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New Appraisal Techniques: The Effect of Theory on Practice

Margaret Hedstrom

Archivists are acutely aware of the need for a better framework and new methods to guide the selection of records with enduring value. Whether appraising the current records of government agencies, corporations, colleges or universities, or social organizations, archivists confront a gargantuan task with meager tools. 1 Appraisal theory provides general principles based on a few broad generalizations: the distinction between

primary and secondary uses for records; the need to evaluate their evidential and informational values; the notion that organizations ought to preserve a record of their significant policies, procedures, functions, and activities; and the premise that certain levels of the administrative hierarchy are most likely to produce records of permanent value.  

Although appraisal theory and methods proved valuable for identifying the archival records of the past generation, both the theory and methods are inadequate and inflexible for appraising contemporary records.

Modern records appraisal began with the premise that preservation of the universe of documentation would serve neither scholars nor repositories. Archivists working at the National Archives in the 1940s and 1950s recognized that repositories could not afford the space or staff to manage all of the voluminous records of their day and that scholars could not "find their way through the huge quantities of modern public records." The records had

---


to document the programs, policies and procedures of an organization; shed light on its important functions or activities; or contain information that was unique and significant. After reviewing all extant documentation of a government agency or organization, archivists could select significant records—generally at the records series level.

Important changes in record-keeping practices and technologies since appraisal guidelines were first formulated in the 1940s and 1950s raise concerns about the adequacy and effectiveness of appraisal theory and practice. The sheer volume of contemporary records is one dimension of this problem. Although appraisal theory and methods were formulated in part to cope with the rapid growth of records during the 1930s and 1940s, the volume of those records pales in comparison to the expansion of records since the 1960s. Patricia Aronsson, in her careful study of twentieth century congressional collections, points out that each member of Congress now accrues between fifty and one hundred cubic feet of records per year, while their predecessors fifty years ago accumulated that quantity of records in an entire career of two decades or more. Likewise, a survey of Yale University's records revealed that university records production trebled between 1960 and the late 1970s. Such large volumes of information make it increasingly difficult for archivists to acquire intimate knowledge of the universe of documentation from which they must select records with enduring value.

---


5 John Dojka and Sheila Conneen, "Records Management as an Appraisal Tool in College and University Archives," in Archival Choices, 30, 41-44.
New record-keeping technologies feed a seemingly insatiable demand for recorded information. Even before the diffusion of the office photocopy machine, T. R. Schellenberg cited modern duplicating devices as a factor in the proliferation of records. The spread of photocopiers since the 1960s has fueled this trend by allowing organizations to reproduce and distribute documents and reports in unlimited numbers.

The introduction of computers adds new complications. Automation of record keeping creates records that are transient and volatile. It allows users in many different locations to view a database simultaneously and to extract selected elements for further manipulation and analysis. It provides a means for collaborative research and report writing without a way to trace individual contributions of authorship, even though the results of such a collaborative effort resemble a traditional printed report. The recording medium is short-lived and reuseable, making it imperative for archivists to appraise the records before they are erased deliberately or allowed to deteriorate unintentionally.

The impact of automation on the identification and selection of archival records is not limited to the special needs of machine-readable records. The use of computers for accounting and statistical analysis fills paper files with reams of charts, tables, and other printouts. The use of word processing technology creates multiple drafts of documents, with minimal changes between drafts; or it leaves the files void of drafts of a document that evolved electronically on a computer screen. Automated indexes to hard copy files are an integral part of many case file systems, and they are replacing the manual card index as the only

---

practical means of accessing information in files with hundreds of thousands of documents. Even though electronic files have not replaced paper documents, both the content and organization of many manual filing systems have been altered by automation. 7

A redistribution of responsibility for many basic societal functions and changes in organizational structure also make the documentation landscape more complex. In the government arena, the new federalism means that programs which once were the exclusive domain of a federal, state, or local government agency are now shared among the various levels of government. Agencies at all levels of government subcontract with providers in the private sector for direct services. 8 In universities, research projects with joint government and corporate sponsorship are carried out by teams whose members reside on many campuses and who communicate at conferences and through electronic mail networks. 9 A decentralization of decision making within organizations further complicates archivists' quests for the documentation of policy development. The structure of a large multi-divisional corporation, for example, cannot be reduced to a


8 For an analysis of the effects of this trend on archival appraisal, see Margaret Hedstrom, "Is Data Redundancy the Price Archivists Will Pay for Adequate Documentation?," IASSIST Quarterly 13 (Spring 1989): 24-30.

9Cox and Samuels, "The Archivist's First Responsibility," 35.
simple pyramid, and its core documentation will not be found exclusively in the files of upper management. 10

These organizational and technological changes together create modern records that are voluminous, interrelated, specialized, technical, and often difficult and expensive to preserve. As programs and activities are carried out with increasingly complex divisions of responsibility, the documentation of many contemporary functions is dispersed and duplicated in the papers and files of numerous individuals, departments, private institutions, and government agencies. Automated information systems often support the inter-institutional communications needed to coordinate and monitor diverse activities. The Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS), for example, illustrates the intricate information flows associated with modern social programs. This system exchanges information among local social service agencies, public and private hospitals and clinics, physicians, insurance companies, and state and federal government agencies. In the sparsely populated state of Utah, this system has more than 100 machine-readable master files and produces 316 different output reports, including six truckloads of paper and nearly 20,000 sheets of computer output microfiche each month. 11 Similar systems exist in most states to link public and private health care

10Bruce H. Bruemmer and Sheldon Hochheiser, The High Technology Company: A Historical Research and Archival Guide (Minneapolis: Charles Babbage Institute, 1989) provides an overview of modern high technology corporations and their associated documentation. For a historical analysis of the rise of internal communication and its significance in modern business, see Yates, Control through Communication.

11Ken White, "We Have the Program, Now We Need Federal Approval" (Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists, New York, New York, 5 September 1987).
institutions and the local, state, and federal agencies that monitor them into a large, complex information network.

New approaches to archival appraisal hold promise for guiding archivists through the maze of modern documentation. The development of documentation strategies, experiments with sharing appraisal data, and efforts to refine appraisal criteria augment traditional appraisal theory. These recent efforts have not been integrated, and they focus on different aspects of the appraisal process. Yet they share a common goal of more systematic and better selection of archival records.

**Documentation strategies**

A discussion of documentation strategies provides a useful point of departure because the documentation strategy approach establishes a broad context for appraisal rather than offering a new appraisal technique. The definition of *documentation strategies*, drafted initially by Larry Hackman and Helen Samuels, is "a plan formulated to assure the documentation of an ongoing issue, activity, or geographic area... ordinarily designed, promoted, and in part implemented by an ongoing mechanism involving records creators, administrators, and users."¹² A

---

documentation strategy is a way for records creators, users, librarians, subject specialists, archivists, and others to define jointly what documentation has enduring value, to plan for its long-term preservation and accessibility, and to evaluate and refine the criteria and mechanisms for selection as conditions change. It is a proactive approach which places creators, users, and custodians of records in a position to shape the historical record actively.

Although the term documentation strategy dates from the mid-1980s, the concept of a nationwide effort to improve the selection of archival materials in one well-defined subject area has its origins at the Center for the History of Physics, a unit of the American Institute of Physics (AIP). In the late 1950s, a committee of physicists recognized the inadequacy of documentation on modern physics, drafted an action plan, and then recruited a historian and an archivist to develop a program for long-term cooperation among many institutions and individuals. Several other joint documentation projects in science and technology disciplines followed, and discipline history centers, modelled on the Center for the History of Physics, have been established on the history of information processing, the


history of electrical engineering, and the history of chemistry. 14 More recently archivists have focused on efforts to craft documentation strategies around subject or functional areas, or regions, and to articulate the elements of a documentation strategy model.

The documentation strategy approach is neither a theory nor a methodology for appraisal, yet this concept makes significant contributions to the appraisal of modern records. First, documentation strategies offer a new approach to understanding the broad context for specific appraisal decisions. The concept is based on a recognition that records are interrelated, just as the processes that create them are interrelated. Therefore, custodians and creators of records from many institutions need to be involved in defining a documentation strategy in order to illuminate the general terrain of documentation on a subject, functional area, or region.

Documentation strategies differ from the traditional records survey which attempts to inventory extant records as a means to understand the universe of documentation. Rather, documentation strategies often begin by identifying significant functions or activities that warrant documentation and analyzing how records are created, administered, and used to support those

---

functions. As the authors of one recent documentation guide explain, "we believe that it is the archivist's task to understand the universe of documentation that is likely to be found, identify those issues and activities that seem to have historical relevance, and find the records or artifacts that best document them." 

The development and implementation of documentation plans bring records creators and users into the process of defining which key aspects of modern society warrant adequate documentation for future research. Through this approach, archivists benefit from the knowledge and expertise of records creators and users who understand technical and highly complex records systems and who can steer archivists toward the most significant records among today's massive volumes of documentation. The documentation strategy approach, if implemented, would also change the role of the appraisal archivist. By insisting upon careful planning, documentation strategies force archivists to think in advance about which records they most desire to preserve, and they can help appraisal archivists establish priorities for acquisition. Finally, the documentation strategy approach recognizes that archivists need to evaluate and revise their collecting priorities and appraisal criteria as conditions change. Unlike a theory of appraisal, which must stand the test of time to qualify as theory, documentation

15 Documentation strategies do use various types of surveys to gather information for assessments of documentation needs and conditions. Collection analysis is one particularly useful tool designed to identify topics that are well or poorly documented by existing holdings in manuscript repositories. See Judith Endelman, "Looking Backward to Plan for the Future: Collection Analysis for Manuscript Repositories," American Archivist 50 (Summer 1987): 340-55.

strategies are designed to accommodate changes in the creation and uses of records, and in the resources available to preserve them.

In common parlance, archivists have not done justice to the concept of documentation strategies. Documentation strategies have become the latest buzz words in the field of archives, and recent conferences have been filled with sessions on documenting many diverse topics. Archivists have begun to use the term documentation strategy to refer to all systematic and proactive efforts to identify archival records and to any collecting efforts that involve two or more repositories. Documentation strategies, however, are more than extensions of joint collection projects. They involve a wide range of nonarchivists to provide expertise, promote and sustain a documentation project, and increase the likelihood of its success. If successful, documentation strategies establish ongoing mechanisms, not only to coordinate the collection of archival records, but to promote, support, and sustain better documentation.

Also lacking are enough models of successful documentation strategies. To date, archivists have discussed why documentation strategies are important and how they might be developed, but there is little practical experience demonstrating that this approach can be implemented or is effective in the long run. The lack of concrete models does not mean that documentation strategies cannot or should not be implemented, but it suggests that archivists need to work with others to test this approach before they are fully aware of the obstacles to implementation and possible pitfalls. 17 Rather than discussing documentation strategies internally, archivists need to promote the idea to other

17 Successful documentation work that has been sustained for a decade or more, such as the work at the Center of the History of Physics, can be instructive for archivists. See Hackman and Warnow-Blewett, "The Documentation Strategy Process," 29-44.
key actors and be prepared to adjust plans and strategies in response to their concerns.

Sharing appraisal data

Another important trend in appraisal techniques is an effort to share information about appraisal decisions through a national database. As part of the seven states RLIN (Research Libraries Information Network) project, several state archives conducted the first systematic test of the potential value of sharing information about appraisal decisions. The test used two fields in the MARC AMC (Archives and Manuscripts Control) format to store information about the final disposition of records, the reasons for appraisal decisions, and the appraisal process. This test was based in part on the premise that different states create and maintain similar records in areas where state government agencies perform similar functions or support similar programs. If records are of a sufficiently generic nature, archivists and records managers will be able to make more informed appraisal decisions by examining the appraisal decisions of their professional colleagues. 18

Through a series of case studies, participants from six state archives tried to ascertain whether archivists in other states had appraised and scheduled similar records series such as litigation files, legislative bill files, case files of prison inmates or parolees, extradition records, and chemical waste transport manifests. When similar records series were located in the RLIN database, participating archivists determined whether they could use information about appraisal and scheduling decisions to make more informed judgments about the value of similar records to

their own repository. The initial test results were inconclusive, but the case studies identified areas for further analysis.

The results of this initial experiment speak to several problems with the practice of records appraisal. First, the pool of data about state government records in the RLIN database is not yet large enough to provide any assurance that a search will turn up records related to those being appraised. Second, much of the available appraisal information is too cryptic to provide useful guidance on appraisal decisions to another repository. Currently, there are no guidelines or professional standards for reaching appraisal decisions or documenting the decision-making process. The first problem might be remedied as more repositories provide data to national databases using established descriptive standards. The second problem is more profound. Archivists may not have sufficient formal, written information about the appraisal process or about specific appraisal decisions to provide a meaningful resource for use by other repositories. Short pronouncements that records have evidential or informational value, for example, lack the concreteness and consistency needed to understand the detailed reasoning behind an appraisal decision. The challenge here is to develop a more precise vocabulary for explaining why records were appraised as permanent or disposable which will capture the determining factors without resorting to vague or overarching generalities.

A clear consensus on the purpose and value of sharing appraisal data has not yet emerged. Archivists in some states expressed the concern that specific statutes and regulations governing the retention of records and local collecting interests were the overriding factors in all appraisal decisions. While they found appraisal information from other states interesting, they

concluded that it was unlikely that such information would ever be the deciding factor in an appraisal decision. 20

Archivists are not always certain how to interpret appraisal information when it is available. If archivists in one repository decide to preserve a particular set of records, does that mean that archivists in another repository should rely on the judgment of their colleagues and preserve a similar set of records? Or does it mean that the documentation preserved in one repository provides an adequate historical record of a particular event or phenomenon? Voluminous case files illustrate this dilemma. Should all state archives preserve inmate case files because two or three states decided to do so; or are inmate case files from two or three states sufficient to document prisoners in state correctional facilities? These concerns will remain predominant in the absence of multi-institutional documentation strategies which will help appraisal archivists determine whether the main reason to preserve any particular records is to document local, regional, or national phenomena.

Sharing appraisal data is an area that warrants further exploration and development. Exchanges of information about a specific appraisal decision could help archivists avoid duplication of effort when appraising similar records. Moreover, exchanges of information about holdings and collection policies are essential elements of documentation strategies. 21 Such information can

---


21 Hackman and Warnow-Blewett, 28, 38-39. Currently documentation reporting relies primarily on newsletters, local databases, and subject area collecting guides. For examples, see the newsletters of the AIP Center for the History of Physics and the Charles Babbage Institute. As part of its national collecting strategy, the Charles Babbage Institute produced a multi-
form the basis for an assessment of needs and conditions in a subject or functional area, or a region, and could facilitate joint decision making about the selection of archival records.

**Appraisal criteria**

Some archivists have emphasized the need for a more precise appraisal methodology which identifies the key factors in appraisal decisions. Frank Boles and Julia Young developed and tested a model of the appraisal process which identifies more than fifty factors that archivists consider when appraising records. The states of Washington and Pennsylvania also use an appraisal matrix to rank factors and arrive at numerical scores which guide final appraisal decisions. Efforts to articulate more explicit appraisal criteria make two important contributions to appraisal techniques. First, these models may lead to more rigorous appraisal decisions by identifying the large number of factors that archivists should consider when selecting records for permanent retention. Second, appraisal models may improve reporting about appraisal decisions by contributing to the development of a standardized and controlled vocabulary to describe the factors that archivists consider in the appraisal process.

