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Current Copyright Law and the Archivist

Suzanne Flandreau Steel

When the Copyright Law of 1976 (Title 17, U.S. Code) was passed, archivists welcomed it as a reform that would remove the distinctions and uncertainties of common law copyright and apply the provisions of the statute equally to manuscripts and published materials. Recent developments in the courts, however, and opinions expressed in two five-year reports of the Copyright Office, have indicated that the end of common law copyright may not have led to an equal treatment of published and unpublished materials in law, even though statutory copyright now applies to both. Recent legal interpretations have maintained old distinctions between published and unpublished materials with regard to "fair use," and to library and archival photocopying of unpublished materials.

In its treatment of unpublished materials, the new copyright law is confusing both for what it does not say and for what it does. It is apparent that, though the 1976 law was a radical change, changes in legal interpretation have not been radical, and there are precedents from the courts of which archivists should be
aware. Specifically, two recent cases, *Harper & Row v. The Nation* and *Salinger v. Random House*, deal with questions of fair use of unpublished materials and other matters that set precedents relevant to scholarly use of manuscripts in libraries and archives. In addition, the latest report on library photocopying by the register of copyrights takes a very hard line on photocopying of unpublished materials that, if enforced, would impede current scholarly and archival practice.

Under the 1976 law any work of authorship in a fixed form is protected by copyright, and registration of the work is no longer necessary. The court cases and the other developments to be discussed center around three sections of the copyright law.

Section 106 enumerates the rights of the copyright holder. These include the right to reproduce a work, to prepare derivative works, and to "distribute copies . . . of the work to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership." For some nonliterary types of works there are also rights of performance and display. Though "publication" is not specifically mentioned, Section 106 repeats the exact wording used to define "publication" in Section 101 of the law. The following two sections, 107 and 108, provide limits on the rights enumerated in 106.

Section 107 is the fair use provision. It codifies a judicial doctrine developed to deal with the publication of copyrighted materials. There are four tests of fair use, and these tests are always applied by the courts. The first is the purpose and character of the use. Nonprofit uses are more likely to be considered fair. The second test is the nature of the work used, and this is a very important one for archivists. The third test is

---

1 *Copyright*, Title 17, *U.S. Code* (1978). Section 102 defines the types of works that are covered by copyright. U.S. government works are specifically excluded in Section 105. Section 408 states that copyright protection is not dependent on registration.
the amount of the work that is used in relation to the whole, and the fourth is the effect on the potential market for the work. All of these tests should be met for the use of the work to be fair.

Section 108 applies to reproduction of copyrighted works by libraries and archives. Controversial when it was developed, it intends to set limits for library photocopying. It has numerous paragraphs and will be discussed in more detail below. Because of the judicial nature of the fair use doctrine and the controversy over library photocopying, the court cases deal with Section 107, that is, with fair use, and the two reports of the register of copyrights with Section 108.

The two recent court cases deal with unauthorized publication of manuscript materials and claims by persons who published them that for various reasons such publication was fair use. The Harper and Row case concerns the memoirs of former President Gerald Ford, which were to be published in book forms by Harper and Row. This firm had sold magazine rights to Time magazine. Before Time could publish, The Nation obtained an unauthorized copy of the book and published a story discussing the memoirs and quoting excerpts. Time canceled its plans to publish a prepublication article on the biography. Harper and Row then sued The Nation for copyright infringement. The Nation claimed that the newsworthiness of the subject made its publication of the memoirs fair use.

The case takes place out of libraries altogether. The dispute is between a publisher and a news magazine, and the most important issue at stake is newsworthiness as a factor in fair use. The case is significant because as part of their defense the attorneys for The Nation claimed that, under the 1976 law, fair use applies equally to published and unpublished materials. The case went to the Supreme Court, which did not accept this view. The Court decided that the right of first publication, an old concept from common law copyright, was more important in the case of unpublished materials than fair use:
The unpublished nature of a work is a key, though not necessarily determinative, factor tending to negate a defense of fair use. And under ordinary circumstances, the author's right to control the first public appearance of his undissemintated expression will outweigh a claim of fair use.2

The Harper and Row decision says, in effect, that an author's right to first publication implied in Section 106 of the law outweighs fair use. When unpublished copyrighted materials are concerned, fair use applies more narrowly than for materials that have been published. Under common law, fair use did not apply to unpublished materials, and to some extent the decision recalls this common law principle.3 This interpretation is not the one most often expressed in the archival literature, where it has been assumed that when common law copyright was abolished fair use under statutory copyright would apply equally to all copyrighted materials.4

The Salinger case applies more directly to libraries and archives. Salinger brought suit against his would-be biographer Ian Hamilton to prevent the publication of quotations from his unpublished letters in a biography. He was denied an injunction


3 For the legal background to Section 107 see Goroff, 336-344.

by the district court, but the ruling was overturned by the United States Court of Appeals, which ruled that even paraphrases of the passages in question infringed Salinger's copyright in his unpublished letters.\footnote{Salinger v. Random House, Inc., 811 Federal Reporter 2d Series 90 (1987). In an interesting and ironic development, the quotations Salinger attempted to suppress became part of the court record and are published in the decision.}

The Salinger decision, which was upheld by the Supreme Court, cites the Supreme Court's earlier decision in Harper and Row. The Salinger decision states that Section 107 does apply to unpublished materials, that even the right of first publication is "subject to the defense of fair use," but that the law "does not determine . . . the scope of the defense as applied to such works."\footnote{Since this paper was written another case, New Era Publications International v. Henry Holt and Co. has been decided. New Era concerns the attempts of a publishing house connected with the Church of Scientology to enjoin publication of a critical biography of the church's founder, L. Ron Hubbard, written by Russell Miller and entitled Bare-Faced Messiah. New Era claims that Miller infringes by quoting passages from Hubbard's unpublished writings. The case was first heard in the United States District Court for New York (695 F. Supp. 1493 SDNY 1988). In his denial of the injunction Judge Leval (whose original decision in Salinger was later overturned) broadened fair use as set forth in Salinger to allow quotation of the copyrighted expression of a subject when only the words themselves would serve the critical purpose of the biographer. The subject's exact words become facts essential to the reader's understanding of the biographer's point. Leval's decision is a mixed one, since he points out that not all the quotations in the book meet this test, and some do infringe. Nevertheless, he denied the injunction as too drastic a penalty on a serious critical study.} The court decided that this scope is narrower, and that
Salinger's would-be biographer exceeded it. In other words, published and unpublished works are not equally subject to fair use.

The Salinger case applies directly to archives because the biographer got much of his information from Salinger letters that he used in major repositories. The case therefore mentions libraries in some important contexts. The point is made almost in passing that the owner of a letter may legally place it in a library and may place restrictions on its use. The owner of the physical object, not the owner of the literary rights, may determine its physical disposition. In other words, archives and libraries are legally entitled to hold their collections and to allow research use of them. Depositing unpublished materials in a library does not amount to publication when the library's stated use policies adhere to the copyright law, and the author retains his rights to his unpublished expression.

The case mentions and validates the use agreements libraries require their users to sign. Salinger made these agreements a part of his suit, claiming that he as copyright holder in the materials used was a party to the agreements. He tried to have the use

On appeal, the United States Court of Appeals also denied the injunction, on the grounds that New Era had unnecessarily delayed its suit, causing the publisher possible additional monetary losses on the production and distribution of the volume. However, the appeals panel refused to concur with Judge Leval's interpretation on fair use, stressing again, as they did in Salinger, that the unpublished nature of the quoted material precluded its use without permission. The case as it stands now has the effect of reinforcing the Salinger decision. [1989 WL 38381 2nd Cir. (N.Y.)]

7 Salinger v. Random House, 95.

8 Salinger v. Random House, 97.
agreements enforced as contracts, claiming that by publishing without his consent his biographer had broken them. The court did not rule on this point, but did note that library use agreements are designed to acquaint researchers with copyright issues. There is a clear implication that the libraries involved had fulfilled their responsibility for instructing their users about copyright.

Neither case mentions photocopying, which is a major concern of archivists. Interpretation of Section 108 is a bone of contention between the Society of American Archivists (SAA) and the Copyright Office. Fair use is a judicially derived doctrine that initially applied to the use of copyrighted material in a publication. It did not apply to unpublished materials under common law. However, it was used to justify library photocopying, and fair use copying of unpublished materials, though illegal in theory, was widely done in practice. Archivists and historians have never equated photocopying with publication.

The assumption has been widespread in the archival profession that when the 1976 law abolished common law copyright, fair use would apply to all unpublished materials under statutory copyright. As late as 1985 an SAA publication devoted to legal concerns in archives clearly states this assumption. Apparently, when it comes to publication, the courts are not willing to interpret fair use so broadly, though they have not given specific opinions on photocopying. If photocopying of unpublished materials under Section 107 is considered a form of publication (which is not permissible), then libraries and archives wishing to photocopy manuscript materials for patrons must do so under Section 108.

9 Salinger v. Random House, 93-94.

10 Gary M. Peterson and Trudy Huskamp Peterson, Archives and Manuscripts: Law. (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1985). See 82-83, where the legality of fair use copying of manuscripts is assumed.
They then tangle with the Copyright Office, which has taken a position on the right of first publication that is even narrower than that of the courts.

For Section 108 to apply to libraries and archives, paragraph (a) states that the repository must not benefit financially from the production of the copy, must be nonprofit and open to the public or at least to qualified researchers, and must warn users about the provisions of the copyright law.

One paragraph of Section 108 clearly applies to manuscripts: paragraph (b) allows a library to duplicate unpublished works in its collection in facsimile for purposes of preservation and security, and it allows copying of unpublished materials for deposit for research use in another library. The disputed paragraphs are (d), which states that a portion of a copyrighted work may be copied for an individual researcher, provided the required copyright notice is attached, and paragraph (e), which allows copying of a more substantial portion or an entire work under the same conditions if it is not otherwise available "at a fair price." SAA claims that these provisions apply to unpublished materials. The Copyright Office claims that they do not.

In Section 108 (i) the register of copyrights is required to hold hearings and to report on the effectiveness of Section 108 in balancing the needs of users against the rights of publishers and copyright holders. This provision was added to the law because Section 108 was controversial at the time it was enacted. Two reports on Section 108 have been issued, one in 1983 and one in 1988. Both reports assert that Section 108 (d) and (e) do not apply to unpublished works.

In 1980 Linda Matthews of the SAA Copyright Task Force wrote a position paper asking that in the first five-year report the register of copyrights recommend a clarification of the language of the law to make it explicit that photocopying of unpublished materials for researchers was allowed under 108 (d) and (e). This clarification would make the law support the accepted copying
practices of most archives. The recommendation SAA got was exactly the opposite. The register replied that the only permissible copying of unpublished materials is under paragraph 108 (b) because

the copy prepared under the auspices of 108 (b) is not for distribution to a library patron. There should be no suggestion that the right of first publication is somehow transferred from the owner of the copyright to the library or archive. . . . Since the copyright owner has elected never to publish the work, that election must be honored. . . . For the same reason, there is no fair use copying permitted beyond that authorized by 108 (b). 12

The Copyright Office's interpretation equates copying with publication as defined in Section 101 because the copy is distributed to an individual patron, thus usurping the right of the copyright holder to distribute copies of the work. The register of copyrights recommended "an amendment to paragraphs (d) and (e) of Section 108 to make clear that unpublished works are not within the copying privileges granted therein." 13 Congress took no action on the 1983 report.


The same recommendation is made in the 1988 report, for the same reasons, though the arguments from both sides include much more hairsplitting. The SAA case claims that the language of the sections does not exclude unpublished materials: it even allows copying of unique materials not commercially available.\textsuperscript{14} The register retorts that since manuscripts are not likely to have "articles" like a periodical, or to be available from trade sources, the language obviously excludes them.\textsuperscript{15} Linda Matthews, who again wrote the SAA statement, declares that the earlier report had no effect on archival photocopying practices: "Photocopying procedures and practices in archives have remained basically unchanged since the first five-year review."\textsuperscript{16} The strong implication is that this situation will not change. In effect, the archival profession is openly disregarding the opinion of the Copyright Office.

Interestingly, both SAA and the Copyright Office have ignored the existence of paragraph (h) of Section 108, which lists the specific types of materials that cannot be copied under Section 108. Musical works, pictorial, graphic or sculptural works, and films or audiovisual works are mentioned, but manuscript works are not.\textsuperscript{17} This would seem to lend some weight to the SAA argument.


\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Library Reproduction of Copyrighted Works}, 1988: 46-49.

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Library Reproduction of Copyrighted Works}, 1988: 255.

\textsuperscript{17} Benedict makes this point in his analysis of the Copyright Office's position on Section 108. See "Fair Use of Unpublished Manuscript Materials," 878.
The question which then arises is what can archivists do, if research as currently defined is not to come to a complete halt? The conventional wisdom among historians about fair use has always favored quoting unpublished material at the risk of any penalties imposed by the law. It has been assumed that in most cases damage to the copyright owner is so slight that legal action is not worthwhile. The tendency is to apply the same attitude to photocopying.

There are possible solutions to the dilemma. One would be a legal case specifically related to library photocopying of unpublished materials for researchers. A test case would resolve the question, but it also might involve a violation so egregious that it would not help the case for archival copying. Legal precedents also do not seem to be on the side of the archivists. The whole case might hinge on whether photocopying is a form of first publication.

Another possible solution is a set of negotiated guidelines like those evolved for interlibrary loan copying from periodicals, for educational photocopying, for use of music in educational contexts, and so forth.

