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GEORGE WASHINGTON FORGERIES AND FACSIMILES

Dorothy Twohig

In preparation for a new and complete edition of George Washington's correspondence, the editors of the Papers of George Washington at the University of Virginia have over a ten year period collected copies of some 135,000 items of correspondence. This includes letters and documents written to Washington as well as those written by him. Among these thousands of documents are some 150 to 200 that bear a special relationship to the rest of the project's holdings. These are the documents produced over the last hundred years by forgers of varying skill and which are often still masquerading as authentic Washington documents.

Forgeries of literary and historical documents go back at least to the eighteenth century, when Thomas Chatterton created a medieval monk named Rowley who wrote verse, William Ireland fabricated Shakespeare plays, and James Macpherson concocted collections of ancient Gaelic poetry until he was unmasked by Samuel Johnson. In the 1830s John Payne Collier, one of the most erudite of British Shakespeare scholars, set out to solve the silences in the history of Elizabethan drama by fitting his own forgeries into existing documents with such skill that scholars occasionally still are deceived. Thomas J. Wise, the leading English bibliographer of his day, fabricated first editions of Ruskin, Browning, Arnold, and other Victorian authors. More recently, the forgers of the Horn Papers and the Vineland Map perpetrated large scale hoaxes with far-reaching implications. Modern discoveries of Robert Burns material are viewed suspiciously by literary scholars and dealers until they are convinced the documents are not the work of Alexander Howland (''Antique'') Smith, whose crude
imitations of Burns not only took in his nineteenth century contemporaries but still deceive unwary researchers. And no twentieth century forger has rivaled the chutzpah of Frenchman Denis Vrain-Lucas who in the 1860s managed to dispose not only of letters of Pontius Pilate, Mary Magdalene, and Judas Iscariot but of his major find, the love letters between Anthony and Cleopatra.¹

So widespread are some of these concoctions that at least one institution, the New York Public Library, deliberately acquires forgeries both for the documents' own intrinsic interest as curiosities and to provide a reservoir of authenticated samples of the work of noted forgers.²

None of the Washington forgers has shown the skill or ingenuity of these nineteenth century masters of fraud. Probably the most prolific—certainly the one most frequently encountered by the Washington Papers staff—was an enterprising Englishman named Robert Spring.³ Born in England in 1813, Spring came to the United States as a young man and opened a book shop in Philadelphia. He may well have intended to make an honest living, but when he found the bookseller's trade less than profitable he soon discovered that he had a freewheeling imagination and a real talent for larceny.

Boasting a dignified demeanor and an impeccable British accent, Spring used his bookshop as a base for launching a new venture into free enterprise. Using a goose quill pen and his own special mixture of antiquated ink, he began forging letters on sheets of paper cut from the front or back of old books. Capitalizing on the enormous veneration nineteenth century Americans had for the first president, Spring specialized in Washington autographs. When he could acquire access to genuine documents he simply traced them, but most of his Washington forgeries were written freehand, after hours of practice in an attempt to reproduce Washington's flowing script.

Spring's operating procedures were outlined at his trial for forgery in Philadelphia in 1869: "He would obtain, by some means, a genuine letter and
then trace it on a sheet of paper, which he stained with coffee grounds to give it the appearance of age. The bogus letter would be inclosed in a note and addressed to some gentleman who had a fine private library. The note stated that the writer was in want of money, and if the recipient desired the autograph letter he could send money to a certain address. He received a number of replies containing remittances varying from $10 to $15, the letters being addressed to several post offices within a few miles of this city."

Spring's demands were modest, and apparently, the customers lined up. His activities were soon detected, however, and he was arrested in Philadelphia in 1858. He skipped bail and took his business elsewhere—namely, to Canada where he posed as an impecunious widow attempting to dispose of her husband's estate. Naturally the widow's inheritance consisted principally of handsome autograph letters of important historical personages. Encouraged by the credulity of Canadians, Spring made another attempt on the American market. He returned to the United States—probably in the early 1860s—settled in Baltimore, and proceeded to open a lively trade in Washington documents, following generally the same procedure he had used in Philadelphia but with a new twist. He now offered his products primarily to British autograph collectors.

Capitalizing on the popularity of Stonewall Jackson in England, he posed as the Confederate general's daughter, fallen on hard times and compelled to sell her father's papers, which coincidentally seemed to consist largely of handsome specimens of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, and of course Jackson, documents. Although Spring's movements during the 1860s are still unclear, he apparently did not confine his activities entirely to the Baltimore area since he was again arrested for forgery in Philadelphia in 1869. Candidly admitting his guilt, he again stood trial and this time served a prison term, dying in poverty in the charity ward of a Philadelphia hospital in 1876.
Spring's forgeries fall into several categories. Although there are a number of multipage letters, perhaps copies from an original document, Spring's most common forgeries consist of an order drawn by Washington on the Office of Discount and Deposit in Baltimore or a Revolutionary pass through American lines. A typical example of the pass reads:

Head Quarters
Valley Forge
Feby 5th 1778

Permission is granted to Mr. John Edwards with his Negro boy Jack to pass and repass this picket at Ramapo.

Go: Washington

The Papers of George Washington staff has acquired innumerable copies of this pass issued to Mr. Johnson and Sam, to Mr. Smith and Tim, to Mr. Carson and Henry, and so on. The pass is so frequently issued to variously named persons and their servants to pass the lines at Ramapo, New Jersey, that manuscript dealer Charles Hamilton has quoted one disgruntled owner as observing that Ramapo may indeed have seen the first traffic jam in American history. Since none of the passes unearthed so far bears the same name, it is evident that Spring changed the names on the document each time he encountered an affluent victim, simply making out a pass to order.

The pass and indeed other Spring forgeries often have a convincing provenance. Present-day owners are able to claim with complete sincerity that the document has been in their family for generations. Since the pass was issued to someone bearing their name there is no reason to doubt that it was not indeed issued to a Revolutionary ancestor. Spring's passes early found their way into public repositories both in the United States and abroad. The Washington project has received one pass through the lines from a major state historical society accompanied by a provenance indicating that it had been presented to the society by the governor of the state in 1867.
Even more common than the pass through the lines is a short letter addressed to Jabez Huntington, "Sheriff of the County of Windham, Connt.," stating that "at the urgent solicitation of several of the Selectmen and respectable inhabitants of the town of Poughkeepsie, I hereby authorize you to discharge from custody Daniel Elliott now a prisoner and confined by Military Warrant to the Gaol of sd. County." The document is purportedly signed by Washington at headquarters at New Windsor, Connecticut. As in the Revolutionary pass, both the name of the prisoner and the date vary with each document.

These release orders represent some of Spring's best work, and even manuscript dealers are occasionally taken in. Several years ago one of these Spring letters to Huntington was offered for sale in a manuscript catalog for $950. The unwary dealer described it as having "slight fading; slight trace of mounting remains at corners. An unusual document; and early form of executive clemency." At least two or three times a year the Washington Papers staff receives an excited call from some friend who has unearthed a "new" Washington document addressed to Jabez Huntington.

Another of Spring's favorites of which he produced innumerable copies was Washington's exhortation to an army captain (whose name also changes with each document) to "extend your picket across the bridge with a patrol on the Norristown Road as far as the King of Prussia tavern, with orders to bring in all Strangers unable to give a good account of themselves, also all persons found loitering near the lines." The sample of Spring's work which surfaced most frequently during the Washington Papers' search for documents, however, is an order supposedly drawn by Washington during the 1790s on the Office of Discount and Deposit in Baltimore. Again, Spring apparently produced these on demand and sold them to credulous Baltimore citizens during his residence in that city.

Although Spring favored short and pithy documents
which did not put too much strain on his orthographic powers, he occasionally produced more ambitious products. His ingenuity sometimes evokes a grudging admiration. While searching in England, the Washington Papers staff acquired from a member of the British peerage a copy of a letter mentioning an ancestor who was Washington's contemporary and with whom Washington frequently corresponded. Unfortunately, the handsome letter which the earl sent to the project was the product of Robert Spring's creativity, probably forged during the period he was peddling Washington and Jackson autographs in England. Undoubtedly a mid-nineteenth century member of the family was delighted to purchase from Spring a letter of so much family interest.

Several other examples of Spring's more ambitious documents have surfaced. One—of which there are at least four versions known—is a letter to James Wood, dated Philadelphia, 12 September 1796. Copies of this document are owned by the Jervis Library, Oberlin College, Mount Vernon, and the Tennessee State Library and Archives. The Washington Papers staff has never located the original letter actually sent to Wood, but a copy of the letter is recorded in Washington's letter books at the Library of Congress. Either Spring somehow saw this version or, less likely, he had access to the letter actually sent to Wood. A privately owned version of the same letter but addressed to a James Overton has also surfaced. Spring also tried his hand at fabricating copies of Washington addresses. He sold his products for five or ten dollars, only occasionally asking as much as five pounds from some of his English purchasers.

In the course of collecting Washington manuscripts over a ten-year period, the editors of the Washington Papers have unearthed perhaps 150 examples of Spring's work, but obviously, this is only the tip of the iceberg. Most come from public and university repositories in the United States and Europe, but a large number are also in the possession of private owners. Perhaps less than half of the libraries, and almost none of the private owners, are
aware that their Washington document is a Spring forgery. It is not at all uncommon to find Spring documents that have migrated—probably from England—into European repositories. Copies have been acquired by the Washington Papers from sources as far afield as Germany's Kestner Museum.

One of the more recent Washington forgers to surface is Joseph Cosey, born Martin Coneely in Syracuse, New York. After a brief career as a printer's assistant, Cosey served in the army for four years (from 1909 to 1912); then, after receiving a dishonorable discharge in the latter year, he moved on to become thief, convict, and check forger. The turning point in Cosey's career came in 1929 when a chance visit to the Library of Congress and a glimpse of a pay warrant signed in 1786 by Benjamin Franklin opened new vistas to him. Pocketing the warrant he slipped out of the library ready to begin a new career. He was not really a thief, Cosey later explained, because the Library of Congress belonged to the people and he was after all one of the people.

Cosey quickly became adept at producing signatures of historical figures. Instead of tracing his forgeries, the method most easily detected, he adopted a more sophisticated and deceptive freehand style, using a mixture of Waterman's brown ink and rusted iron filings. He became expert at foxing and staining to simulate age. More astute than most forgers, he even attempted to duplicate the type of paper used by the individuals whose autographs he was producing. Selling his products for under fifty dollars, he found a ready market, and many of his forgeries have probably gone undetected.

Few prominent Americans were safe from Cosey's attentions. He expertly forged the signatures of John Marshall, Patrick Henry, John Adams, and even that rarest of American autographs—Button Gwinnett. Washington was a speciality. His Washington forgeries are among the best—far superior to the productions of Robert Spring, although Cosey too had some problems in reproducing Washington's signature. The Cosey Washington forgeries are usually short
routine forms and letters and rarely as ambitious in content as the Jefferson draft of the Declaration of Independence, which he offered for sale to a Virginia college, or his notable collection of Edgar Allan Poe autographs.

Cosey forgeries appear frequently in manuscript dealers' catalogs, usually identified as the bogus documents they are. Ironically, his forgeries often bring as much today from collectors of curiosities as his original offerings. Sold at auction in 1970, two Cosey letters—one "bearing a forged docket at head, and with forged integral address-leaf," and the other "bearing forged Washington frank and remnants of red-wax seals (very good, with simulated stains and minor defects)"—carried a suggested auction value of $30. Another Cosey forgery of a Washington document—a discharge for one Edward Bear also bearing a signature of Major John Trumbull was offered for sale by dealer Charles Hamilton in 1982 with a suggested price of $75 to $100. Hamilton noted in the catalog that the document bore stains skillfully applied by Cosey.10

More colorful than either Cosey or Spring was Charles Weisberg, or "The Baron," who surfaced on the New York police blotters in 1935 for minor forgery. Weisberg's Washington speciality was occasional letters and surveys of Mount Vernon, although he was equally adept at producing letters of Stephen Collins, Walt Whitman, Abraham Lincoln, and Katharine Mansfield. Eventually apprehended, Weisberg died in prison in 1945. Some of Weisberg's Washington forgeries are skillfully executed but are usually marred by his tendency to drop the beginning G in Washington's signature below the W and his omission of the o in Go.11

The Papers of George Washington has acquired copies of forgeries from many sources—historical societies, university libraries, major manuscript repositories, state libraries, and private owners. Very few private owners of a forgery are aware that their highly prized Washington document is in fact the product of a nineteenth or twentieth century
forger. But more significantly, perhaps less than half of the manuscript repositories know that one or two of their Washington documents are not authentic. Because scholars are increasingly working with xerox and photostatic copies of documents rather than the originals, they are compelled to rely on the judgment of the keepers of manuscripts on the question of authenticity.

