

Running Head: OREGON SOCIAL

Oregon Social Hygiene Collection Analysis

April Younglove

Emporia State University

Oregon Social Hygiene Collection Analysis

Fred B. Messing was secretary from 1929-1940 of the now defunct Oregon Social Hygiene Society (OSHS). In 1960, Messing's widow donated her husband's personal papers along with all of the OSHS files in Fred Messing's possession, to the Oregon Historical Society (OHS) (OHS librarian-archivist, Jeffrey Wexler, personal communication, March 8, 2008). Thus, although the Oregon Social Hygiene Collection includes some of Messing's diaries, personal awards and photographs, it primarily documents the society's activities. The OSHS Collection consists of 6 cubic feet of photographic, typed, printed, published and unpublished, handwritten, copied, and original materials. OHS preserves the 32 bound volumes and other loose papers and ephemera in 5 document cases and 13 flat boxes. The records within these boxes and cases include mailing lists, receipts, packing slips, blank scraps of paper, filled in diagnostic and personality tests, annual reports, advertisements, graphs, clippings from newspapers, ads for office products, membership cards, correspondence, first person narratives, scrapbooks, diaries, and personal awards of Mr. Messing. The Rabelaisian list goes on, but we will stop here.

The Oregon Social Hygiene Society started out in 1911 as the Portland Social Hygiene Society (PSHS), a sub-committee of Physical Department of the YMCA. PSHS changed its name shortly after forming to OSHS to make the society eligible for federal tax-support (Avery, 1956, p.1). The Oregon Social Hygiene Society was just one of many Hygiene Societies formed in the early part

of the last century. We know this because the entire OSHS collection is littered with tri-fold pamphlets from other regional hygiene societies. Most of the pamphlets are located in files and volumes that contain “samples of printed matter” according to the finding aid, but a few appear in with news clippings and with the society’s synopsis materials located in 17/1.

By looking at the pamphlets and at Mr. Messing’s personal scrapbook, one begins to see that these societies initially formed as a reaction to the tragic and rampant syphilis outbreak of that era. The hygiene societies reacted not unlike many people responded in the 1980s to AIDs.¹ In order to combat venereal disease, OSHS in particular advocated, among other things, posting placards in public restrooms, distributing books and pamphlets, establishing free clinics, creating a national registry of the infected, isolating disease carriers in camps, sterilizing the mentally feeble, and passing laws to regulate those places where sexual disease might spread unnoticed: in taxis, trains, dance halls and hotels (according to its statement of purpose taken from box 2, folder 9). It’s not clear from the records what lead to the organization’s eventual demise, but rolls show dwindling membership over time after the 1940s, as their original goal to stamp out syphilis most likely faded into the background with the invention of penicillin.

When looking at this collection, one begins to wonder, what materials from the Social Hygiene Society’s *didn’t* Mr. Messing possess at the end of his life? To

1

“A mysterious epidemic, hitherto unknown, which had struck terror into all hearts by the rapidity of its spread, the ravages it made, and the apparent helplessness of the physicians to cure it.’ A quote about AIDS? No. It’s about the appearance of syphilis in the early sixteenth century. Writer Colman Jones finds the two diseases share issues, from science and public health to civil liberties and sexuality” (CBC Radio. 1996, np).

determine the true physical and substantive scope of this collection and to assess its current organization and storage methods, we will have to choose a point to begin wading through the papers, and then dive right on in.

To the archivist, a paper is the most basic unit of a manuscript repository, and a record the standard element of an archival repository (Hunter, G., 2003, p.3). Because this collection contains both the personal manuscript papers of Mr. Messing and the organizational records of OSHS, and does not distinguish between the two either in original file order or in finding aids, I will be using both terms here somewhat interchangeably. For this discussion, we will also primarily be concerned with the keepers (archivists) and users (researchers) of archival papers; however, this does not mean that record makers will be ignored. As the renowned archivist Shellenberg (1956) reminds us, in his definitive book, *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques*, documents have primary value to their creators, and secondary value only to researchers. The archivist who organizes records for later use must also keep in mind that documents have senders, receivers, formats, and intent.