---

18 Benedict, 863-864.

19 Some guidelines were negotiated prior to the passage of the law. These include the "Guidelines on Educational Copying from Books and Periodicals" and the "Guidelines for Educational Uses of Music," which pertain to Section 107. Both were the result of negotiations between representatives of educators and publishers encouraged by the House Judiciary Committee in 1975. The so-called CONTU Guidelines covering photocopying for interlibrary loan were negotiated through the National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works (CONTU). They provide further definition of Section 108 (h)(2). All have been reproduced many times in guides for teachers and librarians. See Donald F. Johnston, Copyright Handbook (New York: R.R. Bowker, 1978), 217-223. Negotiated guidelines dating from 1979
The problem with such a course of action is that there is no group representing the interests of all the copyright holders of unpublished materials with which to negotiate. As an alternative to negotiation, SAA along with other interested groups—the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), the American Historical Association (AHA), and other academic organizations—could arrive at a set of guidelines among themselves and publish them. Recognized professional guidelines might at least have the effect of cushioning the impact of a lawsuit on any individual professional who followed them.

A third alternative is to live within the provisions of 108 (b) and to use the clause allowing copying for deposit for research use in another library to develop a system that would get copies, also exist for educational taping of television programs (off-air taping) under Section 110 of the copyright law. Tapes may be used in the classroom for a ten-day period, but permanent retention of a tape requires payment of a license fee. See R.S. Talab, Commonsense Copyright: A Guide to the New Technologies (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 1986), 37-40. In a unilateral move, the International Association of Sound Archives has promulgated guidelines for fair use copying of sound recordings. See the IASA Phonographic Bulletin 44 (March 1986): 16-17 and 49 (November 1987): 5.

The ACRL has published statements on reproduction of archival materials. However, the latest of these was adopted in 1976, before the current copyright law took effect. In very cautious language it enumerates the conditions under which manuscripts may be copied, which include the written approval of "the holders of appropriate common law or statutory rights," but does give encouragement to "the custom and practice among libraries" of fair use copying of manuscripts for individual researchers. See "Statement on the Reproduction of Manuscripts and Archives for Noncommercial Purposes," College and Research Libraries News (November 1976): 271. The ACRL statement is currently being revised.
either through loan or purchase, to libraries to be used by their patrons on the premises. This solution would involve turning archival preconceptions about scholarly use of archival materials completely around, but it bears looking into as an alternative. The archival community would have to develop standard use policies, so that possibly sensitive materials could be used under the same rules in every library, but this might be a beneficial development.

Of course, there are also two other perfectly legal alternatives. One is to obtain permission from the copyright holder before copying, just as is done before publishing. This solution is not popular with researchers, who are accustomed to easy access to photocopies. It solves nothing when a copyright owner cannot be found. The other alternative is to try to obtain an assignment of copyright with the gift agreement when the materials come to the repository. The obvious problem with this solution is that very often (as in the Salinger case) the donor does not hold copyright in the materials being donated. Both of these alternatives, as archivists have continually pointed out, are desirable but not always possible.

The final question is, What happens in the case of a suit? Section 504 of the copyright law outlines remedies for infringement. Anyone who infringes can be sued, including a library or an individual archivist. A copyright holder can sue to recover actual damages, as Harper and Row did when their magazine contract was canceled because of earlier publication of the Ford memoirs in The Nation. They could point to a specific amount they lost from the actions of The Nation, and they got it back.

The alternative is for the court to award statutory damages. These can be as little as $100 if the infringement was not willful or even less if the infringer "believed and had reasonable grounds for believing that his or her use of the copyrighted work was a fair use under section 107, if the infringer was an employee or
agent of a nonprofit educational institution, library or archives acting within the scope of his or her employment" or "such institutions, library or archives itself, which infringed by reproducing the work in copies or phonorecords." This is a professional good faith defense, but it applies only to fair use as set forth in Section 107. It make no specific reference to Section 108, which is where SAA has currently placed its emphasis: if archivists follow SAA's arguments and do copying under Section 108, can they still claim professional good faith?

Good faith is the best defense, but there are also questions of the balance of scholarship and the flow of information and ideas, to which the courts are sensitive. As yet there are no clear answers. In the absence of professional guidelines, each archivist and institution must make individual decisions and policies about copying, basing them on the best available information. It may be possible to combine approaches. For example, archivists could require the permission of a copyright holder before making photocopies, as the Copyright Office would require, except when a copyright owner cannot be located. Then, perhaps they could justify making a copy under Section 107, on the assumption that copying for the private use of a single scholar does not result in serious damage. The necessary good faith effort will certainly have been made.

The strongest opinion against such a course is expressed by the Copyright Office, and Congress has more or less ignored it. The courts have said that fair use does apply to unpublished materials, but that its application is limited. They have commended library use agreements, which usually cover copying. There is a strong possibility that fair use copying would be permissible if a good faith effort to find the holder of copyright in unpublished materials, or his or her heirs, had failed. At the

---

21 Copyright, Section 504.
same time, archivists should show good faith by seeking permission to copy unpublished materials when the copyright holder is known. The free and easy ways of the past should not continue, and every effort should be made to comply with the parts of the law that are clear by providing copyright notices and requiring photocopying agreements.

At the same time, the professional organizations should provide some guidance for their members, either in the form of guidelines or creative and innovative uses of the noncontroversial sections of the law, like 108 (b). This might also serve to protect the individual archivists who would follow such guidelines from statutory damages in the event of legal action. Many historical manuscripts now covered by statutory copyright under the 1976 law will enter the public domain after 31 December 2002, but the inconsistencies of the law will still be present, as it applies to more recent materials. The archival profession should make an effort to come to grips with the various interpretations of the law, and to be guided by them, when possible, in matters of professional practice.

Suzanne Flandreau Steel heads the University of Mississippi Blues Archive. She is a member of the Society of American Archivists Task Force on Copyright, but the opinions expressed here are her own and do not reflect any official positions of the task force. The article was originally presented as a paper at the Southern Archivists Conference meeting, May 1988. The author thanks Richard Turley and Robert Byrd for their comments and suggestions.
Jimmy Carter and the
Presidential Library System

Richard Dees Funderburke

All inquiry into antiquity, - all curiosity respecting the Pyramids, the excavated cities, Stonehenge, the Ohio Circles, Mexico, Memphis, - is the desire to do away this wild, savage, and preposterous There or Then, and introduce in its place the Here and the Now.

("History," Essays, First Series, Ralph W. Emerson)

Ralph Waldo Emerson felt that the study of history was significant to the individual for what it revealed about his own life. The monuments of other ages should be studied until the student "lives along the whole line of temples and sphinxes and catacombs, passes through them all with satisfaction, and they live again to

the mind, or are now." 1 The interest with which he might have viewed his own nation's monuments in the form of presidential libraries can only be surmised. He might have been appalled that the simple democratic nation he knew in the 1840s had come to erect imposing memorials to its presidents. On the other hand, it is difficult to imagine him finding fault with the efforts to preserve and make available to its citizens the written record of the country's chief executives. Certainly, it is much easier to make the "There and Then" of history, the "Here and Now" of knowledge, if the full documentary record of a time is preserved.

The National Archives and Records Service (NARS) 2 has known criticism from the beginning and one particular component has received the most public attention—the presidential library system. From its beginnings under Franklin D. Roosevelt in the late 1930s, the library system has been at the center of scholarly and eventually public debates over its proper role in society. Until the mid-1970s, the debate never reached much beyond the academic world. However, with the growth of the imperial presidency and the subsequent Watergate debacle, the library system moved closer to center stage as the object of a significant political debate.

The Presidential Records Act of 1978 placed the ownership of presidential records generated after 1981 in the hands of the federal government. Nevertheless, there were other significant issues still to be decided and politicians such as Senator Lawton Chiles (D-Florida) began to raise the equally important questions of site location, funding, increasing costs, archival building


2 Since 1984 known as National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).
standards, and the problems of the General Services Administration (GSA)/NARS relationship.

The story, therefore, of the presidential library system during the last two years of Jimmy Carter's presidency is a particularly interesting one. During that period, NARS and the White House worked to assuage the concerns over the financing of the system and to define its proper role in American society and culture. In one sense, it is the story of adroit political maneuvering and bureaucratic power struggles during a time of economic stringencies. In another, it is the clash of presidential and congressional wills over the emblems of power. There were disagreements over the size of the libraries, space allocation for museum versus archives, centralization or decentralization of the facilities, building standards, and geographical access. The question of the purpose or role of the libraries in American society was more nebulous. In the post-Watergate era presided over by Jimmy Carter, the presidency came to be criticized heavily for its imperial tendencies and it was especially galling to many that these tendencies were carried over into the former president's life, during which ex-presidents often became wealthy men. To members of a resurgent Congress, it was time to reexamine and curtail the cost to the taxpayer for office staffs, Secret Service protection, and that largest and most perpetual expense, the monumental presidential library.

In the academic world, criticism of the libraries was not new. As early as 1954, David Lloyd, executive director of the Harry S. Truman Library, Inc., in a speech to a joint meeting of the American Historical Association (AHA) and the Society of American Archivists (SAA), chided scholars for wanting a central depository \(^3\) and praised decentralization for making historical

---

materials more widely available. A few years later, Herman Kahn, director of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Library, supported decentralization for much the same reasons and also as part of a much larger trend of decentralization in all areas of government.

By the late 1960s, when the system had grown to four completed libraries, the centralization issue remained, but some scholars were beginning to criticize the "monumental" nature of the edifices. Noted diplomatic historian Herbert Feis wrote a scathing article along these lines for the prestigious journal *Foreign Affairs.* In an article for *American Libraries,* Ada Louise Huxtable called the Lyndon B. Johnson Library a "museum-memorial" designed to serve a former president's ego. Library Journal editor John Berry derided the "monumental-libraries" and asked that post-Watergate question: why public ownership was not the appropriate way to handle the documents. Former SAA president H. G. Jones also called for public ownership of


presidential materials and ridiculed the LBJ Library as that "pharaoh's monument in Austin."\(^{10}\)

The overriding concern about ownership was not surprising in the mid-1970s and, indeed, most writers referred to Watergate as the inspiration for their ideas. DePauw University archivist David Horn also acknowledged the significance of the national scandal which had permanently changed the American "political and moral landscape." Nevertheless, he asked several pertinent questions about the cost and location of presidential libraries:

Is it advisable to locate these important research centers in different areas of the country, near the Presidents' birthplaces? Are such separate centers too expensive? Is access too difficult for researchers?\(^{11}\)

After 1978, these questions came to occupy center stage.

That the office of president had been tarnished by the Watergate scandal was not lost on Jimmy Carter. The symbols of power were considered so suspect by Carter that he went so far as to ban the playing of "Hail to the Chief" at the beginning of his administration.\(^{12}\) In a response to an interviewer in late 1977, Carter also stated:

The pomp and ceremony of office does not appeal to me, and I don't believe it is a necessary part of the Presidency in a Democratic Nation like our own. I am no better than anyone else. And the people that I admire most who

---


\(^{11}\) David Horn, "Who Owns Our History?," *Library Journal* 100 (April 1975): 635-638.

have lived in this house have taken the same attitude. Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Truman have minimized the pomp and ceremony and pride, personal pride that accrues sometimes to Presidents.\textsuperscript{13}

On top of this, a weakened president had to face a resurgent congress, eager to flex some long atrophied muscles.

In April of 1979, a major article appeared in \textit{U.S. News and World Report} about the money spent by the government on former Presidents Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford.\textsuperscript{14} Subtitled "No taxpayer money is spared to support ex-Presidents in style," the article concentrated on those benefits due Nixon and Ford under the Former Presidents Act of 1958 and the Presidential Transition Act of 1963. These two laws had been passed to provide ex-presidents pensions, staff funding, and special allotments to handle the costs of transition to private life. Amended in 1965, the former act provided Secret Service protection to the former chief executives and their families. According to the article, however, there were gross abuses. Within days of the publication of this article, syndicated columnist Mary McGrory excoriated the former presidents for receiving this public largesse. In conclusion, she said:

\ldots keeping ex-presidents in imperial splendor when the poor are getting their fuel allowance cut for austerity's sake and every day-care center is being scrutinized like a

\textsuperscript{13} Press Interview, 28 December 1977, with Barbara Walters, Tom Brokaw, Bob Schieffer and Robert McNeil, "Former Presidents [5]," Box 30, Staff Offices Administration - Hugh Carter, Jimmy Carter Library. (Hereinafter Staff Offices Administration will be designated as SOA and Jimmy Carter Library as JCL.)

thieves' hideout for waste, is an excess to make the blood boil, especially on April 15.\textsuperscript{15}

Both of these articles were sent to Hugh Carter, special assistant to the president for administration, and other staffers. Neither Congress nor the White House was unaware of these growing expenses prior to their exposure in \textit{U.S. News}. In 1975, the Senate Appropriations Committee had requested a report from the United States comptroller general on federal assistance to former presidents under the Former Presidents and Presidential Transition Acts. The report, dated 24 December 1975, briefly mentioned the Presidential Libraries Act of 1955, but suggested no changes in this law.\textsuperscript{16} Hugh Carter had a copy of this report as well as one prepared by the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress in December of 1976. In this second, lengthy report, the authors mentioned presidential libraries only briefly in an appendix, almost as an afterthought.\textsuperscript{17}

It was only appropriate that Hugh Carter should have these reports. A relative of the president and a key member of the White House staff, he was a major figure in almost all matters dealing with NARS, presidential papers, and also former presidents. In fact, on the suggestion of Hamilton Jordan, Hugh Carter had been appointed the White House liaison officer to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15} Mary McGrory, "Unlike the Poor, Ex-Presidents Get Welfare No Matter What," \textit{Washington Star} (16 April 1979); A-4 in "Former Presidents [2]," Box 30, SOA - Hugh Carter, JCL.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Elmer Staats, "Federal Assistance for Presidential Transitions: Recommendations for Changes in Legislation" in "Former Presidents Act [3]," Box 31, SOA - Hugh Carter, JCL.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Sharon Gressle and Stephanie Smith, "Benefits to Former Presidents of the United States," (Congressional Research Service, 20 December 1976) in "Former Presidents Acts [5]," Box 31, SOA - Hugh Carter, JCL.
\end{itemize}
former presidents and their families. His deputy in this position was Marvin Beaman of the White House Military Office. Other staffers actively involved in these matters were Hugh Carter's assistant, Veronica Pickman, and Vice-President Walter Mondale's aide, Michael Berman. Together or separately, they would deal with most of the subsequent legislative efforts to alter the presidential libraries system.

