The Primary Source

Volume 2 | Issue 3

Article 1

1980

Entire Issue Volume 2, Number 3

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/theprimarysource>

Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(1980) "Entire Issue Volume 2, Number 3," *The Primary Source*: Vol. 2 : Iss. 3 , Article 1.

DOI: 10.18785/ps.0203.01

Available at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/theprimarysource/vol2/iss3/1>

This Complete Issue is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Primary Source by an authorized editor of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

The Primary Source

Newsletter of the Society of Mississippi Archivists

Volume Two

August, 1980

Number Three

ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES NAMED

Dr. Robert M. Warner, 52, director of the Bentley Historical Library at the University of Michigan, has been named Archivist of the United States. In making the appointment, General Services Administrator Rowland G. Freeman III said, "I will rely heavily on Dr. Warner for the efficient and effective management of the National Archives and Records Service, and for maintaining a dialogue with users so that Archival programs can continue to be tailored to meet their needs."

Warner, an archivist, historian and author, will administer the \$80 million budget of the National Archives and Records Service and supervise its 4200 employees in Washington, D. C., the 11 regional centers nationwide and 6 presidential libraries.

Because of the unique requirements of the position of the Archivist of the United States, Freeman established a citizens advisory panel to develop criteria and assemble a roster of highly qualified candidates. They advised the administrator throughout the selection process and worked closely with an executive level governmental selection panel for months.

George M. Elsey, president of the American Red Cross National Headquarters in Washington, D. C., headed the ad hoc panel for review of qualifications of candidates which included 11 other scholars, historians and archivists. Other panelists were: Thomas Deahl, MICRODOC, Philadelphia; Theodore Durr, University of Baltimore; Ruth Helmut, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland; James G. Kolleger, Environmental Information Center, Inc., New York City; Richard W. Leopold, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Jerome Maddock, Calculon Corp., Philadelphia; Philip P. Mason, Wayne State University, Detroit; Rodman W. Paul, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena; William Rofes, IBM, White Plains, N.Y.; Clement E. Vose, Wesleyan University, Middleton, Conn.; and Rabbi Malcolm H. Stren, New York City.

Warner has an impressive academic career at the University of Michigan. He began in 1956 as a teaching fellow, and later held positions of lecturer, associate professor and professor of history and of library science.

Warner has written extensively in the fields of history and archives. He has served as president of the Society of American Archivists and the Historical Society of Michigan. He held leadership positions in numerous civic and professional organizations including the American Historical Association, Organization of American Historians, Michigan Academy of Arts, Science and Letters, American Association for State and Local History and the University of Michigan Research Club. He was a Society of American Archivists Fellow in 1967 and chairman of the planning committee for the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

A native of Montrose, Col., Warner attended the University of Denver and graduated cum laude at Muskingham College in New Concord, Ohio, in 1949. He served with the U. S. Army from 1950 to 1952 and received a master's degree in 1953 and a doctorate in history in 1958 from the University of Michigan.

1981 PROGRAM COMMITTEE NAMED

The Primary Source is a quarterly publication of news and ideas produced by the Society of Mississippi Archivists, a non-profit organization of professional archivists and interested persons. Subscription to The Primary Source is included in the Society membership dues. Membership information is printed on the last page of each newsletter.

Your contributions are welcome. Write The Primary Source, P. O. Box 1151, Jackson, MS 39205.

Deadlines for inclusion are:

- #1 (February) -- January 31
- #2 (May) -- April 30
- #3 (August) -- July 31
- #4 (November) -- October 31

h t holmes.....Editor

FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR -

The pace of the Society has slowed considerably after a very busy spring, but things are still happening. At the July 22 meeting of the Executive Council, it was decided to hold the 1981 annual meeting in Greenville. Interest was also expressed in having a workshop in the fall. As plans develop, you will be hearing more about both of these activities.

Work will begin soon on the Membership Directory for 1979-1980. We hope to have it in the mail by the middle of September. If an address correction is needed for any members, please let me know as soon as possible so the correction can be incorporated into the directory.

While in Atlanta for a meeting last month, I talked with Les Hough, President of the Society of Georgia Archivists. Les invited us to a joint meeting of the Society of Georgia Archivists and the Society of Alabama Archivists in November to discuss the formation of a regional association of archivists and interested citizens from several southeastern states. Mississippi is not presently a member of any regional group, so we are very interested in talking about the idea. You will be hearing more on this also at a later date.

Membership in the Society currently

President Hafter has appointed the 1981 Program Committee. This committee will have the responsibility for planning the annual spring meeting of the Society. The first working session of the committee will be in Jackson on August 21. Please share your ideas for next years program by writing the chair at the Society's mailing address. Committee members are:

H. T. Holmes, Chairman
Manuscript Curator
Mississippi Department of Archives and History

Robert J. Bailey
Vice-President
Society of Mississippi Archivists

Frances B. Boeckman
Archivist
Catholic Diocese of Mississippi

Virgia Brock-Shedd
Archivist
Tougaloo College

Jo Cille Hafter (ex officio)
President
Society of Mississippi Archivists

John Sobotka
Archivist
University of Mississippi Law Archives

stands at 317 (75 new members and 242 renewals) and seems to have leveled off somewhat. Let us hear of friends interested in the archival profession or in preserving Mississippi documentary heritage. We think we have something to offer them. The membership year runs from October 1 to September 30. The application form which appears on the last page of this newsletter is for new members. All current members will receive membership renewal notices in September.

The Society is a dynamic organization constantly looking for ways to serve you the membership. Let us know how we can meet your needs. -- RET

NEWS AND NOTES

The MIDWEST STATE ARCHIVES GUIDE project has entered into another phase of planning. Active participants, the Illinois State Archives, the Minnesota Historical Society and the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, will cooperate in designing compatible computer cataloguing languages. They also will hold seminars on indexing and compile a thesaurus for use as a guide. This regional approach to state records is expected to improve access through subject indexing. During an earlier phase of the project, the participants planned and tested an automated data base system for archival descriptions. The system they developed is based on the NHPRC national guide data base and the Spindex computer program package. Max J. Evans, Assistant Director, Archives Division, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, serves as project director. Write to him at 816 State Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, for more information.

from History News

Legislation which would increase the independence of the ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES was introduced June 19, in the House (HR 7628) by Rep. Richardson Preyer (D-NC), Govt. Information and Individual Rights Subcommittee Chair, and in the Senate (S. 2852) by Sen. Robert Morgan (D-NC). No immediate action has been scheduled on either bill.

HR 7628 would elevate the Archivist to a presidential appointee subject to Senate confirmation, and vest in the Archivist all title 44 USC records management authority. The bill is designed to insulate the position and place the Archivist in a better position to retrieve federal records retained by an individual such as former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, according to the statement by Preyer in the June 19 Congressional Record (pp. H5430-31, daily edition). Preyer hopes the bill will also "serve to stimulate a thoughtful and serious discussion of the issues associated with a view espoused by many historians, genealogists and other scholars - that the National Archives should be an independent entity, separate and apart from GSA."

The Senate bill would do just that - establish an independent National Archives

and Records Administration. The present NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE has been part of the General Services Administration since 1949, putting the nation's historical records in "the same category as toilet paper and brooms," according to Morgan's statement on S. 2853 (June 19 Congressional Record, pp. S7743-6, daily edition). Morgan's statement is useful for its historical background about the National Archives and previous attempts to gain independent status.

from Washington Newsletter

The PENNSYLVANIA HISTORICAL AND MUSEUM COMMISSION recently published a Manual of Archival Techniques, edited by Roland M. Baumann. Funded by NHPRC, this 127-page manual is the result of 3 workshops designed to improve processing and preserving valuable historical records in Pennsylvania that were held in 1978 in Harrisburg, Pittsburgh and Wilkes-Barre. Copies of the Manual can be ordered from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Box 1026, Harrisburg, PA 17120, for \$2.75.

The PRESERVATION, RESEARCH AND TESTING OFFICE, Library of Congress, has recently conducted a series of tests, using sodium borohydride, that substantially improve the folding endurance of paper. The office plans in the near future to conduct two additional tests with diethyl zinc (DEZ) in vapor phase mass deacidification of books, first for 400 volumes and the second, 5000 volumes, to resolve remaining questions on DEZ deacidification and to establish large-scale treatment runs.

The Library recently published Polyester Film Encapsulation, an illustrated pamphlet which provides basic information about the application of polyester film encapsulation to the conservation of library materials.

from LC Information Bulletin

"A New Archivist for a New Decade" is the theme of the eighth annual workshop of the SOCIETY OF GEORGIA ARCHIVISTS to be held November 29-31. The workshop, co-sponsored by the SOCIETY OF ALABAMA ARCHIVISTS, will be held on the campus of Emory University in Atlanta. Dr. Ruth Helmut, president of the Society of American

(cont. p. 4)

Archivists, will speak at a dinner meeting on November 20. On November 21 other speakers from Ohio, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee and Georgia will discuss archival education, building planning, publications, microfilm techniques and technology, disaster preparedness, new relationships among archivists and the impact of the computer on archives. For further information contact the Society of Georgia Archivists, P.O. Box 261, Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES AND HISTORY staff members recently participated in special archival education programs. Dwight Harris, Official Records Archivist, attended the 45th Modern Archives Institute sponsored by NARS in Washington, DC. William Hanna spent 3 days in June at NARS in intensive study of the archival practices of the Motion Picture and Sound Recording Branch.