For the record keepers, the records reveal important clues, hints not just about the original intents of the records and their makers, but also about the journey that the papers took to get to their current owners, about their original organization, and about their current state of disrepair and their ability to be restored. Provenance and original order, the twin pillars upon which modern archival theory rest, concern themselves with the first two puzzles (the past and present lives of records), while preservation addresses the question of their

future. Researchers may be interested in the background, provenance and original order of the collection. However, these researchers will not be able to adequately use a collection unless archivists have first taken measures to preserve it and provide access by providing a representative description of contents and assigning appropriate keywords to the collection in the catalog.

There are many points at which one could dive into a discussion of the Oregon Social Hygiene Collection. However, I will not begin with the posters warning men against sexual disease medicine quackery that are so hilarious to our current eyes, or open up with a description of the intriguing pages upon pages of personality tests administered to young teenage girls (most of whom are likely grandmothers by now). Instead, I will begin my analysis of the Oregon Social Hygiene collection with box 5, folder 1, which, according to the collection's finding aid, contains "Financial records, general, 1933-1940, undated." In opening up this folder, one discovers dozens of loose scraps of papers, many small enough that they flutter right out of the folder and into one's lap: receipts.

Frequently overlooked and certainly not as glamorous as an artifact as the *Book of Kells*, the common store receipt, nevertheless, is a relevant document of a particular transaction between a buyer and a seller. In David M. Levy's (2001) *Scrolling Forward*, Levy considers the humble receipt a representative archival document and declares that "should we find beauty, depth, and power in *these*, we will surely have accomplished something"(8). In determining the activities of the Hygiene Society, receipts are an important piece of the historical puzzle. The researcher hoping to discover what a typical educational presentation by the

OSHS might have been like can use its receipts to try to match names of purchased films with listed dates and locations of presentations in other folders. This would allow a researcher to make fairly educated guesses about what young women at a certain place and time just been shown a film of before OSHS handed them surveys to fill out.

In addition to gleaning film titles, dates, and prices from invoices, other information can be learned as well. In the past, when executive secretaries such as Mr. Messing had clerical assistance and more time to spare than their busy modern counterparts, chief executive officers, it the appears to have been common courtesy (at least for Mr. Messing) to write a letter with every purchase detailing what it would be used for and why, and inquiring about the weather and the family of the seller. One can tell that Mr. Messing sent such letters to sellers because of the lengthy replies that he received back from them along with his filled purchase orders. For instance, one particularly juicy letter accompanying an invoice, written by Mr. Addison W. Baird of The Addison Press, reads, "As there was no piece of literature on Masturbation [sic], the Social Hygiene Society people intimated that perhaps I was the man to write a pamphlet. Here it is" (dated June 25, 1938, located in 5/1). We can guess from this information that Mr. Messing was requesting documents on the topic masturbation from publishing houses along with his purchase orders. We also learn from the accompanying pamphlet by the aforementioned letter writer, that some publications were created especially for OSHS.

In addition to telling us about the educational, preventative, medical, and legal goals of the Oregon Social Hygiene Society, the physical nature of the records themselves testify to the times in which the makers created them. Splashy India ink blots and beautiful scrolling cursive adorn papers with stylish pre-printed headers in the roaring 20s. Annual reports in the 1930s assure members that their decline in membership is only due to the inability of many to pay the \$20 membership fee, and not to a sudden occurrence of moral lassitude. Finally, during the wartime of the 1940s, OSHS members did their part to conserve by using both sides of paper, even cobbling together two different pages with glue to form a whole page on occasion.

Because the typewriter came into use in 1868 before the society's records begin, and photocopying began in the 1960s after these records ended, most of this collection is either handwritten or typewritten. The majority of the copies in this collection have been made with carbon paper, or the truly old fashioned way, by typing a second copy. When the files do have duplicated materials, they appear to have come from a professional printer: for instance, slick looking membership cards pre-signed by the organization's president patiently wait in one file for new members' wallets. A few items do reflect more unusual copying technologies though. Examples of multigraph copies and stencils for mimeography (both early 20th century copying technology) can be found in 1/1, Box 13 and 1/5.

