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PUBLISHER'S NOTE
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Because copublication proved impossible, the executive board and the editor decided to seek the aid of other Southern archival societies in gaining subscribers while still retaining sponsorship. An effort will also be made to recruit editorial board members from other states to build an information network which should increase the scope and audience of the journal. Thus, changing the name to PROVENANCE: Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists reflects these new directions while maintaining our link with the past. The Society of Georgia Archivists thereby continues to make its contribution to the archival profession.
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SGA President 1982
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THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW AND THE INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHT TO BE PRIVATE

Ruth Simmons

"If information is power, its possession should not be monopolized by the state. But the government that gives away information might be taking away another man's privacy. Man can be manipulated by being kept in the dark or by being exhibited in the open. How these two rights are reconciled will be one of the critical constitutional tests of the cybernetic age."

The central archival concern is the preservation of the record and access to that record. If archivists wish to be taken seriously as professionals, they must actively participate in resolving the conflict between the public's right of access to part of that record and the right of the individual to privacy and the protection of confidentiality. Having this in a code of ethics is only a first step. Resolution of this conflict is made necessary by research in current history, the size of twentieth century collections, and the data being collected in state, federal, and private data banks.

The tension between the right of the public to know what the government is doing and the right of the individual to control his public identity is not computer-generated. But the computer's ability to store and retrieve so much information about so many people has increased the potential for governmental abuse. Thus, the development of a conception of privacy to check that potential abuse has advanced in the United States and Western Europe.

It may have been Virginia Stewart who first made the archival profession aware of the rich source of documentation which existed in state agency case files. The major source of documentation of non-elite groups probably exists in governmental case files and data bases. Technically, these data bases can be linked one with
another, creating a wealth of material for social and historical research and also making Harvard law professor Arthur R. Miller's "womb to tomb dossier" a reality. The data bases will not disappear; entitlement programs alone will make this impossible. Therefore, there is a compelling need to ensure the protection of privacy and limited access and control over these files. For, in William O. Douglas's words, "The right to be left alone is indeed the beginning of all freedom." This means freedom from government and researchers alike.

In a paper presented to the Society of American Archivists, Gerald Grob stated, "...the tendency of most scholars has been to make their claim for access take precedence over all other rights, a position that is both irresponsible and dangerous. A system that rests solely on good intentions is, in effect, no system; there are few individuals who would admit to harboring anything but the best of intentions. Consequently, it is imperative that [historians] recognize that the interests of different groups, each with different concerns, must be taken into account."

The problem of access and protection of privacy and confidentiality, as well as the future of the historical record, is compounded by the existence of many state and federal data bases outside of the usual archival holdings. These data bases have remained in the offices of creation because the archives or records centers have not wanted them, or because the creating agencies did not want to give them up. What is of crucial importance here is that scholars have been getting and are likely to continue to get access to these data bases. The desire to protect privacy and confidentiality is one of the motivating factors which encourages the creating offices to keep control of these records. Archivists should begin to think about this problem because it is likely that these records will be kept outside of archives and records centers. Cooperative arrangements must be developed with these creating offices to establish appraisal, description, and access policies, or the central concern for the preservation of the future historical record will be lost. David Flaherty has documented these practices at the federal and international level, and Alice Robbin has
documented these practices in the fifty states. Archivists must not lose the opportunity to help resolve the question of whether there is a point in time when the right to know overcomes the need to protect confidentiality. The time is right to become involved, because the current preoccupation of the privacy debate and the use of government data bases focuses on current access and not on long-term preservation and access. The time is over for ad hoc decisions on access, both for the protection of the repository and for the protection of privacy rights of individuals archivists are ethically and legally bound to uphold.

Each repository should establish formal record-keeping practices, including published access policy and a set of procedures for access to restricted records, and an appeals procedure for access which has been denied. The repository should keep records on who is allowed to use restricted records, and why, and who is denied these records, and why. Archivists must demonstrate fair, rational, and even-handed application of the policy. It is one thing for archivists to be told to change; it is another to be told one is irrational, capricious, and negligent. At the same time, the researcher should be requested to describe his project and state why the need for access to certain confidential records or papers and to be accountable for the use of that information. These procedures are used in repositories across the United States.

Integral to the notion of proper archival management of records, and especially those which require decision making, is the necessity to demonstrate a pattern of practice which shows care and concern. It will be important for the profession to document practice and to share that documentation, for archiving, like the writing of history, is a collective enterprise.

NOTES


Privacy became a public issue during the 1970s to an extent that was unprecedented in American history. In retrospect it now seems inevitable that an information society, with its new-found ability to store, manipulate, link, and retrieve vast quantities of information, would have to contend with abuse of information. Threats to and concerns about privacy predate the computer, of course, but it was the emergence of massive machine-readable data systems that gave rise to the recent wave of legislation, at both the federal and state levels, designed to regulate the collection and use of personal information.

For archivists the concept of confidentiality and restricted access to certain records is not new, but traditionally it applied primarily to government records that were classified for security reasons or to the personal papers of prominent individuals. In both cases the persons or institutions in potential harm by disclosure of information were usually in a position to control the terms on which the records concerning them were released to archival custody. It was not until 1974 that an archivist, Virginia Stewart, addressed in a systematic way the confidentiality problems posed by archival administration of personal case records. In her article she noted the proliferation of such records, particularly in the health and welfare field, and outlined the necessary elements of an archival policy that would address the legal and ethical issues involved.

As Stewart and other commentators on the subject have noted, the responsibility to balance the competing norms of respect for privacy and free access to information in a proper manner takes on special urgency when
the responsibility resides with persons other than those who have a direct personal stake in the matter. The clients on whom sensitive personal information is assembled (with the understanding that it would be treated in a confidential manner) will likely be unaware that the agency executive and the archivist have agreed on a policy that authorizes the transfer of case records to an archives and provides researchers with access to them on the basis of specified conditions.

Relevant archival literature of the past decade is limited to a few articles which have taken their cue from emerging privacy legislation in focusing on public records and on legal issues. As a result, the literature lacks a broad perspective, particularly an ethical one. In order to get beyond the legal issues, it is necessary to analyze the conditions under which the records were created, the purposes for which they were intended, and the assumptions that controlled their development.

This should be a natural approach for archivists. The principle of provenance holds that records are to be viewed in relation to their origins in an organic body or activity. For the most part the application of this principle has been to specific cases, i.e., records emanating from a particular "office of origin" have been preserved as an entity and arranged and described in terms of the activities out of which they emerged. Archivists have, however, generally failed to recognize the utility of applying the same logic to entire categories of records, whether or not they are produced by the same administrative unit. This article, then, analyzes social workers and their attitudes toward case records. For reasons described below, it focuses on the case records of private social agencies although not to the exclusion of social work as practiced in governmental programs.

This is not to argue that archivists should be controlled solely by the values and wishes of the individuals or institutions who created the records. But in the matter of social work case records--and an analogous case could certainly be made for other forms of case files on individuals that developed in comparable circumstances--there are good reasons for coming to terms with those values. The case records are the result of an extremely
self-conscious professional activity. The caseworkers who compiled the information and the executives who administered the records were acutely aware of the same basic issues that confront the archivist at a later stage in the life cycle of the records; and they resolved those issues in a way that, to a greater or lesser extent, they communicated to their clients.

In addition to the logic of deferring to the controlling ethical standards of the social work profession, it should be noted that, as a practical matter, any success in acquiring sets of case records will likely depend on satisfying a social work agency executive that the records' administration in an archival setting will not compromise the ethical standards of the social work profession. Ultimately, the appraisal of the case records of a particular agency—to determine their value and establish an appropriate access policy—will be aided by an understanding of the common external factors that shape all such records.  

The Development of Social Casework

Life's most important truths are usually the simplest. In order to have a case record, there must be a case. That, in turn, requires that an agency or institution define and offer services in terms of individuals or families. Without the assumption that each person and each situation is different, there is no incentive for accumulating more than minimal information. Case work is the specialty within the social work profession that, in contrast to group work and community organization, focuses its efforts on individuals and families. The development of social casework theory and practice provides the key to understanding the records created to document its clients and also the context within which to understand the social workers' attitude toward confidentiality.

Casework had its origins in the private sector, emerging in response to the unsystematic and often politicized outdoor relief—assistance provided to people living in their own homes, outside of institutions—dispensed by public charities. The charity organization movement of the late nineteenth century sought to raise philanthropy to a more efficient and scientific level by eliminating duplication and assistance motivated only by
sentiment. The agents and friendly visitors of a charity organization society (COS) tried to determine that applicants for assistance were deserving and that the help offered was appropriate to the specific need. For all of their moralistic assumptions about worthiness, COS leaders came, in time, to recognize that poverty and dependency resulted from social and economic forces as well as moral weakness.

Mary Richmond's *Social Diagnosis*, published in 1917, represented a major benchmark. Drawing on the experience of COS workers, she assembled the first systematic treatise on how social work should be undertaken. For Richmond, method consisted of defining the situation meticulously so that particular problems could be understood in their proper context. *Social Diagnosis* was essentially a handbook on how to find, weigh, and use all kinds of evidence. It dealt almost exclusively with objective facts and gave little attention to treatment, sharing the widespread assumption of the time that identifying the true nature of a problem would lead logically and directly to its solution.

Although Richmond continued to be viewed as one of its towering figures, social work theory quickly moved beyond her. During the 1920s Freudian and other schools of depth psychology provided caseworkers with a framework within which to understand mental processes and emotions. Adherents to the old school tended to be dismissed as offering amelioration rather than cure because they mistook symptoms for causes. In this heady atmosphere the social worker's role shifted, at least in theory, from one of assembling objective facts about the social environment and interpreting them for the client to one of trying to see things as they appeared to the client. It remains an open question how rapidly theory was translated into practice at the agency level. A recent study of a Chicago agency—the only such study based on extensive analysis of case records over time—concludes that the psychiatric deluge was not felt until the 1940s and that the vast majority of caseworkers continued to follow the strategies laid down by Richmond. 8

The depression of the 1930s required that attention be returned to external conditions as, in the absence of
public relief programs, private social work agencies concentrated on dispensing relief to the unemployed. Once governmental assistance and social insurance programs were established in the New Deal and social programs of the post-World War II era, private agencies were freed to return to casework services, with an emphasis on counseling, relationships, and personality adjustment. Such services attracted a constituency distinctly more middle class than that of the COS days when economic dependency defined most of the cases. Public agencies also began to transcend their original, depression-era function of determining eligibility for financial assistance. The Social Security amendments of 1956 and 1962 redefined public assistance to mean something more than money payments, and thus public agencies moved more into the casework field as well.

This brief review should suggest to archivists that case records are not now, and never were, a uniform and static form of documentation. Over a period of approximately one hundred years, the purposes served by agencies who created them varied, the persons providing the services redefined their roles and their philosophies, and the characteristics of the clientele being served changed. Some agencies do little more than determine eligibility for assistance and thus do not leave a record as intimate and penetrating as those whose contacts with the client are more sustained and intense. A caseworker imbued with Freudian or Rankian insights would seek and record different information than one committed to Richmond's diagnostic approach.

Evolution of Case-Recording Practice

Attitudes toward case records, the purposes they should serve, and the standards that would best meet those objectives evolved in relation to developments in casework methodology. The earliest lists of names and "memoranda of various sorts" gave way to more detailed accounts necessary to distinguish between the "worthy" and "unworthy" poor. As records accumulated, agencies began to observe the emergence of recurring patterns and looked for ways to structure the records accordingly. By 1900 the basic format had been established that has, with relatively minor modifications,
characterized social work case records ever since: a printed face sheet, generally filled out at the initial interview, to present the basic facts to which the social worker would most likely refer; a narrative account added to by the social worker after each contact with the client; an occasional summary account, either when the case was closed or at periodic intervals; correspondence related to the case, usually seeking information about the client from a collateral source; and, sometimes, medical and household budget forms.

What was missing from these early records was any sense of discipline or focused purpose. Richmond recalled the visit in 1896 of Charles Loch, leader of the charity organization movement in Britain: "I saw for the first time a case record--one brought from England--which marched from definite premises to a definite conclusion...[H]e made me see, as I had not seen before, that we had been faithfully recording many aimless visits; that the constructive, purposeful mind was not behind our entries." 11

The 1920s and 1930s represent the high point of enthusiasm for the potential believed to be contained in proper recording, although even then almost every treatise on the subject acknowledged that caseworkers universally regarded it as a necessary evil at best. A consensus had been reached as to the purposes served by case records. 12 The immediate purpose, of course, was to further the effective treatment of the individual client, not only by leaving a record for subsequent workers but also by "establishing the case worker herself in critical thinking." 13

None of the early proponents of recording limited their vision to the interests of the individual client. They went on to laud broader purposes served by recording that helped to justify the time and effort invested. Richmond observed that case records "are not the waste of time that some social workers think them, for we are going to have to depend largely upon the study of full and accurate case records for our own advancement of skill, in the first place, and for the advancement, in the second place, of the body of knowledge that we social workers hold in common." 14 Her
Social Diagnosis was itself based on analysis of case records provided by agencies in five cities. Education of social workers, both in-service training and formal academic instruction, relied heavily on disguised case records. Similarly, case records could provide the basis for effective interpretation of the agency's program to the public on whose support it relied.  

Social workers were not reticent about promoting the value of case records for policy-oriented social research. In the words of one of the early social work texts, "the facts which may be derived from a study of many records constitute an index of general social needs. That is, they are at once data for social research and guides to new legislation."  

Amelia Sears, a Chicago social work administrator and educator, saw as one of the three primary reasons for case recording "to accumulate data concerning poverty, disease, social exploitation and industrial abuse--data that may be effective in securing wider knowledge and hence amelioration of the conditions, social, industrial, and economic, that produce dependency."  

According to Richmond, "Under analysis which is thoroughly competent and careful case records may become the basis of statistical studies or, more often, of social discovery arrived at by nonstatistical methods."