The 44th annual meeting of THE SOCIETY OF AMERICAN ARCHIVISTS will be held Sept. 30 - Oct. 3 in Cincinnati, Ohio. Major program sessions will address strategies for influencing funding authorities - state legislators, library administrators and administrators in general. The acquisition of external funding will receive consideration in two regular program offerings, as well as in a special workshop on the preparation of grant proposals. Additional program sessions will suggest means of making better use of resources in performing archival functions: conservation, processing, appraisal and reference. The meeting program also provides opportunities to keep up with technological changes affecting archival work. Automated systems for archives and records management will be considered in a major session. Practical workshops will address the use of micro- and mini-computers in archival administration. The administration of machine readable records at universities will be the topic of a panel session. Inventorying and scheduling of machine readable records and appraising machine readable records are also on the meeting agenda.

A workshop will cover electronic and non-electronic storage media. A major session will explore available alternatives in microfilming. Technological advances in archival conservation will be the topic of another panel presentation. Twenty-four of the seventy sessions will address the top two concerns identified by the membership. Forty-six other sessions will address a variety of archival concerns. For more information write The Society of American Archivists, 330 S. Wells Street, Suite 810, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

NOTE: An income tax deduction may be allowed for expenses of education (including travel, meals, lodging) undertaken to maintain and improve professional skills (see Treas. Reg. 1.162.5; Coughlin v Commissioner, 203F 2nd 1).

The AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR STATE AND LOCAL HISTORY will hold its annual meeting in New Orleans, Sept. 7-10. Among the problems to be addressed by the program's sessions will be volunteers, security, membership, money, and personnel management. For more information write AASLH, 1400 Eight Ave., South, Nashville, Tenn. 37203.

The COUNTRY MUSIC FOUNDATION LIBRARY AND MEDIA CENTER has opened an audio restoration laboratory equipped to restore sound on pre-stereo recordings to its original quality. Foundation Director Bill Ivey explained the planned uses of the laboratory: to preserve the sound on materials that are deteriorating such as acetate radio transcription, in the library's collections; to stimulate the release of historical material in the country field; and through licensing, leasing and other arrangements, to reissue some historic recordings on the foundation's own label. The Country Music Foundation Library and Media Center is located at 4 Music Square East, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

from History News

The NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE has established the new position of preservation officer. The person chosen for the job will provide overall direction and coordination for the Archives' preservation programs and report directly to the Archivist of the U.S.

from History News

THE EDITOR NOTES -

The publication of this issue marks the completion of my first year as editor of the Society's newsletter. This time has brought me into contact with many people, whose generosity with their time and thoughts have filled the pages of The Primary Source. I cannot say thank you enough for all of the support given this publication. Be warned, however, that my inadequacies in thanking you do not in the least diminish my expectation of your continued help! The continued production of any publication of the nature of The Primary Source depends upon an interested and vocal readership.

At the Executive Council meeting in July, President Hafter was authorized to appoint a Committee on The Primary Source to make proposals for its future direction and to investigate possible sources of additional financial support. In a very democratic share-the-power move, Jo Cille appointed William Hanna, MDAH Senior Manuscript Curator, as chairman of the committee and authorized him to appoint the rest of the committee! The appointments were occupying his attention at press-time, so that's all we have on that, folks, except that we hope to have a statement from the chairman of the Committee on The Primary Source in The Primary Source next time.

One aspect of the newsletter the committee intends to talk about is content. As regular readers are aware of by now, TPS is not really a newsletter - how much news can be news in a four-times-a-year publication? And as we all have noticed, or will by the time you finish this issue, many of the articles appearing in the newsletter would perhaps be more suitable in a journal format. Now, a point not all of us may be aware of: The SMA only has enough money to do what we are doing now. So, indeed, the Committee on The Primary Source does have a dilemma to contemplate.

This issue, however, only has one problem: It's about to burst its staple with information. Eleanor McKay's talk before last spring's SMA meeting is printed herein for those who were not at the meeting. Handling the masses of paper created by everyone these days (not just politicians) is a very serious archival problem. Your attention is directed to Eleanor's approach to this problem with congressional papers. Tom Pardo is inaugurating a series of articles on the classic archival literature with his overview of four archivists who were instrumental in formulating our modern concepts of archival practices. And, introducing yet another new feature, Patricia Galloway reviews a published translation of some French archival materials. Perhaps some heavy reading, but while the weather is hot, settle down in front of the air conditioner with your favorite archival ade and peruse the latest offerings of our colleagues. -- hth

BOOK REVIEW -

REFERENCE REQUESTS?!

Carl A Brasseaux, A Comparative View of French Louisiana, 1699 and 1762: The Journals of Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville and Jean-Jacques-Blaise d'Abbadie Lafayette, La.: Center for Louisiana Studies, 1979) 151 + viii pp., index; price \$6.95.

In this small but reasonably-priced volume, Carl Brasseaux provides translations of the journals of the founder and the last governor of the Louisiana colony in its first French phase. Because the documents span so long a time, there is strong contrast in the two pictures they paint: The first shows the land and its inhabitants as they were found by the French; the second shows the social scene of New Orleans in all the brilliance of Gallic culture of the 18th century. Neither document has ever been published in full in a competent modern translation, and though the historical researcher might quibble with the occasional freedom of Brasseaux' rendering, he has produced a very readable and accurate translation, amply provided with notes and references to primary documentation from archival sources.

It is not only the fact that these documents have not been translated in full before that justifies this work. Both of them are key historical documents, though in very different ways. The Iberville journal, so constantly quoted - and misquoted - in ethnographic research, needs to be made more easily available. The d'Abbadie journal, heretofore relatively unknown, contains much valuable information about the transfer of the part of the colony east of the Mississippi to the English. Additionally, d'Abbadie's interest in the daily social events of the colony causes him to note much that is relevant to the history of the development of French culture in the New World, and it is doubly valuable because no other governor gives quite so detailed a picture of this aspect of colonial life.

The archivist will welcome this publication of archival sources (taken from documents in the Bibliotheque Nationale and the Archives des Colonies in Paris, via, respectively, publication in French and microfilm) as a demonstration of the usefulness of such holdings, even in the form of

(cont. p. 8)

Anyone who has ever worked with reference and attempted to serve all patrons with friendliness and grace has surely felt himself an inmate of Bedlam on occasion. A saner perspective is sometimes restored by laughter resulting from particularly funny, mis-stated questions. Caught up in the zeal of his particular pursuit of knowledge, the patron forgets that the archivist is not privy to this thoughts. Some of the results of such absent-mindedness have been shared by Society members:

"I pray you found something as I am completely confused about this person at this time."

"There is a family legend that _____ was forced to shoe horses for Union troops during the War Between the States, and that he did in a way which would cause the horses to go lame. This causes me to wonder if he might have been executed."

"I would like to get the record of W--- T. B--- the T. stud fore T--- he fought in the civil war if you can help me out it will highly appear that he was my grandfather if you can come up with this record just mail me the bill and the check will follow."

"Dear Sir:

Just want to say I am sorry to have been so long in sending you a THANK YOU note. I had to take a couple of weeks out to be sick. Guess my common sense left me when I asked you to check the 1880 census for _____ since he wasn't born until 1887. Maybe I will be less confused as time goes on. Boy there is a lot to learning the hows, whens, whys and wheres of genealogy."

"A 100 pound rock out West has no value. That same rock in Tunica can be sold."

"At that time a vigilante was operating called the 'regulators' who was hanging anyone sympathetic to the South. This is the possible reason for his disappearing. On the other hand, he might have had another family in your area."

"They were independent people who came to the lonely, swampy jungle to be alone - to live off the plow and the gun on the shoulder."

ACCESSIONS

University of Southern Mississippi
McCain Graduate Library

By donation, the personal library of Mr. Cleanth Brooks, consisting of 2,500 volumes. Mr. Brooks has been one of the most eminent of American critics. Along with Robert Penn Warren, Brooks has been one of the significant factors in shaping the reading habits and the critical judgments of students for the past half century.

The composition of the library is roughly as follows; There is a section of 18th century books, including a number of poetical miscellanies, Wharton's English Poetry, 1774; Beatty's The Minstrel, 1771; Fingal's Macpherson, 1762; an almost complete set of Joseph Ritson; Pilkington's Dictionary of Painters; Edward Jones Musical & Poetical Relicks of the Welsh Bards, 1794; Shennstone's Works; Butler's Hudibras; the Steevens edition of Shakespeare, representing the beginnings of modern Shakespeare criticism; Dodsley's Collection of Plays; Hoggs' Jacobite Relics of Scotland; Percy's Reliques; The Tatler; and Ellis' Specimens of English Poetry. Of especial interest is Hau Kiou Chooan, 4 vols., London, 1761, the first Chinese novel to be published in England. The 17th century is represented by a copy of Il Pastor Fido, 1643. Milton, Shakespeare and Samuel Johnson are represented in depth. Among the Johnsoniana is a rare deluxe edition of Birbeck Hill's In the Footsteps of Samuel Johnson.

