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Activism among archivists has been a subject of heated debate for over ten years. Sparked by the political turmoil of the 1960s, the controversy surrounding this issue continues today with such basic questions as what constitutes activism and what activities should concern activists still unanswered. Yet in our profession where so much remains to be done, both in exploring the records we already have and in assuring the availability of significant records from and for present and future generations, we must be selective in the deployment of our precious scant resources and energies. The following trilogy of articles represents our profession's most recent attempt to define activism and to establish clear priorities for ourselves as archivists in a changing world. Originally given as presentations during the 1976 Society of American Archivists Annual Meeting, these articles identify a number of concerns ranging from the proper orientation for archival collecting and finding aids policies to the moral dilemma facing archivists within a struggling society.

In adapting these oral presentations to a written format, the editorial board of GEORGIA ARCHIVE has made liberal use of subjective judgment in altering or deleting material. Because we have exercised considerable editorial license, persons wishing to review any presentations as originally submitted may contact the authors directly.
My initial reaction when I was asked to participate in this session on the archivist as activist was one of incredulousness. To allot one of three theme sessions at this particularly important convention of the Society of American Archivists, where we are meeting jointly with the International Council on Archives, implies that we do believe we possess, either actually or potentially, the means of becoming true activists, that is, the kind of people, and the type of profession, that can have a major influence in determining not only our own future, but the future of others, even of our entire culture. I find this a staggering claim from a profession that has done nothing that can be termed momentous.

I am convinced that no self-proclaimed activist archivist will ever attract much notice except from members of our own profession, and further, that even if we banded together as a profession and issued an activist manifesto, it would not alter the course of American history in the slightest. But the activists still pose some questions and proposals that warrant our attention, perhaps even our censure. We are, relatively speaking, a young profession. We constantly benefit from criticism, and we must incessantly strive for improvement. But this is not being activist, it is simply a prudent and logical way for any profession to evolve and develop as it increases in sophistication. Thus, the conservative archivist
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is committed to change, but change within limits defined by a cautious and reasoned analysis of needs and opportunities, not upon whimsy, fad, or serendipity.

The conservative archivist believes our professional mission in life is too important to permit hasty changes in existing procedures and methodologies. The archivist stands alone as the guardian of those current and past records that document our culture for present and future generations, and his integrity and impartiality must not be compromised. The conservative archivist recognizes that many areas of our profession require further definition and improvement, but he insists that the basic principles developed by our predecessors were sound. Above all else, the conservative archivist is a realist. He knows that we do not live in an ideal world; he knows that his judgment in the capacity of the "honest broker" is fallible; and he knows, given the resources allocated to him in terms of staff, space, and funds, that his functions as guardian of our culture can be performed but imperfectly. But the conservative archivist does not despair. He is committed to doing the best job possible with the resources he has; he is committed to the basics of our profession—appraisal and transfer of permanently valuable records, the accessioning and processing of those records, and the creation of guides and finding aids to make them accessible to all interested persons. He is even committed to change, as long as he can be convinced that in reallocating his available resources to accomplish such changes that he has neither jeopardized his impartiality nor neglected his fundamental responsibilities as an archivist.

I perceive two major problems with those archivists who style themselves activists. First, the activist archivist is too often tempted to reallocate his available resources in an effort to redress what he perceives as inequities in the policies that directed his predecessors. In so doing, he often ignores the basics, and projects of lasting utility are deferred or terminated. The current craze in our profession for documenting women, blacks, and other special interest groups has caused countless man-hours and archives dollars to be diverted into a frantic reanalysis of our holdings for pertinent records to list in specialized finding aids. Activists
applaud our sensitivity and our timeliness in creating these guides, but the handful of women and blacks who clamor for and benefit from our labors is robbing the general public who need those comprehensive guides whose preparation we set aside in favor of our quest for relevancy.

The second major threat posed by the activists is that their actions may sully the traditional "honest broker" stance of our profession. Once we permit ourselves to be politicized, once we assume the mantle of creator of records rather than the curator of records, we as a profession will have lost most, if not all, of those attributes of impartiality that were in large part our reason for existence. The archivist must maintain his integrity, and he cannot do so if he actively seeks to generate records to fill what he perceives are gaps in the existing record documenting our culture. No individual has the capacity to view the present world and the countless millions of records it generates to determine what aspects of our culture are inadequately documented, and by presuming that he can, the activist in fact will distort the picture of our culture that is consulted by succeeding generations.

The major affliction of the activist archivist, I suspect, is his inability to cope with the identity crisis that has long plagued our profession. The traditional archivist believes that he must keep a low profile. He cannot afford to alienate or antagonize any special interest group or governmental agency, and he must be accessible and helpful to all. Experience has shown that our work can best be done from the stance of the "honest broker." We have found that results are best obtained by working assiduously to develop an understanding and trust with those agencies and institutions which generate the records we believe are permanently valuable, and by providing the best service possible to those who desire to use the records in our custody. But as a result of the traditional archivist maintaining a low profile, most people do not know what an archives or an archivist is. The traditional archives, by its very nature, is liable to be overlooked, and when funding is cut or not forthcoming, or when other agencies are consulted because of ignorance of what we can provide, archivists find it does little good to become partisan or vocal. Our best recourse is to
establish our worth through implementing the best possible archival procedures, thereby making our programs, if not indispensable, at least recognizable as worthy of continued support.

Some people become very unhappy when others do not recognize them as professionals, and they tend to blame the establishment for their crisis of identity. The activist may strike back by asserting that the traditional archivist has ignored virtually everything important in today's culture simply because it is easier for him to continue accessioning the same kind of records as in the past. In some cases the activist may be correct—there are archival administrators who follow faulty selection criteria—but the conservative archivist does not believe that the answer to legitimate problems with our profession can be solved by dramatically altering existing principles and procedures.

Granting that there is room for improvement in the archival profession, let us examine some of the suggestions that have been made by activists to determine whether or not such changes would indeed be beneficial. A major complaint of the activist is that traditional archival procedures inadequately document our culture, thus we are leaving an imperfect record for future generations. They insist that we must actively seek out series of records not now accessioned into our archives that document those aspects of our culture that have been ignored in the past, and when relevant records are not available, they suggest we fill the void by creating records of our own.

Two favorite program elements advocated by activist archivists are oral history and photography. They argue that our archives are filled with records documenting the rich and powerful, and that the oppressed classes, even the "average American," are underrepresented or totally ignored. But do we archivists have the expertise to define what the "average American" is, and even if we ethically should, could we formulate questionnaires free of bias that would help define for posterity what the "average American" in 1976 was like? Could we, as archivists, approach a member of the lower class, especially someone from a different racial or ethnic background, and be certain that our own preconceptions
would not intrude upon our interview? Could we properly assess the effect our mode of dress and pattern of speech, our education and relative affluence, might have on the respondent?

I would argue that few, if any archivists, could conduct a program of oral interviews that would result in a corpus of useful records, and further, that it would be wrong for us even to try. Conservative archivists believe that oral history should be conducted outside the archival environment. Oral history should be generated, if at all, by trained interviewers, who may call themselves historians if they like.

If our archives are dominated by the records of the rich and powerful, with only fleeting glimpses of the less fortunate, it simply means that the society from which we draw our records is dominated by the rich and powerful. In our role as the "honest broker," we select records we deem worthy of preservation, and the generations of historians to come will correctly conclude that the mass of humanity in our day had little influence or power in our society. If we archivists politicize our role by diverting resources from assessing, transferring, and processing a judicious selection of existing records into conducting oral interviews with those persons who appear infrequently in our records, we will pervert, not improve upon, the record of our culture we leave for posterity. Transcripts or tapes of oral interviews, when they are done well by trained interviewers, can have a place in an archives, but they are not a panacea and they should not be generated at the expense of, or be accepted into the archives in lieu of, records of greater value for illuminating our entire culture.

Activist archivists also frequently advocate creating a photographic record of our culture, arguing that this medium best captures, for example, life in the big city ghetto. Photographs can be an important addition to an archives, especially when they are generated as an integral part of the records of a particular agency or institution, and we must be sensitive to the care and preservation of such collections that we accession into our archives. But as with oral history, the conservative archivist objects to diverting archives dollars and staff resources
into the creation of photographs to fill alleged gaps in existing record series, because they must ultimately reflect the preconceptions and prejudices of the archivist who undertakes the project. Certainly, with sufficient funding, we could document in detail the plight of our inner cities, with photographs of ill-clad children forced to play in the streets, with derelicts lying in alleys, with tenements, garbage and rats. But when future generations review our record of what repelled us most about our inner cities, would they conclude that the residents never experienced happiness, never enjoyed family or friends, never learned to cope with their environment?

Photographs, in fact, are not very useful for documenting many aspects of our culture, because they capture only an instant in a continuum and because they record that instant too precisely. What we archivists seek to do is to preserve for posterity an image of our total culture, not just one instant in front of one tenement in one large city. We must spend our time and resources locating and transferring assessment lists, unemployment and welfare rolls, and court records to indicate to future generations what life was like in the ghetto. Once we are certain we have identified and transferred these record series, then we can accept photographs to complement the record. But photographs are often nothing more than illustrative, and other types of records must be brought into our archives if we hope to provide posterity with a comprehensive view of our culture.

Another favorite theme of activist archivists is that we must do more to secure records relating to special interest groups, by generating new records, assiduously seeking out records relating to these groups that heretofore were not brought into the archives, and by creating special finding aids to records already in our custody that relate to them. Conservatives believe that highlighting any particular group is wrong, because it distorts reality. We prefer selection procedures that will bring into our archives records that document all facets of our culture and the creation of comprehensive, rather than specialized, guides to those records. No amount of vocalizing by women, blacks, or other allegedly oppressed, ignored, or misunderstood segments of
American society will change the fact that until the last few years our culture was indisputably dominated by white Protestant males, and in most respects it still is. More important, we archivists must not permit ourselves to compromise our principles by being forced to judge that particular groups have been wrongfully ignored in the past. We must eschew all attempts to force us to divert our scarce resources into enterprises designed to enhance the status of recently activated groups who demand that we archivists provide them with historical legitimacy.

A guide to nearly 33,000 loose papers dating from the Revolutionary War era that we at the Hall of Records will publish this winter exemplifies my point. While we might have gained more applause for preparing specialized guides to specific papers relating to women and blacks during the period, we chose to do a general guide. As much as some people would like to believe that women, blacks, and other non-white-male groups played a crucial role in our struggle for independence, this series of records, which includes virtually all invoices, chits, vouchers, and communications issued by the State of Maryland between 1775 and 1789, establishes conclusively that they did not. White men, the products of modest or oppressed backgrounds, were the backbone of Maryland's war effort, and these men were inspired by the hope of material self-improvement, not rhetoric. What the collection of State Papers does indicate is that the men who bore the burden of the war were a special class of whites. They were not the wealthy merchants, lawyers, and planters whose rhetoric had reluctantly convinced Marylanders to join with the other colonies in declaring independence, rather they were the sons of tenant farmers, newly freed indentured and convict servants, and men who owned neither land nor slaves in a society where economic and social mobility were dependent upon both. Furthermore, the records show that money, not patriotism, inspired this class of white men to enlist. The bounty on the barrel head at the recruiting station was what counted for people at the bottom of the economic spectrum, and with the promise of land at the expiration of service, enlistment seemed like an unprecedented opportunity for them. Ultimately, speculators got most of the soldiers' pay and benefits, but the ranks of privates were nonetheless filled by the dispossessed, who hoped that by marching off to war they might finally
achieve something better for themselves and their families.

Conservatives believe that comprehensive inventories of collections such as the Maryland State Papers are infinitely more useful to the public, and thus are the only defensible course for an archivist to take. This does not mean that comprehensive inventories have to be done in the traditional way. Our work on the Maryland State Papers illustrates that even we conservatives are willing to benefit from progress if it will permit us to utilize our limited resources more advantageously. The guide we have done was inventoried by humans--very inexpensively because we utilized summer interns--but then the items were typed on an in-house text editing system that created machine-readable tapes. The actual sorting, composition, and even the author-recipient index to the collection was done by computer. As a result, we were able to produce a massive finding aid within our budget limitations, and more important, we will be able to offer the public a thousand page book--case bound--for just $16.00.

The fundamental concern conservative archivists have with much of what the activists advocate is that they are calling for us once again to become historians. We were historians once, or at least a part of their professional organization, and many of us have suffered from a sense of inferiority ever since we broke away from them. Still, our relationship with the historical profession has remained close, and many of the reforms advocated by the activists are put forward in the name of assisting future generations of historians. Activists claim that unless we alter our criteria for accessioning records, or unless we actually create records ourselves through programs like oral history and photography, that future historians will be unaware of important facets of our culture.

But when we adopt this type of reasoning, we are actually becoming historians ourselves. We are placing ourselves in the position of the historian of the future, looking at our culture and the records it generates, and saying that the records in our archives do not give sufficient weight to those aspects of our culture that we judge are too important to be overlooked. When tempted to engage in this kind of
history making, we archivists should be sobered by looking at historians themselves. They are much better equipped than we to determine the salient facts of past cultures, and yet each generation of historians changes its collective mind about what the past was like. Historians alter their interpretation of the past not necessarily because they are more closely approaching the truth, but rather because the preconceptions, environment, and educational imperatives of each generation of historians changes. The conclusions of historians are based as much on the personal biases and prejudices of the individual practitioner as they are on the realities of the past.

When an archivist understands that the historian's vaunted quest for the truth is largely a sham, he should then examine his own motives when he advocates generating new records—literally stacking the deck—for future generations of historians. What may seem terribly important to us personally may in the end prove to be unimportant. Those activist archivists who advocated seeking out the records of radical groups in the 1960s, and who promoted their successes as examples of the kinds of social activity that should be documented in an archives, in all probability performed a disservice to future historians, because it turns out the radicalism of the 1960s was but a temporary, and largely inconsequential, phenomenon. The time and resources these activists expended securing the records of radical groups would have been much better spent documenting aspects of our culture in that decade that were more lasting and meaningful.

While archivists should not attempt to emulate historians, our profession could learn one important lesson from them. Historians are members of a respected and well-known profession, and yet, ironically, they do little that is socially redeeming, and they have had a minimal impact on our culture. Most of what historians do interests only a few members of their own profession, while we archivists touch nearly everyone's life, if not for genealogical research, title searching, or solutions to particular problems, at least for a birth, marriage, or death certificate. The irony is compounded by the historian's dependence upon archives for survival, for
without us the historian either would not exist, or he would be reduced to playing the role of a court jester recounting the oral legacy of times past.

But what has given professional respectability to historians, and what is missing from our own profession, is their ability and willingness to write. Most of what historians write is not very good, but still the reputation of individual members and of the profession as a whole is enhanced through publication. We archivists should follow the example of the historians by writing more, and by learning to write better. We need informed, articulate statements from archivists who have long been in the profession concerning exactly what our purpose is and what we hope to attain. We need less rhetoric and simpleminded "how I did it" expositions, and more statements of fundamental theory and policy. I believe most of the misunderstandings between activist and traditionalist archivists could have been avoided had we conservatives taken the time, and had the ability, to express what our policy was to others in the profession.

Unfortunately, as any issue of the American Archivist will attest, most members of our profession are unable to identify interesting and challenging topics for discussion, and even worse, most of us are functional illiterates. I suppose the explanation is that many of us were originally trained as historians, and we abandoned that profession for the archives because we failed, or feared we would fail, to meet the test of writing and publishing demanded by that profession. Still, writing is a skill that can be learned, and I believe we archivists would be well advised to teach ourselves how to do it. If the quality of our profession is to improve, we must explain our position fully to others in the profession, we must exploit those record series that can never be suitably interpreted by anyone other than an archivist, and we must lead the effort to educate the public concerning the role of archivists and archives. If we had done this before in well-written articles and monographs, I seriously doubt we would be meeting here today discussing activism. The good archivist has always been an activist, in the best sense of the word. That the established profession must defend itself against those who advocate programs so foreign to what an archivist in this country has always meant
is, I believe, solely a product of our unwillingness, or inability to articulate the principles that direct us.

In short, the archival profession is an imperfect reflection of the imperfect individuals who make up its ranks. Our goal is to preserve for posterity those records of the present that will convey an accurate picture of our culture and to make accessible to our contemporaries the records in our custody. We never succeed in achieving all our goals, but we do our best, given the resources allocated to us, to come close to the mark. We strive to achieve the status of the "honest broker," seeking to bring new information into our archives as assiduously as we work to disperse information to whomever requests it. We refuse to become record creators, preferring instead to allocate our resources to accessioning new records and creating finding aids to facilitate access to them. Above all else, we who call ourselves conservative, or traditionalist, archivists are realists. We admit there are problems with our profession, but we believe solutions can be found without abandoning the principles our profession has developed through trial and error. We acknowledge that some aspects of our culture could be more fully documented, but we adhere to our determination to remain cultural conservators, not cultural arbiters. We applaud the interest of women, ethnic, and racial minorities in their history, but we refuse to dissipate our archives dollars in combing through records that legitimately document a white, male dominated society to bolster their egos. As realists we know that our resources are limited, that regardless of how pleasant it might be to initiate new experimental programs or to undertake for our own amusement some of the record-generating projects advocated by the activists, it would mean that we would have to cut back elsewhere. Finally, we conservatives are not loath to initiate change, but we insist that the feasibility and productivity of a reallocation of existing resources be made abundantly clear. Our hesitancy to accept change, we believe, is well-founded; from experience we know that our existing programs, policies, and procedures are good ones— they have stood the test of time.
TODAY'S ACTIVIST ARCHIVISTS: A MODERATE VIEW

David E. Horn

As archivists, we are aware of change, of the changing views of events, and of the changing sources of information about them. We weigh the reliability of an aging witness or participant against that of a younger, disinterested historian; we compare incomplete primary sources with later attempts to tell all.

As archivists, we are concerned with many types of changes: new kinds of paper, information retrieval systems, ways of making, filing, and storing records, ways of publicizing our work and available services, and sources of funds.

But what concerns us here is a deeper aspect of our work—the basic orientation from which archivists decide what aspects of our society they will choose to document. For the past several years, most archivists have been concerned with the extent to which they should be activist. When we have asked ourselves whether too large a part of the records preserved in our institutions are concerned exclusively with the elite, with the top of the pyramid, the visible tip of the iceberg of humanity, we have had to answer yes. This has been true in our college and university archives, where 90 percent or more of
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the records were produced by administrators rather than students or teachers; in our business archives, where our records consisted primarily of the personal papers of founders, board members and presidents; in religious archives where we were able to answer questions about early missionaries, generous donors, nationally prominent church members, and the clergy, but could not say much about the members of those religious groups, whether they were rich or poor, laborers, immigrants, or whatever. The questions concerning what kinds of records to collect and what kinds of activities to document are very complex. They have occupied the energies of archivists before us and will continue to do so with today's and tomorrow's archivists. I do not pretend to say that any given collection of material must be saved because an imaginative archivist or administrator can think of possible research uses of this material, nor must the same collection be destroyed because of the expense of storage, processing, and use, or because of the competition of other, more important records.1

The principal question to which I address myself today is the role of the archivist: How active can we be? How active must we be? My view is that archivists must be activists; and must be active as archivists. People who are archivists have many roles—we all live in many different worlds. We who, by choice or chance or necessity, are in the archives world must know and perform well our archives roles. We also have obligations as members of families, as friends, as citizens, and as people engaged (to a greater or less degree) in other occupations—librarians, microfilmer, historians, researchers, genealogists, teachers, administrators. We must be active as archivists and perform well for two reasons: first, our work is essential; second, no one else can or will do it.

