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Introduction

There is no all-encompassing fixed theoretical definition for a community archive that appropriately covers every community archive in operation today. Archivist Andrew Flinn, in his article “Community Histories, Community Archives: Some Opportunities and Challenges”, proposes that a community archive is a grassroots activity with the goal of “documenting, recording and exploring community heritage in which community participation, control and ownership of the project is essential.”¹ Flinn is thinking primarily about the history of community archives in the United Kingdom, but his take on a community archive working for a specific community as a part of that specific community holds true.² A key part of Flinn’s definition is the aspect of community ownership that dictates how the archive functions and what objects it collects to preserve the community’s history as the community sees fit. A community archive exists to preserve the history of a group of people not fully represented by a traditional archive, at least initially, and the archiving process serves to create a cohesive understanding of the community. These types of archives present a revised memory of an event or a group of people in a way that brings attention to the community that may not exist otherwise. Without community involvement in the archival process, the archive eventually ceases to represent fully the history of that specific community.

Since there are no set rules for what a community archive is exactly, or how they operate, archivists executing the collecting, documenting, and preservation of the group’s ephemera are

² In his writings, Flinn regularly references “heritage groups” when discussing archival parlance and, at times, he blurs the term with community archives. For this purpose of this work, community archives serve as a more general term that encompasses heritage groups and other similar collecting organizations that exist outside of the formal institutional setting.
free to determine their own level of autonomy. Community institutions often develop archives from the work they accomplish interacting with their specific community and these archives operate as a complimentary portion of the organization’s mission. Community archives typically function on a smaller size compared to their more formalized counterparts. Funds and resources are limited, particularly for staffing and storage space. It is common for the archivist tasked with managing the collection to have no formal archival training, particularly in the early formative stages of the archival project. These limitations make it difficult for community archives to realize a clear mission of preserving the history of their community.

The dialog between community and institutional archives about what an archive ought or ought not to collect justifies the existence of community archives borne out of exclusionary archival practices. Flinn further argues in his definition that a community archive adopts the term “archive” to remain broad and inclusive in its collecting. By not placing rigid limits on what is collected, community archives provide a more thorough look at the history of the community. Many community archives founded as early as the mid-1990s exist digitally or have a strong digital presence that helps increase accessibility to the information, adding an extra layer to the debate about what constitutes a community archive. These archives adapt to new technological advances quickly, sometimes more so than their institutional counterparts, as a way of overcoming limitations.

Some community archives, unable to sustain themselves independently, establish partnerships with formal institutions that contain larger archives with multiple collections.

---

4 For this paper, institutional archives and formal archives are used interchangeably to describe an archive that operates with a professional staff utilizing formalized archival techniques following a system of best practices. These archives usually have a more reliable budget, and are often operated by universities and various local and national government entities.
5 Flinn, "Community Histories, Community Archives,” 153.
Universities and government institutions are the most common sources for these partnerships as many of these collecting institutions are involved with other aspects of the community group. The degree of community involvement in the partnership ranges from complete autonomy of the archive supplemented by professional support, to a system where the community offers their own opinions to the formalized staff with the final say about the storage and preservation of the collections.  

These partnerships tend to lead to the institutional archive absorbing the collection of the community archive, as the formalized archive invests more resources or interest into the community’s preservation project. When legal ownership of the archival holdings transfers from the community to a new institutional setting the community risks losing control of their own history if the institution no longer maintains the original partnership. A community archive in a formal setting also lacks consistent usage or purpose for the institutional group with the potential of simply storing away the content in an inaccessible manner. The lack of specific rules for what constitutes a community archive leads to collecting without the community’s involvement once the archive transfers ownership to the formal institution. The institutional use or control of these archives is not a negative however, as the acquisition of a group’s ephemera becomes a sign of acceptance for the community entering into a formalized narrative, though the degree of this acceptance varies.

Hesitancy in the formation of partnerships is common if the community feels threatened or distrusts the institutional entity. In his article "The Archival Sliver: Power, Memory, and Archives in South Africa", Verne Harris, the Director of Research and Archives at the Nelson Mandela Foundation, provides a stark example by discussing the damaging effects of the

---

6 Flinn, et al., "Whose memories, whose archives?,” 73.
Apartheid movement on the archival profession in South Africa. Beginning in the late 1970s, as the Apartheid leadership slowly separated from the South African government, small independent community archives collected more openly the history of those persecuted by the regime. The community groups resisted working with the State Archives Service because it excluded non-Afrikaans or English language users and its collection practices served the goals of the Apartheid government’s racial separation.7 The State Archives Service, now the National Archives of South Africa, and other institutional archives still struggle to form partnerships with the community archives working in South Africa. The State Archives Service appraisal process for the acquisition of new holdings was deeply secretive, and the members of the excluded communities were unable to monitor how appropriately the government organization handled their documents.8 Harris’ writing about the South African community archiving problems the country faces represent an extreme example of archival distrust between communities and institutional archives.

In order to maintain a community archive in an institutional setting, the archivist, no matter his or her level of training, must remain invested in and maintain a partnership with the community the archive serves. This partnership is key in all aspects of the archiving process, but it is particularly important with regards to archival appraisal for new additions to the archive when collecting on the behalf of another group.9 If the professional archivist works outside of the community, appraisal is an especially difficult task requiring much research not only about the

---

8 Ibid., 78-79.
9 Archival appraisal refers to a set of decisions relating to what objects are included in a specific archival holding, usually made by the archivist in charge of a collection. Proper appraisal takes into consideration the current collection, the aims of the collection, and benefits of the new object for the collection among other factors. For a theoretical look at objective and subjective appraisal and control of archival acquisition see John Ridener. From Polders to Postmodernism: A Concise History of Archival Theory. (Duluth: Litwin Books, LLC, 2009).
group, but about the potential new objects also. Communication between the archivist and the community is necessary when establishing how to handle or present the archival materials outside of the storage areas. While it is still possible for an archive to collect a community’s history without interacting with the community, the archive cannot be a true community archive without the involvement of the community in the archival process.