By the fall of 1979, the slow wheels of Congress had turned and hearings had been scheduled for November. During the summer, Senator David Pryor (D-Arkansas) had teamed up with Senator Chiles to sponsor joint hearings before their subcommittees on Civil Service and General Services (chaired by Pryor) and on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government (chaired by Chiles). It was also at this time that the libraries were combined with the provisions of the Former Presidents Act and the Presidential Transition Act for scrutiny and reform.

For their hearings, Chiles and Pryor called on Admiral Rowland Freeman, newly appointed administrator of the GSA (parent agency of NARS), to testify "on the desirability of continuing the Presidential Libraries System in its current form." Freeman was enjoined to provide alternatives to the present system with accompanying advantages and disadvantages and comments on the GSA proposal to establish architectural design standards for all future libraries. Also called to testify were

---

18 Memo, Hamilton Jordan to President Carter, 24 March 1977, "Former Presidents [2]," Box 30, SOA - Hugh Carter, JCL.

19 Letter, Marvin Beaman to General Kenneth Dohleman, 22 December 1978, "Former Presidents [2]," Box 30, SOA - Hugh Carter, JCL.

20 Letter, Senators David Pryor and Lawton Chiles to Rowland Freeman, 16 October 1979, "Former President's Office," SOA - Hugh Carter, JCL.
Donald Eirich, associate director of the General Accounting Office (GAO); John Broderick, assistant librarian for research services at the Library of Congress; and Richard Kirkendall, professor of history at Indiana University and spokesman for the American Historical Association.

The first day's testimony dealt with the presidential libraries, and Senator Chiles took the lead, stressing economic factors in his opening statement. Commenting that the hearings were necessary due to the great increase in expenditure for former presidents, the senator pointed to a 285-times increase in costs for these services and facilities from $64,000 in 1955 to an estimated $18.3 million in 1980. For the libraries alone, the increase had been from $375,000 per facility to $1.6 million per facility. This cost, along with spending for staffing and Secret Service, exacerbated complaints of an "Imperial Presidency" which was "not popular with the American people nor is it consistent with our history as a nation."  

Senator Pryor echoed his colleague, stating that with "the rapid growth and with an almost seeming unquenchable thirst for money at the time a President and a family leaves the White House . . . ; I think that we owe . . . the taxpayers our very best effort to make some sense out of this particular program."  

GAO's Eirich tended to support the Chiles/Pryor emphasis. He reached three main conclusions beginning with a concern over a lack of restrictions on what the GSA could accept as an archival depository. This lack of standards had led to the acceptance of a facility for President Ford in which the archives was separated from the museum by three hundred miles. Furthermore, the

---


22 Ibid., 8.
GAO believed that, although the prime function of the libraries was to preserve papers, most management tended to concentrate its attention on the museum function. According to GAO estimates, the savings for a centralized facility with no museum might be as high as $687 million projected over the next hundred years.  

The amplitude of these savings clearly impressed Senator Chiles, as did the minuscule costs of the Library of Congress figures presented by John Broderick. According to Broderick, the cost of providing the papers of twenty-three presidents prior to Herbert Hoover to researchers was $200,000 annually. In addition, the expense of microfilming the entire manuscript collection was only $1.5 million, including presidential papers.  

Testimony took a dramatic change in emphasis with that of historian Richard Kirkendall, who strongly opposed centralization. In transcripts of his remarks annotated by White House staff, the historian stated that scholars were accustomed to decentralized sources and that centralization falsely assumed that the most important researchers were located on the east coast. Furthermore, centralized libraries would mean less knowledgeable archivists and a lower ability to attract collections of related materials. In discussing the low proportion of researchers as facility users, Kirkendall emphasized that tourists and students utilizing the museums were receiving educational benefits from their visits.  

Senator Chiles undoubtedly was better pleased with the remarks of Rowland Freeman of the GSA. Stating that he approved the curbing of excess cost, Freeman urged a major

---

23 Ibid., 22-32.
24 Ibid., 62-64.
25 Ibid., 90-92.
cutback in the museum function and that exhibits be archival in nature (White House note in margin at this point states "& to hell w/culture"). Real savings, however, would come in restricting maintenance expenditures, "As I see it, the alternatives facing us are to centralize, to combine functions, or to limit the size and scale of each library." If centralization was approved, the administrator had some specific recommendations for a "cluster of buildings in a campuslike setting" large enough for six libraries. On a twenty-five year projection, this centralized facility would save close to sixty million dollars over six individual libraries. The GSA should also be able to specify standards on archival storage areas, research areas, processing space, and the "ratio of administrative and exhibit space for these archival facilities." With appropriate legislation, the administrator could put a ceiling on operating costs (with an inflation factor) and have final approval of building design and size.

After several days of hearings on staffing and Secret Service protection, Chiles turned his attention to drafting legislation. In the White House, Marvin Beaman urged Hugh Carter to "closely monitor the situation to see what Senators Chiles and Pryor will do next." After talking with Michael Hall, chief clerk of Chiles's subcommittee, Beaman had obtained a promise to allow the administration to participate in the formulation of any legislation and stressed the importance of staying in touch with Hall. That this was done is evident from a memo to the president from Hugh Carter in December, stating that "although we have encountered some difficulty in gaining their cooperation, we are continuing to

26 Ibid., 70.

27 Ibid., 71-74.

28 Memo, Marty Beaman to Hugh Carter, 13 November 1979, "Former President's Office," Box 31, SOA - Hugh Carter, JCL.
try to meet with Senator Chiles or his staff prior to the introduction of any amendments [to the Former Presidents Act and other laws].”

By January 1980, Hugh Carter, Marvin Beaman, Mike Berman, and John Henderson of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) had received draft legislation from Chiles. The proposal made considerable changes in the then current presidential libraries system, including calls to:

1) end the creation of presidential archival facilities as of January 20, 1981;
2) require the deposit of all presidential records in a central library as of January 20, 1981;
3) order the GSA to provide Congress with a plan for a central library for all presidents after January 20, 1981--such facility to be initially for two presidents but expandable. Each president to be allowed the average space in current presidential libraries plus five percent which was the maximum allowed for a museum;
4) allow the GSA to duplicate, microfilm, and then sell such reproductions of major records;
5) require the White House to dispose of presidential materials while still in office "which no longer have administrative, historical, informational or evidentiary value," after the archivist of the United States’ approval; and
6) set an overall effective date of January 20, 1981.  

The White House had major reservations and objections to these proposals. Primary opposition was to the effective date

---

29 Memo, Hugh Carter to President Carter, [December 1979?], "Former Presidents [1]," Box 30, SOA - Hugh Carter, JCL.

30 Copy of Chiles/Pryor bill to "reform the laws relating to Former Presidents" in "Presidential Libraries - Sen. Chiles’ Bill," Box 13, SOA - Pickman, JCL.
(because it divided a second term for President Carter from his first term in regard to his papers) and to the whole concept of a central library as being less costly. After urging that any new legislation only affect presidents after Carter, the White House proposed that limits be set on federal expenditures for all libraries and that the GSA administrator "approve the archival facilities for each library." GSA could also be ordered to approve the design, operational methods, and any proposed extra-archival programs for any future single archives.

If, however, a centralized library was mandated, the administration had several suggestions. Office space should be provided for each former president. Plans should more carefully consider the ever-increasing amount of paper produced during each succeeding presidency as well as the differences between one- and two-term presidents. Exhibit space should remain at the current average of thirty-two percent and the president’s staff should not be required to expend their valuable time disposing of records while still in office. Finally, microfilming and duplication of vast presidential holdings had not been proven as a means of greater economy in records management.

These views were presented to George Patton of Chiles’s staff as well as Michael Hall and Knox Walkup (staff director for Senator Pryor’s subcommittee) in January 1980. In a memo about this meeting, John Henderson indicated little agreement or promise of compromise between the Senate and the White House. He reported that the congressional staffers had stood firm on the concept of a central library and that they doubted the GSA could impose effective standards on a politically potent former chief

31 "Presidential Libraries, Comparison Between Present Law and Chiles/Pryor Bill" in "Presidential Libraries - Senator Chiles' Bill," Box 13, SOA - Pickman, JCL.

32 Ibid.
executive. As for increased museum space, Henderson encountered strong general opposition and, despite persistent arguments against the microfilming proposal, felt the senators will "fight for this provision as a good compromise" to allay the opposition of scholars and to counter the regional pride arguments.33

In a concluding statement, Henderson suggested that both Pryor and Chiles were using these issues for their own personal ends and were taking advantage of a generally weak presidential position:

Patton's general comments somewhat confirm our earlier information that the bill is an effort to bolster Pryor's and particularly Chiles' credibility with other Senators. Patton's comment on the unique set of circumstances present this year seems to suggest they will push the bill in some form this year. Although we could possibly mount a campaign to convince them of the possible savings from our approach, I foresee an almost impossible burden of proof that we would have to carry.34

During this same time period, Carter's staff had to deal with another crisis--the so-called revolution at NARS. GSA's Rowland Freeman attempted to disperse archival materials held in Washington to regional depositories. NARS staff members and scholars nationwide asked President Carter to order Freeman to make a proper archival study before dispersing records, that the position of archivist of the United States be filled by a qualified person, and that the location and status of the National Archives


34 Ibid.
within the executive branch be studied. While Freeman and the maintenance of NARS within the GSA were supported by Jack Watson, soon to be Carter's chief of staff, and probably by the president, in regard to presidential libraries and with Hugh Carter, Freeman's views were undoubtedly suspect. During the NARS/GSA conflict, Marvin Beaman reported to Hugh Carter on comments made by the admiral in his staff meetings. These included "I am supporting Presidential libraries, but the time has come that we look to a single facility," on 6 November 1979, and "a determination needs to be made whether the libraries are archival or museums. GSA is not in the museum business," on 14 November 1979.

These views were definitely not in line with those of the White House or with those of NARS archivists who had been working closely with Hugh Carter. Since the creation of the NARS liaison office, Hugh Carter had dealt with its staff, even writing numerous personal letters to family members for the Carter oral history


34 Memo, Marty B. to Sonny [Hugh Carter], 4 February 1980, "Presidential Libraries - Senator Chiles' Bill," Box 13, SOA - Pickman, JCL.
program. Weekly reports by liaison chief Marie Allen to her superiors at NARS were often also sent to Hugh Carter. It was no wonder, therefore, that, as the legislative struggle over presidential libraries developed, Rowland Freeman virtually disappeared from the record and the relationship between Hugh Carter and NARS archivists grew stronger.

On 11 March 1980, following the inconclusive talks between their staffs and the White House, Senators Chiles and Pryor introduced S. 2408, or the "Former Presidents Facilities and Services Reform Act," which was essentially the same as that proposed in December 1979. It called for an end to individual presidential libraries as of 20 January 1983 and called for the creation of a central facility to be built in phases, the first of which would house the archives of two presidents. Space per president would be based on a formula combining length of service and amount of square footage in existing libraries. The five percent additional area for archival exhibit space was also retained. If private persons or groups wanted to establish a library, the GSA administrator was authorized to provide technical assistance and to loan materials. Finally, historically significant records were to be duplicated and made available on request for a fee. A similar bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Richardson Preyer (D-North Carolina).

Two days later, Hugh Carter began his efforts to alter, stall, or kill the legislation. His first step was to suggest to President Carter that he might discuss the act in a scheduled meeting with President Ford. In the spring, he received major supportive input from NARS and the GSA. In an elaborate report prepared

37 Letters, Hugh Carter to Carter family members, "Archives [2]," Box 4, SOA - Hugh Carter, JCL.

38 Memo, Hugh Carter to President Carter, 12 March 1980, "Former President's Act [1]," Box 30, SOA - Hugh Carter, JCL.
by Lawrence Cohan, GSA deputy assistant administrator for plans, programs, and financial management, comparing seven types of centralized and decentralized libraries, the conclusion was that a comparison of the base case with the centralized alternatives indicates that centralized alternatives cost from 110 million dollars (11 percent) to 147 million dollars (15 percent) more than the decentralized alternatives even though the centralized alternatives are 12,300 net square feet smaller per President. . . . The centralized alternatives with their relatively high investment costs . . . have the highest present value. In fact, centralized alternatives are seen to cost approximately three times as much as the decentralized alternatives.\(^9\)

A sensitivity analysis attached to the above plan showed that, to equal the cost of the current library program, a centralized, Washington, D. C. facility would require a thirty-five percent decrease in size for presidential libraries. In addition, staff would have to be reduced by fifteen persons per library to equal current costs and it would take two hundred years to reach equality of cost based on the higher investment costs for a centralized library.\(^40\) This was definitely something to combat the GAO study being used by Senator Chiles.

Archivist James O'Neill provided a detailed analysis of the Chiles Act. He pointed out that the Presidential Libraries Act of 1955 failed to provide safeguards to ensure that the libraries were built to archival standards or in convenient, accessible locations.

\(^9\) Copy of "Presidential Study Plans" in "Former Presidents Act [1]," Box 30, SOA - Hugh Carter, JCL.

