Oral History at Arrowhead

Proceedings of the
First National Colloquium
on Oral History

INSTITUTE FOR ORAL HISTORY

Oral History At Arrowhead

The Proceedings of the
First National Colloquium on Oral History

University of California Conference Center
Lake Arrowhead, California
September 25-28, 1966

Edited by Elizabeth I. Dixon and James V. Mink

The Oral History Association, Inc.
Los Angeles, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO THE MEMORY OF WALTER McCAUSLAND

January 16, 1895-September 26, 1966

Walter McCausland was stricken with a heart attack while attending the First National Colloquium on Oral History. He was a native of Philadelphia and attended the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. McCausland was a resident of Buffalo, New York and Vice-President for Public Relations of Niagara Frontier Transit System. He was also Vice-President of the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society and an acknowledged expert in Western New York history, a field in which he published extensively, particularly in *Niagara Frontier*, the quarterly of the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society. Mr. McCausland was representing this institution at the Colloquium.

Colloquium Staff

James V. Mink, *Chairman*
University Archivist & Director of Oral History, UCLA

Mrs. Elizabeth I. Dixon, *Vice Chairman*
Head, Oral History Program, UCLA

Donald J. Schippers, *Colloquium Recorder*

Mrs. Adelaide Tusler, *Colloquium Recorder*
Interviewer-Editors, Oral History Program, UCLA

INTRODUCTION

Since Professor Allan Nevins established the Oral History Research Office at Columbia University almost two decades ago, there has never been a major national meeting on the subject of oral history. The First National Colloquium was planned by the UCLA Oral History Program in order to open a dialogue of communication among those concerned with this new technique of historical investigation, and to attempt to define its problems and terminology.

From September 25 to 28, 1966, nearly one hundred archivists, librarians, historians, members of the medical profession, and psychiatrists from all parts of the United States and as far away as Beirut, Lebanon, met in the informal atmosphere of the University of California's Conference Center at Lake Arrowhead, California to talk about oral history. In the pages following is a record of their discussion. The speakers' presentations were delivered either extemporaneously or from outlines and notes. The tape recordings of these presentations and the ensuing discussions have been transcribed verbatim and edited with minor deletions in the interest of clarity.

Three sessions held at the Colloquium have not been included in the published record. These are: an orientation discussion of the University of California's oral history programs presented in welcoming remarks by Everett T. Moore, Assistant University Librarian,UCLA; a summary of the Colloquium by Mrs. Zenna Serrurier, Los Angeles City Schools; and the concluding general session concerned with the question of establishing an oral history association. It was the sense of the Colloquium's participants that its proceedings should be published, and a committee was appointed to lay the groundwork for an oral history association. This committee has now formulated plans for a second national colloquium to be held in November, 1967 at Arden House, Columbia University's Conference Center in Harriman, New York.

The editors wish to thank the Colloquium speakers for permission to publish their informal remarks. They also wish to acknowledge the editorial assistance of the members of the UCLA Oral History Program's staff, Mr. Donald Schippers, Mrs. Adelaide Tusler, and Mrs. Cheryle Wolf. Mrs. Marion Engelke, UCLA Library Artist, designed the cover for this publication.

James V. Mink, Chairman First National Colloquium on Oral History
Elizabeth I. Dixon, Vice-Chairman

AN AFTER NOTE, ON THE SECOND EDITION

This volume first appeared in multigraph form, in limited edition. The explosive growth of oral history and the rise of the Oral History Association, the seed of which was planted at Arrowhead, soon exhausted the supply. Presently those who perused THE SECOND NATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ON ORAL HISTORY (Oral History Association, New York: 1968) inquired of the first. Hence this new edition of what might be described—at least so far as American historiography is concerned—as a historic publication. It adheres faithfully to the content of the original, except for a slight rearrangement of the front matter, the addition of page headings, and the inclusion, upon the suggestion of James V. Mink, the original editor, of a roster of those attending the meeting.

Louis M. Starr

THE DECISION FOR ORAL HISTORY

James V. Mink, Chairman

I think that the title which has been given to my assignment here at the conclusion of our opening session may imply that I am about to deliver a major address on oral history. I want to assure you that this is *not* the case. I have no new or startling revelations about oral history, and if I did I don't think this would be the time to make them known. The hour is late. For many of you, it is going on midnight.

I only want to suggest what we shall be about here during the next several days. For one thing I hope we will be asking a number of searching questions about oral history. I doubt that any two of us agree completely on every single aspect of this medium. This is normal and natural. Were it otherwise, there would be no point in holding this meeting, except possibly to establish a cult of mutual admiration and professional security. But I like to think the time has come when it is no longer necessary to justify oral history.

One facet of professional security may be what I call "the outside image." For instance, at any sort of social thing where I am not well known, I may be asked: "Well, where do you work?"

"Well, I work at the University."

"And what do you do there?"

"I am the University Archivist."

"What's *that* ?"

But now that I have come into the clutches of oral history, I don't have to worry about that any more. Oral history has *instant* image. Everyone knows *exactly* what you are doing and can tell you how to do it for hours. "You've got to go out and interview my grandmother," they say. "You know, the one on my father's side. She's lived around here for years and has a mind like a tack, just as sharp as a tack. Would you believe it? She lived in a house with a dirt floor." Once I met a man who was most enthusiastic about my work. He thought we were performing a real service because, as he put it, the history of dentistry is sadly neglected on the West Coast. [laughter]

The "inside image" is just as bright. Everyone at the University knows exactly what we're doing. We have a small office in the basement of the College Library Building. It opens onto a hallway which must be the major traffic artery on the campus. Our modest sign, "Oral History Program," is in full view of all who pass by. One day, I saw a student pointing at the sign and she obviously was one of the few at the University who didn't know what we did, but she knows now. As they walked on down the hall, I overheard her friend explaining that, of

course, this was the room where all the qualifying examinations for the doctors' degrees are given. One man saw our sign and immediately recognized that we had something he wanted. As I recall, he was rather a demanding sort, and after he informed us that he was a graduate in history, wanted to know what we had on George III. We tried to explain to him what we did, but he was too impatient, and he just left muttering something to the effect that, obviously, oral history was of no use to him. The UCLA Mailing Division knows exactly what we do, so when they receive letters addressed to the "Office of All History" or the "Oriole History Program," they just write on the envelope: "Try Oral History!"

It must be the same at Columbia. Last spring, I called their program to find out if they would be willing to send someone out here to join with us in this meeting, and when my operator got the Columbia operator on the phone, she asked for the "Office of Oracle History." [laughter] Before I had a chance to correct her, I had Mrs. Mason on the phone, but in the press of discussing this meeting, I forgot to ask about this esoteric specialty. What about it, Dr. Starr?

Well, I think that there must be some more general agreement among us here this evening as to what oral history really is. And yet articles and references to the medium that have appeared in publications all the way from *Playboy* to the *American Archivist* have varied enough for one to conclude that it is still in the process of being defined. At this juncture, an attempt to provide a precise definition would undoubtedly prove restrictive to the growth and use of oral history. On the other hand, some understanding of how it could be, or is being defined, is a necessary introduction to later discussions that we will be having at this meeting. Tomorrow morning, when we join our panel in seeking definitions of oral history, it will be apparent that any assumption or definition of what it involves, involves consideration of most every aspect of its applications, from the question of what is obtained, and how, to the problem of its ultimate preservation and use. And we must restrain outselves (here we have *got* to restrain ourselves) and make sure that our discussions focus mainly on the problem of defining oral history. Consideration of the aspects which influence definition will have their appropriate places in the later sessions on use, directions, techniques, and standards and goals.

When we first decided to sponsor a national meeting on oral history, we realized that it ought not to degenerate into a prolonged discussion of minutiae. Time is an important factor, and we felt that the broader aspects of the medium should be covered. Next, we were faced with the problem of drafting a logical order of discussion, and because we set up the conference, we had to impose our own ideas of sequence. It seemed to us that the first inquiries should be directed toward what oral history is, and for the reasons I have explained. After this, we could ask: "How can it be used? Who are we working for? The academic or the lay community? Or for both?" Some attention to these problems would pave the way for consideration of how we go about gathering oral history materials. Then, with all of this under our belts, we would be able to decide whether it is possible, through an understanding of the objectives of oral history, to establish certain standards for its practice. In our earliest discussions on the conference, we were acutely aware of the need for advice from other programs and the lack of communication among oral history programs which has existed for so long. This fact was pointed up in the difficulties we experienced in trying to compile a mailing list. Of course, our basic guide was the *Columbia Directory,* but after we had gone through this, nothing much beyond it could assure us that we were reaching the people who really

might be interested in attending this sort of a meeting.

It was precisely this situation which suggested that a discussion of the possibility of forming a national organization of oral history would be an appropriate note on which to end this meeting. In discussing our preliminary plans with Dr. Nevins, we were pleased to discover that the idea of a national organization occurred to him as one of the most important benefits that could be derived from this meeting.

We have not digressed from our original intent that this should be a working conference. I think that this must be apparent from some of the announcements I have made this evening. It is *you*, the participants, who are going to do the work. In your scheduled sessions, in your individual discussions, at all times for the next two days or so, I want you to talk and think oral history. Now, I would suggest that we relax awhile; have a few drinks and got to bed. But come tomorrow prepared to begin our deliberations which, hopefully, may be a major decision for oral history. Thank you.

DEFINITIONS OF ORAL HISTORY

Mrs. Elizabeth I. Dixon, Chairman

DIXON: Early last spring, when we started planning this program, as Jim told you last night, we first of all had to impose an order, and so you're stuck with our order. Having arrived at this order, we then had to select the speakers for our first panel. And because it is "definitions in oral history," we wanted to present as broad a spectrum as possible. And so, with that in mind, we've asked Dr. Brooks of the Truman Library to represent Presidential libraries and *their* definitions as a specialized library. We've asked Dr. Hand to represent folklore and its applications to oral history, or vice versa. And Dr. Starr will represent the university programs—the broad general programs. Mr. Edmunds was to have represented industry. Unfortunately, he's not here, and we have no other industrial person to take his place right now.

The object of the panel, then, is really just to provide an overall view of oral history which may serve to establish some points of reference for more detailed discussion later. To insure a free exchange of ideas, each panelist has been encouraged to give a general explanation or definition as he feels it is defined, or should be defined. Each panelist will speak for half an hour, and in order to keep this session within its two-hour limit, I will remind the speaker five minutes before that his time is about to expire, and he can summarize: at the end of the time, it's the axe! We'll have a coffee break after the second speaker has concluded, and when the third speaker has concluded, I'll open the floor for questions, answers, discussions. No fights, please, just arguments. [laughter]

And now Dr. Brooks, please give us your opinion on oral history.

BROOKS: Thank you, Mrs. Dixon. The appropriate thing at an oral history conference would be for the speaker to get a real case of mike fright with all this battery of microphones, but I'll try not to. I warned Mrs. Dixon that her introduction might be longer than my remarks. I don't think I am going to take a half an hour. I would rather have you discuss in whatever time is left.

It's fortunate to be the first one on the program because the first one doesn't have to say anything definitive. The job of the first speaker, as I see it, is to set up a few propositions for the others to shoot at, and I am sure that they and you will do so.

There's a whole array of articles in various journals about oral history which I am sure you have read; and in view of their existence, it's difficult really to add anything new about the basic definition of oral history. Most of those articles, I think, were written in large part to inform persons who had not yet committed this sin of oral history but who were contemplating it, what they were getting into. I hope that's true, because it's a great tendency for people to take generic terms and to give them specialized meaning that may not be understood by persons outside of their own vocation, avocation, or whatever it may be. I do think it's important, when we're talking about definitions, to think about whom it is that we're defining something for; and I think we should not be defining oral history just for

ourselves, but for the people who are going to use our product, the people who are going to finance our activities—and to whom we have to justify our activities—and to the general public, to whatever extent they want to know. But I think we should start by thinking about the simple A B C's of what these terms mean that we throw about so loosely.

I thought about entitling my remarks, "A Plea for Orthodoxy in Oral History." Mr. Moore spoke last night about the interesting variety of projects that are represented here, and that variety itself suggests that there may be some arguments (not fights) about what oral history is. I don't object to a lot of these projects, but I do question whether or not some of them are really oral history. I need to know more about them. It's a bit presumptuous for me, of course, to talk about orthodoxy in oral history in the presence of Professor Nevins who, so far as I know, invented oral history, and Dr. Starr, who has been one of its chief practitioners, if not the chief one, for longer than anybody else here, I think.

I do have, however, a naive feeling that oral history ought to be *oral*, and it ought to be *history*. Maybe that's expecting too much. But when we talk about oral, I think the real distinction we're making is between the spoken word—the spoken recollections of persons whom we talk to about past events—as distinguished from the papers, the letters, the diaries, the records that are created in a given historic period or formally prepared statements of historians, diarists, and others that are written down and perhaps don't have the spontaneity, perhaps not the candor for which we look in oral history.

There is, to be sure, rather a contradiction in terms when we talk about oral history; Dr. Starr and I and several others here don't believe that you ought to save the tapes (more than perhaps a few samples), so we're not always able to produce oral history in oral form; but it's still a record of the spoken word, as distinguished from documents or papers created at the time, or a formal written statement. I suspect there will be some discussion here about this matter of preserving tapes.

Oral history, to me, also should be history. I suspect we'll have more arguments about whether some of these projects are oral history with reference to this term history than we will with reference to the term oral. This implies to me that what we should be dealing with is some interpretation, some account, some sort of representation of past periods, presumably of historic significance. I won't fall into the trap of debating about how far back something has to be to be history. Nobody has ever yet answered that. Maybe yesterday is history. That's all right with me. Now, Jim Mink sent out a number of questions (suggestive questions in advance of the conference) which were very good and very helpful, and one of them was: Do we think that oral history is properly used as a means of compiling statistical information? I don't. I don't think that's history. To me, the fact that oral history is history implies strongly enough that it may well be part of the definition; implies, also that it should be done according to the traditional tenets of historical scholarship. This involves, primarily, objectivity; it involves accuracy; it involves thoroughness and a number of other things which we were supposed to have learned in graduate school—primarily, objectivity.

A good many of us are archivists, and I think an oral history program is particularly appropriate to an archival agency because, to answer another one of your questions, Jim, I think, yes, oral history is a way of supplementing—not substituting for, but

supplementing—the written record, the letters, the diaries, the records, whatever may exist, that were created in the period that we're dealing with. I was talking the other day to Phil Mason, who is the head of the Wayne State Labor Archives and the oral history project there, and he stressed the importance or, at least, the desirability (maybe this isn't the part of the definition, but it appeals to me) of having oral history done by a collecting agency which is in the business of collecting papers of people that were active in the Truman Administration or have been associated with him, but we also collect photographs; we collect tape recordings of historical events (not oral history but actual recordings of the events), motion pictures, museum objects, everything that constitutes the historical evidence of that period; and to us, oral history is one means of accumulating historical evidence.

In making definitions, we should be conscious of the distinction between definitions and techniques, but to some extent, we have to define that activity in terms of the techniques that are used. Now I think that a tape recorder is important enough to oral history to constitute almost a part of the definition. I've interviewed a number of people, including some in England where I had the hardest time getting people on tape of any place. People would talk to me for two or three hours and reveal all, but you couldn't turn on the machine. I think I can take pretty good notes, and I could recreate pretty well what they said, but my notes *do not* constitute actually what they said, a record of their oral statements. Stenographic notes can be much more accurate, but I doubt that they serve this purpose completely either.

Oral history nearly always does proceed, and perhaps enough so that this is also part of the definition, by the process of interviews. That doesn't mean that everybody that conducts interviews is doing oral histry. This reminds me of the statement that was attributed to Horace Greeley, "Not all Democrats are horse thieves, but all horse thieves are Democrats." One of the frequent confusions (and I've seen this in book reviews by prominent historians that ought to know better) is for a person to say that someone who has gone around and interviewed a lot of participants in historic events has been committing oral history. I don't think he necessarily has, unless he has recorded what this other person actually said. Historians have been interviewing people for hundreds of years; there's nothing new about that, and I don't think they've been doing oral history. I think there's a *real* distinction between a researcher who interviews people for *his own* purpose to derive information for *his own* book, and that of what I sometimes call a "pure" oral historian, who is accumulating a stock of evidence for the use of other researchers, any and all researchers, as we do in an archival agency. I think this is related somewhat to the question of objectivity. Maybe I am not fair to the historian who does interviewing for his own research, but it seems to me that the person who is collecting a stock of evidence for other researchers to use is almost by definition likely to be doing a more objective job than the one who is writing his own book, especially the one that has a case to prove.

Again, about an archival agency, and perhaps this isn't an element of the definition but it's something we believe in so strongly that I wouldn't fail to mention it: we feel that the relation between the activity of collecting papers and the activity of collecting oral history interviews is and should be very close indeed. We don't want to go bother a man who was in the Truman Cabinet or an official of the Truman Administration too many times on different activities. The most appropriate thing is to go and talk to him about his papers. Does he have them? Will he give them to the library? This takes an average of about seven years' negotiation. Will he also subject himself to an oral history interview? And I think these two things

complement each other very closely.

Now, they're also related very closely to another point that we think is extremely important. And again, it may strictly not be part of the definition, but it's so closely woven into our concept of oral history that it seems to me appropriate to mention, and that is the preparation of the interviewer. We probably have one of the *most conservative* oral history programs in the country, and it certainly is not the largest, incidentally. But we're taking what you might call a "rifle" rather than a "shotgun" approach. We're going after people that were associated in some way with the events of the Truman Administration or with the career of Mr. Truman, and we're trying to derive information about this field of subject matter. We're not, as some quite respectable institutions are doing, interviewing a whole lot of different people about a lot of different subjects. Thus, with us this question of the preparation of the interviewer is exceptionally important. I think there ought to be a good converse statement to the old statement saying: "If you ask a stupid question you get a stupid answer." That's still true, but it seems to me the reverse is also true. Maybe this is best stated by Lucile Kane in one of her service bulletins for the Minnesota Historical Society. She said that if we want to obtain information from somebody, we ought to know definitely what it is we want to learn before we start out, and I feel this very strongly.

When I talk about orthodoxy, perhaps I should refer to the gospel according to Nevins and Starr. When we started our project four years ago, we read all the articles. One thing we read, and we've become even more thoroughly convinced of after getting our feet wet in this project, is that you spend a lot more time on preparation than you do on the interview. You certainly spend a great deal more time on the transcription than you do with the tape. But in order to economize, we developed one aspect of our program that perhaps is unique in that we chose two large segments of the Truman story and decided to work on those in our oral history program. The chief of our oral history project, Mr. Fuchs, has devoted himself to the pre-presidential career of Mr. Truman. As a result of his work on it, I think he knows more about it than anybody else in the country. He has read everything that has ever been written about the pre-presidential career of Mr. Truman. There's a real paucity of dependable information about what this man did, especially before he became senator. There are a lot of myths, but there's not an awful lot of dependable information. Well, Jim Fuchs has read all this stuff; he has talked to any number of people; and has accumulated quite an impressive array of information on this subject. The point is that this one body of research serves him in interviewing a number of different people. I think the intereviews are more valuable for this reason because they complement each other; they bear on the same field of problems, and gradually, we are building up something really worthwhile.

Now in addition to that—partly because there was a tremendous amount of information in the process of decision making, partly because we knew that there was a daily staff meeting a nine o'clock every morning in the White House during the Truman Administration which was not recorded—we decided to have one man go to Washington and interview people who had been members of the Truman staff. Here again, to my mind, one body of research would serve for interviews with a lot of different people. By this means, the interviewer was able to conduct more intelligent interviews than he would otherwise. He could talk intelligently with the "victims," as I call the interviewees; he understands their responses and their references; and again, the interviews would complement each other. In the course of time, I think that we

are building up quite a substantial body of information. As is bound to happen, a number of other subjects have crept in, so that our man in Washington has also interviewed people about the '48 campaign and a number of other aspects of the Truman Administration, and they are all to the good. But we have concentrated in these two main fields, and I think this is quite important.

I think I have covered everything that I wanted to say, except this: Most of us have to justify our activities to someone, maybe a person, maybe an organization, maybe a government, that provides the funds. Most of us want to look respectable in the academic community. Most of us want, particularly, as our end product in life, to provide useful information to our researchers. For that reason, I think we have to be able to justify the expenditure of money and time and materials on what is necessarily a very expensive and a very time-consuming activity. I think it behooves us to assure, not only that our resources are well spent, but also that our product is useful and of very high quality. I am not sure that all of what I have said is absolutely a part, a necessary part, of the definition, but at least, maybe I have given you some idea of our concept of oral history.

DIXON: Thank you very much, Dr. Brooks. I was reminded of one of Jim's remarks. He said he met a man in Seattle, sometime last month, who said that, in his opinion, oral history was rather like the Holy Roman Empire, which, as you know, was neither holy, Roman, nor an empire. Perhaps oral history isn't oral or history, but we'll come to that later.

Our second speaker is Professor Wayland D. Hand, representing the folklorist in oral history.

HAND: I have been interested, of course, in oral history for a good many years, but in a special brand of oral history, namely folklore. Several years ago, when the Oral History Project was created at UCLA, I must say that I was somewhat envious of the people because they were able to get funds with which to do this important work, and we had been unable, in the ten or fifteen years previous to that time, to get much backing for field collecting. It is very easy to get sums of money (research funds) for library research which prove out to one's colleagues, but to say that you want to go out among unlettered people in the community, find out what their old stories were, the songs they knew, the legends they could tell, the proverbs, the folk speech, the riddles, and all the rest, is something that, in America, still has to come about. People are very slow to see the need of this kind of activity.

I think the principal contribution that I have made as Chairman of the Oral History Committee at UCLA is to try to lower the focus a bit from the types of people interviewed. Over the years we've interviewed lawyers, doctors, professional people, politicians, theatrical people, educators, the whole upper crust of American society, but somehow not found the time to talk to the brick masons, the blacksmiths, the cordwainers, the shepherds, and people of this sort, who have made their own contribution to American society. I hope, after getting some of these, we will go on and interview the chimney sweeps, the hangmen, and the town criers, if there still are such around. Among the most likely informants for any folklore collector are the sextons and the burghers, the people that are around the churches, see the

people married and buried and see everything that goes on, and are privy to a thousand and one little details that other people would not know about at all.

More seriously, having mentioned chimney sweeps, hangmen, and town criers, I do think that folklore and history have a great deal in common, and I shall address myself this morning to those specific areas of folklore that seem somehow to mesh with the kinds of things that you people are interested in and which constitute the main concern of this symposium here today. In the chance, then, that you are not as fully familiar with folklore as you are with history, I have to tell you some of the things that might be the A B C's of my trade. Maybe some of you people will know about them; some of you, perhaps, will not. Since there may be no better time than the present to show how folklore also fits into some of the other topics on the program, I shall weave into my discussion things that have to do with aims, purposes, techniques because there's no place for folklore in these considerations. So if I do get off the radar beam just a little, I'll promptly return to it. The relevance, then, of folklore to history, I think, will come out in many ways.

A famous English folklorist by the name of E.S. Hartland once said that folklore is the science of oral tradition. He didn't say, "oral history" but "oral tradition"—things which are passed on by word of mouth over generations and centuries. And perhaps, in this particular regard, folklorists work in a broader dimension than people in oral history because—on the basis of things which are collected today, and are still current, and may still be excavated from people whose memories go back, not only through their own generation, but also through their family and others, maybe a generation or two—they are able to excavate things, then, which, if pursued far enough back, go back not only generations in time but also centuries. If I had a blackboard, I could illustrate how collecting in the modern generation presupposes a knowledge of the earlier folklore of the twentieth century, of the nineteenth century, and so on back a good long way. Collecting, then, is very old in folklore. It goes back to the time of the Brothers Grimm, a hundred fifty years ago. Actually, if you count folksong scholarship, it would go back into the third quarter, let's say, of the eighteenth century; so it goes back the better part of two hundred years. I would say that the scientific collecting of folklore started about 1875 and has been successively refined, until today the collecting of folklore is a very exact and demanding science, and there are people who could talk to you hours on end about just how you do that, and how you do the other thing.

The notion that material is fast passing from view, unless you get out and collect it, is a very old one. The Grimms, about 1810, had placards printed and circulated, handbills sent to clergymen and educators, and announcements given at country fairs to get out and collect the material from the lips of the living folk, else the material would forever vanish. It has always been the eleventh hour in the collecting of folklore, and this is the appeal we try to make when we go for funds. We say: "You people realize that thousands of people all over the United States die every week who will take to their graves this precious material, the heirlooms, the mental heirlooms of the past, unless someone gets to them and collects this material." I don't know of a single collector who hasn't had the unfortunate and dismaying experience of hoping to get back to a person to get this, that, or the other out of him, or to complete a series of interviews, only to learn that the person has meanwhile died. This happened to me once in the City of Oakland. I was asked by the Library of Congress to go up and interview a man by the

name of Michel Stubblefield, and I put it off, and put if off; the next time I went to Berkeley, I tried to look him up, but he'd been dead two weeks. And this is the way it goes. So in folklore we're always working, and this isn't always equally true, of course, of oral history, at the eleventh hour because there's a whole body of material passing from view as these people go to their rewards.

The people that you interview are likely to have special repertories; some will be polyhistors of their trade. They may have a fairly full range of folklore, but a person knowing folktales, primarily, may know a few legends. Unless you ask for the legends, you will not get them; he will favor his folktales. Someone knowing riddles may have a repertory of proverbs and maxims, but you have to ask for them. Every collector has had the experience of finally getting a crucial piece of information, oftentimes inadvertently, from an informant and will carry on about how excited he is to hear this because it fills in part of a picture; and the person will say, "Gee, I didn't know you were interested in that." I would agree with Dr. Brooks in saying (I'll paraphrase him slightly) that good folklore collecting begins in the library. You have to know what you're after; you have to have a fairly complete budget of what you're after, so that when you get into the field you will not find yourself in the situation of Parsifal, failing to ask the crucial question when there was still time. Many a collector has probed his way to the periphery of information and might, with a little more intelligence and perseverance on his own part, have moved into a whole new terrain and uncovered material that would have been primary. So that training in the field, knowing the repertories, is extremely important, then.

Now some of these categories of folklore (I've mentioned several at the outset of my remarks) really do not qualify as history at all. I would say riddles, maxims, and proverbs are not essentially historical. Although a proverb may hold fast a general idea that was present at sometime in history and to which people universally subscribed, it is not the kind of thing that one could think of in this connection. Folk speech, folk medicine, folk beliefs, and so on, do not qualify.

Which fields, then, do qualify? I would say, then, that perhaps the folktale (we don't mention mythology in this connection) would be, perhaps, the one thing that one could focus on. However, the folktale, in a sense, is idealized history. It deals with events, but these events are a long way in the past; they are vague in geographical terms. As in a Hungarian tale, "This happened in a country, seven times seven countries, over seven times seven hills." This is a long way away, and it has no geographical fixity, and it has no historical fixity. So folktales are essentially idealized history, or things that people envision and want; but I would say that folktales, properly speaking, do not qualify here.

Ancient myths, of course, qualify because into these myths are woven the ideas, the basic ideas, of the people, of the various tribes, their notions of how the world came to be, how the earth was peopled, the flora, the fauna, the constellations; and then came culture heroes, the progenitors of the race and all the rest. This is a sort of prehistory. You can call it whatever you want, but the method of getting it in earliest times was oral. You had to extract these stories from people, and then redactors came along, took the various accounts, and this is the way mythologies, whole mythologies, came into being. But it was essentially an oral

process, and the notions themselves were purveyed from person to person, from group to group essentially by a process of oral history.

In some parts of Europe, notably in Ireland, Finland, and parts of Slavic Europe, ancient mythology lived side by side with modern folklore, and these are the areas where it's really exciting to work. In Germanic Europe, Germanic mythology sort of went out about the year 1000 A.D., and we now look back at considerable historical distance to this period. But as I say, in some parts of Europe, ancient mythology and modern folklore more or less merged.