This thesis looks at three distinct community archives in the United States: two located in the West Coast and one in the Midwest. The first, the Farmworker Movement Documentation Project, began as a project created by a former volunteer, LeRoy Chatfield, nearly a decade after the death of Cesar Chavez, the United Farm Workers (UFW) union founder. This archive brings together the experiences of the volunteers, many of which ran crucial aspects of the UFW’s boycotts. The Farmworker Documentation Project, as it functions under the ownership of the University of California San Diego, exists as an academic tool for researchers and other scholars interested in the work of the UFW that primarily took place between 1962 and 1993. The direct link between the community and the collection, Chatfield, has no formal ties with the university and no longer works on growing the archive.

The second community archive, the Oregon Hops and Brewing Archive, collects the history of the community of brewers and hop farmers in the state that is the largest producer of the plant. This archive is the first of its kind to look historically at the cultural and social significance of beer production in communities primarily within the state of Oregon, but also in the surrounding Pacific Northwest region and abroad. The Oregon Hops and Brewing Archive has always operated out of the Oregon State University Special Collections & Archives Research Center. A rich history of hop growth and research at OSU firmly grounds this archive, which merges the institutional archive with a specialized community in the state of Oregon. The link to
the hop farming and beer brewing community outside of OSU currently seems minimal for this new archive.

The Japanese American Service Committee (JASC), based in Chicago, Illinois, is the final archive studied in this thesis. The JASC began as a service organization with a mission that involved helping Japanese Americans readjust to life after the World War II internment camp history. Through the organization’s direct interaction with the Japanese American community, the JASC developed an archive and library filled with educational materials pertaining to Japanese life in the United States.

Each of these three community archives has its own unique story and group of people served by archival efforts, but they all actively work to highlight the significance of the specific community. All three archives currently operate under an institutionalized gaze and the level of partnership between the institution and the community has differed for all three over their lifetimes. The age of each archive also differs but none of them operated as an archive before 1999, though some collecting occurred well before then by all three groups. These three diverse examples, when looked at together, show that the term “community archive” encompasses a variety of relationships, decisions, and structures that differ from collection to collection when put into practice.
The Farmworker Movement Documentation Project: A Monument to the Volunteers

The Farmworker Movement Documentation Project is a born digital archive created by former United Farm Workers of America (UFW) union organizer, LeRoy Chatfield.\(^{10}\) The archive, established in 2003, became a digital depository for discussions, media, oral histories, writings, and other primary source materials compiled by Chatfield from his personal collecting and the collections of many past farmworker movement volunteers. The farmworker movement and the creation of the UFW took place between 1962 and 1993 on an international level. Chatfield sought to use the project as a way to include the other voices within the movement and expand the academic knowledge about the UFW outside of what is available in the Wayne State University archives, which he thought focused too narrowly on the leadership of the movement.\(^{11}\) Between April 2003 and January 2005, Chatfield was able to compile a list of 1158 former volunteers, and he ultimately made contact with 645 of those volunteers whose various contributions are now in the archive.\(^{12}\)

In chapter four of his essay titled “LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973”, held by the Farmworker Movement Documentation Project archives, Chatfield discusses the early history of the project and the inspiration for it. While this documentation project is about the early history of the UFW, Chatfield and the project do not have a formal affiliation with the UFW as it exists from Chavez’s death to the present. He originally titled it “NFWA, etc.” after the National Farm

---

\(^{10}\) Within this thesis, the term “born digital” refers to a collection or an object created through electronic means. Born digital collections typically exist on a computer hard drive rather than a more physical box or shelved storage location.

\(^{11}\) In brief, the UFW archive at the Walter P. Reuther Library at Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan consists of the papers of many higher ranking union leaders in the movement. The archive also holds periodicals relating to the farmworkers and various issues they struggled with leading up and after the formation of the UFW and government documents with boycott records.

Workers Association as a way of separating himself from the current UFW. He begins his short story in April of 2003 at the sixty-fifth birthday party of the then former California Governor Jerry Brown, an ally of the UFW movement, where he interacts with several other people associated with the UFW. Chatfield looked at the former governor’s birthday party as an eye-opening event, where he realized how long ago the farmworker movement occurred and how many of the people involved with the cause were now aging. He knew many of the volunteers had never publicly told their personal stories about their time spent working with the UFW, a formative event in the lives of many past volunteers.

The Farmworker Movement, born out of a lifelong struggle by many migrant farmers trying to make a life for their families along the west coast, reached its politically contentious height in the early 1970s, just before stalling mid-decade due to internal divides between Chavez and the leadership. Thousands of volunteers, inspired by Chavez’s highly publicized fasts, worked with the UFW organizers to boycott the grocery stores and shipping organizations worldwide that marketed grapes grown in Delano. The boycott took advantage of the secondary boycott tactic, allowed by the exclusion of farmworkers from the 1935 National Labor Relations Act under the Taft-Hartley amendments. These secondary boycotts allowed the UFW to target grocery stores selling or using the produce of the growers that refused to negotiate contracts with the UFW. Consumer pressure forced these retail stores to distance themselves from the grower’s products to avoid hurting their own bottom line. The global boycott strategy proved successful

---

13 Ibid.
14 In addition to his governorship from 1975-1983, Brown currently serves as California’s thirty-ninth governor. He entered the office again in 2011.
for the UFW during the early 1970s, and they began working to transition to a full-fledged union that negotiated contracts between various California growers and the farmworkers.