\(^40\) Copy of "Sensitivity Analysis" for "Presidential Libraries Study" in "Presidential Libraries - General [14]," Box 13, SOA - Pickman, JCL. (Sent to Hugh Carter, Veronica Pickman, and Michael Berman by Marvin Beaman.)
A centralized facility as proposed by Senator Chiles would neither satisfy scholarly and public needs nor be inexpensive to operate. Phased building of the libraries would create "honeycombed structures" and be difficult and costly to operate. The only feasible central site would be in Washington, where both expansion and minimum cost factors would be almost impossible to obtain. A centralized site outside Washington would be detrimental to obtaining the full cooperation of former presidents and might give the appearance of favoring one region of the country over another. Finally, S. 2408 called for a duplication policy which was already in place at NARS and the bill's effective date would divide the papers of a two-term Carter presidency.41

Richard Jacobs, acting assistant archivist for presidential libraries, also provided the White House with valuable input in an effort to present Congress with alternatives to Senator Chiles's proposals. His main suggestion was that the U.S. Code be amended to require GSA to provide a detailed set of standards for presidential archives. These standards would be based on a NARS model library of approximately 56,000 square feet and include such features as site accessibility, cost-effective operation, energy efficiency, adequate public and archival facilities, and compliance with fire safety and handicap accessibility regulations. A GSA report on standards should also include the archivist of the United States's evaluation. This alternative approach to S. 2408 was presented because of Jacobs's view that "it may be futile to make an effort to win over Chiles when efforts may be better spent attracting other members of the committee and committee

41 Copy of NARS analysis of Chiles's bill by James O'Neill; Marie Allen to Hugh Carter, 25 April 1980, "Former President's Act [1]," Box 30, SOA - Hugh Carter, JCL.
staffers to a realistic alternative." He went on to provide an introductory statement for a bill to amend the U.S. Code to require the "professionally established standards." He then offered a draft letter which supported a decentralized library system based on cost analysis and new U.S. Code standards and which was to be signed by Rowland Freeman and sent to Senator Abraham Ribicoff (D-Connecticut), chairman of the senate committee on governmental affairs.

Despite these activities, the White House realized the powerful nature of Chiles's argument for economy as well as its own awkward position, during an election year, in fighting against a law restricting excessive spending for ex-presidents. Nevertheless, support for the decentralized system was strong and clearly the view of top administration officials. In a White House document for Hugh Carter's staff, general statements declared the administration's full support for "legislation to reduce costs to the taxpayers in the area of Former Presidents," but expressed the view that an "election year is an inopportune time for the administration to present its position affirmatively on the substantive issue." In regard to the libraries, the "substantive issue" was centralization. The current system was to be supported

---


44 Letter, Richard Jacobs to Marvin Beaman, 3 June 1980, "Presidential Libraries - General [4]," Box 13, SOA - Pickman, JCL.
with certain modifications drawn from the GSA/NARS studies. These modifications included the end of split facilities such as the Ford Library/Museum, serious consideration of the NARS model library, building standards, and an acreage limitation. Decentralization was to be supported because it encouraged state and local support; promoted the donation of a president's personal and political papers as well as those of family, friends and associates; boosted regional pride; and made the records and educational/cultural activities inspired by the libraries more accessible to the nation as a whole.45

Probably using these points, Hugh Carter's assistant Veronica Pickman worked to derail the Chiles legislation. In her contacts with congressional staffers, she increased the NARS model library figures to 88,000 square feet for a two-term president and attempted to get Senator Sam Nunn (D-Georgia) to use his influence in getting Chiles to postpone further action on his bill until after the election. Furthermore, she contacted the "LBJ people" to have a trustee of that library write Chiles (an LBJ library trustee himself) in support of the administration's position. She also sought Republican help from Senator Ted Stevens (R-Alaska), who was a spokesman for Presidents Nixon and Ford, but who told Pickman that he preferred the Carter White House "out front" at this time.46 In early June, Pickman relayed a suggestion from White House aide Walker Nolan that Hugh Carter enlist the aid of Senators Nunn, Thomas Eagleton (D-Missouri), and John

45 Document titled "Talking Points" in "Presidential Libraries - General [14]," Box 13, SOA - Pickman, JCL.

46 Handwritten notes, May 1980 (?), "Presidential Libraries - General [12]," Box 13, SOA - Pickman, JCL.
Glenn (D-Ohio) in delaying the former presidents bill because it was "too controversial" to be acted upon precipitately.47

Pickman also moved to forestall action on the House version of the bill introduced by Preyer. In a telephone conversation with Ed Gleiman, a professional staff member on Preyer's subcommittee on government information and individual rights, she received assurances that the Preyer bill was introduced as a "courtesy only" to Senator Chiles and that it would not even get through the four subcommittees to which it had been assigned. Gleiman also stated that Jack Brooks (D-Texas), the powerful chairman of the committee on government operations, did not like the bill and would not push it if the White House opposed it.48

These delaying tactics were evidently proving to be successful and exasperating for the opposition. Ronald Chiodo, chief counsel, and Michael Hall, chief clerk, for two of Senator Chiles's subcommittees informed Walker Nolan that the White House was unresponsive and unwilling to negotiate on the libraries bill and was "in fact saying we don't want to do it this year and stuff it." Therefore, they were proceeding with plans to push the bill to mark-up, the process by which congressional committee members actually meet to handwrite any changes to the wording of a bill prior to voting.49

47 Memo, Veronica Pickman to Hugh Carter, 3 June 1980, "Presidential Libraries - General [14]," Box 13, SOA - Pickman, JCL.

48 Notes, Telephone conversation between Veronica Pickman and Ed Gleiman, 29 May 1980, "Presidential Libraries - General [14]," Box 13, SOA - Pickman, JCL.

49 Memo, Veronica Pickman to Hugh Carter, 3 June 1980, "Presidential Libraries - General [14]," SOA - Pickman, JCL.
Shortly after this, Jamie Cowen, minority counsel for the Senate Subcommittee on Civil Service and General Services, began to plan an amendment sponsored by Senator Stevens. Cowen told Pickman that "if Chiles calls for a vote, Stevens has the votes to beat it."\textsuperscript{50} The amendment was duly presented in July and called for the retention of libraries at the local level. Restricting each president to one library, the size was to be based on existing facilities with an additional five percent for exhibits. All future libraries had to meet GSA specifications and would be limited to preservation, research, and restricted displays. Further, prior to accepting title, a library prospectus had to receive the approval of the House Committee on Government Operations and the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs. All additions to existing and future libraries would be from private funds.\textsuperscript{51}

As the Democratic convention approached, the White House efforts regarding the Former Presidents Act seemed to be succeeding. Nevertheless, Brian Walsh, staff member on Chiles's Subcommittee on Federal Spending Practices and Open Government, supported Stevens's proposals and hoped to work out the differences. Although Pickman failed to convince Walsh to postpone the bill until after the election, in memos to her boss, she began to express her confidence in winning Chiles over to the

\textsuperscript{50} Memo, Veronica Pickman to Hugh Carter, 6 June 1980, "Presidential Libraries - General [14]," Box 13, SOA - Pickman, JCL; and Memo, Pickman to Hugh Carter, 18 June 1980, "Former Presidents Facilities and Services Reform Act - 1980 [2]," Box 31, SOA - Hugh Carter, JCL.

\textsuperscript{51} Copy of "Senator Stevens' Amendment to S2408" in "Presidential Libraries - General [11]," Box 13, SOA - Pickman, JCL.
decentralized approach. She, indeed, felt confident enough at this point to reject an offer from Senator James Sasser (D-
Tennessee) to seek Senator Nunn's support against Chiles, stating, "I doubt that will be necessary—the Stevens compromise isn't that far from our position." By the end of July, the White House seemed to be firmly in control. When NARS archivist Richard Jacobs offered to discuss the Stevens/Chiles compromise with the senators, Pickman told him to delay and to reject the 45,000 square feet compromise figure as too small. Stevens's staffer Jamie Cowen told Pickman that the Alaska senator "will not block any efforts we make to slow its [Chiles's bill] progress." Stevens himself had requested that no mark-up be scheduled before 9 September 1980, and Pickman concluded that "time is definitely on our side." At least for the issue of presidential libraries, this was certainly true. The Former Presidents Facilities and Services Reform Act of 1980 became lost in the presidential campaign activities and in the other legislation to be acted on before the Ninety-sixth Congress could adjourn. The 1980 Chiles bill, however, was not totally bereft of results. In a November 1980 report to Hugh


53 Memo, Pickman to Hugh Carter, 7 August 1980, "Presidential Libraries - General [14]," Box 13, SOA - Pickman, JCL.

Carter, NARS's James O'Neill cautioned that, in planning for a future presidential library, the president needed to avoid building an "architecturally imposing edifice" at the expense of proper standards for an archival structure. Also important in planning was that "all parties involved recognize that the archival, research, and exhibit functions are the *raison d'etat* [sic] for the institution," and that without these basic functions, "the library will lose its credibility in whatever else it tries to accomplish."

It seems obvious that the public, political, and governmental dialogue about presidential libraries during the administration of Jimmy Carter was pivotal to settling the issues of ownership, accessibility, and centralization. Although no major legislation resulted from the centralization debate, the primary issue was exhaustively researched by GAO, GSA, and NARS; the results reviewed and discussed by the White House and Congress; and an agreement reached on the necessity for cost cutting regulations and for the imposition of building standards in any continuation of the decentralized system.

Some of the many issues raised by the Chiles legislation had been the concerns of archivists and scholars for several decades. As in any political discussion, it was not conducted in a vacuum. The libraries were a small part of a much larger debate over the role of the president and former president in twentieth century American society. Fears of an imperial president who could abuse his powers were very real and a potent factor in congressional minds. Added to this was the fact that Jimmy Carter was not as politically powerful as his predecessors and was weakened by an unhealthy economy and disasters in foreign affairs, such as Iran.

Despite these handicaps, the White House staff led by Hugh Carter proved very effective. Facts and figures were marshalled

---

35 Letter and report, James O'Neill to Hugh Carter, 7 November 1980, "Presidential Libraries - General [10]," Box 13, SOA - Pickman, JCL.
to refute the expenditure reports used by Senator Chiles. Alternative cost saving proposals were presented to deflect criticism of the decentralized system. The Republican minority was used to offer a major amendment, while the support of other senators, congressmen, and the, at times, all-important congressional staffers was sought for the administration's position. The result was that Senator Chiles was successfully outmaneuvered. But the White House dealt with the potentially embarrassing situation of the NARS "revolution" by decisively siding with the GSA.

This evaluation, however, should not imply that the creation of imposing monuments to American presidents in the form of presidential libraries is desirable. That the libraries perform an excellent service by preserving presidential materials and making them available to the public is true, but it is still difficult to deny the Chiles's argument that they also tend to glorify the individual president, at least in the public mind. The money spent on nonarchival construction and maintenance might be much better spent on funding research, grants, conferences, scholarships, and archival staffing. In so doing, the knowledge of the Emersonian "There and Then" would be used for the benefit of each individual American who sought to make history "Here and Now."

Richard Dees Funderburke is a Ph.D candidate in urban history with a field study in archival administration at Georgia State University. This article is adapted from a seminar paper done for an archives course at GSU.
Since *Roots* helped Americans discover an interest in genealogy, archival work has changed in many ways. One of these is the definition of what constitutes basic archival research. When most archival patrons were scholars, archivists tended to assume that they would ask the traditional historical questions: Why did the North win the Civil War?, for example, or Was General Longstreet a good strategist? Genealogists began to ask simpler, more fundamental questions—not Why did the North win the Civil War, but Did my great-grandfather fight in the Civil War? And they did so by the busload, forcing archivists to rewire reference operations.

Much of the work a sports archivist does involves this new kind of reference. Large numbers of researchers—more often by phone or letter than in person—ask specific, detailed questions at a level at least as basic as the genealogist’s query. The information these patrons seek can be branded as pure fact. The data are nearly devoid of interpretation or analysis and almost
always concern statistics. Were these users interested in the Civil War, to complete the analogy, they would ask, How many bullets were used?

Besides this different and elemental approach to reference, work at The Sporting News archives is anomalous in two other ways that might startle many an archivist in more conventional employment. The first, as is the case with a few other business archives, is that the archivist is obliged to generate uses for the materials that will produce revenue for the company. And the second is that this repository does not house the vast quantities of official corporate records that are the heart of traditional business archives collections.

The Sporting News published its first weekly issue on 17 March 1886, but it took the company more than a century to create a genuine archives. A family-owned enterprise for its first ninety-one years, the publication was started by St. Louis sports entrepreneur Alfred H. Spink and later taken over by his brother Charles. He bequeathed it to his son, J. G. Taylor Spink, who passed it in turn to his son, C. C. Johnson Spink. Having no heirs, Johnson Spink sold the company to the Times Mirror Corporation in 1977.

At its outset, The Sporting News was designed to appeal to what sport historian John R. Betts called "the barroom fraternity," gentlemen of leisure interested in politics, the theatre, and sports. The Sporting News gave its early readers heavy doses of baseball. But in addition, there were regular columns on "The Wheel," "The Gun," "The Stage," "The Ring," and "The Turf." Slowly, over about a quarter century, baseball pushed all the others out, so much so that in the 1920s, the paper earned the unofficial sobriquet "The Bible of Baseball." This nickname has endured to this day although it has not been accurate for nearly fifty years. For it was in 1942 that the magazine began to cover football, basketball, and hockey—in season at first and then year round.
Still, as *The Sporting News* celebrated its centennial in March 1986, it was without an archives. Most of the record materials

*The Sporting News* published its first weekly issue on 17 March 1886. There was baseball on page 1 plus stories on harness racing and wrestling. Inside was other news of baseball and columns called "The Wheel," "The Gun," "The Stage," "The Ring," and "The Turf." Baseball coverage gradually pushed all other sports out, but football, basketball, and hockey stories were reintroduced in 1942. (Reprinted by permission of *The Sporting News.*)
and historical treasures were jammed into one small office and an adjoining storage area called the vault. It really was a vault, with reinforced steel-and-concrete walls and a bank vault door. The combination, incidentally, was 4-0-6, Ted Williams's batting average in 1941, the last time any major leaguer has hit .400. Space was so tight that when an archivist was hired, his desk had to be placed inside the vault, forcing him each day to open the combination lock just to get to work.