The one field that would be of primary interest to us is legend, and I'm speaking not of saints' legends, but of local stories about real people, real places and real events. These accounts arise from actual circumstances; they are embroidered; they are embellished; oftentimes, folk beliefs and superstitions filter into the material; and it is transmuted in many ways, but it is passed on by word of mouth. These accounts, legendary accounts, exist by the hundreds, and in some countries, by the thousands. I mentioned Finland as having a stock in trade of about a hundred thousand legends that have been recorded in oral tradition. So there's a tremendous body of material. And it is, in some countries, on the basis of bodies of legendry and mythology, but principally legendry, the earliest recorded history is written, and I need tell you only of the *Gesta Danorum* of Saxo Grammaticus, which goes back and recapitulates the ancient legends of Nordic Europe—the sagas, the family sagas, and other accounts which were essentially oral all the way along the line. That is one field that I think qualifies.

Now I come at you with another field that you might not suspect belongs in our rubric. I think this is the field of custom and usage, that is, the things that people do. This is essentially not narrative, but actually dramatic, in the sense that things are enacted. And you have then, the life cycle—things that happen in connection with birth, marriage, and death. They are done in every family; they are done in every community, and constitute a body of actual living lore, and if you want to call it history, I don't think I'd object.

In addition to the life cycle—birth, marriage, and death—of which I have just spoken, there are also the calendrical customs: the church, the sacred year, the church calendar; the secular year, the seasonal customs, the planting, the period of growth, harvest and interestingly enough, the off season. This is the time when you can mend the fences, run the fences, mend the harness; when there is time for the women, who are not working the garden helping with the harvest, to do the spinning and things of this sort. This, in a sense, is the way people live, and even though they do it without verbalizing it, to some extent, it seems to me, it should qualify as history telling about the everyday life of people. It seems to me that is a very interesting field.

Then there are the areas of sports and pastimes, dances, and pageants; I wouldn't insist on those too much.

The whole field of the early legal history, the legal antiquities, is a very exciting field in folklore, and greatly neglected, particularly in our own country, where you have these unusual kinds of things. In early New England, for example, there were the so-called "smock" or "shift" marriages, where a widow could divest herself of the encumbrances of her first

marriage and any legal attainders that might come from it by doing certain kinds of things. One of the things was to divest herself of the raiment of her first husband under cover of darkness on the King's Highway, and, as the clergyman married them, perhaps looking down the street, take on the livery of the new husband. These were fairly common. You can read about them in Alice Morse Earle, *Customs and Fashions in Old New England,* and in other writers. They have been anthologized in Bodkin's *Treasury of New England Folklore.* In some places in Europe, she did the selfsame thing in full view of the mourners at the funeral, by walking up to the casket of her husband, placing a key on it, brushing it to the floor; or if she didn't have a key, she'd take a wisp of straw and do the selfsame thing. This, in a sense, represents legal history. It was not oral, I repeat, but was enacted; and things that are done have to be linked with the things that are said, and I think folklore has a way of doing this. One supplements the other, and together, they have a way of constituting a whole.

I would say that the one thing, and I started to say this earlier, the one thing that folklore brings to this discipline of oral history is a sort of time depth, wherein folklorists are interested in going after submerged history. Things which are recovered today, and we could represent them as the top of a column, collected, say, since 1800 in great plentitude all over Europe and America, have earlier literary antecedents. If you find them everywhere today and then can peg literary antecedents of a hundred, hundred fifty, two hundred years ago, then you're fairly sure that this material is fairly ancient, so the discipline of folklore is not only geographical but historical. In Finland they perfected the so-called historic-geographic method where the dimensions of time were equally valid with those of space in trying to reconstruct the onward march of history and folklore.

Well, I think I might conclude now with, say, a pitch for the psychological aspects of this field. The psychologists were very much interested in it: not only Freud, and latterly Jung, but before Freud. Wundt and Leisner found in folklore the documentation of the mental and spiritual life of man in its best and most pristine state. The whole corpus of Jung is based on folktales. He has, in the *Marchen der Weltliteratur,* a series of about forty volumes of tales which he had combed from all over the world, extracted ideas which he believes to be universal. So it rests entirely on these readings.

I will close with one simple story in which I figured, the better part of ten years ago in Fresno, California. We had gone up to collect Armenian folklore. A young colleague in the music field had gone up to get the Armenian folk songs, and I had gone up to collect the tales. We had announced our coming, and they gave us about five or ten minutes each at the big church gathering at the County Fairgrounds to state our business; and so we said what we were there for, and invited people to come up. Half a dozen people came up and said they knew tales and so on.

One of them was a man, fortyish and a bit on the sheepish side, and I said, "Do you know Armenian tales?" He more or less disallowed, but his wife, a hefty German gal, gave him a biff in the ribs and said, "You do, too, because you told these folktales to me when you courted me!" So he was stuck. The following Wednesday night, I appeared at his place to interview him. We got the kids off to bed. First of all, in order to introduce machinery, the tape recorder, you have to do it gently; you just can't go in with sound equipment and get

people to speak right out. What I usually do is take along some little spools, and have the children recite verses or sing songs, and these are played back. They're happy, the parents are happy, and then the kids are trundled off to bed.

Well, he finally started to recite a tale, and the first tale he recited took fifty-five minutes. I could see in a moment that he was a real raconteur. That is, he gestured, and he had moments of elation, then he was outraged, and there was only one brief hiatus in his remarks. At the end of this I said, "Do you tell this tale often?" He said, "No." I said, "Well, how recently have you told it?" He said, "I told it in March of this year." This was August. Then I got the circumstances of why he told it.

He had been taken prisoner. He was in the Russian Army fighting in that general area, pressed into service in Armenia, and then was taken prisoner by the Germans and removed to a compound outside of Stuttgart. Like many another, instead of going back to where he came from at the end of the war, he stayed there, met this girl, courted her, and then emigrated to America, and had been living here some dozen years or so. He said that ever since he had left Armenia, he had tried fruitlessly to get in touch with his mother. He had written her, no answer; he had written friends—no answer, no answer, years on end. So, in March of that year, a letter came, saying that his mother was still alive. I said, "Then what did you do?" He said in broken German (he told the tales in Armenian and then recited them to me in German without benefit of gender and grammatical niceties), *"Ich habe geweinen,"* instead of saying, *"Ich habe geweint"* (I cried when I got the message). I forgave him that. Then he said that he sat down and told himself this tale from beginning to end—told it to himself. The point that I'd wish to make here is that in a moment of personal crisis, elation or whatever else you want to call it, the first thing that came to his mind was a fairy tale. It recapitulated for him better than anything else he could do at the moment—sing a song, say a prayer, jump up in the air—the ten thousand tender associations of home and fireside.

So I hope that with this little emotional pitch at the end, you will not forget the place of folklore in oral history.

DIXON: Our third speaker this morning is Dr. Louis Starr, Director of the Oral History Research Office at Columbia University. Would you speak about oral history in the general programs?

STARR: What is oral history? I listened to some yesterday on the way here, courtesy of TWA and Columbia Records, or did I? Over the headphones on our private channel nine, came something called *Blitzkrieg.* I heard the broken voice of Neville Chamberlain telling the British people that all of his efforts for peace had failed and that, "for the second time within the lifetime of most of us, we are at war." I heard Walter Cronkite introduce Hitler blaspheming Poland, and the Stuka bombers blasting at her pitiful defenders. I hear, once again, the leonine tones of Winston Churchill. It was indisputably oral; it was indisputably history—prime source material. But was it oral history? As I use the term, and as we understand it at Columbia, it was *not.* And why not? Because it added nothing to the sum total of the world's available supply of knowledge.

Don't misunderstand me, that recording and thousands of other recordings of great speeches, or radio interviews, of epic-making news broadcasts have great interest and value; and the work of collecting them, preserving them, and making them available is of great importance, just as to a music scholar, a collection of tapes of Scandinavian folk songs would be of utmost importance.

The people who are interested in such recordings, I'm glad to say, now have their own group, formed almost simultaneously (if we go ahead and form an association) with this one: The Association for Recorded Sound Collections. They had a preliminary meeting at Syracuse last spring and will hold their first formal conclave at the Library of Congress on October 20 to 22, if any of you are especially interested in that gathering. Actually, they're fascinating, and many of them are sound engineers who have actually screened out some of the distracting recording noises so that one can hear Brahms, for example, leading an orchestra playing his own compositions a little better, perhaps, than when it was first recorded. I don't know whether they are going to be able to improve the voice of William Jennings Bryan as we have it now, but I hope so, because, of course, recording imperfections are what keep us from hearing him as we should.

All right then, what is oral history? At Columbia, in golden letters on our doors are the words: "Oral History Research Office"; and Mrs. Dixon has already stolen my line about Talleyrand's observation about the Holy Roman Empire, but it certainly is appropriate. An "office"? We are an autonomous division of the University, functioning under the direct supervision of the central administration and accountable only to it, rather than just an office. The "research," I hope, is justifiable, though there *are* times, to be absolutely candid, as an oral historian should, when our subjects fail to check what they have said, or our interviewers fall down in their homework. When I think of it as a hope rather than a fact, I hope there is more substance in it than there was in the "Holy" of Holy Roman Empire. As for "history," our product very definitely is *not* history. It is, we hope, the *raw material* from which some history will one day be written. And of course we are not, it could be argued, even "oral"--the point that Mr. Brooks made--since our end product is not a tape, but a corrected transcript of what was said on the tape.

Oral history, then, is an imprecise term. A number of you, over the years, have complained to me that there ought to be a better one, but no one yet has come up with a better one. We've tried "living history," and, somehow, that didn't go down; and no doubt there are other possible solutions. Well, as my sons say to me when I have made some observation to which they take exception, "I've got news for you!" Oral history, like it or not, is here to stay. It's gone generic. The New York *Times* and even the New York *Daily News,* that ultimate authority, use it in lower case now. They used to capitalize it, but that was when we had the field to ourselves. For myself, I'm glad. It serves as a perpetual reminder to us, a reminder of the imprecision of our language and of the eternal need to amplify and to clarify, needs which oral historians do well to keep in mind as they work.

I have said that speeches are not oral history. Let me try a sample of what I think is oral history on you and see what you think of this one--it has a certain appropriateness now because much of the world is worried about the Secretary-General of the UN, the future of that office, and who is to hold it. This is Andrew Cordier, talking not long ago, and I will read

simply a short excerpt:

> I was telling one of you this morning, the story of Dag Hammarskjold's visit to Moscow in '58 and '59. He was dining with Khrushchev one evening and Mikoyan was present. Mikoyan asked him at one stage, "Well, Mr. Secretary-General, how do you reconcile the Secretariat and Marxian dialectic?" Mr. Hammarskjold said, "It's something like this: Back in 1953 you and the other great powers and all the membership projected me into space like Sputnik and I've been keeping equal distance from all nations ever since." Well, that concept of being distant was his way of interpreting his role. In other words, he would have insisted that his policy was not American, not Russian, not English, and certainly not Swedish. Sometimes people would say, "This is the Swedish in him," which he did not like. He did not like it to be expressed that he was following a Swedish line. And so this concept of separateness, of being distant from the policy of any given nation was a concept which was very strong with the Secretary-General and which he put in this rather graphic language in reply to Mikoyan. Of course, the conception of the Secretary-Generalship simply cannot exist in Marxian dialectic. I mean, the institution of the United Nations and especially the Secretary-Generalship do not correspond at all with the concept of Marxian dialectic.

Let's try another little sample that tells us something more about the same office and how another man looked at it. From the same author, Andrew Cordier, Hammarskjold's deputy, and for many years, of course, prominent in the affairs of the UN, and in American foreign affairs before that. Of Hammarskjold, he said:

> It was through consultation that he kept on the track, so to speak, and through consultation he gained a lot of support. That is, when people are not consulted who feel they should be consulted, it naturally tends to alienate them, to cause them to feel that they have been by-passed and it therefore produces bad blood.
>
> On that point, for example, Trygve Lie used to say to me when I brought something to him ready for decision, "Have you consulted the elevator girls?" By that he meant, "Have you consulted with everybody that should be consulted with all along the line?" Well, Mr. Lie was also a believer in consultation.

That seems to be what we're talking about—a little illustration of one phase of oral history that's interesting, the kind of anecdote about someone remembered by a person whose memory one trusts implicitly, and the internal evidence is there to prove what the man said. And that's oral history, and I would agree: it's previously unrecorded information about what, in the first instance, a couple of the more important leaders of our time discussed between them regarding an important office, and but for *us,* it wouldn't be preserved, it wouldn't exist.

Just to test the definition, to test my assertion that this is oral history, let me tell you this: Andy Cordier was not, it so happens, talking to an interviewer. He was addressing a group of students at the School of International Affairs at Columbia. He referred to this and

subsequent talks as lectures—lectures we persuaded him to allow us to record and transcribe. In my book this is just as good an illustration of oral history as if the man had been talking to one of our interviewers.

I feel the same way about our transcription of what Benjamin Fine, of the New York *Times,* told our journalism students about his experiences in Little Rock in 1957, only a few hours after he got home from that terrible crisis; or what Tom Wicker, of the same paper, told them, also in highly autobiographical terms, regarding his precise movements and reactions on November 22, 1963, in Dallas, when a President was assassinated.

Perhaps the last two illustrations bring us closer to drawing a line, to setting down a fence post. If the journalism students these two men were addressing had been free to cover what was said, outside of the school (they had to cover it as an exercise that didn't go outside of the school), either by reproducing a transcript or by a comprehensive report of what was said, I would not have put the material in the Oral History Collection. It would no longer represent a worthwhile addition to the world's vital supply of source materials as it stood. But as those transcripts stand, it happens that they are, and it matters not that they came to us through no thanks to an interviewer.

Let's test the fence I'm building around the term "oral history" at another place. And let me say in connection with my metaphor that I don't like fences! But I agree with the sponsors of this gathering that they are necessary, so we'll know what is common ground between us and what isn't. I like fences better than walls, like the Chinese Wall or the Berlin Wall. I think we need fences that give a little; that are not too inflexible, and yet have enough barbs in them to win our respect as fences; fences that, to push the figure a little further, can be climbed through, if one is dexterous and knows what he's about and is properly motivated; but fences stout enough to let the world know where we stand and what we are about.

A half dozen years ago, when we were deeply involved in a quite massive study of the history of flight, we approached Charles A. Lindbergh. The scholar on this assignment, of course, had read *We* and *The Spirit of St. Louis* and everything else he could lay hands on, but he wanted Lindbergh's personal comment on a few vital questions. All of this had been left unanswered, and, of course, any substantive addition that a man like Lindbergh might be able to make about himself or about aviation would be worth obtaining. General Lindbergh made two things plain at once: number one, he would not talk into a tape recorder or any other recording device; number two, he would be glad to see our man and answer any questions. Our interviewer did see him, visited his home in Darien, Connecticut, dined with him, interviewed him, and took notes as fast as he could write. He offered to show Lindbergh the notes but was courteously declined. The General was sure they were accurate and our man was welcome to them.

We had substantially the same experience with Admiral Nimitz, but on a much more extensive scale. These were more intensive interviews, which lasted for the better part of a week on a lonely island in San Francisco Bay. Only a psychiatrist could tell you why the Admiral's stern sense of propriety excluded the tape recorder. But he knew that our man was rushing home every night to write everything he could remember.

All right, is the interviewer's report of what he heard oral history? Mr. Brooks says it isn't. It's a report of an interview. In the one instance, I say it wasn't for our practical purposes at Columbia--you won't find Charles A. Lindbergh listed as a memoirist in our catalog, proud as I would have been to have him aboard. There simply was not enough substantive value, enough that was new to the world of scholarship, or to the world at large, to justify it. The Nimitz interviewer's report, on the other hand, is quite detailed, has a number of little-known or hitherto unknown elements in it about epochal events in World War II, about Nimitz himself. Thus, Admiral Eller, of the Navy History Section, and ourselves regard it, while disappointing because it isn't a verbatim record, as a special prize. There is no tape, and the words, except where paraphrase and direct quotation are used, are, of course, the words of our interviewer. But the circumstances, when it is deposited, will be carefully set forth in the transcript. If that transcript isn't oral history, then we're going to have to put in some new fence posts. I think our pasture has got to be big enough to let us move about as circumstances dictate and still keep out what's of no real value to anyone, like our Lindbergh interviewer's report.

Let's test these fence posts in still another place. Some time ago, I wrote to Lewis Mumford to ask if he'd give us his recollections of Alfred Harcourt; we were doing, I explained, a special project on this very notable but little-known figure in the publishing world. Mr. Mumford had known him well. Would he give our interviewer a few hours the next time he came to New York? Indeed, he would not, said Mr. Mumford in a tart letter. He would not waste his time talking to one of those accursed machines! What was more worthless than talk? Our methods were, as he understood them, the height of folly. Why, he could write all he knew of Alfred Harcourt, and he knew him well, in half the time, and do it properly. Easy solution: "Dear Mr. Mumford, Please do what you said you could do." We got back eighteen pages of *splendid* narration. All right, it's not oral history, but it happens to belong in our collection of memoirs about Alfred Harcourt, and those memoirs are oral history. So what shall we do? Put a little asterisk in the catalog and say that it isn't oral history; he wrote it? On the other hand, it wouldn't exist but for the initiative of the Oral History Office. It's new information. I don't care, personally, and I doubt if, secretly, many of you do, if you read it, whether it was tape recorded or not; especially, if you can check in the introduction and see that the man wrote it.

This leads me a little bit towards special projects. While I don't want to get away from the definition idea, I would like to make one point. In this kit we received there is the most comprehensive bibliography of oral history that I have ever seen, with some wonderful articles that I've never seen before, including one great debate with Fred Shannon. We need a Fred Shannon in this crowd, who would throw positively insulting remarks at the participants and get them so roused that they could come to the defense of oral history as they never imagined! That is a wonderful discussion; you should read it.*

---

*Clifford L. Lord, ed., "Is Oral History Really Worthwhile?" *Ideas in Conflict: A Colloquium on Certain Problems in Historical Society Work in the United States and Canada* (Harrisburg, Pa., American Association for State and Local History, 1958), pp. 17-57.

Among other things in that kit, you will find "An Even Stranger Death of President Harding."** I salute the UCLA people for distributing this because their memoirist is drawn heavily upon in this article, and he is shot to ribbons! They are showing you exactly what can happen to an oral history memoir. We can't go around telling everybody this is the greatest medium ever devised. It has the weaknesses and the strengths of autobiography—published autobiography or unpublished. So we mustn't make extravagant claims for oral history.

To tie up the point that I was going to make: Wouldn't it have been marvelous in 1948, or sometime earlier, to have had a special project, launched by one of the California institutions on the death of President Harding? At that time, we'll say, there would have been more witnesses around who could have talked and would have talked under promise of seal, and would have solved some of the problems that this very able scholar is now struggling with.

We mustn't contend that everything in our collection is gospel truth, nor even that it's going to settle problems that the historian would otherwise have. We're probably raising new ones for him. We're making things more difficult and troublesome for historians, but we're providing them with a richer store of materials to draw upon. I think we are, in balance, providing fresh source material for the world of scholarship; and what else is a great university like this one, or Columbia, or the other institutions that you represent, for, when you get right down to it? What else is it for, except to promote knowledge, and to collect new knowledge, and to help to disseminate it?

RAYMUND WOOD [UCLA]: How long do you consider to be the ideal interview?

BROOKS: Dr. Starr has said we shouldn't build walls, we should just build fences that are somewhat flexible, and this is certainly true. I don't think there's any precise answer to your question. We think about an hour, because after that time your "victim" is probably going to get tired. But there are some people who like it, who get started and you might as well continue. You play it by ear. I don't think you ought to have a precise answer to the question.

STARR: I think there's an outside limit for most people. They begin to become highly digressive and signs of weariness show up between an hour and a half and two hours. But I agree completely with Dr. Brooks. You have to play it by ear.

HAND: Folklorists are very much interested in getting all that a person has, and, as long as the mood is right, you can, generally speaking, keep going. One of my colleagues, a very successful collector, kept an eighty year old person up till two o'clock in the morning, and justified this to his colleagues on the grounds that perhaps the gentleman would be too feeble later on. It seems to me he had overdone it.

SHELDON SELESNICK, M.D. [Mt. Sinai Hospital, Los Angeles]: I'm a psychiatrist doing psychiatric historical research. Our project, sponsored by the American Psychiatric

---

**Frances W. Schruben, "An Even Stranger Death of President Harding," *Southern California Quarterly*, XLVIII (March 1966), 57-84.

Association, is to interview old-time psychiatrists. When we interview these famous psychiatrists, there will be a great deal of information which is quite confidential. They may tell us that fifty, sixty, seventy years from now this can be published, but the question is this: Does the interviewee have a right to say when it can be published or is there a runout time?

BROOKS: This, again, is difficult to answer precisely. I think, generally speaking, the interviewee does have such a right. You're asking him to contribute information. Just as when he gives his papers, he can stipulate conditions of access. I think he does have that right, but I think you ought to expect him to exercise it within reason which may or may not be comparable to the period of the copyright. Literary property right has no specific term of years now. Generally speaking, I think we would try to negotiate with the interviewee to get him to (if he wanted to) stipulate that his interview be closed until some foreseeable period or event, so you're sure that it's going to be lifted some day. Presumably it would be closed until all the participants are gone, or some other benchmark that you can go by, so you know that you're not accumulating something that's forever going to be closed, and if it's going to be useful, I think it ought to be opened reasonably soon.

DIXON: Don't you think, Dr. Brooks, that you would lose the spontaneity if this interviewee thought that he could not close the material, if necessary?

BROOKS: You'd not only lose the spontaneity, you'd frequently lose the interview. [laughter]

STARR: This is as good a time as any to make a point or two, if I may, Mrs. Dixon, because that's an interesting question. Number one, to confirm what Dr. Brooks has said, we cite something mysterious, known as the law against perpetuities. I don't know what the law against perpetuities is, but you can't do anything in perpetuity. You have to set a cutoff date. Number two, why get him to close the whole memoir, when only pages 13 to 15 are lurid? Take those out and put them aside in the safe, and let us have the rest, please.

ROBERT ECKLES [Purdue University]: I've done about 3,000 interviews connected with a company and a business history, and I would say this: know the laws of libel; know the law of slander; know the law of copyright; and then act according to the advice of the attorney, who will try to keep you from being sued. I have hundreds of interviews on tape that go this way: "You can use the general spirit of my interview, but you may not quote me because I so and so, and so on." Now this is in business. If you're in folklore where it doesn't cost anything, all right. One misstatement from me might cost a man a very lucrative relationship in business, so you must be careful. Talk to your lawyer about libel and slander and be guided by him. Now I don't think you shouldn't get the interview, but if you're ever going to put it in writing where it may be copyrighted, be very careful!

THEODORE MARBURG [Marquette University]: You must give the interviewee control over the interview. If he has this control, he will give you the kind of material you are after—the particular type of research material you are trying to collect in oral history.

KANDELIN: These are very eager questions. They are pushing forward to questions of technique. I'd like to come back to definitions. Like Dr. Selesnick, I'm a psychiatrist, and we conceptualize oral as a much broader connotation than merely verbalizing. Here at the colloquium we have a lot of oral activity apart from our discussions of oral history, so why shouldn't it be called "verbal" history?

STARR: I can only reiterate what I've said. The term has become generic, and I think we're stuck with it. I like it, myself, and everybody in this audience seems to know what we mean.

LESTER CAPPON [Institute of Early American History and Culture]: I'd just like to say that, in answer to your question, Dr. Kandelin, all history is verbal history. It would never do to distinguish this field. All history is concerned with words, and ideas that come out of words, so this would make no distinction whatsoever between your techniques and the traditional techniques of the historian.

I would like to ask Dr. Starr a question. I've been a little concerned about your saying that a memoir which somebody wrote down, because he was stimulated to do so by your request for an interview, you would file as oral history. There's nothing whatsoever oral about this. This man might have written a memoir without this stimulus. It has nothing to do with your techniques of oral history, and I don't think it belongs in a collection of oral history, if there's nothing oral about it. I think it ought to be deposited as a manuscript, say, in the Columbia University Library and filed under the man's name. It has nothing to do with oral history.

STARR: I would agree with you, literally. What I'm saying is, that in this catalog we have a section headed: "Special Projects," and here we have the Harcourt-Brace Project, and to leave out Mr. Mumford simply because he didn't talk to a tape recorder, but wrote what he had to say in response to our prompting, seems to me to be nit-picking in this instance. Now, I don't think, generally speaking, we're testing a fence post that has any great significance. I would agree it's not oral history, literally.

CAPPON: I would differ with you very much on that. I think there is a very important distinction.

STARR: But the reader *is told* of this distinction in the introduction!

ELWOOD MAUNDER [Forest History Society]: In the process of editing the transcript of your oral history, how much freedom do you give to the person interviewed to make additions and corrections, and if you do, isn't this in the same category as this written paper Dr. Cappon is talking about?

STARR: It's sort of betwixt and between. Is it in the same category? That's a good question. I brought with me for exhibit a page of a memoir given us by Luther Evans, and it is corrected in his own hand. We intend to leave that as the final product because Mr. Evans didn't say, "Please, final type." He was satisfied to leave his corrections as he made them so that you can read what he crossed out. If he'd crossed out anything sensitive, he would have told us to final

type the page. I think that it has value to leave the subject's editing as it stands rather than to final type. It's not as neat a product, but when have historians been concerned with neatness? They had to learn to decipher the pen scratchings of Horace Greeley [laughter] and I don't think you want to lose the authenticity of the edited memoir, if you can get away with it. We tell the memoirist, "Please, don't be full of the literary niceties when you edit what you've said." Nobody can talk extemporaneously in unrhymed iambic pentameter. [laughter] Look at President Kennedy's press conferences and Ike's. [laughter] We say, "Please let us retain the spontaneity." "And don't put us to a lot of trouble," we are saying secretly to ourselves, "of having to final type because the page is so messy we've got to throw it out."

BROOKS: This is a point where our practice differs from that of Columbia. I think the whole point is one of the fences that will bend. Frequently, many people I've interviewed say: "Please don't keep the tapes. Please don't keep my editing of the transcript. The only thing I'll let you have is the final typing," and if you don't do that, again, you lose the interview. So I think you have to play this, to a certain extent, by ear.

May I say this about the fences and the walls? I think that obviously we don't want to quibble, and we can't be too precise about the definitions. What we're trying to do, as I see it, is to set up a set of ground rules, to start with, primarily for people who want to get into oral history and wonder what it is. When you say, "How do you start an oral history program?" we don't mention to you all the pitfalls and all the exceptions. You're going to come to those. [laughter] We've had enough interviews so that we have encountered a person that wants to write something instead of being interviewed. I think this whole business of ground rules has been quite well expressed in Dr. Tyrrell's Technical Leaflet.* This, I think, is a very good statement of what I call, "pure oral history."

DOUGLASS ADAIR [Claremont Graduate School]: The point has been made that the successful interview takes a lot of perparation. As a teacher in a graduate school, I wonder if present graduate programs' training in history, journalism, or folklore are satisfactory, as they stand, for the preparation of oral historians. Does one just screen out a Ph.D. in history and teach him to run a tape recorder? Are there any techniques that the experience of interviewing could contribute to formal instruction, or is present graduate training adequate to make good oral historians?

STARR: I have wished there was a manual for interviewers many times in my life, yet I wonder just how useful it would be because every interviewer has a different personality, and every subject is new from scratch every time an oral history interview begins. It's very difficult to generalize about this.

Number one, I've had much more trouble with *scholarly* interviewers, who want to go into the last detail, than I have with people who are a little more outgoing, a little more personable, if you will, a little more relaxed in talking. I honor them for their scholarship, but

---

*William G. Tyrrell, "Tape-Recording Local History," American Association for State State and Local History Technical Leaflet 35, *History News,* XXI (May 1966).

we want to produce. We feel that this is one generalization that has some validity: you want more or less outgoing types who won't be terribly concerned because they can't run down the last clue. Number two, on the other hand, I would *certainly* emphasize the importance of preparation, and I think, in that connection, one more thing might be said about special projects. The ratio of time in preparation to time in production is a bad one, when you're sending some person who knows nothing about the publishing field to talk to Cass Canfield. But if you have a publishing project going, the interviewer will know quite a bit about Cass Canfield from his own field work (not home work, but field work) before he even begins. So the ratio of preparation time to production time is much better in special projects, and I think this is the coming kind of work in oral history.

