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Introduction

Museums and archives represent two of the most durable and long-lived means for perpetuating culture and social memory. Like their sister repository, the library, museums and archives fill long-established and specialized roles in the care of cultural materials. These roles, crafted over centuries of changing responsibilities and pressures, must be re-examined in the face of modern needs, technologies, and expectations. While archival repositories and museums have developed into two distinctive types of cultural institutions, they now find themselves amidst a need to consolidate their efforts and provide the public with a coherent means for accessing the increasingly fragmented and diverse cultural evidence produced today. Making this cultural evidence accessible implies not only offering the actual materials but also requiring concerted efforts to link the historical and intellectual functions served by all forms of historical records. Accordingly, it is incumbent upon archivists and museum professionals to provide a holistic context for the materials they hold and to build avenues by which users can connect information from all types of historical evidence.
While many agree that cultural institutions should work together closely, museum and archives professionals have collaborated only to a very small degree. They remain entrenched, rather, in their individual vocabularies and perspectives. While many factors contribute to this continued separation, perhaps the most glaring ones concern the mutually vague sense each repository has of the other. They falter in establishing a connection between the kinds of information available through archives and artifacts, and they falter in sharing the common ground between them. While most museum professionals and archivists generally acknowledge that both work in the overarching "cultural" arena, they define and limit their work exclusively by and to the particular methods of their own profession. Yet, ironically, the most fundamental concerns in one field echo the concerns in the other and thus reveal areas for common discussion: 1) the future of cultural institutions, 2) the changing perception of cultural materials, 3) current professional attitudes concerning the nature of collaboration, and 4) potential joint programs designed to foster a more comprehensive use of cultural materials.

Cultural Institutions

Perhaps the gravest concern faced by cultural institutions is responding to the many changes occurring within the cultural community, while simultaneously maintaining their traditional identities. A shortage of funding, greater competition for public recognition and use, and the effects of an increasingly technologically based infrastructure for disseminating information have led museum professionals and archivists to "modernize" their professional techniques in order to address these pressures. And, at least as significantly as modernizing their respective approaches, both institutions have struggled also to stake out their positions amidst the merging of traditionally information-driven and cultural aspects of historical repositories. This dynamic and often
volatile relationship raises two essential questions in the archival and museum literature: whether traditional repositories will necessarily become more attentive to one aspect—informational or cultural—of their work, and what such a choice will mean for the future survival of institutions.

In many ways, the questions seem odd since cultural institutions have always functioned both as information sources and as cultural repositories. That is, the cultural materials found in museums and archives are used to satisfy particular information needs; they also serve an important social function that relates to the public on a collective rather than individual level. In this public sense, cultural repositories act as custodians of unique cultural evidence by insuring its preservation for future use. This function involves both the selection and maintenance of materials that may or may not be used by contemporary users. The criteria for saving and keeping these materials are based on the potential for future use and on the importance of the materials in providing evidence of events that institutions determine are valuable for society to preserve.

Although they fulfill both functions, museums and archives have traditionally shaped their institutional work along one primary course. Museums have identified most strongly with the cultural aspects of their work, and archives with the informational ones. Museums, for instance, primarily make

---

1 Because both museums and archives include diverse kinds of institutions, it is helpful to clarify the scope of coverage. While many archival repositories fulfill a more administrative role (that is, they are administrative archives), the phrase archival repositories will refer primarily to collecting archival repositories. Similarly, the museums discussed here are mostly history, natural history, and science and technology museums. However, all types of institutions will be considered when discussing the natures of the professions on the whole.

their collections accessible through exhibits, a format that preestabishes the context of artifacts. Such an action emphasizes the museum's function in preserving culture(s). It demonstrates the importance of artifacts beyond any particular use museum visitors may have for them, since it is the museum staff that selects the items. In other words, the visitor views the artifacts the museum has established are important. Conversely, archivists view their records primarily as items for original research. While they too must preserve materials, users access only the material they request. Consequently, archivists focus most ostensibly on serving the information needs of the research community. The emphasis therefore remains on the records as information sources rather than as cultural items.

Today, however, the museum and archival literatures reveal a similar reexamination of these functions and question what priority should be ascribed to each given the changing expectations of the public. Museum professionals and archivists are attempting to decide between the merits of providing a balance between informational and cultural aspects of their work and the merits of minimizing the emphasis of the cultural aspect for the sake of the other. Speaking on the need to follow the former case, Canadian archival philosopher Hugh Taylor wrote that cultural repositories already work with a constrained interpretation of cultural materials. Archivists, he argued, often fail to see the significance of records beyond their extant content. Perhaps because archivists are so immersed in the specific duties of their jobs, they give secondary attention to the cultural implications of archives. He called for a greater interplay between the cultural and informational dimensions of archival materials as well as for a more museum-like focus on the

---

relationship between records and the public, which, both as individuals and on a more abstract level, must be served.

In several works, David Bearman presents the most opposing and controversial view of Taylor’s call for integration. Bearman calls for a complete separation between management archivists, who concentrate on the immediate needs of users and on justifying archival repositories in terms of their current value, and archivists whom Richard Cox labeled “manuscript-type” curators, who deal with primarily historical records and place at least equal importance (to that of current use) on the future use of archival records. Although Bearman’s and Cox’s writings are based in their work in administrative archives, their stand on the future of the archival profession has provided the fodder for an increasingly heated debate in the profession as a whole. As Cox recently wrote, “[T]he curatorial types will become more a part of the museum community and play a lesser role in the issues of documenting society or any particular kinds of organizations. This will be a painful process, but in the end the archival profession will be strengthened.”

Linda Henry, an appraisal archivist with the National Archives, recently denounced Bearman, his “cohorts” (among whom she counts Cox), and “Bearmania” as advocating an ahistorical and narrow view of the profession. Henry provided what to date has been one of the most thorough arguments against Bearman’s well-stated position. Essentially, Henry countered Bearman’s stance that archivists could insure their

---

5 Cox, “Archives and Archivists in the Twenty-First Century,” 109 [italics his].
professional survival only by working exclusively on the information/records management aspect of archival work. Henry observed that, if indeed archivists assumed only that role, there would be no archival profession left—only records management.

While correct on many critical points, Henry failed to mention that, in several respects, Bearman has asked—and forced others in the profession to ask—difficult questions that archivists have yet to answer fully. Bearman, although not the first nor only person to address these matters, focused issues in a new professional vision regarding archivists’ responsibility to current users, financial accountability, the options of long-term storage, custodianship of records, the need for technological solutions to technological problems, and a reexamination of the role of records in “preserving recordness.” Whether one agrees with Bearman on the whole, in part, or not at all, his writings reflect a mounting tension. His description of the changes within the field, while important, fall second to the implicit recognition that the outside forces shaping the profession potentially are more revolutionary. No longer is it an academic or professionally delimited question whether archives are cultural, administrative, or somewhere-in-between kinds of institutions. Instead, if they are to prosper, cultural institutions must define their functions according to values the public will legitimize and support.

Museums, on the other hand, experience no difficulty understanding the cultural dimension of their work. Yet, lest one should assume that the museum profession is any less susceptible to the divisiveness of a professional debate, one only has to turn to the differing interpretations concerning the museum’s role in conveying the meaning or value of objects. Traditionally, museum curators have assumed that visitors “receive” whatever ideas and information had been carefully presented. Yet, increasingly, museum professionals recognize that meaning is a constructive process in which the user plays
at least an equal part to that of the museum. That is, the user brings to the museum interaction his or her own expectations and cognitive abilities to interpret and eventually to draw meaning from the objects and exhibits. Moreover, visitors want platforms that address their questions and concerns. Given the multiple ways in which objects can be presented and interpreted, museums misstep by ignoring the immediate demands of their constituencies and by confining the informational value of artifacts to a traditional and uncontested framework—issues and settings—that museums select as the means for access.

Peter Vergo, one of the most controversial writers in the museum field, voiced the concern of "new museology," a disciplinary perspective of the museum community which holds that traditional museology focuses too much on methods for improving internal procedures and not for enhancing its service to the public. Museums, Vergo warned, do not respond to the public's cultural plurality, economics, and politics. Instead, museums stand primarily as unresponsive monologues that continue whether or not visitors are listening. "Unless a radical re-examination of the role of museums within society—by which I do not mean measuring their 'success' merely in terms of criteria such as more money and more visitors—takes place, museums may well find themselves dubbed only 'living fossils'." Dierdre Stam, a critic of Vergo, noted that while new museology signifies a movement to exploit information about objects for use in wider museum

7 Charles Alan Watkins, director of the Appalachian Cultural Museum, discusses the impact of these perspectives, although he cautions that such a viewpoint suggests that every person can ultimately become his or her own curator—a position, he maintains, that weakens museums, "Are Museums Still Necessary?" Curator 37, no. 1 (1994): 27-8.
9 Ibid., note 4, 3.
functions such as interpretation and access, no specific mechanisms for doing so have been offered.¹⁰

Like the archival field, the museum community is searching for ways to maintain authority over its holdings. The status of museums as legitimate instruments to guard and present artifactual evidence is being challenged. The challenge results largely from the public’s growing awareness that museum exhibitions of the past often represented limited views of cultures and events. Charles Alan Watkins observed that the public is demanding greater control over the content—in terms of artifacts displayed and exhibition themes chosen—and that it wants a closer interaction (not just passive viewing) with that content.¹¹ While the museum community is attempting to become more inclusive and open, the dissatisfaction, or the public’s feelings of “alienation” from traditional repositories, has paved the way for the establishment of other forms of cultural enterprises. Profit operations, such as Disney’s Epcot Center, and countless civil hall exhibits draw large crowds, which museums fear are relying on essentially entertainment-driven activities to provide accurate and authentic cultural evidence. Museologist Julia D. Harrison noted that while museums have necessarily adapted some entertainment practices to continue attracting visitors, they must still find a balance between meeting the shifting needs of their public and maintaining the legitimacy of their collections as the basis for a continuing portrayal of society.¹² The museum community’s fear is that, if it becomes too focused on current needs, it will lose the

---

footing—the long-term vision and social responsibility—that makes museums an essential, public good.

Archives and museums are struggling to define themselves amidst two dual, sometimes conflicting, responsibilities. The first is meeting the expectations and information needs of an increasingly demanding public. The second is delivering the more abstract service of preserving culture, maintaining the integrity of records, and thus assuring the protection of rights and viewpoints. If the records that repositories hold did not so strongly serve both cultural and informational concerns, the debate would be moot since the repositories would have fewer options in developing services and shaping their futures. The nature of unique records, however, insures that cultural repositories must continually reexamine the inherent potentials for use of their holdings. While many professionals in both fields have offered the advantages of focusing on one area of responsibility (namely, Bearman and Stam), there are advantages in emphasizing both. The cultural and informational aspects of records do not have to work at odds; they merely need to be understood in their separate and multiple contexts.

Furthermore, the public expects its cultural institutions to fulfill certain duties. Chief among those duties is the responsibility to act for the collective good of the society. While the public is indeed pushing for a greater response to their individual information needs, it does not absolve cultural repositories from traditional mandates. ¹³ Much of the

¹³ A study sponsored by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and published by the Benton Foundation found that the public perceived libraries' importance primarily due to their social and cultural character. If such a view holds true for libraries, which are associated arguably more with meeting current information needs, the public's perception of the cultural value of institutions is easily applicable to museums and archives, "Buildings, Books, and Bytes: Libraries and Communities in the Digital Age," at <http://www.benton.org/Library/Kellogg/buildings.html>. 
support—financial and ideological—that cultural repositories receive is based largely on their perceived role as permanent institutions whose interest in culture and society is long-term, not transitory. If repositories abandon that obligation, public support not only will end but also potentially will cast public suspicion on any activity the repositories would then presume to undertake. Perhaps the primary caveat is that while change is necessary, continuity is irreplaceable.

If cultural repositories acknowledge an imperative to pursue actively both aspects of their work, they ultimately must convince the public of the value in using records and artifacts both for the information they contain and the culture they embody. To do this, museum professionals and archivists must find concrete ways of showing this duality. And it is here that the two come to points of collaboration. Each repository already possesses particular expertise that can be used to broaden and make tangible an expanded range of functions and potential. By taking their respective positions within the overall cultural domain, museums and archives can help legitimize one another by supporting the role the other plays in maintaining the cultural record. They can share solutions to problems that clearly confront them both. They can affirm their professional status and institutional purposes by demonstrating a productive and necessary fit between archives and museums, between records and artifacts.

Cultural Materials

On a general level, museums and archives acknowledge that life is a discourse conducted through both objects and records, where each type of record signifies a unique expression. Artifacts and archives complement the information in one another and simultaneously provide the basis for an understanding derived from the particular properties inherent in their form. Moreover, artifacts and archives indicate different representations of past activities. As primary materials, they are tools that serve as original
"participants" in events. Where the tool is physical, the tool creates the activity. Where the tool is textual, the activity creates the tool. And history is both a product of initiating an activity and weighing the evidence left from that event. Archives and artifacts are necessary for a complete historical narrative.

Yet, in practice, archivists and museum professionals fail to recognize that making historical evidence accessible not only means linking archives with archives and artifacts with other artifacts but also implies situating historical evidence within the overall environment of cultural materials. Museum professionals and archivists tend to focus exclusively on improving existing methods and perspectives within their particular domains. By separating artifacts and archives from one another, cultural workers lose the opportunity to enhance the "voice" of their particular records. Not surprisingly, cultural records are isolated both physically and intellectually. This divide results not only from discipline-oriented biases but also from the chaotic and changing nature of cultural materials as well.

The increasingly fractured production of cultural materials makes documenting social groups particularly difficult. Archivist Helen W. Samuels tackled the problem of documentation by outlining a series of documentation strategies designed to identify and preserve documentation about a particular area or activity. Her pioneering work focused on documenting an activity by identifying, in advance, what records provided evidence of that action. Instead of allowing records to reconstruct the activity, Samuels specified

that the activity should guide the policies for retaining appropriate records. Moreover, she acknowledged that such a holistic approach must necessarily be conducted on a multi-institutional level. She was concerned with the fundamental task of all cultural institutions—the ongoing process of appraisal and preservation of the cultural record. While few others have proposed such an expansive view of cultural records and the conjugate need to integrate strategies for their preservation, she is not alone in recognizing the need for a more cohesive plan for bringing together multiple forms of evidence. Susan M. Pearce, director of the Department of Museum Studies at the University of Leicester, described the growing movement to preserve culture as a complex portrayal, in which “context” translates into “community,” and material culture, in all its forms, represents an expression of that community at all levels.17

Documenting modern communities proves particularly difficult in light of the often chaotic and unpredictable production of cultural materials. A look at the rise of social groups in the 1960s illustrates this point. Historian David E. Kyvig noted that the civil rights movement exposed weaknesses in social identity and legitimized discrete groups that demanded recognition of their roles in the cultural establishment.18 This shift in political and social power led to a greater interest in understanding these groups, which, as never before, united in a forceful declaration of self-identity. These minority groups brought their own means of communication and cultural documentation into mainstream discourse. Not surprisingly, they often turned to multiple avenues of expression—music, speeches, symbols, films and,

more recently, Web sites and listservs. Cultural workers must now link intellectually these diverse forms of evidence if the groups that created them are to be represented accurately and studied from their original and diverse testimonies.

As never before, the by-products and records of culture are voluminous in quantity and varied in format, and the notion of cultural heritage necessarily embraces them all. From bra-burning symbols to feminist propaganda and black armbands to the thousands of letters written by African Americans to their legislators, these records document part of a common narrative. Together, they belong to the broader pool of cultural heritage. Awareness of this fact represents one of the most dramatic shifts in a collective understanding of cultural heritage, as well as in scholarship. The study of history, now realized, is a story of the masses and their grassroots forms of expression. And consequently, the materials—records and artifacts—of those masses represent an essential component in interpreting the past. Social history, material culture, and ethnography reflect a changing academic and historical perspective which is increasingly relying on the combination and accessibility of historical evidence found in archives and museums.

The problem is that few mechanisms exist to help adhere these disparate elements into a meaningful whole. Simply put, the systems for accessing artifacts and archives are largely incompatible. Although many professionals and laymen alike had hoped that electronic access would provide the means for users to find all types of pertinent materials, only now are they beginning to understand how best to apply technology and grasp the mammoth amount of work necessary to make cultural materials accessible. It is ironic that much of the

---

19 Ibid., 6-7.
20 Harrison discusses the importance of material culture scholarship for anthropological research in “Ideas of Museums,” 168.
renewed interest in historical artifacts and archival documents emerges largely from their accessibility via digital environments, in which the unique qualities of these records all but disappear. In providing access, cultural workers no longer can assume that users will have the benefit of the context provided in the physical repository. Not only must cultural institutions maintain the integrity of cultural records in this mutable and highly unstable environment but also they must be able to provide some intellectual blueprint for finding and unifying scattered pockets of cultural materials. As the public becomes increasingly conversant with the potential offered by electronic access, people will demand that cultural institutions provide more compatible services.

Regardless of the state of technology and its potential use in linking information among cultural repositories, technology has created a push for more cohesive access. This pressure is likely to increase both as a result of the expectations of what technology ideally should provide and from the growing technological fiefdoms which will require multiple forms of access. These concerns, of course, are not lost on museum and archival professionals who, despite the existing division between repositories, acknowledge the need for a more developed relationship.

---

21 While technology has globalized communication systems, it has also enabled individuals and groups to form private information systems that are designed according to widely differing specifications, software, hardware, and modes of access. In many respects, technology has enabled people to live and work in extremely individualized environments that are not easily compatible with other environments, a fact that makes collaboration and interchange extremely difficult. Terry Cook, “From Information to Knowledge: An Intellectual Paradigm for Archives,” Archivaria 19 (winter 1984–1985): 31.
Professional Attitudes

When asked about museum and archives collaboration, cultural workers readily acknowledged an overall benefit in bridging the work of both fields. Despite this general endorsement and a desire to open lines of communication, however, museum professionals and archivists described a working environment that proves often incompatible with collaborative efforts.

These perspectives emerged from a survey of museum and archives professionals conducted in fall 1995 and spring 1997 by the author. The survey aimed at gauging the attitudes of cultural workers concerning museum and archives collaboration and the relationship between artifacts and archives. Toward this end, cultural workers were questioned in three areas: 1) their individual work environments, 2) their willingness to increase awareness and use of artifacts and archival records, and 3) perceived barriers to the interuse of cultural records.

Of twenty-one surveys sent to regional archives and museum professionals, a total of ten responses were received: five from museum professionals, four from archivists, and one from an archivist working in an archives and museum. The five archivists worked in a state agency, a university archives, a special collections in a city library, a private research center, and an archives and museum. The museum professionals worked in a university museum, state department, historical society, and two worked in private museums. Of the nine respondents who provided information on their educational background, eight held master's degrees and the other held a bachelor's degree and an archival certification.

Individual Work Environment

The survey began with questions concerning the individual's work environment. Respondents provided an estimation of the visitor/researcher rates for their institutions. Museum professionals reported an annual average of 267,000
visitors and 48 researchers, while archivists reported an annual average of 10,678 visitors and 9,154 researchers. The single respondent who worked in the archives/museum reported 90,000 visitors and 140 researchers. When questioned about their holdings, archivists' responses revealed that archival repositories consisted of 99 percent records and 1 percent artifacts on average. Museum professionals broke down their collections as 90 percent artifacts and 10 percent archives average.