Reliance on an allegedly fireproof room with a vault door as a substitute for an archives says a lot about how people with good intentions may conceptualize the problem of caring for historical materials. Their perceptions lend support to the theory that there are certain classes of archivists—primarily business archivists and religious archivists—whose first outreach task is to educate their own colleagues and superiors. Any new employee has to learn how to adapt to an existing situation, when to suggest change and when to keep quiet. The newly employed business archivist faces an especially interesting version of this challenge by moving into a for-profit situation and proposing to spend considerable sums of money with the prospect of very little return. Trying to explain what an archives is, how it works, and what it can do for people who are only casually acquainted with the term is a continuing lesson in self-justification. The experience reinforces the old proverb that one really does not learn anything unless one is forced to teach it.

The Sporting News was blessed with a chief executive officer whose plans for the company's modernization included an archives. He had the good sense to consult Anne Kenney, then with the University of Missouri-St. Louis and a member of the Society of American Archivists (SAA) Council, on the records situation. She made the fortunate judgment that the company needed to hire an archivist, and it can be assumed that she helped with the job description and the advertisement that appeared in the SAA Newsletter.
Prior to Anne Kenney's needs assessment study, all historical materials were under the nominal control of the company's historian, a forty-year veteran who had previously been chief copy editor. He was an intelligent man with a real expertise in baseball history and an earnest desire to do well by the materials. But he was not an archivist, and certain of his practices would have caused any archivist concern. The company library, for example, was stored on open shelves just outside the vault area. Approximately four thousand volumes were loosely arranged into five categories: baseball, football, basketball, hockey, and other. They were not catalogued and sat there to be picked off the shelves by anyone for any length of time, even permanently in some cases. In addition, many of the most valuable materials were not kept in the vault at all, but instead overflowed into the already crowded adjoining office area.

Once an archivist was employed, the chief executive officer assigned him to prepare a budget and to help design a building addition that became the real archives. Here again was an opportunity to teach others what the archival profession is all about. The approved budget included funds for temperature and humidity controls, compact shelving, ultraviolet light shields, and a discrete security system. The vault door is no more. Since these initial capital outlays, the archives has been able to purchase an array of archival and library supplies, standard equipment to the trade that was nevertheless foreign to other employees. Most amazing was the reaction caused by the arrival of the microfilm reader-printer, the purchase of which enabled the company to retire bound volumes of The Sporting News and force the use of film. The reader-printer proved to be a strange innovation, even to members of the editorial staff (college graduates all) and second in wonder only to the compact shelving that more than one visitor has misidentified as "a row of little safes."

Slightly more than a year-and-a-half after moving into the new facility, the archives was pretty much in place, albeit with a
processing backlog. Blocks of time were allotted to arrangement and description as well as reference. The archivist also began to work on special projects designed to turn the company’s historical treasures into a source of revenue. This is surely a strange notion for most archivists, especially those employed by not-for-profit institutions, but company officials are convinced that archival holdings can and should be exploited for commercial gain. Developing the archives into a profit center was, in fact, a phrase included in the job description. Thus, the archives has been involved with several proposals to license the use of the company’s name, its logo, and some of its resources. Outside firms have contracted to produce baseball cards, tankards, and other sports collectible items. In the near future, the archives anticipates working with other businesses willing to pay a fee to convert The Sporting News and other company publications to machine-readable formats.

Of what, then, does this sports archives consist? Well, it is not yet and may never be a traditional business archives, that is, the final resting place for company records that have gone through the records management process. The archives would like to do that, of course, in part because the company’s warehouse area is chock full of file cabinets filled with records not subject to any schedule. But a business archivist is as a business archivist does; and, frankly, the archives does not get one reference request in a thousand that has anything to do with the corporate history of The Sporting News Publishing Company.

What people do want to know about is sports, and they rely on The Sporting News as an important source for accurate information. The archivist does reference work for the editorial staff, of course, to support a growing list of publications. He also serves as a source of sports information for a wide variety of telephone callers and correspondents. Tallies show an average of about 350 phone calls and 40 letters a month from people who often identify themselves as subscribers. A certain portion of this
reference work is no more than a response to local callers in St. Louis, people who are not burdened by the cost of a long-distance phone call. These calls tend to increase in number, interestingly enough, when the baseball Cardinals play an afternoon game. Apparently a good chunk of St. Louis residents listens to these games on the radio, arguing sports with colleagues, and calling

J. G. Taylor Spink made The Sporting News indispensable reading for everyone connected with the game. Spink was known as a demanding and irascible workaholic who seemed to live with a telephone on his ear. Correspondents insist that he could track them down anywhere at any time. (Reprinted by permission of The Sporting News.)
The Sporting News to resolve disputes. Questions run the gamut from the current (What's the score of the game?) to the historical (Who was the winning pitcher in the last game of the 1946 World Series?) to the truly absurd (How many cars can be parked in the lot at the Hula Bowl?).

More seriously, the archives regularly assists print journalists, radio and television stations, publishing houses, freelance writers, club and league officials, players' associations, former players and their families, attorneys, agents, students and their parents, fantasy league participants, and scholars. The archivist has assisted Larry Bird's unauthorized biographer, the research staff of "Jeopardy!", the NBC Seoul Olympic crew, several productions of the play I'm Not Rappaport, the film Bull Durham, and former Oakland A's owner Charlie Finley, to name just a few. Trying to satisfy as many of these supplicants as possible, the archives has found it necessary to draw a slightly ill-defined line between legitimate reference requests and questions too obscure to answer. Some may tend to call this latter category trivia, but a sports archives cannot be totally opposed to answering trivia questions. What is important is to develop a sense of how practical a question is and how long it will take to find the answer, and to beg off if the time involved would be excessive. Most patrons understand. Naturally, The Sporting News also offers a research-for-pay option that serves as a polite deterrent in some cases and a satisfactory business arrangement in others.

Short of huge quantities of traditional corporate records, the archives's holdings begin with microfilm: The Sporting News itself; a second company publication, The Sporting Goods Dealer, a monthly trade journal; annual statistics produced for the National and American Leagues; some nineteenth-century sporting papers; and a copy of the Albert Spalding Papers held by the New York Public Library. Next there is the library of about five thousand volumes now, covering all sports but focusing on the four major sports to which the newspaper gives intense editorial coverage:
baseball, basketball, football, and hockey. This total does not include the company's own publications, some of which have been updated yearly since the 1940s. In particular, the archives relies on the annual guides and registers to the four major sports, the guides being comprehensive reviews in text and statistics of the previous season, and the registers statistical encyclopedias to active players.

The archives also has administrative responsibility for the newspaper's morgue, envelopes stuffed with clippings from The Sporting News and a host of other newspapers. The morgue is not located in the archives, in part because it fills more than 150 file drawers. Nevertheless, the editor did ask the archivist to reorganize the files which had grown enormously without anyone's attempting to control them. At first, the morgue was divided into two parts, "Baseball" and "All Sports." Alphabetically arranged, each part contained both biographical and subject files. The biographical files were not in such bad shape, but the subject files were an absolute mess, lacking any sort of index or filing scheme. Material on baseball's league championship series, for example, could be found under L for League, C for Championship, and P for Playoffs. Two years later, the reorganization was complete. The biographical files were physically separated from the subject files and clearly labelled. New clippings are filed by only two individuals whose decisions are guided by a subject index maintained in the WordPerfect software package.

Incidentally, the photo morgue--some several hundred thousand images--is under the direct control of the photo editor, but the archives is regularly involved in the sale of prints for personal use, for publication, and for advertising. In most cases, The Sporting News owns the photographs it holds and can transfer one-time rights for a standard and reasonable fee. When this is not so, the company splits the fee with the photographer at no additional charge to the patron.
Beyond the morgue, the archives has a special collection of newspaper tearsheets, not in the best of condition, but still valuable to the editors. Someone who used to work for The Sporting News while living in New Jersey saved the sports pages of several New York City dailies just during the baseball season, April through early October, from 1917 to 1953. The collection is deteriorating, of course, and should someday be transferred to film.

With regard to primary source documentation, the archives does indeed possess some unpublished materials, including correspondence between Ty Cobb and the late publisher J. G. Taylor Spink; some records from baseball's rules committee; and a box or two of unorganized materials from Ban Johnson, founder of the American League. Add to this list two priceless resources: first, the Charles Martin Conlon collection of glass plate negatives and, second, the player card file. Photographer Charles Conlon worked in New York from about 1905 to 1940. He was employed by a New York newspaper but worked also for A. G. Spalding & Brothers and The Sporting News. When he retired, he sold The Sporting News a collection of about five thousand glass plate negatives, most of them shots of baseball players. The richness of this collection, both as baseball resource and as photographic resource, is almost indescribable. Conlon was a first-rate photographer whose images were well conceived and remarkably sharp. Suffice it to say that his work was good enough for the National Portrait Gallery of the Smithsonian to mount an exhibit of Conlon photographs called "Baseball Immortals, 1905-1935" that hung in Washington and later became part of the Smithsonian's traveling exhibit or SITES program.

The player card file is a unique resource, a collection of three-by-five-inch cards covering the contract history of almost everyone who has ever signed to play professional baseball. There are gaps, but the truth is that if someone claims to have played
professional ball and there is no card for him, then the careful researcher must doubt the claimant's veracity.

It is hoped that this survey of holdings, with its seeming lack of traditional archival materials, does not offend the sense of what an archives is supposed to be. First of all, in terms of preservation and arrangement and description, more is being done correctly than has ever been done before. Secondly, the archives is serving the research needs of the staff more efficiently than was possible previously. Thirdly, the archives has made its presence known to the scholarly community so that the traditional users of archives can work with the materials. In addition, the holdings as they are have enabled the archives to develop a reference service to the public that produces much good will and few complaints even when the information requested cannot be produced. There seems to be an assumption on the part of these sports researchers that if *The Sporting News* does not have the answer, then it truly must be unavailable.

But there is a deeper reason for this high level of satisfaction, and that involves the basic nature of much sports history research. Baseball researchers have their own organization, the Society for American Baseball Research (SABR), which in its early years placed an emphasis on exploring the sport through the use of new statistical techniques, but quickly fell back on a much broader but less sophisticated research agenda. The word *sabrematrician* was coined to identify these new statistical whiz kids, but most of them are content simply to assemble facts that have not been gathered before or to reshape data that has already been published. When SABR announced the creation of the archives to its members, the archivist braced for an inundation of researchers. It did not happen, fortunately, and the archives has been able without much difficulty to balance serving this particular type of reference patron with other job responsibilities.

Creating an archives from scratch is surely one of the most exciting challenges an archivist can face, providing a chance to
exercise skills and talents honed elsewhere in a completely fresh environment. Moving from the not-for-profit world to a business setting adds another element of dash. But hitting lead-off for *The Sporting News* archives is, for the archivist who is also a sports fan, a special treat, a rare opportunity to combine vocation with avocation, to blur the harsh distinction between work and play.

Steven P. Gietschier has been Director of Historical Records at *The Sporting News* since 1986. He worked previously at the Ohio Historical Society and the South Carolina Department of Archives and History in Columbia from where he used to journey to Atlanta to watch the Braves lose.
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Foxes Guarding the Hen House: Archivists in Special Collections

William L. Joyce

While deciding on a title for this presentation, I selected one that was less provocative than that which initially occurred to me, the first iteration being: "Foxes Guarding the Hen House: The Coming Archival Takeover of Special Collections." I decided against this title for two reasons: first, it overstates the current situation and likely future condition of research libraries generally, and special collections units in particular; and, second, it only exacerbates the attitudinal problem that I believe all of us need to acknowledge.

Without meaning to turn this into a pale imitation of *Animal Farm*, I will say that we archivists are, like foxes guarding the hen house, under suspicion. Our contributions to library management are underestimated. Of course, for our part, we often reciprocate the suspicion and perhaps undervalue our own contributions by emphasizing how we are different from librarians and why our own traditions and procedures warrant being maintained separately and apart.

In fact, there is underway at this moment a remarkable convergence of interest between librarians and archivists in which archival methods and approaches are receiving a new hearing in research library circles--because we have something to offer regarding some of the vexing problems currently facing research libraries. By the same token, research librarians have something to tell archivists about our problems and we need to listen.

There is no doubt that archivists, curators, and librarians need one another, and we should seek closer relations. To go further, the recent advent of the archival method in special collections produces ways of addressing problems in research libraries that complement those of traditional library practices. The complementarity of the library and archival approaches needs to be recognized as the opportunity for cooperative problem solving, not as competitive striving.

I use the term *archivist* generically to refer both to archivists and manuscript curators, and the phrase *special collections*, also in a generic fashion, to include archival and manuscript materials and rare books, as well as the wider range of materials that have, especially since the emergence of the new social history of the 1920s and 1930s, been collected for their research value. These include broadsides, pamphlets, playbills, newspapers, maps, photographs, sheet music, prints, and other graphic materials, ephemera such as menus, technical reports, and, lately, machine-readable records. Very often, these materials are more valuable in the aggregate than in the sum of their individual parts. The
bulk of special collections materials now collected—such as those I just enumerated—is amenable to processing according to the tenets of the archival tradition by which the material is arranged and described by provenance and which material derives significance only in relation to other material of the same type.

In considering the traditional areas of collection development, bibliographical description, preservation and conservation, reference and outreach, and education, the respective contributions—indeed, the essential complementarity—of the library and archival traditions become apparent. Such knowledge can help reduce suspicion and misunderstanding and promote fuller cooperation between archivists and special collections librarians.