By looking through the receipts of the Oregon Social Hygiene Society, one realizes that, incredibly, there *are* formats and types of materials not physically

represented in this eclectic and often seemingly disorganized collection. The Social Hygiene Society bought and used on a regular basis, globes and maps, original slides and slide projectors, and books for their lending library – none of which are currently in the OSHS collection. The likely reason for this is that although the collection's scope covers the activities of the whole society, only documents generated by or kept by Mr. Messing survive. In other words, not everything that the OSHS owned was kept by Mr. Messing to later become a record, and Mr. Messing was a long time secretary of the organization and not their long time museum person or librarian. This means that, despite the fact that his secretarial term only accounts for a small fraction of the organizations total time in existence (see fig.4), much of the focus of the OSHS collection is on Mr. Messing and his activities, which consist of putting together ads, ordering pamphlets, writing letters and keeping minutes. Because so much of the organization's documentation survives, we know that Mr. Messing had a penchant, if not for organization (judging by the mishmash of folder contents etc.), than at least for basic history and preservation.

Provenance is an archival word for record heredity. Who had the documents before the current owners? And before that? The Oregon Social Hygiene Collection is now in the care of OHS. Since we know that in 1960, the widow of the Fred B. Messing donated her husband's papers to OHS, we know that the previous owner was Fred Messing. Before Mr. Messing, the papers most likely were in the care of the OSHS secretaries he succeeded, generally belonging to the OSHS itself. This is why the collection is named for OSHS and

not for Mr. Messing or for the Oregon Historical Society. If one did not have access to a finding aid or a friendly librarian (like I did) one still might be able to piece together the provenance of the collection, by realizing that the bulk of the collection consists of organizational records.

Original order refers to how that the records were arranged by their creators. Archivists generally attempt to preserve original order because it helps give context to records and show their intended relationships to one another. Thus, a folder full of receipts is more meaningful than a single receipt, and can come to be more significant when it is seen within the context of the series of financial records it is placed in. When original order is confusing or possibly absent in places, the attempt to recreate it can be quite a chore (or challenge if we prefer to view things more positively). In the case of the Oregon Social Hygiene collection, determining the collection's original order is where my investigation became a true investigation and not just a summary.

The collection was probably processed in 1960 when it was donated after Mr. Messing's death. However, it was not accessioned and given a finding aid until 1996. Because I do not have access to any processing notes or materials (e.g. a collection file or donor file with correspondence with the donor and early lists as received), I had to do a little detective work to discover what the original order might have been.

My first surprise, at this point, was when I looked at the legacy finding aid and compared it to my electronic encoded archival finding aid. The old card catalog claims that the OSHS collection consists of, not 5 document cases and

13 flat boxes as the online finding aid claims, but instead 32 volumes and 2 boxes. There appears to be a discrepancy. Because the collection is measured differently in the two finding aids (document cases and boxes vs. volumes and boxes), I set out to see if these numbers can be reconciled.

The numbered bound volumes in the collection have two sets of volume numbers. Typed labels on the front covers list a volume number and sometimes a Roman numeral, while Arabic numbers (called “old” numbers in the finding aid) are handwritten on the spines in black or white ink. Roman numerals, when they appear, match with the number on the typed label and not with the handwritten numbers. Therefore, I decided to make a list of the volumes in the “old” numbered order to see if it would reveal any useful patterns (see figure 1). In this arrangement, it became clear that volumes 1-13 contain meeting minutes arranged chronologically, while volumes 14-25, on the other hand, are not in date order and contain a variety of materials, including: samples of printed matter, news clippings, photographs, and membership lists. Minutes from vols. 01-03 originally appeared to be missing, but were located filed loose in folders 1/1, 1/2 and 1/3. Hole-punches in the documents indicate that they were removed at some point from 2-ring binders. Minutes from 1934-1938 (most likely the first part of volume 13) have been similarly dis-bound from a 3-ring binder and are filed loose in folder 1/4.