A sizeable number of works are in the Romantic period, including books by and about Coleridge, Byron, Keats, Shelley and Wordsworth. Included is a run of the Keats-Shelley memorial Bulletin, and a first edition of Scott's Kenilworth. There are approximately 1300 volumes of belles lettres, consisting of books by and about the major English and American authors of the 20th century. Among the authors represented in depth are Auden, M. Buckley, Cheever, Dickey, Fitzgerald, M. Ford, E. M. Forster, Graves, O'Hara, H. Lawrence, Wyndham Lewis, Banokov, Walker Percy, Huxley, Pound, Spender and Wallace Stevens. There are approximately shelves of modern Shakespeare criticism by the major critics such as Bayley (Lost Language of Symbolism), Bowra, and Empson,

along with the Bollingen edition of African Folktales and Sculpture. Some of the more valuable books in this period are Hemingway's Green Hills of Africa, Nabokov's Real Life of Sebastian Knight, in the scarce first issue, a group of Robert Frost's Christmas Keepsake poems and the first 8 volumes of the Southern Review.

Finally, there are about 350 volumes of out-of-print and rare literature textbooks and works on Southern history and literature by such authors as William Osler, Reynolds Price, Kate Chopin, J. C. Harris and some lesser known authors.

Additional accretions have been made to the de Grummon Collection of Children's Literature.

SCHOLAR'S PLEA

Biographer of Katherine Anne Porter is seeking information about one IONE FUNCHES from Mississippi. Orphaned, educated in New Orleans convent and married Newell Porter around 1900. Lived subsequently in San Antonio and eventually in California. Any information gratefully received by:

Joan Givner
Associate Professor of English
University of Regina
Regina, Saskatchewan
Canada S4S 0A2

NHPRC NEWS -

Dear Editor:

We have noticed that a number of regional organizations have been considering the pros and cons of applying for grant funds to carry out projects of regional importance. This matter has been raised by regional organizations within steering committee meetings, in program sessions and in questions posed to candidates for regional association offices. It appears to us that discussions have focused largely on whether or not the regional organization is equipped to administer a grant project directly and on potential duplication of efforts of national organizations.

We at NHPRC hope that regional associations and other professional groups will not limit their discussion of potentially useful grant projects to the areas of administrative burden or duplication of effort. We believe that neither of these presents particularly serious obstacles. Regional associations are in an excellent position to foster and influence the development of ideas for projects of particular value to the association or a substantial number of its members. Should a proposal concept emerge as the product of discussion among members, perhaps through the work of a formal grants committee, it seems probable that one institution within the region would be willing to sponsor the proposal and act as the project base. This seems particularly true for development components; applicants other than the regional association itself could probably be found for conference and planning type projects as well.

There are a variety of potential working relationships between a regional archival organization and an institution in the region which has responded to the regional's urging to sponsor an important project. The regional's efforts could be limited to suggesting a needed project and finding a sponsor. More detailed levels of involvement include a) having the regional's grant committee work with the applicant in outlining or even drafting the proposal, by naming a subcommittee or task force to identify and work with an applicant on the specific proposal, c) suggesting a project advisory committee or consultants from membership of the re-

gional association, d) monitoring the progress of the project through written reports, program sessions or site visits. Where agreeable to the interested parties, the costs for this type of involvement by the regional organization in the conduct of a project could be included in the grant budget. The grant process can be a means to address important issues without bringing undue administrative strain on the regional association.

The approach suggested above assumes that regional organizations have as one of their legitimate roles some active involvement in archival developments beyond those which can be achieved through traditional meeting and workshop formats. Perhaps NHPRC views regional associations within this context because they seem aptly suited to fill the gap between institutional projects, which rarely involve activities or findings of value beyond the grantee's particular interests, and projects sponsored by national organizations whose focus is understandably limited to broad issues of interest to their members. Significant problem-solving and developmental projects which fall between these two poles frequently fail to reach the proposal stage for lack of an interested sponsor.

We invite the regional archival associations to meet and talk with NHPRC staff over the coming months to explore these matters further and we hope that you will consider creating an organizational mechanism to continue to influence the development of important projects in a systematic way.

Sincerely,

Larry J. Hackman, Director
Records Program
NHPRC

Review, cont.

copies. The annotation points to a vast range of archival materials now available in microfilm, and the publication as a whole will serve to awaken interest in a period for which the available historical materials are so rich as to shame the relatively tiny body of historical search that has been done on these materials.

Patricia Galloway
MDAH

RECENT LARGE CONGRESSIONAL COLLECTIONS - MAKING THEM MORE ACCESSIBLE FOR RESEARCH

By Eleanor McKay, Curator
Mississippi Valley Collection
Memphis State University

Since the 1930s, approximately, collections amassed by United States senators and representatives have ballooned in size, but not necessarily in information content. As the telephone has become the accepted vehicle for rapid transmission of important information, politicians and their constituents quickly have adopted the benefits of the new technology, which unfortunately leaves no historical record of the business transacted over the phone. There may be a letter to follow-up on the oral communication, but very often this letter helpfully reads, "This letter is to confirm our telephone conversation of yesterday and to inform you that I have taken the action we agreed upon." Constituents have also contributed to swollen congressional collections in their increasing use of their elected representatives as a buffer or citizen advocate with such federal agencies as the Social Security Administration for help in getting retirement benefits; the Veterans Administration for continued rehabilitation of a disabled Vietnam-era veteran; or the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to speed the immigration of a friend or relative into the United States.

As our senators and congressmen have become increasingly responsive to the needs of an increasingly demanding constituency, however, their collections have gradually become only dim mirrors of the politician's important lobbying functions for his constituents and also of the routine operations of the offices on Capitol Hill.

The archivist fortunate enough to acquire a recent congressional collection needs to develop a first-hand sense of the operations of an office on the Hill, either through participation in the office that created the collection or in a comparable office. Ideally, repositories can work out regular disposal schedules, so that at the end of every term or every year, the archivist will travel to Washington to select and pack records for transfer to the repository. Jim Shoalmire until recently served the Mississippi State

University in this capacity in Senator Stennis' office, and John Sobotka similarly represented the University of Mississippi in acquiring Senator Eastland's records.

This first-hand knowledge enables the archivist to recognize the immensity of power and the immediacy of national and world affairs that permeates the communications media of Washington, DC. People on Capitol Hill have access to hours of WATS telephone lines, free microfilming and indexing of congressional records, the opportunity to wine and dine with national and world notables, among many other privileges not accorded most American citizens. And Washington newspapers, radio and television keep their audience minutely informed of the day-to-day changes in a whole host of national and world affairs and crises. That accessibility to power and information often escapes documentation in modern congressional collections. The archivist who has experienced the headiness of that accessibility can adroitly design an oral history program that elicits discussion and analysis of that power. Often even the archivist working several weeks in a Capitol Hill office finds the hometown hopelessly dull upon returning to it.

First-hand experience with the routine of a major political office also sensitizes the archivist to the subtle, unspoken realities of power. Absurd though these examples may seem out of the context of individual state politics, in some states the legalization of the public sale of oleomargarine has been a vital issue, seen as a threat to the state's vital dairy industry. Elsewhere, correspondence from heavy equipment dealers needs to be carefully read, since prominent politicians may have started their careers in family-owned heavy equipment dealerships. The oral history program that does not delve into these local political realities fails to serve the interests of historical research.

Most recent congressional collections pose a major research obstacle in that the physical bulk of the collection makes the researcher either go frantic or reckless in the search for valuable information. We, as archivists, as the keepers of the historical records, have an obligation to use our professional training

(cont. p. 10)

Congressional Collections, cont.

to reduce these collections to a manageable size. Not only must we make the collection useable enough for research use, but we must also insure that there remains room in our stacks for future accessions of real and immediate research value. So often the argument in favor of unweeded congressional collections is that future research trends are unpredictable and we archivists wouldn't want to obstruct these research trends. If, however, a repository clutters up its stacks with 152 cubic feet of the records of a one-term representative (1965-1967) like George W. Grider of Memphis and then 92 cubic feet (1967-1975) of his successor, Dan H. Kuykendall, plus possible hundreds of cubic feet of a contemporary senator, than that repository commits suicide in terms of its original and diversified collecting policy. Someday, another Faulkner correspondent's collection will be offered to the repository, or the records of the city's public television studio, or the records of the local policemen's union, and the repository will have to reject the offered collection for lack of storage space.

In my article in the American Archivist (July, 1978), I wrote of a method of sampling or weeding congressional collections that I think is more valid than the subjective, idiosyncratic weeding that often occurs. Before the archivist decides to employ this method of sampling based on mathematically, randomly-selected items, the archivist must carefully study a congressional collection and look for three characteristics in its series. To be so sampled, a series must contain 1) routine material 2) of a relatively homogeneous nature and 3) be bulky in physical size. In effect, the ratio of valuable research information is inversely related to the bulk of the series. An example is a series of constituent correspondence replete with such requests as copies of the Congressional Record, flags flown over the U.S. Capitol building, or help in getting accepted at West Point or another U. S. military academy. Even if the series also contains more personally sensitive information, such as requests for help with Medicare payments or reactions pro-and-con to such issues as abortion or demand for war with the Ayatollah's Iran, these

are issues and concerns reflected in most contemporary congressional collections. A few letters or phone calls to fellow archivists can rapidly compare collections and determine the uniqueness of congressional series.