Letters of Washington, or indeed of any other historical or literary figure, which are purchased by a library or manuscript repository from a reputable manuscript dealer are usually accompanied by a guarantee of authenticity. The major dealers are conscientious in verifying the manuscripts they offer in their catalogs. While forgeries are often offered for sale by dealers for the documents' own intrinsic interest, they are invariably labeled as forgeries. Once in a while, of course, the dealer himself is misled, and although they are greatly in the minority, there is the occasionally unscrupulous dealer. The pitfall for libraries is more likely to occur when letters are presented as gifts or purchased from private owners.

One state library in recent years was presented with a handsome multipage Washington letter by the family of an alumnus. The acquisition was hailed with considerable fanfare and placed on public exhibition, and only several months later was it discovered that the document was in fact the product of Robert Spring's versatile pen. Obviously, both donor and repository were acting in good faith, but the results caused a certain amount of embarrassment. Forgeries and facsimiles produced in the nineteenth and even early twentieth century have not only acquired an attractive patina of age, but also often a convincing provenance, and neither donor nor recipient has any particular reason to doubt.

Although mistaking a facsimile for an original document is not as embarrassing as not recognizing a forgery, the problems for libraries are somewhat similar. Many facsimiles produced in the nineteenth century have undergone a respectable aging process.
If they were originally printed on a good quality rag paper, they can be difficult to recognize on a casual examination and, since the handwriting is authentic, can be even more misleading than forgeries. The original documents chosen for reproduction usually consist of one page and represent a desirable example of the signer's handwriting. The original facsimiles often had the printer's name and occasionally the date printed at the bottom of the page, but over the years this has commonly been removed either accidentally or deliberately.

The Papers of George Washington has dozens of facsimile copies of a number of original Washington documents. In a few cases the library owning the original letter was aware of the facsimile edition and had its own document authenticated, but most assume that their copy is an original document. The project has, for example, acquired some fifteen copies of a letter from George Washington to Nathanael Greene complaining of the loss of a favorite penknife. It is a handsome one-page document, an admirable example of Washington's handwriting. The copies were all acquired from major repositories, and less than half are aware that the document in their collection is a facsimile.

Very few forgeries will deceive an expert in the forged author's handwriting, and neither forgeries nor facsimiles will remain undetected if sophisticated testing devices are used. Unfortunately, these are not usually available for most libraries or individual collectors. A system for authentication of documents requires a considerable amount of technical equipment: standard and comparison microscopes, a knowledge of their use, familiarity with the watermarks most commonly used, the facilities for chemical testing of ink, and an extensive knowledge of writing implements and postal procedures.

Clues can be obtained, however, from the documents themselves. Some forgeries more readily reveal themselves, even to examiners not having access to a laboratory, and can at least raise
suspicions as to the authenticity of a document. Familiarity with the historical background of a document may reveal anachronisms and errors in content and terminology which will indicate a suspicious document. Amateurish attempts at aging papers with coffee and heat are often apparent to the eye. A comparison of the writing with an authenticated document by the same author, paying particular attention to the evenness of the writing, slant, formation of letters, and wording of the documents, may readily reveal discrepancies.

Most handwriting changes over the course of a lifetime. Washington's handwriting as a young man was a sharp, angular script very different from the familiar flowing writing of his later years. Few forgers bother to make sure their product is accurate in this respect. For a widely varying fee repositories and individuals can have documents authenticated, and it is probably advisable in the case of suspicious documents to take advantage of this service.

No contemporary forger of Washington documents appears to have emerged since Cosey ceased his activities. However, good examples of Washington letters written in his own hand are now fetching well in excess of $5000. Given such temptations, it is impossible to escape a disquieting feeling that somewhere an ingenious scribe, surrounded by quill pens and antiqued paper, is quietly preparing new confusion for future generations of scholars.

NOTES

1 For discussions of the careers of various forgers and famous forgeries, see J.A. Farrer, Literary Forgeries (London, 1907); Richard Altick, The Scholar Adventurers (New York, 1950); S.A. Tannenbaum, Shaksperes Forgeries in the Revels Account (New York, 1928); William Roughead, The Riddle of the Ruthvens and Other Studies (Edinburgh, 1919). The unmasking of the Horn Papers is described in Arthur Pierce Middleton and


3 For an account of Spring's activities, see Charles Hamilton, *Scribblers and Scoundrels* (New York, 1968), 164-73 and *ibid.*, *Great Forgers*, 44-61, which contains illustrations of Spring's forgeries. See also *The New York World*, 8 November 1869. Some of the records for Spring's trial are in the Court of Oyer and Terminer, Philadelphia.

4 *Philadelphia Age*, 5 November 1869.

5 Hamilton, *Great Forgers*, 49.

6 A copy of this forgery is also among the Public Records of Scotland in the Scottish Record Office, Edinburgh.

7 In the Spring version, sections of the letter book copy have been deleted. This forged letter was offered in evidence at Spring's trial in 1869.

8 For a brief account of Cosey's career, see Hamilton, *Great Forgers*, 88-120.

10 Auction 149, item 165.

11 For Weisberg's career and samples of his forgeries, see Hamilton, *Great Forgers*, 8-10, 63-65.

Much has been written about the need to manage records and information and to provide systematic programs for the identification, preservation, and use of historical records, and to do both efficiently. Most of this literature, starting with the unfortunate schism between the archivists and records managers in the mid-1950s, has stressed the positive aspects of a full records program. However, perhaps more attention needs to be paid to the unfortunate results of records programs skewed one way or another. After all, learning by mistakes is often more effective.

The Baltimore (Maryland) records program is a good case in point. Extending back over thirty years, it has limped along, never providing either total records management or a full archival program because of generally poor leadership and a lack of recognizable priorities. At present, an effort is being expended to develop a complete records program in this city. This essay examines why the original records program failed and why it has been resurrected within the past few years. Furthermore, it is written in the conviction that the success of local government records programs is possible only with an inseparable connection of records management and archives administration.

Until the 1940s there were few attempts to manage the records of Baltimore's municipal government. These early efforts were restricted to historical records, although there never was logical criteria for determination of the term historical. The creation of a city library in 1874 produced some
primitive cataloging of older records, exhibitions, and collecting of records and artifacts documenting the history of the city and its government. This agency led to an underfunded Bureau of Archives in 1927 which seems to have accomplished little until the Historical Records Survey (HRS) a decade later. The HRS surveyed records and indexed by name and subject numerous so-called historical documents but neglected the questions of storage, provenance, inventories and administrative histories, and a general guide. For three decades, however, the HRS efforts constituted Baltimore's municipal archives.2

An article in a local newspaper in 1947, only a few years after the HRS labors, revealed to the public a horrible panorama of "dirt-covered, water-soaked, tattered" records strewn about the basement and attic of city hall, itself a structure badly needing maintenance. This article prompted replies by officials of the Maryland Historical Society, the state archives, and various citizens' groups. Interestingly, the state archives offered to care for these records in Annapolis but never pursued the matter further.3 With the exception of the selective preservation of the records of Annapolis—Maryland's first major urban center and state capital—the state archives has provided few guidelines for the care of municipal records.

The response of the municipal government was slow. At the beginning of June 1948 the mayor established a committee consisting of the city comptroller, president of the city council, director of public works, city solicitor, and director of legislative reference to review all records and to formulate a "plan for putting order and system in the keeping of records."4 Under the leadership of Dr. Horace Flack, director of legislative reference, the records committee sent out a questionnaire to all departments soliciting recommendations for retention periods and ascertaining what records were in existence. This committee, however, never proceeded beyond seeking useless records for destruction, mainly cancelled checks and outdated
bonds. Flack spent much of his time contesting the notion that the cost of an independent survey was justified (one consulting firm, Records Engineering, Inc., suggested $42,000). He believed that an ordinance of 1941 enabling the destruction of records older than five years with the approval of the city solicitor and himself was satisfactory, that municipal officials were the most qualified to make judgments regarding the value of records, and that a thorough weeding of the municipal records would reduce their volume as to provide easy storage. Flack, overzealously endeavoring to save money and obviously trying to protect his authority for the maintenance of records given him in the earlier ordinance, headed a committee that faded gradually into inactivity and had no real results. A confusion of destruction with management was the only legacy of this committee.

The outbreak of the Korean War nearly revived the dormant records committee with a new slant towards microphotography. The city treasurer wrote a letter to the mayor in late 1950 suggesting the appointment of a "Committee for Safeguarding City Records" in order "to determine what city records should be microfilmed or placed in safekeeping as a matter of precaution in the event of war." At this time no committee was organized but funds were shifted from civil defense for the purpose of purchasing a camera, storage equipment, supplies, and hiring staff for the filming of essential operating records. This program was initially under the direction of Flack who continued to block the formation of a new committee and survey efforts.

While the city's records were being filmed piecemeal, a plan was introduced to move tons of records from city hall to a temporary storage area several miles away. This idea attracted the attention of several members of the city council who argued for a centrally located records center with a specialized staff. When the matter of funding such a move of records came before the Board of Estimates, it reactivated a records committee. This committee was not under Horace Flack but J. Neil McCardell, the
city comptroller, a change because of Flack's earlier failure regarding the records survey and solution to the records problem. McCardell immediately contacted Records Engineering, Inc. and urged that such private consultants be hired to conduct a survey. Local newspapers immediately picked up the story and encouraged matters to continue to proceed thusly. In the meantime the microphotography unit was shifted from legislative reference and placed under the city auditor, Horace C. Beck, Jr. Beck soon called for a separate, permanently established microphotography unit with full-time staff, a regular budget, and its placement under the city comptroller, not legislative reference, since "experience has shown that this has not been complete satisfactory." Sentiment now dictated that an outside consultant be employed in order to gain proposals quickly for the records work.

On 22 May 1953 the Board of Estimates considered the recommendation of the Committee on Safeguarding City Records to engage Records Engineering, Inc. to do a city-wide survey at a cost of $55,000 and in four phases to ensure the municipal government's satisfaction with the firm's work. The objective of the survey was to determine "economical and efficient methods and procedures in the management and retirement of current and noncurrent records involved in the conduct of the business of the city." Records Engineering would identify records, propose retention schedules, develop procedures for an ongoing records program, determine records suitable for microfilming, and suggest a scheme for the establishment and maintenance of a records center. The first phase was completed by the end of August 1953, and the pleased city officials funded the remainder of the study. In March 1954, the entire survey was completed, reports issued, and the debate over its findings begun.

Overall, the efforts of Records Engineering, Inc. were a major success. Not only did the firm survey the records of twenty-nine agencies holding about forty thousand linear feet of records, but its prime recommendation for the establishment of the position
of records management officer and the Records Disposal Committee was adopted with few modifications. However, several aspects of the survey were extremely poor and continued to plague the creation of an effective program for the municipal government's historical records. It was quite obvious from the tone of the reports and the actual recommendations of retention schedules that the consulting firm was emphasizing the notion of an effective management program as that which would destroy as many records as quickly as possible. Over eighty percent of nearly six hundred recommended schedules called for the retention of records for five years or less; only thirty-four schedules, or less than six percent, called for permanent retention and only two of these because of historical significance. Records Engineering, Inc. made no specific proposals for an archival program except that the Records Management Office would be under the city comptroller, and historical records, only vaguely defined, would continue to be sent to the Department of Legislative Reference which had already been declared as being not appropriate for their preservation. The reduction of records and the proportionate reduction of records storage cost was reiterated and was the theme of the reports. Furthermore, Records Engineering, Inc. seemed little aware of or interested in the records identified by the HRS.

Events between the end of the survey in March and the passage of the ordinance in June establishing the Records Management Division somewhat modified the neglect of historical records. The recommendation that the records management agency be placed under the city comptroller was not heeded; instead, this function was placed under the Department of Legislative Reference, giving a single agency responsibility for both the current and historical documents. This development was predictable with the retirement of Flack a year before and the cooperation and leadership of his successor, Dr. Carl Everstine, since early 1953. More important was the intervention of Wilbur H. Hunter, Jr., director of the municipal museum, who proposed first to his own trustees and then, with their
approval, to the city council an amendment to the pending legislation that historical records could be loaned to the museum and the director of the museum would be a member of a records disposal committee. Hunter, since his involvement with the museum, had seen it as an official repository for such records and urged that it, not legislative reference, be the "proper permanent depository for those historical records which have no further immediate connection with the official activities of the various city departments." With the exception of this last item, the legislation incorporated Hunter's suggestions. 

It is clear from examining the 1954 ordinance that the possibility of beginning a comprehensive records program was within grasp. Providing explicit details on the nature of records and their creation, maintenance, and disposition and having a procedure (albeit, a weak one) for the care of historical records, the success of such a records program was dependent upon proper financial support by the municipal government and the hiring of an individual capable in current records management and sensitive to the potential historical importance of all records. It was in both of these areas that the municipal government failed, and the fledgling records program floundered.