Concentration on our role as archivists and determination to be excellent archivists do not narrow but, rather, widen our view of our roles. We investigate new ways of administration, new methods to share decision and management, not because we are bored with our jobs and idly seeking something else to do, and not simply because of our beliefs in the dignity of individual people (though this is important), but because we are determined to find the best
way to use our limited resources to produce the best possible archives service. We publicize our work (imaginatively, of course) to guarantee the widest use of materials that people need even though they have not been aware of their availability.

We attend meetings of archivists and other associated professionals to share our knowledge and other resources, to learn others' solutions to our present problems, and to anticipate problems for ourselves that others are now facing. We contribute to small and medium-sized archival associations (regional) to share the help we have received from others and to find assistance with our specialized areas. We provide meaningful work for everyone—professionals, para-professionals, secretaries, clerks, students, graduate students, volunteers, retirees—to insure the quality of our services, to provide an excellent means of recruitment, and to make the best use of our most important resource—people.

Thus far my "reconsideration of activist archivism" suggests that we continue to do what we have been doing, once we have reconsidered our reasons for doing it. This examination of motives should result in setting difficult goals and very high standards. Thus far, everything I have said could have been said at any time in the past one hundred years. I must now ask whether the particular conditions of today's world force us to alter our role as archivists.

We live in terrible, fearful times. We are aware of the destructive forces of war, famine, disease, illiteracy, fear, colonialism, political revolution, international terrorism. We cannot ignore particular circumstances of life and their effects on us as people and as archivists—but we must not let them distract us from our properly archival work. It is appropriate to consider here some remarks by John Updike, given in a talk in Australia.

The last time I appeared on a platform in a foreign land, it was in Kenya, where I had to confess, under some vigorous questioning from a large white man in the audience, that the general betterment of mankind, and even
the improvement of social conditions within my own violently imperfect nation, were not my basic motivation as a writer. To be sure, as a citizen one votes, attends meetings, subscribes to liberal pieties, pays or withholds taxes, and contributes to charities even more generously than— it turns out— one's own President. But as a writer, for me to attempt to extend my artistic scope into all the areas of human concern, to substitute nobility of purpose for accuracy of execution, would certainly be to forfeit whatever social usefulness I do have.2

It should be remembered that Updike's writings do reflect current trends in American life. He does not live in an ivory tower, any more than we do. We might not like his answer on the involvement of a writer in social causes, but we must remember that we claim to be every bit as professional as he is. To deny that our work as archivists takes precedence over seemingly irresistible impulses to do other things might be to say that our archival work is not truly professional.

To explain the archival role that I recommend, I shall draw on my background of scholastic philosophy for a method: I shall first describe what it is I do not mean.

Let my first example be an archivist who is almost, literally, buried in his work. He has chosen to minimize his contact with newspapers or television. He knows we are not at war but has no interest in the news beyond that. He is admired for his dedication to his work, but that work is usually measured quantitatively rather than qualitatively.

This limited life and exposure affect every aspect of his archives work. The administration of the archives is as it has always been, with decisions made at the top; no changes here, no archival revolution.

Collection policies have not changed. There are already in the archives plenty of materials to process, to make available for researchers, to index
more and more thoroughly, and additional material comes in regularly from the same administration sources. Why try to gather more material, which would cramp the available space, present new problems of incompleteness and identification? No researchers have inquired about such sources, so they must not be very important. There have also been no changes in the evaluation of material as it is processed, as no new uses are anticipated. In processing, the principle of provenance has always held sway and is still used. Indexes and other finding aids guide researchers relentlessly to records documenting the work of important and official persons.

I should not paint an entirely black picture, as this institution is considered to be an excellent archives. Only acid-free containers are used; exhibits do show the collections and attract people to use them. No researcher is turned away unfairly, but it must be noted that many collections are "closed" for very long periods of time, and little effort is made to dissuade donors from imposing such restrictions.

The recluse archivist not only does not apply for grants, he does not see the need for them. He is well read in archival matters, and even reads those essays and editorials in the new crop of archival publications that urge more activity by archivists. He is aware of current developments in archives work and even writes to a member of Congress occasionally. Perhaps the term "recluse" is unfair, as this archivist is in contact with many people—the archives staff, researchers, administrators, donors—though these contacts continue in the same way that they have "always" been.

How critical should we be of the person I have described as the "recluse archivist"? Does the gain in the internal functions of the institution offset the possible loss of opportunities to document different activities or provide different services? Should we not be as critical of the other extreme, the archivist who is too active even though his undertakings may be professionally related.

As a second example, let us consider an active archivist, perhaps a hyperactive archivist. Aware of the crises in our society and their actual or
possible effects on archives work, he is constantly involved in efforts to change, to revolutionize, some aspect of our society. Evenings, weekends, even vacations are spent in demonstrations, letter writing, meetings, canvassing, and the like. These activities do not necessarily have a bad effect on the proper performance of archival functions, but in practice they do reduce the time and the personal energy available for the day-to-day effort in the archives.

These activities reflect a certain orientation, a definite point of view, and that point of view can affect the work of an archivist as archivist. By such activity an archivist becomes aware of the fact that there are many diverse elements in our society, that many of these have never been properly studied, and that documenting them is a necessary task and an interesting challenge.  

Each reader or listener can form a mental picture of the hyperactive archivist. Perhaps this sort of person is so determined to document some aspect of our culture or of his institution that he becomes not just a preserver but a creator of records--this can happen in oral history projects, for example. An archivist might become overly involved with the organization and running of national, regional, state and local archival associations. These are desirable, even necessary organizations, but over-involvement can result in a neglect of one's work. Even over-involvement in one's own institution can be detrimental. This might result from service on too many committees (or doing too much work as a member of a committee).

To confine one's energies within reasonable limits does not imply a renunciation of all efforts to make improvements both specific and general. Indeed, it puzzles me that some people are constantly involved in time-consuming schemes for the improvement of their country or the world but they neglect, perhaps are unaware of, the problems which are a part of their daily living: the hiring of women and minorities at their own institutions; adequate pay for long-term employees who are really para-professionals or professionals in the level of the work they do, their excellence of performance, and their willingness to assume responsibility--these people are truly
professional in every way except salary. A similarly overlooked problem is the deplorable working conditions of people in archival institutions; inadequate light, heat, space, excessive noise, depressing environment, among others can cause physical and mental difficulties for archivists. These problems can be solved, or at least worked on, by the archivist as archivist particularly if he is an administrator or head of a department or division.

The title of my talk mentions reevaluation, and I favor a thorough, careful, thoughtful reconsideration of everything we do as archivists. Sometimes this process is construed as an attempt to do away with the old, to restructure, to revolutionize. I do not use it in this way. I favor a new look by informed, concerned archivists, and I think many of the things reconsidered will be approved as they are now. The result will be neither a recluse archivist nor a hyperactive archivist but an activist archivist who is busy with the principal concerns of his archival institution and of his profession.

The first area of activity must be administration: because it is traditionally one of our weakest areas. Archivists are not usually well trained for administration, and this might contribute to the widespread resigned acceptance of our sorry lot at the bottom of the totem pole, an attitude that has a direct adverse impact upon the working conditions and salaries of our employees. Most of us prefer "real archival work," but administration is essential for the performance of our other duties. Good administration requires a thorough knowledge of our resources and positions. We must all improve our handling of money, realizing there will be little or no improvement in the amounts we handle. Archives operations are not a luxury, they are necessary for administrators and for historians, but there might be certain luxurious aspects to them as they are now run, and we must eliminate them. Grants offer temporary respite, bringing funds to parched budgets, but we must realistically assess their real value to our total operation and the possibility of maintaining the program or project after the grants expire.

An administrator must be aware of the location of the archives in the organization of the larger
We must particularly consider the necessity to deviate from the procedures developed by large governments when we are working in smaller or different kinds of collections—for example, college records and church records. How large must a collection be before it requires handling by the "record group" method? At this convention we might appropriately point out that provenance is a European immigrant; like other imports, it has been Americanized.

If we have this approach to archives work and to excellence in that work, we shall contribute not only to the science of archives administration but also to the art; we shall contribute not only to the work being done for certain reasons but also to the clarification and improvement of those reasons. Perhaps the "archivist as artist" is a subject for another time, but we all hope to have that mastery of present techniques and that familiarity with the past that will enable us to see more clearly what we are doing and to plan more certainly for the future. We develop a confidence that enables us to make a leap of reason. We share our creativity with others in the certain knowledge that we are doing what needs to be done. Again we find an unexpected appropriateness to our work in the reply John Updike gave to the question, "What is creativity?"

For one thing, creativity is merely a plus name for regular activity; the ditchdigger, dentist, and artist go about their tasks in much the same way, and any activity becomes creative when the doer cares about doing it right, or better. Out of my own slim experience, I would venture the opinion that the artistic impulse is a mix, in varying proportions, of childhood habits of fantasizing brought on by not necessarily unhappy periods of solitude; a certain hard wish to perpetuate and propagate the self; a craftsmanly affection for the materials and process; a perhaps superstitious receptivity to moods of wonder; and a not-often-enough-mentioned ability, within the microcosm of the art, to organize, predict, and persevere.4
If we see our profession as he sees his, then we can say with him: "And I, no doubt, should write, in the decades left to me, in the highest forms I can reach, matter of my own devising." 

NOTES

1 Herman Kahn, Frank B. Evans, and Andrea Hinding, "Documenting American Cultures Through Three Generations: Change and Continuity," American Archivist, 38, No. 2 (April, 1975), 147-58.


4 Picked-Up Pieces, xx.

5 Ibid., xviii.
Almost six years ago on September 30, 1970, I had the privilege of presenting a paper at an SAA Annual Meeting session entitled "The Archivist and the New Left."

The session, chaired by Frank Evans, featured a remarkable presentation by Professor Howard Zinn of the Boston University History Department, which he called "The American Archivist and Radical Reform." This paper was followed by a vigorous critique of Zinn's remarks by Philip Mason of Wayne State University and a perhaps equally vigorous defense and expansion of Zinn's views by myself. All in all, the observations and admonitions made that date attracted the largest audience of any SAA session held prior to 1970.

As I reread Professor Zinn's paper in the course of preparing my presentation, I was struck, in the first instance, by the inordinate modesty of his concluding entreaty to archivists and, secondly, by the enormity and magnitude of the unfolding events of the past six years that have clearly, in my opinion, proven Zinn's remarks to have been prophetic.

Zinn left his audience with but two requests: "One, that they engage in a campaign to open all government documents to the public. If there are rare

Patrick M. Quinn is the Archivist at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois.
exceptions, let the burden of proof be on those who
claim them, not as now on the citizen who wants in-
formation. And, two, that they take the trouble to
compile a whole new world of documentary material,
about the lives, desires, needs of ordinary people."
"Both of these proposals," Zinn contended, "are in
keeping with the spirit of democracy which demands
that the population know what the government is doing,
and that the condition, the grievances, the will of
the underclasses become a force in the nation."

I can vividly recall the reaction of many of
our colleagues following the session. While there
was a certain general agreement that archivists had
indeed been remiss in not devoting sufficient atten-
tion to the task of collecting documentation pertaining
to women, Blacks, and other minorities and the
working class, the reaction to Zinn's call for the
opening of governmental records was decidedly adverse.
Adjectives ranging from ill-advised to ludicrous pep-
pered much of the post-session commentary.

In part as a result of the controversy sur-
rounding the subject of activism, a number of archi-
vists gathered together during the SAA convention in
San Francisco the following year, largely at the
initiative of Lynn Donovan, of the California Histori-
cal Society. With the intention of initiating an in-
formal caucus within the Society, this group adopted
purposes, loosely defined objectives, and, most im-
portantly, commitments to 1) initiate actions designed
to democratize the SAA; 2) increase rank-and-file
participation in the affairs and policy-making deci-
sions of the SAA; 3) encourage the recruitment and ad-
vancement of minorities within the profession; and
4) improve the status of women within the profession.
Now known as ACT, which is variously acronymic for
Activist Archivist or Archivists for Change, the cau-
cus continues to play a prominent and vocal role in
SAA affairs.

It seems to me altogether appropriate at this
conjuncture of the 40th Annual Meeting of the SAA and
the VIII International Congress on Archives, with its
thematic emphasis on "The Archival Revolution of Our
Time," to draw a balance sheet on the progress made by
both the SAA and the profession during the six years
that have elapsed since our colleague from the his-
torical profession, Howard Zinn, confronted us at once
with a scathing critique of our practices, and, most importantly, presented us with a forthright challenge to come to grips with some of the larger issues that place archivists as important components of a broader social fabric.

During the intervening six years we have witnessed a series of most extraordinary revelations of the contents of governmental records—we have seen a beginning, if you please, of the implementation of the spirit, if not the letter, of Zinn's proposal to make all public records open to citizen inspection. We have become acutely aware of the signal importance of a momentous series of events commencing with the release of the "Pentagon Papers." The public airing of the Nixon tapes and other Watergate related disclosures, the release of public records documenting the massive number of illegal activities undertaken by FBI, CIA, and other police and intelligence agencies, and, most recently, the disclosure of the existence of literally millions of pages of documents pertaining to the private lives and activities of thousands of American citizens, the overwhelming majority of whom have never been involved in any illegal activity whatsoever, all bear witness to our need for vital concern. For example, Attorney General Edward Levy, under pressure generated by the multi-million-dollar court suit initiated by the Political Rights Defense Fund and the Socialist Workers Party, disclosed that the FBI had accumulated over eight million documents alone on members of the Socialist Workers Party, an organization which has never numbered more than 1,500 members and, as Mr. Levy admitted, had never engaged in any illegal activities during the period when the documents and dossiers were compiled.

These developments have shocked archivists and perhaps caused them just a bit of shame and reflection. Need it have taken one from outside our ranks to bring to our attention the obvious, necessary and urgent task of pressing the opening of our nation's public records to public scrutiny? Ought not we, as archivists, to have played a central and prominent role in the campaign that Howard Zinn urged upon us since the "Archivists' Code" tells us that "the archivist should endeavor to promote access to records to the fullest extent consistent with the public interest . . ."?
It is hoped that Watergate has provided a watershed for us as archivists to begin, individually and collectively, to play a much more active and important role in opening more and more of our public records to the sunshine of public access. I recognize full well that there are myriad exceptions, nuances, and technical and logistical problems inherent in any undertaking of this magnitude. These, of course, should be taken into consideration and, if possible, be reasonably resolved. But let us not slow or lose the momentum that has been generated. Let us not obscure the spirit of our endeavor in the murk of procedural obfuscation.

What, then, of progress made involving some of the other salient issues that confronted us in 1970? Here, perhaps, both the SAA and the profession have performed much more commendably. It appears that we have made some important progress in two important areas: democratizing the SAA and improving the status of women in both the Society and the profession. In each of these areas, supporters of ACT played important roles, yet much of the credit for improvements that have occurred extends far beyond ACT. In the area of reducing discrimination within the profession, the record is less even. The exemplary work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women in the Archival Profession, chaired by Mabel Deutrich, should be noted here, as should the passage of the SAA Anti-discrimination Resolution at the 1973 convention in St. Louis, which codified for the first time the clear and unequivocal opposition of the SAA to the existence of discrimination in any form within the profession. While we have indeed come a long way in a few short years in eliminating some of the most overt and objectionable impediments to the professional advancements of women in the archival profession, it must be recognized that much more needs to be done before the de jure status of equality enjoyed by women archivists coincides with de facto reality.

While supporters of ACT may well have initially stimulated action designed to implement more democratic forms and procedures of self-government, the credit for realizing these goals must belong to the SAA Committee on the 70s, of which the chairperson, Charles Lee, was a most active and contributive member. The Committee on the 70s played an especially
important role in crystallizing and giving coherent form to a plethora of inchoate complaints, suggestions, and proposals involving constitutional and procedural changes designed to open the SAA's policy-making bodies and procedures to greater membership participation.

There is, however, one area in which scant, indeed almost imperceptible, progress has been made since we last gathered in Washington. It is especially embarrassing, as we concurrently convene with our archival colleagues from throughout the world, to note that very little progress has been made in recruiting Blacks and members of other minorities to the ranks of the archival profession. One need only glance about the sessions of the Annual Meeting to discern that the SAA continues to be one of the whitest professional organizations in the United States. For the few black colleagues we number among ourselves there may well have been substantial improvements in various individuals' personal circumstances, yet any such positive developments reveal only minimal progress. I am not at all suggesting that racism is rampant among the SAA. It is clearly not. Nor is the SAA comprised of men and women of callous or insensitive dispositions. Archivists must, however, begin to take some very real and concrete steps to address minority participation, and we must initiate specific action proposals in this area with the same spirit of resolve and determination that characterized the campaign to improve the status of women in the profession.

Several other achievements of the profession warrant our attention. Archivists, I would suggest, in concert with historians, librarians, and other allied professionals, have become much more responsive to the need for altering collecting and publications policies in order to rectify the inherent biases that Howard Zinn described in connection with documenting the role of working people in American history. Two important projects currently under way serve to underscore and accent this point: the W. E. B. DuBois Papers Project and the Women's History Sources Survey. Both projects serve as prototypes for similar, long-overdue, and much needed projects. In addition, collecting areas have broadened. Accessions reports in the American Archivist and other journals seem to
indicate that many archival institutions are begin­ning to abandon elitist orientations in their quest for new collections.

The other development which merits mention is the forthright collective action taken by American archivists on behalf of their beleaguered colleagues in Maine when that state's archival operation was threatened with elimination. Actions of this sort clearly illustrate the effectiveness and strength of a collective response. The leaders of the I.W.W.--the Wobblies--summed it up well with their slogan: "An injury to one is an injury to all," as did Ben Franklin with his metaphoric admonition regarding the choice of hanging together or separately.

The foregoing remarks have necessarily but scratched the surface and, as such, can scarcely com­prise a definitive balance sheet of the past six years. I have omitted mention of the public owner­ship of the papers of public officials issue, for ex­ample, because my position is very well represented by J. Frank Cook's articulate and comprehensive essay on the subject in the July 1975 issue of the American Archivist. Nonetheless, it seems to me that I have at least noted in passing some of the most important issues that have faced us, as archivists.

Finally, there is the larger philosophical question of whether archivists ought to be activists as well.

Let me make it clear that I am cognizant of the fact that there are many extenuating and inhibit­ing factors which mitigate against archivists playing active roles as archivists in often controversial situations involving issues of social, political, and economic concern to all of us as private citizens.

