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To create a catalog is to bestow power; whoever uses a catalog gains control and access to whatever is being cataloged. Attempts to catalog written material go back to the days of clay tablets and proceed through the preparation of catalogs for medieval monasteries, printed book and card catalogs for libraries, calendars and other finding aids for individual manuscript collections, published guides to repository holdings, and union catalogs to the most recent form: online data bases.

The development of rules for cataloging books and other printed material followed a steady and clearly defined path, although not without controversy. For archival and manuscript material the development of any generally accepted standards was much slower and later in coming. For many years those concerned with books largely ignored manuscript material of any kind, and those concerned with archival material ignored library practices and rules. It was not until the 1980s that the growing impact of improved automation technology revealed to many members of both groups that they had much in common and could benefit from mutual concern and cooperation.

In 1876, Charles Cutter (one of library science's greatest innovators) published the first edition of Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue. It went through four editions, the last published in 1904,
and reflected his extensive experience with library catalogs. A year after its founding in 1876, the American Library Association (ALA) formed a committee on cataloging and turned its attention to rules for cataloging. When the Library of Congress (LC) began to sell printed cards for books in 1901, the need for standardization and cooperation became obvious. A draft ALA code was published in 1902. In 1908, the first Anglo-American code, a cooperative venture of the ALA and the Library Association (of Great Britain), based on LC practice, was published. Dissatisfaction with the omissions of the 1908 code grew during the next few decades, and in 1941, the ALA prepared an expanded draft code. This code generated a great deal of controversy over the level of detail a cataloging code should provide.

Eventually the Descriptive Cataloging Division of the Library of Congress published its Rules for Descriptive Cataloging (1949), and the ALA adopted it as a substitute for the second part of its 1941 draft. Part I of the 1941 draft, dealing with entry and form of headings (now called access points), was also published in 1949. Four and a half pages of the ALA rules relate to choice of main entry for single manuscripts, usually in the form of facsimiles. No rules for description of manuscripts were given in the LC publication. Archives and collections of historical or modern manuscripts were not dealt with at all in either book of rules, both of which served as the generally accepted source of authority for catalogers of printed material until 1967.

The strong impetus for standardization of book cataloging in libraries that was created by the ready availability of LC printed cards, the opportunities for shared cataloging, and the existence of a national union catalog for books had no such counterparts for archival and manuscript material until much later. Unique material in an individual library can be described in any way that suits the particular situation. Furthermore, the cataloger of such material functions in an environment of
cataloging pluralism where there is no clear cut definition of what the most suitable unit for cataloging or descriptive entry should be. In some instances there is a difference of opinion as to whether a book should be cataloged individually or as part of a series, or whether parts of a book should be cataloged separately, but in most cases a book is a book and is the catalog entry. Moreover, there is usually no question about the physical entity of a book, although there may be questions about its physical location.

Manuscript material, on the other hand, can be redistributed, put into large or small boxes, folders, or files. Its extent can be diminished or enlarged and its essence drastically altered. Archival professional literature abounds with advice and guidelines on how to do these things, and there are sound archival practices that should be followed, but there can be no universally accepted code for arranging manuscript and archival collections. Individual repositories of manuscript material treat their collections differently. Some do item level cataloging; others deal only with collections, series, or record groups.

There is a further complication and important difference between the world of single unit and collective level cataloging. The catalog entry usually provides the only direct access to the single unit (particularly for books), whereas for archival and manuscript collections, an intermediary finding aid such as a register, guide, or inventory is usually desirable and often necessary. Advice about the preparation of such finding aids can also be found in the professional literature, and increased uniformity in their preparation in the last twenty years is probably due to the availability of this kind of professional advice. Catalog entries are frequently prepared from the information in the finding aid, are one step further removed from the collection, and by design, provide less information about, and fewer clues to, its contents.

For many years, curators of manuscript material
felt they had much leeway in how the material under their control should be described or cataloged. Setting standards and writing rules in such an atmosphere is not an easily accomplished task. However, if the descriptions or catalog entries of manuscript and archival material are to become part of a cooperative exchange of information or part of an integrated system containing descriptions of other types of library material, some standardization both as to quality and uniformity is necessary.

For medieval manuscripts, the compilation of Seymour de Ricci's Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada (1935-1940) and its supplements is one example of an endeavor that led towards greater uniformity in cataloging individual manuscripts. From time to time articles dealing with the cataloging of manuscripts have appeared in professional periodicals. Attention was also given to the cataloging of archival material. The 1936 cataloging code of the Illinois State Library was considered a good basis for a national code by the Cataloging and Classification Committee of the newly formed Society of American Archivists (SAA), and attempts were made to revise the Illinois code. However, no formal code was ever adopted by the SAA.

In the early 1950's, the Library of Congress, with the cooperation of librarians in other institutions holding manuscript material and the support of ALA, worked toward the development of rules for the descriptive cataloging of various types of manuscripts. The results of this effort were drafts of rules for cataloging single manuscripts, issued in 1953 and 1954, and the Preprint of Rules for Collections of Manuscripts issued in 1954 and distributed to interested librarians. The rules for collections of manuscripts were intended to serve as the basis of entries in the proposed National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections (NUCMC), and it was hoped that they would also serve as national standards for use by individual repositories. When NUCMC did come into existence in 1959, its compilers
followed the 1954 rules. As experience in preparing entries for NUCMC grew, the rules were revised and expanded.

During this same period, criticism within the library profession of the 1949 ALA cataloging rules continued to grow. Under the auspices of ALA and with the cooperation of the Library of Congress and the British and Canadian national library associations, new rules and revisions were proposed and systematically reviewed. In 1967, a new cataloging code, the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) was published. It combined rules for entry and description and included the rules for special materials developed at LC. Revised versions of the 1954 rules for cataloging single manuscripts and collections of manuscripts were published as Chapter 10 of the 1967 code. This chapter is divided into two parts, the second of which relates to manuscript collections and reflects very closely the practices followed by staff members of NUCMC and by LC's Manuscript Division. There is evidence that other libraries owning manuscript collections began to follow these rules, and a number of manuscript repositories submitted data for inclusion in NUCMC that was already in NUCMC entry form. Archival repositories, however, largely ignored these rules, which, because of their library orientation and quasi-booklike appearance, were considered inappropriate.

Although AACR represents a great deal of hard work and was a substantial achievement, it was also considered a compromise. Not long after it was published, some of its provisions were amended and changed. The main reasons, however, for the desirability of a new edition of AACR were the rapid growth of library automation and increased involvement of international groups such as the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions and its program of International Standard Bibliographic Description. Representatives from the United States, Great Britain, and Canada met in 1974 and began planning for this new edition by
setting up a Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR.

The result of this effort was the publication in 1978 of *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, second edition (AACR 2). Chapter 4 of this work is entitled "Manuscripts (Including Manuscript Collections)" and represents a considerable departure from Chapter 10 of AACR. The general introduction to the volume states that "these rules are designed for use in the construction of catalogues and other lists in general libraries of all sizes. They are not specifically intended for specialist and archival libraries, but it is recommended that such libraries use the rules as the basis of their cataloguing and augment their provisions as necessary."

These words were taken literally by many concerned with cataloging manuscript and archival collections who found that Chapter 4 did not adequately meet their needs. To answer their predicament, the Library of Congress, supported by the Council of National Library and Information Associations and the National Endowment for the Humanities, prepared a manual for cataloging manuscript and archival material. The preface and introduction to this work supply much useful information about how and why the project was undertaken and make references to the future development of an automated system that would be compatible with manuscript and archival material as well as with books and other printed material.

The years between the appearance of AACR and AACR 2 marked a period of intense growth and development in automated technology and exchange of bibliographical information. The manuscript and archival community participated in the development of SPINDEX (Selective Permutation Index); the librarians developed MARC (Machine-Readable Cataloging). SPINDEX was born at the Library of Congress, but never went beyond the experimental stage there. In 1967, it was taken over by the National Archives where it eventually evolved into SPINDEX III. The National Historical Publications and Records
Commission (NHPRC) sponsored it as the means for developing a proposed national data base for archival and manuscript material. It was used in the compilation of NHPRC's Directory of Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the United States and for several regional, state-wide, and local projects. SPINDEX made it possible to provide printed data about a large body of manuscript and archival material in a somewhat standardized format, even when the original information was not at all standardized. SPINDEX's major drawback, however, is that it is not an online system.

Online access to bibliographic information is what MARC does provide. The MARC format adopted by the Library of Congress in 1968 was designed primarily for books, but other kinds of library holdings were not overlooked. In 1973, the Library of Congress published Manuscripts: A MARC Format, which contained specifications for both manuscript collections and single manuscripts. This format, however, was never used by LC or by any other major repository. LC's Manuscript Division developed its own MARC-like format (Master Record II) in a batch processing mode; NUCMC is not yet automated.

In 1977, a growing concern in the archival community regarding exchange of information on a national level led the SAA to establish the National Information Systems Task Force (NISTF). Members of its working group included representatives from the National Archives, Library of Congress, Research Libraries Group (RLG), and participants in NHPRC data base projects. One of its first activities was the compilation of a data element dictionary (issued in 1982) to provide standard definitions for data elements used by any repository holding archival or manuscript material. After much study and discussion about the nature of and requirements for a national information system, NISTF proposed that the MARC format be revised and expanded in order to make it more suitable for archival and manuscript collections. Accordingly, during 1981 and 1982 work proceeded along these lines.
While NISTF was doing its work during 1981, RLG also organized a task force of archivists and manuscript curators to develop user requirements for entering information on archives and manuscripts into its automated data base, RLIN (Research Libraries Information Network). There was some overlapping membership in both task forces, financial support for both by the National Endowment for the Humanities, and participation in both by the Library of Congress. These cooperative efforts made possible a joint proposal by NISTF and LC for a new MARC format for archives and manuscripts. In January 1983, MARBI (Machine-Readable Form of Information), the American Library Association's committee that advises LC on MARC formats, approved the proposal, and the new MARC Archival and Manuscripts Control (AMC) format came into being. In 1984, it was formally incorporated into Update 10 of the MARC Formats for Bibliographic Data, published by the Library of Congress.

Although the Library of Congress is the agency responsible for the maintenance of MARC, it was agreed that no changes to the AMC format would be made without the approval of the Society of American Archivists. After NISTF came to an end in December 1982, the society in March 1983 appointed a standing Committee on Archival Information Exchange, which has as one of its missions the joint management with LC of MARC AMC.

The reception given to the new AMC format by archivists and manuscript curators was markedly different from that given to the 1973 MARC manuscripts format. This time the climate had changed radically: automation was a reality; the need and desire to exchange information were pressing; and archivists and librarians had cooperated in a joint venture that appeared to be both acceptable and successful. When RLIN implemented its AMC file in January 1984 with three repositories, the new format became an actual means of exchanging information about archival and manuscript collections. Since then, increasing numbers of repositories, including both libraries and
archives, have begun using MARC AMC.

The SAA has done its share towards fostering use of the format by appointing a special program officer for the Automated Archival Information Program, sponsoring a series of workshops entitled "Understanding the MARC Format for Archival and Manuscripts Control" to be held in four locations during 1986, and making available two works that offer guidance to MARC AMC users. One is a report of a conference of MARC users held in Madison, Wisconsin, in 1984, which lists the AMC fields followed by descriptions of the local practices of nine of the repositories represented at the conference. The other is a guide to the format itself, containing definitions, examples, and other pertinent information, and it includes the Data Element Dictionary prepared by NISTF in 1982.

The MARC AMC format is an increasingly popular topic at professional meetings. Sessions at recent SAA conferences which included explanations of MARC AMC and its applications have been well attended. Use of the MARC AMC format, the SAA manual by Nancy Sahli, and the LC cataloging manual by Steven Hensen by a wide variety of repositories will make possible a hitherto unattainable degree of uniformity and a viable method of exchange of information about archives and manuscript collections. This is not to say, however, that absolute uniformity will be the result. Both the AMC format and the LC manual allow many options, particularly as to the level of determination of the unit to be cataloged, and the provision of access points to the catalog entry.

As more and more manuscript and archival repositories gain access to automated systems, the desire to take full advantage of this advanced technology as a medium of exchange is growing. The format appears to be well on its way to becoming the accepted vessel into which information about manuscript and archival material is to be placed. However, there is somewhat less agreement about how the "pigeonholes" of the format are to be filled.
Although repositories are learning the numerical designations for the different fields, interpretations on their application differ, resulting in variant practices. Consistency in the formulation of access points also remains some distance in the future. Complete uniformity in how the fields are used and in the provision of access points is probably neither attainable nor desirable, but greater cooperation in these areas in order to facilitate the exchange of information for professionals and researchers is an achievable goal. The development of accepted thesauri for such access points as form and genre terms, agency functions, occupations, and subject headings that are particularly relevant to manuscript and archival collections are appropriate and logical next steps for such profession-wide cooperation.

Harriet Ostroff is editor of the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections and head of the Manuscripts Section, Special Materials Cataloging Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. This article is an outgrowth of a talk on "Standards and Rules for Cataloging Manuscript and Archival Collections" given at the Tennessee Archivists/Society of Alabama Archivists Fall Meeting, November 1984.