This eagerness to realize the full research potential of case records led on at least two occasions to symposia where social workers and social researchers discussed ways that records could be shaped to enhance their value still further. In neither instance of discussion by major figures did any of the participants question the appropriateness or validity of utilizing such sources or in any way acknowledge the confidentiality of the worker-client relationship as an inhibiting factor. One agency executive argued that "the statistical value of such information as the case worker does secure is enhanced and not decreased because it is an incident and not the direct object of the investigations." Another suggested that an awareness on the social worker's part that her record was intended for a wider audience would have a salutory effect on the quality of the case work itself.
As previously noted, casework theory underwent a major transition during the 1920s and 1930s, and this was reflected in the guidelines for case recording that emerged in the latter part of that period. Gordon Hamilton's *Principles of Social Case Recording*, first published in 1936, reflected the transition to a psychoanalytic orientation. The advice for recording placed far more emphasis on attitudes and perceptions than on objective facts: "Always the person's attitude toward his situation, his emotional involvement, must be considered as part of the situation itself...The task of reproducing and analyzing this dynamic configuration of person-situation is very difficult." 22 Left behind in this transition was the earlier enthusiasm for social research with public policy implications. It was not a matter of declaring case records off limits for researchers; case records continued to serve as a basis for social work theory building, but the new model simply seemed less suited to supporting socio-economic inquiry.

Enthusiasm for recording waned perceptibly during the 1940s and 1950s. Much of this had to do with a recognition of the cost and inefficiency of recording. A study of a Philadelphia family service agency demonstrated that one third of the costs of providing casework service to the client (or 17 percent of the total agency budget) went toward the costs of recording. 23 Conceivably the sheer volume of case records that had accumulated over the years may have helped persuade administrators to seek ways of reducing the rate at which additional records were created. In this atmosphere it was natural to define the purpose of case records more narrowly in terms of serving the individual client. It was at least arguable that the potential for other uses had never been fully realized, at least to the extent that they had been touted by earlier proponents. 24

One way to streamline case records was to stress selectivity and summary recording. What was known as *process recording*, in effect attempting to write down everything from an interview that a tape recorder could have captured, had long been the means by which clients' perceptions and the treatment process had been recorded. This method is now viewed as of value chiefly
to enhance students' learning during their field experience, and even then, it is often supplanted by videotape equipment. Computers and word processors are a part of the contemporary recording scene, employed most often to supplement rather than replace the traditional social record, to amass statistical data for use in research, accountability, budgeting, and other administrative purposes. As such, their presence in social agencies has yet to contribute substantially to the realization of fears about the threat that they pose to personal information privacy.

Confidentiality of Case Records

Two general observations about social workers' attitudes toward confidentiality can be made with assurance: First, they have unfailingly asserted the confidentiality of their relationships with clients and have applied that to information in their case records; and second, they have seldom if ever claimed that the confidentiality was absolute. Within those parameters there has been considerable variation over time in regard to whom access to information should be granted, for what purposes, and under what conditions. Contributing to the complexity of the issue has been the recognition that the social worker's responsibility to the client is, to some degree, balanced against a concurrent obligation to the agency and to society as a whole. It is not possible here to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the evolution of social workers' attitudes toward confidentiality, but the extent to which social workers have been willing to sanction research use of their case records should be noted. This is directly relevant to the archivist's quest for an appropriate access policy.

COS leaders were hardly preoccupied with confidentiality, but it is significant that one of their chief tools was the confidential exchange, a clearinghouse of information intended to prevent applicants from receiving simultaneous assistance from more than one charitable society. Even when the avowed purpose was the negative one of discouraging abuse of charitable endeavors, they preferred to distinguish between the appropriate and inappropriate use of the records. Information in the central exchange was purposely minimal so that the
individual agencies retained control of the more detailed records, and it was released only to accredited inquirers. As case records became more detailed and sensitive, the potential for their misuse increased correspondingly, a development observed by Richmond. As already noted, she placed great value on case records for training social workers and advancing professional knowledge, but she observed that "the problem of reconciling their use with the highest case work ethics has been a puzzling one." The solution of deleting names and identifying information before making records available was impractical, for, she wrote, "We are confronted at the very start by the fact that it is almost impossible to conceal the identity of a social history subject without suppressing essential data." Richmond edited numerous case records that were printed between 1911 and 1918 in Charity Organization Bulletin, a circular that was distributed among charity organization societies with stern admonitions not to let copies fall into unauthorized hands. The disclaimer that appeared on each issue—"printed but not published"—exemplified the ambivalence of social workers toward the dissemination of case record material, even after identities had been concealed.

During the 1920s social work reached the stage of development when a profession aspires to a formal code of ethics. Although a single code endorsed by the entire profession was not to be achieved until 1951, several local chapters of the American Association of Social Workers drafted statements on ethics which provided the basis for discussion. All of them featured a commitment to honoring the client's confidences. Much of this commitment derived from the fear that the client would not readily confide in the social worker if the information volunteered were spread around indiscreetly. There is some basis for believing that disclosure which escaped the client's notice posed less of a problem. A 1929 survey of Chicago social workers showed strong approval (94 yes, 20 no) of newspapers publishing disguised case histories if the client remained unaware of the publicity. There was equally strong disapproval (12 yes, 90 no) for the same scheme if the client knew
and disapproved of the publication. According to the same survey, a majority believed that the social worker's first responsibility was to the community rather than the client. There was almost unanimous agreement that records should be made available for research by social workers, students, and scientific investigators. 31

Up to this point confidentiality had generally implied that social workers were free to share information with third parties for what the worker believed to be valid reasons, but the decision to do so essentially resided with the social worker or agency and there was little that could compel them, legally or professionally, to release information. This attitude began to change in the late 1930s, at least in part because of the emergence of public welfare and economic security programs, which brought with them the first statutory basis for the confidentiality of case records. The Social Security amendment of 1939 made federal grants to state public assistance programs conditional on the provision of safeguards to restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of the program. Veterans Administration (VA) regulations included similar provisions for records maintained by VA social services and medical care services. 32

The trend in casework theory toward client centeredness had, as a corollary, the effect of acknowledging the client's right to a greater degree of control over use of records about him or her. Although no one yet seriously considered granting clients access to their own records, they were recognized to be entitled to know about and consent, at least in general, to reports about them being sought or shared. It was in this context that social service exchanges (the successors to the confidential exchange) came under attack in the 1950s for facilitating the exchange of information in a way that was no longer widely accepted.33

At this point, then, social welfare organizations began to develop comprehensive policy statements on confidentiality, again reflecting the increased attention the subject was receiving. One of the first and most extensive of these, "Confidentiality in Social Services to
Individuals," prepared by a committee of the National Social Welfare Assembly (NSWA) in 1958, attempted to interpret and apply the *sacrosanct principle* in a way that responded to the public perception that social workers were using it as a shield to keep the public from knowing what social agencies really do. In a sense, it anticipated the conflicting values that would emerge later with the passage of freedom of information and privacy legislation. The NSWA statement argued that the way to "promote trust on the part of the client" was "by holding the agency to a disciplined seeking and constructive use of information on his behalf." This meant that information added to the record should be more rigorously evaluated in terms of its relevance and whether it served the client's best interest. It identified situations where the client's explicit consent was required to share information, suggesting that "when information goes beyond representatives of professions bound by ethics or policies requiring the protection of confidentiality, the client's consent is required." It acknowledged that research often must have access to original material. "Undisguised case records may be made available for studies and research activities which seek to advance social work objectives if they are carried out under direction that assures protection of case information." \(^3\)\(^4\)

And then came the computer. Profound and widespread concern over the threat to informational privacy posed by electronic data systems has given rise to new standards and regulations, and these have been applied to social work case records well beyond, or in advance of, the extent to which they have actually been converted to machine-readable form. A Department of Health, Education, and Welfare committee recommended the establishment of standards for record-keeping practice appropriate to the computer era and saw most of them enacted by Congress in the Federal Privacy Act of 1974. Although the provisions of the act apply to the record-keeping practices of the federal government (and, in general, corresponding state laws apply to state agencies), private social agencies were quick to anticipate the need to bring their practices into substantial
compliance, even before the U.S. Privacy Study Commission intimated as much.  

Some of the principles of the Federal Privacy Act were not new to social agencies. The idea of limiting the collection of data to what was necessary, of limiting disclosure of information to third parties, and of the subject's right to know of the existence of data files were already part of recommended policy if not necessarily practiced by every agency. Unquestionably, the most profound change for social agencies was that of granting subjects access to records about them. There is some evidence to suggest that this has had the effect of limiting the information contained in the file and, therefore, the very utility of the record. Another innovation whose origins can be attributed to the law is the area of records retention. Not before the 1970s was explicit reference made to the need for a policy to dispose of records within a given time after the case is closed or discontinued. None of the statements offered by national social work organizations attempts to specify the length of time, and some of them acknowledge the possible exception of cases to be preserved for teaching or research purposes.

The recent policy statements offer less support for research use of case records than was true in the past. Some statements omit any reference to research while others acknowledge its importance but attach more provisions and restrictions than previously. The "Position Paper on Confidentiality" of the Family Service Association of America (historically one of the most important organizations in the casework field) observes that records can provide understanding of clients' problems, agency services, and gaps in service but goes on to emphasize the client's right to prevent the use of his or her records for research and to require the client's express permission when the possibility of identification exists. A similar statement by the National Assembly for Social Policy and Development recommends that identifiable personal information is not needed for research and should be deleted from records used for that purpose. One senses that the tightened restrictions on research result not so much from actual abuses by
researchers as from a weakened sense of the records' research potential—a sort of atrophy. Given the overall trend toward greater limitations, there has been little incentive to maintain a notable exception for research. 

Implications for Archivists and Archival Research

Archivists in recent years have generally, if uncritically, accepted the idea that case records represent a potentially valuable source of information on an otherwise underdocumented segment of the population, although problems associated with bulk and confidentiality have limited archival acquisition of such records. For example, according to a 1977 survey of state archivists, 76 percent of them perceived public welfare records as having value but only 15 percent had accessioned any. Roy Turnbaugh and John Daly of the Illinois State Archives have registered a dissenting view, noting that the case files of the Illinois Department of Public Aid comprise little more than a proliferation of forms required to certify eligibility, that they "do little to document the lives of the twentieth century poor," and that tabular and statistical reports generated by the department present the same information more concisely. It may well be possible to accept the validity of the latter point of view without discrediting the former. As has already been noted, an agency whose role is confined to determining eligibility for assistance will provide records distinctly different from one engaged in more intensive casework.

The value of case records for historical researchers should derive from the social workers' determination to differentiate one individual's circumstances from the next. They should be valuable for precisely the same reason that Richmond found them so difficult to disguise: the volume and complexity of information on a unique interplay of circumstances, events, and persons literally defined each individual or family to a degree that eliminating or changing the names could not disguise. They also are unique in that in many cases they afford a continuous record over an extended period of time in contrast to the static census portraits at ten-year intervals. The individuality of the records poses a challenge as well as an opportunity to researchers. At
least two analysts have noted that case records do not lend themselves to quantitative statistical analysis as readily as do, for example, census manuscripts. The population recorded is not nearly as broad, the arrangement not as systematic, the frequency and duration of contacts between agency and client more unpredictable, and the information recorded more varied in form and content. All of this may discourage some research use in that full exploitation of the intricacy and intimacy of the information will often require that the researcher take into account the selectivity and biases of the case-workers who created the records.

The range of research that could be expected in an archival setting would be wider than that assumed by the social work profession in its internal considerations of confidentiality and access. Added to the studies of the helping process—analyses of agencies, services, and client populations—will be research projects that exploit the informational rather than evidential values of the records, seeking a way of documenting the lives of ordinary people with no particular emphasis on their status as clients of social agencies. The published results of most of this inquiry should not threaten the privacy of individuals because the focus is on patterns and aggregates.

A policy to govern access to case records held in an archives, such as the policy developed by the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, is already employed in various places. Typically, it requires that the researcher identify himself and demonstrate the legitimacy of his research interest and agree to refrain from disclosing the identity of persons named in the records in note taking, conversation, or eventual publication. The researcher may be required to "indemnify and hold harmless" the archives and its parent institution against any loss or damages arising out of use of the records. In some instances, permission to use case records requires the consent of a representative of the agency from which they were obtained. Such requirements are obviously not a foolproof guarantee that once access is granted the privilege will not be abused, whether maliciously or inadvertently, but they do serve as a deterrent to
misuse and as an educational tool to convey to researchers the importance of respect for privacy.

The requirement that researchers make no notation of names appearing in the case records guards against certain types of disclosure and could conceivably prevent a researcher from being compelled by subpoena to testify in relation to information contained in a case record. At the same time, though, it prevents the researcher from linking information found in the case record with additional information contained elsewhere. Linkage of data stored in contemporary files is, of course, one of the chief concerns in the debate over information privacy of recent years. The implications of linkage and its prohibition for historical research in archival records needs more investigation.

Use of case records by genealogists and family historians poses a different set of issues. Such individuals want information about a particular person or family. Often they come, in effect, as representatives or agents of the person on whom the files was created, although there could be intrafamily disputes about who represents whom. They should be required to attest to their relationship to the subject of the record before being permitted access. The problem then becomes a practical one of identifying the file they are entitled to see in order to preserve the confidentiality of surrounding files. Most agencies maintain their case records roughly in chronological order according to the date the case was opened. A separate alphabetical list—either a card file or a bound register—serves as a cross-reference to name access. Because of the complexity of name changes and variant spellings, this finding aid will be limited—if it has been preserved at all. Adult adoptees seeking information about their biological parents present issues similar to those posed by genealogists, complicated by their legal rights to see such records as defined by the particular state.