I am also aware that precisely because of our disparate backgrounds, employment situations, and positions, it has been and will continue to be diffi­cult for us to act collectively and in concert on any particular issue unless we enjoy the broadest consen­sus—which in many instances suggests that the partic­ular issue we can all agree on may well be banal in its import and innocuous in its resolution.
We are, in the main, a professional society whose basis for existing involves a common interest in archival theory and practice. Beyond that, we may be corporate or trade-union archivists; or employees of states, counties, municipalities, or the federal government; some of us are employed by public colleges, universities, libraries, or manuscripts repositories; others of us work in the private sector, some are members of religious orders. More importantly, some among us are administrators and supervisors; others are administered and supervised. This latter differentiation which distinguishes us from many other professional organizations often makes it especially difficult for us to act in concert and at times tends to diminish our appreciation of each other as peers.

Nonetheless, as archivists we are constantly faced with choices and decisions involving a broad range of issues of concern to all of us. A number of these are relatively trivial and mundane; others are paramount in their importance and urgency. While some fall clearly within the archival domain, many tend to reside in the gray area that spans our dual roles as archivists and private citizens.

Let us reconsider just one of those issues, a most controversial one, which I raised earlier. I am speaking here of a matter often and wrongly, in my opinion, counterposed as the "Right to Know" versus the "Right to Privacy." We have, in fact, two issues here, neither of which is exclusive of the other.

As archivists, as the keepers of the records of our nation, should we not have a say about what kinds of records are being kept on private citizens and a say about who has access to them? I think so.

Two specific examples drawn from my own experience as an archivist for the past decade graphically illustrate the point I am attempting to make. About seven years ago, as an archivist on the staff of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, I was assigned the task of processing the papers of Alexander Wiley, a once-prominent member of the U.S. Senate from Wisconsin, who at times chaired both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee. In the course of processing the totally unrestricted Wiley Papers, I came across what
we today describe as "sensitive material." The item in question, a communication from FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to Senator Wiley, dated in the 1950s, questions the "loyalty" of Senator J. William Fulbright. Hoover asks Wiley if he knows of any information which might be of value to Hoover in substantiating Fulbright's alleged disloyalty, and concludes with a request that Wiley keep his eyes and ears open regarding Senator Fulbright's activities, views, and utterances for this purpose.

In the late 1960s when this document was uncovered, most Americans would not have believed that such a communication existed, let alone have accepted the word of a known political activist such as myself that it existed. Since that time, however, the American people have learned that such communications were commonplace, and were, perhaps, the rule rather than the exception. Given the values of that time, however, what were the moral, ethical, and political responsibilities of an archivist faced with the discovery of a communication of this nature and, more importantly, have those responsibilities changed perceptibly in the interim?

Faced with that decision, I concluded that the best course of action would be to bring it to the attention of Senator Fulbright. Accordingly, I made a xerox copy and delivered it directly to the Senator's Washington office. I have no idea what impact it may have had, and, in fact, my action was never acknowledged by the Senator. Nonetheless, I was convinced that I had acted properly as an archivist and a citizen. Since then I have often wondered how many similar communications have been uncovered over the years by archivists and what, if any, action was taken. Were such communications quickly slipped back into folders—out of sight, out of mind? Were they noted on descriptive inventories? Were copies sent to appropriate authorities?

The second example which I wish to relate pertains to the position of the archivist vis-a-vis the larger questions of freedom of information and the right of privacy.

During the zenith of the anti-war movement and other movements for social change in the late
1960s, the University of Wisconsin at Madison was a major center of dissent. Here, the local police department organized a special tactical unit officially known as the "Affinity Squad."

This body was charged with the mandate of infiltrating and spying on a wide variety of groups alleged by local officials to be "subversive." In the course of carrying out its duties, the Affinity Squad compiled files and dossiers on thousands of Madisonians who may have marched in an anti-war demonstration, written protest letters to local newspapers, or participated in other dissent-related activities. Recently under pressure to disclose the extent of the squad's undercover work, the police department released the expurgated contents of some eight thousand pages of Affinity Squad files to the public. Individuals whose names appeared in the files, among them myself, were allowed to obtain copies of material which pertained specifically to them. From these reports I learned that my activist activities had been monitored for at least three years and that I possessed a "suspicious vehicle," although the records clearly state that I had no record with any police or intelligence agency.

I have introduced these two anecdotes to illustrate the general point that archivists as archivists are faced with various choices which we must act upon even though some decisions may entail "bucking the system." I further suggest that we, as archivists, should collectively be concerned about and unalterably opposed to the compilation and maintenance by security agencies of dossiers and files on private citizens who have done no wrong. While I may well be one of the few members of the SAA with such a "documentary record," I am, however, from all published accounts, but one of a million or so other Americans who have had their constitutional rights violated through such abuse of records creating, maintenance, and disposition procedures.

While I am strongly in favor of the SAA going on record in opposition to governmental record-keeping of this nature, I am not counseling individual archivists to violate or disregard any legal restrictions that have been imposed upon collections in their custody. I do, however, urge administrators and donors to minimize access restrictions on records that
are transferred to archives. Most importantly, I would like to encourage archivists in all institutions, particularly those of the National Archives and Records Service to work through appropriate channels for the removal of all unreasonable access limitations to records in their custody. Furthermore, I urge all archivists as private individuals to speak out against the maintenance of secret files on their fellow citizens.

What else does activism mean? It means that we should not tolerate another "Ohio Massacre" among our ranks. No matter how we might agree or disagree on the particular merits of the positions taken by the two sides on the recent Ohio Historical Society situation, I would hope that we can all agree that the methods and procedures utilized by the administration of that institution have nothing in common with fair play and due process and, as such, should be forthrightly condemned.

At the least, the Ohio experience should spark some meaningful exploration of working conditions for archivists. I would hope that the SAA Council will take up the questions of what constitutes fair employment practices in our profession and whether sanctions could ever be a feasible means of redressing grievances should a similar situation occur. In addition, I would encourage those of my colleagues who are not administrators or supervisors to investigate the possibility of organizing unions at their work places. The American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), and the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) have all at times expressed interest in organizing archivists. In Wisconsin, for example, archivists are organized in the AFT, and the arrangement, I understand, has worked out rather well.

What then is activism? Is it not the process by which each individual archivist acts upon his or her convictions, rather than passively acquiescing to whatever real or imagined conditions or set of circumstances conspire to circumscribe our views, our visions, our goals, our aspirations.
If that is what activism is all about, then let us have more of it. Let us incorporate it as an integral component of the archival revolution of our time.
I

In the early years of the nineteenth century the distinguished librarian of the American Antiquarian Society, Christopher Columbus Baldwin, wrote the following commentary in his diary about the Reverend William B. Sprague, one of the earliest and most successful manuscript collectors:

"I am heartily glad he has gone out of New England for he is so much esteemed wherever he goes that people let him into their garrets without any difficulty, and being a Doctor of Divinity, they never think to look under his cloak to see how many precious old papers he bears off with him."

Whether the Reverend Sprague was the first collector to purloin historical documents in this

This paper is an expanded version of a panel discussion on the "Ethics of Collection," presented at the annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists in Washington, D.C., September 30, 1976. It is also the first published work on collecting ethics since David Duniway's "Conflicts in Collecting" appeared in the January, 1961, American Archivist. Dr. Mason is Director of the Archives of Labor History and Urban Affairs and Professor of History at Wayne State University. The Archives of Labor History and Urban Affairs was the recipient of the 1976 SAA Distinguished Service Award. Dr. Mason served as Executive Secretary of the SAA from 1963-1968, and as its President in 1970-1971.
manner, we do not know; but we do have ample evidence that other collectors, including professional archivists, have adopted and mastered the same technique and have even devised and developed more sophisticated and subtle practices which border on the unethical. The proliferation of archival programs since World War II, especially those which specialize in nonpublic records, and those built around subject themes, seems to have encouraged such practices. The extent of competition between such institutions is often directly related to the use of dubious collecting techniques.

In analyzing the problem of the "ethics of collecting" one has a difficult task in locating evidence to determine the nature and extent of such questionable practices. There is a void in archival literature about the topic; indeed, many archivists are reluctant to discuss the problem at professional meetings and conferences. Aside from the normal reluctance of archivists to "air their professional linen" to outsiders, the question of libel often discourages a candid discussion of unethical practices. Thus, the basic source of information available is from personal contacts with other archivists.

As a starting point, it might be profitable to define unethical practices in the area of the acquisition of archival materials, to distinguish such practices from "fair competition," and to recommend possible methods of dealing with the problem.

There is general agreement that the practice of one archivist unjustly, unfairly or inaccurately criticizing the reputation of another archives or archivist, in order to obtain a collection, is unethical. Such criticism might take the form of a remark such as: "It is unfortunate that Archives 'A' is a fire trap" or "does not have safe or secure storage facilities!" A similar remark, to a prospective donor, might be: "You had better have a good memory for you'll never be able to retrieve anything after the staff of Archives 'B' gets through rearranging the collection." Comments relating to the professional competence of other archivists, presented in a variety of ways—some subtle, others outrageous in the extreme—are not uncommon.
Many would argue that such practices are deplorable and self-defeating, whether or not there is any truth to such charges. In the long run, the denigration of other archival institutions can do irreparable damage to the archival profession, and may, in fact, not only hamper one's own efforts to secure a collection, but actually discourage a prospective donor from placing his collection in any archival depository. Fortunately, most archivists, when competing for a collection, present in an honest and straightforward manner the strongest arguments possible for his or her own institution, and refuse to comment upon other institutions. To an intelligent, sophisticated, and discriminating prospective donor, such candor may be the determinant in selecting the archival repository for his or her collection.

The frequency of this practice of downgrading other institutions is hard to document because evidence is often based upon hearsay or secondary testimony. My own experience leads me to believe that the practice is more widespread than most are aware. Incredulously, some archivists, in competition for a prized collection, have put in writing their negative views about other institutions. In the summer of 1975, for example, the president of a major international labor union with whom the Wayne Labor Archives was negotiating for historical records showed me a letter which he had received from a distinguished university. The letter alluded to Wayne State as being an unsuitable depository because it had no storage space for the union's records. This letter was written four months after the Wayne Labor Archives had moved into a new archives building with more than 60 percent of its 50,000 linear feet of storage space still available. Aside from the blatant dishonesty of the statement made in the letter, signed by a responsible university official, the tragedy of the episode lay in the fact that the letter caused the union to delay any action on the preservation of its records. Now, because of the inter-union factionalism which may continue for years, a decision may not be made, and thousands of irreplaceable union records will deteriorate at an accelerated pace.

The practice of "splitting" collections among two or more institutions deserves special attention from the archival profession. In this
context, I am not referring to the decision of a donor to divide his collection into segments and to place each at a different archives, as has been done, for example, by some public officials. Often such action may be feasible and serve to foster scholarship; in other instances, it may be the only choice that a donor has, because of outside pressures of those associated with particular institutions. Thus, for example, a cabinet officer who has served more than one president may be pressured to divide his collection accordingly between two presidential libraries. Although such practices may upset the "purists" in the profession who are wedded to the principles of "provenance" and "sanctity of the original order," it is often beyond their power to change the wishes of a donor.

Quite a different matter, however, is the action of an archivist to solicit a part of a collection when the central body of papers has already been donated to another institution, and especially where such a division would seriously destroy the integrity and value of the total collection. Examples of this practice are not difficult to document. They include the division of papers relating to various aspects of an individual's career; separating out valuable autograph items; and splitting up the "personal" and "public" records of a prominent public figure. The deposit in two archival institutions of the incoming correspondence and outgoing copies of letters of a major nineteenth century business firm brings into clear focus the ultimate absurdity of the practice.

One cannot overstate the practice of an archivist who persuades a donor to remove a collection from one archival institution and place it in another. Fortunately this act is so blatantly unethical that few archivists dare to venture this far in their collecting activities. Yet some seem intrigued by this display of "one-ups-man-ship," if it can be so described. More than twenty institutions solicited the personal and official papers of Walter P. Reuther after his tragic death in May, 1970. This effort might have been viewed as an oversight even though the disposition plans for his papers and those of the United Automobile Workers were widely publicized in professional journals and other literature. Less defensible were the overtures of several
institutions to the family and UAW officials after they had been informed that Wayne State University had already been designated as the official depository. One institution even offered to build a special wing onto an existing library to house the Reuther Papers.

Field staff members of archives dealing with donors and prospective donors can easily stray into the realm of questionable ethics. The very nature and timing of a donor contact can precipitate a sensitive situation. Often an archivist first sees a prospective donor when the latter is grieved over the loss of a spouse, parent, family member or close friend. Indeed, it may be such an event as a death that encourages a surviving relative or friend to dispose of papers of the deceased. Thus, the archivist is often dealing in an emotion-charged atmosphere with a person who might be incapable of making decisions on a fully rational basis. The same situation applies when an elderly person decides to part with papers created over a lifetime and reflecting his or her whole life's activities.

The unscrupulous archivist has a great advantage. He can use pressure or "hard sell" techniques to persuade a possible donor to part with a collection immediately even though the person has not had the time or the proper presence of mind to make an objective decision. Certainly, the archivist should ensure that the prospective donor possesses a knowledge of the contents of the collection that includes an awareness of sensitive, highly personal, or potentially libelous material, information as to the economic value of the material, and some insight regarding the factors to be considered in selecting an archival repository.

Archivists with experience in field work will quickly point out that these circumstances, in which the prospective donor is unaware of the specific contents of a collection or the implications of a gift to a particular institution, are not limited to situations in which the prospective donor is grieving or otherwise emotionally upset. A number of archivists would also argue that it is irrelevant whether or not a donor is fully informed of the contents of a collection. Some believe that there are cases where it is better if the donor does not know
the complete contents. The overriding objective of these archivists is to secure the collection for the depository, where its preservation and proper care will be assured and where it will be made available to the world of scholarship.

This superficial description of archivist-donor relations is open to obvious criticism. There frequently are extenuating circumstances which change or influence the course of the negotiations for a collection. Archivists have often justified their pressure tactics on the basis that if they did not act decisively a donor might later discard or otherwise destroy important items in a collection because of failure to understand their historical value. They have also expressed fears that the ravages of fire or some other disaster might destroy irreplaceable items if they were not transferred to the archives at once. These arguments certainly have merit.

Yet there is a need in archivist-donor relations for candor, honesty, and an abiding concern for the best interests of the donor. It seems to me that an archivist must attempt to reach a balance, as delicate as it may be at times, whereby the interests of the donor and the researcher are given equal consideration. By carefully reviewing with the donor all parts of a collection, the archivist may be taking a chance that the donor may decide to retain or even destroy certain items that have major historical value. In other instances the archivist may be influenced by ethical considerations to recommend the retention or destruction of items of an especially sensitive or personal nature. In other cases he may have to persuade a donor not only to place his materials in an archives but also to make them available to researchers as soon as possible because of the great historical value of the material. It is evident that ethical and moral considerations permeate many aspects of the relationship between the archivist and donor.

Another collecting practice which is well documented in the annals of the archival profession is the offer of special inducements in return for a collection of archival material. The inducement may be an outright cash payment for a collection, a
commitment that the collection will be housed in special quarters named in honor of a donor, or the assurance that a suitable plaque will be prominently displayed in the archives. A device used by educational institutions is the granting of honorary degrees to major donors. One prominent private collector who had amassed a magnificent collection of nineteenth century literary manuscripts received several such honorary degrees, which he readily admitted were given to him in the hope that they would affect his choice of a depository for his papers. Nonetheless, he cherished the honors and proudly displayed them to his colleagues, but ultimately disposed of his collection to a major library not associated with a degree-granting institution.

To many archivists there is nothing inherently unethical about these practices. Others, however, find them deplorable, especially when monetary awards and a sort of competitive bidding system give a few wealthy institutions unfair advantages in acquiring collections.

There is greater consensus about the use of income tax appraisals as they relate to ethical codes of behavior. Even though the Tax Reform Act of 1969 (H.R. 13270) prohibited the deduction for the gift of one's "self-generated" personal or public papers to an archives or library, there are still situations where such gifts are legitimate, and furthermore there is a movement in Congress to amend the present restrictive gift provisions to allow at least partial deduction of the fair market value. Despite what archivists may personally feel about the fairness of the law, as long as it is honestly administered the ethical questions are not germane. The concern of many archivists is that the earlier practices of archives competing for collections by giving donors inflated estimates of the fair market value of collections might be reintroduced. There is an equal concern on the part of many archival and library professionals over the fact that institutions are providing appraisals or paying for appraisals for collections donated to them. Although the Society of American Archivists officially opposes such practices, the profession needs to give this problem much greater attention.
Finally, there is the dubious practice of "borrowing" a collection from a donor, not intending to return it unless forced to do so. Many of the private collectors of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries whose materials now form the nucleus of distinguished libraries and archives perfected this technique. Some archivists have also used it to enlarge the holdings of their institutions. The rationale or justification for this questionable practice has been offered many times. Collectors and archivists maintain that many persons have no understanding of the historical value of their papers, that they are not being properly cared for, and unless immediate action is taken, such irreplaceable papers might be dispersed, or lost forever to scholars. Therefore, by borrowing a collection with the hope that the owner will soon forget it, be discouraged by "stalling" techniques, or perhaps even change his mind and agree to give his papers to the archives, one makes a contribution to the world of scholarship.

The extent of this practice today, both among private collectors and archivists, is difficult to estimate because few would admit being involved. It probably is not widespread, yet it is not an unknown practice. Many archivists candidly admit that they have no acquisition files whatsoever that include deeds of gift, letters of transmittal, or other records documenting how they gained possession of records in their custody. At least one major archival institution in the Midwest is reluctant to publish a guide to its holdings for fear that it might be forced to provide some proof of how it obtained some of its prized collections. These questionable actions and ethical standards of the past have left an unenviable legacy to the present staffs of such institutions.

Another aspect of collecting which warrants scrutiny is the possible problem caused by the archivist who is also a private collector. Many archivists and librarians are attracted to those careers because they are sincerely interested in research, often in a particular subject area, and have become private collectors in that field. It may be literature, or such specific subject areas as the American Revolution, the Civil War, sports, or the history of a particular locale. While such activities often present no problem, there can be a serious conflict
of interest when such private collecting areas coincide with that of the library or archival institution for whom they work. This conflict is especially dangerous if the archivist in question has responsibility for contacts with prospective donors or other archival field work. Should an archives or library hire someone as a field person who is a private collector in an area relating to the scope of the institution? Should an archivist apply for or accept a position where there is the probability of such an overlapping of interests? What rights does an archives have in monitoring such a conflict of interest? Can it force an employee to cease and desist from acquiring material while he or she is an employee of the institution? Several years ago I was asked by a colleague to advise a man who had offered his autograph collection to an archives for a modest sum. The man reported to me that the archivist who met with him to discuss the transaction offered to pay a higher price for certain of the items for his own personal collection. This suggestion dismayed the owner of the collection and raised serious questions about the integrity of the archival profession.