If we hypothesize that the old volume numbers represent the original order, why is it that the volumes after 13 are not arranged chronologically? For an idea of just how out of date order they are, see figure two, a list of the

numbered volumes that I reordered chronologically. It's hard to imagine that these volumes were numbered before information was entered into them, because it would mean more or less pulling books off the shelf to write in at random (look at figure 2 again and picture the volumes being chosen in this order). Therefore, it seems likely that the original order is reflected in the "new" numbering system with the Roman Numerals. The volumes with old numbers 14-24 were most likely numbered to match the first 13 volumes after the completion of the series, either by OHS or by Fred Messing. It is possible that Mr. Messing put together the later scrapbooks as a means of archiving old paraphernalia since volume 20 from 1899-1907, is confusingly titled, "Fred messing scrapbook" on the cover. Mr. Messing wasn't even alive at this time period.

To better compare the two numbering systems, my archives instructor, Mary Jo Pugh made a chart juxtaposing the new numbers, old numbers, and the Roman numerals (figure 3). Pugh's chart makes it easy to see that the reason the two numbering systems differ is because the "old" numbering system failed to take into account two volumes that seem to be missing from the collection altogether. Some of the meeting minutes, as I mentioned, originally appeared to be missing, but were located dis-bound and in file folders. It is unclear where minutes from 1914-1916 (originally volume six) and 1921-2923 (originally volume 11) are, however. These volumes seem to have been skipped over entirely in the "old" OHS system of numbering, which is why the two sets of numbers do not match after volume five. My hypothesis is that OHS actually is responsible for assigning both sets of numbers (old and new), and that the original volumes

either had no numbers, or occasional roman numerals. Perhaps OHS began to refer to the this first system of numbering as “old” when they did the finding aid years after the original card file and realized that some meeting minutes were not included in the “old” system. This would mean that the “new” more accurate system would be closer to perhaps an original system, even though this is quite confusing as the newer system is technically older.

The OSHS Collection also suffers from both a lack and a surplus. As we know from looking at the charts below, entire volumes of meeting minutes are lacking from the collection. Possibly these minutes were lost by Mr. or Mrs. Messing, or more likely, they were missed in the original appraisal. If the donor was made aware of the collection gaps at the time of appraisal (gaps which may not have been intentional), she might have been able to retrieve and include the missing material at that time. I do not know whether OHS did this or not, because I do not have access to accession documentation. One reason to suspect that OHS did not perhaps do a thorough review of the materials during appraisal is because missing volumes six and eleven (new numbering system) are not noted as being missing on either the catalog card or the electronic finding aid. This is unfortunate, since such a note would have provided a much-needed clue to understanding the original order of the volumes and may have negated my need to make charts in to understand the order.

Since we know that records are missing from the meeting minutes series, it is my suspicion that other records may be missing from the collection as well. I discovered that there are financial records gaps from: 1895-1911, 1915-1916,

1926-1933 and 1940-1960. Other missing records might be harder to identify since not all records were created or retained in date order.

It is evident that while relevant records were missed in the content analysis phase of appraisal, potentially irrelevant materials were meanwhile accepted. On a collection level, the appraisal decision to keep Mr. Messing's personal papers interfiled alongside the organizational records of OSHS is questionable. OHS has physically located personal papers and organizational files together, by keeping them in the same boxes and collection. The finding aid also organizes the papers and files together intellectually, including Fred Messing's correspondence along with Society correspondence and filing his diaries next to Society diagnostic tests in the subject files series. A more focused approach would have been to either accept the organizational records while refusing Mr. Messing's personal papers, or to split the personal papers and the organizational records into two entirely separate collections.

Little weeding was done during processing on a file or document level. There are half a dozen identical copies, in some places, of a particular pamphlet or form letter. Blank scraps of paper and junk mail have not been removed either and appear throughout the collection. Some documents have been left in their original envelopes, still folded. These surplus items add unnecessary bulk to the folders, which adds to the storage costs of the collection, without adding much context or information for the researcher.