BROOKS: May I say one thing to Professor Adair? What I was talking about was not so much training on how to be an interviewer, or how to turn a machine on and off, as preparation in subject matter, which is particularly important in the kind of project we have. We think about having a man study the subject matter in which his interviewee is involved, and we think he can do a better job if that's done. For that reason, we like to have our own people do the interviewing, instead of getting somebody else temporarily.

COLMAN: I would like to make a comment on this preparation of interviewers. At Cornell, we select what we think of as an appropriate interviewer by going out wherever we can find this person—in business, in public administration, in the university. Obviously, we have to provide some kind of clues on how he goes about his business, and for that purpose I prepared a twenty-two page statement that tries, at least, to meet some of the basic problems.

AMELIA FRY [University of California, Berkeley]: I guess the thing that keeps coming up as a main question in my mind on a definition of oral history is that maybe at this time it's not so philosophical, as it is based on the limited budgets that most oral history offices have. [laughter] Your definition of oral history is influenced by a system of priorities that you set up.

I guess we feel that oral history should be oral and it should be significant history, and because of our budget limitations, it should be done with significant figures. Also, because of the research time involved, perhaps series work is better because you use your research on more than one "victim." There are different kinds of oral history interviews which would not exclude the type that provides local color. In our office, this would be a low-priority interview and might possibly be done by people outside the office who would want to contribute the interviews, or it might be done by some other office in the University.

KNOX MELLON [Immaculate Heart College]: What are the arguments in favor of destroying the tape after the transcript has been made? Are there ever circumstances in which you can sometimes learn something about a man's character and personality from the way in which he speaks by hearing his tape that you can't learn later from reading a transcript of that tape?

DIXON: One thing is economy. You keep buying tape, and we're back to the budget again! We can't afford it. Another thing, as Dr. Brooks has said, is that many people *would not* give you such candid tapes, if they thought you were going to keep them forever because they may not like the way they sound on tape. Conversation is not grammatical. Many times they make

errors of statement that can be corrected in a transcript but would have to be spliced out in a tape. So this is one of the arguments for destroying tapes. Now I agree that you need to keep some tapes, but I'm not going to get started on that too much because I think that our panelists should get into this argument too.

BROOKS: We don't keep the tapes for the reasons you've mentioned. Generally speaking, we keep a segment of each tape so that the researcher or anybody else can listen to a man's voice and learn something about his personality. It's usually possible to find a segment of tape that doesn't have the grammatical errors on it and is innocuous for that reason. I have done one or two interviews, and I am simply not going to be able to bring myself to destroy the tapes. They're too good. I think of one or two particularly prominent and competent people whose impromptu speech is beautiful. There's no reason in the world why their tapes shouldn't be kept, and they are so important that I simply am not going to destroy them. Maybe this is one of the fences that bends.

HAND: Folklorists have made a fetish of the received word exactly as it comes from the lips of the informant. Any tampering with it is condemned and even great collectors and editors such as the Grimms have been raked over the coals by young colleagues nowadays, who aren't even dry behind the ears. We do generally keep the tapes and we don't tamper with them.

STARR: On the subject of tape, I agree with Dr. Brooks. It's foolish to imagine that it's going to be worth saving fifty tapes of Francis Perkins. When you want to see exactly how she said it on page two thousand and sixty-three, you're not going to be able to find that place on the tape for a whole half hour or so. By the time you have, you'll decide it *wasn't* worth the trouble. I know about psychologists' and psychiatrists' fascination for speech slips, and I'm sure they are significant; but most scholars who are using our material are not interested in the arts of speech diagnosis, and I'm afraid we have to do what we have done. I also agree completely with Dr. Brooks that when you get a great tape, you save it. When we have *anyone* on tape now (unfortunately we didn't always do this) we save him for five minutes.

MARBURG: It is difficult to save the tapes, as much as we might wish to do so, because of the problems of preservation. I have discussed these problems with some of the experts, and they tell me that within fifteen years or so there will be a breakthrough on this.

DOLORES RENZE [Colorado State Archives]: I would like to mention several points. Long, legal arguments may create more problems for us than they will solve because the more discussion there is, the more likely it will be that prospective interviewees will become leery of tape recorded interviews. It should be recognized that the oral history interview is only one man's opinion of a particular situation or series of events. I would also like to put in a plea for closer contact between oral history programs in order to avoid duplication of effort in interviewing.

ALBERT LYONS, M.D. [Mt. Sinai Hospital, New York]: If we want to have the oral historical records serve archival purposes, we ought to be objective in determining what should be saved. If one wanted to know what was going on three hundred years ago, the best thing, of course, would be to be transported back through some time machine. We can't do that, but the

preservation of tapes is the best way I know of transporting back our future colleagues of several hundred years from now. I think even the irrelevancies, in our view, that are on the tapes today and don't seem to have much meaning, may, in the times to come, turn out to be more important than all these other *important* issues that we thought we should preserve.

COLMAN: For four or five years we've been following your experience, Dr. Starr, of taking a four- or five-minute excerpt. We justified this for the reasons that have been given here, plus the convenience to us. This was handy and saved us a lot of administrative work and a little budget besides. Over the past two or three years various people have come to us and pointed out the value of these tapes. As of July 1st, we shifted gears and now preserve all tapes, with the permission of the respondent. We found that this adds about two percent to the cost of our operation, and in that two percent, I'm including administrative costs as well as the cost of the tape.

The way we handle this is to point out to a respondent, when we contact him, that we would like to consider saving the tapes when the interviews are done. We provide a form so that after we have sent him his final manuscript and we're about to close our relations, we say one thing more, "I'd like to come back now to the preservation of the tape." We give them four alternatives and they sign a statement: "Please, do not save my tape"; "It may be used with my written permission"; "It is closed for X number of years"; "It is open to research."

DIXON: I now think I am going to have to ask you to continue this discussion at lunch.

THE USES OF ORAL HISTORY

Allan Nevins

MINK: Good afternoon, and welcome to our session on "The Uses of Oral History." As you know, we have with us this afternoon, Dr. Allan Nevins. I am going to ask Dr. Louis Starr, the Director of the Columbia Oral History Research Office, to introduce Dr. Nevins to you.

STARR: I suppose I could go on for half an hour introducing the next speaker, but I will try to condense. Thirty seconds should suffice for most of you, anyway. Everybody knows Allan Nevins. He is a great many other things besides "the father of modern oral history." He is a gold-medalist of the American Academy of Arts and Letters. He is a two-time Pulitzer Prize winner. He is, I guess, the only man of my acquaintance, who years after "retirement" from Columbia, seems just as busy, if not just a little busier, than he was on Morningside Heights. He's busy writing; he wrote last year an article about oral history in the *Wilson Library Bulletin.* He pops up here, there, and everywhere because he is a man who loves work. Since he *does* love work, I know he will enjoy talking to you, and that we will enjoy hearing him and seeing him work a little bit on the subject of the future of oral history.

NEVINS: Thank you, Louis, thank you very much. I haven't felt so grateful to you since I administered the doctoral examination to you some years ago and saw you pass with flying colors—a tribute to the teaching I had given you. [laughter]

In the interests of informality and easy intercourse, I'm going to sit down in a moment; and I'm going to suggest that as I talk to you, you interrupt me as frequently as possible with questions, letting me have them as we go along. I shall pause, from time to time, for that purpose.

Let us begin by disposing of the myth that I had anything to do with the founding of oral history. It founded itself. It had become a patent necessity, and would have sprung into life in a dozen places, under any circumstances. I'm in the position of a guide in Switzerland. A valley in the Alps that had previously been barren was filled by an avalanche with a great body of soil and became quite tillable. A poor guide in the village had stumbled over a rock as he came down the mountain, one wintry day, and had started this avalanche that filled the valley. People pointed to him and said, "There's Jacques, he made the valley fruitful!" Well, I stumbled over a rock [laughter] and the avalanche came; it would have come anyway.

I listened this morning to the various discourses with the *greatest* interest. They seemed to me admirable. What I propose to do is to offer some general considerations, and to close with as spirited a defense of oral history as I can possibly present.

It struck me as curious this morning that nothing was said about what one would have ordinarily have expected *a great deal* to be said: The finances of oral history. We begin with finances, and sometimes we end without finances. [laughter] At any rate, we try to go on with finances.

This avalanche of which I spoke did begin with finances. Some of us at Columbia University were happy to know an old gentlemen named Frederic Bancroft. He had been Librarian of the State Department. He had written valuable books of history. He had, more importantly, been the brother of a widower who was *Treasurer* of the International Harvester company, and this brother died while Frederic Bancroft was still very much alive, leaving his entire estate to Frederic. Frederic Bancroft grew old. He knew many of us at Columbia, for he had taken his doctoral degree there. I used often to go down to see him in Washington. He would talk about what he intended to do with the two million dollars he possessed. In the days of Franklin Roosevelt, he enjoyed pointing to the White House and saying, "My income is larger than *that man's*!" Well, as he talked about what he intended to do with those two millions, we made a few suggestions (which always centered around Columbia University). I would take him to dinner, or go to dinner at his house. He would chill my blood by saying, "I'm thinking now of given the two million dollars to the Lowell Foundation for the Lowell Lectureships in Boston." With chilled blood, I would then call my friend Henry Commager and say, "Henry, go take Mr. Bancroft out to dinner, and make some suggestions to counter this Lowell Lectureship idea." When I presently went to Washington again, he would say, "I've been thinking more about where I shall leave my money. It occurs to me that Knox College in Illinois [laughter] would be a very good place." My blood would run cold again, until I could get Commager, or someone else, to take him to dinner once more. Well, he finally did die, and we found that the two millions had been left to Columbia University for the advancement of historical studies. I had some ideas about how to use two millions, and one was in instituting our oral history office there.

At this point, having endowed Columbia University with two million dollars [laughter], I ought to address myself to some general considerations.

More can be said about finances than one might think. The virtues of earning one's own way in an oral history project are numerous and important. The Columbia experience I should think, Louis, is rather instructive, isn't it?

STARR: We're still alive, sir.

NEVINS: We always found it necessary to earn our own way, to a great extent. Columbia possessed itself of these two million dollars, but let us have only a tiny fraction of them; and we needed an annual budget of thirty-six thousand or forty thousand dollars a year which has since swollen to how much, Louis?

STARR: It's about fifty thousand.

NEVINS: We had to scratch for money, and it's no easy task to find it; but this necessity had the virtue of instilling in us a spirit of enterprise, and I think this spirit of enterprise is very important.

It was necessary to institute specific projects which had merit in themselves. For example, we began in a small way with a project in the petroleum industry which took us into Texas and the realm of the great "wildcatter," Mike Benedum, just to earn money for oral history; and then we went on to the Book-of-the-Month Club, which had a history of great

importance from the literary and cultural point of view; and then we went on to the Ford Motor company, which was, of course, pivotal in the history of the whole automotive industry; and from that we went to the Weyerhaeuser Timber Company; and then we went to tracing certain government enterprises. We would not have gone into these projects if we had not been pricked by sheer necessity. If we had been given a great endowment, a few hundred thousand dollars, we might have been much more inert.

Then too, financial necessity led us to consider the possibility of getting people to utilize our collections for the publication of books and articles; and these began to appear in an increasing stream, so that now we are able to put on exhibition quite a number of respectable books written out of our collections. We have not always made money in that way, but we have profited indirectly. A surprising number of the memoirs we collected have been really publishable. Oral history has many literary shortcomings, but quite early in our career, we came upon the head of the great Bowery Bank in New York City, who had also been a leading figure in the city government, and in the social welfare movement in New York, Mr. Henry Bruere. He gave us a memoir which could be published precisely as it stands, and some day I am sure that it will be. Any well-managed oral history project should hold in view the publishable book, and can realize quite a harvest in time, directly or indirectly.

Something was said this morning about the two different approaches to oral history, the rifle approach and the shotgun approach. Any oral history office which goes in for large projects, like the assemblage of material upon the Ford Motor Company, or the automotive industry in general, or the social welfare enterprises of the United States Government, will find itself involved in a shotgun approach to history. This is a departure from the old rifle approach with which we began, interviewing those who seemed to us just important individuals. But a compromise between the two approaches is quite possible and profitable.

At an early stage in our activities, one of our best interviewers, a graduate of the University of California, Berkeley, was examining Mr. Jerome Frank, and getting a good account, first of his legal career, and second, of the part he played in the New Deal years. As the work proceeded, Jerome Frank interrupted it to say: "Mr. Interviewer, wouldn't you like, at this point, to have me tell why I have a definite view as to the innocence or guilt of Mr. Alger Hiss?"(He had just been put on trial.) "Wouldn't you like to know the reasons why I have a very strong set of opinions on that subject?" "No," said our interviewer,"let's pursue this question of your legal career."[laughter]

They moved on, leaving Jerome Frank a bit nonplussed. The reasons why he had strong views as to the guilt or innocence of Alger Hiss, we never learned. They would be worth having. I think that in pursuing the career of President Truman, if any bits of information spring up by the way, let us say, on the history of some phase of American industry, American drama, or American art, those flowers might be cropped while the opportunity offers.

BROOKS: We would certainly crop them, Professor Nevins. [laughter]

NEVINS: Now, in our work at Columbia we were greatly impressed not only by the value of attention to financial enterprise (using all the means possible of earning our own way and collecting contributions from those willing to make gifts), but were above all impressed, from

beginning to end, by the vital importance of integrity in our operation; and that consideration cannot be stressed too strongly. We early realized that our continuance depended entirely upon maintenance of a reputation for absolute integrity. Integrity how? In the first place, we were constantly receiving great bodies of confidential information in all fields, economic, political, literary, social. No leakage could be tolerated. We could not have an interviewer go out and, at an evening dinner party, say, "I was talking to ex-President Hoover today, and he told me something very interesting that I'm sure you would all like to hear." That would be absolutely intolerable! Anyone could see that.

Another kind of integrity was involved. The interviewer had to realize that he was the agent of Clio, of history. It was his duty to bring out historical truth in all its values and to make no concessions. He was not to let the man he interviewed get away with any transparent evasions. He was to hold him to his subject. He was to insist upon clear and veracious answers, so far as he could insist upon them. He was to be as rigid in examination, and if necessary as courageous in cross-examination, as the great attorney, Samuel Untermeyer, a generation ago in New York, was rigid and severe. That's asking a great deal of an interviewer sometimes, but that was the requirement we tried to instill into them.

Every Sunday afternoon, some of you see a good deal of cross-examination on television, do you not? What is the name of the program?

VOICES IN UNISON: *Meet the Press.*

NEVINS: *Meet the Press.* The success of that program lies in the fact that the cross-examiner shows the greatest courage. He never hesitates to ask the most embarrassing questions, the questions that lie at the very heart of the matter.

OSCAR WINTHER [Indiana University]: Professor Nevins, what sort of a person do you think makes the best interviewer? What kind of training should he have? It was mentioned this morning that maybe the Ph.D. Candidate is not the best type of interrogator.

NEVINS: No. It's hard to define the best interviewer. He must have a combination of traits of personality and of intellect that is hard to obtain. He must have what the Germans call *gemutlichkeit,* obvious sympathy with the person whom he interviews, friendliness and tact, as well as courage. He must work hard to prepare himself for every interview, and must have a great breadth of interests not often the possession of the candidate for the Ph.D. [laughter], such candidates as appear in our universities.

There must also be an element of integrity in recording as well as in interviewing. We used to agree, and perhaps we still agree in theory, upon the value of accompanying every interview with a set of notes made by the interviewer upon the character of the man interviewed and the circumstances of the interview. These notes would indicate whether the person interviewed has or lacks intellectual power in the judgment of the interveiwer. They would include a commentary upon the candor or lack of candor evinced by the man interviewed, and comments upon the intensity of feeling exhibited during the interview,

whether a man showed strong convictions upon a given subject or absolute fixity of opinions upon a given personality. There should be a pretty clear indication, if possible, of any point at which the interview passes into sarcasm or irony, because a record in cold type does not disclose the sarcasm evident only in an inflection of voice. We can't preserve enough tape to show where sarcasm is employed. For example, John W. Davis gave a very useful set of interviews upon his career, before and after he was nominated for the presidency. It included some comments upon Calvin Coolidge. My impression is that a note of sarcasm crept into some of his comments upon Calvin Coolidge. [laughter] How far have we kept up our record, Louis?

STARR: Well, that's a difficult problem for us, because we've always been haunted by the ghosts of the subject coming up and hoping to see and admire his memoir in the Oral History Collection, only to stumble upon an addendum that says that I don't think this man really leveled with us, or something to that effect—a critical comment; so that, I'm sorry to say, I've never resolved this riddle. We haven't done it as we should have, but it's something, perhaps, we can work out in the future.

NEVINS: Have any of you had any experience in this?

BROOKS: Professor Nevins, you spoke about the confidential memoranda, these notes.

NEVINS: Yes, they ought to be confidential.

BROOKS: When would these be made available?

NEVINS: That's a question. In the course of time, let us say [laughter], to highly qualified users.

BROOKS: Well, to answer your questions, we have not done this in connection with our interviews. Suppose you interviewed somebody, and you had this set of notes commenting upon his candor, and then in the very near future some researcher comes along and uses that transcript. If he can't see the notes, then he's lost something that another researcher, coming along twenty years from now, may see. Well, what is your idea as to how and when these should be made available?

NEVINS: Everything depends on circumstances. It's an *ad hoc* question that has to be settled on an *ad hoc* basis, I should say.

WILLA BAUM [University of California, Berkeley]: We write an introduction to each of our interviews, and we try to include a little bit of this, but it helps to make it a positive statement because the interviewee does get a copy and it's available to him and all his friends. So we try to word it in a positive way which the astute user can interpret. [laughter] In other words, we say sometimes that he spoke very frankly. Now if it doesn't say that he spoke very frankly, we may say that he was circumspect about his comments on his close associates, or something which, phrased in a positive way, may alert the user; but we find writing our introductions very hard.

COLMAN: We have, in some ways, a rather difficult solution at Cornell. We share completely your feeling about the importance of the interviewer's record of process. We want to know whether the man was sober or drunk, senile or whatever. We save all of these statements; we bind them together under the title, "Interviewer Comments." They are available to any researcher who asks for them; however, we don't advertise that we have them. This is not an entirely happy solution but it's about all we have had the courage, thus far, to undertake.

NEVINS: That shows you have in mind the absolutely essential importance of integrity in the operation, so far as we can attain it. It must be honest. We at Columbia never felt our integrity threatened, did we, Louis? Once or twice threatened, but it was never infringed, never violated. Nobody ever went to a dinner party . . .

STARR: There are many problems, though, it seems to me, connected with this suggestion; and I don't know what the solution is. I think Mrs. Baum has come about as close as anyone I've heard—to write between the lines. It's sort of like reading the *AAA Guide* and trying to find out which are the places they don't think are quite so good.

DIXON: Maybe we could have a vocabulary which says,"Circumspect means he didn't say anything." [laughter]

BROOKS: Professor Nevins, this is a real problem, and maybe I gave the wrong impression when I said we didn't do this at the Truman Library. We do keep notes describing the circumstances of the interviews, but I'm not sure, in all cases, we've told how candid we thought that the interviewee was. I have in mind one particular interview that I did with a gentleman from another country on a subject of importance in international relations, and I don't believe what he said. I think he glossed it all over. This is very difficult to put down in writing, and, if you do, you're going to wonder who's to see it. I don't really know the answer.

LYONS: Isn't it also true that those who hear the tapes later, for example, have to form their own conclusions, and their conclusions may be more accurate than the interviewer's because of greater retrospective knowledge, perhaps, or new information?

NEVINS: That's certainly true.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a good reason for retaining the tapes, isn't it?

OTHER VOICES: A very good reason.

NEVINS: Yes, retaining the tapes is a counsel of perfection, I'm afraid. There are reasons why we can't, in all innocence.

I was much struck, this morning, by what was said about my old friend, Lewis Mumford. I've often clashed with him—he is a man of highly opinionated nature—and regretted his unwillingness to record for oral history because he said it was a faulty medium. Certainly it's a faulty medium. All the media used to present historic truth are faulty; but a great deal can be

said in support of the thesis that, faulty as it is, oral history is an essential defense against oblivion in history, against the absolute loss of historical fact which would otherwise occur; and it becomes more and more clearly essential as new methods of communication are invented or fresh technological advances are made.

I worked for years as a newspaperman in New York, and it really pained me, sometimes, to see the obituary pages of the New York *Times,* published in the center of American life, the great metropolis, the focus of business and literary activity, of drama, of music, and to a great extent of political activity. I well remember that in 1934, Walter Lippmann, with whom I had been associated on the *World,* transferred his residence from New York City to Washington, and he explained this to me. He said, "The reason I am going to Washington is that the capital of the United States has, in 1934, been brought to Washington from New York"; and many people felt that with him. Well, New York had been the center of so many national activities that it had drawn to its avenues and suburbs a near unmatchable array of famous personages. Year by year, they died, and I said to myself as I saw the obituary columns, "What memories that man carries with him into total oblivion, and how completely they are lost." Shakespeare says, "Time hath a monstrous wallet at his back in which he putteth alms for oblivion." We can agree with Shakespeare that it's monstrous, indeed.

Now let me give some illustrations of this fact. Some years ago I was approached by Henry Taft, brother of President William Howard Taft, himself an eminent attorney and long a civic leader. It appeared that Henry Taft, as a partner in one of New York's oldest law firms, had been writing its history. The firm had begun as Strong & Cadwallader; it had become Strong, Cadwallader & Wickersham; it had evolved into Strong, Cadwallader, Wickersham & Taft; and it has since had a further evolution. But who was Strong? Nobody knew; the name had vanished into oblivion.

In his research upon the firm, Mr. Taft discovered in the recesses of an old safe in the Red Cross offices in Washington, a forgotten diary kept by this early partner, Mr. George Templeton Strong, and preserved as much by accident as by design. When this diary was examined, from the ghostly twilight of the past suddenly emerged one of the most vigorous, active-minded, witty, and cultivated New Yorkers of the nineteenth century.

The diary was more than interesting: it was fascinating. It held a world of information upon the political history of the United States from Monroe to Cleveland; upon the history of Columbia College, of which Strong was a trustee; of Trinity Church, of which Strong was a vestryman; upon the New York Bar; upon St. Luke's Hospital, where Strong again was a trustee; upon the Sanitary Commission, the Red Cross of the Civil War days; upon Lincoln and his cabinet, to whom Strong was close during the Civil War; upon a myriad of subjects.

Now, no well-informed man asks, "Who was George Templeton Strong?" His four-volume diary, published by MacMillan, stands next to John Quincy Adams' *Journal* as the greatest such record ever written on American soil, and in literary merit, wit, and humor, it excels Adams' great *Journal.* It's invaluable and immortal!

No one could read such a record, snatched out of total darkness, without feeling the need for an agency which would seek out the dumb George Templeton Strongs of our time

and save for posterity their memoirs. That is what oral history began to do.

Now, we know well enough that autobiography has enormous possibilities, and enormous fallibilities. It is clear that it can present facts as to a man's life, achievements, and motives which nobody but that man knows—facts given with intimacy. Some autobiographies, of course, relate primarily to the external events of a lifetime. General Grant's *Memoirs* for example tell how he acted; they throw very little light upon the psychological forces behind his acts. If a man does try to give an intimate record, however, to make it what the English naturalist, Richard Jeffreys, called *The Story of My Heart,* it ought to excel any other conceivable account of that man's inner life. Now, to meet such a requirement demands a long, leisurely, thoughtful effort—the composition by months or years of labor, of a sustained literary work. Such works are best executed, we would say, in private. Yet the critic of oral history must not, therefore, hastily conclude that it cannot accomplish much in the depiction of personality. In this particular area, it has advantages all of its own. It can tell us more about the mind and soul of Henry Wallace, who gave Columbia over five thousand pages of oral history, than a long, pondered, studiously written set of recollections by Wallace might have done. For, as Sean O'Faolain says in his essay on the art of autobiography, the literary memoirist all too often is not greatly concerned with precise fidelity to fact and to chronological order. He is intent, rather, on producing a work of art. "He worries," says O'Faolain, "only how far he dare play about with facts, distort, dramatize and rearrange, emphasize, enlarge, underwrite, select, even suppress facts in search of what? of his own imagination about himself."

All history depends upon the great use of memoirs, autobiographies. Dependence is often absolute, yet are they more trustworthy than oral history memoirs? Not a bit! Often much less trustworthy. We have been taught to enjoy Benvenuto Cellini, but do we believe all of Benvenuto Cellini's autobiography? I hope not! [laughter] Or Casanova's? I'd much rather think that a great part of Casanova's was fiction, and I suspect that it was. We've been taught to regard J.J. Rousseau's *Confessions* as one of the frankest of autobiographies. We say, "Here's something in which a man absolutely bares his own soul; tells the full truth about himself." Rousseau himself said, "This is the full truth about me. I've held nothing back." Actually we know, thanks to modern research, that Rousseau's *Confessions* comes close to pure invention. It's, in fact, one of the great works of fiction of that century. [laughter] It's full of suppressions, distortions, evasions, and outright, unblushing lies.

Here is where one advantage of oral history lies. If Cellini and Rousseau had been set down before a keen-minded, well-informed interviewer, who looked these men straight in their eye and put to them one searching question after another, cross-examing as Sam Untermeyer used to cross-examine people on the witness stand, they would have stuck closer to the path of truth.

Or take St. Augustine's *Confessions,* a much-admired book. It is one of the immortal books of religious statement, a beautiful piece of art. But does it tell us what we really want to know about St. Augustine, and does St. Augustine, though obviously a man of great rectitude, tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about himself? He relates, at one point, how as a young man he repulsed and abandoned his mistress, keeping for himself, and

depriving her, of their child. It was St. Augustine's, it was not hers; and how the poor girl wept bitterly and swore to God that she would never let another man touch her. Well, I should think she might, after that. He gives this occurrence, which was a brief episode to him, but was a terrible disaster to the poor girl, about three lines; that is, he glosses over it. A representative of oral history would have wrung from him a little more of the facts about that occurrence, I should think. [laughter]

Take John Bunyan's autobiography, *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners,* a very remarkable book, indeed. A sane-spirited and right-minded questioner could have gotten Bunyan to tell less that seems abnormal and more that would seem normal to us.

I recall very well that in our oral history work at Columbia, once, we were probing into the history of a great series of scandals in the labor circles connected with building operations in New York, the building unions; and we were dealing with the labor leader named Brindle. Now, here I am approaching the edge of the fringes of integrity, but this is a memoir that's completely open. I well remember that it was in my office in the History Department at Columbia University. We were cross-examining Mr. Brindle upon his part in labor history in New York, and suddenly there was a strange occurrence in that dusty history office: Brindle, the rather tough labor leader, bowed his head on my desk and burst into tears. He had reached the point at which he was sent to the penitentiary, and his heart was wrung by the recollection. We had gotten closer to the truth with Mr. Brindle than St. Augustine came to himself in his *Confessions.*

WILLIAM TYRRELL [New York State Education Department]: Professor Nevins, you've used the word, "cross-examine." Do you think a good interviewer can use the same techniques of cross-examination that a lawyer does? (I don't mean Perry Mason, I mean the lawyer in the courtroom.) Is this really a valid comparison?

NEVINS: At points, yes. There are critical points in a man's narrative when he ought to be cross-examined. "Now Mr. Smith, let's go into this episode a little more closely," and Mr. Smith is questioned in a way that makes him squirm a bit. I think really that's not only allowable, but desirable. Wouldn't you say so?

STARR: Yes. Professor Nevins mentioned tact, which I think best bears out what you said about the difficulty of finding good interviewers, because to mix tact with courage does require a rare person. It only substantiates what you said.