The disposition by an archives of duplicate items, both printed and manuscript, presents a related problem which requires careful consideration, as does an archives' policy toward the disposition of stamps and stampless covers. Should the staff of an archives have "first choice" over such material? Should staff members be prohibited from collecting such items from their institutions? Must not such duplicates or "non-archival" ephemera be destroyed or returned to donors or their descendents? Can such material be offered for public sale to brighten the financial outlook of the depository? The answers to all of these questions have definite ethical implications.

More important than the above cited areas of concern to the archival profession, in my opinion, are collecting practices and policies which cannot be so easily isolated in terms of ethical standards. Yet they have equally profound and significant long-range implications. Two such areas bear careful consideration of the profession.
The first relates to the practice of an archival institution of soliciting and acquiring collections without having either the immediate or long-range resources to properly administer them. This practice is certainly not a phenomenon of recent vintage. One need only review the collecting practices of historical organizations of all varieties during the past century to see the extent of its excesses. Such institutions have openly and actively collected valuable and irreplaceable archival and historical manuscript materials without any regard for the resources required to preserve, process and service them. Some take a gamble that by amassing more accumulations of historical records that their institutions will be able to obtain the necessary resources for facilities, staff and operation.

In this manner hundreds of valuable historical collections, useful to researchers if their location were known, remain lost, often packed away in the crates, trunks, and boxes in which they were shipped, and stored under poor conditions.

One need not look far to see examples of such neglect: historical societies that regard manuscript collecting as a principal function regardless of whether they have suitable space or staff; local public libraries which have served as the "catch-alls" for local records; and colleges and universities whose once ambitious archival programs have been drastically curtailed are legion. In one instance the voluminous files of a recent Republican Senate leader, one of the powerful public officials of the twentieth century, are located in a small Illinois public library that does not even have the staff to unpack them. Some of the valuable files of the American Fur Company are housed in a small public library in northern Michigan, and although they are now stored in suitable quarters, no guide or finding aid describes their location to researchers. Thousands of historical Civil War collections were located in similar institutions during the recent Centennial of the 1960's, where they too are unknown to historians. A small New England junior college has rich and extensive collections of letters of abolitionist leaders in its vault, unknown even to its own faculty.

If such practices were limited to the nineteenth or early twentieth centuries, or to local
historical societies and public libraries, one might take comfort in the thought that the recent growth of an archival profession has curbed this trend. But such is not the case. In fact, the policies of many of our major archival institutions today are equally open to criticism. Well endowed and competently staffed archives have embarked on aggressive collecting campaigns without any regard to the long-range implications of their policies. A number of major archival institutions are already so overcommitted that they can neither properly administer existing archival holdings nor accept additional installments from donors, much less acquire other important and relevant collections. Unfortunately, many of their holdings are of marginal value, a legacy of predecessors who were more anxious to cater to current fads or who were unwilling to be discriminating. The recent development and almost universal acceptance of quick copy machines and the resultant paper explosion have only exacerbated an already critical problem.

One need only review the practice of widespread collecting of the papers of congressmen, senators, and other public officials to see the problems from a different perspective. The extensive duplication between and among such collections, the widespread inclusion of records of marginal value, and the uncritical decision by archivists to give high priority to collecting such papers are clear proof that the archival profession must reconsider its collecting priorities. Thus, the proliferation of current records, the absurdity of the "scarcity theory," and the popular collecting policy of archival institutions bring into focus one of the critical problems of the profession.

In response to such criticisms, many archivists will argue that they must give preference to past and current historical records or that prior commitments by predecessors have restricted their options. Other archivists complain that policy decisions relating to collecting priorities have been taken from their control and assumed by faculty members, alumni, university officials, prominent citizens, boards of trustees, or others who have little knowledge of archival practices or of the long-range problems involved in uncontrolled collecting. There is validity in this explanation, as Kenneth Duckett recently described in his book.1
This trend violates the essence of professionalism, and the definition of archival collecting policies is a job for highly-trained archivists not well intentioned but often uninformed laymen. It is imperative, as a corollary, that the archival profession give the highest priority to establishing appraisal standards and guidelines, and to developing cooperative rather than competitive collecting programs. In summary, the solicitation and acceptance of records which cannot be properly administered and the absence of carefully and realistically conceived collecting policies are practices which may be within the area of unprofessional and unethical conduct.

A second and final issue of ethical concern relates to the relatively recent development of subject-oriented archives which collect on a national basis materials relating to immigrants, labor, social welfare, transportation, literary figures, women, Indians, and psychologists, among others. The collecting scope of presidential libraries and institutions like the Library of Congress and Smithsonian’s Archives of American Art fall into this category. The inevitable conflict arises when these institutions solicit papers which are also of interest to the state and regional institutions which are interested in these same collections because of their research value to the region.

Several questions might serve to clarify this dilemma. Should the papers of a United States cabinet official, who has served a long and distinguished career in a particular region or state, be placed in a presidential library hundreds of miles away? Are the interests of scholarship better served by placing the total collection in the presidential library, in the Library of Congress, or in the individual’s home state archival depository.

The field in which the archives at Wayne State specializes, the American labor movement, touches this dilemma in a slightly different context. Among the unions which have designated Wayne as their official depository are the United Automobile Workers, the American Federation of Teachers, the Newspaper Guild, the Industrial Workers of the World, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, and the United Farm Workers. Each of these
unions has a national headquarters and regional and local offices scattered in all parts of the United States and Canada. The regional and local records have value in understanding the workings of the international union and at the same time have value to archival institutions in the various geographical areas. Should the records of local unions be deposited in the national archival institution in Detroit or should they be placed in a regional agency? The dilemma is not easily resolved. Aside from the fact that the individual union may hold the power of decision, there is always the possibility that the local archival institution does not want the papers of a labor union. Many conservative persons, who frequently populate the governing boards of depositories, might reject such material as being radical or even "un-American."

The Wayne Archives has recently been criticized for "raiding" California with its acquisition of the records of the United Farm Workers. Yet, in the 1960's and for many years afterwards, no archival institution in California was interested in the United Farm Workers or Cesar Chavez, its charismatic leader. In fact, some universities were reluctant to even collect such records for fear of antagonizing their conservative, "agro-business" governing boards. Moreover, since 1967 there have been numerous attempts by hoodlums, competing unions, and growers to burn, destroy, or steal that union's records. In September, 1976, a former Santa Clara deputy sheriff was convicted on eleven counts of grand theft and concealing stolen property for his burglaries of the offices of the United Farm Workers. Fortunately most of the valuable union records had been transferred to Wayne before the thefts and the fire bombings of the union's headquarters. Had not Wayne previously solicited the papers of the United Farm Workers they would have been destroyed and their information lost forever to researchers.

In the past several years a number of California archival institutions have suddenly "discovered" the United Farm Workers and are deeply concerned that an out-of-state institution is the official depository for the union's inactive records. The charges of "raiding" have surfaced since that time, and attempts have been made to persuade the
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Farm Workers to withdraw their records from Wayne State and return them to California.

Did Wayne act unethically in collecting papers in which no local institution had an interest? Is it under an ethical obligation to surrender these papers to a California institution and to discontinue its collection of United Farm Workers materials? I have perhaps exaggerated this argument somewhat because the United Farm Workers have broader interests than merely the workers in California, but it serves to illustrate this dilemma of the national versus the local archives.

Since the subject archives seems to be a well established institution, attention must be given to this problem. There is a need for greater cooperation, including microfilming programs, but there are other areas which merit our attention. The question still must be answered: Are such activities fair competition or unethical behavior?

In the discussion of the "ethics of collecting" the role of competition between archival institutions has been frequently mentioned, often in a perjorative manner. The nature of the topic has inevitably influenced this emphasis. However, the distinction should be clearly drawn between "fair and unfair" competition. There is a place for fair and reasonable competition in archival collecting programs. Archival institutions, like others in our society, tend to become complacent and to rest on their laurels rather than continually follow up leads. In this context, the advice of Jeremy Belknap, founder of the Massachusetts Historical Society, given nearly two centuries ago, still has relevance. He wrote:

"There is nothing like having a good repository and keeping a good look out, not waiting at home for things to fall in the lap, but prowling about like a wolf for the prey, and we intend to be an active, not a passive literary body; not to be waiting like a bed of oysters, for the tide of communication to flow in upon us, but to seek and find, to preserve and communicate literary intelligence especially in the historical way."
In reviewing the topic, "The Ethics of Collecting," archivists may raise the question as to what can be done to curb the obvious immoral and unethical practices which seem to be on the increase. Can the Society of American Archivists provide the leadership in this area and develop and monitor a code of ethics? How can the distinction between fair and unfair competitive, ethical and immoral practices be made? Perhaps the real question is: Can the archival profession afford to postpone action on this problem?

Certainly as a first step the Society of American Archivists, through an existing committee or a special task force, has agreed to investigate the extent of unethical practices within the profession. A carefully documented survey may provide no new insights, but it should indicate the dimensions of unethical practices. Based upon such a study, the Society can prepare and promulgate a Code of Ethics relating to collecting practices. Perhaps it will be similar to the Archivists Code, which was prepared many years ago to define the responsibilities of the archivist. At that point the Society can determine whether it has the authority and resources to enforce such codes of ethical behavior. Whatever the specific outcome of these efforts, the ethics of collecting must be given major and immediate attention by the profession.

NOTE

1 Modern Manuscripts (Nashville, 1975), 56-85.
What role does an archives play in the appraisal of documentary material? Ordinarily, none at all. An archives receives records deemed to be of permanent historical value from the government or other organization of which the archives is a part. The transfer of material from other offices in the organization to the archives is a routine operation from which no one profits financially. The records transferred are owned by the parent body; title may be transferred to the archives, but this legal step is taken for internal reasons. No tax deduction is taken by the office or unit transferring records to the archives.

If an archives becomes involved in appraisals, it means that a decision has been made by those in charge that the archives should accept material created outside the organization of which the archives is a part. Normally this means that the archives is willing to receive private papers of historical value, but the decision to accept materials other than records inevitably means that non-documentary material will be offered and may have to be accepted. It is difficult to refuse to accept the

Mr. Berkeley is curator of manuscripts and university archivist at the University of Virginia. This paper was developed from two talks on appraisals, one to the Society of American Archivists on October 3, 1975, and the other to the South Atlantic Archives and Records Conference on May 6, 1976.
portrait of the creator of an important body of private papers, for instance. If the archives is part of a governmental or private organization containing a museum or art gallery, its difficulty with non-documentary material may be solved. Otherwise, the archives may have to accept memorabilia, tape recordings, motion picture films, prints, photographs, books, medals—the list is endless. Careful consideration must be given to the problems these varying media create in storage facilities, processing, finding aids, and reference service if the archives does not already have materials of these types among its holdings.

The acceptance or solicitation of private papers and their accompanying materials forces an archives to assume a number of obligations to its donors. All donors of private papers should be advised routinely that there is the possibility of a tax deduction of the value of the donated property provided the donation did not consist of private papers created by the donor. By making such information a regular part of discussions with donors, the archives avoids any recriminations from a donor who finds out too late that he could have taken a tax deduction.

In order to ensure that the donor may take a tax deduction, the archives must arrange to qualify with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). A private archives must obtain a charter as a nonprofit organization in the state in which it is located. This charter must include a provision for the effects of the archives to go to another nonprofit organization should it become defunct. Finally, the archives must obtain a letter from the IRS stating that it is qualified as a tax-exempt organization under the IRS code. A governmental archives probably only needs to obtain the letter.

Once the archives has qualified as a proper organization to which tax-deductible gifts may be made, the archivist must familiarize himself with tax deductions and the appraisal of materials for such deductions. One good and quick way is to obtain a copy of an IRS pamphlet entitled "Valuation of Donated Property." In it IRS states:
You are entitled to take a charitable contributions deduction, subject to certain conditions and limitations on your income tax return for genuine gifts of cash or property to . . . qualified organizations. In the case of property other than cash, the amount of the deduction is the fair market value of the property, reduced in some cases by all or part of any appreciation in value. In all cases, the fair market value is the starting point for determining your allowable contribution deduction. \(^1\)

The phrase "fair market value" in the foregoing statement should be noted since all appraisers are employed to determine that value and since the IRS may choose to challenge that value if it does not agree with the figure listed in a tax return.

The IRS definition of "fair market value" is very important:

Fair market value is defined as the price at which the property would change hands between a willing buyer and a willing seller, neither being under any compulsion to buy or sell and both having reasonable knowledge of the relevant facts. \(^2\)

Determination of fair market value of some property is reasonably easy. If you own a 1972 Chevrolet which you wish to donate to a qualified local charity which needs a car to carry on its work, you can obtain the fair market value of that automobile from one of the standard "blue books" available in the used car trade, and widely used by local tax offices in assessing the property tax value of automobiles.

Other types of property such as real estate and manuscripts cause problems because there is no "blue book" to guide one in the determination of their fair market value. The IRS is happiest when one can quote a verifiable selling price for a similar item whose sale took place as close as possible to the date of donation of the property to an archives. Sometimes, in the case of a letter written by a prominent person whose letters frequently appear in the manuscripts market, such a sales record can be found. There may be a dealer's catalog price or an
auction sale record of a letter with similar content by the same author. Aside from all the questions one might have about a dealer's asking price or an auction sale record (Did the letter actually sell for the listed price? Was the auction held the night of a snowstorm? Was the item bid up by two competing collectors?, etc.), in many cases of donated manuscripts, there is no sales record to use as the basis for a claim of the value of the donated property.

Somehow or other, a value must be placed on the property, and this is, of course, where the appraisal comes in. What is an appraisal? Ralph G. Newman, the noted Chicago appraiser, once wrote in an article originally appearing in Manuscripts and later revised and published in the June, 1966, issue of American Heritage:

The word "appraisal" seems to indicate to many not the science of placing a true, current, acceptable value on an object, but part of a complex game of wits whose ultimate object is to confuse, baffle, obfuscate, or outwit one or several exceedingly curious individuals who are in the employ of a branch of the Treasury Department of the federal government.

Most professional appraisers do attempt to place a "true, current, acceptable," or fair market value on the property they appraise though it is rarely a science as it is practiced by most. In some tax cases, those "exceedingly curious individuals" from the Treasury Department have maintained that the procedure was witchcraft, not science!

Fair market value is really what appraisals are all about, and archivists must understand fair market value as defined by the IRS. Karl Ruhe, former chief of the appraisals section of the income tax division of IRS, spoke on the subject of appraisals to the Society of American Archivists in 1966, and his talk was published in the November 14, 1966, issue of the Antiquarian Bookman. In it, Ruhe notes, concerning fair market value, that the government "under Federal Tax laws [is] looking for the price which the property would actually bring if presently offered for sale, with reasonable time for
negotiation." He went on to stress the fact that he had said the word "would" and not "should." The government is aware that there is a difference between the intrinsic and enduring, or research value of property of the type that concerns archivists, but under the law, they cannot consider the latter value. Their only concern is with fair market value.

Ruhe maintains strongly that "fair market value is a constant, not a variable; it does not vary according to whether an estate, condemnation sale or gift is involved. It does not vary according to whether the taxpayer is seeking a charitable contribution, an estate tax value, or just an adequate compensation for property condemned." This position varies considerably from that taken by Kenneth Duckett in his recent book, _Modern Manuscripts._

Duckett states that there are four types of appraisals, each of a different value, that could be placed on the same manuscripts: 1) fair market value; 2) an estate appraisal made on the owner's death (such an appraisal is generally low because it is rarely done by knowledgeable persons; there is a tradition in the courts of accepting such low appraisals; and the circumstances are those of a "forced sale."); 3) an insurance appraisal made to enable the insurer to recover money should the manuscripts be stolen or destroyed (here the value assigned is generally close to or at fair market value. The owner wishes to be compensated for his possible loss, and a professional appraiser is called in much more often.); and 4) a dealer's appraisal (this is, in a sense, not an appraisal at all. Rather, it is an offer to purchase, and, because the dealer must buy the manuscripts much below what he hopes he can sell them for, it is, in effect, a wholesale price).³

Ruhe is theoretically and legally correct in stating that fair market value is a constant, but practically, Duckett is also correct; the value assigned to a property will vary with the circumstances as well as with the competence of the appraiser. Any appraisal other than fair market could be challenged, of course, since all should be at fair market value.

Normally, an institution and its donors are concerned with IRS's definition of fair market value.
and with appraisals made to determine that value. The archivist should remember that IRS does not require a third party appraisal of material worth less than $200. The donor simply lists the value. IRS may challenge the value assigned, and a professional appraisal would be needed to resolve the issue.

For many years in the United States, some institutions routinely prepared appraisals of the value of property donated to them, the theory apparently being that they were the best judges of its value since they wanted it. However, in recent years the IRS has taken a dim view of such practices. So have the American Library Association and the Society of American Archivists, both of which have adopted ethical standards statements decrying this practice. IRS is very suspicious if the institution prepares the appraisal today. Nevertheless, some institutions continue to prepare appraisals, especially of local material for which they feel they can make a strong case that there is no real market other than that generated by their own activity in purchasing such material. Such material is rarely of great value in the national manuscripts market, and IRS may allow such appraisals because of the low values.

IRS does not like institutional appraisals because there is far too much opportunity for collusion between the donor and the institution. Anyone interested in tales of such collusion might consult the Newman article cited above. Today, IRS usually looks to see if the cost of an appraisal is deducted as a miscellaneous expense on the tax return listing a deduction for donated property. If IRS does not see such a deduction, it may audit the return.

Another approach to appraisals still utilized by a number of institutions, including the University of Virginia, does involve the institution's paying for the cost of the appraisal. The value of the potential gift is not discussed with the donor; a prospective donor is told that it may be possible for him to deduct the value of his gift. If he desires an appraisal, he will be furnished a copy of the appraisal report made for the university's internal records. An appraisal report is never given to a donor until the property has been made a gift and the Deed of Gift received. It is made clear to the donor that any use of the appraisal in a tax return must be
his responsibility. All that the donor is assured of, in advance, is that a competent professional appraiser will be employed by the University to do the work. When the appraisal report is sent to the donor, a form letter accompanies it stating the position of the university; because the university owned the material at time of the appraisal, IRS considers the university to be an interested party to the transaction and may check on the circumstances. The letter reminds the donor that the use of the appraisal in the preparation of a tax return is entirely at his risk, and if the appraisal should be challenged, defense of it is entirely up to the donor.

In case the donor prefers to determine the value of his property before he donates it, he may loan it to the university which will process it and assist the donor in arranging for a professional appraisal. The donor may be put in touch with the university's appraiser, or furnished with the list of appraisers prepared by the SAA Committee on the Collecting of Manuscripts and Personal Papers. In addition Ken Duckett lists appraisers in his *Modern Manuscripts*, some of whom do not appear on the SAA list.

In recent years appraisers have been making appraisals of large modern collections by basing their valuation on the cost to an institution of storing the collection, or of reproducing it by electrostatic copying. However, IRS has attacked such bases of evaluation in their recent court challenge of the income tax return of the late Otto Kerner, Jr., then a former governor of Illinois.