Because of the lack of weeding and processing, there are preservation problems facing the OSHS collection. Many documents have paperclips rusting

away in place. In Mr. Messing's personal papers, photographs are occasionally filed next to acidic paper. Some documents in the collection also have sun and water damage that may or may not have been present before accessioning. In addition, although not a result of processing oversights, inherent vice in the many of the scrapbooks and numbered volumes will cause long-term deterioration. Some volumes have loose or rotting binding. Many of the volumes include papers and ephemera that have been glued onto to various pages. These ephemera will probably deteriorate more rapidly than if they had not been glued into the books (because either the glue itself or the acid in the mounting paper will chemically react with the ephemera and eventually destroy them).

Like Alice, one may feel that unraveling the mystery of the original order and trying to understand the lack of processing and preservation done on the OSHS collection is curiouser and curiouser. In my reference interview with OHS staff member Megan Fridal, I learned that the OSHS collection is one of its most popular and heavily used collections. It could be that in the case of the OSHS collection, that archivists appraising the usefulness of the collection and weighing the preservation costs simply decided to perform minimal processing in order to get it out to the public more quickly. On Google Scholar, a quick search reveals that a surprising number of journal articles have been written about or reference the Oregon Social Hygiene Society collection. It seems likely that the expectation, even before accession, was that it would be of such high interest that users would prefer to have materials sooner rather than to have more carefully archived materials.

Balancing the institution's need to preserve a collection and the researcher's need to use a collection can be tricky. Archivists Boles and Young (1985) created a "black box" method to help with such dilemmas. They emphasize three areas of decision making – determining the value of the information, estimating the costs of retention, and balancing political and procedural conflicts. If the value of the information was great enough, and the benefit of letting researchers have speedier access to the collection outweighed the benefits of weeding and preserving the collection, then perhaps the current level of weeding was appropriate.

An institution's decision to do minimal processing on a collection might affect the level of information available in its finding aids on that collection. Interestingly, although minimal physical processing was done on the OSHS collection, the electronic finding aid available through Northwest Digital Archives (NWDA) is somewhat robust. As I mentioned earlier, a legacy finding aid in the form of a card in a card catalog exists that is very brief – the collection description takes up the front and half of the back side of a single 3x5 card. However, the later electronic finding aid has more information than either the MARC record in the historical society's online catalog or the MARC record listed in WorldCat, the largest national cooperative catalog. The MARC record in WorldCat for the Oregon Social Hygiene Society records appears to have been drawn directly from the OSHS Online Public Access Computer (OPAC) record and is displayed with only some minor tag name changes, for instance listing "Document Type" instead of "Genre/Form" (as that field is called in the OPAC).

The MARC record for the OSHS collection is available through OHS's Online Public Access Catalog. OHS allows remote access to its MARC records without a password, but it does not go so far as to provide users with a raw MARC view. The OSHS MARC record includes the necessary corporate author, added entry, title statement, description, call number and subject access tags, as well as a paragraph length summary and a biographical/historical note. It also includes pointers to the NWDA finding aid embedded in the MARC record. The summary and biographical/historical notes are very general and do not impose any intellectual order onto the collection. For instance, the summary note is little more than a survey of the topics and types of materials in the collection listed in no particular order. From a researcher's point of view, this summary is nice as an overview. Perhaps it includes keywords that would lead me to the collection, but without further description, it is not as useful.

I would prefer to also have a list of file titles in this MARC record to help guide me through the collection once I got to it. At OHS one must request a single box at a time and as the OSHS collection is 10 cubic feet, it would be hard to know where to start or what to request for viewing based on the MARC record alone. In addition, if I were not a library student, I would probably not know what some of the MARC tags such as "Corporate Author" and "Name Added Entry" and mean. Changing these tags on the patron's screen to say "Added Author" or leaving off the "Corporate Author" tag if it matches the title statement might be more user friendly.