It is relatively easy to make a professionally valid judgement that a series is routine and homogeneous. The tricky question is the third one: Is the series bulky enough to warrant item-by-item weeding?

The definition of bulkiness relates to a large body of variables. For instance, is this the only congressional collection your repository is likely to acquire? How many other congressional collections are available to researchers in your state or region? How much stack space is projected for the archive in the future? What is your collecting policy? Is the acquisition of this and perhaps more congressional collections likely to cripple the balanced, overall development of your repository's archival holdings? How is the collection likely to be used at your repository? Does the local university have a faculty member training graduate students in the mechanics of research into the relationship between popular opinion and federal legislation? Are your local historians oriented to antiquarian and genealogical research rather than to the study of more recent history? The truthful answers to these questions relate to the definition of bulk for a given series in a congressional collection. At this time, I hesitate to give a ready formula like if the series contains 100 or more cubic feet, divide by x to determine how many cubic feet to retain after weeding.

We as a profession need to test reasonably our new methodological theories before we adopt them wholesale. We probably all have seen excellent collections of alphabetical subject files ruined 20-30 years ago by processing when the theory was that all correspondence should be pulled out and arranged chronologically in a separate series. This method of arrangement was not rigorously experimented with prior to its adoption. It is better that a few collections should be processed as test collections and their results evaluated, as archival successes or as failures, than that we wholesale adopt the new methods that may result in irretrievably ruined collections, no longer reflective of

(cont. p. 11)

Congressional Collections, cont.

the organization their creator developed. We must remember that a researcher learns not only from the information contained in a collection, but also from the way that a collection is organized. Too often historians are totally ignorant of the manipulation that a collection endures from hostile heirs, careless moving company employees and uncritical archivists. Archivists have little control over the former, but we at least can be rigorously precise in our handling of collections.

Archivists need to develop standards for sampling modern, bulky collections. Through my work with modern congressional collections, I have proposed we sample routine, homogeneous, bulky series in this type of modern collection using random number concepts developed by mathematicians and widely used in other disciplines of learning. As is discussed in my 1978 article, statisticians concur that series marked by the three characteristics mentioned above may be sampled down to 20% or less of the bulk received from the donor. Actually, those blessed with a better knowledge of the application of the statistical techniques to historical research material can apparently reduce a series down to as little as 2% of its original universe, without affecting future research use of the series. Reduction to 20% of the original bulk seems drastic enough, however, until the validity of this method has been tested and analyzed more systematically.

If the archivist decides to weed a routine, homogeneous and bulky series of a congressional collection, weeding by random numbers is both easy and relatively quick. The archivist shows the student assistant or paraprofessional or volunteer the cartons to be sampled. In each carton, the worker then sequentially numbers each item number 1 through X, putting the number in pencil between brackets on the verso of the item. Breaks between folders are not important in this process. An item is defined as a single sheet of paper or a group of papers bound, stapled or otherwise attached as a single unit of information. At each new carton, the worker begins to number the items again at the number 1. Using a page from a book

of random numbers, the worker can start with any number on any page of numbers.

It is permissible to use only the last 2 digits of the 5 digit numbers from a random number chart. For example, starting with any number on the page, the worker selects the number 59823. Using only the last 2 numbers, the worker goes on to item 23 in the first carton, selects number 23 to save, puts numbers 24-27 for discard, saves number 28, and so on until the carton has been entirely sampled.

For the second carton, the worker goes back to the random number chart to select a number next to 59823, going either up, down, left, right or diagonally over from that number. Suppose the next number over is 82594; if the second carton lacks 94 items, skip this number from the chart and move on to the next one. If it is 05203, start sampling at item 3 in carton 2, and so on.

This method has numerous advantages. The valuable time of the professional archivist is not wasted on mechanical work suitable for a less specialized worker. The professional is not bored for long weeks spent on this mechanical work. The work is accomplished evenly and systematically. Too often, we sample large series by saving only that which is interesting or unusual or of a size that easily fits into a standard-sized folder; conventional items that convey information about the routine nature of congressional operations are usually discarded as uninteresting. The less trained worker assigned to number and sample a bulky series can also work to the accompaniment of a radio, turned softly enough to avoid distracting others in the processing room engaged in tasks requiring more concentration.

Before this method of weeding has proven itself through experimentation, the archivist does need to go through the 80% marked for discard and subjectively sort through that material. There may be items that should remain in the collection, such as a letter from Sirhan Sirhan complaining about some aspect of the American political system and dated several years before the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy. Items from the 80% group, that the archivist decides to retain for subjective reasons, must bear an identifying mark, such as a check mark, next to

(cont. p. 12)

Congressional Collections, cont.

the bracketed item number of the verso of the sheet. Once the retained item returns to its original place in the collection, future users of the collection must know if that item belongs to the statistically valid sample or not.

And, of course, the archivist must explain this method of arrangement in the scope and content section of the register to this collection. Researchers need to know about our method of arrangement before they begin their analysis of the collection. To date, there are few well-known ground rules governing the creation or processing of a congressional collection, so neither the archivist nor the researcher can make any valid, fast assumptions.

Various sources in the past have offered model arrangement schemes for congressional collections. Both the Library of Congress and the National Archives prepared manuals for the establishment of filing systems in Capitol Hill offices. Both sets of manuals suffered by their basis on a lack of first-hand experience with the operations of a congressional office, and both failed to offer guidance concerning machine readable records. To my knowledge, the most recent edition of the NARS manual by Wayne Grover appeared in 1958.

The Office of the Secretary of the U.S. Senate established the Senate Historical Office in 1975; Richard Baker has served as the Senate Historian since then. He and his staff are currently preparing a manual concerning arrangement and description of the records of congressional committees. His office also has a program to locate senatorial collections, and they offer extremely knowledgeable information on the acquisition, processing and use of senatorial collections. Dick's phone number is (202) 224-6900. If you are involved with a senatorial collection, do contact this office, which is only too happy to provide accurate information and advice. (There is, as yet, no comparable office for the U. S. House of Representatives, also, though one can generalize from experience with Senatorial collections.)

In September, 1978, the Senate Historical Office sponsored a conference on "Research Use and Disposition of Senators' Papers," held in a Senate office building in Washington. Speakers and audience included sena-

tors, Senate staffers, archivists, and historians. To follow up on the conference, the Organization of American Historians has undertaken to secure grant support for proposals formulated there, including the preparation of a manual for senators concerning model records systems, and of a manual for archivists on model arrangement and description of senatorial collections received at a repository. It is to be hoped that the OAH will soon announce that grant funding for these manuals has been awarded. Reflecting on the composition of the 1978 meeting, Senate staffers, archivists and historians will together to prepare these manuals.

Finally, in the Senate the Office of the Sergeant-At-Arms and the Office of the Secretary are preparing a staff manual on services available to senators and their staffs. The manual will premiere later this year for use in the 3-4 day orientation sessions offered to newly-elected senators and their staffs. The manual will include separate chapters on records management and on mail arrangements. Dick Baker will recommend that repositories acquiring senatorial collections receive copies of the manual, but as of April, 1979 it is not clear if copies of this manual will be generally available. (If a repository accepts a senatorial collection which has been microfilmed and indexed by the system now offered as a free service to Senate offices, the repository must be familiar with the program and the software and hardware it utilizes. The collection can only be used at the archives if the archives has the proper technology available.)

In short, there are ways for archivists to manage the large congressional collection created in modern times, and we need to experiment with them. Otherwise, our repositories must either refuse to accession bulky collections or become glutted with papers of questionable long-term research value. And congressional collections are not the only bulky accessions available to the archives. There are also reject contract and grant application files in the university archives; grievance files of labor unions; and unprocessed scripts and research files of local television stations. We as a profession must learn to manage all types of bulky, routine, homogeneous series offered to repositories, and perhaps sampling using random numbers offers a viable solution.

ARCHIVES CLASSICS AND CLASSICISTS: AN OVERVIEW

By Thomas C. Pardo

Program Officer

Society of American Archivists

I believe it was in an introductory archives course taught by Ruth W. Helmuth at Case Western Reserve University that I first came upon the names of significant archival theorists like S. Muller, J. A. Feith, R. Fruin, Sir Hilary Jenkinson, Ernst Posner and Theodore R. Schellenberg. This list of notable archival figures did not register in my mind as easily as prominent historians such as von Ranke, Bancroft, Turner and Beard, yet I realized during this course that their contributions to the archival profession were equal to those of other fields. It is essential in this age of voluminous accessions, shrinking space and budgetary restraints that we pause momentarily to think about our archival heritage and to see how it has influenced practically every action that we take as archivists today. The archival profession does have a "usable past." Many times, however, we simply do not consider its effect upon our professional lives. Our responsibilities concerning the care and preservation of archives and manuscripts are confined largely to problems of technique and function rather than to principle and theory. We acknowledge the centrality of archival theory in our work as well as the contributions of those who could rightfully be known as "archival pioneers," but it seems as if we only recognize these ideas and the people who created them on formal or special occasions, such as at an archivists' banquet, a regional archives meeting or a class.