Kerner employed Ralph Newman to appraise his papers which had been donated to the Illinois State Historical Library. The decision of the tax court in this case is quite interesting since the IRS successfully challenged Newman's evaluation. Newman followed the usual procedure in dealing with large collections. He estimated the total number of pieces in the collection and reviewed the contents generally. He placed a figure of ten cents as an average minimum value for each piece. To this total he added the value of certain pieces of greater autographic or historical significance, to which specific and higher values were assigned, reaching a grand total of some $73,000. He arrived at his value of ten cents per piece by estimating that this was the cost to the
Illinois State Historical Library of storing the papers, and further, that this was the cost of photocopying each page. He felt that the items had to have a value of at least a dime because the Society had accepted them.

The tax court did not accept his method. "However, even assuming the correctness of petitioner's estimates, petitioner has omitted the critical step. He has not shown that such factors would be considered by a potential purchaser. Reliance on copying and storage costs begs the initial question of whether anyone sufficiently values the collection to pay for the copying of it or to advance funds to purchase and store it." The court noted that the historical value of a collection is "not necessarily indicative of its fair market value." Furthermore, the fact that an Illinois institution had been willing to accept and maintain the collection did not mean that "this institution or any other institution would have also been willing to advance funds to acquire ownership of the collection." For these reasons, the court ruled that Kerner had not established the fair market value of his papers through Newman's approach.

The IRS, in attacking Kerner's $73,000-deduction, employed its own appraiser, Kenneth W. Rendell, to evaluate the collection. Rendell arrived at a figure of about $23,000 as the outside maximum value, and felt strongly that the probable sales figure would have been around $15,000 given the limited market for the 700,000-item collection; the court approved his approach:

In marking his appraisal, Rendell's first step was to determine whether there had been any recent sales of modern gubernatorial papers. He found none. He attempted, as an alternative, to estimate fair market value by defining the contents of the collection, the boundaries of the market . . . and the intensity of demand by customers within the market boundaries. . . . He concluded that the only probable buyers were Illinois institutions interested in the State's politics. . . . He gauged the intensity of market demand by analyzing the quality of the collection from the perspective of a
potential institutional purchaser. . . . [and] concluded that the overall quality of the collection was poor because it did not provide insight into how petitioner created policy or made decisions. The papers failed to convey a feeling of the pulse and energy of petitioner while in office. Instead the collection mainly dealt with the everyday, mundane operations of the state government [and] contained a great amount of unnecessary items. 5

The court accepted Rendell's approach and evaluation. This case puts archivists on notice that the appraisers they employ or with whom they deal must be thoroughly familiar with the latest shifts in IRS winds.

In considering the role of the archives in appraisals, it is interesting to note that the Kerner defense called several archivists from the Illinois State Historical Library to testify in support of Newman's appraisal. This writer was told by Rendell that defending Kerner was difficult because the papers contained a number of series of little or no historical value such as files of fishing license applications.

Manuscript curators and others whose everyday business is the collecting of private papers know that they must accept, from time to time, papers whose research value may not be high. Such donations are taken for various expedient reasons: the donor may be a wealthy person who may have given or be able to give one's institution a handsome gift, or the donor may be an old and close friend of the agency head, or the donor may have other papers of considerable historical value.

The archivist must assume a strong role in negotiating with potential donors over material to be kept in the archives. At the University of Virginia, the Deed of Gift form includes an alternative phrase giving the university the right to destroy, or to return to the donor, any material not wanted. The university has found that most, but unfortunately not all, donors understand this situation because they expect the staff to provide professional advice about the historical value of their papers. The archivists of Illinois State Historical Library would probably
have had an easier time in court if they had been allowed to weed such material as old fishing license applications from Governor Kerner's papers.

The archivist must appraise private papers in the strictest archival sense of the word "appraisal." Once he has done so, he can consider his donor and the situation of the gift, or offer of a gift, before deciding whether to recommend destruction or return to the donor of some or all of the material. He may have to gamble one way or the other; a professional decision is required and can be difficult indeed.

Never should one agree to keep the material, and later weed it out without permission. Nothing will undermine the reputation of a repository with private donors faster than the knowledge that the repository does not keep its word. Part of the problem in the Kerner case was the apparent lack of involvement in the negotiations by the archivists who had to process the papers and service them. Yet they were the ones called upon to assess the historical value to researchers because they then knew the papers better than anyone else. A competent negotiator for a repository must be thoroughly familiar with its role in historical scholarship, be very sensitive to the feelings as well as the needs of donors, and be able to reconcile the two points of view to the benefit of both sides.

Another obligation of an archives which accepts private papers is to process them for research within a reasonable period of time. If an appraisal of the gift is required, the archives must be prepared to make staff time available for the processing of the collection and the preparation of the register in time for the papers to be appraised well before the donor's tax return is due. The archivist should not promise processing schedules which he cannot keep because such failures reflect on the reputation of the archives. Most donors are quite understanding and will accept some delay in processing if informed of the probable schedule from the beginning.

Advising the donor on the legal and tax situation involved in making a gift to the archives should be done only after careful and emphatic
statements that the donor must obtain definitive ad-
vice from his attorney and/or tax accountant. Never-
theless, the archivist should be well-informed in
these areas and be prepared to give his opinion about
possible courses of action.

The archivist should remember that apprais-
als are prepared because a donor wishes to, or must,
use the value of the donated property in preparing a
tax return for some governmental body. The tax prob-
lem is entirely that of the donor and not that of the
archives. A number of libraries and archives refuse
to become involved in appraisals at all. The donor
is told, gently and tactfully, of course, that the
tax problems or possible tax deductions are entirely
his concern and that the archives as a matter of pol-
icy cannot become involved in any way. The archives
will process the papers, prepare the register, and,
if an appraisal is needed, will allow the appraiser
to examine the papers on the premises of the archives.
The archives may assist in locating an appraiser for
the donor by providing a list of names, or may assist
all its donors by arranging that all its donations be
appraised at one time during the year by the same ap-
praiser in order that expenses be shared, and the
cost of appraisals kept as low as possible. The
donor is reminded that appraisal expenses are tax de-
ductible.

Another area for careful consideration by an
archives is the role of its employees as appraisers.
In some cases, staff members of the archives may feel
that their professional experience, knowledge of the
market, work with other appraisers, etc., qualifies
them to appraise materials professionally. The
archives should issue a very clear statement of pol-
icy that all such work must be carried out in the
off-duty hours of the employee, that he may not ap-
praise material after its donation to the archives,
and that he must make it absolutely clear to his cli-
ents that his appraisal reports are in no way en-
dorsed by the archives itself. Should the client
presume otherwise, the archives could be drawn into a
legal challenge of an appraisal report by one of its
employees, or into other problems.

Another problem which may arise for an
archives involves persons who ask it to make an
appraisal of private papers. The recent publicity about the value of personal papers has made the public conscious of the possible value of such papers, and appraisal requests are becoming much more common. At the University of Virginia, archivists are not allowed to make such appraisals as a matter of university policy. However, a file of dealers' prices and auction sales prices on Virginia material is kept at the archives. Catalogs are marked up when they come in, and a clerk types the entries onto cards as time permits. Thus, it is possible to show an enquiring patron some current sales records if the item brought in was written by someone whose manuscripts appear in the market. If the material is not of Virginia interest, the patron may look through recent dealers' catalogs for pertinent records.

Whether an archives should make appraisals for members of the public raises many difficult questions, and the highest authority in the agency will have to decide whether this should be done. The fact that the staff members making the appraisals might be called into court to defend their work should be considered carefully, for the reputation of the archives would be "on the line" in such an instance. Many staff members would not wish to assume duties that might involve them in trials. But an argument undoubtedly can be made that, due to the nature of its work, the archives should be able to provide its public with this service.

An archives which acquires private papers by donation will, sooner or later, be offered material for purchase, and if funds are available, a new set of problems involving appraisals arises. If the material is offered by a dealer, the question is usually one of determining whether the asking price is fair and whether it should be met. Most dealers with established reputations will not negotiate prices for the materials they offer. To do so is not considered "good form." Nevertheless, one might return material noting that it is too expensive for its historical value, expressing an interest if the price were lowered. Small local dealers, on the other hand, can sometimes be argued into lower prices; some even enjoy dickering over the price of material. Because the situation involves two knowledgeable persons, bargain- ing for a lower price is justified.
A different set of circumstances arises when manuscripts which interest the archives are offered by a private individual with no knowledge of the value of the material to be sold. In such cases, it is best to advise the seller to obtain an appraisal and add its cost to the appraised value of the material if the seller does not wish to deduct the cost of the appraisal as a business expense. Of course it would be possible for the archives to take advantage of the ignorance of the seller and obtain the collection for a very low figure. But if the seller later discovers the true value of his material, all sorts of problems can plague the archives, quite aside from the ethical questions such conduct would raise.

The role of an archives in appraising documentary material is a complicated one with many implications, and any archives not now involved should consider carefully the ramifications of its entry into the collecting of private papers which might require appraisals.

NOTES


2 Ibid.

3 Kenneth W. Duckett, Modern Manuscripts (Nashville, Tennessee, 1975), 72-78.

4 "Memorandum Findings of Fact and Opinion," issued by the United States Tax Court in the case of Otto Kerner, Jr., et al., v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Respondent (T.C. Memo. 1976-12; Docket 4686-73), in the possession of the author.

5 Ibid.
Archivists traditionally have been concerned about finding effective means for providing access to archival material. This interest has generated an ever growing body of literature dealing with issues such as the format of guides, systems of indexing, national bibliographic control, and the use of computers to create finding aids. Surprisingly, however, archivists have done very little research on the methods that scholars use to locate relevant archival material, and thus have no gauge of the effectiveness of current finding aids. Since assumptions about research strategies determine the type of finding aids being developed currently, archivists must test those assumptions if they are to create an effective system of national bibliographic control. The purpose of this study, then, is to raise questions about the ways historians—one principal group of archival patrons—use finding aids in their research and to suggest further avenues of inquiry into the problem.

Considering the importance of good finding aids to sound historical research, there ought to exist a considerable body of literature by historians on the subject. Yet, this is not the case. Articles by historians have stressed other points, such as the importance of cooperation between archivists and themselves. The historians frequently relate their own personal experiences, generalizing from them, but...
do not rigorously analyze the ways in which they and their colleagues use finding aids. While personal relationships are important after the scholar has arrived at a research institution, such amenities do not help him locate the repositories where useful materials are housed.

Not all historians have ignored the problem of developing effective guides. Howard Peckham and Frontis Johnston, for instance, have discussed the pros and cons of different systems of indexing, although their comments were based on their own experiences. Walter Rundell's study of the state of the historical profession, based on interviews with numerous historians and graduate students, showed concern for the importance of finding aids by devoting twenty-six pages of text to the subject. The primary thrust of the work, however, aimed at suggestions for improving existing guides such as the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections (NUCMC) and Philip Hamer's A Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States. Rundell did not deal with the problem of discovering the relative effectiveness of various guides. Although the American Historical Association's Joint Committee on Bibliographic Services to History was concerned with the problem of effectiveness, it included all types of bibliographic guides, not merely those for archives. The report of that committee was based on a survey of fifty historians, half of whom specialized in American history, and concluded that historians really do not know what kind of guides they want. The study, only a first step, concluded that little is known about how historians search for materials.

Richard Berner, archivist at the University of Washington, is one of the few authors who has developed a theory on historians' archival research strategies. Berner sought to identify the type of terms historians use in searching for material and concluded in a number of articles that they approach an archival collection with the use of names rather than subject terms. According to Berner, the historian finds all the pertinent names from reading secondary material and therefore is interested only in personal, corporate, and geographical names when using archival guides. Berner argues also that while historians may claim that they use subject terms, they in fact nearly always use names. "By my own
analysis," Berner writes, "more than 90 percent of the approaches are based on the researchers' prior knowledge of personal and organizational names." Berner's theory, though interesting, has several limitations. The basic objection is the lack of empirical evidence. Further, Berner's name approach seems biased in favor of biography, and institutional and traditional political history, while seemingly having limited usefulness for writers of intellectual, social, and economic history who often approach the human past in terms of broad concepts. These scholars are more interested in subjects that transcend individual collections and which are not always directly related to the activities that caused the papers to be created.

Since so little data existed on historians' research habits, a questionnaire was devised to acquire information about two problems. First, how are historians led to sources on the national level; and secondly, are the clues used in the search primarily name identifications, as Berner claims, or subject terms? Only American historians were studied since students of non-American history presumably would rely principally on archives outside of the United States and therefore would use a different set of guides. An attempt was made to send questionnaires to all American historians with doctorates who are presently in departments of history at colleges and universities in the state of Wisconsin. By studying scholars in a limited geographical area, the survey included scholars from all sizes and types of institutions with varying emphases on research. By using college catalogs and Dissertation Abstracts to determine fields of specialization, a list of 123 American historians was compiled. The return rate was quite high, nearly 50 percent (see Table 1). The questionnaire itself sought information on the number of archives visited in the last five years, the use and evaluation of finding aids, and the terms used in searching for archival material.

Upon receipt of completed questionnaires, the author categorized the historians by chronological interest (seventeenth-eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth century) and by field of research (political and nonpolitical). The nonpolitical category was divided further into diplomatic, economic, intellectual, military, and social history. An additional
Table 1

QUESTIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED AND RETURNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distributed</th>
<th>Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin--</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Schools</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total historians</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

category for those whose specialty could not be ascertained completed the listing. These classifications were based upon the research interest indicated on the questionnaire and ranged over all areas of American history, although there was a heavy bias toward political and nineteenth-century history (see Table 2). Each of the three chronological eras, however, was divided evenly between political and non-political historians.

Table 2

FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17th-18th</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N=60 (1 unknown excluded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>*Percentages do not always total 100 because of rounding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The survey provides a rough indicator of the amount of archival research being done by American historians (see Table 3). Each historian was asked a question concerning the number of archival institutions he visited in the last five years. While failing to measure the amount of research, it does reveal a considerable degree of interest. Nearly half of the historians in the sample visited more than five research institutions during the five year period.

Table 3

ARCHIVAL VISITS PER FIVE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Archives Visited</th>
<th>Number of Historians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the basic purposes of the survey was to discover how historians learn of the existence of the documents they need. To resolve this question, the participants were asked to rank six sources in the order of their usefulness. The six were: references in secondary sources, suggestions from colleagues, suggestions from archivists, accession lists in historical journals, NUCMC, and Hamer's Guide. The first three categories represent an informal system of information dissemination, an unorganized and unsystematic means of obtaining knowledge about the location of manuscript collections. The latter three are the core of the national formal system of information dissemination.

Thirty-six of the sixty-one respondents actually gave numerical ratings to the sources, and of these, many found only several of the sources useful. The results showed that the formal system is relatively ineffective in providing information to historians. Historians overwhelmingly indicated that the most useful sources are other historians, either in secondary works or by word of mouth. Of the formal
Table 4

RANKING OF SOURCES--TABULATION I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCMC</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archivists</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Journals</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamer's Guide</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The source rankings were also counted in another way, using the entire sample of sixty-one. This tabulation produced results similar to the smaller sample. Once again, the formal system is ranked at the bottom (see Table 5). Also of interest is that over half of the historians failed to mention Hamer's Guide at all.

Table 5

RANKING OF SOURCES--TABULATION II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of Times Mentioned</th>
<th>Percent of N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Sources</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUCMC</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archivists</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Journals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamer's Guide</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=61
These findings, while tentative, do indicate some trends and suggest areas for further inquiry. First, they call into question the effectiveness of the national level finding aids that are now being used. Since NUCMC and Hamer's Guide are products of the last fifteen years, it is not surprising that word of mouth and the work of other scholars seem to be the most common means of disseminating information. For many years, historians had to depend on the works of their colleagues to find manuscript material. They also relied heavily on studies such as Justin Winsor's Narrative and Critical History of America. Yet NUCMC and Hamer's Guide are not so new to have received such low ratings. If historians lacked knowledge of their existence, then part of the problem may exist in graduate education, with young scholars not being informed about basic bibliographical tools. Such a hypothesis probably would require verification.

While inadequate knowledge of the existence of guides may be part of the problem, the relative usefulness of accession lists in historical journals and Hamer's Guide can also be questioned because of the low ratings that historians gave to them. Both have certain internal limitations due to their formats, with accession lists being the more difficult to handle. These unsystematic lists can be useful only by reading through pages of titles with limited descriptions; and the scholar who uses them will generally find material related to his topic only by chance. Neither do they serve as a convenient permanent source in that it is easier for a scholar to use the index of NUCMC rather than leafing through several years' issues of journals. Editors ought to poll their readers on their use of accession lists and depending on the responses reevaluate the advisability of devoting valuable space for that purpose. Questions also must be raised about Hamer's Guide since so few historians rated it as useful. Due to space limitations, Hamer's descriptions must be brief and cover only a smattering of an institution's holdings. Hence it is of limited utility to most scholars, who seem to be interested in detailed information on specific collections rather than incomplete summaries of the holdings of libraries. If a scholar is interested in a particular collection, he can consult NUCMC; if he is concerned with a particular repository, then he can consult its guide or write to its archivist. If
Hamer's Guide has any utility, it undoubtedly derives from its comprehensive list for the traveling scholar of all archival institutions in an area. It is also a published source for those institutions that do not print guides. However, its low ratings indicate that a format such as that of NUCMC is more useful to historians than a single volume guide.

The questionnaire also attempted to discover the type of terms that historical researchers look for in using guides. Did they primarily use names or subjects in searching the indexes of guides and card catalogs/inventories? In addition they were requested to list the terms most recently used in their research. The purpose was to test Berner's theory that historians nearly exclusively use names in their search of manuscript material instead of subject terms. Many of the historians had severe misgivings over generalizing about the type of terms that they use. Over 20 percent left the item blank or wrote in that they used the two terms equally. Table 6 provides a summary of the responses which indicates that most historians use names the majority of the time.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT--NAME PREFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term Claimed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used in Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Their preference was then compared with the type of terms that they listed. This author classified the terms as either subjects or names. This involved some difficulties, for some terms such as Republican Party or Cherokees could be either subjects or names. The criterion used for classification was if the word was the name of a person, place, or corporate group, it was considered as a name. Thus both Republican
Party and Cherokee Indians were classified as names, while Indians in general or the Mexican War was placed in the subject category. Table 7 shows the actual number of terms listed by each group. The

Table 7

NUMBER OF SUBJECTS AND NAMES LISTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Terms Listed by Group Claiming Primary Use of Names</th>
<th>No. of Terms Listed by Group Claiming Equal Use Subjects</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names 70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects 13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories/Card Catalogs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names 63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects 14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

findings indicate that historians use both names and subjects, even if they claim that they tend to use one more than the other. Names predominated over subjects, suggesting that historians probably do use names more often. Nonetheless, a considerable minority also listed subjects, far too many in fact to claim that historians nearly exclusively use names. Thus to exclude subject terms from guides would cause difficulties for a number of scholars. The results are limited, of course, in only showing how historians believe that they do their research. In reality, they may use a different ratio of names to subjects. The problem is that we have so little hard evidence about historians' research methodologies which underscores even further the need for more investigation into this area. If we are to index guides that will be lasting,
then it is imperative that we learn how historians use them.