Getting the records management operation started in 1954-55 was difficult for Everstine, who frequently appeared before the Board of Estimates pleading for new funds or the transfer of funds to purchase office and records storage equipment. These first years also witnessed bitter battles over obtaining secretarial help and microphotographers. By the end of 1956, however, because of the improvements in the physical appearance of the stored records, funds were being obtained regularly for records storage and the size of the staff was starting a gradual growth. The establishment in 1958-60 of a separate microfilming program for vital records by the new records management officer, C. Frank Poole—similar to what had been tried a decade earlier—was made possible with a relatively easy acquisition of funds above the
normal budget. 17

Despite the early growth of staff and annual reports boasting of successes in gaining control of records, especially through microphotography, the Records Management Office was rapidly losing ground in its purported duties. Even in the area reflecting the largest proportion of staff, microphotography, the demands on this service outstripped its capabilities. By 1962 the records management officer was complaining of not being able to keep up with the necessary microphotography and that municipal agencies were establishing their own microfilming units without any supervision resulting in duplication and the destruction of records without proper authorization. 19 This problem was never brought under control and, as a result, is a problem still plaguing this division.

Even more illustrative of the city's lack of concern for an effective program were the repeated failures to obtain a proper facility for a records center. In its early years records were scattered about rooms in city hall and in portions of other buildings sharing space with other agencies; this arrangement not only caused great difficulty with the management of the records but created animosities with the other departments because of the competition for space. 20 There were at least five attempts between 1958 and 1971 to persuade the city to provide better facilities for its records and to eliminate a serious restriction to successful completion of its responsibilities. 21 The nearest success was in 1965 when the Department of Legislative Reference endeavored to have a records center incorporated into the proposed plans for the Inner Harbor redevelopment. Mayor Theodore R. McKeldin even supported the concept of a center with fifty thousand square feet of space for administrative offices, a reference library, microphotography, and records storage with temperature and humidity controls. This plan, like the others, never proceeded beyond preliminary planning stages. 22 After this failure no serious efforts were made again.

Perhaps even more crucial for the development of a municipal records program than city staff and finan-
cial support were the interests and qualifications of the person selected to fill the position of records management officer. C. Frank Poole held this position from 1955 until his retirement in 1977 and brought no experience regarding historical records and only a limited vision of a total records program. This, of course, was the fault of the city and reflected their emphasis on the destruction of records. Still, at least initially, Poole endeavored to do something about the historical records. In 1956–57 he worked out a plan for the sampling of a massive set of tax records extending back to the eighteenth century seeking the advice of Hunter; the staff of the Maryland Historical Society; and Morris Radoff, the state archivist. Although Radoff urged that all the records be maintained, the sampling procedure was put into motion; the years have proved Radoff to have been correct with much historical information lost forever. Several years later Poole also investigated the lamination process of records preservation and had several hundred documents preserved in this manner.

But such efforts were few and often produced more harm than good. More indicative of the true state of affairs was Poole's effort in 1961 to destroy completely the files of the mayor's office going back to the beginning of the city government in 1797 because these were only a "curiosity," infrequently consulted, and would be too costly to maintain. Only with the intervention of Hunter and the offended sensibilities of the incumbent mayor was this stopped. Modest funding from surplus funds within the agency were used for the hiring of two graduate students from Johns Hopkins University for a weeding and sorting project under the direction of Hunter.

Without question the additional hiring of a trained archivist in the early years of the records management program would have planted the seeds of an effective program for the municipal government's historical records. Frank Poole readily admitted that and summarized the problem in a letter of 1968 to his supervisor asking for an investigation of the
maintenance of the historical records:
Notwithstanding the limited assistance given to me in the area of historical records, there is no planned program for enhancing the use of such records. Researchers attempting to make use of them become discouraged very quickly because of the condition of the records and poor accessibility to them. Although Records Management has a special interest in the historical value of all records, our primary function during the last thirteen years has been in the area of microfilming, storage of records having a relatively short retention period, the retrieval of information and the disposition of records not classified as historical. Moreover Records Management does not have the personnel qualified to properly evaluate records of historical value.

But the problem was more complex. The chief city official interested in the historical records continued to be Wilbur Hunter, director of the Peale Museum. Hunter was not an archivist, had little knowledge of the fundamentals of such work, and often made mistakes in the selection of what documents should be retained for historical value. Beyond Hunter, Poole relied on the opinions of heads of municipal agencies regarding the value of their records, often creating inconsistent and ridiculous schedules. This continued to be the situation until the mid-1970s.

The retirement of the records management officer in late 1977 provided an opportunity to change three decades of the municipal government's neglect of its permanent records. It must be stressed, however, that such an opportunity was available only because the public's awareness of the city's past had been heightened within recent years. From the late 1940s until the late 1960s, when the municipal records of historical significance continued to deteriorate and were being lost and abused, there was little interest in these materials. The Baltimore Sun articles had aroused interest briefly, but in the absence of a
strong, dedicated group of individuals concerned with the unearthing of Baltimore's history, the momentum soon dissipated. Wilbur Hunter's concerns and efforts, despite his mistakes, were usually solitary endeavors. By the early 1970s, however, it was obvious that a flourish of research was underway on Baltimore's past through new efforts in historical preservation, published histories, historical conferences, the work of archivists and librarians, and the popularity of genealogy and commemorative festivals.

The events which led up to the appointment in early 1978 of the city's first professional archivist stem directly from this renaissance. Baltimore's municipal government has had, of course, a significant role in the history of the city—a role that had been almost completely neglected until the late 1960s and the new historical investigations; an 1899 monograph from the Johns Hopkins Press remained the main historical study on the municipal government until a political study of 1968. In the past decade increasing interest has been focused upon the municipal government and the value of its records for research. Recognizing this fact, a newly established Baltimore archival repository, the Baltimore Region Institutional Studies Center (BRISC), endeavored to assist the municipal government in establishing a viable archives program. Dr. Theodore Durr, director and founder of BRISC, had first become interested in the records of the city's planning department because of their affinity with collections already at his repository. In 1973 he made an agreement with that department to catalog their records with an ARCHON automated retrieval system, providing the form of access that planning department staff believed necessary to continue its work. In this endeavor the records management officer cooperated fully and even discussed the prospects of other historical records being sent to BRISC. Spurred on by the removal of the administrative offices and their records from city hall in 1975 for its renovation and the recovery by a local junk dealer of some miscellaneous nineteenth
century bills and receipts inadvertently tossed out, staff of BRISC and other institutions formed the Baltimore Congress for Local Records and History and formulated a large grant to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) for the full development of a municipal archives program. Submitted in early 1977 the grant was rejected primarily because of the lack of a professional archivist on the municipal payroll. However, the junk dealer's activities embarrassed a government sensitive to portraying a positive image continually, and the background efforts by outsiders to preserve its records led to a search for a professional archivist for the post of records management officer vacated in the fall of 1977.

Having been the curator of manuscripts at the Maryland Historical Society for five years, the author was aware that the municipal records were not being properly cared for and researchers not encouraged to use them; he was not, however, prepared for what he discovered in mid-January 1978. Arriving at the late nineteenth century warehouse partially utilized as a records center, he found confused, mistreated historical records, a lack of finding aids to any of the records with the exception of the HRS index, a staff totally unequipped and insensitive to historical records to the degree that ordinary mending tape was being used for repairs, and evidence everywhere indicating that these records had been neglected for an extremely long time. Examination of the management of the current records revealed a program that had not advanced much beyond that established in the mid-1950s, but which was, at least, functioning and which still provided potential for improvement.

After discussions with the acting director of legislative reference, the budget analyst, and other municipal officials, it was readily apparent that the city's new commitment to an archival program went little beyond the employment of the archivist. A short time later this was clarified when a number of historians, archivists, and librarians wrote to the mayor asking that more financial support be given to
the records program; the mayor's response was that
the city had hired a professional archivist. This
response was not surprising. There had been
virtually no communication for years from or about
the records program. Many municipal agencies did not
even realize that this division existed and proceeded
to attempt to solve their records problems completely
on their own. To suddenly appear before the mayor
and the Board of Estimates and request thousands of
dollars for a program they had no cognizance of and
in a time of severe fiscal restraint would not only
bring a negative response but could damage future
requests for assistance.

The direction taken was to bring attention to the
importance of the records program. The first
endeavor was to apply for a grant from the NHPRC as
seed money. The records agency had never received a
grant before, and the contacts already made with the
NHPRC through BRISC and the efforts of just a year
before made this a logical road to follow. Receiving
an NHPRC grant would bring some attention to the
historical records and show municipal officials that
such records were important enough to receive funding
from an outside agency. A grant was made in 1978 for
the arrangement and description of the mayoral and
city council records, the largest record group in the
records center and also the most important for the
administrative history of the municipal government.
Upon the completion of the project another grant for
a records survey of municipal agencies was obtained.
Both grants have been beneficial in subsequent budget
requests and, more importantly, smoothed the way for
the creation of two new assistant archivist positions.

Developing these new positions was one of the
other areas initially emphasized. In a staff of
eight there was only one professional archivist, the
others having only limited involvement with records
management and microphotography and none having the
proper educational background or experience that
would enable retraining. One person could not
arrange and describe all of these records and also
spend time on administrative matters necessary to enhance the program. Student interns were acquired almost immediately through contacts made at the historical society, but here it was obvious also that few could be utilized effectively if dependent upon one individual's attention. With the vacating of a microphotographer's position and the momentum gained by the NHPRC grant, a new position was created and filled in late 1979. The combination of this permanent position, the grant position, and the capability of hosting a greater number of student interns has enabled the cataloging of numerous records—over fifty record groups encompassing more than four thousand cubic feet. Another part-time position for continued surveying of records became permanent in 1982.

The NHPRC grant also helped the partial revision of the original 1954 ordinance to strengthen the archives aspect of the total records program. By this 1978 amendment the title records management officer was changed to city archivist and records management officer; the agency likewise to the City Archives and Records Management Office, and the Records Disposal Committee to just the Records Committee. It was with the Records Committee that another avenue of work also appeared. This committee had been established in 1954 to oversee the approval of records schedules and the program in general but had not met since 1955. Consisting of the auditor, solicitor, comptroller, treasurer, director of public works, director of the municipal museum, and director of legislative reference, the potential for acquiring assistance and influencing municipal policy seemed limitless. Four of the seven are appointed by the mayor and constitute a majority of the Board of Estimates. Showing them the condition of the records and communicating with them on a much more frequent basis has gained their assistance in the seeking of grants, the revision of the ordinance, and in slight increases to the budget when the majority of agencies are facing cuts or being forced to maintain the same level of spending.

Another goal was the building of a constituency
for the use of the historical records. In early 1978 these records were virtually unused, mainly because of the general lack of finding aids. Almost from the start lectures to genealogical groups, historians, and area undergraduate and graduate classes were prepared along with articles and other publications about the records in the Baltimore City Archives.35 Presently, the archives has a solid image with Baltimore residents and others that provides good material for arguing for the maintenance of the records. In 1978 there were only slightly over eight historical researchers a month; in 1979 this increased to over thirty, and in 1981 to nearly fifty.36 Such usage has helped to make a case that the municipal government has a responsibility to maintain these records properly for their use by the public.

Utilizing a fairly established records management program to benefit the historical records has been another area of emphasis. Through contacts with agencies about the microfilming or storage of current records, inquiries were made about other records; in a few cases this has led to accessions of valuable permanent records.37 This has also involved reevaluating records schedules and revising a few to provide for the screening of these records—especially administrative correspondence files—to salvage items of historical significance.38 Another method has been the usage of funds slated for other peripheral functions to buy equipment and supplies in order to start arrangement and description of these records. Most of the first orders of acid-free boxes and folders, map cabinets, and chairs and desks for researchers were acquired in this manner. The budget is now adequately balanced for the management of both historical and current records.

The progress of the reorganization of the Baltimore City Archives has been substantial when compared with what existed prior to 1978 but meager when contrasted to what remains to be done. To have a full-fledged municipal archives, Baltimore needs a modern, climate-controlled records center, a much larger staff enabling constant supervision of
municipal records and a survey of all records, an in-house conservation program or funding for conservation, and a published guide to the records. Such momentum is now there. Shortly, a comprehensive guide to the historical records and a general records manual for the administrative use of the city will be published—only two of a number of projects scheduled for completion and the result of a balanced, cost-efficient local records program. The future of this program is still uncertain, as are most such programs in the current economic and political climate; but the author is convinced that the only logical, effective manner to continue is to stress a comprehensive records program that supports the efficient management of local government, the cost-savings of current records management, and the cultural benefits of an archives program. There is no other way to reverse three decades of lost opportunity in Baltimore. 39
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In the premier issue (fall 1972) of Georgia Archive, David B. Gracy II described some of the planning and preparation required to start an archives. Ten years later, his extremely popular article is still being studied by archivists who are beginning new operations as well as by those trying to make existing organizations more efficient and usable. Since the article appeared, archivists have rethought old practices, learned from experience, and borrowed techniques from friends in libraries, records management, and computer programming. Sources for professional development and education have broadened, financial situations have grown perhaps less certain, and the quantity and types of materials being collected have expanded. Technology has given new hope for processing massive amounts of materials. Also during this time, new archives have opened while others have expanded their staffs and their areas of collecting. Still the purpose remains the same as that stated by Gracy in 1973, to preserve and make available for research historically valuable materials—whether they be volumes, manuscripts, correspondence, microfilm, or computer tapes and disks.