NOTES


AUTOMATION IN THE ARCHIVES:
RLIN AND THE ARCHIVES AND MANUSCRIPT CONTROL FORMAT

David Weinberg

Be it in the circulation or the cataloging department, automation systems are now something that most libraries have begun to accept if not welcome. In particular, the reference departments of many academic libraries use computer systems to serve their patrons in new ways. Over the last several years, computer networks have had a big impact on how libraries operate. The oldest of these networks, or computer utilities as they are often called, is OCLC (originally the Ohio College Library Center, now known as the Online Computer Library Center). A variety of libraries--academic, public, and private--can utilize OCLC's interlibrary loan system and also reduce their original cataloging workload by sharing all their records with each other.

A more recently established computer utility is RLIN, the Research Libraries Information Network of the Research Libraries Group (RLG). While RLIN offers many features similar to those shared by OCLC and other systems, it differs from these systems in the way it searches for a record. It also offers a variety of special formats, one of which is the Archives and Manuscript Control (AMC). Archives can now exploit computer technology just as libraries have for the past decade. Using a database designed specifically for archives and the unique arrangements and descriptions of each archival collection--not a system designed for a library and then adapted for an
archives--repositories are able to automate their collections. This paper discusses the concept of using the AMC format within a repository and the advantages of this format for archival collections.

Before discussing the advantages of such a format, some background information on earlier attempts to automate archival collections should be reviewed. While there have been many attempts to automate and many dollars spent on such projects, the systems only worked as well as the technology of the time afforded. The first attempt at using computer technology for arrangement of primary documentation was made by the Library of Congress's Manuscript Division in 1958. As the technology improved, many private developers, in addition to the Library of Congress and the National Archives, created automation systems that could be used in archival collections and manuscript repositories. Since it is not within the scope of this article to address the development of archival automation, the reader should consult Thomas Hickerson's *Archives & Manuscripts: An Introduction to Automated Access.*  

This work provides a very good overview of computer applications in archival collections.

Computer applications developed through the 1970s were not "interactive," meaning that the computer processing had to be performed in a "batch" mode all at once and the results read after processing was complete. Therefore, there was little intellectual control over the data. The computer systems performed administrative functions and were able to supply lists of particular holdings, series, etc., but they had few searching capabilities using Boolean logic. Additionally, automated systems, although very helpful for the repository were limited only to that repository. This could be expected, given the nature of archives: each is unique, and although each collection follows the rules of the profession for description, inventory, etc., the actual cataloging records are in-house. Attempts to automate archives did exist; attempts to automate union lists for archives did not.
In general, union lists benefit not only the researcher, but also the archival repository. In addition to providing reference service to users of the collection, union lists aid archives in developing their own collection policies. To search a union listing of archival and manuscript holdings, a researcher's only tool was the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections (NUCMC). NUCMC does not represent all repositories, and those repositories listed usually report only a portion of their collections. Nevertheless, NUCMC is the best union listing since it provides a way for researchers to find the most suitable collections for their work. As with most printed catalogs, it has some problems: the level of detail is not complete, and updates are infrequent and, therefore, not always current. This leaves the researcher unsure about which collections need to be consulted and which do not.

An online database (much like the computer utilities used in libraries) can incorporate both of the needs described above. Both the RLIN and OCLC systems are suitable for union lists. Archival holdings can be entered into both networks via the AMC format of each system in using the MARC (Machine Readable Cataloging) record. The RLIN system does offer certain advantages such as subject access and complex searching techniques utilizing Boolean logic. Additionally, RLIN also offers administrative and management functions to aid the repository with its collections. Although the current OCLC database has numerous entries of primary documentation, those repositories that entered their records into OCLC tend to have little control over their records (and certainly no copyright of ownership unlike those collections in the RLIN system ²).

Since archival repositories arrange their documents using the principles of provenance (the office of origin) and original order (the organic order in which the documents were created), cataloging systems such as the Dewey Decimal Classification and the Library of Congress Subject Headings are of little use. In order for an
plus a number of associate and special member libraries. In addition to the AMC format, the main RLIN database consists largely of records from the books format but also supports other specialized formats: machine readable data files, maps, recordings, scores, serials and visual materials as well as the special vernaculars of Chinese/Japanese/Korean (CJK) and the more recently implemented cyrillic characters. RLIN also supports specialized databases which include the Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals; SCIPIO (Sales Catalog Index Project Input Online), an Art Sales Catalog Database; ESTC, the Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalog; and RLG Conspectus, a network wide collection development tool. All of these specialized databases, and the formats within the main database, are searchable from any terminal or personal computer connected with the RLG computer in Stanford.

The AMC format began at Yale University in 1981 after it received an United States Office of Education Title II-C grant and RLG received a grant from the Pew Memorial Trust. Such a project required a new MARC format, primarily due to the complexities of organizing and describing specialized materials such as archival and manuscript documents. The Yale staff developed a MARC format which was circulated in the archival community for preliminary evaluations prior to its widespread implementation in the RLIN system. To use such a format in a union listing, a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) grant enabled several committees to meet, representing the Society of American Archivists through its National Information Systems Task Force (NISTF), the Research Libraries Group, and the Library of Congress. The result was a new MARC format called the AMC.

The cataloging procedures adaptable for the new MARC format are described in Steven Hensen's Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts: A Cataloging Manual for Archival Repositories, Historical Societies, and Manuscript Libraries.
This work augments Chapter 4 (Manuscript and Manuscript Collections) of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd edition (AACR 2). Since the introduction of AACR 2 states that the rules "are not recommended for specialist and archival libraries," in its stead, Hensen's manual not only provides archivists and manuscript curators with a guide that addresses the problems of cataloging such materials, but it also develops a uniform system in language and descriptors. Since an automated union database is one of the goals of AMC, uniformity is crucial. Hence, this manual is required for all repositories that input records into AMC.

By January 1984, five archival collections on three campuses were chosen as pilot users: Yale University, Cornell University, the Labor Management Relations Documentation Center at Cornell, Stanford University, and the Hoover Institution at Stanford. While on a trial basis, Yale was the first of the five archives to input a record into the new AMC. The computer responded with a "transaction successful" and assigned a "production" ID number. Since this was the expected result, everyone involved with AMC was satisfied with creation of the first standardized machine readable record representing primary documentation. This occurred on 23 January 1984. At that point, the other institutions were able to input their records thus creating the nation's first online information system for archival and manuscript collections.

Since that time, a variety of other archival and manuscript repositories have also agreed to join the system. These repositories are special members of RLIN which adds a different composition to the current list of members. Previously, most of the members of the RLIN network were the large academic research libraries. The repositories not affiliated with the member libraries have been added to the special members category which also includes several law, art, and theological libraries. Considering the advantages of the AMC format, many of the major archival collections have joined the network.
Members range from the traditional academic archival collections (Yale University, for example) to the state archival collections (such as the State Historical Society of Wisconsin). The diversity of such members will ultimately make AMC a valued research tool as well as a valued management tool for each of the member archival collections.

The AMC is more than a superior online union list, however, because of the possibility of use of its extensive administrative controls and management techniques. Archives, by their very nature, have never had a standardized system for their collections which could cross institutional boundaries. Instead, a variety of manual systems are used in this setting: inventories, donor lists, accession lists and records indicating the file restrictions and expiration dates. Loose leaf binders often serve as a repository's only finding aid.

With AMC, the repository has several ways to organize and retrieve institutional records. The RLIN system has a variety of indexes to search its bibliographic database: author, title, subject phrase, conference phrase, etc. The database is equipped to search either a complete title, or a portion of the title, for example. For AMC, additional local indexes are available, which enable the archival staff to search the database amongst other indexes by accession number, donor name, and "form and genre."

Since AMC can produce a union list containing many archival holdings in addition to in-house data, information that is critical for the individual repository may need to be kept confidential. The "archival control segment" is part of AMC which contains information about the processing history, including such information as the donors of each collection, locations of the documents within the repository, etc. Some or all of this information can be "masked" from the union list and be available only to the owning repository, if so requested. (In a brief searching exercise, it was found that all of the AMC records were indeed "masked."
The owning repository will see all the information presented in the display that is reproduced in Figure 2. This record indicates the status of the Malinowska papers housed in the Yale University Archives. The record has two sections. The first section represents the process control and the second section represents the action performance. The owning institution may elect to restrict some or all of the information that is provided. Restriction of the data available to other members can be achieved by entering a "n" in the process control display permit (PCDP, see below). This will restrict all information in this part of the record from non-owning institutions.

Figure 2. Misc. document supplied by Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.
Some information may be of a rather sensitive nature, used strictly for administrative bookkeeping, and not necessarily for research or shared resources. This includes important administrative data such as the source of the material (SRCE representing the provenance), the type of material (MATL), the physical location of the material (PLOC), and the record group number (RGPN) within the repository. In the action performance section of Figure 2, the owning institution may elect to do the same as Yale did with this record by placing a "n" in the action display permit (ADP). The information in this section is for administrative notes by and for the repository. As Figure 2 illustrates, Yale is using this as an indication for "project cataloging," its code for a retrospective conversion of special collections under the Title II-C grant.

All of this information is reserved for the exclusive use of the owning institution, unless otherwise specified. In the long display, illustrated in Figure 3, the complete collection of Bronislaw Malinowski's papers are shown. For this example, the records were searched in AMC by the personal name (PN). This information, available to all users of the RLIN system, indicates the collection, period, size, organization, etc. about this collection at Yale University. For further information, this listing directs the user to an unpublished finding aid. AMC does, however, enable a repository to list its inventory by the folder level and even by the item (see again Figure 1 for the hierarchical relationship and provenance of each level) through a linking component in the format.

Yale chose to organize the Malinowski papers into four series: correspondence; writings, lectures, and research materials; the writings of other individuals; and special files. To find further information about the actual documentation, the in-house finding aids as indicated in this
Indexes are consulted. Other information which would be valuable for the researcher includes certain restrictions on the availability of the materials, the name of the repository that maintains the papers, and a summary. This is all listed on the display.

The bottom of the display lists the additional subject headings. The names, places, and organizations are entered as subject headings, and since they represent major figures in Malinowski's papers, they are assigned their own subject headings. This collection was called up by the author's personal name (PN), but could have easily been retrieved as well by any of the subject phrases (SP) listed in this example. (Using subject phrases will also bring up other material not related to the Malinowska papers.) The added entries in Figure 3 are not complete, primarily due to the bulk of information given. (The actual display of this record takes up eleven inches of text displayed on four standard size terminal screens.)

---

Malinowski, Bronislaw, 1884-1942.
Bronislaw Malinowski papers, 1869-1946 (inclusive), 1914-1939(bulk).
14 linear ft. (35 boxes)

Organization: Arranged into four series: 1. Correspondence. II. Writings, Lectures, and Research Materials. III. Writings of Others. IV. Special Files.

Fieldwork and correspondence excluding restricted material available on microfilm (7,121 frames on 7 reels, 35 mm.) from Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, at cost. Order no. HM129.
Educated in Poland, Germany, England; field work in New Guinea, Australia, Melanesia, 1914-1918; taught at the London School of Economics and Political Science, 1921-1942.
Summary: Correspondence, manuscripts of writings and lectures, fieldwork notebooks, photographs, memorabilia, and other papers of Bronislaw Malinowski, cultural anthropologist, teacher, and author.

Gift of Mrs. Valetta Malinowski in 1972.

Correspondence of Elsie Malinowski and Jozefa Malinowski is restricted.

Indexes: Unpublished finding aids in repository. Microfilm guide is available.

Bronislaw Malinowski Papers. Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

Other papers of Malinowski are at the London School of Economics and Political Science.

Location: Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library, Box 1603A, Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520.


LCCN: MS741195
RGPN: MS 19
ID: CTYV84-A19
CC: 9554 DCF: PROC: b

Figure 3. RLIN display of Bronislaw Malinowski papers, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library

Another important feature of the AMC format which deserves an explanation is the partial (PAR) display. Figure 4 shows this display for the same collection of papers. Due to the restrictions that the owning institution placed on this collection in Figure 2, only the record group number (RGPN) is available to non-owning institutions. If, on the other hand, Yale entered a "y" in the PCDP and ADP fields of Figure 2, then all the information regarding the donor, the address of the donor, the location of the materials in the repository and whatever else the owning institution decided to enter
in the ARC Segment would be displayed in the Figure 4.

Figure 4. RLIN display of Bronislaw Malinowski papers, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

There are other benefits to owning institutions and to the research community-at-large. The concept of using RLIN as a management tool for archival collections as a single automated system replaces the operations formerly performed by many manual systems has been explored. Online access allows individual repositories to update their records by simply making the changes online. As a shared resource, users with a terminal connecting to the RLIN database will be able to survey a large collection of primary documentation and evaluate its importance to their research needs. Shared resources for the archival community enable each repository to use AMC and evaluate other collections across the country in order to determine future collection policy.

Where the university or college archives once operated in relative obscurity, AMC will bring a strengthened bond between archives and other research facilities on the campus. This will integrate access to different types of research materials. The main
The database of the RLIN system contains eight different formats: Archives and Manuscript Control, Books, Machine Readable Data Files, Maps, Recordings, Scores, Serials and Visual Materials. It is possible to select any and all of the formats depending on what material is needed. Alan Tucker of RLG commented recently about RLIN and integration that "as a researcher I would like to be able to enter a search such as 'find personal name Gertrude Stein' and retrieve her published works, critical and biographical studies of Stein, a recording of Stein reading her own work, and another of a performance of 'Four Saints in Three Acts,' her personal papers...." 16 The integrated RLIN database will be able to retrieve such records by selecting books, recordings, and archives and manuscripts.

