

MODERN ARCHIVAL LITERATURE

An Annotated Bibliography

by

Jason C. Fowler

May 10, 2006

Books

Benedict, Karen, editor. *Ethics and the Archival Profession: Introduction and Case Studies*, Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2003.

The Society of American Archivists's *Ethics and the Archival Profession* is an explanation of the 1992 revision of their "Code of Ethics for Archivists." The 2005 revision of this document is available from the SAA website. The code governs the ethical conduct of archivists, and the SAA's original code was the first ethical code developed for archivists. Karen Benedict strives, in this work, to make a firm distinction between ethical and professional principles. Ethical principals are the moral obligations incumbent upon a practitioner of a profession. Issues of professional conduct are generally issues regarding how an archivist relates to patrons, other archives, and his or her institution of employment. Benedict notes that both the 1980 and 1992 versions of the code include items that deal with the ethical and the professional. In my opinion, the 2005 revision of the code appears to be more narrowly focused upon the ethical obligations of the profession.

Benedict outlines several practical areas that ethics affects within institutions. She notes that the code recommends that institutions avoid competition. This recommendation raises several questions pertaining to how archivists practically do this. Another area of practical concern is donor relations. This is of concern because relating to donors often touches upon legal issues (right to privacy, taxes, intellectual property) and ethical issues (access, confidentiality, and authenticity.) Other practical areas for ethics include professional benchmarks regarding issues such as staffing and budget. These issues determine how well archives can preserve collections.

Benedict also points out that there are distinctions between laws and ethics. Occasionally, these two come into conflict. Archivists may be required by law to do what is professionally unethical. Likewise, in striving to be ethical, they may be required to break the

law. Benedict recommends that in such circumstances, archivists must act in accord with conscience with full understanding of the potential consequences for their actions. The main areas of legality that archivists generally have to reckon with are issues of privacy rights and property rights. Privacy rights can affect restricting materials or selecting collections. Property rights can affect areas such as theft. Archivists should be aware of the laws that govern these areas and should assure their donors that they are aware of the legal obligations in these areas.

The remainder of Benedict's work provides a variety of helpful case studies that touch upon every area of the 1992 revision of the code. Benedict provides several helpful appendices, one of which includes the 1992 revision of the "Code of Ethics for Archivists." Although many of the sections of the code have now changed, the issues addressed in this book are of enduring value. Although many of the case studies no longer apply to the newly released code, they still serve as helpful guides to appropriate professional conduct for archivists.

Boles, Frank. *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts*, Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2005.

Frank Boles's *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts* assesses the often troubling and convoluted subject of archival selection. Boles believes that selection is a more accurate term than appraisal because it is more transparent about the fact that (gasp!) archivists sometimes have to determine to throw things away (all of you theologians can think of it as the archival version of passive reprobation.) Boles believes that archivists select because selection is a societal need, and archivists are the best-trained professionals for selecting.

Boles surveys the history of theories on selection, and he notes that the waters are now muddied concerning what archivists should do in regard to selection. Several proposals have been offered. The English archivist, Hillary Jenkinson, proposed that archiving was almost purely an administrative activity. In essence, he advised that archivists keep rather than select. T. R. Schellenberg, the former NARA archivist, emphasized selecting materials with reference to secondary users. In other words, Schellenberg seems to have believed in archiving for the purpose of history and culture. Later, Gerald Ham contended that selection involved selecting records that document evidence of the human experience. Most archivists since the 1970s have found some position between Schellenberg and Jenkinson. A practical school developed that was more Schellenbergian. It tried to build a better framework for selection, but it lacked the focus on documenting cultural history. Several other movements and tools (New Paradigm, Macro Appraisal, Functional Analysis, Risk Management, AS 4390) leaned more toward the Jenkinsonian model in downplaying cultural history and secondary users because their proponents believed that archives are just records. Other archivists have countered that some records (i.e. Constitution, Declaration of Independence) have symbolic value and are culturally important.

Boles proposes several broad principles for selection that can apply, in some measure, to any archives. First, archivists may select for a variety of goals as befits the institution. Second,

selection can occur at any time. An archivist can participate in the creation of records, or save them from being destroyed. Finally, both the context (i.e. Jenkinson) and content (i.e. Schellenberg) of records matter. The purposes of the institution or repository will determine how to balance these factors.

Boles contends that selection should be based on an archives's mission. He notes that there are basically two types of repositories, each of which has different missions. Institutional archives exist to document the life and work of an institution. Collecting repository documents records dealing within a certain predefined subject area. Often, especially in educational settings, these two functions are combined. Both types of institutions often have broad mandates, and both should have collecting policies that govern the types of records they collect. Boles discusses the ways that records management, records schedules, records continuums, and functional analysis apply to archives and noted that strengths and weaknesses of each.

Boles argues that the taxonomy for selection on the micro-appraisal level falls into three broad categories: value of information, cost, and political implications. He fully describes many factors involved in assessing each of these categories. He describes a six-step model for selection that included defining goals and understanding the scope of the repository's collections; determining the types of records that are "out there"; prioritizing materials to acquire; defining the functions and documentary levels to acquire; selecting records based upon the above steps; periodic updating of the selection model (at least every five years). Finally, Boles offers arguments for why non-textual formats should be given equal consideration in selection despite their attendant difficulties.

Carmicheal, David W. *Organizing Archival Records: A Practical Method of Arrangement and Description for Small Archives*, 2nd ed. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2004.

David Carmicheal's *Organizing Archival Records* is one of the best guides available for aiding archivists of small institutions in processing their collections. The book is simple, short, and practical. Carmichael not only describes the process for arranging and describing collections in this work, he also provides practical helps such as case studies and exercises that flesh out exactly what he is describing. Additionally, the book contains a CD-ROM that includes a database system that a small archives can use to manage its collections. This book provides a solid basis for training new workers in archives on how to process collections, and because of its brevity and lack of technical jargon, even a new worker should be able to read it within the span of an afternoon. If a new archivist of a small collection consumes this book and Yaker's *Starting an Archives*, he or she will be well prepared to set up and run their archives in an acceptable fashion.

Carmichael divides the book into three sections that deal with the purpose of organization, the levels of organization, and the steps of organization. In short, Carmichael says that the purpose of organizing collections within an archives is to help researchers find the answers to their questions. He notes that archival materials cannot be arranged and described in the same way as books because they were not created like books, they need more security than books, and they are generally more complex in subject matter than books. Thus, organization for archives is much more different than it is for books, although the purpose for organizing both types of materials is similar.

Carmichael divides the levels of arrangement into four categories: record group, series, file unit, and item. He adequately describes each category, and he offers fairly detailed instructions for how to determine the boundaries of series within a collection. He notes that archivists typically discover series within a collection rather than creating them. He stresses the need for distinguishing between archives and manuscript collections. For him, the main

distinction between the two lies in who created the materials. If an institution produced the records, then they are archives. If they were papers created or accumulated by an individual, they are manuscripts. While this distinction is a bit simplistic, Carmicheal's point works extremely well in the type of small archives one might find at a church or a historical society. He also briefly explains the basic steps of accessioning materials.

Carmichael divides archival processing into twelve basic steps that one could adjust to fit almost any small archival institution. The steps are well thought out, and provide a thorough workflow for processing. The processing workflow begins with assigning a number to the collection. After this, the archivist researches the collection and complementary materials to discover such things as who created the collection, when it was created, and what types of materials it contains, and what subjects it addresses. The archivist uses this information to name the collection and to produce initial paperwork that describes the collection in a basic manner. The archivist progressively works through the collection to a greater and greater degree, determining what series are in the collection and how the files are organized. At the end of the process Carmichael describes, the archivist has fully processed the collection, created a brief usable finding aid, labeled and shelved the collection, and created a catalog entry.

Daniels, Maygene and Timothy Walch, editors. *A Modern Archives Reader*, Washington: National Archives and Records Administration, 1984.

A Modern Archives Reader is an archival science reader that was developed by the National Archives and Records Administration. It includes readings on archival history, records administration, appraisal, acquisition, arrangement, description, reference, public programs, and archival management. The work is now over twenty years old, but many of the articles are valuable, especially the articles written by Posner, Schellenberg, Ham, and Jenkinson. The chapter on arrangement includes two essays. In the first, Ernst Posner outlines developments that have happened in archives since the French Revolution. Posner notes that the French Revolution provided a centralized national archives, put the state in charge of records, and provided for the accessibility of records. Then he traces the development of archives administration, legislation, and the concept of *respect des fonds*. The second article on history provides Sir Hilary Jenkinson's reflections on being an archivist. Jenkinson stresses that archives come together naturally, are used for unintended reasons, have an important custodial history, and have the potential for helping anyone in the world.

The chapter on appraisal contains an article on appraisal by Schellenberg. In this article, he sets forth the several distinctions between primary and secondary values, and informational and evidential values. Schellenberg sees these distinctions as important to understanding archives. He supplies tests to apply for evidential and informational values. Leonard Rapport also offers an article that in some respects is a reassessment of Schellenberg's ideas. He argues that some accessions should be reaccessioned, and that sometimes this should occur to reduce bulk and to dispose of records that are not worthy of being kept. The acquisitions chapters offer advice on developing a collecting policy, developing collections, performing field work, and deed of gifts.

The chapter on arrangement offers articles by Schellenberg and Oliver Wendell Holmes on the levels of arrangement. While both chapters are detailed, Holmes offers instruction

on even boxing, shelving, and labeling files. A chapter on organizing photographic collections also recommends that photographic collections be treated as collections, rather than individual items. It notes that there are (at least at the time the article was written) no standards for cataloging photographic collections. There are also sections dealing with finding aids, inventories, registries, and subject guides.

In the chapter of reference, Mary Jo Pugh contends for indexes within archives in order to provide adequate access points to collections that have a provenance based arrangement. Finally, Gerald Ham treats the processes at work in archival selection in an article entitled, *The Archival Edge*. He notes that many have criticized archivists for having a slipshod methodology when it comes to selection. Ham himself enquires why archivists document the experience of humanity so poorly. He offers five developments that force archivists to be more active: institutionalization, bulk, missing data, vulnerable records, and technology. For archivists to adjust to these changes and select materials well, Ham suggests that they must change their habits, be committed to developing national guidelines, allocate resources better to collect missing data, and actively engage in documenting culture.

Describing Archives: A Content Standard. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2004.

Sitting down to read *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (DACS) falls somewhere between reading *Chicago Manual of Style* and stereo instructions on the enjoyment level (despite its length, I prefer to read the former.) DACS is a replacement standard for the Society of American Archivists' *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts*. DACS was designed to be a descriptive standard that can be used within various types of systems for recording descriptive data, and the authors of DACS go to great lengths to stress the standard's independence from the systems that output descriptions. An archivist can use DACS within EAD, MARC 21, or various in-house systems for storing data about collections. The book has three sections that treat how to describe materials, creators, and names. DACS avoids the problem of not providing more than five levels of arrangement and description by requiring that "an information system employ some means of linking together the various levels of description." The standard does not, however, provide instructions for description at the item level or lower. DACS notes that the variety of types of materials prevents providing rules for description at that level.

DACS provides a brief overview of the principles that under gird it. These principles highlight issues such as the uniqueness of archival materials, *respect des fonds*, the difference between arrangement and description, the nature of description, and the necessity of describing the creators of archival materials. As stated above, DACS strives to be independent of any type of access tool. DACS does encourage, however, the creation of access points within whatever tool the archivist uses to store the data. In other words, by supplying archivists with a standard way of presenting necessary descriptive data such as names, places, subjects, documentary forms, occupations, and functions, DACS creates access points for finding resources in much the same way that judicious use of the Library of Congress Subject Headings creates access points for finding books.