The effect of the passage of time on the confidential nature of personal information is a profound issue that requires more consideration than it has received. The social work profession, with its concern for current needs and active records, has had no reason to address
it. Indeed, from its perspective many potential problems, including storage, can be eliminated by identifying the interval at which current needs are exhausted and records can be responsibly destroyed. Those involved in creating privacy legislation generally have not addressed the issue either, although the Federal Privacy Act of 1974 does create an exception to some of the limitations on disclosure for records transferred to the National Archives. 48

There is obviously precedent for preventing access to records for a period of time. Personal papers of notable figures are often accepted with the understanding that all or parts of them will be opened only at, or some specified time after, the individual's death. Census records in the custody of the National Archives become available after seventy-two years, a figure arrived at with reference to actuarial tables. In Canada a policy is emerging of closing case records until ninety years after the birth of the youngest child documented in the record. 49 All of this has developed on a case-by-case basis, although precedents are taken into account in establishing a policy for a new collection. The Society of American Archivists code of ethics and its standards for access recognize the need to protect the privacy of individuals, "particularly those who had no voice in the disposition of the materials" (code of ethics), but provide no guidelines more specific than "reasonable restrictions" and "limited duration." 50

The international archival community has attempted to develop some more specific standards. The 1968 Madrid Congress of the International Council on Archives (ICA) urged a closed period of no longer than thirty years for both public and private papers. The ICA/UNESCO Draft Model Law on Archives, published in 1972, permits no period of closure longer than fifty years for any type of archival records and provides that any records, public or private, older than forty years may be designated a cultural asset and appropriated by an archives. 51 Given the value that American society attaches to personal privacy, it is inconceivable that such standards will be enacted legislatively or adhered to voluntarily by records creators in the
foreseeable future. The underlying premise that preservation of and access to broad categories of records should be addressed systematically is, however, worth pursuing.

The case has been made previously that archivists must play a more active role in determining the destiny of sensitive records by helping shape privacy legislation. That strategy will be incomplete unless accompanied by a parallel activism directed toward the profession that creates and controls the records. Refusal to transfer inactive case records to archives and provide for their preservation is always a "solution" to the problems raised by their confidentiality, and, absent a case for their enduring value, it is a logical one. Archivists, with the help of researchers, are in the best position to make the case that with the passage of time the balance between the competing values of individual privacy and free access to information for societal understanding and enrichment is altered. They will also need to demonstrate a willingness and ability to adhere to and enforce explicit ethical guidelines on information use.

Based on the foregoing analysis of social work ethical standards in regard to confidentiality, it would appear that, given adequate procedural safeguards, case records could be placed in an archival setting in a manner consistent with the longstanding tradition of viewing the records as appropriate for research use. Doing so would not be inconsistent with the provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974, the federal legislation that serves as the standard. There are unresolved problems, to be sure. A strict interpretation of requiring express consent of all data subjects, for example, would obviously paralyze historical research, but policies to overcome this difficulty in a responsible fashion have already been recommended. To the extent that social workers have acknowledged research use as a legitimate basis for access to their case records, they think in terms of applied research. The idea of opening the records for the wider range of historical research, not necessarily tied to the aim of improving the delivery of services, might meet some initial resistance.

Ideally the approach to the social work profession
should proceed at two levels. It should be directed toward the national associations who develop the statements of standards for member agencies and individual professionals. This, in turn, could provide a basis for negotiations between local archival and social work agencies in regard to specific sets of case records. Such interaction among archivists, researchers, and social workers, should result not only in the transfer of particular sets of records but also in greater mutual understanding of each other's values and objectives, to the benefit of all parties.
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SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS: APPRAISAL OF STATE AND LOCAL RECORDS*

David Levine

Archivists have for many years expressed concern about appraising records that may be duplicated, in one form or another, at more than one level of government. To illustrate some of these problems and concerns, social service records were selected as the focus of this article, although the topic could just as easily have been labor records, highway records, or the records of any other function under the jurisdiction of more than one level of government. This analysis will answer two questions central to the appraisal of social service case files. First, is the information contained in case files statistically summarized elsewhere, either in state or local welfare department records? Second, if so, are there other valid reasons for preserving the case files?

The professional literature has little to offer the archivist facing the task of appraising social service records. Eight articles in the American Archivist published between 1960 and 1980 present only platitudes on the value of social service records, especially case files. Some of the articles suggest that, primarily because of confidentiality considerations, case files ought not to be preserved and provide sample retention periods. To the contrary, others assert, while confidentiality is indeed a problem, it can be overcome and, in and of itself, is not a reason to dispose of these historically valuable records. But none of these articles explains how to go about appraising the files, nor do they examine the relationship between the case files and related records created at the same or other levels of government.¹

Without guidance from the literature, archivists should begin by asking certain questions. First, should social service activities be documented? Given the extent
of social service programs in twentieth century society, no one would argue that preserving documentation of them is in any way inappropriate. If archivists agree that preserving records to allow for a full understanding of twentieth century society is an important goal, then we have no choice but to retain records of programs sanctioned by society, including those providing services to the needy. Were archivists to ignore these programs, they would be guilty of neglecting their professional responsibilities.

After dispensing with the question of whether or not to preserve, there is the more difficult question of specifically what to preserve. The best way to answer this is to analyze the available documentation, determine what information it contains, and establish relationships among the different records. In Ohio, where the welfare system is run directly by each of the eighty-eight counties under direction from and accountable to the state Department of Public Welfare, the scope of social service records is quite large. Based on inventories conducted between 1969 and 1977, there were in 1980 approximately fifty thousand cubic feet of case files. This figure does not include case files generated by county or state residential institutions or case files to be generated in the future.

These files document the bulk of the work of Ohio's social service agencies, and they provide a tremendous amount of information about the lives of the recipients of social services. Furthermore, there are not only case files to analyze, but the administrative record series created in the course of conducting the agencies' work as well. The scope of social service records is not only large, but diverse. The task of the archivist is to select from this mass of records those necessary to provide adequate documentation of the social service system and the people it serves. As with any complex task, this one is most readily approached by breaking it down into smaller tasks. The first step is ascertaining what information to preserve; the second is determining which records contain that information and how best to go about preserving them.

In approaching the issue of what to preserve, it is
useful to keep in mind T.R. Schellenberg's distinction between evidential and informational values of records. Documenting the functions and operations of the social service agencies is relatively simple and need not be dwelled on to any great extent here. Archivists should pay close attention to the tried and true rule of basic archival appraisal: identify those records that contain readily accessible information on the organization, functions, policies, procedures, decisions, and operations of the creating agency. Beyond this basic step, there is the endlessly debatable segment of the appraisal process—analysis of the informational values of records. Still keeping with Schellenberg's definition, archivists need to determine what information these records contain on persons, places, or subjects. Then, of course, the archivist will determine how important that information is and how much of it ought to be preserved.

One of the most useful methods of decision making is to pose a series of questions about the problem at hand and then use the answers as a guide to a solution. In this analysis of social service records in Ohio, four questions and their answers were instrumental in formulating an opinion on the value of case files. They are given here in the order in which they ought to be asked.

1. Is the information contained in case files useful for research? Yes, it is. This is probably the most uniform, comprehensive source of information available about a particular segment of our population.

2. How much of the available information is necessary to provide adequate documentation of the subject matter in question? A simple answer would be enough to provide a statistically accurate representation of the recipients of the services. There are many ways this can be done and many factors to take into account. First and foremost is that no case file duplicates another; each one is unique. This does not mean, however, that each file should be retained. It does mean that great care must be taken to assure that a comprehensive and representative sample is preserved. Is it necessary, for example, to retain some files from each of Ohio's
eighty-eight counties? If not, how many? And which ones? Differences between the coal counties of the southeast and the farm counties of the northwest are at least as significant as the differences between night and day, even though they do have certain similarities, such as total population and the sizes of their cities. The differences between metropolitan Franklin County and adjacent rural Pickaway County are equally as great as the differences between some counties separated by 150 or 200 miles. Statisticians, sociologists, demographers, and geographers would all have useful insights to offer in the decision of how many and which case files should be preserved. (This is an excellent example of an instance when archivists should cooperate with representatives of other disciplines to assure retention of appropriate records.)

3. How easily can the desired data be extracted from the records? This depends upon the nature of the documents themselves. The more consistent the forms used from place to place and from time to time, the easier it will be for the researcher to extract data from the documents. The greater the degree of central control over the welfare system in the state, the greater the degree of uniformity. If the distribution of social services is substantially under local control, the greater will be the degree of variation, and the greater the difficulty of conducting successful statewide studies.

In Ohio there is a substantial degree of uniformity. As early as the first years of the twentieth century, county home administrators were required to submit information about the daily movement of inmates to the Division of State Charities on forms prescribed by the division. This daily statistical record was a summation of information kept in the daily record of patients, which listed the names of persons admitted to and discharged from the county home each day. These forms were required to be kept and, hence, would be found in all eighty-eight county homes (except, of course, many have been lost or destroyed over the years). They would
also be found in state agency records, if they survived the test of time. This example leads us directly into the fourth and most important question.

4. Is the information unique, or can it be found in other, more accessible and more concise record series? For all practical purposes, the answer is yes. While it is true that there are many other sources of personal information about people, that information does not pertain directly to this particular group of people, that is, the recipients of social services. This analysis of social service records in the early and middle twentieth century indicates that case files are a unique record indeed worthy of preservation.

Records from the Franklin County Department of Public Welfare and the Ohio State Department of Public Welfare were analyzed for the years from 1910 to 1940 and from 1958 to 1970. Case files in both periods were remarkably similar. They include a variety of forms and correspondence. Applications for assistance—sometimes called face sheets or statements of fact—include, for both periods, a wealth of personal information: name, date and place of birth, citizenship, residence, length of residence at current address, residences of preceding years (usually for the most recent three years), marital status, living arrangements (whether living alone, with a relative, and the like), income (whether the applicant owned any real or personal property and its type and value), health, war service (if any), work history, and more. Significantly, the information on the applications changed little over a relatively long period of time.

In addition to the face sheet, case files include correspondence, medical reports (when applicable), and case workers' notes of interviews with clients. These latter items offer anecdotal information about the lives of recipients of social services that is not available in any other source. Following the analysis of the case files, other record series that might duplicate or summarize the information contained in the case files were analyzed. No such records were located.

Several record series from the Franklin County Home, a predecessor of the current welfare department,
were studied for the early years of the twentieth century. The most likely place to find good statistics on the local welfare program seemed to be within the records of the providing agency. For the period 1910-35, there were four record series which, judging from their titles, might have contained summaries of at least some of the information in the case files. The daily record between 1910 and 1927 included the names of patients admitted or discharged each day. Between 1930 and 1945, the daily record lists only the number of patients admitted or discharged each day. A similar record, Daily Movement of Inmates, covering the period 1910-35, also shows the number of inmates admitted or discharged each day and the total number of inmates in the home each day. It also includes monthly totals in each of these categories. A copy of this record was required to be submitted each month to the Division of State Charities. Neither of these records could conceivably substitute for the case files.

Containing much more information than either of the daily records is the admission record. This included essential personal information about each inmate: name, age, date of birth, case number, date admitted, condition upon admission, and date of discharge or death. While much more satisfactory a record than the other daily records, the admission record does not come close to the completeness of the case files.

Also containing more statistical information than the daily records is the county home annual report. The annual report for the Franklin County Home for 1912 includes the following patient information: total number in house at the close of the year; total admitted during the year; total discharged and died during the year; total number born in the home; and the number of inmates in each of four age groupings (less than 3 years old; 3-16 years; 16-60 years; and more than 60 years). Causes of pauperism were also noted, showing the total number of inmates in each category: idiotic, epileptic, and those disabled by disease, loss of limb, deformity, blindness, or deafness. Finally, the annual report tabulated the inmates by nativity, but in only three categories: Ohio, other states, and foreign countries.
Although this annual report does include a lot of useful data, so much information in the case files is excluded that it would be wrong not to retain at least a sample of the case files for research purposes. The state Department of Public Welfare (DPW) was not created until 1921 and did not play a significant role as a regulatory or oversight agency until 1939, well after the New Deal began. Before that time, there is little statistical information at the state level that pertains to county welfare activities; hence, there is no duplication of information that should be taken into account during appraisal.

After 1939 and the DPW's assumption of ultimate responsibility for welfare programs in Ohio, one would expect to find substantial duplication of information. However, the annual reports of the DPW offer only the most sketchy statistics on county welfare activities. The 1950 annual report lists total expenditures for every assistance program in each county. There is no data whatsoever on the number or type of recipients. The 1969 annual report shows the total expenditure in each category of assistance and the average number of recipients per month in the entire state. There is no individual county data.

The DPW also issues an Annual Report of County Homes. These include more information than do the regular annual reports, but the information applies only to residents of the county homes—a very small portion of each county's welfare recipients. The data included is in extremely broad categories not suitable for refined statistical analysis. Only two age groups are listed (below age 65 and above age 65), and only 3 categories of nativity are listed (Ohio, other states, and foreign born). The Annual Report of County Homes for 1956 is not significantly different from the one for 1972.

The DPW's public assistance monthly statistics seemed a likely place to find the kind of information that might duplicate the case files. These records include a table for each of the assistance programs and list, for each county, the total number of cases, total number of persons, and the total dollar amount expended. Referring to Schellenberg once again, the statistical
summaries contain only evidential value and add nothing to an understanding of who is being served by the welfare system. The case files seem to be the only records with worthwhile informational value.

The most important point of this analysis is that no statistical record contains the range of qualitative information found in the case files. Although some of the information in the case files can be found, in summary form, in some of the statistical reports, it is quantitave in nature and, as such, does not illustrate the clientele of the welfare system. Given the limitations of the statistical reports, a small representative sample of case files should be retained to preserve the kind of qualitative information not reproduced in the statistical tables.