Finite lists of appraisal criteria, however, also have their limitations. If applied without the benefit of a larger context, such as a broad understanding of a collecting area that a documentation strategy might provide, appraisal criteria help with specific decisions, but they do not direct archivists toward...
the most valuable or most important records. All extant
documentation must be evaluated and ranked according to the
criteria using a fairly labor intensive methodology. One
particular weakness of the appraisal matrices is that they do not
accomodate interrelated records very well. Most of the models
include criteria for evaluating the uniqueness of records, but the
models do not account for the fact that few modern records
provide the only unique source of information about an event, a
social phenomenon, or an individual. One goal of modern
appraisal is to select the best source of documentation, often from
many alternative sources. Furthermore, uniqueness is not always
a virtue. In documenting contemporary society, too much
emphasis on unique records will create a historical record that
fails to capture the essence of everyday life.

New challenges

In spite of the contributions of new appraisal techniques,
these approaches fall short of what is needed to appraise many
modern records. Archivists who have appraised electronic
records in modern information systems have encountered some
of the most challenging issues in appraisal. The only effective
way to insure preservation and continued accessibility of
electronic records is to identify records and data with long-term
value when new information systems are being designed. This
approach would make it possible to build routines into the system
to handle retention, disposition, and preservation of selected
archival data. What this approach requires, however, is all of the
elements of a documentation plan, but a documentation plan that
is developed and in place before any records are ever created--
the ultimate in a proactive approach. Defining which machine-
readable and hard copy pieces of an automated system merit
retention will require discussions with the creators of the records,
with primary users, and with potential secondary users. It will
also require a well-defined set of criteria that archivists can communicate to systems designers to identify which information in the system has long-term value. Furthermore, computing becomes decentralized with the proliferation of microcomputers. Control over systems design, records creation, retention and final disposition are placed in the hands of the users of microcomputers. Archivists need to provide clear guidelines for identifying archival records to microcomputer users who appraise records every time they decide whether to delete or save a document or a record.

In developing new appraisal techniques, archivists could exploit the concept of information systems as a useful framework for appraisal and documentation projects. An information system consists of a set of rules and procedures for collecting, processing, maintaining, and distributing information in order to achieve predetermined results. The concept of information systems has dominated information science and provided the basic framework for the design and development of record-keeping systems for more than two decades. Yet the use of information systems concepts for the analysis and appraisal of records has been limited almost exclusively to a handful of archivists who have conducted serious studies of automated information systems. 23

This is unfortunate because systems designs, diagrams of information flows, system specifications, and other documentation of information systems are rich sources for archivists to begin to understand the background, purposes, and organization of modern records. One purpose of an information system design is to define the relationship between different data

---

23 For an example of an appraisal of a large information system, see Alan Kowlowitz, Archival Appraisal of Online Information Systems, Archives and Museum Informatics, Technical Reports, Part 2 (Fall 1988). The information systems concept is also discussed in Hedstrom, "Is Data Redundancy."
elements, data sets, data sources, and output reports. The design itself makes explicit how information flows among the various parties who have access to the system and often includes information about production and distribution of hard copy output.

Aiming appraisals at the information systems level could also bridge a wide gap between the very broad and abstract goals of some documentation strategies and the quite narrow and pragmatic focus of appraisal methodologies. Some of the proposals for documentation areas seem so broad, that archivists may become paralyzed by the scope of the projects and the complex interrelationships among records. Information systems, while manageable, still capture many of the issues that make appraisal of modern records difficult. For example, the national criminal records system is a complex network for transfer of data on criminal histories, criminal identities, warrants, and other crime-related activities vertically between local, state, and federal law enforcement officials, and horizontally between criminal justice agencies within and between states. In addition to identification, social and demographic background, and criminal history data on millions of offenders and suspects, the system contains data on significant actions taken by police agencies, district attorneys, courts, probation departments, correctional institutions, and parole boards. 24 This system, which includes both electronic databases and hundreds of manual files, contains the most comprehensive information on the nature of crime and criminal activity and forms the basis for analysis of long-term trends. A comprehensive appraisal of the system would require collaborative assessments at the federal, state, and local level because local, state, and federal agencies share data and use the

---

24 Kowlowitz, Archival Appraisal of Online Information Systems, 25-34.
system. Ambitious as a cooperative project may be to appraise the information in this system, such a project would fall far short of a documentation plan on crime and criminal justice.

Archivists have been reluctant to use information systems concepts in the development of new appraisal techniques for several reasons. First, there has been a tendency to reduce fundamental changes in the organization and use of information that result from automated record keeping to the narrow issue of what to do about machine-readable records. Traditional archivists tend not to analyze computer-generated reports, correspondence created in a word processing system, or printed transaction documents as components of an automated system. Instead they are treated as extensions of traditional forms of documentation because they continue to reside on paper in manual filing systems. This approach obscures the processes used to create records, their relationship to other forms of documentation, and the impact of automation on the organization, conceptualization, and use of information.

A second reason that archivists may be reluctant to use information systems concepts, or may find it difficult to do so when they try, is that there is not always a neat fit between the structure of an information system and the structures of the organizations it serves. Information systems can span several units within an organization or pass data from one organization to another. Data or records, which in traditional systems were held exclusively by one unit in an organization, may now be combined with other data in a corporate-wide database which is owned either by everyone or no one. Shared databases within or among organizations undermine the concept of provenance and
make ownership of data and responsibility for its preservation unclear.  

Archivists will not be able to use information systems concepts to analyze all extant documentation. Clearly, only a portion of the most recent records are created and organized in information systems. Nevertheless, where information systems exist appraisal archivists can take advantage of the pre-defined parameters of a system and the explicit relationships among its components to provide a framework for analysis of complex, multi-institutional records. This approach can also address one of the concerns of the documentation strategists: functions which at one time were carried out and documented by a single institution are now carried out and documented in systems and networks.

The appraisal of contemporary records, especially records from automated information systems, will require elements of all the new appraisal techniques discussed above. Archivists need not reject traditional appraisal theory, but they must supplement it with information systems concepts developed by systems analysts and information scientists. Archivists must provide records creators with criteria for identifying records with long-term value, so that they can make special provisions to ensure the longevity of fragile media and transient records. Contemporary records are too voluminous, their interrelationships too complex, and the time to appraise them too short, to allow archivists to review all potentially archival records on a case-by-case basis. Unless archivists refine and implement new appraisal techniques to shape the historical record as it is being created, appraisal will

---

25 For a discussion of these issues in the context of government records, see Hedstrom, "Is Data Redundancy."
become limited to evaluating the remnants of record-keeping systems that someone forgot to erase or destroy.

Margaret Hedstrom is Chief, Bureau of Records Analysis and Disposition, New York State Archives and Records Administration. This article is a revised version of a paper presented at the spring meeting of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference, Albany, New York, 6 May 1989. The author thanks Larry Hackman, Joan Warnow-Blewett, and the readers for Provenance for their comments and suggestions on an earlier draft.
The Very Model of A Modern Major General: Documentation Strategy and the Center for Popular Music

Ellen Garrison

In the last two decades much has been written defining, defending, and extolling an approach to the traditional archival goal of "identification and retention of records of enduring value" called by its supporters documentation strategy. The term itself is relatively new; nowhere, for example, does it appear in Frank Evans's 1974 "A Basic Glossary for Archivists, Manuscript Curators, and Records Managers". But the concept can be found in American archival literature as early as the writings of T.R.


2 Ibid.
Schellenberg, and as this article will demonstrate, many special subject repositories like the Center for Popular Music at Middle Tennessee State University have been practitioners, although not philosophers, of documentation strategy since their inception.

Much of the rhetoric of documentation strategy represents in part a reaction to the attitude toward collection development which dominated the profession until the mid-1970s. Characterized by David Gracy in a 1975 Georgia Archive article as the "spilt milk" approach to collecting, this custodial tradition presumed that all information needed about an individual, an agency, or a movement had been—or would be—captured in records (usually written records) and that the task of the archivist was to await the arrival of the records in a repository and then choose those which ought to be preserved.

This custodial era in archives, which stretches from Hilary Jenkinson and beyond, created a professional world in which acquisitions were, as Larry Hackman has written, "decentralized, uncoordinated and incremental" and the archivist "reactive and passive." Awash in the demands of standardizing finding aids, articulating ethical standards, writing open and equal access policies which also protected privacy and copyright, and preserving fragile materials, archivists easily developed a propensity for collecting what was most easily accessible.

---

3 T.R. Schellenberg, Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), 140, urged archivists to collect all those records "necessary to provide authentic and adequate documentation."


Pressured to show increased holdings by superiors with a preference for papers of prestigious (or at least recognizable) individuals, the many new repositories which mushroomed in the 1960s often found themselves in competition for "prize" records and papers. And archivists, perhaps biased toward the rich, the powerful, and the literate by their own custodial blinders, too often bowed to the influence of researcher-data gatherers, thus subjecting archives to the whims of academic fashion.

When academic winds shifted in the late 1960s, tillers in the vineyard of the "new history," which focused on previously ignored minority groups and the quasi-mythical "common people," discovered and often loudly criticized the biases and gaps in the documentary record assembled during the era of custodial passivity. At the same time other factors within and outside the profession forced archivists to reconsider their own role in the new "information age."

Personal papers (even of those white males) documented an increasingly narrow segment of a society structured in groups in which decision making was becoming institutionalized rather than personalized. Magnetic storage media, photocopier machines, computers, and other new technology had changed the format, content, volume, and even longevity of records. Archivists faced a world filled with more and more paper which recorded less and less information just as budgets shrank and resource allocators from state legislatures to grant agencies demanded accountability and rationality in archival collecting.

In a 1975 article, "The Archival Edge," Gerald Ham, Wisconsin state archivist, former Society of American Archivists (SAA) president, and chair of SAA's Committee on the '70s, catalyzed the thinking of archivists buffeted by these internal and external changes. Building on earlier critiques of the bias of archival documentation by Howard Zinn, Sam Bass Warner and G.P. Coleman, Ham excoriated the profession for a "lack of
imaginative acquisition guidelines or comprehensive collection strategies" and for "a limited view of what constitutes the archival record." Archivists' narrow concept of their task, he argued, had produced "a biased record [with] incredible gaps in the documentation of traditional concerns." He proposed a three-pronged strategy to overcome these deficiencies, including what he called "linkages" between related repositories in order to develop "a co-ordinated acquisitions program... representative in subject coverage [and] inclusive in informational formats." 6

Ham followed this initial foray with papers at the 1980 and 1982 meetings of SAA which outlined specific strategies and tactics for moving into what he termed the "post-custodial era": creation of databases to facilitate sharing information on holdings; research on and development of models in documentation strategy; deaccessioning; reduction of record volume through sampling and micrographics; establishing better pre-archival control of records; disciplined application of appraisal criteria "to the whole range of the historical record"; and, above all, coordinated planning at the repository, multi-institutional, and professional level. 7

Ham spoke primarily from the perspective of a public records administrator, but in 1981 Linda Henry applied the same criticisms and perspectives to special subject repositories in

---


criticisms and perspectives to special subject repositories in another milestone article which summarized the position of the "activist archivist." She too called on archivists "to be more sensitive to and imaginative about the types of material that document the history of American culture" and "to assume responsibility beyond a collection to a responsibility for the subject." She broke new ground, however, in her list of tactics for achieving these goals which for the first time included "creating materials about a special subject" and filling gaps in the archival record by utilizing oral history, videography and other recording techniques. 8

Throughout the 1980s, articles, grant projects, and papers 9 explored the rationale, application, and implementation of what Shonnie Finnegan called, in her 1985 SAA presidential address, "that important but ungainly term 'adequacy of documentation'." 10 The American Archivist devoted an entire 1984 issue to what the

---


editor termed collection management. 11 In a 1986 article, Helen Samuels concisely summarized the rationale and techniques for developing documentation strategies, pleading with archivists to "offer the future not individual trees but a forest." 12 One year later Larry Hackman provided a detailed structural model for undertaking a documentation process, a model illustrated by Joan Warnow-Blewett in a companion article on the American Institute of Physics. 13 That same year the final report of the SAA Committee on Goals and Priorities enshrined "appraisal techniques" and "collecting strategies" as coequal and coordinated articles of faith, committing the profession to a new way of approaching a fundamental archival task. 14

These and other writings on documentation strategy did not directly influence the Center for Popular Music at Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU), since its director is not an

11 Charles R. Schultz, "From the Editor," *American Archivist* 47 (Winter 1984): 3. *American Archivist* followed in the fall of 1987 with an issue exploring efforts to implement a documentation strategy model within a single region. The issue, produced by the New England Archivists (NEA) and guest edited by Eva S. Moseley, included articles on regional strategies for documenting the built environment, religion, high tech industry, rural life, and recreation and tourism. NEA originally planned the issue as a collaborative effort between scholars and archivists; Moseley's introduction explores some of the problems which arose in implementing this plan and the implications thereof for documentation strategy.

12 Helen W. Samuels, "Who Controls the Past?," *American Archivist* 49 (Spring 1986): 124.


archivist. But the center's approach to collecting does embody the process and the product advocated by those who have urged archivists to consider both the universe of documentation and the universe of repositories in establishing acquisition and appraisal policies and to create as well as collect contemporary records. Thus, the center might be considered, in Gilbert and Sullivan's phrase, "the model of a modern major general."

The center's collecting policy is rooted first in the original proposal for the center and in the campus academic programs which it was created to support. English professor Charles Wolfe, an authority on country and gospel music, and Geoff Hull, head of the university's recording industry management program, chaired the proposal committee which included faculty from history, music, and English, and the university librarian. This group has evolved into the center advisory board and thus functions as what Hackman termed a "documentation strategy group," providing advice on collecting policy from both users and creators of the center's resources.

The second major ingredient in defining and delimiting the center's broad mandate has been the education, professional experience, and what center director Paul Wells calls his "instincts." This and all other quotations from Paul Wells taken from interview, 16 November 1987.

Given, Wells says, "a largely free hand" in acquisitions, he has drawn on his academic training in music and folklore, his work as operations manager of the University of California, Los

---

15 This and all other quotations from Paul Wells taken from interview, 16 November 1987.

Angeles (UCLA)-based John Edwards Memorial Foundation collection, and his experience in commercial record production to function as a one-person "strategy implementation group-internal" (Hackman's term). He also developed an informal "strategy implementation group-external" (Hackman again) during the center's early months by making visits to collections at UCLA, Brigham Young University, the Library of Congress, Rutgers University, the New York Public Library, and the Country Music Foundation.

Both sources—internal and external—quickly pinpointed gaps in documenting American popular music. While there are one or more collections devoted to country music, blues, jazz, folk music, hymns, and show/mainstream pop music, no repository specializes in either rock or vernacular religious music. Therefore, the center, while building study-level collections in all genres for use by its campus constituencies, has concentrated its research resources in these two fields.

And the center, unlike most other repositories which specialize not only by genre but also by format (e.g. sound recordings, sheet music, manuscripts), has taken a broad format approach in collecting for both study and research use. The center is not, as the director emphasizes, a sound recording collection. Rather the center's goal is to provide "a picture of the whole," a microcosm of the varied ways in which American culture has been expressed by and through music in a collection which includes monographs, microforms, sheet music, serials, sound recordings, photographs, vertical files, artifacts, posters, and other ephemera as well as manuscripts. By underwriting faculty research projects and by recording center-sponsored lectures, performances, and interviews, Wells also works to fill gaps in the existing documentary record.