As indicators of institutions' primary areas of responsibilities, these basic figures suggest from the onset certain logistical and cost questions. For instance, why would museums emphasize research activities for 48 people when they receive an average of 267,000 visitors? How can archives, which have only 1 percent artifacts in their holdings, conduct more museum-like programs? While all ten professionals surveyed maintained a belief that combining the use of artifacts and archives was important in a general sense, they were still left with intractable statistics that made it difficult to justify—to themselves and their institutions—why such an undertaking is valuable despite those numbers.

Use of Artifacts and Archives

The respondents also addressed their individual willingness to expand the use of cultural materials (those beyond their traditional holdings) and to encourage users/visitors to do the same. Eight out of the ten stated a willingness to undertake such projects and collaborate with other institutions. The two respondents who said they were unwilling to participate in this type of collaboration wrote "too much to do already" and "not part of our mission" as their primary reasons. The archivists (three out of five) stated that they would consider increasing such activities because of their overarching obligation to researchers to provide them with as many possible relevant sources. The motivation of museum
professionals (four out of five) was based on a desire to help visitors gain a balanced and full understanding of a topic.

When asked in what ways they could best make use of both artifacts and archives, the respondents (eight out of ten) stated that exhibitions were the most logical form of joint use. The respondents also listed the sharing of information about holdings and educational programs for staff and visitors/researchers as important avenues for collaboration. Despite these responses, few professionals stated that their institutions currently conduct most of these activities. Respondents listed only exhibits as a collaborative forum they regularly use and, even in those cases, are limited by their own collections.

Perceived Barriers

Respondents listed four significant barriers to starting collaborative programs: 1) a lack of information about the holdings of other institutions, 2) the unavailability of cultural materials (outside of an institution’s own materials), 3) diverse preservation and conservation needs, and 4) the limited knowledge each group has about maintaining different types of records. Some comments from the respondents included the need for “more exchange concerning each other’s holdings and missions”; a “better understanding of [the] time factor involved in putting up exhibits”; and “[g]ood old communication and awareness that each exists and could be used for the benefit of each other.” Half of the respondents in each group stated, moreover, that although they had borrowed materials from other institutions, the availability of artifacts (for archives) and records (for museums) was so limited that a combination of items often was difficult and too complicated to arrange. While all five museum professionals expressed a desire to pursue collaboration, only three of the five archivists expressed the same interest.

The survey comments on this topic were vague but gave the impression that while professionals would not object to
greater interaction between cultural repositories, none seemed sure how to overcome potential obstacles. The comments were telling. All of the respondents assumed that interuse and shared programming involved a substantial "shifting" or "shuffling" of cultural materials. In other words, they assumed that providing access to other types of cultural records necessarily involved physically transferring cultural materials from one repository to another. Consequently, chief among their concerns was the need to accommodate the physical requirements of a different type of record. The survey showed that seven of the ten respondents were concerned about lacking an appropriate knowledge base to handle/maintain a different type of cultural evidence, implying again that most professionals equated "interuse" with merely adding to one's existing collection.

Results
The survey indicated that cultural workers, despite an appreciation for the potential benefit of using both artifacts and archives, face tremendous difficulty in finding ways to describe the importance of this work in relation to existing responsibilities. If collaboration is to be achieved, cultural workers must consider ways not just for developing programs but also for evaluating the impact of that work. The traditional system of door counts proves inaccurate and incomplete. While that criticism applies to the evaluation of many aspects of cultural work, it is especially true in the case of such a qualitative and different enhancement of service.

Other static conceptions further hamper archivists and museum professionals. The traditional notion that interuse of artifacts and archives involves necessarily "bringing in" more things to the repository influenced greatly how professionals described their vision of collaboration. That view leads many cultural workers to focus on obstacles, many of which might be prevented altogether by exploring different forms of collaboration and by specifically considering how the purviews
of the museum and archival fields intersect in today's environment.

Interuse and Potential Programs

By sharing information about their records and collections and by becoming more knowledgeable about the overall use of historical evidence, cultural institutions have the ability to provide a more comprehensive, more accurate, and more diverse interaction with the past than has yet occurred. Librarian Lawrence Dowler wrote that users would be better served by: 1) having a better understanding of the use of documentation, 2) not excluding non-archival sources of information when meeting users' needs, 3) systematically building access to records with links to other sources of information, and 4) understanding that the purpose of intended use, not the physical form of information, is the primary archival concern. Librarian Lawrence Dowler wrote that users would be better served by: 1) having a better understanding of the use of documentation, 2) not excluding non-archival sources of information when meeting users' needs, 3) systematically building access to records with links to other sources of information, and 4) understanding that the purpose of intended use, not the physical form of information, is the primary archival concern. Museologist Frans F. J. Schouten similarly noted the need to provide more diverse forms of information for museum visitors. He commented that contemporary museum visitors "behave" in a much more purposeful manner because they actively construct, rather than passively accept, information. Given this change, museums must attempt to connect their collections with other forms of cultural evidence. Dierdre Stam summarized this notion in the following comments:

[B]oth internal and external aspects of museum operations involve the integration of things formerly

seen as separate. . . . Central to this change is the recognition of information as a basic and shared resource. The peculiar qualities of information allow it to penetrate physical walls and thus to foster closer links among parts of the museum, and closer contact with the outside world. Museums are exhorted to take a holistic approach to the information with which they deal, and to the enterprise in which they are engaged, the museum itself. This approach involves integrating internal information . . . providing wider access for staff and public to newly coordinated institutional data, [and] drawing more deeply from sources that reveal the context of objects (through more assiduous use of published materials and original archival resources) . . . .

As it stands, museum and archival work lends itself readily to collaborative projects, since each institution already conducts activities which are compatible and can be modified, in certain instances, to accommodate a general interpretation and use of cultural materials. The range of potential programs for cooperation includes both basic techniques for referring people to additional sources of cultural heritage and more sophisticated programs designed to unify intellectually information in objects and records. As the survey indicated, museum professionals and archivists recognize the potential for collaborative work in three primary areas that relate to work in both museums and archives: exhibits, information about holdings, and educational programs for staff and researchers/visitors.

Identified by both museum and archives professionals as forum for the use of artifacts and archives, exhibitions offer an important means to establish the relationship between

artifacts and archives in the interpretation of ideas. Few juxtapositions work as closely to "reconstruct" an event as do the natural associations of thing and thought that together describe the world. Moreover, the combination of object and text serves to highlight individual dimensions of each type of cultural material.

Take for instance, the recent exhibition of "The Jewels of the Romanovs." Clearly, the exhibition represented high culture in that it consisted of jewelry, elaborate period clothing, and art. While droves of people attended the exhibit for the sake of seeing such valuable items, they also experienced some of the more personal aspects of the Romanovs through the inclusion of their correspondence, diaries, and photographs. Judging by the addition of such material, the curators were concerned with designing an exhibit that demonstrated more than just an assemblage of "pretty" things. The curators aimed at giving a more personal view of the Romanov family, a view that enabled visitors to relate with and understand the individual family members. The archival records presented the context of the family: the relationship among its members, the character of their communications with one another, and the role each individual viewed for himself. Without this more personal view, the gowns and jewels would have remained extravagant but emotionally remote curiosities.

Additionally, as many museums are now discovering, the public is demanding greater physical access to objects. As Charles Alan Watkins pointed out, museum "masqueraders," such as theme parks, are attracting many museum-goers

---


because they offer the public an intimate interaction with objects.27 This interaction engages partly because it is immediate and self-determined in that the viewer—not the curator—decides what information to extrapolate from the object. While Watkins remained cautious about overenthusiastically applying the theme park approach, he affirmed the need to incorporate such a perspective in museum operations.

The acknowledgment of the user’s primacy in making meaning is the foundation of archival institutions. Archives enable people to find and interpret information for themselves. The interaction is personal, wherein the researcher decides what records to use and assumes control of the archival records for a certain period of time (albeit under the supervision of the archival repository) and uses the records in the way he deems most appropriate. This sense of intimacy gives researchers an investment in the records they use and helps establish a personal relationship between the user and the record. Museums can encourage a similar condition of investment by helping users to scrutinize objects in multiple ways, by limiting the distance between the object and the viewer, and by including cues to help the viewer bring a methodical reading of objects to their encounters as with records in archives.

Beyond the use of exhibits, museum professionals and archivists can build an intellectual connection among artifacts and archives for the researcher. Through the inclusion of information about other forms of cultural materials within their respective systems for description and access, cultural workers broaden the intellectual content of their repositories, if not the physical ones. This sharing of information offers the most consistent and integral method for museums and

archives to link information about cultural evidence. Often, researchers assume that finding other types of cultural materials that are relevant to their particular projects are too difficult to find, or worse, they do not even consider the possibility of expanding their research to include other forms of primary materials. Including references at the minimum (photographs or exhibit pamphlets on the higher end) to museums collections or archival groups makes the researchers aware of other possibilities for accomplishing their work and provides a way of finding that material.

By linking information, cultural institutions set the example: artifacts and archives are primary materials that, used together, facilitate research. Archives help complete, for example, the information necessary to understand artifacts. While artifacts provide clues—through their material construction and form—to ascertain their function, the researcher does not know how that artifact was customarily acquired nor how much value (and what kind of value) society placed on the artifact. That information generally comes in the form of archival records.

For their part, objects reveal in concrete form the subjects of historical discourse. Take for instance, research concerning a prominent historical figure. While the figure may well be long gone, his material possessions may survive. Such artifacts render the tastes, physical stature, wealth, and material context of a particular person—information that can be garnered from no other source as authentically and directly as from artifacts. Moreover, artifacts give researchers the opportunity to establish their own connections to the objects of study instead of relying solely on others' descriptions. Through that original interaction between person and object, researchers undergo an experience that is comparable to one experienced however long ago by their subjects. Yet, given the researcher's own background, that same interaction enables the researcher to describe the relationship between
that object and the subject in both historical and contemporary terms.

The work of David B. Gracy II, professor of Archival Enterprise at the University of Texas at Austin, on the life of Moses Austin demonstrates the influence of consulting artifacts for historical research. In examining the contributions of Moses Austin to the lead mining industry, Gracy encountered numerous references to the high quality lead shot produced by Austin's technique.\(^28\) While archival documentation clearly proved the value that Austin's contemporaries held for his work, it provided a limited basis from which to describe the merits of Austin's work to modern readers. Gracy overcame this problem by consulting examples of Austin's lead shot. The examination yielded a fuller description than what was possible using only textual records. It allowed the researcher to judge Austin's shot from two perspectives—that of Austin's contemporaries (through archival documentation) and the researcher's own modern analysis, which could only occur through actual physical knowledge of the objects. The weight, the texture, and the varying sizes of the shots made the telling of history both real and accurate.

Museums and archives can also rely on information from each other to help researchers define their work more efficiently. According to a study of historians and their research processes conducted by Barbara Orbach, a cataloger in the Prints and Photograph Division of the Library of Congress, one of the most difficult elements in the research process lies in the framing of what is to be studied.\(^29\) Many researchers have a difficult time identifying a suitable


beginning and ending point in their investigations. Because
museum exhibitions represent a concise presentation of some
historical theme, they offer a quickly readable treatment of a
topic. Exhibits can be relatively fluid reflections of
contemporary perspectives and so form a gauge of shifting
community and interests. Viewed as examples of approaches
to and coverage of a particular topic, exhibits offer
researchers useful models that can be adopted, adapted, or
rejected.

Finally, in order to make any sort of collaboration fruitful,
museum and archives professionals must educate themselves
and the public about the relationship between artifactual and
archival records. Cultural institutions should create a dialogue
with researchers and visitors by offering programs such as
gallery talks about the multiple uses of cultural evidence.
Similarly, both archives and museums should undertake
activities that explain how cultural institutions gather cultural
materials and make them accessible. Exhibitions can be used,
for example, to demonstrate the process of developing an
exhibit or to chronicle the appraisal function in archives. By
publicly demonstrating traditional aspects of cultural work,
repositories enable users to witness the process of selecting
the topics to be documented and of appraising and gathering
the evidence for doing so. This window into the cultural
workplace demystifies reasons why certain records are kept
and others are not. It establishes that all cultural evidence
comes from a general pool of everyday things from which the
elements used to record history will eventually be drawn.
Moreover, it aids the public in understanding artifacts and
archives as vital components of a common historical narrative.

30 William Joyce notes that traditional finding aids are static documents that
emphasize traditional political points of view and cannot draw attention to
new perspectives on or approaches to historical research, "Archivists and
Conclusion

Archivists and museum professionals share many concerns and face many of the same problems. By collaborating, they each gain a respected ally. Moreover, collaboration permits them to offer their users two important advantages—the opportunity to better understand how different materials express aspects of society and the ability to interpret and use historic evidence more fully. In working to promote the use and value of primary materials, archivists and museum professionals promote the same characteristics for all cultural institutions. Given the intense competition for audience and support, establishing a wider forum for action makes sense.

Archivists and museum professionals are in what archivist Gerald Ham, sixteen years ago, called the "Post-Custodial Era." He warns that archivists must look beyond the contents of their individual repositories and focus on making existing holdings more accessible. More than ever before, professionals in the cultural arena must demonstrate the multiple ways cultural materials benefit society. One essential means for museums and archives to do so is by working to make accessible a holistic cultural record that includes and links all forms of cultural evidence. By assuming this responsibility, cultural institutions fulfill diverse types of information needs and, correspondingly, make their work more visible and more valuable.

Gloria Meraz is a doctoral student in the Archives Program at the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at the University of Texas at Austin and is the archivist for the Texas Library Association.
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The Ethics of Disclosure: The Case of the Brown and Williamson Cigarette Papers

Kurt X. Metzmeier

The story of the Brown and Williamson Cigarette Papers reads like a screenplay inspired by a John Grisham novel. Scene 1: In late 1992 Kentucky attorney J. Fox DeMoisey receives a bombshell, a banker's box full of documents stolen from the state's largest law firm, Wyatt Tarrant and Combs, by his client Merrell Williams. While working as a paralegal assigned to a project indexing secret documents of his firm's client, the Brown and Williamson Tobacco Company, Williams had furtively copied documents he thought demonstrated that the cigarette maker had deliberately hidden its knowledge of tobacco's lethal qualities, qualities that he believed were the cause of his current heart problems.¹

Scene 2: The locale shifts to the University of California San Francisco (UCSF) Medical School in the early summer of
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1994. A large Federal Express package bearing the return address of "Mr. Butts," a cartoon spokesman for the tobacco industry, arrives at the office Dr. Stanton Glantz, a colorful biostatistician and nationally known antitobacco activist. On reviewing the four thousand-plus documents in the package, Glantz concludes that the documents are the same ones tied up in the Kentucky courts and could gravely injure the entire tobacco industry if released. Dr. Glantz deposits the collection in the UCSF Archives and Special Collections department of the library where the documents are soon digitized.

Scene 3: On 29 June 1995, the twenty-fourth anniversary of the Pentagon Papers decision, the Supreme Court of California rules that the UCSF Archives and Special Collections may provide public access to the "Mr. Butts" papers. Although Brown and Williamson had earlier attempted to intimidate staff and researchers by dispatching private investigators to 'stake out' the repository's public areas, the archives opens the Cigarette Papers over the World Wide Web. In its first month on-line the web site gets over 65 thousand hits, perhaps the biggest opening of an archival collection in history.

The deposit of these documents in the special collections department of a publicly supported university raises important ethical issues for archivists. The provenance of the papers is

---

3 "UC To Release Tobacco Firm’s Papers in the Wake of Ruling," Los Angeles Times, 1 July 1995, p. 34.
hopelessly tangled, and clearly the original creators of the documents did not part with them voluntarily. Nor did the documents fairly represent the records series from which they came; in fact, each item was deliberately chosen to prove a point, that Brown and Williamson knew of and ignored the dangers of cigarettes. On the other hand, there is a strong moral impetus for a public university dedicated to providing information to citizens to make the documents readily accessible to the public, and because of its special expertise in the handling of like collections, the archives is the most logical entity within the institution to take on the task. Which should take priority for the archives: dedication to provenance and original order, or commitment to public access to documentary materials?

Archivists' major statement of professional responsibility is the 1992 Code of Ethics published by the Society of American Archivists, the first major revision of its ethics code since 1980. In spite of its relatively recent date, the 1992 code does not directly address the specific ethical quandaries that arrived on the UCSF’s doorstep in the summer of 1994. The general principles underlying the code nonetheless remain the starting point for any discussion of the ethical issues raised by the Cigarette Papers.

Did the mission of the archives justify accepting the documents in spite of the dubious circumstances of their acquisition? What measures could the archives take to

---


mitigate the issues of authenticity raised by its creation and acquisition? Should a repository disseminate a collection of documents copied without the creating institution’s knowledge or consent to further political and legal objectives contrary to the interests of the organization that created them even if a court had determined that the archives’ action would be lawful?

Nothing in the code refers directly to whether an archives should receive a collection of surreptitiously copied documents, especially when the publication of the collection has been adjudicated as proper by the courts. Section I, The Purpose of a Code of Ethics, notes that the code “presumes that archivists obey the laws and are especially familiar with the laws that affect their special areas of knowledge; it also presumes that they act in accord with sound moral principles.” Since the UCSF archives transgressed no laws in this situation, application of this provision turns on the question-begging determination of “sound moral principles.” More specifically relevant is Section IV of the code, Relations with Donors and Restrictions, which enjoins archivists seeking to obtain “documentary materials of long-term value [to] seek fair decisions based on full consideration of authority to transfer, donate, or sell.” Nothing in the commentary would suggest that anything more than a judicial determination of “full consideration of authority to transfer” is required of an institution.

Section III, Collecting Policies, suggests that the stated gift policy of an institution is valuable to this analysis, noting that it is important that the acquisition of documentary materials be “in accordance with their institution’s purposes, stated policies, and resources” in order to “ensure the preservation of materials in repositories where they will be adequately processed and effectively utilized.” In spite of the serendipitous circumstances of their acquisition, the Brown and Williamson Papers fit comfortably within the UCSF
principles for contemporary collecting and for digital archives. According to its mission statement, the repository's purpose is "to advance science, foster excellence in teaching and learning, and promote health science through the collection, development, organization, and dissemination of the world's health sciences knowledge base." The archives has identified three main areas corresponding to research areas at UCSF where it is focusing its collecting efforts and its efforts to make material digitally accessible: AIDS history, biotechnology, and tobacco control.

The mandate of the Tobacco Control Archives is "to collect, preserve, and provide access to papers, unpublished documents and electronic resources relevant to tobacco control issues primarily in California." The showpiece of the collection is the Cigarette Papers, a sample of Brown and

---


10 The AIDS History Project seeks to document the history of the AIDS crisis, with a focus on San Francisco, a city not only hit hard by the disease but also one that had set a model for its response to the crisis by forging an often uneasy cooperation between government agencies and community-based organizations (CBOs). The collection includes oral histories, archives of several CBOs, and a digitized image collection and is available at <http:www.library.ucsf.edu/sc/ccp/aph/> 21 January 1999.


12 "Tobacco Control Archives," <http://www.library.ucsf.edu/tobacco/> 21 January 1999. The genesis of the collection was not the arrival of the "Mr. Butts" package, but rather the passage of Proposition 99, the California antitobacco initiative approved by the voters in 1989, which funnels cigarette taxes into health education. The documentation of the history of this measure, as well as other antitobacco initiatives and antismoking organizations, is a primary focus of the collection.
Williamson's internal reports, research results, correspondence, internal memoranda, minutes and agendas of meetings. These documents are strongly presumed to be the material excerpted by Merrell Williams from papers sent by the tobacco firm to their legal counsel in anticipation of litigation. So in a sense they have been twice selected. A mere five cubic feet of photocopied documents, these papers are accessed almost exclusively in their digitized form.