RITA CAMPBELL [Stanford University]: Have you ever had a person refuse to cooperate at this stage, and either become completely reticent or just refuse to answer?

NEVINS: Yes, that can happen, and then, of course, the interviewer, I think, should indicate in some way that the witness has become evasive.

ADAIR: But you're no worse off—to come back to the term, "cross-examination"—you're not any worse off than you were before.

NEVINS: No, not a bit! You've done your best, yes, and I think the really good cross-examiner does have a considerable amount of tact. That is, he doesn't try to crucify a witness and make him hostile. He will try to bring the truth out of him.

STARR: Has Mike Wallace's material been displayed around here? I think he illustrates, in a kind of thorny way, what we're talking about. He gets honest answers by being really quite brutal at times, but it's always within what could be described as tact, I think.

SELESNICK: Professor Nevins, about St. Augustine and how one would interview him. I think if one was interviewing St. Augustine and found out about his mistress, and went on to find out that she was a world-renowned prostitute and all about this, we would've lost the free association of the great man, who went on to tell us, for the first time until Freud, facts about infantile sexuality, facts about the psychology of gang formation, facts about the tremendous damage done to the human psyche by the superego, at that time known as guilt. What I'm asking you, sir, is whether sometimes you get into subjects which it's just as well to avoid because they're trivial, instead of leading the interviewee to a free-associative realm which will tell far more about his inner feelings than would some little gossipy session about his former mistress?

NEVINS: Oh, I think that's true; and that, no doubt, was the reasoning which led St. Augustine to give only three lines to the episode. And he would probably have put off this interviewer by saying that he said all about it that was strictly significant in his confessions.

SELESNICK: As I recall, in his work, he went on to talk about his mother at about this time; and, of course, his associations from his mistress to his mother have some direct correlations with his later feeling of extreme guilt which brought him back into the Church. Now I think the psychologist, studying the reasons for St. Augustine's conversion, can very easily see then, that this free-associative writing would have been prevented if somebody had interfered and wanted to know all about this little woman he was sleeping with.

NEVINS: Well, you're simply saying, again, that the interviewer needs to have tact and a certain amount of delicacy of perception. Also he'd have to know a good deal about the religious world in which St. Augustine moved and the moral world in which he lived.

MARBURG: I'm troubled with your using the word "cross-examine," which is fine among us here. I would never want a man I was interviewing to feel I was cross-examining him. I would throw out some facts which made what he had said obviously inconsistent, and lead him on from there, hoping he was getting the feeling we were working together, and that he saw he couldn't bluff me. I would never want to have somebody I was interviewing feel I was cross-examining him because I wouldn't get very far with him.

NEVINS: *No,* you're defining a form of cross-examination, . . .

MARBURG: I found that one business executive contended the procedure of cross-examination by district attorney (that's me) was bad management, as he saw it. I wouldn't want him to feel that in the least.

WOOD: Professor Nevins, nobody has yet mentioned the word "journalism" in any of this connection. We've talked about cross-examination, lawyers, and so on. Surely our schools of journalism in our colleges and universities can give us some ideas in this respect. They train journalists to interview people, and they've been doing it for a hundred or more years. Can we use any of the journalism interview techniques in oral history?

NEVINS: We have a professor of journalism here who can answer that question without difficulty.

STARR: Well, I don't know that I *can* answer it without difficulty. I think it's a suggestive idea; it's got some merit. Of course the Q&A form of our typical journalism interview isn't found in our tapes because we want a certain amount of free association. We want the memoirist to produce what he will recognize as his own oral memoir, and he's got to tell it in his own way. For example, there was a celebrated international figure whose life was blighted by Senator McCarthy. I wanted to know about this, and he had a little block about talking about it. The cross-examination (maybe it wasn't cross-examination) was just a gentle insistence that we get this on the record from his point of view. He told it, finally, in his own way and without a great deal of questioning. But I think, also, there is some validity to the journalism statement because we don't want, by and large, long and windy opinions from people who were largely doers. We want the "meat and potatoes" of their incident and anecdote, and how it came about, rather than their opinions about the general direction of federal government in the United States today—and that involves some news sense because we do want opinions. For example, if we interview Andrew Cordier about the future of the UN, it would be a pretty worthwhile thing to have his candid opinion of the organization. So we don't rule out opinions, but I think a sense of news value is helpful to the interviewer here, just as it would be for a reporter. Some people's opinions aren't news and some people's opinions are.

NEVINS: The requirements of a good autobiographical narrative, whether in oral history or outside, are just the same, I should say. They do not defer to media, and can be summed up under three or four rather obvious heads.

It's true that autobiography and history have to be approached with highly critical minds, and that statements of an autobiographical character by a group producing a history of some particular development demand even more caution and a keener critical sense. To produce a truthful record of a man's acts, thoughts, and motives, two qualities are obviously essential: self-knowledge and a fair amount of candor. A great many people, however, never attain self-knowledge, but constantly deceive themselves as to their real motives and acts; they constantly dramatize themselves. Others are seriously deficient in candor. They don't like to tell the truth about themselves, sometimes for good reasons. [laughter]

Our most famous episode in oral history was our interview with Judge Learned Hand, that delightful person who had so much personality; and I well remember the occasion when he burst out and told us how greatly he admired Brandeis and how faulty he thought himself compared with that jurist. He said, "I talk to myself, and I say, 'Learned Hand, you eat too much; you drink too much; your thoughts about women are not of the most elevated

character. Why can't you be like that great man Brandeis who does nothing but read the reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission?' " [laughter] That was a wonderful piece of self-revelation; it gave you an insight into Learned Hand's character.

A great many witnesses are anxious only to produce a false picture of themselves. I am sure that there would not have been much point in interviewing Aaron Burr at any stage in his career. [laughter]

But in the hands of an earnest, courageous interviewer who has mastered a background of facts and who has the nerve to press his scalpel tactfully and with some knowledge of psychology into delicate tissues and even bleeding wounds, deficiencies can be exposed; and oral history can get at more of the truth than a man will present about himself in a written autobiography.

Of course, in a good autobiography, and in any good piece of memoirs, a fresh and vivid memory is indispensible; and not one man or woman in a hundred, particularly an elderly man or woman, has the clear indelibility that we at Columbia found, for example, in Miss Frances Perkins' recollections, which were absolutely perfect, were they not? She recalled in intimate detail every occurrence of her life.

STARR: I don't think we believe she had total recall, Professor.

NEVINS: Yes, but wherever we tested her recollections, they rang true, they were veracious.

Another kind of candor we found in a man of much less freshness of memory, Herbert Lehman, who was one hundred percent honest. He wouldn't lie to himself, under any circumstances, or lie to anybody else. He couldn't always remember what he should have remembered, but so far as memory went, it was absolutely trustworthy; when he was prompted by a good interviewer his memory went a long way, further than it otherwise might have gone. I think that people who pride themselves upon the accuracy of their recollections almost invariably find, on referring to diaries or other records of long-past occurrences, that their memories are, in essential points, confused or erroneous.

We once interviewed Charles Burlingham, the great New York lawyer, who had such a distinguished career and lived to be one hundred years old; he was still, apparently, in possession of all his faculties, except sight and hearing; still, we could interview him, and he could answer questions in depth. When Charles Burlingham told us, at nearly a hundred years of age, in vivid terms, how he had seen a Negro brutally hanged during the Draft Riots in New York City, in front of his father's parsonage on Manhattan Island, the questions arose: Was he telling us what he actually had seen, or was he telling us what his elders suggested that he had seen? I think he was telling us the former; he was telling us what he had actually seen. He had seen the lynching.

One virtue of oral history is that the interviewer can arm himself, very frequently, with such full memoranda of the past, its occurrences and its atmosphere, that he can galvanize a limping memory into spasmodic activity and bring out what otherwise might be lost.

McCAUSLAND: Professor Nevins, may I raise a question there? In Dr. Harlan Phillips' *Felix*

Frankfurter Reminisces, he uses in the introduction, as I recall, the phrase that he was simply the spark that ignited the train of thought; in other words, the switch. You, a moment ago, used the word, "prompting" the subject, which strikes me as quite a different process from manipulation of the corkscrew, dragging out the reluctant facts. What has been the general experience with the two techniques, and does the response depend largely on the ability and experience of the interviewer?

NEVINS: I think the proper function of the interviewer, at this point, is to offer reminders, and these reminders of given circumstance surrounding a set of events will often prompt the man interviewed to recall what lay in the depths of his memory. Surely some of you have had experiences in that direction.

McMAUSLAND: The response would not be so fluent, perhaps if he was trying to . . .

NEVINS: No, no, and there are doubts sometimes. Did Charles Burlingham really see the poor Negro lynched in front of his father's parsonage, or did his aunts and uncles later tell him that he had seen it and ought to remember it? Well, I think he did. At any rate, here we have some record of an historic occurrence which we otherwise would have lacked.

Now for the third requirement. If a man's memory is keen and vivid, and if he does possess fairly full memoranda on his past, the array of facts upon his career is likely to be so immense that he needs a strong faculty of selection. In oral history, he finds useful aids to this process of selection among the multiplicity of facts locked into his past. The autobiographer, of course, possesses an endless array of facts about himself, if he can just remember them, far more than the biographer can ever find out. To use these facts well, to be his own Boswell or Lockhart, the memorist requires an exceedingly just sense of proportion. When acumen of selection is wanting, we get a book as prodigious and as verbose as John Bigelow's five volumes. Volumes which nobody ever opens without a groan.

DIRECTIONS FOR ORAL HISTORY

Louis Shores

Science fiction has suggested the most startling of all dimensions for the future of oral history. Just as the tape recorder in 1948, fortified with sound, for the first time, the interviewer–interviewee history technique which some claim began with Herodotus; so a new device out of the literature of fantasy describes somewhere a device that recalls out of the ether voices from the past. The theory is that once a voice has spoken, the waves continue to ripple indefinitely out there, and require only the rightly timed tuning fork to pick up the vibrations for transmission back to earth. Intriguing as this prospect is, however, oral history will probably have to rely for a long time to come upon such media as we have been able to produce thus far.

Let us begin the consideration of the dimensions of oral history with the mechanics and the technique. History is basically communicated by the verbal medium. From the earliest cuneiform, clay tablets, through the Alexandrian papyri, into the medieval manuscript, and to the invention of printing, the medium of history has been basically verbal. But about the third decade of this 20th century, a movement referred to as "audio-visual" began to gain momentum over considerable resistance by teachers and librarians. Although I am Dean of the Graduate Library School which first required librarians to gain competence in the dissemination of audio-visual material, and advocated the philosophic concept of the "generic" book, which includes all formats from textbooks through television, from 16mm motion pictures to tape recorders, and led in the effort to effect the "shotgun marriage" in Florida between audiovisualists and librarians that resulted in our unique, unified certification, I have considerable reservations about many of these so-called newer educational media. But I cannot approach the discussion of dimensions of oral history without considering first of all, that a major impetus to the whole idea was given by an audio-visual medium: first, the wire recorder, which some of you may recall, and then the tape recorder.

In my long concern with history, dating back to before my own doctoral dissertation in 1934 relating to library history, there has been no aspect of it that has excited me more than my first reading of Dr. Allan Nevins' *The Gateway to History*. I believe the opportunities in oral history are unparalleled. But I am not here to devote my paper merely to favoring oral history, as most of us favor motherhood.

Rather, I want to explore with you some reconsiderations of old dimensions that might lead to some new directions that I hope will not outrage any of us. I do not go quite so far as Marshall McLuhan, who is now a favorite quotable by sophisticates in education and communication. I know Marshall McLuhan, and I have served on a committee with him. I am as puzzled by what he is trying to say as anyone. But part of his thinking has implications for us in oral history: *the form or the format of the medium may affect the content.* He suggests that our shift from the medium of print to newer media like the film, the tape, television, and computerized, programmed instruction may actually change the face of the information we undertake to communicate. Is it therefore possible that this history some of us strive to write *Wie es eigentlich gewesen* can actually be changed by the format of the medium we use to convey records of an event?

When we introduced the tape recorder as an aid, if not as an actual medium, in 1948, did we possibly affect the chronicling of happenings with a dimension heretofore unknown to historiography? I know that the techniques of interview did not begin with the tape recorder. Our own *Journal of Library History* indicates, in the current issue, that Lyman Copeland Draper, the Secretary for the Wisconsin Historical Society, from about the middle of the last century anticipated many of our oral history techniques when he developed his three-phase approach in his plan for collecting interviews. Although after several years of effort he one day characterized his work as "pious—and I might add—thankless labor of rescuing from forgetfulness and neglect the memories of an interesting band of worthies," he nevertheless persisted in developing his structured three-phase technique, which resulted in, first, corresponding with individuals of historical importance; second, undertaking to interview them and prepare the typescript; and third, searching for corroborative documentation *afterward.*

How many obstacles Draper had to overcome in those pre-tape recorder days is indicated by the fact that in his very first year of oral history (1854-55) Draper wrote no fewer than 1,833 letters to prospective individuals of historical importance. When one recalls that the postage rate then was 25 cents per letter, and that the sum of $250 necessary to mail this first year's correspondence was at least four times that amount of money, relatively, one admires even more Draper's job in the post office so that he might have employees' free mailing privileges. When his employment was terminated in the post office, he then appealed to his congressman for franking privilege. Truly, this was an oral historian who was dedicated. But essentially, Draper's oral history was not unlike any other kind of history because it appeared in no other medium than the written word.

The introduction of the tape recorder in 1948 did, in my opinion, offer an approach to the record through another medium than writing. Although we have in many cases eliminated this new format for history by insisting on erasing the tape, once it has been transcribed, or by prohibiting the loan of the tape, or by assuming that the transcription is really the primary source, I ask you to consider this from the point of view of the audio-visualist, of the communication philosopher like Marshall McLuhan. Is it not possible that the distilling of the tape into a typescript has, even with the highest integrity and devotion, resulted in the modification of the primary source, the tape? Doesn't a strict allegiance to historical bibliography dictate that we acknowledge the typescript to be a secondary rather than a primary source? But above all, should not our oral history custodianship insist upon the preservation of the original tape?

I recall a faculty colleague of mine, the late Michael Demashkevich, a philosopher and a scholar in linguistics and the classics, who once declared in a lecture that the nuances in the spoken word may sometimes shade, if not actually change, the meaning of the written word. I have, in a series of exhibits that follows the reading of my paper, a tape of an old "78" disc recording of Taylor Holmes' recitation of Rudyard Kipling's poem "Boots." I had read that poem many times before, as a student in English class and as a teacher of English, subsequently. When I first heard Taylor Holmes recite this poem, not only the rhythm, but the very meaning of these long forced marches by an army, changed completely for me. I have read and re-read President Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Day of Infamy" speech before the Joint Houses of Congress many times since that fateful Monday, December 8, 1941, when I heard it for the first time over the radio. I have always considered this one of the great speeches of all time. It ranks, in my opinion, with the Gettysburg Address. But I had, somehow, forgotten the tension and awe of the atmosphere when the speech was delivered. Then, last year one of my

students presented me with the album of records that reproduced FDR's speeches and "fireside chats." Listen to the "Day of Infamy" again as it was recorded in the House of Representatives, and see if you don't agree that the oral form somehow introduces a nuance which isn't present when the text is read.

Professor Swain, I believe, has sensed this peculiar dimension of oral history and our unwillingness to adjust our craft to it:

> . . . as graduate students we are taught to rely primarily on the written record . . . We are simply not accustomed to thinking of oral evidence . . . the time has come to recognize that historians are "to some extent tradition-bound" as Louis Starr has delicately phrased it, "particularly when it comes to source materials."

Amplifying on this later, Professor Swain observes that the value of oral history is,

> not usually in the detailed new knowledge . . . but in having some of the intangibles of a past era revealed . . . Interviews are particularly useful in getting an emphasis and atmosphere . . . moreover, interviews . . . may open the door to the subjective feel of a person or a period . . .

He illustrates,

> a talk with Harry S. Truman . . . will be an unforgettable experience that will help in writing about him . . . an interview with Senator Warren Magnuson about the NSF Act of 1950 may not produce a single thought that could not be found somewhere in the public record; but just the same the conversation will be revealing. The emphasis on certain words, the suppressed chuckle . . . are intangibles not found in documents. The excitement, frustration, boredom, or humor of a particular situation are often not discerned in the written record. Oral history techniques offer the possibility . . . of recapturing the mood and the spirit of men and their times . . .

The first dimension I plead for is the more serious consideration of the tape itself as a primary source. Strongly I urge that all of us who are developing oral history collections protect the master of the original tape for replaying by later researchers, and for the possibility that some new truth may be discovered from the oral original not revealed by the typescript. We have a good precedent in the National Tape Repository, now housed at the University of Colorado. Since its establishment in 1951, the National Tape Repository has retained a master tape of the original, and offered to duplicate a copy for any library which will either send a blank or pay for the blank tape. Incidentally, the DAVI activated its own oral history program in 1951, and protects its original tapes, offering reproductions to libraries with such restrictions as have been imposed by the interviewee and the library.

Well, if the tape records introduced a basic new element into oral history specifically, and probably to history in general, then should we not ask ourselves the question: are there other media formats that suggest opportunities for oral history?

Perhaps the format which is most frequently identified as synonymous with the term audio-visual is the 16mm motion picture. Now this medium has a sound track which can be obtained separately, and indeed has a device called magnetic tape which permits a lecturer or

an interviewer to record his opinions or recollections through the 16mm projector just as the interviewee records on the tape recorder. What I am suggesting is the possibility that a visual film may stimulate the interviewee to speak more meaningfully. Furthermore, there are subjects for interview that would profit from the introduction of a visual dimension to fortify the taped oral, just as the taped oral has fortified the written word.

Let me indicate an example: I note with interest that the University of Illinois Graduate Department of Physical Education activated, in 1965, an Oral History Research Office under the direction of Dr. Marianna Trekell. Among the physical education areas designated for their oral history approach, these were listed: values or aims of physical education; influences of politics, nationalism, economics, religion, on physical education; leisure; amateur vs. professional; the dance. It was the subject of the dance, particularly, which started me thinking. Would not an interview with a ballerina discussing the evolution of certain steps be enhanced by an accompanying visual such as she might have demonstrated before a motion picture camera? I think of Cornell's oral history project and the numerous ways in which the history of agriculture might be illustrated by visuals, thus giving more meaning to both the tape and the transcript. Yes, I am suggesting that we now fortify oral history with visual history, capitalizing on developments in the audio-visual movement which surround the tape recorder, as well as the disc recorder. Besides the 16mm motion picture, which has become a major teaching tool in our schools and colleges, and in some instances a medium for research, there may well be some potential in these other media formats: the sound filmstrip, radio, TV, videocorder.

This brings me to my next dimension. All of us are aware of the distinction by the interviewer-historian, and the casual (from our standpoint) unprofessionally prepared interview that abounds in these media I have mentioned. And I raise the question: are not the many interviews we have had in films, TV, and radio, and on disc recordings, untapped sources for historical documentation? Before we are outraged by this suggestion, let us look, together, at what has been happening in these other media formats that has pertinence for our mission of oral history.

I have gathered together, for the exhibit which follows, some film clips taken from Encyclopaedia Britannica Films. At my siggestion, Dr. Wayne Howell, a former student of mine, who is now Vice-President of EBF, searched out interviews in the collection of films EBF produces.

For exhibit(after this paper), four film clips from EBF will be projected. They are interviews with Pablo Casals, Robert Frost, Jawaharlal Nehru, Frank Lloyd Wright. All of these interviews illustrate the oral intangibles to which Professor Swain alludes; but I wonder if you will agree that certain visual intangibles are contributed by the facial expressions of the interviewees. I wonder further, whether you feel anything added by Casals' cello performance that punctuates his declaration against Franco and for the Revolution in Spain. Do Frost's observations on several subjects, but particularly on science's limitations when confronted by ultimates, gain anything from the visual record? And does Nehru on Gandhi, speaking from an open air setting in his native land add a new dimension to his interview? Certainly, Frank Lloyd Wright, elaborating on architectural concept in the environment of his architectural creation, gives something to history that the oral medium cannot achieve alone.

Encyclopaedia Britannica Films has contracted with NBC to reproduce that network's interview series. Included are such exciting possibilities as Oppenheimer and Teller on the

decision to drop the bomb; leading doctors on the birth control pill; Barbara Ward Jackson on Britain's search for a new role; George Gallup on the reliability of the polls; Roy Wilkins and William Allen White on civil rights; Winston Churchill on victory at sea. Can these interviews, even without the visuals, become part of our oral history collection, if our area of interest coincides with the subject and purpose of these clips? If we feel that the visuals violate our concept of oral history, then why not produce the idea of *tape clips,* like film clips to give us what comes within our definition of our own oral history mission?

There are two separate questions raised by this introduction of the film clip as a component for our oral history. First, can we find a place within our concept of oral history for what I term the "ready-made" interview, as contrasted with (to borrow a term I experienced during my Fulbright year in the United Kingdom) "the bespoke" interview as structured by the professional oral historian? Still recognizing the superiority of the "bespoke" interview undertaken by the oral historian, is there not yet some value for history in the interview conducted by the journalist, or even by someone qualified neither as historian nor as reporter? I have often speculated on what sort of interview would come by someone not qualified as an historian, but who merely knew the interviewee personally and intimately, and could stimulate responses out of esoteric and mutual experiences unknown to the oral historian. For example, what kind of interview would we get if the interviewer were the wife of the interviewee, or even, since history can weather all kinds of shocks, his mistress?

Encouraged by success with another medium format like the 16mm motion picture, I proceeded to investigate the resources available from television. In my memory, the NBC series for example, or the CBS interview with Eisenhower on the philosophy of the office of the Presidency, have oral history potential. On September 13, 1966, Eisenhower accommodated Harry Reasoner and CBS with on-the-scene interviews. Notable locations were his home town, and especially West Point. Those of you who saw this interview recall that certain intangibles were visually revealed about the form of U.S. military leadership education and the place of such a discipline concept in the philosophy of a democracy.

Shall we, in the interest of historiography, erase the orals and visuals of interviews like that in favor of the interviewer's typescript? Shall we deny other historians an opportunity to evaluate first hand the intangibles of an interview because our techniques may already, in this short span since 1948, decree that the typescript is primary, and the media from which these scripts were produced secondary, or irrelevant, and therefore to be erased?

Positively, I am suggesting that ready-made oral and visual interviews on tapes, discs, 16mm films, radio transcriptions, television, kinescopes, and videotapes deserve more consideration by the oral historian than they have in the past. I believe the librarian should assist the oral historian with these ready-made audio-visual records of interviews more systematically.

What are the bibliographic sources available to the librarian and historian for such ready-made interviews? Admittedly, the bibliography is underdeveloped. For example, letters from two of the three television networks indicated non-availability of either the videotapes, kinescopes, or listings of past and future interviews. The third network referred me to the Television Information Office at 745 Fifth Avenue, New York. We have an oral history ally

there in the person of Miss Catherine Heinz. She writes, "We have been interested in this subject for several years and have discovered that many of these programs are available for rental and/or purchase.

Enclosed with the letter was a "rough list of such programs we have unearthed to date. For example: the McGraw-Hill Catalog of films lists, among others, selected programs from the *Biography Series, See It Now, Twentieth Century.* All of the distributors included on our source list have television programs available.

"As you know, many of these interviews have been published in book form. Two examples are: *Wisdom for Our Time,* edited by James Nelson (Norton, 1961); and *The Best of Emphasis,* compiled and edited by Arthur W. Hepner (Newman Press, 1962)."

Among news clippings and releases Miss Heinz sent me one, probably already known to you better than to me, that seems most important to us as librarians and oral historians. In 1964, the National Association of Broadcasters activated an Encyclopedia of Recorded Sound Committee "to study the feasibility of compiling a master index of all sounds available on tapes, discs, cylinders, wire and film and the possible establishment of a National Archives in which the recordings could be stored and presented."

The release continues,

> The Committee's first task was to "break the sound barrier"—an utter lack of knowledge as to the whereabouts of countless sounds that have been recorded and preserved during the past several decades . . . The Committee is launching a campaign among radio and television stations to preserve on audio tape the more significant happenings . . . so future generations can get an insight into history through a quick playback of the recordings . . .
>
> Every community has its celebrities and interesting people . . . Every town has its own history and milestone events which often are of national interest or importance . . .
>
> All over the country, every day, broadcasters are missing opportunities to record colorful events and voices of historic importance or systematically are erasing what they record.

I submit that we, as librarians, archivists, oral historians, have a fundamental bibliographic opportunity to assist the NAB Committee on Recorded Sound, to search the sound and visual literature for interviews historically significant, to catalog, index, and disseminate information about this ready-made oral history to our colleagues everywhere.

We can begin by searching general catalogs now available to us. *The Educational Media Index,* for example, might stand a systematic search for interviews of historical significance. So might the National Tape Catalog, the indexes to free and inexpensive tapes, scripts, and transcriptions, as well as films, published annually by Educators Progress Service at Randolph, Wisconsin. Catalogs of university audio-visual centers deserve careful review for interviews. I have just discovered that our own media collection at Florida State University has a considerable collection of taped interviews, and some tapes of telelectures, another medium

phenomenon that has lately offered us a new source for ready-made oral history. And what about the disc catalogs of such commercial producers as RCA-Victor, Columbia, Decca, etc.?

Sooner or later, libraries must develop a union catalog of the oral history holdings, not only of the forty universities with established oral history offices, but also of other agencies and sources. Perhaps among the Federal funding opportunities there is a place for a major bibliographic undertaking in oral history.

To this point, the area of oral history that I have been concerned with falls within considerations of technique and selection. I am, first of all, asking reconsideration of the place of the raw tape in the gathering of the memory of the living before they pass on. In the second place, I am suggesting that since the tape recorder in 1948 opened a new "gateway to history" through one of the newer media, is it not possible other audio-visual media, notably the 16mm educational motion picture, television, the sound filmstrip, and the disc recorder offer some comparable opportunities? Third, I am asking us to consider whether our distinction between professional oral history interviews and interviews undertaken by individuals not so qualified have unnecessarily deprived oral history in particular, and history in general, of some sources with potential, found among ready-made interviews available in these other media. Because I believe every question raised in a colloquium like this one deserves some kind of answer from the inquirer, I expose myself by advocating affirmatives on all points. As we move to develop our own oral history collection,I strongly sponsor utilization of additional new media formats besides the tape recorder, and tapping of ready-made, as well as bespoke, interviews.

And so I move on to dimensions in some other areas of oral history. As a professional librarian I am deeply concerned with problems of acquisitions, organization, and dissemination of tapes and typescripts. From the standpoint of acquisition, a policy of book selection (of which we make so much in our professional librarianship) begins by asking, "Whom are we trying to serve?" This question is no different from the question generally asked in dealing with books for the library collection, for a university, or for a research community. Shall we limit our acquisitions to the areas of the library collection, on the assumption that this represents a basic interest of our faculty, students, and scholars in our community? Or should our approach be more eclectic, and interview persons where the opportunity presents itself? Again I am going to answer with an inclination in a direction that may sound diplomatic, but sincerely is a fundamental part of my acquisition philosophy. I believe there should be concentration on the areas represented by the library collection, by the interests of the research community.

Information science, and special libraries, have made much of a technique, which is really not very new, but which they call "Interest Profile." This consists of continuously inventorying investigations of the faculty, of graduate students, or in the case of a special library, researches in progress. The basis of this inventory of interest profile concentration is directed toward acquisition in the areas involved. There are, of course, hazards. With the mobility of our faculty, something can happen which has been cited before. There was a certain historian whose area of concentration was the First Crusade. But this historian had the habit of not remaining in any one university for more than three years. As a result, his academic pilgrimage from coast to coast, and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico, can be drawn on a map of the United States merely by listing the campuses with strong collections on the First Crusade! But despite this a concentration principle is still worthwhile, because in many cases the traveler is succeeded by a faculty appointment who continues the

research interest.