With this and subsequent essays on "classic" archival literature and prominent archival theorists, it is hoped that the past will come alive, and we will be able to understand more completely how certain ideas have evolved and how these ideas have an important role to play not only for today but for the future as well. This essay, which will serve as an overview for more in-depth writings on archival literature, will analyze some of the theoretical contributions of the "Dutch archivists" (a generic term used in this paper to refer to Muller, Feith and Fruin), Sir Hilary Jenkinson, Ernst Posner and Theodore R. Schellenberg as revealed in their careers and writings. The intention of such an analysis is two-fold: 1) to describe certain ideas which were prevalent in European archival thinking of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as illustrated in the works of the Dutch archivists and Jenkinson; and 2) to show how these ideas were later adapted to American archival conditions, as highlighted in the writings of Posner and Schellenberg.

When one begins to trace the origins of modern archival theory and technique, it is essential to recognize the importance of a book published in 1898 entitled Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives. Written on behalf of the Netherlands Association of Archivists by S. Muller (1848-1922), J. A. Feith (1858-1913) and R. Fruin (1857-1935), the Manual espoused a theory of archival administration which demonstrated a relationship between modern record-keeping practices and traditional concepts such as provenance, respect des fonds and continuous custody. Although this publication was widely acclaimed by European archivists, it was not translated into English until 1940. The time of the English edition could not have been more apropos for American archivists, however, because it came when the National Archives was in its early stages of development. Hence, the Manual not only left its mark upon the European archival community, but it had a profound influence upon the emerging federal archives in the United States as well.

Like most of us in the archival profession, the Dutch archivists were committed to bringing order out of the chaos of historical documents and archival collections. In writing the Manual, the Dutch archivists did not wish to create a rigid, dogmatic philosophy about archival procedures which would only serve as a "heavy yoke on the shoulders of our colleagues."¹ On the contrary, they envisioned the Manual to be a reasoned analysis of (cont. p. 14)

1. S. Muller, J. A. Feith and M. Fruin, Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives (New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1940, English edition), p. 9.

Classics, cont.

archival principles which would make the administration of archives more consistent and form. The method by which the Dutch archivists conveyed their views was through a set of "rules" or statements relating primarily to the arrangement and description of public records. Some of the topics discussed in the Manual include the treatment of archival collections, organic entities, the differences between various types of archives, the means by which maintains the original order of a collection and the procedures for developing finding aids.

Looking at the Manual today from a perspective of how archival theory and technique developed so rapidly in the 20th century, one may be tempted to think that the book is a relic of the past. Indeed, this is true in part because certain ideas advanced by the Dutch archivists have been drastically modified and changed as the archival profession has grown and become more sophisticated. Evidence of the seeming "irrelevance" of the Manual can be seen in the Dutch archivists' advocacy of a sharp distinction in the methods of organizing and preserving archives and manuscript. This "myth" of a barrier between archives and manuscript which has been perpetuated throughout the years by a number of archivists and manuscript scholars has largely been discredited in more recent times by Ernst Posner and Theodore Schellenberg. Nevertheless, in spite of some of the dated ideas proposed by the Dutch archivists, the Manual still serves as the one publication which acknowledged the emergence of modern archival science and celebrated its arrival with the creation of a suitable theoretical framework. Several ideas discussed at length in the Manual may help demonstrate its importance as an appropriate guide for archivists today.

One point mentioned throughout the Manual is the need for a systematic approach to the arrangement and description of records. The Dutch archivists clearly felt that arrangements of records would be made on the basis of original order. While this idea had already been advocated in the early 19th century by French and Prussian archivists, the Dutch archivists intended for the concept of original order to apply to medieval records which had been organized in a haphazard fashion as well as to public records which were subject to modern filing systems. On a similar note, the Dutch archivists were very concerned that parts of a collection not be split up but rather linked to other parts so as to create an "organic" entity. From their perspective, this linkage was vitally important in order to better understand how the various parts of the collection related to each other.

The Dutch archivists were also committed to the idea that an organized system of finding aids was essential for archivists to determine the nature of their collections and for scholars to do research in the collections. However, unlike the historian whose responsibility it was to write about the past based on evidence contained in historical documents, the Dutch archivists stated that the archivist should describe collections in terms of their structure and thus avoid any lengthy commentary on the contents of the collection: "This guide should be drawn up in a practical way - above all, therefore, not in too great detail; it should be limited to giving a summary of the contents of the archival collection."²

Such a seemingly narrow definition of the archivist's responsibilities in this area would suggest that there were only a limited number of ways in which archival collections could be described. On the contrary, the Manual makes clear that there are a wide variety of finding aids which can be developed for use by historians and other researchers. In addition, the Dutch archivists pointed out that various finding aids like the inventory, calendar and index should not be utilized in a random way. Instead they stressed the need for establishing interrelated levels of description for archival collections. Finding aids would therefore correspond not only to different levels of arrangement, as revealed in the series descriptions, but they would also address different research needs, as reflected in the calendar which was used to describe the contents of a collection or the index which furnished personal and place names. By establishing distinct levels of finding aids for archival collections, the Dutch archivists felt that the description function would be systematized.

Archival educators by and large agree that the publication of a Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives was significant because it heralded the beginning of the modern archives era. The Dutch archivists' call for a "systems approach" to archives was a reflection of the need for better standards and methods in appraising, arranging (cont. p.

Classics, cont.

and describing massive quantities of records. Although their prose may seem stilted and old-fashioned for today's reader, the Dutch archivists did establish a theory on the care and preservation of archives which would serve as a guide for future archivists. From this perspective alone, one can truly consider the Manual one of the classics of archival literature.

Almost 25 years after the Dutch Manual captured the hearts and minds of Europe's archival community, another influential work on archival administration was published in England. This work, entitled A Manual of Archive Administration, was written in 1922 by Sir Hilary Jenkinson (1892-1961). Oliver Wendell Holmes, formerly of the National Archives, once stated that Hilary Jenkinson was "the most eminent archivist of his generation in the English-speaking world."³ Indeed, Jenkinson's career as a scholar and archivist was illustrious. On the academic side, Jenkinson was a Scholar of Pembroke College, the F. W. Maitland Lecturer at the University of Cambridge and a Reader in Diplomatic and English Archives at the University of London. Jenkinson is best known, however, for his archival accomplishments in 48 years of service with the Public Records Service. During this remarkable span of years, Jenkinson served as Principal Assistant Keeper of the Records and Secretary from 1938 to 1947 and as Deputy Keeper from 1947 to 1954. In addition to the Manual which will be discussed below, Jenkinson was also a prolific writer on such topics as the archival profession, "private archives," transcription of documents, preservation and paleography.

Jenkinson's Manual is a highly detailed text on the theory and practice of archives as viewed from the perspective of English archival institutions, particularly the Public Records Office. In contrast to the Dutch manual, this publication examines various archival topics more extensively. Among the areas covered in the Manual are the definition of archives, the duties of the archivist, the question of archival custody, conservation, arrangement and description, modern archives and the issue of destruction of records and the role of the archivist in the creation of records, or "archive making."

Unlike the Dutch archivists, Jenkinson sees himself and has been seen by other archival theorists as an absolutist. Hence, his widely acclaimed book has stirred much discussion and controversy through the years. Several examples from the Manual will help illustrate Jenkinson's seemingly dogmatic views about archival administration. In one of the most controversial parts of this book, Jenkinson states that records, especially public records, which have been out of the official custody of an archival repository should no longer be considered archives. As Jenkinson states, "Archive quality is dependent upon the possibility of proving an unblemished line of responsible custodians."⁴ From Jenkinson's perspective, archival strays and records received from replevin actions cannot be incorporated within the bodies of records to which they originally belong. These documents, according to Jenkinson, are irretrievably lost. It is interesting to note that Jenkinson does not propose any suitable remedy for these "lost records." Because these records have been deposited outside of official custody, one supposes that Jenkinson would feel that nothing should be done with these items -- a viewpoint that would not be tolerated today.

In arranging records, Jenkinson held the narrow view that all collections must adhere strictly to the concept of provenance. This attitude negates any possible thought on arrangement schemas based on rational order and purpose. While Jenkinson's thoughts on arrangement can be explained in part by his experience with public records, such ideas about the "inviolable" nature of provenance does not satisfy the needs of archivists who are constantly besieged with collections in which original order cannot be restored or in which original order inhibits a better understanding of the collection and its possible uses.

Jenkinson's opinions about the duties and responsibilities of the archivist have also been the subject of much discussion since the publication of the Manual. (cont. p. 16)

3. Oliver W. Holmes, "Sir Hilary Jenkinson, 1882-1961," American Archivist 24 (July, 1961): 345.

4. Hilary Jenkinson, A Manual of Archives Administration (London: Percy, Lund, Humphries & Co., 1937, 2nd edition), p. 11.

Classics, cont.