While at face value the acquisition of the Brown and Williamson papers appears questionable, a careful analysis of the Code of Ethics suggests that no ethical principles have been offended. The principles discussed in Sections I and IV appear to be satisfied by the decision of the California courts establishing the legal right of the archives to accept and provide public access to the papers. From the history of the UCSF Tobacco Control Collection prior to the arrival of the "Mr. Butts" package, it is clear that the UCSF archives had an existing policy of collecting tobacco-related materials. Given these facts, as well as its close connection to a major school of medicine, the UCSF Archives and Special Collections was best situated to "ensure" that the papers were "effectively utilized."

The second area of ethical inquiry concerns the integrity of the arrangement of the Brown and Williamson Papers as they were received by the UCSF. It is a matter of record that the collection was created by the selective removal of key documents from a larger collection to provide evidence for legal case. This purpose is clearly at variance with both the theoretical foundations and the ethical principles of archives.

In Section VI, Appraisal, Protection and Arrangement, the Code of Ethics notes that it is the role of archivists to "protect the integrity of documentary materials and ensure that their evidentiary value is not impaired in the archival work of arrangement, description, preservation, and use." The situation faced by the UCSF archives certainly is not unique since collections of materials culled and arranged to influence history are as old as the letters of Cicero, but the code is not clear about how an archives can remedy the selection and rearrangement done by a donor before it receives the material.

The UCSF archives has made every effort to mitigate the donor's impact on the original order of the records by highlighting the circumstances of the acquisition of the documents and providing thorough abstracting of and indexing to their contents. The image-based system chosen by the archives for digitization cannot be searched directly, but project staff have created abstracts for each document which can be searched by keyword\textsuperscript{15} or browsed within seventeen subject categories.\textsuperscript{16} Abstracts of one hundred fifty words are not uncommon and typically one to three keyword(s) have been assigned to each document. Other indexed fields include author and secondary author, title, year, date, and type of work (letter, minutes, and so forth), all of which can be accessed using the collection's search engine.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15} "Brown and Williamson Collection," at \url{http://www.library.ucsf.edu/tobacco/bwsearch.html} 21 January 1999.

\textsuperscript{16} "Brown and Williamson Collection," at \url{http://www.library.ucsf.edu/tobacco/bwbrowse.html} 21 January 1999.

\textsuperscript{17} The rudiments of the indexing methods are found on the "Help on Searching the Tobacco Control Archives" page, which is available at \url{http://www.library.ucsf.edu/tobacco/ta-search.html}, but the actual tools used to construct the database are not discussed. Either AskSam or Microsoft Access would be satisfactory. The search engine used is FreeWAIS, a freeware search engine widely used on the Internet.
The utility of the site is best reflected in the number of scholarly books and articles made possible through the collection, including the University of California's own volume, *The Cigarette Papers*. However, it also clear that the site has been a boon to litigants seeking compensation from the tobacco industry for personal injuries or, in the case of several state attorney generals, suing the industry for increased health care costs and higher state contributions to Medicare-Medicaid.

The question still remains: Should the UCSF archives have made the material available at all? From its beginning the Code of Ethics makes access one of its most important values, twinning it with the traditional value of preservation. Indeed, the first words of the commentary direct archivists to both "preserve and make available documentary materials of long-term value that have lasting value to the organization or public that the archivist serves." Section VIII of the code, Use and Restrictions, calls for archivists to "encourage use of them to the greatest extent compatible with institutional policies, preservation of holdings, legal considerations, individual rights, donor agreements, and judicious use of archival resources," while Section V of the code, Description, advises archivists to "establish intellectual control over their holdings by describing them in finding aids and guides to facilitate . . . access by users of the archives."20

In order to carry out the code's mandate, the UCSF archives had to grapple with practical questions about how to use digital technology effectively in order to make a collection available.

---


that is both time sensitive and of global interest accessible to users.\textsuperscript{21} The resulting web site is a model for what an electronic archives can be.\textsuperscript{22} The documents and their provenance are well described while abstracts and indexes coupled with a computerized search engine make the contents intellectually accessible on a number of levels. The archives met its duty to inform users of parallel research by posting notices of publications based on the collection. The repository also insured that use of the materials was not reserved to its own researchers by litigating for the right to erect the Cigarette Papers web site.

The UCSF archives has to a large degree mitigated the ethical taint left by the documents' questionable pedigree by making the Brown and Williamson Cigarette Papers available to the widest possible audience. The means by which the documents came into the archives' possession were problematic, though lawful, and their checkered provenance introduced bias into their arrangement. Many archives and special collections would have avoided the conflicts, moral ambiguity, and legal headaches inherent in this controversy. However, the UCSF archives did not cause these problems, and by indexing and abstracting it provided researchers with the means to break free from Merrell Williams's arrangement of the documents. At a time when archivists strive to recast themselves full partners in the information revolution, the

\textsuperscript{21} The Cigarette Papers not only have been used in U.S. tobacco litigation from Mississippi to Massachusetts but also are involved in a large class-action lawsuit in the United Kingdom. Peter Pringle, "Tobacco Giants Face Billion Dollar Lawsuit," \textit{London Independent}, 14 December 1994, p.13; Vicki Orvice, "Tobacco Firms hid Danger," \textit{London Daily Mail}, 20 June 1994, p.11.

\textsuperscript{22} It is not surprising that the UCSF collection is highlighted in the newly inaugurated California Digital Library's Online Archive of California. California Digital Library, "Online Archive of California," at <http://sunsite2.berkeley.edu/oac/> 26 January 1999.
UCSF Archives and Special Collections has thereby shown the way for archival repositories to promote research leading not only into the distant past but also into social action in the present.

Kurt X. Metzmeler is the coordinator of Information Systems Services for the University of Kentucky College of Law and a Librarian III in the UK library system. He holds a J.D. (1995) from the University of Louisville School of Law and has been a member of the Kentucky Bar since 1995.
Taking a Byte Out of the Senate:
Reconsidering the Research Use of Correspondence
and Casework Files

Naomi L. Nelson

In the mid-1970s, a sustained discussion about the
management of modern congressional collections first
emerged in archival literature.¹ Much of the debate over
congressional collections during the intervening twenty years

¹ Looking back from the perspective of 1994, Senate Historian Richard A.
Baker identified several factors leading to an increased public awareness of
the disposition of the papers of public officials in the 1970s. The
unexpected death of influential Senator Richard B. Russell in 1971 resulted
in the very visible transfer of forty-five tons of records in three tractor-
trailers to the University of Georgia. Richard Nixon’s resignation after
Watergate and the legal battle over the ownership of the secret recordings
made in the Oval Office led to a debate over which papers created by
elected officials should be considered private records and which should be
considered public records. Finally, between 1976 and 1980, fifty-three
senators left office (through resignation or election defeat), the greatest
turnover in Senate history. When the dust cleared, congressional papers
remained private records, and increasing numbers of repositories faced the
challenge of accessioning the huge collections. See Richard A. Baker,
in Proceedings of the Congressional Papers Conference Held in Portland,
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concerned the appropriate disposition of the voluminous constituent correspondence and casework files. Most archivists agreed that the casework and constituent correspondence records created and filed under the old paper-based system were bulky, hard to use, and of little research value.²

In the summer of 1976, James K. Benson presented two papers to the Minnesota Historical Society assessing the potential research uses for constituent mail. ³ He identified three possible areas of focus: the content of the mail, the people who wrote, and the impact of the mail on the political decision making. He also identified several potential barriers to research use of these records. These barriers included the large volume of the records, the organization of the records, the inconsistency with which information about the

² Almost every speaker at the 1978 Conference on the Research Use and Disposition of Senators’ Papers addressed the research value of constituent mail, with many concluding that such files were problematic at best and of little use to the social scientist or historian. Lydia Lucas, however, argued that “the way in which a member defines and expresses his relationship to his constituency, and the way his papers reflect this relationship, also shape their most unique and enduring values”; and Frank Mackaman pointed out that constituent correspondence and case work documented a kind of political participation by non-elite members of society. J. Stanley Kimmitt and Richard A. Baker, eds., *Proceedings of the Conference on the Use and Disposition of Senators’ Papers, Washington, DC, September 14–15, 1978* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979); Lydia Lucas, “Managing Congressional Papers: A Repository View,” *American Archivist* 41 (July 1978): 280; and Frank Mackaman, remarks during Archivists Panel in *Proceedings of the Conference on the Use and Disposition of Senators’ Papers*, 68–9.

constituents appears in the letters, the difficulty of categorizing letter content, and the time needed to estimate total quantities of mail on a given topic. The congressmen Benson included in his study all used the paper-based filing systems in use in Congress prior to the introduction of automated correspondence management systems.

In 1978, the Senate began to automate the handling of constituent correspondence, and several archivists and records creators expressed hope that automating (or “computerizing”) mail processing would solve many of the processing and access problems posed by the voluminous mail and casework files. F. Gerald Ham suggested that “[t]hese records possess great advantages for our users. The information they contain can be rearranged, aggregated, compared, and subjected to statistical tests without the laborious tasks of sample selection, data collection, coding, and data entry.” Margery Sly sagely predicted that “some archivists will be lucky and will be able to use computerization to their advantage; others will be faced with an unholy mess.”

Repositories receiving senatorial papers must now evaluate whether the constituent correspondence and casework records created and organized through the use of these early correspondence management systems are easier to access than records created under the paper-based systems and whether automation might offer any benefits to the archivist and researcher. Senator Sam Nunn served from 1972 to 1996, and his papers, now at Emory University (Atlanta, Georgia), provide an example of the types of benefits and challenges offered by correspondence manage-

4 Benson, “Political Research,” 7–8, 10–11, 15.
ment systems. The Senate has provided repositories with uniform electronic databases of coded information about constituents and their interests that should appeal to researchers interested in quantitative analysis. The systematization and standardization offered by these files, however, are a mirage. Senate staffers adapted the systems to individual office needs, and the data contain errors and irregularities. Constituent correspondence and casework files continue to be bulky and difficult to use.

Correspondence Management Systems Come to Capitol Hill

The handling of United States Senators’ constituent correspondence\(^7\) did not change appreciably with the adoption of automation.\(^8\) Staff members answered letters using paragraphs pre-approved by the senator and filed the original letter and a copy of the response for later reference. Indexes provided access to the filed correspondence through key access points, usually including constituent name, subject of the letter, and date of the letter. Staff members also compiled lists of constituent names and addresses for follow-up letters, newsletters, or future mailings and generated

---

7 For the purposes of this article, *constituent mail* and *constituent correspondence* will be defined as including all kinds of correspondence between a member of congress and his constituents. These will include letters on legislative issues, requests for flags and other routine matters, letters requesting that the senator intercede on the constituent’s behalf with another federal agency, thank you letters, and mass mailings. Letters on legislative issues will be referred to as *issue mail*, and letters requesting intervention on the constituent’s behalf with a federal agency will be termed *casework*. In the Senate, the correspondence management system index provided to the repositories upon the senator’s retirement includes all mail indexed on the system, regardless of type.

reports tracking hot topics, mail volume, and other useful derivative information. In the mid-1970s, Congress embraced automated, word-processing systems as the answer to the increasing volume of constituent inquiries. Senate facilities literally were unable to handle the mountains of constituent mail, and the floors of the Senate office building used to store the addressograph plates began to buckle under the weight of the plates. During a hearing before the Senate subcommittee that oversaw computer services in the Senate, Senator Alan Cranston estimated that in 1979 his office alone received from 10,000 to 15,000 letters per week. Members sought a faster way to send high-quality responses to constituents and a more cost-effective way to keep constituents apprised of member activities. They also wanted to reduce staff time spent on producing, filing, and retrieving correspondence and to institute more managerial control over the mail process. The constituent mail function was automated first by using word processing and then by using increasingly more complex correspondence management systems. Word processing combined technologically more advanced office equipment with a systematic approach to office workflow in order to increase both the quality and volume of correspondence

---

9 See Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, Subcommittee on Computer Services, Report on Computer Services to the Committee on Rules and Administration, 95th Cong., 1st sess., 1977, Committee Print, 9.
11 Senate Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch, Oversight on Computer Services in the Legislative Branch: Hearing before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Special Oversight Hearing, Legislative Branch, 96th Cong., 1st sess., 1979, Committee Print, 14.
produced. Building on the systematization and standardization provided by word processing, correspondence management systems offered sophisticated word processing; the capability of inserting selected, approved paragraphs; personalized salutations and closings; personalized text; the ability to create targeted mailing lists; correspondence records; mail count on issues; automatic filing; and correspondence tracking.

Starting in the early 1970s, the Senate Computer Center developed the first database systems—the Automated Indexing System (AIS) and the Senate Mail File (SMF). They designed AIS to store the basic identification information about a document (name or subject, date, staffer, city, document number, and so forth) and then to provide lists of the correspondence sorted by any of those fields. The goal was to end the time-consuming practice of maintaining carbon copy cross-reference files and to facilitate faster filing and retrieval time. The correspondence was filed by a system-generated document number. Name and topic indexes (see figure 1, page 43.) to the senator’s correspondence were generated periodically from the AIS so that the staff could locate a letter by name or topic. The SMF was a centralized database of correspondent names and addresses that could be used to create labels or for follow-up mailings. Initially, staff manually typed the information about constituents and correspondence into these databases, but

13 Report on Computer Services to the Committee on Rules and Administration 1977, 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>09-25-81</th>
<th>INDEX FILE FOR SENATOR X</th>
<th>NAME REPORT</th>
<th>DOCUMENT #</th>
<th>MICROFILM #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRUMLEY, HARRY B., MR.</td>
<td>REQUEST TOURS WASHINGTON DC</td>
<td>09-22-81</td>
<td>1264062007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343 JENIFER STREET</td>
<td>WHITE HOUSE TOUR</td>
<td>PORTLAND, OR 97201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSTON, JENNY, MRS.</td>
<td>ISSUE ENVIRONMENT WATER</td>
<td>09-21-81</td>
<td>1263101001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802 NORTH 24TH STREET</td>
<td>INTERIOR NATIONAL PARKS</td>
<td>SPRINGFIELD, VA 22100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULLIGAN, BART, MR. AND MRS.</td>
<td>CASE CONST INITIAL CONTACTED AGENCY</td>
<td>09-24-81</td>
<td>1266100002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492 COPELY LANE</td>
<td></td>
<td>BORDENTOWN, VA 22102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUTHERFORD, ELLIS, MS.</td>
<td>ISSUE INTERIOR NATIONAL PARKS</td>
<td>09-21-81</td>
<td>1263101002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APARTMENT 499</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARLINGTON, VA 22101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS: 3, 11, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1
with the adoption of the Senate’s Correspondence Mail System (CMS) in 1978, they could download information in batch files from the CMS system to the AIS and SMF.\textsuperscript{15}

The centralized constituent mail system known as CMS was designed to “perform centralized indexing, filing, and retrieval functions and maintain central indexes and mailing lists in accordance with Senate rules.”\textsuperscript{16} Like the AIS, it produced indexes. In addition, it included a topic listing that allowed for easier cross reference for letters with multiple topics. CMS could produce reports to help office managers summarize the opinions expressed in incoming mail and to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of office staff in responding to mail. It cost more per letter, but the additional capabilities it offered were supposed to compensate for this extra expense. By-products from the system included management reporting; casework management; high speed, production printing; mailing list maintenance; and indexing and filing of correspondence. These additional capabilities became a part of the offices’ correspondence function.\textsuperscript{17} In the late 1980s, CMS was upgraded and renamed the Constituent Services System (CSS). In 1991 the Senate Mail

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 50.
\textsuperscript{17} General Accounting Office, \textit{The Senate Should Explore Other Word Processing Alternatives} (1980), 6, 10–11. Eight-eight percent of the offices using CMS reported that they found the CMS management reports useful. Offices that did not use CMS generated the workload and hot topic reports manually. In contrast, only twenty-five offices used the casework subsystem, and some senators complained that the system included features that they did not want to use.
System (SMS) was developed to replace CSS, the SMF, and the AIS with a single database.\textsuperscript{18}

In 1994, the Senate Computer Center decided to stop supporting SMS and began the process of moving all the Senate offices still using SMS to stand-alone correspondence management systems developed by outside vendors. These systems were designed for local area networks (LANs) and located in the senators' District of Columbia offices. The transition to the new systems was completed in 1996. Approved systems included InterAmerica's \textit{CapitolCorrespond}, Intelligent Solutions, Inc.'s \textit{Quorum}, and Electronic Data Systems' \textit{Quick Response}. Because these new systems resided in the senators' offices, they gave both more control and more responsibility to senators and their staffs. Individual office staffs designed and generated their own reports, and those senators interested in having a mail file for mass mailings had to maintain it in-house.

When a senator left office, the Senate Computer Center sent a copy of selected data fields from the correspondence management systems to his or her designated repository. (See figures 2 and 3, pages 46 and 47.) Since the center created the files using proprietary software that the repositories could afford neither to purchase nor to maintain, they sent data in a flat ASCII format that could be accessed using other software. Prior to 1996, they transferred files using seven-inch magnetic reels, nine-inch magnetic reels, or data tape cartridges. In 1996, they sent the files on CD-ROMs.