The center's approach to collecting is perhaps best illustrated by surveying briefly its research resources documenting the evolution of vernacular religious music. This genre of music has
had five distinct incarnations: congregational hymn singing, participatory singing schools or conventions, performing gospel groups sponsored by songbook publishers, independent performing and recording gospel groups, and contemporary Christian music.

The center’s acquisitions focused first on the products of this evolution: hymnals, singing school songbooks, biographies and autobiographies of performers, serials like *Contemporary Christian Music*, and sound and video recordings ranging from independent-label 78s to "Jesus metal" videos. Manuscript collections like the personal papers donated by MTSU faculty member and gospel music writer Don Cusic, which included over one thousand photographs of gospel performers, boxes of press releases from every major Christian record label, and his notes and other records as a member of the board of the Gospel Music Association, complemented these print and audiovisual resources.

Documenting the process by which this evolution occurred proved more difficult. Traditional gospel music has been too image-conscious for much of the "story behind the story" to appear in print, and much of the development of contemporary Christian music has generated little or no written or printed documentation. To fill these gaps the center turned to producing oral history interviews, conducted by Charles Wolfe and Don Cusic; taping visiting lecturers like Don Butler, executive director of the Gospel Music Association; and locating and copying video tapes of early Christian rock festivals and interviews with Christian rock pioneers Chuck Smith and Paul Baker.

Documentation strategy is, as Helen Samuels has said, "more a matter of spirit than one of process," 17 and this example

---

17 Helen Samuels, Remarks at a session on documentation strategy, *Society of American Archivists annual meeting*, Atlanta, Georgia, 1 October 1988.
demonstrates the way in which the Center for Popular Music has, admittedly unconsciously, built its collections in that spirit. First, the center clearly defined the phenomena which it wished to document: American social and cultural history as expressed through popular music. Second, the center based its collecting emphasis in research-level resources on an assessment of the policies and priorities of other repositories with similar objectives, identifying gaps in this collecting universe and then working with other repositories to serve the needs of its own and other researchers. Third, in building the center's collections, staff analyzed the existing archival, print, and nonprint documentation within those areas on which it chose to focus and then began videography, oral history, and other programs to fill the gaps thus identified.

The center is not, however, a perfect example of documentation strategy. Because neither creators nor users of popular music research materials have a single professional association with which the center can work, the center's "documentation strategy group-external" is at best informal and meets sporadically. And the center's first priority has been and will continue to be the needs of the institution to which it is accountable and from which it receives the resources which support its operations.

Nor is the documentation strategy model without problems and pitfalls. Neither library nor archival descriptive theory supplies adequate tools for establishing intellectual control over a focused multimedia collection such as the center. However, combining the archival technique of collection description and library formats and networks for information exchange enables the center to provide better access for popular music researchers than would either approach alone. For example, library rubrics require item-level cataloging of sheet music and establish access points which are better suited to classical than popular music. But an in-house database which uses appropriate access points
for popular songs (e.g. first line as well as title) complements group-level Archives and Manuscript Control-format entries for sheet music collections in local and national library databases, and these entries in turn direct users to the in-house database.

For the Center for Popular Music the benefits of documentation strategy far outweigh such disadvantages. Consulting with other repositories while developing a collecting policy led the center into a cooperative agreement with the Library of Congress for exchange of duplicate sound recordings. Participation in a center sponsored and recorded concert of traditional string band music prompted one performer to give the center a large collection of demonstration country music tapes produced by his father, a pioneer Nashville promoter.

The list is—or could be—endless. But the greatest benefit of adopting the documentation strategy model in developing a collecting policy is the knowledge that the Center for Popular Music has found and filled a niche in preserving the history of American popular music.

Ellen Garrison is archivist of the Center for Popular Music at Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro. This article is adapted from a paper given at the annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists, Atlanta, Georgia, 1 October 1988.
Declassification of Presidential Papers: The Eisenhower Library’s Experience

David Haight

In 1972, eleven years after Dwight D. Eisenhower left the White House, archivists at the Eisenhower Library began processing his high-level presidential papers. The library submitted its first mandatory declassification review request to United States government agencies in 1973; sixteen years later this declassification process continues with no completion date in sight. ¹ The Eisenhower Library’s experience demonstrates that declassifying recent presidential papers is difficult, expensive, and often frustrating both for the requestor and the library.

¹ William J. Stewart, "Opening Closed Material in the Roosevelt Library," Prologue 7 (Winter 1975): 239-241. Stewart described the Roosevelt Library’s successful declassification of almost all of its classified holdings within thirty years after the end of the Roosevelt administration. This thirty-year time frame will not be approximated by more recent presidential libraries.
Nineteen seventy-two was an important year in the history of the United States government's declassification programs. In March, President Richard Nixon issued Executive Order 11652 entitled "Classification and Declassification of National Security Information and Material." This order contained explicit provisions for the declassification of papers created by presidents and their White House staffs, thus removing these materials from a declassification limbo. The order authorized the archivist of the United States to review for declassification all White House-classified materials over thirty years old. More importantly for presidential libraries with classified holdings less than thirty years old, it established the mandatory classification review system which enabled members of the public to request agency reviews of specified security-classified documents. While the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) allows individuals to request reviews of classified documents among official government records and within official presidential records created after 20 January 1981 (after five years from the time the president leaves office), the mandatory review system covers presidential papers created prior to 20 January 1981 and other donated historical materials excluded from coverage under the FOIA. Executive Order 11652 was superseded by subsequent orders, but the mandatory review provisions survived virtually intact and remain an important part of the current executive order governing national security information, Executive Order 12356, issued by President Ronald Reagan in 1982.

---


3 The texts of pertinent executive orders and directives implementing the orders are published as follows:
Also in 1972, the Records Declassification Division was established within the National Archives with a mandate to review systematically all World War II-era classified information in the archives within three years and to provide overall guidance in handling other security-classified material. The division declassified almost 200 million pages of records within the three-year period, most of which were dated prior to 1946. But the end of World War II marked the end of an era, and the high degree of success in declassifying most records of this period may


have been illusory. Declassification of post-1945 materials in the National Archives and in the presidential libraries has proven to be more difficult.

During the early processing of President Eisenhower's papers, the library staff, working under guidance from the National Archives's Office of Presidential Libraries and the Records Declassification Division, developed mandatory review procedures. Yet, the declassification of Eisenhower's papers is progressing slowly. The processing of papers housed in presidential libraries involves the usual steps: arrangement, refolding and reboxing, taking preservation measures, and preparing finding aids. Before most bodies of White House files and personal papers may be opened for research, however, they must also be reviewed page-by-page to segregate security-classified documents as well as materials withheld for other reasons specified in the donors' letters of gift.  

Locating and withdrawing security-marked documents is only part of the job. Complicating the task is the presence within presidential papers of numerous documents bearing no security markings, which, nevertheless, contain foreign government information provided in confidence, intelligence data, or other potentially sensitive information. Many letters in the holdings of the Eisenhower Library from heads of foreign governments do not bear security markings although they were transmitted to the president in strictest confidence and some deal with delicate foreign relations issues. Numerous "flimsies" whose security markings are barely visible constitute another hazard. Consequently, the processing of these materials requires

---

5 Raymond Geselbracht, "The Origin of Restrictions on Access to Personal Papers at the Library of Congress and the National Archives," *American Archivist* 49 (Spring 1986): 142-162. This is a useful discussion of the application of access restrictions to personal papers in presidential libraries.
particular care and knowledge on the part of reviewing archivists. Carelessness can result in the inadvertent disclosure of national security information and, therefore, security violations leading to possible sanctions. On the other hand, excessive cautiousness may close documents which are no longer sensitive. Archivists' reviewing decisions are sometimes criticized by scholars frustrated by the quantity of national security material withdrawn from presidential collections, and the complaint "everything on my topic is classified" is often heard in the library's research room. Thus, the library's staff is caught in the middle between unhappy researchers whom the staff is trying to serve and the stringent regulations governing national security information. Adding to the staff's burdens is the enormous amount of time consumed typing withdrawal sheets inserted within file folders to tell users what materials have been withdrawn. It often requires eight or more hours for a staff member, frequently a GS-11 or GS-12 archivist, to segregate the classified from the unclassified contents of one archives box (eight hundred pages) and to prepare withdrawal sheets for that box. Only basic arithmetic is, therefore, needed to calculate the significant cost of initially processing a one hundred-box collection of predominantly classified documents.

During the years from 1972 to 1985 the library staff opened for research at least twenty-five manuscript collections containing substantive quantities of security-classified documents. These include such key collections as Dwight D. Eisenhower's papers as president (known as the Ann Whitman
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6 See Alonzo Hamby and Edward Weldon, eds., Access to the Papers of Recent Public Figures: The New Harmony Conference (Bloomington, IN: Organization of American Historians, 1977) for several expressions of frustration over access problems at presidential libraries. One of these papers, highly critical of the Eisenhower Library, is Blanche Wiesen Cook's "The Dwight David Eisenhower Library: The Manuscript Fiefdom at Abilene."
File), the records of the White House Office of the Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, the records of the White House Staff Secretary, and the papers of secretaries of state John Foster Dulles and Christian Herter. These twenty-five collections total approximately 1,080,000 pages with an estimated 250,000 to 300,000 pages withdrawn because of security classification during the initial processing. In addition, smaller quantities of security-classified documents were removed from numerous other collections during this period, and processing of national security materials still goes on. By early 1989 the staff had prepared for research use (typed withdrawal sheets) about 50 percent of the 260,000 pages of security-classified pages of National Security Council staff files sent to the library in 1982.

When a collection is opened for research, withdrawal sheets listing all security-classified and donor-restricted items are inserted within individual file folders. Usually these listings contain the names of correspondents, dates and subjects of documents and number of pages per item unless such information is, itself, classified. In all cases, however, sufficient data is provided to enable individuals examining the collection to know when documents have been withdrawn. Researchers use this information to submit mandatory declassification review requests by filling out forms provided by the library.

These figures are estimates and do not include classified documents in collections currently unprocessed because of various restrictions, including the records of the United States Secret Service Presidential Protection Unit and a large body of Federal Bureau of Investigation investigative files. The figures also do not include the thousands of security classified World War II documents found in the library’s military collections because these are not presidential papers. The library’s classified holdings at the beginning of 1972 may have totalled 350,000 pages, but this is merely a rough estimate.
A relatively small percentage of the researchers coming to the library, plus a growing number of mail order researchers, submit mandatory review requests. Some of those who do ask for one hundred or more documents. The Eisenhower Library does not limit the size of requests because the staff realizes that mandatory review is the principal means of declassifying presidential papers and knows that large requests usually result in more material being reviewed for declassification. Requests are scheduled and processed in a manner that insures fair treatment for all users.

When the library receives a mandatory review request, an archivist examines it carefully to determine whether any documents may be declassified on-site by applying agency declassification guidelines which were not available at the time of initial processing. The staff also checks for items published in the Department of State’s *Foreign Relations* series or other sources and looks for document duplicates previously declassified elsewhere in the library’s holdings. Upon determining that requested documents must be submitted to agencies for review, the staff identifies the originating agency for each item, assigns case and document control numbers, and prepares submission lists and transmittal letters to accompany photocopies of requested documents to the appropriate agencies. Requestors are provided typed copies of all submission lists and are also given instructions on appealing denials. Unlike the Freedom of Information Act, however, the mandatory review system offers no recourse to litigation.

During an average month, the library may receive several new researcher-initiated requests, and agencies return large numbers of documents on which actions have been completed. The staff has found it more efficient to concentrate on one phase, 

---

usually the submission phase first, for a varying period of up to three or four weeks in order to clear out backlogs of new requests. Once the submission backlog is cleared, the staff switches to the returned materials and proceeds to declassify, sanitize, copy, bill, contact researchers, and finally refile declassified material in the open stacks and material remaining classified in the vault. At the library most newly requested items are submitted within twenty days, while returned cases may, because of staff shortages, sit for as long as two months before being processed. Thus, two to three months is usually the maximum time a request is at the Eisenhower Library. During the remaining time, often several months to a year or more, the cases are in transit or are in the agencies' custody awaiting review.

Security is an extremely important consideration in every step of the mandatory review operation. All personnel working with classified materials must have TOP SECRET clearance. Classified documents must be stored in security vaults and containers which meet strict specifications. The control numbers within each submission are essential. Since agency letters normally cite document numbers in indicating declassification and denial actions taken on specific requests, a typographical error or misnumbering of a document could have unfortunate results. The security problems are sometimes exacerbated by agency errors which include: failure to notify the library (and even requestors) of actions taken, renumbering documents, losing or misplacing document copies, and failure to heed library recommendations stated in transmittal letters.

---

9 These are specified in the National Archives and Records Administration Security Manual, copy in mandatory review office files, DDEL.
When agencies return requests after acting on them, the library staff must carefully check the material to see that each agency decision is clear and any required coordination with other agencies has been performed. Often documents are returned with instructions to release them only in part. Thus, sanitized copies with portions redacted must be prepared. This is a tedious process involving the deletion of words, sentences, portions of sentences, full or partial paragraphs, or entire pages from copies, with the original documents remaining in the security vault until they are finally declassified in full. Although time-consuming, sanitization does reflect a commitment by reviewing agencies to release as much information to the public as possible. (Obviously, it takes less time to deny a document in its entirety.) Declassified and sanitized documents must be copied with the released materials being placed in the open files for use by other researchers and the copies sent to requestors who are billed for the reproduction costs.

It should be apparent that the mandatory review system involves a large investment of time by library and agency personnel alike. Often an agency must seek concurring opinions from other agencies or from various offices within the originating agency. Agency declassification offices are often understaffed. As a result, backlogs of pending cases build up, and delays in responding to requests are the norm. For example, the National Security Council (NSC) is responsible for reviewing interest in most White House-originated documents. Consequently, the NSC received the majority of requests transmitted from the Eisenhower Library and large numbers from other libraries as well. But mandatory review requests must compete for reviewing time from the NSC’s small staff with FOIA requests, compiled Foreign Relations volumes awaiting clearance for publication, various litigation matters, and political crises such as the Iran-Contra affair. The Department of State also receives numerous requests from the Eisenhower Library, with other agencies such
as the Department of Defense and the Central Intelligence Agency receiving smaller numbers. Other agencies' reviewing operations also appear to be understaffed. Some agencies use on a part-time basis reviewers who are rotated in and out with a resulting loss of continuity in processing requests. This problem might be alleviated with the use of more full-time personnel to maintain reviewing schedules.

Because of the large backlog of requests stacked up at agencies and recurring notification problems, some mandatory review cases have been carried on the library's books as incomplete for several years. Since 1979 the library has sent letters to delinquent agencies asking them to act on cases outstanding for a year or more. These reminder letters have netted mixed results with a few agencies responding and others failing to do so. These letters are now sometimes followed with telephone calls. Because of the various delays seemingly inherent in the cumbersome mandatory review process, most requests require from a few months to a year or more to complete. Therefore, many researchers on a tight deadline, and probably a tight budget, do not submit requests.

All researchers using the library's national security collections do, of course, benefit from the cumulative results of years of mandatory review actions, but it is a relatively small number of users working on long-term projects who initiate the majority of requests. While, as previously indicated, the submission of a large number of documents on behalf of a few people will usually accomplish significant declassification, the results are often skewed as the types of materials submitted for mandatory review depend on the interests of the users. During a given year, several scholars may conduct research at the library on identical or similar documents repeatedly. Consequently,

---

10 Mandatory declassification review office files, DDEL.
Declassification of Presidential Papers

more material has become available on certain topics than on others. Documents on many countries and topics appear to remain unavailable largely because no one has asked for them while other items are repeatedly submitted and denied.