It was Jenkinson's feeling that the primary duty of the archivist was to the archives. According to Jenkinson, the "Archivist...is the servant of his Archives first and afterwards to the student Public."⁵ By "student public," Jenkinson not only referred to those scholars who utilized archival collections, but also to the "secondary duties" of the archivist, namely editing publications, producing finding aids and publicizing archival activities. Jenkinson even went so far as to suggest that the historical and political communities, rather than the archival community, should have the sole responsibility for determining access policies, publications guidelines and archival repository locations. Archivists today can readily see the shortcomings of this truncated view of archival responsibilities. Yet even in the times in which Jenkinson wrote the Manual, archivists characterized themselves in a multiplicity of different roles. Archivists at that time, as well as now, were both publicists and scholars, editors and curators, site planners and administrators. Their responsibilities transcended the traditional antiquarian concern for historical documentation because the nature of modern archives demanded more from archivists in terms of professional skills and knowledge. Hence what Jenkinson seemed to be advocating in his analysis of the "primary" and "secondary" duties of archivists was a view of the profession which had become largely outdated even by 1922.

Despite Jenkinson's purist thoughts on certain archival topics, the Manual is still regarded as a classic in archival literature because of its sweeping range of subjects and its assessment of issues vital to the administration of modern archives. One subject of importance to Jenkinson was the development of conservation techniques and policies, or what he referred to as the "physical defence of archives." Although book and art conservators had already written extensively on matters pertaining to the preservation of paper and artifacts, Jenkinson's examination of this issue is important because it was one of the first occasions in which a prominent archivist recognized the role that conservation plays as an integral part of archival work. Jenkinson defined conservation in rather broad terms. On the one hand, it meant the traditional preservation of deteriorated or damaged documents and bound volumes. For this part of the definition, Jenkinson described various repair techniques and the materials used in making repairs. The second part of Jenkinson's definition of conservation includes matters which pertain to the creation of institutional policies affecting conservation practices. It is in this part of his discussion on conservation that Jenkinson offers much practical and relevant information for archivists today. For example, he analyzes various conservation facts which should be considered in designing archival repositories, such as protection from fire and flood, proper ventilation, adequate lighting and heating and suitable shelving arrangements. Jenkinson also extended the institutional aspects of conservation to include archival security. In discussing this topic, Jenkinson not only offered guidelines for theft prevention and the establishment of "safe rooms," but he also examined the seemingly unsolvable problem of misplacement of records by researchers. It should be noted that a number of Jenkinson's ideas on the "physical defence of Archives" have become obsolete due to rapid advancements in conservation technology. Nevertheless, Jenkinson's thoughts on archival conservation were significant in that they helped set the focus for future debates on this important subject.

Another aspect of the Manual which deserves serious consideration by archivists today is Jenkinson's discussion of records management, or "archive making" in his parlance. Jenkinson was very concerned that with the growth in the quantity of modern records, procedures needed to be established in creating and disposing of such records. According to Jenkinson, the archivist must become involved in the processes which create records, such as in the development of forms, transcription of telephone and conservation messages and copies of dictated letters and telegrams. In addition to working with other departments on establishing records-creating practices, Jenkinson felt that the archivist needed to work closely with business or government associates in developing guidelines for controlling the proliferation of records. It was Jenkinson's opinion that non-archivists needed to become more involved in the retention and disposal of records before they were transferred to the archives. By creating certain rules for the proper disposition of records, Jenkinson believed that an archive would only receive items which were deemed suitable for permanent retention. (cont.)

5. Ibid, p. 124.

Classics, cont.

Jenkinson's pioneering ideas on records management also included an interesting analysis of the factors which should be considered in destroying records. In this part of the Manual, Jenkinson is at his antiquarian best because he is extremely reluctant to destroy any records. He shied away from recommending the destruction of items which are word-for-word duplicates of originals because the search for these duplicates involves time, manpower and intellectual scrutiny. Jenkinson also did not recommend the destruction of ostensibly historically valueless records because archivists of one time period cannot determine future research trends. Obviously, for archivists today who have responsibility for organizational and/or governmental records, Jenkinson's thoughts about the destruction "problem" seem like a trip into the distant past. Yet Jenkinson's prudent notions on this subject are interesting in light of the times in which he wrote the Manual. In the aftermath of the First World War, most European governmental archives, including the Public Records Office in England, were overwhelmed with large quantities of records. Such a deluge forced archivists to establish strict guidelines for the retention and destruction of records. While this process of developing guidelines was not an easy task, it definitely fostered a feeling amongst archivists that the retention of all records was a luxury which most repositories could ill afford to maintain. Hence, when reading Jenkinson's statements about records destruction in the context of the post-World War I period, one comes away with an opinion that the prominent English archivist did not realistically address one of the most perplexing problems affecting the administration of modern archives.

In his Manual of Archive Administration, Sir Hilary Jenkinson presented a theory on archives which was much larger in scope than that given by the Dutch archivists. His views on the custody of records, archival conservation, arrangement and description techniques ("moral defence of archives") and records management practices were significant in that they demonstrated a relationship between modern business or governmental activities and the preservation of historical documents. For American archivists in the pre-World War II era, Jenkinson's book sparked much discussion and led the way towards the development of better archival standards. While this brief analysis of the Manual has presented a view of Jenkinson as someone who was dogmatic and not necessarily inclined to acknowledge certain modern tendencies in the archival profession, it is true nonetheless that Jenkinson was a vitally important figure whose contributions to archival theory and practice are still widely recognized today.

The American and international archival communities lost a dear friend when Ernst Posner (1892-1980) died in West Germany on April 14 at the age of 87. Posner is remembered fondly by American archivists as the one figure who bridged the gap between the Old World and the New World. He had the extraordinary distinction of being one of those rare individuals who possessed a large vision of the archival profession. Posner knew better than most about the archival past, its obscure problems and its prospects for the future. Indeed, we are all saddened by this loss, but at the same time we are richer for having been able to share in his experiences and to grow in the knowledge which he passed on to all archivists.

Ernst Posner had a brilliant career as an archivist. Coming from a strong intellectual family background in Germany, Posner was encouraged to learn and to excel in school. Following military service throughout the entire First World War, Posner received his teacher's license and a doctorate degree. He became an archivist instead of a teacher, however, because of the severe economic conditions in Weimar Germany during the early 1920s.

Posner's archival career began at the Prussian Geheime Staatsarchiv. Even at the beginning of his career Posner was well regarded by his peers. He not only published extensively, but in 1930 Posner became a member of the faculty at the Institute for Archival Science and Advanced Historical Studies which was connected with the Staatsarchiv. The rise of Adolf Hitler in 1933 placed Posner's young and promising career in jeopardy. Because of his Jewish background, Posner had to give up his responsibilities at the Staatsarchiv. During the Krystallnacht episode of 1937 in which the Jewish synagogues in Germany were burned, Posner was arrested and placed in the Sachsenhausen concentration camp for six weeks. The combination of these events ultimately forced Posner and his wife to emigrate (cont. p. 18)

Classics cont.

to the United States like so many other European intellectuals in the late 1930s.

Posner's "second" career began in the summer of 1939 when he became a lecturer in the archives administration course at American University in Washington, D.C. Shortly after his arrival, Posner replaced Solon J. Buck as the head of the archival education program at American. Under his leadership, the program expanded significantly. In 1940, records management courses were added to the archival curriculum. Eventually, the records management offerings were developed into a degree-granting program. Posner also directed the Institute on Archives Administration from 1945 to 1961 as well as the Institutes on Genealogical Research and Records Management. Posner retired from academic life in the early 1960s after serving as the chairman of the history department and dean of the Graduate School at American.

Ernst Posner's writings revealed him to be a true "renaissance man" for the archival profession. Throughout his career, Posner played many roles as a prominent archival writer. One role which he personally cherished was serving as the archivist's historian. Posner once remarked to Theodore Schellenberg that he had spent over 60 years of his life trying to become a historian.⁶ In point of fact, however, Posner was very much a historian of archives. Posner wrote numerous articles and books on archival history from ancient times through the World War II era. Certainly one of the most widely recognized historical works that Posner wrote and one which he considered a labor of love was Archives in the Ancient World (1972). In writing this book, it was Posner's intention to show that archivists should be concerned about their heritage:

To those actively engaged in archival work the history of archives administration should be a serious concern, not merely a subject of curiosity. Beyond that, archivists must feel a need to explore the origin of their profession, to understand the circumstances and forces that have determined its evolution, and, with such understanding, to anticipate and prepare for the future.⁷

Whether Posner himself felt that this publication had raised the historical consciousness of the archival community cannot be ascertained. What can be determined is the fact that this work greatly enlarged the archivist's conception of his/her past.

In Archives in the Ancient World, Posner examined the growth of archival thought in the Egyptian, Grecian, Persian and Roman civilizations. Using two definitions of archives to differentiate between the modern meaning and the ancient meaning, Posner studied the organization and administration of archives as well as conservation practices. Posner also described how certain civilizations destroyed their records because of a failure to recognize and appreciate the value of archives. He placed the blame for such tragic occurrences not only on the ancient archivists but on all archivists who have not been persuasive enough through the years in explaining the importance of archives.

The modern era of archives, from the French Revolution to the Second World War, was likewise a time of great interest to Posner the historian. Posner wrote several essays for the American Archivist and other journals concerning the development of archives administration in Europe and the United States since the late 18th century. Posner's studies on European archival activity conveyed information on the centralization of secular records into national archival repositories, the development of the principle of accessibility of archives to the public as a result of the growth of nationalism and the formation of certain principles such as respect des fonds and provenance. Through his research on European archives, Posner discovered that many government ministries and bureaus were extremely reluctant to transfer their records to the archives. Posner also found that archival holdings were being arranged according to points of view which were not consistent with the unique (cont. p. 19)

6. Frank B. Evans, "Postappointment Archival Training: A Proposed Solution for a Basic Problem," American Archivist 40 (January, 1977): 57-74.