The code is structured in such a way as to prevent redundancy and to make sure that the content of each element is mutually exclusive. Because output standards vary, DACS does not require a specific order for elements that one includes in a description. One helpful provision that DACS makes is that it often suggests where information to supply for a certain element can be contained. For example, it may say something like, "Take the information from other descriptions of archival materials," or "Derive the information from the materials themselves and repository policy." These locations are not always intuitive when one is processing collections. DACS also provides other types of useful information like how to determine what the appropriate title for a collection is. Finally, DACS is also helpful because it allows for a good deal of leeway in how one describes records. DACS recognizes that collections, materials, funds, practices, and capabilities vary greatly from institution to institution. Additionally, archivists differ in the way they describe collections. Rather than supplying a wooden standard that falls into disuse, DACS offers archivists a tool that can be appropriated in developing in-house description policies that in turn bring consistency to descriptive practices.

Ellis, Judith, editor. *Keeping Archives*, 2nd edition. Port Melbourne: D. W. Thorpe and Society of Australian Archivists, 1993.

Keeping Archives is a product of Australia, and was produced in conjunction with the Society of Australian Archivists. It is an archival manual that covers literally every area of archival theory. It is the second best one-volume treatment of archives that I have seen, the best being William Maher's *The Management of College and University Archives*. I am partial to Maher simply because he addresses the context within which I work. Like Maher's work, *Keeping Archives* is now a bit dated. It contains very little treatment about electronic records because in 1993, electronic records were not nearly the concern that they are now. Likewise, it does not treat EAD, Dublin Core, or other newer standards because they did not exist when this volume was published. This is not to say that *Keeping Archives* does not have any valuable content about electronic finding aids. It does offer a sufficient treatment of the MARC-AMC format.

Despite being a product of Australia, it addresses archival theory in a way that is useful to archivists from other nationalities. Although examples used in the book are drawn from an Australian context, the book is universal. The only area of the book that is almost exclusively Australian is the section that addresses law. *Keeping Archives* is unabashedly Jenkisonian in its approach to archives and recommends focusing on record series rather than record groups. Despite this fact, the chapter on appraisal and disposal recognizes a distinction between evidential and informational values in records, a distinction that is usually associated with Schellenberg's theories.

In my opinion, the most valuable contribution that this manual makes is its recommendations for constructing the various types of forms and paperwork that an archives needs in order to document its activities. Towards the end of nearly every chapter, the authors provide recommendations, requirements, and examples for constructing these types of documentation. *Keeping Archives* also has a number of case studies related to archival tasks such

as arrangement and description. The book also includes a number of extremely helpful tables. For example, the chapter on finding aids describes the various types of finding aids that are available to archivists. If nothing else, these types of tables are valuable for training student workers about the correct terminology for the various types of finding aids that they create on a regular basis.

Another strength of the book is the chapter on getting organized. Basically, this chapter is a short treatment on managing archival repositories. The author addresses five broad areas that archivists need to manage: yourself, information needed, people, financial resources, and facilities. Particularly helpful are the author's suggestions for organizing yourself. She supplies information that is useful for helping archivists managing everything from time to projects to diet. I would recommend any archivist to at least inter-library loan *Keeping Archives*, if for no other reason than to read this short chapter on management. *Keeping Archives* is an extremely valuable book, and new archivists should probably purchase this book as soon as they consume Elizabeth Yakel's *Starting an Archives* and David Carmicheal's *Organizing Archival Records*.

Finch, Elsie Freeman. *Advocating Archives: An Introduction to Public Relations for Archivists*, Metuchen, NJ: The Society of American Archivists and Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1994.

Advocating Archives is a collection of essays that describes public relations in archives from a variety of perspectives. It addresses issues such as the relationship between patrons and archivists, raising funds, celebrating significant events, and marketing. The book is well developed and would be beneficial to consult, particularly in an occasional nature to address a specific problem or issue related to public relations. It also offers a few public relations case studies and several appendices that assist in planning for a public relations program for an archives.

The first chapter, "Talking to the Angel," addresses the subject of building a public relations program. The authors look at five elements of service that define an archivist's relationship to the public. These five elements are, "the archivist's professional stance, the physical and psychological environments archivists provide the researcher, the nature of records as the public views them, and what research tells us about the users of records" This chapter provides a foundation that archivists can use to shape the public's perception of them and their duties.

In "Money Talk," Judy Hohmann points out that many archivists ignore the vast resource of private sector money that could underwrite their efforts. Instead they generally look to sources of public funding through grants. Hohmann points out that the private sector funneled to educational institutions "a total of \$12.41 billion in contributions in 1990." In this chapter, she discusses how to solicit these types of funds from corporations, foundations, and individuals. The third chapter, "In Print, On Air," addresses how archivists should approach using the press to inform patrons about significant events in the archives. The author provides instructions for contacting newspapers and television news channels, meeting with the media, holding press conferences, and drawing attention to your collections. In general, archivists should broadcast their information locally rather than nationally.

Philip Mooney's essay, "Modest Proposals," addresses the ways in which archives can gain publicity for their collections by using marketing concepts. Mooney says that four types of marketing tools can be used for archives: publications, exhibitions, audiovisual productions, and public relations activities. He provides suggestions on how to develop brochures and guides, where to place exhibitions, and when and how to use audiovisual productions. His most helpful suggestions were in his public relations section, where he stressed the need for developing positive relationships with reporters to help promote collections.

The fifth chapter addresses the subject of planning for public programs like anniversaries. The author, Timothy Ericson, argues that participating in these events is important because it gives archivists a better public image, it allows them to demonstrate the value of archives, and it offers them a chance to educate patrons. He humorously says that the archivist's first law of outreach is, "Human beings are unable to resist celebrating any anniversary divisible by twenty-five." Ericson believes that archivists must anticipate these events, investigate what focus the institution desires to emphasize in them, use outside help in planning, carefully schedule how they participate, and evaluate the successes and failures of the event after its conclusion. The diagrams he includes for planning events are very helpful. Chapter six addresses how to make use of volunteer workers and how to set up and maintain a "friends of the archives" group. Many of the suggestions for interviewing, educating, and planning for volunteers are applicable to managing archives in general.

The final chapter supplies tips for troubleshooting public relations issues in archives. The authors of the article contend that many problems can be avoided if archivists assess their physical plant, their workers, their patrons, their relationship to the media, and the impact of special events. By thinking carefully through these issues, archivists are able to put provisions in place that will minimize the impact that any of these things can have upon public perceptions of their archives. If negative situations do arise, the authors recommend that archivists be honest with the press, supply a press release, and speak of the situation as positively as possible. For example, if records are destroyed through faulty piping, the authors point out that the archivist

can focus on the records that were saved rather than the records that were destroyed or the faulty physical plant. The archivist can admit that damage was done, but the positive spin on the situation mitigates some of the negative publicity the situation can present. Finally, the archivist should encourage the press to follow up on these types of situations to show how they find resolution. The authors contend that the best way to troubleshoot these situations is through adequate planning.

Gordon, Rachel Singer. *The Accidental Systems Librarian*, Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc., 2003.

Rachel Singer Gordon's *The Accidental Systems Librarian*, is intended to be a basic guide to the various duties that systems librarians undertake. The title of the book comes from the fact that many librarians find themselves taking on systems duties without any formal training. Gordon begins her treatment by listing many of the duties that systems librarians might undertake. These can involve anything from installing hardware to networking to dealing with vendors to being the point person for digitization projects. Because of these varied duties, selecting a title for a systems librarian can be difficult, and the titles for systems librarians are often varied. She notes that the technical aspects involved in systems librarianship tempt some to leave the systems element to those who have an IT background rather than librarians. She says this is a bad idea because librarians understand the needs and vocabulary of other librarians. The librarian does not learn the IT vocabulary naturally, but it is usually easier for librarians to pick up systems language than visa versa. In essence, the systems librarian becomes a liaison between the library, the library administrator, new staff, and the IT department. Gordon also suggests that systems staff should develop documentation of systems tasks and that libraries develop a set of competencies for the systems librarian, and a set of competencies for the library staff. The website of the New Jersey Library Association offers one example of such competencies.

Gordon provides a good overview for the categories of computer knowledge a systems librarian **may** need. These include an understanding of Microsoft software, Macintosh, Open Source software, networking, web design, integrated library systems management, troubleshooting, programming, security, and antivirus. She also suggests that a systems librarian should be active in organizing knowledge. Organizing knowledge involves such things as inventorying computer equipment, compiling various types of statistics for the library, and keeping up with licensing, support information, and systems documentation.

Gordon also says that a librarian's background provides a good background for library systems work in yet another way; the librarian is familiar with methods for researching. This ability helps in systems work because almost every problem systems librarians encounter requires them to look for an answer. At times, this requires a librarian to look in multiple places. This method applies to repairs, troubleshooting, and purchasing. Likewise, librarians are used to having to ferret out the exact piece of information that patrons want. This should enable them to help customer service representatives know exactly how to help them. They should be prepared with detailed information regarding the issue that necessitated their call.

Gordon encourages systems librarians to pursue numerous avenues of social networking to assist them in their work. These avenues include listservs, associations, conferences, informal networks, and collaborative projects. Developing such contacts will be useful when troubleshooting problems or evaluating products. It also gives the systems librarian a chance to assist other librarians in their work.

Gordon's chapter on instruction techniques offers several helpful tips. First, she points out that systems librarians often are responsible for instructing both staff and patrons to use technology. For patrons, this can include instruction on how to use Microsoft Office products, the OPAC, databases, or any number of other technologies. For staff, the list can include all of these plus any software used in the course of work in the library. Gordon says that any instruction should be brief, simple, applicable, and to the point. Whether one is instructing patrons or staff, the practical advantages to learning the lesson should be patently obvious. Classes can be formal if the library has a computer lab, but may need to be informal if it does not. Systems librarians should take whatever opportunities they have, even if they are one on one, to offer technology instruction. Gordon takes a similar tack with education for systems librarians. She notes that often libraries are on a tight budget and do not have the financial ability to provide formal education for systems librarians. In such cases, systems librarians may have to look at alternative methods for education, including conferences, workshops, books, and web

based training. The final two chapters offer helpful suggestions on how one can plan for various technology changes and how one can proceed in his or her systems librarian career.

The Accidental Systems Librarian is an invaluable (at least for me, at this time in my career) work for anyone who finds themselves in such a position. Gordon's book is not just a basic overview of the systems librarian position. It is a resource builder. The websites, articles, and books she cites within the book serve as a veritable toolbox for the librarian with systems responsibilities.

Kurtz, Michael J. *Managing Archival & Manuscript Repositories*, Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2004.

The more I read the second edition of the SAA's Archival Fundamentals Series, the more I like it. The volumes of the second series that I have read so far really seem to outshine the older volumes I have seen. The same can be said of Kurtz's work, *Managing Archival & Manuscript Repositories*. This is a phenomenal monograph that reflects some of the recent shifts that have occurred in management and leadership theories. Not only that, but it's readable, much like Frank Boles's *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts*.

Kurtz begins the work by noting that management should be balanced. Having either too much or too little management in any organization is a bad thing. He also notes that management is largely an American idea. Much management theory is based upon the work of Fayol, who believed that management consisted of planning, organizing, budgeting, directing, and controlling. Kurtz says that management is much more complex now, because of the ways in which relationships work within organizations now. At earlier times, a top down management scheme was often used. Modern organizations often have a less hierarchical structure, and relationships are now more democratic. However, management largely consists of the same basic ideas in any organization or management position. Kurtz points out that management can be difficult for archivists because they are trained to be archivists. He contends that there are several tools that should be in place to effectively manage an archives: a good file system, a follow up system, and a good time management system.

Kurtz believes that leadership is needed even in small archive. Good leadership involves vision, that is, anticipating possible results well ahead of their occurring. Also, leadership involves selling others on the vision of the archives. Good leaders should understand their own tendencies, strengths and weaknesses, and they should use various assessment tools, such as the Myers-Briggs test, to point those out. They should also mentor others as they have opportunity.