Electronic files stored on seven-and nine-inch reels require the use of a mainframe, and even files stored on data cartridges and CD-ROMs require large amounts of storage space and specialized software. Understandably, repositories have not been anxious for researchers to use these files and have not worked to make them accessible by researchers. A

Record layout for Correspondence Management System files sent to repositories by Senate Computer Center in 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name (last, first middle, prefix, suffix)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1-39</td>
<td>char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ex. Public, John Q., Mr., Jr.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Title</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40-69</td>
<td>char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70-99</td>
<td>char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Address line 1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100-129</td>
<td>char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Address line 2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>130-159</td>
<td>char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. City</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>160-189</td>
<td>char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. State code</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>190-191</td>
<td>char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Zip code</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>192-201</td>
<td>char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Correspondence type</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>202-251</td>
<td>char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Correspondence topic</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>252-301</td>
<td>char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Correspondence subtopic</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>302-351</td>
<td>char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Letter date</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>352-357</td>
<td>ymmdd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Staffer initials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>358-361</td>
<td>char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Comments</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>372-471</td>
<td>char</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>State/Zipcode</td>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVER SPRING</td>
<td>MD 20906</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>LABOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWTON</td>
<td>OR 97356</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>DEFENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWTON</td>
<td>OR 97356</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>TRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIETTA</td>
<td>GA 30090</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>GENERIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSEVILLE</td>
<td>GA 30016</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>CONGRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARTWELL</td>
<td>CA 92643-0283</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>DEFENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>D.C. 20524</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>JUDICIARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE</td>
<td>WV 25121</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>DEFENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVELAND</td>
<td>OH 44133</td>
<td>PRESS</td>
<td>REQUEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES PLAINES</td>
<td>IL 60018</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>LABOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACWORTH</td>
<td>GA 30101</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>SCIENCE &amp; TECHNOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBANY</td>
<td>GA 31705</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>TAX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLANTA</td>
<td>GA 30035</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>HEALTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORCROSS</td>
<td>CA 92643-0283</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>DEFENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVANNAH</td>
<td>GA 31404</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>CIVIL RIGHTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLERMONT</td>
<td>FL 34711</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>FOREIGN POLICY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLANTA</td>
<td>GA 30327</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>FOREIGN POLICY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKBRIDGE</td>
<td>GA 30281</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>DEFENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPISTRANO BEACH</td>
<td>CA 92643-0283</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>DC 20041</td>
<td>PRESS</td>
<td>THANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>DC 20005</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>LABOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LILBURN</td>
<td>GA 30247</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>REQUEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLANTA</td>
<td>GA 30301</td>
<td>INVITATIONS</td>
<td>MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANG SHIA HUANAN</td>
<td>CA 30301</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>FOREIGN POLICY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>DC 20002</td>
<td>PRESS</td>
<td>SURVEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORLANDT MANOR</td>
<td>NY 10566</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>DEFENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HICKORY</td>
<td>NC 28663</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>DEFENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>DC 20004</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>FINANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECATHUR</td>
<td>GA 30301</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSTON</td>
<td>TX 77002</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBUS</td>
<td>GA 31906</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>REQUEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBUS</td>
<td>GA 31906</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>DEFENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLANTA</td>
<td>GA 30339</td>
<td>INVITATIONS</td>
<td>MEETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R  OSWELL</td>
<td>GA 30076</td>
<td>PRESS</td>
<td>CONGRATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORDELE</td>
<td>CA 92643-0283</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>DEFENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISVILLE</td>
<td>KY 40205</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>DEFENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALAX</td>
<td>VA 23433</td>
<td>MILITARY AFFAIRS</td>
<td>FOREIGN POLICY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORROW</td>
<td>GA 30620</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>JUDICIARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORROW</td>
<td>GA 30620</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>TAX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
few repositories, like the Richard B. Russell Library at the University of Georgia and Special Collections at Emory University, have worked with information technology experts and political scientists at their institutions to examine some of the data they have received and to explore possible research applications. To date, however, no researcher has studied data from Senate correspondence management systems. In the case of the Nunn papers, use of the correspondence files has been limited to requests by Senator Nunn for information about particular correspondents.

**Barriers to Research Revisited**

Volume is the most cited barrier to research use of constituent correspondence. The adoption of automated correspondence management systems by Congress, other federal agencies, and lobbying organizations made it easier to send mail and contributed to a further increase in the volume of mail handled by Senate offices, making this problem more acute. The amount of mail generated by Congress

---

19 For a summary of the work done at the University of Georgia and Emory University, see Todd Kosmerick, “Congressional Papers Roundtable Minutes, 1998 Annual Meeting, Orlando, September 4, 1998,” *Congressional Papers Roundtable Newsletter* [distributed through e-mail, 2 November 1998].
21 See Paul Chesnut, “Appraising the Papers of State Legislators,” *American Archivist* 48 (spring 1985): 165, for a discussion of rising mail volume at the state level.
increased significantly beginning in the mid-1960s. Volume peaked in the late 1980s, averaging 700 million pieces per year from 1984 to 1989. In 1990, Congress responded to pressure to curb the use of franked mail by imposing new restrictions that reduced the volume of mail sent. Constituent correspondence, however, continues to constitute up to one-third of the volume of members' papers.

The automated correspondence management systems did end the need for carbon copy cross-reference files. Unfortunately, the topically filed master file has been replaced by correspondence filed by system-generated document number. This number is virtually meaningless to the researcher. In many cases, routine mail (namely, flag requests) and casework are interfiled with issue mail, making it difficult to weed the mail prior to accessioning.

Automated correspondence management systems, however, have allowed Senate staffers to avoid the problems of volume and file order by enabling them to retrieve information from the computer rather than from the correspondence itself. Nunn's staff usually wanted to find letters through personal name or subject and were therefore dependent on the computer system to match the information they had about a constituent or letter with the document number under which it was filed. When they located the online entry for the letter, however, they often found that the information they wanted was recorded in the computer file,

---


23 Document numbers are generally chronological by date and order of reply.
and that they therefore did not need to retrieve the actual letter. (See figure 3.) When the letter was processed, the key information from the constituent letter and the senator's reply was captured in the on-line database. The correspondence itself was filed, more or less accurately, by document number and rarely referred to again.

Indeed, from Nunn's staff's point of view, the correspondence system records were the most important records concerning constituent correspondence. They demonstrated this by requesting that three years of data from the old Senate Mail System (or SMS) be migrated to the new CapitolCorrespond system when they converted in 1994, so that they would continue to have the previous three years' correspondence history on-line. The paper indexes to the correspondence were also available, but the speed of access and the clarity with which the system presented information about the correspondence could not be replicated using the paper records under the current filing system.

Paul Chesnut has argued that "most correspondence sent to state legislators is more useful in the aggregate than in its individual form," and Benson's studies demonstrate that the same is true for congressional collections. If researchers are indeed more interested in quantitative studies of constituent mail, the correspondence data files sent to the repositories should encourage their research because much of the data collection has been done for them. Like the Senate staffers, these researchers will be able to bypass working with the actual correspondence. Researchers looking for particular letters or for anecdotes, however, may find these files more

24 Staff members were typically searching for the date on which a constituent had previously written to the senator, which opening paragraph had been used in previous responses, the constituent's address, and the topics on which the constituent had previously written.

frustrating. It is often much easier to find a record for a specific piece of correspondence than to find the correspondence itself. A researcher looking for sample letters on a particular topic, for example, might have to request many boxes or reels of microfilm because the letters are filed according to a system-generated number rather than according to topic. Letters on the same topic often received identical replies, and these letters might be “grouped” or “batched” together when filed. Each group would then be filed under a system-generated number. In Senator Nunn’s office, letters that were part of groups were filed separately from other constituent mail, and letters were arranged in no particular order within a given group. Some of the groups contain over ten thousand letters, and locating a particular letter in such a group takes time and luck.

In addition, data entry errors have resulted in numerous entries in the correspondence management systems with misspelled names, topics, and addresses. File clerks filing the letters by name or topic might catch the error and file the letter under the correct name or topic. Computer-generated indexes, however, will sort the records as entered, leaving the researcher to scan through the entire index to be sure that the desired record was not accidentally entered with an “!” or a “Z” in front of the last name. On the other hand, researchers can use software programs to search for “strings” or groups of characters, letting the computer do the work of scanning the index for the desired term. In addition, the online index can be sorted by address or subtopic rather than

---

26 Patricia Aronsson has pointed out that many researchers appreciate the “anecdotal value” of casework. Aronsson, “Appraisal of Twentieth-Century Congressional Collections,” 93.
27 There are several examples of misspelled words in figure 3.
28 For example, in a subset of Senator Nunn’s 1990–1991 correspondence management system records, the document type “case” was misspelled in twenty-two different ways, including “CAS3E,” “CO,” and “DCAS.”
name or topic, giving the researcher another way of narrowing
the number entries to scan for the desired correspondence.29

Many archivists recommend that constituent mail and
casework be sampled, asserting that the volume of mail can
be reduced without damaging whatever research value there
may be in such files.30 Other archivists warn, however, that
sampling may "mislead a researcher by distorting the record
of the interaction and priorities of legislative activities."31

Accessioning correspondence management systems files will
allow repositories to retain a considerable amount of
information about the constituent correspondence without
retaining all of the actual letters. Researchers will be able to
estimate the total volume of mail received and to compare
the characteristics of the mail that was retained to the mail
that was destroyed.

While researchers may be able to avoid the mountains of
paper files by using the information contained in the
correspondence management system files, however, the size
of the electronic files themselves raise other problems. The
size of the files received by a repository will vary, based on
the congressman’s length of service and his or her policies
concerning constituent correspondence. Senator Nunn’s file
for the older CMS (1978–1994) contained 2,320,000 records
and took up almost 1.1 GB. His largest files from the newer
CapitolCorrespond system (1994–1996) took up a compara-

29 Statistical software packages such as SPSS (Statistical Package for the
Social Sciences) and SAS (Statistical Analysis System) can be used to sort
and search large databases.

30 McKay, "Random Sampling Techniques," 281. Aronsson, "Appraisal of
Twentieth-Century Congressional Collections," 92–93. Mark Greene,
"Appraisal of Congressional Records at the Minnesota Historical Society:

31 Chesnut, "Papers of State Legislators," 166.
Research Use of Correspondence and Casework Files

Relatively small 289 MB. Using these files requires a considerable commitment of file storage space and software designed to handle large databases. Both repositories and researchers may be discouraged from working with these files because of their size. Repositories planning to offer access to correspondence management system files should break them down into small files that can be more easily accessed. Doing so will require the use of servers or mainframes that can retrieve the data from its current storage format and then provide the space needed to manipulate it. Researchers can combine these smaller files to make larger data sets if they so desire. The difficulties caused by the size of the files, however, may be short-lived as advances in technology promise more powerful computers that make processing large databases easier in the future.

Reports, indexes, and lists generated by the correspondence management systems serve as useful summaries of the constituent mail files. The reports helped the senator’s staff to interpret constituent opinions expressed

---

32 Senator Nunn directed his staff to answer every letter, postcard, name on a petition, and most phone calls with a letter. He was in office for twenty-four years, the senior senator from Georgia from 1981 to 1996, and chairman of the Armed Services Committee from 1987 to 1994. Senator Nunn had a higher volume of mail answered and indexed than most other senators because of the leadership positions he held and his policies on answering constituent mail.


34 For example, Emory University will breakdown Senator Nunn’s correspondence management system files by year.

35 For a brief summary of Beth Bensman’s description of the Russell Library’s attempts to work with such large files see Kosmerick, “Congressional Papers Roundtable Minutes,” [distributed through e-mail 2 November 1998].
in the mail received by their office. When the Senate used the centrally controlled CMS, reports and indexes were generated automatically, and staffers had to make a special request to have a duplicate copy run later if the first report was mislaid. The reports and indexes that were important to the office therefore were filed fairly carefully. The systems implemented after 1993, however, resided on local area networks within Senate offices, and the staff maintained the system files directly. They generated reports as needed and may not have kept them as another could be generated on demand. Accessioning the correspondence management system files would allow researchers to generate their own reports and to recreate reports the office may have lost or decided not to generate themselves. Researchers using reports and indexes generated by the systems, however, must be cautioned that the data on which the reports are based contains many irregularities. The reports and indexes do represent the information on the mail available to the senators and their staff, but this information may not reflect accurately the amount or content of the mail itself. Depending on a researcher's interests, what the senator knew about the mail he or she received may be more important than the actual content of the mail.

Those repositories choosing not to provide researchers access to the correspondence management system files should work with the senators' staff members before they leave office to determine which information was important to them and to make sure that reports have been generated to capture that information. For example, these could be reports listing mail volume per month or per year, lists of the most popular paragraphs. Senator Nunn's office maintained a file of these reports. The CapitolCorrespond system that they adopted in 1994 did not automatically generate this report, and the office staff only produced it sporadically.

---

36 For example, the CMS automatically generates a weekly “hot topic” report listing the most frequently used item paragraphs. Senator Nunn's office maintained a file of these reports. The CapitolCorrespond system that they adopted in 1994 did not automatically generate this report, and the office staff only produced it sporadically.
topics per month, or indexes to correspondence on issues important to the senators. The repository might also want to contact potential researchers to determine what kinds of information they might be interested in seeing. Researchers using any of the reports generated or retained should be shown printouts of data from the system so that they can see the kinds of irregularities that exist in the data from which the reports are drawn.  

The organization of the files forms a second barrier to research. When Benson took a representative sample from the paper-based Minnesota constituent mail, he discovered three problems. First, though the congressmen all seemed to have some rough, topical organization for their mail, their systems were different enough to make uniform sampling difficult. Second, the topic categories used were too general to be useful for researchers. For example, a researcher looking for letters on open housing legislation would have to oversample the folders on civil rights in order to get a sufficient number of letters for her study. Third, many constituents covered several topics in their letters. The letter most likely would be filed under only one of them. Benson’s sample, therefore, would not be drawn from the total number of letters on that topic as some of those letters would be filed elsewhere under another topic discussed in the letter. In addition, for quantitative analysis the topics

---

37 The name and topic indexes generated by the CMS provide this kind of information. The systems implemented after 1994 may not automatically generate such indexes, and in such cases the repository should request that an index to a small portion of the correspondence be generated.

38 Benson, “Political Research,” 9, 10–11.

39 Ibid., 8.

40 Historian Richard Lowitt also found this to be true in his research using Senator George W. Norris’s papers. His research, however, was not quantitative in nature, and he felt that he found important information by browsing through the correspondence and reading documents not directly
covered by the constituent’s letter must be put in rigorously defined categories. Given the wandering, unfocused nature of much of the correspondence, such categorization was time-consuming.41

Automation provides some solutions to these problems and presents other problems in a slightly different guise. The Senate Computer Center standardized the correspondence management computer files sent to repositories. The format changed slightly in 1996 after Senate Archivist Karen Paul solicited input from the repositories; however, in general, the same information has been transferred to the repositories over the years. (See figure 2, page 46.) Thus comparisons between the mail received by different senators should be possible. A uniform format, however, can mask differences in the way that the staff used the system. System documentation indicates only what the system was designed to do. It does not document the ways in which a senator’s staffers worked within the system to record things not anticipated by the system designers. For example, Senator Nunn’s Atlanta office overrode the system-assigned document number so that all mail related to a particular case would have the same document number. Lydia Lucas expressed a concern in 1978 that adopting standardized filing systems and means of “computerizing” congressional records would “submerge the individuality of the senator.”42 The danger, however, seems to be not that individual senators will do things differently but that archivists and researchers will not recognize what they have done differently.43

related to the topic that he was researching. Richard Lowitt, remarks during Historians Panel in Proceedings of the Conference on the Use and Disposition of Senators’ Papers, 47.

41 Benson, “Political Research,” 11.

42 Lucas, remarks during Archivists Panel in Proceedings of the Conference on the Research Use and Disposition of Senator’s Papers, 73.

43 For an expanded discussion of the need for archivists to work closely with congressional offices to document electronic records, see Phillips, Congressional Papers Management, 177–80.
Many of the difficulties that Benson had with topic categories were merely transferred to the new systems. Although the correspondence management systems did allow staffers to assign multiple topics and subtopics to correspondence records, there was no control on the terms entered. Topics remained broad and continued to reflect the interests and needs of the individual offices, making comparisons between different offices difficult. Perhaps more significantly, topics could be added at will or accidentally misspelled. Misspellings and unauthorized terms make it difficult to retrieve comprehensive listings of correspondence on a specific topic.

Automation does provide two possible solutions to these problems, however. First, a list of all topics can be generated and any misspellings or unauthorized terms corrected in a copy of the file. Second, researchers can take advantage of the information used to generate the reply letter to locate more accurately letters of interest and to categorize individual letters. In order to create a reply, the correspondence management system needed the codes for the item paragraphs that would make up the reply letter. These codes are listed in a field in the file sent to the repositories. An index for the item paragraphs can be generated from the correspondence management system (see figure 4, page 58), and the text of the approved paragraphs and their codes can be found in the library of approved items, often located in the Systems Administrator files. Many paragraphs were written to respond to particular kinds of letters; for example, supporting the Gulf War, opposing a milk tax, or opposing daylight savings time. The item paragraph codes were used to generate a report listing the most frequently cited constituent concerns or positions. Researchers can use these codes to design the rigorous content categories needed for
## Index to Item Paragraphs (generated by CMS)

### OFFICE: SENATOR SMYTHE

### ABSTRACT REPORT

Date of Listing: SEP-18-81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Subtopic</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
<th>Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>disagree on issue</td>
<td>JAN-07-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thank you again: keep in touch</td>
<td>JAN-07-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thank you again</td>
<td>JAN-07-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>good to hear from you: keep informed of activities</td>
<td>JAN-07-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>call on me, look forward to hearing from you</td>
<td>JAN-07-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>f. i. subj of ltr: Thanks for letter, happy to know views</td>
<td>JAN-07-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>f. i. date of ltr: Thanks for bringing matter to attention</td>
<td>JAN-07-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>f. i. date of ltr: Thanks for ltr. Thanks for letter</td>
<td>JAN-07-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>f. i. publication name: thanks for publication</td>
<td>JAN-07-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agriculture</td>
<td>dairy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>dried milk to compete w/ fresh, anti</td>
<td>SEP-05-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy</td>
<td>public utilities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>f. i. county - adverse impact elec. serv. in counties</td>
<td>SEP-17-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td>solid waste</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>aprec. learning concern about solid waste managment</td>
<td>JAN-07-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td>solid waste</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>newspaper disposal</td>
<td>JAN-11-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing</td>
<td>rent control</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>support local rent control. I agree completely</td>
<td>JAN-11-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interior</td>
<td>national parks</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Green Valley strip mining</td>
<td>JAN-07-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interior</td>
<td>national parks</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>ban strip mining and protect wildlife sanctuaries</td>
<td>SEP-17-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public activities</td>
<td>congrats from senator</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>short - naturalization</td>
<td>SEP-16-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public activities</td>
<td>congrats from senator</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>short, f. i. occasion - for example, 75th birthday</td>
<td>SEP-16-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taxes</td>
<td>marriage penalty</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>encl - single and married tax differences</td>
<td>SEP-17-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife</td>
<td>animal abuse</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>soring of horses</td>
<td>JAN-11-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife</td>
<td>animal abuse</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>inhumane treatment of animals</td>
<td>MAR-14-81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4**
quantitative analysis. In effect, the senator's staff has already coded each letter for content.44

One of Benson's goals in sampling the Minnesota issue mail was to estimate the total quantity of mail received on a specific topic. The correspondence management files should allow a researcher to determine more easily the quantity of mail received on a given topic without having to sample. Researchers, however, will have to take time to examine carefully the data file for irregularities and will need to consult memos and other records concerning correspondence files to determine whether there has been any duplication or data loss. For example, some correspondence management systems allowed staffers to make copies of entries and then assign them different topics/subtopics. When Senator Nunn's office changed its subtopic for Desert Storm from "Middle East" to "Iraq-Kuwait," for example, the staff created a duplicate entry for all records related to the war and entered under "Middle East" to the new topic "Iraq-Kuwait." These records, therefore, appeared twice in the database. In another case, shortly after the change to the CapitolCorrespond system, several hundred new records were deleted when data entry operators accidentally pressed the wrong key. Information about these kinds of data irregularities can only be obtained from the staff members who worked with the correspondence management systems.

44 Some letters, of course, were not answered using the pre-approved item paragraphs. In Nunn's office, these letters answered with customized text were known as "perms." In the correspondence management system file, instead of listing the item paragraph code, the staffer would enter the file name for the newly created language (that is, SPACE.PRM or IRAQ.PRM). "Perms" that were used to answer several letters were made into item paragraphs and assigned an item code. Letters that were not created using the correspondence management system, but were indexed in the system, were known as "handtypes" and might not have any item codes associated with them. Letters indexed but not answered were known as "no reply necessary" or "NRN" letters. Sometimes "NRN" was entered in the item code field. See figure 3 for examples.
The greatest amount of irregularity usually occurs during transitions from one system to another. 45

Benson also pointed to the need for research into who writes to their congressmen. The greatest problem he identified in this area, aside from the volume of the mail, was that vital information was frequently not present in the letters themselves, including age, race, and occupation. 46 This information is also unlikely to appear in the computer database. Benson suggested that researchers might be able to find additional information about constituents in local directories, 47 and the ability to create reports listing constituents by name or by address might make such work easier. Files that have the title data (Mr., Mrs., Dr., Ms., et cetera) separated into a separate field may allow researchers to categorize constituents further by sex. Data entry errors will make any study of constituents difficult, however. Senator Nunn's data files contain numerous examples of misspelled first and last names and incorrect zip codes and state designations in the address fields.