The AMC format is available to all RLG members. This includes the thirty-six member owners representing large research libraries, as well as the associate and special members of RLG. Many of the AMC contributors are part of the member owner libraries while others are affiliated through the associate and special member categories. A complete list of repositories inputting their records into AMC is provided in the Appendix. Since the research community goes beyond member institutions associated with RLG, the Cooperative Library Agency for Systems and Services (CLASS) in California brokers RLIN services to other libraries and information services throughout the country.

When AMC was in the planning stage, and shortly after it began accepting records in 1984, RLG appointed an Archives and Manuscripts Task Force. 17 This task force completed the first two charges to which they were assigned, namely to "develop protocols for reference service" and to "develop acceptable bibliographic standards for archival control records." These two charges have been discussed at length in this article.

The third charge was to "explore the feasibility of integrating records of the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections (NUCMC) into the RLIN data
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It was agreed in September 1985 that NUCMC would enter its records into AMC through the RLIN database at some point in the near future. Once this is achieved through some sort of retrospective conversion and agreement with respective institutions, AMC will indeed be the union listing of archives and manuscript repositories in the country. Unlike monographs entered into the books format, the very nature of manuscript materials (which are unique) does not enable their inclusion into the consortium of research libraries and major manuscript repositories unless all collections are accountable. This can only be achieved by incorporating the smaller and special collections that NUCMC represents into the RLIN database. Once this is possible, a comprehensive national union list will be in place, which will have the capacity to represent the current status of the repositories of the United States.

The fourth charge to the task force is tied directly to the previous charge: "encourage and support use of the AMC format by RLG members, and attract new members with significant archival/manuscript collections." As the benefits of RLIN and AMC become better known, this should happen naturally, although "few good things happen naturally in libraries and archival repositories."

Those involved in the archival profession as well as the Research Libraries Group must actively promote the Archives and Manuscript Control format in order for it to reach its potential as a research and management tool for archives and manuscript repositories.
APPENDIX

The list below represents the total number of institutions that are adding their records into the Archives and Manuscript Control of RLIN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repository</th>
<th>NEH</th>
<th>NHPRC</th>
<th>Tape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Department of Archives and Manuscripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Antiquarian Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Philosophical Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of Chicago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Archives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University - Labor Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations Documentation Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University - New York Historical Resources Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folger Shakespeare Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University - 42 archival/library collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University - Institute of the History of Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University - Medical Archives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University - Peabody Conservatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Historical Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Modern Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Archives and Records Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Gallery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Historical Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Public Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEH ReCon: Retrospective conversion of selected significant holdings, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

NHPRC State Archives: The Seven State Archives Project, funded by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission.
Tape Loaded Records: Spindex records gathered by Cornell's New York State Historical Documents Inventory and converted to the AMC format.

As of 13 October 1986, the repositories listed above have entered 75,138 records into AMC. 20

David Weinberg is the Assistant Curator of the Urban Archives Center, Temple University Libraries. He received his M.S. in Library and Information Science from Drexel University and is currently pursuing an advanced degree in urban history at Temple University.
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NOTES


3 Quote from Harvard President Derek Bok in Lois R. Pearson, "Major Consortium Votes for Ballots; Harvard Quits Group," American Libraries (June 1978): 308. For a good overview of RLG's development, see Joel Shurkin, "The Rise and Fall and

28
4 The member owners of RLG include: American Antiquarian Society; Brigham Young University; Brown University; Colorado State University; Columbia University; Cornell University; Dartmouth College; Emory University; Florida State University; Johns Hopkins University; Louisiana State University; The New York Historical Society; The New York Public Library; New York Unin, Johns Hopkins University; Irene Moran, University of California, Berkeley; Kathy Morton, Yale University; Roxanne Nilan, Stanford University; Bill Wallach, University of Michigan; Barbara Brown and Alan Tucker, RLG; Steven Hensen, Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress; Harriet Ostroff, NUCMC editor, Library of Congress. As cited from "Archives and Manuscripts," unpublished, RLG, July 1984.

5 For information regarding the other special formats and special databases, contact the Library Operations Division, The Research Libraries Group, Inc., Jordan Quadrangle, Stanford, CA 94305. This is also the address for all other "unpublished" material that will be cited throughout this paper.

6 This funding was extremely important in establishing a foundation for AMC. The energies of the RLG staff, in particular Barbara Brown and Alan Tucker, were also very important in developing and testing the MARC format.


8 Steven L. Hensen, Archives, Personal Papers,


11 "AMC Offers Access to Nation's Archival Resources," p. 3.

12 For a complete list of repositories inputting their records into AMC, see the Appendix.

13 For a full reference to the field codes used in this section, see "Archival Control Segment," unpublished, RLG, May 1984.

14 Telephone interview with William E. Brown, Jr., Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University, 14 March 1985.

15 The available indexes for the AMC: Personal name, Corporate name, Title word/Title phrase, Related title, Related record ID, Subject phrase/Subject subdivision, Form and genre word, Donor word/Donor phrase, Geographic. Taken from "On-line Access to AMC Records," unpublished, RLG, May 1983.


17 The Archives and Manuscripts Task Force includes: Tom Hickerson, Cornell University (chair); Tom Frusciano, New York University; Susan Martin, Johns Hopkins University; Irene Moran, University of California, Berkeley; Kathy Morton, Yale University; Roxanne Nilan, Stanford University; Bill Wallach,


19 Letter received from William E. Brown, Jr., 6 June 1985.

20 Statistic for AMC records from RLIN (SHOW NEWs).
ACSAS:
Microcomputer-based Subject Access

Lewis Cox

The Archives of Appalachia at East Tennessee State University (ETSU) recently attempted to improve subject access to its holdings through the development of a computer-based subject access system. The project and the subject access system have been given the acronym "ACSAS" (pronounced access), for "Archival Computerized Subject Access System." This article describes the subject access system and its development and concludes with an analysis of the system and the future role of such systems.

Today there is concerted effort in the archival community to utilize computer technology in order to improve and expand services. The long-term goal is to link all archives together in a nationwide computer network whereby materials can be quickly located at any repository in the country. This network, however, will require considerable work to put it into operation. Until this "ideal" network is in place and operating (and perhaps afterwards), there will be a need for intermediate, local applications of computer technology to improve archival operations. The purpose of the ACSAS project has been to develop a system of this type.

ACSAS provides a structured method of keeping track of the subjects available for research and of the particular holdings relevant to each subject. This is accomplished by entering and updating information in a data base file that can be used to produce a subject guide to the archives' holdings.
ACSAS is not a custom-written program, but is a systematic usage of an existing program.

The first attempts at computerization at the Archives of Appalachia began in 1980 with Dr. Richard Kesner, then director of the archives and the MARS project. MARS (Microcomputer Archival Retrieval System) was a National Endowment for the Humanities project that was originally intended to produce an archival management software package for microcomputers. Project staff concluded, however, that existing general purpose software (for example, spreadsheet, word processing, data base software) could be used effectively to perform the same functions. During this project the archives obtained its microcomputer equipment, including an Apple II Plus microcomputer, DB MASTER data base software, and Easy Writer word processing software. Further development of a computerized system was postponed when Dr. Kesner left the archives in 1981.

Dr. Ellen Garrison became director of the Archives of Appalachia in 1982, and she continued the process of improving access to the archives's holdings through the use of the computer. As part of this process, Norma Thomas, technical services archivist, began standardizing the subject headings used at the archives by converting them to Library of Congress (LC) format. Ms. Thomas's position was funded by the Center for Excellence in Appalachian Studies and Services as part of Tennessee's Centers for Excellence program, for the purpose, among other things, of assisting in the implementation of the subject access system.

Because the author had been working at the archives as a student assistant since 1979, and had worked with Dr. Garrison in various applications of the computer, he was requested to develop a computer-based subject access system for the archives. The project was performed as an independent study in computer science at ETSU under Dr. Evans Adams, beginning in the fall semester of 1984. The independent study was renewed and completed in the spring semester of 1985.
Development of the subject access system consisted of three main phases: research, design and development, and testing. Extensive research was conducted on data base systems in general and on specific subject access systems. From this research, it became apparent that the use of hierarchical relationships has gained widespread acceptance. For instance, in the ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) Thesaurus (a computerized subject access system for educational publications), there is the use of Broader Term and Narrower Term relationships between terms that serve to refer the researcher to more general or more specific terms. Other indexing systems are similarly structured.

System design was the longest and most extensive phase of the project. The system was built around the DB MASTER 4 Plus data base management system on the Apple II Plus microcomputer. Involved in the system design was the design of the subject guide, the data base file, and the procedures for using the system. A user's manual, which explained the operation of the system, was developed, and file maintenance forms, which are used for data entry and editing, were produced. Design of the system was done in consultation with the archives staff in order to produce a more usable and effective system.

Testing of the system has been performed by the archives staff. Actual data was input, modifications were made to the data, and the subject guide was printed. Corrections and improvements were made to the system as necessary. The system now appears to perform satisfactorily. Unfortunately, the archives's need to standardize its index terms has delayed complete implementation of the system, and feedback from researchers is not yet available.

The subject access system was not used as an interactive system. It proved to be a more efficient use of the computer to print a subject guide containing all necessary information, rather than tying up the computer when it was needed for other purposes such as word processing or other data base uses. Using the system involves the following main
procedures:

1. Create categories (with corresponding numbers) by which to group subjects and enter these into the data base.

2. Gather information about the subjects used (subject heading, subject number, corresponding category number, media types referenced, "see" references, "see also" references) using file maintenance forms.

3. From these forms, enter into the data base the information related to each subject.

4. Produce the subject guide from the data base.

5. Add new subjects and modify existing subjects as needed, and reprint the subject guide.

There are four main sections to the subject guide: a category list, categorical summary lists, an alphabetical summary list, and a detailed list. The category list includes those index terms which are used to group related subjects together. Also included is a category number for each category. (See Figure 1.)

Related subjects are grouped by the categories to form the categorical summary lists. For each subject there is a corresponding "media indicator" code, which provides information on the types of media referenced by that subject. A "1" in the column for a particular media type indicates that the media type is referenced by the corresponding subject. The media types include AT (audio tape), BK (book), MS (manuscript), MP (map), PH (photograph), VF (vertical file), and VT (video tape). (See Figure 2.) In the alphabetical summary list, all subjects are listed in alphabetical order, along with corresponding media indicator codes and category numbers for each subject. The category number corresponds to the category of the categorical summary list to which the subject is assigned. (See Figure 3.)

The main section of the guide is the detailed list, which includes main entries and "see" references. The main entries consist of an index
term, "see also" references, and media descriptions. Media descriptions include a media type code and a corresponding media number and are used to describe the holdings relevant to the subject. For instance, a media description of "AT BM-101" indicates audio tape number BM-101. "See" references include an index term and "see" terms. (See Figure 4.)

The subject guide has been designed to be used as a categorical index. The advantage to this approach over a straight alphabetical index is that it is not necessary to know the exact term used for indexing, and therefore, it is less likely that relevant materials will be overlooked. Another advantage is that it brings together related subjects for those doing research over more general subject matter. As mentioned below, this also helps eliminate the problems of using the LC index terms.

The guide is used as a categorical guide by following these procedures:

1. Find the category that most nearly corresponds to the needed subject from the category list. (Figure 1.)

2. Look through the corresponding categorical summary list for a subject term that most nearly describes the subject needed. (Figure 2.)

3. In the detailed list, find the main entry for the subject term. Use the media descriptions to find the material that is relevant to the subject term. (Figure 4.)

4. Use the "see also" references to find other main entries that may lead to relevant material.

If only a certain type of media is desired for a subject, (for example, photographs of quilt-making), the media indicator code in the categorical summary list can be checked to see if photographs are referenced by the subject before going to the detailed list.

The guide is also used as an alphabetical index by following these procedures:
1. Look through the alphabetical summary list for the subject term desired. Use the media indicator code (Figure 3.)

2. If found, look for the main entry in the detailed list. Use the media descriptions and "see also" references in the same way as the categorical index. (Figure 4.)

Project staff produced a "System Manager's Manual" which explains how to use the data base for initial set-up, file maintenance (editing or adding information), and production of the subject guide. The manual also includes a complete data base description, a sample subject guide, sample file maintenance forms, a thorough index, and a glossary. The manual is designed for persons with little or no computer experience.

For creation and maintenance of the data base file, "file maintenance forms" are used. These are completed prior to modification of the data base information in order to prevent arbitrary modifications. These are also used for reference and as a "back-up" in case the data base file is damaged. (See Figure 5). Any modification of the data base is performed by following step-by-step "Procedures." These explain how to use the data base for adding, editing, or deleting information, for printing the sections of the subject guide, and for making backup copies of the data base files. (See Figure 6.)

The advantages to the computer-based ACSAS system over a manual system is the ability to easily produce various indexes (categorical, alphabetical, selective by category, selective by media type). Another benefit is the ability to quickly analyze an archives's holdings by type of subjects or media types. One other benefit is that this system somewhat forces a structured approach to subject access, rather than the arbitrary methods sometimes used by archives.

The decision to use the LC format for the index terms was based on the probability of the use of this format in a national archival computer network. The
LC format has proven difficult to work around in the conversion of the archives's index terms and would not have been used except for the necessity of standardization. The major problem with the LC terms is that there are few that neatly apply to the archives's holdings. This problem is avoided by allowing the archives to use its own index terms for the categories and by using the LC terms for the more specific subject headings.