Kurtz discusses the tendencies of modern organizations to be complex. As stated above, organizations now are less hierarchical and more democratic. This situation means that archivists usually have different relationships to their subordinates now. The archivist should be a coach, mentor, and builder. Some of his main tasks are to interact, connect, and cooperate with others in order to achieve the goals of the archives.

Not only do archivists help foster relationships with other individuals inside and outside their organization, they also seek to understand the organizational context in which they work in order to foster relationships that will help spawn effective results. They should seek to develop and obtain approval for a policy statement that accurately reflects their goals and responsibilities. Their mandate should be from the highest authority possible within the organization within which they work. They should adopt a collaborative team model for their departmental work, and they should cooperate with other departments at an institutional level.

Kurtz addresses planning by noting that this is often considered tedious work, but that it is necessary. He says that good planning takes the larger institution into mind. The archivist considers not only the goal of the archives, but also the goals of the parent institution. Careful planning should be charted in an organizational planning structure that accounts for the number of worker hours available and reasonable estimates about what should be done during those available times. He also notes that performance should be measured on departmental, individual, and overall levels to see how effective the planning program is.

A new addition to this new edition of the book is the chapter on project management. Kurtz says that any project should have some leader, even if the leadership model is not top down. The leader or manager chosen for the project should probably have some stake in the project. This person will spend time gathering information to share with the others about the project. Those working on projects should be competent, and communication within the group is a must. Projects have a life cycle that consists of four stages: conception, definitions, acquisition, and operation. This particular chapter provides several helpful workflows for taking up projects.

Kurtz notes that successful projects depend on five factors being in place: a mandate, support and resources, team leadership and facilitation, communication, and clear goals.

Kurtz offers chapters that specifically address how one should manage information technologies, human resources, communication, facilities, finances, fund raising, and public relations. In each of these chapters, he supplies detailed information about how to make good decisions regarding these areas. Although each of these chapters has its own merits, I found the chapter on facilities to be extremely helpful. Kurtz supplies various tools that aid in development. For example, he supplies a chart that helps one determine how much space should be added when an archives is undergoing reconstruction. These types of practical information make me want to keep this book at arms reach.

Miller, Fredric M. *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts*, Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1990.

Fredric Miller's *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts* is a manual for explaining archival processing. Miller intended the manual to describe processing rather than prescribe policies and practices for individual repositories. He intended it to be useful for novices. He begins the manual by noting that archives are not libraries, and that the two types of institutions differ in several ways. The physical makeup of archives generally consists of records rather than books. Records are created gradually, in a rather unintentional manner (compared to books), and have no common classification scheme. Although there are parallels between an archivist's tools of arrangement and description and a librarian's tools of arrangement and description, the two differ fundamentally. Archivists arrange records according to provenance (external order according to creator) and strive to maintain the original order (internal order) of the records.

In processing, archivists must determine the origins and structure of records. They must understand what types of activities the records document, determine the types of informational content they contain, assess their physical characteristics, and explain their relationship to other records in the repository.

Although this manual covers both archives and manuscripts, one must understand that there are fundamental differences between these two. Records generally come from one source, while manuscripts come from many sources. A manuscript collection contains artificial collections and individual documents. Archives are generally described on a collection level, while manuscripts are not. Archives are generally larger in volume than manuscript collections. Archives are usually self indexing according to provenance, whereas many manuscript collections are not. There are similarities, however. Both types of repositories contain some records, have common types of usage, and need integrated systems.

Miller contends that four principles govern processing: provenance, original order, collection description, and levels of control. Miller provides a helpful timeline of the creation of these principles and their application to archives and manuscripts. He notes that the concept of levels of control is an American contribution to archival science. When Miller speaks of levels of control, he is referring to the concept, popularized by Oliver Wendell Holmes, that records can be divided into several levels for description. Generally, the levels are called record group, series, files, and folders. He also points out that the concept of provenance is generally identified with the record creator. This concept is helpful because it discourages archivists from using arbitrary subject arrangements, and it makes organization of records easier.

Miller discusses accessioning by pointing out that it often begins by correctly identifying the provenance of records. The archivist should be involved in the boxing and labeling of records prior to their being transported to an archives. The archivist is responsible for ensuring the integrity of records in their travel. He or she should use transfer forms and accession forms to document this process. The archivist should prepare a general description of contents and list any separated materials on a separation sheet. The archivist should also examine the contents for record groups and series, weeding, restrictions, and odd or difficult to preserve formats. A preliminary listing, which often consists of a box listing, should be prepared. This step is often more difficult for manuscripts than archives.

Miller urges that in establishing priorities for how to proceed in arranging and describing collections, the archivist should consider the "mission, resources, and clientele of the repository." The archivist should also assess the facilities to make sure that they are adequate for processing collections. Additionally, he or she should take the lead in administering processing by setting forth a plan for the processing of set of records or manuscripts that the staff processes. Miller discusses the various levels of control one uses in arranging records within a repository. He notes that there are very real differences between arrangement by provenance and by filing structure. The former should represent the intellectual arrangement of records, while the latter often represents the physical arrangement of records. He notes that repositories often have

physical divisions of records into such categories as archives and manuscripts. Within each of these categories, the archivist intellectually arranges the records according to provenance, physically arranges the records according to the filing structure (often developing lists of functional records series to assist in this task), and arranges the physical file units in accordance with original order.

Miller concludes his work by discussing the various types of information, tools, and standards that are used to create properly describe archival collections. These sections are probably the most dated sections of the book, because the advent of standards such as DACS and EAD has somewhat supplanted discussions of APPM and USMARC AMC. This is probably the reason that the SAA replaced Miller's book, as good as it is, with Kathleen Roe's work of the same title.

O'Toole, James M. *Understanding Archives and Manuscripts*, Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1990.

James O'Toole's *Understanding Archives and Manuscripts* is a helpful guide to understanding basic information about the history and development of the science of archives. O'Toole contends that knowing how records came to be, what functions they document, what information they contain, and how that information can be used is fundamental to understanding archives and manuscripts. In the first chapter, O'Toole discusses how record making developed from oral transmission used by the earliest preliterate people to the modern proliferation of texts in literate societies through various means. He notes that the shift from oral transmission to written texts produced more precision, more permanent records, and more progress, especially when writing became a widely used form of communication. As literacy increased in society, so did the proliferation of records, which in turn meant that society began to value whole sets of records more than the individual parts.

O'Toole points out that there are six basic reasons for the creation of records: personal, social, economic, legal, instrumental, and symbolic. People save records for both practical and ephemeral reasons. Records archived for practical reasons can be saved either for their original intended use or some unknown secondary purpose. O'Toole then traces the development of various instruments that have been used to record information. He notes that sometimes progress in the means of communication results in more information being recorded (i.e. printing press), and sometimes it means less (i.e. telephone). He concludes the chapter by pointing out that modern records are abundant, decentralized, interrelated, social, have value as a whole, and have shifting usefulness.

In the second chapter, O'Toole recounts the development of archives, particularly in America, and he notes that archival science is a growing discipline in America. He discusses the fact that ancient civilizations used the word archives to refer to any written records. Modern

archival practices really began during the French Revolution when records began to be kept to protect the rights of the people.

O'Toole notes that public records were important in America from the time of the establishment of Jamestown. In the late 18th century, there also developed a historical manuscript tradition that began with the work of the Massachusetts Historical Society, which was established in 1791. This tradition focused on gathering, saving, preserving, and publishing historical manuscripts to ensure continued access to them. During the 19th century, the focus on the historical manuscript tradition in the US far outweighed the focus on the public records tradition. This trend began to change shortly before the beginning of the 20th century with the establishment of the Public Archives Commission of the American Historical Association. The 1930s brought several developments for archives including the building of the National Archives, the formation of the Society of American Archivists, and the Historical Records Survey of the Works Progress Administration. In the decades that followed, archival science went through a period of diversification of interests (i.e. records management) and of consolidation of professional identity (various types of standardization).

The final two chapters describe the work of archivists and the types of knowledge and values that archivists need to possess. Archivists should develop knowledge about the creators of the records with which they work. They should understand how records are created, how they are used, and the types of activities they document. In addition to all these, they should understand basic archival principles such as provenance and original order, and they should have a working knowledge of how to take intellectual and physical control of records for which they are responsible.

Understanding Archives and Manuscripts is an extremely helpful guide to the archival profession. O'Toole explains both the history and concepts behind archival science in simple language. He also provides a basic bibliography of archival texts as an appendix. I would without reservation place this text in the hands of a student worker who was considering a career in archives.

Pugh, Mary Jo. *Providing Reference Services for Archives and Manuscripts*, Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2005.

Mary Jo Pugh's *Providing Reference Services for Archives and Manuscripts* is a major revision of her 1992 work by the same title. Pugh begins this work by noting that archives and reference services in archives are changing at a substantial rate because of communications changes that are occurring in the world. Electronic formats, the expectation for instant information, and increased computing power all raise the bar for archivists. Pugh notes that all of these things necessitate the reworking of her earlier book.

Pugh notes that a shift in the archival profession has taken place in which archivists are now active promoters of archives rather than just passive collectors. She points out that providing access has three elements: intellectual, physical, and legal. Likewise, reference services involve intellectual, human, and administrative elements that include research, personal relations, promotion of materials, and ethics.

Pugh describes Schellenberg's distinctions in primary and secondary uses and evidential, informational, and intrinsic value, noting that Schellenberg overstated the distinction between records and archives by overemphasizing the exhaustion of primary values that he believed characterized archives. She says that archivists should strive to understand the various types of users of archival materials in order to help them find what they need. She suggests that besides just contemplating the needs of their various types of users, archivists should also try to understand how exactly most users seek to obtain information. In short, today, many researchers look for the simplest way they can find the information they need. Now, more than ever, the reference role of the archivist comes into play.

The reference role of the archivist comes into play through the archivist providing intellectual access to collections through the use of finding aids and careful processing. Being careful to do these well provides a context for understanding records. Pugh's discussion of provenance and the levels of arrangement are probably some the clearest that I have seen. The

reference role of the archivist also comes into play through the reference interview process. Archivists need to become proficient in ferreting out the types of information that their patrons need through using a careful interview process. They must also become more proficient in using the various types of electronic communication to provide reference services that will meet the needs of remote patrons. Additionally, they should develop guidelines for how archivists deal with patrons of all types.

Archivists strive to provide access to materials, but doing so is not attended without difficulties. Archivists have to balance issues of privacy, confidentiality, right to know, and equality of access on a daily basis. Archival policies should be developed that seek to create as much access as possible in as even and equal a manner as possible while abiding by the law. Pugh not only discusses access policies, but she also discusses how exactly to offer physical access to the materials. She discusses issues such as preservation, security, and administration of a research room. Likewise, she provides information about copyright, microfilm, loaning materials, and setting policies for photocopying. Finally, Pugh discusses the different models of reference services available to archives, noting that they can be arranged as a curatorial organization (processing and specialized reference), a rotating organization (everyone does reference), or a functional organization (reference is separate from processing). She then describes how archivists can measure the performance of reference services within their organizations.

Ritzenthaler, Mary Lynn. *Preserving Archives and Manuscripts*, Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1993.

Preserving Archives and Manuscripts details how preservation should take place in an archives or manuscript repository. The term preservation generally denotes the "activities and functions designed to provide a suitable and safe environment that enhances the usable life of collections." In order for an institution to implement a preservation program, it generally needs to recognize that preservation needs to take place. The institution should then set initial goals and a program policy for the program. Surveys of the repository must take place on the institutional and collection levels. These surveys allow for the archives to set its priorities and make decisions about how it can most effectively do its work. A budget for preservation should represent at least ten percent of total archives expenses in a year.

