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ARCHIVAL SECURITY
A PERSONAL AND CIRCUMSTANTIAL VIEW

Edmund Berkeley, Jr.

I find my involvement in archival security most ironical, since my chief "background and training" in the subject has been to be the head of an archival agency which suffered a major theft. Had I been given a choice, I should have chosen almost any other method of learning more about this important and complex subject. Certainly I do not recommend my "training program" in archival security to anyone else! As a training method, its chief recommendation is that the subject captures your almost total attention for months and is never far out of your consciousness thereafter. Living for over two years with the ramifications of our theft also has made me intensely aware of the major national problem with archival theft.

Archivists, of course, have been concerned from ancient times with security, since preservation of the materials in their charge is their most important duty. In the not-so-ancient times of the early 1960s when I joined the profession, as a member of the Archives Division of the Virginia State Library, I and my colleagues were taught a good deal about our responsibility to protect and preserve the materials in our care. Perhaps more emphasis was placed on protection from theft than on other kinds of preservation in my on-the-job training, for the Barrow Restoration Shop was adjacent to the staff workroom. The Shop handled the other sorts of preservation problems for us. The late

Mr. Berkeley is Curator of Manuscripts and University Archivist at the University of Virginia. In addition he serves as Chairman of the Advisory Committee of the Security Program of the Society of American Archivists. This paper is adapted from his talk at the Society of Georgia Archivists' Workshop, November 21, 1975.
William J. Van Schreeven, then the state archivist, constantly reminded the junior archivists who had charge of the reading room that we must always be alert to the possibility of theft. I remember several occasions upon which he told the staff of a person or persons suspected of having stolen things from other institutions; very often he had a description of the suspects, and once, a sketch provided by an artistically-talented archivist.

Nevertheless, none of these warnings or stories seemed real to me then. The known thefts had all happened far away from Virginia, and somehow we seemed safe and secure. Most of our patrons were ladies and gentlemen, and genealogists over-impressed with the importance of their family lineage were a much more immediate problem.

Now it is 1975. Two Virginia institutions—one of them my own, and the other the institution for which I formerly worked—have been victims of thefts. The Virginia State Library has been fortunate in apprehending, prosecuting, and convicting its thief. Sadly, the University of Virginia Library has no solid leads to its thief or thieves after two years of investigation. These stories are not unique and can be matched or overshadowed in any gathering of archivists or curators.

The theft from the University of Virginia Library is interesting, perhaps, in that it apparently was an "inside job," that is, one in which there were no visible signs of breaking and entering. We were not aware that we had been robbed for a very long time, and this made the work of the police extremely difficult. Reviewing the circumstances, I find that the first "incident" of importance was the casual discovery by a member of the departmental faculty that one major item was not in its proper filing location when she went to get it to show to some visitors. She reported the fact, and we began a routine search for the document.

I use the word "routine" advisedly because we were in no way alarmed. We do misfile and misplace things occasionally; with more than 9,100,000 items in 12,000 separate collections, we should be insufferable paragons if we did not. Thus, when one item was reported missing, it was considered misfiled and a routine happenstance. Because the item was an historically important one, we did make a number of searches for it, and I mentioned to the university
librarian that we could not locate it. Various staff members conducted searches over a period of some weeks. When they failed to find the item, I decided I should look myself. Hunting through the vault filing area where the missing item should have been, I realized that at least one and possibly two other items were missing as well.

Mental alarm bells began to ring, because never have we misfiled more than one item from the same filing area. But we faced a serious problem in trying to determine whether we had misfiled the items or another cause accounted for their absence.

We never have had in our department what librarians would call a shelf list—a card file or list of the items that should be found upon inspection of a particular shelf or filing area. Such lists were not compiled because they could not materially improve our very good control systems for locating material. We sincerely regretted not having a shelf list of the contents of the vault, a rather large area of more than 900 square feet on two levels. Our department houses a considerable quantity of material in the vault, which it shares with the Rare Book Department of the Library. In this special area are kept our collection of over 3,000 Jefferson papers, the William Faulkner manuscripts, and many valuable literary manuscripts from the Barrett Library of American Literature. In addition it holds materials requiring security but which have no intrinsic value, such as student records from the registrar's office and minutes of the Board of Visitors.

Without describing our existing control arrangements in detail, suffice it to say that we do have a good working system for locating material in our custody, and that from the folders comprising this system we were able to prepare a shelf list of the manuscripts that should have been found in the vault. Compiling this list occupied the majority of the members of the faculty and staff for several days and the clerical staff for nearly a week of typing.

Once this shelf list had been typed onto three-by-five-inch cards, we began a systematic check of the contents of the vault. Some members of the faculty labored at the task every day. But we soon discovered that such work cannot be done for more than a few hours at a time, because the worker becomes sleepy, inattentive, and vocally bored. This careful search proceeded for several weeks. I kept the
librarian informed of our activity, but even at this time, I felt there was no evidence of anything more than our own carelessness.

Several weeks later, a patron requested a photocopy of a George Washington letter which he had placed in the department on deposit. A staff member went to the vault to retrieve the letter, could not find it, and immediately notified me. I in turn at once ordered the entire departmental faculty and some of the library assistants to join the searching in the vault. By late afternoon we had discovered the major disappearance of materials from the autograph collection, whence the majority of items were stolen. I reported the loss to my superior, together with my opinion that a theft had indeed occurred. That night, I wrote out the details of all of the incidents and our actions in response.

The unhappy news of the many missing items was reported to the university president. One of the first things we were asked to do before the police were contacted was to search all of our collections to be sure that we had not misfiled the missing materials elsewhere. A principal reason for ordering such a massive search was the discovery that our insurance policy stated that the company was not obligated if the only indication of a loss was an "inventory shortage." Since we had no evidence of breaking and entering, the company has steadfastly maintained the position of its policy, and the question may have to be resolved in court. (I urge archivists to read carefully the insurance policies that protect them in cases of loss and be knowledgeable to what extent they are covered.)

The order to make the extensive search of our entire holdings was no blithe one issued by an administrator unaware of what the command entailed for us. The university president's executive assistant spent some twenty-five years in the position I now hold. Thus he knew exactly what was involved and how things could be misfiled.

As I look back on the accomplishments of the faculty and staff in response to that administrative order, I am still impressed. Each person was given a copy of the list of missing materials, a list which ran to over four pages and which had virtually to be memorized. All of the members of the departmental faculty, and most of the library assistants—nine people in all—were relieved of other duties and assigned to
searching teams. We left a small staff for the reading room. All departmental leave, other than sick leave (none was taken), was cancelled. The searchers opened and checked every Hollinger box, oversized box, records center box, package, and other carton on more than two miles of shelving, as well as every map tray, file drawer, and other storage container in our charge.

This was in no sense an "inventory" as an insurance company uses that word. There was no attempt to check systematically the contents item by item of each container against a container or shelf list. We do have many such lists, but we could not take the time to carry on a search of that depth. Instead, we attempted to spot the file units--daguerreotype case and folders--which disappeared with the missing letters.

I felt certain, as I told the librarians, that we would find none of the missing items during this search. While we certainly do make mistakes and misfile items, our control system is a good one and adhered to by the staff. There were no flags in place of any of the missing items as there should have been had the items been withdrawn legitimately and subsequently misfiled. The massive search confirmed the effectiveness of the control system. We found very few materials out of place, and almost every instance represented an error made years ago.

During the period that we were checking the manuscript collections, our colleagues in the Rare Book Department conducted a shelf-list reading of the books kept in the vault. This search would have revealed eventually that two books by university alumnus Edgar Allen Poe--Tamerlane and Al Aaraaf, Tamerlane and Minor Poems--were missing, but a patron's request for them before the shelf readers reached their filing location revealed this additional theft.

All employees of the two departments, twenty-two persons, knew that we probably had been robbed. We asked them to keep the news quiet while we carried on our searches, and they responded beautifully. No word of the loss left the two departments for the several months of searching and other actions preceding the public announcement in early December, 1973. Looking back on this period, I think one of the best actions that we took was to keep the personnel of the two departments as fully informed as possible. While much stress and apprehension existed, openness helped to alleviate these problems to some extent.
The completion of our fruitless searches in the Manuscripts Department, coupled with the discovery of the loss from the Rare Book Department of the two extremely rare Poe books, left the University no alternative but to accept the fact that we had been robbed. The university police thereupon were summoned to investigate the case. They were highly critical of the fact that we had delayed so long in bringing them into the case. Knowing something of police work, I appreciate this attitude. But an inside job is insidious. One is unsure that a theft has occurred, as there always is the possibility of a filing error. Another possible explanation of the missing material is that a disgruntled staff member may have hidden them to cause trouble and grief. And if there has been a theft, the likely suspects are those persons with whom you work every day. That one of them has stolen materials is an awful prospect to contemplate, especially if you have hired many of them and worked with the others for years, as I had.

By the nature of our work, the head of an archival agency must have implicit faith in the integrity of the staff of his agency. In no other way can the agency be run without almost insurmountable administrative problems. While I do believe that candidates for archival positions must be investigated, particularly by speaking with former employers and the persons listed as references, the truth of the matter is that even a full field investigation by the F.B.I. would not guarantee that someone might not later steal material. The Daniel Ellsberg-Pentagon Papers case might be cited among others; trusted employees, whose motives are said to be "higher" in such cases, presumably are the ones who keep columnists Jack Anderson and Les Whitten on the pages of our daily newspapers.

The psychological effects of an apparent inside theft are great. The personnel of our two departments inevitably wondered about each other, and the resulting tensions hurt morale. The request, early in the new year, that we all submit to polygraph (lie detector) examination brought the nadir of this tension. Persons who work in libraries and archives rarely are acquainted with police methods and with the polygraph. I was, as I have a brother who has been a policeman. Still the request came as a shock.

I say "request" because it was exactly that. We each had the theoretical right to refuse to take the test,
but as you can imagine, the pressure to submit to it was compelling. So many questions about the test came to me and my colleague in charge of the Rare Book Department that we ran out of answers and appealed to the university administration for help. The head of the university police, a former F.B.I. agent, was sent to meet with both staffs. He was only partially successful in alleviating fears, for a few of the staff vented their frustrations on him with antagonistic and skillful questioning.

Several persons consulted lawyers who advised their clients not to take the test. One staff member, married to a law student, spent hours in the law library reading everything she could find on the polygraph and the law. Ultimately, I believe almost everyone submitted to the test, even some who at first had refused. The pressure to do so was enormous.

It took many months for morale to recover. But when no one was arrested, the staff began to relax. Moreover, as rumors circled the two departments after visits from the police, it became apparent that there was at least one way in which the inside job could have been committed by an outsider. Once this was known, and since the police had not solved the crime, things slowly returned to normal.

If it is true that librarians and archivists rarely are acquainted with police and their procedures, the reverse is equally so. We had to educate the police in our methods and approaches before they really could conduct a thorough investigation. And often thereafter as I conversed with various officers, I realized they did not yet understand rather basic archival procedures, and I would have to begin again. After this experience, I suggest that archivists, curators, and librarians attempt to educate their local police by inviting them to tour the archival agency. Many police departments have public relations programs and will be glad to send officers to the agency as consultants on security. Such consultations provide good opportunities for the education of the police.

Since our theft, we have made several changes in our security arrangements, some of which originated with the police, some of which we thought of ourselves, and others of which were joint efforts. Many of these are simple adjustments, not at all costly for the benefits they bring.
Before the theft, all members of the faculty and staff holding library assistant rank were allowed access to the vault. Faculty members knew the combination since they occasionally needed to open the vault after field trips or when working on Saturday. The police were highly critical of this generous access policy, and we were ordered by the administration to limit severely the number of persons having the vault combination and access. We reduced the number having the combination to two in each department, and this has worked well in practice. One of us always seems to be around to open the vault in the morning. During the day, the inner doors, which open with a key, remain locked, and only those persons with access privileges may obtain the key and go in and out. We regularly change the vault combination—which we now know how to do ourselves—and always after one of the combination holders leaves the faculty.

Originally we tried to confine access to the vault to the same four persons who had the combination, but this proved impractical. As the four persons who have the combination are the curators of the departments and their chief deputies, I and my opposite number soon found that we were spending considerable time as vault "go-fers." Eventually, we persuaded the administration to adopt our present policy of permitting vault privileges to all faculty members of the two departments with at least three years service on our staff.

A second criticism made by the police was that we had no record of vault entry. We now maintain a book near the vault door and log each visit: its purpose, times of entrance and egress, and the name of the person making the visit. I am afraid that none of us see the benefit of the log since it is so easily falsified, but it makes the police happy.

Another change has been refinement of the shelf list of the manuscripts kept in the vault. To enable us to identify these items as ours should any question arise, our cataloger has prepared careful and complete descriptions of all the bound manuscripts and slip cases. We pursued the check of materials there, performing item-by-item inventories of large collections such as the Faulkner and Jefferson papers. This took months, but was worth the time for the peace of mind resulting. We found nothing else unaccounted for.
The general security of the areas of the library building we occupy has been strengthened by reassessment of the system of locks. In the two special collections departments, there are a total of fifty-one doors with locks. All staff and student assistants have access to the key that works the regular locks. They cannot move about the departments without it. We have added to each of the critical entrance-exit doors, as well as to certain others, an extra—a dead bolt—lock. Not only have the dead bolt locks been obtained from a different company than our regular locks, but the key which works them is issued to but four faculty in each department and to the librarian and associate librarian. We would prefer to constrict this number, but in case of an emergency, such as a fire, we must be able to get into our areas quickly. We also re-key this special set of locks routinely every six months.

Our reading room has received a great deal of security attention, for we realize that we are more likely to be "hit" in it than in any other area of our operation. We are fortunate that the room has but one exterior door, by which all visitors must enter and leave, because this makes for good security. The door is located in the middle of one long wall of the thirty-by-ninety-foot room. A large control desk, some ten feet long, faced the patron upon entering the room. Because a series of large structural columns run the length of the room on the wall opposite the door, readers' tables for years had been located in one long row along the wall with the door. A reader at the far table could be forty feet from the chief security person. Worse, when the clerk was at one end of the room, ample opportunity existed for a thief at the other end to slip a manuscript under a shirt or skirt.

To combat this weakness in our layout, we rearranged the room concentrating all the readers' tables in one end. We moved the large control desk next to the entrance to the room and turned it ninety degrees so that the person sitting at it faces the readers. The size and length of this desk either forces anyone entering the room to stop at it or channels them to a new control desk we have created with a table-desk combination. We added a staff desk in the readers' end of the reading room, but man it only when we are so busy that the control desk attendant cannot see all the readers. Staff activities formerly conducted between the structural columns are now concentrated in the end of the room opposite the
readers, removing the noise of staff enterprise from the pa-
trons.

Our next step was to control entrance and egress from the area of readers' tables. Originally a length of chain I picked up at Sears sufficed, but this has been replaced with a theatre rope. Readers may enter or leave the research area only with permission.

We have eliminated one possible way of removing manu-
scripts by requiring that all brief cases, handbags, packages, portfolios, and the like, as well as coats, be checked before the patron enters the research area. We would prefer not to operate a check service, but we did not have the funds to buy, or the floor space to install, lockers with keys.

One suggestion of the police reinforced an idea of our own. For some time we had wished to learn more about our patrons and their projects. Our registration book of many years had space only for name, permanent address, local ad-
dress, and a word or two about the project. We drew up a form which requires much more information about the patron and which enables us to accumulate some useful statistical information about the use of the collections. The police suggested that in addition we request personal identifica-
tion, such as a driver's license or a student identification card, which we now do, recording the numbers from the cards on the registration form. Our rules and regulations, which the patron is asked to read and sign to indicate his willing-
ness to comply, are printed on the recto.

Another novelty for us is requiring patrons leaving the research area to submit all paper for inspection by the staff. If someone absolutely insists on taking a briefcase or a handbag to the table, we permit it only with the under-
standing that we will search the bag thoroughly before the person leaves. (We have granted such a request in but one or two instances.)

Our final innovation affecting readers is a limita-
tion upon the amount of material they may have at a research table. Formerly, we might bring out a book truck full of material and park it beside the research table for the con-
venience of the patron. Now we limit to two the number of (Hollinger) boxes at a table, and we no longer leave book trucks in the readers' end of the room. Readers must turn
in the two boxes to the desk attendant to obtain two more. I still have reservations about allowing two boxes, for it is possible to erect a barricade with them behind which a reader may hide considerable activity. But reducing the limit would mean too much "running and fetching" for the reading room staff, and one must compromise at some point.

Possibly the only perfect system for a manuscripts reading room would insist that each researcher strip to the skin, wear into the room a sheet furnished by the institution, use paper and pencil similarly provided to take his notes, use one piece of manuscript at a time, each one of which would be checked out and in individually, surrender all notes for inspection upon leaving the room, and submit to a body search when returning the sheet in the dressing room. Any system less than this will involve a certain amount of security risk for archivists and curators if they are to fulfill the charge of their profession to see that the materials in their charge are as widely used as their institutional regulations will permit.

Archivists should see that their superiors understand these necessary risks. Then, should a theft occur, the report of it will meet with more understanding. Our situation at the University of Virginia was easier administratively because the librarian has taken an active interest in manuscripts during his professional career and has encouraged the growth of our department during his tenure at the university. It has been of benefit to us also that one of the university president's major advisers is a former curator of manuscripts, and that the president himself is a Tennyson scholar who makes use of our facilities in his own work. Invite your superiors into your areas at every opportunity. Have coffee with them, lunch with them, and lobby them unmercifully. Send them copies of articles on manuscripts, rare books, and the special problems of both. But be sure they develop an appreciation of the concerns peculiar to the administration and security of archives and manuscripts.

Attention has to be devoted, too, to special training for personnel who staff reading room desks. These persons must be the chief defense against theft, and they need instruction in procedures to follow should they observe, or suspect, a concealment of materials leading to a theft.