It is important to point out that this analysis is necessarily germane only to Ohio. It may apply in other states; if it does, it does so by accident, for each state is unique and operates its programs in its own fashion. In an age when people are demanding pat answers to difficult questions, this analysis can serve only as a formula for appraisal, not as a predetermined appraisal judgment. Archivists must analyze the records in question, compare them to the other available documentation, consult appropriate experts to answer technical questions—especially if sampling is involved—and make the most informed decision based on the best information available. This formula will in all likelihood lead to as many different appraisal judgments as there are archivists doing the appraising, but this is all to the good anyway. As Schellenberg noted over twenty-five years ago, "complete consistency in judging informational value is as undesirable as it is impossible of accomplishment."
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ACCESS TO CHURCH RECORDS: TRINITY CHURCH, AN EXAMPLE*

Phyllis Barr

One of the constant problems facing archivists is the tension created between the twin goals of access and the right to privacy. As a result of state and national freedom of information acts and debate in the post-Watergate era about sunshine laws, this problem has come into the forefront of discussion in recent years. Although private institutions are not subject to these laws, neither have they been immune from questions regarding access. For the church archivist, the conflict between making records accessible and, yet, protecting the privacy of the church's members can pose real dilemmas. It is necessary, therefore, to formulate policies to alleviate this tension while at the same time respecting the needs of historians and the privacy of individuals. Archival policies developed at Trinity Church can be modified for almost any parish and probably for hospitals and schools and other institutions dealing with records of private persons.

The scope of the Trinity Church Archives is different from those of many other church archives, primarily because the church has had eleven chapels over the years and has also been the owner of a considerable portion of lower Manhattan (New York City). Chartered by King William III of England in 1697, Trinity is the oldest Episcopal parish in Manhattan. Not only has the church built many chapels and established a variety of institutions and programs, but it has also aided fifteen

*This article is based on a paper given at a meeting of the American Society of Legal History in Washington, D. C., September, 1982.
hundred parishes and other institutions around the world. The archives reflects Trinity's unique and very special history. It contains minutes of meetings; real estate records from the seventeenth through the twentieth centuries; financial ledgers; architectural renderings and drawings; maps; legal case records dealing with the title to Trinity's property; correspondence; diaries; sermons; prints, photographs, etchings, and newspapers; printed materials; and, most important for the question of privacy, official acts records (baptismal, confirmation, marriage, and burial records, as well as lists of communicants and pew deeds).

Diverse groups use the archives—including genealogists, the general public (for copies of baptismal, confirmation, marriage, or burial records), scholars, and journalists. In the past few years, the proportion of scholars to genealogists and members of the general public has shifted. More researchers are using the records for undergraduate papers as well as master's theses and doctoral dissertations. In addition, writers of both fiction and nonfiction often turn to the archives for information about a particular period.

Until five years ago researchers were for the most part offered only limited access to the archives. They were not permitted, except in special cases, to do genealogical research, and it was necessary to obtain permission from the rector to do any other kind of research, including doctoral dissertations or articles. If people wanted copies of baptismal, confirmation, marriage, or burial records, they were able to obtain them by writing or calling. No identification—personal or familial—was required for the person requesting such information.

In 1978 a consultant archivist joined the staff, and in 1980 the office of Parish Archives and Recorder was established. After consideration of the policies of various other institutions, it was decided that the archives should be open to the public, although it was felt that Trinity in general and the archives in particular had a duty to protect the privacy of the members of the church. The office of Parish Archives and the rector's office have formulated a policy which, to some extent, is standard in most repositories. The general rule is that all
records which are in the public domain according to the new copyright law are open to the public regardless of their nature. Records that are not in the public domain have various restrictions. For example, researchers may not examine vestry minutes, legal records, or financial records without permission from the office of the rector. If a person is interested in obtaining baptismal, confirmation, marriage, or burial records or information, he must write to the archives or come by in person and indicate his relationship to the individual so named in the records. Obviously, it is impossible to check the background of anyone requesting this information and, therefore, it is necessary for the information given by researchers to be taken on faith.

Every researcher must fill in a "Use of Archives" form each day he uses the archives, indicating his professional, school, or other affiliation, and the purpose of his research. Individuals doing genealogical research fill in a separate, less detailed form. Researchers are told that they must be aware of their own copyright laws and the laws of libel. Those requesting photocopies of material are given an additional form to complete, which explains the copyright law in relation to photocopying. If a researcher plans to publish materials from the archives, permission must be obtained and credit must be given the archives in the published work. The policies of the archives are explained in a brochure, which is given to all researchers.

There are also rules for the staff who wish to use the archives. No member of the staff, except for certain members of the executive and senior staff, may see the restricted records without permission from the rector's office. All members of the staff using the records must fill in a form and are held responsible for the records while they are in their possession.

The parish has also established some rules and policies for particular situations. For example, information is not given to adoptees in most cases. One adoptee who sought information on place of birth knew the name of both parents but did not know the date of baptism, in what chapel, or by whom. In this instance, it was decided to give the information. If an adoptee were
to write in requesting other information—such as the name of the parents or date of birth—it would not be given, because Trinity feels the privacy of the parents should be protected.

In addition, the Parish Archives does not respond directly to questions from lawyers. Those involved in probate and other cases are informed that it is necessary for them to obtain a letter from the individual involved giving permission to send material either directly to that individual or to the lawyer. This is done to protect the privacy of the individual. One unusual situation involved a visit to the archives from a man who had a jailed friend about to be deported unless it could be proven that the friend was the father of a child baptised in Trinity Church. The man wanted a copy of that baptismal record, which stated *father unknown*. Apparently the mother was unwilling to recognize the paternity of the child for personal reasons. The archives refused to give a copy of the record to the man who was planning, he said, to fill in the father's name himself. The archives also had a hypothetical request from an historian who wanted to know what the response of the archives would be if he wished to do a study on illegitimacy rates in the last ten years. He was told that he would not be permitted to see the baptismal records, because it would be an invasion of the privacy of the individuals so named, but that the archives would be willing to tell him how many *fathers unknown* were listed.

The archives also has access policies regarding oral history interviews. After an interview has been processed, a copy of the transcript is sent to the interviewee who then has the opportunity to make sure that there are no errors. After the corrections have been made, a legal agreement is sent in which one can indicate when the interview may be made available to researchers and whether there should be any restrictions on access. The agreement is based in part on those of other institutions, although it has been reviewed by Trinity's lawyers. This release also assigns and transfers to the parish the exclusive right to publish the materials and all other rights to use and sale of the materials, including, without limitation, the exclusive
right to copyright the materials in the name of the parish in any country or countries and to renew such copyright. The parish does permit the interviewee to publish any part of the material, provided that the interviewee gives the parish at least thirty days' notice.

One of the considerations in drawing up this agreement was the necessity of not only protecting the privacy of the interviewee but also that of anyone mentioned in the interviews. Even if the interviewee gives the parish unrestricted rights to use the materials, the archivist does have the right to close portions when they deal with living people to whom access might prove a problem. Similar procedures are followed for gifts of papers to the Parish Archives. A legal agreement is drawn up between the donor and the parish, and the gift is then accepted formally by the vestry of Trinity Church. The donor has the right to restrict portions of it for particular periods of time.

During 1981 when this article was first conceived, a number of church institutions were canvassed as to their policies. It was discovered that the churches questioned did not have any policies. Most did not have archivists and did not permit researchers to do genealogical research in the office. Information about baptisms, confirmations, marriages, and burials was sent to people in answer to telephone or written queries. Several of those interviewed stated that they realized that they should have some policies and would take this up with their rectors or vestry.

A questionnaire mailed early in 1982 to each of the 110 Episcopal dioceses in preparation for a paper on Episcopal church records indicated some of the problems facing churches on both the diocesan and parish level. Among the questions were: (1) do you have a diocesan archives; (2) do you have a professional archivist on the staff; (3) how many of your parishes have established archival programs; and (4) do you have a policy regarding the retaining of records?

Of the seventy-eight who responded, fifty-one said that they had established archives, but only nine had professional archivists. Seven had volunteer archivists with professional training; two had temporary archivists;
and two had librarians with archival training. Only forty-seven said that they had policies regarding retention of records. Thirty-eight of the respondents have given parts of their collections to other institutions such as universities, state libraries, historical societies, seminaries, and the Archives and Historical Collection of the Episcopal Church in Austin, Texas. These have usually been given as loans and not as outright gifts. Most of the people in charge of records at diocesan or parish levels are registrars, historiographers, or parish recorders. In other cases, members of the clergy are responsible for records.

Given the answers to this questionnaire as well as the telephone survey, it is not surprising that most church institutions do not have established policies regarding access. In addition, diocesan and parish archives are consulted infrequently by historians. Whether this is because Episcopal and Anglican church records are not of great interest to social historians or whether historians simply are not aware of the wealth of material lying undisturbed, it is hard to say. A greater awareness and use on the part of historians would undoubtedly lead many of these institutions to formulate very needed policies.

One of the most important things that archivists could do is to formulate written policies and regulations so that patrons will not think in any way that they are being discriminated against or that rules are being made solely for them. For this reason, Trinity printed a brochure that gives all its policies in addition to other information on the archives. This has been extremely useful in preventing potentially difficult situations.

As previously noted, there has been a spate of articles written recently in the scholarly journals on access to private records. These deal in theoretical terms with some of the practical problems which have been discussed here. In addition, numerous articles have appeared in newspapers and on television dealing with the so-called sunshine laws. The Freedom of Information Act (U.S.) states that all records are accessible, except records or portions of records which fall within one of eight categories—among them, records
to which access is denied by the government; those ex­empted by state or federal statute; those that would re­sult in unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, affect collective bargaining, or involve trade secrets. The question, both for the government and private institu­tions, is what is unwarranted invasion of privacy? Un­fortunately, there is no hard and fast rule.

New York State also has a freedom of information law which states that "an agency may withhold a record, or portions thereof, when disclosure will constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy....Each in­dividual has the interest of protecting his or her per­sonal privacy against unreasonable disclosure...." It also specifies that the right to privacy is not absolute but relative. One section deals with genealogical records; it notes that rights of access to vital records, such as births, deaths, and marriages, are not governed by the freedom of information law but rather by the public health law and the domestic relations law. 1 Each of these statutes states that access must be granted upon showing of a proper purpose, but the law does not define a proper purpose. Although, as noted above, these laws do not govern private institutions, they do pose prob­lems that such institutions face. 2

In the case of a church, such as Trinity, the ar­chivist would have to be concerned not only with the right to privacy of its staff members, but those who are communicants of the church and who have been bap­tised, married, or buried there. 3 This raises a partic­ular question in regard to clergy correspondence. Should clergy records comprised of letters to and from communicants be even given to an archives? If so, for how many years should they be restricted? Many of these letters deal with personal problems such as divorce, abortion, deaths in the family, and money matters. How can historians be served so that they will know what issues people faced at a particular time while at the same time the privacy of those who wrote to members of the clergy will remain protected?

It is in the interest of the archivist, the historian, and all researchers to preserve the past and to make it as accessible as possible without invading
anyone's privacy. This involves a great deal of care, attention, thought, and consultation with lawyers who are familiar with privacy and copyright laws. Lawyers familiar with probate and adoption laws should review a church's archival policies on access in order to make sure that there is no infringement on the rights of individuals involved. It is also incumbent upon historians and other researchers to make themselves familiar with the copyright law, particularly those portions dealing with public domain and photocopying.

There is undoubtedly tension between historians and archivists, although many archivists are also historians and, therefore, are very sympathetic to the needs of other historians. For example, the archivist-historian can understand very well the desire of other historians to have access, yet, the archivist has a certain responsibility to his institution, and therein lies most of the problem. Each institution has the right to set access policies and procedures, and the archivist is then given the daily responsibility to implement them. Each institution also has the right to control the dissemination and the use of any materials in the archives, as long as it does not conflict with any law.

Historians should be aware of the problems facing archivists and understand that archivists have certain duties and responsibilities which go beyond the historian's right to know. With care, attention, and cooperation, it is possible—as demonstrated by the Trinity Church Archives program—to create a balance of these interests.

NOTES


2 Robert Rosenthal states, "The scholar's access to the record is not a right, but is determined by his needs and the needs of a democratic society. His access
to public records is the same as any other citizen's."

3 John Lockwood says that one of the criteria the archivist should keep in mind is what documents involve the home and family life of an individual donor or a staff member of an institutional donor. Lockwood, "Private Papers and the Doctrine of Delayed Retribution," in The Scholar's Right, 11-19.

4 Norman Graebner believes the scholar's right to know mandates the retention and preservation of records beyond the period that they are needed for legal requirements, but the scholar must also respect the privacy of individuals and correspondents. Graebner, "History, Society, and the Right to Privacy," in The Scholar's Right, 20-24.
APPRAISAL STRATEGIES FOR MACHINE-READABLE CASE FILES*

Ross J. Cameron

The increasing use of computers in both administrative record keeping and in social science research challenges archivists to reevaluate previous appraisals of many types of records. The creation of computerized data bases which contain information from legal, criminal, medical, welfare, and other investigatory, regulatory, client, and personnel files has brought case files into this group of records which must be reappraised. Although they may include the same subject matter as textual case files, machine-readable case files may be appraised differently because of the media on which they are recorded and the amount of information they contain. This new media greatly reduces some of the problems in preserving and using textual case files—for example, large volume, slow and tedious access, and protection of privacy.

The appraisal of machine-readable case files involves essentially the same considerations as that of other machine-readable records. In reviewing these general considerations, their particular relevance to case files where appropriate will be discussed. Though these comments are primarily based on experience in the Machine-Readable Archives Branch, National Archives and Records Service, the author does not intend that they apply only to federal records or even only to government records. They should apply to any machine-readable case files.

*The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and should not be construed as official policies, procedures, nor recommendations of the National Archives and Records Service.
Several primarily technical considerations must be made first in the appraisal of all machine-readable records. The appraiser must determine that the file is the final edition, or master file. A raw input data file or working copy should be disposed of unless it is the only, or most thoroughly edited, version of the file extant. In rare instances two versions of a file might be kept if the appraiser discovers that editing of the file included the deletion or alteration of data elements or units of observation for reasons other than the correction of keying errors, data inconsistencies, and the accidental duplication of cases. Changes reflecting subjective judgments which might bias the data or its interpretation should be carefully examined and noted in the appraisal.