The transition from social movement to union created a new set of problems for the UFW. Managing contracts proved more difficult for the UFW organizers. Many had no experience working for a union and a rivalry between the UFW and the Teamsters Union exacerbated problems with the contract negotiations. After the success of the grape boycotts, growers worked with the Teamsters “to sign secret sweetheart contracts,” at the benefit of both the Teamsters and the growers who avoided working with the UFW representation. The Teamsters attempted to discredit the UFW’s nonviolent image by routinely attacking volunteers, resulting in the deaths of two UFW allies among other brutal attacks in 1973. Chavez worked to maintain his nonviolent strategies, and, after the state enacted the California Agricultural Labor Relations Act (CALRA) that banned the secondary boycott, switched tactics to seek political assistance for the farmworkers through the CALRA board and the newly appointed Governor Jerry Brown.\(^\text{17}\) Agricultural businesses dominated the California political structure, and they used their influence to stagnate the UFW, rendering the union powerless to help the growers. Chavez’s distrust of his leadership increased at this time, and, in a fit of paranoia, he worked to purge the union of board members and volunteers.\(^\text{18}\) These purges, the turning point for the union, acted as a divisive moment for many volunteers who left the union dissatisfied with its progress toward helping the farm workers.

Around the same time as Brown’s birthday party, Chatfield had also been in regular correspondence with Professor Paul Henggeler of the University of Texas-Pan American History.

\(^{\text{17}}\) Ibid., 51-53.
Department. Henggeler reached out to Chatfield numerous times between November 2002 and early 2003 to discuss his research of the farmworker movement and a project he was working on involving transcribing the tape recordings of the UFW board meetings that occurred between 1976 and 1981.\(^\text{19}\) During the earlier stages of these board meetings, the UFW was restructuring the ranks of its leadership after the purges of the numerous leaders and volunteers Chavez distrusted following the failure of the UFW’s campaign for Proposition 14.\(^\text{20}\) Much of the correspondence between the two serves as the foundation for the Farmworker Movement Documentation Project, and it now exists through a retelling by Chatfield in essay form stored within the archive. Chatfield viewed Henggeler’s project as important, but only capable of producing a narrow view of the volunteers working for the UFW because many of these board meetings were about the internal leadership struggles instead of the work the volunteers performed.

The Farmworker Movement Documentation Project ambitiously seeks to move the modern focus of the farmworker movement from Chavez and his leadership alone back to the volunteers and organizers that made the movement a success. Chavez was a fallible leader, particularly when looking at the UFW and the struggles the organization underwent as they worked to better the farmworkers. In his essay, “LeRoy Chatfield 1963–1973”, Chatfield recalls the creation of the Farmworker Movement Documentation Project. He speculates how a monument to the volunteers might look in contrast to the Chavez sculpture in Sacramento commemorating his 1966 “March to Sacramento.” Chatfield states that in his version of the monument, Chavez’s name is not included with those of the more than one thousand volunteers because he believes that the volunteers need recognition apart from Chavez and outside of his

\(^{19}\) Chatfield, “LeRoy Chatfield 1963-1973”.
\(^{20}\) Garcia, *From the Jaws of Victory*, 219-220.
large shadow. The volunteers, particularly those outside of California, routinely relied on their own ingenuity and skills while receiving minimal direct input from Chavez. The Farmworker Movement Documentation Project, following along with Chatfield’s speculation, serves as the monument to the volunteers of the organization, and it helps them have a voice ten years after the 1993 death of Chavez.

Chatfield believes that the persona of Chavez, who could not have completed the successful boycott programs and union organization alone, often overshadows the importance of the volunteers within the movement. The celebrations of Chavez, especially when comparing his actions to those of Martin Luther King Jr., drew attention to the issues surrounding the citizenship of Mexican Americans in the 1970s. Many Americans found it easier to sympathize with the problems surrounding individual citizenship after the turbulent civil rights era than they did with the cause of the farmworkers who were trying to improve their economic situation.

Setting Chavez apart from the volunteers as this monolith of a leader is dangerous to the history of the movement because of the “historical subversions” that arise out of positioning him as a heightened presence over the movement. In order to run the UFW and the many aspects of the movement that occurred across the country and abroad, Chavez heavily relied on the advice of his organizers and mentors, along with the volunteer support that grew out of the UFW’s public appeals to help the cause. In his book, Beyond the Fields: Cesar Chavez, the UFW, and the Struggle for Justice in the 21st Century, Randy Shaw devotes an entire chapter to the discussion of the careers in social justice had by many UFW volunteers after they left the union.

---

22 Cowie, Stayin’ Alive, 54.
Shaw’s look at the post-UFW careers of the volunteers aligns with Chatfield’s monument idea, as it attempts to provide some recognition for the work done with the UFW while also highlighting what the union inspired these volunteers to do in the future. Several of these volunteers used their UFW training to continue successfully working for farm worker justice, or other social movements around the country.