Economics and the fact that the archives already owned the software were the major factors in the decision to use the DB MASTER 4 Plus data base program. DB MASTER did provide the necessary functions and performed reasonably well but, due in part to the limitations of the Apple II computer, proved difficult to work around since the design pushed it to its limits. A better but more expensive system would have consisted of an IBM PC compatible computer and Knowledgeman, DBASE III, or an equivalent programmable data base program. With such a system, the use of custom-designed menus would have been possible. This would greatly simplify the operation of the subject access system for the user by listing the choices to perform certain functions of the ACSAS system (such as add a subject, print an alphabetical listing, etc.) rather than requiring the user to know what parts of the program to go through to perform a certain task. Also, help screens to explain operation of the system could have been made available. However, because DB MASTER provides a way to translate its files into a format that can be read by other programs (text format), it is possible for the data produced by it to be transferred to an upgraded system as the need arises.

As computer equipment and software prices fall, and as archivists become more familiar with computer technology, the computer will become a standard archival tool. It will enable archivists to provide a broader range of services and to improve the efficiency of the archival office. Eventually, it will enable archivists to share information and access to records with their colleagues and
researchers nationwide. And, this will certainly expand to include archivists around the world. ACSAS will, it is hoped, be a useful contribution to the archival community in its efforts to utilize microcomputer technology. It is not intended to be a final solution, but a starting point, a foundation that can be built upon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>ART/ARCHITECTURE/CRAFTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>BUSINESS/INDUSTRY/LABOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>ETHNIC GROUPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>FAMILY/COMMUNITY LIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>FOLK CULTURE/FOLKLORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>GENEALOGY/BIOGRAPHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>GEOGRAPHY/GEOGRAPHIC NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>HEALTH SCIENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>HISTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>LITERATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>LOCAL (COUNTY/CITY) HISTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>MASS COMMUNICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>MUSIC/PERFORMING ARTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>NATURAL RESOURCES/CONSERVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>RECREATION/TOURISM/TRAVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>RELIGION/CHURCH HISTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>SOCIAL ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>SOCIAL GROUPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.**
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CATEGORICAL SUMMARY LIST

CATEGORY NUMBER: 100

ABMMPVV- 
TFSPHFT-

00000000 AGRICULTURAL EXHIBITIONS
00000100 AGRICULTURE
00000000 BUTCHERING HOGS
00000000 COTTON PRODUCTION

-------------------TOTALS FOR 100-------------------

Figure 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT.</th>
<th>NUM.</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>ABINGDON, VIRGINIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>ACUFF CEMETERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>AFL-CIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>AFRO-AMERICANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>AGED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL EXHIBITIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>ALDERMAN, PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>ALICE LLOYD COLLEGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>ALLENDALE ESTATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>AMERICAN COLLECTION SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>AMERICAN FEDERATION OF HOSIERY WORKERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>AMERICAN FOLKLIFE CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>AMERICAN LITERATURE - TENNESSEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>AMERICAN REVOLUTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>AMERICAN TEMPERANCE UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF HARRIMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>ANDERSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>ANNEXATION - JOHNSON CITY, TN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>APARTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>APPALACHIAN ALABAMA DEVELOPMENT PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>APPALACHIAN ALLIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>APPALACHIAN BOOK AND RECORD SHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>APPALACHIAN CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL EQUITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>APPALACHIAN CONSORTIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>APPALACHIAN FIRESIDE CRAFTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>APPALACHIAN FLYING SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>APPALACHIAN INSTITUTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00000100</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>APPALACHIAN LITERARY LEAGUE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
(Figure 3 continued)

00000000 200 APPALACHIAN ORAL HISTORY PROJECT
00000100 540 APPALACHIAN PEOPLE'S SERVICE ORGANIZATION
00000100 140 APPALACHIAN REGION, SOUTHERN - BIBLIOGRAPHY
00000100 280 APPALACHIAN REGION, SOUTHERN - BIOGRAPHY
00000100 480 APPALACHIAN REGION, SOUTHERN - DESCRIPTION AND TRAVEL
00000100 340 APPALACHIAN REGION, SOUTHERN - HISTORY
00000100 260 APPALACHIAN REGION, SOUTHERN - LANGUAGES
00000100 360 APPALACHIAN REGION, SOUTHERN - LITERATURES
00000100 300 APPALACHIAN REGION, SOUTHERN - MAPS
00000100 200 APPALACHIAN REGION, SOUTHERN - STUDY AND TEACHINGS
00000100 180 APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION
00000100 320 APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR HEALTH ADVANCEMENT

Figure 3.
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Abingdon, Virginia
   See: Washington County, Virginia
Acuff Cemetery
   See: Sullivan County, Tennessee
Afl-Cio
   See: Collective Labor Agreements
Afro-Americans
   Media Description: VF
Aged
   See Also: Casey County, Kentucky
   Media Description: VF
Agricultural Exhibitions
   See: Washington County (TN) Agricultural & Mech
   See: Washington County (TN) Fair Association
Agriculture
   See Also: Appalshop Films
   See Also: Tennessee Department of Agriculture
   See Also: Tennessee, University of
   Media Description: VF
Alabama
   See: Appalachia Alabama Development Plan
Alderman, Pat
   See Also: Appalachian Region, Southern - Maps
   See Also: Cherokee Indians
   See Also: Clinchfield Railroad
   See Also: Franklin, State of
   See Also: Overmountain Men
   See Also: Tilson Family
   Media Description: VF
Alice Lloyd College
   See: Kentucky
Allendale Estates
   See: Kingsport, TN - Buildings
American Association of University Women
   Media Description: VF
American Collection Service
   See: Washington County, Virginia
   Media Description: VF
American Federation of Hosiery Workers
   See: Magnet Mills, Inc.
American Folklife Center
   (Continued)
American Literature - Tennessee
   See: Tennessee, University of Extension Series
American Revolution
   See: Tennessee - History - Revolution - Register
American Temperance University
   See: American University at Harriman
American University of Harriman
   Media Description: VF
Anderson County, Tennessee
   See Also: Oak Ridge Children's Museum
   Media Description: VF

(Figure 4, continued)
Media Description: VF
American Literature - Tennessee
   See: Tennessee, University of Extension Series
American Revolution
   See: Tennessee - History - Revolution - Register
American Temperance University
   See: American University at Harriman
American University of Harriman
   Media Description: VF
Anderson County, Tennessee
   See Also: Oak Ridge Children's Museum
   Media Description: VF

Figure 4.
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FILE MAINTENANCE FORM #2

MAIN ENTRIES

( ) Add ( ) Edit ( ) Delete

Category:................................. Category number:.............

Subject:................................. Subject number:..............

Media Indicator: A B M M P V V - T K S P H F T -

..............

SEE ALSO references:

Ref.
No.

---For Editing Only---

:ADD EDIT DELETE:

MEDIAN DESCRIPTIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Type</th>
<th>Media Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.
1. Use File Maintenance Form #2
2. Run DB MASTER (See the Initialization Procedure).
3. Invoke the SHORT FORM option from the MAIN MENU (choice 4). Answer "N" to "CREATE NEW FORM?".
4. Load the short form for MAJOR TERMS.
5. Invoke the ADD RECORDS option from the MAIN MENU (choice 2).
6. Insert the disk labeled "SUBJECT GUIDE, MASTER, V. 1, COPY 1" in DRIVE 1 when prompted.
7. If adding 1 subject, press <RETURN> when the additions prompt appears. If adding many subjects, press <ESC> and answer "Y" to "LAST RECORD DEFAULT MODE?".
8. Enter the appropriate information for the Major Term record: (See the DATA DESCRIPTION for information on the contents of these fields.)
   a. CATEGORY NUMBER - use the number from step 1.
   b. SUBJECT NUMBER - use the number assigned in step 1.
   c. REFERENCE NUMBER - this is always "0" for Major Terms. Press <RETURN>.
   d. CATEGORY/SUBJECT - enter the subject term from step 1.
   e. MEDIA INDICATOR - use the number in step 1.
   f. MARC TAG - use the number from step 1.
   g. RECORD TYPE - enter "MT" (Major Term).
9. Press "<CTRL>-A" to add this record.
10. Repeat steps 8-9 for all Subject References.
11. Press "<CTRL>-C" and return to the MAIN MENU.
12. Close files and exit (choice 8).
13. If no more data entry/editing is to be done for the day, backup the files by using the BACKUP Procedure.

Figure 6.

Lewis Cox is currently assistant manager and computer services technician at Computer Applications, Ltd. in Johnson City, TN. This article was written as the result of an independent study conducted for the
computer science department at East Tennessee State University while the author was a student. The author wishes to thank Dr. Ellen Garrison, current director of the Archives of Appalachia; Norma Thomas, technical services archivist at the archives; Dr. Richard Kesner, former and first director of the archives; and Dr. Evans Adams, sponsor of the independent study, for their cooperation, guidance, and assistance in the successful completion of the ACSAS project.

NOTES

1 The Archives of Appalachia is located in Johnson City, Tennessee. The archives specializes in preserving and making available for research materials dealing with the Appalachian region that have significant historical and informational value.

2 In this article, subject term, subject heading, and index term are synonymous and include topics (subjects) and proper names of persons, organizations, or geographical areas.
From 1950 to 1985 the federal government experienced much success in disposing of records with insufficient retention values. During those thirty-five years some 140 million cubic feet of records were created, and some 120 million cubic feet of records were destroyed. By way of comparison, between 1789 and 1950 the federal government created less than 30 million cubic feet of records and destroyed less than 10 million cubic feet of records. To a large extent the success the federal government has experienced in efficiently and effectively destroying temporary records, particularly during the past four decades, is the result of the records disposition activities of the National Archives. While these activities prior to 1950 are generally well known and appreciated, those since 1950 are not. What follows is a discussion of those efforts during the past thirty-five years and a brief discussion of what the future holds in store for the National Archives and the federal government.

The National Archives began 1950 with a new name, the National Archives and Records Service (NARS), reflecting its dual responsibilities for federal archives and records. In both areas NARS faced many challenges, but probably none was more important than identifying permanent records for retention and temporary records for disposal. This records disposition task in 1950 was indeed a challenge, as half of the 20 million cubic feet of records was
unscheduled.³ Addressing this challenge, NARS in 1951 informed the federal agencies that by 30 June 1954 they would have to develop schedules identifying all of their records and proposing dispositions for each series of records. NARS, upon receiving the schedules, would appraise each series.⁴ Those appraised as temporary, with the approval of Congress, would be authorized for disposal.⁵ To assist agencies in developing their schedules and improving their records disposition programs, NARS began providing records disposition training courses and publications.⁶ NARS also helped the agencies by producing General Records Schedules, which provided approved dispositions for routine administrative records common to most agencies.⁷

By 1955, as a result of NARS and agencies efforts, upwards of ninety-five percent of all federal records were covered by a schedule.⁹ Consequently, 17.7 million cubic feet of records were destroyed between July 1949 and July 1956. During that same period, however, the federal government created three million cubic feet of records more than it destroyed, leaving a total accumulation of 23.3 million cubic feet of records, or twice as many records than existed in 1941.

Despite the large volume of records being destroyed and the success in getting records scheduled, Archivist of the United States (1948-1965) Wayne C. Grover, in 1954, wrote "the simple fact is that with all our efforts we still have not solved the problem."¹⁰ Grover's assessment was accurate, and the records disposition problem worsened during the late 1950s for a variety of reasons. The first, over which NARS had little control, was ever increasing annual volume of records created by the federal agencies. Between July 1949 and July 1958 approximately 27.5 million cubic feet of records were created, an amount nearly equalling the amount between 1789 and 1949.¹¹

Federal agencies, in attempting to schedule their growing volume of records expeditiously and often not fully evaluating the value of each series,
recommended that twenty-five percent of their records be retained indefinitely. 12 This in itself was not a major problem as NARS appraised each series on the schedules. Those it did not believe warranted indefinite or permanent retention were recommended for disposal. Unfortunately, NARS lacked sufficient resources to appraise adequately all the series recommended for indefinite retention, and agencies, often disagreeing with the NARS recommendations, took no actions to reschedule their records for disposal. Thus, millions of cubic feet of records remained unscheduled, even though they were identified on schedules. Because of insufficient NARS resources and the agencies believing they had scheduled most of their series of records--even though they were technically unscheduled--the number of series appraised by NARS during the late 1950s declined significantly. Between July 1952 and July 1956, NARS appraised an average 6,000 series annually. This figure dropped to less than 2,000 between July 1957 and July 1960. 13

Another problem was actually a mixed blessing. Agencies were allowed to retire their unscheduled records, including those recommended for indefinite retention, to the Federal Records Centers (FRCs). The FRCs, authorized by the Federal Records Act of 1950 and operated by NARS, provided agencies with low-cost storage for their records until such time as the records were transferred to the National Archives or were destroyed. In 1949, the first Hoover Commission recommended that such centers store at least twenty percent of all federal records. That goal was reached so quickly that, in 1955, when the FRCs contained forty percent of all federal records, the second Hoover Commission recommended that the goal be raised to fifty percent. 14 By allowing agencies to retire their unscheduled records to the FRCs, the federal government saved millions of dollars in storage costs, and NARS obtained physical custody of many valuable records, thereby minimizing the danger of their accidental destruction. Additionally, many of these records, Grover
maintained, were too current to be appraised adequately. This reason was actually a rationalization, as it is generally better to appraise records as early in their life cycle as possible. In any event, without sufficient resources to appraise the millions of cubic feet of unscheduled records retired to the FRCs, NARS was content to gain physical custody of them until such time as it did have the resources.