Virginia State Archivist William Van Schreeven, who trained me, was one of those large men who have the knack of
moving quietly. On many occasions I have heard a question issuing from the empty air behind my right ear and jumped to find Van Schreeven standing there, a smile upon his face. He was particularly fond of pulling this stunt on those of us who manned the main desk in the reading room. While he expected us to take work to the desk, he insisted we learn to work with one eye on the readers in the room. His "sneak attacks" were one way of reminding us of our primary responsibilities of service and security.

I think we must do more to train our public service personnel to develop this technique of double vision. It is almost a cliche of manuscript work that our staffs are far too small to accomplish all that needs to be done. We expect our employees to write letters and perform other functions while working in our reading rooms. We must, I believe, lessen these administrative demands. When weighed against the security responsibilities of these persons, the routine work should be secondary. Of course, the employees need to have enough work to accomplish so that they do not fall asleep like the guards in some reading rooms I have visited.

For many years a clerical employee, backed by a faculty member, manned our main control desk in the reading room. This arrangement was adequate in a time when reader use was not particularly heavy and reader's questions uncomplicated. The clerk could handle our accessioning as well as the public service. But our reader use, climbing steadily, has increased seventy percent during the past four years. Combining the greater demands for service with the need for improved security, we found it desirable to rearrange job descriptions so that a library assistant is stationed at the main desk and assigned public service duties only. The person has the support of the public services archivist in the room, as well as the stack supervisor. Also available in the staff end of the room are another faculty member and clerk, though their desks do not permit them to observe the readers. The library assistant is our main security person in the reading room, and for this reason, late last fall I asked the university's legal adviser to visit the room to review the security and to give us advice about the legal problems involved with accusing someone of removing material from the room.

The attorney looked over the situation and immediately suggested that we post large and prominent signs forbidding
the removal of library material from the room. Such a state-
ment appears in our rules and regulations, but it is one of
many paragraphs on a legal-sized sheet with lots of small
type. The attorney felt someone could maintain that he did
not read "all that stuff." We now have two large signs. One
hangs prominently over the control desk facing the readers at
their tables; the other is displayed on the inside of the doors
through which one must pass to leave the room.

Several days after this visit, the attorney sent us
a sheet of suggestions and procedures for dealing with a per-
son that we might see, or suspect of, concealing something.

Conduct yourself with utmost courtesy and def-
erence to the individual's right of privacy and
free movement. . . . If one strongly suspects an
item has been slipped inside the clothing, the in-
dividual should be delayed until the University De-
partment of Police has been called. Do not push,
touch, or otherwise physically interfere with the
suspect. If you see the item or actually saw him
conceal it, you should attempt to delay him by block-
ing his path as discreetly as possible. Politely ask
him to wait a moment until a police officer arrives.
If the individual becomes obstreperous or violent,
you may not fight with him or physically stop him
without being in danger of infringing upon his rights
or getting hurt yourself. You may only actually ar-
rest him if you have a reasonable suspicion that a
felony has been committed in your presence. You
should exercise this common law right and duty to
arrest only in the most compelling of circumstances.
Note the name and address of the suspect and the time
of the incident. If you confront or detain a library
user, have a witness (another employee) there with
you.

At my request, the attorney also had one of his assis-
tants review the *Code of Virginia* to see what laws were ap-
plicable in case we detained someone who was proven innocent
after a search. I had nightmares of one of us being sued for
false arrest, and feared a staff member would be reluctant to
confront someone suspected of theft if the staff member knew
he was personally liable in a case of false arrest.
The check of the Code revealed that there were no applicable laws in the Commonwealth which offered to librarians and archivists the protection granted to merchants detaining someone suspected of shoplifting. The university attorney immediately drafted legislation to cover this situation, and sent it to us for our review. I went over the proposed legislation with my faculty, and we submitted a number of changes to the attorney, chiefly to the definition of library materials. The old definition in the Code was useless, as it did not mention many types of materials commonly held in libraries today. The bill was polished up and returned to me with the suggestion that I ask a delegate to introduce it. The University had a number of other bills in which it was interested and did not wish to spread its influence too far.

With some trepidation, I sent the bill and a letter of explanation to our local representative. He was most cooperative. We got the bill into the hopper just ahead of the deadline for submission to the 1975 annual session of the General Assembly, and were fortunate to have it pass both houses and be signed by the governor. The bill makes concealment of library property a crime. As "proof of the willful concealment ... shall be prima facie evidence of intent to commit larceny thereof." More important from our point of view is the section entitled "Exemption from liability for arrest of suspected person."

A library or agent or employee of the library causing the arrest of any person pursuant to the provisions of §42.1-73 [the section on concealment] shall not be held civilly liable for unlawful detention, slander, malicious prosecution, false imprisonment, false arrest, or assault and battery of the person so arrested ... provided that, in causing the arrest of such person, the library or agent or employee of the Library had at the time of such arrest probable cause to believe that the person committed willful concealment of books or other library property. [The full text of the bill appears on pages 18 and 19.]

We feel that we are rather well protected in dealing with a reader concealing something prior to leaving with it. The bill does not make a confrontation situation easier, but it does give the staff some confidence that in such a situation they have support for their actions, provided they proceed carefully.
The topic of publicity of a theft from an institution is an important and difficult one. Although our staff for several months had concealed the news of the theft and the searches being conducted, it seemed inevitable that word would get out and reach the press. We believed we should be in a far stronger position to control the story if we released it ourselves, and released it rather than waiting to be confronted. In most respects, I think we were right. Virginians were stunned to realize we had manuscripts and rare books so valuable that someone would wish to steal $125,000 worth. By and large, press reaction was sympathetic. There were a few critical reports aimed at our apparent lack of security, which we fueled by letting slip through in our press release one statement that was easily misinterpreted.

For many years, libraries and archives have not wished to publicize thefts because it was felt that knowledge of a theft would cause potential donors to withhold their gifts. In some instances, institutions have been unwilling to prosecute thieves because the publicity of a trial would have revealed the theft. This attitude has eased the work of thieves. Without public announcement of missing materials, dealers sometimes purchased stolen materials unwittingly. A dishonest collector was willing to purchase materials that he might have shied from were it well known they had been stolen from an institution.

At this time, I do not know of a single collection that we have failed to acquire because the potential donor felt our security was not good enough. Of course, there may be some who have not told us. Other donors did ask about the theft in the months after our announcement, but their questions were sympathetic ones resulting from curiosity. I am convinced that the publicity of the theft did have positive benefits for our collecting program. We gained public consciousness of our repository as no report of an accession ever had, or probably ever will.

The worst risk run by publicizing a theft, in my opinion, is that the thief may feel the publicity has destroyed his market for the stolen property, leaving him no alternative but destruction of the material. This was a major concern of the University of Virginia in making the decision to publicize our theft as widely as possible. Since we have not to this date recovered any of our stolen material, it is possible that the thief or thieves did
destroy it. We may never know. But we felt that the benefits of publicity outweighed the risk.

Breaking with the old tradition of concealment of a theft was an important step. More honesty about theft from archives and libraries is needed. The country is in the midst of a major crime wave involving archives and libraries, but only archivists and librarians seem to be aware of it. Publicity will help, for the more responsible people who are aware of our security problem, the more assistance we shall receive in dealing with it. One excellent sign of support is the $90,000 grant to the Society of American Archivists from the National Endowment for the Humanities to fund a number of proposals for specific programs on archival security.

My involvement with archival security has not been a pleasant one. It has been instructive but not in ways that I should have preferred to mark my career. I am glad to be involved in archival security from a more objective and useful perspective, and I hope and expect that the next paper that I write on this subject will not have to carry the qualifying phrase of this one in its title.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:
1. That §§ 42.1-72 and 42.1-73 of the Code of Virginia are amended and reenacted and the Code of Virginia is amended by adding sections numbered 42.1-73.1 and 42.1-74.1 as follows:

§ 42.1-72. Injuring or destroying books and other property of libraries. — Any person who willfully, maliciously or wantonly writes upon, injures, defaces, tears, cuts, mutilates, or destroys any book or other library property belonging to or in the custody of any public, county or regional library, the State Library, other repository of public records, museums or any library or collection belonging to or in the custody of any educational, eleemosynary, benevolent, hereditary, historical library or patriotic institution, organization or society, shall be guilty of a class 1 misdemeanor.
§ 42.1-73. Concealment of book or other property while on premises of library; removal of book or other property from library. —Whoever, without authority, with the intention of converting to his own or another's use, willfully conceals a book or other library property, while still on the premises of such library, or willfully or without authority removes any book or other property from any of the above libraries or collections shall be deemed guilty of larceny thereof, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished as provided by law. Proof of the willful concealment of such book or other library property while still on the premises of such library shall be prima facie evidence of intent to commit larceny thereof.

§ 42.1-73.1 Exemption from liability for arrest of suspected person. —A library or agent or employee of the library causing the arrest of any person pursuant to the provisions of § 42.1-73, shall not be held civilly liable for unlawful detention, slander, malicious prosecution, false imprisonment, false arrest, or assault and battery of the person so arrested, whether such arrest takes place on the premises of the library or after close pursuit from such premises by such agent or employee; provided that, in causing the arrest of such person, the library or agent or employee of the library had at the time of such arrest probable cause to believe that the person committed willful concealment of books or other library property.

§ 42.1-74.1 “Book or other library property” defined. The terms “book or other library property” as used in this chapter shall include any book, plate, picture, photograph, engraving, painting, drawing, map, newspaper, magazine, pamphlet, broadside, manuscript, document, letter, public record, microform, sound recording, audiovisual materials in any format, magnetic or other tapes, electronic data processing records, artifacts, or other documentary, written, or printed material, regardless of physical form or characteristics, belonging to, on loan to, or otherwise in the custody of any library, museum, repository of public or other records institution as specified in § 42.1-72.
Do you remember the lovely old bookmark with the legend:

Steal not this book for fear of shame,
For it is in the owner's name
And when you're dead the Lord will say
Where is that book you stole away?

It seems that in today's world, we have to rely less on the suspect's fear of questioning by the Lord and more on the inculcation of a proper respect for questioning by our law enforcement people and—let's face it—by ourselves. The sad truth is that if we do not do it ourselves, it will not be done. The sage was right who said: "An alert and dedicated staff is the most effective defense a library can have."

You have asked me to come here with some suggestions on detection and deterrence. This puts me, as we say, between a rock and a hard place. You all know about physical security of archives and libraries than I do, as Mr. Berkeley's magnificent presentation well proves. Yet if I confine myself to talking about law, I will be like the child who, when his father asked what the teacher had said, replied, "More than I wanted to know."

After weighing these hazards, I have decided to talk about archives and library security in terms of circumstantial evidence. This type of evidence takes up considerable time and thought on the part of lawyers. One of our early great judges, Justice Bleckley, pointed out that often among
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the facts most clearly established in a case are those to which no witness had ever testified.

I will give you an example of circumstantial evidence. A rather scroungy little man walked into Tiffany's in New York some years back and asked to look at diamond rings. The clerk took a tray of rings out of the showcase and laid it on top of the glass counter. After examining them carefully, the customer asked to see something better. The clerk replaced the tray and got out another one. That in turn was rejected and replaced. Eventually the clerk brought out a tray from the interior of a vault with each exquisite ring sparkling in its own place. After the customer had examined them all under the eagle eye of the staff, he turned to leave without making a purchase. As he reached the door, he stumbled and fell, and out of his pockets rolled two- or three-dozen glittering cut stones. You can imagine what happened: somebody locked the door, somebody called the police, and three or four stout men held the suspect down. Unfortunately, the brilliants were from Woolworths, and were poor quality at that. And the purported customer turned out to be none other than Groucho Marx, who had pulled the hoax in order to win a bet.

Did Groucho Marx have a false arrest suit against anybody? Certainly everybody in that store had what the lawbooks call "probable cause" to think him a thief, which is really what I am here to talk to you about. Probable cause, in the context of theft, is simply that totality of circumstances which would make a reasonable man believe that a particular human being has possessed himself of a particular piece of property belonging to somebody else, and that his purpose in doing so is to make off with it without the owner's consent. Now, all sorts of things can lead you to such a conclusion, from a wild hunch to actually seeing the person stick the item under his coat, and the question you always have to ask yourself when you reach this conclusion is whether that fictional masterpiece and darling of the law—the hypothetical man of ordinary prudence and discretion—would reach the same conclusion you have. If he would, or if a jury would think he would under the circumstances, then you have probable cause. Otherwise you do not. Simple, isn't it?

The fact of the matter is, however, that if custodians of books and records and artifacts err, it is usually
on the side of conservatism. I have never heard of a false arrest action being brought against a librarian, and am sure that none has been in Georgia. The Archivist of the United States has pointed out that archivists are a trained and dedicated group with a strong public service orientation. He adds:

I wonder if we are sometimes prone to forget that not all those with whom we come in contact have equally high standards of probity and honesty . . . . [We need to] devote at least a little time to the fact that documents are sometimes stolen, to the ways in which thieves operate, and to a study of deterrents against theft. We must teach our archivists to be suspicious and watchful without diminishing in any respect their obligation to be courteous and helpful to researchers.¹

It seems to me that this is putting a great burden on you to be two kinds of people at the same time, as though you were expected to be both a doctor and a detective. But it is true that even with police officers and security men around, it is ultimately the staff who prevents or detects documentary theft.

There is such a thing as a professional thief of valuable documents. It is your job to educate him into the realization that there are other avenues of trade more remunerative for him, and that he has made a tragic error in his choice of career. To do this you must on occasion be alert and willing to act on the evidence before you.

What is required in the way of surveillance depends less on the class of people using the facilities than on the value of the holdings. Even sedate and elegant institutions patronized in the main by serious researchers become vulnerable as they accumulate rare items which attract the attention of a professional documents or museum thief, or the value of which proves tempting to someone who heretofore has proved to be a trustworthy employee. I might say that my reading in the area suggests that in a truly great percentage of the important heists an employee is implicated, either acting alone or working in concert with a professional specialist in this type of theft. This is outside the purpose of my discussion today, except to point out that it exists and that the security measures to combat it

¹
are of a different and specialized character.

In document theft, the same circumstances operate as in shoplifting. I recently heard a talk by the head of security at Rich's department store, who said that not only is inventory loss by theft now accelerating astronomically, so that it equals between 1 and 2 percent of sales, but samplings of recovered goods suggest that a majority were stolen by or in connivance with an employee working in the store. This is a horrifying state of affairs, but it is one of the facts of life in today's business world. Nevertheless, stores are frequent targets of false arrest suits, which may be even more costly. Therefore, the motto of these security people, and I also advise it for those on your staffs stationed in reading rooms, is "IF YOU DIDN'T SEE IT, IT DIDN'T HAPPEN."

Institutions such as the Atlanta Public Library sustain their losses primarily piecemeal and as a result of customer theft. This means that the usual theft will not reach felony proportions. In Georgia there are no such things as common law crimes. Only what is declared illegal by statute can be the subject of police action. The statute determines whether the crime is a felony or a misdemeanor, because here by definition any crime punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary for over one year is a felony. All other offenses are misdemeanors. The maximum penalty for a misdemeanor is a year in jail and a $1,000 fine. A theft of goods, the value of which totals less than $100, is declared to be a misdemeanor; over $100, it is a felony. This has important consequences. A citizen's arrest can be made only when the person actually sees the crime being committed in his presence, unless the crime is a felony and the perpetrator is escaping and the person has probable cause to believe this man actually committed the crime.

You may be surprised to learn that, so far as I can find out, no actual arrests are made by the Atlanta Public Library, although it employs a detective and a security officer and also makes use of Checkpoint, one of the better electronic surveillance methods. All books are electrically coded, and there is a very efficient turnstyle system that forces traffic to flow out through a narrow passage where books are checked out by deactivating an electronic signal which has been placed in them. If the signal is not deactivated, the turnstyle locks and the customer is unable
to exit. At that point, the customer is politely reminded by the attendant at the desk that he should produce his book to be checked, or he is asked to open his briefcase, or whatever, to determine the cause for the alarm. If the customer refuses point blank, however, the staff employee at the desk must release the turnstile lock and allow his departure. In the end, the system has only a psychological value. And it is expensive. I do not know what Atlanta pays, but such a system normally costs $2,500 or more per year for rental, plus 15¢ to 30¢ per book for the tape, plus a tremendous amount of staff time to place the coded material in each book. Furthermore, it is far from accurate. The system picks up any metal, and a metal briefcase, or a can of hair spray in a pocketbook, will set it off. Also it can be fooled. If the book is carried under one's pants belt with a coat over it, or under one's coat with an arm over it, there will be no signal. In spite of all this, the Atlanta Library feels the system worthwhile, which gives some indication of the volume of book thefts. When a large system like the Atlanta Library simply throws up its hands insofar as invoking the law, it becomes clear what every depository of books and papers is up against. After making some study of the laws on the books, I have become convinced that we do in fact need legislation which will allow archivists and librarians some practical access to the law as a deterrent to theft.

First, let me point out that there are separate categories of thieves and that it would be rewarding to consider briefly the kind of people you may come up against. At one end of the spectrum is the absent minded professor who unintentionally gets a manuscript mixed up with his own papers and starts out with it. There is the busy researcher who is technically guilty. He has to leave and decides it would be much easier for him to finish his reading in the privacy of his own home before sneaking the copy back in. There is the very occasional scholar who has become so enamored of his own field, and developed such a sentimental attachment to his area, that the temptation of personally possessing some document or artifact is irresistible. There is the true pathological kleptomaniac. There is the amateur beset by sudden temptation, and there is the professional who works through a fence or even sometimes on commission from an unscrupulous dealer or collector. He is, of course, the most dangerous, and you are not likely to catch him in the act. He will have given false references, if you demand references, and one of the best safeguards you can have is
to make at least spotchecks to be absolutely certain that users unknown to you personally have the proper credentials. If the price is worth it, he may go to great lengths to establish himself as a bona fide scholar. There are also, as recent events have shown, both the mentally unstable and the political protester, such as the group of women revolutionaries who bombed the Harvard Library in 1970. There also have been instances of destruction of catalogues.