7. Ernst Posner, Archives in the Ancient World (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), p. 1.

Classics, cont.

characteristics of records, such as classifying records along subject lines. With the rise of an archival profession and the gradual development of better relations between archivists and administrative units, Posner claimed that government agencies began to lose their proprietary attitudes about records generated from their offices and accept the idea that archivists are the legitimate custodians of records.

Posner was also fascinated with the growth of archival administration in the United States. His writings on American archival history, with the exception of this state archives study, were largely centered upon the establishment of the National Archives. For example, in his article entitled "Archival Administration in the United States," Posner traced the various steps in the creation of the National Archives from the Public Archives Commission in 1899 to the signing of the National Archives Act in 1934.⁸ Other writings by Posner have examined the various branches of the National Archives, the development of the record group concept of arrangement and the relationship between the National Archives and other archival repositories. From these observations, Posner acknowledged the meteoric rise of the still relatively young American archival profession and expressed confidence that the United States would assume a position of leadership in many international archival projects.

Another role which Posner played as a significant writer was that of a commentator on matters of interest to archivists, particularly in the United States. It was in this role of a commentator where Posner's tremendous abilities were best recognized and appreciated. Unlike many of his peers, Posner had an uncanny skill for isolating an issue, problem or trend, dealing with it in relationship to the times and other considerations, and proposing innovative solutions or observations for handling the subject.

One topic of great concern to Posner during his "second" career in America was the condition of American state archives. In his presidential address at the annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists in 1956, Posner pointed out the need for a study of the "origins, present status, functions and problems of American state archives." Several years later, the Society acted upon this recommendation by selecting Posner as the director of a wide-scale project to survey state archival repositories. The culmination of this study, which occurred between 1961 and 1964, resulted in the publication of American State Archives.

The writing of American State Archives came at a time when many state archival practices were abysmal. In a number of states, archival repositories were not fully funded by state governments and thus could only provide partial services for the preservation of records. Other state archives with better facilities and operating procedures still suffered from their "second class" status within the spectrum of state governmental agencies. With these conditions in mind, Posner examined all 50 state repositories and the archives of Puerto Rico for the purpose of creating standards for the organization and operation of state archives. Posner evaluated their legal basis, policies and procedures, personnel practices, buildings, equipment and financial resources. From his survey, Posner issued many recommendations for specific archival repositories as well as for state archives in general. These recommendations are still being acted upon today.

Another matter which Posner spent considerable time studying and which was closely aligned with this professional experiences was the quality of archival training in the United States. As an archival educator, Posner was deeply interested in the early development of various American archival training programs and how their courses of instruction influenced the future direction of archival education.¹⁰ It was Posner's opinion that students of archival administration should receive their basic training in history and related fields. He generally subscribed to the recommendations given in the famous Bemis committee report of 1938 which advocated courses in American history and political science and an apprenticeship in an archival repository as the necessary academic prerequisites for (cont. p. 20)

8. Ernst Posner, "Archival Administration in the United States," in Kenneth W. Munden, ed. Archives and the Public Interest (Washington:Public Affairs Press, 1967), pp. 114-130.

9. Ernst Posner, "What, Then, Is the American Archivist, This New Man?" American Archivist 20(January 1957): 11.

10. Ernst Posner, "Archival Training in the United States," Archivum 4(1954): 35-47.

Classics, cont.

archivists.¹¹ Posner went beyond these suggestions, however, by placing emphasis on the need for "broad training in advanced methods of research in history and related fields" as well as "study of and instructions in the history of records making and records administration."¹² These ideas were later used to design the curriculum for the American University archival training program. Under Posner's supervision, courses were offered in the history of historical writing, research methods and materials, comparative administrative history, administrative history of the federal government and records management. During the late 1940s and 1950s, Posner's contributions to archival education were generously acknowledged when the American University curriculum served as a model for other archives courses. Through his influence on such programs as those of the University of Denver and Wayne State University, Ernst Posner played a prominent role in the conceptualization of contemporary archival training in the United States.¹³

There are many other aspects of Ernst Posner's life as a European and American archivist which cannot be mentioned here but which will be the substance of a subsequent essay. Needless to say, the ideas, theories and observations of Ernst Posner significantly affected the way American archivists view their profession. He broadened our horizons by making us conscious of the archival past and respectful of the opportunities which lie ahead in the future. He overcame acute personal adversity to participate in one of the greatest archives experiments of all time, namely the creation of a federal archives for the United States. And he developed a program of archival education which has now been duplicated in a number of universities across the country. In short, Ernst Posner gave archivists a sense of mission and a belief that our work as custodians of America's documentary heritage is an honorable calling. Because of this, we are all enriched.

One of the many themes stated in Daniel Boorstin's widely acclaimed historical trilogy, The Americans, is the idea that Old World ways of thinking and living were changed and adapted to fit New World conditions. In numerous instances, Boorstin related the story of how American settlers borrowed ideas from European thought and then altered them to suit the unique American environment. This theme certainly reflects the life and writings of Theodore R. Schellenberg (1903-1970). As one commentator has observed, Schellenberg was a great "Americanizer" and "popularizer" of archival theory and technique.¹⁴ Through his career at the National Archives and in his notable publications, Schellenberg offered a distinctive American view of archival administration which had a significant effect upon the development of archival institutions in the mid-20th century. Indeed, all American archivists of recent times have benefited immeasurably from Schellenberg's contributions.

Schellenberg was a native of the Great Plains. Born and raised in Kansas, he attended Kansas State University before heading east to the University of Pennsylvania for graduate work in history. After receiving his doctorate in 1934, Schellenberg traveled to Washington to join other young professionals who were taking positions in the new federal agencies of the New Deal. His first appointment was that of secretary of the Joint (cont. p. 20)

11. The Bemis committee was officially known as the Committee on the Training of Archivists. It was one of the first committees established by the Society of American Archivists. Under the chairmanship of noted diplomatic historian, Samuel Flagg Bemis, the committee issued a report in 1938 on archival training in Europe and appropriate courses of study for prospective archivists in the United States. The committee rejected a library science curriculum and, instead, recommended courses in American history and political science for students in archives. See Evans, "Postappointment Archival Training," p. 58.

12. Ernst Posner, "European Experiences in Training Archivists," American Archivist 4 (January 1941): 36-37.

13. Evans, "Postappointment Archival Training," p. 59.

14. Jane F. Smith, "Schellenberg: Americanizer and Popularizer," paper to be presented at the annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists, Cincinnati, Ohio, October 2, 1980.

Classics, cont.

Committee on Materials for Research of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council. In this position, Schellenberg experimented with various uses of research materials, particularly microfilm, and was instrumental in writing the Joint Committee's report entitled Methods of Reproducing Research Materials (1935).

Schellenberg's career at the National Archives began immediately after he concluded his work on the Joint Committee. Prior to the official formation of the National Archives, Schellenberg served as associate national director of the survey of federal archives. His work in locating and analyzing various federal records led to a new position as one of the deputy examiners in the newly created Archives. As an examiner, Schellenberg continued his surveying work as well as made recommendations for the transfer of records into the Archives building. In 1938, Schellenberg became the Chief of the Division of Agriculture Department Archives. It was in this first administrative assignment that he played a prominent role in the development of records disposal schedules. Schellenberg held this position until 1945 when he left the National Archives and became the records officer of the Office of Price Administration. In 1948, Schellenberg returned to the restructured National Archives and Records Service and became the program advisor to the Archivist of the United States. Two years later, in 1950, the growth of NARS activities forced the Archivist to create a new assistant archivist position which would oversee the administrative duties of the agency. Schellenberg was appointed to this post. Over the next eleven years, he clarified many standards for archival functions in the National Archives. Schellenberg and his staff also produced several in-house procedural manuals, the most widely known of which was the National Archives Handbook of Procedures (1952). Prior to his retirement in 1963, Schellenberg was appointed assistant archivist for the Office of Records Appraisal. In this capacity, he re-examined the entire appraisal process and implemented new procedures for the appraisal of federal records.

During the immediate post-World War II period, it was fashionable among "consensus" historians and cultural theorists to believe in the "exportable" nature of American ideas and institutions. These intellectuals adhered to the notion that American ways of living and thinking could be transferred to other nations without any possible damaging consequences to long-standing cultural mores and traditions. From the archival perspective, Schellenberg cautioned against this view of exportation because of vast differences in record-keeping practices between the United States and other countries. Schellenberg noted, for example, that American records were kept on the basis of diverse filing methods, whereas other nations utilized the registry system of arrangement. Schellenberg also recognized the variations in backgrounds among American and foreign archivists. According to Schellenberg, American archivists were better trained in appraisal procedures and handling massive quantities of modern records, while archivists elsewhere were trained in preserving older collections.