In the fourth chapter of “LeRoy Chatfield 1963–1973”, Chatfield briefly describes the central role he occupied among Chavez’s loyalists both before and during the purges. Chatfield first joined with the UFW in 1963 during the Tulare rent strike against the Tulare County Housing Authority, where he worked as a leader of the marches for better housing for the farmworkers in the county. A member of the Christian Brothers, Chatfield, or Brother Gilbert, as he went by at the time, was still working as a member of the clergy, and this strike was his first experience working as an organizer. By the mid-1960s, Chatfield left his religious post to start working full-time for Chavez on the grape boycotts, organizing pickets against grocery stores, primarily in California, that carried anti-union grapes. After working closely with Chavez for ten years, Chatfield left the union in 1973 to focus on establishing stability for his family, whom he had moved up and down the state of California dozens of times as he followed Chavez’s orders.

Several of Chatfield’s essays mention how favorably Chavez viewed him and the work he did for the union and the farmworker cause. Chatfield stresses how important his leaving in good terms was for the documentation project because he did not personally alienate anyone once associated with the UFW’s earlier history, and he could more easily reach out to the

24 Garcia, From the Jaws of Victory, 35.
volunteers without worrying about personal tension. Additionally, Chatfield continued communications with other members and allies of the UFW, and he explains that this better situated him to carry out a project of this magnitude. Other than a reliance on those providing information for the content and contact information, Chatfield seemingly worked alone while he collected the materials for his archival project until he started publishing the documents and media in website format.

From May 2004 to January 2005, the project facilitated an online discussion about the movement using a Listserv. Chatfield moderated the conversation and invited 301 former volunteers to participate of which, 275 people shared their unique experience with the movement and its leader, Chavez, in a series of email messages. Overall, the Listserv discussions are unedited in terms of content, and they cover a wide range of topics from early Community Service Organization leadership, to speculations for why the movement faded from view going into the 1990s. These Listserv conversations became the first published portion of the NFWA project, which briefly took the form of a multimedia compact disc circulated to a small audience prior to the formation of the website in 2004.

There is an issue of exclusion within this archive as Chatfield restricted participation to members that worked full-time for the United Farm Workers union at some point between 1962 and 1993. This does limit the voices presented, but only to a small extent that likely helps limit Chavez bashing by dissatisfied volunteers. Chatfield’s focus on full-time volunteers allowed him more in-depth personal accounts that specifically dealt with the UFW and limited the less substantial stories. The majority of the part-time volunteers were the farmworkers themselves, many of whom worked at the farms and helped the union at inconsistent rates. Chatfield believes

26 Ibid.
that only those working full-time for the union had the dedication required for changing the lives of the farmworkers, though he admits that many of the union’s organizational tactics, primarily those surrounding the boycotts and the California proposition campaigns, heavily relied on part-time volunteers for their ability to mobilize quickly.27

Chatfield additionally failed to connect with any of the members of the Chavez family, though not for a lack of effort. Several members of the Chavez family, particularly his children and those more active in promoting Cesar’s legacy, received a personal letter from Chatfield encouraging them to participate, but each family member ignored the letters. Much of the two and a half page letter is Chatfield’s attempt to tell the family that he does not want to create this project as a way to capitalize on the memory of Cesar Chavez, and he seeks to reassure them of how their involvement further promotes Chavez’s legacy.28 Even though the Chavez family did not directly contribute, the archive does not entirely exclude their voice as the other volunteers told stories of how the family assisted the movement.

Another more important and more telling example of exclusion within the archive is the lack of any Filipino volunteer stories, which Chatfield highlights as a further example of their discrimination within the UFW.29 When he was compiling his list of volunteers for the Listserv discussions, Chatfield was unable to find information about any of the Filipino volunteers, and many of the volunteers admitted to him that they had not stayed in contact with any of the Filipino farm workers or volunteers. After Chavez met with Ferdinand Marcos, the dictator of the Philippines, in August 1977, the majority of the Filipino members of the UFW, including the

29 Ibid.
high-ranking leader Philip Vera Cruz, separated from the union. Before Chavez’s trip to the Philippines, the UFW neglected the Filipino farmworkers within its ranks. This was partly because of how the Filipino farmworkers organized and migrated from job to job along the Pacific coastline, but more so due to rifts between them and the leaders of other farm worker unions dominated heavily by Chicano leadership.

Chatfield’s perception of Chavez, as seen through his essays, continues to center him as a powerful leader of a community of farmworkers. He is seldom critical of Chavez directly, though he does not dissuade those who are unless they are not providing productive feedback in his opinion. As Chatfield mentions in his essay, “LeRoy Chatfield 1963–1973”, many of his essays about Chavez as a leader were written to “fend off an anonymous detractor” and other critics who questioned Chavez’s vow to nonviolent leadership. Some of Chatfield’s essays about Chavez, “Cesar Chavez, Founder” and “Cesar Says” in particular, paint a nostalgic and romanticized look at Chavez’s leadership and personal character as it pertained to the movement. This more positive approach in looking at Chavez’s involvement further strengthens Chatfield as a more neutral peacekeeping figure within the project. At times, this makes his essays come off as bias toward keeping a positive image of Chavez even when there are glaring failures with aspects of his leadership.

In April 2014, the University of California San Diego officially took ownership of the Farmworker Movement Documentation Project and accessioned the contents into the university library’s Special Collections. After more than a decade of working on the project, Chatfield passed the work of the archive along to the university, which now preserves the website leaving

31 Garcia, From the Jaws of Victory, 119-120.
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the original organization. The UC San Diego library hosts a collection of objects relating to California’s history, and the school intends to keep up the work Chatfield put forth with the archive while expanding its scholarly value. Additionally, the school is excited to work with and learn from a born digital archive as many collections explore digitization efforts as a way of circumventing accessibility and storage issues many traditional archives deal with today.\(^3\) The university is maintaining Chatfield’s vision of how the materials should exist in a public place where people, both scholars and those outside of academia, have open access to the information. At this point, the University of California San Diego has not announced any plans to continue collecting and expanding the archive outside of what Chatfield built.