The priority NARS gave to records disposition during the late 1950s was another factor limiting the destruction of records. When a Records Management Division was created within NARS in December 1949, records disposition was given high priority, and the division devoted considerable resources to providing training on the subject for thousands of federal employees. But, by the mid 1950s, NARS had turned its attention increasingly to other aspects of records management.

This change in priorities was the result of two factors. First was the belief that most records were covered by schedules, and second was President Dwight D. Eisenhower's August 1955 order to the General Services Administration (GSA) to give more attention to paperwork management. This order resulted from a recommendation made by the second Hoover Commission that agencies do the same. Responsibility for advising agencies on their paperwork management activities fell on the Records Management Division, which became the Office of Records Management in November 1956. Thus, with more attention given to such activities as mail, directives, forms, and correspondence management, less attention was given to records disposition.

By the end of the decade, NARS was devoting less than three percent of its training resources to records disposition. It did, however, produce some very useful publications, such as "Applying Records Schedules" and "The Appraisal of Modern Public Records," for the agencies and its own personnel to use.

On 30 June 1959, NARS estimated that only 1.7 of
the federal government's 24 million cubic feet of records were still unscheduled. But, by simply allowing agencies to identify over twenty-five percent of their records for indefinite retention and NARS not having the resources to appraise those records fully, some six million cubic feet of records were technically unscheduled as the decade ended. This situation, along with the ever growing volume of records being created, resulted in more records being created than destroyed. Between 1950 and 1958, the federal government created 27.5 million cubic feet and destroyed 23.9 million cubic feet of records.

In 1960 the General Accounting Office (GAO), because of its concern with the accumulation of records, reviewed the state of records disposition in the federal government. Its report, issued in 1961, called for better disposition practices, especially a more selective retention policy, that is, agencies should stop insisting that twenty-five percent of their records should be retained indefinitely. NARS agreed and responded to the report by taking several actions.

In January 1962, NARS created an Office of Records Appraisal and charged it with reducing the volume of records that had been identified for indefinite retention. This office, headed by Theodore Schellenberg, author of the classic *Modern Archives* (1956), immediately began assisting agencies to develop records retention plans which identified records of enduring value in functional terms. After he retired in December 1963, the unit was abolished, and its functions were divided between the Offices of Federal Records Centers and the National Archives.

By June 1964, sixty-nine agencies and their subdivisions had prepared retention plans, covering some three million cubic feet of records. Reviewing these plans, NARS found that about two percent of the records covered by them would be retained permanently. Although this percentage was a lot more realistic than that of the previous decade, the retention plans suffered from problems of frequently
being vague and difficult to implement. By the end of the decade, NARS and the agencies had given up on the retention plans as a mechanism to reduce the volume of records identified for permanent retention.

Congress and the president were also concerned about the government's records disposition efforts. During the mid 1960s, a House of Representatives subcommittee held hearings to study what they termed the "Federal Paperwork Jungle." Although the subcommittee was pleased with NARS's efforts and the fact that agencies were able to reduce the average life of a temporary record series from thirteen to nine years between 1955 and 1966 and were retiring substantial quantities of records to the FRCs, the subcommittee found problems still existed. Specifically, too many records were being designated for permanent retention and too many temporary records were being maintained beyond their scheduled disposal date. The solution to these problems, the subcommittee reported, was to give greater attention to identifying records for disposal and destroying them when scheduled. 25

In January 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson imposed a limited moratorium on the purchase of new filing cabinets, believing this would encourage agencies to retire records to the FRCs and destroy eligible records. As a result, agencies purchased sixty-eight percent fewer filing cabinets in 1965 than in 1964. In September 1966, the president addressed a memorandum to all federal agencies urging the disposal of eligible records, retirement of records unneeded for current business, and the reduction of filing equipment. 26

Agencies responded to the requests made of them by Congress and the president, particularly in retiring records to the FRCs. Between 1960 and 1973 the holdings of the FRCs grew from 5 to 11.5 million cubic feet of records. Much of this growth was the result of agencies simply dumping their unscheduled records into the FRCs. This was especially true for the Washington National Records Center in Suitland, Maryland, which opened in 1967 with a capacity for
over 3.5 million cubic feet of records.

Although the federal government saved millions of dollars in storage costs, use of the FRCs had the negative effect of agencies giving less attention to scheduling their records for disposition. It is not surprising that of the thirty-three agencies NARS inspected between 1965 and 1970 only three were found to have good records disposition programs. Unfortunately, NARS did not have the resources to help agencies. During the mid 1960s, NARS had only fifteen archivists assigned to appraisal duties, and in April 1968, as a result of budget restrictions and vacancies, the NARS appraisal staff consisted of ten archivists.

The unscheduled records problem and the continued growth of records, some 28.7 million cubic feet having accumulated by 1973, prompted the GAO to evaluate the government's records disposition program that year. Its report criticized the lack of records disposal efforts and the NARS policy of allowing agencies to retire their unscheduled records to the FRCs. NARS responded to the report by prohibiting, with some exceptions, agencies from retiring these records to the FRCs and by creating a Records Disposition Division within its Office of Federal Records Centers, which would concentrate on reducing the volume of the government's unscheduled records.

These actions had a dramatic impact on federal records disposition activities. Agencies began developing schedules. This resulted in a significant increase in the number of series submitted to NARS for appraisal. During the period July 1972 to October 1977, agencies submitted an average nine thousand series annually, or twice as many as they had during the 1950s. This increase, it should be noted, was also the result of agencies submitting newly created series for appraisal as well as requesting the change of disposition for already scheduled series.

With the increased attention given to the growing paper mountain, well over 25 million cubic feet of
records were destroyed during the 1970s. The General Records Schedules produced by NARS proved very beneficial to agencies and covered the disposition of over thirty percent of all federal records by the end of the decade. Use of these schedules was made mandatory by Congress in 1978 for all post-1921 records to which they applied. Another NARS activity helping agencies was its inspections of their records disposition programs. These inspections, begun in 1963, provided an excellent mechanism for determining how well agencies were destroying their temporary records and for offering suggestions for program improvements. But, because of limited resources, NARS was able to hold five or six inspections a year during the late 1960s and only two or three annually a decade later.

Despite NARS and agencies' efforts to reduce the volume of records accumulating during the 1970s, well over 34 million cubic feet existed as the decade ended. Two major reasons why disposals did not keep up with the amount created were the lack of resources to appraise the unscheduled records in the FRCs and many records, otherwise eligible for destruction, were not destroyed because of court orders, litigation, or potential litigation. Although after 1973 agencies were prevented from routinely dumping their unscheduled records into the FRCs, these centers in September 1979 held 3.9 million cubic feet of unscheduled records.

At the same time the FRCs held over 500,000 cubic feet of records that could not be destroyed because of legal and administrative restraints, over half of them involving the IBM antitrust lawsuit. Three years later, despite the resolution of the IBM case, there were still over 430,000 cubic feet of records in the FRCs that could not be destroyed because of litigation involving Agent Orange, asbestos, and nuclear testing. Another 27,000 cubic feet of Office of Personnel Management personnel security investigation records in 1982 were being delayed from destruction because of congressional interest in them.
Perhaps the most extensive and far-reaching freeze came from a court order halting the destruction of all Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) records. In January 1980, Judge Harold H. Greene of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia ordered the FBI to halt the destruction of their records until NARS reappraised them. This NARS did in 1981. But as of this writing, the court order remains in effect while the judge reviews the 1,400-page NARS appraisal report. 36

At the end of the 1970s the federal paper mountain continued to grow. But it was but a mole hill compared to the electronic mountain range that developed during the decade. In 1970 the federal government's reels of computer tape contained about seven percent of all of the government's information. By the end of the decade, upwards of two-thirds of federal information was contained on reels of computer tape. 37 To address the disposition of computer-generated records NARS, late in the 1960s, created a Data Archives Staff unit and made it responsible for machine-readable records and archives. Within a few years this unit produced a General Records Schedule covering computer-generated records, and in 1974, it became a full-fledged division. By 1980 it had a staff of fifteen professionals. 38

The growing amount of information and records being created and accumulated during the latter part of the 1970s caused great concern to those who realized that if the government did not effectively manage its records, the information contained in them would be harder to find and use. Congress responded to this concern by adopting numerous pieces of legislation beginning with the establishment of the Paperwork Reduction Commission in 1975 and culminating with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, all of which were aimed at the more effective management of the creation, use, maintenance, and disposition of records and information. 39

In 1980, to ascertain how well NARS and the
agencies were responding to the congressional initiatives, the GAO undertook an audit of the government's records management efforts. Its report, entitled "Federal Records Management: A History of Neglect," was issued in February 1981. This title, in view of the efforts made by the agencies and NARS, is not only incorrect but unfair. Nevertheless, the GAO was correct in pointing out that federal records disposition programs had some shortcomings. 40 But the findings of the GAO were nothing that NARS did not know already. Its agency inspections between 1975 and 1980 found that only one-third of the agencies inspected had good records disposition programs. 41

Even before the issuance of the GAO report NARS increased its disposition efforts, especially getting unscheduled records appraised. Agencies, beginning in 1979, were frequently encouraged by NARS to identify their unscheduled series and to submit them for appraisal. Many agencies responded to the encouragement, primarily in order to have those records eligible to be retired to a FRC. Between October 1977 and October 1982, agencies submitted nearly 70,000 series for appraisal. Until early 1981 NARS made significant progress in appraising those series, as well as the backlog that remained from the 45,000 series which had been submitted between July 1972 and October 1977.42

But, in the spring of 1981, the progress began to slow as NARS assigned seventeen archivists to appraise the FBI records. This number of appraisers was normally what NARS assigned to handle all federal records. As a result of this unique utilization of resources NARS had a backlog of 15,511 series to appraise on 30 September 1981. The number climbed to 21,042 by July 1982, but with the return of the FBI appraisers to regular duties, the backlog declined to 16,138 series by the end of 1982. 43

Late in 1979, a major effort was begun to appraise and schedule the unscheduled records in the FRCs, which at the time contained 3.9 million cubic feet of such records. 44 By October 1984, only
658,768 cubic feet of the FRCs' 14.3 million cubic feet of records were still unscheduled. The appraising of over three million cubic feet of records in six years was a significant accomplishment. However, it should be noted that a sizable portion of the volume consisted of a few enormous series, and in several instances, the appraisal simply called for the selection of certain files for permanent retention and the destruction of the remainder. Another sizable volume of unscheduled records, because of the manner in which the records were arranged, were scheduled to be transferred to the National Archives, where the actual appraisal would take place during archival processing.

Although NARS expended considerable resources to appraise the unscheduled records in the FRCs, it did not neglect its other records disposition responsibilities. During the 1979-1985 period, NARS continued to evaluate agency programs, issue handbooks and regulations, hold workshops and seminars, and appraise records. To facilitate the disposal of records, in 1983 NARS published a major update of the General Records Schedules, which included disposition standards for new series of temporary records and additional schedules. The following year it authorized agencies to destroy records lacking archival value that had been microfilmed and to apply the disposition approved for the hardcopy to the microfilm without the specific, prior approval of NARS. Hitherto agencies were required to obtain NARS approval before disposing of the hardcopy. NARS also expended considerable energy appraising the series agencies submitted for appraisal. Despite losing many experienced appraisers during 1983 and 1984, NARS was able to reduce the backlog of series to appraise from almost 17,600 on 1 October 1982 to 8,200 series on 1 October 1984, and eventually to 6,000 series by 1 April 1985.

The efforts by the agencies and NARS to appraise and schedule records, to reduce excessive retention
periods, to narrow the scope of freezes on records destruction, and to destroy records at their scheduled disposal date resulted in the federal government's being able to slow the growth of records during the 1979-1984 period. Nevertheless, the accumulation of records increased from 36.8 to over 40 million cubic feet during the period. This latter figure represented a doubling of the volume since 1950, despite the federal government's destroying well over 120 million cubic feet from 1950 to 1985.

Although the federal government made considerable progress in arresting the accumulation of federal records, it was not equally successful in addressing the disposition of machine-readable records, which by 1985 contained upwards of eighty percent of the government's information. Well over one-third of the government's 15 million reels of computer tape had not been appraised, and more than twenty major agencies had not scheduled any of their machine-readable records. That more progress was not made was the result of several factors.

Many agencies, often not realizing that those records needed to be scheduled like any other media, did not identify their machine-readable records on schedules. Additionally, NARS did not have sufficient resources to assist agencies address their machine-readable records. From a staff of fifteen professionals in 1980, NARS's Machine-Readable Archives Division was reduced, after budget cuts and a hiring freeze, in status to a branch and to a staff of seven professionals in 1982. Although NARS, working with the GSA during 1984 and 1985, attempted to make agencies more aware of their responsibilities with respect to their electronic records, much work remains to be done before the federal government matches the success it has had in addressing the effective and efficient disposition of paper records.