The argument for the eclectic approach is no more convincing than can be illustrated by Florida and probably right here in California, where many distinguished scholars tend to retire. With the dedication of an oral historian, I declare it would be a shame not to inverview these retired notables before they pass on, even though their area of interest is far removed from the library concentrations. I say this, because, as the oral history movement spreads to more campuses, we will inevitably develop a network of cooperation which will imitate the interlibrary loan precedents for other books, and we will develop a counterpart for the photoreproduction practice that is gaining momentum in our libraries. We may find ourselves adopting and adapting more and more of the electronic devices for transmission, like radio teletype, facsimile, and the remote computer console. What may happen eventually is something like the Farmington Plan for research libraries of the United States, under which certain libraries are allocated responsibilities for concentration in certain areas. But also, what may follow inevitably is a program of information retrieval such as science and industry have been developing over the years, with federal support, and such as is now being imitated by both the social sciences and the humanities.

Which leads to the dimension of organization of the oral history collection. Certainly what has been done at Columbia University and at the other offices for oral history is foundational. But such a catalog of oral history as Columbia University's fine effort is only a beginning. The quarter of a million page collection of sources of materials found at Columbia is now represented by a catalog which presents only these four access possibilities: a biographical directory of the interviewees, alphabetically arranged; a list of the special projects; a record of the lectures, seminars, forums, and panels; and a list of persons represented. But research requires more detailed indexing than that, and analyses far beyond any thus far bibliographically recorded for these source materials. There is, as you know, something in information science called KWIC (Key Word in Context) Indexing. A beginning might be made, possibly with some financial support, for a pilot KWIC indexing of one or more oral history collections in the United States, with a view, as oral history collections expand everywhere, toward a machine-readable catalog, resulting in a computerized print-out record, which would be kept continuously cumulated. Even with my limited background in information science, and after consultation with the chairman of the Information Science area in my school, I believe both the tapes and the typescripts, as oral history collections, can be made more accessible to scholars through immediate, or early beginning of key-word indexing.

Which brings me to the last dimension relating to dissemination. Greatest restrictions have been placed on the use of tapes and scripts. This is not new to any of us who have been in the military service. I was, during World Was II, a security officer and a cryptographer. We used, as you know, four basic military classifications: restricted, confidential, secret, and top secret. These are not too different from our "open," "permission requested to quote or cite," "permission required," "closed."

We all know the reason why we must observe these security classifications, not only because they may affect the original interview but because they could well result even more easily in the kind of suit which has now exercised both the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians relative to the biography of Henry Clay Frick. history, no less than research access to other materials, is confronted by copyright problems. The problem revolving around photocopying of written and printed sources will undoubtedly

envelop tape and other reproduction. Pending further refinement of present codes, the four security classifications now recognized in oral history should be limited according to some of the requirements now instituted on some campuses. For example, some universities limit access to master's theses and doctoral dissertations, and then only upon written request to the faculty advisor, which involves filling out certain forms on file.

But I now propose for open material that a more systematic effort be made to inform the layman of the opportunity and challenge of the oral history movement. Just as most libraries exhibit and display printed material, it might be well for us all to have an oral program of particularly dramatic interviews that are open. These could be scheduled in libraries where most oral history offices are located and publicized in the community, as well as on campus, to enlist support for the oral history movement.

Inevitably, I conclude as I began, with a bit of fantasy, but who knows, a bit of reality in the not-too-distant future. I have already suggested new media, besides the tape, that may well offer new gateways to history. These media are all sensory, depending largely on sight and hearing. Nor do I preclude the possibility of media appealing to our other senses—olfactory, tactile, gustatory—senses that may reinforce our understanding of the past, present, and future. Furthermore, I speculate on the possibility of extrasensory perception as a medium for historical research. As one of a growing number, in both the scholar and lay communities who have been watching the investigations at parapsychology laboratories, like that at Duke, I do not rule out the possibility that, one day, telepathy and clairvoyance may prove to be a far more reliable medium than any device we have thus far invented. Years ago, I recall reading a novel by Upton Sinclair entitled *The Overman* in which the young hero, shipwrecked on a remote island, and upon awakening saw standing over him a beautiful young lady. Instantly, she blushed. What he discovered, subsequently, was that the inhabitants had no oral or written language. They communicated with each other directly, telepathically. [laughter]

Just think what it will mean to the oral historian whose interview is no longer dependent upon words, but whose understanding of history as reported by a notable, comes to him directly by telepathy, communicated to him more faithfully than ever before in the history of history.

TECHNIQUES

IN ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEWING

Donald J. Schippers, Chairman

SCHIPPERS: This panel was part of our idea of bringing the views from various disciplines to bear on oral history. I think our basic mistake in naming the panel "Various Techniques" was in not making adequate distinction between oral history as a method and the techniques by which the method is utilized. So a lot of the things that might be appropriate for a session like this would probably be better referred to the session this afternoon on standards and goals. Instead of saying, "Various Techniques in Oral History," we probably would have better named it, "Interviewing Techniques as They Are Viewed By Representatives of Different Disciplines Who Have Employed Tape Recorders in Accumulating Information to be Used for Historical Documentation." [laughter] I guess that proves short riddles are just as puzzling as long ones, but I might add that the size of the printing bill helped to decide on the little one.

We did, however, try to make things clear to the speakers for this session. We asked them to comment on their interviewing experiences with a tape recorder and to draw from their particular fields of knowledge to make observations about interviewing which would be of benefit to all of us. We assumed, of course, that the approach to interviewing is largely determined by the objective of the interviewer—that is, how he intends to use the material he gains, and/or how he hopes someone else might use it. Of course, in the terms of the present consideration, the tape recorder is a crucial factor which presents, obviously, both promises and problems. With this in mind, we asked each speaker for suggestions he might have about improving interviewing techinques. These considerations should prove helpful in suggesting ways oral historians might borrow interviewing techniques from other disciplines, and to what extent they must evolve their own interviewing techniques.

Mr. Charles T. Morrissey is Director of the Vermont Historical Society. His experience in oral history began in 1962 at the Harry S. Truman Library; two years later, he was asked to take charge of the newly formed oral history program for the John F. Kennedy Library. He served as Chief of this Program until August 1966. Mr. Morrissey is the author of a large number of articles on the subject of oral history.

MORRISSEY: You might wonder why a nonpracticing oral historian is here, particularly one from the State of Vermont. We don't have an oral history project in operation. And, of course, in dealing with Vermonters, there are certain obstacles. [laughter] Perhaps you've heard of the man who was married to the same woman for going on fifty years and sitting in front of the fire one night he said, "Abigail, when I think of what you've meant to me all these years, I can hardly keep from telling you." [laughter] And also maybe you've heard of the Vermonter who went to the city, like so many have for more than a century now; he became a very successful business man. He was being interviewed on why he was successful, and he said, "Hard work, my boy, hard work. That's why I'm successful." Then he said, "Would you mind turning off

the set for a minute?" The set was turned off, and he said, "That's right, hard work. I went out one morning to work on the farm and I worked so hard, I said I was going to get out of here and go to the city." [laughter]

We've heard a lot about fences and pastures, and this is reassuring to a Vermonter. I have one across the street from me. But I was a little concerned yesterday morning that some people were dumping things in my pasture, and I didn't like that. Nonetheless, I've dumped a few in myself, and we'll pick them up and talk about them.

Perhaps this will strike you as an unorganized presentation on oral history interviewing, but I think perhaps it's the only way in which to do it. Let me make a few prefatory observations about techniques. My experience has been restricted almost entirely to political figures—those who have been elected to public office, or those appointed to public office. The more I've discussed oral history with various people, the more I've become impressed with the fact that techniques and other aspects of oral history vary with the type of person you're interviewing. My experience with political figures might be different from someone who is interviewing people in medical research, scientists, early alumni of the University of California, or people in other professions. Likewise, with any large category of people there are individual variations. I interviewed fat old tired congressmen and bright young men who came to Washington with John F. Kennedy, in some cases younger than I. It is an unusual experience to be interviewing someone on Kennedy who is not yet thirty-one years old.

A lot depends on the interviewer, and I'm talking now about a single interviewer. We have tried team interviewing, but I'm rather lukewarm about it. In some cases it's worked out well, but it all depends on the person you're talking to. To some people, three is a crowd, others enjoy having several people around the table. For the most part, however, we prefer one interviewer facing one interviewee. We think that works out best.

A lot depends on the interviewer's background: how much prior research he's done; how many interviews he's already conducted; that is, how many interviews he's conducted on the subject that he's going to discuss with the person before him today. Did he have a preliminary, exploratory interview in which to discuss the project and the procedures? That very definitely has an influence on how he would conduct the interview.

How much control does he have over the situation confronting him? Once, I went to interview a senator, and was told I had twenty minutes. I was forty minutes late in getting to his office, so obviously this is a factor. When you're rushing for an airplane, if you've done four interviews, and you have a fifth one coming up, you're not in the best of shape to really focus on this one. (I've done as many as five in a single day, in a city away from home.) You're tired, you're rundown, you're confused, and in some cases you can't remember if the person you're interviewing said something to you five minutes ago, or if somebody you interviewed earlier in the day said something to you; that very definitely affects your technique. A lot depends on how much control you have over your situations.

Let me say that to reduce interviewing to a set of techniques is, as one person put it, like reducing courtship to a formula. Gould Colman has pointed this out; Elizabeth Dixon has pointed this out in some of the things she's written about the UCLA project. There is a danger

of too much reliance on tools and not relying sufficiently on old-fashioned intuition as to which tool to use in which situation.

It's very easy to be critical of how someone does an interview. You've probably heard the story of the football player who ran back the opening kickoff of a game for a touchdown. The coach called him off the field and criticized him for not doing things right. He caught the wrong way; he used the wrong arm to straightarm somebody, and so forth; and the player said, "How was it for distance, Coach?" [laughter]

We should truly play it by ear, as Philip Brooks said yesterday; so what follows is meant to be taken in a cautious, tentative way. It will sound much more didactic than it is intended. Nevertheless, I want to distill my experience with interviewing about ninety people on the Kennedy project and about fifteen on the Truman project, a total of probably one hundred and thirty-five separate interview sessions.

We had what we called volunteer interviewers at the outset of the Kennedy project, about a hundred and thirty-five of them, who did a total of about three hundred interviews. When I say volunteers, I mean journalists, people in the administration, colleagues of people to be interviewed, friends, all sorts of arrangements, put on a kind of person-to-person, informal basis. There were two other interviewers working with me full time on the Kennedy project, and it was my responsibility to train them and supervise their work.

In dealing both with President Truman and President Kennedy, our interest was episodic. We'd interview a person on his association with each of these Presidents. We were not strictly autobiographical in getting his whole story. This obviously has problems; when you interview someone like Averell Harriman, you'd like to get the whole story. But our purpose was to focus on the Kennedy chapter or the Truman chapter and hope that, someday, somebody will get the rest. We just couldn't do everything.

One of the things we emphasized was to let the interviewee talk. It's his show. Let him run with the ball. As Louis Starr said, "A good interviewer is a good listener." Oftentimes we would start by saying, "When did you first meet John Kennedy?" Or "When did you come into his orbit?" He would take off, usually chronologically; this might turn into a topical treatment, just running on haphazardly; I would sit and listen. There's a value to this because he's volunteering what's foremost in his recollections.

While this was going on, I would often sit with a notepad and pencil, just writing one or two words about things he had covered, or things I wanted to come back to. Before the interview started, I would tell him that I would take notes, in the sense of trying to get down just a word here or a word there, or perhaps asking him later for the correct spelling of a name he mentioned. We always carried a notepad with us when we went on an interview.

After he had run through his story, I would often go back and interlace my questions with what he had already said, trying to probe deeply into certain matters, raising points he missed, asking for examples of generalizations he had given.

In phrasing our questions, we found it most important to leave them open-ended. That

is, not to indicate in the phrasing of the question, the answer you expected to get. We would not offer alternatives and say, "Was it this way or that?" or "Was it either this way or that way?" We would try to state the question in such a way as to get him to pick his own alternative, because he might come up with one that we had not anticipated. We would avoid the loaded word. On the film of the interview done at Berkeley, that word "lobbyist" bothered me. Some people aren't "lobbyists": they are "public relations consultants," "industrial representatives," or something else. We would try very desperately not to impress our own conclusions on the answers the man was giving. It is very hard to restrain yourself, but one way we would try to do it, would be to phrase our question, "To what extent was such and such so?" not, "Was such and such so?" We would not try to build a case like a lawyer trying to build a case in a courtroom. I used to advise people to read the Warren Report, because so many times the attorney would say, "This is the way it was, wasn't it?" and the witness would say, "Yes" or "No." And right down the page, the answers are yes or no. We went at it saying, "Tell us how it was; describe it in your own words." Let the interviewee volunteer what he thought was important.

I advise people to read the transcripts of Lawrence Spivak's program, *Meet the Press,* and then do it just opposite from the way he does it. [laughter] Those are available, incidentally. It is worthwhile to see how someone can phrase a tricky question in trying to trip up someone being interviewed on that program.

We would, of course, avoid jargon, and for academic people that's difficult. Many people in Washington don't like academic people and don't understand academic publications because of the jargon. Dean Acheson, among others, has spoken very forcefully on this point.

Last night some of us saw a film interview with Robert Frost, in which he was asked about his poem, *Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening.* Well, Frost was interviewed on another occasion by another interviewer and afterward described the interview. Let me quote to you from Robert Frost: "He wanted to know what I intended to imply when I wrote *Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening.* I told him I meant it was time to go home."

"Yes," the interviewer asked, "but what did you have in mind when you made that statement?" [laughter]

"I had in mind that it was getting late and I should be moving on."

"Yes," countered the interviewer, "but what hidden symbolic meaning did you intend to record?" And Frost said, "Well, I was about fed up, so I told the interviewer, 'I thought it was about time I was getting the hell out of there.' " [laughter]

We would try to focus in our interviews on the dynamics of how policy was developed, the actual development of policies. This may seem obvious to us, but many of these volunteer interviewers we had on our project would ask a man in 1964 or '65 how he appraised policy developed back in '61 and '62. We wanted to know how that policy developed, and then, perhaps, conclude with his appraisal of it. One guideline I would stress, perhaps above all others, is that a good interviewer should pursue in detail—*pursue in detail*—constantly asking for examples, constantly asking people to illustrate points they are making.

A good interviewer should not allow intimations to pass into the record without elaboration: specifically, what did the person mean by such and such? We would try to keep our questions brief and pointed. At most, a question, in our opinion, should occupy no more than two sentences: one sentence to say, "This is why I'm going to ask you this question," and then, "This is the question I'm asking you"; ending the question with a question mark, and then sitting, biting the lip, keeping quiet, letting the man think (hopefully), letting him answer the question. It's difficult to endure, that embarrassing silence that bothers so many of us socially when we talk.

In oral history one of the great dangers is for the interviewer to feel that he has to keep talking until the interviewee tries to get a word in edgewise. I think, sometimes, the interviewer tends to rush things. We should let the interviewee set his own pace; if it is slow, from our viewpoint, nonetheless, it is his pace. We should let him go at his own rate. With the volunteer interviewers in the Kennedy project, we found, time after time, that they were rushing the man from one point to another, and we actually had cases of the man saying, "Just a minute, can I say something about that last point, before you rush on?" [laughter]

People often ask about mike fright. Are people afraid of the mike and the tape recording equipment? Our experience with the Kennedy volunteer interviewers was that *they* were more scared of the equipment than the people being interviewed. Most of the people being interviewed were familiar with microphones; they had spoken publicly; they had dictated their own letters, and so forth. However, many of the volunteer interviewers were new to tape recording equipment and uneasy with it. They didn't know whether they were doing the right thing, if the volume was high enough, if the mike was close enough, and this sort of thing. It bothered and affected the quality of the interview.

When there were very tough questions to be asked, we learned to postpone the tough ones until the interview was well underway. Obviously, we wanted to establish a good rapport; the longer the interview lasted, more times than not the man would relax, open up, and even enjoy the occasion. Likewise, by asking tough questions, the man might take offense, and that would affect the remainder of the interview. The definition of tough question varies for different people. Some people were offended when we raised the question of John Kennedy's religion as a factor in the 1960 election, which strikes us as a very normal question for a political scientist or historian to ask about. Also, if we had several tough questions to ask, we would never ask them consecutively. We would ask one, handle it, and then try to move the interview into an area we wanted the man to talk about, so he would relax and enjoy it; then perhaps later, come back to another tough one.

In phrasing the tough ones, we often did what book reviewers do: "Some readers might object to the author's tendency to do such and such." Which really means, "I object to his tendency to do such and such." We'd say, "Some people have reported that you got into difficulty on such and such a project." In other words, we're asking him to answer these anonymous people who aren't in the room.

Constantly in our interviews, if we had an important subject we wanted to cover, we would return to it from different angles. Let's say we were interested in the West Virginia primary of 1960; so we'd talk about it, why Kennedy defeated Humphrey. Later, if we were

talking about how the Kennedy campaign was organized, we might move back into West Virginia from a different angle, such as the Kennedy organization in West Virginia and how it was set up. If later we were talking about public-opinion polls, we'd move into the West Virginia primary from that angle; if we were talking about campaign finances, we'd move in from there; if we were talking about the relationship between John Kennedy and Hubert Humphrey throughout their political careers, we'd move in from there. We were always amazed at how a different approach on a different topic would produce new information. The danger, in other words, is to think a matter has been entirely discussed when you cover it once, drop it, and then don't come back.

In the course of all this, we would try to find out how good the man's memory was. We would throw in little questions, sometimes, to test it. For example, if he mentioned the name of a person named Lawrence, we'd say, "Is that the Lawrence that was governor of Pennsylvania or the Lawrence who writes for *U.S. News and World Report*?" And we would say, "Did that happen before or after something else happened?" And these little clues someday, we assume, will help the researcher who's reading the transcript or listening to the tapes to decide how much weight he should put on the testimony of this person.

Likewise, we would try to find out, indirectly, how close the person was to the events he was discussing, if he was intimately involved or on the periphery. We tried to ask questions to bring this out. And many times somebody would admit, "Well, no, I wasn't there when that happened, but I heard about it afterwards." And that of course has great bearing on how much weight an historian should put on it.

We tried to find out who was involved in a certain matter. Let's suppose, how the Peace Corps speech was prepared in the 1960 campaign; who was where? who worked on what draft? and so forth. This obviously has leads for the future; and in interviewing other people, you can ask them about it.

We would also ask a lot of these people what other evidence would exist for the things they were talking about. Would there have been a memorandum on the subject? Or did some newspaperman with entree have something reliable in his column on that particular subject? Did he keep a diary? Was there exchange of correspondence on it? And, as a result, in the long run, the oral history transcripts at the Kennedy Library will say an awful lot about the documentation in conventional written sources pertaining to the Kennedy Administration.

We would try not to miss the obvious, even if it seemed silly to cover the obvious. For example, somebody would say, "I was responsible for getting voters registered in the Mexican precincts of Los Angeles." Well to him, I suppose, this was an easy task, but we wanted to know exactly how you go about it. Where do you start? What do you do? And we'd ask him to elaborate on some of these procedures that people in public office and public affairs conduct.

We'd often use documents in our interviews; that is, if the man's memory was poor, let's say on the 1948 campaign, I'd have an itinerary of where Truman spoke in that campaign, each stop, right through the day. Or we'd present a picture of the people who were present at a certain occasion. By seeing the people who were there, he might say, "Oh, yes, this fellow helped us with the draft of such and such." Or we'd show them newspaper columns and say,

"How does this represent your impressions of how such and such happened?"

On other occasions, we'd set up a hypothetical adversary. This is a technique that Forrest Pogue of the George Marshall Library has used. He'd say to someone, "You were present when Roosevelt died, and someday someone is going to write a book saying Roosevelt was murdered. How would you answer that?" And of course the fellow would offer all sorts of evidence in response to it.

There were many times when we were stuck. We were covering matters we didn't know much about, so we'd rely on the old-fashioned journalistic technique of who, what, when, where, how, why, and so forth.

Also, constantly in the course of interviewing, we would try to put ourselves in the position of the person being interviewed. We'd try to visualize the web he operated in, if he had worked with people in Congress, in the White House, in the Bureau of the Budget, and other departments, the press, lobbyists, or the Democratic National Committee. We would try to visualize how he must have operated with all these other people in Washington, and in that way, try to think of questions that would perhaps bring to light some of these relationships.

We'd also try to put ourselves in the place of other students who would be interested in what this person had to say, and suddenly, the oral historian becomes an economist or sociologist, or he says, "If I were a biographer of John Kennedy, what could this person offer about the biography of Kennedy? If I'm a student of public administration, what can he offer about certain procedures that were conducted?"

We'd ask ourselves, "How does this fellow spend his day? Where does his time go?" And if you could figure that out, you could figure out what questions to put to him.

We sent our transcripts back to be edited by the person interviewed. In the eyes of many people, this is considered to be an indulgence to the interviewee. We used it as a second opportunity to ask questions we didn't think to ask in the first interview. We would ask for the elaboration. We'd clip a question to the side of the page and say, "Senator, could you give an example of this?" In some cases, if a man had not covered a subject in the transcript, we would leave a blank section. "Would you mind writing in pen some more on this?" With that blank paper in front of him when he went through the transcript, sometimes he would actually sit there and fill it up with two hundred and fifty words or so, and contribute some material that was valuable.

Also, if you chicken out in an interview and don't ask the tough questions, you can always ask them when you send the transcript back to be edited. I think the key question in assessing an oral history transcript is really not how much material does it provide for history, but rather, how well did the interviewer do with the circumstances affecting him and the material he had to work with? You can't blame the interviewer if the interviewee has a bad memory.

Perhaps you've heard the story of Jack Curtis, who coached football at Stanford for many years, and was showing a film of one of the games to the Stanford Alumni. In the film,

the quarterback faded back to throw a forward pass. He was rushed; the quarterback faked out one man; straight-armed another; outran a third; ran across the field, threw a pass sixty yards down the field; it was caught by one of his own teammates for a touchdown. And while all this was going on the screen, Curtis was shouting from the back of the room, "Look at me coach! Look at me coach!" [laughter] Well, you can't blame the interviewer if the interviewee doesn't do a good job. But you can blame the interviewer if he doesn't take advantage of every opportunity available to him. And it seems to me that's the key question. If the interviewer did the best he could with what he had, you can't blame him for the results. If he did less than that, you can blame him, and I think he should be blamed appropriately.

Let me say that very little has been written about techniques of oral history. I hope in the future, if we form an association, that we can have workshops on this to bring to bear our varying experiences to help the uninitiated, perhaps, to see actual transcripts and have the interviewer explain why he did certain things and didn't do others. Likewise, I think somebody very productively could prepare a thirty-minute tape with three voices on it: an interviewer, an interviewee, and a narrator, the narrator saying why the interviewer is doing this, or if the interviewer makes a mistake, the narrator perhaps pointing out what the mistake is and what he could have done that is different.

Interviewing, in conclusion, is very difficult when you think that the good interviewer must know his stuff; he must be listening to what the man is saying; he must think of more questions to ask; he must be thinking of what the question was he just asked, to make sure the man is answering it. He must know what's already been covered; know what he has yet to cover. He must anticipate where he's going to go if the man, while he's talking, indicates he's about through with the subject; and in anticipating where the conversation is going to go, he must in his mind be beginning to try to formulate that so it will come out well-phrased. It's a very difficult business. Anyone who does it successfully, is probably so successful that he should be interviewed and not doing the interviewing himself.

SCHIPPERS: In our association with Dr. Albert Kandelin, our office staff has been very greatly impressed not only with his feeling for history but his observations about interviewing in general. I'm sure you will be also.

Dr. Albert W. Kandelin is a graduate of the University of Michigan and received his training in psychoanalysis in Los Angeles. He is a member of the American Medical Association, the American Psychoanalytic Association, a Fellow of the American Psychiatric Association, and Chairman of the History Committee of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Association. He has been in private practice since 1948, and is also currently serving as an Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at UCLA.

KANDELIN: I hold the position of Chairman of the History Committee, one of the standing committees of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Society. This is a chapter of a national organization, the American Psychoanalytic Association. We are a group of about one hundred members. The earliest of this group came to Los Angeles almost as long as forty years ago. The majority of the pioneer members had their training in Europe, many of them European-born, but not necessarily. Some of the very interesting members were Americans who had training in Europe and then returned here to practice. Naturally, they have interesting insights into the

early European psychoanalytic scene.

For almost ten years there has been a vague sense of the potential significance of organizing and preserving the history of the psychoanalytic movement in California. The growth and extension of analysis in America continues the development of the science and philosophy founded by Sigmund Freud. The evolution is seen in formal papers, scientific psychoanalytic papers—there's always a great deal of historical sense. That is, the evolution of a particular problem or theory under consideration is always given a scrutiny by a literary review.

However, that somewhat differs with what preoccupies me. Freud's genius included a flow of new concepts extended into unexplored areas; often these were preliminary, and extended later by his followers. I'm trying to refer to the history of *ideas,* which is the highest level of historical thought, somewhat beyond the scope of any of the work that I and my committee have done. But, again, it is implicit in most scientific papers. That is, what is the history of this idea?

More closely related to my work, or even largely, is the history of persons. That is, those persons who followed Freud in the psychoanalytic movement, especially those who came to California. What were their aims, their actions, their accomplishments? Where did they come from; how did they adjust? What were their problems; what were their rewards? History, eventually, is a scrutiny of individual lives. Through a process of identification with these people, each of us shares their problems and, hopefully, avoid some of their mistakes.

Intimately associated with the persons in psychoanalytic history is the history of organization. This derives a good deal from the tense and emotional aura which inevitably is associated with the emergence of new discoveries. Debate, controversy, and dissension have not been absent from psychoanalytic deliberations. Their force has changed the course of psychoanalytic organization. Freud himself had a great zeal for a strong central society of analysts. This he felt to be a guarantee against the erosions of deviation, opportunism, and quackery. A principal evolution in America and California has been the development of authorized and organized training centers which aim at maintaining a high standard of ethical and technical excellence.

In this way, I'm trying to give you a kind of an overview, my personal viewpoint, something I've evolved in the several years I've been preoccupied with this area. I groped about with various techniques. I was appointed committee member, and the chairman at the time didn't seem to know what to do, so I became the chairman and *I* didn't know what to do. Instant historian, you know. [laughter] I think I told Jim Mink it was as if we took a librarian and told him to practice medicine. But it wasn't quite that bad. I had access to certain manuscript material which is in a back room at the Institute office in storage. It took a long time to find it. Nobody told me it was there. I made appeals at meetings for people to supply manuscript material, with very poor results. Or, let me say, a few people were generous but they were very few.

I started interviewing with paper and pencil. Of course, I got miserable results. But I happened to read in the Westwood *Independent* that Fletcher Bowron, ex-mayor of Los

Angeles, would commence a study on the history of Los Angeles. And down in small print at the bottom were the names of Elizabeth Dixon and Doyce Nunis at UCLA, who were presumably, I guess, going to do the real work. [laughter] I phoned Elizabeth Dixon and learned there was such a technique as the oral history work that they were doing. So I commenced it. I have done some things with it, but not very much, even to date. Yet, I think I've done enough to have learned—my committee and I have learned—some of the fundamentals.

The UCLA staff gave me an outline which I have chosen to follow briefly to get into the interview technique. First, the interviewer. Our interviewers were generally younger colleagues of the distinguished older analysts. This worked out well because the younger colleague was already an expert in the field. And he had a curious attitude about what the older man and, perhaps, even his European experiences amounted to. These younger people were ordinarily of a student generation which had been trained by the respondent. So you can see, we had, to begin with, a good thing going. That is, the younger analyst interviewing the older analyst. Analysts ordinarily listen, but in these interviews, many questions were asked.

In the sense that an interview is a dialogue between two persons, no third person should participate or be present. On two instances, wishfully helpful wives sat in and made contributions, which were very confusing because of transcription difficulties, largely, or they were too distant from the microphone. They were sitting in the corner knitting and would throw in their remarks [laughter] and you couldn't quite hear them. Other obstacles were chirping birds and barking dogs.