When searching their OPAC from the OHS research library, I found that subject access was acceptable, but incomplete. By perusing through journal articles that reference the OSHS collection, I can see that popular subjects include OSHS's views on the sexual education of young people, their involvement in eugenics advocacy, and their early literature about syphilis. Although the term "venereal diseases" is mentioned in the summary note, syphilis is never specifically mentioned. There is no mention in the MARC record of eugenics at all. When looking for information on OSHS's sexual education work, searching is easier, although not foolproof. I initially tried the term "morals" in the OPAC's simple search box and was shown three search results, none of them the OSHS collection. This puzzled me as I knew that the term "moral education" is one of the subject headings in the record. Apparently, the catalog is not able to "stem" words, that is, to recognize that "morals" and "moral" are the same word. If one searches for "sex education," the result is better: the OSHS collection is listed on the first page of search results. The words "sex" and "education" are located separately in the MARC record, but their search algorithm is able to make the match for me.

Interestingly, when searching for the collection by "Oregon Social Hygiene Society," several other records are listed as search results that refer directly to the Society. Some of these appear to have a single item that references the OSHS, and one match appears to be a secondary source written about them. The separately listed "Report of activities of the Oregon Social Hygiene Society" (alternately titled, "Record of achievement 1919/20"), however, is puzzling. If, as

the record says, its corporate author is the OSHS, then why not include it in the OSHS collection? Does OHS not extend the concept of providence to items that are accessioned at different times? Perhaps this signals, like the inclusion of Fred Messing's personal papers in an organizational records collection, that OHS has a definition of providence that is non-standard?

Unlike the MARC record in the OHS OPAC and in WorldCat, NWDA's finding aid describes the collection in far greater detail and imposes an intellectual order onto its contents. The physical materials of the collection are organized according to size and binding (unbound records go in files, bound volumes are stored in boxes). Beyond this, however, there is no overarching arrangement to the physical materials (items are not necessarily in date order within files, for instance). However, intellectual organization of the records on the electronic finding aid brings order to the collection by listing groups of like materials together. The writer of the finding aid breaks the collection into the following four series: Minutes of meetings, correspondence, subject files and financial records, and lists the file titles and locations in each series.

This intellectual arrangement is useful because it allows us to identify additional gaps in the collection (although it does not necessarily answer questions as to why the gaps exist or where the missing material might be). By listing a container location and a description (usually file title) for each file in the series, the user can more easily browse the collection's contents and can make a somewhat educated guess about which boxes to request from the Oregon Historical Society for viewing. The series' of Minutes and Financial Records are

fairly easy for the researcher to navigate (if you don't take into account the thorny new/old volume issue), however, the Correspondence and Subject Files are not as easy to work out. Both of the latter series mix personal and organizational files. Although the folders or boxes containing the papers of Fred Messing typically have file titles that indicate his authorship of them, this is not always true. In addition, the Subject File names can be especially misleading. For instance, "Publications from other sources" sounds as if it might be a folder full of leaflets and fliers, but it is actually a complete original narrative created and typed by the OSHS and then glued into a scrapbook and illustrated with cut out pictures from magazines and pasted-in examples of what the written text is referring to. All of the series' with the exception of the Subject Files are arranged in chronological order on the electronic finding aid. The Subject Files series appears at first to be arranged alphabetically by file title, except that the alphabetical order breaks down about at 15/1 for reasons that remain unclear to me.

It seems that folder titles were most likely assigned during processing as all folders appear to be identical and match the folders seen throughout OHS. It is not clear if the titles were taken from old folders and transcribed onto new ones, but in either case, the contents of each folder are not very organized. Few records are arranged alphabetically or chronologically within file folders, for instance. Most file titles merely attempt to describe what the bulk of that folder appears to contain.