The flurry of records disposition activities during the 1979-1984 period led to the destruction of some 30 million cubic feet of records. Historians
and others became concerned that NARS was more interested in destroying rather than preserving records. In 1979, some forty journalists, political activists, historians, and organizations filed suit in a U.S. district court to halt the destruction of the FBI's records. They believed that NARS had not done a thorough job in originally appraising that agency's records. During 1980 and 1981, historians, court officials, and others complained that a disposition schedule approved in 1980 would allow the destruction of many valuable district court case files.

NARS responded to the concerns and complaints by increasing its efforts to explain how the disposition process worked, by seeking the advice of those doing the complaining, and by assuring the historical community that in appraising records NARS continually sought to preserve all records of enduring value. It also developed a new disposition schedule for the U.S. district court case files and, because of a court order, reappraised the records of the FBI. Seventeen archivists, including the author, were assigned the task.

From the beginning of his tenure as Archivist of the United States (1980-1985), Robert M. Warner urged that his agency improve its disposition policies, procedures, and practices. One major change in the way NARS approached its appraisals during the 1980s was utilizing the team approach, primarily in addressing voluminous series of records. These were generally case files of mixed research potential. In such appraisal NARS developed specific criteria for identifying valuable case files for permanent retention. NARS also consulted historians and other researchers for an additional perspective on the value of certain records.

To improve the disposition process further, Warner appointed a task force to study the NARS appraisal and disposition program during the fall of 1982. This task force, on which the author served as a consultant, issued its report in November 1983. The following October, Warner approved most of its
recommendations and assigned specific offices to implement them. To improve the effectiveness of the NARS's services to the agencies, he created an Office of Records Administration in December 1984. The Records Disposition Division, which had been part of the Office of Federal Records Centers, was placed in the new office, where it was renamed the Records Appraisal and Disposition Division.

On 1 April 1985, NARS became an independent agency, the National Archives and Records Administration. During NARS's existence the federal government made significant progress towards the goals of scheduling all federal records and destroying temporary ones in an effective and timely manner. On 1 April 1985, ninety-five percent of the FRC holdings were scheduled, and it is estimated that eighty percent of the volume of federal records were scheduled. NARS's scheduling efforts resulted in the federal government's being able to destroy some 120 million cubic feet of records between 1950 and 1985.

Despite the successes that had been experienced during the previous thirty-five years, the records disposition challenge still remained formidable on 1 April 1985. Over six million cubic feet of records still were unscheduled, including at least five million reels of computer tape and some 600,000 cubic feet of records in the FRCs. Many of the latter records, because of their older age and the manner in which they were arranged and retired, will be difficult to appraise.

To appraise those records, as well as new series and revisions to existing ones, the National Archives on 1 April 1985 had less than thirty staff members, many of whom had other duties in addition to appraisal work. Agencies, who have the responsibility for identifying and scheduling their records frequently do not have the resources and expertise to do an adequate job. Many agencies are still not properly scheduling their nontextual records (that is, machine-readable, audiovisual, and cartographic), or if they do, not complying with the schedules. Unfortunately, the National Archives
does not have the resources to monitor agency practices nor to train agency personnel fully in proper disposition practices.

The future of federal records disposition presents perhaps a greater challenge today than it did in 1950. This is not only because three times more records are being created annually than thirty-five years ago, but because information is being recorded, stored, and accessed on a growing variety of media. This latter factor raises many questions about what is a record and whether or not the series concept is still valid.

Fortunately, both the National Archives and the federal agencies realize that questions like those need answers, and both are committed to finding them. Fortunately also, both are committed to ensuring that records of enduring value are identified and preserved, and those that do not warrant continued retention are destroyed in an effective and timely manner. Just how successful they will be can be easily judged by how effective the federal government is in finding and using the information it needs and what records are available for researchers. If the past is indeed prologue, the federal government, with the help of the National Archives, should be very successful.

James Gregory Bradsher is a supervisory archivist with the National Archives and Records Administration's Planning and Policy Evaluation Branch. In summer 1986, he was a fellow at the Bentley Historical Library in Ann Arbor, Michigan, where he worked on an article about the appraisal of the FBI's records. The views expressed by Dr. Bradsher are his own and do not necessarily reflect official NARA policies.
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50 It should be noted that a provision in the National Archives and Records Administration Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-497) requires that the public be given an opportunity to comment on proposed disposal decisions by publishing notice about them in the Federal Register. Because of a desire to save on
printing costs NARS attempted to appraise as many series as possible before 1 April 1985 when the publishing requirement began.

51 During the same period the FRC holdings increased from 13.6 to 14.3 million cubic feet of records.

52 Committee on the Records of Government, Report, 89.


54 Ibid., 4-5; Committee on the Records of Government, Report, 89.


57 John Anthony Scott, "The FBI Files: A Challenge for Historians," American Historical Association Newsletter 18, 3 (March 1980): 1-2; Ann Mari Buitrago and Leon Andrew Immerman, Are You Now or Have You Ever Been in the FBI Files: How to


62 Subsequent to the FBI records appraisal the team approach has been used to appraise Department of Justice litigative case files, U.S. District Court case files, National Aeronautics and Space Administration research and development materials, Civil Service Commission investigative case files, and National Science Foundation contract and grant case files.

63 Unfortunately, in many instances, consultants, in keeping with Schellenberg's dictum that "any scholar with a little intellectual ingenuity can find a plausible justification for keeping almost every record that was ever produced," simply suggested that all case files be retained rather than helping develop specific criteria to identify those case files that truly warranted permanent retention. Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, 152.


65 The Records Appraisal and Disposition Division was given responsibility for the appraisal of machine-readable, cartographic, and audiovisual records, which hitherto had been the responsibility of the archival custodial units.


Integration, a word that has had high emotional overtones in the area of racial relations since the 1950s, is now a buzzword in automation circles. While it usually is used to refer to the combining of various types of software, it is also taking on a special meaning for archivists, librarians, and information specialists. Just as it is the dream of librarians to handle all their book transactions including selection, ordering, cataloging, and circulation on a unified automation system so, too, do archivists envision a computer system that will facilitate all archival functions.

The market for archive-specific software is so small that few software producers are paying attention to the archival need for programs that handle appraisal, acquisition, processing, preservation, and reference activities. Thus, most archivists are forced to adapt commercial software that was written for a different market or, like the Presidential Libraries and the National Archives and Records Administration, have software written to their specifications. For archives in large libraries, the challenge is to use book-oriented
software for manuscripts and other historical materials.

Though integration can refer to hardware, software, or data, the integration of archival functions will be the main focus of this article. To achieve functional integration, it is assumed that the archivist will attempt to exchange data between two or more software packages or two or more modules of a single, often called integrated, software package such as Knowledgeman or Symphony. Thus, the word integration will also refer to data integration. The term software will refer to that which tells the computer what to foul up, how to foul it up, and what to do with the fouled-up mess.

The planning and implementation of this exchange of data by archivists requires analysis of the step-by-step procedures by which they use data to acquire, process, describe, control, and report on their archival records. Because each step may be handled best by software or systems that manipulate data in a different way, archivists have been faced with regular exchange of information from one format to another. Due to the frequency of this conversion, it behooves the archivist to devise methods to prevent wasteful rekeying of information. Consideration of field length, field name, field type (text, number, date, graphic), special characters, construction of subfields, software compatibility, storage and memory requirements, and arrangement of data must be planned for when formatting the data at first entry for the most effective exchange of information.

In libraries which are also trying to achieve functional integration, there is debate on what constitutes an integrated system. Because libraries are moving away from singular systems of telecommunicated data and towards local online systems using microcomputer hardware and software, systems have been fragmented into modules that store data only in segments, not in a well-coordinated, integrated system. Thus, for libraries and archives, the dream of a true, functionally integrated,
automated system is problematic. Yet, many archivists continue to dream despite the hardship.

Integration of the functions of typical software can be accomplished by manufacturer design or through the use of standards for the exchange of data between software packages. Commercial software is generally designed for functions such as word processing, spreadsheets, database management, or project management. While each of these types of packages specializes in a specific means of data handling, they often have some similar capabilities. For example, many word processors have search features. Spreadsheets can sort data, and some database managers have calculation capabilities.

So-called integrated packages combine two or more of these functions in a modular structure. Symphony, for example, contains all of the previously mentioned types except the project manager and the picture management. Popular packages with three or more of these functions include: Lotus 1-2-3, Knowledgeman, and Framework II, which are available for the IBM PC and compatibles, plus Jazz and Excel for the Macintosh. All of these except Knowledgeman are based primarily on a spreadsheet and, thus, are handicapped by narrow field width and rigid row and column structure. Other software combinations, usually from a single manufacturer, are designed to fit together, even though they are purchased separately. An example of this is the PFS series, which has Write, File, Report, Graph, Plan, and Access (telecommunications) packages that can transfer data from one format to the other.

Another way that software permits transfer of data is through a standard exchange format. These include: ASCII, SDF, DIF, SYLK, and MARC. In addition to learning about these standards, archivists should be aware of evolving standards such as ISO 8211, which is a government-advocated standard for describing related files within a relational or hierarchical system. The big advantage of these standards is that they facilitate some transfer of data between products. The disadvantage is that the
structure does not always fit the needs of the user and no one standard has been widely adopted.

Many archives which began automation with micros in the late 1970s or early 1980s started by using word processors to create finding aids at the folder level. They have had to face the dilemma of needing to transfer those files to a database manager for indexing and searching capabilities. There has also been a tendency to create database management files that must be searched individually. The files are frequently not coordinated with one another. Information from one data file should be structured for transfer to other files, in order to save keystrokes. The use of a variety of packages by separate units of an institution often discourages the proper exchange of data. For example, the person responsible for acquisitions in a large archives needs to coordinate his data files with those of the processing and description units.

The beauty of relational database managers, such as dBase III, are that they allow the opening of and indexing from more than one file at a time. Additionally, separate files are not created just to have an alphabetized index. Several indexes can be created and browsed from a single file, so that modification in the master file can reflect the new information in all the indexes. Yet, the more complex relational database packages are more difficult to transport than a flat file, because of the difficulty of transferring the links created by opening several files at once. Furthermore, database managers cannot handle all the requirements of an integrated system. Therefore, exchange of data between software packages must be considered.

What are the implications for archivists who will exchange data in order to achieve functional integration? Memory and storage requirements are often so extensive for data exchange that archives are just recently getting micros large enough to handle it effectively. Internal memory of 512K or larger is becoming a necessity to accomplish these tasks efficiently. MARCON, MICROMarc, and PRESNET
all are working on modules to accomplish the upload or exchange of data between the local system and a national bibliographic utility such as RLIN (Research Libraries Information Network) or OCLC (Online Computer Library Center). Though it is difficult to upload a MARC-formatted record to a utility, downloading is easy through screen dumps. Since it is rather easy to create a readable disk file from a bibliographic utility record, one might consider creating this MARC record first and then using it to create local, often more searchable databases from the nationally available record. Printed guides to a collection, for example, could be done on a word processor based on records downloaded from bibliographic utility records. While this might seem like a backwards procedure, it is the formula many libraries use to create their local databases.

Archivists should consider a variety of types of data transfer. Transfer of data from a database manager to a word processor is often necessary when the report generator in the database manager is not sophisticated enough to generate the type of printout desired by the archives. Mailmerge software, which allows data to be shared between these two types of software is also useful for publicity mail outs and even lead files. The word processor, or text format, which is frequently the same as an ASCII format, can be used as the middle step in exchanging data between two noncompatible database managers. The transfer of data from a word processor ASCII file to a database manager, a situation faced by many archivists who first began on a word processor, requires thoughtful structuring of the ASCII file. Each paragraph, marked by a carriage return, will be imported as a separate record. Once it is imported to the database manager, the data can be divided into fields if it is of uniform length.

Though this may all seem tricky, it can save a great deal of typing if the transfer needs to be accomplished. However, when transferring spreadsheet or chart information to a word processor—even within an integrated package such as Symphony—the formulas
do not transfer and the information is locked so that recalculation is impossible. Another drawback to most transfer of data is that special features such as underlining, boldface, and non-ASCII characters such as the cents sign are not transferred to the target file. The structural and special features problem in the transfer necessitates the use of global search and replace capabilities in software that is to handle the transferred data to massage data and correct errors in exchange. Special feature or add-on programs that are useful to data exchange include: operating environment programs, macros, and multi-user systems.

Graphics or pictures stored with optical disks and additional software to integrate functions will be the wave of the future. Optical disk access will require special software, and database managers will have to be able to store and retrieve digitized pictures. Optical disk storage, which allows a great deal more storage space, will be needed because of the massive amount of electronic storage space needed to handle photos, posters, and maps or films and video productions.