Control of the interview. Certainly the interviewer should ask questions; we don't want a monologue. What is aimed for is a synthesis of careful inquiry and thoughtful response. In general, avoid a fixed and rehearsed performance. Rather, the ideal should aim at free association—I use a psychiatric term, a psychoanalytic term. And I urge a subjective orientation by all means. Challenges can stifle. Corrections should be minimal during the course of an interview, or at least discreet and diplomatic. In a second interview, there is more opportunity for questions or suggestions or hints from the interviewer, but, again, to be used minimally if the flow from the subject is free, spontaneous, and productive. In any interview, the principle of an associative anamnesis should apply. This implies a freedom from rigid chronology or programmed order of development, or avoiding the stereotyped questions-and-answer method, which is an awful trap. Maximum productivity follows if freedom is developed toward association in ideas, free from the tensions of the fixed outline, avoiding by all means the atmosphere of a compulsive adherence to completing one question at a time.

Notes prepared in advance by either interviewer or interviewee, in my opinion, tend to discourage the desired freedom, but need not be eliminated entirely. Sometimes they are useful to the elderly who are uncertain about details or dates. Sometimes we have turned off the recorder as a courtesy to allow comment aside or to gather together a new line of thought. Invariably good material gets missed. Better to include everything and edit later anything considered immaterial or unsuited.

Regarding time and setting of the interview. It should be conducted on the respondent's home grounds; give him this advantage in his home or office. Interviews should be limited to comfortable duration—sixty or ninety minutes and no more. A second interview, if desired, should follow in a week or two. Don't wait too long, because otherwise a certain continuity is interrrupted. Smoking and drinking are useful on occasion to promote a little conviviality. Arrange it so there is no interruption for lunch. I've discovered that the table conversation may well cover the most interesting details and they will not be repeated again in the subsequent recording.

About motivating the interviewee. Repeatedly, I encountered the protest from the respondent that, "Well this or that particular recollection is personal history, and not at all of any interest to the history of our organization." Perhaps beforehand a reassurance should routinely be given that personal details are the warp and woof of history. This is usually easy to make clear, but it's important to say it and to emphasize it. Personal involvement seems to get downgraded in the mind of the respondent, I'm sure out of a feeling that his self-esteem is somehow threatened or he's somehow under excessive scrutiny. Or, he has a mistaken concept that only big events make history, which we know differently. If necessary at this point, one explains the function of later editing which aims at accuracy, but also the elimination of threats of libel or slander, which has already been commented on here.

About editing transcripts, I can describe some of my experiences, without knowing the final answer about ideal practice. We follow the UCLA technique of keeping the initial transcript, allowing the interviewee to edit it, if he is so inclined, and then making a final transcript of his edited version. In our slim, relatively limited experience, some subjects have not changed anything, which is ideal. Others have changed quite a bit, which is tragic. The latter is unfortunate; the subject again obviously considers his product of immortal documentary importance, and polishes it up to eliminate slips and awkward constructs, reducing its humanity and making it less of a free and spontaneous dialogue. Perhaps in these instances, a future rewriting of the initial interview would have to be done, using the original transcript to find out what really went on.

I read, through the courtesy of the UCLA staff, the oral history literature on display here. These are general expositions, you know, with the description of the interview process—the transcribing or historical research potential and so forth. Real details of interviewing technique are only rarely encountered, although the principles are described. It's from principles that we have the foundation for a theory. A final step, of course, would be to evolve a technique.

In describing to you psychiatric interviewing, perhaps you can make some of the comparisons with oral history interviewing. There are some similarities and, conversely, some contrasts. Similarly, each is a dialogue between two human beings, one of the two aiming to gain knowledge in the form of data and insights from a second; the second presumably cooperating to transmit this knowledge. A contrast lies in the therapeutic aim of the psychiatric interview. Modern psychiatry was born in the jail, the asylum, and the almshouse, and grew up as a servant to the custodian. At first there was little need for interviews; examination was cursory; diagnosis was minimal; therapy did not really exist.

Gradually, with the improvement of facilities, there was a need for mental examination. But not yet as therapy, or certainly not much for the interview as therapy. Mental illness was attributed to mystical sources. Later on, quite a bit was attributed to physical causes, each thought rarely amenable to cure. Not until the era of moral treatment and the dawn of psychogenic theory of mental illness did the interview emerge in its present importance. The discoveries of Freud and his followers have hastened this movement and now the interview stands as the basic tool of psychiatry. By means of interviewing, diagnostic illumination and therapeutic intervention proceed, usually simultaneously.

The primacy of the interview as therapy was a long time aborning, not only because recognition of the psychic genesis of mental illness was resisted but also because psychiatry inherited a burdensome legacy from general medicine. To join the club, psychiatry had to observe the rules and to follow the crowd. I refer to fixed tradition in medicine, drummed into every medical student. First of all, he takes the patient's history. Then he proceeds to the examination. Then he makes the diagnosis, and finally will recommend or carry out the treatment. The psychiatrist has not escaped this teaching or this tradition, substituting only mental examination for physical examination. Even today, students are taught in some places this old-fashioned routine. History—long,methodical, and by syllabus—followed by mental status examination, usually equally exhaustive and exhausting, finally reaching the summit of the diagnostic formulation and concluding with recommendations.

Let me illustrate from Noyes and Kolb, which is psychiatry's most popular textbook now in five or even six editions. They recommend, in quotes, "A flexible manner, but the following bases are to be touched in taking the history: First, the presenting problem." That is, what is the chief complaint? That's a sentence or two. Then, "The Present Illness." A paragraph or two. But then concluding (or continuing, hardly concluding), "Heredity." And then, "Developmental and Home Factors Involving Influences and Experiences During Childhood Personality Formation, Childhood and Adolescent Characteristics, School History, Occupational History, Medical History, Psychosexual History, Marital History, Social Adaptability, General Activity and Interests, Personality Traits and Characteristics," and finally, "Emotionally Disturbing Experiences." [laughter]

Now having concluded that, we proceed to the mental examination, which proceeds under the following headings: "General Appearance, Manner and Attitude, Consciousness," meaning *state* of consciousness [laughter], "Apperception, Affectivity and Mood, Cognition and Expressive Aspects of Behavior, Associations and Thought Processes, Thought Content and Mental Trend,Perception, Memory, Fund of Information, Judgement, Insight and Personal Maturity." To be followed by special psychological tests as indicated.

Well, of course, then the next step is a diagnostic formulation, using a pigeonhole from a large available assortment. [laughter] And then, of course, making a recommendation for treatment. If psychotherapy is a recommendation, presumably it will commence at some later date. Today the principles in this encounter are exhausted.

Several important discoveries have been made which lift the burden, at least change it from such a rigid routine with little chance of success at hand. The first discovery was the discovery that the history and mental examination need not and indeed cannot be separated.

While relating his history, the patient reveals his psychopathology. Well, this is certainly a desirable economy. But hold on, another discovery pushes this further: therapy cannot wait either, but commences with the beginning of the interview or even earlier. Many people feel better when they call up for the appointment. [laughter]

Closely related is another discovery: that is, the psychiatrist is not merely an observer. This isn't a one-way process. He's also a participant in a lively interchange, in a subtle psychic dialogue transcending even the exchange of the words. This is the commerce that sometimes comes too close for comfort. At which side of the desk do I belong? [laughter] It reminds me of a definition of a psychiatrist: He's a nervous man who has made the discovery at which side of the desk he chooses to sit. [laughter]

So, we have moved away from the traditional, the fixed outline, the rigid ordering of procedures, towards something more permissive, perceptive, non-directive. I use the phrase, "associative anamnesis" coined by Felix Deutsch, an eminent psychoanalyst. A book many of you know about and possibly have read is Theodore Reik's, *Listening with the Third Ear.* This is a wonderful title because it points out so clearly the technique which aims at listening beyond the manifest content of the spoken words to reach some of the subtleties of the unspoken language of the unconscious. The discoveries of Freud have given us the "third ear," and now the emphasis is on understanding the phenomena of human behavior rather than collecting and cataloging them. Now the interview becomes a close human experience designed to foster the relationship. This gives rise to a new vocabulary of technical terms such as "empathy," "rapport," "transference," and "countertransference." And new methods have been added, such as free association, dream analysis, and analysis of slips.

A very respected writer, Harry Stack Sullivan, considered the interview as designed primarily to discover obscure problems of living, difficulties the patient himself cannot understand clearly and about which he may even mislead himself and others. These difficulties can be conceptualized only when one grasps what sort of a person the patient is, what he does, why he does it, and then helps him to understand equally this knowledge. I can quote now from some of the books I esteem, and sort of paraphrase. One is Merton Gill and Frederick Redlich, *The Initial Interview in Psychiatry.* I thought it was illuminating and it might be interesting to you. What are the major determinants of the interview, using the word determinants in the sense of whatever the results? First: the personalities of the participants. No two persons will conduct an interview alike nor will any two respond alike because no two people are identical in personality, with the possible exception of identical twins in the first few days of life. Examples of personality determinants. Examples affecting the behavior of the interviewer might be that person who quickly needs to show how clever he is or how authoritarian, what an important person he is. Where he might be excessively *friendly*, maybe basically he's struggling with some hostility. He may be blustering or challenging or sarcastic.

A second determinant is listed by Gill and Redlich as the "socially defined roles of the participant." To illustrate, an uneducated person may think of the psychiatrist as a threatening authority figure, feared because all his patients are insane (or so he thinks) and feared for his powers of mind reading and brainwashing. More sophisticated people are free from casting the psychiatrist in this rather frightening role. A college girl will see him as masculine, virile, real cool. [laughter] And so forth and so forth.

Now the psychiatrist himself must be alert to some of these considerations, and I epitomize it by saying that he should be as able to listen as alertly and intently to his free clinic patients as to those who have enough to pay fees for his private practice. That is, he shouldn't put the first into an inferior role and he shouldn't overestimate the second.

The third determinant would be the purpose of the interview. It influences the course and content of the session. And again I illustrate by example: the suffering anxious neurotic person seeking help will come and be completely frank and cooperative, but what about the delinquent who has no wish for therapy, who has been sent by the court as a condition of probation? That's a very different circumstance.

Gill and Redlich continue by speaking about the aims of therapy and this might be useful in trying to orient you into generally what the interview tries to accomplish. The first would be to create a rapport to facilitate communication. And the techniques here are common-sense techniques. We use decency, consideration, tact, guarding against haste, hostility, or impatience. And then, I suppose the real aim is to make an appraisal of the person and the disorder and, in so doing, try to guess what kind of motivation there is here for therapy and what is the capacity for therapy. And then, finally, of course, moving on to therapy itself.

Giving you now more detail, I will paraphrase another of the very popular books in psychiatric education, called *A Primer for Psychotherapists,* by Kenneth Mark Colby of San Francisco. He states the aim is to relieve the patient of distressing neurotic symptoms or discordant personality characteristics which interfere with his satisfactory adaptation to the world of people or events.

A brief review of the concept of mind may or may not fit in here but I can make it brief. Again paraphrasing Colby, the mind is an apparatus which has as one of its functions the task of maintaining a state of equilibrium. It deals with stimuli which tend to raise a state of tension. The mind seeks either to discharge or bind this tension. The stimuli come from two directions, roughly: externally or internally. The external ones are those initiated by sensory perception. Internal stimuli are those originating within, and we might label them wishes, or instinctual impulses. Such a wish impulse can be discharged or bound, depending on the executive action of the mind. That is, the mind will decide.

Harmonious regulation of stimuli maintaining a state of equilibrium is necessary to normal mental functioning. Sometimes the mind is incapable of successfully binding impulses and the result is neurotic conflict manifested by symptoms of disturbed attitudes. Psychotherapy aims to produce a favorable change in his disturbed balance, leading to a fuller gratification of the wish or at least to a more suitable compromise. The first task is to make an appraisal as mentioned above. The therapist aims to see the wish-defense system involved and then to alter this by a series of maneuvers. This is the basic theory of therapy. The tactics or tools by which the therapist pursues his aim are the statements made by him, chiefly interpositions and interpretations.

At this point you can see a major difference between the oral history interview and the psychiatric therapy interview. Therapy is not an aim in oral history, but indeed is the prime aim

inthe psychiatric history therapy. Historical data about the patient's life therefore assume a secondary position in the psychiatric interview, while these are primary for the historian. The tactics employed by therapist and historian will necessarily differ but with a considerable measure of overlapping, inasmuch as each is urging a free flow of thought and speech.

Does this mean that psychiatrists can contribute to teaching of interview techniques as applied to historical and other non-therapeutic interviewing? I think so. If oral history grows, as is the ambition of the people here, one of the problems will be to achieve effective economies and certainly teaching of technique will evolve as a necessary step. In this teaching, at least a review of psychiatric interviewing techniques will have a place along with the contributions of other disciplines, such as journalism interviewing and social-work interviewing. We heard yesterday about cross-examination, which may be termed legal interviewing.

At this point, it may be well to consider the problem of the so-called common-sense approach. That is, the argument that interviewing technique cannot and perhaps even ought not to be taught. The proponent of this view holds that interviewing is within the realm of ordinary social experience, with basic skills already held to some degree by all persons—to a large degree by talented persons—that extra skills are within reach by experience, and that teaching of interviewing is unnecessary and even futile. It will be stated that interviewing has had universal application for a long time and in many ways in industry, social sciences, case work, and other researches, all without the benefit of special techniques. However, in my estimation, this is not particularly true. I think techniques have been evolved, perhaps studied and taught, maybe not necessarily very formally, maybe not documented but largely by preceptorship, which is, incidentally, the way psychoanalytic and psychiatric techniques are still taught—largely by preceptorship.

My own experiences in teaching have included supervising of psychotherapy conducted by resident physicians and medical students. This is certainly teaching. And I can testify to incidents where errors of the student could be defined, corrected, and with good results following. I myself have experimented with direct observation of teaching. Rather traditional is to send the student and the patient into the room for an hour and if the student emerges [laughter] give him another hour to let him describe what happened. However, I (and this is not original with me) have experimented with direct observation. That is, we go in with the student and allow him to be identified as the physician and I sit to one side and am identified as a friendly consultant in a secondary role. But I have the opportunity of observing directly and this of course has proven to me that there are mistakes that are easy for me to pick up and afterwards easy to correct.

So I conclude with a sense of zeal that there is something about a need for developing not only a *theory* of interviewing, but certainly a *technique* of interviewing. And if the technique can be analysed and taught, perhaps the teaching will come from these different schools that I mentioned.

SCHIPPERS: On the one hand, you say we can learn from some of the psychiatric techniques. On the other hand, you seem to see a danger in us getting too bound up in them.

KANDELIN: Perhaps I can correct myself. I was giving you a history of the traditional medical way of going through all these categories, and I'm saying, "Stay away from that as a model and instead adopt as a model, the free-flow, permissive, non-directive technique of the modern therapist."

PETER OLCH, M.D. [National Library of Medicine]: Dr. Kandelin, you stated earlier that a number of the interviews were done by the students of some of the older psychotherapists, and I wonder really whether the student sometimes is the best individual to direct some key, perhaps bomb-like questions to the *geheimrat?* [laughter] For instance, I can think right now, in all seriousness, of some very pointed, and I think important questions that I would like to direct to a number of my former professors, but I'm sure, even in an oral history situation, they would not be answered the way they would be if asked by a third party who had some knowledge in this field but was not directly involved as a former disciple of this man.

KANDELIN: In the first place, when I used the word student, I may not have made clear they *had been* students, and at the time of the interview were fully qualified psychoanalysts and colleagues. If their own training and personal psychoanalysis had been successful, they were no longer timid students, they were colleagues on an equal basis with a shorter life-span and well able to explore with the older person.

OLCH: I realize this. I think my point was that there are certain areas, for instance, dealing with the politics of institutional medicine, where I'm sure the third party could get into this at some depth, but I *know* that this individual will not sit down with me because he saw me stewing under this same circumstance in his institution, in his department, even if it were ten or fifteen years before.

KANDELIN: I can't deny there may be such instances.

HAND: I would like to add a footnote to the presentation of these speakers, referring first to remarks made by Dr. Kandelin about third persons at interviews or the "fifth wheel." In folklore, we call these people oftentimes, "marplots," who may range all the way from wives who hate to see their husbands giving up an evening to talk with someone, to someone who is involved in one way or another, who will actually not only thwart the interview but will make sure that it actually terminates, and will carry on and ridicule the whole notion of sitting at all. In folklore we have a special problem that way, where you do not necessarily know all about the interviewee before you go. You take your chances, and you get into these situations that are unforeseen. That would be one thing. And then a group situation, where too many people are speaking at once and so on; the right way to do it is single out the most likely informant and to make, then, a special appointment with him or her under more favorable circumstances and let them go on from there.

As for a remark made by Professor Morrissey—putting off the tough questions to the end or after you are well into the interview—we have a comparable situation in folklore where certain kinds of material are so intimate that you cannot broach it at once. You have to await a favorable time. This favorable time is usually after you have won the informant's confidence,

perhaps after the second or third visit. Then you can start prying into matters that have to do with people who have religious beliefs that tend to spill over into the field of popular belief and superstition.

And then last, and perhaps best of all, is the erotic material. You have to wait until the very end before you can start going after this kind of thing, and even so you should not press your luck too far. In the American Folklore Society, in Washington about ten years ago, a certain person was to have talked on the customs and the argot of the El Paso underworld, and the chairman of the meeting stood up in a perfect deadpan and said, "Professor so-and-so, who was to address himself to this subject, cannot be here tonight because he was beaten within an inch of his life trying to get the material." [laughter] Any folklore collector of experience can regale you for hours on end with these situations that you get into by pressing your luck too far and too soon.

RENZE: There are some things that I feel I have gained here which perhaps restates my past thinking. One of them is in the situation that our doctors have talked about and some of my friends in the medical field have said, "Ours is a succession of interviews that may extend over a long period of time, perhaps over a whole lifetime, so that you have a developmental effect." That stimulated me to think that perhaps many of our oral history interviews have been entirely with individuals who have reached full maturity or are at the end of their career, and so, therefore, you have a fairly good reflective or passive type of history. I'm wondering if you could not gain something, by following a medical concept of an extended series of interviews over a career time if you're in this situation. I would use one example that I think is very good. I'm concerned with people in public office and in politics, either appointed or elected. One of the things we started doing some years back was to get a statement from a newly elected governor at the time that he is preparing his message to the legislature, when he really is setting forth what he hopes to do in his administration. Unless he's a very old hand in the political field, he comes in with a good many idealistic objectives. The next time that we have a public statement from him is at the time he's going out of office, and in this one he's reflecting on what he's been able to accomplish, and it may be a very, very different thing than from what he hoped to do when he went in. If he's re-elected, in his new message he has a newly oriented view of what he's going to do. Then perhaps he's been in some years and has a fully matured career and he is reflecting on it. I think that, in oral history, we might keep in mind that we don't limit our interviews to those who are elder statesmen in their fields but that we sometimes go out and picture the development at the beginning of the career, midway, and perhaps as they finish. I think this could be an extremely important and useful concept of oral history interviews, and I think we might well take several leads from the practicing psychiatrist and physician.

SCHIPPERS: I know that others have ideas along the line of continuing tapes.

SELESNICK: I'm working for the American Psychiatric Association trying to interview old-timers who have contributed to the field of psychiatry, and we hope to do these interviews on videotape. I think this has a great significance in the future because so much of the communication is nonverbal. I'll never forget watching an interview with C. G. Jung. In this interview, he was asked a very, very important question, namely, what he thought about the

archetypes. Jung answered, "Well, you know, I wasn't there when they originated." And there was a certain twinkle in his eye, as if to say, "Now, why are you students taking this concept so seriously? It's sort of a philosophical speculation." You could tell from the twinkle in his eye, and from the tongue-in-cheek way in which he responded. You could never get this from a manuscript, and you couldn't even get this from his own writing.

May I also mention that, when we interview people, they are not lying to us many times. They are caught within the concept of repression. For certain reasons unknown to them, they are unable to relate material. This does not mean people are lying to us. This doesn't mean they are consciously distorting. One of the things we can do as interviewers is to help lift suppression. Material that is suppressed is just about conscious. It's between the conscious and the unconscious—what we call the "preconscious." There are certain techniques of doing this, and I think that one technique that hasn't been mentioned is the use of humor. Let me give you an example. I was seeing a young woman whom I knew had many problems which were revolving around her sexual area and which she just couldn't get to. I asked her what her fantasies were and she said, "I would love to go into outer space and course around the heavens."

I said, "What would you do?"

She said, "Well, I think I would take a companion with me."

And I said, "What would you do?"

She said, "Well, I don't know what I would do."

I said, "Do you think you might have some outercourse?" [laughter] From then on in, we had an excellent rapport [laughter] on sexual problems.

One thing that Freud once pointed out is that many times material which is suppressed can be lifted. Unfortunately, around it there are many many areas that are important for investigation. A patient in Freud's early days said, "Professor Freud, I would love to be analyzed, but there is one topic that I just can't discuss with you. So would you please analyze me, but I don't want to discuss this one subject."

And Freud said, "Well, I can't make the deal with you. It would be as if I was the chief of police and you were the chief of all the criminals and we made a deal. The deal would be that all of the criminals could be arrested if they were not on the *hauptstutze* (the main street). You know, in no time at all, all the criminals would be living on the *hauptstutze.*"

So much of the material that is just barely conscious has many other areas around it that are also barely conscious. I think that good interviewing technique is using relaxing techniques, not cross-examination techniques. For example, a sense of humor can be most effective.

One thing that impressed me is something Mr. Morrissey said, namely, "Who is afraid of the mike?" Now the person who is afraid of the mike is the interviewer, because he is

interviewing an expert in an area that he is not familiar enough with. Therefore, he is the one that is really on the spot. The interviewee, after all, knows the material. Therefore, I think it's tremendously important for the interviewer to know a *great* deal about the interviewee, his life, biographical data, as well as his contributions.

BAUM: Mr. Morrissey, we have interviewed a lot of people of minority groups as well as political figures and I think that we would follow your suggestions on interviewing techniques right down the line, so perhaps they are general and not applied only to political figures.

We have put a big emphasis on training our interviewers, but we have used some volunteer interviewers. We've had differing degrees of success. Most of them were, I'd say, less successful than our regular staff interviewers. I would like to know what your success has been with these volunteer interviewers and how you can use them effectively, or what kind of training you give them to get as effective a result as possible?

MORRISSEY: One, success has been very limited. Two, as I suggested, I think workshops and more literature on oral history interviewing would be helpful. Three, as you pointed out, Peter [Olch], the stranger coming in from the outside can often be much more successful than an intimate who knows the person being interviewed. I used to come in as a stranger and I could ask questions and pursue matters which I don't think a friend would want to pursue with another friend because he might jeopardize the friendship. It used to be referred to as "Father Morrissey's traveling confessional." [laughter]

MARBURG: I would like Dr. Morrissey to comment a little bit on jargon, because it seems to me what you really are after is not the avoidance of jargon but to know the jargon of the people you are talking to. I know in business history, we spent a lot of time finding out certain terms that they all know and asking the questions in those terms. I imagine in every field one works on that. I presume there are, of course, things that are unique to academics.

MORRISSEY: I'm an historian not a political scientist, and I've been spared the ordeal of learning much of the jargon. There is a great gap between practitioners of politics, let's say congressmen, and those political scientists who write about what congressmen do. And time after time, congressmen—in many cases, extremely well-educated people, Rhodes scholars, and whatnot—would bring this up in an interview: that much that is written about what goes on here on "the hill" has no relationship to what actually happened. A lot of us in the academic world think in terms of "forces." We talk about labor, the press, ethnic groups, the Catholic issue, whereas to a politician, his world is one of personal relationships. If you mention the press, he'll come back with Joe Blow who writes for the Washington *Post*. If you mention the Catholic issue, he'll mention what a big help Bishop so-and-so was in San Antonio, and that sort of thing. That's not jargon really, but it's the type of thing that we try to avoid.

BROOKS: I would be interested in the reaction of both panelists, perhaps Mr. Morrissey first, to Professor Nevins' recommendation of a candid commentary on the integrity of the interview. Did you do this on the Kennedy project?

MORRISSEY: This is a very difficult subject.

BROOKS: There is no doubt of that. [laughter]

MORRISSEY: And it's unavoidable, because, in the course of doing one interview, you want to make notes for the file that can be used in interviewing other people concerned with the same matter. We did this at the Truman Library, as you know. And if someone was sick or transferred, the notes in the file would fill the gap of one interviewer leaving or going on elsewhere. We often wondered whether we should come back and dictate a memorandum on whether the fellow was elusive, sober, drunk, tired, what you will. All of you, I think, have had the experience of a man wanting to tell you something because he feels he has an obligation to. He set up the interview, he invited you to his office, but he doesn't want to tell you on the tape. So he can satisfy this ambivalence by telling it to you off the tape. It makes him feel good to communicate it, but he's assured that, supposedly, you won't do anything with it. This raises a problem whether we should make a memo, put in the file, and years hence, when the propriety and sensitivity of this information no longer applies, release it. We did some of this. We never practiced, as a routine matter, the dictating of a memo on each interview. I'm not sure if we did the right thing or the wrong thing.

SERRURIER: A very brief question to Dr. Kandelin. The tape recorder is practically the basic tool of the oral historian, but I don't think you mentioned the tape recorder once. Is that because you don't use it, because you do use it in ways which don't apply to other forms of interviewing, or is it some other reason?

KANDELIN: The tape recorder has proved to be of very little use clinically. There are some people who have elaborate installations in their offices, but I'm sure, shortly, they gather dust. You have to have it here [in your head] and not on the tape. There is some application in groups, and don't mistake me, it is still useful for research purposes.

SERRURIER: I was thinking of straight therapy.

KANDELIN: For straight therapy, I don't know of any colleague who routinely or even commonly records interviews. In an eight-hour day, five or six days a week, you'd soon have such volume that you couldn't store it, and you librarians know what that amounts to.

WOOD: We've had plenty of examples here of the structured versus the unstructured interview. The structured interview I would say, Mr. Morrissey, is definitely your field, where you have made an appointment with a political figure or congressman or whatever it is who has agreed to give you an hour of his time. You are presumably sending him, ahead of time, a kind of outline of what you want him to talk about so he can be prepared. I presume this is the procedure. On the other hand, from the psychotherapy point of view, there is an extreme stress on free association. I want to know if you would react, Doctor Kandelin, to the suggestion that the structured interview should be discarded almost immediately when your interviewee starts to talk, and then free association should follow. When you found your interviewee started to, as it were, ramble, would you then, as a psychologist or psychoanalyst, bring him back, and say, "Well, let's get back to the point?"

KANDELIN: No, as an *oral historian*, I'd come back. An oral history interview should not deteriorate into a therapeutic interview. I see your confusion. I meant only that there is something in the sense of an ideal model in the free-associative interview which will still be productive and economical in the oral history sense. That's all I meant. It's a model ideal to encourage freedom, but by no means to allow it to go to the point of being a therapeutic interview.

MORRISSEY: Could I comment on that, Doctor?

KANDELIN: Certainly, go right ahead.

MORRISSEY: With the people in Washington, we often got one shot and that meant no preliminary exploratory interview. Two, we very rarely sent them a list of questions ahead of time because we found that, many times, when they saw the questions, they didn't want to play the game. Thirdly, when people asked ahead of time that we submit questions. almost invariably, they decided to postpone the interview. Fourthly, on the point about letting the man wander, we do that in our interviews but we don't necessarily transcribe it, which will save you time later.

JOHN BERUTTI [Sierra College]: I think that when you're gathering oral history on a given area, such as I'm interested in, you almost have to go to the programmed interview so that you can get any data that you would need for future historians. But, from a therapeutic point of view, I sometimes wonder, Doctor Kandelin, in selecting certain elderly people for the interview, if you're not giving them some social therapy, in the broader sense that they will want to ramble and give some opinions on their experiences in the area of other people, and you almost have to let them.