The state of Oregon has a long history of hop production and beer brewing, dating back prior to its official statehood in 1859. In 1852, Henry Saxer, a German immigrant, opened the first Oregon brewery, Liberty Brewery, in the city of Portland. A few years later the soon-to-be Oregon beer mogul Henry Weinhard opened his namesake brewery, also located in Portland. William Wells planted the first commercial Oregon hop yard in Buena Vista in 1867, a time when the majority of the hops grown in the United States came from New York, the first state to produce the plant in the country. Saxer, Weinhard, and the other Oregon Brewers that followed them sold nearly half of all of the beer they brewed in Oregon during the early 1900s overseas to the Philippines, Hawaii, Alaska, and the British Columbia area in Canada. During this same time, most of the hops grown in the United States came from farms in the states along the northwestern Pacific coast region.

Depending on the season and the weather conditions, the state of Oregon produced anywhere from 70,000 bales of hops to 160,000 bales over the first ten years of the twentieth century. The market was highly lucrative for the producers, who collectively stood to make an average of three million dollars each season between 1900 and 1912. Farmers shipped most of these hops to the eastern part of the United States for subsequent export overseas, primarily to supplement the hops grown by England and Germany for their own brewing. A statewide ban

---

34 The term ‘hops’ in this paper refer to the female flower part in the hop plant. In addition to providing flavor, hops also provide an antimicrobial function that prevents spoilage. Hops, in certain cases, have limited bacteria growth and provide sterilization. For more information and examples of studies conducted on the antibacterial properties of the plant see Fergus G. Priest and Iain Campbell, eds. *Brewing Microbiology*. 3rd ed. New York: Plenum Publishers, 2003.


37 Ibid., 544.
on alcohol in Oregon in 1914 followed by the outright prohibition of the production of alcohol in the United States under the Eighteenth Amendment, in effect from January 1920 until December 1933, dampened the Oregon brewing industry, but hop farming continued thriving in the state. By the 1930s, continuing into the World War II era, Polk County in northwestern Oregon carried the nickname of the “Hop Center of the World”. The Willamette Valley region continues to produce the second largest amount of hops in the country into the first decade and a half of the twenty-first century.  

Home brewing, the process of small scale personal brewing rather than commercial production of beer, helped create growth in the industry in Oregon and throughout the United States following the repeal of the prohibition of alcohol. President Jimmy Carter signed House Resolution 1337 in October 1978, “which contained an amendment that created an exemption from taxation for beer brewed at home for personal or family use.” This amendment allowed anyone the opportunity to brew his or her own beer in small quantities, and this small batch brewing approach helped generate new and improved styles of beer through experimentation. As home brewers in Oregon increased their skills and production volume, many opened small brewpub restaurants with the help of a 1985 state law that allowed for both the production and sale of beer on the same grounds. Oregon is now home to more than two hundred breweries of various sizes, many of which started as home brew hobbyist projects.

The Oregon State University Hop and Brewing Archives is the first archive in the United States dedicated to the collection and preservation of the craft beer and hops manufacturing

---

38 Oregon State University. "The History of Brewing in Oregon".
39 Ibid.
40 Ibid.
The Hop and Brewing Archive began in the summer of 2013 when the university noticed the relationship between the craft beer market in Oregon and the history of research on hops and brewing techniques conducted at the school over the past century. Archivist Tiah Edmunson-Morton manages the archive, along with a small staff of processing archivists that help create finding aid information for the objects, assist with interviews, and manage the archive’s digital presence. The school views this community archive as a way for the university to further connect to the community it is a part of, both locally in Corvallis and statewide.42

The history of hops at OSU date back to 1893 when scientists began planting hops on the campus grounds as a component of the food sciences program. In the early 1970s, researcher Dr. Alfred Haunold, working in a joint appointment with OSU and United States Department of Agriculture, began conducting scientific research on hops and the fermentation process involved with brewing beer. Dr. Haunold’s research with the university’s Aroma Hops Breeding Program lead to the creation of six different hop varieties commonly used in brewing today along with other unique hop strains.43 The results of this research provided brewers the opportunity to create a wider variety of different beers by experimenting with Dr. Haunold’s aromatic hops in new ways. In 1995, the university established a Fermentation Science program in the Department of

Food Science and Technology that educates future brewers in the history and science of the craft.\textsuperscript{44}

The Hop and Brewing Archive works as an educational and preservation partner within the community. Edmunson-Morton meets regularly with brewers and hop growers throughout Oregon, acquiring documents and other objects as she expands the archive. In addition to collecting objects, Edmunson-Morton conducts interviews with brewers and farmers to learn their personal histories.\textsuperscript{45} Each Oregon brewery and hop grower has its own unique history and process for creating beer or farming hops. Many of the farms and smaller breweries are family owned and multigenerational, stemming from European immigration to Oregon during the mid nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{46}