This study raises more questions than it answers. For instance why do historians make such heavy use of the professional grapevine rather than formal sources? Is the problem in graduate education or is it something intrinsic in the guides themselves? Why is Hamer's Guide rated so low? Do historians really use subject terms as frequently as they claim they do? What type of indexing will be the most helpful to scholars? All these questions need to be answered. The purpose of a system of formal guides is to rationalize the process of searching for needed archival material, yet evidence indicates that the present system of formal guides is not achieving its goal as well as one could desire. Hopefully this study will be only a beginning of research into this problem, for only when archivists study the research strategies of scholars can effective finding aids at the national level be developed.

NOTES


The ranking of sources was also correlated with type of historian and while the percentage of each group (political vs. nonpolitical) that rated the source as useful varied, the sample was too small to be significant. In general political historians tended to check off all of the sources, while the nonpolitical historians checked off the informal sources and neglected the formal ones. This difference is something that should be reexamined in a larger survey since the variation in the type of sources used indicates that the groups have different archival research strategies or that the indexing of the formal sources is biased toward political historians.
THE APPLICATION OF FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PRIVACY LAWS TO NON-PUBLIC RECORDS

Sam Sizer

Washington State Archivist Sidney F. McAlpin's paper on the conflict of "Privacy vs. Right to Know," read at the 39th Annual Conference of the Society of American Archivists in Philadelphia October 1, 1975, provoked such a lively and interested discussion among those who heard it, especially among the several state archivists in the audience, that the Program Committee for the society's 40th annual meeting decided to schedule a follow-up session for one year later. Apparently, it was a wise decision; of the ten concurrent sessions competing for the attention of the more than 700 archivists present at the Washington meeting on September 28, 1976, the "Privacy and the Right to Know: 1976" session attracted an attendance of some 230 persons.

In the first of two substantive papers presented at this encore session, lawyer and former archivist Mary M. Goggin, speaking from her experience as Chief of the Administrative Law Branch, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, outlined some of the administrative problems faced by a federal executive agency in complying with both the Freedom of Information Act of 1967, and the Privacy Act of 1974, the

Dr. Sizer is Curator of Special Collections at the University of Arkansas. This article was part of a presentation entitled "Privacy and the Right to Know: 1976" given at the Society of American Archivists Annual Meeting held in September, 1976.
restrictive provisions of which are applicable, with certain exemptions, to those records of a federal executive agency which are "maintained in what is referred to as a 'system of records' defined . . . [as] a group of records from which the Government retrieves information pertaining to an individual by a personal identifier."4

McAlpin's new contribution, "A Legislative Update: Privacy and the Right to Know," examined the issues specifically "in terms of privacy and access legislation enacted at the state level."5 Briefly tracing the history of such legislation, he focused on some 120 privacy bills recently introduced in the several state legislatures and commented in particular on several which would have created serious difficulties for the archival programs in their respective states had they become law.6

Neither federal agency official Goggin nor archivist McAlpin dealt explicitly with present problems created for the executive agencies of state government by FOI and privacy acts. However, it is recognized as likely that these problems, as they are encountered to some extent in each of the several states where such laws are operative, would be found to differ little, administratively, from those confronted by HEW and, presumably, other federal executive agencies.

Similarly, neither paper made direct reference to the applicability of either the 1967 or the 1974 act to the National Archives. It may be fairly assumed, though, that the former creates relatively little more difficulty for the Archivist of the United States than the State of Washington's Public Disclosure Act of 1973, as amended,7 does for the Washington State Archivist, for whom privacy legislation is seen to pose, presently or potentially, much the greater problem. Moreover, the new federal privacy law, which became operative on September 27, 1975, has virtually no direct applicability to records in the National Archives, as one section of the act exempts those records from all but a few of its minor provisions.8

Both speakers, federal official Goggin and state official McAlpin, recognized the people's right of freedom of access to public information and to
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reasonable protection against the unwarranted divulgance of personal information preserved in public records, and neither saw any inherent conflict in carefully drawn federal or state laws designed to regulate public agencies in the preservation of those rights. Both emphasized, however, the potential for conflict in carelessly drafted legislation and the resultant difficulties which indiscriminate or too broadly applicable future statutes, federal or state, might pose for governmental administrative agencies and for governmental archival programs.

Explicitly or implicitly examined in these two thoughtful and informative papers, then, were the present and potential situations insofar as existing or prospective FOI and privacy legislation impinges, or might someday impinge, upon two categories of public officials engaged in the management of records: the government administrator responsible for the interim preservation of, and for administrative access to, those current or semi-current public records created or received by his or her own federal or state agency (or "office of origin"), and the government archivist responsible for the permanent preservation of, and research access to, those non-current public records created or received not by his or her own agency, but by other agencies of federal or state government.

Unexamined, however, were the present or potential impact of access and privacy statutes, either federal or state, upon the great many archivists and manuscripts curators in the nation who are responsible for the records of no public agency. These would include those who, employed by such private institutions as the non-tax-supported college or university, ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or business firm, manage the archives of their own institutions, as well as those who, whether employed by a non-public research institution such as the endowed or privately funded research library or historical society, or by the public (i.e., tax-supported) institution such as the state university or the state-franchised historical society, manage not their own institution's archives but the purchased or donated archives of other private institutions (e.g., the labor union) or historical and literary manuscripts collections consisting of the personal papers of individuals.
At present, federal laws have not, with the single exception of the "Buckley Amendment" (the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974) impinged upon the private institution, nor even upon those collections of private papers which are preserved in a state university or other tax-supported institution. Moreover, few state laws have had more than a minimal impact upon these institutions and collections. The notable exception, of course, would be the short-lived effect of the carelessly drawn State of Washington Public Disclosure Act of 1973, which inadvertently failed to exempt (as "records" of state institutions) the manuscripts collections held by the state's tax-supported colleges and universities, thereby voiding contractual donor restrictions on such collections and consequently jeopardizing the entire collecting programs of those academic institutions. Fortunately, the statute was corrected by amendment in 1975, before too much damage had resulted.

Moreover, there would seem to be little danger that any new or future FOI legislation, enacted by Congress or by a state legislature, would be intentionally applicable to the "private sector," as the whole basic premise of such legislation has always been limited to the public's right to know about the public's business as this is reflected in public records created or received by public officials in the course of transacting that business. In any event, even if such legislation were so sweeping as to be applicable in any degree to non-governmental records, it would represent little threat to the non-governmental archivist or curator beyond that posed by the Washington statute of 1973, simply because most archivists for private institutions (excepting, perhaps only those managing commercial or industrial archives) and virtually all curators of historical or literary collections would be found to share government archivist McAlpin's concern for broadening, encouraging, and facilitating, rather than narrowing and discouraging, research access to those parts of their holdings which are not closed by donor imposed restrictions.

Privacy legislation, however, can be a different matter. Even in the present absence of widespread or stringent statutory restrictions on access
to non-governmental records, many archivists and curators responsible for the management of such records may have long ago elected to comply, in effect, with the spirit and intent of privacy laws. Some, for instance, have taken voluntary action, apart from any donor imposed restriction, to close or to limit access to such "systems of records" as the personally identifiable service case files and job application files which are invariably a substantial part of the donated papers of a former congressman.

But voluntary action in a spirit of concern for the legitimate privacy of persons is one thing, while the strict letter of the law is another, and there looms today a real and present danger that ill conceived, overly broad, or thoughtlessly indiscriminate privacy legislation, enacted in the near future, could indeed have consequences which would be even more serious for the private archivist and for the manuscripts curator than for the government archivist. The latter's holdings, after all, do have important administrative, fiscal, and legal, as well as historical, values. Consequently, even if substantial parts of these holdings were to be closed, in the interests of personal privacy, to all but "authorized" agency officials, government archives would still serve an important function. This is far less true, however, of many non-government archives, and especially of collections of private papers, whose uses are more apt to be those of scholarly research. To prohibit access to these records on the part of individual (i.e., not "authorized") researchers would do a great disservice to scholars as well as to the search for historical truth.

Concern for the protection of legitimate personal privacy is, of course, not new. As McAlpin has noted, "Privacy legislation at the state level does predate the Federal Privacy Act of 1974 and . . . the development and expansion of specific exemptions in access statutes represent valid attempts to secure privacy, if only as a secondary and competing interest."11 As pointed out by Goggin, an example of this type of exemption included in a federal statute but typical of many such exclusions found in state codes is that provision in the Freedom of Information Act of 1967 which allows the withholding of records "the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy."12
But popular interest in privacy has increased at an accelerating rate in recent years, much of it encouraged by such public-spirited organizations as Common Cause, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Nader groups, and perhaps more of it spurred, albeit unwittingly, by the F.B.I., the C.I.A., and the Orwellian threat of computer technology. McAlpin has counted 120 privacy bills introduced into state legislatures in the past two years. Most of these (39 were enacted into law and 81 were withdrawn or defeated) were reasonably and carefully drawn, limiting their applicability to consumer credit files, criminal justice files, and medical records; to the security of automated data systems; or to prohibitions on the use of Social Security numbers in file index systems. It is inevitable, though, that within the next few years more broadly comprehensive bills will be considered in the several state legislatures and in the Congress.

Created by the Federal Privacy Act of 1974 is a "Privacy Protection Study Commission" of seven persons appointed by the President or by the Congress, whose mandate is to "make a study of the . . . information systems of governmental . . . and private organizations . . . and to recommend to . . . the Congress the extent . . . to which the requirements and principles of [the Privacy Act of 1974] . . . should be applied to the . . . practices of those organizations by legislation . . ." In addition, the Commission is authorized to draft so-called "model legislation" for use by state and local governments in regulating the "collecting, soliciting, processing" and use of private as well as public information systems. Exempted from the Commission's study are only the "information systems maintained by religious organizations." Obviously, the recommendations of the Commission could have, in the near future, a direct and profound impact on the non-governmental archivist, especially were these recommendations to include an extension of the already accepted "Buckley" principle, presently limited to student records, so that it encompasses a much broader range of records held by those private institutions which receive federal aid.

A second possible source of future difficulty for archivists in the private sector could turn out to be the "Confidentiality-Privacy Study" now being
conducted by the innocuous sounding Commission on
Federal Paperwork, some of whose staff members have
already looked beyond procedures for records manage-
ment in federal agencies and are presently consider-
ing the question of possible Congressional action to
protect personal privacy in non-governmental archival
holdings.

Thirdly, there remains on the horizon the
incipient legislation drafted by Representatives
Goldwater and Koch. Introduced into the 94th Con-
gress January 23, 1975, as H.R. 1984, but not yet
acted on by the House Judiciary Committee's Subcom-
mittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, this in-
congruously numbered bill for a broadly comprehensive
law designed to "protect the constitutional right of
privacy of individuals concerning whom identifiable
information is recorded" would apply its stringent
provisions not only to "any unit of any State or
local government or other jurisdiction," but also to
some private enterprises.

Certainly a strong case can be made, on
philosophical grounds, at least, for the inapplica-
bility of most privacy legislation to purchased or
donated research materials which, created in and by
the private sector, are preserved and used under cir-
cumstances and for purposes greatly different from
those under which and for which the government
agency--or even the university registrar, the credit
bureau, the insurance company, and the medical
clinic--assembles and compiles personal data in the
individually identifiable case files of a records
system. A great deal of personal information may be
contained, for example, in the incoming and outgoing
letters which comprise the correspondence series of a
manuscripts collection, and indexed correspondence
series might even be construed as constituting what
amounts to a "system of records" which enables the
retrieval of "information pertaining to an individual
by a personal identifier." But the information con-
tained in such letters has not been collected or com-
piled without the knowledge of, or against the wishes
of, a third person "data subject." Nor has it been
provided by a correspondent in required exchange for
course or consumer credit, insurance coverage, medi-
cal treatment, grant funds, or a fellowship. Rather,
it is information knowingly given, in the first per-
son, under compulsion of no requirement.
Moreover, in making such a case, it might even be worth considering the degree to which the laws of private property, assuring to owners a reasonable freedom in determining the uses of their properties, might preclude the application of access-restricting privacy laws to purchased or donated materials which have been deeded to a research institution.

In any event, if the interests of a major segment of the archival profession are to be secured against an unreasonable misapplication of law, either through an uninformed legislative intent or through mere legislative carelessness, then some such case will have to be made, as each occasion arises, before the legislative committees of the several state legislatures which may be expected to consider, in the near future, new or broadened statutes designed to protect personal privacy. Some such case probably should be made, before the Privacy Protection Study Commission, which is already holding public hearings around the country. And some such case may have to be made before hearings of the Commission on Federal Paperwork and the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights.

Most importantly, though, such a case will have to be made, in each or all of these instances, by the archivist for the private institution or by the curator of manuscripts collections. It cannot be expected that the administrator of the state or federal executive agency, or the state archivist or the national archivist, can or will argue the case effectively. For the perspectives, the problems, and the concerns of these bureaucratic and archival officials are, as McAlpin and Goggin have demonstrated, quite different from those of the men and women who manage non-government records.


e.g., Wisconsin Assembly Bills 752, 1517 (1971); Minnesota House Bill 387 (1973).


10 McAlpin 1976, p. 6.

Goggin, pp. [3-4]; emphases hers.


Many jokes have been told about the work of committees, including the story of the ill-fated horse who, designed by a committee, emerged as a camel. Inventories and Registers: A Handbook of Techniques and Examples elicits no such derision. The Society of American Archivists Committee on Finding Aids has produced a useful and long-needed compendium of the basic record created by archivists.

A deceptively simple and splendidly organized work, the book sets out to describe present practices in archival description. A brief introduction defines and compares the seven components of the inventory and its manuscript counterpart, the register. There follows a discussion of the purpose, content and format of each component—preface, introduction, biographical sketch/agency history, scope and content note, series description, container listing, index/item listing—and from two to five examples of each. An all-too-brief bibliography is also included.

Although each section was written by a different author, the standardized format, along with careful editing by committee chairmen Frank G. Burke and David B. Gracy II, surmounts the usual unevenness of multi-author works. Some sections, especially those on the biographical sketch and the scope and content note, are stronger than others, but all contribute to an understanding of the process of analytical description. Some curators will find the section on series description disappointing, since no attention is given to the handling of groups arranged chronologically, a practice common for eighteenth and
nineteenth century private papers. And rather more space than necessary seems to have been devoted to container listing.

These are perhaps carping criticisms, but they demonstrate the one weakness of the Handbook. Although based initially on a survey of four hundred institutions during the planning stages of SPINDEX II, the present volume has focused on the problems and procedures at large repositories with large staffs who process large groups of manuscripts. Of the twenty-one models, for example, sixteen are drawn from state and national archives, state universities and state historical societies.

Curators and archivists at smaller repositories will be able to adapt these forms to their own use, editing and abbreviating as necessary. But to do so requires a grasp of the theory of processing and an understanding of the place of the inventory/register in the continuum of finding aids so ably described by Terry Abraham in Georgia Archive, II (Winter, 1974), 20-27. For most curators and archivists, this work is best used in conjunction with the more detailed analyses found in Kenneth Duckett's Modern Manuscripts, T. R. Schellenberg's Modern Archives, and similar longer works.

Frank Burke and his committee are nonetheless to be congratulated for providing archivists with a sound, simple, usable tool which will take its place on the basic reference shelf alongside the Basic Glossary for Archivists, Manuscript Curators and Records Managers, also published by the Society of American Archivists. One looks forward with pleasure to future publications by the Society if they meet the standard established by these two works.

Southern Historical Collection Ellen Barrier Neal
The Atlanta Historical Society celebrated its fiftieth anniversary in 1976 by publishing a guide to its manuscript collections. The Guide, which is a much needed document for researchers whose interest is Atlanta, provides both an entree to 517 of over 800 individual collections and a means of assessing the success of an organization which was founded in 1926 "to promote the preservation of sources of information concerning the history of the City of Atlanta. . . ."

The Guide is divided into two equally important sections: a descriptive inventory of the collections (in alphabetical order by name of principal individual, agency, or association), and an index with headings for "proper names; names of organizations, titles of manuscripts, published works and newspapers; and for subjects." The descriptions of the collections are sufficiently concise to keep the book at 160 pages yet detailed enough to give researchers an adequate assessment of the contents. Each collection has an entry number, a dating of the time period of its papers, and an approximation of its volume, as well as a description which highlights documents and subgroups which the Historical Society staff felt were of the greatest research value. Now researchers can discover whether collections contain one reminiscence written fifty years after an event or a holographic account recorded at the time, printed programs of association meetings or minutes which reveal behind the scenes struggles, newspaper clippings in scrapbooks or correspondence which contains an insider's information.

The Index to the Guide provides an excellent cross-referencing of the listings in the descriptive inventories; there are, for example, thirty-six entries under "Atlanta, Civil War." The main weakness of the Index is its subject classification: its listings are limited and several of those which are included are inadequate. For example, under "Crime," there is no reference to the Fulton County Criminal Court Records which include docket books from 1882 to
1959; and under "Architects," there is no mention of W. H. Parkins, whom the Guide describes as "one of the city's leading architects." On the whole, however, the Guide is a useful research tool which will be supplemented in the future by a guide to the extensive photographic collection of the Society.

The publication of its Guide should have been a time for the Atlanta Historical Society to promulgate its plan for the next fifty years of collection. The progress in the most recent five years has been remarkable: the archives has moved into new and modern facilities of Walter McElreath Hall, the staff has been enlarged, and efforts have been undertaken to attract the personal papers of many prominent Atlantans. Yet the Guide missed an opportunity to lay out the archival plans for the future with a statement of an accessions policy which would seek to correct the weaknesses of the present collection. There are, for example, no papers from Mayors William B. Hartsfield (1937-1962), Ivan Allen, Jr. (1962-1970) or Sam Massell (1970-1974), all of whom have headed city administrations since the founding of the Historical Society. There is also a scarcity of material on blacks in Atlanta, a shortcoming which is the result of the system of segregation which affected all aspects of life in Atlanta. The Historical Society should have announced its intention to strengthen its collection in these and other areas. So too, in addition to its proposed guide to the photographic collection, the Society should have unveiled a plan for providing updates of its holdings in the event that the next hardcover guide must wait until 2026. The Society has been successful in its purpose of "the preservation of sources of information concerning the City of Atlanta"; it can only be hoped that the next fifty years will see a systematic program of collection which makes the organization even more successful.

Georgia State University
Timothy J. Crimmins
It may always remain a paradox that archivists working in the special field of archival information retrieval and archival automation have never spent a great deal of energy communicating the results of their research and experience to fellow-archivists. In such a special world where so many new developments are taking place and tools and techniques are changing so quickly, such communication is vital to everyone involved. It is impossible to expect that a few sessions at annual meetings and the work of a few in committees of the Society of American Archivists and the International Council on Archives can remedy satisfactorily the many information problems which most archivists and archives administrators have been facing when dealing with archival automation.