The materials stored in archives come in a wide variety of formats. An archivist needs to have a general understanding of how to preserve various types of paper, inks, skins, textiles, and photographic materials. Likewise, archivists must understand the types of adhesives used on these materials, including the ways in which they can be used and the damage they can cause to collections. Ritzenthaler addresses all of these issues in her third chapter. In particular, her discussions of papers and adhesives were especially detailed and helpful.

Ritzenthaler notes that the main causes of deterioration for records are usually temperature, relative humidity, light, biological agents, abuse, and disasters. The best way to prevent damage from these causes is to monitor and evaluate the conditions within the archives, and to have a good HVAC system. She points out that a ten degree reduction in temperature can double the life span of paper, while a ten degree increase will cut its life in half. Likewise, relative humidity should be well regulated.

She notes that the best conditions would be 40-65 degrees Fahrenheit, but conditions of 70 degrees and a relative humidity of 45%, plus or minus 2 degrees and 2 percentage points, are acceptable for an archives. She suggests that an archives have at a minimum a thermometer

and a hygrometer. However, she recommends that archives purchase a hygrothermograph and a psychrometer to track conditions over long periods of time. To protect materials from light, archives should have shades or UV filters over all windows and fluorescent lights. Lights should be cut off when they are not needed. An acceptable level of light in reading room areas ranges from 30 to 60 foot-candles.

Concerning handling, Ritzenthaler basically urges using common sense. She recommends the use of gloves, fully supporting all types of materials that are being handled, using trucks and multiple people to transfer materials, avoiding materials like tape, and handling photographic and magnetic media by their edges.

Ritzenthaler offers advice on storing and handling materials. She stresses that handling and storage decisions should be based upon what best preserves materials in light of their format and condition. She describes the various types of shelving and furniture that is available for use in archives. She also describes the methods and products one should use to store various types of record formats. Her chapter on preservation and administration supplies a brief guide for administering records throughout the entirety of their lifespan. She notes various threats to preservation that occur during this time. She also discusses preservation solutions like photocopying and microfilm, and points out best practices for using both.

In my opinion, the most useful chapter in the book is the final chapter, which addresses conservation. Here, Ritzenthaler discusses in great detail the various conservation options, such as deacidification and paper strengthening, that archivists have at their disposal. Equally helpful, though, are her discussions about making conservation decisions. She supplies information about determining when conservation treatment is needed, and she provides a philosophy for making informed decisions about good conservation practices.

Schellenberg, Theodore R. *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956. SAA Archival Classics Series. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2003.

Even commenting on a book like this can be a little unnerving. Schellenberg's *Modern Archives* is an archival classic, and for me to even say that is tantamount to saying that the Grand Canyon is grand. The thing needs no praise, especially from someone as insignificant as me. It is also unnerving because for me to criticize the book in any way is tantamount to my looking at a particular part of the Grand Canyon and saying, "Well, right here it does not look so grand." Again, I am insignificant, and Schellenberg is not. He is the hero of archivists—an archivist's archivist, if there ever was one. So, I confess at the beginning of this review that I am probably unqualified to say anything of this work.

In this book, Schellenberg discusses a wide variety of topics related to archives and records management. He begins by describing the way national archives programs developed in France (Archives Nationales in 1795), England (Public Record Office in 1838), and the United States (National Archives in 1934). The reasons for the existence of archives are governmental efficiency, cultural preservation, personal interest, and official (i.e. so a government can do its work.) He notes that records must meet at least two qualifications to be considered archives. First, they must be "created or accumulated to accomplish some purpose." Second, they must "be preserved for reasons other than which they were created or accumulated." He also notes the Jenkinson believed a third qualification was necessary; an archive must have "the possibility of proving an unblemished line of responsible custodians."

Schellenberg points out a couple of fundamental differences between archives and libraries. First, they differ in holdings. The materials holdings of libraries were created in a different manner from the holdings of archives. Likewise, the way a library acquires its holdings differs from the way an archive acquires its holdings. Libraries and archives also differ in their methods. The two types of institutions differ in the way they appraise, select, arrange, describe their respective materials. Still, each type of institution can benefit the other. Archivists should

also cooperate with record managers or officers. An archivist is concerned with the work of records managers because he or she will eventually receive their records, describe their records, and provide availability to their records in accord with policies that the originating institution set forth. Archivists should participate in discussions with records managers about how records are arranged. The two occupations have differing roles relating to the primary and secondary value of records. Record managers judge the primary value. Archivists ultimately judge the secondary value, although they receive input in this regard from records managers.

Schellenberg devotes a whole section to records management. This section deals primarily with government records. He contends that the nature of records is that they ever increase in number, volume, and complexity. The most difficult types of records to manage are the ones that are the most important. Records dealing with origins, policies, and procedures are attended with difficulty and do not pass quickly into non-current use. Each government agency should have a staff concerned with record keeping that works with an archivist to determine what records have enduring value. Records pass from current use in an agency's office, to non-current use in a records management center, to non-current use in an archives.

Schellenberg's section on archives covers several topics of importance with regard to archives. He addresses the conditions of archival management by pointing out that modern archives are difficult to deal with because they are difficult to identify and come in a variety of forms. Yet they must be maintained because they are often unique and are valuable for many purposes. Schellenberg pointed out that NARA basically separated the activities conducted in managing archives into four parts: disposition activities, preservation and arrangement activities, description and publication activities, and reference service activities. Work in an archives should be assigned by subject matter. Workers should generally understand archival principles, but they should also have background in a field of work that can complement the materials that they will work with in the archives. There should be an organizing plan to the work of an archives to ensure that the work on collections progresses evenly.

In discussing appraisal, Schellenberg notes that in America, two values determine whether or not records should be retained. Evidential value refers to the evidence that documents the function of the government that produced the records. There are three tests for determining evidential value: the position of each office in a structure, the functions performed by an office, and the activities carried out by an office. The most important records will usually come from the top of a hierarchy. Four types of records should be analyzed of evidential value: policy records, operating records, housekeeping records, and publications. Informational value refers to records providing information about persons, corporations, events, and problems. When appraising records for informational value, the archivist is not always concerned with their provenance. Basically, appraisal means the archivist is to consider the various types of research for which scholars can use the records. Schellenberg conceives of the archivist as historically trained. When archivists encounter a particular type of information in records with which they are unfamiliar, they should consult a scholar familiar with that type of research to see if the records are significant.

Schellenberg briefly touches upon preservation practices. If any section of this work could be strengthened, it is the section on preservation. He points out that the two types of threats to records are internal and external (environmental). He says that good facilities are necessary to an archives and will generally eliminate the external threats. He points out that records are often threatened by materials intrinsic to them. He also says that at the time of his writing, laminating was an acceptable and preferred means of preservation activity for paper. He notes that this practice was in the process of evaluation.

Schellenberg's discussion of arrangement is quite helpful, particularly because he recounts the history of terms such as *fonds*, *respect des fonds*, provenance, and original order. He points out that the principles of archival arrangement are quite different from the principles of record keeping, primarily because archivists arrange records from multiple agencies in a way that demonstrates their relation to one another. He recounts the history of arrangement first by considering Europe. France's *Archives Nationales* originally had subject based arrangement

developed by Camus and Daunou. In 1839, however, Guizot departed from this system and proposed that records be grouped in *fonds* according to the creating institution. In 1841, the term *respect des fonds* first occurred in a circular produced by the Minister of the Interior, Count Duchatel. However, within the *fonds*, France still arranged by subject. Prussia (i.e. Heinrich von Sybel, 1881) extended this concept by developing the idea of provenance, claiming that an archives should group according to the administrative units and maintain the arrangement of the creating agency. The Dutch extended these ideas and claimed that records should be arranged according to the original order of the registry. Finally, English archivists, particularly Jenkinson, claimed that archivists should never transgress original order, even in regards to miscellaneous items within records.

In America, archivists for the National Archives faced several problems. First, they had to determine what to call groups of records because their groups differed somewhat from European records. They settled on the term "record group." Second, they had to decide how to divide the records of various agencies within the departments of NARA. Third, they had to decide on how to arrange record groups. Finally, they had to decide how to arrange records within record groups. Schellenberg concludes this subject by suggesting that several things. First, records should be in separate units according to agency. The holdings of archives should be divided into units or groups. They should maintain records in the order in which they were received. Finally, records being used for informational purposes should be arranged in the way that best serves scholars.

Schellenberg discusses description by noting that it has four basic elements: authorship, physical type, title of the unit, physical structure of the unit. In America, records are modern in form and content. Very few records predate the 19th century. At the National Archives, they divide their records into approximately 300 record groups and use two different schemes to describe their records. The provenance scheme is the preferred method. Here, the archivists describe record groups according to their hierarchy and administrative function. They produce finding aids in various stages of development for all record groups. The National

Archives also sparingly uses a pertinence scheme of description. They occasionally develop either reference information papers or detailed lists about special topics. Obviously, this method cannot be applied to entire repositories.

Schellenberg briefly addresses publication before turning his attention to reference in the final chapter. Here he looks at the policies governing access and use. He argues that archivists should encourage openness of records for the public good and discourage unreasonable limitations on access. However, doing what is best for the public good also means that certain types of records, such as those that pertain to the security of the nation, present foreign affairs, confidential business information, or personal information, should have very limited or restricted access. Schellenberg also makes several points concerning use. First, all users should be treated similarly. Second, reasonable requests should ideally be filled in order of importance, without regard for the status of the person making the requests. Archivists should, however, ask for identification to ensure that the patron is trustworthy. Likewise, patrons should sign a statement acknowledging that they received the materials. Lending (as opposed to using) of materials should be discouraged, although it is sometimes appropriate to lend records to the creating agency. Finally, reproduction services are generally appropriate, as are certain types of information services requests.

Yakel, Elizabeth. *Starting an Archives*, Chicago: Society of American Archives and Scarecrow Press, 1994.

Elizabeth Yakel's *Starting an Archives* is an entry level book on how one should go about starting an archival program within an institution. Yakel begins her work by noting that the term archive can denote the official noncurrent records of an institution, the agency that preserves such records, or the building in which such records are housed. Yakel distinguishes between archives and manuscripts by pointing out that manuscripts can refer to an individual's papers, a collection of items put together by a person or persons, or individual items obtained because of some special significance. In short, an archive is produced by an institution and a manuscript is produced by a person.

An institution that starts an archive has crucial decisions to make about the institutional commitment, archival staff, and archival facilities. The institution has to decide if it wants to commit the time, money, and resources to starting such a program. The benefits are great in terms of preservation, but they can be expensive. Some institutions may let an outside agency care for their records. If an institution decides to start an archive, the administration should give the archive authority over records and place it as an independent wing within the institution, probably under a vice president. It must also commit to funding such things as staff compensation, a supply budget, and education. The selection of archival staff should be limited to persons who are active workers that are interested in preserving records. The archives is not just a place to send older workers so they can retire. The people who work within archives should immerse themselves in archival culture. Finally, an archives must be willing to invest what can be a substantial amount of money to the upkeep of a building in which to house the archive.

Yakel contends that several documents are necessary to the formation of an archive. First, the archive needs a statement of authority, that delineates where the archive falls within the hierarchy of the institution. The archive also needs a mission statement that describes what the archive documents, how the program was initiated, what materials it collects, and what groups it

serves. Additionally, the archive needs a document that sets forth the plans and priorities of the archive for both the long and short terms. Finally, the archive needs to have an annual report, a collection development policy, a description of positions, a budget, and an advisory board.

Yakel provides an in depth look at what elements should be included in a collection development policy. She contends that one of the first things that an archive needs to do is survey their records to see exactly what materials comprise the materials. This process informs both the mission and the collection development policy of the institution. Archivists should also make a practice of appraising records within their institution in order to determine which records are of enduring value. Likewise, archivists should maintain intellectual control over their materials via paperwork. There should be a clear paper trail from the time of accessioning all the way through the life of the materials until, if necessary, deaccessioning. This paper trail includes an accession record, a deed of gift or transfer form, and a deaccession list.