KANDELIN: All right, there's some overlap. [laughter]

ENID DOUGLASS [Claremont Graduate School]: Mr. Morrissey, I want to ask you about whether you had developed any theory about proximity to events, because obviously one of your problems was closeness to the event, and sometimes closeness is a handicap. And you mentioned the problem of the staffs of the two presidents. Certainly it immediately occurred to most of us that probably at a later date someone can go back and, in fact, get a more valuable analysis of what happened. Is there not perhaps a point in their lives that really is better than a younger age, or an in-between point that might be more productive?

MORRISSEY: The latter one is very difficult and hard to know, and hard to generalize about. On the former, I have some impressions, but no theory. The impression is that the closer you can interview the man with respect to the events he was engaged in, the better the interview will be. If you get him soon after it happens, he still gives you the values, assumptions, attitudes, and viewpoints of the man he was at the time these things happaened. For example, I interviewed John Bailey, Chairman of the National Committee, about a month after the assassination. He was still John Kennedy's Chairman of the Democratic National Committee. I came back a year later and did another interview. He was a different man. Take the Truman people. A lot of them, before 1952, were White House staff people. By 1964, they had been

Washington attorneys or businessmen or whatnot for twelve years and they were looking back on themselves the way we look back, in some cases, on our childhood. If some of you have either seen or read *Krapp's Last Tape,* the play, you remember that famous scene in which he's playing a tape recorder and he says, something about "that's the fool I took myself for thirty years ago." [laughter]

DOUGLASS: Don't you run into reluctance to talk at all when you're that close to something?

MORRISSEY: Actually, we did better in the aftermath of the assassination than we did as time went on.

SCHIPPERS: I'm sure we have more questions, but you'll just have to buttonhole these people in private and address them to them.

OBJECTIVES AND STANDARDS

Mrs. Elizabeth Dixon and Dr. Gould Colman,
Co-chairmen

DIXON: We've decided that this session shouldn't have been called Standards and Goals, but *Objectives* and Standards. For one thing, you cannot have standards until you have determined your objectives, so we have reversed the order of things. We have also added another category—implementation. There are certian things that we might consider as standards which really are not—they are implementations of standards and goals.

Gould has made a list of what we thought might be considered primary objectives. I think he should read it.

COLMAN: I'd like to preface this list with an indication of its scope. What we have done is try to exclude objectives and standards which apply to only a small number of oral history programs. We have tried to come up with a list that is appropriate for oral history in all places at all times. The list is drawn primarily from the experience at Berkeley, UCLA, Columbia, and Cornell. None of us measures up to the standards that we have arrived at, although I think all of us could with a little bit of effort. It's primarily a matter of being consistent about things that we are not now consistent about.

I'd like to read the first two objectives together because they are rather closely related. Number one: To obtain information through oral communication appropriate to the recognized needs of teachers and researchers. Number two: To enable respondents to raise and explore issues, events, and personalities in ways they find appropriate. These are the two goals that involve the substantive content of our technique, field, profession, as you will.

DIXON: Let's have some statement on, first of all, whether you think these are pertinent to all programs. Are these our two primary objectives?

BAUM: On the second one, is the purpose of this to prevent an interview from being too tightly corralled, so that the interviewee has no chance to speak at all?

DIXON: In other words, let the respondent or the interviewee direct his efforts. In the later part of the interview, you can come in with what *you* think is important.

SERRURIER: Does the first one deliberately exclude people who are neither researchers nor teachers from the possible benefits of the program?

COLMAN: That certainly wasn't our intention.

TYRRELL: Why couldn't you have as one of your objectives unrecognized needs? How do you know what the needs are going to be in the future?

COLMAN: My only feeling there would be, how do you direct something toward unrecognized needs?

DAVID BISHOP [University of Arizona]: I suggest we put in "obtain and preserve." This seems to be collecting only but not keeping.

CAPPON: I think it ought to simply read "oral communication for historical use." Why do you have to direct it to recognized needs? If this is oral history, then you're doing it for use for historical research, whatever that may be. The more you direct it to recognized needs, the more you are apt to warp the material you're gathering. I do not think you should have any needs except the general historical purposes of oral history.

DIXON: One thing that perhaps has to come in is, what is historical? Are we aimed only at historians or are we working for other disciplines?

CAPPON: Anything dealing with the past is historical. It has nothing to do with whether you are a professional historian or not.

RENZE: Following Lester's comment. "Historical information needs," because sometimes they are informational needs.

VICTOR WITTEN, M.D. [Dermatology Foundation of Miami]: The accumulation of information may be used for more than what one finds, in the dictionary sense, historical. There are numerous ways in which material may be used that at the moment may not be historical; eventually it will become so. In this way, if one really is puritan, you're going to limit the usefulness of the material you're accumulating. I'm for the more liberal interpretation.

COLMAN: You've provided the rationale for the wording we have here.

BROOKS: I'd like to support Dr. Cappon's point. We're talking about oral history. And if this group is going to set up an association, it seems to me it's going to have to define its metes and bounds. I lean a bit more toward definite metes and bounds than Dr. Starr did yesterday morning.

There are two real questions that worry me about this whole session. One of them is whether you're preserving things in oral form or not, or whether you're using the oral technique to get information, which is essentially what your statement of objectives means. The second is, is oral history history, or not? I think it should be.

DIXON: It has been suggested to me by Emmet Lavery, a playwright of some note, that these materials that we're gathering will be used in the future not only for historical purposes, but for play-writing purposes, for such works as his own *Magnificent Yankee,* for instance.

BROOKS: We wouldn't argue against their value or their utility or the desirability of doing them. It's simply what you call them.

DIXON: I think you're perfectly correct in this. And I think that we must have metes and bounds, but we can't have them too tight.

WINTHER: I was wondering why we should specify the purposes for which this information is gathered. Rather say, "obtain and preserve information for posterity." Because that's what we're doing, isn't it? And then it's open to everybody.

COLMAN: This is true. I think the thing we had in mind was the potential value. And this potential has not been realized, although we are at present making some efforts at Cornell in this direction which I'm optimistic about.

Let me give you an illustration of a project that at present we are planning that five faculty members are working on. This would involve interviews with fifteen farm families, both the farmer and the farm wife and members of the family six years old and older. These interviews would be conducted on a annual basis for fifteen years. They would be both prospective and retrospective in character. We would be accumulating information of use to historians that would enable them to write histories of farms on a comparative basis—the kind of data that is just not available at present. We would be providing material for an interdisciplinary course in decision-making on the American farm with the students in that course participating in planning the interviewing "schedule" for the succeeding years. Because if you are focusing on decision-making, you have to change questions as you move from year to year, hoping for comparability. So here, our orientation is toward historical research, sociological research and also an interdisciplinary course for classroom instruction.

Now, if we narrow this to the point where we are talking only about uses to posterity and emphasizing uses to the historians it seems to me we run the risk of discouraging people in other disciplines from making use of this technique in other ways than the historian would use it.

BROOKS: Nobody wants to discourage you, we simply want you to call it what it is.

JOSEPH MALONE [American University of Beirut]: I think we're beating a dead horse here. What we're doing is collecting historical materials and if a sociologist or somebody else wants to use it, you know, he's not going to be shot. Really all this phraseology is just a waste of time.

COLMAN: I'm inclined to agree with you. On the other hand, it's been my experience in sitting with people in academic situations that phraseology somehow turns out to be mightily important. I think what we should do is get everybody's reactions quickly so we'll have it on the record and we can try to work out some of the wording later.

DIXON: Are you in agreement with the basic statement?

BAUM: As I look this over, it doesn't seem to eliminate any kind of interviewing. Without the word "historical," it could include the Gallup Poll kind of interviews, or sociological interviews of one-hour duration. I think there should be some kind of difference between oral history and all other kinds of interviewing. It should not be on the uses, but maybe on the aims of it.

Certainly we don't want to limit the uses, because I think that oral history should have sociological uses also.

COLMAN: Very good point that we had quite overlooked here.

ALDEN MILLS [*Research Publications,* Sacramento, Calif.]: Could you simplify that by saying, "to 'obtain and to preserve significant historical information through oral communication"? Suppose a novelist wanted to use it, you'd be as glad to have a novelist use it as an historian, wouldn't you?

MAUNDER: Perhaps you would agree to add just the words "which information is not readily or easily available through other sources of history." I don't think we want to duplicate and repeat what is already available and I think we take this for granted.

ELIZABETH CALCIANO [University of California, Santa Cruz]: Could you state again exactly what we're going to do with this sentence once we've arrived at it? Aren't you afraid we're trying to rule out people? Are we trying to build a framework for an oral history group?

COLMAN: This is certainly one objective here.

MINK: I think the material that comes out of this session will be brought into focus tomorrow morning when we discuss the development of a national organization.

CALCIANO: Well, then, if somebody doesn't fit exactly into this pigeonhole, they can't belong to this organization?

DIXON: Not at all. What we're saying is that these, we hope, can be general objectives.

MINK: This is a working session. We want your ideas—a working format.

COLMAN: All of these ideas that are now being recorded will be grist for the mill. Certainly we don't want to narrow this down to where we are very small but select company. That's not our objective.

BAUM: I think your aim in this idea of recognized needs of teachers and researchers was to incorporate the idea that the interviews are not random, and that the interviewers *are* prepared on a subject. I don't think we want to eliminate the idea that there is also a preparation and aim of what we're trying to get at involved in this.

COLMAN: This is exactly the idea we want to emphasize—that anybody in the oral history business will have done their homework; they will have read appropriate materials; they will have consulted appropriate people before they go out with their tape recorders and ask questions.

Number three: To acquaint users with the process of interviews and the conditions under which interviews were held. This refers to the kind of thing Dr. Nevins mentioned yesterday afternoon: Was the respondent reluctant to respond in certain areas? What was the state of his

mind and health? Did somebody else prompt him? Who was there? Did he consult other sources? Did he insist the recorder be turned off?

Number four: To make known to potential users the availability of oral history interviews and the content of these interviews.

Number five: To make legally adequate arrangements with respondents regarding the use of transcripts and tapes, indicating where ownership of the transcripts and tapes and literary rights reside.

Number six: To maintain the integrity of the oral history process. (Under standards, how you do this will be developed.)

Number seven: To obtain, in cooperation with manuscript repositories, manuscripts and other materials which augment oral history transcripts and tapes.

WALT WHEELOCK [La Siesta Press, Glendale, Calif.]: May we use "recordings" rather than "tapes?" If anyone wants to use a disc, they still can belong, can't they?

DIXON: You can say "recordings."

MORRISSEY: The third, fourth, and fifth statements raise some difficult issues of propriety. For example, making known the content of an interview when the content is not to be made known, in accordance with the wishes of the respondent. Furthermore, this question of the interviewer taking notes about the circumstances surrounding the interview should be covered, legally or otherwise.

DIXON: May I say that I think the word "availability" before the part about content should cover that. Now if there are certain things that are sealed and certainly non-available, you can't give the content. As far as the little precis about what happened, whether the respondent was senile, or whatever, there certainly are a lot of things at UCLA that come under University policy about the use of confidential material which has been placed in the archives being subject to the permission of the office of origin. So this would be one of our "outs." However, there are things involved here that need to be gone into.

LYONS: I question the use of the third statement altogether. I don't think it belongs in any summary of goals or objectives or even for that matter, implementation. I personally don't believe it's worthwhile. In fact, I don't believe that it's a contribution to history. I think it immediately directs history in the direction that you think it should go, by saying a man was senile or something else. I think I would rather leave it to those who come after me to determine when they hear the tape as to how they evaluate it.

STARR: The point has been made also that if we allow the interviewer his licks, we ought to allow the subject his licks as to what he thought about the interviewer. [audience laughter] I honestly think we shouldn't stub our toe on this. Isn't this something for each of our respective offices to decide in the light of our discussion rather than to lay down a universal practice? I don't believe any of us could follow a universal practice.

DIXON: This is why we made up this list, to let people decide whether they are universal or cannot be.

BAUM: I think that perhaps we could include this, but interpret it broadly to the degree that we should say what the project is about and when the interviews were conducted and some information like that. How confidential your information gets will depend upon the project, but I don't think this particular statement tells whether you have to put your personal remarks in there or not. It does say that you have to identify for what purposes you went after this, or what institution you're working for, or who you are. I think that just a floating interview isn't worth much unless it has a little bit of a heading on it.

FRANK HOBDEN [UCLA]: I'm a person entirely outside the field and I find you all talking as if you think everybody else knows all about this. I'm wondering if you don't need a very general sort of statement, something like this: "To recognize that available documentary evidence may be usefully supplemented and enriched by oral interviews." Start off with this and then go down and specify things about training, legality, or whatever is involved. I think there should be some kind of setting that you put the whole objective in.

COLMAN: What we're trying to do is get out on the table the kind of objectives that have been discussed over the last several days here, and the kind that are entertained by existing organizations. I hope that all of you who have any reactions will get them on the record here so that, eventually, both the content and wording can be smoothed out and an appropriate introduction of the sort that you suggested can be provided.

Of these goals, the one that I feel the most uncertain about is the one that Dr. Lyons questioned here a moment ago—this record of interviewer process. Up until about a year ago, we did not do this because it seemed to me to raise serious ethical questions. I felt that the respondent should know every bit of information which was being preserved. And since he is not acquainted with the content of the interviewer's remarks, we had no business keeping them. I was persuaded by some of the other people who are in this business that the researcher's need to know is such that this information should be placed on record and made available to him, although it poses all sorts of difficulties both in the recording and in the utilization of it.

ECKLES: May I suggest, on this whole problem of the ethics and use of the tapes, *that you* look at standard archival practice. If you wish to see good archival practice, may I refer to what Mr. Brooks does and what I've been through this summer with the National Archives. The most strict, limited, and, I think, fair use of material on tape and on microfilm is to be found in the *Public Archives and Rules* of the Dominion of Canada. I think we can hit-and-miss around a bit, but the essence of it seems to be that what you have is stated to all possible users after you have laid down your rules. And the rules should be published so that any user of tape will know exactly what they are—maybe he even signs such a declaration—and then all you have to do, as the holder of the archives, is to abide by the rules you have set up. There are standard archival practices in Canada in both English and French. May I refer this group to them before we debate further, because I think all of our questions could be answered by the testing of *years* in using intimate documentary material. There is not a great deal of difference between making a man's written memoirs or a personal letter available for

use publicly than to get his permission to use a tape that he's made in a private interview.

As I understand, we're all going to be bound by copyright laws and I think the copyright law is such a mess now that if you wish to quote from a letter from anyone, you had better write the man himself and his family, even though this letter is in your archive and he has said it's for public use. You should be very careful. So I should say that the general rule to follow, if you want to let somebody outside the two people who made the tape, make use of it, is to get their permission if it is to go beyond, you understand, normal archival practices.

SCHIPPERS: On number three, it seems to me that, if the interviewing process is entrusted to an interviewer (whom we are starting to call an oral historian), then he is acting in the capacity of an historian, and he does have the training to make judgements. After all, if historians couldn't make judgements, we wouldn't have any written history. The point is, that this process of judging has to be done by somebody at some time. I think probably the only question is whether the interviewer, in all cases, is competent to make this kind of objective appraisal. If that could be ensured, some kind of explanation of the interview is in order, if legalities can be cleared.

WINTHER: I would go along with what Mr. Eckles has said. We could be guided by long-established rules, and then we might need to extend these rules and regulations in order to fit our particular case. I think they could be simplified and we could be guided by already established standards.

WOODS: Coming back to number three—as a practicing librarian, I see no problem here. It seems to me that the annotation, which we might call it, which goes in the front of the tapescript is similar to a book review. A man who writes a book has no right to protest if he gets a devastating review. A public librarian certainly has a right to paste a review into the front of the book. In other words, a public librarian, perhaps, has a responsibility to warn the potential reader that this book has such—and—such characteristics, written by a man who was pro-Nazi, or whatever the situation is. And the man who wrote the book has no protest against this. So I see an analogy there.

MAUNDER: Does the librarian have the responsibility of putting more than one review in?

WOOD: No. He may feel that the responsibility is to put at least one review in. Whether that review is good or bad is immaterial to the point I'm making.

CAPPON: It seems to me we're confusing two different things here in the list. One is a statement of goals for the carrying on of the processes of oral history. The other is setting up provisions or restrictions, for the use of this material. The first one, having to do with the methods that are used, is the concern of the practitioner in the process of making oral history. This is of no concern to the user of the materials. He may be curious enough to ask how this was done, but that's another matter. To what extent these materials are accessible is an entirely different proposition, and it should not be confused in a list of goals. Goals for what? First, goals for the recording of oral history—for carrying on the practice by the present standards. Secondly, the goals for making this material accessible under whatever the necessary restrictions are. These are two entirely separate problems, and I think they should be

completely divorced one from the other. Because the user of the materials is not concerned with the techniques unless he is curious just to know about it. This is something for the practitioner, for the professional people in the job.

MALONE: I would take issue with this analogy to the book review. First of all, I don't think it's anything like a book review. Secondly, just to refer to the book review, I think the author from time to time *does* have a right to protest to a review when he can demonstrate that the reviewer has not read the book.

SERRURIER: The author of a book knowingly and deliberately exposes his product to the reading public, and does it with full knowledge, while the interviewee does not. The interviewee makes the tapes with the assurance that certain restrictions will be observed, so I don't think it's analogous.

WILLIAM MASON [Los Angeles County Museum]: I was just wondering about another little conflict of house rules. In some cases, an archive is formally sealed for the benefit of the "house" historian, just on the off chance that some day he might want to use it. Would this be the case with oral history materials?

DIXON: I think we have to discuss this under ethics.

BAUM: I'm still worrying about this number one, where we snipped off the "recognized needs of teachers and researchers." I think an essential of an oral history project is that there is preparation beforehand and some kind of an idea of getting a certain amount of material. I think that has to be included somehow. It can't be left out.

DIXON: Does the preparation properly belong in a goal or in a standard? We have covered some of this in what we think are standards *based* on objectives.

BAUM: I think it's an essential part of the definition of oral history, which defines it as historical, but it's also done by prepared people. You can still walk out with your tape recorder and get something that may be historical, but you haven't done anything in preparation, and I don't think that's oral history.

DIXON: I think that's a very good point.

BISHOP: Does number four imply bibliographic organization and control on the local, national, and international levels?

COLMAN: I think that implication is there, yes.

BISHOP: I think it should be.

STARR: An additional goal which has been a long-sought goal in our minds, because we've run a general oral history operation, would be for those of us who have interests that extend beyond geographical limitations to have representatives in all parts of the country who are familiar with oral history and who could put their hands on capable interviewers and could do the job for us no matter what special project we get. Citrus growers, let's say. Here are some ex-members of the Citrus Growers Association in Florida. If you have a Miami representative,

you can include it. If you don't, your hands are pretty well tied. Extending our coverage would be a marvelous goal, I think, for oral history.

DIXON: I think, too, this can be probably one of the primary goals of an organization if we get that far in setting up the communication.

STARR: Let me discuss one little phase of improving the standards. We don't like to let flat statements or statements that are clearly wrong remain in the record, although, to a certain extent, every historian has to have the *caveat emptor,* the user beware, attitude.

DIXON: I think that the program itself has the obligation to check every date and every spelling that it possibly can. But you can go just so far and then you have to quit spoonfeeding the historian; you have to let him do a little work.

COLMAN: Let's get on with standards. I think we probably could discuss these individually. The list is much longer. Some of them are quite obvious and won't involve any discussion; others will involve considerable discussion.

The first one: To record under conditions of adequate fidelity without background noise.

LYONS: Every person's program must be dictated by his own objectives. In the years to come, the background noise may turn out to be more important than what a man says. I mean the noises in the street or a thousand and one things which would seem to us just an annoyance now, in a few centuries may turn out to be useful. Some interviews have been deliberately held in places which gave the atmosphere of what was going on, in the hospital corridor and so on. I don't say everybody should do this or nobody should do it. I just say that it should not necessarily be a standard.

COLMAN: I personally accept everything you say. What I had in mind was air conditioners that would drown out the voice of the respondent. How about, "without *distracting* background noise"?

LYONS: How about just "adequate fidelity"?

WITTEN: I can't agree with just "adequate" fidelity. It's an impossible thing, if one really tries to make it convenient for the interviewee. At times there are noises, such as birds chirping in the trees. I think it should read, "with a minimum of background," because when one listens to these things, they tend to be distracting.

DIXON: When the typist has to type them, if you do transcribe, she will *swear* that you *deliberately* drowned out this speaker.

WITTEN: To tape at the highest fidelity, requires that one be trained in it. You must be familiar with recorders, familiar with microphones and how to use them. This would be a *sine qua non,* really, if this method is to be used for a particular purpose, and should be part of the training of the interviewer.

COLMAN: Number two: To make transcripts which are verbatim translations of oral records. What this means, in effect, is that the order of the interview will not be changed, that grammar will not be corrected, that errors of fact will be allowed to stand unless they are deleted or altered by the respondent.

DIXON: This is the original transcript we're speaking of. In essence, what we're saying is, that the typist can't edit, that she must type everything she hears.

COLMAN: To eliminate any confusion, let me add another phrase here. I'll re-word that to read: To make transcripts that are verbatim translations of oral records for review by the respondent.

WITTEN: There are very good reasons for doing that. If one is going to retain the tape, it becomes absolutely necessary in the time index of tape and transcript. There is no other way of doing it.

LYONS: I object to your additional words. Some of us don't believe you should return the transcript to the interviewee. We would like to preserve the record as it is without any change.

DOUGLASS: What about adding the words, "initial transcript"?

STARR: I'm afraid we would have to depart from this totally. We have transcribers who have worked for us longer than our interviewers have and we leave it to them. We monitor their tapes, so we have this check on them. When a man clearly has made a false start, has said, "No, that's a mistake," or is repeating something for the third time, she has the wit not to transcribe it. Now, maybe we're wrong, but that's the practice we've followed. This ties up also with whether you make a final draft, and many times we do not. We'd rather have the spontaneity of the first draft. So I don't think we need to be arbitrary about this.

MALONE: I would be much happier if you would change the word "translation" to something like "rendering," because if we ever do get an oral history program going, we'll be working in Arabic and translating.

CALCIANO: I question whether this should be a standard, because, as has just been pointed out, each project has a different use that is made of its transcripts, and whether you want to keep them verbatim or not depends on your use. I wonder whether we can come up with one standard that's going to satisfy all the divergent opinions in this group, and if we can't, then should it be a standard?

DIXON: I agree on the one hand and I don't think I understand on the other. When you talk about ultimate use, are you doing a second transcript?

CALCIANO: Well, generally, I keep one transcription that's pretty faithful. I tell my typists, "Don't start for the first four minutes because we're talking about something totally irrelevant, and we were just getting loosened up." So I'm not totally faithful in that respect. I've got one interview that I did with an old gentleman who came from Yugoslavia when he was seventeen. I almost didn't get the interview because he was too proud. He didn't want his ungrammatical speech to be recorded. The only way I could get this interview was to swear that I would correct it to letter-perfect English if it killed me. I've put it in the front that I've done this. I can't have that transcript floating around with all his mistakes.

DIXON: But you had an original transcript made from this tape?

CALCIANO: I did, but I can't swear it will be seen.

DIXON: But the point is that there should be a verbatim transcript. What follows is another question.

DOUGLASS: Wouldn't it satisfy most of the people here to state, "to make initial transcripts," and leave off "for review by the respondent," because what you do after that is up to you.

DALE ODOM [North Texas State University]: I think that we all agree that we need a standard on making accurate renderings of the tapes, so why can't we just say: "make an essentially accurate record of the tape or of the oral record." There has to be an acceptance of this standard or you don't have the integrity to type what you recorded essentially.

COLMAN: I agree there are a lot of things to consider here, and this is not the final draft by any means.

One point is that it is of value to many users to know how the respondent actually spoke, whether he indeed did make three false starts, whether he indeed did have two events confused, whether his chronology was off, whether he made a few Freudian slips, whether he misused grammar. This sort of thing.

Another point, and in my mind this looms equally large, is that if the transcribers are authorized to make alterations as they find appropriate (knowing that transcribers will find different things appropriate), if the other personnel connected with the oral history program also make alterations in terms of content and the order of content, how is the user to know who did what? How is he to acquire any great amount of confidence in the material that he is dealing with? Hopefully, he wants to know what the respondent did and said, and what the interviewer did and said, and what other people involved in this process did and said. And once we open the doors to changes, once we depart from the standard that has just been laid down, temporarily and for purposes of reaction, where do we stop?

CAPPON: I think we're faced right here with a very fundamental consideration in this whole process of historical editing. You can draw an analogy to the transcript and the original written document that came from the hand of the author. The first text, so far as we can determine, is the sacred text. To what extent that may have been revised by him or somebody else puts that next document in an entirely different category in terms of its value as historical evidence.

Now, in the nineteenth century, editors, who were mostly literary people, were inclined to pretty up the historical document. If you read what is called the *History of the Expedition of Captains Lewis and Clark,* which Nicholas Biddle based upon the original journals, and you compare that so-called history of the expedition, which is really an abridged transcription of the journals, you'll find tremendous differences—additions and subtractions. You will find that the language of Clark, for example, who was not a very articulate person through his pen, is very much prettied up in Biddle's transcription. It seems to me that now, our modern historical editors would never think of doing this. This is the worst possible thing you could do, and any historical editor who works with original documents who would perpetrate this today would be damned eternally.

Now you're faced exactly with the same thing. It seems to me that the first transcript, the faithful prevailing transcript of the recording, is the sacred document. What you may do with that transcript in eliminating these repetitions and so on, is another matter. I'm sure I'm treading on some people's toes here, those who are not giving due recognition to this sacred first transcript. I think this is a very serious matter, because you're already tampering with the information that came out of the mouth of this person, whether it's bad grammar, whether it's sheer repetition. I don't think that makes a particle of difference. We've got to see more and more the analogies between the kind of document you're getting from the oral source, with the so-called sacred primary document that historians have used for many generations.

AUDIENCE: Bravo! Bravo! [much applause]

STARR: We've all got to follow the procedures that we think are best, that have worked best for us. We have a sacred obligation under the tenets that we practice to *destroy* the first draft, if the respondent so desires, because we cannot submit what he has said to the oral history collection without his consent. To obtain his consent, we let him go over what he has said. We hope that he *does* go over it and change things that, on second thought, he deems wise to change, things that he said that were downright wrong. We allow him this right; we insist on allowing it in our operation. We *cannot* submit the "sacred" first transcript. We're duty-bound, if he tells us to, to burn it. If the user of the oral history collection is under the impression that he is reading a verbatim transcript, when it says in the front that this has been edited and read by the subject, then he is a very badly mistaken person. He hasn't read his front matter and he didn't listen to us when he came to see us before looking at the collection. So I don't think they're misled as to the nature of the documents that they're reading. But *please* don't be arbitrary.

Mr. Odom suggested a very good emendation. We want to be substantially accurate. We want it to be essentially accurate, whatever qualification you put in, to allow those of us who don't follow these rigid standards to continue to operate and belong to the happy family.

CAPPON: I would like to speak to this point, if I may. I think Dr. Starr is not speaking to the point. First of all, regardless of what you do with the document, this still doesn't change the point that the original document is the primary source. Now many an original written document has been destroyed by the author. I don't quarrel with that. It's entirely up to the author if he wants you to save it,or if he wants you to destroy it. But that's beside the point. There is many a written document to which the author himself has added marginal notes or has revised. This is nothing new in terms of original source material of a written form. When you allow the author who gave the interview to make revisions of the transcript, it's still *his;* it still comes from him, even though it's in written form.

DIXON: But *he's* the one who changes it and not someone else.

CAPPON: That's right, he did the changes, so it's his work. So it seems to me the points you're making, Dr. Starr, are really beside the point. To the historian, this first primary document is absolutely the most important thing we have and you cannot take undue liberties with it. If the author demands it, that's quite another matter. That's up to him.

MASON: The responsibility is not just to the historian and historical accuracy, but also the linguist a hundred years from now might be considered here. Possibly Mrs. Calciano's Yugoslav's descendants might be more interested to hear how great-grandfather spoke than

they would be in just his story. They might even be glad to know that he knew English at all. This is one argument for saving the tapes.