Facing these hazards and a stunning increase in possessory crimes in the past few years, archivists confront two questions. One is how best to keep people, either inadvertently or with intent, from removing property without consent from repositories. The other is how far it is prudent to go in ambiguous circumstances without subjecting yourselves or your employer to charges of false arrest or false imprisonment. There are, in the present state of the law, stringent safeguards which a suspect may invoke, and I believe it might be helpful to go into the reasons for them so that you can better understand the issues as they are sometimes seen by trial judges. This also will give my reasons for certain changes I would recommend in the law.

In general, a suspect's defenses are constitutional in nature, usually predicated on the Fourth amendment in the Bill of Rights, enacted in 1791 and described as one of the most litigated provisions in the Constitution. It provides that every man shall be safe in his person, papers and effects, and that no search is legal except on oath specially designating the person or place to be searched and on a showing of probable cause. The Supreme Court recently stated that probable cause (to believe a crime has been committed) is not a technical concept, but is based on factual and practical considerations of everyday life on which reasonable and prudent men act (Adams, 407 U.S.). It applies to arrests, detentions, and searches. Searches without search warrants are always illegal, except in certain instances or by virtue of certain legislation which I will mention shortly. Somebody who knows sufficient facts to constitute probable cause must swear to those facts before a judge or magistrate, and if the magistrate agrees, he may issue a warrant. This warrant is served only by a peace officer and only on the person or the property which it describes. That forbids you from making any search ever of a person you think is concealing stolen goods on his person, or among his effects, unless you come under an exception.
Not only that, it eliminates your calling any policeman to search the suspect under any circumstances, unless you are very sure you can prove the value of the object is over $100. Remember that a policeman cannot arrest and search without a warrant if the theft is a misdemeanor, rather than a felony, unless he personally has seen the offender take the item. What you tell him may amount to probable cause to believe the suspect is in possession of the material, but the officer can arrest for a misdemeanor without a warrant only if the misdemeanor is committed in his presence. Hence, in Georgia the idea of holding a suspect by watching or talking to him until you can get a policeman may not necessarily work, even if the officer arrives immediately and even if he believes you, unless you convince him also that the value of the material reaches felony proportions. This explains why the Atlanta Public Library makes no arrests.

Lest warrants appear more impediment than support of law, they are in fact absolutely vital to our existence as a free people. It has been recognized since the days of the Magna Carta that the power of government to take a citizen's person or property, unless it was lawfully undertaken and unless a written record showed it to be lawful, was slavery. By the eighteenth century this was well established; however, another practice had grown up of issuing what were called "general warrants." While they showed that a crime had been committed, and authorized a search, they did not specify who could do the searching or who could be searched. Hence, anybody could use them on anybody. General warrants became the same as no warrant at all. This went on until 1763 when the British Secretary of State, Lord Halifax, felt it necessary to suppress an underground periodical called the North Briton. He issued some of these warrants, and among the houses searched on the strength of them was that of a member of Parliament, John Wilkes. Nothing was found. Wilkes brought a damage suit against Lord Halifax based on the proposition that general warrants were void and that Halifax was no better than a criminal in having his, Wilkes', house ransacked under these circumstances. Amazingly, Wilkes won the case, and a jury gave him £1,000, or about $24,000 in today's money. He then brought suit for false imprisonment based on the same transaction and was awarded close to $100,000. American history buffs will remember the incendiary effect this had on Americans complaining of some similar British practices in the colonies.
With your permission I will skip the next 200 years and get to the present state of repair of the edifice raised on those ancient and honorable foundations. Since World War II, expanding social consciousness on the one hand and increased problems resulting from criminal activity on the other have given rise not so much to changes in the structure of the law as to a complicated architecture of U.S. Supreme Court opinions attempting to delimit the rights and duties of peace officers. The affects directly concern archivists in institutions large enough to have security guards or detectives equipped with police powers on call, and knowledge of the opinions is a prelude to an understanding of the rights and responsibilities of every archivist and librarian.

In 1968, just 200 years after the British Wilkes case, the U. S. Supreme Court decided Terry v. Ohio (392 U.S. 1). A plainclothesman in Cleveland, Ohio, had noticed three men acting strangely. He watched them for a lengthy period. One man would walk down the street, look in a store window, move away, look in again, and then go back and talk to the other two. A second man would repeat the performance, and so on. The officer decided the men were casing the store preparatory to a hold up. Note that he had no "probable cause" for this conclusion, but he did have an "informed suspicion." He went up to them to investigate. Their answers were unsatisfactory; he quickly "frisked" one of them, Terry, by patting his outer clothing, felt a hard object, reached in and drew out a revolver. He was then in a position to arrest Terry for carrying a concealed weapon—that is, for a misdemeanor being committed in his presence. One of the predicates of a lawful arrest is that the suspect may then be fully searched, as well as taken down to the station house, booked, and interrogated at length. Terry eventually was convicted of possession of a concealed weapon and contended that the conviction should be set aside because he had been unlawfully arrested and searched. This led the court to face the hard realities of life, and to acknowledge that a "stop" is a sort of seizure, and a "frisk" is a sort of search. But it reached the conclusion that "stop and frisk," within limits, could be performed on less probable cause than "search and seizure." The ultimate conclusion of the U.S. Supreme Court in Terry v. Ohio was that when a police officer (and please note here that I am still talking about policemen and not ordinary citizens like you and me) "observes unusual conduct which leads him reasonably to conclude in the light of his experience that criminal activity
may be afoot," and while these facts do not amount to probable cause to believe a felony is being committed in his presence, they yet serve as a justification to pursue the matter by further investigation. This usually means going up to the suspect and talking to him. If his suspicions are not allayed, and if the initial stop was reasonable under the circumstances, and if for some good reason he feels apprehensive (he suspects a crime of violence has been committed, or that the man may be armed and dangerous), he may then "frisk" the suspect—that is, give him a pat-down to ascertain whether he has weapons. This is only a weapons search and not a search for a packet of marijuana or a missing manuscript. But if such an item is found in the course of the weapons search, the suspect may be arrested rather than "detained," searched rather than "frisked," and conducted unceremoniously to the station house.

Much case law has been made since Terry, including a 1972 decision which allowed a police officer to interrogate a man sitting in a car on a tip that he had heroin and a gun under his belt, to reach under the belt, on finding the gun to arrest him for weapons possession, and then to search him and the vehicle for the narcotics. This is a lot closer to your situation, because here the officer is acting on information from another person and not on what he sees himself. It is an indication that the court may broaden its position to justify a limited detention and search for less than probable cause, and for something the officer did not see but which was told to him by somebody else. It is doubtful that such a rule ever will be applied generally, and in my opinion it would be exceedingly dangerous to every citizen, including good guys like you and me. But the case does suggest that there can be circumstances in which a police officer can act on information furnished him by another person, in addition to that which reaches him from his informed senses. The rule therefore could be made the basis of legislation which would allow a peace officer to detain, and if necessary search, a person whom the informant—a reading room attendant, for example—has actually seen attempt to steal archival, library or museum property. The same legislation could protect that informant if he told the truth and if what he observed in fact amounts to probable cause.

By the way, the word "arrest" itself can be confusing. We rightly think of it as the process by which a suspect is orally charged with a specific crime and taken to
the police station. In addition, we now have two other meanings to consider. In the "stop and frisk" context, the person is accosted by a police officer involuntarily for purposes of investigation. If he is not free to walk away, this investigatory stage is not an "arrest" in the usual lay sense of the word, but legally it is. Even the Supreme Court calls it instead a "momentary detention" (and words of that sort), while admitting that it is sheer torture of the English language to pretend it is not a "seizure" of the person, just as an arrest is. But in the law of false arrest, the slightest touching or detaining of a person against his will is an arrest, and if not lawful, consensual or privileged, it can be the basis of a damage suit.

I feel that you need more protection in cases where you really have cause to believe that someone is making off with the archival or library property. The legislation I would propose addresses three questions: Can we broaden the area where the detention (and if necessary the search) of such a person is lawful? Can we broaden the area of consent? And can we broaden the area of privilege?

Of course the situation you confront is much more subtle than that of the detective in a high crime area who believes he recognizes an escaped felon, or who sees conduct that suggests a suspect is casing a store preparatory to breaking in or is selling narcotics. What probably happens is that you the archivist suddenly realize something has disappeared and a visitor could have taken it, or that a visitor has closed his briefcase on what could be a valuable document or reference book, or even that you think you saw him slip something surreptitiously under his coat. Even if you are fairly sure there is a thief in your presence and that he has the material in his possession, you can hardly hold him against his will, certainly not if his possessory crime is only a misdemeanor, which it would be if the value of the manuscript, or whatever, is less than $100. Of course you have the right politely to question him. It is when you seek to detain him against his will that you are in trouble. If the material has been charged out to him, he is responsible for it. But if he denies knowledge and refuses to open his coat or his briefcase, and the material in fact appears to be missing, what do you do?

We need legislation to broaden the area of detention and search. I suggest that detention and search never be attempted by a custodian of materials. Assuming that you have a detective or security guard with police power on the premises, or can get a policeman there quickly, you must remember
that even if you saw the suspect pocketing the material, the policeman only has your word for that fact. Further, he only has your word for the fact that the material is worth over $100 and therefore is of felony proportions. Hence the policeman himself would be doing an illegal act if he arrested without a warrant for a crime not committed in his presence, especially if that crime might be only a misdemeanor. To shore up his power, for your protection, I suggest a clause found in some of the shoplifting statutes. It reads:

A peace officer may, upon a charge being made and without a warrant, arrest any person whom he has reasonable cause to believe has committed or attempted to commit theft of or intentional damage to Depository property.

If you have seen a theft, or seen things which, although they are circumstantial evidence, convince you that the visitor is committing a theft, your relation of these facts to the officer gives him the probable cause required by the statute. It places you more or less in the position of an informant, and the 1973 Allen case I mentioned which allowed a limited detention based on an informant's tip, indicates that such legislation would be Constitutional as a reasonable search or seizure. The Supreme Court has emphasized on several occasions that it is only the unreasonable search which is prohibited. The presumption that any search without a warrant is unreasonable is what needs to be removed in the situation we are talking about.

The second piece of legislation I propose shores up your position and gives you a qualified privilege to act where you otherwise could not. It protects you for what you do within its parameters, and it also protects you where you call a policeman and the policeman, acting on what you have told him, makes an arrest. The purpose of such legislation is to give you immunity from a false arrest or false imprisonment suit or malicious prosecution where you have probable cause to believe that the suspect has removed the material and is intending to steal it. The wording can be taken substantially from the paragraph of Mr. Berkeley's Virginia legislation headed "Exemption from liability for arrest of suspected person" or from the Georgia Code §105-1005, which is the Georgia shoplifting statute. The law provides, in a store situation, that if an employee reasonably thinks a customer is shoplifting, and if the customer has behaved in
such a manner as to cause a man of reasonable prudence to believe that he was shoplifting, and if the time and manner of detention or arrest of the customer are reasonable, the customer may not recover damages against the store or the employee for detention. This constitutes a defense to a false arrest or malicious prosecution action and is what is called a "qualified privilege" based on probable cause.

To illustrate, recall Groucho Marx and his prank with the phony diamonds. Under common law rules, if he were detained and searched and no store property found on him, he technically would have a right of action for false arrest. Once a mistake is made, it does not matter how much probable cause the storekeeper had: if he is wrong, he is liable. The "reasonable cause" legislation reverses this situation and is illustrated nicely in the Georgia case of S. S. Kresge Co. v. Carty [120 Ga. App. 170]. Our shoplifting law makes it illegal not only to steal merchandise, but to steal or alter labels. A woman and her husband walked into a K-Mart store and spent a lot of time in the picture frame department. A clerk saw her put into her pocketbook a yellow roll of something which looked to him like the rolls of price tags used by the store in that department. The store had been having trouble with people switching labels on merchandise, so the clerk followed Mrs. Carty out to the sidewalk and asked her whether she did not have a roll of price tags in her pocketbook. The yellow roll turned out to be not a roll of price tags but a yellow tape measure she had brought along for use in selecting a picture frame. She alleged that she was forced to go back into the store and allow a search of her bag, and suffered great humiliation and so on. Under the former rule, the store would have been liable for damages. With the shoplifting statute, the court held that "it is the public policy of this state that there be no recovery" where the person's behavior reasonably caused an employee to believe the person was shoplifting. It added: "It is when the jury may conclude that an honest mistake was made and that the merchant had reasonable cause to believe that one was shoplifting that the defense is available."

Custodians of valuable property, such as archives and records, need this same protection. It covers you for what you do personally and what you cause a police officer to do in the way of arrest or search if it finally turns out that a mistake was made.
Even with this protection, however, I must warn you that stores generally caution their staffs to be very careful in what they do or say. Rich's, as I have said, adopts the basic slogan for its security people: "If you didn't see it, it didn't happen." And while Rich's and some other stores now use on all the higher priced merchandise the electronic markers which set off an alarm if not removed, the employees are trained never to make accusations. Instead, they apologize to the customer, blame the presence of the activator on the probable negligence of a sales clerk in forgetting to remove it after making a sale, and point out that of course the customer does not want to wear the item with the activator on because it would set off alarms in other stores. In this way, according to Rich's head of security, they frequently reassure the customer sufficiently to get her to open her shopping bag or whatever. The employees also may suggest that they be shown the sales slip in order to reprimand the clerk, and by this means recover a considerable amount of stolen goods by allowing the customer to save face and pretend that the item got into the shopping bag simply by accident. But in these instances, so far as I know, they do not make a case against the shoplifter.

This brings me to a third possible piece of legislation. As I said, any detention, any interference with the right of another person to come and go as he sees fit, is an arrest. And arrests without warrants for arrest, like searches without a valid arrest or a search warrant, are presumptively illegal. The burden is always on the person making the arrest or search to convince a jury that he had probable cause, that he acted under the circumstances as a reasonable person would be expected to do. The really blanket exception to these rules is the search by consent. One who consents to the opening of his briefcase or pocketbook cannot complain. This is the premise on which the airlines operate in requiring you and your hand luggage to go through electronic surveillance. The underlying theory is that nobody is forcing you to go into the protected area, but if you want to do so you must consent to certain actions which otherwise would be an invasion of your privacy. The reason for this curtailment of your rights lies in public necessity. It is a protection to the public and crews who fly on airplanes against the illegal acts of the hijacker, the mentally disturbed person with a bomb, and so on. Its purpose is to promote the public welfare.

Archivists and librarians who have in their care articles of great value are in a special situation, because
what you are protecting is a unique and irreplaceable cultural heritage. I should like, therefore, to see archives, museums and libraries protected by a Consent to Search law, which would imply the consent to search clothing or personal effects from presence in the area. The visitor must know that he is giving up a part of his right to privacy before he enters; the choice is then his, as it is the airline passenger's, whether or not to use the facility.

An act could state:

Any Depository may place within its entrance-way a sign substantially as follows: YOUR PRESENCE HERE CONSTITUTES CONSENT TO THE SEARCH OF ALL CLOTHING AND PERSONAL EFFECTS BROUGHT ON THESE PREMISES. The custodian or authorized agent of a Depository displaying such notice may detain and question any person whose conduct causes reasonable grounds for suspicion that such person is engaging, or is about to engage, in theft of, or criminal damage or trespass to, Depository property. The employee or agent also may search the clothing and personal effects of the suspect. Visitors will be deemed to have consented to reasonable detention and search, and no action for false arrest, false imprisonment, or malicious prosecution may be predicated on such action.

Not every library or archives will want to post such a sign because of the public relations problem it might engender. For those used primarily by bona fide researchers and serious visitors and students, it should be very helpful. Even with the probable cause and reasonable man legislation, cases may occur that must be suffered through trial and jury verdict because of wide differences in testimony. I think this is what makes storekeepers hesitate, even when they are sure that the taking was a theft. Instead, they are satisfied if they get back the merchandise, or even part of it. Merchandise is replaceable; manuscripts are not.

I would make one final comment on the words used. In Georgia, "theft" encompasses every taking with the intent to deprive the owner of the property. Defacement or damage to books is covered by the criminal damage statute (Code §26-1502) if the damage exceeds $100, or the criminal trespass statute (Code §26-1503(a)) if the damage is less than $100.
or if there is willful interference with the possession or use of the property not amounting to theft. The word "property" in the criminal code means either real or personal property.

The three changes in the law which I am suggesting would apply whether the property involved was a broken window, a defaced wall, a desk or typewriter, a document, or work of art. They would apply also whether or not the person suspected is a user or an employee. These three areas—broadening the permissible "arrest" area for peace officers, activating a probable cause defense, and establishing a consent to search rule where appropriate—would give archivists, librarians, and museum curators maximum protection. You need this protection, for you are the guardians of our cultural heritage. And only as we have an opportunity to know and venerate the past can we meaningfully inform the future.

NOTE


[Action aimed at securing appropriate legislation to protect Georgia's archivists in defending the resources entrusted to them does not stop here. See ARCHIVE NOTES, pps. 73-83, below.—Ed.]
TAKING THE MAN OUT OF MANUSCRIPTS  
ATLANTA'S PILOT PROJECT FOR THE WOMEN'S HISTORY SOURCES SURVEY

Julia Voorhees Emmons

Interest in woman's history is on the rise. A recent issue of Woman's Abstracts lists over fifteen articles that explore aspects of women's past: from English lady philanthropists of the Romantic period to early community work of black Atlanta clubwomen; from women who supported John Wesley to housewives of seventeenth-century Salem, Massachusetts. For the most part these articles deal not with political women, the suffragettes and other ardent reformers whose attacks on male-dominated institutions have been so widely studied, but rather with woman's social and economic past, examining their lifestyles to discover what they did, how and why they did it.

As the field of women's history expands, with more systematic attention given to the lives of individuals, the need for subject access to primary material increases. To date, however, most sources lie buried in manuscript collections whose general descriptions rarely highlight the material: Mrs. John Doe's diary and household accounts seldom have any prominence in the catalog of the John Doe papers. It is to uncover and describe fully such "hidden" documents that the recently-launched Women's History Sources Survey addresses itself.

Funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the project is headed by Andrea Hinding and Clarke A. Chambers
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of the Social Welfare History Archives of the University of Minnesota. Its goal is to produce a multi-volume guide, modeled on the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections (NUCMC), to consist of thousands of descriptions of individual collections—personal and family papers, government, corporate and institutional records—together with subject, name, and geographical indexes. These descriptions will be obtained from all known repositories, including national, state, and local archives, historical societies, and church, business and other institutional collections. Information will be gathered by mail or through visits conducted by one of the sixteen paid area representatives of the project.

Although the Women's Survey was funded only in the autumn of 1975, its initiating proposal was described in the April, 1973, American Archivist, and the potential importance of the project has been appreciated since then. In the autumn of 1974, a year before actual funding, Darlene Roth-White, who has done important research into the history of women's organizations in Atlanta, and the present writer determined to anticipate funding by designing a pilot project, the success or failure of which would be relayed to the Minnesota headquarters. We chose two archives for our experiment—the Special Collections Department at Emory University, to be explored in the fall quarter of 1974, and the Georgia Department of Archives and History, to be examined in the following quarter.

The key to the success of our non-funded project turned out to be the students in my course in Social Science literature, for theirs was the responsibility of making accurate descriptions. All had had a prerequisite course in basic reference. They were given the option of counting their participation in our experiment as their term project in the course. The level of interest was such that most chose to take part. In a special, preliminary session, Ms. Roth-White talked to them about the ever-widening parameters of women's history, and I acquainted them with NUCMC, Philip Hamer's Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States and Canada, and the other important guides to manuscripts. Then the students, as a group, accompanied me to the archives to be searched that quarter.

From the beginning I hoped to make the project mutually beneficial. Through their examination and description of manuscript collections potentially valuable for the
experiment, the students also would be producing data of real value to the archives itself. Thus it was important that the student treat the material with care and describe it according to the archives' own format (the descriptions could be adapted to a Women's Survey format later if necessary). At each repository, the curator of manuscripts showed the students how materials were arranged, pointed out how they were to be described, and made a cautionary statement against disrupting existing order. The curator also provided a list of possibly useful collections from which each of the students selected one to examine. If no inventory existed, the students made one; if there was an inventory, they edited a copy to emphasize the women's papers. Most descriptions followed an expanded NUCMC format. The students were requested not to bombard the staff with questions, but to ask me. To maintain continuing supervision, I met with each student weekly and kept in close contact with the archivist. Because completeness and accuracy were of utmost importance, the students were asked to spend five hours a week at the archives. The alternative to this arrangement, assigning them a certain number of boxes to "get through," might have inclined them to speed carelessly through the task. Some students completed several small collections; others spent the quarter describing one large set of papers. Throughout the experiment the archivists at both institutions were warmly encouraging and very helpful; all of us working on the project were impressed and most appreciative of their support.

At the end of the quarter, each student handed in three copies of each description. One went to the archives, a second was reserved for the Women's Survey, and a third was placed in our files. The archivists reported the descriptions to be of high quality and some to be of permanent use. The value of the project from the students' point of view also was considerable. Without exception, they found the experience rewarding, and some participants were enthusiastic enough to choose to do archives-related projects in later quarters. Ms. Roth-White and I were pleased also, for we accumulated in-depth descriptions of over fifty collections that held papers important for the study of women's history.

Among the rich holdings at the Georgia Department of Archives and History, the students found five boxes of personal and business correspondence, 1906-1956, of Rhoda Kauffman, an outstanding figure in the development of Atlanta's health and welfare agencies; a journal, 1857-1883, filled with
the shrewd observations on religion and Southern society of Louisa Warren Patch Fletcher; the letters, records, and clippings, 1951-1967, of Adah Toombs, active in Atlanta civic movements and a campaigner for Georgia prison reform; and, in a lighter vein, the collection, 1865-1959, of the musical Barili family, which included material on Adelina Patti, and Emily and Louise Barili, important figures in Atlanta's early cultural growth, 1870s-1940.

The students also had success at Emory University's Special Collections. Among the most interesting sources located there were the Civil War and Reconstruction diary and letters of Dolly Lunt Burge, within the Burge Family Papers; papers, reports, and correspondence, 1918-1963, of women's activist Mary Barker and of her educator sister Tomie Dora Barker; five boxes of material, 1868-1970, by and on Methodist civil rights activist Dorothy Tilly, which include her papers as a member of the President's Commission on Civil Rights, 1947; and twenty-three boxes of documents and correspondence, 1958-ca. 1970, relating to Eliza Paschall, an important figure in Atlanta politics who, among other positions, has been director of the Greater Atlanta Council on Human Relations.

Although the Women's History Sources Survey recently received the funding requested for it, we plan to continue our "pilot" project in the Atlanta area as long as there are archives to explore, students eager to explore them, and archivists to welcome our effort.
FINDING AIDS ARE LIKE STREAKERS

David B. Gracy II

Finding aids are like streakers—they have to be seen to be appreciated. And like streakers, they have come in for considerable criticism. Some persons say there are too many finding aids, others too few; some believe they are too cursory, others too detailed; some demand more publications, others call for a great centralized bank of information in machine-readable form. All agree, though, that finding aids rank among the most important products of archival repositories. Lacking finding aids, one who would use an archives sails an ocean of information without a compass.

Like instruments for navigation, finding aids take many forms. One, a published guide of vignettes describing hundreds of collections, promotes access to the holdings in aggregate of an archives. Another, a card catalog of data assembled at the end of the processing cycle explicitly to illuminate research potential reveals similar items of information scattered through several collections. A third form, a basic control document, like a preliminary inventory, focuses on a single body of material, emphasizing arrangement and organization. A finding aid, then, is any descriptive media, card or document, published or unpublished, that establishes physical, administrative and/or intellectual control over material. Finding aids make it possible for a repository, with grace and dispatch, to meet its two most critical demands: retrieving research material for a patron, and locating for a donor the material he has placed in the
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Institution for permanent preservation. "No other aspect of a library's activities is more deserving of staff time or more dependent on a high level of staff skill," Ruth Bordin and Robert Warner assert in their widely-circulated book, *The Modern Manuscript Library*, than the production of finding aids.¹

Finding aids may be grouped into three categories: 1) those created for internal control of collections, 2) those produced for in-house reference service, and 3) those published for out-of-house consumption. Each one has its own purpose and style, its own priority and scope. A well-rounded archival program will prepare at least one finding aid from each of the categories, and normally produce them in the order of internal control documents first, in-house reference service material next, and reports for external publication last.

The first group, or stage, of finding aids is the document produced by the archives in the process of gaining control over an accession. Whether labeled a worksheet, accession checklist, preliminary inventory, inventory, register, or something else, the document is the repository's first serious effort to describe a collection and can be produced only after the staff has opened and surveyed the record group. (I shall use interchangeably the terms "record group" and "collection," which archivists and manuscripts curators respectively use to identify the same thing.²)

The basic control document describes both the structure and substance of a collection, but emphasizes the structure. Thus the control document highlights data on the types of records included—correspondence, legal papers, minutes, photographs and so forth—and illuminates in depth the arrangement and bulk of the collection. A brief note on substance pulls together both information about the records, such as their origin and provenance, and data on the subject content of the group. Though usually short, this latter data may be expanded to point out in which subject areas the material bulks in either quantity or date periods and any notable gaps that exist in the documentation. A third fundamental description made at this stage is that of housing and location. Some repositories create a separate shelf list for use in retrieving their holdings, while others incorporate this information into their basic control document. Generally the more detailed this location information, the more exact a researcher can be in his request for material and the less staff time need be diverted to reference and retrieval.
Among the variety of basic control documents, worksheets and accession checklists usually record on a form with scant elaboration the order and contents of a collection. These are little more than outlines of arrangement—bare tables of contents—or they may be descriptions by record unit that do no more than pull together material related either by type of document or by subject. The strength of the control document, however, lies in the explicitness of its physical description. Its user can tell where in the collection to look for the information he seeks.

Preliminary inventories have followed many styles, being by design descriptions of tentative situations. Nevertheless for most archivists, the term calls up the document produced by the National Archives and Records Service (NARS). This preliminary inventory is produced only after extensive, laborious work has been devoted to a record group to determine its arrangement, contents and quantity. Generally NARS' preliminary inventories provide more substantive information than accession checklists, but omit reference to housing or location. They excel in showing the research potential in the collection and in indicating the relationships among record groups. And like a temporary tax, these preliminary inventories, now printed and indexed, have a very permanent look about them.

Inventories and registers (two names for the same document, the distinction, when it is made, being that an inventory is produced by an archives and a register by a historical manuscripts repository) differ from preliminary inventories principally in that they are admittedly finished documents. They describe collections after nonessential items have been removed and after the final arrangement has been determined. In many places, particularly historical manuscripts repositories, they are the first control document produced, simply because the collections are small enough that final decisions as to permanent historical value, arrangement and housing can safely be made without the need of an intermediate step.

Given the fact that each repository must produce one of the basic control documents, the question becomes, which one? The answer hinges on five considerations. The nature of collections received and the size of the staff are two obvious factors. Third is the primary need, or needs, the document must satisfy. In the Southern Labor
Archives, for example, the inventory serves first as the basic control document. But in addition it acts as a finding aid, as a shelf location document, and as a receipt to a donor for his gift. A large percentage of our donors are organizations still very active and concerned to be able to refer to specific documents in their files. Our inventories are explicit enough that most donors can suggest which box, occasionally which folder, houses the document they seek.

The fourth consideration is the research use the archives experiences. If most patrons are the same people who created the records, the archives may need develop no further finding aid system, since the users, already familiar with the files, will require little assistance. Such well-informed patrons, however, are rare in most archives and historical manuscripts repositories open to the public. Moreover, a diverse clientele can place varying demands on the retrieval capacity of the archives. Scholars tend to study subjects that require in-depth searches of several collections for relevant information. Antiquarians, genealogists, and local historians usually query for specific names, events, places and things. Where a scholar would be concerned with the rise of textile unionism in the South, an antiquarian would want to know the date the first textile union was founded, and the local historian and genealogist would wish to learn the names of the officers and members.

The fifth and final factor to be considered in determining which control document is most appropriate is the breadth of the repository's finding aid program. If the control document is to be the backbone of the program, one of the more descriptive forms, such as an inventory, must be preferred. If, on the other hand, a full subject description is to follow in the second stage of finding aid production, the skimpier accession checklist that accents arrangement and location would be acceptable. The crux of the issue, though, is planning. The archivist, to serve adequately his large, growing, and varied clientele, must map out his finding aid system to draw on the strengths of each of the three groups of aids before him. Hence, he cannot determine finally which of the first-stage aids will be best until he has concluded which of the others he will use to supplement it.

In-house reference finding aids--card catalogs, annotated lists, and a file I call a "nowhere else" file--
focus on the subject content of the holdings, even though they may be grounded into a locator system to speed retrieval. They centralize information from or about several collections, ideally drawing from, but not superseding, the basic control document. From the central vantage point of an in-house reference aid, a researcher can survey extensive holdings for material relevant to his special interest. Indeed, this type of finding aid is analogous to a computer data bank, which a person can probe and search at length to extract the data (or in this case knowledge of the data) he desires.

Some archives strive to accomplish the same end by collecting all the basic control documents into a central file. Large repositories tend to this solution because the sheer quantity of material to reference is so great there is not staff enough to do more—to retrace and refine steps once taken. A few individual archivists follow the practice in order to maintain for themselves an indispensable role in the locating process. At best the substitute for a true centralized finding aid is cumbersome, at worst, inexcusable.

An effective, simple finding aid that can begin to adapt a collection of control documents to a true centralized system is the annotated list. The least sophisticated of the second stage, centralized type, it is merely a list an archivist prepares of collections that bear on a subject of frequent inquiry. The archivist can elaborate on the individual entries on the list as necessary, indicating such data as the extent of appropriate information and its location within a collection.

Surely the most common in-house, reference finding aid, however, is a card catalog. To some archivists, the term "card catalog" means subject indexes, or selective indexes, either of the control documents or of the collections themselves. The direct collection indexes, needless to say, are the more inclusive of the two, and no other finding aid can provide more detailed, specific information on the contents of any or all the holdings of a repository. To others the term may include a chronological file wherein cards are maintained grouping the holdings by decade or other appropriate time period. Similar files might illuminate autographs or geographical points or outsized documents or photographs. The list, of course, could be expanded according to the specific circumstances of a repository. But no finding aid can improve on the card system for integrating and centralizing the in-house reference service. A computer retrieval program merely does it faster.
A third manifestation of the in-house reference aid is the "nowhere else" file. A honey-coated idea, it is a trap. It begins innocently enough, often in a repository's formative months, as a catchall for those things on which the staff wishes to delay decisions until the direction of the repository has become more clearly established. In one place the file of inventories was mixed in, then ready-reference material was added, and finally small collections the repository's inadequate shelf listing might lose in the stacks were squeezed in too. As it grew, the file took on a personality all its own. It became an archives within an archives, and soon demanded and got its own finding system, which one had to master to use the file itself, which was in turn the principal finding device for the repository's holdings. By the time the file had filled several dozen legal-size cabinet drawers, it had become more obstacle than aid. Such a file is the tail wagging the dog and results from inadequate planning for a well-rounded finding aid system.

When someone remarks that the production of finding aids moves from the general to the particular, the person is speaking only of the first two groups of finding aids and has neglected the third. This final category includes those aids prepared for distribution and use outside the repository and whose principal purpose is to inform the research community of material recently made available to it. Third stage aids include reports to scholarly journals, entries in the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections, reference information circulars, guides, and brochures of holdings.

Every good archivist and manuscripts curator knows that to obtain material of enduring value, even through a records management program, he must be aggressive, must go into the vineyards to keep his purpose and program in the minds of those to whom archival activity is not a principal concern. By the same token, the material he has collected and laboriously processed will be used only if he takes pains to inform potential users of its existence. This, quite simply, is why many archivists utilize not one or two of the third stage aids, but all of them.

Notices in scholarly journals often are billed as accession reports. But they are more likely to be the lists of collections recently processed and opened for research.
Calling attention to holdings not yet ready for research use invites unpleasant consequences. For one, it promotes frustration and dissatisfaction in a user denied access. Or, if the material is opened, the repository courts irretrievable loss of items simply because the agency lacks basic control over them. Finally, hasty opening invites confusion of an arrangement not yet documented. For their part, these notes demand little time to prepare, for they rarely provide more than a sentence or two about any one collection. Furthermore, similar notices are sent to each scholarly journal the archivist thinks might be interested in the information. Though these printed reports may wait months for publication, they are the fastest means open to an archivist to publicize his holdings broadly. From the researcher's point of view, they offer the most comprehensive source of information on recently opened collections. To journals, each printing much the same data, the notices are becoming a costly problem. Hence, the suggestion has been made that one central automated instant retrieval system be created for storing, collating, and distributing this information.

The next most general out-of-house finding aid is the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections (NUCMC) published by the Library of Congress. Each entry in NUCMC illuminates an individual collection. Data on quantity and inclusive dates supplements a basic paragraph describing subject content. These vignettes in turn are grouped by repository. Hence the index of NUCMC is the only means of access a person has to the information. The index, though, makes it possible for the researcher to locate data he desires without having to read page after page, as is the case with journal notices. Thousands of collections have been reported, and NUCMC has proven itself invaluable to the researcher seeking material, as well as to the archivist striving to make it known. The wonder is the disgustingly large number of repositories that have not participated.

Reference information circulars prepared by an institution may either expand the NUCMC paragraph describing the intellectual content of a collection or take the form of an enlarged, more sophisticated annotated list. The Western History Research Center at the University of Wyoming in particular issues the former in one or multiple-page descriptions of significant collections. NARS, on the other hand, publishes the latter to describe materials in several record groups that bear on a particular subject.
Finally in the third category are brochures of holdings and guides. These exhibit more fully than any other publication the depth and extent of a repository's holdings. Where NUCMC rejects true archival and physically small collections, and journals lack space adequate to list every last accession or opening, a guide, by definition, is all-inclusive. Because so great an investment of time and expense is required to produce a guide, most repositories wait until the descriptions of the collections they hold are extensive enough to fill a book-sized publication. Where a guide is produced only after a repository has come of age, specific circumstances may call forth a brochure of holdings. The Southern Labor Archives issues one of these mini-guides every spring to coincide with an annual labor banquet, the proceeds of which are presented to the archives. This brochure serves as a thank-you to those who help support the archival program through the banquet, doubles as an announcement to researchers of the holdings, and moreover, has proven quite valuable as a tool in the collecting program.

To build an efficient finding aid system, an archivist must exhibit the traits of either a good gardener or a schizophrenic. He must be able, in other words, to distinguish, and work with, both the forest and the trees. On the one hand, his scope has to be broad enough to design a system drawing from, and integrating, all three categories of finding aids. On the other, his sense of priorities must tell him which of the specific manifestations are appropriate for his particular situation. The critical element is planning. Archivists face a great enough task dealing with increasingly large and frequent accessions that they cannot afford to squander energy meeting a never diminishing demand for assistance in using their holdings. Haphazard "nowhere else" files that might once have served the limited needs of a small repository cannot satisfy the requirements of a modern archives. Instead, the production of finding aids must proceed logically and purposefully from control documents, to in-house reference materials, to out-of-house publications, building a pyramid of information about a repository's holdings, which brings us full circle back to the streaker. Having prepared our finest finding aid system, we, like he, have gone the limit to expose those things that distinguish our repository from every other one.
NOTES


On March 1, 1940, a committee was appointed in the National Archives "to make a study of finding mediums and other instruments for facilitating the use of records in the custody of the Archivist." Headed by Solon J. Buck, a future Archivist of the United States, the committee the following year recommended the abolition of the divisions of Classification and of Cataloging, those inappropriate legacies of librarianship, manifestations of which continue to plague the archival profession even today. According to Philip M. Hamer, the chronicler of the committee's activity, the concept of the "record group" then became the basic tool for establishing intellectual control over the holdings of the National Archives. "Record group" is defined as: "A body of organizationally related records established on the basis of provenance with particular regard for the administrative history, the complexity, and the volume of the records and archives of the institution or organization involved."