The Hop and Brewing Archives, as a newer archive, is currently expanding its collection of documents and objects relating to the history of hops and brewing. The archive has a broad, open-ended collecting policy currently, an approach designed to increase the variety of objects held in the archive and expand the archive’s connection with the community it serves. The archive’s website lists several different categories of objects sought from the hop and brewing community members for acquisition to the collection, with an emphasis on finding more unique or rare objects. Background information about the people and businesses involved with the history of brewing in Oregon represent the majority of the collection, and the archive also holds a number of items relating to the production and sale of beer such as menus from brewpubs and casks used to store the beer as it ferments.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{44} Oregon State University. "The History of Brewing in Oregon".
\textsuperscript{45} Blaustein-Rejto. "America’s First Beer Archive Tapping Into Hop History".
Many of the objects used when brewing beer are larger and more difficult for the archive to store in its collections in the library. To combat this shortage of space, Edmunson-Morton uses a method of “post custodial” archiving. For this archive, post custodial archiving relies on the advancing technologies used when digitizing records. By taking advantage of new technologies, the Hop and Beer Archive can grow in size much more rapidly by compressing information and objects into a hard drive. Issues of preservation involving the paper documents and mechanical objects are also limited, as the archive does not need to devote as much time keeping objects safe and maintained. The Hop and Brewing Archive makes and maintains electronic copies of many of the objects held within the collection, and this digitization effort applies to more than just written documents and historic photographs. The archive is exploring three-dimensional photography in the coming years as a way to create an image of larger objects such as brewery tanks and bottling machines incapable of being stored at the library but still have a value to the archive.

Many of the objects in the collection are available digitally, either in full form or as a citation with information about the object’s location. The Hops and Brewing Archives currently houses thirty-seven interviews with various members of the community, some dating back to the 1980s, each available to anyone online through the University’s webpage. The photograph hosting website Flickr presents several albums of historic photographs held in the Hop and Brewing Archives. The Flickr webpage contains digital scans of newspaper articles featuring a
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48 Post custodial is a term first used by Gerald Ham to describe an archive that is large in size, varied in information, and created by collecting objects with irregularity. For more see Sarah A. J. Flynn. “The Records Continuum Model in Context and Its Implications for Archival Practice.” Journal of the Society of Archivists 22, no. 1 (August 4, 2010): 86-88. or John Ridener. From Polders to Postmodernism: A Concise History of Archival Theory. (Duluth: Litwin Books, LLC, 2009), 152.

49 Oregon State University. "Contribute to OHBA”.

50 Blaustein-Rejto. "America’s First Beer Archive Tapping Into Hop History".
wide range of Oregon brewing and related farming topics, along with current acquisitions and event photographs from partnering museums and organizations.

The Oregon Hops and Brewing Archive staff also runs a public blog to highlight specific objects in the collection or historical events related to the archive. The blog, titled “The Brewstorian”, operates using the blogging service Tumblr, and postings appear two or three times a month on average. The blog targets a more casual audience interested in the history and contemporary events of the Oregon beer community. The Brewstorian offers pictures coupled with a few paragraphs of supporting text or a link to a more in-depth article.

Another strength of this university-based archive is the collection of published books, journals, and periodicals about the field written by historians and journalists within the last century. Zotero, a web based research and citation tool, houses the online presentation of the Hops and Brewing Archive collection in the form of a research friendly bibliographic database. The entries are searchable by title and tagged with a few words or phrases that group the sources together with other similar writings. There are roughly four hundred objects listed in this database, and each listing provides information for: what the object is, a description of the object, and a URL link to the digitized object or the Special Collections & Archives Research Center webpage for the physical location of the object. The Zotero collection is not a comprehensive listing of everything held by the archive, and the archival staff updates it regularly with new objects. The database also contains postings for relevant articles and events that discuss the beer industry and issues related to the collection.

The Hop and Brewing Archive’s main goal moving into the future is to continue developing and interacting with the community of brewers in new ways. The archive thrives on
the growing future of the craft beer industry, no matter what the future brings for the industry.\textsuperscript{51} Scientists, at OSU and other locations around, continue studying hops and creating new strains for brewers to experiment with in their ever-changing breweries both large and small. As the number of independent farmers growing hops and independent brewers creating new beers increases, the Hop and Brewing Archive will continue having new stories and objects that need preservation and documentation.

\textsuperscript{51} Blaustein-Rejto. "America’s First Beer Archive Tapping Into Hop History".
Japanese American Service Committee

After the attack on Hawaiian naval base Pearl Harbor by Japanese pilots on 7 December 1941, Japanophobia spread throughout much of the United States. The United States had its fair share of anti-Japanese sentiments well before the Pearl Harbor attacks however, as demonstrated by restrictive legislation directed at Japanese Americans. Japanese immigration to the Hawaiian territory was common, but on the mainland, United States congressional legislation limited citizenship opportunities for Japanese Americans and eliminated immigration to the United States from Japan in 1924. Educational and work related opportunities became almost nonexistent for those of Japanese decent in the years leading up to the war as congress stripped away property rights and American prejudice grew. In 1941, nearly 300,000 people of Japanese ancestry lived in the United States or on the Hawaiian Island territory, with roughly two thirds of that number classified as naturalized citizens. President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 on 19 February 1942, granting military leaders permission to create restricted military zones on the premise of national defense.52

General John L. DeWitt administered Executive Order 9066 as a part of his duties within the Pacific Theater campaign. General DeWitt issued a series of military proclamations just a few weeks after Roosevelt signed the order. Beginning with Public Proclamation No. 1, DeWitt restricted Japanese American liberties and put the community under further surveillance.53 This first proclamation transformed the coastal sections of California, Oregon, and Washington and the southern section of Arizona into a region known Military Area No. 1. Initially, under the guise of protecting the country against attacks from Japan, those of Japanese ancestry living in these regions were required to leave Military Area No. 1 and head inland into the Mountain West

53 Ibid., 12.
or Midwest regions of the country. After three weeks, General DeWitt issued Proclamation No. 4, which halted any further relocation from Military Area No. 1 and provided the foundation for the internment camp structures.\textsuperscript{54}

By the early summer of 1942, the military established sixteen temporary camps along the west coast on fairgrounds and in horse racetracks while they constructed permanent camps reminiscent of military barrack camps. United States troops gathered the future internees at marked pickup locations within Military Area No. 1 and sent them on buses to camps located throughout the west coast and the mountain west regions. Those forced to live in the camp gave up or sold the majority of their possessions, and the camp organizers only allowed families to bring what they could carry.\textsuperscript{55} By August, roughly 120,000 Japanese Americans were living in the ten permanent internment camps. These camps, operated by the War Relocation Authority (WRA), were located in Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming.\textsuperscript{56} Those of Japanese ancestry living in Hawaii, with a few exceptions, did not enter into the camps because the population was too large and moving the community to the mainland was impractical.