Both the 1978 Conference on the Research Use and Disposition of Senators' Papers and the 1986 Congressional Papers Project Report written after the conference on congressional papers sponsored by the Dirksen Congressional Center and the National Historical Publications and Records Commission emphasized that donor restrictions pose perhaps the greatest barrier to research use of congressional

45 Many archivists have recommended that repositories work closely with congressional staff members to ensure that the transfer of records is complete and orderly and to allow the archivist to become familiar with the way that the office functioned. See Paul, Records Management Handbook, 129; Connell Gallagher, "A Repository Archivist on Capitol Hill," The Midwestern Archivist XVI, no. 1 (1991): 49-58; and Faye Phillips, "Harper's Ferry Revisited: The Role of Congressional Staff Archivists in Implementing the Congressional Papers Project Report," Provenance VI (spring 1988): 26-44.


collections. Constituent correspondence is generally given long restriction periods to respect constituent privacy. It is a simple matter, however, to create a copy of the constituent management system files without the name and street address fields (see figure 3). The resulting file protects individual constituent confidentiality while allowing researchers access to aggregate data about the correspondence. Repositories that plan to offer access to the correspondence management system data files should try to open these files to researchers as early as possible. Computer files that are open and used are much more likely to be refreshed and migrated to new storage formats and are therefore more likely to be preserved in a usable format.

**Conclusion**

Automated constituent correspondence system records are well suited for aggregate, quantitative research. The correspondence management system records provided in electronic form by the Senate Computer Center are an important access tool, a source of significant information, and the only index to senatorial constituent correspondence. They can be used as a finding aid for the correspondence records and to sample or weed those files. Unlike the correspondence itself, they can be purged of confidential information easily and, therefore, more quickly opened for research. Perhaps most significantly, the Senate staffers have already coded demographic and topical information into the computer files, providing a database that can be adapted readily for use with statistical database software.

Correspondence management system records, however, promise more than they can deliver. Misspellings, missing data, missing records, and duplicate records combine to undermine the reliability of the data files as both indices and data sets. The repository must be familiar with how the

---

senator’s staff used the system in order to help the researcher correctly interpret the files. The size of the computer files themselves make them difficult to manipulate and search, and using the data may require skills that most archivists currently do not possess. The correspondence management files that serve as an index are separate from the correspondence, and the correspondence is extremely difficult to access without that index. The key to the item paragraph codes that provide more precise subject access are also in a separate file.

Repositories planning to provide access to correspondence management files must commit time and resources to working with the Senate staff to document the systems and how they were used, to reformatting the data into smaller files, and to migrating and refreshing the data to keep it accessible as technology changes. These are significant commitments considering the problems posed by the data and the lack of interest researchers have shown in constituent correspondence, in general. Unfortunately, although correspondence management systems provide some advantages to users interested in data manipulation and quantitative analysis, data contained in them is, as archivist Margery Sly feared, “an unholy mess.”

Naomi L. Nelson is the Modern Political Collections Archivist in the Special Collections Department, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University. This article combines several papers given at the annual meetings of the Society of American Archivists and the Congressional Papers Roundtable between 1994 and 1998.
The GAMMA Project:
A Cooperative Cataloging Venture

Beth Bensman and Susan Potts McDonald

Archival and historical organizations have traditionally suffered from a lack of funding and personnel. One way to combat this classic problem is through the development of collaborative grant-funded projects. By bonding like institutions together and creating a cooperative venture with a common goal, institutions can share funds, personnel, and knowledge in an undertaking that provides assistance to all without placing undue stress upon individual organizations.

The GAMMA (Georgia Archives and Manuscripts AutoMated Access) Project is a perfect example. It united participants from Georgia’s historical organizations, archival repositories, and libraries interested in increasing access to their historical collections. Using grant funds, the project group hired and trained two archivists to create and enter catalog records into a national bibliographic database for historical collections located at participating institutions. These archivists acted as “roving” catalogers working from institution to institution throughout the course of the project. Participating institutions contributed what staff resources they could, and project staff completed the majority of work. Thus with minimal input, participating institutions substantially increased access to their collections.
Background

Founded in 1938, the University Center in Georgia (now the Atlanta Regional Consortium for Higher Education) initially consisted of institutions of higher learning in the Atlanta-Athens area. Primarily created to strengthen member institutions’ academic and library programs through cooperative ventures, the center developed projects focused on the areas of collection, access, policy development, and document delivery systems. Recently the University Center expanded to include not only academic institutions but also affiliate historical and archival organizations such as the Atlanta-Fulton County Public Library, the Georgia Department of Archives and History, the Institute of Paper Science and Technology, and the Jimmy Carter Presidential Library.

The Special Collections Group of the University Center in Georgia was formed in 1990, primarily as a forum to share information on specialized topics pertinent to archives and special collections. Composed of representatives from the special collections departments of each of the University Center libraries, the group focused on developing project ideas to help promote access to Georgia’s manuscript resources. By 1993 the group had organized a proposal for a collaborative, retrospective cataloging project. The GAMMA Project grew out of the group’s desire not only to increase the availability of information about Georgia’s primary resources but also to strengthen cooperation between institutions and as a basis upon which to build future collaborative projects. In addition, the group hoped the cataloging project would increase the use and understanding of the MARC (machine-readable cataloging) format in Georgia and help identify related collections held by different repositories throughout Georgia.
Project Outline and Development

The GAMMA Project proposed to create 2,500 collection and series level bibliographic MARC records for archival collections held by University Center and other Georgia repositories. Records would be entered into a national bibliographic database and eventually downloaded into local online public access computer systems (OPACS). Two archivists, hired with project funds, would perform the majority of the cataloging with assistance from staff at participating institutions. While project archivists would be located at one central place, they would travel to each participating institution for initial orientation meetings and thereafter as necessary. The Special Collections Group hoped that using roving archivists instead of each institution hiring individual catalogers would provide greater consistency in cataloging and decrease the impact (in terms of finances and staff time) upon participating institutions.

Since both Emory University and the Georgia Department of Archives and History (GDAH) had planned and implemented earlier retrospective cataloging projects, the group selected the two project co-chairs from these institutions: Virginia J.H. Cain (Emory) and Steven Engerrand (GDAH). Emory was selected as the location for project staff due to space availability and capacity to coordinate grant funds. Staff would enter project records directly into the Research Libraries Group RLIN (Research Libraries Information Network) database, then transfer them into the OCLC (Online Computer Library Center) database. The group selected RLIN over OCLC as the initial bibliographic database for several reasons. The two earlier Georgia retrospective conversion projects entered records directly into RLIN, and thus the co-chairs were already familiar with RLIN's procedures and practices. This also meant that records produced as part of the GAMMA Project would reside in the same database as the earlier records from Emory and the GDAH cataloging projects. Also, Emory (and
GDAH) both possessed direct RLIN lines. Finally RLIN, the largest database of archival and manuscript materials, is international in scope and offered the broadest access to Georgia’s archival and manuscript holdings.

Application to the Gladys Kreible Delmas Foundation resulted in an award of $70,000 for a two-year period beginning in 1993. Using these moneys as matching funds, the Special Collections Group of the University Center of Georgia (under the auspices of Emory University) applied to the National Endowment for Humanities for $173,966 (outright) and $55,000 (matching funds). With funds secured in 1994 for a grant period to run from September 1994 to August 1996, the search committee began the process of reviewing applications for the two staff positions. In addition, during November the project arranged for two workshops offered by the Society of American Archivists to be taught in Atlanta. Focusing on the MARC format and archival cataloging standards, the workshops were open to staff committed to participating in the project.

By January 1995, two archivists, Susan Potts McDonald (Project Archivist) and Beth Bensman (Assistant Project Archivist), began work on the GAMMA Project. While the two archivists’ responsibilities included the coordination of activities between project staff and the designated representative(s) from each participating institution, the majority of their work focused on the planning and implementation of the cataloging and data entry processes.

Cataloging Procedures

All cataloging adhered to the conventional descriptive standards: *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* (2nd Edition) as well as *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts: A

---

1 During the planning stages and at the initial onset of the project, RLIN had not yet converted to their present method of access via the Internet.
Cataloging Manual for Archival Repositories. Subject headings were selected and formed from the Library of Congress Subject Headings and the Library of Congress Name Authority, when possible. Staff made limited use of local headings only when necessary.

The RLIN system gave the staff some flexibility when creating a MARC record. Although fields must follow in numerical order (that is, all 1XX fields, followed by 2XX fields, 3XX fields, and so forth) within each numerical block, a cataloger may decide the arrangement of the selected fields. Project staff surveyed other institutions involved in retrospective cataloging projects (Emory, GDAH, Kentucky Department for Library and Archives, and the Alabama Department of Archives & History) and viewed records in RLIN to determine fields appropriate for the GAMMA Project. (See figure 1, page 68, for a list of fields used and the record order.)

Since descriptive practices varied from institution to institution, staff designated certain fields as "required" for a minimal MARC record. Several of the required fields were necessary for data entry into the RLIN database while others were deemed important for the project. These required fields: 040 (cataloging source), 1XX (main entry, if applicable), 245 (title statement), 300 (physical description), 351 (organization and arrangement note of materials), 545 (biographical or historical note), 520 (summary, etc. note), 524 (preferred citation of described materials note), 852 (location), the 6XX (subject access fields), and 7XX (added

---

2 In addition to "public" fields viewed in the database, each RLIN record contained an ARC (Archives Record Control) segment which included information on provenance, accession, and processing. Basically, the ARC segment served as a management tool for RLIN members and could only be viewed by the institution that input the record. While not viable for non-RLIN members of the GAMMA Project, RLIN required its completion for each catalog record entered into the database.
GAMMA Project MARC Fields

010  Library of Congress Control Number
035  System Control Number
040  Cataloging Sources
1XX  Main Entry
245  Title Statement
300  Physical Description
340  Physical Medium
351  Organization and Arrangement Note of Materials
545  Biographical or Historical Note
520  Summary, etc. Note
580  Linking Entry complexity Note
506  Restriction on Access Note
540  Terms Governing Use and Reproduction Note
555  Finding Aid Note
530  Additional Physical Form Available Note
533  Reproduction Note
535  Location of Originals/Duplicates Note
561  Provenance Note
546  Language Note
581  Publications About Described Materials Note
524  Preferred Citation of Described Materials Note
500  General Note (Related Collection in Repository)
544  Location of Associated Archival Materials Note
500  General Note (Project Note)
6XX  Subject Access Fields
7XX  Added Entries
773  Host Item Entry
797  Located Added Entry - Corporate Name (GAGP)
852  Location

Figure 1
entries) together formed a basic record with enough information to identify both the collection and the holding institution.

The use of the 040 (cataloging source) field was particularly pertinent to the project. As a collaborative effort eventually involving over thirty different institutions, the 040 (cataloging source) field identified both the transcribing agency (the project) and the holding institution. RLIN created a library identification symbol specifically for the project—GAUCG—to indicate that the records were created as part of the project. The use of this field, as well as the citation and the location fields, guaranteed that each record would be identified with its holding institution as well as part of the project.

When possible, staff attempted to broaden this basic record with fields considered “required if applicable.” This included 340 (physical medium), 506 (restrictions on access note), 540 (terms governing use and reproduction note), 530 (additional physical form available note), 533 (reproduction note), 535 (location of originals/duplicates note), and 546 (language note). Finally, staff included “optional” fields to provide an even fuller bibliographic record such as the 555 (finding aids note), 500 (general note used to describe related collections within the repository), 544 (location of associated archival materials note), 561 (provenance note), and 581 (publications about described materials note). Staff used the 544 (location of associate archival materials note) whenever possible to highlight the intellectual linking of related collections at different repositories. Often, as staff cataloged additional collections, they updated earlier records to reflect the location of related materials.

Since a number of institutions involved in the project had previously reported collections to the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections (NUCMC), the use of the 010 (Library of Congress control number) field helped link the
online record with the printed version. Several repositories utilized a local collection number to identify collections, and those numbers were entered into the 035 (system control number) field.

Although project staff had discouraged the use of local fields unless absolutely necessary, the project placed one local searchable field, 797 (local added entry - corporate name), in each record. By inserting the text “gagp” in this field, the RLIN database could search on this term and create a result that encompassed all project records. RLIN also allowed refinement of search results. So by further searching on the 852 (location) field, project staff could isolate the records of a single institution. Project staff found this particularly helpful during record updates or for printing records for an entire institution.

Development of Cataloging Tools

To simplify the coding and input process, GAMMA staff developed a description form (see figure 2, page 71). The description form included all designated fields along with the appropriate indicators and subfield codes. In some instances, such as the 1XX, 6XX, or 7XX fields where indicators would differ depending on the type of entry, blanks were left in order to fill in the correct code. When dealing with institutions that would contribute numerous records, project staff created forms containing all repeatable information, such as the cataloging source, citation, and location fields, already printed on the form. In order to track the status of the catalog record, the top of each description form contained a “control segment.” Boxes within this section provided space

---

3 For those collections previously reported to NUCMC and subsequently entered into RLIN, a new record was not created unless substantial changes or additions occurred to the collection.
The GAMMA Project

GAMMA Project
University Center in Georgia

Description Form

CONTROL SEGMENT:

Action: Code
Review1
Input
Review2
Revisel
Date

Initials

Action: LONG/out
LONG/in
Review2
Print
Completed
Date

Initials

FIXED FIELDS:

ID: GAGP98-A
CC: 9654
CP: gau
MMD: OR:

VARIABLE FIELDS:

010 bb (NUCMC) (hMS

035 bb (Control #) (a(GU)MS

040 bb (Cat source) (aGU(cGAUCG(eappm

1__ _bb (Main entry) Source:

(a

(245 00 (Title statement) (a

(f_____________________________ )

Figure 2
for project staff and staff at participating institutions to date and initial each step of the process.

To provide assistance when completing the description form, project staff created a manual that defined each field; listed the appropriate indicators, subfields, and punctuation; indicated additional sources of information; and included examples of each field's appropriate use (see figure 3, page 73). To keep cataloging consistent for similar materials such as political, literary, civil war, church, or labor union collections, GAMMA staff constructed "templates." These templates listed suggestions for added entries such as corporate name, subject terms, geographic, and form genre. The templates also indicated when to subdivide geographically, when to use free-floating subdivisions, as well as suggestions for the use of general or specific terms.

To collect information from participating institutions, GAMMA staff created an abbreviated version of the description form. This collection worksheet (see figure 4, page 74) basically eliminated numerical field tags, indicators, and subfield codes and replaced them with text definitions for each field. Thus staff at the participating institutions did not need to be familiar with MARC tagging in order to assist with the project.

Project Workflow

The project's intent had always been that GAMMA staff would undertake the majority of the work. So the workflow plan (see figure 5, page 76) put the onus of cataloging, MARC tagging, and data entry on the project staff. However, with staff members at the participating institutions more knowledgeable about the scope and content of their collections, the responsibility for selecting collections for the project and forwarding the proper information fell to the institutions.

After selecting a collection, institutional staff completed each field on the collection worksheet pulling information
Organization and arrangement note (351)

Indicator Codes: bb

This field has two distinct subfields; subfield [a] refers to the organization of the collection; subfield [b] refers to the pattern of arrangement. If the collection is comprised of a single item, it is not necessary to complete this field. <Choose either subfield [a] or [b], you cannot use both.>

( Subfield Codes:
  [a] Organization
  [b] Arrangement

Subfield [a] : Organization

Describes the manner in which a collection has been subdivided into smaller units such as a collection divided into series.

(a) Organized into three series: (1) Correspondence, (2) Diaries, and (3) Association files.

Subfield [b] : Arrangement

Describes the pattern of arrangement within the collection being described (i.e. alphabetical, by record type, unarranged).

(b) Arranged in chronological order.
(b) Arranged in numerical order by case number.
(b) Arranged alphabetically by military unit, and then chronologically.

& APPM, Chapter 1.7B7

( This field ends with a period.
Collection Description Form

Processing Level: (completely) (partially) (unprocessed) (unknown)

Main Entry:

Title:

Date Span:

Physical Description:

Arrangement:

Biographical/Historical Note:

Summary Scope Note:

Figure 4
either from existing finding aids or from personal knowledge of the collection. For added entries, institution staff simply listed names, subjects, places, or events they felt merited attention. Next, using the description form, GAMMA staff took the information, summarized it, determined the appropriate access points in accordance with *Library of Congress Subject Headings* and Library of Congress Name Authority File, added the necessary indicators and subfield codes to form a complete MARC record, and entered the record into RLIN. For a final check, GAMMA staff required participating staff to review all their institution's records after data entry to ensure that the catalog record accurately reflected the collection's content.

**Data Entry Process**

GAMMA staff developed several procedures and tools to facilitate data entry. When possible, they entered all records for an institution into RLIN at the same time. Thus GAMMA staff could create "hot keys" to streamline inputting and eliminate errors. These hot keys or macros contained repeatable information found in the 040 (cataloging source), 524 (preferred citation of described materials note), and 852 (location) fields. Project staff also developed a data entry log sheet for each participating institution that included the date, RLIN record number, and a running total of records entered. While the log sheets provided a summary of records input for each institution, it also helped catch discrepancies. As a quality control measure, GAMMA staff routinely inspected each other's work. When one staff member cataloged a record, the other would review it. Also, when one staff member entered a record into the RLIN database, the other would review it. While later use of student assistants limited the amount of data entry done by the project archivists, they still reviewed all data entry.
RECORD SELECTION
1. Select the records that you wish to include in the project.

2. Determine if there are any logical collection groups (i.e. large collections with multiple series, collections related by topic or form) and submit these together. This will facilitate cataloging because they will likely have many common elements.

3. Please carefully review the attached GAMMA Record Selection Criteria, which outlines the types of collections that are not appropriate for the project.

COMPLETING THE DESCRIPTION FORM
1. Complete a Collection Description Form for each collection using the existing finding aids or by reviewing the materials themselves.

2. Create a letter-size folder for each collection that you have selected to be cataloged. In each collection folder enclose the description form and copies of any related finding aids including container listings, accession records, NUCMC entries, biographical/historical information. These tools will assist the project archivists in cataloging and subject indexing.

3. Send the collection folders via University Center truck mail or regular mail to the project staff. Project staff may also come to pick up the collection folders and discuss project progress with staff from time to time.

CATALOG REVIEW
1. After the project staff receives the collection folders, they may call to ask specific questions to clarify information regarding a particular collection. Information can be conveyed by several means including FAX, e-mail, regular mail, or the University Center mail truck.

2. Once the record is entered into RLIN, a copy of the record will be printed and sent for your review. This review should concentrate on content. Make sure the record is a true reflection of the contents of the collection. In addition, review the subject headings for accuracy and completeness.

3. After you have reviewed the record, mark any corrections to the record in red. Initial and date the record in the upper right hand corner. Return the record via University Center truck mail or regular mail to the project staff.

FINAL RECORD PRODUCTS
1. At the completion of the cataloging of your institution's records, a complete set of your fully tagged records will be forwarded to you.