In LaGrange, Troup County, Georgia, much time has been spent recently in planning and starting an archives. Several years ago, citizens began to express concern that a lovely old bank building on Main Street was falling into decay. In 1976 a Victorian jail was converted into the Chattahoochee Valley Art Association, and people hoped similar use could be found for the bank. Also, the Georgia legislature authorized local municipalities to maintain their records and provide care for historically valuable volumes and papers. The Troup
County Historical Society, with the support of the Callaway Foundation, decided an archives to care for city and county government records and other local records would be an appropriate institution to house in the sixty-five year old bank building. A new archives was conceived.

Archival planning began at this point. Archivist Richard Kesner, then of the Archives of Appalachia at East Tennessee State University, was consulted. Building plans were drawn which met archival requirements for records rooms and processing space. The plans included specifications for security provisions and temperature and humidity controls.

Planning continued with the hiring of archivist Faye Phillips as director. Beginning in July 1982, she worked with contractors to see that the building was finished, with salesmen to equip the building properly, and with the community to familiarize them with the purpose of the archives. The author began work as archivist in January 1983 in time to do exhibits for the opening, to assist in developing procedures for use of the building and its holdings, and to start inventorying county records already transferred to the archives. Much planning has already gone into starting this archives; more will be done as the staff meets the basic archival responsibilities of collecting, preserving, and making available for research materials of enduring historical value—county and city government records, manuscripts, and genealogical materials documenting LaGrange's and Troup County's past.

In this article, Gracy's 1973 statements are examined in light of experiences of the staff and planners of the Troup County Archives in starting the new organization in the early 1980s. That his article is still relevant today is reflected in the fact that people who planned Troup County's archives shared many of his concerns. They realized the need to find qualified archivists in a profession with no certification and few prescribed steps for becoming an archivist. The planners recognized the need for adequate, long-term financial support. Knowing that
materials would be needed for collecting, they began thinking of photograph collections, family records, and printed materials which should be in the archives. They also discussed their concerns about the safety of county and city government records and those of local educational institutions. Finally, the planners were aware of the historical interest already in LaGrange—preservation of century-old homes and buildings is a topic familiar to many of the town's citizens. This base could be built upon to make the archives a true community asset.

In the early paragraphs of his article, Gracy discussed the reasons for establishing an archives. He stated, "The paper explosion of the twentieth century brings not only more documents to save but also more pressure to act." The Georgia Records Act as amended (1982) gave the people of Troup County an impetus to consider starting an archives. The act mandates that each municipality, county, and school board in Georgia approve a records management plan and include provisions for the maintenance and security of the legal records documenting the activities of the department or office. With the director's appointment as records management officer for the county and the archives' designation as the repository for records of permanent historical value, the archives enabled the county and city to meet the General Assembly's specifications. Also, at this stage in discussing the need for an archives, efforts were made to ensure that the program would receive sufficient funding. The support of the Callaway Foundation in providing proper housing and the promised financial support of the county and city government for day-to-day operations gave members of the Troup County Historical Society sufficient assurances to continue their efforts to build an archives.

The next step, mentioned only briefly by Dr. Gracy but examined in other archival literature, was planning the building. Kesner was consulted and space was allotted for various archival tasks. The third floor has a workroom for processing activities,
a records room with 4,388 square feet of shelf space, an audiovisual room for microfilming and developing photographs, and a classroom and office space. The second floor is designed for use by the public. It has a large conference room, a meeting room which can seat seventy persons, offices for the historical and genealogical society, and a kitchen. The first floor contains a laboratory with work space for various conservation activities, a vault, photocopying equipment, office space, microfilm reading room, a large research room with shelving for reference and rare books, and a foyer or exhibit area. Security measures were part of the building plans from the very beginning. Fire and smoke detectors, fire-retardant doors for the records room, bells announcing a person's entrance into the building, and security alarms provide extra measures of protection needed by manuscript repositories. A former bank building, which last housed the Good Will Store, has been renovated into a modern archives.

The time had come to staff the new enterprise. After a search of several months, members of the historical society's Archives Committee selected Ms. Phillips as director. Her qualifications included eight years of working experience at several southern manuscript repositories (including the Southern Labor Archives, with Dr. Gracy) and advanced degrees in history and library science. In both 1973 when Gracy wrote his article and 1982 when Troup County was looking for an archivist, standards for judging archivists' qualifications remained limited—experience and good judgment continue to be more important than specific degrees and particular skills. Then, as now, archivists need to possess a wide range of talents—archival competency; ability to work with employees, researchers, donors, and advisory board members; knowledge of records management and cataloging practices; and administrative expertise to develop budgets, apply for grants, and plan for growth. These talents and skills are needed as the director juggles roles as administrator, records manager, archivist, and
building maintenance supervisor. The variety of duties and demands have changed little since Gracy wrote.

After assuming her duties, Ms. Phillips began to staff the archives, to write a collection policy, and to develop a statement explaining what the archives does and does not do. The collection policy provides the archives staff a rationale for accepting certain materials and rejecting others and a framework for planning future development of the collection. The policies have been clearly stated and made available to interested researchers, donors, and persons providing financial support. The collection policy serves as one means of educating the public about the types of materials one might expect to find in the archives and the types the staff might be interested in adding to its holdings. Guidelines for general building use were also developed at this time. They were incorporated in press releases distributed for the dedication and included in brochures given to users and donors. The concern now, after several months of operating, is that the archives staff must abide as much as possible by the policy. Care must be taken to see that research materials which complement the goal of documenting and preserving the area's history are accessioned and inventoried. A properly outlined collection policy can do much to aid in future planning and to assure that a collection reflecting the objectives and reasons for existence is built.

Somewhere in the development of the archives, the front doors are opened—either quietly or with a well-publicized event announcing the commencement of a new operation. Troup County chose to have a formal dedication ceremony. The occasion was used to begin explaining to the community what an archives actually is; in Troup County, as elsewhere, few people knew. The gratifying support given by the community and fellow archivists through their presence and kind words at the opening provided welcome encouragement as the staff began a large but exciting task.

The very next morning after the dedication,
researchers wanting to use the collection had to be faced. Fortunately, before the opening, Gracy's advice to have materials available for research had been followed. One of the archives' groups, the West Central Georgia Genealogical Society, donated their collection of local and family history magazines and books. The archives staff added other county histories and reference books about the state. Though small, the collection is useful to both longtime and beginning genealogists. The books are shelved in an easily explained subject arrangement while cataloging, done mostly by Library of Congress MARC card orders, proceeds. This has meant that genealogists have been the most common early users but the staff expects to attract local historians, scholars, and other interested persons as more materials are made available. Gracy's point about having materials ready for use should not be overlooked—the books gave researchers materials to use, permitted the staff to devote their attentions to inventorying the first shipment of county records, and enabled the archives with its potential research value to stay in the minds of the public and possible donors. Over one hundred and twenty persons used the collection through research visits, calls, and letters during the first months of operation.

During this time, a microcomputer has been used to inventory over seven hundred volumes of county records. Researchers can go from census records to deed indexes to tax digests. The widespread use of computers and their applications in archives has been a major innovation since Gracy's writing and has enabled the Troup County Archives staff to avoid developing a huge backlog of unprocessed materials in the first few months of operation.

The Lanier E-Z 1 microcomputer at the archives combines word processing and basic computer (data managing) functions. The computer is used for listing government records and for indexing and describing both manuscripts and archives. The card catalog is for books and periodicals only. One computerized accessions list serves as a donor file,
a title index, a locations file (maybe major additions will not cause major headaches), and a chronological index. The list can be sorted to separate like items, that is, all maps carry the code MP- and an accession number. These codes can be sorted both alphabetically and chronologically to group the various types of materials included in the collection. The lists can also be used to determine the size of holdings or the size of recent donations; a couple of commands yield a statement regarding the number of linear feet, items, and volumes. The list also indicates which items have been processed or cataloged and when gifts were made. Finally, groups which have been inventoried are footnoted on this list. A separate file maintained for Accessions/Footnotes contains the inventories. Copies of these lists, inventories, and indexes can be produced at any time and, thus, can be easily updated. Also, lists produced for use by the public do not contain location or donor information; a holdings list notes only archives codes and numbers, titles, inclusive dates, sizes, and brief descriptions. Developing a subject index will be the next project.

County and city records also are being accessioned on the computer. Holdings are entered and like items—all Superior Court minutes, for instance—are grouped together on the computer with locations indicated. Thus, the staff can avoid spending days physically shifting large volumes and boxes to get the items together on the shelves and can easily tell where gaps exist. The computer file also assists with records management; permanence or scheduled date of destruction are indicated.

Reference procedures have been developed and amended during this time. Since the archives is open to the general public, care must be taken to explain how hundred year old, decaying volumes should be handled. Sometimes people have to be instructed where they should begin their search of their family tree. (Of course, other researchers have chastised staff members for not researching their own families, emphasizing the thrill of finding a grandfather eight
Forms have been developed and decisions made about how detailed researcher registration will be. The basic rules and regulations researchers are expected to abide by have been written. Photocopying procedures and costs also have been determined. Throughout this, care was taken to avoid overwhelming users with forms and regulations while allowing the staff to operate a professional and secure archives which preserves rather than destroys its holdings.

Another vital part of daily operations proved to be public relations with donors, members of the parent organization, and the community. These public relations activities include everything from speaking to the Rotary Club and the Retired Teachers Association or showing slides to a classroom of fifth graders to giving the city manager a tour of the building as a reassurance that records are better cared for in archives than elsewhere. The director's public relations activities have been many and varied. Support of community members and interested community groups, such as historical societies or university history departments, will always be important to the success of archives. These groups may also prove to be valuable in seeking out other donors or in serving as allies in times of fiscal, legal, or other troubles.

A final area of planning, which seems appropriate to consider in this look back at "Starting an Archives," is for the future. In these early days of existence, the Troup County Archives is occasionally haunted by ghosts of the future. Will there be groaning in 1993 about the way things were done in the beginning and the problems caused by poorly rendered decisions? In 1983, is everything being done to make sure this will not be the case? Planning and deciding what procedures and policies to use take time. Following the guidelines chosen while still being flexible will not be easy. Even deciding what information to include in computer inventories is time consuming. The hours could be spent cataloging more books or arranging photographs; yet, it is hoped
that by taking the time today—and next year and the years following—to do the job right, tomorrow's archivists may avoid grudgingly living with what was done or having to redo work. Troup County Archives in 1993 will not be perfect, but the present staff intends to work hard to see that it is at least a very good archives with a sound records program.

The future holds other concerns as well. Will the financial bases be sound? Should steps be taken now to build an endowment? Should an off-site storage area for proper records management of county and city records be used to save work in the future? Will archivists be prepared, through education, experience, and professional development, to meet the demands of 1993 and, later, the twenty-first century? Is formal computer training needed for survival? Is one certified records manager, in the person of the director, enough? The questioning and the thinking about the future goes on. The important thing, whether at institutions six months or sixty years old, is that archivists think about their institutions and their profession and begin preparing for the future today.

These are certainly not the only steps required for starting an archives, but they are points to be considered in beginning operations. They are also concerns David Gracy had ten years ago. Today, as then, each situation continues to be different from the next, but much can be gained by looking at the experiences of others. Older institutions can learn from the experiences of newer ones, and new institutions will certainly be, as Troup County Archives is, in debt to the archivists at older facilities who have already faced the same problems and offered their assistance and advice when asked. It should be remembered that different types of archives—university, historical society, religious, government, and business—share many of the same goals and problems of preserving and making available for research materials of historical value. Archivists should also remember Gracy's closing statement:
Yet, it is the good judgment and careful planning of the archivist that finally combines the principles of the profession with the specifics of the occasion to produce an effective archival operation.
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One of the most significant features of post-World War II archival development has been the tremendous increase in the number and variety of researchers. Archives users are no longer an elite clientele, the scholar involved with traditional areas of historical research—political, economic, and military history. Within the discipline of history itself, there are now a wide variety of researchers, working in many different areas, who avail themselves of the resources of archival institutions. Other scholars, including sociologists, economists, geographers and even scientists, are now using archival sources to support their research projects.