RENZE: I would certainly second my colleague's remarks. One other thing I want to ask though. Why, speaking of transcripts, have we all had a meeting of the minds that there must always be a transcript? I can think of a *thousand* times when a transcript is really not germane to the questions at all, because oral history is not necessarily the transcript. I think in certain situations it may be, but, to me, we're being restrictive by assuming or agreeing that there's always a transcript.

COLMAN: I think I'm speaking for both of us here. It was certainly not our intention to suggest there should always be a transcript made, but I recognize that the way this is worded it has just exactly that meaning. So it should be, "when transcripts are made."

BAUM: In our project we do edit. In part, we're talking about the initial transcript, but in our project, the initial transcript is slightly edited, probably by the transcriber in the way that Professor Starr suggested. We cut out the "hems" and the "haws" sometimes, or the talk about the coffee as it's served, if we indicate to the typist that it is an aside. When we come in to do an interview, we turn on the tape recorder before we even sit down. We do not make a formal beginning to our interview, purposely. We talk about the dog and the children and so on. That's all on the tape. We do this purposely, and we tell the person. We try to indicate by our informality that editing is going to follow, and we feel this gives us a much freer interview. If there is not going to be editing, we do the interview, initially, in a different way. In other words, we would edit when we interviewed, and I think that would give us a different result. As it is, we're both very relaxed. We know that it's going to be edited. We will cut out the coffee at the transcribing point, and then we will reorganize some of the material before it goes back to the interviewee. We do not try to pretty it up.

Part of our purpose in editing is to make it a nice enough presentation to them, in way of sequence in content. We do some of our interviews over three or four years, so that you get a lot of repetition and you get a lot of material that is out of order. And the person worries about it a lot. When he tells you that story he forgot, you tell him, "Don't worry about it. We'll put it back in the proper chapter, later." Well then, we do edit it slightly and we think this prevents him from editing it a great deal. If you make a few small changes, you can prevent him from rewriting the whole thing. I turned back seventeen hundred pages to someone, and he is rewriting the whole thing. If I'd done a better job of editing it in the first place, he wouldn't have rewritten it. I think I was just lazy giving it to him at this time, and I think it's going to be unsuccessful.

STARR: Exactly, Mrs. Baum, if you don't edit at all, you are not even going to get the man to read the transcript, because he'll be so disgusted with the way he said things.

BAUM: That's right. He may refuse to give it back to you, because he feels like a fool!

LYONS: I would just like to make a general observation. As you know, I spoke very strongly for retaining the tapes; for making the transcripts verbatim and leaving them that way; for allowing those who don't want to transcribe, not to transcribe, and so forth. And I'm in agreement with Dr. Cappon's whole philosophy, but I also recognize that there's a point of view expressed by Dr. Starr. I favor this kind of discussion so that we know where everybody stands, and we learn from it. I think we ought not to be precise in setting guidelines, nor

restrictive in setting standards, and therefore, we ought to consider that this is simply a text on which we can all express ourselves but not a chronicle which we have to follow.

J. CARLYLE PARKER [Stanislaus State College]: I have a suggestion here. It's actually from several sources. Could we combine the groups together by making it read?: "When the initial transcripts are made, they should reflect the original intention, meaning, and style of the author."

DOUGLASS: Really, when you get technical about it, isn't the tape itself the only truly primary source in this process?

CALCIANO: Yes, you'll get many cases where the transcriber will not have been able to quite hear what was said and miss it, and where you can't remember exactly what was said.

DOUGLASS: You can't absolutely say that the transcription is ever exactly accurate.

MARY ROSENBERG [Oregon Historical Center]: It seems to me that, as we talk, it becomes more imperative for this statement which will precede the transcription, to describe in detail what *was* done to the transcription and by whom.

MAUNDER: I wonder whether we're getting just a little too pure here. Primary sources that we look at in archives are letters, diaries, and journals. These are manuscripts that are composed by their authors but reviewed in the writing of them. Here, we're talking about composing something else. And I think the author would like an opportunity to review this also before he enters it into the realm of primacy as a document. I think this is what Dr. Starr is arguing for.

CALCIANO: Since we don't agree, does it have to be a standard?

COLMAN: Well, we don't have to settle this all this afternoon.

The next standard is: When transcripts are made, to provide respondents with an opportunity to review their transcripts and to make changes they find appropriate.

OLCH: That was covered under discussion before. Obviously there are two camps. Some do and some don't.

WITTEN: I object because, since I use the tapes primarily, although I have a typed script, I would like the prerogative to use the tape as I wish. And by giving the opportunity to correct the typescript, I can't change the tape. Therefore, I can't use any of the material. This would be hamstringing me.

COLMAN: I think there are ways this can be handled. But it seems to me that the tape can be handled as a matter separate from the transcript.

DIXON: Dr. Witten, you say that you use this script when you're working with the man making the tape?

WITTEN: No, I use the script only as an index to find what I want in the tape promptly when I record abstracts; otherwise, I would have to spend hours listening to all of the tapes in order

to select a small amount of material.

COLMAN: Perhaps that could be reworded to: When transcripts are made available to researchers, respondents have an opportunity to review them.

Next: To inform users whether the transcript was so reviewed and to what extent changes were made.

MILLS: Does this apply to changes made by the respondent and by the staff, or by the respondent only?

DIXON: Changes that were made by both the author and the staff.

COLMAN: The next one relates to interviewers and their selection and training: To obtain adequate interviewers, to provide appropriate training for interviewers; and to require that they be adequately prepared before beginning an interview.

TYRRELL: Can't you just say?: "To obtain adequately trained and prepared interviewers."

COLMAN: All right, but it isn't as simple as it looks.

BISHOP: Is that to obtain or to use?

DIXON: To obtain.

BISHOP: You're going to obtain them already trained and prepared?

COLMAN: This is where the complications come in. That was why I had all that verbiage in there. Let's just deal with the fundamental questions here and we can revise the wording later.

DIXON: In other words, we need adequately trained and prepared interviewers, but where they're trained and how they're trained is another point. You have to train them yourself most of the time.

DOUGLASS: Does this imply that you are always operating with a stable of interviewers? Because our program does not function that way.

DIXON: This means that if you expand, then this is one of the things you want.

DOUGLASS: I don't know that we'll ever do it that way.

VOICE: [to Douglass] You're the interviewer?

DOUGLASS: No, I'm not the interviewer. We use our faculty.

DIXON: But the faculty members are trained and prepared interviewers.

DOUGLASS: Well, that's why I'm asking though. Are you implying that the interviewer is an

animal that is universally trained by the program?

COLMAN: No, not necessarily.

WHEELOCK: I'm curious. Are you going to defrock an oral history interviewer because he didn't happen to prepare and had to take it spontaneously? Is this going to determine stripping him of his microphone?

RENZE: Aren't we just trying to say that we need to recognize the need?

COLMAN: Yes, I think so.

ODOM: To avoid slipshod interviewing.

STARR: I must confess we've sent out many an untrained interviewer on a special project, and by the time he got a quarter of the way through, he knew quite a bit about what he was doing, thank heavens. But we want to foster the training of qualified interviewers.

DIXON: But this is why we're trying to establish some sort of standards--for people in the future.

STARR: I think "fostering" would entail a footnote: the preparation of a good interviewer's manual.

DIXON: Would you write it for us? [laughter]

STARR: I don't know how to begin.

DIXON: We wouldn't either.

COLMAN: To accompany the transcript with a clear photograph of the respondent as he appeared at the time of the interview. We don't assume the standard is going to be met, but that this is desirable.

DIXON: This is what we're trying to say: "These are desirable things that we can work toward."

COLMAN: I might point out that, at Cornell, we never have made any requirement about that. We simply found that most interviewers, on their own, recognize the importance of doing it. I don't think I've ever even mentioned the subject, but somehow we do seem to have photographs. And I think that it's not a very hard requirement to meet.

DIXON: Berkeley's manuscripts are greatly enhanced by the use of photographs, and it adds a lot to the interview.

WITTEN: It's not only the photograph at the time. After all, the interview involves the interviewee's entire life, and I have found that the families have been quite cooperative in

supplying pictures that had been taken through the many years. This adds immeasurably, really, combined with other memorabilia.

COLMAN: Next: To accompany the transcript with a bibliography of all sources consulted in preparation for the interview.

STARR: I think that's a wonderful idea, but, it's going to be awfully hard for me to get my people to do their homework, if they have to list ten thousand different sources. I wonder if that's not just in the realm of a good idea.

COLMAN: This is just exactly my thought, as I had no idea how I'd get the people to do it. But if this were a goal that was agreed upon by a professional group as desirable (such as Ph.D. requirements are established), we might be able to obtain something we would all regard as useful.

STARR: I agree with you on "desirable," but not on "required."

COLMAN: The next one: To provide, as a minimal standard, card-file index and page index of proper names and general subjects to accompany the transcript.

CAMPBELL: It occurs to me that this is like machine information retrieval. I would hate to put all the names on card files and run them through a computer.

ODOM: They're talking about it as a minimal standard here.

CAMPBELL: That's why I want the word "minimal" struck out.

MORRISSEY: I'm having a hard time restraining myself from saying, "Ah, this is very ideal," but as people say in Vermont, "Where is the money going to come from to do it?"

DIXON: These are standards we have thought up. You know, the more of them you can abide by, the better. But don't you have to have some basis for some kind of standards?

ODOM: Why don't you change this word "standards" to "ideals"? [laughter]

COLMAN: Next one. To bracket in the transcript all emendation supplied by others than the respondent. Such as, when first names are supplied. In many cases, the respondent will not use a first name. It's of considerable value, particularly if the man's name is Smith, to have his first name in there. If the staff supplies that first name, it should be put in brackets. If any other information is supplied, it should be placed in brackets to alert the respondent that that was not part of the interview.

TYRRELL: I don't want to quibble, but shouldn't the interviewer get that information?

DIXON: If he can get it. But there are times when you can't get it. There are times when he may say, "I don't remember." So that if you do supply it, then you're not giving him credit or taking away credit.

KANDELIN: This reminds me of the use of brackets in some of my transcripts, not names, but verbs and adverbs to describe actions, attitudes, moods, and emotions. We had one talented transcriber (who we couldn't afford for very long) who gave us vivid transcripts by inserting such words as "lowly," or "quickly," "long pause," or "with great emotion," and so forth. Should that be mentioned here?

DIXON: May I say that when you read Dr. Kandelin's transcripts, you can almost hear the people because of what this woman did to the transcripts. And this is information supplied by someone other than a respondent.

COLMAN: Next one: To inform respondents of all copies of transcripts which have been made and inform respondents of their contents.

DIXON: In other words, the copy he gets is the same as the copy placed in the institution or elsewhere.

BAUM: Why don't you put, "where deposited."

DIXON: Well, "of all copies made and place deposited."

BAUM: I'm trying to indicate where they are, such as, when we send you one, they know you have a copy.

MALONE: I just would like to ask Mr. Colman if he's going to do that with his farm families?

COLMAN: We haven't worked out the details on this yet. [much audience laughter]

MALONE: I think it's an important question, because as you know, I'm a little bit worried about what I call "court history"--working with statesmen and men of letters and that sort of thing. If you're going to be dealing with people who are the postmen and the firemen and the people who were in the great earthquake in Alaska and that sort of thing, you're going to have a terrific problem in reaching this standard.

COLMAN: There's no question of it. It seems to me, however (I feel quite strongly about this one), that this is an implementation of our goal about following ethical procedures; that we're not holding back anything that they do not know about.

MALONE: May I pursue this just one step further? There is a great problem here, because at some point, I foresee the situation in my own program, if we ever get it launched, of going out and chatting with some Bedouin in the Aden Protectorate and getting him to talk simply because he doesn't see a lot of paraphernalia around. He's a Bedouin, and I want to talk to him about the tribe he belongs to, where he came from, how he participated in some great event. If I showed up with the tape recorder, quite obviously under my arm, I might frighten him away. I've been tempted to go and have a tape recorder under my coat, you see. But this is a very big ethical question that I would like to have discussed here.

LYONS: I think it's more than an ethical question. It can be a very dangerous requirement, as

many of these standards are. We may actually be doing a disservice to ourselves and to others among us, or to others outside of our group, because, if we don't conform to each of these standards at some time or other, someone who perhaps is miffed about something, can point to these very standards of the very organization to which we belong and point out that they were not fulfilled. I, therefore, feel that, while we ought to go through all these, we ought to seriously consider scrapping them all and making general statements. These are good suggestions for all of us as to what we can do, but I'd hardly like to see them as standards which we should have to follow.

BAUM: On this last one, I would like to make this even more restrictive, in that we not only inform respondents of all copies, but inform them in the beginning where copies will be deposited; and if we wish to deposit others elsewhere, that we get their permission before doing so.

BISHOP: This would cut out all xerography then, because you couldn't possibly make another copy for Bibliotheque Nationale if they happened to want one.

DOUGLASS: Yes, this is a legal question. *We* can't do it. We can't give a copy to anyone unless we ask the interviewee.

TYRRELL: I think that's implicit.

COLMAN: The next one is: Titles and terms will be avoided which suggest that the end product of oral history is history. For example, "oral historian."

BROOKS: I think there is serious question about the term oral historian. Mr. [Joseph] Harris [State University of New York], who has done some interviewing in Africa, has some interesting observations on that, where the oral historian is the person who carries on the culture by oral methods. And there are other reasons why this term might be somewhat suspect. But I'm wondering what is the purpose of this objective? To avoid implying this is history? If it's oral history, why isn't it history?

DIXON: It's the *material* of history, isn't it?

COLMAN: I think the thought is this: We know why the term "oral history" is with us. The explanation has been provided by Dr. Starr and Dr. Nevins. It's become generic. It's misleading. A lot of us have tried to think of a better term, but we couldn't come up with one. Certainly we tried at Cornell. It wasn't solely the fact that it had become generic that deterred us--we couldn't do any better without a long unwieldy term. But let's not continue to mislead. Let's stop where we are.

BROOKS: I don't think it's misleading, necessarily. I object to that objective.

MALONE: This means, of course, that when you want to interview people, you call up and say, "This is an office, the name of which I cannot mention." [laughter]

CAPPON: I think that every technique, method, or what-have-you has to have its terminology,

and it seems to me you're kind of hamstringing yourselves. I don't favor the term "oral historian." I think that's a bad phrase. If you said "oral recorders" or something like that, that would come nearer to what you're doing, but I think every technique and method has to have terminology. You have to agree on the basic terminology; otherwise, you can't communicate very well among yourselves. So I don't see why you should hamstring yourself by forbidding it. You've got to have it. It's a question of what it will be and how much sense it makes.

PARKER: I suggest that, if you really want to do this, you had better do away with the term "oral history." For example, the Mississippi Valley Historical Society did away with the journal by that misleading title. And they were in operation for several years before they finally did away with it.

ODOM: Can't part of this be avoided by phrasing this positively rather than negatively? What you're trying to accomplish here is to get across to people who are going to be working in oral history or using oral history that what we're providing is the substance with which you can write history.

WITTEN: It appears at this point that it's necessary to make definitions for those who participate in this program. If one is not going to call them oral historians (and I agree that they shouldn't be), there should be another name for the people working in this field.

BAUM: We've got to have a terminology. Right now at Berkeley, we people who work in oral history are "editors," and you've just about eliminated the editor functions from oral history, and you're liable to eliminate us completely. [laughter]

COLMAN: The last is: The final selection of respondents shall be determined exclusively by the personnel of oral history programs; the content of interviews shall be determined by program personnel and respondents. This is to assure us freedom of operation, so that somebody outside the program does not tell us that we cannot add certain things and that we can't interview certain persons.

LYONS: Are you going to refuse a grant? [laughter]

DIXON: We have a question here. Should an oral history office turn down a grant, if the granting agency wants to limit the subject to be covered or review the manuscripts with an eye to possible censorship?

BAUM: I'd like to comment on this last one. I disagree with it, simply because I think it's fine, and I think that the determination would be in the best possible hands. But I don't think that we would be able to get through the University on that basis.

DIXON: Do you mean that the University says you have to interview certain people, or does your committee say you have to interview certain people?

BAUM: I think that this is too impossible a statement. Certainly, there should be something brought out which gives the oral history personnel some degree of selection. I think to give them exclusive selection is not going to fit into many institutional programs.

DIXON: This is in the final selection that we're talking about now. Not the fact that people make recommendations, including your faculty, or anything like that. I think that the office itself should determine the final selection and the order in which the interviews will be done.

BAUM: It's still too strongly stated. It's a standard which many of us could not meet.

STARR: I think it's probably one of those things that we can't enforce. But I think it's a desirable goal to include, and I hope it's implicit that members of my advisory committee (and Allan Nevins is the chairman of it) are free to make suggestions.

COLMAN: Well, that completes the list. Does anyone have an addition?

PARKER: I was wondering if we should make a provisional objective: cooperation and reciprocal agreements of subjects and respondents is encouraged.

LYONS: Couldn't it be stated?: "To promote cooperation among all oral history programs."

STARR: I would think that should be Point One.

RENZE: When you get down to a very practical situation, if an organization should result, I believe that will be settled for you pretty well. But you've got to state what your objectives are.

PARKER: I have another comment that I think you should consider, especially if you start an organization, and that is some consideration of accreditation.

STARR: One other objective might be to foster the use of oral history materials, where appropriate, as a teaching device. This has been very useful at Columbia in seminars, when we've used oral history materials to train history Ph.D. candidates in the evaluation of source material. There is a wonderful future for oral history here.

MARGUERITE COOLEY [Arizona State Library]: As one who has not done any of this at all, might I just make one suggestion: If you would please stay with very broad and overall statements, these standards and objectives that can be accomplished. With all the so-called "nit picking," you could scare everybody off. [laughter and applause]

COLMAN: At this point, we're ready to thank you for your thoughts, your contributions, and your reactions.

COLLOQUIUM SPEAKERS

DR. PHILIP C. BROOKS, Director of the Harry S. Truman Library, Independence, Missouri, received his Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1933. Prior to entering federal service, Dr. Brooks taught at the University of California, Berkeley, and George Washington University , and served as Bibliographer for the American Historical Association. Since 1935, he has served in a number of capacities with the federal government, including the posts of Records Officer, National Security Resources Board; Chief, Federal Records Center, San Francisco; and Director, Harry S. Truman Library. He is the author of a number of historical studies as well as books on records management. Dr. Brooks is an active member of the Society of American Archivists and served as president from 1949 to 1951.

DR. GOULD P. COLMAN is Director of the Cornell Program in Oral History. He received his B.A. in 1951, and his Ph.D. in 1961, in American History, from Cornell University. He inaugurated an oral history program at the New York State College of Agriculture in 1962. This program broadened in scope, and in 1965 was established as the Cornell Program in Oral History with no geographical or subject limitations. Dr. Colman is the author of various publications including articles on the subject of oral history.

MRS. ELIZABETH I. DIXON, Vice-Chairman of the Colloquium, was Head of the Oral History Program at UCLA. She received her B.A. in International Relations from the University of Southern California in 1960, and her Master's degree in Library Science from UCLA in 1961. She has published several articles in the fields of oral history and California history, and is editor of the Oral History Department of the *Journal of Library History.*

PROFESSOR WAYLAND D. HAND received his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in 1936, and joined the faculty of the University of California, Los Angeles in 1937. He is a member of the American Folklore Society, the Modern Language Association, and the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast and was recently honored with the fourth International Giuseppe Pitre Folklore Prize for his two-volume work entitled, *Popular Beliefs and Superstitions from North Carolina,* part of the seven-volume set known as the Frank C. Brown Collection of North Carolina Folklore. Professor Hand has twice been a Guggenheim fellow and is Professor of Germanic Languages, Director of the Center for the Study of Comparative Folklore and Mythology, and Chairman of the Faculty Advisory Committee for the Oral History Program at UCLA.

DR. ALBERT W. KANDELIN is a graduate of the University of Michigan and received his training in psychoanalysis in Los Angeles. He is a member of the American Medical Association, the American Psychoanalytic Association, a Fellow of the American Psychiatric Association, and Chairman of the History Committee of the Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Association. He has been in private practice since 1948, and is also currently serving as an Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at UCLA.

MR. JAMES V. MINK, Chairman of the Colloquium, is University Archivist and Director of the Oral History Program at UCLA. He received his B.A. in 1946, and M.A. in 1949, in History, from UCLA and taught history at this institution. In addition he received the graduate degree B.L.S., in Library Science from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1952, and a

certificate in Archival Administration and Preservation from the American University, Washington, D.C., in 1953. Mr. Mink is author of various publications in western American history, archives, and library science, including *The Papers of General William S. Rosecrans and the Rosecrans Family*. He is a member of the Society of American Archivists.

MR. CHARLES T. MORRISSEY is Director of the Vermont Historical Society. His experience in oral history began in 1962 at the Harry S. Truman Library; two years later, he was asked to take charge of the newly formed oral history program for the John F. Kennedy Library. He served as Chief of the Program until August 1966. Mr. Morrissey is the author of many articles on the subject of oral history.

PROFESSOR ALLAN NEVINS is Senior Research Associate at Huntington Library in San Marino, California, and DeWitt Clinton Professor Emeritus of American History at Columbia University. He has twice received the Pulitzer prize for biography and is a Gold Medalist of the National Institute of Arts and Letters and the New-York Historical Society. Among his many publications are *The Emergence of Lincoln; The War for the Union; Ford, the Times, the Man, the Company;* and *Herbert H. Lehman and His Era*. Professor Nevins launched the first oral history program in the United States at Columbia University in 1948, and currently serves as Chairman of the Columbia program's University Advisory Committee.

MR. DONALD J. SCHIPPERS, Colloquium Recorder, has been an Interviewer-Editor for the UCLA Oral History Program since 1961. He received his B.A. in History from UCLA in 1964, and is completing graduate studies in the History of the American West at Occidental College.

DR. LOUIS SHORES has been Dean of the Library School, Florida State University, since 1946. He has been in the library profession since 1918, having held a variety of distinguished posts including Librarian of Fisk University and of Peabody Institute of the City of Baltimore. He is the author of many works in the field of library science as well as an editor of encyclopedias. In 1966 he founded the *Journal of Library History* and is the editor of this periodical, the first to contain a regular department devoted to the subject of oral history.

DR. LOUIS M. STARR received his Ph.D. at Columbia University in 1954. From 1954 to 1957, he served as Director of the Sevellon Brown Foundation for the Study of Social History and American Journalism. Since 1956, he has been Director of the Columbia University Oral History Research Office. He is an Associate Professor in the School of Journalism at Columbia and author of *Bohemian Brigade: Civil War Newsmen in Action*. He has also contributed to the *Dictionary of American Biography*.

FIRST NATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ON ORAL HISTORY

ROSTER

Douglass Adair, Professor of History, Claremont Graduate School

Ed Ainsworth, Columnist, Los Angeles *Times.*

Katherine Ainsworth, Chairman, California Library History Committee, California Library Association

Warren Albert, M.D., Associate Director, Archive-Library Dept., American Medical Association

Laird Anderson, Manager, Community Relations, 3M Company

Willa Baum, Head, Regional Oral History Program, University of California, Berkeley

John M. Berutti, Sierra College

David Bishop, Librarian, College of Medicine Library, University of Arizona

Philip C. Brooks, Director, Truman Library

Christian Brun, Head, Dept. of Special Collections, University of California, Santa Barbara

James Bylin, Reporter, *Wall Street Journal*

Elizabeth Calciano, Editor, Regional History Project, University of California, Santa Cruz

Rita R. Campbell, Archivist and Research Associate, Hoover Institution, Stanford University

Lester J. Cappon, Director, Institute of Early American History & Culture

J. J. Cardoso, Asst. Professor of History, Chico State College

Gould P. Colman, Director, Cornell Program in Oral History

Marguerite B. Cooley, Director, Dept. of Library & Archives, State of Arizona

Elizabeth I. Dixon, Head, UCLA Oral History Program

Enid H. Douglass, Executive Secretary, Oral History Program, Claremont Graduate School & University Center

June Barth Dow, Official Representative, University Extension, University of California

Robert Eckles, Professor of History, Purdue University

Harold F. Elliott, Manager, National Archives & Records Service

Amelia Fry, Oral Historian, Regional Oral History Program, University of California, Berkeley

Bernard Galm, Editor, UCLA Oral History Program

Mary Ellen Glass, Research Assistant, Desert Research Institute, University of Nevada

Martha Gnudi, History Librarian, Biomedical Library, University of California, Los Angeles

Wayland D. Hand, Director, Center for the Study of Comparative Folklore and Mythology, UCLA

Joseph E. Harris, Associate Professor of African History, State University of New York

Catherine Harroun, Interviewer, Regional Oral History Program, University of California, Berkeley

Raymond Henle, Director, Herbert Hoover Oral History Program

Mrs. Raymond Henle, Assistant to Director, Herbert Hoover Oral History Program

Frank E. Hobden, Director, Academic Communications Facility, University of California, Los Angeles

Albert W. Kandelin, Chairman, History Committee, Los Angeles Psychoanalytic Association

Jane Kimball, Reference Librarian, University of California, Irvine

Robert Knutson, Head, Dept. of Special Collections, University of Southern California

H. J. Koenig, Regional Director, National Archives & Records Service

Don Kunitz, Head, Dept. of Special Collections, University of California, Davis

Albert S. Lyons, M.D., Archivist, Mt. Sinai Hospital, New York

Joseph J. Malone, Professor of History, American University of Beirut

Theodore Marburg, Professor of Economics, Marquette University

William Mason, Associate Curator of Archives, Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History

Elwood R. Maunder, Executive Director, Forest History Society, Inc.

Walter McCausland, Vice-President, Buffalo & Erie County Historical Society

Knox Mellon, Jr., Chairman, Dept. of History, Immaculate Heart College

Alden B. Mills, Editor, *Research Publications*

James V. Mink, Director, UCLA Oral History Program

Everett T. Moore, Assistant University Librarian, UCLA

Charles T. Morrissey, Director, Vermont Historical Society

William V. Nash, Assistant Director, University of Washington Libraries

Allan Nevins, Senior Research Associate, Huntington Library

E. Dale Odom, Coordinator, Oral History Program, Assistant Professor of History, North Texas State University

Peter Dean Olch, M.D., Deputy Chief, History of Medicine Division, National Library of Medicine

John W. Orton, Research, Genealogical Society, Church of the Latter Day Saints

Allan Ottley, California Section Librarian, California State Library

Grayce B. Owen, Records Manager, Dept. of Library & Archives, State of Arizona

J. Carlyle Parker, Head, Public Services, Stanislaus State College Library

Dolores C. Renze, Archivist, State of Colorado & President, Society of American Archivists

Joseph H. Riggs, Associate Professor of Speech, Memphis State University

Mary Rosenberg, Student, Oregon Historical Center

Donald J. Schippers, Interviewer-Editor, UCLA Oral History Program

Sheldon T. Selesnick, Coordinator, Psychosomatic Research, Mt. Sinai Hispital, Beverly Hills

Zenna Serrurier, Educator, Los Angeles City Schools

Louis Shores, Dean, Library School, Florida State University

Ronald L. Silveira De Braganza, University Archivist, University of California, San Diego

Sam B. Smith, Director, Tennessee State Library & Archives

Harlan L. Soeten, Curator, San Francisco Maritime Museum

Edward B. Stanford, Director of University Libraries, University of Minnesota

Louis M. Starr, Director, Oral History Research Office, Columbia University

Ruth Teiser, Interviewer, Regional Oral History Program, University of California, Berkeley

Adelaide Tusler, Interviewer-Editor, UCLA Oral History Program

William G. Tyrrell, Historian, Division of Archives & History, State Education Department, New York

George E. Warren, University Archivist, University of Oregon

Walt Wheelock, Historian & Publisher, La Siesta Press

Nancy E. Whitten, Librarian, History Collection, University of California, San Francisco

Oscar O. Winther, Professor of History, Indiana University

Victor H. Witten, M.D., Trustee, Dermatology Foundation of Miami

Raymund F. Wood, Associate Professor, School of Library Service, University of California, Los Angeles