Thus, it is clear that archivists should plan to integrate their archival functions by using packages such as relational databases, integrated software that facilitates transfer of data from one module to the next, or software with similar exchange standards. While automation may not be necessary for all archival functions, efficiency dictates that automated functions be coordinated with one another. Though data transfer is not always easy, it is a skill archivists must acquire. As Margaret Kimball wrote recently about integration of RLIN into existing Stanford University Archives and Special Collections procedures, "Integration does not occur overnight. It is a process of evolution involving trial and error in some cases and in others just a concerted effort to change a way of thinking."
The functions found in most commercial software packages include: (1) Word processing: This function is often used for correspondence, forms management, and report writing. Word processors have insert, delete, block move, search and replace, plus special formatting features that are appealing for creating finding aids. In general, word processors are free form, with paragraph endings or line endings providing the main structure; (2) Spreadsheets: This function is generally used for calculation of statistics such as budgeting, but they may also be suitable for calculating records centers' holdings and appraisal. Spreadsheets are structured in Row and Column fashion with limited cell width; (3) Database management: This function is most common to libraries and archives. Database managers search, sort, and list data organized in fields, records, and files. For example, a description of all the collections of an archive might be a file, then each collection would be a record, and the title of a collection would be one of the fields. Database managers usually contain an additional reports generation module; (4) Chart or graphics software: This is used in conjunction with a spreadsheet to create bar or pie charts which are often used to dramatize reports; (5) Project management: This is a newer form of software, often thought of for planning grant work or similar projects. It may have records management, tickler, or lead file possibilities, because of its calendar and reminder capabilities; (6) Communications: This includes bibliographic utility software as well as software for electronic mail, simple file transfer over telephone lines, and dumb terminal emulation when the computer is attached to a larger host computer. This is the chief means of computer to computer data exchange; and (7)
Picture managers: These handle digitized images such as photos, maps, or posters.

2 ASCII is a government promoted standard created by the American National Standards Institute and tends to be the method of exchange used by many word processors and telecommunications packages. It should be the dominant form; however, the manufacturers of spreadsheets and database managers have promoted their own standards. SDF (System Data Format) is promoted by Ashton-Tate, the creator of dBase, a very popular database manager. DIF (Differential Interchange Format) was popularized early by the manufacturer of the spreadsheet Visicalc. SYLK was developed by Microsoft, the creator of Multiplan and the Word. This format has become very popular, particularly to the Macintosh which enjoyed early attention from Microsoft. MARC (Machine-readable cataloging) was developed by libraries as a means of exchanging bibliographic information. The recently developed Archives and Manuscripts Control format is an example of a MARC format. Unlike the other formats which determine the files' structure, MARC assigns tags to each field in the file. Archivists should plan data elements that will be put in the MARC format so that they will follow the standards from an early stage.

3 Operating environment programs allow the user to open more than one file at once, to transfer files with cut and paste capabilities, and to view data from several files or programs in windows. Macros are programs that reside in the computer's internal memory. Macro programs allow the user to enter data or commands within another program by pressing a combination of keys at one time. They save keystrokes by allowing the user to program the keyboard with text or commands that are frequently repeated. Multi-user systems create local area networks (LANs). Some of the popular systems include Novell, Ethernet, and System 36 from IBM. Many of the library systems, like LS2000, NOTIS, or VTLS,
have built in multiuser capabilities.

4 Margaret J. Kimball, "Workflow for Processing Manuscripts in Automated Systems," Rare Books and Manuscripts Librarianship 1,2 (Fall 1986): 117-126.
North Carolina State University is the headquarters for a new electronic service for the humanities and social sciences. The service, ScholarNet, offers a wide variety of useful telecommunications services to the academic community. Subscribers can exchange electronic mail and manuscripts for joint research. They can download course syllabi, bibliographies, software and book reviews, and public domain software. ScholarNet also includes the Associated Press news, travel planning, an online encyclopedia, an events scheduler, and much more. ScholarNet currently includes two divisions: PoliNet covers the areas of political science, public administration, and criminal justice; HumaNet includes materials for English, history, philosophy, and religion. For more information write Richard W. Slatta, ScholarNet Director; North Carolina State University, Box 8101, Raleigh, NC 27695-8101 or telephone (919) 737-2908.

The Metro Government of Nashville and Davidson County (Tennessee) dedicated a new archives this year. The archives is housed in the former Mount Zeno School. The papers of mayors and other city officials and data on the formation of the metropolitan form of government will be stored in the archives for use in documenting the city's heritage.
The state of Alabama has formed a DeSoto Commission to further studies on sixteenth and seventeenth century Alabama and the Southeast. Though the commission is mostly interested in DeSoto's exploration of Alabama, its five-year plan is to contact scholars who are interested in grant or contract work on topics relating to the era of exploration and conquest in the Gulf Coast states. Other topics that will be considered are the expeditions of Marcos Delgado and Tristan de Luna y Arellano, as well as the native contacts of maritime exploration. Interested scholars should contact Dr. Douglas E. Jones, DeSoto Commission, Alabama Museum of Natural History, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL 35466.

The George C. Marshall Foundation in Lexington, Virginia announced publication of Manuscript Collections of the George C. Marshall Library: A Guide. Funded in part by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the guide provides an abstract for each of the 121 collections held by the library. To obtain the publication free of charge, contact Anita M. Weber, Assistant Archivist, George C. Marshall Foundation, P.O. Box 1600, Lexington, VA 24450.

The city of Mobile, Alabama has published A Guide to the Mobile Municipal Archives. The guide is authored by Clifton Dale Foster, Tracey J. Berezansky, and Frank E. Roberts. The work is the result of a one-year arrangement and description project funded by the National Historical
Publications and Records Commission. For more information contact Jay Higginbotham, Mobile Municipal Archives, P.O. Box 1827, Mobile, AL 36633-1827.

* * *

The 1987 national meeting of the Popular Culture Association will be held in Montreal, Canada from 25 to 29 March. An invitation is extended to anyone involved in the teaching or study of Westerns and the West. There will be panels on "Space and Freedom in Western Film and Fiction" and "The Rise and Fall of Television Westerns," as well as papers on a variety of subjects dealing with Western history, literature, films, television programs, etc. For more information contact Gary A. Yoggy, Professor of History, Corning Community College, Corning, NY 14830.

* * *

The Southern Association for Women Historians has established two biennial prizes. The Julia Cherry Spruill Publication Prize is for the best published work, book, or article in southern women's history. The Willie Lee Rose Publication Prize is for the best book in southern history written by a woman. The first carries a cash award of $500, and the second, one of $750. The first period of eligibility for both is 1985 and 1986. Entries should be sent by March 1987 to each of the following prize committee members: Carol Bleser (Chair), Department of History, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634; Elizabeth Jacoway, 4 Dogwood Drive, Newport, AR 72112; and Jo An Carrigan, Department of History, University of Nebraska, Omaha, NE 68123.
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The Louisiana State University Libraries has recently created a new department in its Special Collections. The new Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Historical Collections encompass the collections and staff members previously designated as the Louisiana Collection, the Manuscripts Collection, the University Archives, and the Russell Long Collection. The new unit will be developed and serviced by a united staff and accessed through a single automated catalog.

The final report of the Louisiana Historical Records Assessment Project funded by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission was submitted to the granting agency in June 1986. The report, which systematically analyzes records management programs in the state, will soon be available in published form. The project coordinator was Doug Harrison.

The University of Texas announced on 10 March 1986 the acquisition of an extensive archives of materials documenting much of the life of the Mississippi between 1790 and 1900. The acquisition, referred to as the Natchez Trace Collection, contains diaries, correspondence, court records, periodicals, household inventories, business ledgers, newspapers, slave bills of sale, medical records, maps, broadsides, catalogs, battlefield letters, and sheet music from Louisiana and Mississippi.

Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania announces a graduate degree in applied public
history. More than ninety percent of their graduates are employed in historical societies, museums, public and private agencies as well as archives. In addition to the regular program of study, the program offers courses and internships which concentrate on American daily life. For more information write Dr. John Opie, Director; Graduate Program in Archival, Museum, and Editing Studies; Department of History; Duquesne University; Pittsburgh, PA 15282 or telephone (412) 434-6470.

An acid-free computer paper, called Texlife Computer Printout, is available now from Texwipe Company. For durability the paper is impregnated with latex during the manufacturing process. It is designed to be used for printouts that will receive extensive handling. Texlife comes in two sizes: 9 1/2-by-11-inch with removable perforated sides and 14 7/8-by-11-inch, blue-bar printed form. Fifteen hundred sheets come in a case. For information or samples write The Texwipe Company, 650 E. Crescent Avenue, Box 308, Upper Saddle River, NJ 07458 or telephone (201) 327-9100.

The Association for Recorded Sound Collections has been awarded a $48,298 research grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities for a study of audio preservation. The eighteen-month project will study existing practices and literature on sound preservation, conservation, and restoration and will publish a bibliography, a glossary, and recommendations for selection media. For more information contact Elwood McKee, Project Director, 118 Monroe Street, #610, Rockville, MD 20850.
The East Tennessee Historical Society received a $30,000 grant from the state office of Tennessee Homecoming '86 to produce a television documentary on twentieth century Tennessee.

The University of Kentucky Libraries, Special Collections, has been awarded $153,000 by the U.S. Department of Education's Title IIC program. The grant covers the second year of Special Collection's plan to enter collection level descriptions into OCLC, to deacidify and encapsulate pre-twentieth century Kentuckiana, and to produce a guide to the holdings in Special Collections that document the heritage of Kentucky.

Archives in Appalachia is the published result of a project undertaken in 1984 by the Appalachian Consortium, with support from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, to survey institutions in south central Appalachia and locate records pertaining to the history of the region. Over 1,000 questionnaires were sent to appropriate repositories (such as colleges and universities, historical societies, museums, and public libraries, but excluding governmental repositories and state archives) located in North and South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, and Georgia. The guide contains responses from 181 repositories and includes basic information about the repositories and their holdings, indexes by subject and type of material, and a list of coming attractions, that is, institutions that did not collect relevant materials at the time of the survey but planned to in the future.

The stated purpose of the survey and resulting directory was to provide research access to local resources documenting south central Appalachia. The directory accomplishes this purpose in a straightforward, no frills fashion. The main entries are arranged first by state and then alphabetically.
by name of repository. Each entry includes the name, address, and telephone number of the repository, with the name of a contact person; the type of repository; the types of records held; and the span dates, volume, and broad subjects of the holdings. Information on subjects, types of records, and types of repositories is conveyed through two-letter abbreviations rather than descriptive narrative. The system is simple and the meaning of each entry is clear. A complete list of all of the abbreviations and their meanings is conveniently located at the beginning of the guide, immediately preceding the main entries. Although brief narratives would be welcome, primarily to clarify the point-of-view of each repository (religion through the eyes of a church-sponsored mission?, health science promoted in opposition to traditional home cures?), the entries as published provide adequate information for most purposes.

The directory offers two indexes, one by record type and the other by subject, which allow researchers to pinpoint likely sources for the materials they seek. Each record type or subject category lists the reference numbers of applicable main entries. Like the main entries, the reference numbers within each category are also subdivided into groupings by state, a helpful feature.

One problematic quirk in the format of this publication is the alphabetical arrangement of the main entries. The introduction to the directory notes that "the form of entry used for a repository depended primarily on the form used by the individual completing the questionnaire." The resulting inconsistencies can cause complications in locating a particular institution. In some cases, repositories are listed under department names (such as Special Collections), so that a researcher using the guide to check the holdings of the University of Kentucky, for example, many have to look in several places to find the entry. In addition, a repository's name is found under the first word in the name, regardless of the name by which it is commonly known. The introduction
to the directory advises users to check all possible locations for names of specific repositories. Nevertheless, cross-references would be helpful, and in a larger publication, would be essential.

*Archives in Appalachia* does fulfill the purpose for which it was intended—guiding seekers of resources on south central Appalachia to the ends of their various rainbows. While much of the information is also available in other publications, this new reference work provides updated, specialized information, aimed at a particular audience, in a suitable, usable format.

Christopher Ann Paton
Georgia State University


The Alabama Historical Records Advisory Board, with the National Historical Publications and Records Commission's support, recently coordinated an extensive survey of the state's records. To carry out the work of the Alabama Assessment Project, a distinguished group of Alabama archivists, records managers, librarians, historians, government officials, and private citizens were organized into three task forces: State Government Records, Local Government Records, and Historical Records. This published report summarizes their findings and recommendations.

Although Chapter 1, "Alabama's Archival Heritage" by Richard J. Cox, is not a task force report, it sets the stage for the detailed analyses that follow. This chapter will be of particular interest to
Alabama archivists as well as patrons of the Alabama State Department of Archives and History (ASDAH). Cox traces the evolution of the ASDAH from its founding in 1901 by Thomas M. Owen to the present.

The task force report on state government records reveals how the ASDAH has failed to live up to its archival responsibilities as envisioned by Owen. Nearly every state, with the exception of Alabama, has produced finding aids for its records. Furthermore, Alabama records that have been identified as historically valuable are inadequately preserved and arranged. There is little systematic scheduling of state records for retention or disposal.

A state records management program is desperately needed in Alabama. Such a program will enable the ASDAH staff to work closely with state agencies in drafting records schedules for orderly disposal of nonessential materials and preservation of historically valuable items. A state records center also is needed to handle records from creation to disposal, temporary storage, or permanent retention. Freed from the onerous burden of maintaining tons of worthless records, state agencies can serve Alabamians more efficiently and economically, and the ASDAH can provide better access to historical sources.

To achieve these goals, the task force recommends that future legislation defining public records emphasize origin rather than format, thereby allowing the ASDAH to accession computerized records, videotape, movie film, and other nontextual materials. This task force also calls for expanded leadership roles in records management for both the ASDAH and the State Records Commission.