Declassification success is poor for some subjects. For instance, the Eisenhower administration's covert activities and its nuclear weapons strategy are popular research topics at the library, but only a small percentage of documents requested on these subjects are declassified. Foreign government documents, especially those under thirty years old, are seldom declassified although often requested. Declassification success also varies among geographic areas and countries. For example, a high percentage of requested items on Eastern Europe is consistently withheld because United States policies toward this region have not changed significantly over the years. In contrast, most materials on Vietnam have been declassified when submitted for review.

Although it is often difficult to predict with confidence what types of materials are likely to be released in individual requests, the library staff through experience recognizes certain types of information and documentation for which it can expect many denials. A listing of broad categories of sensitive information, frequently denied, has been incorporated in an information sheet on mandatory review which the library distributes to researchers.\(^{11}\)

Research trends help shape and limit the scope of mandatory review declassification actions as do the agencies' inability to commit adequate staff resources to declassification. In addition, a few restrictive features not included in previous orders have been written into the current executive order on national security information, Executive Order 12356. The order permits only United States citizens or permanent resident aliens to submit

\(^{11}\) Mandatory Review Information Sheet, DDEL.
mandatory review requests. This exclusion of foreign researchers has had a significant impact at the library. From 1983 through 1989 over two hundred foreign citizens (about 16 percent of total researchers during this period) have conducted research in the Eisenhower administration, with most of their work covering aspects of United States foreign policy. In this regard, the mandatory review system differs from the FOIA which does not exclude use by foreign citizens. Some agency officials criticize the act for this reason and urge restricting its use to United States citizens, also.  

The executive order's provision for reclassifying previously declassified information is also worrisome. The order states that the president or an agency head or designated official may reclassify previously declassified information if it is determined in writing that (1) the information requires protection in the interest of national security and (2) the information can reasonably be recovered. Fortunately, the directive implementing the executive order contains specific criteria to be considered before a reclassification action may be taken. These include the time elapsed since the disclosure of the information, the nature and extent of disclosure, the ability to inform the persons to whom the information was released of the reclassification action,

12 See John R. Burke, "The Freedom of Information Act Ten Years On," Perspectives, American Historical Association Newsletter, 24 (January 1986): 24-25. Ambassador Burke, formerly Deputy Assistant Secretary, Classification/Declassification Center, United States Department of State, suggests at least some of the rationale behind this citizenship limitation, citing costs of the FOIA to the United States taxpayers. Burke urged that the act be available only to U.S. citizens as he commented that the Department of State has been obliged to supply information to communist or anti-American newspapers overseas with the results being publication of slanted versions of the information at the expense of U.S. taxpayers.
the ability to prevent further disclosures, and the ability to retrieve the information voluntarily from persons having received it. 13 There have been only a few instances where this was done—and no cases in the past several years.

The presence of numerous duplicates in the library’s holdings poses the continual possibility of submitting copies of previously declassified documents and receiving more restrictive actions on the duplicates. The staff, therefore, searches for duplicates when processing requests. The resubmission of previously sanitized documents also occasionally results in reclassification problems. Researchers often ask that sanitized documents be reviewed again, hoping that more information will be released. The library will resubmit such items when two years have passed since the original sanitization action was taken. Instructions are placed on such documents, indicating to the reviewing agencies which portions have already been released. In spite of these instructions, a few years ago an agency indicated to the library its intention to reclassify sizeable portions of a previously sanitized document knowing that these portions had been open for over five years. The agency was informed of the recoverability test and withdrew its reclassification request.

Finally, in contrast to Executive Order (EO) 11652 which was issued in the wake of the Pentagon Papers controversy, with public availability of government information a major issue, and EO 12065, issued by a president publicly committed to more openness in government, the current executive order appears more restrictive in tone than its predecessors. This restrictive-

---

sounding language disturbs many scholars. The library's experiences, however, suggest that the current executive order merely expresses in writing the attitudes and practices carried on by reviewing agencies which belied the more liberal-sounding previous orders. Executive Orders 11652 and 12065 were not implemented as progressively as many had hoped, and EO 12356, flawed though it may be, is not as bad as it appears. No sharp curtailment of declassification actions on mandatory review requests through the library has occurred under EO 12356, although agency reviewing appears to have become more restrictive in certain areas, particularly intelligence, foreign government information, and relations with European countries.

How successful is the labor intensive and costly mandatory review system? Statistics can tell part, but only part, of the story. From 1973 to 1976 the library, and undoubtedly other government agencies as well, experimented and struggled to develop workable procedures. An accurate assessment of mandatory review success during this period is difficult to make because of inadequate recordkeeping, but the library did submit a few thousand pages with some declassification accomplished particularly on materials relating to normally less sensitive topics.

The Eisenhower Library's institutional memory really began in 1977 when current procedures and formal reporting requirements were established. During the period from 1977 through 30 June 1989, 16,323 documents (60 percent) totalling 52,971 pages (46 percent) were declassified in full after being submitted for agency review. During this time 4,705 documents (17 percent) totalling 35,943 pages (31 percent) were released in

sanitized form while 5,975 documents (22 percent) and 25,810 pages (22 percent) were denied in full. About 78 percent of all documents acted on during these years were declassified in full or in part. For example, one can compare the 79 percent release rate for 1,348 documents acted on in FY 1979 during the Carter administration with the 79 percent release rate for 3,349 documents reviewed in FY 1982 during the Reagan administration. Other years could also be compared with similar results.\(^\text{15}\)

Statistics, of course, do not tell everything. Not included in the above totals are data on documents still pending action after lengthy delays. As of 31 July 1989 the library still had 985 pending cases requested by 197 researchers with approximately 356 of the cases at least two years old. The statistics also fail to indicate the quality of historical materials being declassified and do not reveal the subjects covered.\(^\text{16}\) The library’s declassification accomplishments can perhaps be best illustrated by describing a major category of documents which have been subjected to heavy mandatory review action.

The Eisenhower administration’s conduct of national security policy is recorded in several types of documents. These include summaries of NSC discussions; memoranda of conferences with the president prepared by his White House staff secretary; the president’s communications and conversations with his secretaries of state and defense, members of the Joint Chiefs of

\(^{15}\) Statistical Data, Mandatory declassification review office files, DDEL.

\(^{16}\) The Information Security Oversight Office’s annual reports to the president are primarily compendiums of declassification statistics with little analysis. Thus, ISOO Annual Report to the President FY 1986 describes mandatory review as "a highly successful mechanism for the declassification of information," but does not mention the problems of the system.
Staff, and his national security advisors; his correspondence and memoranda of conversations with heads of foreign governments; and reports, messages, and files reflecting the functioning of various White House offices, presidential commissions and committees. All of these types of materials have been subjected to mandatory review. By the end of 1989 about 530 (80 percent) of White House Staff Secretary’s Memoranda of Presidential Conferences had been declassified in full or in part, and most summaries of NSC meetings through 1959 had been released in part. Consequently, sufficient declassified material now exists to make research on most aspects of the Eisenhower administration’s foreign policy feasible.

The publication of the Department of State’s Foreign Relations volumes for the Eisenhower years is ongoing with most volumes for the years 1952-54 printed and many for 1955 to 1957 also in print. These volumes will have an important impact on the library’s declassification program for years to come. To summarize briefly a project conducted at the library over several years: historians from the Department of State’s Historical Office, with clearances, gained access to and drew heavily upon the library’s classified holdings. As a result of this extensive research, many documents from the library have been selected and printed in the department’s Foreign Relations series after having been submitted to the thorough declassification review process applied to all Foreign Relations prior to publication. The appearance of these volumes gives the staff a useful tool to

---

17 Most of the White House Staff Secretary’s Memoranda of Presidential Conferences, called (Andrew) "Goodpastermemcoms" at the library, are found in Dwight D. Eisenhower’s papers as president (Ann Whitman File), DDEL, with the majority filed in the DDE Diary and ACW Diary series in this collection. The declassification figures are based on a survey of these documents and withdrawal sheets.
consult when processing mandatory review requests. This publication is also used in conducting systematic reviews because it contains titles of papers, names of individuals, and details on subject areas. The publication of the library’s highest level documentation on many national security matters will significantly influence research at the library and will require the staff to continue examining these volumes. When preparing documents for submission to the agencies, one expects to release some documents immediately and submit fewer for agency review.

Much still remains to be done. As of 31 July 1989, an estimated 380,000 pages remained classified. This sheer volume of documentation is one of the major impediments to declassification as the library is forced to rely on the mandatory review system for wholesale declassification. This system was not intended to be used as a program for large-scale declassification; instead, it was established to satisfy individual researcher’s needs for limited numbers of documents. Nevertheless, the library each year transmits thousands of pages via the cumbersome mandatory review route.

Along with volume, the existence of still currently sensitive information in high-level presidential papers holds up their declassification. A frequently stated misconception, possibly fostered by the provisions of Executive Orders 11652 and 12065 for scheduled downgrading and automatic declassification, is that high-level documents can be readily released to the public after a specified time period (thirty or even twenty years). Intermingled throughout the countless numbers of routine memoranda, drafts of public statements, and other items which clearly should be unclassified, are scattered items which may still be sensitive even after twenty-five or thirty years or else are technical in nature. Such materials require review by experienced and expert agency personnel.
Are there any viable alternatives to the expensive mandatory review system? On-site systematic review is often mentioned as a possibility. The Records Declassification Division's experiences with World War II, and now even cold war era, documents are cited as models to follow. The Eisenhower Library received guidelines from the principal agencies allowing the staff to declassify most military and diplomatic information in its holdings created prior to 1946. Consequently, the library's significant body of World War II documentation is almost entirely unclassified. The staff has continued to apply guidelines to documents created during the late 1940s and even to the much larger body of presidential papers created during the 1950s. In contrast to the guidelines for the World War II period, however, guidelines covering 1950s information are more limited in scope, and key agencies, such as the NSC, have issued guidelines which preclude the release of substantive documents by the library. The guidelines for declassification and release of White House-originated classified information, issued by the archivist of the United States in cooperation with the NSC, are helpful in declassifying routine items such as social correspondence and transmittal memoranda, but do not cover most NSC and presidential materials involving substantive foreign relations and national security matters. Most of these materials must still be submitted to the NSC for review.

Other important agencies have, however, developed adequate guidelines which archivists at the library have used to declassify over 5,500 documents totalling 15,700 pages since 1980. These guidelines are limited by their time frame and coverage. For instance, many State Department guidelines currently cover materials created before 1955, although guidances for the 1955-59 period are in use for some countries and regions and are being developed for others. Nevertheless, systematic review continues at the Eisenhower Library as a limited operation which achieves the declassification of much routine material (some would say
"junk") and a limited number of substantive documents whose subject matter is clearly specified as nonsensitive by the guidelines.  

Attempts have also been made with only limited success to induce agencies to send declassification teams to the library to review documents. These have been fairly useful, with the NSC visits being particularly productive because of the preponderance of White House materials. But, the need for inter- and intra-agency coordination is an impediment to on-site reviewing by agency declassification teams. The various agencies may believe they do not have the time and money to invest in a broad cooperative systematic review effort, and there seems to be little incentive for agencies to ask Congress to fund agency systematic review of such materials. The current executive order permits agencies to undertake systematic review of classified materials in their custody but requires only the National Archives to do so.

The Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO), established to monitor the implementation of EO 12065 and now 12356, advocates in its annual reports to the president the need for increased systematic reviewing within the National Archives.  

While acknowledging that systematic reviewing, either on-site by archivists or by agency personnel in Washington, D.C., is expensive, it might be fair to ask a few questions. Should the National Archives, pursuant to ISOO’s recommendations, invest more money and personnel into assisting various agencies develop guidelines or conducting systematic review? Should the archives help pay for a representative of the NSC, alone or with other agency representatives, to spend an extended period at the Eisenhower Library reviewing classified materials? Should the

---

18 Monthly declassification reports, mandatory declassification review office files, DDEL.

National Archives request a supplementary congressional appropriation to fund such declassification activities? While these questions may not be easily answered without considerable study, they might suggest possible future courses of action. For any of them to be answered positively means that the Eisenhower Library's and the National Archives's relationship with agencies must be based on cooperation and trust.

In the meantime, the Eisenhower Library staff expects to continue to invest much time and effort in the mandatory review operation because at present it is, in effect, the "main declassification show in town." The library, aided by increased automation, will continue to strive to improve its mandatory review procedures. Many forms, standard letters, agency addresses, and other data can now be stored on and readily retrieved from computers; perhaps other applications of automation can be found to streamline the process.

Certainly, the library's declassification efforts appear to be justified by public demand and by results. As many as two out of every three researchers at the library work on national security-related topics. The staff receives and processes a large number of requests every year with no appreciable change in activity likely anytime soon. The library tries to inform researchers of declassification developments with its "Quarterly Listing of Declassified Documents," an in-house listing of all documents declassified through mandatory review. This listing is often purchased or borrowed through inter-library loan. Despite the efforts, however, the library will probably never succeed in fully satisfying users. Research on many important issues of the 1950s will continue to be hampered by the classification problem. Researchers working on files which have largely been declassified still complain about the occasional item remaining classified or sanitized.

In summary, the Eisenhower Library, through the expenditure of considerable resources, has achieved the full or
partial declassification of over ninety thousand pages of high-level documents since 1973 plus several thousand pages of routine material. Many research projects, impractical a few years ago, can now be undertaken at the library with satisfactory results. Nevertheless, entire series remain largely classified, and the mandatory review procedure must continue indefinitely. On-site systematic reviewing at this and other presidential libraries will probably remain secondary in importance to mandatory review, in contrast to the systematic reviewing conducted at the National Archives. It is clear that the Eisenhower Library staff will still be deeply involved in declassification years beyond 1991, the thirtieth anniversary of the end of the Eisenhower administration. Consultations with archivists at more recent presidential libraries with even greater quantities of security classified materials indicate that these libraries also face many long years of declassification work. For the Eisenhower Library, after years of processing national security collections, the declassification picture is a mixed one, with some success, some disappointments, and many headaches and frustrations. Declassification will not occur automatically. It will be accomplished only through the combined efforts of archivists and agencies responding to researchers' demands.

David Haight, an archivist at the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library since 1971, has been involved in the declassification process from the beginning. This article is a revised version of a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists, St. Louis, Missouri, 27 October 1989. The author expresses his appreciation for the assistance and support provided by many people including Carol Briley, Linda Ebben, John Fawcett, Nancy Smith, Mack Teasley, Alan Thompson, and especially Barbara Constable and Linda Smith who are largely responsible for operating the Eisenhower Library's mandatory declassification review program. The opinions expressed herein, however, are solely the author's.
The Provenance of Provenance in Germanic Areas

Maynard Brichford

The conventional story is that the principle of provenance was "formulated at the French National Archives" in the 1820s and adopted gradually in nineteenth century Europe as a response to the necessity to organize archival material for scholarly research. Based on the 1841 French statement concerning respect des fonds in departmental archives, the Prussian edict of 1881, the publication of the classical and neutral formulation by Muller, Feith, and Fruin in 1898, and the international ratification at the Brussels Conference in 1910, the principle of provenance became a governing factor in archival arrangement.