The collection level description in the NWDA finding aid is similar in places to the MARC record collection description. The Historical Note, for instance, in the electronic finding aid, contains many of the exact same words and phrases and the Biographical/historical note in the MARC record. However, the finding aid is far more detailed. It expands upon the MARC record significantly, adding information about its original formation, activities, and funding. In addition, the finding aid adds a second paragraph to the Historical Note, giving a brief biography of Mr. Messing and explaining what his connection to the society is. It is not apparent from looking at the MARC record that Mr. Messing's personal papers make up a prominent section of the collection. He is not mentioned at all in any of its notes. The finding aid also took information that was previously in the summary section of the MARC record and moved it to the more appropriate category named "Content Description." In its summary, the finding aid briefly describes in a three sentences what the hygiene society is, who Fred Messinger is, and what the four areas of arrangement are instead.

As a researcher, I primarily relied on the electronic finding aid and did not use the OHS MARC record at all. I found that the finding aid's listing of folder titles was incredibly valuable. Without actually changing the collection and sorting Mr. Messing's papers from the OSHS's records, there is little that I might add to or change about the electronic finding aid to make it more complete. However, a series level description might be helpful if it described the physical and intellectual arrangement of the collection. For instance, it would have been nice to have a note about the "old" and new numbering system of the volumes. I also

would have appreciated a either a note about the series files, explaining a bit more about how and why the titles are grouped together, or perhaps a different approach to the subject files altogether. Otherwise it subject files section appears to be a lazy catchall area for “everything else.”

Overall, the Oregon Social Hygiene Society records are a valuable part of the Oregon Historical Society, enhancing the understanding of those who wish to learn more about Oregon’s past. Those who are interested in the Oregon Social Hygiene collection would be wise to come in and make use of it sooner rather than later. Preservation issues, although not immanent, face these fascinating and often used papers. Fortunately, as time has gone on, finding aids to help researchers understand and access this collection have become increasingly descriptive and complete. It is my hope that in the future, these tools will become even better, perhaps clarifying some of the more confusing aspects of this collection and including digital surrogates so that researchers can even view papers without damaging them.

Works Cited

- Avery, C. (1956). Toward an understanding of sex education in Oregon. *The Coordinator*, 5(1): 1-10
- Boles, F. & Young, J.M. (Spring 1985). Exploring the Black Box: The Appraisal of University Administrative Records. *American Archivist*, 48: 121-140.
- CBC Radio. (1996). "Deja vu: AIDS in historical perspective." *IDEAS*. Excerpts available online at: <http://www.cbc.ca/ideas/features/Aids/index.html>
- Hunter, G. (2003). *Developing and maintaining practical archives* (2nd ed.). New York: Neal-Schuman.
- Levy, D. (2001). "Meditation on a receipt." *Scrolling forward: Making sense of documents in the digital age*. New York: Arcade Publishing.
- Schellenberg, T. R. (1956). *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Figure 1: Volumes in old numbered order

Meeting minutes volumes:

(Missing minutes from vols. 01-03 are filed loose in folders 1/1, 1/2 and 1/3; hole-punches indicate removal from 2-ring binders)

04 – 1912-1913, meeting minutes

05 – 1913-1914, meeting minutes

(Missing minutes 1914-1916)

06 – 1916-1917, meeting minutes

07 – 1917-1918, meeting minutes

08 – 1918-1919, meeting minutes

09 – 1919-1921, meeting minutes

(Missing minutes 1921-1923)

10 – 1923-1929, meeting minutes

11 - 1929, meeting minutes

12 – 1929-1934, meeting minutes

(Missing vol. 13. Minutes from 1934-1938 are filed loose in folder 1/4 and show evidence of removal from a 3-ring binder)

Non-meeting minutes volumes:

14 – 1913, undated data

15 – 1914-1917, undated samples of printed matter

16 – 1917-1919, undated, samples of printed matter

17 – 1937-1940, scrapbook

18 – 1919-1921, undated publications from other sources

19 – 1913-1914, lists, misc.