This interest in the potential of archives has extended outside the scholarly world to embrace the community at large. This diverse range of nonspecialized users—journalists, genealogists, university students, and teachers—has had a significant effect upon the archival world and has led to changes in the organization of archives and the services that they provide. The advent of the new type of researcher has encouraged archival repositories to develop new services in order to meet the needs of the new community of users.

Since the 1950s in Great Britain and Ireland, a number of archives have developed sophisticated educational programs designed to encourage the use of archival materials at the primary and secondary
school level. There have been a number of reasons for this rapid growth and interest in promoting educational service. Local history teacher associations have sprung up which have actively encouraged the use of archival sources in the classroom. There has been a growth in local historical societies whose main purpose has been to publish documents relating to local history. Teaching methods have changed, and many teachers want to extend beyond the traditional textbook approach to education. The importance of local studies has grown as country records offices have been organized to preserve the records of their areas. Many archivists have come to the conclusion that for archives to survive as viable institutions in these tough economic times, they must broaden their base of support and their clientele to include services and users outside the scholarly world.

Not all archivists and teachers in Great Britain and Ireland are sold on the educational value of using documents in teaching. Critics argue that children lack the maturity and intellectual development to use archival sources. These critics look at the introduction of archival documents in the primary and secondary schools as the "gaudy wrappings of the 1970s with which the teacher tries to disguise the bitter pill of history." They further point out that many teachers themselves are incapable of using archival sources intelligently. Some teachers are set in their ways and do not really want to try new techniques; others are overburdened by administrative duties; and some are beset by the problem of distance from an appropriate repository.

The proponents of using archival documents in education argue that the use of archival material in the classroom is compatible with trends in the educational curricula in which children do things for themselves rather than being taught by the "chalk and talk" method. Accompanying this trend in education is a general assault on the whole textbook method to teaching history whereby subject matter becomes dry and dull, student interest is stifled, and second-hand
views of history are regurgitated. The proponents argue that using archival sources in the classroom can stimulate student interest by forming the basis for the most direct form of contact with the past, more true than any textbook can hope to be. Many teachers and archivists also believe that the use of documents in the classroom gives children historical perspective and is the only real way of introducing the student to history so that he can learn what history is all about and what the work of the historian is really like.

Those who see the educational value of the classroom use of archival sources realize that different types of material have to be selected for different age groups. One archivist who has done research on the topic has found that—for children under fourteen—the younger the child, the less likely that he will be able to relate several pieces of information. Single documents, especially ones rich in illustrations, appear more appropriate for this age group. Students over fourteen tend to study a subject in more depth and to appear more interested in intricate detail.

Age also appears to be no barrier. Some teachers who have experimented with the use of archival sources in the classroom claim that by nine or ten children are at the right level of intellectual development and can be stimulated by exposing them to documents which relate to their own locale. Children become excited and enamored with the possibility of being "real historians" by researching their own localities.

In the 1960s, many European archivists and school teachers began to realize the potential of archival sources and decided that more should be done than merely looking at the material. A period of experimentation began, with the services provided by a particular type of repository depending on the resources, staff, and financial capabilities of the archives and the interest of school officials. Some repositories appointed archivists whose sole responsibility was to develop an educational program. Their services included organizing whole or half day
sessions at the archives, providing instruction on research methods to high school students in order to prepare them for the university, assembling educational facsimiles based on archival sources and mobile exhibits which could be sent to schools upon request, and establishing training programs for school teachers.8

Educational programs in Great Britain and Ireland have evolved into four main areas of activity: services provided at the archives, services organized in the schools, publications, and in-service training programs for teachers. The type of programs adopted by various county archives varies and depends upon a number of factors, including staffing, space, finances, and interest.

Many archivists prefer to have the services at the archives rather than at the schools, since the pupils handle the documents under supervision, thereby insuring the security and preservation of the repository's resources. Teachers may also prefer to have the educational programs organized at the archives where the original material can be used without the difficulties associated with transporting them to the classroom and where enough space is provided to handle the usually large classes.

A special feature of services at the archives is a separate room where the children and their teachers can be accommodated without distracting the repository's regular clientele. Ideally, the room is soundproof, and since the usual archival accommodations are not suitable for handling groups of children, special equipment—moveable furniture, display equipment, lightweight and portable screens—is provided. Traditional finding aids have also proved inadequate, and many archivists have developed special types of indexes, forms, and narrative finding aids for both the pupil and the teacher.9

When the class arrives at the archives, the teacher works with an archivist who has been designated the repository's educational officer. A number of projects may be undertaken, depending upon
the legibility of the material and its suitability for the course of study. Slide shows can be organized and have proven particularly effective when they have incorporated colorful, illustrative material such as postcards, prints and posters. Other types of projects might include writing essays; talks by the teacher and archivist, illustrated by documents and followed by class discussion; and creation of scrapbooks which consist of photocopies of archival sources. Many projects are designed to foster a professional attitude on the part of the child toward his assignment, and some teachers even require that students keep a record of the sources consulted.

Whether the setting is the archives or the classroom, many British and Irish archivists strongly favor having the students handle original documents, believing that this is as important to the learning process as the reading of documents. One archivist who has observed the interaction of children with archival sources has said that "there is something special about the idiosyncratic shape of early forms of handwriting, which is lost when photocopies are employed." Some repositories—the Essex County Records Office in England, for example—encourage bringing original materials into the classroom, provided proper care is taken to insure security and preservation.

However, these repositories are the exception, and most archivists confine their services in the schools to mobile exhibits centered around a subject that children are studying in class. Archivists experienced in assembling mobile exhibits believe this important because an unrelated exhibit is "merely a form of publicity for the archives and not an educational program." In addition to a relevant theme, other factors are important for mobile exhibitions. Special upright panels to facilitate mobility and the display of items are needed; photocopies of documents and not the originals, of course, are used; and concise, legible notes are required to explain the exhibit's theme and to clarify any of its
subthemes.

Publications for the classroom usually take the form of photocopies of archival sources put together, usually in folders, and accompanied by some explanatory material. These packets are known as archival teaching units (ATUs) and are the most popular method of bringing the archives to the classroom. Each packet consists of twenty to thirty documents. The copies must be fairly legible, with the handwriting reproduced clearly enough so that young school children can read them. Transcripts may be used for documents that do not reproduce well. Some repositories, such as the Public Records Office of Northern Ireland, produce packets consisting of facsimile reproductions on one side and a printed transcript on the other.

The ATUs center around a distinct theme (e.g., emigration, shipping in the nineteenth century, the industrial revolution, or the great Irish famine of the 1840s), and it is important that the documents selected for the units be not only informative but also visually appealing to capture the students' interest. Basic information is provided about the records in the archives, the relationship of records to each other, the context of the records, and why the records were chosen, along with a glossary. These notes are not, however, an effort to explain the documents completely. As one archivist has pointed out, "If the notes become too important a part of the unit, they may make it difficult for the teacher to use the text the way he wants, and it may create a situation where the teacher ends up doing more work with the unit than if he had devised his own."

The ATUs are used in a variety of ways, either supporting the traditional methods of teaching or serving as a classroom aid to stimulate and make possible new approaches. Many teachers have written about the practical value of the archival teaching unit. One has said that after the unit has been assembled it can be used for different classes and that the use of the packet has turned out to be an academically satisfying occupation for the teacher. Its use in the classroom maximizes the pupil's independent
thought and work, and it is versatile enough to be used at all levels of the secondary school curriculum. Many archivists believe it is more worthwhile to spend time assembling ATUs than trying to accommodate the students in the records offices while grappling with the problems of space and security.

Both approaches stress the importance of working together: the teacher because of his understanding of the classroom potential of archival sources and the archivist because of his knowledge of his collections. To facilitate the classroom use of archival materials, something more is needed than merely putting documents in the hands of children and expecting enthusiasm and interest to be aroused. Unimaginative use of archival materials can be less productive than imaginative use of textbooks and notes. As one teacher has pointed out, "At least most pupils know what to do with the latter."

Many British and Irish teachers, like their American counterparts, have never set foot inside an archive or have ever had the opportunity to work with archival materials. Since the early 1970s, several archives have established in-service training programs to educate teachers in how to make a more critical and wiser selection of sources and to provide an opportunity for teachers to get to know archival sources and their potential, as well as the facilities of the records office.

There are two types of in-service training programs—the teacher can either be permanently attached to the records office or take a leave of absence from regular duties and spend a lengthy period of time (usually a year) at the records office. In the first program, teachers are allocated to the county records office and conduct the services for the schools from the repository, staying for a long period of time and virtually becoming members of the archives staff. They perform an important role in organizing and developing the educational services for the repository. This can be very useful for many county archives. Few can afford a full-time educational officer, as education constitutes just one of many areas
of archival activity. Also, since the teacher is the one who must use the archival sources, he more than the archivist knows best how the needs of the student can be filled through the use of archival sources.

There may be one drawback when teachers become permanently attached to the archives: they can become outsiders to the educational system. Many archivists, therefore, prefer to see a turnover of teachers, thus creating a situation whereby a greater number are made aware of the possibilities of archival sources for teaching purposes and the wide range of sources available in the archives.21

One of the most successful of the second type of in-service training programs is that at the Public Records Office of Northern Ireland (PRONI). PRONI gives a high priority to education services and has one professional archivist who spends a great deal of his time developing the educational program of the archives. He is responsible for handling educational inquiries from teachers, students, local historians, and the public and for organizing traveling exhibits for schools and teacher centers. He also acts as an adviser to a wide range of curriculum development projects throughout Northern Ireland, such as the use of the computer in teaching history; supervises the archives' in-service training program; and guides and helps teachers in the selection and use of documentation for instructional purposes.22

The educational program began in the mid-1960s, soon after the new archives building had been completed. Although the building cost several million pounds, the number of people using the resources of the repository was quite small. In order to justify the cost of the new building and the money that was needed to equip and maintain it, PRONI concluded that it had to "educate a new public."23 The program began slowly, with members of the staff becoming involved with such projects as developing facsimile kits of archival sources for primary and secondary schools and leading short courses on the use of historical records for teaching. The administration of PRONI believes that, after several years, its educational program has
stimulated a public demand and interest in its resources and services. The archives has now "withdrawn to the proper functions of archives administration; that is, servicing that demand."

The in-service training program for teachers at PRONI began in 1975 as a short secondment of approximately four months. A few months later it was decided that this was too short a time period, and the program was extended to a full year. The secondments are advertised and paid for by the Northern Ireland Department of Education. The department supports over one hundred secondments, covering a wide range of subject areas and available to a wide variety of institutions. Eight secondments have been offered to libraries, archives, and museums in Northern Ireland, and PRONI must compete with four other institutions for the secondments.

Prior to 1982, the selection of the seconded teachers was solely in the hands of PRONI; but now the selection is made by government civil servants, and the archives role is limited to supplying criteria for the type of applicants the repository seeks. The competition for the available positions is quite stiff.

Interviews with the director of PRONI, its educational officer, and two of the teachers on secondment indicate that all involved believe that the in-service training program has been very successful. The administration of PRONI credits the program with developing a pool of expertise in the country which will not only make use of the repository's resources but will also promote and encourage the use of archival sources throughout the province. Secondment will foster not just more and more use of archival sources but also "more expert use." The staff at PRONI sees the secondment program as helping to overcome the fear that teachers normally have of archival sources. The teachers come to see documents as resources that can be used like any other resource, depending upon the classroom situation.

For the teacher, in-service training helps to overcome two of their biggest problems: the
inconvenient hours of service in the archives and the distance. PRONI is the only viable archives in Northern Ireland and is responsible for collecting a wide range of material from private papers to official government records. Consequently, archival sources in Northern Ireland are centralized in Belfast. PRONI's normal hours of service are similar to many American archival institutions: 9:00A.M.-5:00P.M., Monday through Friday. Consequently, it is difficult for teachers from outlying areas to get to the archives and use its resources. Secondment enables selected teachers to serve as resource persons, helps them develop expertise about the archival resources of PRONI, and gives them the opportunity to serve as an advisor to history projects based on archival sources. In addition, teachers have photocopying privileges during their secondment, and this allows them to build collections of archival documents which they can take back to their home area. During their secondment at PRONI, they may be contacted by other teachers who desire certain types of material for their classrooms.28

If an American archivist is interested in establishing an education program for children, what are the factors to be considered, based on the experience of British and Irish archivists? First, there is the intangible element of confidence—confidence that the program is worthwhile and confidence that, with time, the program will succeed. Brian Trainor, the director of PRONI, has said that it took approximately ten years to gain the confidence of the educators and the history inspectors, the people archivists must convince to introduce the necessary changes in the curriculum.29

Trevor Parkhill, educational officer at PRONI, also pointed out that the matter of confidence may begin with the archives' own staff. The archivist will have to convince other archivists that establishing such a program is a legitimate archival function. Archivists, caught up with huge backlogs of material and a busy search room, may not think
that time spent developing services for children—a nontraditional user group—is worth the effort. This may result in lukewarm support and internal resistance to the development of the educational program.30

American archives embarking upon educational programs for children will also need special rooms, money, and equipment to get the program going. An area of the archives should be set aside which can be used to accommodate a large, active, and, perhaps, noisy class of children. There should be adequate financial support for travel, if the educational program involves visits to the schools; for special equipment (mobile exhibit stands, lightweight and moveable furniture and screens, if slides are to be shown); and for material for facsimile kits. A photocopier should be purchased and made available to teachers who want to duplicate material for classroom use. This is essential for archives which do not have the staff or the resources to stay open during hours which are convenient for teachers.