By the earlier months of 1943, the WRA started encouraging the internees who passed a forced loyal survey to move out of the camps and seek jobs or attend colleges in the Midwest or along the East Coast. Many Japanese were reluctant toward moving eastward so soon after their forced move hardly one year before. The younger generations, known as the Issei, grew comfortable with their life in the camps and many attempted to live as detainees for as long as

possible rather than enter the now less certain world outside of them. The increase in hostilities against the Japanese by other Americans also added in the hesitancy felt by many internees now forced out of the camps. President Roosevelt announced that the camps would all close by the end of 1945. The government provided internees with twenty-five dollars and a train ticket, but many of them no longer had a home or job to which they could return. The situation left the survivors with few resources needed to reintegrate back into American communities.

The Japanese American Service Committee (JASC) organized in Chicago in 1946 on the heels of World War II. The organization, originally called the Chicago Resettlers Committee, developed to help Japanese immigrants and their children establish themselves in the Chicago area after leaving the internment camps. Nearly 20,000 Japanese Americans moved to Chicago following the disbandment of the internment camps at the end of the war in an attempt to start new lives. The JASC originally acted as a unification organization for members of the Japanese American community in Chicago that helped find jobs and housing in the city. In addition, the JASC assisted those new to United States in learning about the culture of their new home. By the 1960s many of the internment survivors successfully adapted to life in Chicago, and the JASC reevaluated its mission to focus more on social services, specifically relating to geriatric care with the aging Issei community, and increasing multicultural awareness of Japanese Americans living in the city.

---

57 The word Issei, meaning “first generation”, is given to those Japanese Americans born in Japan, but immigrated to the United States independently. Their children are referred to by the word Nisei, which means “second generation”. A less common generational term is Sansei, which refers to the third generation children of Nisei. For more information about the generational dynamics of Japanese Americans, particularly within the context of the early twentieth century see: Forrest E. LaViolette Americans of Japanese Ancestry. New York: Arno Press, 1978.
58 Ibid., 63.
Today the JASC continues working with the Japanese American community in Chicago by offering a variety of different outreach programs designed to educate a multicultural community about Japanese history and culture. The majority of these outreach programs are classes that teach Japanese language, cooking, and flower arrangement, among other cultural topics. These outreach programs also include specific events for children and the aging designed to improve the wellbeing of the Japanese American Community in the Chicagoland area. As a social service nonprofit, the JASC employs a social worker, a home support staff, and operates an adult day care aimed at maintaining senior independence for community members.

In 1999, the JASC formally established The Legacy Center Archives, which consists of over 400 different collections of objects dating back to 1890. The archival holdings include three-dimensional artifacts, papers, photographs, and internment period objects gathered from camp survivors. The archive prides itself on having the “most significant collection” of Japanese American objects outside of the United States West Coast region. Karen Kanemoto manages the Legacy Center for the JASC. She is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the center during its public hours, and she provides the archival management functions needed for the care of the collection. Kanemoto works with JASC’s receptionist, Yuki Scroggins, on translating into English various documents held in the archives in order to expand future research possibilities.

Kanemoto acts as the liaison between the Japanese American community, of which she is a part, and the institutional entity of the JASC organization with respect to the process of collecting for the archive. The Legacy Center Archive practices an open donation policy within

---

the community, complete with a list of suggested objects that might strengthen the archive’s education oriented mission.

A large part of the archive exists digitally through a searchable online database hosted by Eloquent, an external database developer specialized in presented digital records for archives and museums. The home screen provides users with brief and simple instructions for how to search for objects or topics. Many of the objects, particularly the various historical papers, are bibliographic in nature and require the researcher to request reproductions or actively visit the Legacy Center for more information. The object descriptions as they exist currently do not amount to much more than a descriptive sentence for most of the digital holdings, but some of the objects contain a sizable set of background paragraphs. The JASC provides photographs of some of the objects or, more commonly, the people mentioned in its holdings, though these instances are few. The database supports Google Maps integration and allows users the option of finding specific locations of origin or points of reference for certain objects. Digitizing at the JASC is ongoing, but the Legacy Center currently provides roughly a few hundred of its objects digitally.

In addition to its more archival functions, the Legacy Center also provides basic research library functions for visitors by appointment a few times each week. The center maintains a circulating collection of items for educators and researchers working at various scholarly levels. The more easily accessible objects primarily consist of more widely publish books, videos, and Kamishibai folktale story packages that teach about Japanese and Japanese American culture. Visitors to the library have supervised access to much of the archival collection and can request objects through a bihourly page system. The Legacy Center Library space opens up the
collection further for researcher looking to study more than what currently is available online in the database software.

The staff at the Legacy Center Archives continue to engage actively with the Japanese American community in Chicago, and the collection they help preserve. Ongoing efforts to translate and digitize the collection open up the possibilities for increased research about internment history and the Japanese Americans that now call Chicago home. The archive functions as a component of the JASC outreach programs that helps the committee carry out its mission of having a “living culture” as the organization continues collecting from the next generation of Japanese Americans.⁶⁴ As the generations move farther away from the original Issei population, the JASC Legacy Center Archives’ responsibility for preserving earlier experiences will increase in significance.