**Collection development**

In the library tradition, selection decisions are made item by item through identification in catalogs, approval plans, and other approaches that normally give selectors responsibility for developing collections in broad subject areas. Increasingly, cooperative programs such as those offered by the Research Library Group, the Center for Research Libraries, and local library networks provide opportunity for less unilateral and more cooperative library activities. As librarians face continuing pressure from inadequate acquisition budgets and severe space constraints, the archival concepts of appraisal and documentation strategies, and that of bulk reduction techniques through sampling, would seem to offer librarians useful strategies for collection building, even as they may ease space pressures. We should not, however, lose sight of the fact that it is the normal condition of research libraries to grow.

**Bibliographical description**

The growing convergence of the library and archival traditions is perhaps nowhere more apparent than in the cataloging of books and book-like materials and in the processing of archival materials.
At the simplest, most direct, level, it appears to be only a matter of time before the archives and manuscripts control (AMC) format and the books format, together with others (including those for visual materials, maps, serials, and music scores), are linked in a single, integrated format. This will pose a serious challenge as to whether we can be more confident that there is a sufficient consensus on the use of vocabulary so that we can communicate the significance of what we have cataloged. (Is the descriptive language of materials sufficiently precise? Series means one thing to an archivist; it means something very different to a cataloger of monographs. Will, for example, chronological subfields be common and equally germane in libraries, archives, and museums?)

The experience of archivists with the AMC format shows the importance of authorities, tables of value, and standardized lists, and we realize that librarians have accomplished much in the area of standards and authorities. We have much to learn from them, as the recent work of Max Evans and the growing archival concern for standards demonstrate.

If we view the archival tradition as an alternative model to that of library cataloging for the organization of information, then the archival approach of understanding material in terms of its origins and the purposes for which it was created becomes more important. Information is seen in its institutional context and institutions are treated as coherent systems (similar to the systems that are so central to information studies). This approach is especially congenial to cataloging or processing those special collections whose collective value is greater than their individual components. This accounts, at least in part, for the current popularity and rapid growth of the AMC format, which is branching out into recording online the contents of the National Union Catalog for Manuscript Collections, as well as recording appraisal information on state records.
The Machine-Readable Cataloging (MARC) Visual Materials format, substantially based upon the work that led to the AMC format, offers a flexible approach to cataloging visual materials that combines the item and collection approaches to cataloging, though the use of standards in connection with that format is also of rising concern. As the use of automation by librarians and archivists forces all of us to rethink our procedures and assumptions, distinctions between the work of archivists and librarians are rapidly becoming blurred.

Preservation/conservation

While the "brittle books" campaign appears to focus on the preservation needs of published, as opposed to unpublished, materials, campaign sponsors appear to be aware increasingly of the preservation needs of archives. Certainly we need to maintain pressure to ensure that archival materials are eligible for funding from such programs. A significant problem associated with preservation microfilming for archivists is the immense amount of preparation most unpublished collections require before filming. In the area of conservation, it was archivists at the National Archives who developed the concept of "intrinsic value" to determine when a document or series of documents should be conserved and retained in its original format because the artifact contained information or characteristics that would be lost if the original was not maintained.

Many times, there is information in the very properties of the original that dictate that it be saved; examples include a copy of Helen Hunt Jackson's novel Ramona bound in birch bark, a document with an important watermark in the paper, material with color illustrations, or simply those items with potential value for exhibitions. For a recent exhibition, for example, the New York Public Library found itself borrowing Margaret Sanger's newsletter because the original had been filmed and discarded.
Surely, the concept of intrinsic value holds as much value for rare book librarians as for archivists.

Reference/outreach

The current restrictive environment in terms of copyright as the litigation surrounding the biographies of J. D. Salinger and L. Ron Hubbard attest, privacy, and other access issues, confers increasing importance on the administration of restricted collections. It is archivists who are experienced in dealing with such situations, and the technological challenge to copyright will likely lead to further legislative adjustments and may lead to an expanded role for archivists accustomed to managing such matters.

A good many libraries are also contending with exhibitions these days, and it is frequently the prints, broadsides, ephemera, manuscripts, and other materials from special collections (frequently in the custody of the archivist) that are so often used. Ironically, exhibitions are often "driving" other library outreach programs, including publications (primarily in the form of exhibition catalogs) and events such as lectures, symposia, conferences, and other activity. Librarians and archivists are equally burdened by the need to become more knowledgeable and active in the outreach area.

These complementarities show that, if their relations are not altogether symbiotic, the common purpose shared by librarians and archivists requires both to collaborate in their work as fully as possible and more frequently than ever. In many situations, either the library or archival tradition will be called upon; the key is in training librarians and archivists to recognize what situations warrant the application of one or the other tradition.

Education

The education of both librarians and archivists appears to be equally unsettled at the moment. The American Library Association is making wholesale changes in the accreditation of
library and information studies programs, while there also appears to be widespread dissatisfaction among librarians with the nature of the education. Many library schools, such as the School of Library Service at Columbia, are undergoing curricular changes, including more courses in other fields.

For our part, we archivists have revised our graduate education guidelines and are seeking ways of influencing accreditation of those programs. This certainly includes the prospect of our involvement in the new approaches to library education.

The core courses of library and information studies curricula should be adapted to include archival, as well as library, theory in areas as basic as bibliographical description. It is also noteworthy that the new dean of the School of Information Studies at Drexel University is Richard Lytle, former archivist of the Smithsonian Institution, while the new dean of Michigan's School of Library and Information Studies is Robert M. Warner, former director of the Bentley Historical Library and, most recently, archivist of the United States--foxes guarding the hen house indeed.

The problems of the nation's research libraries are massive and getting more so. (Simply ponder estimates of the cost to eliminate the nation's brittle books problem.) Whether on campus or in some other setting, research repositories need all the help they can get to address their problems. Librarians at such institutions can begin to help themselves by carefully considering all possible solutions to problems--especially what we might call the archival alternative--and then to begin to forge the consensus to implement those solutions. That will require careful education of all constituencies--especially our researcher patrons and
administrators--outreach, and advocacy to increase broad understanding to achieve what one archival colleague calls the process of "defining common problems to forge cooperative solutions."

William L. Joyce is associate university librarian for rare books and special collections at Princeton University. An earlier version of this article was given as the keynote address at a meeting of the New England Archivists in Wellesley, Massachusetts, on 26 March 1988.
News Reels

The University of Louisville (Kentucky) has established an in-house records management system, named Jerome. The system is currently used to record all incoming accessions, produce a numbered and dated work sheet, and has the capacity to edit and update the original as the material is processed. The system is built around the commercial database product Advanced Revelation. The archives is also inputting collection information into OCLC using the MARC format. For more information on the system contact Dale Patterson, Associate Archivist for Systems Management, University Archives, Ekstrom Library, Louisville, KY 40292.

* * * * *

The Clemson University Libraries announced that the papers of Strom Thurmond are now open for research. The papers, presently comprising over two thousand cubic feet of material, document the life of Thurmond, a former governor of South
Carolina and currently the senior U.S. senator from South Carolina. Seven series are currently available for research, along with scrapbooks, photographs, cartoons and certificates; more series are in the process of being opened. They are a rich resource for historians of the twentieth century and are especially valuable for documenting legislative history, the States' Rights Democratic party, and the issues such as defense and civil rights. The collection is also a useful source for the history of South Carolina, particularly the political sphere.

* * * * *

The Tennessee Archivists presented their Distinguished Service Award to Vanderbilt University Archives and Special Collections at their fall 1988 meeting in Gatlinburg. The award was presented in recognition of the institution's exemplary service and active leadership in promoting the cause of the archival profession.

* * * * *

The Southeast Library Network (SOLINET) has received a ten-month planning grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) to support the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL) as it plans a cooperative preservation microfilming project. The plan includes centralized features that make it a first in cooperative filming. Joseph Boykin, director of libraries at Clemson University and chair of ASERL, describes the project as "initiated...to create a joint facility for the microfilming of brittle materials contained in the collections of member institutions."
The National Archives-Atlanta Branch has opened a Civil War and Reconstruction exhibit called "Hell to Pay Generally--the Civil War and Reconstruction." The exhibit can be viewed during the hours the research room is open: 7:30-4:30 Monday through Friday, Tuesday nights until 10:00, and the second Saturday of each month from 9:00 to 5:00. The exhibit will be on display until 31 August 1989. The exhibit will consist of documents from the holdings of the National Archives-Southeast Region and Mathew Brady photographs from the National Archives.

Cactus Software has announced the availability of Minaret, an automated collection management system that runs on IBM personal computers and compatibles and, eventually, networks and the UNIX operating system. The package, which supports all MARC formats including the Archives and Manuscripts Control format, is flexible enough also to use non-MARC fields. Minaret costs $595 for the PC version. A demonstration system is available with working software, a full manual, and a limit of twenty data records for $50. For more information contact Cactus Software, 850 N. State Street, Suite 2F, Chicago, IL 60610-3352, (312)642-8655.
The Florida Bureau of Archives and Records Management has released a "Request for Proposal for an Integrated Information System for the Florida State Archives." Installation of the system is slated for June 1989.

* * * * *

The Florida State Archives has begun work on a Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) grant-funded project involving preservation of its motion picture collection. More than sixteen thousand films transferred to the archives by the Florida Department of Commerce will be viewed, cataloged, and selectively transferred to video. The motion pictures, many of which were produced to promote Florida tourism and development, will be catalogued and cross-referenced with similar subjects and collections in the archives.

* * * * *

The National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) has funded the following grant projects for archives in the southeast:

Florida State Historical Records Advisory Board, Tallahassee, FL received $51,656 to produce a study on the issues surrounding information technology and public records in the state of Florida.
South Carolina Department of Archives and History received $25,700 for an archival fellowship in the academic year 1989-1990. The grant was jointly funded by the NHPRC and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

Jackson State University, Jackson, MS received $5,000 for a consultant to aid in planning the survey and collection of organizational and business records and personal papers of black twentieth century Mississippians.

Lauderdale County Department of Archives and History, Meridian, MS received $76,240 to establish an archives and records management program for the records of the county and the city of Meridian.

Florida State Historical Records Advisory Board, Tallahassee, FL received $5,000 for continuing support of the travel and meeting expenses of the board.

Richard J. Cox

Denominations and religious orders in the United States have a strong tradition of interest in their history and the preservation of their records. The Episcopal church has had diocesan historiographers and archivists since the mid-nineteenth century.¹ The Catholic church has undergone a significant rebirth of interest in and efforts on behalf of managing its institutional archival


records. Besides the endeavors of such individual denominations, the religious archivist has been a ubiquitous feature on the American archival scene throughout the twentieth century, in both number of repositories and individuals employed as archivists.  

The tradition of American religious archives does not mean, however, that there are no serious problems and challenges facing these repositories and their archivists. Despite the Episcopal church's archival tradition, for example, Mark Duffy recently wrote that the "church, at least at the parish and diocesan level, has not begun to address the problems posed by modern-day methods of recordkeeping." Duffy noted that one of the major causes of this is the church's preoccupation with "present and future concerns," although James O'Toole, one of the leading students of religious

---


archives, stated that "most of the problems facing [Catholic] diocesan archivists are similar to those facing the archival profession as a whole: archivists must broaden their base of support by solidifying their professional standards and activities." Whatever the cause, religious archivists and their institutions face serious difficulties as they near the end of this century.

Such stresses are exacerbated because documenting the church as an institution, difficult enough it would seem, has meant documenting religion and society. O'Toole has rightly said that religious archives have as a mission to document something "very intangible, often fleeting, and perhaps in the end undocumentable." The responsibility of religious archives to be mindful of the church as an institution that has had a pervasive role in society makes the lack of resources and other problems besetting these guardians of this portion of documentary heritage loom even larger.

If religious archivists and their institutions find such problems difficult, the evangelical portion of this community faces even greater problems. In general, evangelical Christian institutions tend to be more oriented to the present and the future. They have little appreciation for their heritage and, consequently, have done little to identify and preserve their historical records. Their organizations tend to be more constantly in flux, less organized,

---

5 "Catholic," 293.


7 For a case study that reveals the complexities of documenting the work of the spirit, see James M. O'Toole, "Things of the Spirit: Documenting Religion in New England," *American Archivist* 50 (Fall 1987): 500-17.
and less hierarchical than the mainstream denominations and religious orders.

Looking at evangelical religious archivists and their institutions as part of the modern archival community brings even more daunting challenges, issues, and questions into focus. The past decade has certainly revealed that the American archival profession is not a static occupation. It has been a time of intense self-analysis (statewide assessment and reporting projects and national planning efforts), deliberate action (advocacy on behalf of the National Archives's administrative independence and individual certification), and changing standards and practices (the adoption of the USMARC Archives and Manuscripts Control format, to name only one). 8

All of these trends and concerns are reflected and, to some extent, addressed in the recently published proceedings of the Evangelical Archives Conference. 9 This conference, held in July 1988, was an "effort to work out ways to better preserve and use the records of the institutions of the evangelical movement in

The literature on these and related topics is extensive, but a perusal of the American Archivist during these years will provide an excellent view of the archival profession in the 1980s. For general summaries of recent changes and future directions, see Larry J. Hackman, "A Perspective on American Archives," Public Historian 8 (Summer 1986): 10-28, and "Toward the Year 2000," ibid., 92-98.

Evangelical was defined in its "broadest sense," referring to "conservative Protestants committed to the need for personal salvation through Jesus Christ, the authority of the Bible, and preaching the Christian gospel."\(^{10}\) The conference attracted an "unusual assortment of people" including "executives of evangelical Protestant agencies, archivists, researchers, librarians, ministers, and teachers."\(^{12}\) A grant from the Lilly Foundation to Wheaton College’s Institute for the Study of American Evangelicals supported the meeting; the staff of the Archives of the Billy Graham Center, headed by Robert Shuster, planned and carried out the conference.