Adequate technical documentation is an essential part of the file. At the very least the documentation must include a record layout, which indicates the location of each piece of information in the record, and a codebook, which explains the value or meaning of coded information. Sample forms on which the information was first recorded and reports on the uses made of the data and the conclusions drawn from it are also important documentation. Operator’s and user’s manuals, which explain the processes of creating and using the file, are useful for the appraisal, though they might not be included in the documentation package.

Another crucial technical consideration is the readability of the data. If the physical condition of the tape is such that a portion of the data is neither readable nor recoverable, the appraiser must decide whether the extent of and possible bias from the damage is sufficient to invalidate the usefulness of the file. This judgment is based on the general archival decision on the legal, evidential, and informational value of the file.

If these technical considerations are satisfied, the archivist then makes the primary archival evaluation as to whether the legal, evidential, and informational value of the file merits its permanent retention. For machine-readable records the informational value is usually the most important of these. This is determined by the subject matter and quality of the data elements in the file, the extent of its coverage, and its potential for further analysis or reanalysis. As for all records regardless of
media, the significance of the subject matter is judged on the basis of current and predicted future research trends.

Several interrelated trends in research have led to the initial or increased research use of many case files and other records. Social and economic history have grown considerably in recent years. Numerous subfields such as welfare history, labor history, the history of crime, and the history of physical and mental health have also developed. And interest in historical approaches among sociologists, economists, and other social scientists have expanded the research community. The growth in the use of quantification and statistical analysis among historians and other social scientists has significance for both textual and machine-readable case files. Machine-readable case files provide an ideal source for prosopography, or collective biography. If the file contains members of the group a researcher wishes to study, the personal characteristics are already collected and ready to be analyzed to provide a group profile.

Many case files are very important sources for the growing study of non-elite history, or history from the bottom up. Most non-elites do not leave records; or, if they do, their descendants do not retain them nor deposit them in appropriate repositories. Therefore, most historical records that survive are from or about elites. Since the study of history is necessarily based on surviving records, it thus has been biased because it overwhelmingly reflects the ideas and activities—the lives—of elites. Just as the records of prominent or wealthy people are more likely to be preserved, so are those of prominent or large businesses and institutions.

Direct and indirect government involvement in the daily lives of non-elites has expanded greatly in the last half century with the growth of regulatory and social welfare programs. This has resulted in the creation of large volumes of records with information on the otherwise unrecorded characteristics and activities of this segment of the population and of the business and social world. Some of the present imbalance in the records of elites and non-elites can be rectified by the retention of case files. For example, the Machine-Readable Archives
Branch has accessioned the case files of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. In order to monitor compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the commission maintains files of demographic and sociographic information on the employees and trainees of private employers, joint labor-management apprenticeship programs, employer-conducted apprenticeship programs, state and local governments, and public elementary and secondary schools, and members of labor union locals. Other records on many of the smaller businesses and institutions included in these data bases will probably not be retained for future research.

In addition to the subject matter of the data the archivist must also appraise its quality. Quality is judged on three criteria—reliability, validity, and accuracy. Reliability refers to whether all persons using the same procedures would arrive at the same value for the data element. That is, would everyone count or assign the same numeric value or code? Validity refers to the appropriateness of the procedures, or operational definition, of the data element. That is, does this data element truly represent the concept being studied? And accuracy refers to whether the data has been keyed correctly. That is, is the value within the specified range of values for that data element, and is it logical in relation to other data elements in that record? The investigatory and regulatory nature of many case files makes the reliability and validity of subjective judgments and other data very important. For example, a drug user information system might be disposed of because the subjects were persons arrested for other crimes but suspected of being drug users by the arresting officer with or without any evidence.

The extent of the file's coverage, or its universe of observations, is another important archival consideration. The chronological and geographical coverage usually should be sufficient to provide representative coverage of the subject matter. If the machine-readable copy is a sample from textual records, then the validity of the sampling procedure must be evaluated. If records for only a brief, insignificant time period exist, then the file should be rejected. Limited geographic coverage
may indicate which repositories would be appropriate for retaining the data, or it might result in the file's destruction. For example, a Wiretap Commission file was created to analyze the success of wiretaps in prosecuting suspected organized crime figures. However, data from metropolitan New York City where a very large portion of the cases occurred was not received. This lack of coverage could result in the file's disposal.

One of the most important considerations on the informational value of the file is its potential for further analysis. This further analysis may be of two types. The first is internal—can the information within the file be analyzed in ways beyond those which the creator and users performed? Machine-readable case files may be very susceptible to this type of further analysis because the creators are often primarily interested in individual cases rather than in profiles of all subjects. Demographic and sociographic information recorded for routine identification purposes may seldom, if ever, have been analyzed in conjunction with the subject matter data. This is particularly true if the information is made machine-readable for tracking or housekeeping purposes rather than for research. For example, a Housing and Urban Development file on rehabilitation loans and grants was created in machine-readable form to simplify tracking of loans, grants, and loan repayments. But, it also contains routine demographic and sociographic data which is not analyzed by the agency and, thus, offers potential for further analysis. Tracking systems may offer other opportunities for study, especially time-series analysis.

The second type of further analysis is external. This refers to the file's potential for linkage with other data files, particularly ones not available to the creator or previous users. Direct linkage is possible if each file contains personal identifiers such as name, social security number, or some other common identification number. Greater potential for direct linkage exists with files of related subject matter. Indirect linkage, or cohort analysis, is possible if the files contain common demographic or sociographic data elements such as age, sex, occupation, education, or geographic location. In
this way case files might be linked with census or survey files resulting in potential for new analysis.

The fact that a file has been thoroughly analyzed and cannot be linked with other files does not necessarily mean that it is disposable. If the initial analysis resulted in significant or controversial findings, other researchers in the field may wish to reexamine the data for themselves in order to evaluate or confirm the original conclusions. Members of many disciplines and sub-disciplines have called for data archives for this express purpose.

Machine-readable case files, thus, offer much potential for informational value. They may also lead to a growing concern for the possible legal and evidential value in machine-readable records. As more agencies and institutions come to depend on computers for storing and using large volume file systems, case files may exist in machine-readable form only. The investigatory and regulatory nature of case files would thus make them important sources of legal and evidential value. For example, the Immigration and Naturalization Service is in the process of creating a large statistical reporting system which will be the primary source for information on aliens and deportees, eventually replacing textual records.

In addition to technical considerations and the legal, evidential, and informational value of the file, the appraiser must also take into account whether the information exists in another media or mode. If so, the archivist must answer a series of questions about the other copy. Is it available? Will it be preserved? Does it have a more useful arrangement? Will it be more or less expensive to preserve? Will it be easier or less expensive for researchers to use? And finally, does it contain more or less information?

These questions are very important in the appraisal of machine-readable case files since there are often associated textual case files. Because of the large volume of most textual case files, machine-readable copies offer advantages in terms of space and other preservation and reference costs. Even more important, it is much easier to delete personal identifiers and to provide
disclosure-free copies of machine-readable case files to researchers for as long as privacy has to be maintained. The great concern over the protection of individual privacy makes this aspect very important. It is also much easier to extract cases with desired common characteristics from a machine-readable system.

Sometimes, however, machine-readable versions of the tracking or housekeeping type mentioned earlier may also present serious problems. First, they may not contain enough information from the textual case files to merit their retention in place of the textual records. Nevertheless, they may be useful as indexes for the selection of cases with desired characteristics. Second, they may be online systems containing only current data on active cases. If previous data and nonactive cases are not transferred to a history file, this system would not merit retention. As more agencies convert to machine-readable systems for large files, these latter problems should diminish.

In review, machine-readable case files offer some advantages over textual ones: (1) they are already prepared for the prosopographer to generate subject profiles and perform statistical analysis; (2) they have great potential for further analysis, especially linkage with other files whether directly or through cohort analysis; (3) it is much easier to provide researchers with valuable files and still protect the privacy of the individual; (4) last, but certainly not least, is the savings in storage space and other preservation and reference costs.

NOTES


FEATURES

ARCHIVES AND THE TEACHING OF HISTORY

In writing about the relationship and common interests shared by archivists and historians, scholars have focused primarily on research in archival repositories and the mutual concern for the preservation of valuable historical documents. Little has been noted about the role archives can play for those who teach history. Besides presenting research opportunities for scholars, archives provide a classroom where students from grade school through college can study and learn history by using manuscripts, photographs, oral history transcripts, audiovisual tapes, and other archival material.

Initiating a teaching program using archives requires cooperation between the archivist and teacher. The archivist needs an awareness of the goals and content of the course being offered, while the teacher must be informed of the documents and items available in local archives, historical societies, or museums that will be pertinent to the course. The burden of responsibility for promoting this relationship will most likely fall upon the archivists since, far too often, archives suffer from obscurity and lack of awareness by the general public. This article will focus on potential classes that can be conducted for elementary, secondary, and college level students and demonstrate the number of ways archives can play a useful and vital role in the teaching of history.
Because of their age, elementary school students from grades three through six will benefit least from the initiation to archives. Normally, young children do not have the maturity to appreciate archival documents, and devising teaching projects can be difficult. But some presentations are possible and involving children at an early age is important.

One way archives can be used successfully at this level is through frequent class tours and field trips to local archives, historical societies, or museums. This is done in some school systems, but it is seldom done with much frequency. Tours and visits acquaint students with the purpose and nature of archives by allowing them to view interesting archival documents, photographs, and memorabilia. Such visits are even more productive when they are coordinated with the subject content of the history course being taught. Presenting a course lecture or program in the archives, surrounded by pertinent documents and memorabilia, will likewise be more meaningful than if given in the school classroom. Coordinating such visits to coincide with the course being offered is not always possible—depending on the local repository—but knowing what holdings are available can be beneficial. Tours and presentations can also be used successfully for secondary school students.

Other potential projects for elementary and secondary school students are photographic and audio recording presentations. Visual images and sound recordings hold the attention of younger children and leave a lasting impression. By working together, archivists and teachers can use photographs and tapes that narrate a story or particular historical event. Events such as fires, disasters, or visits by prominent historical personalities are often well documented in many archives and local historical societies. Preparing a visual or audio presentation about these happenings, supplemented by whatever documents or memorabilia are available, can be successful. Assigning a brief writing exercise on these presentations or some aspect of the visit is an additional way young students may reflect on the relationship of archives and history.
Local history projects can be especially rewarding. The Georgia Department of Archives and History utilizes such projects to encourage elementary and secondary students and teachers to become involved in working in local history. By studying various primary sources that document community or family history, students are introduced to the rewards of historical research.

Secondary and college level students offer even greater opportunities for teachers using archives in the teaching of history. One such project is research in archival collections. It may be assumed that most junior and senior high school students do not have the sophistication or abilities to make full use of manuscript collections, and no archivist would want irresponsible students using their material. But working on research projects that draw upon individual letters, photographs, oral history transcripts, or recordings can be productive for high school students when the project corresponds to course work then being covered in the classroom. Closely related to this research are essays that stress the historical significance of manuscripts, photographs, or materials students have examined in the archives. Research may be pursued, also, on the individual who wrote the letter or the person who appears in the photograph. These essays and assignments can vary in length and difficulty, depending on the abilities of the class, and they should coincide with the course material when possible.

Responsible and trustworthy students can undertake additional projects that are both helpful to the archives and to their personal historical understanding. Identifying photographs, indexing, item listing of individual manuscripts, and gathering biographical data and information for inventories and registers are useful and worthwhile projects for students. Not every high school student could be entrusted with such responsibility, but the potential does exist.

Other possible projects beneficial to students and archivists, especially curators of historical societies and museums, are photographic essays. Students with appropriate interests and abilities could be encouraged to photograph landmarks, historical buildings, or
well-known local individuals and prepare biographical or historical essays. If the photographs are of acceptable quality they could then be used to supplement the holdings of the archives.

High school and college students can be encouraged, too, to use oral history interviews. In archives where such programs are active, students might read transcripts and listen to tapes to discern the techniques and problems of such methodology. They may then be assigned interviews with family members or other select persons in order to give them firsthand experience. If such interviews are of acceptable quality and content, they may be used as part of the archives' oral history collection. Specific or general writing exercises should be assigned that challenge students to reflect on their introduction to archival research.

College students especially can undertake a wide variety of projects, and many colleges and universities have archival programs where such classes are initiated. Assigning papers and projects to be completed from research in manuscript collections is a good way to acquaint the student with the problems of historical research and methodology. It is an excellent way, too, for the archivist to promote little-used collections.

Perhaps the biggest advantage for the archives in utilizing college history students is that they can perform archival tasks. Responsible undergraduate students could index, do limited processing, make folder listings and other types of finding aids, and compile research for inventories and registers. These archival tasks teach them much about history and archives, as well as relate directly to the content of the courses they are studying in the classroom.

The examples presented in this article are just a few of the ways archives may be used successfully in the teaching of history at the elementary, secondary, and college levels. In summary, such projects and programs depend upon the type of repository available in the community as well as upon the interest and cooperation of both the teacher and the archivist. More importantly, it requires a receptive attitude and imaginative thinking on the part of all involved to initiate such programs.
Utilizing archives in the teaching of history can do much to stimulate interest in students for both disciplines.

Thomas T. Spencer

NOTES


2 A few articles have been written that make some reference to the use of archives in the teaching of history. See, for example, John Hope Franklin, "Archival Odyssey: Taking Students to the Sources," American Archivist 32 (October 1969): 375-381, and Howard B. Gotlieb, "The Undergraduate and Historical Manuscripts," American Archivist 23 (January 1960): 27-32.

3 Alice Knierim, "Center for Local History Education: An Outreach Program of the Georgia Department of Archives and History," Georgia Archive 10 (Spring 1982): 13-22.

4 This project proved successful at the Yale University archives. See Gotlieb, "The Undergraduate and Historical Manuscripts," 27.