---

⁶⁴ Japanese American Service Committee. "About JASC".
Conclusion

The three archives observed in this thesis provide a type of case study for the more common interactions that exist between formal institutions and community collecting organizations. The Farmworker Movement Documentation Project provides a look at a more typical and expected outcome with a community archive’s absorption into a formalized archive as a piece of the institutional collection. Both the Japanese American Service Committee and the Oregon Hop and Brewing Archive represent institutions that created community archives, but did so in two entirely different ways. The JASC existed for decades as a stand-alone organization focused on issues other than proper archival practice, but they acquired many archive friendly objects as their programs and reach expanded. Oregon State University took a common interest among the community and its scientific researchers as a basis for developing an archive aimed at promoting a specific community.

The application of the term “community archive” onto these three collecting groups brings into question what the term connotes for more formal or less formal archives alike. The Farmworker Movement Documentation Project and the Japanese American Service Committee Legacy Center Archives do not self identify as community archives, even though there is a much more direct community interaction with these two collecting entities. Each archive makes references to a specific community it is involved with, but the specific application of the term on these two archives is done so by the author. Both of these archives effectively interacted with the community, though the Farmworker Movement Documentation Project now seems more removed from the community the more it moves away from Chatfield’s management. It is particularly interesting that neither of these two archives applied this term to themselves as they grew into more pronounced archiving.
When developing the Farmworker Movement Documentation Project, Chatfield reached out to the community of volunteers as thoroughly as possible, which acted as a form of community reunification. Within the eleven months since Chatfield turned over ownership of the archive it became much more stagnant in growth and lost the living archive element Chatfield fostered while creating the project. The documentation project likely will not include many, if any, new components to collection generated by the volunteers from the movement now that the University of California San Diego Library owns the collection. The Farmworker Movement Documentation Project blends its collection into the University of California San Diego Archives so well that someone utilizing the resource for research could miss many of the community elements that went into the original creation of the project.

The JASC Legacy Center Archive continues actively working with the community served by the archive. The organization describes the archival process a documentation project geared at the Japanese American community more often than any other descriptor. The archives, and even the sections consisting of the Legacy Center as a whole, are secondary to some of the other service programs ran by the JASC, though this is gradually changing as the organization caters more to the younger parts of the community. For the JASC, funding concerns are a major obstacle that the other two archives do not suffer from to the same extent. The institutional focus of the JASC directs the budget toward the social service programs as a priority, which makes improving the digital presentation, along with other archival tasks, difficult for the Legacy Center’s one full-time staff member.

---

Of the three archives looked at in this thesis, only the Oregon Hops and Brewing Archive outright calls itself a “community archiving project” in the publicity information it provides. The archive developed out of a strong regional interest in a subject rather than through a strong community involvement as compared with the other two archives observed. The major distinction that the Hop and Brewing Archive operates under when compared to the other two archives in this thesis is that the archivists are collecting about a community rather than for a community. The community, in this case, is a community perceived by the archive that does not necessarily have a fixed boundary outside of craft beer. The specificity to Oregon is a feature imposed on the collection by the archive, but thriving craft beer communities now exist all over the United States.

The archival process in place with the Oregon Hop and Brewing Archive is better termed as a community-involved archiving project at this time rather than a full-fledged community archive. Instead of working specifically with a member of the community, the archive created a broadly termed community consisting of nearly anyone involved in the process of manufacturing beer within the state of Oregon. While the archive holdings are stored within an institution that has a stake in the community, there are minimal partnerships between the archive and the various brewers and hop producers in Oregon. This method is successful, as the archive contains more than just the work of Dr. Haunold and other OSU specific objects. The request for objects publicly listed on the website and the Brewstorian targets a broad audience throughout the state by establishing the acquisition parameters as “collecting things that would show someone

---

66 Oregon State University. "Oregon Hops and Brewing Archive: Hops and Brewing, it's a History Worth Saving." http://scarc.library.oregonstate.edu/ohba-brochure.pdf.
years from now [...] the pieces of the brewing scene”. The OSU archive is also the newest archive looked at in this thesis, a factor that plays a big role in the minimal community grounding it currently possesses as an archive. It remains to be seen if the Oregon Hop and Brewing Archive will form an active partnership with a specific brewery, grower, or even region of Oregon as the newer archive develops.

Even though they do not adopt the term, the Farmworker Movement Documentation Project and the JASC Legacy Archives better fit the term community archive. The development of an archiving project for the volunteers of the UFW by a volunteer and employee of the UFW keeps this archive heavily invested within the community. Chatfield created this archive by working within the community, with other volunteers and their families, and he did seek professionalization until he wished to move on from his role with the project. In working with the JASC Legacy Center, Kanemoto and the other staff members assisting her remain increasingly active in their archival work. They currently seem most focused on expanding the history and memory of the Japanese American community, and their work keeps the living element of the archive in existence.

The phrase “community archive” is a term in need of refinement within the museum and archival professions. Institutional archives collecting without a community involvement does little to develop a community archive or serve a community’s history as something other than an afterthought. Without a well maintained connection to the community, the institution removes the living element the community’s collection embodies. This places the ephemera in a position no different from the collections already held by the institution, in most cases. By building a

---

more dynamic definition of what a community archive is and how it fits into the formal
terminology, archivists, professional and community-based alike, are better able to care for and
respect the unique status of the valuable nontraditional holdings that exist within different
communities.
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