Most important for the archives is to have a staff willing to work with children and their teachers. Whoever is responsible for developing the educational program "must not take a superior attitude to the school teacher who comes through the door and wants to explore the possibility of doing a local studies project. Otherwise, the teacher may never return."31 The archives will need an archivist who has some teaching background to nurture the teacher and persuade him that it is worthwhile to try to introduce the use of archival materials into the classroom. Eventually, enough teachers will be trained who have experience with archival sources and who will get on decision-making panels and create pressure to make changes in the curriculum which will suit the demands of teaching history through archival sources.
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In recent years articles have celebrated the growth and quality of college and university archives, so much so that a session at the 1982 annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists focused on whether higher education was documented out of proportion to other aspects of American life. As part of an ongoing discussion of this topic it would be instructive to investigate the distribution of academic archives and to explore ways colleges and universities without archives can better care for their records. Throughout this discussion it is important to remember that college and university archives are not established to provide documentation on the subject of higher education; they are established to care for the records of their institutions. That these records also provide information on the history of higher education is an additional benefit, not the archives' primary goal.

No one will dispute the increase in numbers of college and university archives. This growth, documented in surveys by the Society of American Archivists' College and University Archives Committee, is reflected in directories published by the society. To keep things simple, entries in these directories will be accepted at face value and aspects of what the author will call the Cinderella syndrome will be ignored. Included among the sufferers of the Cinderella syndrome are archives in institutions with combined archives and special collections departments in which the archives is treated as the neglected stepsister getting the leftover resources, time, and attention; archives which appear in directories clothed in their fancy ball dress but which in reality exist in rags, underfed, understaffed, and
often ignored; and archives whose programs had little more substance than Cinderella's finery and vanished after a similarly short existence.

Putting aside the question of the quality of archives in those institutions which at least nod in the direction of having an archival program, it is interesting to note which institutions, or rather which types of institutions, do not have archives. A comparison of the entries for a number of states in The College Blue Book for 1981 and the 1980 Directory of College and University Archives in the United States and Canada (taking into consideration those academic institutions listed in the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) Directory as having institutional records show that almost all four year colleges and universities have some kind of archival program. Of the 1,206 institutions listed in The College Blue Book for the states of Alabama, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin, 443 (or 37 percent of the total) were in the College and University Archives Directory and/or the NHPRC Directory. Of the 763 remaining—that is, those who do not report archival programs—only 104 are four year colleges or universities with over 1,500 students. The other 659—86 percent of the institutions without archives—tended to be junior colleges, community colleges, vocational and technical schools, and small colleges with under 1,500 students. Branch campuses of universities, somewhat more difficult to verify because their archives are sometimes included in the entry for the archival program of the main campus, also often seem to be among the missing. These are rather startling figures.

Can we really claim higher education is adequately documented if records in whatever quantity or quality for these types of institutions are not preserved? Such schools enroll hundreds of thousands of students, and they often have a significant economic and social impact on their locality. Are we fostering an elitist history of higher education if we ignore these
If we agree that documentation of the full variety of higher education is essential, is there a better way, or another way, to accomplish this goal than the current system under which the institution bears the full weight of caring for its own records? While every institution should be concerned with the management of its records, given economic realities can archivists in good conscience recommend that every institution undertake a full archival program with the space, staff, and financial commitments such a program would entail? What alternatives can be suggested to people from the small junior college, the moderate-sized music conservatory, and the large vocational-technical institute?

There are at least four options worthy of consideration: (1) deposit or gift of the institution's records to an existing repository, (2) contracting out for archival services, (3) using existing archival networks or creating new ones, and (4) entering into a cooperative agreement with similar institutions or other components of a larger entity.

For some institutions the simplest and perhaps wisest answer may be to place their records under the care of an established repository. This could take the form of a gift or a deposit. Certainly before any agreement is complete and an instrument of transfer or deposit is signed, the usual discussions covering ownership and copyright, terms of access, kind of processing expected, and disposition of duplicates and other records not of enduring value should take place. In addition, there should be agreement on the provision for later additions to the collection, whether and under what conditions items from or portions of the records would be returned to the originating institution, and what is to happen to the records if the repository ceases to exist. The institution placing its records at the repository may be asked to pay some or all of the processing or storage costs.

For the academic institution this results in its
records receiving excellent professional care at less cost than support of an in-house archival program would entail. Such a solution might be ideal for a small private college, especially a church-related school whose records could be placed in the repository which cares for the records of the church which sponsors the school. This sort of arrangement is often made for records of predecessor schools, or schools which no longer exist. There is no reason why mutually acceptable arrangements could not be reached for records of schools which continue to function.

The second option, contracting out for archival services, would avoid one of the main drawbacks of the first, for it would allow the records of the institution to remain on campus. Under this option a trained archivist from outside the institution would process the records, prepare finding aids, and help establish record schedules for future accessions. A detailed procedures manual would help a non-professional on campus retrieve information and give the records minimal care in the intervals between the visits of the archivist. An archivist with commitments to several institutions could find this an alternative to a more traditional job. Consultant agencies also might be willing to enter into such contracts. Archival service centers—a much discussed but so far rarely available aid to archives—which could provide processing and other archival services might provide an attractive variation on this option.

Archival networks may also help archivists broaden the documentation of higher education and improve the quality of care records of academic institutions receive. Most of the existing archival networks deal with public records and many divide states along geographical lines. Many states also have systems of publicly supported community colleges or technical institutes placed geographically so that all citizens have reasonably easy access to at least one of these schools. Would it be unrealistic to propose that existing network centers collect the
records of these schools? They are, after all, public institutions of recognized local importance. In states like New York which do not have an archival network but do have a system of community colleges as part of the State University of New York (SUNY), could a network be established to handle the records of all the component parts of the SUNY system? 

The other option, a cooperative agreement with similar institutions or other components of a larger entity, may be especially applicable for branch campuses. An archives on the main campus could keep selected records documenting the purpose and strongest programs of the branches. A cooperative arrangement between similar institutions—all vocational schools or all Catholic schools in a geographic area, for example—might be possible. These institutions might want to share the services of an archivist and order supplies jointly. However, any such cooperative arrangement would have to take into account or overcome the natural competition for students and other scarce resources which exists between similar institutions.

None of these options is without problems. There may be any number of other alternatives. The point is that while archivists can not play fairy godmothers generating the resources and commitment necessary for an archival program with a wave of the magic wand, they can begin to think about and explore options open to those whose institutions cannot or will not support a full in-house archival program. Now is not the time to rest on laurels, with congratulations on the thoroughness of the documentation of higher education—not while institutions fail to manage their records properly because a full archival program seems beyond their means and whole areas of higher education remain underdocumented or ignored.
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Appraising while arranging is probably such a natural process that most never consider it appraisal. Yet, retention appraisal and arrangement work hand in hand during the progressive refinement of control over an accession. Each successive level of control more specifically identifies the records present. This changes the context for the appraisal and progressively narrows the focus of the retention decisions. Rather than a single step, weeding occurs bit by bit, depending on the information made available through arrangement.

Making retention decisions is not so much a matter of looking for certain types of materials as it is a matter of asking appropriate questions of the materials found:

1. Are these documents unique? Are there copies in archival custody? Extra copies of many items (typically multiple copies of mimeographs or ephemera) are prime candidates for disposal as a result of failing this question.

2. Do these documents contain valuable information about a person, corporate body, place, condition or event? Do they contain valuable evidence of transactions or interactions? Is the information...
or evidence available in other documents? Often daily reports can be discarded when weekly or monthly summaries are available.

3. Does anyone care about this information or evidence? For the records generator, is it needed for current administration; is it likely to be needed for future administrations? For researchers, has anyone worked on this type of topic; is anyone likely to do such work? Sometimes retention is warranted despite a current lack of scholarly interest because the topic documented is either intrinsically or potentially important. Yet, even though some value can be perceived in almost every item, most documents will never be used. To facilitate a reasonable amount of weeding, most archivists interpret the question to mean "Is anyone likely to care a great deal?"

These types of questions have been discussed at length in the general appraisal literature. Some archivists and records managers have even developed sophisticated systems for using the questions to assign retention rating factors to records. However, no matter how complex the scoring system, the answers to these questions depend not on some absolute standard of retention value but on the context in which the questions are asked. This context is set both by the level of the processing and by the external assumptions.

As the arrangement process moves progressively from the general to the specific so does appraisal. The questions asked are always the same, though they are geared to the appropriate level. For example, at the series level, whole series are appraised: is this series unique; does it present valuable information or evidence, etc.? Since appraisal moves progressively, retention standards initially appear to be relatively lax or conservative. Many folders and items are retained that will later be weeded out. They are accepted at earlier stages simply because they are not yet individually identified. As they are identified their relationship with other records
in the accession and the archives becomes clearer. Appraisal of the folders and items is then easier and more natural.

Refining an accession arrangement prompts reappraisal: what was an appropriate retention decision at one level may not be at the next. For example, when first accessioned (when no contents detail was known), the papers of Texas State Senator A. R. Schwartz all appeared to be of archival value. They were the central office files of a key state politician in the 1960s and 1970s. Among other attributes, several topics of extreme local interest—flood insurance and hurricane preparedness planning legislation—presumably documented by these papers were not well represented in area repositories. Through refinement of the accession arrangement to the series level, the papers were found to include general correspondence, newspaper clippings, legislative materials (bills and related documents), campaign materials and other assorted series. New retention decisions were needed. At this stage the clippings were discarded, since they gave only general information on actions taken and almost no information on the motive or processes behind the public actions. Discarding the clippings in this case was also routine because various repositories in the state keep and index the newspapers represented.

Later, when the individual folders in some of the series were put in order, still other materials were discarded. For instance, duplicate copies of bills and reports were removed from the legislative files. In this way the accession was pared down to the more valuable records. Even so, there would undoubtedly be reason for additional weeding should some of the remaining series be refined to the folder or item level.

The Schwartz papers are but one example of a familiar pattern. When negotiating for records or appraising on-site in preparation for transfer to the archives, the archivist is usually willing to accept any box that looks like it includes material possibly...
of archival value. After the records have been transferred and while they are being arranged into subgroups and series, the various sets of folders identified are appraised together. If and when the processing moves to file unit level, the individual folders are appraised. Only if the processing descends to the item level are individual items intensively considered. While single items are discarded at every level, the basic pattern is to decide first whether the records in aggregate (the subgroup or series) are worth keeping before assessing the individual items separately. There are exceptions to this general rule. For example, processing the unorganized papers of a documentary pack rat may require sifting through the whole accession item by item or bundle by bundle to find the documents of archival value.

Through this processing sequence, from the general to the specific, the refinement of the arrangement leads to the ever more refined appraisal of the accession. The retention decisions, in turn, help to pinpoint segments of the accession worthy of further processing (since only the worthy materials are kept). This complementary relationship makes appraisal a facet of the arrangement process rather than a separate issue.

Just as the level of processing affects appraisal decisions, so do external factors. The most important of these is the quality of the documentation already collected. Some apparently routine records—for example, ancient storehouse lists—convey much valuable information simply because so little other documentation of the subject or period exists. However, where basic records have been preserved, there is usually little need for the more peripheral records. Modern records are often characterized as presenting too much information, not too little. Thus, appraisal is frequently used to reduce the bulk of an accession without significantly altering the quality of the information in it. For example, constituent problems dealt with by an elected official may vary in some details, yet fall
into general patterns. The complaint letters, though individually unique, are collectively similar. Since a fair sample can adequately represent all the information in such files, there is no need to keep all the items.

The quality of documentation cannot be strictly measured. The sense of adequacy instead is based on an estimate of the research interest in the topic documented. Assessments of the research interest usually involve anticipating the type of researcher and the method of research. Sometimes it is useful to keep many items of small information or evidential value because collectively they can provide raw data for quantitative studies. Similarly, when a biography is anticipated, it is necessary to keep more of a person's notes and rough drafts in order to document processes as well as results. In scientific and literary papers notes that reflect the intellectual processes are sometimes as valuable for researchers as documents that present the final product.