5 For an analysis of one program using graduate level history students to perform archival tasks, see James E. Hansen II and John Newman, "Training History Students in Working Archives," History Teacher 13 (February 1980): 211-221.
SELF-INDEXING CONTEMPORARY PHOTOGRAPH COLLECTIONS

A review of current library and archival literature on the cataloging of photographs illustrates the diverse methods of arranging and describing visual records. Photographic collections range in size from a handful of old pictures to collections housing hundreds of thousands of photographs and negatives. As varied as the size of photograph collections, there also seems to be as many different cataloging and arrangement schemes. While most cataloging methods have unique features, they usually can be categorized in three types of retrieval systems: (1) card catalog, (2) image-bearing cards, and (3) self-indexed collections. This is an explanation of the Auburn University Archives' (Alabama) efforts to cope with the sudden influx of a sizable collection of contemporary photographs.

At Auburn the approach to cataloging photographic images follows the pattern of other manuscript repositories and university archives. When the archives was established in 1964, material from the university library and several administrative offices was transferred to the new department. Included with these files and manuscript collections were photographs. Little is known about the handling of photographs in those early years. More than likely, they were stored in a filing cabinet and arranged by source. By 1968, the photographic holdings had reached a significant size (about one thousand images) and dictated a more sophisticated finding aid system.

The archives staff developed a card catalog system. The photographs or negatives were given a number which denoted size, format, and location. For example, an 8 x 10 print could have a number IV B 312. The Roman numeral IV denoted print, the letter B denoted size, and 312 was the number in that format, size division. Major subject categories were created to file the catalog
cards. The cards described the photograph and listed the location number. The catalog system had two major divisions, university-related and non-university-related photographs. The subjects for the Auburn University photographs covered broad areas such as Buildings, Athletics, Students, Faculty and Staff. The non-university, or general photographs, included subject headings such as: Auburn, City of; Alabama dignitaries; Alabama Cities; Military; and a few other general subject areas. Apparently, this system worked satisfactorily for several years and no major changes seemed necessary.

Then, in 1977, the archives acquired four major photograph collections. Two local newspapers, the student newspaper, and the college yearbook turned over their old photograph files to the archives. The majority of the images were prints with some negatives. In total, the archives acquired about one hundred thousand images in a matter of months.

The initial decision was to rearrange the system to accommodate the influx of new photographs. A Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) employee worked six months cataloging some three thousand prints. New subject categories and subdivisions within current categories were added to the card catalog. It became increasingly apparent that this system was not adequate to hold another ninety thousand images.

When the CETA employee was hired on a full-time basis by another university department, cataloging came to a halt. An analysis of the backlog of uncataloged photographs and the cataloging procedures indicated that with student labor the current holdings would not be completely cataloged for ten years. This estimate did not allow for further photographic acquisitions. With the addition of this many cards to an already cumbersome scheme, the staff expected the system to become inefficient. A change had to be made.

After discussion on the merits and handicaps of the card catalog system, the archives staff agreed that the only sensible means for making uncataloged photographs available for use was to establish a self-indexing system. The old system was left intact with future acquisitions
to be added to the self-indexing arrangement. The self-indexing system bypasses the catalog card. Instead of the card being filed in a subject category, now the print or negative is filed by subject. The system allows for the grouping of similar types of photographs where the old system did not; if researchers are looking for photographs of Auburn mascots, they can be located in a matter of seconds by pulling one or two folders.

The self-indexing photograph collection now includes three main series: Auburn University-related photographs, non-university photographs, and an individual file. Photographs and negatives are categorized within one of these three divisions. Most categories are then subdivided into subcategories when applicable and possibly slotted chronologically within these subcategories. Example: AU ATHLETICS - Football - Game Action - Alabama, 1982.

The subject categories are established by the archives staff and are based on common sense and knowledge of the local area. An authority list is maintained on major subject categories created for the system. The list is also used to assist researchers in identifying the appropriate location of needed photographs.

All prints and negatives (negatives are placed in acid free envelopes) are annotated to show category, brief description or identification, date and source. The marking of category on the print or negative envelope is essential for refiling purposes. The date (if known) and source name is helpful if the researcher wishes to consult a newspaper account relating to the photograph or to obtain a more complete description.

The archives staff, making use of trusted work-study students, began the self-index cataloging in late 1981. As of April, 1983, 90 percent of the backlog has been added to the archives photograph collection. The system has been tested by researchers and has proved very workable and much preferred to the old card cataloging scheme.

The main area of concern had been the problem of preservation. The self-indexing system is based on the photographs as the indexing unit and must be handled by the researcher. The archives staff felt that the
benefits of the self-index cataloging scheme outweighed the possible preservation problem. The system has allowed the archives to quickly catalog thousands of prints and negatives and make them available to researchers, all with very little cost in staff time or money. The self-indexing procedure also helped to preserve more photographs. Weeded out of the collection were totally useless photographs (dogs, fireplugs, trees, etc.), severely damaged prints, and unidentified photographs. If the card system had been used for cataloging, the appraisal standards would have been extremely rigid, forcing the staff to make a difficult decision on which images to preserve. Probably only 20 percent could have been retained under the card catalog system.

In summary, the decision to adopt a self-indexing system for photographs was based on several factors. First, the archives was faced with the problem of cataloging one hundred thousand images. The former card system would have delayed for years the accessibility of thousands of photographs. Second, the photographs accessioned were basically contemporary; almost all were post-1950 with the majority dated from 1960 to 1980. Some prints were produced by a fast, cheap process which created images that probably will last only ten to twenty years. Extensive cataloging techniques would not be worth the effort. Third, the archives photographic cataloging schemes would not allow for the influx of some one hundred thousand new images. The system that had problems with fifteen thousand prints and negatives would have been unworkable with a sixfold increase. Another factor involved the lack of identification on many of the prints. The self-indexing system allows the grouping of photographs without specific and complete identifications. The card system was not as flexible in this respect.

As with all photographic cataloging schemes, it is important that archival personnel understand the system and are able to locate requested items. This is extremely important to self-indexed collections, and specific procedures and guidelines should be developed. All
staff members with reference duties should understand the system and know how photographs have been categorized. Recognition of the faults of the self-indexing is crucial to its success and implementation.

The self-indexing approach may not be the solution to all problems with a large contemporary photograph collection. At Auburn University, it has proved successful in speeding the cataloging process and in making these images available to researchers.

Bill Sumners
A task force designated by the National Archives and Records Service has recommended the establishment of an Archival Research and Evaluation Unit to report to the Archivist of the United States on current technology that could be applied to storage, retrieval, and preservation problems. The task force wants the unit to draw on the expertise of the business and research community in an effort to set goals and to find technologies for meeting the goals during a period of budget cutbacks.

Recommendations from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) needs assessment grants in Mississippi and Georgia contain similarities. Both recognize the need for attention to local governmental records, machine-readable records, conservation, cooperation among archival agencies, and archival education. While both reports place responsibility for promoting archival education and distributing information with the state archival organization, Georgia envisions an even larger role for its society. A guide to the holdings of archival repositories, which was recommended in both states, was produced with grant money in Georgia. Though Georgia desires a review of the legislative mandate of its state archives, Mississippi wants additional storage space and improved micrographics in its state archives.

NHPRC has more money than expected for 1983. The next deadline for applications is 1 September. For more information contact Edie Hedlin, NHPRC, National Archives Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20408 or call (202) 724-1616. Grants in the Southeast announced at the end of 1982 included $37,561 to the Alabama Department of Archives and History to improve the records management program and $23,616 to Mississippi Valley State
University, Itta Bena, Miss., for arrangement and description of university records.

A new system for protecting color photographs is available from Permacolor Corporation, 701 Parkway, Broomall, Pa. 19008. The life of a color photo on display under fluorescent light can be greatly increased by Permacolor's process of matting and hermetically sealing the photo. For the same price as a frame and glass, a photo can have the advantage of a procedure which filters out damaging wavelengths of light.

There has been recent increased use of computers, both micro and mini, by archives and related organizations in the state of Georgia. The Society of Georgia Archivists has computerized its mailing list. The Russell Library, University of Georgia Libraries, has applied an Apple computer to processing of manuscript collections. Atenco Business Archives in Atlanta uses a computer to manage a records retention service for private businesses. Troup County Archives acquired a minicomputer for word processing and other applications. A survey of the nationwide use of computers in archives is being conducted by Peter Schinkel for an SAA presentation. To participate in the survey contact Schinkel at Georgia Department of Archives and History, 330 Capitol Ave., S.E., Atlanta, GA 30334.

U.S. Representative Thomas I. Downey (D-NY) introduced legislation early in 1983 to restore the tax deduction of fair market value for donations to archives and museums of literary, musical, or artistic compositions by their creators. Similar legislation has also been introduced in the Senate after being passed by the Senate Finance Committee in the last Congress. Due to
present tax law many writers and artists have deferred
donation of their records in hopes of gaining more favor­
able tax incentives for themselves or their heirs. The
U.S. Copyright Office is seeking changes in the law to
exempt unpublished works from consideration in section
108 of the 1978 law. Several other proposals that have
been made will be of concern to archivists.

Georgia's 250th birthday is being celebrated through
the coordination of more than four hundred local events
throughout the state. Gardening, travel, communi­
cations, transportation, agriculture, religion and the mili­
tary are some of the themes scheduled for displays and
events in the latter part of 1983. The Georgia Depart­
ment of Archives and History plans to aid the retention
of local governmental records with the program theme
"A Year for the Record." Many repositories in the state
have erected displays and given support to local activ­
ities. For further information write to the Georgia
Semiquincentenary Commission, P.O. Box 2139, Savan­
nah, GA 31498.

A new state archival group, the Society of Florida
Archivists, held an organizational meeting in Daytona,
5 May 1983. A constitution for the group has been
drafted. Those organizing the society include Ed Trib­
ble, State Archivist of Florida; Carla Kemp, Florida
Division of Archives, History, and Records Management;
Dean Debolt, University of West Florida; and Caroline
Mattern, University of Florida.

North Carolina State University is offering a Master
of Arts in Applied History. Half of the thirty-six-hour
course falls in historical studies with the rest in ar­
chival management, including classes in iconographic
materials and archival conservation. Two three-hour
practicums, which can be substituted for a thesis, involve supervision by the state archivist of North Carolina and a project in the student's area of interest. The University of South Carolina has started a similar program. For more information about the North Carolina program, write: Director of Graduate Studies, Department of History, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27650.

The Duke University Manuscript Department has received approval from their university librarian to initiate OCLC cataloging of manuscript collections. OCLC cataloging will supplement the more detailed indexing of manuscript collections provided by the department's card catalogs and will provide collection-level access to the department's holdings by subject and main entry in the library's primary public catalog or any online replacement thereof. All collections cataloged since the publication of the manuscript department's printed guide in 1980 will be entered in OCLC.

Staff of the library's cataloging department will work with the manuscript department to provide further training and to develop manuscript workforms and workflow procedures. It is expected that catalogers in the manuscript department will fill out an OCLC manuscript workform when they complete the cataloging of a collection, and this workform will be submitted to the cataloging department for review by a professional cataloger to see that all information conforms to AACR2 standards before the record is entered in OCLC.

The Kentucky Historical Records Needs Assessment Project, a one-year grant funded by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, recently compiled its final report for distribution to interested parties. Some of the short-term recommendations coming out of the project for Kentucky historical records
Repositories included: workshops on archival and records preservation topics, institutional loan of microfilm equipment for records preservation, establishment of an archival information clearinghouse, and a reporting mechanism for statewide historical records accessioning. Long-term recommendations focused on expanded institutional interdependence, adequate staffing for archival programs, a state-supported technical assistance program, and more clarity as to the appropriate repository or repositories for historic records in special subject areas.

Copies of the final report are available from Dr. Lewis Bellardo, Director, Public Records Division, Department for Libraries and Archives, Box 537, Frankfort, Kentucky 40602.
THE ARCHIVIST'S SEARCH FOR GRANT FUNDINGS

Timothy Walch

The search for foundations and funding sources for archival or manuscript projects can be frustrating and confusing. By one estimate, there are fifty thousand foundations and agencies in the United States providing funds for all manner of projects. As if to make matters worse, the wealth of information available on these foundations and agencies can easily overwhelm the uninitiated. How can anyone hope to sort out the agencies potentially interested in archives and manuscripts from such an enormous number of sources of funding? The search need not be a burden if archivists use common sense, carefully evaluate potential funding sources, and tap available grant information services and reference works.

Archivists should first be conscious of several factors that will affect their search. The single most important piece of information to acquire about any foundation or source of funding is its record of grants. Statements of purpose, philosophy, and objectives are important, but often vague—if not ambiguous—while recent lists of grants show clearly how foundations and funding agencies apply their philosophies. Moreover, such lists will give archivists a notion of whether or not their proposals will even be welcomed. A foundation or grant agency which makes awards only to universities for research on a specific disease would not be a good candidate to support an archival project—even in the history of science or medicine. Archivists should also keep in mind that very few foundations have ever reviewed or evaluated an archival grant proposal, and even fewer have funded archival projects. It is no surprise, therefore, that grant-seeking archivists spend a substantial amount of time evaluating the potential interest of foundations in their archival proposals.
Another factor for archivists to keep in mind is that large national foundations and grant agencies—whether public or private—are not necessarily the best, most convenient, or easiest sources of support for archival projects. "The grant candidate," notes expert Virginia White, "should not limit his search to the larger foundations but will find it worth the effort to explore possibilities among medium-sized or smaller sized foundations especially for individual grants or institutional grants for well-defined, modest-sized programs." Archivists seeking grant support for a project that has clear-cut local appeal—a state or community history, for example—would do well to seek support from state or community foundations. Partial support from a local foundation will always make a project more appealing to a national foundation should additional funds be necessary.

Keeping these two factors in mind—the grant record and the orientation of the foundation—archivists can then turn their attention to the search for foundations likely to be interested in their specific projects. This essay will focus for the most part on the publications and services of the Foundation Center, a nonprofit, nonadvocacy organization which has gathered information on tens of thousands of foundations for nearly twenty-five years. Without a doubt, archivists should start their search for grant funding with this center.