In publishing SPINDEX II at Cornell University, Hickerson, Winters, and Beale are taking a step in the right direction. Not only do they report on their particular experience with SPINDEX II at Cornell University, but they also examine the system in the broader context of the North American experience in archival automation. After a quick review of a number of attempts and various alternative solutions to applying automation techniques to facilitate the work of the archivist and produce improved finding aids, the authors provide the reader with a short account of the development of SPINDEX II, before specifically dealing with their own experience in using it at Cornell University for the production of detailed finding aids to their collections of University Presidents' papers. This last chapter is especially valuable since it includes a detailed report on the specific system application at Cornell and a discussion of the usefulness of the various program fields for their projects. A fourth chapter entitled "Today and tomorrow" examines the variety of contemporary developments in the field provided by such systems as PARADIGM, NARS A-1, PROSPEC, BRISC and MRMC as well as a different use of SPINDEX II by the South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

Considering the number of existing parallel undertakings, it is quite appropriate to agree with
the authors' plea for more cooperation between institutions sharing a need for automation. As stated in the introduction, such "cooperation" is crucial for the efficient usage of computer assistance.

Given the nature of the publication and the intent of its authors, it seems almost irrelevant to criticize them for not offering lengthier treatment of the many problems they mention without delving into them with more details. The twelve appendices provide the specialist with most of the essential details of the Cornell application, including excerpts from their processing procedures manual, the technical appraisal, and cost data. Although the non-specialist may find the report interesting, it may prove of little practical use; it would have been quite useful to add to the description of concurrent systems a few comments on the negative and positive aspects of each. The authors' refusal to criticize other systems makes the nonspecialist wonder why SPINDEX II was chosen at Cornell University over other systems.

The reader will agree that those points are minor in comparison to the qualities of this overview of SPINDEX II. The publication is well presented in an inexpensive format which, although fragile, no doubt helped keep costs down. It is hoped that this example may be followed by other users of automation techniques in the near future.

Public Archives of Canada

Marcel Caya


Doris Ricker Marston may be an unfamiliar author to archivists and professional historians, but she has been a successful free-lance writer for thirty-five years and has published literally thousands of articles, sketches, short stories, newspaper and magazine features, brochures, and a historical novel for young people. She returned to school midway in her career, long enough to earn a master's degree in history in her native New England. In this
book she addresses those who are interested in writing historical material, but who may get "bogged down in the intricacies of professional research." Her concluding remark in the Introduction, that she hopes a few readers will "learn to write about our precious American heritage with confidence and joy," suggests the level of her intended readership and the obvious verve she brings to the subject.

The Guide is a compendium of suggestions and examples for the novice writer of popular history, covering the selection of a topic, the varieties of research material and places to find it, the use of oral history, audiovisual material, and personal experience. Marston also devotes chapters to the different types of historical writing: features and short articles, poetry and short fiction, biography, nonfiction, local and regional history, and history for young people.

Admittedly a book should not be reviewed for what it is not, but rather for what it is. This book is written for the amateur historian and budding writer who will more probably not be dependent on his published writing for a living but will pursue it as an avocation. For such a person, without a professional background and graduate education, the volume will spark ideas and kindle interest. Yet even so, Marston may not have covered the ground as thoroughly as she should have. The chapter on job opportunities for writers of history seems altogether too optimistic and casual. Federal and state government jobs involving historical writing are not easy to secure, and many of them are now going to unemployed historians with graduate degrees and writing and research experience, not to neophyte writers.

Drawing largely from her personal experience, Marston has occasionally generalized too much or selected her examples too frequently from specialized or local publications unknown or inaccessible to general readers. Lacunae worth noting include her failure to mention the Bettman Archive as a possible source for illustrations in her chapter on "Illustrating Your Work," her oversight, in discussing sources of popular culture and audiovisual material, of the massive collections at the Center for Theater Research housed at the State Historical Society of Georgia.
Wisconsin, and her omission of Hamer's Guide in a section dealing with manuscript collections. The author also mistakenly suggests that state libraries lend directly to the public through the mails, a practice that is far from uniform. Some repositories might challenge her assertion that the Massachusetts Historical Society, next to the Library of Congress, "has the most important collection of American manuscripts...."

It is nevertheless interesting to read the work of someone who after nearly forty years of writing for the public still communicates a contagious enthusiasm for her subject. Any amateur will profit from reading the Guide, especially as a companion to Thomas E. Felt's Researching, Writing, Publishing Local History. There is little, however, that will benefit the trained archivist or historian.

University of Wisconsin
Nicholas C. Burckel
Parkside


JOSEPH HENRY PENDLETON, 1860-1942: REGISTER OF HIS PERSONAL PAPERS. (History and Museums Division, Headquarters, United States Marine Corps, 1975. Pp. 232)

Students of American military history in general and Marine Corps history in particular will be interested in these manuscript registers published by the Corps' History and Museums Division, formerly the Museum Division.

In 1973, the Division produced a register to the papers of General Wilbur Scott Brown. General Brown's papers are housed in fifty-three folders and three packets, are primarily correspondence, memoranda, and speeches describing his service experiences.

Martin K. Gordon, compiler of both registers, lists the key subject areas in the Brown papers as
his service tours in Nicaragua, on board the Pennsylvania, and in Korea; and his ideas and writings on armed forces unification, the cold war, amphibious warfare, artillery doctrinal development, and military schools after World War II.

The most fully developed subjects, however, pertain to Brown's post-World War II activities. From 1946 to 1949 he was both a student and instructor in the Naval Section of the Air Command and Staff School at Maxwell Field, Montgomery, Alabama. He taught amphibious warfare and fire support coordination with air support, two subjects upon which he came to be recognized as a leading authority. This position in America's Air University provided Brown a rare vantage point from which to view the intensive inter-service rivalry of the postwar years. His study of this rivalry led him to advocate the integration—but not the actual unification—of the three military services.

In 1975, the Division, now located in Washington, D.C., published a register to the personal correspondence of General Joseph Henry Pendleton. Though the exchange of letters begins in 1881, the first significant segment concerns Pendleton's service in the Philippines in 1909-1912, and in Nicaragua in 1912. The next notable segment of papers describes his experiences as Commander of the 4th Marines in the Dominican Republic in 1916. The correspondence also documents Pendleton's continuing interest in Dominican developments long after his service there.

The bulk of the Pendleton material, however, pertains to his work with the development of the Base and Recruit Depot at San Diego between 1919 and 1924. It was Pendleton's lobbying efforts in Congress and at Marine Corps Headquarters that made the base—later named for him—a reality. A corollary concern espoused by Pendleton throughout his career, the preservation of the rights of the Marine Corps against what he perceived as Navy neglect and aggression, is particularly articulated in this segment.

Both publications have a foreword, a preface, a table of contents, a table of arrangement, a biographical sketch, a descriptive inventory, a
chronology of the subject's life, and a bibliography of articles and books about the Marine Corps, some written by Brown and Pendleton. The descriptive inventory follows the strict chronological arrangement of the papers, describing—sometimes extensively—many of the individual letters, reports, and other documents.

The many in-depth descriptions of selected documents, which comprise the strongest feature of the registers, do tend to make them selective calendars rather than registers. The chronological arrangement and the length of the descriptive inventories—Brown's covers 89 pages, Pendleton's 224—make an index necessary if subject information is to be found quickly. Unfortunately, neither register is indexed, which constitutes the biggest weakness of both publications. The researcher is told, for instance, that Pendleton corresponded for many years with two other Marine officers and with the revolutionary leader Desiderio Arias about developments in the Dominican Republic. He is further informed that Pendleton was an ardent Single-TAXer and drafted a single-taxation plan for the Dominican Republic. Without an index, however, searching through the collection for such specific information would be painfully slow.

The researcher will also find the registers deficient in two other respects, the first of which is the lack of specific data on volume. The Pendleton register states that the general's papers cover sixty-six years of Marine Corps history in seventy-one folders, but it does not state exactly or even approximately how many leaves, items, or linear feet constitute these seventy-one folders. Folder 2 of the Brown papers, as another example, requires seventeen pages of description, but the reader still does not gain a clear understanding of the volume of documents being described. Both registers would have been improved by the inclusion of either an approximate leaf or item count by folder or a linear measurement by folder or year.

The registers also suffer from a lack of a precise dating methodology. Each register has a set of dates on the cover, but they are the respective birth and death dates of Brown and Pendleton, not the
span dates of the papers. In fact, the chronological scope of the papers can be determined only by checking the tables of arrangement. The number of items within a given time period, a type of information of even more concern to researchers than chronological scope, can be determined only by tedious searching through the descriptive inventories.

Even with the flaws just mentioned, these two registers are solid finding aids, because of their excellent descriptive inventories, their lengthy and well-written biographical sketches, and their extensive bibliographic entries. Both publications should give impetus to the study of America's most glamorous military arm.

Southern Labor Archives

Robert Dinwiddie
** The Office of Development of Memphis State University has published a 1977 calendar which emphasizes important dates in the school's history and is illustrated with photographs, maps, drawings, and other materials from the Mississippi Valley Collection, a special collection of printed and nonprinted materials concerning all phases of life in the lower valley.

** The Atlanta Historical Society has published *Tullie's Receipts*, a selection of nineteenth century recipes, home remedies, and facsimilie of advertisements. This handsome publication is available for only $6.00 from the AHS, 3099 Andrews Dr., Atlanta, Ga. 30305.

** Published by the Secretary of State's office and compiled by Pat Bryant, Deputy Surveyor General, *Entry of Claims for Georgia Landholders, 1733-1755* provides a useful description of property holdings under the "Trustees for Establishing the Colony of Georgia in America."

11th ANNUAL ARCHIVES INSTITUTE. 25 July - 19 August, 1977. General instruction in basic concepts and practices of archival administration; experience in research use, management of traditional and modern documentary materials. Program focuses upon an integrated archives/records management approach to records keeping and features lectures, seminars, and supervised laboratory work. Instructors are experienced archivists and records managers from a variety of institutions. Subjects include appraisal, arrangement, description, reference services, records control and scheduling, preservation techniques, microfilm, manuscripts, educational services, among others. Fee: $528 for those wishing 6 quarter hours graduate credit from Emory University; $175 for non-credit participants. A certificate is awarded to
those who successfully complete the Institute course. Housing is available at a modest rate. For further information write to: Archives Institute, Georgia Department of Archives and History, Atlanta, Georgia 30334.

** The National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials held public meetings in several cities in November and December. Most testimony heard by the Commission favored public ownership of all papers created by the President and his aides. There was more disagreement concerning similar ownership of papers created by members of Congress and Federal judges. Few people expect Congress to pass legislation declaring their papers to be public property.

Many witnesses before the Commission also advocated separating the National Archives from the General Services Administration.

The last public hearings of the Commission were held in Washington, D.C. in January.

** The National Historical Publications and Records Commission and the University of South Carolina will again sponsor a summer Institute on the Editing of Historical Documents. For information regarding application forms, tuition, fees, and grants to enrolled students, write NHPRC, National Archives Building, Washington, D.C. 20408. Application deadline is March 1, 1977.

The Atlanta Public Library is developing CPIS, the Community Participation Information System. The computer list will include professionals, civic, and community organizations in the Metro Atlanta area. A printed copy of the list will be available to be checked out from the Library. To have your organization included contact Mrs. Ollie Davis, Atlanta Public Library, Government Information Department, 126 Carnegie Way, N.W., Atlanta 30303, telephone 688-4636, extension 246.
The National Endowment for the Humanities recently announced that twenty-three institutions had been awarded funds to assist them in making archival and manuscript collections more available to the public. Among them are:

$53,380 to the University of Arizona for the preparation of a guide to the research materials in the Jesuit Historical Institute.

$11,261 to the Georgia Department of Archives and History to support the arrangement and description of the papers of Mary L. Ross, an historian of Spanish colonization in America.

$133,784 to Radcliffe College to support the establishment of an archives of the "Career and Family Patterns of American Women."

$22,000 in grant funds and $44,000 in gifts and matching funds to the Carolina Charter Corporation to provide support to the Colonial Records Project of the North Carolina Division of Archives and History.

$37,000 to Duke University to support the preparation of a new edition of the Guide to the Manuscript Collections in the Duke University Library.

The National Historical Publications and Records Commission recently announced the awarding of grants to twenty-one institutions. Three of them are:

$5,000 to the Connecticut State Library to study early court records, appraise their condition and potential research value, and prepare a program for preserving them and making them available for use.

$9,780 to the Society of Georgia Archivists for the production of a slide-and-tape program to be used by records custodians who
have no professional training and by institutions which have not developed programs to preserve their records of historical value.

$3,600 to Memphis State University as matching funds for the arrangement and description of the West Tennessee Historical Society archives and manuscript collections.

June 1 is the deadline for submission of proposals for consideration in September, 1977.

** The Supreme Court has agreed to hear a plea by Richard Nixon that only he may determine the disposition of White House documents and tape recordings created during his administration. Regardless of the outcome of this new hearing, public access to the material will almost certainly be delayed by another lawsuit challenging the details of the National Archives' proposed program of processing the Nixon papers.

The U.S. Court of Appeals has ruled that no matter what happens to the Nixon materials, those tapes played for the jury that convicted some members of the Nixon staff of conspiracy in the Watergate cover-up are definitely in the public domain. Nixon's lawyers, however, are also expected to appeal this ruling.

** Alexander Hogan, Director of Civil Law for the province of Alberta, Canada, presented a paper on the "Freedom of Access to Government Records," at a recent meeting of the Edmonton Chapter of ARMA. Edited version may be obtained from H. A. Brinton, Madison Building, 9919-105 St., Edmonton, Alberta.

** In a letter signed December 13, 1976, and addressed jointly to Archivist of the United States James B. Rhoads and University of Michigan President Robben W. Fleming, Gerald Ford announced the donation of papers and other historical materials pertaining to his twenty years in public office to the National Archives and Records Service for preservation in Michigan.
very numbers quickly became a security problem. This alarm was partly abated by a crash program to stamp more than 78 cubic feet of the most heavily used material.

The Archives now plans to microfilm the most heavily researched Carter material so that scholars can study Carter's administration of the state government.

** On January 1, 1978, most of the provisions of a new copyright law will take effect. The law, known as Public Law 94-553, creates a single national system of statutory protection of all copyrighted works, published and unpublished; increases the length of a second copyright to forty-seven years; provides for automatic federal copyright protection for unpublished works that are already in existence on January 1, 1978; specifically recognizes the principle of fair use as a limitation on the exclusive rights of copyright owners; and specifies circumstances under which the making or distribution of single copies of works by libraries and archives for noncommercial purposes does not constitute infringement of copyright.

Copies of the new statute may be obtained at no cost by writing to the Copyright Office, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20559.

** On Saturday, September 18, 1976, thirty-five Iowans met to form the Iowa Historical Materials Preservation Society. Toby Fishbein of the Iowa State University Archives was elected president and Audrey M. McVay will edit the newsletter. Membership dues were set at $3.00 for individuals, and $10.00 for benefactors. For information write to: Dorothy Goldizen, Secretary-Treasurer, Route 9, Bloomfield, Iowa 52537. GOOD LUCK to the Iowa Historical Materials Preservation Society.

** The Georgia Folklore Society is sponsoring the Georgia Folk Music Archive Project. The Project hopes to encourage community interest in Georgia's musical heritage, to enhance appreciation of Georgia's folk musicians, and to preserve archival-quality
recordings of all active traditional and ethnic musicians in the state of Georgia. For information write Karen Lane, Coordinator, P. O. Box 54740, Atlanta, Georgia 30308.

A sizable chunk of composer Mack David's charitable deduction of $120,080 has gone with the wind. David, who wrote La Vie En Rose and Tara's Theme for Gone With The Wind, had taken this deduction on music manuscripts and other materials donated to the University of Southern California. A court scaled the deduction down to $78,000.

Dr. George-Anne Willard of the History Department of Georgia State University has been appointed the Georgia Representative of the Membership Committee of the Southern Historical Association for 1977.

Membership in S.H.A. ($10.00 regular, $5.00 for students, $3.00 for retired persons) includes four copies of the Journal of Southern History and a program of the annual meeting.

** For temporary filing of large sheets, Kole Enterprises, Inc., Box 520152, Miami, Florida 33152, offers a 200 lb. test corrugated fiberboard box. Measuring 27" high x 32-1/2" wide and 19" deep, the box has a flip-top lid that holds down to form a solid writing base. Each file includes twelve 24" x 30" folders. Empty, the box weighs 25 pounds and may be moved with die cut carrying handles.

** The Conservation Information Program at the Smithsonian Institution has produced slide and videotape presentations to acquaint museums, organizations, and individuals with a selection of principles currently practiced in the field of museum conservation. Some topics are: The Wet-Cleaning of Antique Cotton, Linen and Wool; The Cleaning of Prints, Drawings and Manuscripts on Paper; Paper Artifacts; and The Nature of Air that Surrounds Museum Objects. There are
seven slide presentations and twenty videotapes. Address correspondence to: Elena Borowski, Conservation Information Program, 2235 Arts and Industries Building, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

In an effort to insure proper documentation of Bicentennial activities, American Revolution Bicentennial Administration head John W. Warner is urging all community Bicentennial committees to consult appropriate institutions for advice and aid regarding selection and retention of their records.

Contact local Bicentennial groups about their records in your area.

An unusual note from Canada: The Historical Research group of the Professional Institute of Public Servants is commencing negotiations for a new contract with the Treasury Board. The HR group comprises archivists at the Public Archives of Canada and research historians, most of whom are at National Historic Sites. Is this a wave of the future?

**CALENDAR OF EVENTS**

**1977-1978**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Association of Historians</td>
<td>Athens - Holiday Inn</td>
<td>April 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of American Historians</td>
<td>Atlanta - Regency and Marriott</td>
<td>April 6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Historical Society</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>April 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>April 29-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of Georgia Archivists</td>
<td>Athens - Russell Library</td>
<td>May 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Georgia Architecture Seminar Tour
For information contact:
Janice Hardy, Director
Architecture Seminars
Georgia College Art Dept.
Milledgeville, Georgia 31061

Southern Historical Association
New Orleans

Georgia Studies Symposium
For information contact:
Professor Nash Boney
Dept. of History
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

** The Library of Congress Information Bulletin, November 19, 1976, contains in an appendix a three-page summary of the major provisions of the Copyright revision bill which President Gerald Ford signed into law on October 19. A brief history of the legislation is given along with the address at which copies of the new statute may be obtained free of charge: Copyright Office, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20559.