Yakel's chapter on arrangement and description defines several useful concepts. Provenance is the concept that records from one creator should not be mixed with those of another. Record Groups are records that are arranged together and related because of provenance. A series is a division of similarly organized materials created by the **creator of the records**. All arrangement of records is to take place with these concepts, as well as the idea of original order, in mind. Yakel contends there are five levels of arrangement: repository, record group, series, file unit, and item. One essential feature of records description is the finding aid. Yakel says this is comprised, at minimum, of two parts: an orientating narrative section, and a file or container list.

Articles

Altman, Burt., and John R. Nemmers. "The Usability of On-line Archival Resources: The Polaris Project Finding Aid," *The American Archivist* 64 (2001): 121-131.

This article describes the way that the libraries of Florida State University planned for the first phase of the Pepper OnLine Archival Retrieval and Information System (POLARIS) project. The Pepper Collection is a collection of politician Claude Pepper's papers. The first phase of the project provides a finding aid and search engine for the collection. Later stages in the project will provide online digital copies of items in the collection. Before beginning in earnest, the FSU archivists had to survey the literature about such projects. They knew that in the first phase of the project they would need to design user studies, brainstorm about and evaluate potential users, measure user responses. To determine how to design user studies, they contacted Jakob Nielsen in order to get his advice. He recommended that they use real potential users, and that they keep their questions short. When the project finally launched, the staff used log files on servers to determine how many users were using the finding aids. The Pepper Collection actually generated a substantial amount of interest and justified the practice of putting finding aids on the web, contrary to the concerns of archivists such as Richard Cox about online finding aids not being useful to users.

Bastian, Jeannette Allis. "A Question of Custody: The Colonial Archives of the United States Virgin Islands," *The American Archivist* 64 (2001): 96-114.

In 1917, Denmark transferred custody of the islands now known as the U. S. Virgin Islands to the United States. When they did so, Danish officials also packed up almost all the records pertaining to the colonial history of the islands and took them to Copenhagen. The United States took all the remaining documentary evidence and put it in the National Archives. This causes a problem for the people of these islands, because they now have a fundamental disconnect from the records that document their early history. Bastian surveys the colonial history of these islands, noting that they were originally controlled by the Danish West India

Trading Company. The history of the islands is fraught with slave trading and rebellion. Danish authorities kept very good records in the Danish language from the earliest times of the Danish occupation of the islands. Already, the people of the island had a disconnect with their records because they could not speak the language. Denmark eventually obtained about 4000 linear feet of records from the islands. The transfer of the islands to U. S. custody specified that all records were the custody of either Denmark or the U. S. The author notes that the division of records between the U. S. and Denmark was slipshod. Bastian argues that two factors, the principle of provenance and the intent of the treaty to make records accessible to islanders, suggest that the records should have remained on the islands.

Church, John A. "William J. Barrow: A Remembrance and Appreciation," *The American Archivist* 68 (2005): 152-160.

This article occurs in volume 68, but the data at the bottom of the article says that it is volume 67 from 2004. It is not. This article examines the life and work of William J. Barrow. Barrow was a pioneer in the field of document restoration, and he developed techniques for deacidification and reinforcing paper. Church wants to correct recent prevailing notions about Barrow that stem primarily from the publication of Nicholson Baker's book, *Double Fold*. In *Double Fold*, Baker contends that librarians have waged an "assault on paper," through the use of microfilm and certain preservation techniques. In the book, Baker criticized Barrow's deacidification process, his lamination process, his accelerated aging tests for paper. He also accuses Barrow of basically plagiarizing the idea for deacidification. Church was qualified to write the article about Barrow mainly because he was Barrow's research assistant. He provides in depth information about why Baker is wrong in his assessment of Barrow. He also shares some deficiencies that he saw in Barrow, lest one think that he was merely a devoted Barrow apologist.

Chute, Tamar G. and Ellen D. Swain. "Navigating Ambiguous Waters: Providing Access to Student Records in the University Archives," *American Archivist* 67 (2004): 212-233.

The authors of this article point out that archivists' fear of compliance with Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) will probably have a negative effect on the amount of information about students that is available for historical research in the future. They recount the history of the development of FERPA. They note that most legislators have not considered the negative effect on research that the FERPA legislation produces. They point out that very few publications on archives have addressed the issue, despite the fact that many archivists struggle with knowing how to apply FERPA.

The authors surveyed a large number of university archives in order to find out how archivists respond to FERPA, and they supply the processed data from these surveys in the article. Their conclusions from the surveys are that most archivists are unsure exactly how to react to FERPA, and the way institutions seek to coordinate adherence to FERPA with access to records differs widely from institution to institution. The authors conclude the article by urging that archivists become involved in lobbying for greater access. Additionally, they urge that the SAA should establish best practices guidelines that would instruct archivists in how to comply with FERPA and grant a great degree of access to records for research purposes.

Cloonan, Michele V., and Shelby Sanett. "Preservation Strategies for Electronic Records: Where We Are Now--Obliquity and Squint?," *American Archivist* 65 (2002): 70-106.

This article presents the results of a survey to determine the way in which institutions are seeking to preserve authentic electronic records. These results are from the first round of a three round study on preservation of electronic records. The authors conducted the survey with a limited set of institutions, almost all of whom were involved with InterPARES. This, of course, meant that most of these institutions were already working to preserve electronic formats in some form or fashion. The authors used open ended responses to almost all of the questions, to help draw forth the various types of methodologies that institutions were using to address the problem. The authors offer several pages that summarize the answers to a variety of questions posed to participants. The authors conclude with three main points. First, they notes that dealing

with electronic media, which by its nature is ephemeral, has caused individuals within these institutions to broaden their definition of preservation. Second, they found that institutions try to address the problem of preserving electronic records without carefully evaluating the costs involved beforehand. Third, they found that most of the institutions did not have a preservation policy dedicated to dealing with electronic records. On the contrary, most seemed to simply fly by the seat of their pants with regards to preserving these items. At best, they wrote the policy as they pursued their work. The authors take note of the fallacious nature of such thinking.

Cox, Dwayne. "The Rise of Confidentiality: State Courts on Access to Public Records During the Mid-twentieth Century," *American Archivist* 68 (2005): 313-322.

Dwayne Cox's article describes the gradual shift that occurred in American jurisprudence with regard to public records. Prior to the late 1800s, America upheld the English common law tradition that stressed that access to public records was dependent upon demonstrating "a 'direct and tangible' interest in the information." American law shifted, though, as more and more people began to believe that access to these records was a right for citizens. As the push for access increased, more and more types of records were deemed confidential. Cox sets forth the history of legal cases regarding public records in the United States.

Several salient points emerge from Cox's article. The situation Cox describes seems to suggest that courts were more likely to say that businesses had a tangible interest than individuals. Cox notes that Kentucky was one of the most staunch adherents to the common law standard, which is interesting to me if for no other reason than I live in Kentucky. It also seems, from the article, that often the requirements for confidentiality were applied unevenly and often in defense of the government's interests, rather than the public's good, not that these two things have to be exclusive of one another. Finally, Cox notes that the laws that restrict access to records are often given names that stress the openness of records, which is a practice that he detests.

Cox, Richard J. "Lester J. Cappon and the Relationship of History, Archives, and Scholarship in the Golden Age of Archival Theory," *American Archivist* 68 (2005): 74-112.

In this article, Richard Cox discusses the life and career of Lester J. Cappon, a longtime member of the Society of American Archivist and an early proponent of the public history movement. Cox admits that he disagrees with Cappon on many subjects, but he concedes that Cappon was an important figure in American archival science. For example, Cappon takes a historian's approach to archives, and he resisted the influence of librarians and library schools on archivists; Cox takes a records approach to archives, and teaches at a library school. Although Cappon was a contemporary of Jenkinson, Norton, and Schellenberg, his writings are now largely unknown and unused in archival science courses. Cappon was fairly influential during his lifetime, serving as the president of the Southern Historical Association, the SAA, and the Association of Documentary Editors. Although he was from Milwaukee, much of Cappon's career took place in Virginia. He helped edit the *Bibliography of Virginia History Since 1865*, and he served as an archivist at the University of Virginia, managed the Virginia Historical Records Survey, and oversaw Williamsburg's Archives and Records Department. Cappon conceived of the archivist as being "somewhere between the librarian and historian." Although he worked as an archivist and a records manager, at heart he was really a manuscript curator. He introduced a generation of history students to documentary editing. He emphasized the need for annotations in documentary editing.

Cox, Richard J. "Public Memory Meets Archival Memory: The Interpretation of Williamsburg's Secretary's Office," *American Archivist* 68 (2005): 279-296.

This article discusses the Secretary's Office in Williamsburg, Virginia, which was the first public records office in the United States. The structure was completed in 1748, so it predates both the revolution and the establishment of the republic. Cox notes that it is "the only original Colonial central government building extant." However, most people, including historians and archivists, seem to know and care very little about the history behind the Secretary's Office. This is true in spite of the fact that the building exists in Williamsburg, which is a type of Mecca for American history buffs.

Cox examines the history of the interpretation of the office, pointing out that very little emphasis has been placed upon the office as a records office. It has been used for exhibitions and public speeches, but because, in all likelihood, many consider records to be boring, this original intent of its use has not been highlighted very well. Cox concludes that this lack of emphasis on records keeping and archives as a function of the building needs to be corrected. Indeed, it is ironic that a town that so often relies on archival sources would fail to emphasize archival science. He hopes that this will be corrected by the 400th anniversary of Virginia in 2007, and he suggests a possible layout for an exhibit about archives and records keeping in the Secretary's Office.

Craig, Barbara L. "Perimeters with Fences? Or Thresholds with Doors? Two Views of a Border," *American Archivist* 66 (2003): 96-101.

This article by Barbara Craig was written in response to several articles in the same issue of the journal that examined user expectations. She responds in six points. First, she points out that these articles did a good job at determining users expectations and methodologies. She suggests that similar research should be done to determine how archivists conduct their work, transfer knowledge, and differentiate novices from professionals. Second, she claims that the language of the archival profession often serves as a barrier for patrons. Third, she says that we need to understand the community borders that differentiate various types of users. Fourth, in thinking about how to implement the changes mentioned, she suggests that rather than serving the long tail, archivists should focus on activities and projects that cross the borders of groups. Fifth, only archivists can promote the type of information she is talking about. Finally, she says that knowing users' habits will help archivists prepare to better serve users.

Dingwall, Glenn. "Trusting Archivists: The Role of Archival Ethics Codes in Establishing Public Faith," *American Archivist* 67 (2004): 11-30.

This article examines the reasons that archives professionals should have a code of ethics to which they subscribe. Dingwall argues that on the continuum between occupations that

are and are not professions, archivists fall somewhere in the middle. This leads him to ask why archivists should subscribe to a code of ethics. His main contention is that archivists should subscribe to a professional code to foster a trust of archivists by the public. Archivists have complex professional relationships with their various constituencies. Archivists must balance their commitments to both records creators and patrons, and serve as a mediator between the two. They must also answer to their employers.

Dingwall surveys the various differences in the codes of several professional archives organizations. He notes that all of them are deontologically based yet include teleological elements. He argues that archivists need to be active in comparing and revising ethical codes to include more teleological language. He believes that such actions will increase the public's trust and understanding of the archival profession. Archivists should be aware of these codes and use them in carrying out their work. Likewise, they should educate others about archival ethics.

Dow, Elizabeth H., and others. "The Burlington Agenda: Research Issues in Intellectual Access to Electronically Published Historical Documents," *American Archivist* 64 (2001): 292-307.

