "arbitrary" numbering of the record groups that the Committee included in its recommendations.

In the article on "The National Archives and the Archival Theorist" (Archives and the Public Interest, pp. 131-140), I have expressed my thoughts on the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act and on the Federal Records Act of 1950, and I shall not repeat them here. I should revise a prediction of mine, however, namely that "The records manager-archivist must be considered an American phenomenon." With greater or lesser speed, other countries have empowered their archival agencies to move into the area of records management, although their programs do not embrace the phase of records creation and are mainly aimed at the establishment of records centers.

As regards the contributions and merits of the various Archivists of the United States, I have mentioned already that I did not get to know Dr. Connor well. His reputation in American historical writing and teaching and his gentle manners contributed much to the external recognition of the National Archives and to the internal consolidation of the staff. Dr. Connor's appointment was undoubtedly the best appointment that could be made at that time, although professional integration might have proceeded faster had Dr. Leland received the appointment.

What I said about Dr. Buck at the unveiling of his portrait in the then Conference Room of the National Archives now sounds stilted and cool to me. Our relationship was based on mutual respect and on admiration on my part. As time went on, it developed into a warm friendship for SJB and his wife. It is difficult for me to gauge the feelings of the staff toward Dr. Buck. I do not think they appreciated the progress that was being made in carrying out a program aimed at internal professionalism: the "records administration program," pooh-poohed as Fuller Brush salesmanship, met with little enthusiasm; there was too little appreciation of the Buck-inspired international archival activities; and there was little trust in some of the men who at one time or another seemed to influence his thinking (Dan Lacy and Dallas D. Irvine). It was not given to Mr. Buck to unbend. He must have appeared stern to those who did not know him well; he did not have a sense of humor; and he was too much inclined to lecture to his audiences, including members of Congress. Don't we still see him getting up in the discussion periods at meetings of the SAA with

an emphatic: "Mister Chairman" and setting us straight, the speaker as well as the audience? I do not think that SJB and, for that matter, the National Archives was much liked by the State archivists and archivists outside the National Archives in general. It was during the Buck period that Morris L. Radoff, referring to the National Archives, used to talk disparagingly of the "Federalists."

In that regard things changed for the better during the Grover regime. Wayne was able to relax with the "boys," had a dry sense of humor, and got along well with his "colleagues" in the States. Inside the National Archives and Records Service it may not have been the same story. I hesitate to write this down, but two episodes have stuck in my mind: one, when Phil Bauer was "asked" to take over the editorship of the American Archivist, and the other when Phil Hamer was "earmarked" to run the Summer Institute in 1961. Nobody had done more to close, or at least narrow, the gap between the National Archives and archivists in other parts of the country than Everett Alldredge. The symposia offered by the National Archives and Records Service in cooperation with regional offices and State archival agencies, which he initiated as President of the SAA, seem to have been a more effective means of achieving professional homogeneity than the meetings of the Society. Ev's premature death has been one of the very serious losses the cause of archives has suffered.

I was never as close to Wayne Grover as I had been to Dr. Buck, although I had been in charge of his doctoral program at The American University, or as I was to Bob Bahmer and his wife. Only once were we at the Grover home, and that was in connection with some SAA business. This, by no means, diminishes my respect for Grover's great achievements as Archivist of the U.S. The expansion of the National Archives into the National Archives and Records Service, the establishment of the records centers in the country at large, and the organization of archives sections in the centers are his work and represent his great contributions, to name but a few of them.

I am sure I am expected to comment in some detail on our offerings in archives administration and records management at The American University. What I want to say may reflect a certain degree of momentary atrabiliousness, but as I see it now, I cannot ignore the feeling that the program did not develop its full potential. The following may be the reasons:

1. My own shortcomings as an instructor and as the person responsible for "pushing" the program (see also under 6 below).
2. I had little support from the University which most of the time was

limping along with its small endowment of \$2,000,000.