2. You will be notified when your records are loaded into OCLC.
Problems Encountered

Meetings between GAMMA staff and institutional participants began in May 1995. The workflow, as described in figure 5, and the use of the collection description forms worked quite well for initial project participants—usually larger institutions with several staff members and at least some written descriptions of their holdings. However, as the GAMMA Project branched out to include smaller repositories, frequently with either a lone archivist or an individual with only part-time archival duties, the level of participation by institutional staff decreased. Often, only sketchy descriptions existed for collections, or in some cases no description at all existed. In some cases with only a single person staffing the archives, the workday included no time to complete the description forms. In these cases, GAMMA staff truly became roving catalogers and traveled throughout Georgia visiting repositories and cataloging directly from the archival materials. Institutions still selected collections for inclusion into the project, and GAMMA staff returned records after data entry for review. This new process simply bypassed the use of collection description forms by institutional staff and decreased the amount of participation by institutional staff.

Additional problems surfaced as work progressed. Since participating institutions determined collection selection, GAMMA staff began to find that often not the most historically rich holdings were selected but rather those with either existing descriptions or single items quick and easy to describe. Project staff wanted to include collections that would aid researchers not only in Georgia but also outside the state and that truly deserved a MARC record in a major bibliographic database. In discussion with the project co-chairs, GAMMA staff compiled a list of record criteria for inclusion in the project to aid institutions in the selection process (see figure 6, page 78).
GAMMA Record Selection Criteria

To help you in selecting records for inclusion in the GAMMA project, we have put together a list of record types or subjects that are not appropriate for the project. There may be exceptions to these criteria, when in doubt, please contact either Susan or Beth.

- collections comprised of the archival records of your own institution
- collections consisting entirely of copies (photocopies, transcripts, etc.) of original materials, however you may submit microfilm collections when the originals are still in private hands
- collections that require extensive processing in order to describe (it may still be possible to catalog such a collection at a minimal level which could be updated at a later time)
- collections that have restrictions that deny access for an extended period of time, however it is acceptable to submit collections that have restrictions on use (use microfilm copy rather than originals, etc.)
- state or local government public records (this also includes single court case materials)
- collections consisting of typescript manuscript(s), unless part of a larger collection of related materials
- collections that are illegible due to fading, damage, or poor penmanship
- collections that contain information that is not understandable in regards to who created it, what it is about, or its geographic location
- collections that consist primarily of ephemera rather than correspondence, etc.
- collections consisting solely of land deeds/grants unless part of a larger collection of family papers
- single letters that contain no information of historical value
- faculty collections or student correspondence unless it documents more than their academic career or extends into family papers
- collections consisting of family bibles

Figure 6
A second difficulty stemmed from an institution’s desire to include all information about a collection in a MARC record. GAMMA staff stressed that the MARC record would act as a “pointer” to the institution holding the materials. In other words, the project created a record that contained enough information to identify the collection and its creator without rewriting the finding aid. Researchers could then contact the repository for further information or to obtain a copy of the finding aid. To this end, project staff attempted to keep MARC project records brief and succinct. Biographical notes included only enough information to “place” the person (information such as birth and death dates, professions, marriages, and so forth) and did not include an extensive life history. In the same manner, the scope and content note included information on either major collection strengths or areas where little known information existed.

Another situation arose as the project expanded and included more and more organizations—authority control. Staff had begun to keep a list of any names found in the Library of Congress Name Authority File and to photocopy printed biographical references used to establish a name. However, due to the close relationship between the collecting areas of many Georgia institutions, names not found in either the Library of Congress Name Authority File or reference materials began to surface. Without an authority for these names, inconsistencies developed. Eventually project staff compiled name (personal and corporate), subject, and genre term authorities for all access points used during the project. The subject authority became particularly helpful as a means to provide consistency in cataloging. As seen in figure 7 (page 80), the list included references to related terms, narrow terms, and duplicate if applicable terms. Staff used the latter reference as a reminder to utilize certain subjects in conjunction with others.
GAMMA AUTHORITY FILE:

TOPICAL SEARCH TERMS

DUP: Duplicate if applicable [May]; Subdivide geographically
SN: Scope note [Chron]: subdivide chronologically
RT: Related term [Year]: add year
NT: Narrow term

4-H clubs--[May].

Abolitionists--[May].
   RT Slavery--[May]--Anti-slavery movements.

Abortion--Law and legislation--[May].

Abscam Bribery Scandal, 1980.
   Political corruption--[May].

Actors--[May].
   SN Stage actors
   NT Motion picture actors and actresses.
   NT Television actors and actresses.

Acting teachers--[May].

Actresses--[May].
   SN Stage actresses
   NT Motion picture actors and actresses.
   NT Television actors and actresses.

Adult education--[May].
   Continuing education--[May].

Adult education of women--[May].

Advertising--Tobacco industry--[May].

Advertising campaigns.

Aerodynamics.
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RLIN and OCLC Differences

By August 1996, the GAMMA Project had entered over two thousand records into the RLIN database, and staff began negotiations between RLIN and OCLC for the transfer of records from one database to the other. RLIN created a tape load with a test batch of one hundred records that project staff submitted to OCLC. Project staff soon learned that moving catalog records from one MARC database to another created several problems due either to differences between RLIN MARC and OCLC MARC cataloging practices or to problems inherent with a collaborative project.

When OCLC mapped the RLIN MARC record to an OCLC MARC record, the process moved information from the RLIN ARC (Archives Records Control) segment to the equivalent MARC fields in the main body of the record—local fields such as 950, 998, 090, and the 541 (immediate source of acquisition) and the 583 (action note). Eventually staff stripped these fields from the record since this information was never intended for public use or as part of the main record. They mapped the 852 field containing the location of the holding institution to the 851 field and the 035 (system control number) field with the institution’s manuscript collection number to an additional 524 (preferred citation of described materials) field with a display constant of “collection number.” For the 040 (cataloging source) field, the symbol for the holding institution (subfield a) remained the same. However, OCLC created a new dummy symbol (A7M) for the transcribing agency (subfield c).

After resolving these problems, GAMMA staff proceeded with the project’s first tape load and sent 2,549 records to OCLC in March 1997. However, another problem arose due to OCLC’s limitations on overall size and number of fields per bibliographic record. OCLC only allowed a maximum of fifty fields per bibliographic record; characters within a single field could not top 1,879; and an overall on-line record could not exceed 4,096 characters. Even though RLIN employed none
of these restrictions, GAMMA staff knew project records would eventually reside in the OCLC database and always had been careful not to exceed the fifty-field limit. Yet, short of counting each character, there was no way to estimate either the overall record size or characters per field. As a result, several of the GAMMA records were over OCLC's limits. OCLC provided GAMMA staff with a list of records that required downsizing, and they edited them to conform to standards. This problem seemed to settle the last difference between the two systems.

However, when OCLC loaded the records into the database, an unexpected problem arose with OCLC's WorldCat interface. WorldCat does not display all fields included in an OCLC MARC bibliographic record but only a limited set determined by OCLC. For example, the 524 (citation) and 851 (location) which identify the record's holding institution do not display in WorldCat. Since OCLC set the GAMMA holdings under the dummy OCLC symbol (A7M), the holdings' profile displayed "Emory University, GAMMA Project." As a result researchers erroneously contacted Emory for information on any project record. This problem was particularly vexing, since project staff had been assured that these two fields would display in WorldCat. To eliminate this problem, OCLC set holdings for all project members who were current OCLC members. For all project participants who were non-OCLC members, OCLC created symbols for the institution and set the appropriate holdings.

In comparing the two systems, it is fairly obvious that RLIN is much more responsive to archival cataloging and collaborative projects than OCLC. RLIN's public interface allows display of the majority of fields entered for any bibliographic record (including the citation and location fields); the system places no limitations on either number of fields per record, field size, or overall record size; and RLIN
also provides free Internet access to the AMC portion of its database via a Z39.50 gateway.¹

Additional Project Funding and Activities

During the process of loading the records from RLIN to OCLC and while completing the initial grant, the Georgia Historical Records Advisory Board (GHRAB) provided additional funds to continue the GAMMA Project through April 1998. Eventually the project created and entered 3,076 records into RLIN. (See figure 8, page 84, for a final list of project participants.) These grant funds also permitted the creation of a tape containing all GAMMA Project records, which is housed with the Southeastern Library Information Network (SOLINET)—the OCLC provider for the Southeast. SOLINET allowed institutions to share in the creation of local data creation tapes for use in OPACs, which decreased institutional costs.

In addition, GHRAB funds enabled the GAMMA Project to expand its initial mission and explore the use of Standard Generalized Mark-up Language (SGML). Using the Encoded Archival Description/Document Type Definition (EAD/DTD), the GAMMA staff marked up thirty-five finding aids from seventeen of the thirty-two GAMMA participants. To demonstrate the potential for collaboration between the MARC record and the finding aid, staff linked each encoded finding aid to its MARC record using the 856 (electronic location and access) field. Currently, Emory University houses the EAD finding aids on the GAMMA web page.⁵

However, plans are underway to move the encoded finding aids to the Georgia Library Learning Online (GALILEO)

¹ To search the RLIN Gateway, go to NUCMC's homepage at <http://lcweb.loc.gov/coll/ncmc/nucmctxt.html> and select "NUCMC Z39.50 Gateway to the RLIN AMC file."
⁵ <http://sage.library.emory.edu/Sage/gamma>.
GAMMA Project Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Scott College</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur J. Moore Methodist Museum</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Catholic Archdiocese</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta University Center</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Avenue Research Library</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta State University</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry College</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Georgia Historical Society</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State University</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Pulaski National Monument</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College &amp; State University</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Department of Archives and History</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Historical Society</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern University</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida Pearle &amp; Joseph Cuba Community Archives</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Carter Presidential Library</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King, Jr. Library and Archives</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical College of Georgia</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer University</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Georgia Historical Society</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorter College (Northeast Documentation Project)</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of West Georgia</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troup County Archives</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia/Hargrett Library</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia/Russell Library</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan College</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminister Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>3076</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8
database. Eventually, copies of all the GAMMA Project OCLC MARC records will also reside on GALILEO with links between the MARC record and the appropriate encoded finding aid.

With the completion of the GAMMA Project in August 1998, the project group planned to designate record custodians to update the RLIN and OCLC records in order to keep them viable. While Emory volunteered to update RLIN records, negotiations are still underway for an institution to take responsibility for updating the OCLC records.

Impact of the GAMMA Project
The GAMMA Project achieved the main goals desired by the Special Collections Group: to achieve increased access to Georgia's historical collections and to identify related collections held by separate repositories. Over a three-year period, project staff entered more than three thousand collection and series level records into RLIN and OCLC. This dramatically increased access to collections in Georgia and consequently helped institutions provide better service to their patrons. By itself, this is a remarkable achievement and a boon to any researcher undertaking a study of historical materials located in Georgia. In addition, the project identified numerous examples of related collections held by different repositories across the state. For instance, in one city an institution held a nurse's scrapbook, which contained photographs, postcards, and clippings documenting her service overseas during World War I. Across town in another repository, project staff located a collection of letters to the same nurse from soldiers she had nursed overseas during the war. Neither institution was aware that the other held similar collections. This is just one of several connections uncovered during the GAMMA Project.

As a cooperative cataloging venture, the GAMMA Project
worked very successfully. While the amount of staff time contributed by participating institutions varied according to what the institution could spare, project staff completed the majority of the work. This allowed institutions that could not afford to hire additional personnel or contribute much staff time to the project to participate. By centralizing all cataloging work, project staff were able to maintain consistency and to develop authority files useful for any additional cataloging or descriptive projects. This centralization of work also allowed several institutions to share in skills (MARC and EAD) that may not have been easily acquired by their own staff members. Plus, as a result of the project's activities and the workshops presented by project staff, the use and understanding of the MARC format increased in Georgia. Finally, the project brought the historical community in Georgia together to focus on a shared endeavor upon which future projects can build. The success of the GAMMA Project should serve as a model for other cooperative projects in the archival community and lead to similar endeavors in Georgia and the United States.

Beth Bensman, formerly Assistant Project Archivist with the GAMMA Project, is currently the University Archivist/Special Collections Librarian for Thomas Jefferson University in Philadelphia, PA. After leaving the GAMMA Project, she was the Technical Archivist for the Richard B. Russell Library for Political Research and Studies at the University of Georgia.

Susan Potts McDonald, formerly Project Archivist with the GAMMA Project, is Senior Archivist at the Special Collections Department, Emory University.

6 One reason that the project functioned so well is that a consortium—the University Center in Georgia—was already in place and functioning. Thus, the major participants were attuned to working together on cooperative ventures.

7 During April and May 1998, project staff presented three workshops detailing the MARC format, its use in automated and paper-based environments, and the selection and formation of subject headings.
Over the past two decades archivists have moved to define and codify their own separate and distinct profession, inventing a new language, developing a more intensive and expansive training regimen, and constructing a unique theoretical base. Such efforts may have helped archivists to distinguish themselves more clearly from other disciplines, but this new professional orientation has also produced conflicts with former friends and allies over issues such as government-

---

1 The literature on archival professionalism has become a minor cottage industry over the past two decades. For some representative samples, see the discussion in Archivaria 17 (winter 1983–1984) in a series of essays entitled “The Debate Over History and Archives.” Other examples of the genre include Terry Eastwood, “Nurturing Archival Education in the University,” in Tom Nesmith, ed., Canadian Archival Studies and the Rediscovery of Provenance (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1993), 475–507; and Richard J. Cox, “Professionalism and Archivists in the United States,” American Archivist 49 (summer 1986). A good way to trace the increasingly disparate views of archivists and historians on a variety of issues is to consult the web site of the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History (http://www.h-net.msu.edu/~ncc) and to review the digests for the past three years.
tal policies concerning electronic mail, funding priorities for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, and Freedom of Information Act requests. The historical profession, too, has undergone significant changes as shifting research agendas, marketplace realities for graduate students, and the ascendancy of the race, class, and gender paradigm within historical discourse have seriously challenged the notion of objective scholarship based on meticulous archival research. As a result archivists and historians have suffered through a somewhat strained relationship.

Although archivists have spent considerable time during this period studying the sociology of professions, they have rarely examined the lives and thoughts of individuals who actively worked to build the modern historical and archival professions. Yet a thoughtful scrutiny of the career of one such individual, J. Franklin Jameson, offers a cautionary tale for contemporary archivists who seek to refine the sorts of institutional structures that Jameson and his colleagues created within the historical profession. When one considers the messy interplay of personal, social, historical, and economic motives documented in the first two volumes of Jameson's papers, a complex picture emerges.

---


Without question, J. Franklin Jameson (1859–1937) served as one of the principal architects of the modern historical and archival professions and as an enthusiastic proponent of professionalization generally in the late-nineteenth-century United States. He participated in the founding of the American Historical Association (AHA) and eventually was elected its president; served as the first managing editor of the American Historical Review; conceived of and subsequently directed the Department of Historical Research at the Carnegie Institution of Washington; and spent much of his adult life building and perfecting training structures for historians. A devoted archival user, Jameson also led the fight for documentary publication projects, tirelessly advocated the construction of a national archives building, and promoted public funding for manuscript repositories.

Jameson, a Massachusetts native and Amherst College graduate, had entered virtually uncharted terrain when he resigned his teaching position at Worcester High School in 1880 to begin graduate study at Johns Hopkins University. The Baltimore-based institution, which had opened its doors in 1876 with aspirations of transforming American higher education, emphasized meticulous research and rigorous empiricism in all disciplines and relied on the German seminar method to instruct students in its ideal of scientific scholarship. Jameson’s familial financial circumstances and somewhat provincial western Massachusetts origins had not

Rothberg with the assistance of John Terry Chanse and Frank Rives Millikan (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1996). These are the first volumes in a projected trilogy.  

completely prepared him for the academic competitiveness of Johns Hopkins. He nonetheless eagerly embraced the values and virtues of scientific history and cultivated a disdain for the "gentlemen amateurs" who had dominated American historical scholarship throughout most of the nineteenth century.

He graduated in 1882 with the first history doctorate to emerge from Herbert Baxter Adams's famous seminars and spent the next two decades training a new generation of graduate students. Throughout these years Jameson emphasized establishing professional boundaries and regulating scholarly standards within the historians' guild, and he devoted himself assiduously to developing institutions which would enforce such boundaries.

The scientific school of history's reliance on careful analysis of primary sources appeared to produce a natural alliance between university scholars and manuscript curators, and on the surface Jameson ardently supported a partnership between academic historians and a wide range of historical enterprises. While at Hopkins, for example, he held a membership in the Maryland Historical Society; when he accepted a professorship at Brown he quickly joined the Rhode Island Historical Society and actively participated in its programs. Jameson also lectured widely at historical societies

---


throughout the nation and even lobbied the president of the University of Chicago to upgrade its archival and library holdings as a key element in his negotiations for a professorial post there.

Jameson’s private ruminations, however, reveal a very different story. Though he made good use of the Maryland Historical Society’s collections as a graduate student, the future founder of the AHA in 1884 described membership in the state organization as a “waste of money.”

He further declared that the society “hasn’t much life or scholarship in it” and regularly derided its meetings and supporters. The Rhode Island Historical Society fared no better in Jameson’s estimation. He judged an 1889 paper by William Warner Hoppin on the Peace Convention of 1861 “rather empty,” and described the society’s 1890 annual meeting as “a torment.”

Some clues to the reasons underlying these negative characterizations can be found in a March 1887 diary entry in which Jameson recorded a visit to the New-York Historical Society to deliver a scholarly address. There a society trustee of long and distinguished New York lineage completely resisted Jameson’s best efforts as a revisionist, scientific historian to demolish Edmund Bailey O’Callaghan’s two-volume *History of New Netherlands* and rose to defend the antiquarian study rather than alter his perception of Dutch scholarship. Jameson concluded that such patrician hobbyists who “know nothing of good historical work” threatened his own goal of placing historical scholarship on a solid academic foundation and needed to be excluded somehow from the serious work of writing history.

Throughout these years Jameson therefore emphasized regulating scholarly standards within the historians’ guild. He

---

7 Ibid., 72, 182, 187–88, 316, 320.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid., 143.
hoped to use the AHA to erect professional barriers against men like the trustees and place the discipline firmly in the hands of a new generation of trained academicians, free of "old-fogeyism" and schooled in the methods of the German seminars.¹⁰ When the AHA was founded in 1884, Jameson later recalled, many individual colleges "had little more relation to the general world of scholarship than if it had been a Buddhist monastery." By placing history practitioners in regular contact with each other and providing a forum for scientific approaches to scholarship, the organization would, Jameson believed, subvert the parochial influence of the workplace and create an elite corps of agenda-setting historians who would define the professional discourse and place history within the academic mainstream.¹¹

Jameson's dream of professionalizing history ultimately endured a series of setbacks and produced largely disillusionment and disappointment for him. From the outset, he appeared chagrined at his slow progress and the attitude of many fellow historians. AHA meetings never seemed to live up to his expectations. A movement to affiliate the association more closely with state historical societies earned his particular enmity. Writing to his mentor at Hopkins, Herbert Baxter Adams, he observed that the only hope for the AHA "to improve the qualities of its scholarship" was not to align with the historical societies but rather to cultivate "the university and collegiate teachers." The AHA in his view should focus primarily on strengthening "the alliance with the professorial body" at the expense of amateurs whom he

¹⁰ Ibid.
¹¹ Rothberg, Selected Essays, 349–54.
derided as “of little account intellectually except as trustees of material and as possible furtherers of publication.”