Supported itself by many foundations, the Foundation Center provides many services free or at a nominal fee through two national libraries, two field offices, and more than ninety regional collections in fifty states. The libraries located in New York and Washington and the field offices in Cleveland and San Francisco dispense a variety of information in both hard copy and microform from foundation reports filed each year with the Internal Revenue Service. The libraries and field offices also have a great number of books and periodicals about philanthropy and grantsmanship, allowing grant seekers to learn about the grantmaking process as well as about the foundations themselves. Access to information about particular foundations is facilitated by an automated system of research aids which also constitute the main
source of information for the center's printed materials. The regional collections, located at public and research libraries around the country, contain specific information on foundations in the appropriate state; the regional collections also contain copies of all the publications distributed by the Foundation Center.

The key to the many services provided by the Foundation Center are three overlapping automated data bases maintained in the center's two national libraries. These data bases store information on thousands of foundations and provide selective subject coverage of grants awarded. The availability of this information in machine-readable form allows the center to answer very specific questions quickly and with a certitude not possible using manual research. Output from each of these data bases is disseminated in annual editions of The National Data Book, The Foundation Directory, and The Foundation Grants Index, which represent the data base files "frozen" in print as of the date of publication. Copies of these publications are available in many public libraries as well as in the regional collections and field offices of the center.

The largest of the three data bases is the Foundation Center's National Data Base, which is the basis for The National Data Book and contains capsule information abstracted from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Because it includes information on the twenty-two thousand, most active private foundations in the United States, the center's National Data Base is the most complete of any available, giving public information on thousands of local foundations in specific states or regions and making the information particularly useful for applicants with projects of local or area interest. The data base includes foundation names, mailing addresses, principal officers, total amounts of grants paid, assets, expenditures, gifts received, IRS identification numbers, and the dates for the fiscal information.

Unfortunately, the Foundation Center's National Data Base does not provide information on grants made or subjects of interest to particular foundations. Grant seekers should use the center's National Data Base to gather general information on foundations in particular
states or locales, and then, with a list of candidates in hand, turn to the Internal Revenue Service Forms 990-AR and 990-PF filed by the target foundations. These forms list the contributions, gifts, and grants made. If the number of grants is small, the list may appear on page 4 of Form 990-AR. More common, however, is for foundations to attach separate schedules of grants to Form 990-PF. The IRS does not require foundations to state their specific interests, but grant seekers can read between the lines by examining the list of grants themselves.

Copies of all of these IRS forms (on aperture cards) are available in the Foundation Center's two national libraries; copies of IRS forms for foundations in individual states are also available in appropriate regional collections of the center. Copies of the forms arranged by state are also available for sale from the Internal Revenue Service, P.O. Box 187, Cornwell Heights, Pennsylvania 19020.

Archivists who carefully use this national data base in conjunction with appropriate IRS forms will be able to determine the likely interest of specific local foundations in all or part of an archival project. To be sure, using these tools will require intuition and hard work, but once the work is completed, it is likely that the archivist will have identified several potential sources of support. The emphasis on potential is important; it may take months or years of cultivation before a local foundation agrees to support an archival project, but without a doubt, this is the place to start.

The second of the center's three data bases is the Foundation Directory Data Base, which focuses on approximately three thousand American foundations with assets over $1 million or annual grants totaling $100 thousand or more. These foundations represent about 93 percent of foundation assets and 92 percent of grant dollars awarded each year. Such statistics tempt many grant seekers to focus exclusively on the major foundations; indeed, these foundations are inundated with unsolicited proposals each year and have learned to say no without so much as a glance at the project idea. Grant-seeking archivists should resist the temptation to
send their proposals to these institutions unless their project fits very clearly into the target foundation's recent pattern of funding.

The descriptive information in the Foundation Directory Data Base includes foundation name, address, telephone number, statement of purpose and activities, financial data, officers and trustees, grant application information, frequency of board meetings, and, more importantly, the subjects of philanthropic interest to the foundations. Thus, with relatively little effort, archivists can determine which of the larger foundations are interested in the humanities or in history-related projects. Unfortunately, neither archives nor manuscript is a subject heading, so archivists seeking support must still turn to the IRS forms.

The third of the center's data bases is the Foundation Grants Index Data Base, which includes information on more than four hundred of the largest foundations. Unlike the other two data bases, this one does provide subject access to the grants made by these foundations. In other words, it provides specific information on grants of $5 thousand or more in all subject areas and serves as an excellent guide to the program interests of the largest American foundations. Data base records include descriptions of individual grants, amounts and dates authorized, limitations, recipient names and locations, foundation names and locations, and index terms. In using the subject index, archivists will necessarily have to search under several headings—most notably, historical, history, and library—to find archives and manuscript projects, but they can be found in this data base.

As noted earlier, much of the information in the center's three data bases is available in published form, and the center also provides a number of other publications which will be of value to archivists in search of benefactors. The most significant of these are the annual Comsearch Printouts, which are computer printouts in sixty-eight subject areas listing the grants made during the preceding calendar year by about 350 major foundations. The printouts are generated as computer searches of the three Foundation Center data bases and
serve as guides to the interests of large foundations in each category. Archives and manuscripts proposals are found under the subject headings libraries, museums, and historical projects. Available from the center in both microfiche and paper, Comsearch Printouts provide a handy guide to foundation-supported work in specific areas during specific years.

Also very useful—especially in locating regional sources of grant support—are state foundation directories. Many of these directories are updated annually and are based on information filed with the Internal Revenue Service or with appropriate state agencies. Frequently indexed by field of interest, these compilations allow archivists to identify quickly which local foundations will most likely be interested in archival projects. Once these foundations have been identified, grant seekers should write for copies of annual reports and any available procedural guidelines. Such reports and guidelines will provide the best indication of how welcome a proposal might be. A bibliography of state foundation directories is available from the Foundation Center.

In addition to publishing directories and catalogs of grant information, the Foundation Center also participates with an independent organization, the Council on Foundations, in the bimonthly publication of Foundation News. This valuable periodical includes up-to-date installments of The Foundation Grants Index as well as articles on all aspects of philanthropy. Subscription information is available from the Council on Foundations, 1828 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Two other publications available from the Foundation Center are also worth noting. Carol Kunzig's Foundation Fundamentals: A Guide for Grant Seekers is a practical, readable, comprehensive guidebook which focuses on how to begin the search for foundation funding. Among other topics, Kunzig discusses the implications of foundation size, how to identify foundations interested in a particular subject field or geographic area, and how to present proposal ideas to target foundations. Kunzig also provides worksheets, checklists, and a useful bibliography. The Foundation
Center's Source Book Profiles is a biannual subscription publication that focuses on foundations giving a total of more than $200 thousand worth of grants per year. The profiles are three to five pages in length and include detailed factual breakdowns of each foundation's gifts by subject area, by grant type, and by grant recipient type. Additional analyses of patterns of giving are also provided. Both of these publications are worth close examination by archivists in search of foundation funding.

The Foundation Center's guides and directories are not definitive, of course. Archivists seeking information on federal government grant programs will want to return to two excellent guides published by government agencies. Both the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance and Federal Programs for Libraries: A Directory provide detailed information on the requirements of specific federal programs. Archivists will be pleased to find that agencies other than the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Historical Publication and Records Commission are giving grants for archives-related projects.

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance is updated twice a year and contains current information on all available federal grants and contracts. For each program, the catalog lists the full name of the program and agency, authorization, types of assistance, use and use restrictions, eligibility requirements, application and award process, assistance considerations, postassistance requirements, financial information, program accomplishments, regulations, guidelines and literature, related programs, examples of funded projects, and criteria for selecting proposals. In short, the catalog is the place to start a search for appropriate federal programs.3

A second government catalog with particular value for archivists and librarians is Federal Programs for Libraries: A Directory published by the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources of the U.S. Department of Education. The directory provides essential information on library and archival programs; much of the information was distilled from the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance and the publications of the American
Library Association's Washington Office. In addition to providing handy information on federal programs, the booklet also includes a helpful introduction and two very useful bibliographies on funding sources and grantsmanship.

The archivist's search for grant funding—particularly nongovernment sources of support—has never been easy, and the task is likely to get even more difficult in the future. Recent cuts in federal funding for archives and manuscripts projects—and the likelihood of additional cuts in future fiscal years—will increase the competition for the shrinking grant dollars of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission and the Research Resources Program of the National Endowment for the Humanities. Utilizing the data bases of the Foundation Center and directories on federal grant programs, however, the motivated archivist can make significant progress in identifying other potential sources of grant funding for archives and manuscripts projects.

NOTES


In addition to these Foundation Center publications, archivists should consult the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, available on subscription from the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. 20402. A
final publication of note is *Federal Programs for Libraries: A Directory*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1980. This publication is available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. The order number is ED 14858 and the publication is available in two formats: microfiche ($0.91 plus postage) and hard copy ($8.60 plus postage).

2Virginia P. White, *Grants: How to Find Out About Them and What to Do Next* (New York, 1975), 128. Archivists looking for additional guidance on grantsmanship would do well to read this book. White includes practical, useful advice on basic sources of information, government grants, foundation grants, the preapplication phase, preparing the application, and the grant award process.

3For order information, see footnote 1.

4For order information, see footnote 2.
REVIEWS, CRITIQUES, AND ANNOTATIONS

(NOTE: The review editors take special pride in recognizing the Georgia Semiquincentenary, the 250th anniversary of the founding of the state, by acknowledging the issuance of several noteworthy local historical publications, reviewed in this section.)


Anniversaries seem to be occasions when the good is gratefully recalled, the bad conveniently forgotten. While this pattern may hold true for many of the projects and ventures marking the semiquincentenary commemoration of the founding of Georgia in 1733, it in no way fits either of the volumes under review. Each of these handsomely produced books comprehends the fullness of what Bill Shipp characterized recently in the Atlanta Constitution (9 February 1983) as "this beautiful and awful place called Georgia."

The Georgia Catalog is two volumes in one. "Part I: A History of the Architecture of the State" by John Linley, a faculty member of the School of Environmental Design at the University of Georgia, serves also as something of a field guide. "Part II: A Catalog of Buildings Included in the Historic American Buildings Survey" (HABS) includes statewide listings for the
National Register of Historic Places, National Historic Landmarks, and the Historic American Engineering Record. Together, the history and the catalog constitute a convenient, attractive introduction to the built environment of Georgia.

Engaging is the word that best describes John Linley's chronology. With the skill he demonstrated in *Architecture of Middle Georgia: The Oconee Area* (Athens, 1972), the author readily transcends, in his own words, "more conventional architectural histories"; indeed, his attention throughout to town and city planning, to landscape and gardening, building crafts and industries alone guarantees such transcendence. But more than mere coverage distinguishes Linley's work, and that is something contained in his self-description as "a practicing architect and a teacher," for both roles are reflected in his book.

As a practicing architect, Linley notes such concerns as the recent revival in the Georgia mountains of the early and soon abandoned colonial craft of constructing log houses and the failure of many imported building styles to survive Georgia's climatic challenges, as against the success of some indigenous types (most notably, the so-called dog trot house) in proving their suitability to that climate, as well as their adaptability to changing times. He also indicates the spread of the "favored NNE-SSW orientation for residences" together with the use of louvered blinds in successful, preindustrial efforts at climate control and the virtual disappearance during modernization of "outbuildings and dependencies," as contrasted with the surprising affinity between a modern machine (the automobile) and an historic form (the Savannah alley). What is more, he seems ever ready to make connections between present and past, less to suggest "influences" than to enlighten the past with examples from a more familiar present. Note his distinctions between Miesian simplicity and Federal elegance or a Wrightian flow of living spaces and a Gothic Revival opening up of domestic interiors.

As a teacher of architectural history, Linley dips inevitably into "architectese," which, happily, is translated in a Glossary of Architectural Terms. Fortunately
also for the reader, the author demonstrates considerable moderation in his usage of this specialized vocabulary.

In conventional architectural histories, exposition as an end in itself presents no basic problems, for what is depicted is the architecture of a recognized elite. In works such as The Georgia Catalog, which seek to transcend this narrow tradition, exposition sometimes sputters before reality. Thus, it is in Linley's third chapter that the reader initially confronts the South's peculiar institution with a half-page photograph and description: "Unique buildings of the period include the Slave Market (ca. 1795) in Louisville, which was built at the juncture of primary Indian trails and used as a trading post for all kinds of public sales."

How stark, misdirected, and banal this exposition appears when measured against the historical reality of stealing and selling human beings. Questions crowd the mind confronted by the Louisville Slave Market: Who and how many slaves; where were their sales taking them; why such a structure in the open air, in the civic center of an avowedly civilized community; and how came it to survive in a region that has all but obliterated the material culture of both slavery and segregation? This is said less to criticize Linley's intentions—he later treats the housing of slaves, servants, and workers in the chapter "The Antebellum Period"—than to point out the potential hazards of extending architectural history's descriptive art into areas and conditions that are anything but value-free.

The second part of Linley's volume, the actual HABS catalog, takes up about one-quarter of the text and is the impetus for the publication of The Georgia Catalog. Established in 1933, the Historic American Buildings Survey published its initial survey in 1941, issued a supplement in 1959, and now, on the fiftieth anniversary of its founding, has authorized this and other state catalogs.

The three-columned HABS catalog is arranged alphabetically by place—town, city, or nearest town or city in each county—with a subheading for each county included. Each building is listed separately, delineated architecturally according to the standard HABS format,
and furnished with a HABS number for reference and an inventory of the photographs, drawings, and other data on file at the Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress. A map of HABS sites in forty-seven Georgia counties invites comparison with maps of National Register listings in one hundred Georgia counties, National Historic Landmark sites in twenty-two counties, and Historic American Engineering Record sites in three counties. These maps constitute a ready guide to significant structures statewide. Unfortunately, since the illustrations—-all contained in the history section—are unnumbered, the reader who attempts to cross-check and compare is forced to refer constantly to the two indices. All the same, this is the only (and a relatively minor) inconvenience in using this valuable and handsomely produced book.