The conference proceedings reflect the structure of the conference. Four smaller groups of meeting participants conferred on minimum standards for programs, cooperation among archival institutions and between archives and their users, a national plan for collecting records of the evangelical movement, and means to gain greater support for and understanding of religious archives. The format was an effort to address the problem of too few repositories collecting evangelical records despite a great quantity and diversity of relevant documentation. The published proceedings primarily consist of the reports of these four working groups. They reflect recent trends and issues in the archival profession and provide a convenient way of commenting on the

\(^{10}\) *Proceedings*, i.

\(^{11}\) *Ibid.*, ii.

conference and its larger implications for religious archives\textsuperscript{13} and
the modern archival community.

The report on guidelines and minimum standards for religious
archival institutions is very strong. This section carefully describes
the requirements for policies and procedures (such as mission
statement and collecting policy), staffing for basic archival
functions (such as appraisal and acquisition, preservation
management, and advocacy and outreach), essential programmatic
functions (inter-institutional cooperation, program planning, and
authority), facilities, holdings administration, and user services.
Finally, the section provides a few points for starting religious
archival programs.

There are at least three reasons for the strength of this
section. First, it reflects the proper perspective for managing
religious archives. It notes that "starting an archives is simply a
first step in a long journey to preserve important historical
records." The section also concludes that "by focusing attention on
some of the commonly accepted archival standards, and the
support necessary to meet these standards, these guidelines can
measure their own ability to establish and maintain an in-house
program."\textsuperscript{14} Second, the recommended guidelines and minimum
standards were drafted in the conviction that religious archival
programs possess problems and concerns common to the archival
profession. Third, the guidelines and standards obviously draw
upon much of the excellent work done in this area in recent years,

\textsuperscript{13} For the purpose of this review the author considers the
evangelical movement to represent broadly the concerns and
problems facing religious archivists in general. There are some
differences; for example, many parts of the evangelical movement
fall outside mainstream denominational structures and governance,
making them more difficult to document and to win resources to
preserve their historical records.

\textsuperscript{14} Proceedings, 3.
especially by the Society of American Archivists's Task Force on Institutional Evaluation.¹⁵

There are some minor weaknesses in this area that the conference planners need to consider as they carry on their work. The comments on arrangement and description make no reference at all to the availability of the USMARC Archives and Manuscripts Control format, which is rapidly emerging as a standard and which certainly has numerous implications for the profession and its institutions. The description of advocacy and outreach really restricts itself to outreach. Advocacy is a more deliberate effort to win support for the archives from a parent organization, government, constituencies, or the general public on behalf of some specific issue or activity; it is more than just exhibitions and publications. Records management is described as being "extremely important to an archival program because it can help to insure that no permanently valuable records are inadvertently destroyed."¹⁶ There are, in fact, other important reasons for records management that have little or nothing to do with archives, such as the economy and efficiency of an institution's management and its use of information in that management. Records management is itself a profession undergoing change, moving to somewhere between the Management of Information Systems (MIS) and Information


¹⁶ Proceedings, 8.
Resource Management (IRM). Under staffing, the needs for archivists are articulated: "All archives require, at the minimum, a person trained in basic archival procedures and techniques to direct the overall program and carry out the archival and program functions enumerated above." This concept neglects the need for preservation/conservation skills which most archivists probably do not have, even though the report stated that "preservation management" is a necessary function. Finally, in advice for starting an archives, there is no discussion that "prior to opening

17 There is a need for a holistic approach to information management. Richard M. Kesner recently wrote that "librarians, archivists, documentalists, data processing (DP) personnel, and records managers need to bring their skills as analysts and service-oriented professionals to this redefined body of tasks. In so doing, they must also become more aware of current information technologies and of their parent institution's internal dynamics--political and otherwise. They must become, in short, true information managers with a catholic view of their duties and what is required of them in the workplace." Information Systems: A Strategic Approach to Planning and Implementation (Chicago: American Library Association, 1988), 11.

18 Proceedings, 9.

19 Ibid., 7. Archivists are aware of the need for preservation, but they lack adequate education and training in conservation treatment and preservation management. There is, at the present, only one graduate education program in the United States, at Columbia University, educating individuals to work in library and archives preservation. SAA's recent initiatives in short-term preservation management training are now being evaluated for their effectiveness.
the archives" some assistance from consultants might be extremely helpful; adequate planning requires suitable archival expertise.\(^20\)

The discussion of communication networks and cooperation is the briefest of the four parts of the proceedings. Its focus is the "problems of cooperation among archival institutions engaged in the collection and preservation of evangelical records, as well as cooperation and communication between archivists and users of such materials." The individuals preparing this report concluded that "there were simply too few archives of any kind that were actively collecting" evangelical records.\(^21\) They recommended identifying areas not being collected, preparing a directory of archives in nondenominational Evangelism, using existing communication networks or creating new ones, creating or using existing "subject research and discipline history centers in areas that include American religion,"\(^22\) expanding microfilming of evangelical records, and seeking "grant funding to support any or all of these activities."\(^23\) A set of recommendations was also made regarding users. These included making better efforts to work with scholars, including asking researchers to assist in appraisal, and promoting the use of archives by other researchers such as "church administrators and pastors" and high school and college students.

The weaknesses in this part of the proceedings are somewhat more pronounced than in the first section, even though making cooperation a major emphasis is exemplary and too often


\(^{21}\) *Proceedings*, 17.


neglected by archivists. There is again no mention of participation in shared descriptive networks like the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN). Admittedly, use of such utilities by many of the small and underfunded evangelical bodies is difficult to conceive, but it is still worth some consideration. Cooperative advocacy to make changes in the various activities mentioned is not considered at all. There is little indication of ways that expertise among evangelical and religious archivists and the larger archival community can be shared. The use of regional preservation centers, the possibilities of jointly hiring trained archivists, and the consideration of linking administratively certain kinds of religious archives programs are all other topics not mentioned that could be listed as possible avenues of exploration. Of course, the lack of homogeneity of the evangelical community and its disinterest in giving up its records to non-evangelical archival programs are serious obstacles to be overcome.

The documentation portion of the proceedings, designed "to investigate the gaps in the universe of information regarding documentation of the evangelical movement and to recommend a plan of action,"\textsuperscript{24} is the strongest and most provocative result of the conference. The individuals discussing this topic placed their attention on developing a "strategy of documentation for the movement" since "it was not feasible for the 'gaps' in the documentation to be discussed until an overall framework was conceived."\textsuperscript{25} Assembling such a framework was clearly seen as being only a beginning of more important efforts to follow. Seven "activities or expressions" of the evangelical movement were identified: denominations/fellowships/communities, education, human services, media, mission/ministries, political/social action groups, and professional organizations. Definitions of each of the

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 21.

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 21.
areas were developed, along with efforts to ascertain the current status of their documentation, obstacles to their documentation, and mechanisms for documenting. "Three overarching deterrents" were also considered: a "lack of clear historical consciousness," "limited resources," and the "elusive nature of significant aspects of the activities of the evangelical movement." 

This section was generally the most defined of the four major areas of the conference, in part because it was able to draw on recent thinking on documenting society. There seemed to be little confusion, as there often is, between archival appraisal techniques--surveying and sampling, for example--within the broader goal of documenting society or a major component of that society. Moreover, the conference participants were aware of the need to formulate first the right questions about Evangelicalism before suggesting actions to survey and collect or to encourage the establishment of institutional archives in the religious community.

The final part of the report concerns developing greater archival awareness and understanding within the evangelical community. Here the participants addressed two areas, the "intrinsic importance of archives" and "developing the support for the concept and importance of archives within the evangelical community." Here the report is very familiar and not very original (at least for archivists), listing a variety of ways to develop support, ranging from informing administrators about the

26 Ibid., 22-23.


28 Proceedings, 34.
value of archival materials to collecting data on individual churches, so that anniversaries and other important dates and events can be commemorated in ways that celebrate the importance of archives.

This last section is the least developed of the four. The statements about what this working group discussed seem to indicate that it got bogged down in slightly extraneous issues. Defining Evangelism was a major point of discussion, when in fact the remainder of the proceedings suggests that a fine working definition was available. Surprisingly, the report noted that defining archives "provided a challenge." This difficulty might have been the result of the peculiar nature of religious archives, although the definition finally agreed upon seems rather straightforward and one long accepted and used by the archival profession. More likely, the difficulty with definition may have been the result of this particular working group consisting mostly of nonarchivists. The conference was, after all, also trying to educate nonarchival members of the evangelical community about the need and desirability of preserving its historical records. If the conference and its published proceedings ultimately make a positive impact on evangelical religious leaders to care for their archival materials, then this criticism will prove to be unfounded.

These distractions obviously prevented the individuals from tackling their assignment in any substantive manner. Ways of marketing the importance of archives noted in these pages are marginal: "Archives," the report stated, "enable those who study its records to learn from the past and, it is hoped, avoid repeating past failures. A proper understanding of the present results can be used to plan for the future." As archivists know, such

29 Ibid.

30 Ibid., 35.
statements are easier to write than they are to substantiate. More specific reasons could have been developed, considering there are some excellent models that at least lay the groundwork. The use of the word *intrinsic* is also extremely confusing since it has an accepted, more specific archival meaning. Overall, the list of proposed activities needed much more fleshing out than occurred during the conference; it is particularly uneven when contrasted to the detail in the documentation section of the proceedings.

Despite the minor problems (and they are rather minor) with the proceedings, this publication and the conference represent a remarkable beginning for renewing interest in evangelical religious archives. The effort is worthy of replication in a number of other areas in the archival community, especially considering the archivist's mission to document society. The work of the Joint Committee on the Archives of Science and Technology and the Evangelical Archives Conference, assuming that both establish ongoing bodies, are important models for the kinds of issues and activities that need to be taken on by the archival profession if it hopes to document fully modern society. Along with efforts to


33 "The term 'intrinsic value' has long been used by archivists to describe historical materials that should be retained in their original form rather than as copies." In *Intrinsic Value in Archival Material*, Staff Information Paper 21 (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Service, 1982), 1.
understand the complexities of documenting science and technology and religion, the profession requires similar work in areas such as the arts, agriculture, education, business, and recreation. Although there is some work going on in these fields, major national efforts are needed to help the profession meet its broad societal mission and to assist the work of archivists in geographical regions and in their institutions.

This publication is an indicator of an emerging professional maturity in the religious archives community. It serves notice that although needs are great, so is the potential. One only hopes that the follow-up national meeting called for at the 1988 conference will take place and the fine work that was started, continued.

Richard J. Cox is lecturer in Archives and Records Management in the School of Library and Information Science at the University of Pittsburgh. The author is indebted to three participants in the Evangelical Archives Conference—Tim Ericson, Jim O'Toole, and Helen Samuels—who made comments on an initial draft of this review.

---

34 Proceedings, 45.
Reviews


Contemporary Georgia is an outgrowth of an annual ritual of the University of Georgia, in which new professors trek through Georgia, discovering the diversity and change to be found within its borders. The book is an armchair version of the tour.

How can this volume be categorized? Like the old "industrial and agricultural guides," it is full of maps, tables, and descriptions of the state’s resources. Like the Works Progress Administration (WPA) guides, it captures the flavor of cultures and community life. And like the regional studies produced by Howard Odum and his disciples in the 1930s, it has a purposeful tone. Like Odum, the authors are engaged in public service through their state’s university: "We all share two assumptions: things could be better, and improvement can come from informed decision making and wise planning" (xi).

The volume begins with a concise, readable, and candid overview of the state’s history. Along with the heroic stories of
Oglethorpe et al., it describes grinding poverty and racial oppression, including Atlanta's racial massacre in 1906.

A major theme of the volume is the duality of Georgia's economy: "There are two Georgia sub-economies--the Atlanta metropolitan region and the remainder of Georgia" (95). The former is growing and prospering, while much of the latter is in decline. Similarly the state's population is clustered around metropolitan Atlanta. By the turn of the century over forty-two percent of Georgia's people will live there.

Politics and government reflect the influence of an earlier day when most of the people and power were in rural Georgia. The state's tradition of "little government" is a residue of its rural past. The volume recounts with approval the modest expansion of state services in the twentieth century and the replacement of demagogic politicians with business-like, "good government" officials. The volume reflects a rosy picture of "consensus politics," a nonideological give-and-take, where the objective is "allocating some satisfaction to everyone concerned . . . so that no one goes home angry" (158).

Two parts of the progressive triad--education and human services--receive special attention. (The third, highway construction, appears in various parts of the book.) Accounts of public education and services for the poor and disabled begin with a painful and frighteningly recent story of backwardness. The authors acknowledge the legacy of underfunding and neglect, but they argue that in recent years Georgia has made great strides in education and human services.

The volume ends with thumbnail sketches of life in five Georgia communities. The picture of community life which emerges echoes the larger theme of the book: diversity of lifestyles from one part of the state to another, the disparity between the "two Georgias," and harmony within local communities.

This is such a useful volume that this review could easily end without further comment. But as an addition to the dialogue
about how to make Georgia better, two more points could be considered. First, the "two Georgias" theme, a powerful metaphor for uneven development, needs to be refined. If there are two Georgias, there are also (at least) two Atlantas, two Ocillas, and so on. Deeply rooted poverty persists alongside the gleaming towers of Atlanta, and the "other" Georgia contains a residue of old power structures which have contributed to the impoverishment of many. Second, the persistent "little government tradition" is less the result of nonideological "consensus politics" than of policies which favor some Georgians at the expense of others. Remove federal transfer payments from the "other" Georgia and it would be in desperate trouble.

In the coming decade Georgians will continue to debate the role of universities and other state agencies in creating a better Georgia. This handy volume will contribute to that process as well as introduce to old-timers and newcomers alike the rich varieties of life in Georgia.