Once registration of the record group was done, the records within it would be described in collective units: "series, groups of series, or parts of series, or such other units [as seem desirable]." Refinement of the various record levels occurred within the National Archives and is reflected most succinctly in Oliver Wendell Holmes's well-known article "Archival Arrangement--Five Different Operations at Five Different Levels." Though Holmes distinguished
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five discrete levels—depository, record group, series, file folder, and item—he expressly limited his paper to the experience of the National Archives.

There has been, as Mario Fenyo observed a decade ago, 5 no further substantial elaboration of the initial impressionistic concept of the record group that grew out of the Buck Committee's study of 1941. Moreover, there has been no attempt in the literature, prior to my recent article, "Arrangement and Description of Manuscripts," 6 to extend the concept of levels of archival arrangement to the arrangement and description of manuscripts collections. To do so, some modifications are in order. The "depository level"—"the breakdown of the depository's complete holdings into a few major divisions on the broadest common denominator possible and the physical placement of holdings of each such major division to best advantage in the building's stack area" 7—can be dismissed as being largely irrelevant. It is an arrangement scheme imposed on the collections by the depository and is not intrinsic to them. Also, the "subgroup" must be given full status as a record level, becoming the key to establishing effective intellectual controls for manuscripts accessions having subgroup characteristics. In the Society of American Archivists glossary, "subgroup" is defined as: "A body of related records within a record group, usually consisting of the records of a primary subordinate administrative unit. Subgroups may also be established for related bodies of records within a record group that can best be delimited in terms of functional, geographical, or chronological relationships. Subgroups, in turn, are divided into as many levels as are necessary to reflect the successive organizational units that constitute the hierarchy of the subordinate administrative unit or that will assist in grouping series entries in terms of their relationships." 8 A common error is confusion of subgroups with series—"file units or documents arranged in accordance with a filing system or maintained as a unit because they relate to a particular subject or function, result from the same activity, have a particular form, or because of some other relationship arising out of their creation, receipt, or use." 9

With respect to provenance—the origin of the records—Holmes, and the profession at large, has failed to discriminate its different relationships to the various record levels. Provenance is a concept relevant only for the record group and subgroup. The other record levels relate
to the order of the records. This distinction is of the utmost theoretical and practical significance. Holmes does hint at it, however, (and provides the theoretical basis for my article in the *Drexel Library Quarterly*) in his statement:

> Once all series are assigned to record groups and subgroups so that the boundaries are fairly certain, the archivist looks within the group or subgroups and works out a logical arrangement sequence for the series so assigned.\(^\text{10}\)

Perhaps the main weakness in the formulation of the different record levels by the National Archives staff and by Holmes lies in the failure to distinguish between function, as expressed in the process of record creation, and form, as expressed in the various record levels. Both the record group and subgroup relate to function, personal or corporate, the activity of generating the records per se. Thus, they relate to provenance. The other record levels relate to the form the documentation takes—the filing order. Filing order of course pertains not to the activity being documented, but merely to "filing activity." In other words, the record group and subgroup are of one genre, while the other records levels are of a different one. Only in part are they hierarchically related. Historically, in writing on the subject, that has been practically the only view of their relationship. But there is another view.

Items are filed in folders and the folders grouped into series. Ideally, the series are, or should be, kept with records of the administrative unit which generated them. The administrative unit is the parent of the series, clearly suggesting more than a mere hierarchical relationship. The series and its sub-units are quite simply the way in which the generator of the records chooses to keep them. The generator in the archival schema is represented by none other than the record group and its sub-units. These are corporate entities, while the series represents only the documentation itself and its arrangement.

Another weakness in the formulation lies in the implication (for which the National Archives can be faulted no more than the profession at large) that the concept of record levels applies only to public and corporate records, not to personal papers. How implicit this limitation is can be judged by the definitions of record group and subgroup in...
the glossary prepared and published by the Society of American Archivists in 1974 and quoted above.¹¹ This is the same kind of error of judgment that I pointed out several years ago in the development of cataloging rules for the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections.¹² It is caused by the reluctance or inability to extend archival principles to the arrangement and description of personal papers.

I wish to demonstrate also that the subgroup concept, when extended to personal papers, provides a precise, consistent, objective and simple method for arrangement and description. Although the subgroup represents a subordinate record level, it is equivalent to the record group in the sense that both terms apply to documentation generated from activity of a given corporate entity. Remember that other record levels—series, file folder, and item—relate only to the form which the documentation takes, not to how and by whom it was generated.

Typically, the papers of a person are sought for preservation in a repository because of the special activities that person engaged in. Inherently, these activities take on a corporate function. If that person indeed acted for a corporate body and the records of that activity are included with his papers, those, as part of the person's papers, could be subgrouped under the name of that corporate body.

In most registers I have seen, there appears to have been no attempt to utilize the subgroup concept. Instead, the records of each separate corporate activity are scattered among the various series. Stated differently, there is a confusion of subgroups with series. Not only does this mixture of subgroups and series cause diffuse bibliographic control, but it also makes access more troublesome for the user and for those who serve the user. Retrieval is inherently more erratic and uncertain unless subgrouping has been done as a first step in arrangement, following the theoretical model offered by Holmes.

A useful definition of "subgroup" then, beyond that in the Society of American Archivists' glossary, would be: "Records generated from the separate corporate activities of a person constitute the basis for arrangement of those records into subgroups." Unlike subgroups in public and other corporate records, there is no question of subordinacy of activity, merely separateness. In a phrase, subgroups in manuscripts collections are "separate but equal." By applying
the subgroup concept to the arrangement and description of personal papers, a solid basis can be established in a manuscript repository for comprehensive control of its holdings and for prioritization of its processing program.

"Separate corporate activities," the records of which form the subgroups of a collection, can be determined on the basis of whether or not the creator of the papers is acting as the agent of another party. This "other party" is inherently a corporate one. Materials which cannot be subgrouped in this manner automatically will become a "personal papers" subgroup, in effect the residue which cannot be classed under a corporate subgroup.

In examining items and file folders, how does one determine what constitutes "acting in a corporate capacity"? Mere membership in an organization surely does not. To qualify for subgrouping, there must be documentation which reflects the person's actions for, and on behalf of, an organization. Generating such documentation, one typically will undertake committee work, act as an officer, or serve in some other capacity for an organization. Consequently, the obvious clues to look for are (in order of preference):

1. in what capacity a person signs a letter [this is the surest];
2. the letterhead on which the item is written; and
3. key words in text and other internal evidence [this is the least preferred technique because it leads toward item by item analysis and should be employed with caution for that very reason].

Because most persons have engaged in a variety of corporate activities, either in the course of negotiations or upon accessioning the papers it can be verified whether or not there is documentation of these activities. Assuming such documentation to exist, the first step in arranging the material is to establish a subgroup for each of the separate activities. Thus, the records of each of that person's corporate functions will be consolidated in one place within his papers. If this were done prior to shelving the papers and without further processing, the papers nevertheless would be quite accessible for research.
Bibliographical access would be achieved through the catalog and indexes of the repository in the normal way, inasmuch as entries describing the accession would have been made at least for the name of each subgroup and for the person who generated the records. What has been achieved is control to the subgroup level for that one accession. If this procedure were followed for each accession, the repository would have reasonably comprehensive control of its entire manuscript collection.

Another achievement would be the establishment of a more fully rational basis for the repository's arrangement and descriptive program as a whole. Thus a firm foundation would be laid for decisions as to which accessions should be first controlled to the series or file folder or item level and which subgroups should receive prior attention. Further, such a procedure can be applied to family papers, subgrouping according to the name of the addressee, and to records of private corporate bodies, subgrouping according to affiliated bodies, predecessor organization(s), or other corporate arrangements.
NOTES
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Coping with large collections is one of the major challenges facing the modern archivist. He wants to make all records in his care as usable for research as possible. But were the bulkiest holdings to receive the care commonly devoted to the small ones, the behemoths would preempt the attention and resources of the repository. For handling extensive collections, the allocation of staff and resources must differ from the assignment appropriate for the management of smaller groups, not only in scope, but also in nature. Collecting voluminous records forces adjustments in the cataloging process too. The materials cataloged, the timing of the operation, and the depth of the work cannot be analogous for large as for small groups simply because the limits of both time and staff will not permit it. Nor is the type and degree of reference service unaffected. Basically, meeting the challenge of the massive collection is a matter of ordering priorities, and the formulation of a clear policy for the management of these mammoths is imperative before a repository is committed to their pursuit.

The cardinal rule in dealing with massive collections is don't panic. If suddenly inundated by tens or hundreds of linear feet of materials, an archivist should not let the sheer bulk frighten him into impotence, or overwhelm him into dropping everything in a frantic attempt to cope with the flood. It cannot be stressed enough that large collections
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must find their place within a larger structure of priorities, and cannot be allowed to distort these priorities to serve their own needs. These collections can be controlled rather quickly, and with an investment of staff time that is comparatively modest when balanced against the benefits of knowing the contents and location of all material in the repository.

The acquisition and accessioning of a massive collection is only the beginning of a repository's relationship with the material. Yet the controls established during the accessioning process can determine whether this relationship will prove rewarding or frustrating, whether it will foster a sense of respect and affection for the collection, or generate despair and resentment among the staff, whether large collections in general will be assets to the institution's total holdings, or debilitating drains on staff time and skills, on space, supplies, and administrative energy.

The first step in managing a massive collection is establishing basic bibliographic control over it, and doing so immediately upon its receipt. Basic bibliographic control is a record of the contents and location of each box. Tailored to the type of collection involved, to its physical and organizational condition, and to the repository's own administrative structure and staff resources, eight means of obtaining this information are open to the archivist.

1. Obtain copies of box lists, records lists, indexes, or file keys prepared by the donor's office. If the files are in good order, the donor's box list can serve as a preliminary finding aid. Moreover, file keys, indexes, and other lists can provide a framework for subsequent processing. Keep a record of the type and inclusive dates of records known to have been retained or discarded by the donor.

2. If logistics permit, box, label, and list the materials in situ before transferring them to the repository. In this way, categories of unwanted materials can be eliminated at the outset, file series and physical relationships can be preserved intact, and lists or summaries of box contents can be prepared as part of the packing process. Thus, an orderly and progressive transfer can be arranged, and the materials can be shelved directly upon receipt. If this must be done after the materials
arrive, however, it need not inhibit effective control procedures.

3. Pack all materials in standard-sized records storage boxes. This simplifies shelving and retrieval and makes possible an accurate estimate of the collection's size. If the records were shipped in standard records storage boxes and arrived in good condition, there should be no occasion at this stage to rebox them.

4. Identify and reconstruct, if time permits, readily distinguishable series or record types. Examine the file lists (if any), as well as both the outside and inside of the original packing boxes, for clues. Once the structured and obvious portions of a collection are recognized, the remainder becomes much less formidable.

5. Unstructured, disorganized, and poorly identified materials can be grouped according to whatever logic comes immediately to mind, but otherwise boxed as is. One must guard against getting bogged down in an attempt to arrange and identify this miscellany and correlate it definitively with the rest of the collection. On the other hand, one cannot foreclose attempting to make sense of the material. Control is impossible without knowing what the papers are, even if on so simplistic a level as "family correspondence, 1930s-1950s" or "background and reference materials."

6. Prepare a box list, unless the papers were accompanied by a useable one, in only enough detail to give an adequate idea of the contents of each box. For structured collections, the list need record merely inclusive contents and approximate dates (i.e., Box 1. Legislative Files, 1970. Box 2. Constituent Correspondence, 1970). Or it can be slightly expanded to bring out a few prominent files (i.e., Box 6. Subject Files, A-D, 1971, including separate folders for Associated Milk Producers, Cooperative League of America, District Organization). More varied contents can be summarized by subseries or types of documents (i.e., Box 11. Annual Reports, 1965-1970; newspaper clippings, 1967-1970; reports from midwest co-ops, 1966-1971). Truly miscellaneous boxes of
material might require lists of folder titles or groups of related materials. Listing should not be made into an elaborate production; the accessioner many times can merely sit down among the papers with a typewriter and prepare the list directly from the boxes.

7. As box lists are made, prepare temporary labels for the boxes, including collection title, box number, and accession number or other control reference. Thereafter, the boxes may be shelved.

8. A brief narrative introduction to the collection, indicating type of papers and their condition will help refresh the archivist's memory later when assigning cataloging projects or answering inquiries about the papers.

It is important at this stage to identify all materials as quickly as possible in an expressible, retrievable way. Matters of consolidation, arrangement, and exact identification can be dealt with when the collection is processed. It is unwise to do a careless job of this initial inventory on the assumption that the collection soon will be processed, however, for the detailed work may not follow shortly. (Once archivists have a firm grasp on one body of materials, they tend to cast their eyes afield in search of still more papers.) Other priorities intrude, and some collections low on the list might languish among the backlog for years. With good preliminary lists, this delay creates no major problems. Without such lists, anyone needing to handle the collection is, quite literally, blind and helpless.

Establishing even the most cursory controls can require many days if the collection is truly massive. But the alternative, shelving or stacking boxes untouched, should be recognized as constituting a de facto decision to leave them unusable by anyone, even their donor. Moreover, the time spent creating preliminary control records will be more than compensated for in time saved during subsequent servicing and processing of the papers. A preliminary list enables the staff to make necessary retrievals from a collection with a minimum of time. If it is the institution's policy to permit research use of unprocessed papers, many large collections, or at least portions of them, can be fed into the historical equation much sooner than they would
otherwise become available. Even if these records are not opened to the public, donors of large political, organizational, and business collections seem to request retrievals of information from their papers more frequently than other donors, and they expect the repository to be able to honor their requests.

Bibliographic control facilitates many cataloging decisions. The overview of a collection's scope, content, and arrangement that the initial container list provides will help the cataloging supervisor plan priorities, judge how much work needs to be done on each collection, to whom it should be assigned, which portions can be skimmed and which need more detailed work. It is much easier for a cataloger to begin restructuring series or grouping related materials by scanning a list than by handling dozens of boxes. An approach that has focused on gaining an overall grasp of the structure and content of a collection also helps guard against the temptation to take refuge from its size in a piecemeal attack, doing meticulous organization and description of rich or unified or easily-grasped portions while the rest remains a mystery.

Cataloging large collections requires a different approach than is appropriate for small ones. Their sheer size means that a unitary finding aid which incorporates the same degree of detail that a small collection enjoys will be unwieldy. And limitations of staff time are especially evident. It is probably never going to be feasible to do the type of cataloging of a large collection that is possible, or appropriate, for a smaller one. Those who have been oriented toward small, rich collections find this fact hard to accept. We tend to feel that we are lowering our standards any time we do less than a thorough, meticulous job of physical care and content analysis. We assure ourselves that this is only "preliminary processing" or "partial processing"; we call our finding aids "preliminary inventories"; and we plan to do a proper job on the papers some day, all the while suspecting that we never will.

But does the more summary processing that necessity dictates for large collections really need to constitute a lowering of standards or imply a half-done job? All archivists know how rapidly the quantity of twentieth century documentation has swelled, how great a mass of materials remain unassimilated, and how often these papers prove to
be of more value in the aggregate than for the content of individual items. Therefore, a deliberate effort to make as much material as possible available as soon as possible, accompanied by the basic information necessary for its use, would seem best calculated to serve the needs of the majority of those who want to use such papers. A processing approach oriented toward meeting this priority constitutes not a lowering, but a redefinition, of standards to arrive at those which are appropriate for massive collections.

With this philosophy, processing basically can constitute an expansion and refinement of the concept represented by the initial container list—maximum accessibility as against maximum analysis. A brief narrative introduction to the collection, a box or series list, summary statements on series contents, and folder lists provide an overview of the collection that a user can scan quickly and easily to form a preliminary judgment on the value of the collection to his research.

Once the container list is made, it can be supplemented as a finding aid with the addition of progressively more specific levels of detail—notes, special lists, folder content summaries, and citations to specific items for appropriate series or files, depending on the character of the papers, their complexity, available staff time, research demand, and the cataloger's assessment of content value. A "building blocks" approach of this sort aims at providing the researcher with reference tools that are simple and uncluttered, that describe the collection in identifiable units, and that give him ready access to information about the portions he is interested in, without burdening him with a mass of irrelevant detail. The distinctive physical and bibliographic characteristics of large collections influence their processing in ways that often permit a great deal of flexibility and a wide range of options, even while forcing evaluation of some procedures formerly thought sacrosanct. Such collections lend themselves particularly well to divisions of labor or variations in procedure that allow a maximum of staff time and professional expertise to be concentrated on those portions that need most attention or warrant deepest analysis.

The larger a collection, the more structured it tends to be, and therefore the more obvious the arrangement of its essential components. The office or organization that
generates a substantial quantity of papers has to keep the material in some semblance of order if it expects to make use of the data. Even records in considerable disarray will have folder titles, similar labels for related files, similar contents for various parts of a series, annotations of file location, or other clues that will help verify or recreate at least a basic structure. The more structured a collection, the easier it is to prepare a hierarchical finding aid, focused on identifiable segments, which can then be expanded or contracted at will.

Many such collections consist in large part of materials whose research value is relatively low in relation to their bulk (such as financial records or constituent correspondence), or which are unitary or sequential in character (such as working papers, minutes, monthly or annual reports). Their processing is largely manual or repetitious, and, without risking either harm to the collection’s physical integrity or loss in content analysis, usually can be done by clerks or beginners with a minimum of supervision. Skilled, experienced staff members are freed to direct their expertise toward richer, more heterogeneous, or more disorganized units.

Massive collections dictate an altered approach to weeding and discarding. Their physical bulk alone makes obvious the fact that everything cannot be saved. Archivists must be prepared to make painful judgments. The space, time, and supplies required to process and store the materials must be weighed quite coldly and knowledgeably against the variety and the likelihood of their potential use. On a large scale, weeding must be based on entire series or types of materials, rather than on particular items. The fewer the number of anticipated rejects in a particular file, the harder it is to justify spending time searching for them.