20 – 1899-1907, Fred messing scrapbook

21 – 1917-1923, news clippings

22 – 1915-1916, news clippings

23 – 1928-1937 (circa), news articles and photographs

24 – 1911-1916, Lists of contributors

25 – 1914-1919, membership lists and contributions

Other unnumbered bound volumes

6/6 diaries (3 vols)

5/2, 5/3, 5/4 cash books

5/5 ledger

10/2 scrapbook

18/4, 18/5 – record books

Figure 2: Numbered Volumes arranged chronologically

- 20 – 1899-1907, Fred messing scrapbook
- 24 – 1911-1916, Lists of contributors
- 04 – 1912-1913, meeting minutes
- 14 – 1913, undated data
- 05 – 1913-1914, meeting minutes
- 19 – 1913-1914, lists, misc.
- 15 – 1914-1917, undated samples of printed matter
- 25 – 1914-1919, membership lists and contributions
- 16 – 1917-1919, undated, samples of printed matter
- 22 – 1915-1916, news clippings
- 06 – 1916-1917, meeting minutes
- 07 – 1917-1918, meeting minutes
- 16 – 1917-1919, undated, samples of printed matter
- 21 – 1917-1923, news clippings
- 08 – 1918-1919, meeting minutes
- 09 – 1919-1921, meeting minutes
- 18 – 1919-1921, undated publications from other sources
- 10 – 1923-1929, meeting minutes
- 23 – 1928-1937 (circa), news articles and photographs
- 12 – 1929-1934, meeting minutes
- 17 – 1937-1940, scrapbook

Figure 3: 1ST Half of Mary Jo Pugh's OSHS Collection Chart

OSHS vol #	OHS old vol	Content	Current location	Notes
<u>1</u>		Executive Committee minutes, 1911 Sept-1912 Jan	1.1	2 hole punch
<u>2</u>		Executive Committee minutes, 1911 Sept-1912 Jan	1.2	2 hole punch
<u>3</u>		Executive Committee minutes, 1912 May-Oct	1.3	2 hole punch
<u>4</u>	4	Minutes 1912 November 1- 1913 September 6	6.1	
<u>5</u>	5	Minutes 1913 September 1-1914 October 9	6.2	
<u>6</u>		Missing minutes 1914-1916	0.0	
7	6	Minutes 1916 April 14-1917 November 9	7.1	VII (7)

8	7	Minutes 1917 November 16-1918 October 25	7.2	VIII (8)
9	8	Minutes 1918 November 1- 1919 October 31	8.1	IX (9)
10	9	Minutes 1919 November 7- 1921 June 3	8.2	X (10)
<u>11</u>		Minutes 1921—1923	0.0	
<u>12</u>	10	Minutes 1923 September 24-1929 Feb	9.1	
<u>13</u>	11	Minutes 1929 Feb-Oct	9.2	Vol IV (4), pages removed?
<u>14</u>	12	Executive Committee minutes and reports 1929 September 29-1934 October 1	10.1	
<u>15</u>	13	Minutes, 1934-1938	1.4	3 hole punched, for binder

	14	Data 1913, undated	14.1	Vol 1 is this Vol 1 of volumes of data?
	15	Samples of printed matter 1914-1917, undated	11.2	Vol II (2) -- 5 entries on fly leaf, note page numbering. Were there preceding volumes of samples of printed materials or were these three vols in this order in the office?
	16	Samples of printed matter , 1917-1919, undated	12.1	Vol III (3)
	17	Scrapbook 1937-1940	12.2	
	18	Publications from other sources 1919-1921, undated	13.1	Cover title Your City A book for Mayors, "The Municipity is interested in the problems of disease control because..." pages with numbered pictures
	19	Lists, miscellaneous), 1913-1914	13.2	membership lists. Instructions for managing membership information. 132 No. 1 Letters, clippings of Oregon legislators
	20	Fred Messing scrapbook 1899-1907	14.1	personal papers?
	21	News clippings , 1917-1923	15.1	

	22	News clippings 1915-1916	15.2	
	23	News articles and photographs , circa 1928-1937	16.1	un id pix, not in same time period as clippings
	24	Lists of contributors and other lists circa 1911-1916	18.3	Those who have given \$ 5 or over
	25	Membership lists and contributions 1914-1919	18.2	3 hole punch on short side, pasted over original form with title "current expenses YMCA

Figure 4: Date ranges represented in the Oregon Social Hygiene Collection