Breadth can be as important as depth. For example, the weeding of the Schwartz papers has so far been relatively conservative, since there is a fair chance researchers will want to study Schwartz himself or his role in the state senate. No one but a biographer would want to know the full range of Schwartz's activities; yet, in anticipation of such a researcher all of the legislative files have been kept, including those on relatively trivial matters. If in time there appears to be little interest in Schwartz, the papers can be reappraised and many of the legislative files discarded. Considering these various external factors does not alter the questions that need to be asked, it just changes the acceptable answers: are these notes and drafts of interest? Yes, to the biographer; no, to the quantitatively oriented social historian.

General appraisal plans drawn up before processing begins are useful for identifying the external assumptions that will govern the appraisal. Such plans help give coherence to the retention
decisions that are made. Some archivists actually write out a plan, while others simply make mental notes. Yet, whatever its form, an appraisal plan is but a tentative sketch of the weeding to be done. It is not a substitute for the questioning during processing.

Appraisal is not a one-shot task. Since the underlying premises can change, reappraisal is necessary. As mentioned above, most reappraisal occurs naturally as accessions are arranged in more detail. If the progressive arrangement occurs in steps separated by several years, any changes in the premises will automatically be reflected in the retention decisions. Leonard Rapport has also identified the need to reappraise at previously arranged levels. Such reappraisal weeds out whole accessions or large segments of accessions that have proven useless or have already received their fullest possible use. Just as processing prompts reappraisal, reappraisal prompts reprocessing (or discarding).

The complementary relationship between arrangement and appraisal is not often fully expressed in general discussions of either topic. That relationship is nevertheless an important aspect of progressively refined processing and deserves more explicit attention. Archivists generally agree on the need for better appraisal guidelines in many areas. For such guidelines to be most workable they must clearly place appraisal within the context of the processing workflow.

Uli Haller

NOTES

1For example, see two of the basic works on appraisal: Maynard J. Brichford, Archives & Manuscripts: Appraisal & Accessioning (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1977) and Theodore R. Schellenberg, "The Appraisal of Modern Public Records," National Archives Bulletin, no. 8 (1956). Neither refers to arrangement when presenting appraisal tech-
niques. It is also interesting to note that the word appraisal is not even mentioned in Schellenberg's Management of Archives (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965), a work that concentrates on arrangement and description.


COLLECTING AT THE 1982 WORLD'S FAIR

When the World's Fair came to Tennessee (1 May-31 October 1982), it brought an opportunity for the staff of the McClung Historical Collection of the Knoxville-Knox County Public Library to collect small, ephemeral fair-related items. There is a scarcity of such items from the city's early exposition experiences--the Appalachian Expositions of 1910 and 1911 and the National Conservation Exposition twenty years later. This led to thoughts on the needs of future researchers and how easily similar requests might be met with relatively little effort in the present.

With our 1982 World's Fair collecting, we were working with a low-to-no budget, which certainly helped define our collecting policies. Fortunately, a good many ephemeral items were free. Our staff was alerted to look for anything with the World's Fair red flame logo. Good taste and discrimination were not factors--price was. We operated on the theory that unsuitable material, as well as duplicates, could be weeded and discarded at a later date.

There was an official everything for the fair, and we collected product containers and advertisements as much as possible. J.F.G. coffee bags, Flavor-Rich milk cartons, empty Coca-Cola cans, even Smoky Mountain Market hot dog wrappers all found
a home in our collection. I had a season pass to the fair and made it a point to pick up weekly schedules, brochures, and pamphlets from the pavilions. Once Lay's Three Little Pigs made the mistake of leaving their basket of self-portraits untended, and I took a handful of those—all for a good cause, of course. On the fair site I hung around garbage cans and watched the pavement for discarded tickets and other treasures. Several friends refused to go to the fair with me more than one time, claiming my bag-lady approach to collecting lacked dignity.

On a more cultural level, our library director Paul Bartolini, brought us programs from the entertainment events. Bill McArthur, the head of the McClung Collection, proudly brought in a menu from the Sunsphere Restaurant. We were also fortunate that State Senator Victor Ashe was generous in passing along the many lovely invitations to parties and special events he received.

One especially interesting donation was that of material received from the local Girl Scout Council. They had worked hard to coordinate camp-like accommodations for Girl Scouts from all over the United States, with the result of hosting 10,811 people. I am particularly pleased with the material because it represents a non-fair produced but Knoxville-related aspect of the fair. Margaret Dickson, the head of Lawson McGhee Library's children's department, was responsible for the donation which was followed by several post-fair deposits made by the Girl Scouts.

We contacted several local businesses for donations. The Coca-Cola Company sent over two of their commemorative trays, and the World's Fair shop at Miller's Department Store was very generous in donating a number of items we did not have, including t-shirts, ceramic souvenirs, and even a solar-powered hard hat.

I bought all of the different World's Fair postcards I could find. My special attention to postcards stemmed from the fact that those from Knoxville's earlier expositions make up the bulk of
our scanty material on the fairs and they have received heavy use from researchers. Knoxville benefitted from the 1982 fair's presence in that several excellent aerial photographs of the city were taken and reproduced on postcards. We have copies of those cards with our regular postcard collection as well as with the World's Fair material.

Postcard hunting emphasized the need to be ever vigilant in our search for material. One of the best postcards was located in a grocery store twenty-five miles away, and I never did find one like it in Knoxville. Likewise, the visitor center at the energy museum in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, had a number of World's Fair brochures which I never saw in Knoxville. The same held true for a stop at a North Carolina visitor center. It was frustrating to realize how much good material we were missing by either not knowing of its existence or not being where it was available.

We purchased small promotional items such as World's Fair drinking glasses available from Wendy's and McDonald's. Then, towards the close of the fair a lot of surplus souvenir items went on sale. One real find was a pair of deely bobbers (glittery shapes attached to a headband by long, loose springs) for fifty cents. In years to come researchers may speculate on the appeal of this apparel, but they certainly do represent a genuine aspect of the fair's ambience.

Another area of the fair's impact on Knoxville, one which many people would prefer to forget, involved the housing situation and evictions. One of my favorite artifacts, a t-shirt designed and donated by a genuine World's Fair evictee, shows a red, flame-shaped happy face clutching dollar bills in each hand and bears the words "Greed Comes to Knoxville."

There were several reasons we began our collecting. First was our awareness of the lack of extant materials from previous local expositions. Second, there was opportunity. The fair site was only a few blocks from the downtown library. Had it
been miles away, I am certain that our collection would have been much smaller. We hope the collection will be useful to researchers and helpful in putting together future exhibits on the fair. Our material is perfect for use in recreating a typical scene from the fair, perhaps showing visitors waiting in line to get into the Chinese Pavilion.

In January 1983 the McClung Collection took custody of the official 1982 World's Fair Collection, which consists of approximately one million pieces including slides, video tapes, documents (excluding legal and financial records), artifacts, and printed material. Most of what we collected was duplicated in the official collection. However, it was in mint condition, which was not always the case with the items we retrieved from underfoot on the fairgrounds.

At the time we began our collecting, we had requested to be chosen as the repository for the official World's Fair material, but no final decisions were reached until after the fair's closing. We could not assume we would be selected and do no collecting on our own, for that would have left us with very little or no record of the fair. Also, use restrictions have been placed on the official collection and access to that material is very limited. We have no such restrictions on the items we collected and have been able to help with requests that otherwise might have had to go unanswered for the six year restriction period.

As a post-fair footnote—the collecting continues. We have received several nice gifts from individuals in past months. Also, a dedicated McClung staff member is faithfully, systematically drinking his way through each color can of World's Fair beer—and bringing in the empties.

Sally Ripatti
The Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA), in 1983, was designated as the primary data center for the state. With the agreement of the governor and the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, DCA becomes the central census depository and distributes census information to the public through the State University Library/Information System.

The South Carolina Department of Archives and History is offering to local governments a microfilming service that will pay for itself. Hoping to extend beyond the currently funded project of microfilming pre-1920 land records and estate papers, the department established a fund for microfilming that is planned to sustain itself.

American Association for State and Local History, Nashville, TN, received $144,334 to produce for distribution a slide/tape presentation, a brief pamphlet, and a guide to managing local records. The project continues the work of the National Advisory Committee on the Management, Preservation, and Use of Local Governmental Records.

The Kentucky Department for Libraries and Archives, Public Records Division, has a $150,000 National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) grant to distribute money to local governments for microfilming, document preservation, and rerecording of deteriorating records. Numerous courthouse and city hall fires in the past five years have demonstrated the vulnerability of the records.
The University of Georgia Libraries, Special Collections Division, has accessioned a collection of forestry photographs and organizational records from the Southern Forest Institute. The records contain the files of four forestry organizations. The photographs, which number more than one thousand, highlight the southern logging industry between 1939 and 1946.

• • •

Florida and Alabama, in 1983, were added to the list of southern states receiving $25,000 Needs Assessment Grants from NHPRC. The National Association of State Archives and Records Administrators has been given supplemental grant money to conduct a planning seminar for state historical records coordinators in states currently receiving assessment grants.

• • •

The Coalition for the Preservation of Alabama Newspapers obtained a $10,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) to develop a statewide plan to preserve the state's newspapers. Work on the project began in July 1983 with a survey to determine newspaper holdings in the state.

• • •

The M. I. King Library at the University of Kentucky also received a NEH planning grant for Kentucky's portion of the United States Newspaper Project. It is anticipated the project will identify newspaper sources and microfilm them. For additional information, contact Frank Levstik, Newspaper Project Director, King Library, UK, Lexington, KY 40506.

• • •

The University of Louisville obtained a $12,000 NEH
grant for microfilming the records of the Works Project Administration's Kentucky Medical Historical Research Project. The project is a joint venture of the Kornhauser Health Sciences Library and the University Archives, both at the University of Louisville. The project archivist is Janet Hodgson.

The SPINDEX Users Network (SUN) plans to expand its membership and coverage in its newsletter to include archivists, librarians, and records managers who use mini, micro, and main-frame computers. For more information, contact Tom Converse, Kentucky Department for Libraries and Archives, P.O. Box 537, Frankfort, KY 40602.

As part of the second year of the Yale-Cornell-Stanford-Research Libraries Group (RLG) Title II-C project to develop a TLG automated bibliographic system of manuscripts and archives, funds have been provided to convert Cornell SPINDEX format records to RLIN/MARC format records. In the late fall of 1983, specifications for the conversion will be written and software should be available by mid-1984.

Conservation Resources International (41 N. Royal St., Alexandria, VA 22314) is currently marketing archival containers made from "lig free" material. This paper, which is free of the lignin in wood tissue, not only has the proper ph, but also contains a layer of mylar. The lig free photo boxes are buffered only on the outside.

Process Materials Corporation (301 Veterans Blvd., Rutherford, NJ 07070; telephone 201-539-3900) is now selling an opaque photographic negative enclosure. The "Archivart" enclosure is acid free and unbuffered.
REVIEWS, CRITIQUES, AND ANNOTATIONS


Sometimes a book comes along which exactly fills a need, meets its purpose, and fits its audience. Nearby History is such a publication. The two authors have written forthrightly, concisely, and wittily and have managed in the process to offer an enormous amount of information. The book covers the essential areas of local historical concern, what they are and how to use them—whether they involve published and unpublished records, photographs, artifacts, buildings, or even immaterial things such as rituals and customs.

Each chapter is devoted to a separate kind of historical source material for local historians to use in telling their stories. Each chapter is, in essence, a primer on the techniques and materials of such diverse but important local historical undertakings, as oral history, historic preservation, taking and analyzing photographs, finding and describing artifacts, and so on. To assist the users further, the authors have provided extensive bibliographies at the end of each chapter and a series of appendices showing standard forms and formats used in museum and archival agreements, listings of support agencies (such as regional branches of NARS and state NEH committees) and survey forms and local ordinances for historic preservation. As if that were not enough, the book is full of examples and illustrations—edited portions of actual local histories, photographic case studies, maps, and sample interviews.
Nearby History is intended primarily to assist beginners and students of local history, but it is far more useful than that and should reach a broad audience. It will serve as a provocative reminder to professionals in all roles of the level of personal engagement involved in local history, of the controversies inherent in many local historical questions, and of the limitations of using any single technique in approaching the study of a place and its people.

This book pulls no punches while it informs. Kyvig and Marty deliver their messages in a straightforward manner which tells the reader what is necessary to know, what is easy and what is hard to do, where the traps are, and what the rewards and pleasures are likely to be in historical research. Nearby History is recommended as a handbook for all parties involved in local historical inquiry.