This recognition of different archival practices did not prevent Schellenberg from being an archival ambassador for the United States. It was Schellenberg's feeling that American archivists, particularly those from the National Archives, needed to work with archivists from other nations in hopes of developing better procedures and stronger international ties. Schellenberg attempted to strengthen American relations with archivists from other countries through his work in Australia and South America in the 1950s and early 1960s. In 1954, Schellenberg traveled to Australia as a Fulbright lecturer in archives and records management. During his stay, he served as an archival advisor to the Commonwealth and state governments, held several seminars and gave many lectures on the values of modern records. On his return to the United States, Schellenberg visited the national archives of New Zealand, India, Pakistan, Switzerland, Austria, West Germany, France and England.

Schellenberg made a second trip abroad in 1960 when he went to South America as an archives specialist under the International Educational Exchange Program. The purpose of this trip was to promote the archival profession in South America and to distribute American archival literature in Spanish and Portuguese. Through his tour of seven countries, Schellenberg gave lectures on the importance of archives, the archival and library professions and the history of the National Archives.

The South American trip gave Schellenberg an opportunity to promote (cont. p. 22)

Classics, cont.

the first Inter-American Archival Seminar. This seminar, which was held in Washington in October, 1961, was a successful venture. Sponsored by the National Archives and several other organizations, the seminar brought 43 archivists and historians together from 17 Latin American nations. During the seminar, the participants organized the Inter-American Technical Council on Archives and developed a quarterly publication entitled Boletín Informativo. While the tangible products of the seminar barely survived Schellenberg's retirement in 1963, this event contributed significantly to the growing professionalization of archivists in the Western Hemisphere.

No one ever made the claim that Schellenberg's writings were literary masterpieces. Like so many archivists, his writings are difficult to read because he emphasized technical matters concerning archives and manuscripts. Nevertheless, what Schellenberg lacked in literary skills, he made up for in theoretical insights. This knack for conceptualizing archival issues is best revealed in his widely acclaimed book, Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques (1956). This publication became the major theoretical work on archives for Schellenberg's generation. It was not only hailed by archivists in English-speaking countries, but it was well received in other nations as well, thus prompting it to be translated into German, Hebrew, Portuguese and Spanish. Due to the favorable response on this book, Schellenberg received the Waldo Gifford Leland Prize from the Society of American Archivists in 1959.

Modern Archives was created largely from the research conducted by Schellenberg for his Australia trip as a Fulbright lecturer. The book was written primarily for the public record archivist, but its message is pertinent to all archivists who recognize the challenges in administering modern archives. Schellenberg stressed the need for more uniform practices in archives regardless of physical differences in records and the variety of archival repositories. In developing this theme, Schellenberg emphasized the importance of understanding the relation of public records for current use to those practices in an archival repository. He also examined the relationship between archival and library principles, the relation of various activities between archival institutions and the relationship between American and European practices. On this last point, Schellenberg's comments were particularly important because it marked the first time in which a comparative study had been made of archival practices in other nations.

In Modern Archives, Schellenberg broke away from several ideas espoused by European archivists, particularly Sir Hilary Jenkinson. For example, Schellenberg took issue with Jenkinson in stating that the management of current records was not entirely within the domain of the agency that created them, but was within the purview of the archivist as well. On the matter of records appraisal, Schellenberg did not agree with Jenkinson on the point that administrators could make sound decisions about the value of records created in their agency. It was Schellenberg's opinion that archivists must actively participate in the formulation of appraisal standards in order to benefit future researchers.

Schellenberg was also greatly concerned in Modern Archives about the need for an expansion in the roles and responsibilities of archivists. Unlike archivists of a previous age who merely serviced records for research purposes, Schellenberg felt that modern archivists had to meet contemporary challenges with new skills and knowledge. Hence, from his perspective, today's archivists had to assume the roles of scholar, administrator, appraiser, conservator, reference specialist and records manager in order to cope with the demands created by modern archives. Through these statements, Schellenberg attempted to instill some pride amongst archivists for the work they do. Whether he succeeded in accomplishing this cannot be determined. However, as Donald McCoy notes, Schellenberg "may not have been entirely successful in curing the inferiority complexes of some archivists, but he did bolster their faith in themselves and in the significance of their profession."¹⁵

Following his retirement from the National Archives in 1963, Schellenberg wrote a second book entitled The Management of Archives (1965). This work can be more accurately described as a compilation of previous writings by Schellenberg on archival administration. Unlike Modern Archives, this book is broader in scope and is written (cont. p. 23)

15. Donald R. McCoy, The National Archives: America's Ministry of Documents, 1934-1968 (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1978), p. 181.

Classics, cont.

for a larger archival audience, or as Schellenberg defines his readers, "the custodians of research material - archivists, manuscript curators and librarians."¹⁶

The significance of Management of Archives for the archival community lies in its principle theme. Schellenberg states in the book that the principles and techniques which pertain to the administration of public records can also be applied to manuscript collections of recent origin, such as personal papers and organizational records. This idea is tremendously important for archivists because it recognized, once and for all, the need to tear down the mythical barrier between archives and manuscripts in terms of their care and preservation. Schellenberg's pronouncements on this subject also had historical repercussions because it signified a definite break with the views held by the Dutch archivists and Sir Hilary Jenkinson. In substantiating this idea of a similarity in the administration of archival and manuscript materials, Schellenberg examined various principles affecting textual, cartographic and pictorial records.

Schellenberg provided an interesting historical perspective upon the development of American archival practices as well as analyzed new methodological trends in the library and archives fields. Among the topics discussed in the book are record attributes, physical arrangement of collections in a repository, description of private papers, preparation of guides, notational systems, arrangement and description of cartographic and pictorial records and subject cataloging.

One issue which was given minor treatment in Management of Archives but which concerned Schellenberg was the training of archivists. Schellenberg was well qualified to write about this subject. For many years, he supervised the archival training programs at the National Archives and he collaborated with Ernst Posner in teaching the summer session American University advanced course in the preservation and administration of archives. From his experience as an archival educator, Schellenberg felt that manuscripts and archives possessed roughly the same characteristics and thus should be administered by the same principles and techniques. Since all archival functions are influenced by the way records are created, used and maintained, it was Schellenberg's opinion that all archivists should be trained in the administration of current records. Schellenberg stated that prospective archivists should take courses in archival methodology, conservation and reprography, library science and records management. Like Ernst Posner, he felt that a good grounding in history was essential for archivists, but he was also deeply committed to the importance of archival methodology as well.

In contrast to the views of Posner and other archival educators, Schellenberg believed that archives courses given within the library science curriculum were the most effective way to train archivists. He opposed the concept of historians teaching archival education because they would be prone to emphasize historical developments at the expense of methodological concerns. Schellenberg was also aware of librarian shortcomings in educating archivists. He felt that librarians would apply their techniques of organizing materials to archives and would become so obsessed with technique that they would lose sight of their scholarly functions. Nevertheless, despite these handicaps, Schellenberg felt that librarians should teach archives as long as they understood the differences between published and unpublished materials. According to Schellenberg, librarians were the ideal educators because of their emphasis upon methodology and their willingness to make material available to the public. Out of these virtues, Schellenberg believed that librarians could pass along a respect for documentation and an ethos of service to archivists.

Throughout his archival career, Theodore R. Schellenberg was concerned with a problem common to all archivists today, namely the need for better systems and standards in administering archives and manuscripts. Schellenberg tackled this problem in many effective ways. He helped establish sophisticated procedures for selecting and organizing records in the National Archives at a time when the agency was in its infancy. He formulated theories on archives administration which acknowledged the works of the European theorists (cont. p. 24)

16. Theodore R. Schellenberg, The Management of Archives (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965), p. x.

Classics, cont.

and yet offered new ideas and information based on developments in contemporary archives. As one who had the rare ability to conceptualize and write about major issues affecting the entire archival profession, Schellenberg stirred the feelings and attitudes of those who knew him personally as well as those who were only acquainted with him through his publications. Not everyone agrees with Schellenberg's views, but practically everyone appreciates and has benefitted from his numerous contributions. As a prominent world leader stated not so long ago, Schellenberg "will be remembered with gratitude wherever and whenever men and women strive to prepare, or improve themselves, as archivists."¹⁷

To read and comprehend the "archival classics" of the Dutch archivists, Sir Hilary Jenkinson, Ernst Posner and Theodore Schellenberg is a challenge of Olympian proportions. The style of writing exhibited by these prominent figures lacks literary verve and vitality. Information contained in their works is highly technical and thus dulls one's senses if taken in concentrated doses. Criticisms aside, these "classics" are as important for archivists today as they were for previous generations. In general, they represent the intellectual lifeblood of the archival profession. They demonstrate the continuity in archival thought as well as describe the changes which have occurred through the years. More important, however, is the fact that these writings and the people who wrote them helped give to all archivists an identity of who we are and what our professional responsibilities should be. It is this enduring legacy which ties the past to the present and which makes their messages crucial for the archival community as a whole.

17. Ian MacLean, "Archival World Leader," in "In Memoriam: Theodore R. Schellenberg, 1903-1970," American Archivist 33 (April, 1970): 198.

"...no other profession calls for more various talents."

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION FORM

1979 - 1980 Membership Year

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

PHONE NO. _____

Annual dues are \$5.00. Please make checks payable to The Society of Mississippi Archivists and send this form and dues to Anne S. Wells, Treasurer, Society of Mississippi Archivists, P. O. Box 5408, Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762. The membership year runs from October 1 to September 30. Current members will receive a membership renewal notice in September.