3. Because we were poor, we could not offer scholarships in archives administration that might have attracted students.

4. Our two-semester course in the History and Administration of Archives was offered at night. Consequently, students interested in an archival career found it expedient to obtain NA jobs and to take the course after office hours. That was, of course, before the NA developed its present programs of recruitment and training.

5. I still believe that an academic program in record and archives administration should have been crowned by a Master's degree in Archives Administration which would identify the holder as a fully competent person in the field. London University has such a program. Why should not we?

6. Although this should not be considered an excuse, I might mention again that most of the time I served as dean or director of one of the University's major divisions and, simultaneously, as Chairman of the Department of History. In that dual responsibility, I taught two courses and the Ph.D. and M.A. seminar. Nowadays, a regular faculty member teaching on the graduate level teaches two courses! The archives course met in the Conference Room of the National Archives, and so at the end of an often busy day at 1901 F Street, NW. I walked over to the National Archives to catch some fresh air and to meet students for a cup of coffee at the Executive Pharmacy in the 900 block of Pennsylvania Avenue. That was a useful arrangement, but it did not give me time to relax before the meeting of the class from 6:00 to 8:20 p.m. All of this added up to a fairly strenuous 12 hours.

I guess I was fairly competent to deal with the history of archival development in Europe and the U.S., the subject of the first semester of the class. On the other hand, when it became a matter of discussing the various phases of the archival process, I was somewhat handicapped, because I had no practical experience in working with American records, and so I did not feel completely at ease.

The summer course (The Institute on the Preservation and Administration of Archives) may be considered a success. It became the prototype of many such courses now being offered in various parts of the country and has helped to create some esprit de corps and to impart professional know-how to those working in the archives field. Under the leadership of Frank Evans it is now offered twice a year to satisfy an ever increasing demand. I think Dr. Evans was right when he abolished the intern work in the

National Archives, because that imposed a heavy burden on National Archives personnel, often unable to give proper attention to the trainees assigned to their unit. In my days the course was at its best, when Elizabeth Drewry agreed to supervise the internship projects.

Turning to our offerings in record administration, I regret to say that Miss Chatfield's four semester sequence on the undergraduate level did not meet the needs of the time when record management became a recognized phase of organization and management. Joe Pomrenze's two-semester course did to an amazing extent. In my opinion, Joe is a brilliant teacher who is able to work with the class, or rather have the class work with him. I have never seen anything like it. He is also an excellent promoter so that enrollment in his class has held up extremely well. I imagine his is by far the best course in the field taught anywhere in the country.

During the last 10 years, I have lost touch with what is going on in the training field, and hence, I do not wish to propose what might be done to provide a strong program of archival education in Washington. If such a program is to be developed, it should have its center of gravity in the National Archives cooperating with one of the city's universities and it must be funded by the Federal Government. I do not have H. G. Jones' Records of a Nation to refer to. I seem to remember, however, that he is thinking of some such arrangement.

In what I have jotted down, I may have exaggerated our shortcomings. If only through the summer institutes, we may have made our contribution toward raising the level of archival work in the United States. We should have been doing better, however.

P.S. I am shocked to discover that I have not said anything much about the role Waldo G. Leland has played in my career in the U. S. He obtained for me the Carnegie Foundation grant in 1940, and I imagine he was instrumental in obtaining for me a full-time appointment on the faculty of The American University in 1945. I met Dr. Leland in 1938 during my short exploratory stay in the U.S., and I was much impressed by his kindness, his awareness of archival conditions in Europe, and his insight into what should be done in this country. I did not see Mr. Leland frequently, except during the period when Dr. Holmes and I were working on war-time protection of archives in enemy occupied and enemy countries, and when, in Spring 1945, I was working for the ACLS, arranging and describing the records of its formative period, 1918 to 1933. My admiration for Mr. Leland has remained unchanged. He is to me one of the finest, gentlest, and most knowledgeable minds I have been privileged to meet.

My admiration for him is based on a feeling of deep respect for the wonderful man he was, and will last until the end of my life.