The Burlington meeting was an interdisciplinary gathering of various experts on several different types of electronic publishing to discuss how to set standards for a particular project (i.e. The George Perkins Marsh On-line Research Center) and how those standards could be applied to other projects. The need for the discussion stems from the fact that users need intellectual access to scholarly electronic editions of published works, similar to the indexes and footnotes found at the end of scholarly printed documents. They noted that there were several issues that they needed to address in this project, such as potential users, tacit web knowledge of users, the best markup for the project, interoperability of data with other systems, whether or not to use hyperlinking to external documents, the capabilities for retrieving information, ubiquity and findability of information to users, and publication practices. Rather than proposing any type of standards, the Burlington meeting narrowed in on the fundamental issues and proposed the

different types of professionals that should gather to address these fundamental issues. They recommend collaboration of professionals from these areas to address these issues.

Doylen, Michael. "Experiments in Deaccessioning: Archives and On-line Auctions" *American Archivist* 64 (2001): 350-62.

Doylen notes that archivists often finding, in the course of their work, items that fall outside of their collection development policy, but that still have significant financial value. In this article, Doylen addresses whether or not it is legal, ethical, or practical to use web based auction sites for deaccessioning materials. Doylen surveys the literature related to deaccessioning material and notes that neither Schellenberg nor Jenkinson suggested that one should deaccession material already in an archives. An article by Leonard Rapport in 1981 (this is the same article that is mentioned in one of the books above) was the first to suggest that archivists should examine records to see if they need to be reduced or deaccessioned. He notes that before deaccessioning materials, an archivist should consult the deed of gift to make sure the action is not restricted. He should also seek to find another repository for the collection, if there is one. He describes the way that the Archives of the University of Wisconsin explored using eBay by obtaining permission from the university, addressing the legal restrictions, considering the impact on donor relations, and determining how to use the proceeds generated from the sale of the materials. They used the funds to underwrite their own acquisitions program, and they made approximately \$2300 in six months.

Ericson, Timothy L. "Building Our Own 'Iron Curtain': The Emergence of Secrecy in American Government" *American Archivist* 68 (2005): 18-52.

This article was the 2004 presidential address at the Society of American Archivist's annual meeting. Ericson begins his address by contending that the U.S. Government had created an "iron curtain" of secrecy around records. He seems to rely heavily upon Daniel Patrick Moynihan's *Secrecy: The American Experience* in this article. Ericson recounts several recent examples of government secrecy, and then he points out that many archivists have been largely

silent on the issue of government secrecy, despite archival literature and ethical codes that urge archivists to provide access. He divides efforts at government secrecy in the U.S. into three distinct periods: 1774-1870, 1870-1940, and 1940-2004.

Ericson points out that government officials were conducting secret business even prior to the American Revolution by making transactions for munitions under cover of secrecy. The signing of the Declaration of Independence was a secret event, and Washington's administration, the First Continental Congress, and Congress all kept classified and secret information. The extent of secrecy increased with events like the trial of Aaron Burr and the advent of new munitions technologies during the Civil War. The apathy of Americans in general and government officials in particular toward public records also contributed to many records remaining secret with little to no public outcry.

During the second period, American legislators tailored their legislation regarding secrecy after procedures that were used in Great Britain. Because of various concerns to national security, more and more types of records became classified, including records such as patents. Ericson seems to equate some civil liberties issues, such as anti-sedition legislation and censorship legislation, with government secrecy. Ericson believes that during the third period, "Conspiracy, loyalty, and secrecy became the forces that fed off one another and led to the establishment of the uncoordinated approach to information security that today is scattered throughout the federal government." Executive orders from the president authorized a great amount of classified information. The Atomic Energy Act (1946) and the National Security Act (1947) fostered the creation of much classified information. Ericson notes that even the budget of the CIA was classified until 1987. Ericson concludes by urging members of the SAA to become informed on these issues, to cooperate with other groups that encourage access to records, to encourage public official to grant access to records, and to become active in promoting civil liberties.

Duff, Wendy M., and Catherine A. Johnson. "Where is the List with All the Names? Information-Seeking Behavior of Genealogists," *American Archivist* 66 (2003): 79-95.

Anyone who has worked in an archives for more than two weeks cannot help but snicker at the title of this article. The authors point out that during the 1990s many archivists became interested in the searching habits of their users. This is the first study dedicated exclusively to finding out the habits of genealogists, a numerically significant block of archival users. Duff and Johnson try to discover how genealogists find relevant material, how they conduct research, and how they use the various information sources available in archives. To conduct the study, the authors surveyed a small sample that consisted of both amateur and professional genealogists. Genealogists generally start with names of family members, then they gather information about individuals within the families, then they flesh out the details about the person. This process is not always that linear. Expert genealogists often start by searching for background information about the time period being studied. Genealogists will often use names, dates, geographical locations, and specific genres of material to try to find the information they need. Genealogists also contact people such as archivists and other genealogists to help them find what they need. They are more open to other genealogists than to archivists, and novice genealogists are often unfamiliar with the archives system, thus making it take longer to find the information they need. Efficient access is a necessity for genealogists, especially for professional ones who charge their clients by the hour.

Gilliland-Swetland, Anne J. "Archival Research: A 'New' Issue for Graduate Education,"
American Archivist 63 (2000): 258-270

This article discusses the new emphasis on archival research that is taking place in several archival science schools, but most specifically at UCLA. The author contends for "pluralism in graduate education," with regard to the various disciplines within which archivists are educated. The Archives and Preservation Management specialization at UCLA combines research and professional skills into one curriculum to emphasize their integrated nature. The author notes that requiring research concentrations can occur on the graduate, doctoral, or post-doctoral levels. She points out that understanding research methodology matters because it helps

archivists understand their field's literature, recognize good research questions, understand ethical concerns, prepare for research, and conduct research. Additionally, placing this emphasis at the graduate level will prepare archivists for pursuing doctoral education.

Greene, Mark. "The Power of Meaning: The Archival Mission in the Postmodern Age," *American Archivist* 65 (2002): 42-55.

Mark Greene contends that some archival science writers have tried to narrow the concepts of records, archivists, and archives. Greene believes that this tendency falls short of the best description of these terms. He notes that there are now two competing paradigms among archivists worldwide: the archival paradigm and the recordskeeping paradigm. Those holding to the archival paradigm hold in correct tension the balance between understanding records as evidence and understanding them as memory. The recordskeeping paradigm, on the other hand leans to far to the evidence end of the spectrum, and either ignores or significantly minimizes the societal and historical obligations incumbent upon archivists to preserve memory. Greene contends that this view damages the archival profession by diminishing "the historical record by narrowly defining the archival purview," as preserving transactional records. It also misunderstands the need for institutional and collecting archivists. Finally, it ignores the "value" of non-transactional records. Greene seems to encourage two things: acceptance of the archival paradigm, and listening to the wisdom in postmodernism, which does not narrowly, nor objectively, define the task of archives *a priori*.

Hensen, Steven L. "Revisiting Mary Jane, or, Dear Cat. Being Archival in the 21st Century," *The American Archivist* 65 (2002): 168-175.

Let me begin this review by duly noting that it has nothing to do with either marijuana, or a song by Tom Petty. If that's why you stopped by here, you will be sorely disappointed. "Revisiting Mary Jane," was Steven Hensen's presidential address at the 2002 Society of American Archivists meeting in Birmingham, Alabama. Hensen reflected that a past SAA president had presented his address in the form of letters that he wrote to an aspiring archivist.

Hensen wanted to do the same in his address, so he presented letters he wrote to a former Duke University archival assistant.

Hensen wanted his protégé to understand several things about being an archivist in the 21st century. He noted the advantages that this former assistant had because she wanted to be an archivist since she was in the sixth grade. He talked about the quality of archival programs that were now available, compared to the scarcity of such programs during his time of education. He pointed out that the concept of archives was now an "in" thing and that in many ways, archivists would lead the information technologies fields because they had been used to managing information and ensuring authenticity for generations. Hensen also went to great lengths to promote the use of standards and to point out the benefits of being part of an association like the Society of American Archivists.

Hickerson, H. Thomas. "Ten Challenges for the Archival Profession" *American Archivist* 64 (2001): 6-16.

In this article, Hickerson addresses and describes ten challenges that he feels the archival profession must address. He believes that archivists must learn to manage the entire lifespan of electronic records. He notes that failure to address this problem will result in a lack of relevance. He believes we must work to preserve non-textual holdings like images and sound recordings. He believes that archivists should view their task as global, and that they should collect materials that come from a variety of cultures. He thinks that archivists need to work to create access to contemporary records. He believes archivists should do things to make their collections more accessible to the short head of their main constituencies, while at the same time encouraging use of collections by the long tail of users that may not use the archives often. He thinks archivists should focus on collecting records that document under documented groups. He believes He believes that archivists should do more research on the relationship between archives and information management. He thinks that archivists should work to strengthen professional archival associations. He believes archivists should encourage participation with those who are

in other fields that can help augment the work of an archives. Finally, archivists must work to ensure that the public trusts them to preserve its evidence.

Hirtle, Peter B. "Archives or Assets?" *American Archivist* 66 (2003): 235-247.

This article by Peter Hirtle looks at the issues regarding archival holdings, copyright, property rights, and profitability. Hirtle points out that archival holdings are often extremely valuable and costly. He notes that many archivists would like for their institutions to profit from their holdings, and they often see digitization as a means to that end. He notes that because of copyright, property rights, and public domain issues, licensing for such projects should be carefully thought out because these issues are extremely complex. He says that with any collection, an archives could have at least four relationships that were possible concerning property rights and copyright. An archives may not own property rights or copyright. If it does have property rights, the archives, a third party, or the public domain may hold copyrights. He points out that unpublished holdings in an archives can be copied and sent to another repository for preservation without violating copyright. Some congressional leaders would like to abolish the public domain. Some institutions want to use quasi-copyright control because of their physical control of collections to maintain their profitability in the collections. Museums are particularly bad in this regard. Hirtle offers legal, ethical, principled, and practical arguments for why such control will ultimately fail.

Hodson, Sara. "In Secret Kept, In Silence Sealed: Privacy in the Papers of Authors and Celebrities," *American Archivist* 67 (2004): 194-211.

Keeping the private papers of living individuals can often be a difficult task because much of the content of their correspondence may be extremely private and sensitive. When keeping these types of papers, archivists run the risk of compromising the individual's privacy rights through allowing patrons to intrude into the person's private affairs or expose embarrassing facts about the person. However, the situation does not necessarily go away at the creator's death. Other individuals are often mentioned in private papers, or there are letters in the collection that

they have written. In this article, Hodson recounts the difficulties that attend archivists who are trying to balance privacy rights and access for the papers that belonged to various types of celebrities.

Hodson notes four reasons why handling these types of papers are more difficult than handling traditional historical collections. First, they are by nature high profile, because their creators were high profile. Second, because they are private papers, they deal with individuals instead of events. Third, copyright issues often come to the fore when dealing with these papers. Fourth, because of the nature of competition for these types of unique papers, archivists are forced to try to obtain the papers while the creators are still living. Hodson notes that there are no good answers for how to deal with the situations. She recommends being familiar with privacy issues and setting guidelines within which an archives can try, as much as possible, to protect a creator's privacy. I just wish Howard Gottlieb had given us the answer before he passed away.

Hyry, Tom, Diane Kaplan, and Christine Weideman "'Though This Be Madness, Yet There is Method in 't': Assessing the Value of Faculty Papers and Defining a Collecting Policy " *American Archivist* 65 (2002): 56-69.