The same holds true for internal arrangement within folders or files in a structured series. The time spent in meticulous sorting of individual items, in a context where precise order is not essential to their usefulness (such as routine correspondence), might better be employed elsewhere.

Acquisition of large collections has forced many institutions to reevaluate the utility and necessity of housing all papers in acid-free folders and boxes. Their price, multiplied by hundreds or even thousands of linear feet, is more than all but the most lavish budget can
withstand. Most institutions which choose to collect on a massive scale will at some point confront the harsh necessity of resorting to corrugated boxes for permanent storage, and of retaining the original folders whenever they are in good condition. The choice seems less painful if the alternative dictates that the collection remains unprocessed or even uncollected.

The problems of size and scale that influence the processing of massive collections will also alter, and to some degree hamper, their use in the reading room. Their sheer size, combined with the fact that many are used in the aggregate, means that the mechanics of retrieval and reshelving become a major factor in allocating staff time to their management. Even hierarchical finding aids with concise summary data can confront researchers with a substantial body of reading matter before they ever see the papers themselves. Since the lists have the potential of containing much more data than can readily be brought out in a card catalog or other indexing tool, and since the papers in turn contain much more material than can ever be fully reflected in a container list, the researcher has to approach a massive collection with a firmer grasp of what he wants and where he might find it than he would expect to need in a simpler, smaller world. The same problem, of course, faces the reference staff which must answer mail inquiries or guide researchers in the use of the collections.

Computerization holds the promise of alleviating these difficulties by permitting quick retrieval of specific data on box or folder contents from as large a data base as processing time can provide. The costs of obtaining the hardware and of hiring or developing the necessary expertise, however, still remain prohibitive for most repositories. The best interim measure may be to formulate finding aids from which information eventually can be fed into an automated system with a minimum of restructuring.

Acquisition of massive collections demands a commitment from a repository to fit the mammoths into an overall scheme of institutional priorities. Moreover, the institution must cultivate a psychological and philosophical attitude that permits it to approach them realistically. Coping with large collections is indeed one of the major challenges facing the modern archivist, and like any other challenge, is rewarding only when successfully mastered.
Do we hold the principle: "Archives are for use"? We develop expertise in locating, identifying, acquiring, transferring, processing, and describing historical materials. And then we lock them up! We restrict access; we limit use; we put them in closed files; we wrap them in red tape, tied with Gordian knots woven from donor restrictions, claims of literary property rights, government regulations, and personal preferences.

Changing these ways must become a primary concern. We can begin with collecting. There is no patented solution for the dilemma of accepting materials with unreasonable restrictions or, by a refusal to agree to the conditions, of acquiescing in their destruction. We might be able to avoid this problem, however, by discussing the usefulness of materials in our first contacts with potential donors. We can explain that other collections, with similar information, are available to researchers, and that those researchers mention the collections by name in their citations. Thus we can create a climate in which donors expect their materials to be available for use in the archives. We archivists can help donors (and others) to regard our institutions as centers of research, rather than as places for storage.

It sometimes happens that records are restricted in one place but available elsewhere. A local businessman might want to restrict access to the records of his firm when he gives them to an historical society, but if he is advised that the reports he has made to various government offices
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are available as public records, he should see the advantage of easy access to the one location where all the records are available. The same situation could occur with personal papers. A university professor might want her papers locked in a vault for a long time, even though her publications, her reports, and her letters to other professionals are available elsewhere. Her own papers, the best source for complete information about her work, should be available to researchers.

What can be done about restricted material already in our collections? We should review the documents in our vaults and back rooms and should ask who has placed limitations on access to each of the restricted collections. If the present archivist or curator has done it, the policy can be reconsidered easily. If a predecessor restricted the materials, can that person be consulted? If a donor has requested secrecy, perhaps it is time for a new contact to discuss accessibility. Circumstances that made the restriction desirable may have changed.

I am advocating an active reconsideration of all restrictions on our collections, both the limitations on particular items and such general laws as withholding papers from researchers for fifty years, or some other length of time. It is easy, temptingly easy to a busy archivist, to reply, in person or by mail, to an inquiry: "That material is not available," or "Those tapes are reserved by executive privilege," or "The diaries will be opened at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, July 2, in the year 2108. I shall have retired by then, but I shall leave a note for my successor to contact your successor." Instead of turning such requests aside, curators can use inquiries as opportunities for re-thinking policies on access.

Would this be too much work? Is reconsideration too much fuss and bother? No indeed! It is a necessary part of our work if we accept the principle that archives exist for the use of researchers. I am not advocating the opening of all records to all inquirers at all times. I am not thinking of records involving national security or of records containing personal information, for example. I am thinking of the records of local and state governments, businesses, churches, colleges and universities, and various organizations. Some of these records are open when they are made and should be kept open after transfer to archives or other repositories.
Archivists have a dual responsibility—to protect the privacy of individuals and to make historically valuable records available for researchers. This duality will continue, and will continue to present us with difficult problems. In some instances, however, we have restricted access to records for the wrong reasons. A careful reconsideration of the reasons and the restrictions will help us meet our responsibility to researchers. Archives are for use.
BOOK REVIEWS


The records center has always been, and will continue to be, one of the most important elements of a good records management program. As a repository for semi-active and inactive records, it provides many of the economies and efficiencies that justify full-scale records programs. Thus, literature that provides evaluation criteria and operating benefits for such a facility is of considerable use to the practicing archivist and records administrator. Published in pamphlet format, The Organization of Intermediate Records Storage most definitely meets this requirement. It is applicable to large, as well as small, records facilities. Prepared under a contract between UNESCO and the International Council on Archives, and authored by A. W. Maahs, Records Administration Officer of the Public Records, London, in collaboration with Guy Duboscq, Director-General of the Archives de France, this publication provides an interesting and informative review of intermediate records storage (records center) concepts on an international basis. Information for the study, which is recommended by the authors as a manual, was gathered through a questionnaire distributed to a number of countries and responded to by twenty-six. The text generally follows the structure of the questionnaire, and the inclusion of the questionnaire in the appendix gives the reader an opportunity for personal comparison.

Following an introductory section which outlines the general principles of records centers, as well as their need and operations in responding countries, the publication covers: structure and equipment of records centers; staffing; procedures for retirement of documents; treatment of records in a records center; elimination of documents in a records center; procedures for transfer from records centers to archives; and, in a concluding section, the values of such a facility. The answers to the questionnaire are...
considered in each case, sometimes in a summation format, sometimes on a country-by-country basis. In addition to the questionnaire, the appendix also includes plans for a records center to be constructed at Fontainebleau, France; a photo of racking (shelving) in the Intermediate Repository at Hay, United Kingdom; Federal Records Center facility standards in the United States; and a specimen of disposal schedules from the United Kingdom.

The Organization of Intermediate Records Storage offers valuable guidelines for the establishment of a center, but it is not a "how to" manual. It would have been of more value if it had presented some sample layouts of modern records centers, detailed specifications on housing and shelving equipment, and control systems. Comparative analysis of techniques is not made. Facts are presented as collected by the authors, and the interrelationships of the different operating elements of a records center are not taken into account.

Due to authorship, the study is also archivist oriented, maintaining that all centers should be under the control of an archival agency and personnel trained in archival management. The term "records manager" appears only once or twice in the entire work. It is this reviewer's feeling that the lack of an international understanding of records management, rather than a subrogation on the part of archivists, is the cause of this circumstance. The study is primarily government oriented, thus eliminating from view many of the new techniques in records center operations advanced by private industry. There is much to be gained by archivist and records manager alike from a comparative analysis of practices. I am certain the area of computerized controls and the problems of documents in new forms (covered by the questionnaire but not in the text) would have been given more consideration had both disciplines been involved.

As a study to promote the use of intermediate records storage (records centers) and to outline the factors to be considered in planning a records center, this addition by UNESCO to its archival series is a most valuable contribution, and its authors deserve our thanks for their efforts.

Lockheed Aircraft Corporation

William Benedon
Once concerned mainly with the written document, or the printed page, archivists and librarians find themselves today faced with a new challenge. They are called upon in this visual age to administer picture files, to preserve and unlock for use visual documents that once were considered of but marginal interest. No wonder then that the last few years have seen the emergence of a new specialty. Picture librarians have found a fertile field, both in the publishing industry and in the libraries of industrial firms sustaining picture archives. One of their basic tasks is the development of efficient retrieval systems, that is, to find ways to make visual materials accessible with all possible speed.

Few libraries have foresightedly worked along these lines. The Newark Public Library is one of the few. Its Local History Index permits library users to track down pictures of the city's past by way of a card index that has been kept up to date for many years. Ms. Gilbert's booklet describes lucidly both the history and system of classification of the index. Proceeding from general city views to buildings and down to the minutiae of architecture, the Newark Index seems to provide the user with a unique panorama of this history-drenched locality.

Much thought no doubt has gone into the development of this system. Categories, divisions and subdivisions are clearly defined. Procedures have been established from which the indexer is not to stray. Such rules are indispensable to keep this index within bounds and diminish the danger of creating vacuous categories apt to be lost in the shuffle.

Although one cannot question the usefulness of this index, I have my doubts whether picture librarians today should follow its procedures. To maintain it requires expertise and sound picture judgment—not to speak of the considerable typing chores necessary to keep abreast of new acquisitions.

How much better off we would be if we could help the picture researcher not only by providing a written reference (which can be misleading), but also by actually
showing him the picture itself. And luckily, we can. Our photographic age has put at our disposal methods of microfilming or xeroxing pictures inexpensively and effectively. These photographic techniques bring the searcher eye to eye with the picture, saving him and the picture librarian the time in handling a multitude of volumes, often quite unwieldy.

I am reminded of an incident from Homer's Iliad. When a rusted spear lodged in the knee of Patroclus (I have a visual index card of this in my own Archive), the Greek army surgeons adduced that the rust itself would act as a healing agent and cure the prostrate hero. Taking a rather bold vault from this incident, I conclude that our age, which has swamped us with photographs and all sorts of images, has at the same time provided us the means, in the form of new microfilming methods, to handle the avalanche with dispatch and economy.

As one who has practiced picture indexing for many years, I applaud any systemic survey such as this book presents.

The Bettman Archive

Otto Bettman


The care and keeping of collections is a principal responsibility of a curator, whatever his title. Archivists, historians, and records managers frequently encounter problems involving the preservation of paper, photographs, and three-dimensional objects. The records-keeping profession is well aware of the techniques used to insure the proper preservation, from creation to storage, of paper and photographs. We lack knowledge, however, of the best ways to preserve three-dimensional objects. Frequently we encounter these as a result of our involvement in records. We should, and can through this book, equip ourselves with enough knowledge to perform preventive maintenance until a specialist can be called in.
The Care of Historical Collections is subtitled "A Conservation Handbook for the Nonspecialist," and that is what it is. It is divided into three parts. Recognizing that "conservation is an attempt to prolong the life of objects," the author in the first part deals with the health and safety of collections. The need for adequate storage space, both as to size—for handling existing collections and any acquired later—and as to protection from environmental extremes, is given priority. The concerns of storage security, fire protection, and environment are developed. Climate considerations and controls to correct them are covered in discussing the problems of humidity, sunlight, ultraviolet rays, atmospheric pollution, and bacterial action.

The second part of the book deals with the preliminaries of conservation and specifically covers the aspect of research on the artifact and the setting up of a workshop to perform the necessary conservation work. Research on the artifact is necessary to determine its historical value. The section on the workshop covers the physical workroom, equipment, safety, and records (i.e., keeping a record on each artifact and procedures performed on it).

In the third part, the author deals specifically with problems in the care of, and corrective measures for, paper, wood, leather, ferrous objects, copper and copper alloys, tin, pewter, lead, gold, silver, ambiguous silvery-looking materials, textiles, ceramics, glass, bone, ivory, and teeth and stone. Basic guidelines are given for performing first aid on each type of material. The author cautions curators to recognize the limits of their knowledge and call in a specialist when necessary.

Although there is no index, the subject is presented in a format that makes the absence of an index not a detriment to using the book. Four appendices dealing with adhesives, abrasives, brushes and paints, and a glossary of selected chemical names round out the book.

The author has done a commendable job in reducing the "how to" to a basic minimum. The addition of a bibliography after every section allows the user to consult special reference works on each subject. After administering first aid, one can learn what steps will be necessary should major surgery be required.

Virginia State Library

Louis H. Manarin
The Society of American Archivists, on recommendation of its Committee on Awards, presents an Award of Merit to Georgia Archive.

October 2, 1975

Ann Morgan Compbell, Executive Director
GEORGIA ARCHIVE received high praise from the Society of American Archivists on October 2, when, during the SAA's Presidential Banquet, the journal was presented an "Award of Merit." Under the rules for judging the merit of printed contributions to archival theory and practice, GEORGIA ARCHIVE was not eligible for consideration. But the judges considered our publication "excellent" and created a citation for it.


The matter does not stop here. The January, 1976, issue of the Newsletter of the Georgia Department of Archives and History reports the creation of an internal security committee and the inauguration of new procedures to implement tightened security. A guard in the central reading room and staff ID tags are two of the measures being taken. Public Records Section head, Harmon Smith, summed up the situation neatly when he declared: "It's easy to fall into laxness about security. These measures will place inconveniences on staff and visitors alike, but we simply have to do it. The public will have to face the fact that they will be restricted because of the actions of a few."
Pointing out that "the problem" must be approached in the broad perspective, as well as in each repository, the SAA has obtained a grant of nearly $100,000 to launch a four-pronged attack. The young and ambitious Archival Security Program is described by its administrator, Timothy Walch, in the following three paragraphs.

"The news that archival theft has become a major dilemma for the profession will surprise few readers of this journal. Most of us have heard those hair-raising stories about teams of criminals carting off hundreds of priceless documents from institutions all over the country. Worse yet are the tales about scholars and staff members stealing from their own libraries and manuscript repositories. The problem becomes more critical each year, and the bicentennial celebrations of 1976 will certainly encourage thieves to expand their activities.

"For many years the archival profession acted on the premise that if the theft problem was ignored it would disappear. In the past few years, however, archivists have become more and more willing to discuss theft and replevin at professional meetings. The session on archival security at the SGA workshop last November is good evidence of this trend. More importantly, the suggestions made at earlier conferences and at the SAA council meetings have been translated into a security program funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities. In brief, the plan of action contains four facets: a registry of stolen or missing materials, a newsletter to report theft, replevin, criminal proceedings, and security news, a technical consultant service to help individual institutions develop security programs and procedures, and a Security Manual to meet the needs of archives and libraries, especially those institutions with limited resources. The work, now in its third quarter, will be spread over a three-year period from June, 1975, through May, 1978.

"Each of the four facets will be an effective deterrent against archival theft. The SAA also realizes that this project cannot be the first line of defense. Clearly the protection of valuable and irreplaceable archival materials is the responsibility of everyone working in an archives or manuscript repository. All archivists will have to ask themselves tough questions about their security procedures. What type of identification should be required of
patrons? What kind of information should be included on call slips? What should patrons be allowed to bring into the reading room? Should valuable items be stamped and/or separated from archival collections? The answers to these and other security questions are not easily found. Yet, as the present Archivist of the United States noted nearly ten years ago, 'through our collective efforts we can make real progress toward convincing the document thief that he has made a tragic error in his choice of a career.'"

For more information on the SAA program, contact: Timothy Walch, Associate Director, SAA Archival Security Program, University of Illinois, Chicago Circle, Library, Box 8198, Chicago, Illinois 60680, (312) 996-3370.

"But what can I do?" is the ultimate question of the individual archivist. There are three things you can do.

First, look at the security of your own operation. Can you see researchers as they work with your holdings? Do they have the opportunity to hide documents among their notes and leave? Are your use records kept in sufficient detail that if something turned up missing you could trace the history of its use?

Second, join with the SGA in working for a law in Georgia that would give curators of libraries and archives greater security in their actions protecting the material under their care. After reading the lead articles in this issue, send your ideas on provisions such a law should, or should not, contain to the SGA, Box 261, Georgia State University, Atlanta 30303. The Society hopes to have a bill ready for introduction into the General Assembly next January.

Third, keep abreast of developments. Join the SAA in order to receive, among other benefits, the "Archival Security Newsletter." Attend the program on "Archival Security and the Law" to be offered during the SAA annual meeting in Washington September 28-October 1.

On January 27, UPI carried the announcement by Secretary of State Ben Fortson that 183 Confederate Army discharge papers have been stolen from the state archives.
The theft came to light on Christmas Eve when Fortson received a letter from a man in Iowa concerning one of the discharges. Fortson's office and the Georgia Bureau of Investigation are investigating.

Following extensive review of security procedures, the staff of the state archives compiled a checklist of inexpensive protective measures that can be readily instituted without costly hardware.

RESTRICT ENTRY
Limit staff, patron, and tradesmen access to the building or archives area to a few, well-supervised doors, preferably to a single door.

IDENTIFICATION
Have all persons, staff as well as patrons and tradesmen, show positive identification (with photograph) before being admitted to the facility.

STAFF I.D.
Staff members should wear conspicuous badges identifying them as staff.

REGISTRATION
Require all patrons and visitors to register their name, address, nature of business, and time of entry at the beginning of each visit. Check identity information against the identification document they present at the time of admission. When they leave the facility, have visitors and patrons record their time of departure in the same register.

VISITOR'S BADGE
Issue to visitors who will be frequenting non-public areas of the facility visitors' badges which are to be worn conspicuously. These badges need not be elaborate. A numbered, colored card in a simple badge holder will suffice. As it is issued, record the badge number in the Patron/Visitor Registration Book and instruct the visitor to turn in the badge upon departure. Visitors going into or through restricted areas must be accompanied by a staff member.

NO COATS, CASES, ETC.
Do not permit researchers to take coats, heavy wraps, briefcases, purses, bags, or enclosed containers of any description.
into research areas. Have a check room or key lockers for these materials.