** The November, 1976, issue of College and Research Libraries News contains the revised versions of the "Statement on Reproduction of Manuscripts and Archives for Noncommercial Purposes" and the "Statement on Access to Original Research Materials in Libraries, Archives and Manuscript Repositories," both developed by the Committee on Manuscripts Collections of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries. The Society of American Archivists' Committee on Reference and Access Policies prepared a draft statement on "Standards for Access to Research Materials in Archival and Manuscript Repositories" which was published in the July, 1976, issue of The American Archivist. Chairpersons of the SAA and ACRL committees, along with the Association of Research Libraries counterpart committee, will be discussing the possibility of combining the separate access statements into one statement to which all the organizations could subscribe.
The Special Collections Department, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University, has produced a leaflet entitled "Manuscript Sources for Women's History: A Descriptive List of Holdings in the Special Collections Department." A copy may be obtained free of charge by writing to the Department, Atlanta 30322.

** New book of great value to Genealogists and Local Historians: In the Name of God, Amen: Georgia Wills, 1733-1860 by Ted O. Brooke of Marietta. Published 1976 by the author, its 224 pages are an index to the extant wills recorded in Georgia in various places in the courthouses. The author invites additions and corrections and did a marvelous job with this private project, long overdue in Georgia research. Available from the author, 79 Wagonwheel Ct., N.E., Marietta 30067, for $18.

** Historic Preservation Handbook (1976) is now available free from the Department of Natural Resources. This 112 page work is an update of the previous publication with much information about documenting historic structures for the National Register of Historic Places and has an excellent bibliography of books in the preservation and architecture fields. Its subtitle "A guide for volunteers" is its intent, but those further along in the field can learn something as well. Available from DNR, 270 Washington St., S.W., Atlanta 30334.

** Georgia Museums and Historic Sites (1976), a 26 page listing of all museums and historic sites in the state open to the public with some indication of the hours when they are open. It is an invaluable sourcebook for the traveling historian. Available from the Dept. of Natural Resources, 270 Washington St., S.W., Atlanta 30334.

** Are you familiar with the newly developed GRUB, Georgia Review of Unusual Books, by the University of Georgia Libraries, Athens, Georgia? This publication solicits those works that might not be reviewed elsewhere and is available (free?) from the UGA library.
Anyone interested in a list of County Histories of Georgia Counties currently in print or being written should contact Ken Thomas at the Dept. of Natural Resources, 270 Washington St., S.W., Atlanta 30334 (Historic Preservation Section) for one. This list is valuable in helping librarians and special collectionists acquire those volumes related to their region, especially Georgiana.

Is there anyone doing research or that has any collections dealing with Christmas and how it was celebrated in the nineteenth century in Georgia? The Parks and Historic Sites Division, DNR, 270 Washington St., S.W., Atlanta 30334, is interested in this for use at various state parks. Contact Ms. Patti Carter at (404) 656-7092 or the above address.

The Council of the Society of American Archivists at its December meeting formed an ad hoc committee to explore and define ethical guidelines in archives and manuscript collections especially in the areas of collecting, serving patrons and managing records material. The committee will have a twofold mission: 1) to draft a code of ethics to be considered by the profession, and 2) make recommendations to Council on the appropriateness and feasibility of the Society adopting sanctions against unethical actions.
RECENT WRITINGS ON ARCHIVES AND MANUSCRIPTS

The Georgia Folklore Society is now publishing a Newsletter which gives information about their activities as well as the activities of the Folk Music Archive Project. It will be published quarterly and can be obtained by writing the Georgia Folklore Society, P. O. Box 54740, Atlanta, Georgia 30308.

The Public Archives of Canada has published 212 finding aids of the Manuscript and Public Records Divisions on microfiche. "Finding Aids on Microfiche" can be purchased on a subscription basis $98 for series I and II and approximately $50 per year thereafter) or individual finding aids will be available to researchers for 50¢ per fiche on a minimum order of $4.00. Write: Finding Aids on Microfiche, Manuscript Division, Public Archives of Canada, 395 Wellington St., Ottawa, Ontario, K1A ON3.

Peter Robertson, "More Than Meets the Eye," Archivaria, 1 (Summer, 1976), 33-43, considers the photograph as a document.

R. J. Taylor, "Field Appraisal of Manuscript Collections," Archivaria, 1 (Summer, 1976), 44-48, discusses monetary appraisal and suggests they be done only after study of the material under controlled conditions in the archives.

"Protecting Federal Records Centers and Archives From Fire" is a summary report of the General Services Administration Advisory Committee on the Protection of Archives and Records Centers which was appointed after the July, 1973, fire at the Military Personnel Records Center in Overland, Missouri. The full committee report will be available in the spring of 1977 but a single copy of the summary report may be obtained by writing the General Services Administration, Office of Federal Records Centers (NC), Washington, D.C. 20408.

"A Progress Report on the Records Grant Program: The Future Belongs to You!" by Larry J. Hackman, the Deputy Executive Director of the Records Program of the National History Publications and Records Commission, can be found in *The Midwestern Archivist*, 1, No. 2 (1976), 21-27.

A recent work of use to those interested in study of Georgia: *Georgia History: A Bibliography*. Compiled by John Eddins Simpson. (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1976. Preface, introduction. Pp. xvii, 317.) This work concentrates on secondary and edited primary sources and provides a listing of books, pamphlets, periodical articles, theses, and dissertations, arranged partly by chronology and partly by topics. A section on sources for local history is included. The compiler in his introduction points up the existing need for a guide to manuscripts that pertain to Georgia history. $15.

The Southern Historical Collection of the Library of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill announces the publication of *The Southern Historical Collection: Supplementary Guide to Manuscripts, 1970-1975* to complement and update its Guide to Manuscripts issued in 1970. Everard H. Smith III is the editor and preparation of the Guide was made possible by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Individual copies of the Supplementary Guide and Guide are available for $2.50 and $7.00 respectively. The two volumes may be purchased as a set for $9.00. Write: Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Wilson Library 024-A, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514.

S. J. Pomrenze, "The Freedom of Information and the Privacy Acts and the Records Manager--Selected Considerations," *ARMA Records Management Quarterly*, 10 (July, 1976), 5-9, considers important factors to be reviewed by records managers planning records systems.


For archivists considering a media production as a means of reaching a broader audience, the "A-V" column in History News (August, 1976) provides a concise, highly useful comparison and contrast of the different media—sound/slide programs, motion pictures, videotape and multiple-media productions.

Charles G. LaHood, Jr., and Robert C. Sullivan, Reprographic Services in Libraries: Organization and Administration (Chicago: American Library Association, 1976; Library Technology Program Publication Number 19). Designed to assist librarians in initiating a reprographic service for patrons, as well as in organizing, managing, and maintaining existing services. Separate chapters on small, medium and large library programs. Appendices include select list of national and industry photographic standards, and a list of the type of documents that are illegal to reproduce photographically. Pp. 74. Paperback for $4.50. Order from ALA Order Department, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, Illinois 60601.

http://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/georgia_archive/vol5/iss1/14
RECENT ACCESSIONS AND OPENINGS OF GEORGIA RESOURCES

GEORGIA REPOSITORIES

Athens

Richard B. Russell Memorial Library
University of Georgia

In early January the Library opened to researchers sixteen series of the Richard B. Russell Manuscript Collection, 1920s-1971 (1708 linear feet). The collection covers Senator Russell's career from the time he was Speaker of the Georgia House of Representatives until his death in 1971, when he was Speaker Pro Tempore of the U.S. Senate. However, coverage of the years of his service in the Georgia House and as Governor is minimal (one linear foot).

The bulk of the collection is from the Senate office and is subdivided into twenty series, according to the Washington office's filing arrangement. The first sixteen series are open (but with some items restricted); four additional series are closed.

An in-house finding aid, which contains an introduction to the collection, an explanation of Washington office procedure, descriptions of the series, and container lists, is available in the Library.

Atlanta

Atlanta Historical Society

CITY OF ATLANTA: Recorder's Court, Docket books, 1878-80, 2 vols.; Bicentennial Commission, Minutes, correspondence, publicity releases, brochures, examples of sales and promotional items, activities scrapbook, policy files, financial records,
project files, calendar of events, 12 cu. ft.


FULTON COUNTY: Finance Dept., Accounts payable, 1876-1933; receipts journal, 1913-15; treasurer's accounts, 1886-1957; warrant registers, 1919-48; Court of Ordinary treasurer's reports, 1854-75; Inferior Court journal (liquor licenses), 1854-81; general ledger, 1896-99; cash disbursement record, 1878-87; treasurer's report, 1913, 1915-58; journal A/P, 1934-36; war bond purchases, 1943-52; parks revenues, 1938-51; correspondence and subject files of John F. Still, Director of Finance, 1963, 2 cu. ft.; 17 vols.

MILTON COUNTY: Treasurer's receipts and disbursements ledgers, 1884-1931; cash books, 1912-29; voucher register, 1908-12; property tax register, 1905; road tax ledger, 1904-24; Superior Court receipts and record of court orders, 1859-72; Court of Ordinary financial records, 1872-1928; bonded officers, 1928; county surveyor record book, 1882-91; penitentiary records, 1918-22; audit, 1931; 27 vols.

CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH Records, 1858-1967: Minutes of session and registers, index of members, deacons' records, trustees' minutes, Presbyterian Ministers' Assn. minutes; 32 vols.

DAILY INTELLIGENCER, 7 Oct. 1858-31 Dec. 1864 [microfilm copy]

HUGH M. DORSEY, JR., Collection: Scrapbooks containing information on the life of Judge R. T. Dorsey; gubernatorial campaign, 1910-18; term as Governor, 1917-19; family life; political and family matters, 1917-24; 6 vols. 2.5 cu. ft.

ARTHUR C. FORD (1832-1888) Papers, 1860s-1976: Fifth president, Georgia State Dental Society; business papers, 1866-83; family correspondence, 1872-1976; Civil War physical exam results; letter describing Federal raid on Varnell's Station, Ga., 1864; .4 cu. ft.
FRANKLIN M. GARRETT Collection: Compilation of DeKalb County Inferior Court jurors, 1823-47 (99 juries) and 1848-51 (18 juries); Atlanta Bicentennial Commission correspondence file, 1975-76; .8 cu. ft.

PERRY FAMILY Letters, 1854-1897: Madison, Atlanta, and Augusta, Ga.; 111 items (.4 cu. ft.).

Special Collections
Robert W. Woodruff Library
Emory University

BETHESDA ORPHAN ASYLUM (Chatham Co., Ga.)
Records: Diaries of O. W. Burroughs, Director, Bethesda School for Boys, 1915-45; journal of the superintendent, 1871-76; scrapbook of newscuttings, 1923-30; microfilm (1 reel).

ELEONORE RAOUl GREENE Papers, ca. 1870-1940: Raoul family correspondence; materials relating to women's suffrage movement and Atlanta League of Women Voters; papers of Emily Harrison relating to Fernbank Science Center; ca. 50 ms. boxes.

WILLIAM B. HARTSFIELD Papers, addition: Personal business and financial papers and memorabilia; 14 ms. boxes.

MABEL LOEB RIDENOUR Papers, 1925-1967: Papers relating to her advertising business in Atlanta and to other professional and social activities; 4 ms. boxes.

STERNBERGER CO. (Clio, Marlboro Co., S.C.)
Records, 1889-1927: Account books, stock inventories, records of the Clio Ginnery Co., daybooks for general store, records of fertilizer sales and cotton purchases; 100 vols. + 2 ms. boxes.

MAURICE THOMPSON Papers, addition, 1882-1912: Resident of Crawfordsville, Ind.; mainly letters from other writers and literary critics; 111 items.

ALFRED A. WEINSTEIN Papers, 1934-1963: Atlanta physician; papers relating to prison-camp experiences during World War II, and personal and professional papers; ca. 300 items.
GOODRICH COOK WHITE Papers, 1922-1972: Correspondence, reports, minutes, clippings, and other materials relating primarily to his tenure as president of Emory University; 30 ms. boxes.

Manuscript Section
Georgia Department of Archives and History

GREENE COUNTY: Board of Education minutes, 1856-67, 1874, 1876-83, 1900-1950; reports, 1895-96, 1899-1907, including teachers' reports, financial reports, and reports on teachers employed, attendance, school districts, and school censuses; teachers' licenses, 1912-33; cash books, 1899-1902, 1908-14; 11 vols. [to be microfilmed].

ATLANTA PRIMITIVE BAPTIST CHURCH Minutes, 1922-1975: Minutes, financial reports, correspondence, obituaries, lists of members and baptisms; 10 vols. [to be microfilmed].

JAMES S. BALDWIN Day Books, 1889-1897, 1900-1909, 1911-1946: Floyd Co., Ga.; log of daily activities, weather conditions, financial accounts; 9 vols. [to be microfilmed].


CUNNINGHAM-BEAVERS FAMILY Papers, 1826-1895: Fayette and Fulton Cos., Ga.; correspondence, accounts, receipts, misc. documents; 311 items [to be microfilmed].

DOVES CREEK BAPTIST CHURCH (Elbert Co., Ga.) Minutes, 1902-1962: Minutes and Memorials; 2 vols. [to be microfilmed].

GOSHEN BAPTIST CHURCH (Dawson Co., Ga.) Minutes, 1896-1927, 1930-1974: Data on members and church government; 3 vols. [to be microfilmed].

HEPHZIBAH (Richmond Co., Ga.) AGRICULTURE CLUB Records, 1913-1928, 1944-1964, 1975: Also known as Hephzibah Farmers' Club and Hephzibah Agricultural and Agriculture Club; minutes, membership lists, constitution, by-laws; 3 vols. [to be microfilmed].

JOHN M. B. NORWOOD Medical Recipe Book, 1854, 1861: Whitesville, Harris Co., Ga.; doctor's handwritten book of remedies; includes accounts and annotated list of members of Co. E, 20th Georgia Regiment; 1 vol. [to be microfilmed].

Jones Co., Ga. Store Account Book, 1816: Unidentified store; lists customers, purchases, and amounts; 1 vol. [to be microfilmed].

RAILBOW PARK BAPTIST CHURCH (Decatur, Ga.) Minutes, 1970-1975: Minutes, financial reports, by-laws, correspondence, and lists of committees, church officers, new members, and baptisms; 4 vols. [to be microfilmed].


Southern Labor Archives
Georgia State University

ATLANTA PRINTING PRESSMEN AND ASSISTANTS, LOCAL 8, Records, (1911) 1940-1973: Primarily correspondence concerning underwriting contracts, jurisdictional matters, union elections, and training programs; some correspondence with several companies about contract negotiations, job classifications, and grievances; 7865 leaves.

JOSEPH JACOBS Records, 1936-1974: Primarily correspondence and legal documents describing his work for the United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers International Union as both legal counsel and public relations consultant; principally concerns the organization of local unions in Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Georgia; material relating to his legal work for the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, mostly in Florida; 4678 leaves.
CARMEN LUCIA Papers, 1929-1974: Newsclippings and leaflets about her career as an organizer for the United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers International Union in California, Texas, Tennessee, Massachusetts, Virginia, Alabama, Illinois, Connecticut, and Georgia; 1014 leaves. [The Archives also has a recorded interview with Ms. Lucia.]

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, DISTRICT 35, Records, 1941-1974: Correspondence with international headquarters, field representatives, local unions, and companies, principally concerning organizing campaigns, contract negotiations, and strikes; audits, wax recordings of speeches from 1952 convention, films made by USA educational dept.; 3300 leaves.

Note: Inventories to these collections are available in the Archives.

Carrollton

Archives
West Georgia College

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS, WEST GEORGIA COLLEGE CHAPTER, Records, 1965-date: Minutes, correspondence, membership data; 518 items.

EDITH LAFAYE COBB Papers, 1971-1975: Material relating to co-editorship and compilation of Georgia Library Resources (Georgia Library Assn., 1975), including surveys, correspondence, computer cards, notes; 907 items.


W. BENJAMIN KENNEDY Papers, 1969-1974: Draft, manuscripts, notes, maps, and other materials used to prepare Muskets, Cannon Balls, and Bombs (Beehive Press, 1974); 1455 items + 1 reel of microfilm.
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NEW HOPE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST CHURCH Minutes, 1829-1869: Minutes, membership lists, financial data; 1 vol. (200 pp.)

WARD PAFFORD Scrapbooks, 1971: Clippings about his inauguration as president of West Georgia College, letters from friends; 2 vols.

WEST GEORGIA COLLEGE Records: Latin American Studies Program (defunct), Course schedules, correspondence, faculty data, 1966-75, 128 items; Cooperative Program in Elementary Education, Reports, conference data, publications, 1955-58, 23 items; Sand Hill Story Program, Filmstrip (The Sand Hill Story, 1958), testimonials, reports, pictures, projects, outcomes, 1948-60, 8 folders + 1 filmstrip; Office of the Registrar, Student rosters, schedule changes, reports to the Chancellor and the Southern Assn., student geographical and religious data, statistics, charts, correspondence, 1933-76, 2000 items; Library Committee (defunct), Minutes and reports, 1957-73, 92 items.

WHOOPING CREEK PRIMITIVE BAPTIST CHURCH (Carroll Co., Ga.) Records, 1852-1915: Xerox copies of minutes, cemetery plat, membership roll; 186 pp.

OUT-OF-STATE REPOSITORIES

North Carolina

Southern Historical Collection
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

SOUTHERN ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM COLLECTION (#4007), Series A, Bass-DeVries: Interviews with political, business, labor and social leaders, political scientists, and elected officials, conducted by Jack Bass and Walter DeVries in preparation for their book, The Transformation of Southern Politics; tapes and transcripts of interviews with Jimmy Bentley, Norman Bishop, Benjamin Brown, George Busbee, Jimmy Carter, Mike Egan, George Esser, Grace Hamilton, Roy Harris, Booy Hill, Charles Kirbo, John Lewis, Herb Mabry, Edward McIntyre, Reg Murphy, Rita Jackson Samuels, Carl Sanders, Robert Shaw, Andrew Young; tapes only, Julian Bond, Newt Gingrich, Hal Gulliver,
SGA TREASURER’S REPORT

14 January 1977

Balance on hand 1 January 1976 $ 604.63

Income

Memberships $ 612.50
Subscriptions 413.30
Back issues of Georgia Archive sold 118.05
Advertisements 80.00
Reimbursements 39.96

$1,263.81

$1,868.44

Expenses

Printing $ 863.11
Postage 199.61
Copyright 12.00
Miscellaneous (bank charges, reprint fee, entertainment) 66.42

$1,141.14

Balance on hand 1 January 1977 . . . . . . . . $ 727.30
JOIN THE SOCIETY OF GEORGIA ARCHIVISTS

The Society of Georgia Archivists invites all persons interested in the field of archives to join. Annual memberships effective with the 1977 membership year (beginning January 1) are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Type</th>
<th>Subscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>$ 7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>More than $30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Memberships include GEORGIA ARCHIVE, the SGA Newsletter and notice of the quarterly meetings. ALL MEMBERSHIPS ARE TAX DEDUCTIBLE.

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

THE SOCIETY OF GEORGIA ARCHIVISTS

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

NAME ________________________________

ADDRESS ________________________________

CITY __________________________ STATE ______ ZIP ______

POSITION ________________________________

WHAT ASPECTS OF ARCHIVES PARTICULARLY INTEREST YOU? ____________

Mail Application and Remittance to:

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