*Vanishing Georgia,* because of its visual appeal, might easily qualify as one of those coffee table books that appear in waves (usually during Christmas season) and are remaindered and advertised, seemingly forever, in unsolicited, seasonal mail-order catalogs. But, because of what it represents, *Vanishing Georgia* is much, much more. It is, to begin with, a selection of over two hundred photographs from the eighteen thousand prints in the Vanishing Georgia collection of the Georgia Department of Archives and History. It is also a measure of the range between the beautiful and the awful in this state.

The photographs are reproduced in an 11-x-8½-inch format that focuses attention automatically on the pictures and not on the words accompanying them. Most of the captions are commendably brief and to the point. For the most part, the compilers have paid close attention to Mies van der Rohe's design dictum that "less is more," happily avoiding those psychoanalytic flights of interpretation that infest so many anthologies of this sort, choosing instead to let the photographs speak for themselves both individually and collectively.

The photographs are grouped under six headings—-"The Land," "The Town Evolves," "How We Looked," "Enjoying Ourselves," "Into the Twentieth Century,"
and "Days Remembered"—each with an informative and unpretentious two-to-three page introduction. Although other possible groupings—by area or period—suggest themselves, the one carried out here is especially effective in conveying the variety of everyday life in the state. "Into the Twentieth Century," for example, opens with a picture of an early automobile being driven down (the wrong side of, according to later traffic laws) a country road and includes a scattering of some dozen auto-related shots among photographs of civic fairs, advertising promotions, other new technologies (telephones, airships, movies, and the medical and domestic sciences), new products (Coca-Cola), new structures (a dam and a hotel), and unrelated period pieces (a scene from a local-option Prohibition election, another of convict labor in old-fashioned zebra suits). In the end, this diversity of images produces a unity all its own.

Certain clusters of images stand out. They range from everyday life, with farm women variously hulling rice, hoeing corn, and riding a cow, to the bizarre, with a carnival geek holding a live snake in his mouth and a portly small-town police chief astride a dead circus elephant which had just trampled its keeper. Both the occasion and the composition of the photographs are compelling.

What is missing from Vanishing Georgia is some equivalent to the survey materials provided in The Georgia Catalog. Only two pages of its introduction are given over to a description of the Vanishing Georgia Project. Here we do learn that it was begun in 1975 and is ongoing, that most of the collection covers the period from 1890 to 1930, and that photographs were selected "primarily for their documentary content and historical significance." In addition, Sherry Konter, who wrote the text, describes in some detail the field procedures followed for extending the project's influence statewide. What potential users of this collection need—ideally as an appendix in a paper cover edition of this volume—is systematized information about coverage by county and topic, as well as some indication of photo numbers and original source. Something along the lines suggested in George Talbot's landmark catalog At Home: Domestic
Life in the Post-Centennial Era, 1876-1920 (The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1977) would be useful. Until such a research supplement is available, Vanishing Georgia must remain less than an introduction to the collection.

Still, by chapters, in subject groupings or singly, the photographs of Vanishing Georgia convey the sense that here is real life. Here is the Georgia the traveler yet encounters along rural roads and among scattered hamlets—the full range, the beautiful, and the awful. Together with The Georgia Catalog, it provides a special introduction to the built—and the lived in—environment of the state.

Emory University and Atlanta University

Dana F. White


By what standard should an illustrated city history be judged—the story it tells, the insights it provides, or the goals it sees for itself? In his introduction to Atlanta: Triumph of a People, Norman Shavin describes the volume as one written "to trace some major and minor roads to self discovery," constructed "to be readable, anecdotal and well illustrated," and "designed to be used and enjoyed, not shelved and ignored." By these criteria, this Atlanta history is at least a partial success. It is, first and foremost, a coffee table book, to be picked up for perusal during an idle moment. The photographs, special features sections, and corporation advertisements summarize succinctly the 1917 fire, the crash at Orly, and the 1895 fair and provide minihistories of such local institutions as the Coca-Cola Company, the Atlanta Life Insurance Company, and Rich's Department Store. The brief, lively sketches in the book and the book's size (nine-by-twelve inches) should keep Atlanta: Triumph of a People out in view where it can indeed be "enjoyed, not shelved and ignored."
Shavin and Galphin have written the latest in a long line of city-boosting, business-oriented histories that include Edward Y. Clarke's *Illustrated History of Atlanta* (1877), Paul W. Miller's *Atlanta: Capital of the South* (1949), and First National Bank's *Atlanta Resurgens* (1971). In all of these, an upbeat narrative tells of the commercial initiatives that molded an important American city. The Shavin–Galphin account distinguishes itself, though, from its predecessors and also from the better known local histories written by Franklin Garrett in several ways: It attempts to trace the city all the way to the present; it seeks to integrate the accomplishments of black Atlanta into its narrative; and it tries to depict the changes in the physical forms of the city.

By bringing Atlanta to the present, Shavin and Galphin deal with a critical issue earlier histories ignored—race. Yet while they chronicle some achievements of black Atlantans, they do not present a fully integrated history of the city. Their priorities emerge in the relative space given various subjects. One third of the volume is devoted to color photographs of the city today and sketches of those businesses which sponsored the publication. About 10 percent of space is devoted to the Civil War; only one percent to the civil rights movement. Black Atlantans are found occasionally in the text, more frequently in the period after 1960; but their important contributions to Atlanta are segregated into a separate four-page feature entitled "Atlanta's Amazing Blacks." Nobel Laureate Martin Luther King, Jr., is treated in one page; Constitution editor Henry Grady in two; and author Margaret Mitchell in six. While black Atlantans are visible in this volume as they have been in no previous popular work, the dimensions of the city's black side remain largely unexplored. There is no treatment of the colorline that replaced slavery in the 1870s, no use of photographs to illustrate the segregation of public facilities in the twentieth century, and no quotations of progressive white leaders (such as Henry Grady) who supported segregation.

The point of view taken throughout is of the white
business leadership, most clearly apparent in the account of the "Whirlwinds of Change" beginning in the 1960s. Desegregation was something city leaders "handled" because "segregation was an impediment to a national corporation's free flow of employees, an offense to a majority of its customers, and a magnet for agitation where practiced." The handler in this account is Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr., whose racial moderation is contrasted with the stridency of his electoral opponent Lester Maddox, but whose efforts to buttress residential segregation in southwest Atlanta early in his administration are conveniently omitted. On the other hand, the achievements of Maynard Jackson—Atlanta's first black mayor—are seen only as disruptions of the old alliance between (white) business and government.

Shavin and Galphin have selected illustrations which document the transformation of a railroad terminus to a regional metropolis, yet they miss the opportunity to make that dramatic physical change more intelligible to current residents. Photographic captions give details of locations and dates of earlier streetscapes, but there are no then and now examples. Thirty-two pages of color photographs give striking views of modern Atlanta, however, their relation to the rest of the text is unclear. And for those readers who wish to increase their knowledge of Atlanta, Shavin and Galphin provide no guidance beyond their own text. Apart from photo credits at the end of the volume, there is no listing of sources, no suggestions for additional reading. The absence of these standard devices greatly limits the utility of this study. Atlanta is a far more complex city than the one rendered here, a metropolis whose major roads to self discovery still need to be traced in a popular book.

Georgia State University

Timothy J. Crimmins

87
For years, The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia, twenty-five volumes edited by Allen D. Candler and Lucian Lamar Knight and published between 1904 and 1919, have been the essential source for students of early Georgia history. Equally valuable, but less well known, were the remaining records—some twenty volumes in typescript, which could be consulted at only a very few locations around the state. Their inaccessibility worked a considerable hardship on both lay and professional historians, with the result that many needed studies went unwritten.

In 1976, under the auspices of the Georgia Commission for the National Bicentennial and the Georgia Department of Archives and History—with Kenneth Coleman and Milton Ready serving as editors—Volume 28, Part I, of the unpublished records was brought out by the University of Georgia Press. Since that initial effort, Volume 28, Part 2, and Volume 27 have also appeared. With the arrival of this latest addition, Volume 20, hope that the project will be completed is raised once again.

The subtitle for Volume 20 underscores its significance. In it are some of the most important documents relating to the founding of Georgia and to the critical years during which those "victims of philanthropy" (as Daniel Boorstin called the settlers) struggled to make the dreams of their London sponsors a reality on Yamacraw Bluff. Letters to and from the colony reveal with a clarity found only in primary sources the reality of day-to-day life in a settlement struggling to survive. At the same time, they show with equal clarity how little those trustees who guided the colony understood the hardships their charges faced. The tale told in these letters and accounts, however, is not entirely one of failure, for if it were, Georgia would not be celebrating its semiquincentenary this year. They
relate—simply and eloquently—the genesis of Georgia, and with their publication they are available for all to read.

This is an important addition to an important series. The Georgia Press should be encouraged by everyone interested in the preservation and use of historic records to complete the project. Along with the already published Colonial Records (which, with the Revolutionary Records of Georgia, are available on microfilm), it will give the state a resource its citizens will treasure forever.

Clayton Junior College Harvey H. Jackson


This handy pamphlet is an interesting introduction to the topic and, although directed primarily toward books, should be on the shelves of all archivists responsible for security.


Archival managers may find in this publication useful suggestions for dealing with the ever-present internal communication problem. The publication is based on the experience of Association of Research Library members.
Images in Time: A Basic Guide to the Processing and
Preservation of Historical Photographs. By Jean E.
Dryden. Alberta: Alberta Educational Communications
Corporation, 1982. Pp. 56. Preface, bibliography,
photographs, forms. Softcover. No price given.

Intended primarily for individual collectors and
small archives and museums, this publication is at-
tractively illustrated by photographs from the Provin-
cial Archives of Alberta. The short text goes beyond
the limits suggested in the subtitle to include comments
on acquisitions and reference.

Public Works History in the United States: A Guide
to the Literature. Compiled and edited by Suellen M.
Hoy and Michael C. Robinson with research associate
index. Cloth. $49.

Sponsored by the Public Works Historical Society,
this bibliography consists of an annotated list of books,
articles, dissertations, and theses written as history
about public works in the United States. The entries
are organized alphabetically by author within fourteen
topical chapters. Items published through 1980 are
cited; the quarterly newsletter of the Public Works
Historical Society lists or reviews subsequent publi-
cations. It is indexed for authors and titles only and
is for reference and special utility in archives with
public records.

Material Culture Studies in America. Compiled and
edited with introductions and bibliography by Thomas
for State and Local History, 1982. Pp. xviii, 419. Pre-
face, bibliographic essay, tables, index. $22.95.
Paper, $15.

An anthology designed for introductory courses on
American material culture, this volume brings together the essential literature on the subject—articles on the history, theory, method, and practice of material culture research. Schlereth supplies a very long original essay on the history of material culture studies in America from 1876 to 1976, lengthy introductions to each of the other twenty-three articles, and a selective bibliographical essay. It is good for archives doubling as museums.


This booklet in the Special Libraries Association's Professional Development Series is divided into two main sections "Principles" and "Process." Naturally, Gracy compares and contrasts archival activity with that of librarians. Although probably intended for librarians untrained in archives who are given archival responsibilities, this concise, well-written essay will also be a useful introduction for archival education courses and on-the-job training of new employees.

NOTE: Greenwood Press (88 Post Road West, P.O. Box 5007, Westport, CT 06881) has published Research Institutions and Learned Societies, edited by Joseph C. Kiger (Pp.xxv, 551. $45). This volume in the Greenwood Encyclopedia of American Institutions series provides information on more than 160 nonprofit societies, academies, councils, libraries, laboratories, and museums which have had a national influence during the last two centuries.

NOTE: The 300-page Guide to Genealogical Research in the National Archives expands and updates the 1964
edition. It is available for $21 (hardcover) or $17 (softcover) from Genealogical Guide, Box 601, National Archives, Washington, DC 20408.

NOTE: Archivists may wish to contact the National Archives Trust Fund (NEPS), National Archives Building, Washington, DC 20408, concerning the recent availability of the 1910 census.

NOTE: Both Heritage Books, Inc. (3602 Maureen, Suite 104, Bowie, MD 20715) and Gale Research Company (Book Tower, Detroit, MI 48226) would be pleased to provide information concerning their publications.
INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

Editorial Policy

• Members of the Society of Georgia Archivists, and others with professional interest in the aims of the society, are invited to submit manuscripts for consideration and to suggest areas of concern or subjects which they feel should be included in forthcoming issues of PROVENANCE.

• Manuscripts received from contributors are submitted to an editorial board. Editors are asked to appraise manuscripts in terms of appropriateness, pertinence, innovativeness, scholarly worth, and clarity of writing.

• Only manuscripts which have not been previously published will be accepted, and authors must agree not to publish elsewhere, without explicit written permission, a paper submitted to and accepted by PROVENANCE.

• Two copies of PROVENANCE will be provided to the author without charge.

• Letters to the editor which include pertinent and constructive comments or criticism of articles or reviews recently published by PROVENANCE are welcome. Ordinarily, such letters should not exceed 300 words.

• Brief contributions for Short Subjects may be addressed to Glen McAninch, Richard B. Russell Memorial Library, University of Georgia Libraries, Athens, GA 30602 or to Box 261, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303.
Manuscript Requirements

• Manuscripts should be submitted in double-spaced typescripts throughout—including footnotes at the end of the text—on white bond paper 8½ x 11 inches in size. Margins should be about 1½ inches all around. All pages should be numbered, including the title page. The author's name and address should appear only on the title page, which should be separate from the main text of the manuscript.

• Each manuscript should be submitted in two copies, the original typescript and one carbon copy or durable photocopy.

• The title of the paper should be accurate and distinctive rather than merely descriptive.

• References and footnotes should conform to accepted scholarly standards. Ordinarily, PROVENANCE uses footnote format illustrated in the University of Chicago Manual of Style, 13th edition.


• Use of terms which have special meanings for archivists, manuscript curators, and records managers should conform to the definitions in "A Basic Glossary for Archivists, Manuscript Curators, and Records Managers," American Archivist 37, 3 (July 1974). Copies of this glossary are available for $2 each from the Executive Director, SAA, 330 S. Wells St., Suite 810, Chicago, IL 60606.
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