CALL SLIPS
ONE FOLDER RULE
ITEM CHECK
Have call slips for all original records. Have patrons use only one folder of loose records at a time. Check the contents of the folder before and after each use. Researchers should be instructed to keep all documents in the order in which they were received from the attendant.

IDENTIFICATION MARKS ON DOCUMENT
Identify each book or document with a distinctive, permanent mark in a location not easily removed but not obscuring the text. This may be done as records are checked out.

SUPERVISED USE
Allow use of original records and rare books only in well-supervised areas. The attendant supervising researchers in this area should have no other duties.

RESHELVING/REFILING
Researchers should not be allowed to reshelve or refile books or records. Specific staff members should have this responsibility to reduce the danger of mishandling.

CIRCULATION/LOAN
Original records should under no circumstances be circulated or loaned.

COPYING
It is recommended that electrostatic and photostatic copying be done by staff members, or at least supervised by them, in order to insure careful handling of the records and reduce the risk of accidental damage.

INSPECTION
Patrons' research materials should be inspected as they leave the research areas. Have a conspicuous sign stating that researchers must permit such an inspection and that they may be subject to personal search.

WRITTEN RULES
Have a concise, but complete, set of written rules and regulations presented to each patron and visitor. Provide
a place for them to read these and have them sign an awareness statement that they have read the rules and agree to abide by them.

**EMERGENCY PROCEDURES**

Develop clear, legally sound procedures for handling erratic, ill, or suspicious persons and be sure that staff personnel are trained to follow them.

**LIMIT STAFF ACCESS TO RECORDS STORAGE AREA**

Limit the staff involved in the pulling and refiling of original documents to a very few, trusted, conscientious persons. Only these persons should have access to the records storage area. Unauthorized personnel, including staff, in the storage area should be stopped, questioned, and escorted from the area. Use "in" and "out" cards to reduce the danger of misfiling.

**Inventory of Missing Items**

*Georgia Department of Archives and History*

The following five pages contain a list of the items known to be missing from the Georgia Department of Archives and History. All these documents enumerated were a part of the official state government records of the Civil War period. It is possible that other items are missing, but the fact has not yet been discovered. Documents that have been recovered are omitted from this list.
Part I. Discharge Papers. These items were the first to be discovered as missing. They are papers relating to discharges from the Georgia Army, the Georgia State Troops and the Georgia State Line and were a part of the records of the Georgia Adjutant General's office. Most are certificates of disability for discharge, each 1 sheet and about 7 3/4 x 9 3/4 inches. Other documents are vouchers and receipts for payments to discharged soldiers, each 1 sheet but the size varies. A few items are certificates of discharge, each 1 sheet, but the size varies. Missing are discharge papers for the following persons:


Part II. Enlistment Oaths. These oaths of enlistment into the Georgia Army were a part of the records of the Georgia Adjutant General's office. Each document is one sheet but the sheet size varies. Enlistment oaths are missing for the following persons:

Part III. Militia Enrollment Lists. On Dec. 14, 1863, the Georgia General Assembly passed an Act to enroll into the Georgia Militia all white males aged 16 to 60 who were not then in military service. These Militia Enrollment Lists were a part of the records of the Georgia Adjutant General's office. Most lists are on sheets 15 3/4 x 13 7/8 inches. Lists for the following Georgia Militia Districts (GMD) are missing:

320th GMD of Baldwin County (sheet 2 of 3 sheets); 546th GMD of Bibb County (oversize sheet); 143rd and 163rd GMD of Greene County; 550th (Sugar Hill) GMD of Gwinnett County; 302nd and 304th GMD of Jones County (2 copies); 359th and 459th GMD of Jones County (2 copies); 807th GMD of Marion County; 567th, 547th and 461st GMD of Newton County; 390th and 310th GMD of Putnam County; 374th, 307th, 310th, 312th, 313th, 369th and 314th GMD of Putnam County; 123rd GMD of Richmond County; 124th GMD of Richmond County.

Part IV. Miscellaneous Papers. The following items are missing:

Contract between Paul J. Semmes, agent for the State of Georgia, and Joseph R. Anderson & Co., proprietors, Tredegar Iron Works, Richmond, Va., dated Dec. 27, 1860. 3 pp., each about 8x10 inches.

Contract between Paul J. Semmes, agent for the State of Georgia, and Charles Knap, proprietor, Ft. Pitt Foundry, Pittsburgh, Pa., dated Dec. 11, 1860. 3 pp., each about 8 1/4 x 13 inches.

Requisition for ordnance and attached receipt, showing that Henry Cleveland received specified articles from T. M. Bradford, State Military Storekeeper at Milledgeville, Ga., in November, 1861. 1 p., about 8x12 1/4 inches.


Letter, Richard M. Cuyler, Savannah, Ga., to L. F. Choice, Milledgeville, Ga., dated Sept. 27, 1861. 1 p., about 8x10 inches.


Letter, Levi S. Hart, Military Storekeeper, Savannah, Ga., Arsenal, to Capt. Berry, Georgia Army Ordnance Bureau, dated Mar. 18, 1861. 1 p., about 6 1/2 x 6 1/2 inches.

List of "Arms in Arsenal ready for immediate use," dated State Arsenal, Milledgeville, Ga., Sept. 30, 1861. 1 p., about 6 1/2 x 8 inches.


Receipt signed by Levi S. Hart, Military Storekeeper, State Arsenal at Savannah, Ga., listing items received from Capt. Hollifield, commanding Georgia Artillery, dated Apr. 30, 1862. 1 p., dimensions unknown.


Part V. Depredation Affidavits. After Sherman's March to the Sea many Georgians filed depredation affidavits with the State of Georgia listing property stolen or damaged by the U. S. Army. Depredation affidavits are missing for the following persons:

Giles H. Griswold, Mrs. Perina T. Griswold, Samuel Griswold, all of Jones County, Ga.

Part VI. Military Rosters. The following items are missing from a file containing miscellaneous rosters and muster rolls of military units. These items are usually 2 or more pages in length and the page size varies.

Henry County, Ga., roster of men subject to military service, compiled Mar. 4, 1862; Liberty County, Ga., roster dated Aug. 4, 1863; Talbot County, Ga., roster of men subject to military service, compiled Mar. 4, 1863.

Part VII. Other Papers. The following missing items cannot be identified more completely than appears below. This portion of the list is compiled by noting that file folders are now empty. In most cases the folders contained incoming correspondence but sometimes the folders contained a wide variety of other documents. The contents of some of these folders are listed in Part IV. Miscellaneous Papers but other documents may also have been in these folders. The list is by file folder label.

From Correspondence Received by the Georgia Chief of Ordnance: A. W. M. Archer, Henry Cleveland, Levi S. Hart, D. C. Hodkins & Sons, Lachlan H. McIntosh, Paul J. Semmes.

From Correspondence Received by the Georgia Quartermaster General: J. C. Ives.

From Correspondence Received by the Georgia Adjutant General Relating to the Georgia Navy: Edwin P. Starr, Lachlan H. McIntosh.


Part VIII. Tissue Letter Books. Some tissue letter books containing correspondence sent by the State of Georgia offices of the Chief of Ordnance, the Quartermaster General, the Commissary General, the Adjutant General and the Governor have missing pages. Whether these pages were missing since the Civil War or have recently disappeared is not known. In some cases indexes to the books indicate that the missing pages contained letters; in other cases the index implies that the missing pages were blank. Although no list of missing pages is included here, if any such pages are found it should be possible to determine whether or not they are the property of the Georgia Department of Archives and History.
The MISSED Archivist, Vol. I, No. 1 (November, 1975), is the most recent addition to the growing archival literature. It is "a journal devoted to the interests of all those anonymous toilers in the vineyards of history: the manuscript assistants, pages, clerk/archivists and book truck operators who always stay at home to keep the shop running while their bosses go off junketing to such exotic cities as Detroit, Chicago, and St. Paul." Whether the toilers are anonymous, the publication itself--lacking any return address--certainly is.

Front page news is the following notable item from Washington:

Senate File 2602, A Bill for an Act to Deny the Use of the United States Mails to Undated Material, appears headed for passage by the Senate. This law will truly prove a boon to future catalogers. To date the only opposition has come from manufacturers of universal calendars.

"The new social history is simply the new genealogy writ large, and it requires for its historical base a similar archival approach," Samuel P. Hays declares in the concluding segment of his article "History and Genealogy: Patterns of Change and Prospects for Cooperation," Prologue, 7 (Fall, 1975), 187-191. "No longer can the historical researcher justify a project on the grounds that it exploits a given body of records. This is inadequate simply because the dimensions of an historical problem are quite independent from the system which collected the historical information." Professor Hays adds that "The archival record is merely an artifact, a momentary product of a given act in time and space, and not a reflection of the context of life itself." Thus, he concludes, "All this requires a new archival perspective, one that shifts from the context of the administrative system within which the records were created to one of individuals as they move through life and come into contact with governmental processes."
There is no question that Professor Hays's article, of which these excerpts are a brief glimpse, ranks among the most provocative writing this year on archival enterprise.

The fact that the piece is concerned with genealogical research—a topic of slight attention heretofore in the literature—is indicative too, that this important field has begun to receive its due in recent archival publications. For one thing, the article is but one installment of Hays's three-part series in *Prologue*, the second segment of which already has been noted in *GEORGIA ARCHIVE* (Summer, 1975, p. 179). For another, *Prologue*, 7 (Winter, 1975), includes Richard S. Lackey, "Genealogical Research: An Assessment of Potential Value," 221-226, which points to instances in which data unearthed by genealogists proved highly valuable to historians and which calls for greater cooperation between the two groups. The *American Archivist* (October, 1975) contains three views of family history, an emerging facet of social history, which draws on non-traditional sources. Family history is proving to be a valid tool for the college and high school teacher struggling to relate the broader sweeps of history to individual students. Teaching historians Kirk Jeffrey and David H. Culbert report to archivists the scope of their inquiries and classroom use of family history material in their articles "Varieties of Family History" (pp. 521-532) and "Family History Projects: The Scholarly Value of the Informal Sample" (pp. 533-542). David E. Kyvig, Director of the American History Research Center, University of Akron, suggests implications of the new field on archival enterprise in "Family History: New Opportunities for Archivists" (pp. 509-520). Archivists should collect "family biographies"—most of which are prepared as class assignments—partly for what they can report about the family, and partly to obtain valuable traditional source material that comes to light in the writing of these pieces. But no archivist, Kyvig warns, should accumulate family biographies without considering first the concomitant problems of privacy, which easily could be violated in making these stories available, and of focusing the collection so that the variety of family biographies collected will be a useful sample rather than a miscellaneous assemblage.
"The risks of any apparent weakening in the pledge of confidentiality are too great to take," Vincent Barabba, director of the Bureau of the Census, told Congress in his opposition to H.R. 10686 of Representative Paul Simon (D-Illinois), which would formalize the opening of census returns after seventy-five years. "The real issue," Representative Gunn McKay (D-Utah) replied, "should not be strict confidentiality, but rather how to allow access without harming the enumerated." James E. O'Neill, Deputy Archivist of the United States, spoke to the value of historical analysis of the data, and concluded by remarking that to his knowledge the National Archives has never received a complaint alleging invasion of privacy through release of census data of this vintage.

** After nearly a year of frustrating delay, the Public Documents Commission, charged by Congress with studying the matter of control, disposition and preservation of records and documents of the President and other Federal officials, met on December 15. The Commission expects to establish a small staff, to commission several major studies by consultants, and thereafter to hold public hearings throughout the country.


"In the last analysis, our history is the source of our heroes and our villains, our heresies and our virtues. Properly and constructively to earn dividends from this moral capital, the nation depends upon the interpreters and transmitters of our history—our historical agencies. To do this,
after everything has been said about competence, energy, funding, planning, programming and constituencies, to do this in contemporary America requires also a commitment to history as a vibrant vehicle for good in the world and a faith that the world is worth surviving and doing good in."

Thus concluded the presidential address of Leslie H. Fishel, Jr., at the recent annual meeting of the American Association for State and Local History. The complete text of his talk--"The Role of the Historical Society in Contemporary America"--is included in the December, 1975, issue of History News and is worth every moment committed to reading it.

On New Year's Day itself the Atlanta Journal and Constitution brought news of the newest archival repository in the state--an archives and museum of education at Georgia College in Milledgeville. Dr. John H. Lounsbery, chairman of the education department, is heading the committee asking the Board of Regents of the University System to establish the repository to collect contracts, certificates, letters, reports, text books, samples of furniture and taped interviews.

The "Vanishing Georgia: Heritage Photography Project" of the state archives was featured in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, Sunday Magazine, January 18, 1976. The project is designed to enhance the record of the life styles of Georgians by copying old photographs. It has received considerable volunteer support. In the first thrust of the program four archives staff members and four volunteers spent two days in the Morgan County courthouse photographing and recording information on old pictures brought in by county residents. It is hoped the project will duplicate this effort in every Georgia county.
** New in Atlanta is the Document Conservation Center established by Harold Moore, formerly with the Georgia Department of Archives and History, a man with eleven years of conservation work and four as a commercial bookbinder. Located in the Atlanta Historical Society's new building, the Center will employ all restoration and preservation methods currently available and will incorporate new techniques as they are developed. The shop will perform work for all manner of organizations—libraries, educational institutions, societies, museums, governmental units, churches—and individuals. For further information, contact Harold H. Moore, Document Conservation Center, 3099 Andrews Drive, Atlanta 30305, telephone (404) 261-1837.

** The National Endowment for the Humanities, Kodak, and Ehrenreich Photo-Optical are funding the newly-established Regional Center for the Conservation of Photographic Materials at George Eastman House, the International Museum of Photography, in Rochester, New York. This new center will work on preservation of the Museum's collections, evaluate new materials and techniques in preservation, disseminate information and advise on storage and care of materials, and do "limited" research toward the solution of problems in photo conservation.

** The Xerox Corporation has released a new archival bond paper. Available in four stock sizes, the paper is acid-free and excellent for xeroxing onto permanent paper items such as newspaper clippings which are odd-sized, heavily acid, and frequently in a crumpled and torn state.

** Oce-Industries, 6500 North Lincoln Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60645, is marketing a copier that will reproduce newspaper-sized pages—17" x 24"—five a minute. No warmup time is required and copies are delivered dry.

** Discussions of "archival security" that focus only on problems present during operating hours cover but half the issue. Unauthorized persons in the stacks after hours are as unwelcome as malicious daytime visitors. A new, heat-sensing intrusion detector, recently placed on the market, is described in the American Archivist (October, 1975), 580.
** The Drexel Library Quarterly, 11 (January, 1975), is a special issue titled Management of Archives and Manuscript Collections for Librarians. Articles focus on collecting, arrangement and description, aural and graphic archives, the law and the manuscripts curator, and preservation. Copies are available for $4 from the Graduate School of Library Science, Drexel University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104. A lengthy review of the issue appears in the American Archivist, (July, 1975), 378-381.

** Nicholas C. Burckel, "Establishing a College Archives: Possibilities and Priorities," College and Research Libraries, 36 (September, 1975), 384-392, offers suggestions applicable well beyond the academic sphere.


** The most recent release from the Society of American Archivists is a guide to the basics of Paperwork Management Programs, prepared by the SAA Records Management Committee, and available free. Write Executive Director, SAA, University of Illinois, Chicago Circle, Library, Box 8198, Chicago, Illinois 60680.

With a grant from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the SAA will produce five manuals on archival functions: surveys and inventories, appraisal and accessioning, arrangement and description, reference and access, and preservation. These are to be published in 1976, after which other titles will be added. SGA members A. Carroll Hart and David B. Gracy II are working with this project.

** Procedures for Salvage of Water-Damaged Library Materials by Peter Waters, Restoration Officer, Library of Congress, is the most recent publication available free for the asking from the Office of Assistant Director of Preservation, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540. Others include "Selected References in the Literature of Conservation," "Environmental Protection of Books and Related Materials," and "Preserving Leather Bookbindings." Others are planned.
** The Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the National Endowment for the Arts have issued Ralph Sargent's *Preserving the Moving Image*, a report on the technology of film and television materials. Write American Film Institute, Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Washington, D.C. 20566. Price $3.95.


** The National Historical Publications and Records Commission issues a newsletter--*Annotation*--that describes the Commission's work and is free on request to the NHPRC, National Archives Building, Washington, D.C. 20408.

** The Committee for the Preservation of Architectural Records of the Architectural League of New York publishes a *Newsletter* describing efforts at preservation and description of architectural archives throughout the U.S. and Canada. Address the Committee at 41 East 65th Street, New York 10021.

** Candace S. Bogar, "Classification for an Architecture and Art Slide Collection," *Special Libraries*, 66 (December, 1975), 570-574, makes a valued contribution in defining problems and solutions for custodians of large slide collections.

** Association of American Publishers offers free a 5-page brochure titled *Copyright Permissions: A Guide for Noncommercial Use.* It gives a brief history of copyright, the current status of copyright revision legislation and interprets the concept of "fair use." Write the AAP, 1920 L Street, Suite 750, Washington, D.C. 20036.

** The annual bibliography of writings on archives, historical manuscripts and current records—this one for items issued in 1973—appears in *American Archivist*, (July, 1975), 339-374.
The Georgia Baptist Historical Society has published *Obituaries from the Christian Index*, an abstract of notices appearing 1822-1879. Copies are priced at $20 and are available from Reverend Waldo Harris, Box 775, Washington, GA 30673. Marriage records from the *Christian Index*, 1829-1855, may be ordered for $10 from Mary Overby, Curator, GBHS, Stetson Memorial Library, Mercer University, Macon 31207. Available for use in the Library are card files and bound indexes of abstracts of obituaries, 1880-1916, marriage records, 1855-1916, ordinations, 1829-, ministers, 1800-1900, and a picture file, 1900-present, all from the *Christian Index*. Another card file indexes memorials from Baptist Association minutes.