A Manual of Archival Techniques is a revised edition of a work first published in 1979 and reviewed in the spring 1981 Georgia Archive. The 134-page manual contains an introduction, ten articles on various aspects of archival knowledge, four articles on agencies from which to seek help, an appendix, and a bibliography. All the articles are brief, some consisting of only three pages and the longest being nine pages. This 1982 edition is only slightly different from the first: James W. Williams replaces Samuel Murray on "Storage, Space and Equipment"; an article on
bookbinding has been replaced by Lois Olcott Price's "Phased Conservation for Books and Bound Archival Material"; and Sarah D. Holland has updated the article on the Pennsylvania Humanities Council, which in 1979 was the Public Committee for the Humanities in Pennsylvania.

The other eight articles on techniques deal with appraisal and arrangement of textual material, photographs, and maps; reference services; security; disaster planning; and first steps in preservation. Section Five describes two Pennsylvania and two federal agencies that offer assistance to archival repositories. The appendix provides samples of forms, terminology for photographic and print processes, and a do-it-yourself security checklist. The bibliography has been expanded, especially in the fields of appraisal and accessions, maps, space utilization, and bookbinding, while a bibliography on grant writing is entirely new.

This manual is aimed at beginning archivists and curators and at those persons working in agencies where technical expertise and finances are likely in short supply. Ms. Price's article on phased conservation, as an example, focuses clearly on techniques that are within the capabilities of most repositories. She realistically states that proper environmental conditions, proper shelving, and proper protective housing (folders, envelopes, boxes) constitute the bulk of a sound conservation program. In regard to more advanced conservation problems, she advises caution and the seeking of professional assistance and training. This same regard for the needs of the intended audience characterizes most of the articles. The three weaker articles—those on security, description of textual records, and appraisal and arrangement of textual records—are weak because they lose sight of this audience.

All manuscript repositories would do well to make this volume required reading for new staff members.

The 50-page Guide to County and Municipal Records on Microfilm in the Pennsylvania State
Archives will be very useful to anyone interested in doing grass roots research in the Keystone State. Guides of this type should be comprehensive, sensibly designed, and uncluttered, and this one is. The 4,984 rolls of 35mm microfilm contain five million pages of records covering the period from 1682 to the present.

The Guide format continues the practice of the state archives of placing county and municipal records into two different record groups. Except for minutes, which are normally listed first, the office or bureau records that constitute each county or municipal listing are arranged alphabetically. The date of creation and county seat are given for each of the fifty-five counties, and the incorporation date and county are provided for each of the 106 municipalities. Inclusive dates of the records and the number of rolls of microfilm involved complete the listing for each record series.

With the appearance of these two fine volumes, the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission (PHMC) has established a solid publishing foundation on which to build. The editors, Roland M. Baumann of A Manual and Nancy L.P. Fortna and Frank M. Suran of the Guide have set a high standard. Those in the archives and research communities can only hope that the PHMC will continue its interest in publications in these areas.

Robert Dinwiddie

Georgia State University


This volume represents the first published regional guide to manuscript material in Indian history. It proposes to serve an increasing scholarly interest
in Indian affairs and follows on the heels of several other bibliographical and research tool compilations. These include the CLIO press bibliographical release based on *America: Life and History* and *Historical Abstracts*, the establishment by the Newberry Library of an Indian study center, and the seminal publication, *Bibliographical Guide to the History of Indian-White Relations in the United States*.

The compilers note that there has been much written on southeastern Indians—much of it without benefit of manuscript material. Since most of the scholarly work on southeastern Indians has either been done by archaeologists and ethnohistorians who rely more heavily on oral traditions and on field work than on documentary sources or by historians who rely on documents but omit coverage of the Indians, this situation is understandable. The recent attempts to collect, edit, and publish the papers of Chief John Ross of the Cherokees are a notable exception, and the Chepesiuk-Shankman guide may encourage additional professional and scholastic broadening.

The collections represented in this volume are numerous and some of them quite rich. The reported holdings include everything from news clippings to photographs to large collections of private papers. Indeed, there are surprises in store: significant oral history collections at the Universities of Florida, South Carolina, and Kentucky and records of Indian students at Hampton Institute, for example.

The guide is organized with utter simplicity—by state, by city, and then by repository within the cities. The listings tend toward inconsistency in the level of information which they give, which is typical of a questionnaire compilation and not a serious fault. Occasionally, the content and pertinence to the subject of Indian affairs is not obvious, but more often than not, the information is straightforward and useful. This book is an ideal selection for archivists who need to make recommendations to researchers and an ideal sourcebook for researchers.

Editors
Physically, Windows to the Past is a teaching aid featuring thirty-eight photographic facsimiles of documents from Illinois county records. Following a brief introduction and suggestions for additional reading, a transcription, explanation, list of new words and terms, and questions for discussion are provided for each document. The documents are not all related to the same topic; each stands separately. This decision not to focus on a specific event or person or location is the one aspect of this publication with which some teachers may find fault.

Intellectually, three trends appear to have come together to influence this project. One is the growing interest in local history and its increased importance in the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools. The revolt of twenty years ago in the secondary schools against required courses, lectures, memorization, and homework forced history teachers to revise their teaching methods. If students were allowed to be their own historians, they would have to go to the sources to do research. This meant that many history teachers turned their students loose on oral history or local history projects. Fortunately, this practice has become much more sophisticated with the assistance of numerous helpful publications, many sponsored by the American Association for State and Local History. In Illinois, Windows to the Past will become one of the most useful teaching aids for state history.

A second trend exhibited here is the booming interest in the history of common people, i.e., social history. As both student and teacher in Illinois, the Land of Lincoln, the reviewer remembers
Illinois history was actually taught as "the life and times of Abraham Lincoln." Windows to the Past is a significant contribution to improving upon that tradition. Abraham Lincoln is not the subject of any of the thirty-eight documents, and he is barely mentioned in the introduction; though mentioned he is, probably in compliance with some state law. Rather, the concerns and variety of the documents reproduced can perhaps best be demonstrated by listing a few of the document types: military land patent, jail diagram, tavern license, apprentice indenture, overseer of the poor claim, and mine inspection report. The sum of the documents is not a history of the state or county governments from 1818 to 1880, but rather a suggestion of how average people lived as reflected in their dealings with government.

The third trend is the effort of archives to increase their budgets through outreach programs. This trend has been hurt by state and federal budget decisions of the last three years. Certainly outreach is the new item on many archives budgets, and it may suffer from the same fate feared by women and blacks in a faltering economy, "Last hired, first fired." Nonetheless, the theory that increasing public interest in archives will lead to increased budgets still prevails among archivists. But along with obtaining original funding for outreach, another problem has been the type of outreach to pursue. All too often archivists have encouraged teachers to bring their students to archival facilities for "exciting personal research" without proper preparation of the students or even the teachers. The reviewer's first exposure to archival research included more of a feeling of helpless, hopeless floundering than of creative discovery, and it is doubtful that this is an unique response. Windows to the Past overcomes the numerous problems of original research by students by publishing selected documents for their perusal and by providing teachers with a guide on the use of the documents. In short, Windows to the Past will not only be used by the history
teachers of Illinois, but also serve as a model for archival institutions seeking to develop or enhance outreach programs. 

Martin I. Elzy 

Carter Presidential Materials Project


First published in 1968 in a limited run, assuming that few people were interested in an agricultural topic, Paisley's From Cotton to Quail has become one of the most xeroxed items in Florida history. Because of its immense popularity, the University Presses of Florida waived their long-standing prohibition on reprints and reissued the book in 1981.

It is easy to see why From Cotton to Quail has such a following. Paisley is a good writer and his extended career as a journalist has enabled him to relieve the tedium of a work about plantation agriculture and farm productivity. Paisley, furthermore, really enjoys his subject and probably knows the red hills of Leon County, Florida as well as his own home. The research is solid, although limited in that major collections at the national archives in Washington and recent monographs like Jerrell Shofner's definitive study of Reconstruction Florida (Nor Is It Over Yet) are not used.

The vicissitudes of antebellum cash crop agriculture and principally plantation cotton cultivation are the subject of the first chapter, which is really background for Paisley's topic. The reader learns a lot about individual producers and quantities of commodities, and since Paisley's objective, as stated in this title--agricultural chronicle--is to present this material in a narrative
recitation, there is little or no analysis. Although
the subjects may have been outside the author's
scope, the freeze of 1835, the beginning of the
Second Seminole War late that same year, the onset of
the national depression in 1837, and the demise of
the Union Bank in the 1840s would seem to merit some
attention.

Post-Civil War Leon County agriculture is dealt
with in the succeeding chapter, and here again,
Paisley emphasizes lists of producers and
commodities. Although the author did not use the
Freedmen's Bureau Records (Record Group 105) at the
national archives, this omission is probably not
significant given the focus of attention of From
Cotton to Quail.

As Paisley advances into the late nineteenth and
twentieth centuries, his control of the material is
more evident, and the last three chapters make a real
contribution to understanding the evolution of
southern farming in the southern Georgia and middle
Florida region. It is evident that farmers in Leon
County were adapting to changing production and market
conditions and that profits, rather than politics,
were the focus of their attention. Paisley's
documentation for these chapters is impressive; other
sources that could have been used would have been
redundant.

This is a good book and well worth having for
anyone interested in middle Florida agriculture. The
reviewer certainly looks forward to Paisley's

Michael Schene
National Park Service

Automating the Archives: Issues and Problems in Com-
puter Applications. Edited by Lawrence McCrank. White
Paper. $27.50.

The papers in this volume emphasize the
application of computers to archives and manuscripts rather than machine-readable records and come from a symposium held at the University of Maryland in April 1980. Since then, advances in the field of archives automation have made this collection interesting only from a historical standpoint. However, that is quite enough to recommend it. For anyone who wishes to understand today's developments, this volume will serve as an excellent introduction to what has come before.

In addition, the broad overview of the central questions of automation presented in the keynote addresses and in the section on needs assessment and priorities are still relevant. Editor Lawrence McCrank's comments are interspersed throughout and are helpful in pulling the conference's divergent themes together.

It is hoped that conferences of this nature will become regular events and that proceedings can find their way into print in time to inform the profession of developments in this rapidly changing field.

Robert Bohanan
Carter Presidential Materials Project

NOTE: Greenwood Press (88 Post Road West, P.O. Box 5007, Westport, Connecticut 06881) recently published the first in a series of guides to state and local history. A Guide to the History of Louisiana, edited by Light Townsend Cummins and Glen Jeansonne, has xi and 298 pages and is priced at $35. Volumes in the series will consist of historiographical essays and descriptions of major collections of primary sources. The publishers intend the series to be of use to both professional and amateur historians.

The second and third volumes of the Greenwood Press series History of Black Americans by Philip S. Foner have been published. Ranging from 500 to 700 pages, the three volumes are (1) From Africa to the Emergence of the Cotton Kingdom, 1975, $45; (2) From
the Emergence of the Cotton Kingdom to the Eve of the Compromise of 1850, 1983, $45; and (3) From the Compromise of 1850 to the End of the Civil War, 1983, $39.95.


A free copy of this valuable research tool may be obtained from the address above, and all institutions receiving inquiries concerning the papers of United States Senators will wish to do so. Another example of the fine work of the Senate Historical Office, the Guide provides information on the location of former senators' manuscript collections, oral history interview transcripts, memorabilia, photographs, and portraits as reported by 350 research institutions in the United States. State lists of former senators and a list of repositories showing senators' collections in their custody follows the primary alphabetical list of senators.


Originally privately published, the University of Georgia Press has added photographs and other information for this republication in the Brown Thrasher Books series. The International Grand Prix auto races were held on Savannah's seashell paved roads in 1908, 1910, and 1911.

Guide to the Roebling Collections. Edited by Eliza-

Civil engineers John Roebling and his son, Washington, participated in design and construction of the Brooklyn Bridge and several other important American bridges. This volume describes the manuscripts, photographs, designs, and plans in the Roebling Collection at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and lists the Roebling materials at Rutgers University.


Each page of this privately published, light-hearted pamphlet consists of an aphorism concerning archival work accompanied by an appropriate illustration.
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• Members of the Society of Georgia Archivists, and others with professional interest in the aims of the society, are invited to submit manuscripts for consideration and to suggest areas of concern or subjects which they feel should be included in forthcoming issues of PROVENANCE.

• Manuscripts received from contributors are submitted to an editorial board. Editors are asked to appraise manuscripts in terms of appropriateness, pertinence, innovativeness, scholarly worth, and clarity of writing.
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- Use of terms which have special meanings for archivists, manuscript curators, and records managers should conform to the definitions in "A Basic Glossary for Archivists, Manuscript Curators, and Records Managers," American Archivist 37, 3 (July 1974). Copies of this glossary are available for $2 each from the Executive Director, SAA, 330 S. Wells St., Suite 810, Chicago, IL 60606.
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