This article is a report of the results of a study that the staff or the archives at Yale University undertook to determine a collecting policy for faculty papers. The staff sought to determine the types of materials that they should collect and the faculty from whom they should collect them. They first surveyed the available literature on faculty papers, and by chance stumbled across an article on the Minnesota Method, an acquisitions method developed by the Minnesota Historical Society. The method is a highly pragmatic, six step process for appraisal that blends several competing methodologies. The method helped them develop an appropriate policy for their institution. The policy suggests that they collect from people of influence, trailblazers and researchers, good teachers, and people with "important university records." To determine who these people were, the staff had to do research on potential candidates. They applied a "C. Vann Woodward" test. Teachers had to have a wide influence comparable to the imminent southern historian for them to keep their papers. They also decided to require a vita

and picture from all faculty. Since implementing the policy, it has helped the Yale staff deal with thorny situations, like ones in which they had to decline to take a deceased professor's papers.

Johnson, Catherine A. "Chatting Up the Archivist: Social Capital and the Archival Researcher," *The American Archivist* 65 (2002): 113-129.

Johnson and Duff propose that researchers develop relationships with archivists (and other information specialists, I would add) to find resources for research more effectively. In this article, they examine the way that researchers go about building these relationships. They believe this is a significant question because the advent of the World Wide Web may change this relationship. The authors wrote a previous article that looked at the information seeking behavior of historians. In this article, they look at the behavior of not only historians, but also PhD students. They base their research on interviews conducted with the historians and the students, and research journals kept by the students. They found that historians valued archivists' knowledge of their records' scope, content, arrangement, and provenance, much of which was yet unpublished. PhD students relied heavily on archivists to explain how to use archives.

Most of the respondents felt that gaining the trust of an archivist was necessary in order to gain access to records. This was especially true in the context of religious archives. Many times, relationships developed through spending time in the archives and through "chatting" with an archivist. The authors note that the relationships between archivists and historians are often reciprocal. Some of the PhD students admitted that they were intimidated about visiting the archives. The authors conclude by noting that younger researchers may miss out on developing these relationships because of their reliance upon the web.

Laver, Tara Zachary. "In a Class by Themselves: Faculty Papers at Research University Archives and Manuscript Collections," *The American Archivist* 66 (2003): 159-196.

This article examines faculty papers at ARL-libraries. Zachary wrote the article because there is very little research available that helps set forth policies and practices for dealing with this unique form of collection. She notes that there was only one survey of such

papers at research universities available, and that survey was published in 1983, twenty years prior to the publication of this article. Zachary selected twenty-four schools to participate in a survey about the "administration, acquisition, processing, and use of faculty papers, in addition to general information about the size of faculty collections in relation to other holdings."

The survey responses are insightful. The institutions surveyed were split between those who considered such collections archives and those who considered them manuscripts. Surprisingly, only 21% of these schools had a collection development policy that addressed faculty papers. The papers on average represent 22% of the manuscript holdings at these institutions. Most institutions that have a policy regarding the papers collect them to elucidate other records in their collections. Most have some sliding scale for evaluating papers based on the creators stature, involvement in the institution, and outside influence. Most of the institutions put a pretty high priority on processing these materials. They generally believe that full finding aids are in order for faculty papers. Most institutions find that faculty papers are used as much or more than the papers of individuals from outside the faculty. The overwhelming majority of users used faculty papers to write institutional history.

Loe, Nancy E. "Avoiding the Golden Fleece: Licensing Agreements for Archives," *The American Archivist* 67 (2004): 58-85.

Let me just say at the outset, so that I will always know, this article has several appendices that offer forms one can use in an archives. The forms include an application for permission to publish and a copyright restrictions warning replete with detailed conditions of use. I should have something similar to these in my forms manual, but it is nice to know that there are alternates if I need them. Licenses are agreements that allow the owner of intellectual property rights to grant their use to another individual or institution. New media (i.e. Multimedia) has created a demand for access to items in collections, especially visual items. Although many archivists thought licensing for including their collections in the new media would provide income for their repositories, often many of the publishing companies for new

media are under funded and never produce lucrative products. In short, archives may never receive one red cent for allowing publishers such as these to use their materials. Often publishers will try to obtain as many rights as they can, and they will present archives with licenses they created that grant them rights "throughout the universe." Archives should provide their own licenses in these situations. Licensing materials does have some unfavorable consequences. Archives must be familiar with their rights to ensure that they do not infringe on someone else's rights. Likewise, licensing your materials can lead to various types of misuse of collections. Loe offers about thirty different points to consider in deciding how to license one's materials.

MacNeil, Heather. "Picking Our Text: Archival Description, Authenticity, and the Archivist as Editor," *The American Archivist* 68 (2005): 264-278.

In this article, Heather MacNeil examines the issue of authenticity as related to archival description. She admittedly writes from a postmodern perspective, and she intends to reexamine an area that has largely been ignored. She argues that more work should be done examining the relationship between description and authenticity. She says that textual criticism offers a parallel for what the archivist often does in describing a collection, because both textual critics and archivists are trying, as much as possible, to describe an authentic representation of an original body of work.

She says that comparing textual criticism and description could mean several things. First, she contends that archivists should be up front about the nature of their work by admitting that they play an influential role on the way that later researchers interpret a collection. Second, she contends that finding aids are socio-historical texts, and that the changes that take place in them shape the way that researchers understand a collection. Third, she suggests that archivists should be open, in some way, to showing the various iterations of the text of a finding aid over time. This can be attained, largely, through the use of annotations, although one does not want to overuse them. She ends by noting that further exploration of this topic needs to be pursued.

Nesmith, Tom. "Seeing Archives: Postmodernism and the Changing Intellectual Place of Archives," *American Archivist* 65 (2002): 24-41.

Tom Nesmith wrote this article in order to shed more light on the way that postmodernism affects the way that archivists mediate information. He notes that for many years, archivists ignored the effects of this philosophical system upon their work. That changed with the publication of Derrida's *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Nesmith contends that if the means of human communication is as seriously impaired as postmodernists say it is, then all types of objective truth are in question. Archivists like Jenkinson tended to believe that archives "just happened," in much the same way that western thinkers believed that language was divinely ordained. Derrida contends that the entire process of communication is part of the process of "archivization." In a similar manner, archivists participate in this process by shaping the way that researchers view records. Nesmith contends that any archives work is a type of creation. Archiving sets records apart in a way that says, "this is what we need to know about it." The same is true of making finding aids. In doing so, the archivist suggests that all you need to know about these records is what is in this inventory. Archivists especially help create records today because of technology. Archivists often promote creating electronic records to be archived. NARA provides a good example of this trend because of its conscious effort to try to archive new electronic records of national importance.

O'Light, Michelle and Tom Hry. "Colophons and Annotations: New Directions for the Finding Aid," *American Archivist* 65 (2002): 216-230.

In this article, the authors address the problem of subjectivity within finding aids. Finding aids by nature are subjective. When archivists create finding aids, a process of selection takes place during which certain important contextual information is left omitted. Likewise, the items included in the finding aid only present one person's view of what is important within it. The authors note that postmodern theory, which stresses relativism and subjectivity, has already been applied to the field of archives in a variety of ways. The theory affected acquisition by making archivists focus on collecting the papers of under-documented groups. It also affected description by forcing archivists to recognize that even in striving to maintain original order,

they still use well-developed social constructs for ordering materials. Archival standards actually even help to mask the problem by lending "an aura of objectivity to our descriptions."

Although several responses to the problem have been suggested, these authors contend that adding colophons to finding aids could alleviate the problem. A colophon is a note that occurs at the end of a text and describes how the text was created. Within a colophon, the creator could describe information such as his or her education level and how he or she ordered the papers. Likewise, the use of annotations could allow either the creator or patrons to highlight or describe items within a collection. This could take place in text or electronically.

O'Sullivan, Catherine. "Diaries, On-line Diaries, and the Future Loss to Archives; or, Blogs and the Blogging Bloggers Who Blog Them," *American Archivist* 68 (2005): 53-73.

Catherine O'Sullivan's "Diaries, On-line Diaries, and the Future Loss to Archives," is a provocative look at the impact of the emerging blog culture on archives. In the article, Sullivan traces the historical development of both traditional diaries and blogs, notes similarities and differences between the two media, and offers recommendations for how to preserve blogs. Sullivan contends that traditional diaries really began to gain popularity in the seventeenth century due to the Reformation and the rise in literacy. Through the centuries, traditional diaries served a variety of functions. Some were private, but others were public. They were used them to confess sins, boast of exploits, keep financial records, keep calendars of activities, and reflect on their lives. Because of the types of subjects addressed, diaries often have significant evidential value.

Blogs show many similarities to personal diaries. Both are easily created with little expense. They can both be private or public, although blogs are generally public. Both contain a variety of types of content. Both diaries and blogs can provide examples that have great evidential value. Likewise, both can provide examples of writers who use them to air the private details of their lives publicly. There are differences, however. Diaries once tended to be a luxury because literacy was a luxury. Now, far more people can read and write, so the content in blogs

often varies greatly. More people probably participate in blogging than ever has been the case with traditional diaries. Blogs and diaries also obviously differ in format, with the latter being much easier to preserve because it exists in a physical format. O'Sullivan contends that the Internet Archive or a dedicated server with a web crawler could be used to preserve blogs, although both of these approaches could offer other legal challenges that would have to be addressed.

Patterson, David E. "A Perspective on Indexing Slaves' Names," *American Archivist* 64 (2001): 132-142.

Indexing slaves' names to provide access points for researchers can be extremely difficult, primarily because slaves often had no last name or took the last name of their owners. Patterson proposes using the owners name as the main reference point. He contends that this is in keeping with the way that records were kept at the time. Patterson notes that ignoring such names, or not putting them in finding aids, is a form of misrepresentation. He also admits that having a proper form for the name is difficult to do. He points out that often tracing the history or genealogy of a slave involves finding the slave's last owner and tracing the slave's history back through that family's history. This is why he suggests using an owner's name as a reference point. He notes that we should not do this with well-known slaves such as Harriet Tubman or Frederick Douglass. He recommends using a form that states the owner's name in brackets and the slave's name on the outside (i.e. [Boyce, James P.] Matilda). Different name forms should usually be listed separately unless the researcher is extremely intimate with the records and can verify that different name forms refer to the same persons. The fullest form of the forename is always preferred as the main slave name reference. Surnames are to be included, but they can represent several different types of relationships to other individuals. Additionally, prefixed names may be used to distinguish one slave from another.

Prom, Christopher. "The *EAD Cookbook*: A Survey and Usability Study," *American Archivist* 65 (2002): 257-275.

This article provides summary results of a survey and usability study of the *EAD Cookbook*, a guide designed to ease the implementation of the Encoded Archival Description standard for finding aids. Prom notes that many have questioned whether EAD is a viable option for archival institutions to use in producing finding aids because of the difficulties in implementing EAD creation. The *EAD Cookbook* was designed to help institutions use this standard, but Prom asks whether the cookbook itself is efficient and easy to use for archives. To determine this, Prom surveyed a number of individuals who had used the cookbook to create EAD finding aids at the institutions for which they work.

Prom surveyed individuals from institutions of various sizes. The result of Prom's survey highlighted several points. At the time of the survey, most of the respondents had not yet mounted their EAD finding aids on the internet. Many users had self-taught computer skills. Some felt that in order to use the cookbook, one had to have a pretty good handle on technology. Others felt that there were several bugs in it. Despite negative reaction by some respondents, others felt that the source was an invaluable tool to their EAD projects. Prom covers some basic points about the usability of EAD and the way people search. He supplies the results of a "Google test" to which he subjected finding aids from some of the institutions he surveyed. The results were less than to be desired on finding aids that had been modified in substantial ways that differed from the cookbook. He believes that the *EAD Cookbook* is an effective tool, but that more tools are needed for making EAD easier to implement.

Prom, Christopher. "User Interaction with Electronic Finding Aids in a Controlled Setting," *American Archivist* 67 (2004): 234-268.