Frances Howell Beckemeyer, comp., *Abstracts of Georgia Colonial Conveyance Book C-L, 1750-1761*, ($10), and Brigid S. Townsend, comp., *Indexes to Seven State Census Reports for Counties in Georgia, 1838-1845* [Laurens, Newton, and Tattnall counties for 1838, and Warren (33rd and 34th Battalions), Dooly, and Forsyth counties for 1845], ($5), are new from the Taylor Foundation, Box 38176, Atlanta 30334.

Sources of Georgia Biography: An Annotated Bibliography is the fine product of a graduate seminar in the Division of Librarianship at Emory University. Compiled by Mary E. Gibert, Roger Hux, Donna Mancini, Ann Patterson, Lois Seed, Sally Somers, and Joe Wible, the 44-page publication provides the first "unified source for students seeking collective biographies of Georgians," that is, of "persons who made a distinctive contribution to society while living in the state." Some 127 works, each listing a minimum of ten individuals, are included. Contact: Professor Julia Emmons, Division of Librarianship, Emory University, Atlanta 30322. Price $3.00.

The 10th annual Archives Institute of the Georgia Department of Archives and History and Emory University has been scheduled for July 26-August 20, 1976. The Institute offers general instruction in basic concepts and practices, as well as experience in research use and management of documentary materials. Write the Georgia Department of Archives and History, Atlanta 30334.
The 7th annual Workshops on College and University Archives—one workshop advanced, the other introductory—will be offered June 13-18, 1976. Address Ruth Helmuth, University Archivist, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio 44106.

The SGA's 4th annual Workshop on Archives and Records has been scheduled for November 19-20, 1976.

SGA TREASURER'S REPORT

Balance on hand, January 1, 1975 $565.48*

Income
Dues $610.00
Subscriptions 411.50
Annual dinner 101.50
Purchases (single issues of GEORGIA ARCHIVE) 43.55
$1166.55

Expenses
Postal charges $137.00
Printing & copy charges 815.46
Copyright fees 12.00
Annual dinner 141.96
Office supplies 18.82
Misc. expenses 2.16
$1127.40

Balance on hand, December 31, 1975 604.63

*Adjusted to reflect bank charges in 1974.
RECENT ACCESSIONS AND OPENINGS OF GEORGIA RESOURCES

GEORGIA REPOSITORIES

Athens

MANUSCRIPT COLLECTION
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA LIBRARIES

JOHN MACPHERSON BERRIEN Letters, 1825-1849: To Littleton W. Tazewell, Senator from Virginia, discussing congressional matters; 6 items.

FERGUSON BETHUNE Letter, March 5, 1782: Tory requesting pack horses; 1 item.

FREEMAN Collection, 1802-1920: Materials concerned with the Union City Realty & Trust Co. and Consolidated Trust Co.; 377 items.

NELL UPshaw GANNON Diaries, 1933-1973: Concerned with family matters and social affairs in Athens; 52 items.

GEORGIA CONGRESSMEN Collection, 1826-1936: Biographical information assembled by Charles Lanham for the Dictionary of the United States Congress; 57 items.

DUPREE HUNNICUTT Papers, 1900-1946: Bills, receipts, accounts of an Athens family; 850 items.

NEW ENGLAND-MISSISSIPPI LAND CO. Papers, 1785-1826: Material concerning the Yazoo land companies and Perez Morton; 30 items.

JAMES EDWARD OGLETHORPE Letter, Jan. 16, 1734: Concerned with the settling of the Salzbergers in Georgia; 1 item.

JAMES MONROE SMITH Papers, 1895-1917: Business and legal papers concerning lawsuits; 77 items.
WILLIAM HARDEN/NELL HARDEN Collection, 1826-1936: Harden family papers; includes letters written by Gov. George M. Troup; 970 items.

JAMES JACKSON Letters, Feb. 19-20, 1782: Reports a foray of British cavalry; 2 items.

Atlanta

ATLANTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

ATLANTA, BIRMINGHAM, AND ATLANTIC RAILROAD Photographs, 19 June 1908: With accompanying descriptions of the company's first regular passenger train; 20 photos.

CHATTahoochee BRICK Co. Property Documents, 1820-1940: Plats, deeds, and indentures relating to the firm's property acquisitions in DeKalb, Fulton, and Cobb counties; 2 cu. ft.

MARGARET R. CRiSSoN Collection, 1914-1918: Two scrapbooks of clippings and photos, several U.S. Army documents, artifacts, items relating to her WWI service as a nurse in the "Emory Unit," and a history of the Unit; 1 cu. ft.

FULTON COUNTY, TAX APPRAISER'S OFFICE, Real Property Appraisal Cards (Old Series, 1950s-1960s): Show land lot, district, square, unit, plat diagram, construction details, sanitary tax, etc.; 22 filing cabinets.

WILBUR G. KURTZ, SR., Taped Interviews: Describe his experiences as technical adviser to the movies Gone With the Wind and The Great Locomotive Chase and his relationship with Margaret Mitchell; 1 1/2 hrs.

KENNETH G. MATHESoN Papers, 1906-1922: Former president of Georgia Institute of Technology; includes scrapbook of clippings about Georgia Tech, copies of speeches delivered while president, and several personal photos; 1 cu. ft.

RABUN GAP-NACooCHEE GUILD Records, 1935-1974: Minutes and financial statements, 2 scrapbooks of clippings and photos of the school, and 11 manuscripts about its purposes and functions; 1 1/2 cu. ft.
DRS. S. F. and M. T. SALTER Papers, 1870-1923: Medical forms, pamphlets, formulae for prescriptions used in their mail-order medical practice, lectures delivered at the Georgia College of Eclectic Medicine, numerous copies of the Eclectic Star (newspaper), medical journals, correspondence, photos, and medical instruments; 2 cu. ft.

ALLEN C. SMITH Papers, 1937: Manuscripts, notes, and correspondence relating to Georgia politics, 1840-1850, including his dissertation on the Republican Party in Georgia; 1 1/2 cu. ft.

C. MILDRED THOMPSON Papers, 1915-1963: Personal papers of late Dean Emeritus of Vassar College; includes copies of her writings, correspondence with 3 U.S. presidents and various government officials, documents relating to Vassar College and its proposed move to New Haven, and correspondence and clippings from the Conference of Allied Ministers, 1944; 3 cu. ft.

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS DEPARTMENT
ROBERT W. WOODRUFF LIBRARY, EMORY UNIVERSITY

WILLIAM B. HARTSFIELD Papers: Mayor of Atlanta, 1937-1961; 8 cartons (in process; not yet open to researchers).

HAROLD H. MARTIN Papers, additions, 1973-1974: Materials created during the writing of Three Strong Pillars, a history of the Trust Company of Georgia; 2 MS boxes.

SUSAN MYRICK Papers, 1939-1972: Correspondence, scrapbooks, and memorabilia relating to her career in journalism (with Macon Telegraph) and her work as a technical adviser for the movie Gone With the Wind; 2 MS boxes.

ELIZA K. PASCHALL Papers, Addition, 1944: Typed journal kept while with the American Red Cross in England during WWII; ca. 75 pages.

GLENN W. RAINERY Papers, additions, ca. 1929-1950: Mainly personal correspondence, scattered items on labor movement and New Deal programs in the South; 1 carton.
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES AND HISTORY
Manuscripts Section


BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB, Atlanta Chapter Records, 1920-1974: Minutes, yearbooks, correspondence, scrapbooks, publications; 20 cu. ft.

LAY HAMPTON EVERHART (1870-1945) Papers, 1792-1930: Officer, U. S. Navy; family correspondence from throughout the world, includes his impressions of the Battle of Manila Bay and genealogical data on Everhart family; 288 items.

BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM MONTGOMERY GARDNER Memoirs, 1842-1865: Typed transcript, describes service in the U.S. Army during the Mexican War and in the Confederate Army in the Civil War; 100 pp. (In the James Gardner Collection.)

GEORGIA APPALACHIAN TRAIL CLUB Records, 1930-1974: Correspondence, minutes, publications, photographs, drawings; 10 cu. ft. (To be microfilmed.)

GREENE COUNTY, GA., BOARD OF EDUCATION Minutes, 1884-1900: Board minutes and minutes of teachers' annual and monthly institutes; 2 vols. (To be microfilmed.)

DR. GEORGE HORINE Office Account Books, 1896-1903: Eye, ear, nose, and throat specialist, Americus, Ga.; 2 vols. (To be microfilmed.)

SAMUEL PORTER JONES (1847-1906) Papers, 1880-1905: Evangelist, Methodist Episcopal Church, North Georgia Conference; consists of family, personal, and business correspondence, sermons, legal and business papers, photographs, newsclippings; 2 cu. ft.
HENRY D. MCDANIEL (1836-1926) Papers, 1873-1926: Correspondence, letter books, records from his law practice, and material relating to the University of Georgia of which he was a trustee; 5 cu. ft.

PARKER FAMILY Papers, 1836-1865: Family correspondence; Jackson, Clarke, and Murray counties, Ga.; 65 items.

Public Records Section


DEPT. OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: Public Relations Unit, State advertising files (FY 1970, FY 1973; 2 cu. ft.); Director's subject files (1973; 1 cu. ft.); Bureau of Community Affairs, Area planning and development 701 supervision files (FY 1974; 13 cu. ft.); Local assistance co-ordination office block grant files (FY 1974; 1 cu. ft.); Local assistance co-ordination office project files (FY 1972-FY 1974; 1 cu. ft.); Latin American and Canadian Affairs Unit, Director's subject file (1974 and prior years; 2 cu. ft.); International Division, Foreign countries projects files-U.S. projects files (FY 1973 and prior years; 4 cu. ft.).

COURT OF APPEALS: Case files, case nos. 47000-48283 (January, 1972-April, 1973; 124 cu. ft.)

CRIME COMMISSION: Director's subject files (1970-1975; 6 cu. ft.)


EXECUTIVE DEPT.: Legal Div., Division subject files (1971-1975; 36 cu. ft.); Office of Planning and Budget, State and local government co-ordination study files (various dates; 9 cu. ft.); Intergovernmental co-ordination subject files (1971-1974; 11 cu. ft.); Appalachian Regional Commission project files (various dates; 10 cu. ft.)

DEPT. OF LAW: Attorney General, Opinions correspondence file (1967; 5 cu. ft.)


METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY: General manager's subject file (FY 1974; 6 cu. ft.); Finance and Administration Div., Assistant general manager's subject file (1974; 1 cu. ft.); Intergovernmental Relations Div., General manager's subject file (1973-1974; 2 cu. ft.); Construction Management Div., Director's subject file (1974; 4 cu. ft.); Program Control Div., Director's subject file (1974; 3 cu. ft.); Transit System Development Div., Assistant general manager's subject file (1972-1974; 8 cu. ft.); Atlanta Transit System, Operations report file (various dates; 24 cu. ft.); Rate increase application and supporting document file (various dates; 10 cu. ft.); Tangible property inventory file (10 vols.); Intangible property inventory file (20 vols.)


SECRETARY OF STATE: Commissions Div., Returns of regular, special and local referendum elections (1974; 13 cu.

SUPREME COURT: Case files, case nos. 9147-13899 (1876-1885; 91 cu. ft.); Proceeding books (1854-1859; 13 vols.); Record books of proceedings and opinions (1846-1855; 15 vols.); Minute books (1846-1967; 34 vols.); Opinion books (1855-1890; 57 vols.)

DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION: Support Services Office, Director's subject files (1974; 2 cu. ft.); Road Design Office, Highway project plans files (various projects; 3 cu. ft.)

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA: Board of Regents, Minutes, Board of Regents (1971-1972; 1 cu. ft.); Admissions and Testing Office, Freshman normative data file (1958-1959; 1 cu. ft.)

SOUTHERN LABOR ARCHIVES
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY


AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY, AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, LOCAL 3 (Fulton County) Records, 1951-1974: Correspondence, minutes, financial records, legal documents, and printed material relating to pensions, organizing in DeKalb County, and legislative interests; 2,800 leaves.
PLUMBERS AND STEAMFITTERS, LOCAL 72 (Atlanta)
Records, 1939-1972: Correspondence, financial records, and printed material concerning jurisdictional matters and financial affairs; 564 leaves.


UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS, LOCAL 144 (Macon) Records, 1887-1970: Correspondence, minutes, financial records, reports, and printed material relating to apprentice programs, contract negotiations, wage predeterminations, and local union finances; 10,990 leaves.

UNITED TEXTILE WORKERS OF AMERICA Records, 1930 (1941-1956)1975: Correspondence, minutes, financial records, and printed material illuminating a wide range of activities including organizing in New England and the South, the movement of New England textile firms to the South, community opposition to unionization, joint union-industry-government efforts to strengthen the textile industry, and competition with the Textile Workers Union of America; 104,000 leaves.

UNITED TEXTILE WORKERS OF AMERICA, SOUTHERN REGION, AREA B, Records, 1972-1973: Primarily correspondence between Area Director Roy Whitmire and the UTW International officers; major topic is the Southern Conference in Atlanta, May, 1973; 540 leaves.

Carrollton

ARCHIVES
WEST GEORGIA COLLEGE

JAMES EMORY BOYD (1906- ) Speeches, 1961-1965: President, West Georgia College, 1961-1971, member, University System Board of Regents; Speech notes; 10 in.
St. Simons Island

COASTAL GEORGIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

PHINEAS MILLER Letter, 29 Nov. 1788: To Charles Rutledge; entitled "Memorandum for a Description of Cumberland Island," contains a physical description of the island; 4 pages.

NOTE: Appointments to use material must be made through the Museum of Coastal History, P.O. Box 1151, St. Simons Island 31522; phone (912)638-4666.

OUT-OF-STATE REPOSITORIES

North Carolina

MANUSCRIPTS DEPARTMENT
WILLIAM R. PERKINS LIBRARY, DUKE UNIVERSITY
DURHAM

SAMUEL WRAGG FERGUSON Memoirs, 1902: Includes description of his participation in the Atlanta Campaign.

JOHN MCINTOSH KELL Papers, 1785-1921: Kell and Munroe family correspondence from Macon and elsewhere; 4,285 items and 8 vols.

ANNA B. MCLAURIN Papers, 1841-1878: Includes letters from William A. Fuller, conductor of the train from which "The General" was stolen; 48 items.

LUCY RANDOLPH MASON Papers, 1917-1954: Labor organizer for the CIO in the Southeast; 6,528 items and 4 vols.

GEORGE P. METZ Papers, 1860-1891: Diary of a Union Army ambulance driver in Georgia, 1864-1865.

JAMES NOURSE Diary, 1862-1878: Relates experiences of Union soldier during the Atlanta Campaign and Wilson's Raid.

GEORGE F. PALMES Papers: Includes daybook, 1869-1871, of Palmes & Lyon, wholesale grocers and commission merchants at Savannah.
Physician's Ledger, 1831-1838: Author not identified, Lawrenceville (Gwinnett County).

THOMAS ROSIS Papers, 1851-1858: Cuban revolutionary in Savannah; 30 items.

SCARBOROUGH FAMILY Papers, 1760-1939: Correspondence of this Montgomery County, N.C., family includes 27 letters, 1836-1856, from relatives or friends who were farmers in Carroll, Fulton, Harris, Monroe, and Troup counties in Georgia; 1,414 items and 23 vols.

JOHN EDGAR DAWSON SHIPP Diary, 1876: Describes his student days at Gordon Institute, Barnesville.

ALVA CARMICHAEL SMITH Papers, 1840-1969: Coal wholesaler and retailer in Columbus; 4,223 items and 2 vols.

ALEXANDER SPRUNT & SON, INC., Papers, 1779-1960: Records, 1875-1953, of major Wilmington, N.C., cotton exporting firm that drew business chiefly from Georgia and the Carolinas; 5,860 items and 235 vols.

RUTH ELIZABETH (NEWTON) UNDERWOOD Papers, 1926-1942: Material on Southern Conference on Women and Children in Industry; 27 items and 4 vols.
Frank B. Evans, *Modern Archives and Manuscripts: A Select Bibliographic Guide* (1975) $8.00 members $11.00 others

A Basic Glossary for Archivists, Manuscript Curators, and Records Managers (1974) $2.00 members $2.00 others

Directory of State and Provincial Archives (1975) $4.00 members $6.00 others

Directory of Business Archives in the United States and Canada (1975) $1.00 members $3.00 others

Forms Manual [for college and university archives] (1973) $5.00 members $8.00 others

Ernst Posner, *Archives and the Public Interest* (1967) $5.00 members $6.00 others

The American Archivist:
- Index to Volumes 1-20 (1938-57) $6.00 members $10.00 others
- Index to Volumes 21-30 (1958-67) $6.00 members $10.00 others
- Mary Jane Dowd, Compiler

The American Archivist, 1938-1974 $20 roll, $175 set, members $25 roll, $225 set, others

35 mm. microfilm, 10 rolls

Add $1.00 postage & handling charge on orders under $10.00 which are not prepaid.

**Society of American Archivists**
The Library, Post Office Box 8198
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Chicago, Illinois 60680
JOIN THE SOCIETY OF GEORGIA ARCHIVISTS

Founded in 1969 to promote the knowledge, understanding, and use of archival agencies, the Society meets quarterly in February, May, August, and November, and publishes the semiannual journal, GEORGIA ARCHIVE.

The Society of Georgia Archivists invites all persons interested in the field of archives to join. Annual memberships are:

- Regular: $5.00
- Contributing: 10.00
- Sustaining: 25.00
- Patron: More than $25.00

Memberships include GEORGIA ARCHIVE and the Society of Georgia Archivists Newsletter. ALL MEMBERSHIPS ARE TAX DEDUCTIBLE.

To join and receive GEORGIA ARCHIVE, clip and return the application blank below.

THE SOCIETY OF GEORGIA ARCHIVISTS

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

NAME_________________________________________________________

ADDRESS_____________________________________________________

CITY_________STATE_______ZIP__________________________

POSITION_____________________________________________________

WHAT ASPECTS OF ARCHIVES PARTICULARLY INTEREST YOU?_______

Mail Application and Remittance to:

The Society of Georgia Archivists
Box 261
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/georgia_archive/vol4/iss1/12
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