This story does not always take into consideration the status of archival practice and the literature available at the time. Often, the story was written by archivists who were influenced by their association with programs that had invested man-years in the restoration of provenance. Many archives were planned and established and had arrangement systems determined long before the French Revolution. Provenance or organization
according to source was a natural and normal practice. Bureaucracy and hierarchy provided a rational organizational structure for government and a natural organizational scheme for archives. Archivists had kept records according to their origin in chancellery or financial chamber for hundreds of years. Provenance was a significant factor in the authentication, appraisal, and description of archives as well as their arrangement. While archival theory and practice developed along parallel lines in all major European states, the acceptance of the principle of provenance in the German states of Prussia, Saxony, Hesse, Bavaria, and Austria illustrated how archival growth and state building established provenance as a fundamental part of archival theory. 1

In 1632, the Venetian scholar Baldassare Bonifacio noted that "order itself is something divine" and that academicians called order "the soul of the world." He held that "confused and badly mixed" archives "are of no use." In the ninth chapter of his De Archivis, Bonifacio recommended dividing archives first by locations, then by affairs, and finally by times. Locations were for material pertaining to the Italian cities from which Venice received records. Affairs included categories for wills, trade documents, and contracts. His strong commitment to a tertiary chronological order was followed by an appeal for alphabetical indexes. 2


There is a direct connection between diplomatics and provenance or respect des fonds—between the seventeenth and eighteenth century work of the Maurist scholar Jean Mabillon and Göttingen history professor Johann Gatterer and those who formulated the nineteenth century archival theory of arrangement. In 1681, Mabillon’s *De Re Diplomatica* created the science of documentary criticism and the authentication of documents. Mabillon’s detailed studies and comparisons of documents issued from the same chancellery focused attention on the source of records. In 1764, Gatterer founded a historical institute to provide an academic basis for instruction in the disciplines required for archival practice. Diplomatic manuals included sections on the chancelleries, their organization, and documents they issued.

Before the French Revolution, archivists were administrative or juridical officials who supplied documents to support the claims of kings, ministers, or institutions or to defend the laws and privileges of the state against hostile claims. By the eighteenth century, the influence of the Benedictine Maurists and Jean Mabillon had established a school of historians who valued both the knowledge and the serious study of original documents. As a result of this movement, the French Bourbon monarchs appointed jurist-scholars, such as Theodore Godefroy, to be archivists for the royal Trésor des Chartes. In the post-revolutionary reaction, the nobility employed archivists as

---

"feudalists" who could recognize the surviving registers of fees and debts. Working with these old documents required experienced jurists familiar with customary law or Roman law for former times. 4

Governments kept records arranged in chronological series and alphabetical by subject, that is, topic, person, or place. In Germany, registers date from the fifteenth century when a general growing differentiation in the organization of public administration and management occurred. Registries formed the genetic elements of archives. The first German works on the care of registries were published by Jacob von Rammingen at Heidelberg in 1570 and 1571. Between 1713 and 1715, Jakob Wencker published two manuals on archival practice in Strassbourg. In the latter half of the eighteenth century, many archival texts appeared. In his 1777 archival manual, Brandenberg archivist Philipp E. Spiess extolled the "permanent order" that the archives provided for office registries and declared that access should be the main criterion for evaluating arrangement systems. In 1928, Hans Kaiser lamented that archivists ignored Spiess's sound advice and, influenced by the "systematizing spirit of the 18th century," established subject arrangements. In 1783, Karl G. Günther’s Über die Einrichtung der Hauptarchive besonders in teutschen Reichslanden proposed groupings according to internal affairs and external affairs with many divisions and subdivisions. Texts by Johann C. Gatterer (1799), Friedrich Stuss (1799), Karl F.B. Zinkernagel (1800) and Georg A. Bachmann (1801) took similar approaches. In 1786, Bavarian Karl von Eckhartshausen wrote that "organization is

the first pillar of archival sanctity." He stressed the importance of a knowledge of governmental organization and arrangement for future use. In his 1796 text, published in Augsburg, Ludwig Benedikt wrote that the "principal aim" of the archivist was to arrange the official documents and papers in his custody. In 1788, the Prussian government adopted the principle of chronological filing.

With slight variations, most German states adopted systems for the chronological accumulation of documents relating to specific topics or functions in bundles, cartons, or binders. Before 1808, single subject files were typical. Thereafter, the volume of records increased rapidly, and collective records relating to many subjects became common. Subject classification appeared to facilitate user access to the rapid accumulation of archives, and it was championed by secondary users such as historians. In 1833, L.B. von Medem of Stettin wrote that "arrangement is almost the purpose of the archives, without it the archives is meaningless; its use inconceivable." 5

Archival growth was the driving force in the development of German archival theory and practice. From 1457 to 1924, 232 archives were established in the German-speaking countries of Europe. In this 467-year period, half of the archives were founded in four time periods amounting to 100 years—seventeen in the generation following the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, thirty-two in the forty-five years after the 1715 Treaty of Rastatt as Hohenzollern Prussia and Hapsburg Austria achieved dominance, fifty-five in the thirty-five-year period at the close of the Napoleonic wars, and twelve in a five-year period at the founding of the modern German state in the 1860s. These periods of state building following major peace treaties provided optimal conditions for archival growth. The employment of new archival staff at the four key cities of Berlin, Munich, Stuttgart, and Vienna reached twenty-five in the decade of the 1850s and continued at a high rate until 1939. The late nineteenth century was a growth period for large archives, city archives, and Austrian archives.  

The problem of mass was of increasing importance in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as modern nation states took shape and the use of printed forms spread. Case files and dossiers for military, health, and penal purposes became common as governmental records systems. With the increasing volume of official records, registries began to identify the value of documents in advance and to authorize their destruction and divide them for filing according to value, for example, the French schedules of the 1840s. While many of the old privileges were abolished in the era of the French Revolution, archival records


gained new importance for scientific research. The growth of the Austrian Haus-, Hof-, und Staatsarchiv shows the dramatic increase in archival holdings during the nineteenth century:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>Record files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>13,125</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>63,250</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>7,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>71,750</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between 1866 and 1878, the Hessian archives in Marburg grew from twenty-five hundred to ten thousand linear meters. The increased volume of archives and the growth of archival institutions in the nineteenth century are also reflected in the construction of buildings to house archives. Archival buildings were erected in Vienna (1843-46 and 1899-1902), Düsseldorf (1873-76), Breslau (1875-77), Wiesbaden (1879-81), Strasbourg (1894-97), and Karlsruhe (1902-05). In many other cities, castles, palaces, government buildings, libraries, museums, and other structures were converted to archival uses.  

The wars of the Napoleonic era emphasized the potential value of documentary patrimonies and the problem of alienation. Napoleon’s seizure of archives and their removal to Paris contributed to an increased concern for provenance as an organizational principle. The emperor attempted to create a vast central European archives in Paris for international historical

---

research. On his orders, 35,000 boxes, 15,556 trunks, and 12,049 files were moved from European capitals to Paris. The cornerstone for the new Archives Nationales was laid on 15 August 1812, but the fall of the empire led to the provisions of Article 31 of the Peace of Paris, which required the return of all archives, plans, and other documents. The principle that records belonging to territories pass with sovereignty to the newly formed states has been accepted by settlements from the 1356 Treaty of Paris between the Dauphin and Savoy to the 1919 Treaty of Saint Germain establishing new nations from the Austro-Hungarian empire.

The principle of provenance was not a new idea, but a theoretical formulation based on experience. Like other successful theories, provenance gained acceptance. Several factors contributed to its development. First was the termination of ecclesiastical archives, the 1803-06 period of Mediatisierung in which sovereignty passed from independent imperial states to new national states, and the consolidation of archival resources in public repositories. A second factor was an increase in the conflicting pressure on archivist-jurists and archivist-scholars to organize material in accordance with subject interests, that is, the principle of pertinence.

The parallel evolution of romantic and scientific history has characterized modern archival development. Whether annals, chronicles, pamphlets, or tracts, records were compiled to glorify the Middle Ages and legitimize nationhood. At the same time, universities launched research efforts to understand the past "wie es eigentlich gewesen ist" (as it actually was)—a phrase used by

---

the director of the Vienna Archives in a twenty-two-volume history begun in 1778. In the early nineteenth century, the romantic movement brought a renewal of taste for medieval history. Political events, which rendered the mass of old documents of little use for administration and justice, strengthened the demand for archivists who were historical scholars rather than jurists. In 1819, in proposing the compilation of a state history, Friedrich Wilkens of the Berlin Academy of Sciences recommended that the holdings of the Prussian state archives from different districts, institutions, cities, and religious foundations should be kept together in an arrangement by source. "To mix different archives in confusion" was not advisable.9

After the Peace of Tilsit in 1807, the Prussian state developed modern departmental ministries. The archives of the new ministries were soon added to the archives of the old state council. By 1815, the new ministerial registers were reaching the archives. The "old flasks," or classifications suitable for the old Brandenburg state, were receiving the "new wine," or the records of nineteenth century Prussia. The resulting "disaster" involved an application of the principle of arrangement according to subject rather than the historical-archival arrangement according to the source or provenance of the registers. This situation continued for the next fifty years as some incoming records were distributed according to chronological or subject schemes. Only a group of experienced archivists made the access system in the Prussian state archives tolerable. From 1853 to

---

1873, Gottlieb Friedlaender, an archivist with library experience, was a determined advocate of subject arrangement.

In 1875, Heinrich von Sybel took over the direction of the archives. Records delivery lists provided links between registry locations and archival locations, but the mixing of documents and the lack of a thorough, absolute system brought increased demands for an effective arrangement principle. On 1 July 1881, Sybel issued the regulations adopting the principle of provenance and the registry principle. Written by Max Lehmann, they required arrangement according to source and the maintenance of the order and file designations assigned in the agency of origin. The segregation of older record groups from those of the newer administrative authorities was facilitated by the Prussian practice of fastening or binding the documents. Thus, the merger of files or bundles from different origins was somewhat superficial and relatively easy to correct. In 1896 and 1907, the 1881 regulations were extended to description work and made applicable to provincial archives within Prussia. ¹⁰

In 1869, Karl Menzel noted that the different German states held similar archives and that it should be possible to draw up similar rules for their classification and arrangement. Conceding that many archives had satisfactory arrangement practices, he criticized "incorrect viewpoints" and, specifically, schemes

developed to serve administrative needs that could not be adapted for use by scholars. Menzel noted that nonofficial or private use of the Prussian state archives in 1868 outnumbered administrative use by 653 to 521. Seven years later the ratio of private to administrative use was 969 to 500. Noting that the scholars became more numerous every year, he concluded that a re-examination of arrangement practice was mandatory. He cited examples of scholars' access problems, but counseled archivists to act conservatively and retain "what is useful from the old" so that both administrative and scholarly users could use the arrangement and not be confused by frequent changes in archival practice. 11

Similar developments were occurring in Saxony, where, in 1816, Christian Heinrich Delius offered a plan to unite Saxon archives in Halle. A student of Gatterer and collaborator with the Prussian statesman and scholar Baron Heinrich von Stein, Delius proposed that documents should be separated on the basis of origin and not "disunited according to an arbitrary classification." Delius's plan was not carried out. In 1822, Karl Hahn was instructed to establish a provincial archives in Magdeburg. Heinrich A. Erhard was chosen to direct the arrangement and inventorying of archival records. He devised a geographical subject system to establish "territorial provenance." Like most such schemes, Erhard's divisions resulted in a mixture of provenance and pertinence. From 1822 to 1846, Christian L. Stock organized records and accepted registry order as superior to the subject scheme outlined in his instructions. By 1834, when a second Saxon archives was
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founded in Dresden, a provenance system had been formulated and was in use. Around 1850, a reaction in favor of subject arrangements set in, which lasted until 1906.  

When the Hessian state archives were assembled at Marburg in 1867, Kassel archivist Christian Grein adopted a subject scheme based on Zinkernagel’s 1800 archival handbook. At this time, the Prussian archives in Berlin was adopting a provenance system based on formation and origin, but, in 1870, the director in Berlin approved Grein’s system for the merged Hessian archives in Marburg. In a 5 March 1873 instruction, Prussian state archivist Max W. Duncker stated the basis for the application of the principle of provenance in the Hessian archives. In 1877, when Gustav Könnecke became chief of the Marburg archives, provenance was recognized as the controlling principle of arrangement.  

Bavaria’s archival history was well documented. From 1881 to 1896, Max J. Neudegger published five monumental volumes on the history of the Palatine-Bavarian archives of the Wittelsbach family. He discussed provenance, the creation of new record groups, and organizational structures and arrangement. His chronologies record the first archivist (1589), the centralization of the archives and registry system (1640), problems relating to volume and classification (1710), academic work in documentary criticism (1727-32), Eckartshausen’s decree concerning arrangement (1784), and frequent removals and losses due to wars. The Bavarian archives law of 26 June 1799 established the archives for the kingdom. Archivist Franz J. von Samet coped with the dislocations and wars of the 1790s and the

---


secularization of religious institutions and territories that brought a continuous flow of new material into the state archives. Primarily a collector, von Samet arranged his holdings in three parts according to state and feudal geographical jurisdictions, city and markets, and religious. The secondary arrangement was alphabetical. Under the capable hand of Maximilian Joseph Count Montgelas, the archives survived the Napoleonic tumult. The best contemporary account of archival life is provided by Karl H. von Lang's memoirs. A Swabian, von Lang worked his way through the positions of protocolist and secretary for the Hardenberg house. He prepared records inventories, wrote a family history, and supplied "a fresh pile of dispatches" for the baron's signature each day.

When the Bayreuth archivist, Philipp Spiess, died in 1794, Hardenberg commissioned von Lang as his replacement in the position of privy archivist, with a salary increase from 240 to 1,000 gulden. In 1811, von Lang went to Munich to establish the imperial Wittelsbach archives and, a year later, received an official appointment to a position that carried a salary of 4,000 gulden. His memoirs record his concerns when his employers in Munich asked for an archives plan for "the institutions and people" as if he were "the director of a new acting troupe" and when his predecessor refused to hand over the key to the office. Von Lang persevered, learned about the topography of Bavaria and its officialdom, and developed a plan for Bavarian historical research. In the late nineteenth century, the military archives and other new record groups were not mixed with previous holdings, and access was improved by guides and indexes. A final commitment to provenance came in the 1920s.  

Based on a proposal by Christian J. Schierl von Schierendorff in the 1720s, the Austrian Hapsburg house archives were planned in 1748 and formed in 1749. Archives of other state offices and regions were added during the reign of Empress Maria Theresa. The archival removals and turmoil of the Napoleonic wars increased interest in improved archival organization. Archives director Josef Hormayr organized the Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv in 1810. The organizational and territorial complexities of the empire and the record groups it produced prompted Ludwig Bittner to describe the nineteenth century as the period of artificial or synthetic arrangement systems. Until 1851, the archives centralized its holdings in Vienna, and Josef Knechtl was in charge of arrangement work. While Theodor von Sickel, who founded the Institute for Austrian History in 1854, understood the concept of organic archival bodies of records and the principle of provenance, the Viennese archives directors were unable to develop an arrangement program. In the years after 1897, Director Gustav Winter sought to achieve a synthesis between the numerical control system based on the guidelines in the founding decrees of 1749-52 and the principle of provenance. The appearance of the German edition of the Dutch manual (Muller, Feith, and Fruin) in 1905 and the adoption of provenance by the International Congress in 1910 removed the last opposition in the Austrian archives. 