This article presents the results of tests that were conducted by the archives at the University of Illinois to determine how different types of potential patrons interact with various types of electronic finding aids. Prom describes the methodology used for the tests. The tests used a variety of types of participants. Some had used archives before. Some were archival novices. Some had computer experience but no archives experience. Some had archives

experience, but little computer experience. The tests had a good mix of people that probably fairly represent the types of patrons an archivist would encounter. The participants were tested to see if they could find specific information at several types of sites. Some sites used searchable EAD, but others used non-searchable EAD, HTML, or PDF.

There were several points in the article in which I was particularly interested. First, Prom's findings regarding PDF were that most participants did not like it. Not surprisingly, they felt that it was bulky and it took a long time to search. Second, search interfaces should be fairly simple and straightforward, and they should "avoid archival terminology." Those participants who had either computer or archival experience were most successful and used the least amount of time to find what they needed. Clear mapping and browsing functions often helped searchers find what they need more efficiently than a search box. Prom also notes that users often use browser functions like CTRL+F to find the data for which they are searching. He suggests that archivists probably should not do anything that will cause this feature not to work (i.e. like dividing the finding aid up into multiple pages), unless they have a complex search system in place that can more than make up for it.

Robyns, Marcus C. "The Archivist as Educator: Integrating Critical Thinking Skills into Historical Research Methods Instruction" *American Archivist* 64 (2001): 363-384.

Marcus Robyns contends that university archivists can further the goals of education by incorporating critical thinking skills into their archival methods training courses. He points out that many states have tried to incorporate critical thinking into their public school curriculum. He contends that archivists are in the perfect position to advance these goals by using primary source materials to teach students to think critically. He offers eight criteria for what he believes critical thinking is, which includes, verification of facts, determining reliability, dealing with ambiguity, and calculating the strength of arguments. He notes that critical thinking is typically part of the historical method. Criticism is of two types, external, which deals with the context of records, and internal, which deals with the content of records. He points out that

librarians have long educated people on these skills, but archival literature barely addresses it. He describes the way that he implemented critical thinking elements into his program at Northern Michigan University by addressing issues like primary sources and historical research and having group discussion about these issues. He had the students evaluate this process to determine how effective it was.

Shuster, Robert. "Documenting the Spirit," *American Archivist* 45 (1982): 135-141.

Robert Shuster is archivist at Wheaton College's Billy Graham Center. In this article, Shuster contends that archivists of religious collections should work to document the enthusiasm that occurs in religious contexts. He notes that Gerald Ham pushed for archivists to select materials that would provide an accurate record of human experience. Shuster explains that enthusiasm is part of the record of human experience because it is part of the explanation for why people do the things that they do. Collecting these types of materials helps "create a true picture of the past."

Shuster points out that documenting enthusiasm is not an easy thing to do. Churches often have statistical information, and individuals often have personal papers, but these do not usually capture the essence of what Shuster is wanting. He contends that oral histories, folk art, music, and other such media would be appropriate sources for capturing a glimpse of enthusiasm, especially within a collection like his. Although this article is extremely brief and replete with several examples of the kinds of collections to which Shuster is referring, it is provocative in its application of Gerald Ham's criteria for selecting archival and manuscript materials. Every religious archivist should read Shuster's article. I only wish he published more often.

Stevens, Michael E. "Voices from Vietnam: Building a Collection from a Controversial War," *American Archivist* 64 (2001): 115-120.

Michael Stevens is the Wisconsin State Historian and the administrator of the Wisconsin State Historical Society. In this article he describes the way in which the society used

a book project to build a collection of Vietnam War-era materials. From the inception of the project, the society had both in mind, so neither of them was an accidental side effect. The project began with the publication of a similar book that provided excerpts of diaries from Wisconsin soldiers who served in the military from the Spanish American War until World War II. This work was derived from the society's collections. A Wisconsin congressman requested a similar work be made for Vietnam veterans, but the society had no such collections. The Wisconsin legislature provided funding for collecting diaries and letters of Vietnam veterans, and multiple divisions of the society cooperated to obtain these types of items. The staff of the society went to great lengths to obtain these items, even going so far as visiting Vietnam veterans' reunions to promote the project. The news media provided an additional boost to the project. The author notes that follow-up with contacts was essential, and that every donation resulted in the donor receiving a copy of the published book. The society initially borrowed much of the material, but many of the veterans eventually donated the material to the society.

Stark, Bruce. "The Archivist as Detective; Or, The Case of *Ledyard v. William Morgan*," *American Archivist* 67 (2004): 269-92.

In this account, Bruce Stark describes a security situation that occurred at the Connecticut State Library in Hartford between 2000 and 2002. In short, the staff of the library discovered that certain records which they believed had been in their custody were found in the Archives of the Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center. Complicating matters was the fact that the staff of the research center believed that they had obtained the records legitimately from a dealer. The staff of the state library believed the records were stolen. The missing records created a firestorm of controversy that launched the state library into media attention for well over two years.

Stark describes the research or detective methodology the staff of the state library used to determine their legitimate ownership of the records. Eventually, the records were returned, and the explanation for the crime was that the records had been stolen and sold by a man who stole

large numbers of records from the library twenty years earlier. The man had been caught and imprisoned shortly after he stole the records, but the staff of the library was unaware that these records had been stolen. From this account, Stark draws several conclusions about the value of records, security, and keeping good records about collections.

Swain, Ellen D. "Oral History in the Archives: Its Documentary Role in the Twenty-first Century," *American Archivist* 66 (2003): 139-158.

This article surveys the historical development of oral history in the United States. Swain notes that there was a close connection between oral history and archives when oral history began to be used in the U. S. The primary use for oral history during the early years was to fill in the gaps that were in archives. Swain notes that the discipline grew in popularity, especially during the 1990s. But despite the discipline's growth and archivists' involvement with it, very few archival publications during the 1990s specifically addressed the subject of Oral History.

Archivists have been split on the issue of whether or not to create oral histories because many of them question whether they can maintain neutrality and objectivity in the midst of creating materials. Others fault oral history for being a less than adequate because of the faulty memory of the interviewee. Swain answers by pointing out that oral history should be used carefully in conjunction with other records. Archivists and librarians should work together to make sure that oral histories are correctly labeled, have the correct bibliographic information, and are preserved in the best way possible. Likewise, both archivists and librarians should work to understand the needs of their users and to help meet those needs.

Tibbo, Helen R. and Lokman I. Meho. "Finding Finding Aids on the World Wide Web," *American Archivist* 64 (2001): 61-77.

This article surveys the findability of archival finding aids on the World Wide Web. The authors note that multiple standards (MARC-AMC, EAD) have been developed for placing finding aids on the web in some form or fashion. They point out that many believe that mounting

finding aids on the web makes them inherently more findable. This belief is common despite the fact that the various search engines on the web use a variety of different algorithms and methods of indexing. The authors wanted to test whether or not this was actually the case.

To test the findability of web based finding aids, the authors searched among nearly two-thousand archives listed on the University of Idaho Special Collections site. To be included in the project, an archive had to have at least 4 complete HTML finding aids mounted on the web. The finding aids had to have the minimum requirements for finding aids listed in Frederic Miller's *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts*. The author's finally selected a sample group of 25 institutions. They also selected six popular search engines with which to run their test. The authors tested each engine to see how it would find specific finding aids using either keywords or specific strings. They also tested to see if their results would improve if they searched multiple search engines. The researchers offer several sets of statistics on searching. Their findings are probably a bit dated by now, though. At the time of the writing of the article, they referred to Google as one of the lesser known search engines. However, their suggestions for how to improve searching are probably still valid. I would be interested to see how this same test would perform today, especially now that search engines like Google have the ability to find XML based finding aids such as EAD.

Tschabrun, Susan. "Off the Wall and into a Drawer: Managing a Research Collection of Political Posters," *The American Archivist* 66 (2003): 303-324.

Susan Tschabrun points out that political posters are extremely important cultural markers that often have a powerfully evocative message due to their combining word and image. She notes that libraries, archives, and museums typically resist collecting political posters, and if they do collect them, they generally do a pretty poor job of describing them and making them accessible. This article addresses the challenges that are attendant with taking care of this type of ephemeral collection. Political posters often have an inherent research value because they attest to the existence and power of minority factions within political spheres, and many scholars have

recently begun to study political posters. Because political posters are ephemeral and have an inherent obsolescence, she recommends that institutions who want to collect them should probably start by working with private collectors who have already started collections.

Tschabrun offers a lengthy discussion of all the attendant difficulties of cataloging posters. In short, determining sufficient cataloging data is usually very difficult. She recommends that posters be cataloged on the item level. Size, printing processes, and its public nature are all reasons that make preserving posters difficult. She also looks at all the difficulties that come with trying to digitize posters,

Tschan, Reto. "A Comparison of Jenkinson and Schellenberg on Appraisal," *The American Archivist* 65 (2002): 176-195.

The SAA awarded Reto Tschan the Theodore Calvin Pease Award in 2002 for this article. The article addresses the history of archival appraisal or selection. Tschan sets forth the respective selection theories of Jenkinson and Schellenberg. He says that Jenkinson stressed both authenticity and impartiality in archives largely through taking archivists out of the appraisal process. Jenkinson believed that the context of records was important and that any appraisal or selection of "valuable" records on the part of an archivist destroyed the context. He points out that Schellenberg's work was to be a rebuttal to Jenkinson's theories. Although Schellenberg stressed *respect des fonds*, he also contended that because modern records are bulky, some selection must take place. According to him, selecting the records to include in an archives takes place on the basis of secondary values. Archives are records that have enough secondary value to keep permanently.

Because bulky records were a problem, both Schellenberg and Jenkinson proposed solutions. Schellenberg believed that the archivist, in conjunction with records creators and other qualified consultants, should select which records are valuable enough to be retained. Jenkinson, on the other hand, believed that records creators should select which records are valuable enough to be retained while they are still in use. The archivist was a neutral party to the whole process.

Tschan points out that proponents later theories of appraisal, such as documentation strategy and functional analysis, tried to reject the theories of both Schellenberg and Jenkinson because they ultimately led to a narrow selection that does not provide sufficient documentation of society. Both of these strategies tried to somehow include society in the selection process. He notes that these theories still use Schellenberg's conception of value. Others have taken a "neo-Jenkinsonian" approach to records, wherein they agree to consult with records creators about what records should be created, but they do not select which records should be preserved. Tschan attributes the rise of Jenkinsonian theories in the U.S. to the rise of electronic formats. Some want to deal with these new formats by keeping in their contexts as much as possible. However, a post-custodial school has developed that wants to select electronic records that will be beneficial. This, of course, is closely tied to Schellenberg's value judgments.

Yakel, Elizabeth. "Encoded Archival Description: Are Finding Aids Boundary Spanners or Barriers for Users?" *Journal of Archival Organization* 2 (2004): 63-77.

This article addresses the usability of the Encoded Archival Description (EAD) standard for archival finding aids. Yakel points out that most of the attention on EAD has been on its development as a standard. While EAD is a good format for storing information about collections, Yakel asks whether it makes collections somewhat transparent to users. More specifically, she asks if EAD acts as a barrier or boundary spanner for patrons using archival collections. To determine the usability of EAD for patrons, Yakel set up a usability test using six subjects who were asked to find certain types of information within the finding aids of the Historic Pittsburgh Finding Aids at the University of Pittsburgh (<http://digital.library.pitt.edu/ead/>). The subjects used in this test were graduate students in information science, although not in archival science, so they would probably be more informed about the general concepts of information retrieval than average patrons.

In essence, the results of the findability test were not good. The subjects tested had several problems in using EAD finding aids to find specific information. Many of the tasks that

the subjects found difficult would probably have been less difficult had the site used some commonly accepted principles of web usability. Unfamiliar archival terms and unsophisticated search habits also complicated finding the required information. However, the subjects were able to find some of the information they needed. Ultimately, Yakei found that EAD finding aids ultimately act as both barriers and boundary spanners.