Many of his criticisms of amateur practitioners have a decidedly familiar ring for today’s archivists who can sympathize with some of his positions. Few would dispute the need for archival repositories to avoid “fussy antiquarianism,” for example, and many archivists undoubtedly would nod in agreement when Jameson mocked genealogists who visit archival repositories “for no other purpose than to hunt up their genealogies and to prove their right to entrance into the charmed circle of the Sons of This or the Daughters of That.” And while some might dispute his extreme view that “no historical society has a right to use its research and publication funds in furthering the purposes of these people,” many curators secretly wish that their research clientele contained more scholars and fewer family historians.

These critiques have become so professionally orthodox over the years that today they appear almost bland and unexceptional. For Jameson, however, these words constituted a revolutionary call to action. Before embracing his agenda, contemporary archivists sympathetic to his cause need to understand the source of his rebellion. Both his

---

12 Rothberg, The Years of Growth, 176–81, 188–89, 226–27. By 1897, Jameson even contemplated resigning his position as managing editor of the American Historical Review when the possibility loomed that such “highly popular” writers as Theodore Roosevelt, Alfred Thayer Mahan, and Moses Coit Tyler might be asked to contribute articles and thereby call into question the journal’s scientific standing.

13 Jameson’s low opinion of historical societies did allow for some qualitative distinctions. He expressed considerable respect for the accomplishments of the large, publicly funded southern and western societies such as that in Wisconsin. Historical commissions and organizations in such states “put their historical work into the hands of persons who know not only how such things should be done, but also what is worth doing.”

public statements and his private ruminations indicate that he was uncomfortable with some aspects of modern American life and that to him professionalism appeared to be an antidote to cure what he viewed as important deficiencies in the American character. Specifically, his papers betray an intense suspicion of the twin evils of democracy and capitalism.

Theoretically, Jameson revered American democracy, and his scholarly writings generally favored the American system of an orderly, democratic tradition that had developed in the forests of Germany.\(^15\) Jameson's democratic enthusiasm dissolved, however, when he confronted the political implications of popular government that sometimes handicapped his own professional aspirations. As early as 1897 he criticized the "weak desire" of historical societies to "placate people who, it is thought, may in time, if sufficiently indulged, turn from their personal and private interest in ancestry, and begin to take an interest in history." His appraisal of the situation worsened as he got older. The academic who once celebrated American democracy matured into a scholarly curmudgeon who lamented the large number of superficial historical studies on the market, most of which constituted "poor flashy things, with catchpenny titles and sensationally colored text" hurriedly slapped together to satisfy "a pathetic desire of multitudes to know more about history."\(^16\)

Privately, Jameson had in fact always betrayed ambivalent feelings toward democratic culture, an ambivalence reflected in his 1882 comment about a political rally at Baltimore's Concordia Opera House organized by local "good


government” proponents: “It is no comforting sight to see with your own eyes the unintelligence of your fellow-citizens, and the poor quality of their leaders.” Two years later he saw a seemingly competent public official face financial ruin and a middle-aged career crisis when his father, a loyal Republican and postmaster in the town of Amherst, lost his position after Grover Cleveland’s election merely owing to the need for Democrats to install their own men in power. Such experiences pushed him toward a more elitist stance. Ultimately, the young graduate student concluded, “I am in danger of entertaining aristocratic feelings; the feelings, that is, of an aristocracy of intelligence, no other.”

Jameson’s personal life reinforced these aristocratic proclivities. His move from the small college town of Amherst to the more immigrant-influenced city of Worcester and ultimately to the cosmopolitan Gilded Age metropolis of Baltimore exposed him to the nation’s extraordinarily diverse and heterogeneous population. As he struggled to come to terms with America’s increasingly complex ethnic and racial make-up, he reverted to broad stereotypes and cultivated a sense of cultural and intellectual superiority, calling the 1880 valedictory address at Worcester High School where he taught “just such a speech as might have been expected from a half-educated young Irishman.” While at Hopkins he derided Japanese students as “passing stupid” and characterized Baltimore as a “queer city” where “cul’d gemmen ‘n’ ladies abound,” occasionally amusing his family by writing letters home in mock African American dialect.

Insecurity concerning his social position and place in the world permeated even the most private recesses of his mind. At Hopkins, judging by his diary, he led a fairly lonely and

18 Rothberg, The Years of Growth, 41, 50, 307, 310, 328.
unsatisfying life, punctuated by periodic bouts of depression linked to what he viewed as his own shortcomings and snubs from colleagues. Unable to connect with ordinary people yet scorned by those whose social eminence he respected, Jameson moved through Hopkins as somewhat of a loner, often shunning social occasions. He threw his soul into his professional work instead, and vocational camaraderie and association with historians became his social salvation. Commitment to the rigors of historical research created a community of cohorts and soul mates, whereas other personal relationships often proved disappointing, and his lifelong commitment to the historical profession served as an important source of personal satisfaction, prestige, and self-esteem.

While Jameson hoped that historical professionalism might help resolve his own social anxieties and counter the leveling tendencies of contemporary democracy, it also appeared to him to offer a way for academics to insulate themselves from the vagaries and harsher qualities of the American economy. A commitment to pure scholarship might place the professor and his collegial cohort above the grasping, competitive world of American capitalism that seemed to sacrifice quality at the altar of consumer desire and reasonable cost. He deplored the influence of capitalist culture on historical organizations generally and lamented that the societies, though "charged

---

19 A November 1883 diary entry, for example, dwelled on "the imperfections in my teaching, the occasional defects of my memory, the slight discomforts of my position under [Herbert Baxter] Adams the schemer, the narrowness of my groove, the insufficiency of my acquisitions, the slowness of my special work, the failure to accomplish any striking result, the smallness of my professional acquaintance, the remarkable fewness of my friends, the lukewarmness of their regard for me, the absence of delight from my life and of spirits from my nature."

with immaterial, one might even say spiritual, interests," proved subject to the compromises and concessions necessary "in this complex and vulgar world." Wealthy men, he wrote, controlled the historical societies and contributed to the superficial, amateurish nature of the historical enterprise generally. Further, the societies themselves, which needed to "win their public support, their money, and their members by devoting themselves to local history," often failed to serve the loftier goal of encouraging pure historical scholarship. 21

While at Hopkins he also regularly criticized President Daniel Coit Gilman, bemoaning the constant "advertising" that he seemed to engage in, and complained that the president's effort to please donors moved the university in academic directions that stifled its graduate programs and hindered its commitment to pure research. To Jameson, scholars should remain above public scrutiny, outside American economic restraints, and beholden only to the pure world of scholarly inquiry. 22 Privately, Jameson also fumed at the inequities of American capitalism. His own modest origins meant that money proved a regular source of anxiety in his life. His Hopkins student diaries reveal constant fears over losing his fellowship and continual efforts to ingratiate himself with powerful academics in order to ensure his future, and later salary considerations often forced him to delay or reconsider career moves.

Jameson developed and articulated these concepts most thoroughly after he moved to Providence, Rhode Island, to accept a position at Brown in 1888. There, issues of academic inquiry, trustee control, and the economics of educational policy rose to the fore when E. Benjamin Andrews resigned as president of the university after the trustees asked him to repudiate his support for the free silver position during the

21 Rothberg, Selected Essays, 258, 261, 298.
1896 campaign. Andrews’s resignation energized Jameson, who played an instrumental role in rallying faculty protests against the trustees’ actions.

Jameson took dead aim at the university's governing board, observing to Columbia president Seth Low that “half of them are business men, mostly without literary tastes” who lacked knowledge of university life and did not even have strong ties to the local community. Confiding his thoughts to his father, Jameson especially criticized Worcester manufacturer and trustee Joseph H. Walker as an example of “a lot of conceited parvenus . . . who get put on boards of trustees simply because they are rich, then dictate to us what we shall say both inside and outside the college.”

The public letter of protest to the board, drawn up by Jameson in consultation with colleagues at Brown, illustrated well his sense of academic professionalism and his distaste for the financial aspects of American life. He and his cohorts attacked the trustees' notion that “the material growth of a university is of more importance than independence of thought and expression on the part of its president and professors” and urged the trustees to make “the pecuniary question . . . distinctly subordinate” to broader moral and academic considerations. 23

Around the turn of the century Jameson became a principal advocate for the creation of a national archives building in Washington, D.C., in order to house the rapidly accumulating body of historical documentation produced by government agencies. In 1914 Jameson, firmly ensconced in his job as director of Historical Research at the Carnegie Institution, chose to address an annual meeting of the American Library Association on this topic. This peculiar

---

23 Rothberg, The Years of Growth, 212, 214–21, 224. Ultimately, the faculty protest proved successful; the board urged Andrews to withdraw his resignation, and he remained as president.
oration, designed to appeal to legislators and the general public, indicates the way in which Jameson necessarily came to terms with some American realities as he moved into middle age.

Although he incorporated a bit of idealism into the address and spoke of the needs of an "enlightened democracy," Jameson focused almost exclusively on the practical in his speech. He hoped that Progressive-era America, with its emphasis on administrative efficiency, might be mobilized to create a national archives where scholarly pleas had failed, and he peppered his remarks with data concerning rental costs, fire prevention needs, and comparative administrative arrangements in comparable nations around the globe. In fact twenty more years would elapse before a national archives came into being. As Jameson had predicted in 1914, creation of the agency ultimately constituted a victory for the administrators whom he scorned as a history professor and for the patriotic and genealogical groups, like the American Legion and the Daughters of the American Revolution, whom he contemptuously dismissed as a scholar. 24

Archivists continuing on their own professional odyssey in late-twentieth-century America would do well to ponder the outcome of Jameson's crusade to professionalize the practice of history. He conceived of professionalization as a process of defining boundaries, carving out turf, and creating an elite body of practitioners. Indeed, Jameson and his peers

successfully fostered a series of institutions that continue to influence historians’ practices today: a professional association, a scholarly journal, public funding, and graduate training. Viewed from a broader perspective, however, his crusade appears less successful. He had in fact helped create many of the problems which hinder historical practice today: the great divide between talented amateurs and narrowly trained professionals, the growing obscurity and popular inaccessibility of much academic discourse, and the redefinition of serious history as something that occurs almost exclusively in an academic context.

Jameson had thus achieved professional status at the cost of social influence. The tradeoff may have successfully resolved many of his personal insecurities and anxieties, but historians generally appeared less connected with American culture and were less able to influence political life than ever before. Only by building coalitions with groups they professed to disdain, from historical societies to the American Legion, could they exert any control over the important twentieth-century public debate involving heritage and memory.

In attempting to define their own professional stances, archivists should remember the popular appeal of archives today rather than repeat Jameson’s mistakes. Tempests in a teapot with historical editors, librarians, academics, and records managers do little to advance archival issues, to connect with the broader public, or to promote archival professionalism generally. Rock radio stations, baseball teams, film makers, and fast food outlets often publicly proclaim the virtues of going “back to the archives” for golden oldies, memorable athletic moments, significant newsreel clips, and historical photos. Yet archivists, like Jameson, often squander this social capital when they resort to parochial, professional positions on significant issues. Instead, archivists need to determine how to harness this current, broad-based, popular interest in memory in order to promote their agenda. Advocating narrow research priorities and dismissing friendly
critics will not do it. Listening to diverse publics and thinking about common threads and cooperative ventures might.\textsuperscript{25}

If Jameson’s papers reveal anything, they expose the danger of creating a rigidly hierarchical notion of professional practice designed to exclude those at the margins and to create an inner circle of nationally visible elites who attempt to set \textit{the} agenda through professional associations and journals. Exclusiveness leads to sterility and, as Jameson discovered, social irrelevance. To be effective, archivists need to nurture diversity within their own guild rather than adopt the Jameson model. He viewed the historical profession primarily as a New England-oriented, male, Anglo-Saxon, university-based, and graduate-trained fraternity. While few archivists today would advocate such an ethnically homogenous and gender-stratified definition of professionalism, other divisions continue to plague the profession: institutional archives vs. manuscript repositories; graduate-trained archivists vs. those with post-appointment training; national organizations vs. local and regional groups; lone arrangers vs. laborers in large bureaucratic organizations; archival theoreticians vs. everyday practitioners. Vital, inclusive, and alive professions constantly reflect on their own practices, scrutinize their hidden assumptions, and question their most cherished convictions. They listen closely to multiple constituencies and often obtain their most innovative ideas from the periphery.

\textsuperscript{25} Examples abound, of course, of the popular appeal of archives. A recent example took place at the New York Mets-Atlanta Braves game at Shea Stadium on 15 July 1998. With rock music blaring in the background, the public address announcer screamed, “\textit{LET'S GO BACK TO THE ARCHIVES},” and the scoreboard lit up with “Memorable Moments in Mets History,” a series of film clips from various games played on previous July 15 games. Fans applauded wildly. Similarly, radio station WBGO in Newark, New Jersey, features “Jazz From The Archives” every Friday, hosted by archivist and director of the Institute for Jazz Studies, Dan Morgenstern.
Finally, archivists need to stay "close to the marketplace," in the language of current corporate jargon, rather than follow Jameson's model and create a supply-side definition of professionalism. His students produced monographs for which no demand existed; he recoiled at popular efforts to influence the historical agenda; and his ideal university operated outside the constraints of democracy and capitalism. Today, archivists too often engage in similar, purely internal dialogues. Repositories publish finding aids and bibliographic compilations without consulting users. Funding exists, so digitized collections appear without gauging real demand. Archivists often take professional positions without consulting colleagues in allied disciplines, or even gathering varied viewpoints within their own ranks. Archival educational "summits" focus on tenured educators and exclude those who hire archival students.

Under the misapprehension that today's archivists can control their own destiny, they render themselves powerless and cede control over the future. Jameson engaged in his own version of all of this. When he confronted reality in his crusade for a national archives, he had to admit publicly that if the national archives movement were to bear fruit it would owe more to the powerful pressure of administrators than the historical profession that he labored so hard to create. He and his colleagues, he was forced to conclude, were a "feeble folk relatively." That may be his own most telling epitaph for his professionalization agenda. Archivists journeying down the same path need to digest and contemplate these words from Jameson.

Peter J. Wosh is director of the Archives Program, Department of History, New York University.
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Fresh Focus

Too often the pressure of the present-day work environment lures archivists into ignoring their professional past or advancing shortsightedly into the future. To encourage such reflection on the archival enterprise, Provenance launches a new feature in this issue, Fresh Focus. This series of occasional essays opens with a survey of Carter Woodson’s pioneering efforts to collect the history of African Americans written by Eric N. Johnson, a student in the archival program at the University of Texas.

We invite contributors to explore neglected chapters in archival history or to share an original, especially historical, perspective on the current world of archival affairs. Provenance particularly encourages submissions for Fresh Focus from new or student archivists who are, after all, the future of the profession.

Editorial staff will appraise submissions in terms of appropriateness to the guidelines set forth for inclusion in Provenance’s Fresh Focus section. Please address submissions or questions to the Fresh Focus editor, David B. Gracy II, at the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, SZB 564, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712-1276; (512) 471-3892. E-mail: gracy@gslis.utexas.edu

The Editors

Carter G. Woodson and the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History

Eric N. Johnson

Eighty-four years ago, in a year fraught with racial tension, Carter G. Woodson created a bold organization dedicated to providing a cultural and historical framework for African American studies. Earlier that year, in an attempt to counteract D. W. Griffith’s damaging portrayal of black-white relations in his recent film The Birth of a Nation, University of Chicago sociologist Robert E. Park held a conference “to interest southern whites in collecting black folklore.” Woodson had declined Parks’s invitation to speak at the conference, on the basis that he was not a folklorist, but
added that he soon “planned to start an organization devoted to the preservation and dissemination of historical and sociological information on the Negro race.”

On 9 September 1915 he launched the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History to discover, evaluate, and provide a solid scientific foundation of primary and secondary documentation to counter the research conducted to date, research which in large part had dismissed African Americans as a passive, weak, and thoughtless race that had been overwhelmed by the strength and intellect of Western culture.

To understand the importance of the organization that proved invaluable to the study of African American history and culture, it is necessary first to understand the motivation and drive of its founder. Termed by many “The Father of Black History,” Woodson strove throughout his life to uncover and reveal the truth and value of the African American presence in the United States. Founder of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, the Journal of Negro History, and Negro History Week, he also established the Carter G. Woodson Collection at the Library of Congress and made an indelible mark as a prolific researcher, collector, and writer of African American history and culture.

Woodson’s birth at a time—in 1875—that has been called the nadir of the black experience in America had shaped his outlook and ambition, driving him to examine and promote the African American’s place in history. Prior to his entrance into Douglass High School in Huntington, West Virginia, at the age of twenty-five, Woodson spent his life laboring on the railroad and in the mines. From that early experience he viewed education above all else as the tool by which to achieve his desire and ambition for respect. In 1926 he would write: “If a race has no history, if it has no worthwhile

---

tradition, it becomes a negligible factor in the thought of the world, and it stands in danger of being exterminated."

"Enrolling at Harvard University to obtain his doctorate, he attended the lectures of professors Ephraim Emerton, Charles Gross, Roger Merriman, William Munro, and, most outstanding, Edward Channing, a scientific historian who stressed original sources and objectivity, principles Woodson later ceaselessly inculcated among his researchers."3 In 1912 Woodson became the second African American in the United States to receive a doctoral degree in the field of history. In 1914 he became a member of the American Negro Academy, "... a selective organization ... to promote the publication of scholarly work and to collect the works of black authors and archival materials."4

Woodson's staunch individualism and social conviction soon led him to the conclusion that however positive the academy's influence might be on academia, its elite membership did not have a broad enough impact on the general African American and white populations. In 1915 Woodson's dissatisfaction with the academy's elitism combined with the impact of D.W. Griffith's offensive portrayal of African Americans in *The Birth of a Nation* to create an energy out of which emerged the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History. Although he started with only four hundred dollars, Woodson intended to reach a much broader audience than the American Negro Academy. Disregarding advice from all quarters, he deliberately kept the price of the association's publication, the *Journal of Negro History*, low. At twenty-five cents per issue he hoped to encourage academics and non-academics alike to subscribe

---

4 Ibid., 8.
and participate in the budding association. According to Woodson biographer Jacqueline Goggin,

The major objective of Woodson's research program was to correct the racist bias in the work published by white scholars. To accomplish this goal Woodson and his assistants uncovered previously unknown source materials, asked different questions of source materials used by white scholars, and developed new historical and sociological research methods. By using new sources and methods, Woodson and his assistants pioneered in writing the social history of black Americans and moved away from interpreting blacks solely as victims of white oppression and racism. Instead, blacks were seen as major actors in American history.5

This Herculean effort to provide a cultural and historical framework for African American studies brought to light records and manuscripts previously overlooked by the majority of scholars. Woodson led the association's efforts to uncover and preserve the social records of common individuals and helped pave the road for the work of future archivists, historians, and students. The association's work with census records, tax records, personal and financial documents, diaries, and other materials revealed a wealth of information about the accomplishments and lives of slaves, tradesmen, clergymen, abolitionists, indentured servants, and countless other unsung groups. The creation of this large body of organized documentation and the rigorous analysis performed on it catalyzed subsequent research ranging from African American culture to slavery to the history of the South.

5 Ibid., 67.
In 1922 Woodson published *The Negro in Our History*, an investigation of free blacks in antebellum America based primarily on the 1830 federal census. The creative use to which he put that and other source material pushed the association, and particularly himself as its leader, to the cutting edge of scholarly research. The association demonstrated that history could indeed be written about non-elite segments of society. After the study was published, “scholars realized that a vast potential for social history research lay in census manuscripts.”