The establishment of new archives in the nineteenth century created a demand for professional literature. German archivists


Bittner, Gesamtinventar, 16-17, 20-22, 24, 35, 138, 143-144, 149.
published four journals. In 1806, Paul Österreicher and F. Döllinger published the *Zeitschrift für Archivs- und Registraturwissenschaft* in Bamberg. In 1834, Ludwig F. Hoefer, Heinrich A. Erhard, and L. B. von Medem issued the *Zeitschrift für Archivkunde, Diplomatik und Geschichte* at Hamburg. Erhard’s section on the organization of the archives related to physical arrangements and archival skills. In 1850, Friedrich T. Friedemann published the *Zeitschrift für die Archive Deutschlands* at Gotha. The first three journals did not long survive. Most of the contents concerned diplomatics, paleography, and news of archival institutions. In 1875, Franz von Löher began publishing *Archivalische Zeitschrift*, which included information on archival organization. 18

Scholars developed a strong interest in publishing archival resources. In 1819, Baron von Stein organized a society to publish the source documents for medieval German history. He hired Georg H. Pertz as editor, and the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* became a model for historical criticism, a powerful incentive for the development of archival programs, and a "nursery of...archivists." Leopold von Ranke, the central figure among nineteenth century German historians, was introduced to archival sources by one archivist, borrowed his "wie es eigentlich gewesen ist" phrase from another archivist, and used archives throughout Europe. These contacts have not been stressed by historians as much as the denial to Ranke of access to the Vatican Archives and his practice of having assistants bring documents from the archives to his home, where they were read to the

master to secure his decisions concerning copying. In 1894, the Prussian Academy of Science began publication of *Acta Borussica*, an administrative history of the eighteenth century Prussian state.  

Archival principles and theory are based on and validated by experience or practice. National pride may stimulate claims of priority or uniqueness. The evidence suggests that the acceptance of the principle of provenance was a slow process and not the sudden result of decrees, edicts, regulations, and endorsements. Archivists had always recognized the fundamental advantages of arrangement according to source. The principle of provenance was a response to changing conditions in the nineteenth century. These included the reorganization of postrevolutionary national governments; new types of records and new governmental functions, in part due to the secularization of religious institutions and the centralization of power; shifts between centralized and decentralized systems; systemizers who sought to cope with increasing volume of records; scholars who created a new clientele for archives; library classification systems; and bureaucratic and professional pressures for regulations and standards. In 1983, Lieselott Enders summarized the usefulness of the principle of provenance in the organization or arrangement of records; its value as an appraisal principle in selecting the documentation of specific registry builders; and its role as research principle for the authentication of archives by the investigation of archival sources and source criticism. Enders's observations constituted a current endorsement of an archival principle based on centuries of experience. Information in

---

archival sources is not a commodity with a common, fixed market value. Its significance lies in its source. ¹⁸

Maynard Brichford is University Archivist at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
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When Archivist Meets Architect

Donald B. Schewe

Most archivists are better prepared to file and retrieve blueprints than to read them, more comfortable with COM (Computer Output Microfiche) than CAD (Computer Assisted Design), and better prepared to discuss linear feet of documents than square feet of floor space. Yet archival repositories do not spring up full-blown, and if the space an archival facility is to occupy is going to be utilitarian and provide for the various specialized needs of an archives, the archivist must become involved with the design process. In practical fact this means working with an architect either to design new space or to refurbish old space. This can be done, even if the archivist is
untrained in construction methodology, mechanical engineering, or quantum physics.

The first and most important step to be taken once the decision to build or remodel has been made is to establish a relationship with an architect. This may sound fairly simple and straightforward, but it requires more than just meeting and becoming friendly with the architect (important as that is). The architect will want to know who the client is—that is, who has the ultimate say in the building, which can often be translated into who pays the bills. The architect will set out to please the client, whomever that may be. Few archivists will enjoy the luxury of being the client—usually there is a board or an agency that really pays the bills, and the archivist is the employee or agent of that group. The wise archivist will establish his relationship with the board or agency, and his relationship with the architect vis-a-vis the board, at the very first meeting. That lets the architect know where he stands and where the archivist stands, so when the archivist says he needs seventy-two degrees and 50 percent humidity twenty-four hours a day the architect knows that a special heating and cooling plant will have to be built into the building, and this is not a luxury that can be dropped later when the need arises to cut costs.

Part of establishing a relationship with the architect also includes agreeing very clearly in the beginning what is expected of both parties. It is best to have a full-service architect, who will work throughout the construction project providing a number of services (explained below). But it is important to establish in the beginning what the agreement with the architect is. This includes what the architect charges for services, how and when payment is to be made, what charges for extras are, who is the contact person when questions arise, and any other possible questions.

At the same time, it is helpful to establish what type of building is expected. The primary purpose of buildings is to be
utilitarian—they are meant to keep the elements off while the occupants go about their business. This is easy to forget, because buildings can also be quite elegant, and the frills can catch the attention of the architect rather than the functional necessities. These frills may or may not cost a good deal of money, but the balance between the utilitarian and the beautiful should be established. This will probably mean that some compromises will have to be made along the way, but it is important to establish in the beginning where to stand with regard to these trade-offs.

There are also architects who will get carried away with "the importance of history," "the grandeur of the past," and "the romance of the written word." They will design a building to reflect on the outside the importance of what is inside. This may or may not be a good idea. Some grand architectural statements are wonders to behold, but impossible to work inside. There will need to be compromise here as well, and it is best to gain agreement from the beginning on what is paramount—the functional utility of the building or its architectural statement.

Very few people understand what archivists do, and architects are no exception. Unless the architect has built an archives before, he will probably not understand what the archivist needs. It is up to the archivist to explain this to the architect. There are various ways this can be done, but two elements are essential: the first is a written statement of needs and the second is site visits with the architect to other archival repositories.

The statement of needs will take a good deal of time to prepare, but it is essential to spend this time in order to let the architect know what the purpose of the building is. The statement should start with a general overview of what the building's uses will be and include what standards are expected in the structure. The Society of American Archivists, Association of Records Managers and Administrators, National Fire Protection Association, and other professional organizations
provide such standards, and it is a good idea to secure copies of these and include them with the statement of needs. Then, it is helpful to address each area within the building and explain what that area's uses are. Go into as much detail as possible: include a complete description of what activities take place in the area; what light levels are needed, both artificial and natural; any special needs for electricity; what temperature and humidity controls are standard; whether water and sewer service are necessary here; what load levels the floor must support; what areas should be located next to each other; and any other special needs for that area. And the archivist should not worry if some of the needs are conflicting--these can be resolved later. The important thing is to be imaginative and come up with all possible needs.

The needs book should be prepared and given to the architect well in advance of any visits to other archival repositories. These visits give the archivist an opportunity to highlight important points made in the book. They also provide a chance to compare various approaches to building problems, both good and bad. (Before visiting an archival repository, contact someone there who can talk to archivist and architect about the pros and cons of the place--not to mention someone who will be honest about his facility. It is often helpful to have the architect talk to the architect who designed the building to be visited.) These visits are also opportunities for the archivist to get to know and work with the architect.

At this point the architect begins the design process, and the archivist's responsibility is to assist in this effort. The temptation for the archivist is to assume that knowledge of how archivists work automatically translates into knowledge of how to design an archival repository. This is not necessarily true. A good architect will look for and suggest new ways of laying out the building and alternative solutions to the conflicting needs outlined in the needs book. A good archivist will look at the
proposed plans with an open mind and see whether the architect's suggested solutions will work. Just because the research room has always had a door on the north side is no reason not to have one on the east side. A good way to test plans is to take them and "walk through" a typical day, looking at how normal operations would take place in the new structure. If something in the new building will not work, or will not work well, tell the architect, and more importantly, tell him why it will not work. This is a give-and-take process and should not be expected to happen in one or two sessions. A complex building can take several months to design properly.

Once the compromises have been made and difficulties resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned, construction can begin. This does not end the relationship of archivist and architect. A full-service architect will continue to work throughout the construction process. No matter how well designed buildings are, inevitably changes will be necessary as unexpected problems arise. Manufacturers discontinue items specified in the original design, or weather delays impact construction schedules; these and a thousand and one other questions must be resolved as the building rises from the ground, and the architect is an integral part of this process.

It is a good idea to have a regular meeting (probably weekly) between the archivist, the architect, and the various contractors and subcontractors. At such meetings these difficulties can be resolved. Additionally, this is a way to keep in touch with the progress of the building (whether it is on schedule or not), and how close the project is to the original budget.

As construction nears completion it is important to work closely with the architect to develop a "punch list" of those items the contractor will need to complete before the building is acceptable and final payment will be made. It is helpful to all concerned if these problems are pointed out as they are discovered, rather than waiting to the end of the project. Even
so, at the end reserve a day (or more) for walking through the building and preparing a final list of problems to be resolved. The architect will be very helpful in this process and should be viewed as an agent of the archivist (or the archivist’s agency) in dealing with the contractor.

The day will come when the records are moved into the building and the carpenters and painters leave. This does not end the relationship between the archivist and architect. If the archivist is happy with the building, he should indicate it by nominating the architect for some of the awards given by groups such as the American Institute of Architects. (Awards might also be considered for the construction company, the various subcontractors such as heating and air conditioning, and any special-applications contractors.)

This ends the relationship, right?

No, not quite yet. The architect will want his new potential clients to come see his work, and the archivist should accommodate that. After all, the archivist found out about the architect by talking to some of his earlier clients.

Not only that, but other archivists, just starting on the process of building a new facility will be asking for help and bringing their architect to see the latest in archival construction. If a good relationship with the architect was maintained, the archivist will be able to ask him to talk to the visiting architect and to provide the type help one professional can give to another. Or, the archivist might even write an article about working with architects.

Donald B. Schewe is director of the Jimmy Carter Library. This article is adapted from a presentation given at the fall meeting of the Society of Georgia Archivists, Roswell, Georgia, 22 September 1989.
Team Collaboration through the Design Process, or What an Architect Says to a Friendly Archivist

Larry C. Sweat

The intent of this article is to remove the shroud of mystery behind what a design professional does and to help create a viable dialogue between the archivist and the architect. Archivists should be viewed as experts. The complexities of operating an archival library are best understood by the people who work day-to-day in and maintain their facility. Conversely, architects are trained problem-solvers who should be able to present creatively alternative solutions about how the building may work or how people may use it. Consideration of these different solutions can often lead to improvements of existing situations. A significant contribution from both parties throughout the design process is critical to a successful project.

Below is an outline of this team approach.

I. PREDESIGN
   A. Roles of the Archivist.

      1. Accept responsibility for clear, timely direction to the architect. Establish one point of contact, who has the authority to make decisions.

      2. Develop a detailed program, even if it ultimately changes. This program should include but not be limited to the following:

         a) Approximate square footage calculations of each space,

         b) A written description of each building component and how staff and the public use them,

         c) A list of equipment required for each space, and
d) Specific do’s and dont’s for each space (natural light, security, climatic control, etc.).

3. Provide site information which should include the following:
   a) Topographical survey,
   b) Area or campus map, and
   c) Architectural drawings of the existing facility.

4. Use colleagues as a resource.
   a) Interview other administrators of similar facilities.
   b) Gather published technical data on equipment.

5. Use case studies of other leading facilities and collect drawings of these projects.

6. Nuts and bolts
   a) Be able to describe the current structural, mechanical, electrical, security and fire protection systems.
   b) Be prepared to describe how "smart" a building from a technical standpoint is needed.

7. Involve the campus planner in early design discussions.
   a) Input from this professional will be important to integrate the facility into a campus plan or city context.
   b) Public access and physical connections to other buildings can be improved or designed at this stage of the project.

B. Roles of the Architect.

1. Questions for the archivist.
   a) What are the goals of the new facility?
   b) Why are the archivists in need of this project?
   c) What existing conditions work well, which do not?
d) What elements of the facility can be flexible in their location? What elements have to maintain certain adjacencies to function properly?

e) What should be the perceived image of this new facility?

f) What quality level will be expected?

g) What will the budget constraints be?

h) In what sequence do different uses of the building occur (public, staff, service, processing of documents, etc.).

i) What will the schedule be?

j) What technical equipment is required?

k) What parts of the facility, if any, could be added at a future date?

2. Code Research.
   a) The architect should do a thorough code analysis of zoning and life safety requirements.

3. Correspondence.
   a) The architect should provide clear and accurate documentation of project meetings.

4. Contractual agreement.
   a) Both parties should resolve this issue as soon as possible.
   b) Contracts should include but not be limited to scope of work, schedule, payments, add services, reimbursables, etc.

5. Site Analysis.
   a) In initial meetings, the architect should request a visit to the proposed site and a walk-through of existing conditions with the archivist.
   b) The architect should incorporate this site research into a site analysis.

   a) These diagrams should be organized in a clear format and should illustrate the different
relationships of each building component. They should be used as a tool to gain client input.

7. Quiet time.
   a) The architect will need a period of time to formulate alternative conceptual solutions to the design problems.

II. CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

A. Alternative design schemes.
   1. These schemes, produced by the architect, should be diagramatic and to scale.
   2. They should be presented in a clear, comparative format.
   3. The architect should encourage the archivist’s participation in working sessions and provide him with multiple sets of prints to review with his staff.

B. Strong direction.
   1. The archivist will have to prioritize and evaluate design considerations.
   2. The archivist must provide clear direction of which concepts to pursue.

C. Revision or refinement.
   1. The architect will require time to generate other concepts or to revise and refine one of the previously discussed schemes.

III. FINAL CONCEPT

A. Architectural drawings.
   1. As a final concept is developed, the architectural drawings should become more detailed and accurate.
   2. The architect should discuss with the archivists what type of presentation techniques will be most suited for their needs.
   3. At this stage of the process primary or larger scale issues should be solved, and more time should be
spent on refinements to secondary and tertiary concerns.

B. Cost estimates.
   1. The architect should begin to formulate a construction cost estimate of building components and building systems.

IV. FINAL APPROVAL

A. Value engineering.
   1. Before the final presentation can begin, the archivists and the architect must discuss the pricing estimate.
   2. Design elements must be given priorities within the assigned budget constraints by eliminating or modifying any elements or equipment from the present scheme.

B. Final presentation.
   1. The archivists will give the architect direction to proceed with his final presentation.

As the architect completes his work, the archivists should feel as though they have been an integral part of the design process. Most likely, they will be called on to help sell this project to other parties and should feel knowledgeable in doing so. The process can and should be a learning, enjoyable experience to both parties.

Larry C. Sweat, AIA, is a design principal in the Atlanta, Georgia architectural firm of Moseley Sweat Thompson Standard & Dines, Architects, Inc. The firm provides design services in planning architecture and interiors for commercial, housing, and university projects. They have recently completed the design for the Georgia State University archives building of the William R. Pullen Library in Atlanta, Georgia. This article is an excerpt from a presentation given at the annual meeting of the Society of Georgia Archivists, Roswell, Georgia, 22 September 1989.
Dear Editor:

My article about alligator-skin bindings in the Florida State Archives appeared in the fall 1988 issue of *Provenance*. [Editor’s Note: See Hal Hubener, "Sunshine State Showpieces: Alligator-Skin Bindings in the Florida Archives," *Provenance* VI (Fall 1988): 43-49.] Regrettably I must inform you that I believe I have misidentified the leather on these books. I believe these inlays have been tooled or stamped to create the illusion of alligator skin. I am writing to you, therefore, to explain the circumstances of the error.

What prompted my re-evaluation was a discovery made several months ago in a book club meeting at which I had shown club members a book I owned. It was published in the late nineteenth century and was bound in what appeared to be alligator skin. One club member said that in his opinion the leather was not alligator. He added that the practice of using tools or stamps to create the scaled appearance was not uncommon during the late nineteenth century. He also noted the fragility of the leather, which made him think the binding was sheepskin.