Many of the findings and recommendations of the first task force are similar to those of the other two groups (Local Records and Historical Records). Theft and negligent destruction of local government records have become so epidemic that any future discussions of records management programs may be moot--these records may disappear. More public
pressure must be brought to bear upon the elected officials who are legally responsible for these records. Laws can be drafted to guarantee that historically valuable records are maintained in the proper archives with specific guidelines for preservation and access. A statewide union catalog or computerized finding aid should be designed for all of these records. Yet, these recommendations will not eliminate widespread conflicts and competitiveness in collection policies (especially among local repositories), nor will they alleviate the general lack of cooperation among many archives in the state.

This ambitious preliminary report calls for a new awakening of archival professionalism and cooperation in Alabama. The ASDAH must assume a primary leadership role in this campaign, but the other state archival entities must pull their share of the load. Increased public awareness of the value of historical records is needed; but perhaps, if archivists concentrate on doing their jobs well and serving their constituencies in a competent, professional manner, there will be no need for an aggressive public relations effort aimed at enhancing the image of the archival profession. This report is an important step toward revitalization of Alabama's archival heritage. The staff of the Alabama Assessment Project are to be congratulated for an exemplary publication. Now, members of the entire Alabama archival community must respond to the challenges presented by this report.

David E. Alsobrook
Carter Presidential Library

Managing Local Government Records is the first manual ever produced in New York to show local officials how to deal with their records problems effectively. The manual is certainly a must for local officials and researchers in New York state; however, the volume makes a larger contribution by being of value to officials outside the state. Persons working to establish control over local records in places from Macon, Georgia, to Eugene, Oregon, should find this useful. Though few new ideas are presented (alas, no amazing shortcuts or cure-alls have been expounded), the steps needed to create a total records program are carefully and clearly detailed in these eight chapters.

Prepared by the New York State Archives with partial support from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, this manual is similar to manuals prepared by other states in recent years, including Georgia's Managing Public Records, Local Government Handbook. As an overall introduction to records storage and care, the volume is designed more for local officials new to the world of records management than for archivists and records managers who have faced similar problems for years. However, even veterans will find this a useful reference tool as a source for new ideas or as a checklist to gauge progress being made at their own records centers.

The book begins by laying the burden of responsibility on local government officials. Help from the state archives will come primarily in the form of advice, suggestions about specific problems, and publications. As noted on page one of the introduction, local officials should expect only "limited field assistance" from the archives' staff. Since the care of records created 10, 75, or 175 years ago does not inspire the same front-page news coverage as a new hospital wing or improved roads,
local officials have frequently ignored records problems in the past. The introductory chapter reminds these officials that it is their duty to care for local records and that records are "an essential informational resource and an important cultural asset."

Basic records management concepts are detailed in other chapters. Inventorying, scheduling, microfilming, retention, and disposition are all explained with suggestions regarding implementation. For instance, a three-page insert following the chapter on surveying and analysis contains step-by-step instructions on inventorying records. Another chapter addresses the need to care for archival records. The preservation and care of the five percent of local records that typically have permanent value is seen as an integral step in establishing a good records program. While not specifically naming all records of archival value (readers are referred to other publications of the New York State Archives), the authors stress the importance of these records and the steps required for preserving and making them accessible to the public. Simply establishing a sound and effective records management program over local records does not mean a local records official's job is done--records meriting permanent retention will require further care.

Three-fourths of this book will be of value to local officials everywhere. The last thirty pages will be of greater interest to New Yorkers. A chapter on where to go for more assistance (including brief bibliographic entries), laws and regulations relating to local records, and a list of the findings and recommendations of the New York State Historical Records Advisory Board in 1984 remind that this volume was prepared for the people of a particular state.

Bruce Dearstyne, New York state's Principal Archivist for External Programs and Executive Director of the National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators, did a
commendable job in writing this volume. The mere fact that the manual may be of interest to officials in states far from New York raise a central question: Do we really need fifty such volumes from each state in the Union which repeat the same basic ideas and then conclude with several pages of interest primarily to those living in that state? State politics might necessitate the need for fifty manuals, but perhaps the National Information Center for Local Government Records (NICLOG) will provide a service to local and state officials by showing that while schedules for individual records series need to be prepared on the state or local level, manuals for the care of these records can be prepared for a broader audience. NICLOG's manual should be available this spring. In the meantime, New York's volume should serve as a model for others to follow.

Kaye Lanning
Troup County (Georgia) Archives


Researching the History of Your School is a forty-page booklet which has, as the title suggests, a worthwhile purpose. The manual, published by the State Archives of the New York State Education Department, declares in its introduction an "underlying theme of the manual--that local resources can be used by students and teachers for the recovery and understanding of local educational history." (p. 1)

Unfortunately, the booklet will have limited use
in advancing that theme outside New York. Chapter II, "The Development of Elementary and Secondary Education in New York," is a short overview that might be of interest to those in that state, but it would not be significant to students elsewhere. Chapter III, a tabular listing of educational milestones, also applies only to New York.

The heart of the manual rests in Chapters IV and V. The booklet lists sources for the researcher to consult in his quest for school data. However, the lists are too general to be more than common sense; certainly, they are not specific enough to be timesaving.

Possibly a novice teacher could gain insight and confidence from the general checklists and suggested lesson plans. In addition, the bibliography would be useful for a New York teacher. However, this limited usefulness would not warrant purchase outside the Empire State.

Vivian S. Rice
Morrow (Georgia) High School


This slender volume about the history of the premier archival institution of the United States will be standard reading for the next generation of budding archivists, taking its place next to works such as the Society of American Archivists's Basic Manual Series. A copy of this work should be issued to all new National Archives and Records
Administration (NARA) employees in order that they may gain a better idea of the history of their agency. This volume, moreover, serves as a good introduction to the National Archives for the general public, including those individuals who hold the purse strings.

A 1984 issue of Prologue published in celebration of the National Archives's fiftieth anniversary is the source for this collection of essays about that institution. Great demand for the issue encouraged NARA staff to undertake further essays to complete the overview of its history. In this endeavor the staff has succeeded beyond the expectations usually related to anniversary publications.

The primary strength of this volume is the lucid, objective account of the history of this institution which permits the work to be accessible to disinterested citizens, overworked graduate students, and seasoned professionals. The text is amply illustrated by photographs which help to distinguish it from dry and seldom-read works. These photos may overemphasize the archives leadership, but they also include rarely printed images of actual archival activities and working conditions of which the general public, including graduate students, are not aware. Photos of a dozen processors in one large room sitting at what were, no doubt, navy-gray desks or a trio of staff members wheeling in metal containers filled with records provide unusual glimpses of archival work.

In his introduction, Timothy Walch identifies the major weaknesses of this work. This is by no means the definitive history of the agency; rather, these are perceptive essays created under the constraints of time and publication space limitations. Each author's narrative has its own perspective. There is a certain amount of repetition, particularly among the first three essays, which could have been reduced. The essays discussing recent events will be subject to revision by later historians. There is little space devoted to archival developments outside
the National Archives, though comparisons might be illustrative.

Walch states that this book is a "modest" effort which fills a void in historical literature. That is an understatement. The essays provide a solid basis for an understanding of this guardian of our heritage. The essays do not gloss over the problems and politics of this institution, such as racial discrimination, internal politics which forced the resignation of an Archivist of the United States, or the traumatic episodes related to the Nixon papers.

This book is highly recommended. It is not only informative, but easy reading. In an image-oriented age, there is hardly a leaf in the book without a photograph. The work is a major service to the archival profession and one which should be on any reading list of courses in archival administration.

Michael F. Kohl
Clemson University


Both may be ordered from the Society of American Archivists, 600 South Federal, Suite 504, Chicago, IL 60605, at a cost if $32.00 to SAA members and $45.00 to others.

Because of their arrangement, these two manuals
look alike at first glance. Both duplicate the field-by-field structure of the tenth update of MARC Formats for Bibliographic Data published by the Library of Congress in 1984. This publication revised the standards for all MARC formats then in use, including Archives and Manuscript Control (AMC). It was not intended to be a manual and cannot function as one.

From the Formats, Nancy Sahli has extracted the information relevant to the AMC Format, expanding, explaining, and arranging this information in a useful manner. A helpful introduction (in question and answer form) provides information about the AMC format's development, structure, and implementation. Also included are examples of a data entry form and AMC format records, as well as the SAA's "Data Elements Dictionary," published separately in 1985. Sahli's manual is written with more grace and goes into much greater detail than the AMC manual recently published by OCLC (Online Catalog Library Center). It is essential for anyone using the AMC MARC format.

Of equal interest is Max Evans and Lisa Weber's Compendium of Practice. It is the product of a national conference held at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin in the fall of 1984 in which representatives from institutions which had implemented or were about to implement the AMC format met to compare and examine their practices. Since it contains little prefactory material, some familiarity with the AMC format is necessary to appreciate this work. It is arranged like the Sahli manual and contains the USMARC definitions and OCLC and Research Library Group policy statements for each field. Specific examples from each of the repositories using the format are included in the field descriptions. Particularly useful are the lengthy descriptions of the main entry (6XX) fields.

Taken together, these two manuals provide archivists using the MARC AMC format with all the information they need. Archivists not planning to use MARC, who simply wish to gain some understanding of AMC and its impact on the profession, may be
better served by more general discussions of the uses and implications of archival automation such as Katherine D. Morton's article in the Winter 1986 issue of The American Archivist, "The MARC Formats: An Overview."

Robert Bohanan
Carter Presidential Library


A must volume for the neophyte, this is a comprehensive treatment of the processes which are touching all our professional lives. The volume is divided into three broad sections--History and Background, Planning and Preparation, and Applications--with chapters covering topics such as online catalogs, online search services, optical disk storage, and shelflist conversion. Best news of all: It's lucidly organized and easily understandable.

Standard Citation Forms for Rare Book Cataloging, by Peter Van Wingen and Stephen Davis, 1985, $10.00. Bibliographic Description of Rare Books, Rules formulated under AACR 2 and ISBD(A) for the Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Books and Other Special Printed Materials, 1981, $7.50. Graphic Materials: Rules for Describing Original Items and Historical Collections, compiled by Elizabeth Betz, 1982, $12.00. All three titles are available from the Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service, Washington, DC 20541.
These three guides exemplify LC's commitment to standardizing access points. Standard Citation Forms, while not attempting to be a recommended canon of bibliography sources, does reflect those bibliographies found most useful in describing special collections holdings at LC, with input from the Rare Books and Manuscript Section of ALA, and the American Antiquarian Society.

Bibliographic Description expands and elaborates on AACR 2's brief section on rare printed materials—a response to the need to have a single, thorough cataloging standard.

And, Graphic Materials fills a gap in cataloging guidelines for those thousands of research libraries, archives, historical societies, professional organizations, and private collections which are custodians of graphic materials. These rules provide guidance within AACR 2, with attention to the impact of automation on inventory control and research access.


All phases of archival reference services are covered in this compilation—organization and arrangement, guides and collection inventories, national information centers, RLIN's Archives and Manuscript Control project, evaluation techniques, and many others. The volume should be a part of any archives professional reference collection.

Video to Online: Reference Services and the New

Practical advice, with comparative assessments, make this an important addition to professional collections. There are chapters on database choices, bibliographic retrieval, comparisons of online and manual searches, free vs. fee searches, applications to interlibrary loan searching, and on integrating local data bases with print materials and reference services.


The nearly five hundred nineteenth century products represented here are still being manufactured. The value of the catalog to historical repositories is in terms of the identification of artifacts and gizmos. Entries include descriptions, history, and lore surrounding the items, and range from clawfoot tubs to birch bark canoes.
INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

EDITORIAL POLICY

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 and related correspondence should be addressed to Sheryl B. Vogt; editor, PROVENANCE; Richard B. Russell Memorial Library, University of Georgia Libraries, Athens, GA 30602.

Manuscripts received from contributors are submitted to an editorial board. Editors are asked to appraise manuscripts in terms of appropriateness, scholarly worth, and clarity of writing.

Accepted manuscripts will be edited in the above terms and to conform to the University of Chicago Manual of Style.

Only manuscripts which have not been previously published will be accepted, and authors must agree not to publish elsewhere, without explicit written permission, a paper submitted to and accepted by PROVENANCE.

Two copies of PROVENANCE will be provided to the author without charge.

Letters to the editor which include pertinent and constructive comments or criticisms of articles or reviews recently published by PROVENANCE are welcome. Ordinarily, such letters should not exceed 300 words.

Brief contributions for Short Subjects may be addressed to Glen McAninch, Special Collections and Archives, King Library North, University of Kentucky Libraries, Lexington, KY 40506.

Books for review should be sent to Martin Elzy, 1408 Quail Hunt Drive, Riverdale, GA 30296.
Manuscript Requirements

Manuscripts should be submitted in double-spaced typescripts throughout--including footnotes at the end of the text--on white bond paper 8 1/2-x-11-inches in size. Margins should be about 1 1/2 inches all around. All pages should be numbered, including the title page. The author's name and address should appear only on the title page, which should be separate from the main text of the manuscript.

Each manuscript should be submitted in three copies, the original typescript and two copies.

The title of the paper should be accurate and distinctive rather than merely descriptive.

References and footnotes should conform to accepted scholarly standards. Ordinarily, PROVENANCE uses footnote format illustrated in the University of Chicago Manual of Style, 13th edition.


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," The American Archivist 37, 3 (July 1974). Copies of this glossary may be purchased from the Society of American Archivists, 600 S. Federal Street, Suite 504, Chicago, IL 60605.
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