Using census data, marriage registers, birth and death certificates, letters, diaries, and oral histories, these scholars pointed to the positive achievements and contributions of Afro-Americans during the adverse conditions of slavery. Only recently have historians adopted the methods and sources for research data first used by Woodson and other scholars who published in the *Journal of Negro History*. Indeed, during the last twenty years both black and white historians of Afro-American history have had to rediscover the methods as well as the content of the work done by the pioneering generation of black scholars.

Negro History Week celebrations, established by Dr. Woodson and the association in 1926, featured exhibits of primary sources to encourage the public to donate documents in their possession for preservation and use in historical archives. “The outstanding success of this venture brought him

---

the Spingarn Medal, [and] W. E. B. DuBois stated that Woodson had performed the most striking piece of scientific work for the Negro race in the last ten years of anyone he knew." Fifty years later Negro History Week evolved into Black History Month, now widely celebrated throughout the United States. This outgrowth of the efforts of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, and of Dr. Woodson in particular, continues to encourage people from all walks of life to donate records of African American achievement and history so that future generations will have access to their past.

After 1926 the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History continued to collect and research a wide variety of primary source material under Dr. Woodson's guidance. In spite of a gradual loss of funding for the association and the Journal, Woodson proceeded with his efforts at a breakneck pace. In 1928 he applied for a grant from the Social Science Research Council with the argument: "If such a tremendous amount [of primary source material] could be collected without funding . . . even more could be accomplished if paid field workers were sent into the rural South to collect sociological data and historical documents." The next year the Social Science Research Council granted the association a one-year sum of four thousand dollars, which it used to collect over 2,500 southern manuscripts and records.

In Woodson's 1943–1944 Annual Report to the Journal of Negro History, he stated gloomily that "research during the war had been greatly handicapped, there was an acute shortage of workers, and a much reduced staff, and the association could not compete with the high salaries offered

---
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Travel was restricted during this period, and most of the association's efforts involved "exploiting the few untouched sources" on Africa. However, the association continued to collect, preserve, study, and promote its findings, and the impact of the groundbreaking work done by Woodson and his colleagues continued to grow.

On 3 April 1950 at the age of seventy-four, Dr. Carter G. Woodson died unexpectedly in the night. The success of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History in researching, collecting, and organizing historical materials documenting the African American experience and its struggle to disseminate its findings throughout the country helped to orient archival collecting and to overhaul traditional historical research, thereby laying the foundation for a more honest and thorough understanding of American culture than any previously available. Woodson biographer Sister Anthony Scally later concluded that the demand for black studies in colleges and universities in the 1960s "owed its impetus to his unremitting and zealous emphasis upon the importance of spreading the truth about the African and Afro-American background, and the use in elementary and high schools all over the country of his black history texts."

---

11 Ibid., 17.
12 Ibid., 19.
REVIEWs


Reflecting on over twenty years of experience as a practicing archivist and as an archival educator, Frank Burke provides a unique resource to researchers and archivists alike with his book, Research and the Manuscript Tradition. Neither textbook, nor manual, Research and the Manuscript Tradition is a behind-the-scenes tour of archival history, theory, and practice written to initiate neophyte researchers into the world of archives and manuscripts repositories. Burke targets his book at researchers rather than archivists in an attempt to "rectify the gap in research education and training . . . because researchers are not likely to become familiar with texts on manuscript use in their career, whereas archivists are."

Working with the premise that researchers who understand the rationales behind collecting, arrangement, description, reference, et cetera will be better able to utilize the collections of an institution, Burke explains the nuts and bolts of archival work. Burke acknowledges the idiosyncrasies of these nontraditional information centers, conceding that to the uninitiated collecting policies seem arbitrary and finding aids, both print and electronic, appear to be complex and
inaccessible. He then systematically demystifies the functions and products of manuscript collections and repositories. Taking each aspect of archival work in turn, Burke explains why the archivist does what she/he does and what benefits researchers derive from these efforts. He addresses the governing tenets of arrangement, description, reference, collecting policies, law and ethics.

Research and the Manuscript Tradition is a well-written, carefully arranged diagram of archival theory and practice. Burke addresses each issue concisely and eloquently, with emphasis on real-life examples. Burke tells the researcher what to expect from a reference interview, how to use electronic media to track down collections, and how to maximize research time once at a repository. Whether or not its intended audience, novice researchers, will read the book cover to cover, understand the complexities that professional archivists easily digest, and benefit from the information is another question all together. At times the book provides more detail on specific segments of archival work than a novice would need to know or be able to synthesize. For example, is it important for researchers to know the mechanics of FirstSearch beyond the caveat, "Warning, consult a trained professional"? Those occasional tangents contribute to the inclusiveness of the book, but may detract from its usefulness to novices.

This is the book that archivists wish all researchers would read before walking through the reading room door. Clearly, patiently, and thoroughly, it preempts questions such as Why is this collection restricted? Or how do I find related collections? However, this is not the type of book to sit on a shelf at the reference desk; rather, it should be required reading in undergraduate and graduate historical research methods classes. While some of the material or topics may be too esoteric or of little immediate concern to them, notably the section on law and archival ethics, it provides a solid foundation to students taking those first tentative steps into
the archives. Although Burke argues that archival students have access to other texts and professional guides during their education, this book is a worthwhile addition to a first-year bibliography.

Although this book is hard to categorize being neither reminiscence, nor guidebook, nor manual, it makes a valuable contribution to both archival and historical education. *Research and the Manuscript Tradition* provides the bibliographic instruction for manuscripts repositories that students badly need and for which archivists should be eternally grateful.

Susan E. Dick
Processing Archivist
Georgia Historical Society

***


As the authors of this timely and accessible handbook relate in their preface, documentary editors have traditionally been reluctant to codify their practice. Only relatively recently, with the formation of the Association for Documentary Editing in 1978, have editors gained a venue in which to discuss their methods of practice. A guide and an annotated bibliography prepared for the association are essential works to anyone embarking on a documentary edition. Nonetheless, this newest publication, *Editing Historical Documents*, whose authors bring with them a wealth
of experience, fills a void by providing not only a clear discussion of the various conventions but also examples that illustrate how current, mostly larger, historical editions have applied the different styles of editorial principles to a broad sample of documents held at various archives and libraries in the United States.

The book is organized into nine well-arranged chapters preceded by discussion of the field of documentary editing that may have been more forthright in its discussion of funding issues in light of disagreements among archivists and historians over what types of projects better preserve and make accessible the documentary heritage. The first chapter serves as an insightful overview of the important decisions editors face when setting out to define the goals of an editing project, taking into consideration the types of sources, intended audience, and size and breadth of an edition. Chapter 2 addresses the fundamental challenge of selecting and arranging the documents for a selective or comprehensive edition and optimum presentation. The text here is filled with examples, although it is in the next seven chapters, which discuss decisions about the style of transcription, annotation, access and indexing, front and back matter that the examples reproduced from current editions serve their greatest purpose by allowing the reader to examine various methods in practice.

Chapter 3 provides an introduction to the general principles of transcription and is followed by a chapter that delves into the details of various styles of transcription, including the various forms of “expanded transcription,” which is the style most frequently employed by editors of historical editions and covered further in Chapter 5. Similar to the style of the introductory chapter on transcription, Chapters 6 and 7 provide the reader with an overview of annotation methods and many examples of how annotation styles may be instructed by, among other things, the intended audience of the edition. The book continues with a brief chapter on
indexing and concludes with instructive advice on what to include in an edition’s front and back matter.

Clearly cited facsimiles presented throughout the book are drawn from over one hundred book and microform editions and illustrate the application of editing practice to various types of documents, including handwritten, machine-created, illustrations, and foreign language text. In sum, this handbook offers both new and experienced editors who are intending to reach either a more general or academic audience with samples of various methods at their fingertips, which previously editors had to gather painstakingly on their own.

I do have some quibbles. This handbook spends only a few paragraphs on the role of electronic editions, and thus does not provide the guidance on this topic that its authors claim in the introduction. Nor do the authors provide enough information about the Modern Editions Partnership, which is developing important standards for creating electronic texts for CD-ROM and the Web. Nonetheless, while the electronic environment will provide new tools, the editor’s fundamental role will not change. This handbook will guide present and future editors to achieve the clear and consistent style in their work that the authors of this book have clearly achieved in theirs.

Anke Voss-Hubbard
Archivist
Rockefeller Archive Center

***

Thomas's Lest We Forget is not the particularized, scholarly tome of professional writing replete with sociological analysis. It is accessible by readers of all ages. This is not a history of African Americans but is instead a historical examination of the crime of slavery and the injustice and suffering that institution wrought. It is a representation through facsimile artifacts and documents of the voice and experience of the enslaved person. The tone of this book is compassionate rather than bitter. The author makes clear her relationship to the subject by the repeated phrase—"my people"; nonetheless, her work resonates with the findings of the rich historiography of the past thirty years devoted to American slavery.

The plea for "balance" in today's society creates a risk of not hearing the voice of the slave with compassion. In the case of American slavery, the willingness of the reader/scholar to embrace compassion leads to historical understanding. In the minds of some, this compassion violates balance by separating the issue of slavery from a more general history, particularly when a publication is directed at a young or general readership. By opening up to Thomas's voice for early American slaves, we learn something and enrich ourselves. This voice is sorely needed, even in the large and sympathetic body of historiography devoted to this subject.

Narrow studies of slavery often miss its global context, but this book locates slavery squarely in a world order guarded by an exploitative system of colonialism. An example of this is a circa 1450 map of Africa. When the reader pulls a sliding blind, this map of Africa becomes the segmented, arbitrary possessions of 1880. Though broad in scope, I find nothing in
this book to contradict the general consensus of professional historians.

Thomas's work is an unusual book of special interest to the archival community. Not another tome of standard historiography, it is a portable exhibit between hardcovers. Of special interest to the profession is its reliance on creative facsimiles of documents to convey its message about American slavery. In contrast to standard works in which the documentary source is obfuscated in a cryptic citation, the author imaginatively replicates the documentary and material evidence of slavery and presents it in a full focus for the reader.

Beyond being a good introduction to the history of the crime of slavery, this book is also a work by which the student can see the sources of history and understand something of how published history is forged. Archivists are forever looking for ways to exhibit delicate holdings without compromising their preservation. Many good examples exist in this book of effective facsimiles that convey the texture and patina of real documents. The use of facsimiles and three-dimensional construction in this work focuses the subject in a way unknown to any except those who work daily with historical documents.

A good example of this use is the construction of a tobacco tin. The reader opens the "tin" and removes from it the manumission paper of a freed slave. The paper is a beautiful facsimile, which conveys the experience of real documents. It instills the reader with some of the discernible reverence that its original owner must have borne. In reproducing this artifact, Thomas achieves accessibility unknown in professional history where it likely would have been reduced to a footnote.

The use of facsimiles and three-dimensional constructions in this work makes the subject concrete. Thomas's aesthetic response to the document is a rich one. She recreates the striking experience of encountering a forgotten fact in a
crinkled, stained document. The fact is then evocatively presented in the replicated artifact. The effect is far more arresting than that of academic abstraction.

*Lest We Forget* is a magnificently produced and visually stimulating book. The cover bills it as a “three-dimensional interactive book with photographs and documents from the Black Holocaust Exhibit.” It does not disappoint. Given the importance of slavery to the history of Georgia, I can think of no repositories in this state, which could not benefit from this special publication. For repositories, patronized by students and lay readers, it is paramount.

Dale L. Couch  
Georgia Department of Archives and History

**     **


As an introduction to the career of an important regional and national politician and as an archival descriptive tool, the new *Guide to the Richard B. Russell, Jr. Collection* from the Richard B. Russell Library for Political Research and Studies at the University of Georgia Libraries is a successful publication. At a time when the archival community is placing great emphasis developing EAD for detailed finding aids, it is encouraging to see the continued value of summary guides to collections. The Russell Library has produced a new model guide.
Richard Brevard Russell, Jr., born in 1897 in the small town of Winder, Georgia, gave fifty years of public service which began in 1921 with his election to the Georgia House of Representatives and ended with his death in 1971 after thirty-eight years as a powerhouse in the United States Senate. The high regard in which he was held by his colleagues is reflected by the 1972 renaming of the Old Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C., as the Richard Brevard Russell Senate Office Building.

Russell's first elected position was to the George House of Representatives at the age of twenty-three. Four of his ten years there were as its Speaker; in 1930 Russell was elected governor of Georgia. Upon the death of Senator William Harris in 1932, Russell ran for and was elected to the United States Senate, becoming the nation's youngest senator at age thirty-five. His freshman appointment to the Appropriations committee paved the way for a powerful future in the Senate. He later chaired that committee as well as the Committee on Armed Services. Advising presidents from Roosevelt to Nixon, Russell influenced national security and other areas of national policy during the Great Depression and the New Deal through the Vietnam War.

The printed guide to the Richard Russell Collection is the culmination of a process that began in 1958 with an initial deposit of several boxes of files in Georgia, steam rolled with the 1971 transfer of forty-five tons of the senator's papers, and reached a milestone with the opening of the collection for research in 1977. Along the way, the Russell Foundation was established and the Georgia General Assembly passed legislation to assist with the funding of the Russell Library. Similar to the Dirksen Foundation which had been created to establish the Everett Dirksen Library at Pekin, Illinois, the Russell Foundation and the Richard B. Russell Estate supported the growth of the Russell Library as a major center for research in political history and public policy. The library now houses over one hundred collections, and the Foundation
endows a Russell chair in history at the university. Other institutions can only envy the support of such a foundation which funds special programs and this fine new guide.

The *Guide to the Richard B. Russell, Jr. Collection* provides the traditional components of a summary guide: biographical essay, collection note, collection outline, series descriptions, and supporting appendices such as a chronology and a list of committee assignments which give further context for the collection. The handsomely illustrated publication also includes a bibliography, a list of interviews in the related Richard B. Russell Foundation Oral History Project, and a useful “subject-subgroup/series index” which helps a researcher access the collection. What the guide offers that is of special interest to practicing archivists as well as practical researchers is a history of the collection and the Russell Library as a repository, and functional information on the library’s policies and procedures which will help researchers plan visits to use the collection. Edited by Sheryl B. Vogt, archivist and department head of the Russell Library, the *Guide to the Richard B. Russell, Jr. Collection* is a welcome addition to a healthy group of guides to congressional collections and a new model for archival guides in general.

L. Rebecca Johnson Melvin
University of Delaware Library

***

Editorial Note: This review was first published in the 1996 issue of Provenance. Technical and proofreading errors caused the omission of several lines in the final copy. The review is reprinted here for the benefit of the reviewer, the author, and our readership.

Faye Phillips’s Congressional Papers Management is an important and ambitious but flawed work not susceptible to easy categorization or emphatic judgment. Phillips offers this volume as “a critical companion” to the records management publications of the House and Senate historical offices, and to the 1992 Documentation of Congress (to which she was also a contributor), to assist archivists in repositories that have made a commitment to acquire, catalog, and make available one or more congressional collections. The book has five chapters: one each on collecting, appraising, and arranging and describing congressional papers; one on “Guidelines for Arrangement and Description”; and one on “Sampling and Electronic Records.” Phillips has included many sample forms and an up-to-date bibliography of writings on congressional papers.

There are basically three types of repositories which care for and about congressional collections: 1) those that specialize in congressional and other public affairs collections, 2) those that actively collect congressional papers as part of a larger geographic and topical mandate, and 3) those that—deliberately or accidentally—acquire at most one or two congressional collections largely out of keeping with the rest of their holdings. The curators in these three types of repositories have distinct (though not entirely separate) needs
when it comes to furthering their education in the management of congressional papers. By structure and content, *Congressional Papers Management* seems to be a cross between a beginners manual for those new to congressional collections and a processing manual for paraprofessionals employed by geographic and special-focus repositories.

Phillips has published *Congressional Papers Management* at a time of increasing turnover in congressional delegations and when more and more repositories are receiving their first such collections (and begging for help). In the face of this increased need, the book seeks to provide one-stop-shopping for curators of congressional papers collections, extensively summarizing general archival works on collection development and arrangement and description. Particularly in the chapters on collection and appraisal, Phillips provides a good synthesis of a growing and complex body of writing on congressional papers while properly adding her own assessments in clear but discreet terms. She gives welcome prominence to the need for a collecting policy for congressional papers. The two chapters on arrangement and description are based on policy and finding aid examples gathered from other repositories and extended summaries of basic manuals on archival processing. The fourth chapter includes extensive references to conservation problems.

As an introductory manual *Congressional Papers Management* has at least three important weaknesses. First, it does not set the management of congressional collections in the larger context of a repository’s other collections. While there are indeed aspects of modern congressional collections that distinguish them from other collections, the book treats them as if totally unrelated to the equally massive records of a modern social service agency or business or religious congregation or labor union. This conceptual narrowness is reflected in the fact that, with the exception of the first arrangement and description chapter, Phillips cites virtually no literature that is not specifically about congressional papers. While this
is noticeable in the chapters on collection development and appraisal, it is positively crippling in the chapter on sampling and electronic records.

Second, and related, the vast majority of the specific examples cited in the book (particularly in the two arrangement and description chapters) are of papers of collections that should better be looked at as exceptions rather than rules. Richard Russell, Sam Nunn, Mike Gravel, Hubert Humphrey, and Frank Church are in no way "typical" members of Congress (not even "typical" senators), and the decisions made about their papers should not be taken as typical or standard. The result of this bias is to give the impression that "correct" processing of congressional papers is far more detailed than (or, many archivists would ever, should be) is the case. One specific example (p. 147) are the directions for item ordering and item weeding Press Files: "if item arrangement is more time-consuming than the repository can afford, then only remove the duplicates..." Removing duplicates, however, is itself often more than the repository can afford, and depending on the extent of the duplication, it is quite possible that the space saved by searching for duplicates is worth less to the repository than the staff time taken to search for them.

Third, if the book is intended to be a fairly comprehensive manual, why are there not chapters on conservation and on reference and outreach? A conservation chapter, in particular, would have made sense given the extensive repetition (series by series) in the arrangement and description chapters of admonitions on dealing with audio-visual material, oversized material, and deteriorating boxes and folders. Why include documentation policy but little discussion of deeds of gift? (Viewed instead as a processing manual for paraprofessionals in larger institutions, Congressional Papers Management does not really need these extra chapters, and also does not need its current chapters on collection development and appraisal.) Most disappointing,
for a 1996 imprint, is the section on electronic records. This thin section (6 pages of 181) ignores the abundant writing on electronic records not specific to congressional offices, and begs for a more detailed examination of the content, structure, and function of the current Senate systems and some words about the more common software being used in House offices.

So this is a useful but flawed book. It is probably most valuable for those curators without much experience managing congressional papers (though it sets standards that are unrealistic for many of them) and as a teaching tool for use by supervising curators at repositories specializing in congressional collections (where by definition a higher level of resources per collection have been available to congressional papers). Curators at repositories who view and treat congressional collections as a fairly routine segment of much broader appraisal and processing activities will find Phillips's fine synthesis of appraisal issues of most interest. Curators with responsibility for congressional collections owe it to themselves to read through this book at least once and to make the decision to purchase a personal or institutional copy on the basis of that direct assessment.

Mark A. Greene
Curator of Manuscript Acquisitions
Minnesota Historical Society
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