Robert C. McMath, Jr.
Georgia Institute of Technology


Although most archival repositories have microfilmed portions of their holdings from time to time, only a few have a systematic and ongoing program for converting carefully selected collections to a microform format that will guarantee permanency. Archivists early became aware of the increasing fragility of the paper in documentary collections, but these concerns have only recently
been echoed by librarians faced with mounds of brittle books, a
d vocal group of preservation professionals, and an increasingly
sensitive and informed public. With the added incentives of
significantly increased grant funding and, for the first time, an
easily understandable manual, more archives will be able to
consider microfilming as an option in their preservation programs.

Preservation Microfilming discusses both the decision-making
context and the procedures for preservation microfilming, using
language that is nontechnical but clear and precise. Basic
technical terms needed to communicate with micrographics
managers are defined in a glossary and explained in the discussion
of issues and procedures. The preservation professionals and
program administrators who collaborated on this book present
their material in the tone of a sympathetic colleague who offers
basic information, step-by-step guidelines, and options for
consideration and evaluation. There is food for thought for the
converted and encouragement for the fainthearted. In short, this
is a manual that is "user friendly."

As a manual, Preservation Microfilming does not purport to
be "a one-stop, learn-everything encyclopedia" on the topic (xxi)
but aims to provide a framework for decision making and to
present issues that must be addressed as each institution designs
its own program. To the credit of the editor and contributors, the
book is an integrated whole. It is a description of the
preservation microfilming process, a general guide to each step of
the operation, and a reference tool pointing to more specific
sources of information. Larger concerns balance the "how to."
Chapters focus on making basic administrative decisions about the
program, selecting materials to be filmed, planning the process and
preparing the materials, standards and practices in filming,
providing and sharing bibliographic information about the finished
product, and controlling costs. Illustrations, sample forms, tables,
and lists are used effectively to explain technical concepts or
procedures, show special equipment, and provide summaries of useful information.

One of the book's strengths is the way it deals with preservation microfilming as part of a larger world—as one of many preservation treatment options or as one problem in the bibliographic control of collections, for example. The decision to include information about preservation microfilming in an archival as well as a library setting (xi) is fortunate, although the archival world described here may not be as familiar as it could be.

The recurring tendency to equate library books with archival documents instead of collections is frequently misleading. In the chapter that discusses the selection of materials for filming, it would be helpful to describe the kinds of "different curatorial approaches" that archives need to employ (27). Mention could also be made (35-36) of another method for selecting archival material for filming—that is, by identifying appropriately filmable series that appear regularly in similar types of collections, such as alphabetical indexes to gubernatorial or congressional papers. Other issues affecting archives might be included briefly, such as whether collections being prepared for filming should be available at all times for public use (22). A larger issue, and one that affects the choice of preservation microfilming as an option in an archival program, is only referred to in passing (118, 173): What is the relationship of preservation microfilming to filming for business or records management purposes? What considerations would suggest the use of certain kinds of microfilming standards instead of others?

All considered, however, Preservation Microfilming is an excellent manual that deserves to be used often. It will withstand frequent but thoughtful examination.

Laurel Bowen
Georgia State University

This volume is another handsome member of the extensive family of publications issued by the American Association for State and Local History. The book's cover, designed by Gillian Murrey, carries a calligraphic title and color reproductions of two right/wrong (in preservation terms) watercolor landscapes. Even in the mists of its light fading, the wrongly treated work is attractive and, compared with the other, suggests what might have been if preventive caution had been used.

The cover is truly and subtly an emblem for the content of the book. Ellis's prose is clear and pleasant, so easily sophisticated that she is able to move from the theoretical, esoteric plane to the specific, practical application within paragraphs and sentences. There is none of the disjointed "turn to page x for instructions," yet plenty of instruction is offered in the skills of handling paper in storage, on exhibit, and in the reading room.

Although ideal conditions and treatments are described, Margaret Ellis is a realist. This is shown in her definition of the term proper environmental conditions: "the conditions under which we can reasonably expect artworks to survive longest. The term denotes suitability, rightness, and appropriateness: it represents a compromise between what we know to be optimum and what we recognize as realistic." Such an attitude encourages the conservation effort more effectively than the discouragement of the less than perfect. In other instances too, the author eschews absolute numbers, but for the more difficult disciplines of consistency and balance.

While the book contains a sensitive discussion of elements to be considered in the care of works of art on paper, its practicality is intended for both collectors and curators. Illustrations and
instructions on procedures are exceptionally apt and direct. The manual is thorough in treating the most problematic details of preservation concern. For appropriate applications, such as tape removal, the services of a qualified conservator are recommended. A description of such individuals, suggestions on locating them, and advice on interacting with the specialists are helpful. Further practical assistance is to be found in three appendixes: the first is a fine list of conservation supplies and suppliers; the second gives specific instructions on the making of rice or wheat paste; the third, on the construction of a thymol cabinet, contains the appropriate caveats on this method of mold control.

The carefully selected and limited further readings sections following chapters, and the bibliography, offer different sources than the archivist ordinarily encounters and for that reason are of great value. While the references are pertinent, the absence of some fine Society of American Archivists publications is regrettable. Possibly the reason relates to the exclusion of photographs as part of this topic. However, Merrily Smith's Matting and Hinging Works of Arts on Paper and Ralph Ehrenberg's Archives and Manuscripts: Maps and Architectural Drawings are well known.

If there is a concern about The Care of Prints and Drawings, it is that archivists will disregard the work as inappropriate when, in fact, it offers superb background and fine advice in the area of paper conservation. Typographic glitches that twice turned prints into paints during correspondence for this review suggest a tendency to see the manual as engaging art curators only. Perhaps in an age of growing cross-disciplinary awareness, many will be curious enough to investigate another finely developed perspective. It would be well worth the exercise.

Marice Wolfe
Vanderbilt University Archives
Reviews

The Copyright Primer for Librarians and Educators. Mary Hutchings Reed. Chicago: American Library Association with the National Education Association, 1987. Pp. 76. $7.95, paper.

As the author of The Copyright Primer notes in her introduction to the booklet, "the new Copyright Law is no longer new." Yet despite the fact that librarians, educators, and archivists have been working under the provisions of this law for over ten years, confusion still abounds with regard to its applications in many specific circumstances. How do archivists determine the copyright status of an item? What uses may be considered "fair"? What constitutes a "reasonable search" for a copyright holder? For what uses may photocopies be made? How does the copyright law apply to newer technology, such as videotapes and computer software?

This booklet provides understandable information on basic copyright issues and discusses topics such as fair use, copying, and photocopying in simple, clear terms. While some sections of the work do not apply to situations frequently encountered in most archives (i.e., classroom photocopying of books and periodicals, or performances of copyrighted dramatic works for teaching purposes), most of the information will be useful for archivists to have on hand, either for basic background reading or to apply to particular circumstances in the archival setting.

The format of the booklet is clear and straightforward. The introduction deals with basic questions ("What is copyright?" and "What is the duration of copyright?"). The second section examines the concept of fair use and discusses the four factors that the law states shall be considered in determining fair use as well as the findings of relevant court cases and research. Subsequent sections focus on specific topics such as "Fair Use," "Library Copying under Section 108," "Sheet Music," "Videotapes," and "Computer Software." Each section opens with an overview of the issues involved. Where published guidelines exist (as for
copying of sheet music, or off-air taping) they are included and discussed.

The most useful parts of the booklet are the question and answer segments included at the end of each section. The questions highlight the application of the law to specific circumstances (such as "Can a library put an unpublished manuscript into its online computer data base?"; "What is a fair price?"; and "Can an off-air recording be added to the library collection?"). Answers to the questions are based on the law itself, legislative and judicial history related to the law, and guidelines that have been developed since the law took effect. Archivists may find some of the implications regarding issues such as copying to be surprisingly liberal. At the very least, the guidance offered by the author provides food for thought and an opportunity to reevaluate our understanding and implementation of the law.

The sections "Infringement Liability and Remedies" and "How to Obtain Permission" will be of particular interest to most readers. The section on music may be the least useful to archivists. In the author's words, "music is the elixir of life and also a copyright headache." The information provided in this booklet relates primarily to school-oriented problems of performance rights and the copying of music for performances. Archivists who need advice on dealing with published or unpublished recorded sound materials will need to seek guidance elsewhere.

Overall, The Copyright Primer is an excellent source of information relating to copyright issues and is well worth having
on hand. It is well written and thorough; in addition to serving as a "refresher course" in the basics of copyright law, it offers an opportunity for archivists to take a fresh look at some old problems.

Christopher Ann Paton
Georgia State University


In 1985 Karen Paul and the Senate Historical Office produced *Records Management Handbook for United States Senators and Their Repositories*, a volume that has been a valuable, if Utopian, source of advice to senators’ staffs and staffs of repositories holding Senate records. This new volume, *Records Management Handbook for United States Committees*, will stand as an important companion work to the earlier publication. While its primary audience is Senate committee staff, the handbook will be of immense use to archivists working with senatorial collections as they try to solve the problems attendant to the records created during a senator’s committee work.

In well-organized chapters committee records are defined and identified according to committee organization and functions, and records disposition schedules and transfer procedures are laid out clearly. Recommendations for setting up files and filing and the management and disposition of automated records, ever more pressing problems, are plainly spelled out and invaluable. The
chapters on the treatment of sensitive and classified information and on public access issues, well supported by exhibits, present previously scattered information in a concise, understandable fashion. An equally succinct chapter on micrographics could have been clearer about the long-term use and cost-effectiveness ratio of film but is otherwise useful. Other sections answer questions about ownership of committee records and how to deal with consultants' records, both of which have puzzled many archivists, especially those who attempted to find answers prior to the establishment of the position of archivist in the Senate Historical Office.

The written text is clear and well done, but the charts, listings, exhibits, and sample forms make this volume important. They are presented effectively and will give fast answers to harried committee staff members, many of whom may not take time to read this handbook from cover to cover. All archivists will benefit from acquainting themselves with this volume, if only for the valuable appendixes containing such items as glossaries and filing rules, the chapter on files management techniques, and the suggested readings. In fact, substituting the word institution or organization for congress, and changing committee staff to staff in some of the text produce copy that can be used by any archivist giving records management advice.

In a perfect world all committee staff members responsible for committee records would read and apply the procedures set out in this manual. If even a fraction of them do and begin to follow the disposition and transfer recommendations, the Senate archivist will be inundated with records and requests for help—and the
documentation of the committee work of the Senate will grow in value and usefulness. In any case, all the information any staff member or archivist would need is laid out here in a useful fashion, waiting for implementation.

Margery N. Sly
Smith College


In The Management of Local Government Records: A Guide for Local Officials, Bruce W. Dearstyne immediately puts the reader at ease. He approaches this guide, designed for the non-records management professional, as if he were in the room chatting with you. His style decreases the possibility of the reader's throwing down the book in frustration as too technical. Practical in presentation while providing sound records management theories, the guide will save readers valuable time as well as face while knowledgeably taming the ugly information monster in front of the ever-present skeptical audience. A number of interesting photographs, sample forms, and helpful tables increase its readability.

Dearstyne states in the preface that his guide "covers the basics of records management, introduces advanced concepts, and suggests where to turn for more help." A clearer statement might be that the guide is a detailed plan for securing financial and authoritative support to begin a records management program and for building a program foundation by the development of records retention and disposition schedules. In addition, the guide reviews
elements of a records management program which would enable an organization to save money and create, process, and store its information more efficiently. This statement prepares the reader for the abrupt change in approach beginning with chapter five in which the author discusses merely what and why instead of what, why, and how. At this point, the reader who has been subtly held by the hand should be told that the following chapters are a departure point from which other sources must be utilized. The last chapter provides an abundance of information on related associations, publications, and state programs which will be useful to any organization starting a records program.

After reading the guide, a government official will realize that records management is a programmatic activity, far more involved than filing. The author spins his widening web with topics that "fit together and re-enforce each other." Planning a program, identifying program personnel, records surveying, information creation control, vital records, and management of archival records are but a few of the subjects he pursues to build a good overview of records management.

While written for the novice, Dearstyne's Management of Local Government Records will interest the professional who must educate students and clients in the theories and practices of records management. Records appraisal comes to mind as a case in point. "A records manager is not the czar of records; the job is more like a musical conductor, getting people to work together in harmony" is another statement which could be used when records managers are accused of empire building.
Dearstyne has provided a useful tool. There is little doubt that the red alert should be raised for local government records as an endangered species, and this guide provides needed information enabling these officials to manage a valuable resource on a small budget.

Juli G. Stewart
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

* * * * *


The planning reflected in this document demonstrates that handling machine-readable records is a long and arduous process that raises a myriad of technical and archival questions at each stage in a record’s life cycle. Though it is one of the pioneers in dealing with electronic records, the New York State Archives and Records Administration has decided to take an incremental approach in dealing with this monumental problem. Staff members are planning to concentrate on several important systems each year, rather than tackle all systems at once. The plan also includes an emphasis on outreach, recognizing that the State Archives and Records Administration will need the help of many other governmental bodies if it is to succeed.

Pending funding, the archives hopes to spend a million dollars over a five-year period. Using a management technique of dividing the attack into a hierarchy of mission, goals, and activities, the planning document carefully outlines each of the projected activities for the next five years.
Some of the more significant of the twenty-seven tasks described in the report are to

1. evaluate standards for the transfer of data,
2. integrate machine-readable records into the overall records management and archival approach of state government,
3. establish a tape maintenance and storage service at the records center,
4. provide training and technical assistance to those managing machine-readable records, and
5. accession, describe, and make available for research electronic records with long-term value.

All archivists and records managers who recognize the scope of the task undertaken by their colleagues in New York wish them well, for they will certainly pioneer new territory and ease the burden for those who follow.

Glen McAninch
Kentucky Department for Libraries and Archives
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