I immediately thought of the similarity of this book to the record books in the State Archives and returned to the Archives a few weeks later. While there I showed my book to several leather tanners and one book dealer. They all thought it was bound in alligator skin.

One of the tanners did suggest a search for hair follicles, so I examined several of the Archives volumes under magnification and found many tiny holes. If the holes do represent follicles, then the leather obviously must have come from a mammal, not
a reptile. Under magnification one can also see that the scales on these inlays are not well defined. Some are squarish, some oval and others triangular. Inside the scales are lines that look as though they have been drawn by means of a tool. These lines are only a couple of millimeters in length and under magnification look exactly like the lines that define the circumference of the scales. The similarity would indicate that the scale patterns are not genuine.

One approach to identifying the skin is chemical analysis. This procedure is not recommended since it would involve removing a portion of the inlay. Even if analysis were possible, it would yield results only for that individual binding. Discussions with several zoologists and the chief of the State of Florida Crime Lab revealed that this approach is not recommended anyway, since the strong lyes with which the leather was tanned could render chemical or serological analysis invalid. DNA analysis might be possible, according to one biologist, but the cost would probably be high and again the process would require damage to the binding. As with chemical analysis, the results would be valid only for that one book.

The most practical way to determine the origin of the skin is to observe the hair follicle patterns, since the patterns vary from mammal to mammal. It is likely that the volumes in the Archives are bound in calf, goat or sheepskin, since those skins are most commonly used in leather-bound books. One anthropologist at the University of Florida, in Gainesville, may be able to identify the leather, but the Florida State Archives will not allow the volumes to be removed and the anthropologist’s high consultant’s fee rules out his traveling to Tallahassee. The individual has agreed, however, to examine photocopies or photographs.

Despite the misidentification, the intrinsic values of these books still hold. The artistic use of the skin, the gold tooling, the marbled-pattern paper, age and exhibit value remain, and there is added interest in the fact that there was a practice of using
tools or stamps to create the illusion of a reptile's skin. There is also the fascinating question of why binderies would use tools to create the impression of alligator leather when the "real thing" was in such abundance. One rare books librarian suggested that the leather may not be flexible enough for use as a binding and that given the popularity of the skin as expressed in handbags, shoes and suitcases, the imitation may be nothing more than a reflection of that taste.

I shall keep Provenance informed of the efforts of the University of Florida anthropologist to shed more light on the leather, and I welcome suggestions from readers concerning a definitive method of identifying the animal from which the leather came.

Hal Hubener
Special Collections Librarian
Lakeland (Florida) Public Library
News Reels

Fifteen state and local government archives—including the Kentucky Department for Libraries and Archives, Public Records Division (PRD); the Georgia Department of Archives and History; and the Alabama Department of Archives and History—have successfully completed the first six months of the Government Records Project, funded by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). The grant allowed these fifteen institutions to input descriptive information into the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), a national bibliographic database used by many major research libraries in the United States. While PRD staff were being trained, programmers at RLIN were working to convert PRD's SPINDEX database and the Kentucky Guide Project SPINDEX database to the MARC format for Archives and Manuscript Control (MARC AMC).

* * * * *
In the spring of 1988 the University of Louisville Archives (Louisville, KY) received a grant from the Kentucky Foundation for Women to create and improve finding aids for its collections of women's materials. Now, halfway through the project, the Gerta Bendl papers and the historical records of the Business and Professional Women of Kentucky, 1921-1985, are complete. The files of the League of Women Voters of Louisville, 1920-1980, are accessible via computer. Currently, work is progressing on the Sara Landau papers.

* * * * *

Editors of the Papers of Jefferson Davis, Lynda Laswell Crist and Mary Seaton Dix, announced that volume seven in a planned fourteen-volume series is nearing completion and will be sent to publishers soon after centennial observances in 1989. Crist and Dix have spent the past twenty years editing the papers, a project begun at Rice University twenty-five years ago. Volume seven will document events leading to Davis's being chosen to lead the Confederacy in early 1861. Crist anticipates that the series will be completed in about another twenty years.

* * * * *

The Georgia Department of Archives and History Director Edward Weldon was appointed by Georgia Governor Joe Frank Harris to a twenty-one member State Mapping Advisory Board. The board is charged with the responsibility for recommending
ways of updating the land records and information systems used by both state and local governments in Georgia. One responsibility of the new board will be to recommend specifications and standards for collection and distribution of data. It is to submit a report within a year.

* * * * *

The Original Montgomery County Historical Society, Inc., is a unique group of southeast Georgians who are trying to capture the history of a county that comprised all or a portion of ten present-day Georgia counties. Few county historical societies have attempted this kind of documentation of their "pre-creation" history. This society has commissioned two works: an accurate map of the county's original boundaries and the writing of the county's first history. Montgomery County was created by an act of the Georgia legislature passed 19 December 1793.

* * * * *

Jane Pairo, formerly Assistant State Archivist at the Virginia State Library and Archives, has been named the first Manager of the Preservation Program at the Southeastern Library Network (SOLINET). "Jane's leadership in this new position will provide the management focus needed to expand the program," notes Executive Director Frank Grisham. "An immediate benefit is that Lisa Fox, who has been serving as Coordinator, can now concentrate her energies in her new role as Program Development Officer." Ms. Fox served as Coordinator of the Preservation Program since its establishment in 1985. As the
Program Development Officer, she will be responsible for training, outreach, and initiation of new preservation services.

Sandra Nyberg will continue as Field Services Officer, with emphasis on a proposed cooperative microfilming project with the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL) in addition to her training and consulting activities.

SOLINET's Preservation Program, funded in part by the National Endowment for the Humanities Office of Preservation, is one of the most active in the nation. Services range from training and publications to disaster assistance and a reference service. A special focus is coordination and support for emerging statewide preservation efforts.

* * * * *

The Florida State Historical Advisory Board has received a grant from the NHPRC for its grant proposal "Information Technology and Public Records: Emerging Issues." The purpose of the project is to examine and focus attention on current and emerging policy issues which, regardless of technical solutions, will have to be resolved by state and local governments' record custodians. The results of the study will be published as a primer of the policy and operational issues which must be considered when opting to use a new technology in the creation, keeping, and retrieval of public records. The publication will be directed to public administrators, records custodians, archivists, and records managers.

* * * * *
The Lakeland (Florida) Public Library announces the approval of a grant by the Florida Endowment for the Humanities. Entitled "Pilots in the Sun: Civilian Pilot Training Schools, 1940-1945, Lakeland and Avon Park, Florida," this grant will allow the library to construct a traveling photographic exhibit which will open at the library in September 1990.

The project will commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Lodwick School of Aeronautics in Lakeland. In addition to framed photographs there will be an exhibit catalog with brief histories of the pilot schools in Lakeland and Avon Park, as well as oral histories of former pilots, instructors, and personnel of the two schools.

The Lakeland school was the outgrowth of one of the nine original schools in the Civilian-AAF (Army Air Force) Pilot Training Program. The program was a significant force in building this country’s air strength, which in turn helped win the war. The two schools trained more than 10,000 pilots, 1,200 of whom were British.

For further information, please contact: Hal Hubener, Project Director, Lakeland Public Library, 100 Lake Morton Drive, Lakeland, FL 33801, (813) 686-2168.

* * * * *

The Louisiana State University Libraries received a grant of $66,140 from NHPRC to underwrite part of the cost of the University Records Survey Project. The grant funds will pay salary for two years for a university archivist, who will survey the existing records of the university and prepare a record group and series structure for them. In cooperation with the Louisiana Division of Archives, Records Management, and History, the
archivist will devise retention and disposition schedules for the university records and prepare a records management manual for the campus. The University Records Survey Project is under the direction of Robert S. Martin, assistant director of libraries for special collections. The archivist will report to Faye Phillips, head of the Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Collections, which includes the University Archives.

* * * * *

The New York State Archives and Records Administration has announced the passage in 1989 of legislation establishing the New York Local Government Record Management Improvement Fund. The new fund is expected to generate five to ten million dollars per year to improve archives and records administration in local government statewide. The agenda of local government needs and recommendations for how they should be met are contained in Quiet Revolution: Managing New York's Local Government Records in the Information Age, the December 1987 report of the New York Local Government Records Advisory Council. The fund will be used to address these needs.

* * * * *

Margaret Hedstrom of the New York State Archives and Records Administration has been awarded the first Award for Excellence in Government Information Services by the New York State Forum for Information Resource Management. Hedstrom shared the award with James Tansey of the Division of Substance Abuse
Services. The award recognizes their work on a project to develop a "sourcebook" that will inventory and catalog information in New York's health and mental health agencies and include descriptions of historical records from the State Archives and demographic information from the State Data Center.

Hedstrom and Tansey led the Forum Information Clearinghouse Project Team successfully to obtain a $32,000 grant from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for the sourcebook pilot project. When completed, the sourcebook will provide information such as data content, source, media, special characteristics, and availability on projected 250-300 automated information systems and related paper files. The sourcebook will be produced as a printed reference and as a searchable electronic database. The project will also assess policy issues that affect sharing and dissemination of state government information. A recommendation for this kind of project was included in the State Archives and Records Administration's 1988 publication, *A Strategic Plan for Managing and Preserving Electronic Records in New York State Government*.

* * * * *

The American Association for State and Local History (Nashville, TN) Technical Information Service has published a report from the Common Agenda Database Task Force. The task force was charged with developing two essential tools to manage the data of historical collections and facilitate information exchanges between collections. One of these tools provides a format to describe the scope of a group of related objects--an entire collection, a part of a collection, or even an exhibit. The other
tool is a group of basic categories of information—data fields—that could be used to record historical data about objects effectively.

* * * * *

The United States Senate passed by voice vote S.J.Res. 57 on 31 July 1989. This legislation would establish a national policy to promote the use of permanent, alkaline papers. A similar bill in the House, H.R.J.Res. 226, is still pending before committees. In a hearing conducted spring of 1989 in the House of Representatives, witnesses testified that the deterioration of the acidic papers in archives and libraries can be avoided in the future by the use of alkaline printing and papers. There is also evidence that alkaline paper, which will last several hundred years, can be produced at no greater cost than acidic papers. American publishers have already begun to convert to alkaline paper. Approximately a quarter to a third of American hardcover books are now printed on permanent paper, although this is usually not noted in the publications themselves.

* * * * *

The Working Group on Standards for Archival Description, sponsored by Harvard University and funded by a grant from the NHPRC, announces that the fall 1989 issue of The American Archivist (volume 52, number 4) will be devoted entirely to
archival description standards and the work of the Working Group. It will include:

1) the full text of the Working Group’s final report which contains an analysis of the practice of archival description and the implications of developing and implementing description standards;

2) seventeen specific recommendations to the archival community that focus on establishing procedures within the profession for standards development and review;

3) the texts of twelve background papers prepared by various members of the Working Group as the basis for its deliberations;

4) a checklist of existing technical standards, conventions, and guidelines that are applicable to archival description; and

5) a select bibliography of articles and books discussing the practice of archival description, the application of standards, and related issues.

The expected production schedule for the issue should make it available by early April 1990. Those who are not SAA members or anyone else wishing to purchase this special issue of The American Archivist will be able to do so at the single-issue cost of $15.00 plus postage. For further information contact Teresa M. Brinati, Managing Editor, Society of American Archivists, 600 South Federal, Suite 504, Chicago, IL 60605.

* * * * *

Three new Fellows were named by the Society of American Archivists (SAA) at its 53rd annual meeting in St. Louis. Richard Cox, Maygene Daniels, and Terry Eastwood received the society’s
highest honor. Established in 1957, this distinction is awarded to a limited number of individuals for their outstanding contributions to the archival profession.

These three new Fellows join 104 other members so honored. The SAA Professional Standards Committee evaluates nominees on the following criteria: appropriate academic education and professional and technical training; a minimum of seven years professional experience in any of the fields advancing the society's objectives; writing of superior quality and usefulness in advancing the society's objectives; and contributions to the archival profession through work in and for the society.

Fellows are elected by three-quarters vote of the SAA Professional Standards Committee, which consists of the five most recent presidents of the society and two members elected annually by SAA officers and council.

* * * * *

Former U.S. Senator Thomas F. Eagleton received the first J. Franklin Jameson Award given by the Society of American Archivists. The award, named in honor of the historian and advocate for the archival profession, recognizes an individual, institution, or organization, not directly involved in archival work, that promotes greater public awareness of archival activities or programs.

Senator Eagleton, a Missouri Democrat, was a leader in the movement to restore the National Archives and Records Administration to an independent position. He was convinced that it was good public policy to have a strong archival agency independent of political domination to preserve the historical heritage of this nation. His tireless efforts also defeated repeated attempts by others to politicize the office of archivist of the United States.
Scott Cline, the Seattle (Washington) City Archivist, has received the C. F. W. Coker Prize from the Society of American Archivists for editing the publication, *A Guide to the Archives of the City of Seattle*. Established in 1985 and conferred annually in the fall, the award recognizes outstanding finding aids and innovative development in archival descriptive tools.

The 242-page *Guide* describes nearly 600 records series and includes a 2,300-term subject and name index. It is the first comprehensive, collection-level finding aid published using MicroMARC: AMC—which won SAA’s Coker Prize in 1988. To date, it represents the largest form report project utilizing the software and, as a result, is a model for other Micro-MARC: AMC users in their planning for future finding aids.
REVIEWS, CRITIQUES, AND ANNOTATIONS


A first glance at this volume is misleading. Both because most of the ten essayists have written extensively before on the subjects they address here and because a breezy introduction and the brief editorial synopses at the head of each essay seem designed to capture and help nonspecialists, one might well suppose that the volume is intended to extend the reach, rather than add to the sum, of scholarship. A quick glance at the endnotes only strengthens this first impression: the thirty-three pages largely refer to published primary and secondary sources; there are few citations of manuscript materials.

One should not be misled, however. Not only would it be almost impossible to get the clear focus on Oglethorpe provided here simply by reading the other works of the several contributors, but by reflecting on Oglethorpe from the perspectives of their very different specialities, the authors make their other work meaningful in new ways.

What this volume does is both put Oglethorpe in various contexts and examine several of these contexts—the frontier,
reviews, warfare, slavery, Indian relations—from his evolving
point of view as a Georgia trustee and military officer. The
results are a more complex and fully realized character and a
more dynamic picture of Georgia’s first two decades as a British
colony than were possible as recently as a few years ago.

What is not yet possible is to see Oglethorpe and Georgia
through the eyes of the Spanish, French, and others who acted
on, and reacted to, Georgia’s founder and his colony. Though
Indian viewpoints do begin to emerge in intriguing ways, there
are almost no references to the French, Spanish, Austrian, and
Prussian archival holdings here. Clearly, these are new frontiers
to be explored in the ongoing recovery of Georgia’s infancy and
Oglethorpe’s engrossing life story.

As clearly, Georgia’s colonial historians and Oglethorpe’s
biographers have done a remarkable job, not only of mining but
also of seeing brought into print the English language records
feeding their stories. Most references to original sources in these
essays are to materials now available in print. The largest bodies
of unpublished papers cited are the Phillips Collection of Egmont
Papers in the University of Georgia Libraries, some remaining
manuscript colonial records of Georgia, the papers of James
Boswell at Yale, the Sir Andrew Mitchell Papers in the British
Library, and the William H. Lyttleton Papers at the University of
Michigan. Given what remains, it seems entirely possible that by
Georgia’s tercentenary the printed record might be extended to
incorporate most of the relevant portions of these and other
holdings.

More noteworthy for archivists is the way this collection of
essays extends the record by giving close scrutiny to maps,
engravings, portraits, and other iconographic materials. Not
used merely to illustrate as so often in the past, these materials
here (and in other works by some of these same essayists) become
windows on political and diplomatic motivation and perception as
well as on values and expectations. The opening of these
windows has let fresh air into the study where Georgia's origins and early development are still being pored over to advantage.

In the face of such contributions, it seems almost mean spirited to observe that the book could have been produced to better advantage. Illustrations are neither as clear nor as effective as they might be. A more ambitious, less breezy introduction might better have prepared the reader to appreciate what follows. The headnotes to each essay might better have been included in a section of that expanded introduction, so that the reader could gain in one place a sense of what he or she would encounter in the volume as a whole. Finally, a book aimed not only at specialists but also at a wider audience should not appear academic; this one physically does, despite the verbal gambits to put the nonspecialist at ease.

To criticize the serving of the food is not to criticize the cooks, only to commiserate with them. This book is fine fare, and this is all the more remarkable given the number of cooks involved. Of course, some dishes may seem better done (more original, better integrated) than others, but each has substance worth savoring.

David Moltke-Hansen
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill


The R. J. Taylor, Jr., Foundation has done it again. Since its inception, this organization has made a mark in the historical and genealogical professions with its sponsorship of a number of publications that help those working in these and other fields.
Now, with the appearance of *An Index to English Crown Grants in Georgia, 1755-1775*, they have done themselves one better, for this is the most important work in their long list.

As Professor Louis DeVorsey points out in his interesting foreword, the genesis of this index can be traced back to the Coastal Marshlands Protection Act of 1970 which made establishing "paramount title" to marshlands based on English crown grants essential to any private claim of ownership. All of a sudden historians, geographers, and genealogists found themselves competing with "outsiders" for access to the records, and these interlopers quickly discovered just how difficult the scholar's task had been. One might argue, given the growing "Roots" phenomenon of the 1970s and the bicentennial surge of early Georgia scholarship, that public pressure might have eventually caused state officials to ease access to these records, but when the legal profession and corporate giants joined the fray, it was only a matter of time before action was taken.

Fortunately, that action was taken by people whose first interest was the past, not the present. Deputy Surveyor General Pat Bryant and her assistant, Marion R. Hemperley, with the enthusiastic support of Secretary of State Ben W. Fortson, Jr. (and the encouragement of a host of scholars like Professor DeVorsey), began publishing abstracts of the more than five thousand crown grants. When they were done (1972-74) the state had brought out nine volumes. They were a treasure trove of information, as anyone who has used them will testify.

There was no comprehensive index, however, so a researcher seeking information about a person or place mentioned in a grant, but not the principal grantee, had to go through each grant—one at a time. Now that problem is solved. *An Index to English Crown Grants in Georgia, 1755-1775* is the answer to the researcher's prayer, for it contains all of the people and places mentioned in any British crown grant, presented in a "user friendly" fashion that will surely reduce the time overworked
staff have had to spend explaining how to use finding aids. This book is a model for the profession. The R. J. Taylor, Jr., Foundation deserves its thanks.

Harvey H. Jackson
Clayton State College


*The Black Experience* joins Debra L. Newman’s *Black History: A Guide to Civilian Records in the National Archives* as one of the few published guides describing holdings relating to the black experience within government archives. The Florida State Archives is to be commended for recognizing the need for such a guide and for taking the initiative to seek a grant from the Library Services and Construction Act to publish it.

The guide is a slim volume, only fifty-two pages including the index. Its stated purpose is to "identify and describe the sources within the Florida State Archives Collection that document the lives, culture, and experiences of Black Floridians; and to assist the researcher in locating the materials." Included are state government records, manuscript collections, local government records, the Florida Photographic Collection, and the Florida Collection (of the state library).
A brief introduction describes the purposes for the development of the guide, provides the rationale for what is included, and contains a discussion of the arrangement of the entries. This latter section on the arrangement identifies, in lay language, the difference between a series description for record groups ("reflect[s] the administrative role of the Department") and subgroups ("reflect[s] the programmatic functions of that unit"). A most helpful feature is a listing of the nine elements of a series entry description, with an example. Whenever pertinent, restrictions on the records are duly noted, thereby advising researchers before they make the trip to the archives.

In the introduction, the section "Other Sources" states that only the "richest sources of documentation on Black history discovered by the survey" are described in the guide but that other records containing relevant information are available. These other sources, which the guide claims might also be valuable for black history research, are listed by title and record group number in this section and in an appendix. Some confusion is created, however, by a statement that all of these record groups are listed in the appendix. A comparison of the appendix and the "Other Sources" section shows that some of the record groups listed in the latter do not appear in the appendix. Examples of the black history-related context of these records would have been useful.

The guide is arranged by type of material (that is, public records, manuscript collections, etc.), and within each section the entries are arranged alphabetically. A description of the record group precedes the series description; the series entries list type of material, a general description of the series, black history subjects, and in some cases the relationship of specific files to topics in black history.

A notable feature of the guide is the description of the photographic holdings. Although not unique—Newman's *Black History Guide* also included photographs—it is still not the norm
to describe photographs in a guide to archival and manuscript collections. The move by repositories toward intellectually linking photograph holdings with archival holdings even while physically segregating photographs because of format should be encouraged.

A four-page index "provides access by subject, personal names, geographic names and agency names" and refers to series, files, subjects within files, and photographs. There appear to be very few problems overall, although it should be noted that there are no cross references. This is not a major problem in such a small guide and could perhaps be overlooked. However, because the tone of this volume is accessibility to a general audience, not just scholars, cross references would have been especially helpful. For example, all references to riots were found under "racial violence." Logical, but not one's first choice. A "see reference" from riots would have been more useful in a volume of this type.

Of the over fifty items randomly checked in the index, the one glaring omission was an entry for "funeral homes," particularly since there are four entries for funeral homes in the section on manuscript collections. A few entries for indexed terms were overlooked (e.g., "busing" files on page 10, a series on page 13), and "minority business enterprises" should have been listed as "minority business development," the file name used most often.

A noteworthy attribute of the guide is the placement of photographs which serve to illustrate the records being described. The captions, unfortunately, do not indicate if the photographs come from the same record group or were obtained from another source. This apparently is not so much a problem of the guide but instead reflects the arrangement of the photographic collection; the cataloging does not appear to include information on provenance.

There are some minor problems with the guide which do not impact significantly on its overall usefulness. There are a few
collections in the section on manuscript collections in which it is not made clear what their relationship is to black history issues (e.g., W. A. Register, Jr., Oral History and T. P. Strickland Store Ledgers). In the Florida Photographic Collection the lack of a general heading and an overall description for the subsection on individual photographers’ files mars this otherwise good feature of the guide. Each photographer’s collection is treated at the same level (as identified by the typeface) as the other five photograph collections; collection descriptions do not exist for two of the photographers, nor are their first names provided. All of this could have been explained in a general descriptive statement for this subsection thereby avoiding the awkwardness of the current setup.

Another problem was that some of the information in the entry descriptions was not always relevant to an understanding of a department’s involvement with black history-related issues. Some of the information seemed unnecessary, such as listing the article and section of the constitution establishing a particular unit and listing the boards and commissions the head of a department sat on within the government (e.g., descriptions for commission of education and state comptroller). In the latter example, no subsequent explanation shed light on the relationship of these memberships to black history concerns.

Despite these criticisms, the guide is a good tool for researching Florida black history which should prove helpful to a variety of researchers. The government records in particular are important sources of information for a wide range of subjects from education, civil rights, and legislative issues to genealogical sources, prison records, labor, and slavery.

Diana Lachatanere
Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture


As one of its bicentennial projects the United States Senate has sponsored the publication of the Guide to the Records of the United States Senate at the National Archives (Senate Document 100-42). The United States House of Representatives, also in commemoration of the Bicentennial of Congress, has sponsored the publication of the Guide to the Records of the United States House of Representatives at the National Archives (Document 100-245). The Center for Legislative Archives of the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) has gained control over the massive records of Congress held at the National Archives and produced these workable guides.

Guides serve repositories and users in many ways. They provide assistance to researchers seeking more information on Congress or about committees on which congresspeople served. Congressional records give insight into the career and activities of a particular congressperson that might not be found in his papers housed at a repository other than the National Archives. Guides can tell what records are available for use and which records do not exist. A guide can inform researchers which records are available in formats other than the original:
microform, videodisk, electronic, or other. Led by information in a guide, researchers may or may not decide to visit the National Archives. The purpose of a guide to the repository is, most importantly, to further intellectual control over records and thereby assist researchers and the creators of the records. Guides also promote the use of archives and serve as public relations tools. The Guide to the Records of the Senate and the Guide to the Records of the House of Representatives fulfill these purposes.

The Senate guide builds upon a preliminary inventory (1789 through August 2, 1946; 6,558 cubic feet) of Senate records produced by the National Archives in 1950. The bicentennial guide encompasses records from 1789 to 1989 (20,000 cubic feet). The arrangement of the guides is not Congress by Congress but committee by committee. Given is a brief history of each Senate and House committee and a discussion of the records produced by the committee. Emphasis is placed on subject content. The introduction also states the limitations of the guides. Reading the guides gives a better understanding of the way Congress actually works and the procedures needed to use the records.

Chapter 1 of the guides, identical in both, does an excellent job of explaining the classification scheme used for congressional records from the late 1930s through 1947 for Senate records and through 1962 for House records. Records received after those dates are arranged by Congress, then committee or subcommittee and series, not by a classification scheme. The guides indicate by what file number items on a particular subject can be located and in some cases indicate the number of feet of materials. For example, records of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which include subcommittees investigating the use of farm crops during World War II are in file number 78A-F1 and equal four feet of records. Researchers are cautioned, however, to use the new guides in conjunction with the Preliminary Inventory of the Records of the United States House of Representatives, 1789-1946 and the loose-leaf inventory of Senate
record file numbers available from the NARA Center for Legislative Archives. This chapter is essential to using congressional records at the National Archives.

The guides identify nontextual records from Congress, tell where they are located in the National Archives, and list published materials which assist in using the nontextual records. Appendixes include lists of majority and minority leaders, secretaries, and microfilm publications; select bibliographies of historical works and published finding aids to both the House and Senate; and glossaries of legislative and archival terms. While this information is available in other places, it is extremely helpful to have it compiled in the guides.

Another useful section is the one on citing unpublished government documents. Too often researchers’ difficulties in properly citing archival materials make it impossible for other researchers to relocate sources cited. These guides along with NARA’s General Information Leaflet 17, Citing Records in the National Archives of the United States, provide the necessary assistance for researchers to cite complicated references properly.

One unusual feature of the guides is that each paragraph of the text is numbered, somewhat like a National Archives inventory. For example, paragraph 3 of chapter 1 begins with the number 1.3. Each paragraph of each chapter begins with a number. The index is keyed to the paragraph numbering system instead of to page numbers. The subject term "land offices" in the Senate guide refers the readers to "12.9," which is chapter 12, paragraph 9, instead of the page on which the information appears. This method may have been employed to make indexing and revision of the detailed text easier, but researchers may be misled into thinking that the paragraph numbers represent series and subseries numbers. Researchers may ask at the archives for "12.9" records instead of the records of the Committee on Public Lands, 1816-1946, to which chapter 12 of the guide refers. The
index to the Senate guide also has some inaccuracies. The citation for "Russell B. Long" references paragraph 9.33, but it should be 9.34. Other citations checked, however, were accurate.

Physically the books are large, 8½-by-11½ inches, and heavy. But considering the amount of information contained, a smaller book with readable type would be difficult to produce. The page format is well spaced with enough white space to facilitate reading without wasted space. The type is clear and readable. There is a possibility that the covers of the guides will not withstand heavy research use. The blue and burgundy color chips off the boards when the books are scratched or banged. In a few years all the color may chip off the covers.

These guides are a welcome addition to the National Archives and Records Administration guides. Research libraries should have copies in their central reference departments. For repositories that collect congressional papers, the guides offer an avenue for locating appropriate committee records for their researchers. Researchers using congressional papers can benefit by reviewing these guides before visiting the National Archives. All repositories which collect congressional papers need to acquire these volumes for their researchers and staff.

Faye Phillips
Louisiana State University

* * * * * * * *

Michigan Image Cataloging System Software

University of Michigan Software has released Michigan Image Cataloging System slide management software to organize data
for slide collections. Developed at the university’s Department of the History of Art, the system is unique in its ability both to print labels and cards and to store databases on floppy disks (fifteen hundred records per disk). Because data can be removed from the working hard disk drive, it leaves the drive free for other files or for massive data manipulation. The data stored on the floppy disks can be transported to other computers, and the disks themselves can be backed up.

Michigan Image Cataloging System allows the user the option of easily combining databases or dividing them into smaller units. A typical slide collection may have fifty thousand to one hundred thousand images, thus making it necessary to divide the slide database into manageable segments in order to reduce work and search time.

The cataloging system is a user friendly program which offers extra-long field lengths (up to 110 characters) and a straightforward, menu-driven design. It can also print out more information on labels (four lines to a label, two labels per slide) than many other programs. The only limiting factor is the size of the label or card. Output can be onscreen or on cards with sizes of two-by-two inches, three-by-five inches, or four-by-five inches.

Some features include global replacement; merge option for combining databases; menu driven with escapes; drive selection (work with a floppy or hard disk at the same computer); printing any range of records or a single record; filter to eliminate duplication of slide call numbers (with an override for desired duplication); toggle switch to search, print, change, or enter either in record number order or slide call number order; compressed fields for storage (no unused field space is stored); Boolean searches; deletion of any range of records; and copying any range from one database to another.

Technical specifications for the system are IBM PC/XT/AT or compatible with hard disk, 640K RAM, DOS 2.0 or above, color
monitor and EGA or CGA, or monochrome monitor and IBM or Hercules graphics card.

The Michigan Image Cataloging System comes with full operating instructions and is available at a cost of $1,000 per nonprofit site license (site defined as a single department within a university or museum) or $2,000 per commercial license, plus $10 shipping and handling. A demonstration disk is available upon request. For more information, contact University of Michigan Software, Intellectual Properties Office, 475 E. Jefferson, Room 2354, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1248 (phone 313-936-0435, fax 313-936-1330).

* * *

Let The Record Show: Practical Uses for Historical Documents is the title of the New York State Archives and Records Administration's new audio-visual show about the importance of historical records to society. The sixteen-minute show highlights vignettes that demonstrate the benefits New Yorkers derive from using historical records: a research botanist using century-old botanical journals to document ecological changes at Goat Island, Niagara Falls; a member of a homeowners' organization near Syracuse studying the plans and blueprints of an old bridge to help determine if it is still safe; a Saratoga Springs teacher whose students study century-old community records for a better understanding of how people lived in the past; and a dance company in New York City that uses videotapes of its own performances and other records to plan future presentations. The basic message is that historical records are crucial to meet a great variety of important, practical needs.

The show includes a discussion on how historical records are selected, cared for, and made available in repositories across New York. It introduces the idea that well-developed, adequately supported programs are needed to administer these invaluable
resources. *Let the Record Show* is designed to appeal to a variety of audiences, including trustees of historical institutions, professional organizations, civic and cultural groups, and teachers and students. It can serve as an excellent device to stimulate discussion about the location, accessibility, and condition of historical records in one's own community.

For more information about this show in VHS or slide/tape format, contact Terri Sewell, State Archives and Records Administration, Cultural Education Center, Room 10A63, Albany, New York 12230.
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